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## EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO[[@Headword:EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO]]

             or Paul's letter addressed to the Christian Church at the ancient and famous city of Ephesus (see below), that church which the apostle had himself founded (Act 19:1 sq.; comp.Act 18:19), with which he abode so long (τριετίαν, Act 20:31), and from the elders of which he parted with such a warm-hearted and affecting farewell (Act 20:18-35). SEE PAUL.

I. Authenticity. — This epistle expressly claims to be the production of the apostle Paul (Eph 1:1; Eph 3:1); and this claim the writer, in the latter of these passages, follows up by speaking of himself in language such as that apostle is accustomed to use in describing his own position as an  ambassador of Christ (Eph 3:1; Eph 3:3; Eph 3:8-9). The justice of this claim seems to have been universally admitted by the early Christians, and it is expressly sanctioned by several of the fathers of the second and third centuries (Irensus, adv. Haer. 5:2-3; 5:14; 5:3; Clemens Alexandr. Paedagog. 1:108; Protrept. 9:69, ed. Potter; Strom. 4:8, page 592; Origen, cont. Cels.3:20; 4:211, ed. Spencer; Tertullian, adv. Marc. 5:11; 5:17; De Prescr. Her. chapter 36; Cyprian, Testim.3:7, etc.); and after them the constant and persistent tradition of the ancient Church. Even Marcion did not deny that the epistle was written by Paul, nor did heretics refuse occasionally to cite it as confessedly due to him as its author lrcnaeus, Hesr. 1:8; 1:5; see Hug, Introd. Fosdick's transl. page 551; Hippolytus, Philosophumena, 6:34). In recent times, however, its genuineness has been somewhat vehemently called in question. The epistle is also cited as part of sacred Scripture by Polycarp (Ep. ed Philipp. c. 1; c. 12); and it is probably to it that Ignatius refers in writing to the Ephesians (c. 12; compare Cotelerii Annot. in loc.; Pearson, Vind. Ignatian. part 2, page 119; Lardner's Works, 2:70, 8vo). De Wette has attempted, from internal evidence, to set aside this external proof of the Pauline origin of this epistle; but his cavils have been so fully and satisfactorily answered by Schott (Isag. in N.T. page 260), Guerike (Beitrage zur hist. krit. Einleitung ins N.T. page 106), Hemsen (Der Ap. Paulus, page 130), Rickert (Der Br. Pauli an die Epheser, page 289), and others, that later De Wette himself, both in the introductory pages of his Commentary on this epistle (ed. 2, 1847), and in his Introduction to the N.T. (ed. 5, 1848), only labors to prove that it is a mere spiritless expansion of the epistle to the Colossians, though compiled in the apostolic age. Schwegler (Naehapost. Zeitalt. 2:330 sq.), Baur (Paulus, page 418 sq.), and others advance a step farther, and reject both epistles as of no higher antiquity than the age of Montanism and early Gnosticism. The objections adduced are chiefly the following:

1. The absence of any friendly greetings in this epistle, coupled with what are alleged to be indications of want of previous acquaintance on the part of the writer with the Ephesians, facts which, it is asserted, are incompatible with the supposition that it was written by Paul, whose relations with the Ephesian Church were so intimate.

2. The occurrence of words, and phrases, and sentiments, which indicate acquaintance with those Gnostic ideas which were familiar only at a period much later than that of the apostle.

3. The close resemblance of this epistle to the epistle to the Colossians, suggesting that the former is only an enlargement of the latter. The first of these objections may be passed by here, as the allegations on which it rests will be particularly considered when we come to the question of the destination of the epistle; at present it may suffice to cite the remark of Reuss in reference to the unreasonableness of such objections: "If Paul writes simple letters of friendship, they are pronounced insignificant, and so spurious, because there is a want of the didactic character in them; and, on the other hand, if this prevails, there is proof of the spuriousness of the writing in the absence of the other. What! must both elements always be united according to some definite rule? is it so with us? or are any two of Paul's epistles alike in this respect?" (Die Geschichte d. H. Schr. Neuen Test. page 104, 3d ed.) The second of the above objections has reference to such passages as Eph 1:21; Eph 2:7; Eph 3:21, where it is alleged the Gnostic doctrine of Sons is recognised; and to the expression πλήρωμα, Eph 1:23, as conveying a purely Gnostic idea; and to such words as μυστήριον, σοφία, γνῶσις, φῶς, σκοτία, etc. On this it seems sufficient to observe, without denying the existence of Gnostic allusions in this epistle, that, on the one hand, the objection assumes that, because Gnostic schools and systems did not make their appearance till after the age of the apostles, the ideas and words in favor with the Gnostics were unknown at an earlier period, a position which cannot be maintained, SEE GNOSTICS; and, on the other, that, because the apostle uses phraseology which was employed also by the Gnostics, he uses it in the same sense as they did, which is purely gratuitous and indeed untrue, for to confound the αἰῶνες and πλήρωμα of the apostle with the αἰῶνες and πλήρωμα of the Gnostics, as Baur does, only proves, as Lange has remarked, that "a man may write whole books on Gnostics and Gnosticism without detecting the characteristic difference between the Christian principle and Gnosticism" (Apostol. Zeitalt. 1:124).

With regard to the resemblance between this epistle and that to the Colossians, it can surprise no one that, written at the same time, they should in many respects resemble each other (see Klopper, De origine Epp. ad Ephesians et Colossians Gryph. 1853); but it does not require much penetration to discover the many points of difference between them, especially in the point of view from which the writer contemplates his main subject, the Lord Jesus Christ, in each; in the one as the prehistoric, pre- existent, supreme source of all things; in the other as the incarnate, historical, exalted, glorified head of the Church, to whom all things are subjected (comp. Eph 1:20-23, with Col 1:15-20; and  Lange, Ap. Zeit. 1:118). As for the alleged "copious expansion," that may be left to the judgment of the reader, as well as the counter notion of Schneckenburger, that the epistle to the Colossians is an epitome of that to the Ephesians made by Paul himself. On such objections in general, we may say with Reuss that "rash hypotheses, whatever acceptance they may have received, tell by their deficiency or strangeness, not against the epistle, but against themselves; and, in opposition to all cavils, the many traits which disprove the presence in the thoughts of a deceptive imitation by a foreign hand stand as valid arguments in its defense" (Gesch. page 104). For a detailed reply to the arguments of De Wette and Baur, the student may be referred to Meyer, Einleit. z. Ephesians page 19 sq., ed. 2; Davidson, Introd. to N.T. 2:352 sq., and Alford, Prolegomena, page 8.

II. The Readers for whom this Epistle was designed. — In the opening words, "'Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, to the saints that are in Ephesus and faithful in Christ Jesus," the words in Ephesus, ἐν Ε᾿φέσῳ, are omitted by the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., the cursive numbered 67, by Basil (expressly), probably by Origen, and possibly by Tertullian. This. combined with the somewhat noticeable omission of all greetings to the members of a church with which the apostle stood in such affectionate relation, and some other internal objections, have suggested a doubt whether these words really formed a part of the original text. On the subject of the persons addressed, therefore, two hypotheses have been principally entertained, besides the common opinion which, following the (disputed) reading in Eph 1:1, regards the party to whom it was sent as the Church at Ephesus. (See the Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol. 1866, page 129 sq., 742 sq.)

1. Grotius, reviving the opinion of the ancient heretic Marcion, maintains that the party addressed in this epistle was the Church at Laodicea, and that we have in this the epistle to that Church which is commonly supposed to have been lost. The view of Grotius, which has been followed by some scholars of eminent name, among whom are found Hammond, Mill, Venema, Wetstein, and Paley, rests chiefly on two grounds, viz. the testimony of Marcion, and the close resemblance between this epistle and that to the Colossians, taken in connection with Col 4:16. With respect to the former of these grounds, it is alleged that, as Marcion was under no temptation to utter a wilful falsehood in regard to the destination of this epistle, he probably had the authority of the Church at Laodicea, and, it may be, the tradition of the churches generally of Asia Minor, for  the opinion which he expresses (Grotius, Proleg. ad Ephes.; Mill, Proleg. ad N. Test. page 9, Oxon. 1707). But, without charging Marcion with designedly uttering what was false, we may suppose that, like some critics of recent times, this view was suggested to him by the apostle's allusion, in Col 4:16, to an epistle addressed by him to the Laodiceans. Nor is there the least ground for supposing that Marcion spoke in this instance on the authority of the Asiatic churches; on the contrary, there is every reason to believe the opposite; for not only do Origen and Clement of Alexandria, who were fully acquainted with the views of the Eastern churches on such matters, give.no hint of any such tradition being entertained by them, but Tertullian, to whom we are indebted for our information respecting the opinion of Marcio, expressly says that in that opinion he opposed the tradition of the orthodox churches, and imposed upon the epistle a false title, through conceit of his own superior diligence in exploring such matters (adv. Marc. Eph 5:17). With regard to the other argument by which this view is advocated, admitting the fact of a close resemblance between the epistle to the Colossians and that before us, and the fact that Paul had, some time before sending the former epistle, written one to the Church at Laodicea, which he advises the Colossians to send for and read, how does it follow from all this that the epistle to the Laodiceans and that now under notice were one and the same?

It appears more probable that, seeing the two extant epistles bear so close a resemblance to each other, had the one now bearing the inscription "to the Ephesians" been really the one addressed to the Laodiceans, the apostle would not have deemed it of so much importance that the churches of Colossee and Laodicea should interchange epistles. Such being the chief arguments in favor of this hypothesis (for those which, in addition, Wetstein alleges from a comparison of this epistle with that to the Church at Laodicea, in the Apocalypse, are not deserving of notice; see Michaelis, Introd. 4:137), we may venture to set it aside as without any adequate support. It may be observed, also, that it seems incompatible with what the apostle says, Col 4:15, where he enjoins the Church at Colossie to send his greetings to the brethren at Laodicea, etc. No one sends greetings by another except when it is impossible to express them one's self. But if Paul wrote to Laodicea at the same time as to Colossee, and sent both letters by the same bearer, Tychicus, there was manifestly no occasion whatever for hit sending his salutations to the latter of these churches through the medium of the former; it was obviously as easy, and much more natural, to send his salutations to the Church at Laodicea in the epistle addressed to  themselves. This seems to prove that the epis'tle to the Laodiceans had been written some consider.able time before that to the Colossians, and therefore could not have been the same with that now under notice. SEE LAODICEANS (EPISTLE TO).

2. The opinion that this epistle was not specially addressed to any one church, but was intended as a sort of circular letter for the use of several churches, was first broached by archbishop Usher (Annal. Vet. et Nov. Test. page 680, Bremae, 1686). To this opinion the great majority of critics have given their suffrage; indeed, it may be regarded as the received opinion of Biblical scholars in the present day. This may make it ap.parently presumptuous in us to call it in question, and yet it seems to us so ill supported by positive evidence, and exposed to so many objections, that we cannot yield assent to it.

(1.) In the first place, it is to be observed that this is a hypothesis entirely of modern invention. No hint is furnished of any such notion having been entertained concerning the destination of this epistle by the early Church. With the solitary exception of Marcion, so far as we know, all parties were unanimous in assigning Ephesus as the place to which this epistle was sent, and Marcion's view is as much opposed to the supposition of its being a circular letter as the other. As respects the external evidence, therefore, this hypothesis is purely destitute of support

(2.) It is a hypothesis suggested for the purpose oaf accounting for certain alleged facts, some of which are, to say the least, doubtful, and others of which may be explained as well without it as with it. These facts are, a. The alleged omission of the name of any place at the commencement of the epistle; b. Marcion's assertion that this epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans, which, it is said, probably arose out of his having seen that copy of this circular epistle which (had been sent to Laodicea; c. The want of any precise allusions to personal relations subsisting between the apostle and those to whom this epistle was addressed; and d. The expressions of unacquaintedness with those 'to whom he wrote, which occur in this epistle, e.g. Eph 3:1-4. How these facts may be reconciled with the supiposition that this epistle was addressed to the Ephesians will be considered afterwards; at present the question is, How do they favor the hypothesis that this was a circular letter? Now, supposing them to be unquestionable, and admitting that they are not irreconcilable with this hypothesis, it must yet appear to all that they go very little way towards affording primary  evidence in its support. It is not one which grows naturally out of these facts, or is suggested by them; it is plainly of foreign birth, and suggested for them. But when it is remembered that the first of these alleged facts is (to say the least) very doubtful; that the second is made to serve this hypothesis only by means of another as doubtful as itself, and that, were its services admitted, it would prove too much, for it would go to show that, to the Laodiceans, the apostle not only sent a peculiar epistle, mentioned Col 4:16, but gave them a share also in this circular epistle written some time after their own; and that ;the third and fourth are both either partially or wholly questionable, it must be admitted that this hypothesis stands upon a basis which is little better than none.

(3.) Had the epistle been addressed to a particular circle of churches, some designation of these churches would have been given, by which it might have been known what churches they were to which this letter belonged. When it is argued that this must be a circular letter, because there is no church specified to which it is addressed, it seems to be forgotten that the designation of a particular set of churches is as necessary for a circular epistle as the designation of one church is for an epistle specially addressed to it. If we must leave out the words ἐν Ε᾿φέσῳ in Eph 1:1, what are we to put in their place? for if we take the passage as it stands without them, it will follow that the epistle was addressed to all Christians everywhere, which is more than the advocates of the hypothesis now under notice contend for. The supposition that the title was left blank is equally gratuitous, unreasonable, and unnecessary.

(4.) In Eph 6:21-22, Paul mentions that he had sent to those for whom this epistle was destined Tychicus, who should make known to them all things, that they might know his affairs, and that he might comfort their hearts. From this it appears that Tychicus was not only the bearer of this letter, but that he was personally to visit, converse with, and comfort those to whom it was addressed. On the supposition that this was a circular letter, this could hardly have been practicable.

3. We return, then, to the question of the genuineness of the suspected words "at Ephesus," ἐν Ε᾿φέσῳ.. At first sight the doubts against them seem plausible; but when we oppose to these

(a) the preponderating weight of diplomatic evidence for the insertion of the words,

(b) the testimony of all the versions,

(c) the universal designation of this epistle by the ancient Church (Marcion standing alone in his assertion that it was written to the Laodiceans) as an epistle to the Ephesians,

(d) the extreme difficulty in giving any satisfactory meaning to the isolated participle (τοῖς ο῏υσι, to those that are), and the absence of any parallel usage in the apostle's writings, we can scarcely feel any doubt as to the propriety of removing the brackets in which these words are enclosed in the 2d and later editions of Tischendorf, and of considering them an integral part of the original text.

If called upon to supply an answer to, or an explanation of the internal objections, we must record the opinion that none on the whole seems so free from objection as that which regards the epistle as also designed for the benefit of churches either conterminous to, or, dependent on that of Ephesus. The counter-arguments of Meyer, though ably urged, are not convincing. Nor can an appeal to the silence of writers of the ancient Church on this further destination be conceived to be of much weight, as their references are to the usual and titular designation of the epistle, but do not and are not intended to affect the question of its wider or narrower destination. It is not unnatural to suppose that the special greetings here omitted might have been separately intrusted to the bearer Tychicus, possibly himself an Ephesian, and certainly commissioned by the apostle (Eph 6:22) to inform the Ephesians of his state and circumstances.

III. Occasion of writing this Epistle. — It does not seem to have been called out by any special circumstances, nor even to have involved any distinctly precautionary teaching (compare Schneckenburger, Beitrage, page 135 sq.), whether against Oriental or Judaistic theosophy, but to have been suggested by the deep love which the apostle felt for his converts at Ephesus, and which the mission of Tychicus, with an epistle to the Church of Colossae, afforded him a convenient opportunity of evincing in written teaching and exhortation. The epistle thus contains many thoughts that had pervaded the nearly contemporaneous epistle to the Colossians, reiterates many of the same practical warnings and exhortations, bears even the tinge of the same diction, but at the same time enlarges upon such profound mysteries of the divine counsels, displays so fully the origin and  developments of the Church in Christ, its union, communion, and aggregation in him, that this majestic epistle can never be rightly deemed otherwise than one of the most sublime and consolatory outpourings of the Spirit of God to the children of men. To the Christians at Ephesus dwelling under the shadow of the great temple of Diana, daily seeing its outward grandeur, and almost daily hearing of its pompous ritualism, the allusions in this epistle to that mystic building of which Christ was the corner-stone, the apostles the foundations, and himself and his fellow-Christians portions of the august superstructure (Eph 2:19-22), must have spoken with a force, an appropriateness, and a reassuring depth of teaching that cannot be overestimated.

IV. Contents. — These easily admit of being divided into two portions, the first mainly doctrinal (1-3), the second honorary and practical.

1. The doctrinal portion opens with a brief address to the saints in Ephesus, and rapidly passes into a sublime ascription of praise to God the Father, who has predestinated us to the adoption of sons, blessed and redeemed us in Christ, and made known to us his eternal purpose of uniting all in him (Eph 1:3-14). This not unnaturally evokes a prayer from the apostle that his converts may be enlightened to know the hope of God's calling, the riches of his grace, and the magnitude of that power which was displayed in the resurrection and transcendent exaltation of Christ-the head of his body, the Church (Eph 1:15-23). Then, with a more immediate address to his converts, the apostle reminds them how, dead as they had been in sin, God had quickened them, raised them, and even enthroned them with Christ; and how all was by grace, not by works (Eph 2:1-10). They were to remember, too, how they had once been alienated and yet were now brought nigh in the blood of Christ; how he was their Peace, how by him both they and the Jews had access to the Father, and how on him as the corner-stone they had been built into a spiritual temple to God (Eph 2:11-22). On this account, having heard, as they must have done, how to the apostle was revealed the profound mystery of this call of the Gentile world, they were not to faint at his troubles (Eph 3:1-13): nay, he prayed to the great Father of all to give them inward strength, to teach them the love of Christ, and fill them with the fullness of God (Eph 3:13-19). The prayer is concluded by a sublime doxology (Eph 3:20-21), which serves to usher in the more directly practical portion.

2. This the apostle commences by entreating them to walk worthy of this calling, and to keep the unity of the Spirit: there was but one body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one God (Eph 4:1-6). Each, too, had his portion of grace from God (Eph 4:7-10), who had appointed ministering orders in the Church, until all come to the unity of the faith, and grow up and become united with the living Head, even Christ (Eph 4:11-16). Surely, then, they were to walk no more as darkened, feelingless heathen; they were to put off the old man, and put on the new (Eph 4:17-24). This, too, was to be practically evinced in their outward actions; they were to be truthful, honest, pure, and forgiving; they were to walk in love (Eph 4:25-32; Eph 5:1-2). Fornication, covetousness, and impurity were not even to be named; they were once in heathen darkness, now they are light, and must reprove the deeds of the past (Eph 5:3-14). Thus were they to walk exactly, to be filled with joy, to sing, and to give thanks (Eph 5:15-21). Wives were to be subject to their husbands, husbands to love and cleave to their wives (Eph 5:23-33); children were to honor their parents, parents to bring up holily their children (Eph 6:1-4); servants and masters were to perform to each other their reciprocal duties (Eph 6:5-9). With a noble and vivid exhortation to arm themselves against their spiritual foes with the armor of God (Eph 6:10-20), a brief notice of the coming of Tychicus (Eph 6:21-22), and a twofold doxology (Eph 6:23-24), this sublime epistle comes to its close.

V. Date. — This epistle was written during the latter part of the apostle's first imprisonment at Rome, at about the same time with that to the Colossians, A.D. 57. This appears from the following circumstances: Timothy was not yet with Paul (Eph 1:1); Paul was then a prisoner (Eph 3:1; Eph 4:1), but had been allowed to preach (Eph 6:20; comp. Act 28:30-31); Tychicus (on his first journey) carried this epistle (Eph 6:21; comp. Col 4:7-8). The question of order in time between this epistle and that to the Colossians is very difficult to adjust. On the whole, both inter. nal and external considerations seem somewhat in favor of the priority of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Comp. Neander, Planting, 1:329 (Bohn), Schleiermacher, Stud. und Krit. for 1832, page 500, and Wieseler, Chronol. page 450 sq. SEE COLOSSIANS (EPISTLE TO).

VI. Commentaries, etc. — The following is a full list of separate exegetical helps on this epistle, the more important having an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Victorinus, In ep. ad Ephes. (in Mai's Script. Vet. III, 1:87); Jerome, Commentarii (in Opp. 7:537; also in Opp. Suppos. 11:995); Chrysostom, Homilice (in Opp. 11:1; Bibl. Patr. 9); Claudius Taurinensis, Expositio (in Mabillon, Vet. Anal. 91); \*Calvin, Commentarii (in Opp.; also tr. into English, Lond. 1854, 8vo) ; also Sermons (tr. by Golding, Lond. 1577, 4to); Ridley, Commentary (in Richmond's Fathers, 2:14); Megander, Commentarius (Basil. 1534, 8vo); Sarcer, Adnotationes (Frckf. 1541, 8vo); Major, Enarratio (Wittemb. 1552, 8vo); Nailant, Enarrationes (Ven. 1554; Lond. 1570, 8vo); Weller, Commentaries (Norimb. 1559, 8vo); Vellerus, Enarrationes (Nuremb. 1559, 8vo); Bucer, Praelectiones (Basil. 1562, fol.); Musculus, Commentariis (Basil. 1569, fol.); Heminge, Commentary (Lond. 1581,. 4to); Binemann, Expositio (Lond. 1581, 4to); Anon., Exposition (Lond. 1581, 4to); Stewart, Commentarius, (Ingolst. 1593, 4to); Rollock, Commentarius (Edinb. 1590, 4to; Genesis 1593, 8vo); Zanchius, Commentaria: (Newstad. 1594, fol.); Weinrich, Explicatio (Lips. 1613, 4to); Battus, Commentarii (Rost. 1620, 4to); De Quiros, Commentarius (Hisp. 1622, fol.; Lugd. 1623, 4to); Meeleuhrer, Commentarius (Norimb. 1628, 4to); Hanneken, Explicatio (4to, Marp. 1631; Lips., 1718; Jen. 1731); Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rost. 1636, 4to); Cocceius, Commentarius (in Opp. 5); Althofer, Animadversiones (Alt. 1641, 4to); Crocius, Commentarius (Cassel, 1642, 8vo); Bayne, Commentary (Lond. 1643, fol.); Wandalin, ParapIrasis (Slesw. 1650, 8vo), Boyd, Praelectiones (fol., London, 1652; Genesis 1660); Anon., Annotationes (8vo, Cambr. 1653; Amst. 1703; also in tihe Critici Sacri); Ferguson, Exposition (Edir b. 1659, 8vo); Crell, Commentarius (in Opp. 1:4); Lagus, Commentatio (Gryph. 1664, 4to); Schmidt, Paraphrasis (Arg. 1684, 1699, 4to); Du Bosc, Sermons (Fr., Rotterd. 1699, 3 volumes, 8vo); Goodwin, Exposition (Strasb. 1699, 4to); Spener, Erklar. (Hal. 1706, 1730, 4to); Gerbaden, Geopent Door (Tr. ad Rh. 1707, 4to); Pfeffinger, Dissertationes (Arg. 1711, 8vo); also, De visitatione Pauli ap. Ephesios (Arg. 1721, 4to); Roll, Commentarius (Tr. ad Rh. 1715, 1731, 2 volumes, 4to); Hazevoet, Verklaar. (L.B. 1718, 4to); \*Dinant, Commentalrii (Rotterd. 1721, 4to; also in Low Dutch, ib., 1711, 1722, 2 volumes, 4to); Van Til, Commentarius (Amsterd. 1726, 4to); Fend, Erlaut. (s. 1. 1727, 4to); Ziegler, Einleit. (in Henke's Magaz. 4:225); Crusius, De statu Ephesinorum (Hafn. 1733, 4to); Gude, Erleut. (Laub. 1735, 8vo); also, De eccl. Ephesians statu (Lips. 1732, 8vo); Royaards, Verklaar. (Amst. 1735,  3 volumes, 4to); Van Alphen, Specimen (Tr. ad Rh. 1742, 4to); Huth, Ep. ex Laod. in encycl. ad Ephesians (Erlang. 1751, 4to); Justi; Br. a. Laod. d. Br. an d. Ephesians (in his Verm. Abhandl. page 81); Pezold, De sublimitate in ep. ad Ephesians (Lips. 1771, 4to); Moldenhauer, Uebers. (Hamb. 1773, 8vo); Chandler, Paraphrase (London, 1777, 4to); Schitze,. Commentarii (8vo, Lips. 1778, 1785); Cramer, Ausleg. (Hamb. 1782, 4to); Esmarch, Uebers. (Alton. 1785, 8vo); Krause, Anmerk. (Frkf. 1789, 8vo) ; Brinkman, Uebers. (Hamb. 1793, 8vo); Muller, Erklar. (Hdlb. 1793, 4to); Morus, Acroases (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Hanlein, De lectorib. ep. ad Ep. (Erl. 1797, 4to); Popp, Erklar. (Rost. 1799, 4to); Van Bemmlen, Epp. ad Ephesians et Colossians collatce (L.B. 1803, 8vo); Schneckenburger, Aphorismen d. Br. a. d. Ephesians (in his Einl. ins N.T. No. 13); Von Flatt Vorles. (Tub. 1828, 8vo); Holzhausen, Erklar. (Hanov. 1833, 8vo); Simcoe, Illustration (Lond. 1833, 4to); \*Meier, Commentar (Berl. 1834, 8vo); \*Harless, Commentar (8vo, Erl. 1834; Stuttg. 1858); \*Ruckert, Erklar. (Lpz. 1834, 8vo); Matthies, Berucks. (Griefsw. 1834, 8vo); Lohlein, Syrus interpres (Erl. 1835, 8vo); Passavant, Ausleg. (Basel, 1836, 8vo); Lunemann, De ep. ad Ephesians authentia (Gott. 1842, 8vo); \*De Wette, Handb. (Lpz. 1843, 8vo, volume 2); \*Stier, Auslegung (Berl. 1848- 9, 2 volumes, in 3 parts, 8vo; abridged, 1859, 8vo); Perceval, Lectures (Lond. 1846, 12mo); M'Ghie, Lectures (Dublin, 1846, 2 volumes, 8vo); \*Baumgarten-Crusius, Commentar (Jena, 1847, 8vo); \*Meyer, Commentar (Gott. 1853, part 2); \*Eadie, Commentary (Glasg. 1854, 8vo); Bisping, Erkldr. (Munst. 1855, 8vo); Kahler, Predigten (Kiel, 1855, 8vo); Hodge, Commentary (N.Y. 1856, 8vo); \*Turner, Commentary (N.Y. 1856, 8vo); \*Ellicott, Commentary (8vo, Lond. 1855, 1859, 1864; Andov. 1860); Neuland, New Catena (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Clergymen (4), Revision (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Pridhamr, Notes (Lond. 1862, 12mo); Lathrop, Discourses (Phila. 1864, 8vo); Bleek, Vorlesungen (Berl. 1865, 8vo). SEE EPISTLES.

## ETHIOPIANS[[@Headword:ETHIOPIANS]]

             (כּוּשׁ, Isa 20:4; Jer 46:9, כּוּשַׁי; Sept. Αἰθίοπες, Vulg. Ethiopia, Ethiopes), properly "Cush" or "Ethiopia" in two passages (Isa 20:4; Jer 46:9); elsewhere "Cushites," or inhabitants of Ethiopia (2Ch 12:3; 2Ch 14:12 [11], 13 [12]; 16:8; 21:16; Dan 11:43; Amo 9:7; Zep 2:12). SEE CUSHITE.

## Eaba[[@Headword:Eaba]]

             abbot of Malmesbury, in the 8th century. Eadbald (Lat. AEdboldus), 12th bishop of London, A.D. 796.

## Eachard John, D.D.[[@Headword:Eachard John, D.D.]]

             an English divine, was born in Suffolk in 1636, and was admitted at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, in 1653. He became fellow of his college in 1658, and was chosen master in 1675. He died July 7, 1697. His Works were collected in 3 volumes, 12mo. (London 1784), containing a Sketch of his Life, a Discussion of Hobbes's State of Nature, and an Essay on The Grounds of the Contempt of the Clergy. — New Genesis Biographical Dictionary 5:53; Kippis, Biographical Britannica, 5:529.

## Eachard Lawrence[[@Headword:Eachard Lawrence]]

             SEE ECHARD.

## Eadbert[[@Headword:Eadbert]]

             (i.e., Albert or Adalbert).

(1) Bishop of Lindisfarne, A.D. 688; died May 6 (his day of commemoration), A.D. 698.

(2) Ninth bishop of London (sometimes called Filbrith), cir. A.D. 772-788.

(3) Abbot of Reculver (called also Heahbert), A.D. 747.

(4) Abbot of Mercia, A.D. 747.

(5) Abbot of Sherborn, A.D. 803.

(6) First bishop of the South Saxons, A.D. 711.

(7) Fifth bishop of the Middle Angles at Leicester, A.D. 764-787.

## Eadburga[[@Headword:Eadburga]]

             (i.e., Ethelburga).

(1) Daughter of Aldwulf, king of the East Angles, was abbess of Repton, in the 7th century.

(2) Widow of Wulfhere, king of Mercia, wjs second abbess of St. Peter's, Gloucester, A.D. 710-73.

## Eadfrid[[@Headword:Eadfrid]]

             (i.e., Alfred). SEE EADFRITH. Eadgar (i.e., Edgar).

(1) Third bishop of Lindisfarne. cir. A.D. 706-731.

(2) Tenth bishop of London, A.D. 787-793.

## Eadfrith[[@Headword:Eadfrith]]

             bishop of Lindisfarne from 698 to 721. He is sometimes named as the first translator of the Bible into Anglo-Saxon, but this is a mistake. There is, however, a splendid manuscript, written by Eadfrith with his own hand, in the Cottonian Library. It is known as The Durham Book. — Wright, Biographical Brittanica Literature, Anglo-Saxon Period, page 242.

## Eadhed[[@Headword:Eadhed]]

             a priest of Oswy, king of Northumbria; ordained by Deusdedit in 664, consecrated bishop of Lindsey in 678, and transferred to Ripon soon afterwards.

## Eadie, John, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Eadie, John, D.D., LL.D]]

             a distinguished divine of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, was born at Alva, Stirlingshire, May 9, 1810. He graduated from the Universityof Glasgow, studied at the Divinity Hall of the Secession Church (United Presbyterian), and in 1835 was ordained pastor of the Cambridge Street Church, Glasgow, in which he speedily attained great eminence and usefulness. He was regarded as the leading representative of the denomination to which he belonged and of the city which has always been its stronghold. As a preacher he was distinguished for his hard common- sense and occasional flashes of happy illustration, for his masculine piety, deep earnestness, and breadth of sympathy, both intellectual and emotional. He was frequently called to other important charges, but was too strongly attached to Glasgow to leave. In 1836 he removed with his congregation to a new and beautiful church at Lansdowne Crescent, where his influence continued unabated until his death, June 3, 1876.

Dr. Eadie bore the reputation of extensive and profound scholarship, and in 1843 was appointed by the Church to the chair of hermeneutics and the evidences of natural and revealed religion in Divinity Hall. As a critic he was acute and painstaking, as an interpreter eminently fair-minded. In the pulpit, as in the professor's chair, his strength lay in, the tact with which he selected the soundest results of Biblical criticism, whether his own or that of others, and presented them in a clear and connected form with a constant view of their practical bearing. If this last fact gave a non-academic aspect to some of his lectures, it rendered them not less interesting and probably not less useful to his auditors. Being engaged in two distinct offices, either of which were sufficient to claim all his energies, he nevertheless found time for an amount of work in a third sphere, of which the same thing may be said. Most of his works were connected with Biblical criticism and interpretation, some of them being designed for popular use and others being more strictly scientific. To the former class belong his contributions to the Biblical Cyclopaedias of Kitto and Fairbairn, his edition of Cruden's Concordianae, Oriental History, and his discourses. The Life of Dr. Kitto obtained a deserved popularity, also his Dictionary of the Bible for the  Young, Lectures on the Bible to the Young, etc. His last work, the History of the English Bible (1876, 2 volumes), will probably be the most enduring memorial of his. ability as an author. He is the author of valuable expositions on the Greek text of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians. See his Lie, by Brown (Lond. 1878). (W.P.S.)

## Eadred[[@Headword:Eadred]]

             (or Heardred), bishop of Hexham, consecrated October 29, 797, died in 800. Eadric, second abbot of St. Albans, A.D. 796. Eadsige, archbishop of Canterbury, of whose parentage and birthplace nothing seems to be known. The earliest mention of him presents him as one of the chaplains of Canute; he was then a secular, and, of course, in priest's orders. He was consecrated bishop of St. Martin's in 1035; was translated to the see of Canterbury in 1038, and repaired to Rome for the pallium. On his return home, In 1043, he was called upon to officiate at the coronation of Edward the Confessor-the memorable event of his life. He died in 1050. See Hook, Lives of the Abbs. of Canterbury, 1:489 sq.

## Eadulf[[@Headword:Eadulf]]

             (or Aldwulf, Lat. Adulphus).

(1) Eighth bishop of Lindsey, A.D. 796-836.

(2) Fifteenth bishop of Lichfield, cir. A.D. 803-816.

## Eagle[[@Headword:Eagle]]

             occurs in Scripture as the translation of the Hebrews נֶשֶׁר (ne'sher, so called from tearing its prey with its beak; occurs Exo 19:4; Lev 11:13; Deu 14:12; Deu 28:49; Deu 32:11; 2Sa 1:23; Job 9:26; Job 39:27; Psa 103:5; Pro 23:5; Pro 30:17; Pro 30:19; Isa 40:31; Jer 4:13; Jer 48:40; Jer 49:16; Jer 49:22; Lam 4:19; Eze 1:10; Eze 10:14; Eze 17:3; Eze 17:7; Hos 8:1; Oba 1:4; Mic 1:16; Hab 1:8), with which all the designations of the kindred dialects agree, Chald. נְשִׁר (neshar', Dan 4:33; Dan 7:4), Sept. and N.T. ἀετός (Mat 24:28; Luk 17:37; Rev 4:7; Rev 12:14). As there are many species of eagles, the nesher, when distinguished from others, seems to have denoted the chief species, the golden eagle, χρυσαίετος, as in Lev 11:13; Deu 14:12. The word, however, seems to have had a broader acceptation, and, like the Greek ἀετός and Arabic nesr (see Bochart, Hieroz. 2:312 sq.), sometimes comprehends also a species of vulture, especially in those passages where the nesher is said to be bald (Mic 1:16), and to feed on carcasses (Job 29:27; Pro 30:17; Mat 24:28), which, however the true eagle will occasionally do. SEE GIER-EAGLE; SEE HAWK; SEE OSPREY; SEE OSSIFRAGE; SEE VULTURE.

1. The characteristics of the eagle referred to in the Scriptures are its swiftness of flight (Deu 28:49; 2Sa 1:23; Jer 4:13; Jer 49:22; Lam 4:19, etc.); its mounting high into the air (Job 39:27; Pro 23:5; Pro 30:19; Isa 40:31; Jer 49:16); its strength and vigor (in Psa 103:5); its predaceous habits (Job 9:26; Pro 30:17; compare AElian, Anim. 10:14); its setting its nest in high places (in Jer 49:16; comp. Aristotle, Anim. 9:22; Pliny, 10:4); the care in training its young to fly (in Exo 19:4; Deu 32:11); its powers of vision (in Job 39:29; comp. Homer, Il. 17:674; AElian, Anim. 1:42; Isidore, Origg. 12:1; Pliny, 12:88); and its molting (Psa 103:5). As king of birds, the eagle naturally became an emblem of powerful empires (Eze 17:3; Eze 17:7), especially in the symbolical figures of Babylon (Dan 7:4), and the cherubim (Eze 1:10; Eze 10:14; Rev 4:7), like the griffin of classical antiquity. SEE CREATURE, LIVING. Eaglets are referred to in Pro 30:17 as first picking out the eyes of their prey.

The following is a close translation of a graphic description of raptorial birds of this class which occurs in the book of Job (39:26-30):

By thy understanding will [the] hawk tower,

Spread his wings southward?

Perchance on thy bidding [the] eagle will soar,

Or [it is then] that he will make lofty his nest?

A rock will he inhabit, and [there] roost,

Upon the peak of a rock, even [the] citadel:

Thence he has spied food,

From afar his eyes will look:

Then his brood will sip blood;

Ay, wherever [are the] slain, there [is] he!

To the last line in this quotation our Savior seems to allude in Mat 24:28. " Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" that is, wherever the Jewish people, who were morally and judicially dead, might be, there would the Roman armies, whose standard was an eagle, and whose strength and fierceness resembled that of the king of birds, in comparison with his fellows, pursue and devour them. The ἀετοί of Mat 24:28; Luk 17:37, may include the fultur Jalvus and Neophraon percnopterus; though, as some eagles prey upon dead bodies, there is no necessity to restrict the Greek word to the Vulturide (see Lucian, Navig. p. 1; comp. Seneca, Ep. 95; Martial, 6:62). The figure of an eagle is now, and has long been, a favorite military ensign. The Persians so employed it, which fact illustrates the passage in Isa 46:11, where Cyrus is alluded to under the symbol of an " eagle" (עִיַט) or "ravenous bird" (compare Xenoph. Cyrop. 7:4). The same bird was similarly employed by the Assyrians and the Romans. Eagles are frequently represented in Assyrian sculptures attending the soldiers in their battles, and some have hence supposed that they were trained birds. Considering, however, the wild and intractable nature of eagles, it is very improbable that this was the case. The representation of these birds was doubtless intended to portray the common feature in Eastern battlefield scenery, of birds of prey awaiting to satisfy their hunger on the bodies of the slain. These passages have been by some commentators referred to the vulture, on the assumed ground that the eagle never feeds on carrion, but confines itself to that prey which it has killed by its own prowess. This, however, is a mistake (see Forakal, Descript. Anim. page 12; compare Michaelis, Orient. Bibl. 9:37 sq., and new Orient. Bibl. 9:43 sq.); no such chivalrous feeling exists in either eagle or lion; both will feed ignominiously on a body found dead. Any visitor of the British zoological gardens may see that the habit imputed is at least not invariable. (See also Thomson, Land and Book, 1:491.) Aquila bisfasciata, of India, was shot by Colossians Sykes at the carcass of a tiger; and Arapax, of South Africa is "frequently one of the first birds that approaches a dead animal."

Of all known birds, the eagle flies not only the highest, but also with the greatest rapidity (comp. Homer, Il. 22:308). To this circumstance there are several striking allusions in the sacred volume. Among the evils threatened to the Israelites in case of their disobedience, the prophet names one, in the following terms: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth" (Deu 28:49). The march of Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem is predicted in the same terms: "Behold, he shall come up as clouds, and his chariots as a whirlwind: his horses are swifter than eagles" (Jer 4:13); as is his invasion of Moab also: "For thus saith the Lord, Behold he shall fly as an eagle, and shall spread his wings over Moab" (Jer 48:40); i.e., he shall settle down on the devoted country as an eagle over its prey. (See also Lam 4:19; Hos 8:2; Hab 1:8.)

The eagle, it is said, lives to a great age, and, like other birds of prey, sheds his feathers in the beginning of spring. After this season he appears with fresh strength and vigor, and his old age assumes the appearance of youth. To this David alludes when gratefully reviewing the mercies of Jehovah, "Who satisfieth thy mouth with good things, so that thy youth is renewed like the eagle's" (Psa 103:5); as does the prophet, also, when describing the renovating and quickening influences of the Spirit of God: "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint" (Isa 40:31). Some Jewish interpreters have illustrated the former passage by a reference to the old fables about the eagle being able to renew his strength when very old (SEE BOCHART, HIEROZ. 2:747). But modern commentators for the most part are inclined to think that these words refer to the eagle after the molting season, when the bird is more full of activity than before. Others prefer Hengstenberg's explanation on Psa 103:5," Thy youth is renewed, so that in point of strength thou art like the eagle."

The passage in Mic 1:16, " Enlarge thy baldness as the eagle," has been understood by Bochart (Hieroz. 2:744) and others to refer to the eagle at the time of its molting in the spring. Oedman ( Vermischte Samml. 1:64) erroneously refers the baldness spoken of by the prophet to point to the Vultur barbatus (Gypaetus), the bearded "vulture or lammergeeyer, which he supposed was bald. It appears to us to be extremely improbable that there is any reference in the passage under consideration to eagles molting. Allusion is here made to the custom of shaving the head as a token of mourning; but there would be little or no appropriateness in the comparison of a shaved head with an eagle at the time of molting. But if the nesser is supposed to denote the griffon vulture (Vultur fulvus), the simile is peculiarly appropriate; it may be remarked that the Hebrew verb karach (קָרִח) signifies "to make bald on the back part of the head;" the notion here conveyed is very applicable to the whole head and neck of this bird, which is destitute of true feathers. The direction of the prophet is to a token of mourning, which was usually assumed by making bald the crown of the head; here, however, it was to be enlarged, extended, as the baldness of the eagle. Exactly answering to this idea is Mr. Bruce's description of the head of the "golden eagle:" the crown of his head was bare; so was the front where the bill and skull joined. The meaning of the prophet, therefore, seems to be that the people were not to content themselves with shaving the crown of the head merely, as on ordinary occasions, but, under this special visitation of retributive justice, were to extend the baldness over the entire head. With reference to the texts referred to above, which compare the watchful and sustaining care of his people by the Almighty with that exhibited by the eagle in training its younger ones to fly, especially the spirited one in Deu 32:11-12 —

As an eagle will rouse his nest;

Over his fledglings will hover;

Will spread his wings,

Will take it [i.e. his brood, or each of the young];

Will bear it upon his pinions:

[So] Jehovah, he alone would guide him [i.e. Israel];

And there was not with him a strange god" —

We may quote a passage from Sir Humphrey Davy, who says, "I once saw a very interesting sight above one of the crags of Ben Nevis, as I was going in the pursuit of black game. Two parent eagles were teaching their offspring, two young birds, the maneuvers of flight. They began by rising from the top of the mountain, in the eye of the sun. It was about midday, and bright for this climate. They at first made small circles, and the young birds imitated them. They paused on their wings, waiting till they had made their first flight, and then took a second and larger gyration, always rising towards the sun, and enlarging their circle of flight so as to make a gradually ascending spiral. The young ones still and slowly followed, apparently flying better as they mounted; and they continued this sublime exercise, always rising, till they became mere points in the air, and the young ones were lost, and afterwards their parents, to our aching sight." The expression in Exodus and Deut., "beareth them on her wings," has been understood by Rabbinical writers and others to mean that the eagle does actually carry her young ones on her wings and shoulders. This is putting on the words a construction which they by no means are intended to convey; at the same time, it is not improbable that the parent bird assists the first efforts of her young by flying under them, thus sustaining them for a moment, and encouraging them in their early lessons. (Comp. AElian, Anim. 2:40; Oppian, Cyneg. 3:1:15; Jerome in Jesa. 46; Naumaun, Naturgesch. d. Vogel, 1:215; on the contrary, Aristotle, Anim. 9:22.),

Finally, the eagle was an Assyrian emblem, and hence probably the reference in Hab 1:8. The eagle-headed deity of the Assyrian sculptures is that of the god Nisroch (q.v.); and in the representations of battles certain birds of this order are frequently shown accompanying the Assyrian warriors in their attacks, and in one case bearing off the entrails of the slain. From the Assyrians the use of the eagle as a standard (q.v.) descended to the Persians, and from them probably to the Romans. In all ages, and in most countries, as the proverbial "king of birds," it has been the symbol of majesty among the feathered tribes, like the lion among beasts.

2. The eagle, in zoology, forms a family of several genera of birds of prey, mostly distinguished for their size, courage, powers of flight, and arms for attack. The bill is strong, and bent into a plain pointed hook, without the notch in the inner curve which characterizes falcons; the nostrils are covered with a naked cere or skin of a yellow or a blue color; the eyes are lateral, sunken, or placed beneath an overhanging brow; the head and neck covered with abundance of longish, narrow-pointed feathers; the chest broad, and the legs and thighs exceedingly stout and sinewy. Eagles, properly so called, constitute the genus Aquila, and have the tarsi feathered down to the toes; they are clothed in general with brownish and rust- colored feathers, and the tail is black, grey, or deep brown. Sea-eagles (genus Haliaetus) have the tarsi or legs half bare and covered with horny scales; not unusually the head, back, and tail more or less white. The larger species of both measure, from head to tip of tail, 3 feet 6 inches or more, and spread their wings above 7 feet 6 inches; but these are proportionably broad to their length, for it is the third quill feather which is the longest, as if the Creator intended to restrain within bounds their rapidity of flight, while by their breadth the power of continuing on the wing is little or not at all impeded. The claws of the fore and hind toe are particularly strong and sharp; in the sea-eagles they form more than half a circle, and in length measure from 1.5 to 1.75 of an inch. These majestic birds have their abode in Europe, on the shores of the Mediterranean, in Syria and Arabia, wherever there are vast woody mountains and lofty cliffs; they occupy each a single district, always by pairs, excepting on the coasts, where the sea- eagle and the osprey (Pandion halicetus) may be found not remote from the region possessed by the rough-legged eagles — the first because it seeks to subsist on the industry of the second, and does not interfere with the prey of the third. It is in this last genus, most generally represented by the golden eagle (Aquila chryaeta) that the most powerful and largest birds are found. That species in its more juvenile plumage, known as the ring- tailed eagle, the imperial eagle, or mogilnick (A. heliaca), and the booted eagle (A. pinnata), is found in Syria; and at least one species of the sea- eagles (the Hal. ossifragus, albicilla, or albicaudus) frequents the coasts, and is even of stronger wing than the others.

These build usually in the cliffs of Phoenicia, while the others are more commonly domiciliated within the mountains. According to their strength and habits, the former subsist on antelopes, hares, hyrax, bustard, stork, tortoises, and serpents; and the latter usually live on fish; both pursue the catta (pterocles), partridge, and lizard. The osprey alone being migratory, retires to Southern Arabia in winter. None, excepting the last mentioned, are so exclusively averse to carrion as is commonly asserted: from choice or necessity they all, but in particular the sea-eagles, occasionally feed upon carcasses of horses, etc.; and it is well known in the East that they follow armies for that purpose. Hence the allusions in Job and Mat 24:28, though vultures may be included, are perfectly correct. So again are those which refer to the eagle's eyrie, fixed in the most elevated cliffs. The swiftness of this bird, stooping among a flock of wild geese with the rushing sound of a whirlwind, is very remarkable; and all know its towering flight, suspended on its broad wings among the clouds with little motion or effort. Thus the predictions, in which terrible nations coming from afar are assimilated to eagles, have a poetical and absolute truth, since there are species, like the golden, which really inhabit the whole circumference of the earth, and the nations alluded to bore eagles' wings for standards, and for ornaments on their shields, helmets, and shoulders. In the northern half of Asia, and among all the Turkish races, this practice is not entirely abandoned at this day, and eagle ensigns were constantly the companions of the dragons. China, India, Bactria, Persia, Egypt, the successors of Alexandria, the Etruscans, the Romans, the Celtae, and the Arabs had eagle signa of carved work, of metal, or the skins of birds stuffed, and set up as if they were living. These, named עִיַט (ayit, a "ravenous bird," Isa 46:1, whence ἀετός), aquila, eryx, simurg, humma or humaion, karakush (the birds of victory of different nations and periods of antiquity), were always symbolical of rapid, irresistible conquest. A black eagle was the ensign of Kalid, general of Mohammed, at the battle of Aisnadin, and the carved eagle still ,seen on the walls of the citadel of Cairo, set up by Karakufsh, the vizier of Salah- ed-din, to commemorate his own name and administration, indicates a species not here enumerated. At least for distinct kinds of eagles have been observed in Palestine, viz. the golden eagle (Aquila Chrysaitos), the spotted eagle (A. naevia), the common species in the rocky districts (see Ibis, 1:23), the imperial eagle (Aquila Heliaca), and the very common Circaetos gallicus, which preys on the numerous reptilia of Palestine (see the vernacular Arabic names of different species of Vulturidae and Falconidae in Loche's Catalogue des Oiseaux observ. en Algerie; and in Ibis, volumes 1, 2, Tristram's papers on the ornithology of North Africa). The Hebrews nesher may stand for any of these different species. though perhaps more particular reference to the golden and imperial eagles and the griffon vulture may be intended. The Aq. heliaca, here figured, is the species most common in Syria, and is distinguished from the others by a spot of white feathers on each shoulder. (See the Penny Cyclopcedia, s.v. Falconidae; Hebenstreit, Aquilae naturae S.S. Historia, e historia naturali et e Monumentt. vett. illustrata, Lips. 1747.) SEE BIRD.

## Eagle (2)[[@Headword:Eagle (2)]]

             in the Church of England, the desk or lecturn from which the lessons are read is often in the form of an eagle with outspread wings. The usage is probably derived from the fact that, in ecclesiastical symbolism, the eagle is the accompanying symbol of the apostle John (see Jamieson, Sacred and Legendary Art, 1:137).

## Eagle, As An Architectural Term[[@Headword:Eagle, As An Architectural Term]]

             is used to designate a branzen or wooden lectern, the upper portion of which; represents an eagle with outstretched wings, on the back of which is a book-rest. Many ancient examples of such lecterns remain in collegiate and cathedral churches, and a great number of new specimens have been made for use after the old models. SEE LECTERN.

## Eagle, In Christian Symbolism[[@Headword:Eagle, In Christian Symbolism]]

             St. Gregory considered this bird to typify the contemplative life; other fathers regarded it as an emblem of resurrection (Psa 103:5). It is the symbol of St. John the Evangelist, as it soars up to heaven and the sun; and he dwells in his Gospel and the Revelations specially on the divine discourses and the celestial glory of the Sun of Righteousness. It also represented the regeneration of the neophyte; the resurrection of the Saviour (says St. Ambrose); and renewing of the soul on earth, as glory hereafter will renew body and soul; the power of grace when it is portrayed drinking at a chalice, or in combat with a serpent, the type of evil.

## Eagleton, William, D.D[[@Headword:Eagleton, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Maryville, Tennessee, March 25, 1796. He was educated in Maryville College, and studied theology in the South- western Theological Seminary, at the same place. In 1827 he was licensed by the Union Presbytery, and soon after was elected professor in Maryville College, In 1829 he accepted a call to the Church in Murfreesborough, where he remained till his death, March 28, 1866. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 431.

## Eames, James Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Eames, James Henry, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Dedham, Massachusetts, November 29, 1814. The first two years of his college course were spent at King College, Bristol, Tennessee, and the last two at Brown University, where he graduated in 1839. He pursued his theological studies with Reverend John Bristed, of Bristol, R.I., was ordained deacon in December, 1841, and presbyter in 1842; was rector of Ascension Church, in Wakefield, for about four years, when he took charge of St. Stephen's Church in Providence, remaining there until 1850, and then engaged in missionary labor in Rhode Island; became rector of St. Paul's Church, Concord, N.H., in 1858, and held that position until his death, Which occurred in the harbor of Hamilton, Bermuda, December 10, 1877. For many years Dr. Eames was. chaplain to the asylum for the insane, and performed a large amount of missionary work in New Hampshire. Three times he travelled in Europe, and spent part of several winters in Bermuda. (J.C.S.)

## Eanbald[[@Headword:Eanbald]]

             (or Enbald).

(1) The pupil and successor of Albert in the archiepiscopal see of York, A.D. 782. He was very vigorous in the administration of his diocese, and died at a monastery called Etlete (or Edete), August 10, 796.

(2) Called also Heantbald, succeeded the, foregoing as archbishop of York, and his history is given with considerable detail by Alcuin. He appears to have died A.D. 812.

## Eanbert[[@Headword:Eanbert]]

             bishop of Hexham, cir. A.D. 800-806. Eanfrith, fifth bishop of Elmham, A.D. 736.

## Eanes[[@Headword:Eanes]]

              (Μάνης,Vulg. Esses, Syr. Mani), a name given (1Es 9:21) as that of a third son of Emmer (Immer); apparently in place of Harim, and his first two sons Maaseiah and Elijah of the Hebrews list (Ezr 10:21). Fritzsche suggests (Exeg. Handb. in loc.) that καὶ Μάνης is a mistranslation of the וּמַבְּנֵי, "and of the sons of," of the Hebrews text, the three names following having been omitted by the Greek translator.

## Eanswitha[[@Headword:Eanswitha]]

             (or Enswida), a British saint, commemorated Aug. 31, was the daughter of Eadba, king of Kent, and lived a virgin, in a nunnery founded by her, at Folkestone, where she died, some say in 640, others in 673.

## Ear[[@Headword:Ear]]

              (properly אֹזֶןo (Zen, οϊvς), the organ of hearing. In Scripture the term is frequently employed figuratively. To signify the regard of Jehovah to the prayers of his people, the Psalmist says, "His ears are open to their cry" (Psa 34:15). To "uncover the ear" is a Hebraism, and signifies to show or reveal something to a person (1Sa 20:2). The Psalmist, speaking in the person of the Messiah, says, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened" (Psa 40:6). Ainsworth reads, " Mine ears hast thou digged open." The Sept., which Paul follows (Heb 10:5), reads the passage thus: "A body hast thou prepared me." "Make the ears of this people heavy," occurs in Isa 6:10, that is, render their minds inattentive and disobedient; with a similar meaning, the prophet Jeremiah speaks of " ears uncircumcised" (Isa 6:10). Among the Jews, the slave who renounced the privilege of being made free from servitude in the sabbatical year submitted to have his ear bored through with an awl, which was done in the presence of some judge or magistrate, that it might appear a voluntary act. The ceremony took place at his master's door, and was the mark of perpetual servitude (Exo 21:6). SEE EARRING.

## Ear (2)[[@Headword:Ear (2)]]

             EARRING, an old English agricultural term for ploughing, occurs in Gen 45:6; Exo 34:21; 1Sa 8:12, as a translation of the term חָרַישׁ (charish', ploughing, as it is elsewhere rendered). (See Critica Biblica, in, 210.) The same now obsolete word is used by our translators in Deu 21:4; Isa 30:24, to represent the Hebrews word עָבִד (abad', to till, as it is often elsewhere rendered). SEE AGRICULTURE; SEE EGYPT. So Shakspeare says "to ear the land that has some hopes to grow" (Richard II, 3, 2). It is etymologically connected with the Latin aro, to plough. It is directly derived from the Anglo-Saxon erian, " to plough, " and is radically the same with harrow. What we call arable land was originally written ear: able land. The root ar is one of wide use in all the Indo-European languages (see Miller, Science of Language, p. 239). SEE PLOUGH.

## Eardley, Sir Culling[[@Headword:Eardley, Sir Culling]]

             one of the founders of the Evangelical Alliance, was born in Hatfield in 1805. He was a son of sir Culling Smith, baronet, succeeded to the baronetcy in 1829, and in 1847 assumed by royal license his maternal name of Eardley, his mother having been a daughter of the last lord Eardley. He was educated at Oxford, but did not graduate, having scruples as to subscribing the oaths administered in taking the degree of A.B. He represented Pontefract in one short Parliament previous to the Reform Bill, and in 1846 was an unsuccessful candidate for Edinburgh in opposition to lord Macaulay, sir Culling basing his claim chiefly on his opposition to the Maynooth grant. Sir Culling greatly distinguished himself for the active part he took in the work of the Evangelical Alliance and other religious associations, and the cause of religious toleration, in particular, found in him an indefatigable and most active champion. — Ann. Amer. Cyclopcedia for 1863, page 358.

## Eardulf[[@Headword:Eardulf]]

             (Lat. Ardulphus). (1) Bishop of East Anglia (Dunwich) in 747. (2) Twelfth bishop of Rochester, cir. A.D. 762.

## Earle (or Earles), John[[@Headword:Earle (or Earles), John]]

             an English prelate, was born at York in 1601, and entered Merton College, Oxford, in 1620. He became chaplain and tutor to prince Charles, and chancellor of the cathedral of Salisbury. On the Restoration he was made deani of Westminster, and consecrated bishop of Worcester in 1662. In September 1664, he was transferred to the see of Salisbury. He died November 17, 1665, leaving Microcosmography (Lond. 1628, 8vo; 6th ed.  1630, 12mo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Earle, Jabez, D.D[[@Headword:Earle, Jabez, D.D]]

             an English Independent minister, was born about 1676, and educated among the Dissenters. He was assistant to the Reverend Thomas Reynolds, at the Weigh-House, London, in 1699; and in 1707 removed to Hanover Street, where he ministered more than sixty years, and died in 1768, leaving a number of Sermons and theological treatises, etc. (1706-35; new ed. 1816, 8vo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 1:169; 2:6, 492, 508, 530.

## Earlom, Richard[[@Headword:Earlom, Richard]]

             a pre-eminent English engraver, was born in London in 1742, and was the pupil of Cipriani. He died in 1822. The following are some of his principal plates: The Holy Family; Mary Magdalene Washing the Feet of Christ; David and Bathsheba; The Repose; The Virgin and Infant; The Infant Jesus Sleeping; The Presentation in the Temple; The Virgin and Infant with St. John. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Early English[[@Headword:Early English]]

             a title often given to the first pointed or Gothic style of architecture in England. It is also called the Lancet Style, and also (in the nomenclature of the Ecclesiological Society) the First Pointed Style. " It succeeded the Norman towards the end of the 12th century, and gradually merged into the Decorated at the end of the 13th. It first partook of the heaviness of the Norman, but soon manifested its own beautiful and peculiar characteristics. The arches are usually equilateral and lancet-shaped; the doorways are often divided into two by a single shaft or small pier; the windows are long and narrow, and, when gathered into a group, are frequently surmounted by a large arch, which springs from the extreme molding of the window on each side. The space between this arch and the tops of the windows is often pierced with circles, or with trefoils or quatrefoils, which constituted the earliest form of tracery. Each window, however, is generally destitute of any tracery in itself" (Chambers, s.v.) The moldings, says Parker, in general consist of alternate rounds and deeply-cut hollows, with a small admixture of fillets, producing a strong effect of light and shadow. "Circular windows were more used in England during the prevalence of this style than in either the decorated or perpendicular, and fine specimens remain at York and Lincoln cathedrals, and at Beverley Minster. Groined ceilings are very common in this style; in general they have only cross springers and diagonal ribs, with sometimes longitudinal and diagonal ribs at the apex of the vaults, and good bosses of foliage at the intersections. The pillars usually consist of small shafts arranged round a larger circular pier, but others of different kinds are to be found, and a plain octagonal or circular pillar is common in country churches. The capitals consist of plain moldings, or are enriched with foliage and sculpture characteristic of the style.

The most prevalent base has a very close resemblance to the Attic base of the ancients, though the proportions are different, and the lower torus is worked with a considerably larger projection. The buttresses are often very bold and prominent, and are frequently carried up to the top of the building with but little diminution, and terminate in acutely-pointed pediments, which, when raised above the parapet, produce in some degree the effect of pinnacles. Flying buttresses were first introduced in this style. Pinnacles are but sparingly used, and only towards the end of the style. The roofs appear always to have been high-pitched. The ornaments used in this style are by no means so various as in either of the others; occasionally small roses or other flowers, and bunches of foliage, are carved at intervals in the hollow moldings, but by far the most common and characteristic is the toothed ornament, which is often introduced in great profusion, and the hollows entirely filled with it. The foliage is very remarkable for boldness of effect, and it is often so much undercut as to be connected with the moldings only by the stalks and edges of the leaves; there is frequently considerable stiffness in the mode in which it is combined, but the effect is almost always good: the prevailing leaf is a trefoil. Towards the latter part of the style crockets were first introduced. The style may be said to begin in the later half of Richard the First's reign, about which time St. Hugh began his cathedral. During the reign of king John the Early English style had obtained the complete mastery; but the reign of Henry III was the great period of the Early English style, which had now obtained perfection. That king himself and his brother Richard were great builders. The most perfect example of the style is perhaps Salisbury Cathedral. Towards the end of the reign we have examples, such as the presbytery of Lincoln and the chapter-house of Salisbury, of what may be almost called the Decorated style, though the moldings and many of the details are pure Early English. This kind of work may best be called Transitional." SEE ARCHITECTURE.

## Early, John, D.D[[@Headword:Early, John, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Bedford County, Virginia, January 1, 1786, of Baptist parents. He was converted in 1804; licensed to preach in 1806; and in 1807 entered the Virginia Conference, wherein he continued laboriously and faithfully till 1815, when the growing necessities of his family obliged limn to locate and engage in secular business. In 1821 he re-entered the effective ranks, and labored with marvellous success until 1846, when he connected himself with the Church Sonth, and devoted his energies to establishing and operating the Southern Book Concern. In 1854 he was elected to the episcopacy; in 1866 was granted a superannuated relation, and died in Lynchburg, November 5, 1873. Bishop Early was full of the missionary spirit, and everywhere awakened missionary zeal; was one of the chief founders of Randolph-Macon College; was a man of great energy and devotedness, and held a high position in the esteem of the Church. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1873, page 914; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Early, William[[@Headword:Early, William]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in New Jersey, October 17, 1770; was converted at about nineteen; entered the itinerancy in 1791; was superannuated in 1821, and died in June of the same year, having preached for thirty years. His first two years in the ministry were spent as missionary to New Brunswick, where he endured much hardship in zealously laboring for his Master's cause. His after ministry in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland was very useful to the Church. — Min. of Conferences, 1:380.

## Earnest[[@Headword:Earnest]]

             Α᾿ῤῥαβών is evidently the Hebrew עֵרָבוֹן (erabon', a pledge) in Greek characters. It is a mercantile term which the Greeks and Romans appear to have adopted from the Phoenicians (kindred in dialect with the Hebrews) as the founders of commerce. With a slight alteration in the letters, but with none whatever in the sense, it becomes the Latin arrhabo, contrast arrha; French arres; English earles (in the old English expression Earl's or Arle's money) and earnest. These three words occur in the Hebrew, Sept., and Vulgate in Gen 38:17-18, and in Gen 38:20, with the exception that the Vulgate there changes it to pignus. The use of these words in this passage clearly illustrates their general import, which is that of an earnest or pledge, given and received, to assure the fulfillment of an engagement. Hesychius explains ἀῤῥαβών by πρόδομα, something given beforehand. The Hebrew word was used generally for pledge (Gen 38:17), and in its cognate forms for surety (Pro 17:18) and hostage (2Ki 14:14). The Greek derivative, however, acquired a more technical sense, as signifying the deposit paid by the purchaser on entering into an agreement for the purchase of anything (Suid. Lex. s.v.) This idea attaches to all the particular applications of the word, as anything given by way of warrant or security for the performance of a promise, part of a debt paid as an assurance of paving the remainder; part of the price of anything paid beforehand to confirm the bargain between buyer and seller; part of a servant's wages paid at the time of hiring, for the purpose of ratifying the engagement on both sides. The idea that the earnest is either to be returned upon the fulfillment of the engagement, or to be considered as part of the stipulation, is also included. A similar, legal and technical sense attaches to earnest, the payment of which places both the vendor and purchaser in a position to enforce the carrying out of the contract (Blackstone, 2:30). The payment of earnest-money under the name of arrabon is still one of the common occurrences of Arab life. Similar customs of paying down at the time of a contract "something to bind the bargain" have prevailed among all nations. (See Smith's Dictionary of Class. Antiq. s.v. Aarha.) SEE BARGAIN.

The word is used three times in the New Testament, but always in a figurative sense: in the first (2Co 1:22) it is applied to the gifts of the Holy Spirit which God bestowed upon the apostles, and by which he might be said to have hired them to be the servants of his Son; and which were the earnest, assurance, and commencement of those far superior blessings which he would bestow on them in the life to come as the wages, of their faithful services: in the two latter (2Co 5:5; Eph 1:13-14) it is applied to the gifts bestowed on Christians generally upon whom, after baptism, the apostles laid their hands, and which were to them an earnest of obtaining a heavenly habitation and inheritance, upon the supposition of their fidelity. This use of the term finely illustrates the augmented powers and additional capacities promised in a future state. Jerome, in his comment on the second passage, exclaims, "Si arrhabo tantus, quanta erit possession the earnest was so great, how great must be the possession!" (See Kype, Macknight, and Middleton on these passages; Le Moyne, Not. ad Var. Sacr. p. 460-480.) In a spiritual sense, it denotes those gifts and graces which the Christian receives as the earnest and assurance of perfect happiness in a future world. (See Clauswitz, De Arrhabosse, Halle, 1747; Winzer, Comment. in loc. Lips. 1836; Schulthess, in Keil and Tschirner's Analecten, II, 1:215 sq.) There is a marked distinction between pledge and earnest in this respect, that the latter is a past-payment and therefore implies the identity in kind of the deposit with the future full payment; whereas a pledge may be something of a totally different nature, as in Gen 38:1-30, to be resumed by the depositor when he has completed his contract. Thus the expression "earnest of the Spirit" implies, beyond the idea of security the identity in kind, though not in degree, and the continuity of the Christian's privileges in this world and in the next. Moreover, a pledge is taken back when the promise which it guaranteed is fulfilled; but whatever is given as earnest, being a part in advance of the whole, is of course retained. SEE PLEDGE.

Earring stands in the Authorized Version as the rendering of three Hebrews words of considerably different import. SEE RING.

1. עָגַיל (agil', from its roundness), properly a ring, specially an ear-ring (Num 31:50; Eze 16:12), nearly all the ancient ear-rings exhibited in the sculptures of Egypt and Persepolis being of a circular shape. These are the ἐνώτια spoken of in Jdt 10:4.

2. נֶזֶם (ne'zem, either from its perforating, or from its use to muzzle in the case of animals), a ring, specially a nose-ring, but also an earring, which two da not seem, therefore, to have materially differed in form. It most certainly denotes an earring in Gen 35:4; but in Gen 24:47; Pro 11:22; Isa 3:21, it signifies a nose-jewel, and it is doubtful which of the two is intended in Jdg 8:24-25; Job 42:11. SEE WOMAN. Hence also we find לִחִשׁ (lach'ash, properly a whispering or incantation), a charm or remedy against enchantment, i.e., a superstitious ornament, often a gem inlaid in a plate or ring of precious metal, on which certain magic formulas were inscribed, and which was worn suspended from the neck or in the ears of Oriental females (Isa 3:20). SEE ENCHANTMENT. The " collars" or " chains" spoken of in Jdg 8:26; Isa 3:19, may also have been a species of eardrop. See those terms.

No conclusion can be formed as to the shape of the Hebrew earrings except from the signification of the words employed, and from the analogy of similar ornaments in ancient sculpture. The word נֶזֶם, by which these ornaments are usually described, is unfortunately ambiguous, originally referring to the nose-ring (as its root indicates), and thence transferred to the ear-ring. The full expression for the latter is נֶזֶם אֲשֶׁר בְּאָזְנִיַם (Gen 35:4), in contradistinction to נֶזֶם עִלאּאִ (Gen 24:47). In the majority of cases, however, the kind is not specified, and the only clew to the meaning is the context. The term occurs in this undefined sense in Jdg 8:24; Job 42:11; Pro 25:12; Hos 2:13. The material of which the earring was made was generally gold (Exo 32:2), and its form circular, as we may infer from the name עָגַיל, by which it is described (Num 31:50; Eze 16:12): such was the shape usual in Egypt (Wilkinson's Egyptians, 3:370). They were worn by women and by youth of both sexes (Exodus 1:100). It has been inferred from the passage quoted, and from Jdg 8:24, that they were not worn by men: these passages are however, by no meats conclusive. In the former an order is given to the men in such terms that they could not be mentioned, though they might have been implicitly, included; in the latter the amount of the gold is the peculiarity adverted to, and not the character of the ornament, a peculiarity which is still noticeable among the inhabitants of southern Arabia (Wellsted's Travels, 1:321). The mention of the sons in Exo 32:2 (which, however, is omitted in the Septuagint), is in favor of their having been worn, and it appears unlikely that the Hebrews presented an exception to the almost universal practice of Asiatics, both in ancient and modern times. That they were not, however, usually worn by men is implied in Judges 14:24, where gold earrings are mentioned as distinctive of the Ishmaelitish tribes. The men of Egypt also abstained from the use of earrings; but how extensively they were worn by men in other nations is shown by the preceding group of heads of different foreigners, collected from the Egyptian monuments. By this also the usual forms of the most ancient ornaments of this description are sufficiently displayed. Those worn by the Egyptian ladies were large, round, single hoops of gold, from one inch and a half to two finches and one third in diameter, and frequently of still greater size, or made of six single rings soldered together. Such probably was the round agil of the Hebrews. Among persons of high or royal rank the ornament was sometimes in the shape of an asp, whose body was of gold set with precious stones. Silver earrings have also been found at Thebes, either plain hoops like the earrings of gold, or simple studs. The ancient Assyrians, both men and women, wore earrings of exquisite shape and finish, especially the kings, and those on the later monuments are generally in the form of a cross (Layard, Nineveh, 2:234, 250).

Lane thus describes those now worn by Egyptian females: "Of earrings ('halak') there is a great variety. Some of the more usual kinds are here represented. The first is of diamonds set in silver. It consists of a drop suspended within a wreath hanging from a sprig. The back of the silver is gilt, to prevent its being tarnished by perspiration. The specimen here given is that for the right ear; its fellow is similar, but with the sprig reversed. This pair of earrings is suited for a lady of wealth; so also is the second, which resembles the former, excepting that it has a large pearl in the place of the diamond drop and wreath, and that the diamonds of the sprig are set in gold. Number 3 is a side view of the same. The next consists of gold, and an emerald pierced through the middle, with a small diamond above the emerald. Emeralds are generally pierced in Egypt, and spoiled by this process as much as by not being cut with facets. The last is of gold, with a small ruby in the center. The ruby is set in fine filigree-work, which is surrounded by fifteen balls of gold. To the seven lower balls are suspended as many circular bark" (Mod. Eg. 2:404). The modern Oriental earrings are more usually jeweled drops or pendants than circlets of gold, but sometimes they consist of a small round plate of silver or gold suspended from a small ring inserted into the ear (Kitto, Pict. Bible, note on Exo 32:2). This circular plate (about the size of a halfpenny) is either marked with fanciful figures or set with small stones. It is the same kind of thing which in that country (Mesopotamia) is worn as a nose-jewel, and in it we perhaps find the Hebrew earring, which is denoted by the same word that describes a nose-jewel. Jewels were sometimes attached to the rings: they were called נְטַיפוֹת (from נָטִ, to drop), a word rendered in Jdg 8:26, Sept. ὅρμισκοι, Vulg. sonilia, A.V. "collars;" and in Isa 3:19, καθεμα, torques, " chains." The size of the earrings still worn in Eastern countries far exceeds what is usual among ourselves (Harmer's Observations, 3, page 311, 314), hence they formed a handsome present (Job 42:11) or offering to the service of God (Num 31:50). SEE JEWEL.

The earring appears to have been regarded with superstitious reverence as an amulet: thus it is named in the Chaldee and Samaritan versions קִדַישָׁא, a holy thing; and in Isa 3:20 the word לְחָשַׁים, prop. amulets, is rendered in the A.V., after the Septuagint and Vulgate, earrings. On this account they were surrendered along with the idols by Jacob's household (Gen 35:4). Chardin describes earrings, with talismanic figures and characters on them, as still existing in the East (Brown's Antiquities, 2:305). SEE AMULET.

## Earnulph[[@Headword:Earnulph]]

             SEE ARNULPH.

## Ears[[@Headword:Ears]]

             SEE EAR.

## Ears of Corn[[@Headword:Ears of Corn]]

              (מְלַילָה, melilah', so called from being cut of, Deu 23:25; שַׁבֹּלֶתshibbo'leth, from its growth, Gen 41:5 sq.; Rth 2:2; Job 24:24; Isa 17:5; כִּרְמֶל, karsuel', prop. a cultivated field, as often; hence produce or ears therefrom, i.e., grits, Lev 2:14; Lev 23:14; 2Ki 4:42; אָבַיב, abib', green ears, Exo 9:31; Lev 2:14; στάχυς, Mat 12:1; Mar 2:23; Mar 4:28; Luk 6:1). The remarkable productiveness of the cereals in Egypt has been proverbial from the days of Joseph (Gen 41:47) to the present time. Jowett states, in his Christian Researches, that when in Egypt he plucked up at random a few stalks out of the thick grain-fields. " We counted the number of stalks which sprouted from single grains of seed, carefully pulling to pieces each root in order to see that it was one plant. The first had seven stalks, the next three, then eighteen, then fourteen. Each stalk would bear an ear." Even greater numbers than these are mentioned by Dr. Shaw, and still more by Pliny. It also often happens that one of the stalks will bear two ears, while each of these ears will shoot out into a number of lesser ears, affording a most plentiful increase. SEE CORN.

## Ears, Touching Of[[@Headword:Ears, Touching Of]]

             In holy communion it seems to have been the custom to touch the organs of sense with the moisture left on the lips after receiving the cup.

## Ears, Touching the[[@Headword:Ears, Touching the]]

             an ancient ceremony in the baptism of catechumens, which consisted in touching their ears and saying Ephphatha, "Be opened." This was joined with the imposition of hands and with exorcism, and is supposed to have signified the opening of the understanding to receive instruction on the faith. Ambrose derives the custom from our Savior's example in saying Ephphatha, when he cured the deaf and dumb. The practice never became general. Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 10, chapter 2, § 13.

## Earth[[@Headword:Earth]]

             properly the name of the planet on which we dwell. SEE GEOGRAPHY.

I. There are two Hebrew words thus rendered in the A.V., both of which are rendered by γῆ in the Sept., and this γῆ is rendered by "earth," "land," " ground, "in the New Testament. SEE DUST.

1. אֲדָמָה, adamah', is the earth in the sense of soil or ground, particularly as being susceptible of cultivation; hence the expression אַישׁ אֲדָמָה, lit. "man of the ground," for an agriculturist (Gen 9:20). The; earth supplied the elementary substance of which man's body was formed, and the terms adam and adamah are brought into juxtaposition, implying an etymological connection (Gen 2:7). SEE ADAM. The opinion that man's body was formed of earth prevailed among the Greeks (Hesiod, Op. et Di. 61, 70; Plato, Rep. page 269), the Romans (Virgil, Georg. 2:341; Ovid, Met. 1:82), the Egyptians (Diod. Sic. 1:10), and other ancient nations. It is evidently based on the observation of the material into which the body is resolved after death (Job 10:9; Ecc 12:7). The law prescribed earth as the material out of which altars were to be raised (Exo 20:24); Bahr (Symb. 1:488) sees in this a reference to the name adam: others, with more reason, compare the ara de cespite of the Romans (Ovid, Trist. 5:5, 9; Horace, Od. 3:8, 4, 5), and view it as a precept of simplicity. Naaman's request for two mules' burden of earth (2Ki 5:17) was based on the idea that Jehovah, like the heathen deities, was a local god, and could be worshipped acceptably only on his own soil. SEE GROUND.

2. More generally אֶרֶוֹ, e'rets, which is explained by Von Bohlen (Introduction to Gen 2:6) as meaning etymologically the low in opposition to the high, i.e., the heaven. It is applied in a more or less extended sense: 1, to the whole world (Gen 1:1); 2, to land as opposed to sea (Gen 1:10); 3, to a country (Gen 21:32); 4, to a plot of ground (Gen 23:15); and, 5, to the ground on which a man stands (Gen 33:3); also, in a more general view, 6, to "the inhabitants of the earth" (Gen 6:11; Gen 11:1); 7, to heathen countries, as distinguished from the land of Israel, especially during the theocracy; i.e., all the rest of the world excepting Israel (2Ki 18:25; 2Ch 13:9, etc.); particularly the empire of Chaldaea and Assyria (Ezr 1:2); 8, in the New Testament especially, "the earth" appears in our translation as applied to the land of Judea. As in many of these passages it might seem as if the habitable globe were intended, the use of so ambiguous a term as "the earth" should have been avoided, and the original rendered by "the land," as in Lev 25:23; Isa 10:23, and elsewhere. This is the sense which the original bears in Mat 23:35; Mat 27:45; Mar 15:33; Luk 4:25; Luk 21:23; Rom 9:28; Jam 5:17. 9. Finally, in a spiritual sense, the word is employed (in the N.T.) in contrast with heaven, to denote things earthly and carnal (Joh 3:31; Col 3:1-2). See Wemyss, Symbol. Dict. s.v.; SEE WORLD.

To demand earth and water was a custom of the ancient Persians, by which they required a people to acknowledge their dominion; Nebuchodonosor, in the Greek of Judith (2:7), commands Holofernes to march against the people of the West, who had refused submission, and to declare to them that they were to prepare earth and water. Darius ordered his envoys to demand earth and water of the Scythians; and Megabysus required the same of Amyntas, king of Macedonia, in the name of Darius. Polybius and Plutarch notice this custom among the Persians. Some believe that these symbolical demands denoted dominion of the earth and sea; others, that the earth represented the food received from it, corn and fruits; the water, drink, which is the second part of human nourishment. Sir 15:16, in much the same sense, says, " The Lord hath set fire and water before thee; stretch forth thy hand unto whether thou wilt; and chapter 39:26, "Fire and water are the most necessary things to life." Fire and water were considered by the ancients as the first principles of the generation, birth; and preservation of man. Proscribed persons were debarred from their use; as, on the contrary, wives in their nuptial ceremonies were obliged to touch them. SEE ELEMENT.

II. The idea which the ancient Hebrews had of the figure of the earth can only be conjectured from incidental hints occasionally given in Scripture (Isa 40:22; Pro 8:27; Job 26:10; Psa 24:2; Psa 136:6). From these passages, taken together, says Rosenmuller (Alterthumsk. I, 1:133 sq.), we obtain the notion of the earth's disk as circular, rising out of the water, and surrounded with the ocean, the heaven being spread over it as a canopy. Though floating free in the boundless immensity of space, yet, through the Creator's might, it remains firmly fixed, without moving (1 Chronicles 17:30; Psa 93:1; Psa 104:5; Psa 119:90). It is rather inconclusive, however, to infer the popular notions of the earth's figure from what may have been nothing more than the bold imagery of poets. Some have supposed that so long as the Hebrews were a nomadic race, they conceived of the earth as resembling a round tent, with the expanse as its covering; but that in later times, when domiciled in Palestine, they spoke of it as a splendid palace resting upon its many pillars (2Sa 22:8; Psa 75:3; Psa 104:5; Proverbs 5:25-29). The Greek and Roman writers (Hesiod, Theogn. 116 sq.; Ovid, Metam. 1:5 sq.; comp. Euseb. Prasp. Ev. 1:10 [Sanchoniathon, ed. Orelli, p. 9 sq.] Zendavesta, 1:170 sq.) also vary in their representations on this point, describing the earth sometimes as an oblong square, sometimes as a cube, sometimes as; a pyramid, sometimes as a chlamys, or outspread mantle. (See Eichhorn, Urgesch. ed. Gabler, Nurnb. 1790; Doderlein Rel. — Unterr. 7:59 sq.; Beck, Weltgesch. 1:99 sq.; Bauer, Hebr. Mythol. 1:63 sq.; De Wette, Bibl. Dogm. page 76 sq.; Baumgarten-Crusius, Bibl. Theolog. p. 264 sq.; Colln, Bibl. Theol. 1:166; Mignot, in the Memoires de l'Acad. des Inscr. 34:352 sq.; Anquetil, Oupnekhat, 1:409 sq.; Johannsen, Die kosmog., Ansichten d. Inder u. Hebr. Altona, 1833, Dornedden, in Eichhorn's Bibl. 10:284 sq., 548 sq.; Gessner, in the Comment. Soc. Goett. volume 2; Corrodi, Beitr. zum vern. Denken, 18:15 sq.; Link, Urwelt, 1:268 sq.; Wagner, Geschichte d. Urgesch. p. 496 sq.; Umbreit, in the Stud. u. Kritiken, 1839, p. 189 sq.; Ballenstedt, Die Urwelt, 3d ed. Quedlinb. 1819; Von Schrank, Physik. theolog. Erkldr. der 6 Schopfungstage, Augsburg, 1829; Beke, Researches in Primeval History, London, 1834; Burton, View of the Creation, London, 1836; Tholuck, Literar. Anzeig. 1833, No. 67-78; Keil, apologia Mos. traditionis, Dorpat, 1839; Benner, De censura Longini in verba Gen 1:3, Giess. 1739; Burmeister, Gesch. d. Schopfung, Lips. 1843; Waterkeyn, Kosmos Hieros Grimma, 1846; Goguet, Urspr. d. Gesetze, 2:227.) SEE COSMOGONY.

## Earthen Vessel or Earthenware[[@Headword:Earthen Vessel or Earthenware]]

             SEE POTTERY.

## Earthquake[[@Headword:Earthquake]]

              (רִעִשׁ, ra'ash, a shaking, σεισμός).The proximate cause of earthquakes, though by no means accurately defined, seems referable to the action of internal heat or fire. That the earth was once subject to the action of a vast internal power springing probably from the development of subterranean or central heat, the elevations and depressions, and the generally scarred and torn character of its exterior make sufficiently evident. A power similar in kind, but more restricted in degree, is still at work in the bowels of the earth, and occasionally breaks down all barriers and devastates certain parts of the world. There is good reason for holding that earthquakes are closely connected with volcanic agency. Both probably spring from the same cause, and may be regarded as one mighty influence operating to somewhat dissimilar results. Volcanic agency, therefore, is an indication of earthquakes, and traces of the first may be taken as indications of the existence (either present or past, actual or possible) of the latter. (See Hitchcock's Geology, p. 234 sq.) The manifestation of these awful phenomena. is restricted in its range. Accordingly, geologists have laid down certain volcanic regions or bands within which this manifestation takes place. Over these regions various traces of volcanic agency are found, such as either gaseous vapors, or hot springs, or bituminous substances, and in some instances (occasionally) active volcanoes. Several sources of bitumen are found on the Tigris, in the Persian mountains, near the Kharun, and at Bushire, as well as along the Euphrates. At Hit, especially on the last-mentioned river, it exists on a very large scale, and, having been much used from the earliest times, seems inexhaustible. Abundant traces of it are also to be seen amid the ruins and over the entire vicinity of Hillah, the ancient Babylon. Syria and Palestine abound in volcanic appearances. Between the river Jordan and Damascus lies a volcanic tract. The entire country about the Dead Sea presents indubitable tokens of volcanic agency. Accordingly, these places come within one of the volcanic regions. The chief of these are,

 (1) that which extends from the Caspian Sea to the Azores; (2) from the Aleutian Isles to the Moluccas; (3) that of the Andes; (4) the African; (5) the Icelandic.

Syria and Palestine are embraced within the first band, and these countries have not unfrequently been subject to earthquakes. (See Stanley, Palest. pages 279, 283, 285, 363; Volney, Trav. 1:281; Rusegger, Reisess, page 205). SEE PALESTINE.

That earthquakes were among the extraordinary phenomena of Palestine in ancient times is shown in their being an element in the poetical imagery of the Hebrews, and a source of religious admonition and devout emotion. An earthquake, when great, overturns and changes the surface of the earth, subverting mountains, hills, and rocks, sinking some parts, elevating others, altering the course of rivers, making ponds and lakes on dry lands, and drying up those that already existed; and is therefore a proper symbol of great evolutions or changes in the government or political world (Heb 12:26). See Wemyss, Symbolical Dict. s.v. In Psa 18:7, we read, "Then the earth shook and trembled; the foundations also of the chills moved and were shaken, because he was wroth" (comp. Hab 3:6; Nah 1:5; Isa 5:25). It was not an unnatural transition that any signal display of the will, sovereignty, or goodness of Providence should be foretold in connection with, and accompanied as by other signs in the heavens above or on the earth below, so by earthquakes and their fearful concomitants (see Joe 2:28; Mat 24:7; Mat 24:29). Earthquakes are not unfrequently attended with fissures of the earth's surface; instances of this are recorded in connection with the destruction of Korah and his company (Num 16:32; compare Josephus, Ant. 4:3, 3), and at the time of our Lord's death (Mat 27:51); the former may be paralleled by a similar occurrence at Oppido, in Calabria, A.D. 1783, where the earth opened to the extent of 500 and a depth of more than 200 feet, and again by the sinking of the bed of the Tagus at Lisbon, in which the quay was swallowed up (Pfaff, Schopfungsgesch. p. 115). These depressions are sometimes on a very large scale; the subsidence of the valley of Siddim, at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, may be attributed to an earthquake. Similar depressions have occurred in many districts, the most remarkable being the submersion and subsequent re- elevation of the temple of Serapis at Puteoli. The frequency of earthquakes about the Dead Sea is testified in the name Bela (Gen 14:2; compare Jerome ad Isa 15:1-9). SEE SODOM. The awe which an earthquake never fails to inspire, "conveying the idea of some universal and unlimited danger" (Humboldt's Kosmos, 2:212), rendered it a fitting token of the presence of Jehovah (1Ki 19:11); hence it is frequently noticed in connection with his appearance (Jdg 5:4; 2Sa 22:8; Psa 77:18; Psa 97:4; Psa 104:32; Amo 8:8; Hab 3:10). Earthquakes, together with thunder, lightning, and other fearful phenomena of nature, form no small portion of the stock of materials which the interpreters of the German rationalistic school employ with no less liberality than confidence in order to explain after their manner events recorded in the Scriptures which have been commonly referred to the immediate agency of God. Hezel, Paulus, as other miracle exploders would, but for this resource, find their "occupation gone." But, if there is reason for 'the statement that truth is sometimes stranger than fiction, it may with equal propriety be observed that their " natural" causes are most unnatural, unlikely, and insufficient. SEE MIRACLES.

The first visitation of the kind recorded as having happened to Palestine was in the reign of Ahab (about B.C. 905), when Elijah (1Ki 19:11-12) was directed to go forth and stand upon the mountain before Jehovah: "And behold Jehovah passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before Jehovah; but Jehovah was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but Jehovah was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but Jehovah was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice." A terrible earthquake took place "in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah" (B.C. 781), which Josephus (Ant. 9, 10, 4) says " shook the ground, and a rent was made in the Temple, so that the rays of the sun shone through it, which, falling upon 'the king's face, struck him with the leprosy," a punishment which the historian ascribes to the wrath of God consequent on Uzziah's usurpation of the priest's office. That this earthquake was of an awful character may be learned from the fact that Zechariah (Zec 14:5) thus speaks respecting it: "Ye shall flee as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah:" and it likewise appears from Amos (Amo 1:1) that the event was so striking, and left such deep impressions on men's minds, as to become a sort of epoch from which to date and reckon; the prophet's words are, "two years before the earthquake." SEE UZZIAH. From Zec 14:4 we are led to infer that a great convulsion took place at this time in the Mount of Olives, the mountain being split so as to leave a valley between its summits. Josephus records something of the sort, but his account is by no means clear, for his words (τοῦ ὄρους ἀποῥῥαγῆναι τὸ ἣμισν τοῦ κατὰ τὴν δύσιν) can hardly mean the western half of the mountain, as Whiston seems to think, but the half of the western mountain, i.e., of the Mount of Evil Counsel, though it is not clear why this height particularly should be termed the western mountain. We cannot but think that the two accounts have the same foundation, and that the Mount of Olives was really affected by the earthquake. Hitzig (Comm. in Zechariah) suggests that the name מִשְׁחַית"corruption," may have originated at this time, the rolling down of the side of the hill, as described by Josephus, entitling it to be described as the destroying mountain, in the sense in which the term occurs in Jer 2:25. SEE AZAL.

The only important or clear earthquake mentioned in the New Testament (except the doubtful one of Mat 28:2) is that which happened at the crucifixion of the Savior of mankind (Mat 27:50-51; compare Luk 23:44-45; Mar 15:33). The concomitant darkness is most naturally held to have been an attendant on the earthquake. Earthquakes are not seldom attended by accompaniments which obscure the light of day during (as in this case from the sixth to the ninth hour, that is, from 12 o'clock at noon to 8 o'clock P.M.) several hours. If this is the fact, then the record is consistent with natural phenomena, and the darkness which skeptics have pleaded against speaks actually in favor of the credibility of the Gospel. Now it is well known to naturalists that such obscurations are by no means uncommon. It may be enough to give the following instances. A very remarkable volcanic eruption took place on the 19th of January, 1835, in the volcano of Coseguina, situated in the Bay of Fonseca (usually called the coast of Conchagua), in Central America. The eruption was preceded by a rumbling noise, accompanied by a column of smoke which issued from the mountain, increasing until it assumed the form and appearance of a large dense cloud, which, when viewed at the distance of thirty miles, appeared like an immense plume of feathers, rising with considerable velocity, and expanding in every direction. In the course of the two following days several shocks of earthquakes were felt; the morning of the 22d rose fine and clear, but a dense cloud of a pyramidal form was observed in the direction of the volcano. This gradually ascended, and by 11 o'clock A.M. it had spread over the whole firmament, entirely obscuring the light of day, the darkness equaling in intensity that of the most clouded night: this darkness continued with little intermission for three days; during the whole time a fine black powder continued to fall. This darkness extended over half of Central America. The convulsion was such as to change the outline of the coast, turn the course of a river, and form two new islands. Precisely analogous phenomena were exhibited on occasions of earthquakes that took place at Cartago, in Central America, when there prevailed a dense black fog, which lasted for three days (Recreations in Physical Geography, page 382). In the case of the volcanic eruption which overwhelmed Herculaneum and Pompeii (A.D. 79), we learn from the younger Pliny that a dense column of vapor was first seen rising vertically from Vesuvius, and then spreading itself out laterally, so that its upper portion resembled the head, and its lower the trunk of a pine. This black cloud was pierced occasionally by flashes of fire as vivid as lightning, succeeded by darkness more profound than night, and ashes fell even at Misenum. These appearances agree perfectly with those witnessed in more recent eruptions, especially those of Monte Nuovo in 1538, and Vesuvius in 1822. Indeed earthquakes appear to exert a very marked influence on our atmosphere: among other effects, Lyell (Principles of Geology, 1:400) enumerates sudden gusts of wind, interrupted by dead calms; evolution of electric matter or of inflammable gas from the soil, with sulphurous and mephitic vapors; a reddening of the sun's disk, and a haziness in the air often continued for months (Joe 2:30-31). Other interpreters, however, understand the earthquake in Mat 27:54 to have been merely some special and supernatural operation of God, in attestation of the marvelous work that was in progress, producing a tremulous motion in the immediate locality, and in connection therewith a sensible consternation in the minds of the immediate actors; hence there is no other historical allusion to it. This view is confirmed by its being in the second case connected with the angel's descent (Mat 28:2; compare 1Sa 14:15). Like the one that occurred at Philippi (Act 16:16), it is perhaps to be regarded as a somewhat exceptional phenomenon, wrought for a specific purpose, and consequently very limited as to its sphere of action. Nor does it appear from any notices of Scripture that the phenomena of earthquakes in the ordinary and extensive sense of the term, played more than a very occasional and subordinate part in the scenes and transactions of sacred history. Treatises in Latin on the earthquake at our Savior's passion have been written by Berger (Viteb. 1710), Posner (Jen. 1672), Schmerbauch (Lubbeai. 1756), Schmid (Jen. 1683). SEE DARKNESS.

An earthquake devastated Judaea some years (31) before the birth of our Lord, at the time of the battle of Actium, which Josephus (Ant. 15:52) reports was such "as had not happened at any other time, which brought great destruction upon the cattle in that country. About ten thousand men also perished by the fall of houses." Jerome writes of an earthquake which, in the time of his childhood (about A.D. 315), destroyed Rabbath Moab (Jerome on Isa 15:1-9). The writers of the Middle Ages also speak of earthquakes in Palestine, stating that they were not only formidable, but frequent. In 1834 an earthquake shook Jerusalem, and injured the chapel of the nativity at Bethlehem. In 1837 (January 1) Jerusalem and its vicinity were visited by severe shocks of earthquake, yet the city remains without serious injury from these subterranean causes. This last earthquake totally overthrew the village of Safed, in Galilee (Thomson, Land and Book, 1:428 sq.). For a full account of these and others, affecting various parts of Syria, see Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palest. volume 2, chapter 4, Comp. Bulenger, in Graevii Thesaur. 5:515 sq.; Forbiger, Handb. d. alt. Geogr. 1:636 sq.

## Earulfus[[@Headword:Earulfus]]

             abbot and confessor, commemorated Dec. 29.

## East[[@Headword:East]]

             is the rendering of the following terms in the English Bible. SEE GEOGRAPHY.

1. מַזְרִח mizrach' properly denotes the rising, sc. of the sun, and strictly corresponds with the Greek, άνατολή, and the Latin, oriens. It is used tropically for the east indefinitely (Psa 103:12; Dan 8:9; Amo 8:12, etc.); also definitely for some place in relation to others, thus, "The land of the east," i.e., the country lying to the east of Syria, the Elymais (Zec 8:7); "the east of Jericho" (Jos 4:19); "the east gate" (Neh 3:29), and adverbially " eastward" (1Ch 7:28; 1Ch 9:24, etc.). Sometimes the full expression מַזְרִחשֶׁמֶשׁ, sunrise is used (indefinitely Isa 41:25; definitely, Jdg 11:18). See below.

2. קֶדֶם, ke'dem (with its modifications), properly means what is in front of, before (comp. Psa 139:5; Isa 9:11 [12]). As the Hebrews, in pointing out the quarters, looked towards the east, קֶדֶם, fore, came to signify the east, as אָהוֹר, behind, the west, and יָמַין, the right hand, the south. In this sense kedem is used (a) indefinitely, Gen 11:2; Gen 13:11, etc.; (b) relatively, Num 34:11, etc.; (a) definitely, to denote the regions lying to the east of Palestine (Gen 29:1; Num 23:7; Isa 9:11; sometimes in the full form, אֶרֶוֹ9קֶדֶם, " land of the east" (Gen 25:6), the inhabitants of which are denominated בְּנֵיקֶדם" children of the east." SEE BENE-KEDEM.

Sometimes kedem and mizrach are used together (e.g. Exo 27:13; Jos 19:12), which is, after all not so tautological as it appears to be in our translation "on the east side eastward." Bearing in mind this etymological distinction, it is natural that kedem should be used when the four quarters of the world are described (as in Gen 13:14; Gen 28:14; Job 23:8-9; Eze 47:18 sq.), and mizrach when the east is only distinguished from the west (Jos 11:3; Psa 1:1; Psa 103:12; Psa 113:3; Zec 8:7), or from some other one quarter (Dan 8:9; Dan 11:44; Amo 8:12); exceptions to this usage occur in Psa 107:3 and Isa 43:5, each, however, admitting of explanation. Again, kedem is used in a strictly geographical sense to describe a spot or country immediately before another in an easterly direction; hence it occurs in such passages as Gen 2:8; Gen 3:24; Gen 11:2; Gen 13:11; Gen 25:6; and hence the subsequent application of the term as a proper name (Gen 25:6, eastward, unto the land of Kedem), to the lands lying immediately eastward of Palestine, viz. Arabia, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, etc.; on the other hand, mizrach is used of the far east with a less definite signification (Isa 41:2; Isa 41:25; Isa 43:5; Isa 46:11). In describing aspect or direction, the terms are used indifferently (comp. kedem in Lev 1:16, and Jos 7:2, with mizrach in 2Ch 5:12, and 1Ch 5:10). SEE WEST; etc.

"The East" is the name given by the ancient Hebrews to a certain region, without any regard to its relation to the eastern part of the heavens, comprehending not only Arabia Deserta and the lands of Moab and Ammon, which really lay to the east of Palestine but also Armenia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Chaldea, which were situated rather to the north than the east of Judaea. Its geographical boundaries include Syria, the countries beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, and the shores of the Indiana Ocean and of the Arabian Gulf. The name given to this entire region by the Hebrews was אֶרֶוֹ קֶדֶם (ἀνατολή), or the land of Kedem or East; by the Babylonians it was called עֲרָב, or Α᾿ραβία Arabia. Its miscellaneous population were called by the former "sons of the East," or Orientals, and by the latter either Arabians, or the "people of the West." The Jews themselves also apply to them the Babylonian name in some of their books written after the Captivity (2Ch 22:1; Neh 2:9). The Arabs anciently denominated themselves, and do to this day, by either of these names. To this region belong the "kings of the East" (Isa 19:11; Jer 25:19-25, Hebrew). The following passages may suffice as instances showing the arbitrary application of the term "east" to this region. Balaam says that Balak, king of Moab, had brought him from the mountains of the east (Num 23:7), i.e., from Pethor on the Euphrates. Isaiah places Syria in the east (Num 9:11), " the Syrians from the east" (bishop Lowth). The distinction seems evident in Gen 29:1," Jacob came unto the land of the children of the East." It occurs again in Jdg 6:3, "Even the children of the East came against them" (Sept. οἱ υἱοὶ άνατολῶν; Vulg. coeteri Orientalium nationum). The preceding facts enable us to account for the prodigious numbers of persons sometimes assembled in war against the Israelites (Jdg 6:5; Jdg 7:12), " and the children of the East were like grasshoppers for multitude," and for the astonishing carnage recorded (Jdg 8:10), "there fell a hundred and twenty thousand men that drew the sword." It seems that the inhabitants of this region were distinguished for their proficiency in the arts and sciences (compare 1Ki 1:4; 1Ki 1:30), and were addicted in the time of Isaiah to superstition (Isa 26:1-21). SEE ARABIA.

The east seems to have been regarded as symbolical of distance (Isa 46:11), as the land stretched out in these directions without any known limit. In Isa 2:6, the house of Jacob is said to be "replenished from the east" (מ לְאוּ מַקֶּדֶם), which some explain as referring to witchcraft, or the arts of divination practiced in the East while others, with greater probability, understand it of the men of the East, the diviners and soothsayers who came from the east (compare Job 15:2); the correct text may, however, be מַקֶּסֶם, with sorcery, which gives a better sense (Gesen. Thesaur. page 1193). SEE WITCHCRAFT.

3. Α᾿νατολή, sunrise. This word usually occurs in the plural, and without the article. When, therefore, we read, as in Mat 2:1-2, that μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν came to Jerusalem saying we have seen his star ἑν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, we are led to suspect some special reason for such a variation. The former phrase is naturally rendered as equivalent to Oriental Magi, and the indefinite expression is to be explained by reference to the use of קֶדֶּםin the Old Test. The latter phrase offers greater difficulty. If it be taken "in the east," the questions arise why the singular and not the customary plural should be used? why the article should be added? and why the wise men should have seen the star in the east when the place where the child was lay to the west of their locality (unless, indeed, ἐν τῇ ανατολῇ relates to the star, and not the wise men themselves, to whom it seems to refer). Pressed by the difficulties thus suggested, the majority of recent interpreters take ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ literally in its rise, and trace a correspondence of this with the τεχθείς of the preceding clause: they inquired for the child, whom they knew to be born, because they had seen the rising of his star, the signal of his birth. Alford objects to this, that for such a meaning we should expect αὐτοῦ, if not in Mat 2:2, certainly in Mat 2:9; but the construction falls under the case where the article by indicating something closely associated with the subject, supersedes the use of the demonstrative pronoun. In the Sept. ἀνατολαί is used both for kedem and mizrach. It should be observed that the expression is, with but few exceptions (Dan 8:9; Rev 21:13; compare 7:2; 16:12, from which it would seem to have been John's usage to insert ἡλίου), ἀνατολαί (Mat 2:1; Mat 8:11; Mat 24:27; Luk 13:29), and not ἀνατολή. It is hardly possible that Matthew would use the two terms indifferently in succeeding verses (Mat 2:1-2), particularly as he adds the article to ἀνατολή, which is invariably absent in other cases (compare Rev 21:13). He seems to imply a definiteness in the locality-that it was the country called קֶדֶם, or ἀσατολή (comp. the modern Anatolia), as distinct from the quarter or point of the compass (ἀνατολαί) in which it lay. In confirmation of this, it may be noticed that in the only passage where the article is prefixed to kedem (Gen 10:30), the term is used for a definite and restricted locality, namely, Southern Arabia. SEE STAR IN THE EAST.

The only other terms rendered " east" in the Scriptures are the following: חִרְסוּת (charsuth', pottery), applied to a gate of Jerusalem, improperly called "east gate" (Jer 19:2), but meaning the potters' gate (s.v.), i.e., one which led to the " potters' field" in the valley of Hinnom (see Strong's Harmony and Exposition, Appendix 2, page 11). SEE JERUSALEM. מוֹצָא (motsa', a going forth, as it is elsewhere usually rendered), applied poetically to sunrise (Psa 75:6) For "east-wind," "east-sea," see below.

EAST, TURNING TOWARDS THE.

1. The earliest churches faced eastward; at a later period (4th or 5th century) this was reversed, and the sacramental table was placed at the east, so that worshippers facing it in their devotions were turned towards the east. The Jewish custom was to turn to the west in prayer. Socrates says (Ecclesiastes Hist. book 6, chapter 5) that the church of Antioch had its altar on the west, i.e., towards Jerusalem.

2. Many fanciful reasons are assigned, both by ancient writers and by modern ritualists, for worshipping towards the east. Among them are the following:

" (1.) The rising sun was the symbol of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness; and, since people must worship towards some quarter of the heavens, they chose that which led them to Christ by symbolical representation (Tertullian, Apol. 1:16).

 (2.) The east was the place, of paradise, our ancient habitation and country, which we lost in the first Adam by the Fall, and whither we hope to be restored again, as to our native abode and rest, in the second Adam, Christ our Savior (Apost. Const. lib. 2, c. 57).

 (3.) The, east was considered the most honorable part of the creation, being the seat of light and brightness.

 (4.) Christ made his appearance on earth in the east, and thence ascended into heaven, and there will appear again as the last day. The authority of many of the fathers has been adduced by ecclesiastical writers in support of these views. The author of the Questions to Antiochus, under the name of Athanasius, gives this account of the practice: 'We do not,' says he, 'worship towards the east, as if we thought God any way shut up in those parts of the world, but because God is in himself the true Light. In turning, therefore, towards the created light, we do not worship it, but the great Creator of it; taking occasion from that most excellent element to adore the God who was before all elements and ages in the world.' A little attention to geography shows that these are nothing but fancies. That part of the heavens, for example, which is east at six o'clock in the morning, is west at six o'clock in the evening, so that we cannot at both these periods pray towards 'that quarter of the heavens where (according to Wheatly) God is supposed to have his peculiar residence of glory,' unless, if we turn to the east at morning prayer, we turn to west at even song. Not only so, but two individuals on opposite sides of the globe, though both suppose that they are praying with their faces to the east, are, so far as it respects each other, or any particular 'quarter of the heavens,' praying in opposite directions, one east and the other west, one looking towards that 'quarter,' the other away from it. So that all such reasons are rendered futile by the geographical fact that, owing to the rotation of the earth on its axis, every degree of longitude becomes during the twenty-four hours both east and west."

3. Turning East in Baptism. — In the ancient baptisteries were two apartments: first, a porch or anteroom (προαύλιος οϊvκος), where the catechumens made their renunciations of Satan and confessions of faith; and the inner room (ἐσώτερος οϊvκος), where the ceremony of baptism was performed. When the catechumens were brought into the former of these they were placed with their faces to the west, and were then commanded to renounce Satan with some gesture and rite expressing an indignation against him, as by stretching out their hands, or folding them, or striking them together, and sometimes by spitting at him as if he were present. The words generally used by the candidate were, "I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps, and his service, and his angels, and his inventions, and all things that belong to him, or that are subject to him." The reason assigned by Cyril (Catech. Mystag.) for standing with the face to the west during this adjuration is that the west is the place of darkness; and Satan is darkness, and his kingdom is darkness. That the candidate turned his face to the east, and made his solemn confession of obedience to Christ, generally in these words', I give myself up to thee, O Christ, to be governed by thy laws." This was called promissum, pactum, or votum — a promise, a covenant, a vow. The face was turned to the east because, as Cyril tells his disciples, since they had renounced the devil, the paradise of God, which was planted in the east, and whence our first parents were driven for their transgression into banishment, was now laid open to them. — Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 11, chapter 7, § 4; Farrar, Ecclesiastes Diet. s.v.

4. It is "a curious instance of the inveteracy of popular custom that in Scotland, where everything that savored of ancient usage was set aside as popish by the reformers, the practice of burying with the feet to the east was maintained in the old churchyards; nor is it uncommon still to set down churches with a scrupulous regard to east and west. In modern cemeteries in England and Scotland no attention appears to be paid to the old punctilio of interring with the feet to the east, the nature of the ground alone being considered in the disposition of graves" (Chambers, Encyclopaedia, s.v.). — Wheatly, On Common Prayer, chapter 2, § 2; Hook, Ecclesiastes Dict. s.v.; Bingham, Orig. Eccl. 13, 8:15. SEE CHURCH EDIFICES.

## East Gate[[@Headword:East Gate]]

             SEE EAST.

## East Sea[[@Headword:East Sea]]

              (with the art. הִיָּם הִקִּדְמֹנַי, ha-yam hak-kadmoni', the forward sea; Sept. ἡ θάλασσα ἡ πρώτη) is an epithet used in two passages (Joe 2:20; Eze 47:18) of the DEAD SEA SEE DEAD SEA (q.v.), because it lay on the eastern side of the Holy Land. The Mediterranean Sea, because lying in the opposite direction, was on a like account called the West Sea, or the sea on the western border (Num 34:6; Jos 15:12, etc.). SEE SEA.

## East Wind[[@Headword:East Wind]]

              (קָדַים, prop. the east [as often rendered], i.e., eastern quarter; hence elliptically for the wind from that direction, Job 27:21; Isa 27:8; Jer 18:17; Ezekiel 29:26; the full expression רוּחִ קָדַים. It also occurs, Exo 10:13-14; Exo 10:21; Psa 48:8; Eze 17:10). This is in Scripture frequently referred to as a wind of considerable strength, and also of a peculiarly dry, parching, and blighting nature. In Pharaoh's dream the thin ears of corn are represented as being blasted by an east wind, as, in a later age, Jonah's gourd was withered and himself scorched by "a vehement east wind' (Gen 41:6; Jon 4:8); and often in the prophets, when a blighting desolation is spoken of, it is associated with the east wind, either as the instrumental cause or as a lively image of the evil (Eze 17:10; Eze 19:12; Hos 13:15; Hab 1:9, etc.). This arose from the fact that in Egypt, Palestine, and the lands of the Bible generally, the east wind, or a wind more or less from an eastern direction, blows over burning deserts, and consequently is destitute of the moisture which is necessary to promote vegetation. In Egypt it is rather a south-east than an east wind, which is commonly found most injurious to health and fruitfulness; but this also is familiarly called an east wind, and it often increases to great violence. Ukert thus sums up the accounts of modern travelers on the subject: "In the spring the south wind oftentimes springs up towards the south-east, increasing to a whirlwind. The heat then seems insupportable, although the thermometer does not always rise very high. As long as the south-east wind continues, doors and windows are closed, but the fine dust penetrates everywhere; everything dries up; wooden vessels warp and crack. The thermometer rises suddenly from 16- 20° up to 30-36 degrees, and even 38 degrees of Reaumur. This wind works destruction upon everything. The grass withers, so that it entirely perishes if this wind blows long" (Geogr. page 111). It is stated by another traveler, Wansleb, with special reference to the strong east wind employed on the occasion of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea which took place shortly after Easter: "From Easter to Pentecost is the most stormy part of the year, for the wind commonly blows during this time from the Red Sea, from the east" (see in Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses, page 9 sq). There is nothing therefore, in the scriptural allusions to this wind which is not fully borne out by the reports of modern travelers; alike by sea and by land it is now, as it has ever been, an unwelcome visitant, and carries along with it many disagreeable effects. SEE WIND.

## East, Christianity in the[[@Headword:East, Christianity in the]]

             SEE ARABIA; SEE ASIA; SEE CHINA; SEE INDIA; SEE JAPAN.

## East, Prayer Towards The[[@Headword:East, Prayer Towards The]]

             SEE BOWING; SEE ORIENTATION.

## Eastburn James Wallis, A.M.[[@Headword:Eastburn James Wallis, A.M.]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in London Sept. 26,1797. In 1803 he came to New York, and in 1816 passed' A.B. of Columbia College. In 1818 he became rector of St. George's, Accomac County, Va., where his ministry is still spoken of with great respect. In 1819 he sailed for Santa Cruz, and died on the 2d of December of the same year. He composed the beautiful Trinity Sunday Hymn; a lyric, entitled The Summer Midnight; a poem, Yamoyden, a Tale of the Wars of King Philip. and Various anonymous essays.-Sprague, Ann. v. 635.

## Eastburn, Manton, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Eastburn, Manton, D.D., LL.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in England, February 9, 1801, being brother of James W., the poet. His parents came to America when he was a boy. He graduated from Columbia College, New York, in 1817, and in due time thereafter from the General Theological Seminary in the same city. He was ordained assistant minister of Christ Church in 1822; became rector of' the Church of the Ascension in 1827; was consecrated bishop of Massachusetts December 29, 1842; and died in. Boston, September 12, 1872. Bishop Eastburn published several addresses an essays, and edited Thornton's Family Prayers. See Drake, Diet. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1873, page 133.

## Easter[[@Headword:Easter]]

              (πάσχα, a Greek form of the Hebrews פֵּסִח, and so Latinized by the Vulgate pascha), i.e., Passover. Easter is a word of Saxon origin, and imports a goddess of the Saxons, or, rather, of the East, Estera, in honor of whom sacrifices being annually offered about the Passover time of the year (spring), the name became attached by association of ideas to the Christian festival of the resurrection, which happened at the time of the Passover: hence we say Easter-day, Easter Sunday,, but very improperly; as we by no means refer the festival then kept to the goddess of the ancient Saxons. So the present German word for Easter Ostern, is referred to the same goddess, Estera or Ostera. — Calmet, s.v. The occurrence of this word in the A.V. of Act 12:4 — "Intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people" — is chiefly noticeable as an example of the want of consistency in the translators. SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION. In the earlier English versions Easter had been frequently used as the translation of πάσχα. At the last revision Passover was substituted in all passages but this. It would seem from this, and from the use of such words as "robbers of churches" (Act 19:37), " town-clerk" (Act 19:35), " sergeants" (Act 16:35), " deputy" (Act 13:7, etc.), as if the Acts of the Apostles had fallen into the hands of a translator who acted on the principle of choosing, not the most correct, but the most familiar equivalents (comp. Trench, On the Authorized Version of the N.T. p. 21). — Smith, s.v. For all that regards the nature and celebration of the feast referred to in Act 12:4, SEE PASSOVER.

## Easter Controversies[[@Headword:Easter Controversies]]

             There was much controversy in the early Church as to the days on which our Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated. The churches of Asia Minor celebrated the death of the Lord on the day corresponding to the 14th of the month Nisan, on which day, according to the opinion of the whole ancient Church, the crucifixion took place. The Western churches, on the other hand, were of opinion that the crucifixion should be annually commemorated on the particular day of the week on which it occurred, that is, Friday. The resurrection was accordingly commemorated by the former party on the day corresponding to the 16th of Nisan, and by the other party on the Sunday following Good Friday. The two parties also differed with regard to the fasting preceding Easter. The Western churches viewed the death-day of Christ exclusively as a day of mourning, and they did not terminate the time of fasting until the day of resurrection. The churches of Asia Minor, on the other hand, looking upon the death of Christ wholly as the redemption of mankind, terminated fasting at the hour of Christ's death (5 o'clock in the afternoon), and immediately after celebrated the Agape and the Lord's Supper. In addition to these two parties, both of which were within the old catholic Church, there was another, repudiated by the Church as heretical. This third party, an Ebionitic sect, agreed with the churches of Asia Minor in adhering to the commemoration of the day of the month (14th and 16th of Nisan), but differed from them in insisting upon the continuance of the obligatory character of the ancient law, and the consequent duty of Christians to celebrate the Jewish Passover. Both were called Quartodecimani, from the fourteenth (Latin quartodecimus) day of the month on which they commemorated the death of Christ. Eusebius mentions (Hist. Ecclesiastes 5:23; Vita Constant. 3:19) Palestine, Pontus, Gallia, Rome, Osroene, Corinth, Phoenicia, Alexandria, as churches following the Western practice. To these the emperor Constantine, in a circular enjoining the observance of a decree of the Nicene Council on the subject, adds all Italy, Africa, Spain, Britain, Greece. Thus the Western practice appears to have largely prevailed. Its adherents traced its origin to the apostles Peter and Paul, while the churches of Asia Minor rested their differing practice upon the authority of the apostle John. Both parties adhered to the name of Pascha (Passover), by which they understood sometimes the whole week commemorating the Passion, sometimes the specially festive days of this week. In the course of time (it is not known when) the death-day was distinguished as πάσχα σταυρώσιμον, and the day of resurrection as πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον. Irenaeus explicitly bears testimony that the bishops of Rome up to Xystus (at the beginning of the 2d century) kept peace with the adherents of the other practice. The first effort to come to an agreement on the controversy was made by bishop Polycarp, of Smyrna, about the middle of the 2d century, when on a visit to bishop Anicet, of Rome. The two bishops received each other with the kiss of peace, but neither of them was willing to sacrifice the practice of his predecessors. Nevertheless they parted in kindness, and peace continued to reign between the two parties. A few years later, the Ebionitish Quartodecimani caused great trouble at Laodicea (about 170), at Rome (about 180), where a certain Blastus was at their head, and in other places. Books against them were written by Melito of Sardis and Apollinaris of Hierapolis, both of whom were adherents of the practice of Asia Minor; by Clement of Alexandria and Hippolytus (about the middle of the 3d century). Of all these books only fragments are left. That of Hippolytus shows that at this time the Jewish Quartodecimani were regarded by the Church as heretics. The first serious dispute between the parties within the old Catholic Church broke out about 196, when bishop Victor, of Rome, issued a circular to the leading bishops of the Church, requesting them to hold synods in their provinces, and to introduce the Western practice. Some complied with this request; but the synod held by bishop Polycrates, of Ephesus, emphatically refused, and approved the letter of bishop Polycrates, who, in defense of the Asiatic practice, referred Victor to the authority of the apostles Philip and John, to Polycarp, and to seven of his relations, who before him had been bishops of Ephesus. Victor at first intended to excommunicate the Asiatic churches, and therefore issued an encyclical to the Christians of those regions, but whether he really carried out his threat is not certain; the words of Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 5:24) on the movements of Victor are by some understood as implying a real execution of the excommunication, while the more common opinion is, that, in consequence of the indignant remonstrances against such a usurpation of power by the Western bishops, especially by Irenaeus, the threat was never executed.

Thus far the controversy between the Asiatic and the Western churches had only concerned two points, namely, (1) whether the day of the week or the day of the month on which the death of Christ occurred should be commemorated; (2) when the fasting ought to be terminated. Now a third point of dispute arose, as to the time when the 14th day of Nisan really occurred. Many of the Church fathers are of opinion that, according to the original calculation of the Jews up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the 14th of Nisan had always been after the spring equinox, and that it was only in consequence of a miscalculation of the later Jews that the 14th of Nisan occasionally fell before the equinox. They therefore insisted that the 14th of Nisan, which for both parties within the Church determined the time of Easter, should always be after the equinox. As the year of the Jews is a lunar year, and the 14th of Nisan always a full-moon day, the Christians who adopted the above astronomical view, whenever the 14th of Nisan fell before the equinox, would celebrate the death of Christ one month later than the Jewish Passover. As the Christians could now no longer rely on the Jewish calendar, they had to make their own calculations of the time of Easter. These calculations frequently differed, partly from reasons already set forth, and partly because the date of the equinox was fixed by some at the 18th of March, by others at the 19th, by others at the 21st of March. The Council of Aries in 314 endeavored to establish uniformity, but its decrees do not appear to have had great effect. The subject was therefore again discussed and acted upon by the OEcumenical Council of Nice, which decreed that Easter should be celebrated throughout the Church after the equinox, on the Friday following the 14th of Nisan. It was also provided that the Church of Alexandria, as being distinguished in astronomical science, should annually inform the Church of Rome on what day of the calends or ides Easter should be celebrated, and the Church of Rome should notify all the churches of the world. But even these decrees of the Council of Nice did not put a stop to all differences, and it was reserved to the calculation of Dionysius Exiguus (q.v.) to gradually introduce uniformity of practice into the whole Church. Some countries, like Great Britain, did not abandon their ancient practice until after a long resistance. At the time of Charlemagne uniformity seems to have been established, and no trace is to be found of the Quartodecimani. The revision of the calendar by Pope Gregory XIII, on the whole, retained the Dionysian era, but determined more accurately the Easter full moon, and made careful provision for avoiding any future deviation of the calendar from the astronomical time. By these minute calculations, however, the Christian Easter sometimes, contrary to the decrees of the Nicene Council. coincides with the Jewish Passover. This, for instance, was the case in 1825. — Mosheim, Church Hist. 1:68; Neander, Church Hist. 1:298; 2:301, 302 Mosheim, Comm. 1:523; Weitzel, Die christliche Paschafeier der ersten Jahrhunderte (1848); Rettberg, in Zeitschrift fir historische Theologie, 1832, volume 2; Hefele, in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:871; Steitz, in Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 11:140; Steitz, Die Differenz der Occidentalen u. der Kleinasiaten (in Stud. u. Krit. 1856). (A.J.S.)

## Easter, Celebration of[[@Headword:Easter, Celebration of]]

             In the ancient Church the seventh day of Passion-week (q.v.), the great Sabbath, as it was called, was observed with rigorous precision as a day of fasting. Religious worship was celebrated by night; and the vigils continued till cock-crowing, the hour at which it is supposed our Lord arose. At this hour the stillness of these midnight vigils was broken by the joyful acclamation, "The Lord is risen! The Lord is risen! The Lord is risen indeed!" The day of Easter was celebrated with every demonstration of joy as a second jubilee. There was a solemn celebration of the Lord's Supper; the baptism of catechumens; appropriate salutations, and demonstrations of joy; the liberation of prisoners, and the manumission of slaves. Charities were dispensed to the needy. Courts of justice were closed. The heathen were forbidden to celebrate public spectacles in order that the devotions of Christians might not be interrupted. The week following was considered as a continuation of the festival. During this time, those who had been baptized at Easter continued arrayed in white, in token of that purity of life to which they were bound by baptism. On the Sunday following they laid aside their garments of white, and were welcomed as members of the Church. — Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 20, chapter 5.

## Easter, John[[@Headword:Easter, John]]

             a distinguished Methodist Episcopal minister. Dates of his early life are wanting. He joined the itinerancy in 1782, and located in 1792. His ministerial career was "brilliant," and "his success almost unparalleled." In 1787, on Brunswick Circuit, Va., eighteen hundred souls were added to the Church under his ministry. William M'Kendree and Enoch George, afterwards bishops in the Church, were brought to God through his preaching. See Wakeley's Heroes of Methodism, p. 219; Life and Times of Jesse Lee, p. 356 et al.

## Easter, John (2)[[@Headword:Easter, John (2)]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Norfolk Co., England, September 21, 1800, and joined the Wesleyan Methodists in 1824. In 1830 he emigrated to America, and settled in Geneva, N.Y. He entered the itinerancy in 1832, and took a superannuated relation in 1838. His death was caused by a rocket, at Geneva, on July 4, 1842. Mr. Easter was a man of great worth, and a useful and beloved preacher. — Minutes of Conferences, 3:345.

## Easter-candle[[@Headword:Easter-candle]]

             SEE PASCHAL TAPER.

## Easter-eggs[[@Headword:Easter-eggs]]

             The egg was the symbol of creation in Egypt, and of hope and the resurrection among early Christians; and the custom of giving colored pasch eggs on Easter morning is found in the East, in the Tyrol, in Russia, in Greece, in many parts of England, where it may be traced back to the time of Edward I, and was observed at Gray's Inn in the reign of Elizabeth. In France the pasch egg is eaten before any other nourishment is taken on Easter day. Tansy pudding, according to Selden, is a memorial of the bitter herbs eaten by the Jews; and peculiar cakes in some places formed the staple fare on this day. Paul II issued a form of benediction of eggs for England, Scotland, and Ireland. Henry VIII received a paschal egg in a case of silver filigree from the pope. The Jews regarded the egg as a symbol of death. — Walcott, Sac. Archaeol. s.v. SEE EGG.

## Eastern Church[[@Headword:Eastern Church]]

             a designation given,

1. Specifically to what is commonly called the Greek Church, in distinction from the Western (or Latin Church). The title claimed by that Church itself is Καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία τῆς ἀνατολικῆς The Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church. SEE GREEK CHURCH. Bishop Coxe, in the Churchman's Calendar, calls it the "Grand Trunk, or main stem of the Catholic Church."

2. The name Eastern Church, or, more properly, Eastern churches, is given to Eastern Christendom, divided into the churches named in the following list, which gives their statistics to the close of 1867, as far as they can be ascertained:

1. The Greek Church. — Russia (in Europe, 51,000,000; in Siberia, 2,600,000; in the provinces of the Caucasus no official account of the ecclesiastical statistics has yet been made; the total population of this part of the empire is 4,257,000, the population connected with the Greek Church may be estimated at about 1,500,000; hence total population of Russia connected with the Greek Church is about), 55,000,000; Turkey (inclusive of the dependencies in Europe and Egypt), about 11,500,000; Austria, 2,921,000; Greece (inclusive of the Ionian Islands), 1,220,000; United States of America (chiefly in the territory purchased in 1867 from Russia), 50,000; Prussia, 1500; China, 200; total, 69,692,700. The figures referring to Russia, Austria, and Prussia are from an official census; those concerning China are furnished by the Russian missionaries in Pekin; those on Turkey and Greece are estimates almost generally adopted. SEE GREEK CHURCH; SEE RUSSIA.

2. The Armenian Church. — According to D. Petermann (in Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie), the total number of Armenians scattered in the world is about 2,500,000. Of these, about 100,000 are connected with Rome, and are called United Armenians; 15,000 are Evangelical Armenians, and all others belong to the National (or "Gregorian") Armenian Church. The number of the latter may therefore be set down at about 2,400,000. The great majority of them (about 2,000,000) live in Turkey, about 170,000 in Russia, and 30,000 in Persia. SEE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

3. The Nestorians, including the Christians of St. Thomas in India, number about 165,000 souls, exclusive of those who have connected themselves with Rome, or have become Protestants. SEE NESTORIANS.

4. The Jacobites in Turkey and India are estimated at about 220,000, but the information concerning them is less definite than that about the preceding churches. SEE JACOBITES.

5. The Copts and Abyssinians.-The Copts may be roughly estimated at about 200,000, the Abyssinians at about 3,000,900. SEE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH; SEE COPTS.

Together, therefore, the population connected with these Eastern communions embraces a population of about 76,500,000. All these bodies lay claim to having bishops of apostolical succession, and consequently all of them are embraced in the union scheme patronized by the High-Church Anglicans. Both the Low-Church and the Broad-Church parties dislike the idea of a union with the Greeks, Copts, Abyssinians, and the other Eastern communions; but the High-Churchmen, of all shades of opinion, are a unit on this subject. An important fact in the history of this movement is the official transmission of a Greek translation of the pastoral letter issue; (1867) by the Pan-Anglican Synod to all the patriarchs and bishops of the Greek Church (Schem, in Methodist Quarterly Review, 1868, p. 280).

On the Eastern churches, besides the articles on the separate churches in this Cyclopaedia, see Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church (N. Y. 1867, 8vo); Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church (London, 1847-1850, 4 vols. 8vo). -A list of the patriarchates, sees, etc., of the Eastern churches is given in the Churchman's Calendar, 1868, p. 36 sq.

## Easterwine[[@Headword:Easterwine]]

             (or Eosterwini), coadjutor-abbot of Wearmouth, was the nephew of Benedict, the founder of that monastery, and was born in 650. At the age of twenty-four he renounced his secular prospects, was ordained in 679, and devoted himself with singular humility and affection to the duties of his recluse life. He died March 7, 686.

## Eastlake, Sir Charles Lock[[@Headword:Eastlake, Sir Charles Lock]]

             an English painter, was born at Plymouth in 1793. He. studied under Fuseli at the Royal Academy, and at the Louvre, in Paris. He went to Rome in 1817, and remained there many years. In 1841 he was appointed secretary to the royal commission on the arts; from 1843 to 18 17 was keeper of the National Gallery; and in 1850 Wavs knighted, made president of the Royal Academy, and director of the National Gallery. He died in Pisa, December 23, 1865, Among his most noted works are, Christ Weepinug over Jerusalem; Pilgrims Arriving in Sight of Rome; Christ Blessing Little Children; Hagar and Ishmael, and the Raising of Jairus's Daughter. He wrote Materials for a History of Oil Painting, and Contributions to the Literature of the Fine Arts (posthumous; edited by lady Eastlake). A History of his life was published by lady Eastlake in London in 1870.

## Eata (or Ecka)[[@Headword:Eata (or Ecka)]]

             (1) First bishop of Hexham. A.D. 678, and the fifth of Lindisfarne, 681- 685, as originally from Northumbria, and abbot of Old Mielrose; he died October 26, 686.

(2) An anchorite of Crayke, in Yorkshire, who died in 767.

## Eating[[@Headword:Eating]]

              (properly אָכִל, akal', ἐσθίω). The ancient Hebrews did not eat indifferently with all persons; they would have esteemed themselves polluted and dishonored by eating with those of another religion or of an odious profession. In Joseph's time they neither ate with the Egyptians nor the Egyptians with them (Gen 43:32), nor in our Savior's time with the Samaritans (Joh 4:9). The Jews were scandalized at his eating with publicans and sinners (Mat 9:11). As there were several sorts, of meats the use of which was prohibited, they could not conveniently eat with those who partook of them, fearing to contract pollution by touching such food, or if by accident any particles of it should fall on them. SEE FOOD.

At their meals some suppose they had each his separate table; and that Joseph, entertaining his brethren in Egypt, seated them separately, each at his particular table, while he himself sat down separately from the Egyptians, who ate with him; but he sent to his brethren portions out of the provisions which were before him (Gen 43:31 sq.). Elkanah, Samuel's father, who had two wives, distributed their portions to them separately (1Sa 1:4-5). In Homer, each guest is supposed to have had his little table apart and the master of the feast distributed meat to each (Odyss. 14:446 sq.). We are assured that this is still practiced in China, and that many in India never eat out of the same dish, nor on the same table with another person, believing they cannot do so without sin, and this not only in their own country, but when traveling and in foreign lands. This is also the case with the Brahmins and various castes in India, who will not even use a vessel after a European, though he may only have drank from it water recently drawn out of a well. The same strictness is observed by the more scrupulous among the Mohammedans, and instances have been known of every plate, and dish, and cup that had been used by Christian guests being broken immediately after their departure. The ancient manners which we see in Homer we see likewise in Scripture, with regard to eating, drinking, and entertainments. There was great plenty, but little delicacy; great respect and honor paid to the guests by serving them plentifully. Joseph sent his brother Benjamin a portion five times larger than those of his ether brethren. Samuel set a whole quarter of a calf before Saul (1Sa 9:24). The women did not appear at table in entertainments with the men; this would have been an indecency, as it is at this day throughout the East. —SEE BANQUET.

The Hebrews anciently sat at table, but afterwards imitated the Persians and Chaldaeans, who reclined on table-beds or divans while eating. (See Gier, De vett. Ebr. ratione caenandi, Lips. 1639). This mode of reclining at meals was common in the East, and also among the Greeks and Romans. Under the Roman emperors the couches were sometimes made semicircular. SEE ACCUBATION. At the present day, in the East, the custom is to sit or recline upon the floor at meat, and at other times on cushions. Many of the Arabs use no knife, fork, spoon, or plate in eating their victuals (these being used only by foreigners, and that as a special privilege); they dip their hands into the milk which is placed before them in a wooden bowl, and lift it to their mouth in their palm. Dr. Russell states, "The Arabs, in eating, do not thrust their whole hand into the dish, but only their thumb and two first fingers, with which they take up the morsel, and that in a moderate quantity at a time." The present mode of eating in Syria and Palestine is thus described by Dr. Jowett: "To witness the daily family habits, in the house in which I lived at Deir el Kamr (not far from Beyrout), forcibly reminded me of Scripture scenes. The absence of the females at our meals has already been noticed. There is another custom, by no means agreeable to a European, to which, however, I would willingly have endeavored to submit, but it was impossible to learn it in the short compass of twenty days' visit.

There are set on the table, in the evening, two or three messes of stewed meat, vegetables, and sour milk. To me the privilege of a knife, and spoon, and plate was granted; but the rest all helped themselves immediately from the dish, in which it was no uncommon thing to see more than five Arab fingers at one time. Their bread, which is extremely thin, tearing and folding up like a sheet of paper, is used for the purpose of rolling together a large mouthful, or sopping up the fluid and vegetables. But the practice which was most revolting to me was this: when the master of the house found in the dish any dainty morsel, he took it out with his fingers and applied it to my mouth. This was true Syrian courtesy and hospitality, and had I been sufficiently well-bred, my mouth would have opened to receive it. On my pointing to my plate, however, he had the goodness to deposit the choice morsel there" (Researches, p. 210). Niebuhr's account is as follows (Description of Arabia, page 52). "The table of the Orientals is arranged according to their mode of living. As they always sit upon the floor, a large cloth is spread out in the middle of the room upon the floor, in order that the bits and crumbs may not be lost, or the carpets soiled. (On journeys, especially in the deserts, the place of this cloth is supplied by a round piece of leather, which the traveler carries with him, Travels, 2:372.) Upon this cloth is placed a small stool, which serves as a support for a large round tray of tinned copper; on this the food is served up in various small dishes of copper, well tinned within and without. Among the better class of Arabs, one finds, instead of napkins, a long cloth, which extends to all who sit at table, and which they lay upon their laps. Where this is wanting, each one takes, instead of a napkin, his own handkerchief, or rather small towel, which he always carries with him to wipe himself with after washing. Knives and forks are not used.

The Turks sometimes have spoons of wood or horn. The Arabs are so accustomed to use the hand instead of a spoon, that they can do without a spoon even when eating bread and milk prepared in the usual manner. Other kinds of food, such as we commonly eat with a spoon, I do not remember to have seen. It is, indeed, at first, very unpleasant to a European, just arrived in the East, to eat with people who help themselves to the food out of the common dish with their fingers; but this is easily got over, after one has become acquainted with their mode of life. As the Mohammedans are required, by their religion, very often to wash themselves, it is therefore even on this account probable that their cooks prepare their food with as much cleanliness as those of Europe. The Mohammedans are even obliged to keep their nails cut so short that no impurity can collect under thereon; for they believe their prayers would be without any effect if there should be the least impurity upon any, part of the body. And since, now, before eating, they always wash themselves carefully, and generally too with soap, it comes at length to seem of less consequence whether they help themselves from the dish with clean fingers or with a fork. Among the sheiks of the desert, who require at a meal nothing more than pillau, i.e., boiled rice, a very large wooden dish is brought on full, and around this one party after another set themselves till the dish is emptied, or they are satisfied. In Merdin, where I once ate with sixteen officers of the Waiwode, a servant placed himself between the guests, and had nothing to do but to take away the empty dishes, and set down the full ones which other servants brought in. As soon as ever the dish was set down, all the sixteen hands were immediately thrust into it, and that to so much purpose, that rarely could any one help himself three times. They eat, in the East, with very great rapidity; and at this meal in Merdin, in the time of about twenty minutes, we sent out more than fourteen empty dishes." SEE DINE.

The Hebrews, like the modern Orientals, rose early, about the dawn of the day, when they breakfasted. They were accustomed to take a slight repast about noon; and this to husbandmen and mechanics was probably the principal meal (1Ki 20:16; Rth 2:14; Luk 14:12). Wilkinson says, "That dinner was served up at midday among the ancient Egyptians may be inferred from the invitation given by Joseph to his brethren: 'Bring these men home, and slay and make ready, for these men shall dine with me at noon' (Gen 43:16); but it is probable that, like the Romans, they also ate supper in the evening, as is still the custom in the East." Supper appears to have been the principal meal among the Hebrews, as it was among the Greeks and Romans. Among the Romans it anciently took place about three o'clock; but in the East, as at the present day in Persia, about six or seven in the evening, in order to avoid the enfeebling heat of the afternoon (Mar 6:21; Luk 14:16; Luk 14:24; Joh 12:2). In 1Sa 9:13, we read that the people would not eat of the feast until Samuel had arrived and consecrated the sacrifice. But this circumstance affords no evidence of the custom of asking a blessing on food. In the time of Christ, however, it was common before every meal to give thanks (Mat 14:19; Mat 15:36). SEE MEAL-TIME.

In closing this subject, we may properly notice the obligations which are considered by Eastern people to be contracted by eating together. Niebuhr says, "When a Bedouin sheik eats bread with strangers, they may trust his fidelity and depend on his protection. A traveler will always do well, therefore, to take an early opportunity of securing the friendship of his guide by a meal." The reader will recollect the complaint of the Psalmist (Psa 41:9), penetrated with the deep ingratitude of one whom he describes as having been his own familiar friend, in whom he trusted "who did eat of my bread, even he hath lifted up his heel against me!" Hence, in part, no doubt, the corviviality that always followed the making of a covenant. Hence, also, the severity of some of the feelings acknowledged by the indignant man of patience, Job, as appears in several passages of his pathetic ex-postulations. It is well known that Arabs, who have: given food to a stranger, have afterwards thought themselves bound to protect him against the vengeance, demanded by consanguinity, for even blood itself. (See Layard's Nineveh, 2d series, p. 217.) SEE HOSPITALITY.

To "eat" is frequently spoken metaphorically in Scripture of the enjoyment or partaking of temporal or spiritual blessings (Jer 15:16; Eze 3:1; Rev 10:9). Wemyss's Symbol. Dict. s.v. SEE DRINK; SEE TASTE.

## Eaton, Asa, D.D[[@Headword:Eaton, Asa, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Plaistow, N.H., July 25, 1778. His preparatory studies were begun at the age of twenty-one, and he graduated from Harvard University in 1803. On October 23 of the same year Christ Church invited him to act as lay-reader, and he continued in this position until 1805, when he was ordained, and remained rector until 1829. In that year he became city missionary, laboring among the destitute until 1837. From 1837 to 1841 he was connected with St. Mary's Hall, a young ladies' school at Burlington, N.J. Then he returned to Boston, but without a regular charge, and died there, March 24, 1858. See, Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1858, page 341; Necrol. of Harvard College, page 178.

## Eaton, George W., D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Eaton, George W., D.D., LL.D]]

             a distinguished Baptist scholar, was born near Huntingdon, Pennsylvania, July 3, 1804, and graduated from Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., in 1829. Upon his graduation he was appointed tutor, which position he held a year or two. In 1831 he became professor of languages in Georgetown College, Kentucky, and in 1833 professor of mathematics and natural philosophy at Hamilton College. He subsequently filled the professorships of ecclesiastical and civil history, and of systematic theology, and was appointed president of Madison University and of the Hamilton Theological Seminary, holding the latter position until his death, August 3, 1872. Dr. Eaton was a man of the widest and warmest sympathies, earnest in his convictions, and able to maintain them with fervid eloquence. (J.C.S.)

## Eaton, Horace, D.D[[@Headword:Eaton, Horace, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Sutton, N.H., October 7, 1810. He studied at Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., and graduated from Dartmouth College in 1839 and from the Union Theological Seminary in 1842. For six years he was pastor of the Sixth Presbyterian Church in. New York city, and thereafter of the First Presbyterian Church in Palmyra, N.Y., until his death, October 21, 1883. See Providence Journal, Oct. 23, 1883. (J.C.S.)

## Eaton, John[[@Headword:Eaton, John]]

             was born at Kant in 1575, and studied at Oxford. In 1625 he was made rector of Wickham Market, Suffolk, where he died in 1641. His writings: are Antinomian. They are, The Discovery of a most dangerous dead Faith (London 1641, 12mo): The Honeycomb of free Justification (London 1642,. 4to). He was imprisoned for this last work by the Long Parliament. — Wood, Atheniae Oxonienses; Hook, Eccl. Biog. 4:526.

## Eaton, Joseph[[@Headword:Eaton, Joseph]]

             a veteran Baptist minister, was born at Wells, Maine, June 22, 1743. He was converted at the age of twenty-two, licensed to preach in 1793, and in 1798 was ordained pastor of the Church in Wells, the service being performed in Berwick. After his resignation, in 1820, Mr. Eaton was engaged for several years in evangelistic labors in the section of the country in which he lived. His death took place in December 1831. See Millett, History of the Baptists in Maine, page 442. (J.C.S.)

## Eaton, Joseph H., LL.D[[@Headword:Eaton, Joseph H., LL.D]]

             a Baptist minister, brother of Reverend G.W. Eaton, D.D., was born in Berlin, Delaware County, Ohio, September 10, 1812. He graduated from the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution (now Madison University) in 1837, and for three years thereafter was engaged in teaching. He was elected professor in 1841, and in 1847 president of what is now Union University, Murfreesborough, Tenn. His ordination took place in 1843, and he was pastor of the Church in the same place, having also the oversight of several county churches. His health broke down under these excessive labors, and he died, January 12, 1859, See Cathcart, Baptist Cyclop. page 358. (J.C.S.)

## Eaton, Peter, D.D[[@Headword:Eaton, Peter, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Haverhill, Massachusetts; March 25, 1765. He studied under the Reverend Phineas Adams, graduated from Harvard College in 1787, taught a school for one year at Woburn, and then passed some time in the study of theology. Having received license, he preached his first sermon in Boxford, January 10, 1789, and in October following was installed as pastor there. In 1819 he preached the annual sermon before the Legislature of Massachusetts, and in 1820 resigned his charge at Boxford. In 1845 he removed to Andover, where he remained until his death, in April 1848. Dr. Eaton published many valuable Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:222.

## Eaton, Samuel[[@Headword:Eaton, Samuel]]

             a Congregational minister, was a native of England, and took his degrees at Magdalen College, Cambridge. He entered into the ministry of the Established Church, but, on account of his Puritanism came to New England with the Rev. John Davenport in 1637, and was co-pastor with him at New Haven. He returned to England in 1640, and formed a Congregational church at Duckenfield, Cheshire. By the Act of Uniformity he was compelled to cease preaching in 1662, and died June 9, 1665. He published A Defense of sundry Positions and Scriptures alleged to justify the Congregational Way (1645; second part, 1646): — The Mystery of God incarnate, or the Word made Flesh cleared up, etc. (1650): — Vindication, or further Confirmation of the Scriptures, produced to prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ, distorted and miserably wrested and abused by Mr. John Knowles, etc. (1651): — Treatise of the Oath of Allegiance and Covenant, showing that they oblige not (replied to 1650): — The Quakers Confuted, etc. (1659). — Sprague, Annals, 1:98.

## Eaton, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Eaton, Thomas, D.D]]

             a Scotch clergyman, graduated from Glasgow University; was licensed to preach in June, 1807; presented by lord Douglas to the living of Kirriemuir in 1809, and ordained March 22, 1810. He died April 5, 1856, aged seventy-nine years. In him learning, knowledge, modesty, and moral worth were combined with meekness and piety. He published six different works, chiefly of a local theological character. See Fasti Eccles. Scoticanae, 3:777.

## Ebal[[@Headword:Ebal]]

              (Hebrews עֵבָיל, stone), the name of one or two persons, and also of a hill.

1. (Sept. Γεμιάν [Vat. MS. omits], Vulg. Hebal.), A various reading for OBAL SEE OBAL (q.v.), the son of Joktan (1Ch 1:22; compare Gen 10:28).

2. (Γαιβήλ v. r. Ταιβήλ [1 Alex MS. Γαοβήλ], Vulg. Ebal.) The fourth son of Shobal, son of Seir, the Horite of Idumaea (Gen 36:23; 1Ch 1:40). B.C. ante 1694.

3. (Sept. Γαιβάλ, Josephus Γίβαλος,Vulg. Hebal.) A mountain on the northern part of the tribe of Ephraim, on the north-eastern side of the valley in which was situated the city of Shechem (now Nablous), in Samaria (q.v.). See Mills, Three Months at Nablus (London, 1864).

1. It was here that the Israelites were enjoined to erect an altar, setting up plastered stones, and respond to the imprecations uttered in the valley, according to the divinely prescribed formula, upon those who should prove faithless to the Sinaitic law (Deu 11:29; Deu 27:4; Deu 27:13), while the responses to the blessings were to be uttered by the other division of the tribal representatives stationed upon the opposite mountain, Gerizim. Both the benediction and the anathema were pronounced by the Levites, who remained with the ark in the center of the interval (compare Deu 27:11-26, with Jos 8:30-35, with Joseph. Ant. 4, 8, 44, and with the comments of the Talmud, Sota, 36, quoted in Herxheimer's Pentateuch). But, notwithstanding the ban thus apparently laid on Ebal, it was further appointed to be the site of the first great altar to be erected to Jehovah: an altar of large unhewn stone, plastered with lime, and inscribed with the words of the law (Deu 27:2-8). On this altar peace-offerings were to be offered, and round it a sacrificial feast was to take place, with other rejoicings (Deu 27:6-7). Scholars disagree as to whether there were to be two erections — a kind of cromlech and an altar; or an altar only, with the law inscribed on its stones. The latter was the view of Josephus (Ant. 4:8, 44; 5:1, 19), the former is unhesitatingly adopted by the latest commentator (Keil, Comment. on Jos 8:32). The terms of Moses' injunction seem to infer that no delay was to take place in carrying out this symbolical transaction. It was to be "on the day" that Jordan was crossed (Joshua 27:2), before they "went in unto the land flowing with milk and honey" (Joshua 27:3). Accordingly Joshua appears to have seized the earliest practicable moment, after the pressing affairs of the siege of Jericho, the execution of Achan, and the destruction of Ai had been dispatched, to carry out the command (Jos 8:30-35). After this Ebal appears no more in the sacred story. By a corruption of the above- cited texts, the Samaritans transferred the site of the appointed altar to the opposite mountain, which has hence attained the greater notoriety. SEE GERIZIM.

2. The question now arises, where were Ebal and Gerizim situated? The all but unanimous reply to this is, that they are the mounts which form the sides of the fertile valley in which lies Nablu's, the ancient SHECHEM-Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south.

 (1.) It is plain from the passages already quoted that they were situated near together, with a valley between.

 (2.) Gerizim was very near Shechem (Jdg 9:7), and in Josephus' time their names appear to have been attached to the mounts, which were then, as now, Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south. Since that they have been mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela (Asher, 1:66) and Sir John Maundeville, and among modern travelers by Maundrell (Mod. Trav. page 432). The main impediment to our entire reception of this view rests in the terms of the first mention of the place by Moses in Deu 11:30 : A.V. "Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh?" Here the mention of Gilgal, which was in the valley of the Jordan near Jericho, of the valley itself (Arabah, mistranslated here only, "champaign"), and of the Canaanites who dwelt there, and also the other terms of the injunction of Moses, as already noticed seem to imply that Ebal and Gerizim were in the immediate neighborhood of Jericho. This is strengthened by the narrative of Joshua, who appears to have carried out the prescribed ceremonial on the mounts while his camp was at Gilgal (compare Jos 7:2; Jos 9:6), and before he had (at least before any account of his having) made his way so far into the interior of the country as Shechem.

This is the view taken by Eusebius (Onomasticon, s.v. Γεβάλ). He does not quote the passage in Deuteronomy, but seems to be led to his opinion rather by the difficulty of the mountains at Shechem being too far apart to admit of the blessings and cursings being heard, and also by his desire to contradict the Samaritans; add to this that he speaks from no personal knowledge, but simply from hearsay (λέγεται), as to the existence of two such hills in the Jordan valley. The notice of Eusebius is merely translated by Jerome, with a shade more of animosity to the Samaritans (vehementer errant), and expression of difficulty as to the distance, but without any additional information. Procopius and Epiphanius also followed Eusebius, but their mistakes have been disposed of by Reland (Palaest. p. 5034; Miscell. pages 129-133).

With regard to the passage in Deuteronomy it will perhaps assume a different aspect on examination.

1. Moses is represented as speaking from the east side of Jordan, before anything was known of the country on the west, beyond the exaggerated reports of the spies, and when everything there was wrapped in mystery, and localities and distances had not assumed their due proportions.

2. A closer rendering of the verse is as follows: "Are they not on the other side the Jordan, beyond (אִחֲרַים, the word rendered 'the backside of the desert' in Exo 3:1) the way of the sunset, in the land of the Canaanite who dwells in the Arabak, over against Gilgal, near the terebinths of Moreb?" If this rendering is correct, a great part of the difficulty has disappeared. Gilgal no longer marks the site of Ebal and Gerizim, but of the dwelling of the Canaanites, who were, it is true, the first to encounter the Israelites on the other side of the river, in their native lowlands, but who, we have it actually on record, were both in the time of Abraham (Gen 12:6) and of the conquest (Jos 17:18) located about Shechem. The word now rendered "beyond" is not represented at all in the A.V., and it certainly throws the locality much further back; and, lastly, there is the striking landmark of the trees of Moreh, which were standing by Shechem when Abraham first entered the land, and whose name probably survived in Morthia, or Mamortha, a name of Shechem found on coins of the Roman period (Reland, Miscell. page 137 sq.). SEE GILGAL.

In accordance with this is the addition in the Samaritan Pentateuch, after the words "the terebinths of Moreh," at the end of Deu 11:30 of the words "over against Shechem." This addition is the more credible because there is not, as in the case noticed afterwards, any apparent motive for it. If this interpretation be accepted, the next verse (31) gains a fresh force: "For ye shall pass over Jordan [not only to meet the Canaanites immediately on the other side, but] to go in to possess the land [the whole of the country, even the heart of it, where these mounts are situated (glancing back to Deu 11:29)], the land which; Jehovah your God giveth you; and ye shall possess it, and dwell therein." It may also be asked whether the significance of the whole solemn ceremonial of the blessing and cursing is not missed if we understand it as taking place directly a footing had been obtained on the outskirts of the country, and not as acted in, the heart of the conquered land, in its most prominent natural position, and close to its oldest city — Shechem.

This is evidently the view taken by Josephus. His statement (Ant. 5, 1, 19) is that it took place after the subjugation of the country and the establishment of the tabernacle at Silioh. He has no misgivings as to the situation of the mountains. They were at Shechema (ἐπὶ Σικίμων), and from thence, after the ceremony, the people returned to Shiloh.

The narrative of Joshua is more puzzling. But even with regard to this something may be said. It will at once be perceived that the book contains no account of the conquest of the center of the country, of those portions which were afterwards the mountain of Ephraim, Esdraelon, or Galilee. We lose Joshua at Gilgal, after the conquest of the south, to find him again suddenly at the waters of Merom in the extreme north (Jos 10:43; Jos 11:7). Of his intermediate proceedings the only record that seems to have escaped is the fragment contained in Jos 8:30-35. Nor should it be overlooked that some doubt is thrown on this in Jos 8:30-35, by its omission in both the Vat. and Alex. MSS. of the Sept.

The distance of Ebal and Gerizim from each other is not such a stumbling- block to us as it was to Eusebius; though it is difficult to understand how he and Jerome should have been ignorant of the distance to which the voice will travel in the clear elastic atmosphere of the East. Stanley has given some instances of this (Sinai and Pal. page 13); others equally remarkable have been observed by those long resident in the neighborhood; who state that a voice can be heard without difficulty across the valley separating the two spots in question (see also Bonar, page 371).

It is well known that one of the most serious variations between the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch and the Samaritan text is in reference to Ebal and Gerizim. In Deu 27:4, the Samaritan has Gerizim, while the Hebrew (as in A.V.) has Ebal, as the mount on which the altar to Jehovah and the inscription of the law were to be erected. Upon this basis the Samaritans ground the sanctity of Gerizim and the authenticity of the Temple and holy place, which have existed there. The arguments upon this difficult question will be found in Kennicott (Dissert. 2), and in the reply of Verschuir (Leovard. 1775; quoted by Gesenius, De Pesst. Sam. page 61). Two points may merely be glanced at here which have apparently escaped notice.

1. Both agree that Ebal was the mount on which the cursings were to rest, Gerizim that for blessings. It appears inconsistent that Ebal, the mount of cursing, should be the site of the altar and the record of the law, while Gerizim, the mount of blessing, should remain unoccupied by sanctuary of any kind.

2. Taking into account the known predilection of Orientals for ancient sites on which to fix their sanctuaries, it is more easy to believe (in the absence of any evidence to the contrary) that in building their temple on Gerizim, the Samaritans were making use of a spot already enjoying a reputation for sanctity, than that they built on a place upon which the curse was laid in the records which they received equally with the Jews. Thus the very fact of the occupation of Gerizim by the Samaritans would seem an argument for its original sanctity. On the other hand, all critics of eminence, with the exception of Kennicott, regard this as a corruption of the sacred text; and when it is considered that the invariable reading in Hebrew MSS. and ancient versions, both in this passage and the corresponding one in Jos 8:30, is "Ebal,"' it seems strange that any scholar would for a moment doubt its correctness. Kennicott takes an opposite view, maintaining the integrity of the Samaritan reading, and arguing the point at great length; hut his arguments ,are neither' sound nor pertinent (Dissertations on the Hebrew Text, 2:20 sq.). The Samaritans had a strong reason for corrupting the text, seeing that Gerizim was their sanctuary; and they desired to make it not merely the mountain of blessing, but the place of the altar and the inscribed law. SEE SAMARITANS.

3. Ebal is rarely ascended by travelers, and we are therefore in ignorance as to how far the question may be affected by remains of ancient buildings thereon. That such remains do exist is certain, even from the very meager accounts published (Bartlett, Walks about Jerusalem, App. page 251 sq.; and Narrative of Rev. J. Mills in Trans. Pal. Archeol. Assoc. 1855), while the mountain is evidently of such extent as to warrant the belief that there is a great deal still to discover.

The report of the old travelers was that Ebal was more barren than Gerizim (see Benjamin of Tudela and Maundrell, in Early Travels in Palestine, pages 82, 433; Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 2:71); but this opinion probably arose from a belief in the effects of the curse mentioned above. At any rate, it is not borne out by the latest accounts, according to which there is little or no perceptible difference. They are not isolated mountains, but culminating points of a chain. Their declivities facing the vale bear a singular resemblance to each other. They are equally rugged and bare; the limestone strata here and there project, forming bold bluffs and precipices; but the greater portion of the slopes, though steep, are formed into terraces, partly natural and partly artificial. For this reason both mountains appear more barren from below than they are in reality, the rude and naked supporting walls of the terraces alone being thus visible. The soil, though scanty, is rich. In the bottom of the vale are olive groves, and a few straggling trees extend some distance up the sides. The broad summits and upper slopes have no trees, yet they are not entirely bare. The steeper banks are here and there scantily clothed with dwarf shrubbery; while in spring and early summer, rank grass, brambles, and thistles, intermixed with myriads of bright wild flowers-anemones, convolvulus, tulips, and. poppies-spring up among the rocks and stones. Ebal is "occupied from bottom to top by beautiful gardens" (Mills; see also Porter, Handbook, page 332). The slopes of Ebal towards the valley appear to be steeper than those of Gerizim (Wilson, pages 45, 71). It is also the higher mountain of the two. There is some uncertainty about the measurements, but the following are the results of the latest observations (Van de Velde, Memoir, page 178):

Nablus,     above sea,  1672 ft.

Gerizim           do.         2600 " ... above Nablus, 928 ft.

Ebal        do.         about 2700" ... do. 1028

According to Wilson (Lands, 2:71; but see Robinson, 2:277, 280, note), it is sufficiently high to shut out Hermon from the highest point of Gerizim. The structure of Gerizim is nummulitic limestone, with occasional outcrops of igneous rock (Poole, in Geograph. Journ. 26:56), and that of Ebal is probably similar. At its base above the valley of Nablus are numerous caves and sepulchral excavations. This was, doubtless, the necropolis of Shechem (Robinson, 3:131; Van de Velde, 2:290). The modern name of Ebal is Sitti Salamiyah, from a Mohammedan female saint, whose tomb is standing on the eastern part of the ridge, a little before the highest point is reached (Wilson, page 71, note). By others, however, it is reported to be called 'Imad ed-Din, "the pillar of the religion" (Stanley, page 238, note). The tomb of another saint, called Amad, is also shown (Ritter, page 641), with whom the latter name may have some connection. On the south-east shoulder is a mined site bearing the name of Askar (Robinson, 3:132). SEE SYCHAR.

## Ebal, Mount[[@Headword:Ebal, Mount]]

             We extract some additional particulars from Lieut. Conder's Tent Work in Palestine, 1:88:  "There are three curious places on Ebal: one of which is a rude stone building, enclosing a space of fifty feet square, with walls twenty feet thick, in which are chambers. The Samaritans call it part of a ruined village, but its use and origin are a mystery. It resembles most the curious monuments near Hizmeh, called the 'Tombs of the Sons of Israel.' The second place is the little cave and ruined chapel of Sitt Eslamiyeh, 'The Lady of Islam,' who has given her name to the mountain. It is perched on the side of a precipice, and is held sacred by the Moslems, who have a tradition that the bones of the saint were carried hither through the air from Damascus. The third place is a site the importance of which has not been previously recognised. It is a little Moslem Mukam, said once to have been a church, called 'AmAd ed-Dinl, the 'Monument of the Faith.'

The name thus preserved has no connection with Samaritan tradition, but it is undisputed that the sacred places of the peasantry often represent spots famous in Bible history. It is therefore perhaps possible that the site thus reverenced is none other than that of the monumental altar of twelve stones from Jordan, which Joshna erected, according to the Biblical account, on Elal, and not on Gerizim, as the Samaritans believe, charging the Jews with having altered the names (Deu 27:4). The hill-top on which this monument stands is called Ras el-Kady, 'Hill of the Judge.' It was here that the Crusaders placed Dan, the site of Jeroboam's Calf Temple, and the present name may perhaps be connected with this theory, Dan ('the Judge') being translated into the Arabic Kady ('Judme'), jnust as it has been at the true Dan, now Tell el-Kady, at the source of the Jordan." (See illustration on opposite page.)

## Ebarcius[[@Headword:Ebarcius]]

             (1) Sixteenth bishop of Nevers, cir. A.D. 696.

(2) Thirty-third bishop of Tours, cir. A.D. 696.

## Ebasius[[@Headword:Ebasius]]

             bishop of Vicus Aterii, in Byzacia, Africa, cir. A.D. 641-649.

## Ebba[[@Headword:Ebba]]

             (Abha, or Ebbe), abbess of Coddingham, in Berwickshire, was daughter of Ethelfrid, king of Northumbria, and sister of St. Oswald. In A.D. 679 her. convent was burned, and she died August 25 (her festal day), 683.

## Ebbo[[@Headword:Ebbo]]

             archbishop of Rheims, was the son of a Saxon serf, and was born about 775, or, according to other accounts, about 786. While a boy he became known to the young king Louis, the son of Charlemagne, who sent him to a convent school, and had him educated for the ministry. As he belonged to a serf family, and could not receive orders, Louis set him free, after which he was ordained. After the accession of Louis to the throne, Ebbo's influence rapidly rose, and in 817 the king secured his election as archbishop of Rheims. Soon after, in 822, he placed himself at the head of a mission to the Danes. His plan highly pleased both the king and the Pope. The Danish king Harald allowed him to preach Christianity, but refused to become a Christian himself. Many Danes were baptized; but, owing to some threatening movements against Harald, Ebbo in 823 returned to the emperor, and at the Diet of Compiegne made a full report on his mission. Soon after he undertook a second missionary visit to Denmark, at which he disposed the king favorably towards Christianity. In 826, the king, with his wife, his oldest son, his nephew, and a suite of 400 men, came to the emperor's court at Mayence and was baptized. The mission in Denmark was now placed under Ansgar, and Ebbo returned to his archbishopric. He took an active part in the affairs of the state, and in the war of the sons of Louis against their father, he, with most of the bishops, took side with the sons. He presided at the assembly of bishops which in 833 compelled Louis to do public penance, as such an act, according to the laws of the Church, made him unfit to bear arms. But when, in 834, Louis regained his power, Ebbo was arrested and kept a prisoner in the convent of Fulda. He was brought before the Diet of Diedenhofen in 835, and confessed himself guilty of offenses which, in the opinion of the judges, made him unfit for any further administration of his office. He was again confined in the convent of Fulda, where he remained until the death of Louis in 840. He then prevailed upon Lothaire, who made an attempt to possess himself of the whole empire of his father, to reinstate him as archbishop of Rheims (December 6, 840). In May, 841, king Charles, the brother of Lothaire, again expelled him; and as, at the conclusion of peace, Lothaire did not take a special interest in Ebbo, he lost his archbishopric forever. In the last years of his life, king Louis of Germany appointed him, with permission of the Pope, administrator of the diocese of Hildesheim. He died March 20th, 851. Ebbo compiled an Indiculum Ebbonis de ministris Remensis ecclesiae, an instruction for the clergy of his diocese as to their mode of life, and an Apologia Archiepiscopi Remensis cum ejusdem ad gentes septentrionales legatione. They are of small size and no value. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19:447; Wetzer u.Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:349. (A.J.S.)

## Ebbo (2)[[@Headword:Ebbo (2)]]

             (Lat. Ebulus), twenty-ninth bishop of Limoges, cir. A.D. 752.

## Ebbo, Saint[[@Headword:Ebbo, Saint]]

             twenty-ninth bishop of Sens, was born at Tonnerre (Burgundy). He was of a noble family, but entered the monastery of Saint-Pierre-le-Vif; was elected abbot of it, and soon succeeded his uncle, St. Gericus, bishop of Sens. He spent the latter part of his life in a hermitage at the village of Arce, where he died in 750. He is commemorated August 27. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ebed[[@Headword:Ebed]]

              (Hebrews id. עֶבֶד, servant [q.v.], i.e., of God; comp. Abda), the name of two men.

1. (Many MSS., and the Syr. and Arab. Versions, have עבר, Eber; Sept. Ι᾿ωβήλ; Alexand. MS. Αβέδ; Vulg. Ebed and Obed.) The father of Gaal  (q.v.), who headed the insurgents at Shechem against Abimelech, tyrant judge of the Israelites (Jdg 9:26-35). B.C. ante 1321.

2. (Sept. Ωβίθ v. r. Ωβήν, Vulgate Abed.) Son of Jonathan, and family- head of the lineage of Adin; he returned with 50 males from the captivity (Ezr 8:6). B.C. 459.

## Ebed-Jesu[[@Headword:Ebed-Jesu]]

             a Chaldaean patriarch and Syrian writer, lived about the middle of the 16th century. He received his education at Gozarta, and was afterwards bishop of that place. In 1554 he was elected as the successor of Sulaka, first patriarch of the Nestorians, and confirmed by the Pope in 1562. Ebed-Jesu was a man of great erudition; he was familiar with the writings of all the Greek and Latin fathers, and was also master of the Arabic, Chaldee, and the Syriac. Many of the Nestorians were converted by him, and the numbers of the Chaldees were augmented under his administration. He died a few Years after his visit to Rome (1562), in a monastery at the village of Seert in Mesopotamia. We have from him a poem in three parts: Sur le voyage a Rome, le retour et la mort de Sulaka; Poeme a la louange de Pie IV; a Confession of Faith, read at the 22d session of the Council of Trent. — Assemani, Bibi. Orient. 1:538; 3, page 3, 325; Hoefer, Nouv. Biographie Generale, 15:595. (J.H.W.)

## Ebed-jesu[[@Headword:Ebed-jesu]]

             surnamed BAR-BRICHA (Son of the Blessed), an eminent Nestorian theologian, was born in Mesopotamia about the middle of the 13th century. After having been for five years bishop of Sigara, in Arabia, he was made Nestorian bishop of Soba or Nisibe in 1290. Where Ebed-Jesu pursued his studies is not known, but the works which he has left us show that he was fluent in the Arabic, well acquainted with the Greek, and his dogmatical writings especially dis. play an extensive knowledge with philosophy and dialectics. He seems also to have been familiar with the works of the great Jacobite Bar-Hebrseus. His works, which are more than twenty, are mostly of a theological character; on the interpretation of the O.T and N.T., on the Logos, sacraments of the Church, and a treatise on the truth of the Faith (published by A. Mai in Syriac and Lat., Script. Ver. 10:317: —Epitome or Collections of the Canons of Councils (also published by Mai): — Canones xxv opostolici ob Ecclesiae ordinationem: — Prima christianae doctrine Diffusio (a Description of the Countries that permitted the preaching of the Apostles): — 23 Canons of the Apostles, edited by St. Clement: — 5 other Canons of the Apostles, published also by St. Clement: — The Paradise Eden, containing 50 poems, divided into two parts, called Henoch and Blias, beginning with the Trinity, and ending with the Resurrection. (Comp. Assemani, Bibl. Or. 3:1, page 325 sq.) Of literary importance is his catalogue of 200 Syrian writers (ably edited by Assemani, Bibl. Or. 3:1, pages 1-362), at the close of which his own writings are also given. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gin. 15:594; Herzog, 3:613; Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 3, part 1: (J.H.W.)

## Ebed-melech[[@Headword:Ebed-melech]]

              (Hebrews E'bed-Me'lek, עֶבֶדמֶלֶךְ, servant of the king, i.e., Arabic Abd el-Malek, Sept. Α᾿βδεμέλεχ,Vulgate Abdemelech), an Ethiopian at the court of Zedekiah, king of Judah, who was instrumental in saving the prophet Jeremiah from death by famine (Jer 38:7-13), and who, for his humanity in this circumstance, was promised deliverance when the city should fall into the enemy's hands (Jer 39:15-18). B.C. 589. SEE JEREMIAH. He is there styled a eunuch ( אַישׁ סָרַיס and he probably had charge of the king's harem (compare Jer 38:22-23), an office which would give him the privilege of free private access to the king; but his name seems to be an official title = King's slave, i.e., minister. SEE EUNUCH.

## Ebeh [[@Headword:Ebeh ]]

             SEE REED.

## Ebel [[@Headword:Ebel ]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Ebel Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Ebel Johann Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant mystic and theosophist, was born in 1784 at Passenheim, in the province of Eastern Prussia. In 1809, while a preacher in the Established Church of Prussia, he attracted the attention of his ecclesiastical superiors on account of his connection with the theosophist Schonherr (q.v.). Subsequently he was appointed preacher at Koenigsberg, where he gathered around him a circle of enthusiastic followers, among them a few noble men and a larger number of noble women. Foremost among the latter were the countess of Kanitz and the countess von der Groben. In 1837, at the request of the Consistory of that city, a suit was instituted against him and his friend Diestel, which belongs among the most remarkable trials of the kind in modern times. He was in 1842 acquitted from the chief charge of the establishment of a new sect, but deposed from office for violating his official duties by communicating to others theosophic and philosophical views differing from the doctrines of the Church. He died in 1861, at the villa of his friend the countess von der Groben. Ebel wrote a number of works, chiefly of a mystic nature, among which are the following: Die Weisheit von Obesn (1822): — Der Tayesanbruch (1824):Die gedeihliche Erziehunq (1825) : — Bibelworte u. Winke (1827): — Die Philosophie der heil. Urkunde (1854-56). A full account of Ebel, his doctrines and followers, is given in Dixon, Spiritual Wives (London and Philadelphia, 1868), where is also printed for the first time a paper by professor Sachs, which was the chief evidence used against Ebel. See also Diestel, Das Zengenverhdr in d. Processe wider d. Prediger Ebel u. Diestel (Leipz. 1838), and Ernst count von Kanitz (follower of Ebel), Auqfkldrung nach Actenquellen, etc. (Basel, 1862). (A.J.S.)

## Ebeling, Christian[[@Headword:Ebeling, Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Buickeburg, November 3, 1668. He studied at Jena; was in 1697 professor of philosophy at Rinteln; in 1708 professor of ethics, and in 1714 doctor and professor of theology. He died September 3, 1716, leaving De Mysterio Triziftatis (Lemgo, 1714): — Ethicae Christianae Compendiom (ibid. 1715): — Exameno Concilii Tridentini (ibid. 1716): — Theologia Homiletica (ibid. eod.). See Strieder, Hessische Gelehrten Geschichte; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ebeling, Johann Justus[[@Headword:Ebeling, Johann Justus]]

             a German theologian, was born at Elze, August 27, 1715. He studied at Helmstadt; was appointed in 1740 pastor at Garmessen, and became in 1753 superintendent at Luneburg, where he died March 2, 1783. His principal works are, Andachtige Betrachtungen, etc. (Hildesheim, 1747): — Sunden der Menschen (Lemgo, 1748): — Heilige Wahrheiten des Glaubens, etc. (Luneburg, eod.): — Erbauliche Betrachtungen. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Eben[[@Headword:Eben]]

              (אֶבֶן, e'ben, stone), stands as a prefix in several geographical names, which designate monuments set up to commemorate certain events SEE STONE; e.g. SEE EBEN-BOHAN; SEE EBEN-EZEL; SEE EBENJEZER; SEE EBEN-ZOHELETH.

## Eben-bohan[[@Headword:Eben-bohan]]

             SEE BOHAN.

## Eben-ezel[[@Headword:Eben-ezel]]

             SEE EZEL.

## Eben-zoheleth[[@Headword:Eben-zoheleth]]

             SEE ZOHELETH.

## Ebendorffer (de Haselbach), Thomas[[@Headword:Ebendorffer (de Haselbach), Thomas]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian; who died in 1464, is the author of Commentarius in Evangelium Johannis: — Expositio Symboli Aposto forum: — De Casibus Excommunicationis: — De Novem Alienis Peccatis: — Commentarius in Esaiam. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ebenezer[[@Headword:Ebenezer]]

              (Hebrew with the art. E'ben ha-E'ezer, אֶבֶן הָעֵזֶרstone of the help; Sept. Α᾿βενέζερ; Josephus translates λίθος ἰσχυρός), the name given to a place marked by a monumental stone which Samuel set up as a memorial of the divine assistance in battle obtained against the Philistines (1Sa 7:12). — SEE PILLAR. 'Twenty years before this, the same spot  (mentioned in the history under the same name by anticipation of its subsequent designation) witnessed the discomfiture of the Hebrew hosts, the death of the high-priest's sons, and the capture of the sacred ark by the Philistines (1Sa 4:1; 1Sa 5:1). Its position is carefully defined (1Sa 7:12) as between Mizpeh "the watch-tower," one of the conspicuous eminences a few miles north of Jerusalem and Shen, "the tooth" or "crag," apparently some isolated landmark. Neither of these points, however, has been identified with certainty-at least not the latter. According to Josephus's record of the transaction (Ant. 6:2, 2), the stone was erected to mark the limit of the victory, a spot which he calls Corrhaea, but in the Hebrew BETH-CAR SEE BETH-CAR (q.v.). Eusebius and Jerome affirm (Onomast. a.v. Α᾿βενετέρ, Abenezes) that it lay between Jerusalem and Ashkelon, near (πλησίον, juxta) Bethshemesh. Now Bethshemesh stands on a low ridge on the south side of the rich valley of Sorar. On the opposite side of this valley, on a rising ground, about three miles north-west of Bethshemesh, are the ruins of an old village called Beit-far. The situation answers in every respect to that assigned to Beth-car; and the name may possibly be an Arab corruption of the latter. It lies in the direct route from Mizpeh to the plain of Philistia, and is just on the borders of the latter province, where a pursuing army would halt (Porter, Handbook for Syr. and Pal. page 283). But, as this is very far from the probable site of Mizpeh (Neby-Samwil), it is hardly possible to fix the position of Ebenezer at that of Beth-car. The monumental stone in question may rather have been set up at the point where the enemy began to flee, and we may therefore seek its locality nearer the Israelitish metropolis, possibly at the modern village Biddu, a short distance west of Neby-Samwil (Robinson, Researches, 2:133, note). SEE SHEN.

## Ebenezer (2)[[@Headword:Ebenezer (2)]]

             On the strength of Jerome's location of this spot, near Bethshemesh, Lieut. Conder proposes (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336) to identify it with the present Deir Arban, two miles east of Ain-Shems, "a large village on the lower slope of a high ridge, with a well to the north, and olives on the east, west, and north" (Memoirs of Ordinance Survey, 3:24).

## Eber Paul[[@Headword:Eber Paul]]

             a companion of Luther and Melancthon and an eminent Hebrew scholar and theologian, was born at Kissingen, November 8, 1511. He received his first instruction from his father, and continued his studies at Anspach. The sudden death of his mother caused his father to recall Paul from Anspach, and while on his way home he was thrown from his horse and became humpbacked. In 1526 he had so far recovered that he could resume his studies at Nuremberg, and in 1532 he entered the university at Wittenberg. Here he was employed as amanuensis to Melancthon, with whom he became so intimate that he consulted him on all important matters, and hence Eber received the name of Philip's Repository (Repertorium Philippi). He was also a faithful disciple of Luther. In 1536 he began to lecture on grammar and philosophy, and in 1541 he accompanied Melancthon to the Diet at Worms. In 1544 he was appointed professor of Latin grammar, in 1550 dean of the philosophical faculty, and in 1551 rector of the university. After the death of Forster (1556) he was appointed professor of Hebrew and chaplain to the royal chapel at Wittenberg. These positions he soon changed for others, and in 1559 he was made general superintendent of the electorate and, as doctor of theology, a member of the theological faculty of the university. From this time to' the day of his death, December 16, 1569, he devoted himself entirely to theology and to the faithful discharge of his duties as general superintendent of the electorate. After the death of Melancthon he was regarded as the head of the university. He took large part in the Adiaphoristic and Crypto- Calvinistic controversies but always showed himself moderate and learned. His principal works are: Expositio Evangeliorum (Francf. 1576): — Calendarium historicum (1551, 4to): —Historia populi judaici a reditu ex Babylonico exilio usque ad ultimum excidium Jerosolymae (Witeb. 1458; new ed. 1562, and translated into German, French, and Dutch): — Unterricht u. Bekenntn. vom h. Sacrament des Leibs u. Bluts unseres Hermr (Wittb. 1562): — Biblia Latina (Vitemb. 1565): — Expositio Evangelicorum Dominicaliunz (Frankf. 1576). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 15:599 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 3:618 sq.; Plank, Gesch. der protest. Theol. 4, Theil 1 (Lpz. 1798), 448-525; Sixt, Paul Eber (Heidelb. 1843, and another book by the same author, Anspach, 1857); Pressel, Paul Eber nach gleichzeitigen Quellen (1862); Bibl. Sacra, 20 page 644 sq.

## Eberhard Johann August[[@Headword:Eberhard Johann August]]

             a Rationalistic theologian of Germany, was born in 1739 at Halberstadt. He studied theology at Halle, and was in succession preacher at Halberstadt, Berlin, and Charlottenburg. The. latter position he obtained by express order of king Friedrich II. In 1778 he was appointed professor of philosophy at Halle, where he opposed the idealism of Kant and Fichte. He died in 1809,. Eberhard is a representative of what is called "the vulgar Rationalistic school" (Vulgar — Rationalismus). He wrote a considerable number of theological, philosophical, historical, and other works. Among his theological works are: Nene Apologie des Socrates (Berlin, 1772, 3d ed. 1788): — Vorbereitung zur natufrl. Theologie (Halle, 1781): — Geist des Urchristenthums (Halle, 1807-1808); and Sittenlehre der Vernunft (Berlin, 1781). — Brockhaus, Conversations-Lex. s.v. (A.J.S.)

## Eberhard, Matthias[[@Headword:Eberhard, Matthias]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Treves, November 1, 1815. He studied at the clerical seminary of his native place, and received holy orders in 1839; in 1840 became chaplain of St. Castor's, at Coblentz; was called in 1843 as episcopal secretary to Treves, and appointed the same year professor of dogmatics at the clerical seminary there. In 1850 he became member of the chapter, and was consecrated in 1862 bishop of Treves. After Arnold's death, in 1864, his name was stricken from the list of candidates as persona regi minus grata, but he was elected in 1867 by the chapter. In 1869 and 1870 he was at Rome as member of the Vatican Council. The Prussian "Folk-Laws" brought him in 1873 in conflict with the government, and as he could not pay the fines, he was imprisoned in 1874. He died May 5, 1876, leaving De Tituli Sedis Apostolicae, etc. (Treves, 1846). (B.P.)

## Eberle, Christian Gustav[[@Headword:Eberle, Christian Gustav]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born in 1813, and died December 9, 1879, at Ochsenbach, in Wurtemberg. He published, Luthers Glaubensrichtung (Stutttgard, 1858): — Luther ein Zeichen dem widersprochen wird (ibid. 1860): — Luthers Evangelien-Auslegung aus seinen homiletischen und exegetischen Werken (ibid. 1857). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:302. (B.P.)

## Eberlin Anton[[@Headword:Eberlin Anton]]

             one of the German reformers was born in Swabia towards the end of the 15th century. He entered the Franciscan order, and was chosen preacher of the Franciscan convent at Tubingen, from which, in consequence of some difficulties, he was, in 1519, transferred to Ulm. Here he became acquainted with Luther's writings, and having adopted his doctrines, had to leave Ulm in 1521. Repairing to Basle, he became very popular, but was driven away by the bishop of Basle. He found an asylum with Ulrich von Hutten and Francis of Sickingen, and wrote with them several works on ecclesiastical and monastical abuses. In 1522 he came to Wittenberg, where he became personally acquainted with Luther and with Melancthon, under the influence of whose teaching he wrote in the same year his Vom Missbrauche christlicher Freiheit, breathing a charitable spirit. In 1524 he went to Erfurt, where he preached for some time and thence to Wertheim on the Main (1526). He died soon after. His works, to the number of 34, were mostly of local interest; among the others, the most important one, entitled Wie sick eyn Diener Gottes worts ym all seynem thun halten soll (Wittenberg, 1525, 4to), has seen several editions, and can be found in A. H. Franke, Monita pastoralia. See Dollinger, d. Reformation, etc. 1:205; Strobel, Liter. Museum, 1:365; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:620.

## Ebermann, Vitus[[@Headword:Ebermann, Vitus]]

             a German Jesuit, was born in 1597. In 1620 he joined his order, was professor of philosophy and theology at Mayence and Wiirzburg, and died April 8, 1675, leaving Bellarmini Controversiae Vindicatae: — Parallela Ecclesiae Verae et Falsae: — Anatomia Calixtina: — Irenicum anti- Calixtinum: — Irenicon Catholicon Helmstadiensi Oppositum: — Bellarminus Vindicattis (4 volumes): — Justa Expositio cum Lutheranorum Doctoribus. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Alegambe, Bibliotheca Scriptorum. Societatis Jesu. (B.P.)

## Ebert, Jacob[[@Headword:Ebert, Jacob]]

             an eminent Hebrew scholar, was born at Sprottau in 1549. He was professor of Hebrew and theology at the university then in Frankfort on the Oder, now in Berlin, and at one time its rector magnificus. So versed was he in Hebrew that he could write in that language. He died in 1614. His works are, Historia Juram sentorium. (Frankfort on the Oder, 1588, 8vo): — Institutio intellectus cum elegantia (ibid. 1597): — Electa Hebraea 750 a libro Rabbinico Mibchar Hapheninim (1630, 12mo). — Tetrasticha febraea in textus evangelicos, etc. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xv. 609 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Ebert, Samuel[[@Headword:Ebert, Samuel]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born at Leipsic, October 17, 1747; studied theology there; was appointed deacon at Taucha, near Leipsic; and itn 1791 preacher of St. George's, at his nativeplace. He died August 8, 1807, leaving Homiletisches Magazin uber die evangelischen Texte (Leipsic, 1780): — Homiletisches Magazin uber die epistolischen Texte (ibid. 1782; 2d ed. 1792): — Homiletisches Magazin fur die Passionszeit (ibid. 1783): — Homiletisches Magazin uber den Katechismus Lutheri (ibid. 1791). See Doring, Die gelehten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ebert, Theodor[[@Headword:Ebert, Theodor]]

             son of Jacob Ebert (q.v.), succeeded his father as professor of Hebrew at the university its Frankfort on the Oder. He shared also the honor of being rector with his father. Ebert died in 1630. Among his principal works are, Vita Christi, tribus de curiis rhythmorum quadratorum hebraicorum (Frankf. on the Oder, 1615, 4to): — Animad psalticarum Centuria (1619, 4to): — Manuductiones aphoristicae ad discursum atrium sectiones xvi (1620, 4to): — Chronologia prcecipuorum Lingua Sancte Doctorum, ab O.C. ad suam usque aetatem (1620, 4to): — Eulogia juris consultorum et politicorum qui linguam hebraicam et reliquas orientales excoluerunt (1628): — Poetica Hebraica (1638, 8vo), in which the Hebrew meters are more extensively exemplified than in any other work. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 15:610; Etheridge, Intr. to Hebrews Literature, page 374.

## Eberus, Paul, D.D[[@Headword:Eberus, Paul, D.D]]

             a German clergyman, was born at Kitzingen, in Franconia, November 8, 1511, and was educated at Anspach. He was appointed to the professorship of philosophy in 1544, and in 1556 to that of Hebrew; in 1558 he gathered a Church in Wittenberg. He died December 20, 1589. Some of his works are, Expositio Evangelion: — Dominicalium Calendarium Historicum (Wittenb. 1550, 8vo, reprinted at Basle the same year).

## Ebiasaph[[@Headword:Ebiasaph]]

              (Hebrews Ebyasaph', אֶבְיָסָ prob. a contraction for אֲבַיאָסָ, Abiasaph; Sept. Α᾿βιασάφ and Α᾿βισάφ, Vulg. Abiasaph), the son of Elkanah and father of Assir, in the genealogy of the Kohathite Levites (1Ch 6:23). B.C. cir. 1660. In 1Ch 6:37 he is called the son of Korah, from a comparison of which circumstance with Exo 6:24, most interpreters have identified him with the Abiasaph (q.v.) of the latter passage; but (unless we there understand not three sons of Korah to be meant, but only three in regular descent), the pedigrees of the two cannot be made to tally without violence. SEE ASSIR. From 1Ch 9:19, it appears that he had a son named Kore. In 1Ch 26:1, his name is abbreviated to ASAPH SEE ASAPH .

## Ebionites[[@Headword:Ebionites]]

             a sect of Judaizing Christians who received the doctrines of the Gospel very partially, and denied the divine nature of Christ. They do not appear to have been at any time numerous, and it is doubtful whether they ever obtained such consistency as to have a definite creed.

1. The Name. — The name is derived from the Hebrew אֶבְיוֹן, poor. This term was anciently applied in derision to Christians in general (Epiphanius, adv. Haer. 29:1), and came later to designate Jewish Christians (Origen, cont. Celsum, 2:1). First (Lexicon, s.v.) makes the derivation refer to Mat 5:3 making "Ebionites" equivalent to "oppressed pious exiles" (Isa 25:4). Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes in, 27) fancifully derives the name from "the poverty and meanness of the Elbionite doctrine concerning Christ." Tertullian (De Praescrip. Haeret. c. 33) derives it from a founder, Edion, who maintained the authority of the Jewish law, and rejected the miraculous conception and divine nature of spirit. The derivation first above given is now generally adopted.

2. History. — Dorner (Person of Christ, Edinb. translated 1:189 sq.) traces the Ebionitish tendency as far back as the Epistle to the Hebrews. “From that zeal for the law with which Paul had to contend, the Judaizing spirit was led not at first to impeach the Christology, but rather the Soteriology, or the work of Christ. But the consequence of the legal stand-point soon showed itself. The party which the Epistle to the Hebrews had in view must have over-estimated the law of the O.T. regarding holy times, places, acts, and persons alike, and have been wanting in the Christian knowledge which knows how to secure to the O.T. its abiding significancy, which it has as a divine institute without imperiling the newness and conclusive completeness of Christianity." Epiphanius traces the origin of Ebionitism to the Christians who fled to Pella after the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 66 (adv. Hoer. 29:1). According to Hegesippus (Hist. Ecclesiastes 4:22), one Thebutis, at Jerusalem, about the beginning of the second century, "began to corrupt the Church secretly on account of his not being made a bishop." "We find the sect of the Ebionites in Palestine and the surrounding regions, on the island of Cyprus, in Asia Minor, and even in Rome. Though it consisted mostly of Jews, Gentile Christians also sometimes attached themselves to it. It continued into the fourth century, but at the time of Theodoret was entirely extinct. It used a Hebrew Gospel, now lost, which was probably a corruption of the Gospel of Matthew" (Schaff, Church History, 1, § 68, page 214).

3. Doctrines. — Dr. Schaff sharply distinguishes Ebionism from Gnosticism as follows: "Ebionism is a Judaizing, pseudo-Petrine Christianity, or a Christianizing Judaism; Gnosticism is a paganizing or pseudo-Pauline Christianity, or a pseudo-Christian heathenism. The former is a particularistic contraction of the Christian religion; the latter a vague expansion of it" (Church History, § 67). According to the same writer, "the characteristic marks of Ebionism in all its forms are, degradation of Christianity to the level of Judaism, the principle of the universal and perpetual validity of the Mosaic law, and enmity to the apostle Paul. But, as there were different sects in Judaism itself, we have also to distinguish at least two branches of Ebionism, related to each other, as Pharisaism and Essenism, or, to use a modern illustration, as the older deistic and the speculative pantheistic rationalism in Germany, or the two schools of Unitarianism in England and America.

1. The common Ebionites, who were by far the more numerous, embodied the Pharisaic legal spirit, and were the proper successors of the Judaizers opposed in the epistle to the Galatians. Their doctrine may be reduced to the following propositions:

 (a.) Jesus is, indeed, the promised Messiah, the son of David, and the supreme lawgiver, yet a mere man, like Moses and David, sprung by natural generation from Joseph and Mary. The sense of his Messianic calling first arose in him at his baptism by John, when a higher spirit joined itself to him. Hence Origen compared this sect to the blind man in the Gospel who called to the Lord without seeing him, 'Thou son of David, have mercy on me!'

 (b.) Circumcision and the observance of the whole ritual law of Moses are necessary to salvation for all men.

 (c.) Paul is an apostate and heretic, and all his epistles are to be discarded. The sect considered him a native heathen, who came over to Judaism in later life from impure motives.

 (d.) Christ is soon to come again to introduce the glorious millennial reign of the Messiah, with the earthly Jerusalem for its seat.

2. The second class of Ebionites, starting with Essenic notions, gave their Judaism a speculative or theosophic stamp, like the errorists of the Epistle to the Colossians. They form the stepping-stone to Gnosticism.

Among these belong the Elkesaites" (Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1, § 68, 214 sq.). The pseudo-Clementine homilies teach a speculative form of Ebionism, essentially Judaizing in spirit and aim [ SEE CLEMENTINES, 2, page 383]; and compare Schaff, Ch. History, 1, § 69; Dorner, Person of Christ, Edinb. transl., page 203 sq.).

4. Ebionism has reappeared, since the Reformation, in Socinianism (q.v.), and in the other forms of what is called Unitarianism (q.v.). Some Unitarian writers have undertaken to show that Ebionism was the original form of Christian doctrine, and that the Church doctrine as to the person of Christ was a later development; so Priestley, in his History of the Corruptions of Christianity (Birmingham, 1782). Bishop Horsley replied to Priestley in his Charge to the Clergy of St. Albans (1783), and in other tracts, collected in Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley (Dundee, 1812, 3d ed.). Horsley, in this controversy, made use of Bull's learned treatment of the subject in his reply to Zwicker (see Bull, On the Trinity, Oxford, 1855, 3 vols.: 1:116; 2:376; 3:175 et al. See also Waterland, Works, Oxf. 1843, 6 vols.: 3:554 sq.). A far abler advocate of the Socinian view is Baur, in his Christenthum d. drei erstess Jahrhunderte; Lehre v.d. Dreieinigkeit Gottes; Dogmengeschichte, etc. Baur's position is clearly stated, and refuted by professor Fisher (Am. Presb. and Theolog. Rev. October 1864, art. 1). "Baur agrees with the old Socinians in the statement that the Jewish Christianity of the apostolic age was Ebionite. But, unlike them, he holds that we find within the canon a great departure from, and advance upon, this humanitarian doctrine of Christ's person. He professes to discover in the New Testament the consecutive stages of a progress which, beginning with the Unitarian creed terminates in the doctrine of Christ's proper divinity. There occurred at the end, or before the end, of the apostolic age, a reaction of the Jewish Christianity, which with Baur is identical with the Judaizing or Ebionite element; and this type of Christianity prevailed through the larger part of the second century." (See Fisher, 1. c., for a criticism of this view, and for a brief but luminous sketch of Ebionism. On the other side, see N. Amer. Rev. April, 1864, page 569 sq.).

Literature. — See, besides the works already cited, Irenaeus, Har. 1:26 (Ante-Nicene Library, verse 97); Gieseler, Ueber die Nazarder und Ebioniten, in Archiv fur A.&N. Kircheng., 4:279 sq. (Leipsig, 1820); Mosheim, Comnmentaries, 1:220, 400; Neander, Church Hist. 1:344; 350; Schliemann, Die Clementinen (Hamb. 1844), page 362 sq.; Herzog, Real- Esacyklopadie, 3:621 sq.; Martensen, Dogmatics (Edinburgh, 1866), § 128; Shedd, History of Doctrines, 1:106 sq.; Burton, Ecclesiastes History, Lect. 11; Burton, Bampton Lectures (Oxford, 1829), notes 73-84.

## Eblis[[@Headword:Eblis]]

             the name given to the devil by the Mohammedans.

## Ebnerian Manuscript[[@Headword:Ebnerian Manuscript]]

              (CODEX EBNERIANUS, usually designated as No. 105 of the Gospels, 48 of the Act 24:1-27 of the Pauline Epistles), a beautiful cursive Greek MS. of the entire N.T. except Revelation, consisting of 425 quarto vellum leaves; assigned to the 12th century; formerly belonging to Jerome Ebner von Eschenbach, of Nuremberg, and now in the Bodleian Library (No. 136). A facsimile and description are given by Tregelles, in Horne's Introd. page 220. SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

## Eboda[[@Headword:Eboda]]

              (Ε᾿βόδα), a city mentioned only by Ptolemy (17, 18) as situated in the sea- board quarter of Arabia Petraea (see Reland, Palast. p. 463), in 65.25 and 30.5, and marked on the Peutinger Table as lying on the Roman road 23 Roman miles south of Elusa (q.v.). Dr. Robinson (Researches, 1:287) discovered the site in the modern el-Abdeh (otherwise Aujeh, ib. page 560), eight hours from the site of Elusa, at the junction of Wady es-Seram with Wadi el-Birein (ib. page 284). It contains extensive ruins, situated on a rocky ridge from sixty to one hundred feet high; especially the remains of an acropolis, of a capacious castle, and of a large Greek church, with numerous walls, columns etc., still standing, and several wells or reservoirs, but no inhabitants (ib. pages 285, 286).

## Ebon Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Ebon Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Ebon is the most southerly of the Marshall Islands. These islands are the second group of Micronesia, beginning from the east with the Gilbert Island. The first Scripture in this language was from the gospel of  Matthew, chapters 5 to 11. This translation was printed at Ebon, between 1858 and 1860. The work was done by the pioneer missionaries, Reverends E.T. Doane and G. Pierson. A version of Mark, prepared by Mr. Doane, was printed at Honolulu in 1863. The Reverend B.G. Snow prepared for the press the gospels of Matthew and John, and the Acts, and revised Mark for a reprint. In 1871 he prepared the gospel of Luke and a revision of Matthew for the press. In 1877 Genesis was issued from the mission press at Ebon, translated by J.F. Whitney, who also resumed the work on Romans, left unfinished by Mr. Snow, and translated the epistles from 1 Corinthians through Philippians. These were printed at the New York Bible House in 1882, together with the book of Genesis and the three epistles of John. The Reverend E.M. Pease, who joined the mission in 1877, has resumed the work of translation of the rest of the New Test. (B.P.)

## Ebony[[@Headword:Ebony]]

              (הָבְנַי, hobni', stony, q.d. stone-wood [comp. the Germ. Steinholz, "fossil- wood"], only in the plum. הָבְנַים, hobnim' [text הָוֹבְנַיםfor הוֹבֶנַרם, hobenim'], Sept. [by some confusion or misinterpretation, see Rosenmuller, Schol. in loc.] τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις, Symma chus ἐβένους, Vulg. Edentes] hebeninos) occurs only in one passage of Scripture, where the prophet Ezekiel (Ezekiel 10-17:15), referring to the commerce of Tyre, says, "The men of Dedan were thy merchants; many isles were the merchandise of thine hand: they brought thee for. a present horns of ivory and ebony." SEE DEDAN. The Hebrew word is translated "'ebony" in all the European versions; but, as Bochart states (Hieroz. 1:20, part 2), the Chaldee version, followed by B. Selomo and other Jews, as well as the Greek and Arabic versions, render it by pea-fowl (pavonses). Some of the Hebrew critics, however, as Kimchi, also acknowledge that Arabian ebony is meant. Of the correctness of this opinion there can now be no doubt. In the first place, we may allude to Dedan being considered one of the ports of Arabia on the Persian Gulf, or at least to the south of the Red Sea; and, secondly, as observed by Bochart, the terms hobnim and ebony are very similar, the latter word being variously written by ancient authors, as ἐβένη, ἔβενος, ἔβενον, ebenus and hebenus. The last form is used by Jerome in his Latin, and ἔβενος by Symmachus in his Greek version. The Arabs have abnus, which they apply to ebony, and by that name it is known in Northern India at the' present day. Forskal mentions abnus as one of, the kinds of wood imported in his time from India into Arabia. Whether the Arabic name be a corruption of the Greek, or the Greek a modification, as is most likely, of some Eastern name, we require some other evidence besides the occurrence of the word in Arabic works on materia medica to determine, since in these Greek words are sometimes employed as the principal terms for substances with which they are not well acquainted. Bardust is, however, given by some as the Arabic name, abnus as the Persian. Naturalists have found the latter applied to ebony in north-west India, as did Forskil on the Red Sea. Ebony wood was highly esteemed by the ancients, and employed by them for a variety of purposes (Theophr. Hist. Pl. 4:5; Plin. H.N. 6:30, § 35; 12:4, § 8, 9; Strabo, 15:703; Pausan. 1:42, 5; 8:17, 2; Ovid, Met. 11:610; compare Barhebr. Chron. page 181). It is very appropriately placed in juxtaposition with ivory, on account of the beautiful contrast in color. Ivory and ebony are probably, however, also mentioned together because both were obtained from the same countries, Ethiopia and India; and, among the comparatively few articles of ancient commerce, must from this cause, always have been associated together, while their contrast of color and joint employment in inlaid work would contribute as additional reasons for their being adduced as articles characteristic of a distinct commerce. But it is not in Ezekiel only that ebony and ivory are mentioned together, for Diodorus, as quoted by Bochart, tells us that an ancient king of Egypt imposed on the Ethiopians the payment of a tribute of ebony, gold, and elephants' teeth. So Herodotus (3, 97), as translated by Bochart, says, "Athiopes Persis pro triennali tributo vehunt duos choenices auri apyri (id est, ignem nondum experti), et ducentas ebeni phalangas, et magnos elephanti dentes viginti." Pliny, referring to this passage, remarks, “But Herodotus assigneth it rather to Ethiopia, and saith that every three years the Ethiopians were wont to pay, by way of tribute, unto the kings of Persia, 100 billets of the timber of that tree (that is, ebene), together with gold and ivorie;" and again, "From Syene (which confineth and boundeth the lands of our empire and dominion) as farre as to the island Meroe, for the space of 996 miles, there is little ebene found: and that in all those parts betweene there be few other trees to be found but date-trees; which peradventure may be a cause that ebene was counted a rich tribute, and deserved the third place, after gold and ivorie" (Holland's Pliny, 12:4). It is sometimes stated that the ancients supposed ebony to come only from India. This arose probably from the passage of Virgil (Georg. 2:117): "Sola India nigrum fert ebenum." But the term "India" had often a very wide signification, and included even Ethiopia. Several of the ancients, however, mention both Indian and Ethiopian ebony, as Dioscorides and Pliny; while some mention the Indian, and others the Ethiopian only, as Lucan (Phars. 10:304): "Nigris Meroe fecunda colonis, laeta comis ebeni."

The only objection to the above conclusion of any weight is, that hobnim is in the plural form. To this Bochart and others have replied, that there were two kinds of ebony, as mentioned by Theophrastus, Dioscorides, etc., one Ethiopian, the other Indian. Fuller and others maintain that the plural form is employed because the ebony was in pieces: "Refert ad ebeni palangas, quoe ex India et Ethiopia magno numero afferebantur. Φάλαγγας vocant Herodotus et Arrianus in Periplo. Plinius palangas, aut phalangas, variante scripturae, id est, fustes teretes, et qui navibus supponuntur, ant quibus idem onus plures bajulant" (Bochart, 1. c.). But the names of other valued foreign woods, as Shittim and Almuggim, are also used in the plural form. Besides abnus, Arab authors, as stated by Bochart (l. c.), mention other words as similar to and substituted for ebony: one of these is called shiz, shizi; also sasem and semsem, in the plural form semasim, described as "nigrum lignum ad patinas conficiendas.'" Hence, in the Koran, those who are tormented in Gehenna, it is said, will issue from the fire after a certain period of confinement in it: “They will go forth, I say, like the wood semasin;" that is, black, from being burnt in the fire. That such a wood was known we have the testimony of Dioscorides: " Some sell sesamine or acanthine wood for ebony, as they are very similar." Some critics, and even Sprengel, in his late edition of Dioscorides, read συκάμινα instead of σησάμινα, for no other reason apparently but because συκάμινα denotes a tree with which European scholars are acquainted, while sesamina is only known to those who consult Oriental writers, or who are acquainted with the products of the East. Bochart rightly reprehends this alteration as being unnecessary, in view of the existence of the words sesamina, sasinz, or semsem among the modern Arabs, and cites a notice of Arrian to the same effect (Bochart, l.c.). 'The above word is by Dr. Vincent translated sesamum; but this is an herbaceous oil-plant.

If we look to the modern history of ebony, we shall find that it is still derived from more than one source. Thus Mr. Holtzappfel, in his recent work on Turning, describes three kinds of ebony.

1. One from the Mauritius, in round sticks like scaffold poles, seldom exceeding fourteen inches in diameter, the blackest and finest in the grain, the hardest and most beautiful.

2. The East Indian, which is grown in Ceylon and the Peninsula of India, and exported from Madras and Bombay in logs from six to twenty, and sometimes even twenty-eight inches in diameter, and also in planks. This is less wasteful, but of an inferior grain and color to the above.

3. The African, shipped from the Cape of Good Hope in billets, the general size of which is from three to six feet long, three to six inches broad, and two to four inches thick. This is the least wasteful, as all the refuse is left behind; but it is the most porous, and the worst in point of color. No Abyssinian ebony is at present imported: this, however, is more likely to be owing to the different routes which commerce has taken, although it is again returning to its ancient channels, than to the want of ebony in the ancient Ethiopia. From the nature of the climate, and the existence of forests ins which the elephant abounds, there can be no doubt of its being well suited to the group of plants which have been found to yield the ebony of Mauritius, Ceyoon, and India, the genus Diospyrus of botanists. Of this several species yield varieties of ebony as their heartwood, as D. ebenum in the Mauritius, and also in Ceylon, where it is called kaluwara. It is described by Retz "folis ovato-lanceolatis, acuminatis, gemmia hirtis;" and he quotes as identical D. glaberrima (Fr. Rottb. Nov. Act. Havn. 2:540, tab. 5). D. ebenaster yields the bastard ebony of Ceylon, and D. hirsuta the Calamander wood of the same island, described by Mr. Holtzappfel as of a chocolate-brown color, with black stripes and marks, and stated by him to be considered a variety of ebony. D. melanoxylon of Dr. Roxburgh is the ebony-tree of Coromandel, and is figured among Coromandel plants (1, No. 46); it grows to be a large tree in the mountainous parts of Ceylon, and in the Peninsula of India — in Malabar, Coromandel, and Orissa. The black part of the wood of this tree alone forms ebony, and is found only in the center of large trees, and varies in quantity according to the size and age of the tree. The outside wood is white and soft, and is soon destroyed by time and insects, leaving the black untouched (Roxb. Fl. Ind. 2:530). Besides these, there is in the Peninsula of India a wood called: blackwood by the English, and sit-sal by the natives: it grows to an immense size, is heavy, close-grained, of a greenish-black color, with lighter-colored veins running in various directions. It is yielded by the Dalberyia latifolia. To the same genus belongs the Sissu, one of the most valued woods of India, and of which the tree has been called Dalberyia sissu. Theo wood is remarkably strong, of a light grayish hue, with darker-colored veins. It is called sissu and shishum by the natives of India. This is the name which we believe is referred to by Arab authors, and which also appears to have been the original of the sesamina of Dioscorides and of the Periplus. The name may be applied to other nearly allied woods, and therefore, perhaps, to that of the above D. latafolia. It is a curious confirmation of this that Forskill mentions that in his time shishum, with teak and ebony, was among the woods imported from India and Arabia. It is satisfactory to have apparently suck, competent confirmation of the general accuracy of ancient authors, when we fully understand the subjects and the products of the countries to which they allude (Kitto, s.v.). According to Sir E. Tennent. (Ceylon, 1:116) the following trees yield ebony: Diospyros ebenum, D. reticulata, D. ebenaster, and D. hirsuta. The wood of the first-named tree, which is abundant throughout all the flat country to the west of Trincomali, "excels all others in the evenness and intensity of its color. The center of the trunk is the only portion which furnishes the extremely black part which is the ebony of commerce; but the trees are of such magnitude that reduced logs of two feet in diameter, and varying from ten to twelve feet in length, can readily be procured from the forests at Trincomali" (Ceylon, l.c.) It bears a berry that is eaten by the natives when ripe. The leaves are elliptical, having numerous veins. The corolla or colored part is shaped like an antique vase, and bears eight stamans (Kitto, Pict. Bible, in loc. Ezekiel). There is every reason for believing that the ebony afforded by the Diospyros ebenum was imported from India or Ceylon by Phoenician traders, though it is equally probable that the Tyrian merchants were supplied with ebony from trees which grew in Ethiopia (Smith, s.v.). SEE TYRE. (See Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Ebenus; Penny Cyclop. s.v. Ebony; Geiger, Pharmaceut. Botanik, 1:697). SEE BOTANY.

## Eboras[[@Headword:Eboras]]

             a Persian presbyter, martyred with Miles, a bishop, and Seboa, a deacon, during the reign of Sapor.II (A.D. 346); and commemorated November 13.

## Eborinus[[@Headword:Eborinus]]

             sixteenth bishop of Toul, cir. A.D, 664.

## Ebraldines Order Of The[[@Headword:Ebraldines Order Of The]]

             SEE FONTEVRAULD.

## Ebrardus[[@Headword:Ebrardus]]

             an author and theologian of Bethune, in France, who lived during the latter part of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th. He is known only by his writings. One of the principal of these, his Gracismus, a collection of rules of rhetoric, prosody, grammar, and logic, was for many years used as a textbook. His principal theological works are Liber antihaeresis against the Cathari, which was first published under the title Contra Waldenses in Gretser's Trias scriptorum, contra Waldenses (Ingolstadt, 1614, 4to), and reprinted in Bibl. Patr. Max. (of Lyons, volume 24), and lastly in Gretser's Opera Omnia (volume 12, part 2). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 3:625.

## Ebrbuharites[[@Headword:Ebrbuharites]]

             an order of monks among the Mohammriedans, who derived their name from their founder, Ebrbuhar, the scholar of Nacshbendi, who came from Persia to Europe in the 14th century to propagate their faith. They professed to surrender all care about worldly concerns, and to give themselves wholly up to the contemplation of eternal objects. They were esteemed heretics by the Mohammedans generally, because they refused to go on pilgrimage to Mecca, alleging that the journey was unnecessary, as they were permitted in secret vision, while sitting in their cells, to behold the holy city.

## Ebregesilus[[@Headword:Ebregesilus]]

             ninth bishop of Cologne, A.D. 590.

## Ebregesius, Saint[[@Headword:Ebregesius, Saint]]

             twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth bishop of Liege, A.D. 618-623; commemorated March 28.

## Ebremar or Evermer[[@Headword:Ebremar or Evermer]]

             the third Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, was born at Cickes, near Terouanne, towards the close of the 11th century. Admitted by Lambert, bishop of Arras, to the priesthood, he joined the first Crusaders, and was of the number appointed by Godfrey de Bouillon canon at the holy sepulcher. In 1103, on the deposition of Daimbert (q.v.), he was elevated to the patriarchate, in which, after much contention on the part of Daimbert, he was solemnly confirmed by the decree of a council. He was a member of the Council of Nablous (1120), and in 1123 signed the treaty between the crusading princes and the Vemetians. A letter of this prelate, with the response by Lambert of Arras, is contained in the 5th volume of the Miscellanea of Baluze. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 15, 618.

## Ebremundus[[@Headword:Ebremundus]]

             SEE EVREMOND.

## Ebrigisilus[[@Headword:Ebrigisilus]]

             twenty-third bishop of Meaux, about the end of the 7th century.

## Ebroinus[[@Headword:Ebroinus]]

             forty-second bishop of Bourges, A.D. 810.

## Ebronah[[@Headword:Ebronah]]

              (Hebrews A bronah', עִבְרוֹנָה, passage, i.e., — of the sea; Sept. Ε᾿βρεναί), the thirtieth station of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to Canaan (Num 33:34-35). Since it lay near Ezion-Gaber on the west, as they left Jotbathah, it was probably in the plain now known as the Ka'a en-Nikb, immediately opposite the pass of the same name at the head of the Elanitic branch of the Red Sea (see Robinson's Map in Researches, volume 1). Rommel (in the Hall. Encyklop. 1:167) compares the Avara of Ptolemy (Num 33:17), in Arabia Petraea (66 degrees 10 feet and 29 degrees 40 feet), with the Havarra of the Peutinger Table; a very improbable supposition. Knobel thinks (Exeg. Handb. in loc.) that the Ezion-Gaber in question cannot be the port of that name at the head of the Elanitic Gulf; for, as the next station mentioned is Kadesh, this was too far from the north end of the gulf to be reached in one march; but this objection is of little force, as there is no uniformity in the 'intervals between the stations. Schwarz (Palest. page 219) rightly regards Ebronah as merely the name of a "ferry," by which the people perhaps crossed this arm of the sea (!), or where travelers usually crossed it.

## Ebrulfus[[@Headword:Ebrulfus]]

             SEE EVROUL.

## Ebulus (Evolius, Eubrelus, or even Ermilius)[[@Headword:Ebulus (Evolius, Eubrelus, or even Ermilius)]]

             (1) Third bishop of Limoges, A.D. 89.

(2) Sixth bishop of Avignon, A.D. 202.

## Ebutius[[@Headword:Ebutius]]

              (Ε᾿βούτιος), a decurion (δεκάρχης), and a person distinguished for good judgment and prompt action who was sent with Placidus by Vespasian to invest Jotapata while garrisoned by Josephus (Josephus, War, 3, 7, 3). He was slain while defending Vespasian from a furious sally during the siege of Gamala (ib. 4, 1, 5).

## Ecanus[[@Headword:Ecanus]]

              (Vulg. id., the Greek text being lost), one of the five swift scribes who were selected to attend Esdras (2Es 14:24).

## Ecbatana[[@Headword:Ecbatana]]

              (1Es 6:23) or "ECBAT'ANE" (τὰ Ε᾿κβάτανα, 2Ma 9:3; Jdt 1:1 sq.; Tob 5:9, etc.; comp. Josephus, Ant. 10:11, 7; 11:4, 6; Α᾿γβάτανα in Ctesias 1; Herod. 1:98; 2:153), the metropolis of Media (Curt. 5:81), situated 88° and 37 degrees, 45 feet, according to Ptolemy (6, 2, 14), and after the time of Cyrus (Strabo, 11:522 sq.; Pausan. 4:24, 1; Xenoph. Cyr. 8:6, 22; Anab. 3, 5, 15) two months in the year the residence of the Persian (later the Parthian) kings. It is somewhat doubtful whether the name of this place is really contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. Many of the best commentators understand the expression בְּאִחְמְתָא, in Ezr 6:2, differently, and translate it in arca "in a coffer" (see Buxtorf and others, and so our English Bible in the margin). The Sept., however, give ἐν πόλει, " in a city," or (in some MSS.) ἐν Α᾿μαθὰ ἐν πόλει, which favors the ordinary interpretation. If a city is meant, there is little doubt of one of the two Ecbatanas being intended; for, except these towns, there was no place in the province of the Medes "which contained a palace" (בַּירָה), or where records are likely to have been deposited. The name Achmetha, too, which at first sight seems somewhat remote from Ecbatana, wants but one letter of Hagmatana, which was the native appellation. The earlier and more correct Greek form of the name, too, was Agbatana (see Steph. Byz. page 19; compare Wesseling ad Herod. 3, 65). Lassen (Biblioth. 3, 36) regards the name as Zendish, Aghwa-Tana, "land rich in horses." Hyde (De rel. vet. Pers. page 541 sq.) compares it with the Persic Abadan, "cultivated place;” Ilgen (on Tobit, l.c.) regards it as Sbemitic; compare Syr. Chamtana, "fortress." For other etymologies, see Simonis Onom. V.T. page 578 sq.; Gesenius, Thes. page 70.

Two cities of the name of Ecbatana seem to have existed in ancient times, one the capital of Northern Media, the Media Atropatene of Strabo; the other the metropolis of the larger and more important province known as Media Magna (see Sir H. Rawlinson's paper on the Atropatenian Ecbatana, in the 10th volume of the Journal of the Geographical Society, art. 2). The site of the former appears to be marked by the very curious ruins at Takht i-Suleiman (lat. 36 degrees 28 feet long. 47 degrees 9 feet); while that of the latter is occupied by hamadan, which is one of the most important cities of modern Persia. There is generally some difficulty in determining, when Ecbatana is mentioned, whether the northern or the southern metropolis is intended. Few writers are aware of the existence of the two cities, and they lie sufficiently near to one another for geographical notices in most cases to suit either site. The northern city was the "seven-walled town" described by Herodotus, and declared by him to have been the capital of Cyrus (Herod. 1:98-99, 153; compare Mos. Choren. 2:84); and it was thus most probably there that the roll was found which proved to Darius that Cyrus had really made a decree allowing the Jews to rebuild their Temple.

Various descriptions of the northern city have come down to us, but none of them is completely to be depended on. That of the Zendavesta (Vendidad, Fargard II) is the oldest and the least exaggerated. "Jemshid,” it is said, "erected a var, or fortress, sufficiently large, and formed of squared blocks of stone; he assembled in the place a vast, population, and stocked the surrounding country with cattle for their use. He caused the water of the great fortress to flow forth abundantly. And within the var, or fortress, he erected a lofty palace; encompassed with walls, and laid it out in many separate divisions, and there was no place, either in front or rear, to command and overawe the fortress." Herodotus, who ascribes the foundation of the city to his king Deloces, says: "The Medes were obedient to Deloces, and built the city now called Agbatana, the walls of which are of great size and strength, rising in circles one within the other. The plan of the place is that each of the walls should out-top the one beyond it by the battlements. The nature of the ground, which is a gentle hill, favors this arrangement in some degree, but it was mainly effected by art. The number of the circles is seven, the royal palace and the treasuries standing within the last. The circuit of the outer wall is nearly the same with that of Athens. Of this outer wall the battlements are white, of the next black, of the third scarlet, of the fourth blue, of the fifth orange: all these are colored with paint. The last two have their battlements coated respectively with silver and gold. All these fortifications Deloces caused to be raised for himself and his own palace. The people were required to build their dwellings outside the circuit of the walls" (Herod. 1:98, 99). Finally, the book of Judith, probably the work of an Alexandrian Jew, professes to give a number of details, which appear to be drawn chiefly from the imagination of the writer (Jud 1:2-4).

The peculiar feature of the site of Takht i-Suleman, which it is proposed to identify with the northern Ecbatana, is a conical hill rising to the height of about 150 feet above the plain, and covered both on its top and sides with massive ruins of the most antique and primitive character. A perfect enceinte, formed of large blocks of squared stone, may be traced round the entire hill along its brow; within there is an oval enclosure, about 800 yards in its greatest and 400 in its least diameter, strewn with ruins, which cluster round a remarkable lake. This is an irregular baError! Not a valid filename.sin, about 300 paces in circuit, filled with water exquisitely clear and pleasant to the taste, which is supplied in some unknown way from below, and which stands uniformly at the same level, whatever the quantity taken from it for irrigating the lands which lie at the foot of the hill. This hill itself is not perfectly isolated, though it appears so to those who approach it by the ordinary route. On three sides — the south, the west, and the north — the acclivity is steep, and the height above the plain uniform; but on the east it abuts upon a hilly tract of ground, and here it is but slightly elevated above the adjoining country. It cannot, therefore, have ever answered exactly to the description of Herodotus, as the eastern side could not anyhow admit of seven walls of circumvallation. It is doubted whether even the other sides were thus defended. Although the flanks on these sides are covered with ruins, "no traces remain of any wall but the upper one" (As. Jour. 10:52). Still, as the nature of the ground on three sides would allow this style of defense, and as the account in Herodotus is confirmed by the Armenian historian, writing clearly without knowledge of the earlier author, it seems best to suppose that in the peaceful times of the Persian empire it was thought sufficient to preserve the upper enceinte, while the others were allowed to fall into decay, and ultimately were superseded by domestic buildings. With regard to the coloring of the walls, or, rather, of the battlements, which has been considered to mark especially the fabulous character of Herodotus's description, recent discoveries show that such a mode of ornamentation was actually in use at the period an question in a neighboring country. The temple of the Seven Spheres at Borsippa was adorned almost exactly in the manner which Herodotus assigns to the Median capital ( SEE BABEL, TOWER OF ); and it does not seem at all improbable that, with the object of placing the city under the protection of the seven planets, the seven walls may have been colored nearly as described. Herodotus has a little deranged the order of the hues, which should have been either black, orange, scarlet, gold, white, blue, silver — as at the Borsippa temple — or black, white, orange, blue, scarlet, silver, gold — if the order of the days dedicated to the planets were followed. Even the use of silver and gold in external ornamentation — which seems at first sight highly improbable — is found to have prevailed. Silver roofs were met with by the Greeks at the southern Ecbatana (Polybius, 10:27, 10-12); and there is reason to believe that at Borsippa the gold and silver stages of the temple were actually coated with those metals. (See Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1:185.)

The northern Ecbatana continued to be an important place down to the 13th century after Christ. By the Greeks and Romans it appears to have been known as Gaza, Gazaca, or Canzaca, "the treasure city," on account of the wealth laid up in it, while by the Orientals it was termed Shiz. Its decay is referable to the Mogul conquests, cir. A.D. 1200; and its final ruin is supposed to date from about the 15th or 16th century (As. Soc. Journ. 10, part 1:49).

In the 2d book of Maccabees (9:3, etc.), the Ecbatana mentioned is undoubtedly the southern city, now represented both in name and site by Hamadan. This place, situated on the northern flank of the great mountain called formerly Oroiates, and now Elwend, was perhaps as ancient as the other, and is far better known in history. If not the Median capital of Cyrus, it was, at any rate, regarded from the time of Darius Hystaspis as the chief city of the Persian satrapy of Media, and as such it became the summer residence of the Persian kings from Darius downwards. It was occupied by Alexander soon after the battle of Arbela (Arrian, Exp. Alex. 3:19), and at his decease passed under the dominion of the Seleucidae. In the wars between his successors it was more than once taken and retaken, each time suffering largely at the hands of its conquerors (Polyb. 10:27). It was afterwards recognized as the metropolis of their empire by the Parthians (Oros. 6:4). During the Arabian period, from the rise of Bagdad on the one band and of Ispahan on the other, it sank into comparative insignificance; but still it has never descended below the rank of a provincial capital, and even in the present depressed condition of Persia it is a city of from 20,000 to 90,000 inhabitants. The Jews, curiously enough, -regard it as the residence of Ahasuerus (Xerxes?) — which is in Scripture declared to be Susa (Est 1:2; Est 2:3, etc.) — and show within its precincts the tombs of Esther and Mordecai (Ker Porter, 2:105-110). It is not distinguished by any remarkable peculiarities from other Oriental cities of the same size.

The Ecbatana of the book of Tobit is thought by Sir H. Rawlinson to be the northern city (see As. Soc. Journ. 10, 1:137-141). SEE ACHMETHA. Eccard.

SEE ECKHARD.

## Eccard, Johannes[[@Headword:Eccard, Johannes]]

             a celebrated composer of Church music, was born at Muhlhausen, on the Unstrut, Prussia, in 1553. Having received some instruction in music at home, he became, at the age of eighteen, the pupil of Orlando di Lasso at Munich. In 1574 he was again at Miihlhausen, where he resided four years, and edited, together with Johanln on Burgk, his first master, a collection of sacred songs called Crepundia Sacra Helmboldi (1577). He was for some time engaged in a private family, and in 1583 became assistant conductor, and twelve years later first chapel-master, at Kinigsberg. In 1608 he became chief conductor of the elector's chapel in Berlin, and died in 1611. Eccard's works consist exclusively of vocal compositions, such as songs, sacred cantatas, and chorales for four or five, and sometimes for seven, eight, or even nine voices. They are instinct with a spirit of true religious feeling, and possess an interest above their artistic value. Eccard's setting of "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott " is still regarded by the Germans as their representative national hymn. Eccard and his school are in the same way  inseparably connected with the history of the Reformation. Of his songs a great many collections are extant. See Encyclop. Brit. (9th ed.) s.v.; Grove, Diet. of Music.

## Ecce Homo[[@Headword:Ecce Homo]]

             a name given in art to pictures representing the suffering Savior as described in Joh 19:5 : "Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man!" It is a comparatively recent subject in art, dating from the 15th century. There are two forms of it, viz. the devotional picture, which offers the single head, or half-figure of Christ, to our contemplation, as the "Man of Sorrows" of the Passion, and the more or less historical picture, which either places him before us attended by Pilate and one or more attendants, or gives the full scene in numerous figures. For an account of them, see Jamieson, History of our Lord in Art, 2:92 sq.

## Ecchellensis or Echellensis Abraham;[[@Headword:Ecchellensis or Echellensis Abraham;]]

             a Maronite scholar, was born at Eckel, Syria, and was educated in Rome, where he afterwards taught the Syriac and Arabic languages. In 1630 he was called to Paris to assist in the preparation of the great Polyglot Bible of Le Jay. For this work Ecchellensis furnished Ruth in Syriac and Arabic, with a Latin translation, and the 3d book of Maccabees in Arabic. He undertook also the revision of the Syriac and Arabic texts, and the Latin versions contributed by Gabriel Sionita. He returned again to Rome to fill the chair of Oriental languages offered him in that city, and died there in 1664. Ecchellensis' writings are numerous; among the most important are: Lingua Syriacae sive Chaldaicae perbrevis. Institutio (Rome, 1628, 4to): — Synopsis propositorum sapientiae Arabum, inscripta speculum mundum representans, ex arabico sermone latini juris facta (Par. 1641, 4to). — Sancti Antonii Magni Epistolae viginti (Par. 1641, 8vo): — Concilii Niceni Prafatio, etc. (Par. 1645, 8vo): — Sancti Antonii Magni Regulae, sermones, documenta, admonitiones, responsiones, at vita duplex (Paris, 1646, 8vo): — Semita Sapiestia, sive ad scientias comparandas methodus (Paris, 1646): — De Proprietatibus et virtutibus medicis animalium, plantarum ac gemmarum, tractatus triplex Habdarrahman (Paris, 1647, 8vo): — Chronicon orientale nunc primum latinitate donatum cui accessit supplementum Historiae orientalis (Par. 1653, fol.): — Catalogus librorum Chaldaeorum, tam ecclesiasticorum quam profanorum, auctore Habed-Jesu (Rome, 1653, 8vo), with notes: — Concordantia nationum christianarum orientalium in fidei catholicae dogmate (Mayence, 1655, 8vo). In this book he seeks to harmonize the sentiments of the Orientals with those of the Roman Church. Leo Allatius assisted him in his work. De Origine nominis Papa, ... adeo de ejus primatu, etc. (Rome, 1660), and Eutychius vindicatus sive Responsio ad Seldeni Origines (Rome, 1661, 4to), were works written in the controversy against the Protestants. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 5:621.

## Ecclesia[[@Headword:Ecclesia]]

             SEE CHURCH.

## Ecclesia (2)[[@Headword:Ecclesia (2)]]

             (the Church), one of the eight primary Eeons in the system of Valentinus (q.v.), and held to be the archetype of the lower one on earth. The Gnostics likewise had a heavenly Church, but not a distinct being. This notion is evidently a corruption of the Scriptural idea of the heavenly Jerusalem, and tendencies to a fanciful separation of the Church triumphant and the Church militant are noticeable in the Shepherd of Hermas (Vis. 2:4) and in Clement's Second Epistle to the Corinthians (chapter 14).

## Ecclesia Apostolica[[@Headword:Ecclesia Apostolica]]

             a name applied by some of the early fathers to the,Church of Rome, on account of'the prevalent belief that the apostles Peter and Paul both taught at Rome, and honored the Church by their martyrdom.

## Ecclesia Matrix[[@Headword:Ecclesia Matrix]]

             (Mother Church), a name given in ancient times to the cathedral church, to which all the clergy of a city or diocese belonged.

## Ecclesiae Causidici[[@Headword:Ecclesiae Causidici]]

             (Church lawyers), the name formerly applied to ecclesiastical chancellors. SEE CHANCELLOR.

## Ecclesiae Domus[[@Headword:Ecclesiae Domus]]

             SEE DOMUS.

## Ecclesiae Seniores[[@Headword:Ecclesiae Seniores]]

             SEE SENIORES.

## Ecclesiarch[[@Headword:Ecclesiarch]]

             in the East, was the sacrist, who had general charge of the church and contents, and summoned the people by bells or other means. The minor ecclesiastical officials were under his authority.

## Ecclesiasterion[[@Headword:Ecclesiasterion]]

             a term sometimes used in early times to denote the church building as distinguished from the ecclesia, or members of the Christian Church.

## Ecclesiastes[[@Headword:Ecclesiastes]]

             the fourth of the poetical books in the English arrangement of the O.T., and one of those usually attributed to Solomon. In the Hebrews Bible it is the seventh and last of the first part of the Hagio.graphi,כְּתוּבַים, or fourth division of the Jewish Scriptures. In the Sept. and Vulg. it is placed between Proverbs and Canticles, as in the A.V. SEE BIBLE. It is the fourth of the five Megilloth (q.v.) or Rolls, as they are called by the Jews, being appointed to be read at the Feast of Tabernacles. The form of the book is poetico-didactic. Without the sublimity of the beautiful parallelism and rhythm which characterize the older poetic effusions of the inspired writings. The absence of vigor and charm is manifest even in the grandest portion of this book (Ecc 12:1-7), where the sacred writer rises above his usual level. (See generally, Bergst, in Eichhorn's Bibliothek, 10:955-84; Paulus, in his Neues Repertorium, 1:201-65; Zirkel, Ueb. der Prediger, Wurzb, 1792; Umbreit, Coheleth scepticus, Gott. 1820; Stiebriz, Vindiciae Solomonis, Halle, 1760; Henzi, Ecclesiastes argumentum, Dorpat, 1827; Muhlert, Palaogr. Beitrage, page 182 sq.; Hartmann, in the Wien. Zeitschr. 1:29, 71; Ewald, Ueb. d. Prediger, Gott. 1826; Umbreit, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1849; Bruch, Weisheits-Lehre der Hebraer, Strasburg, 1851.) SEE SOLOMON.

I. Title. — The Hebrew name is קֹהֶלֶתKohe'leth, and is evidently taken from the designation which the writer himself assumes (Ecc 1:2; Ecc 1:2; Ecc 7:27; Ecc 12:8-10; Sept. ἐκκλησιαστής, Vulg. ecclesiastes, Auth. Vers. "preacher"). It is the participle of קָהִל, kahal' (cognate with קוֹל, voice, Greek καλέω, Eng. call), which properly signifies to call together a religious assembly (hence קְהַלָּה קָהָל, a congregation). The apparent anomaly of the feminine termination תindicates that the abstract noun has been transferred from the office to the person holding it (so the Arab. caliph, etc.; see Gesenius, Thes. Hebrews page 1199, 1200), and has thus become capable of use as a masculine proper name, a change of meaning of which we find other instances in Sophereth (Neh 7:57), Pochereth (Ezr 2:57); and hence, with the single exception of Ecc 7:27, the noun, notwithstanding its form, is used throughout in the masculine. Ewald, however (Poet. Buch. 4:189), connects the feminine termination with the noun חָכְמָה (wisdom), understood, and supposes a poetic license in the use of the word as a kind of symbolic proper name appealing to Pro 30:1; Pro 31:1, as examples of a like usage. As connected with the root קַהִלthe word has been applied to one who speaks in an assembly, and there is, to say the least, a tolerable agreement in favor of this interpretation. Thus we have the comment of the Midrash, stating that the writer thus designates himself "because his words were spoken in the assembly (quoted in Preston's Ecclesiastes, note on 1:1); the rendering Ε᾿κκλησιαστής by the Sept.; the adoption of this title by Jerome (Praf. in Eccl.), as meaning “qui catum, i.e., ecclesiam congregat, quem nos nuncupare possumus Concionatorem;" the use of "Prediger" by Luther; of "Preacher" in the A.V. On the other hand, taking קָהִלin the sense of collecting things, not of summoning persons, and led perhaps by his inability to see in the book itself any greater unity of design than in the chapters of Proverbs, Grotius (in Ecc 1:1) has suggested Συναθροιστής (compiler) as a better equivalent. In this he has been followed by Herder and Jahn, and Mendelssohn has adopted the same rendering (notes on Ecc 1:1, and Ecc 7:27, in Preston), seeing in it the statement partly that the writer had compiled the sayings of wise men who had gone before him, partly that he was, by an inductive process, gathering truths from the facts of a wide experience. The title of the hook, however, indicates that the author did not write only for a literary public, but that he had in view the whole congregation of the Lord; and that his doctrine was not confined within the narrow bounds of a school, but belonged to the Church in its whole extent (comp. Psa 49:2-4). Solomon, who in 1Ki 8:1-66 is described as gathering ( יִקְהֵל) the people to hold communion with the Most High in the place which he erected for this purpose, is here again represented as the gatherer (קֹהֶלֶת) of the people to the assembly of God. It must, however, be borne in mind that, though Solomon is animated by and represents Wisdom he does not lose his individuality. Hence he sometimes describes his own experience (compare Ecc 1:16-17; Ecc 2:9; Ecc 2:12; Ecc 7:23, etc.), and sometimes utters the words of Wisdom, whose organ he is, just as the apostles are sometimes the organs of the Holy Ghost (compare Act 15:28).

Against the common rendering of קֹהֶלֶתby preacher or Ecclesiastes, which is supported by Desvoeux, Gesenius, Knobel, Herzfeld, Stuart, etc., it has been urged:

1. The verb קָהִלdoes not properly include the idea of preaching: such, however, would naturally be its derived import, inasmuch as popular assemblies are usually convened for the purpose of being addressed.

2. It ascribes to Solomon the office of preacher, which is nowhere mentioned in the Bible; it is too modern a title, and is inconsistent with his character, if not with the contents of the book: this, however, only applies to the title in its modern sense, and not to the above generic view.

3. It destroys the connection between the design of the book and the import of this symbolic name: this again depends upon the preconception as to the design of the book; the import, as above explained, is not unsuitable. Moreover,

a. Coheleth is neither a name of rank nor of office, but simply describes the act of gathering the people together, and can, therefore, not come within the rule which the advocates of the rendering preacher or Ecclesiastes are obliged to urge.

b. The construction of the feminine verb with it in Ecc 7:27, is incompatible with this view.

c. Abstracts are never formed from the active participle; and, d. There is not a single instance to be found where a concrete is first made an abract, and then again taken in a personal sense. These objections are too minute to be of much force, and are overruled by the peculiar use and application of this word, which occurs nowhere else.

The other explanations of Koheleth, viz., Gatherer or Acquirer of wisdom, and Solomon is called by this name because he gathered much wisdom (Rashi, Rashbam, etc.); Collector, Compiler, because he collected in this book divers experience, views, and maxims for the good of mankind (Grotius, Mayer, Mendelssohn, etc.); Eclectic, ἐκλεκτικός, a name given to him in this place because of his skill in selecting and purifying from the systems of different philosophers the amassed sentiments in this book (Rosenthal); Accumulated wisdom — and this appellation is given to him because wisdom was accumulated in him (Aben-Ezra); The Reunited, the Gathered Soul — and it describes his re-admission into the Church in consequence of his repentance (Cartwright, Bishop Reynolds, Granger, etc.); The Penitent — and describes the contrite state of his heart for his apostasy (Cocceius, Schultens, etc.); An assembly, an academy — and the first verse is to be translated "The sayings of the academy of the son of David" (Doderlein, Nachtigal, etc.); An old man — and Solomon indicates by the name Koheleth his weakness of mind when, yielding to his wives, he worshipped idols (Simonis Lex. Hebrews s.v.; Schmidt, etc.); Exclaiming Voice, analogous to the title assumed by John the Baptist — and the words of the inscription ought to be rendered, "The words of the voice of one exclaiming" (De Dieu); Sophist, according to the primitive signification of the word, which implied a combination of philosophy and rhetoric (Desvoeux); Philosopher or Moralist (Spohn, Gaab, etc.); The departed spirit of Solomon introduced as speaking throughout this book in the form of a shadow (Augusti, Einleit in d. A.T. page 240); Koheleth is the feminine gender, because it refers to נפש, the intellectual soul, which is understood (Rashi, Rashbam, Ewald, etc.); it is to show the great excellency of the preacher, or his charming style which this gender indicates (Lorinus, Zirkel, etc.), because a preacher travails, as it were, like a mother, in the spiritual birth of his children, and has tender and motherly affection for his people, a similar expression being found in Gal 4:19 (Pineda, Mayer, etc.); it is to describe the infirmity of Solomon, who appears here as worn out by old age (Mercer, Simonis, etc.); it is used in a neuter sense, because departed spirits have no specific gender (Augusti); the termination ת is not at all feminine, but, as in Arabic, is used as an auxesis; etc., etc., etc. We believe that the simple enumeration of these views will tend to show their vagueness, fancifulness, and inappropriateness. (See Dindorf, Quomodo nomen Cohelet Salomoni tribuatur, Lpz. 1791.)

II. Author and Date. — These have usually been regarded as determined by the account that the writer gives of himself in chapter 1 and 2, that it was written by the only " son of David" (Ecc 1:1), who was " king over Israel in Jerusalem" (Ecc 1:12). According to this, we have in it what may well be called the Confessions of king Solomon, the utterance of a repentance which some have even ventured to compare with that of the 51st psalm. This authorship is corroborated by the unquestionable allusions made throughout the book to particular circumstances connected with the life of the great monarch (compare Ecc 1:16, etc., with 1Ki 3:12; Ecc 2:4-10, with 1 Kings 5:27-32; 1Ki 7:1-8; 1Ki 9:7-19; 1Ki 10:14-29; Ecc 7:20, with 1Ki 8:46; Ecc 12:9, with 1Ki 4:32). Additional internal evidence has been found for this belief in the language of Ecc 7:26-28, as harmonizing with the history of 1Ki 11:3, and in an interpretation (somewhat forced perhaps) which refers Ecc 4:13-15 to the murmurs of the people against Solomon, and the popularity of Jeroboam as the leader of the people, already recognized as their future king (Mendelssohn and Preston in loc.). The belief that Solomon was actually the author was, it need hardly be said, received generally by the Rabbinic commentators, and the whole series of Patristic writers. The apparent exceptions to this in the passages by Talmudic writers, which ascribe it to Hezekiah (Baba Bathra, c. 1, fol. 15) or Isaiah (Shalsh. Hakkab. fol. 66 b, quoted by Michaelis), can hardly be understood as implying more than a share in the work of editing, like that claimed for the "men of Hezekiah" in Pro 25:1. Grotius (Praef. in Eccles.) was indeed almost the first writer who called it in question, and started a different hypothesis.

It may seem as if the whole question were settled for all who recognize the inspiration of Scripture by the statement, in a canonical and inspired book, as to its own authorship. The book purports, it is said (Preston, Proleg. in Ecclesiastes page 5), to be written by Solomon, and to doubt the literal accuracy of this statement is to call in question the truth and authority of Scripture. To many it has appeared questionable, however, whether we can admit an a priori argument of this character to be decisive. The hypothesis that every such statement in a canonical book must be received as literally true, is, in fact, an assumption that inspired writers were debarred from forms of composition which were open without blame to others. In the literature of every other nation the form of personated authorship, where there is no animus decipiendi, has been recognized as a legitimate channel for the expression of opinions or the quasi-dramatic representation of character. Hence it has been asked, Why should we venture on the assertion that, if adopted by the writers of the Old Testament, it would have made them guilty of a falsehood, and been inconsistent with their inspiration? The question of authorship does not involve that of canonical authority. A book written by Solomon would not necessarily be inspired and canonical. It is said that there is nothing that need startle us in the thought that an inspired writer might use a liberty which has been granted without hesitation to the teachers of mankind in every age and country. Accordingly, the advocates of a different authorship for the book in question than that of Solomon feel themselves at liberty to discard these statements of the text as mere literary devices.

They argue that in like manner the book which bears the title of the "Wisdom of Solomon" asserts, both by its title and its language (Ecc 7:1-21), a claim to the same authorship, and, though the absence of a Hebrew original led to its exclusion from the Jewish canon, the authorship of Solomon was taken for granted by all the early Christian writers who quote it or refer to it, till Jerome had asserted the authority of the Hebrew text as the standard of canonicity, and by not a few afterwards. But in reply to this it may justly be said that the traditional character of the two books is so different as to debar any comparison of this kind. SEE WISDOM, BOOK OF.

The following specific objections have been urged against the Solomonic and for the personated authorship of this book.

1. All the other reputed writings of Solomon have his name in the inscription (compare Pro 1:1; Son 1:1; Psa 78:1-72), whereas in this book the name of Solomon is studiously avoided, thus showing that it does not claim him as its actual author. Yet he gives other equally decisive intimations of his identity, and the peculiar character of the work sufficiently accounts for this partial concealment. Moreover, in some of his other undoubted writings he employs similar noms de plume (Pro 30:1; Pro 31:1).

2. The symbolic and impersonal name Koheleth shows that Solomon is simply introduced in an ideal sense as the representative of wisdom. On the other hand, it appears to have an equally tangible application to him historically.

3. This is indicated by the sacred writer himself, who represents Solomon as belonging to the past, inasmuch as he makes this great monarch say, "I was (הָיַיתַי) king," but had long ago ceased to be king when this was written. That this is intended by the praeterite has been acknowledged from time immemorial (comp. Midrash Rabba, Midrash Jalkut in loc.; Talmud, Gittin, 68 b; the Chaldee paraphrase, 1:12; Midrash, Maase, Bi-Shloma, Ha-Melech, ed. Jellinek in Beth Ha-Midrash, 2:35; Rashi on 1:12). Yet it does not necessarily require that interpretation, but may naturally be understood as simply referring to past incidents, e.g. "I have been [and still am] king." The passage certainly gives no support to the idea of a fanciful authorship.

4. This is moreover corroborated by various statements in the book, which would otherwise be irreconcilable, e.g. Koheleth comparing himself with a long succession of kings who reigned over Israel in Jerusalem (Ecc 1:16; Ecc 2:7): the term king in Jerusalem (ibid.) showing that at the time when this was written there was a royal residence in Samaria; the recommendation to individuals not to attempt to resent the oppression of a tyrannical ruler, but to wait for a general revolt (Ecc 8:2-9) a doctrine which a monarch like Solomon is not likely to propound; the description of a royal spendthrift, and of the misery he inflicts upon the land (Ecc 10:16-19), which Solomon would not give unless he intended to write a satire upon himself. These historical allusions are too vague to be thus pressed into service. As to the political references, we know (1Ki 11:14; 1Ki 11:23) that insurrectionary manifestations did exist in Solomon's reign, and were aggravated by his rigid and exacting government (1Ki 12:4). It has been asked whether Solomon would have been likely to speak of himself as in Ecc 1:12, or to describe with bitterness the misery and wrong of which his own misgovernment had been the cause, as in Ecc 3:16; Ecc 4:1 (Jahn, Einl. 2:840). On the hypothesis that he was the writer, the whole book is in acknowledgment of evils which he had occasioned, while yet there is no distinct confession and repentance. There are forms of satiety and self- reproach, of which this half sad, half scornful retrospect of a man's own life — this utterance of bitter words by which he is condemned out of his own mouth — is the most natural expression. Any individual judgment on this point cannot, from the nature of the case, be otherwise than subjective, and ought therefore to bias our estimate of other evidence as little as possible.

5. The state of oppression, sufferings, and misery depicted in this book (Ecc 4:1-4; Ecc 5:7; Ecc 8:1-4; Ecc 8:10-11; Ecc 10:5-7; Ecc 10:20, etc.) cannot be reconciled with the age of Solomon, and unquestionably shows that the Jews were then groaning under the grinding tyranny of Persia. There are sudden and violent changes, the servant of today becoming the ruler of tomorrow (Ecc 10:5-7). All this, it is said, agrees with the glimpses into the condition of the Jews under the Persian empire in Ezra and Nehemiah, and with what we know as to the general condition of the provinces under its satraps. But we cannot suppose that these evils, which have been prevalent in all times, were alluded to as specially characteristic of the writer's day.

6. The fact that Koheleth is represented as indulging in sensual enjoyments, and acquiring riches and fame in order to ascertain what is good for the children of men (Ecc 2:3-9; Ecc 3:12; Ecc 3:22, etc.), making philosophical experiments to discover the summum bonumis held to be at variance with the conduct of the historical Solomon, and to be an idea of a much later period. In like manner, the admonition not to seek divine things in the profane books of the philosophers (Ecc 12:12) are thought to show that this book was written when the speculation of Greece and Alexandria had found their way into Palestine. In short, the doctrine of a future bar of judgment, whereby Koheleth solves the grand problem of this book, when compared with the vague and dim intimations respecting a. future state in the pre-exilian portions of the O.T., is regarded as proving that it is apost-exilian production. But the untrustworthy character of these arguments is evinced by the parallel case of the book of Job (q.v.). It is also urged that the indications of the religious condition of the people, their formalism and much speaking (Ecc 5:1-2), their readiness to evade the performance of their Vows by casuistic excuses (Ecc 5:5), represent in like manner the growth of evils, the germs of which appeared soon after the captivity, and which we find in a fully-developed form in the prophecy of Malachi. In addition to this general resemblance, there is the agreement between the use of הִמִּלְאָךְ for the "angel" or priest of God (Ecc 5:6, Ewald, in loc.), and the recurrence in Malachi of the terms יְהוַֹה מִלְאָךְ, the "angel" or messenger of the Lord, as a synonym for the priest (Mal 2:7), the true priest being the great agent in accomplishing God's purposes. Significant, though not conclusive in either direction, is the absence of all reference to any contemporaneous prophetic activity or to any Messianic hopes. This might indicate a time before such hopes had become prevalent, or after they were for a time extinguished. It might, on the other hand, be the natural result of the experience through which the son of David had passed, or fitly take its place in the dramatic personation of such a character. The use throughout the book of Elohim instead of Jehovah as the divine name, though characteristic of the book as dealing with the problems of the universe rather than with the relations between the Lord God of Israel and his people, and therefore striking as an idiosyncrasy, leaves the question as to date nearly where it was. The indications of rising questions as to the end of man's life and the constitution of his nature, of doubts like those which afterwards developed into Sadduceeism (Ecc 3:19-21), of a copious literature connected with those questions, confirm, it is urged (Ewald), the hypothesis of the later date. It may be added, too, that the absence of any reference to such a work as this in the enumeration of Solomon's writings in 1Ki 4:32, tends, at least, to the same conclusion. But such considerations drawn a silentio are highly inconclusive.

7. The strongest argument, however, against the Solomonic authorship of this book is its vitiated language and style. It is written throughout with peculiarities of phraseology which developed themselves about the time of the Babylonian captivity. So convincing is this fact, that not only have Grotius, J.D. Michaelis, Eichhorn, Doderlein, Spohn, Jahn, J.E.C. Schmidt, Nachtigal, Kaiser, Rosenmuller, Ewald, Knobel, Gesenius, De Wette, Noyes, Hitzig, Heiligstedt, Davidson, Meier, etc., relinquished the Solomonic authorship, but even such unquestionably orthodox writers as Umbreit, Hengstenberg, Gerlach, Vaihinger, Stuart, Keil, Elster, etc., declare most emphatically that the book was written after the Babylonian captivity; and there is hardly a chief rabbi or a literary Jew to be found who would have the courage to maintain that Solomon wrote Koheleth. Dr. Herzfeld, chief rabbi of Brunswick; Dr. Philippson, chief rabbi of Magdeburg; Dr. Geiger, rabbi of Breslau; Dar. Zunz, Professor Luzzatto, Dr. Krochmal, Steinschneider, Jost, Gratz, Furst, and a host of others, affirm that this book is one of the latest productions in the O.T. canon. We are moreover reminded that these are men to whom the Hebrew is almost vernacular, and that some of them write better Hebrew, and in a purer style, than that of Koheleth. With most readers, however, a single intimation of the text itself will weigh more than the opinion of these or all other learned men. On the other hand, the Rabbinical scholars, who certainly were not inferior in a knowledge of Hebrew, appear to have found no difficulty in attributing this book to Solomon. Most of those above enumerated are of very questionable sentiments on a point like this, and it must be borne in mind that a very large, if not equal, amount of learning has been arrayed on the opposite side. The last of the above objections, however, deserves a more minute consideration.

Many opponents of the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes have certainly gone much too far in their assertions respecting the impurity of its language. The Graecisms which Zirkle thought that he had found have now generally been given up. The Rabbinisms likewise could not stand the proof. The words, significations, and forms which seem to appertain to a later period of Hebrew literature, and the Chaldaisms, an abundance of which Knobel gathered, require, as Herzfeld has shown (in his Commentary, published at Braunschweig, 1838, page 13 sq.), to be much sifted. According to Herzfeld, there are in Ecclesiastes not more than between eleven and fifteen "young Hebrew" expressions and constructions, and between eight and ten Chaldaisms. Nevertheless, it is certain that the book does not belong to the productions of the first, but rather to the second period of the Hebrew language. This alone would not fully disprove the authorship of Solomon, for it would not necessarily throw the production into the latest period of Hebrew literature. We could suppose that Solomon, in a philosophical work, found the pure Hebrew language to be insufficient, and had, therefore, recourse to the Chaldaizing popular dialect, by which, at a later period, the book-language was entirely displaced. This supposition could not be rejected a priori, since almost every one of the Hebrew authors before the exile did the same, although in a less degree. It has been thought, however, that the striking difference between the language of Ecclesiastes and the language of the Proverbs renders that explanation quite inadmissible. This difference would prove little if the two books belonged to two entirely different classes of literature — that is, if Ecclesiastes bore the same relation to the Proverbs as the Song of Solomon does; but since Ecclesiastes and the Proverbs belong essentially to the same class, the argument taken from the difference of style, can only be avoided by attributing it to the effect of greater age in the writer. The occurrence of Chaldee words and forms in any Hebrew document is by no means a certain and invariable indication of lateness of composition. We must be careful to distinguish archaisms, and words and forms peculiar to the poetic style, from Chaldaisms of the later period. Moreover, the Hebrew writings which have been transmitted to us being so few in number, it is of course much more difficult decisively to determine the period to which any of these writings belongs by the peculiar form of language which it presents, than it would have been had there been preserved to us a larger number of documents of different ages to assist us in forming our decision. Still, from the materials within our reach, scanty though they are, we would naturally draw a conclusion as to the age of the book of Ecclesiastes, not altogether certain, indeed, but decidedly unfavorable to an early date; for it needs but a cursory survey of the book to convince us that in language and style it not only differs widely from the other writings of the age of Solomon, but bears a very marked resemblance to the latest books of the Old Testament.

1. One class of words employed by the writer of Ecclesiastes we find rarely employed in the earlier books of Scripture, frequently in the later, i.e., in those written during or after the Babylonish captivity. Thus shalat', שָׁלִט, he ruled (Ecc 2:19; Ecc 5:18; Ecc 6:2; Ecc 8:9), is found elsewhere only in Nehemiah and Esther. The derived noun שַׁלְטוֹן, shilton', rule (Ecc 8:4; Ecc 8:8), is found only in the Chaldee of Daniel; but שִׁלַּיט, shallit', ruler, appears once in the earlier Scriptures (Gen 42:6). Under this head may also be mentioned מִלְכוּת, malkuth', kingdom (Ecc 4:14), rare in the earlier Scriptures, but found above forty times in Esther and Daniel; and מְדַינָה, medinah', province (Ecc 2:8; Ecc 5:7), which appears also in Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, and likewise in 1Ki 20:14-19, where "princes of the provinces" are mentioned among the officers of king Ahab, but in none of the earlier Scriptures.

2. A second class includes those words which are never found in any Hebrew writing of earlier date than the Babylonian captivity, but are found in the later books: as זְמָן, zesnan', set time (Ecc 3:1) = מֹועֵד, which we meet with in Hebrew only in Neh 2:6 and Est 9:27; Est 9:31, but in the biblical Chaldee and in the Targums frequently; פַּתְגָּם, pithyam', sentence (Ecc 8:11), which appears in Hebrew only in Est 1:20, but in Chaldee frequently. (If this word be, as is commonly supposed, of Persian origin, its appearance only in the later Jewish writings is at once accounted for. See Rediger's Additions to Gesenius' Thesaurus.) מִדָּע madda' (Ecc 10:20), a derivative of יָדִע, to know, found only in 2 Chronicles and Daniel, and also in Chaldee; and the particles אַלּוּ illu', if (Ecc 6:6), and בְּכֵן beken', then, so (Ecc 8:10), found in no earlier Hebrew book than Esther. From this enumeration it appears that the book of Ecclesiastes resembles the book of Esther in some of the most distinctive peculiarities of its language.

3. A third class embraces those words which are not found even in the Hebrew writings of the latest period, but only in the Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra, or in the Targums, as יַתְרוֹן yithron', profit, which is used nine times in Ecclesiastes, never in any other scriptural writing, but frequently in the Targums, under the slightly modified form yuthran; so also כְּבָר kebar', already, long ago, which recurs eight times in this book; תָּקִן, takan' (Ecc 1:15; Ecc 7:13; Ecc 12:9), found also in Chaldee (Dan 4:33, etc.); רְעוּת reuth', desire, recurring five times, and also in the Chaldee portions of Ezra; רִעְיוֹן (Ecc 1:17, etc.), עַנְיָן (Ecc 1:13, etc.), גּוּמָוֹ (Ecc 10:8).

4. Other peculiarities, such as the frequent use of the participle, the rare appearance of the "vav consecutive," the various uses of the relative particle, concur with the characteristics already noted in affixing to the language and style of this book the stamp of that transition period when the Hebrew language, soon about to give place to the Chaldee, had already lost its ancient purity, and become debased by the absorption of many Chaldee elements. The prevalence of abstract forms again, characteristic of the language of Ecclesiastes, is urged as belonging to a later period than that of Solomon in the development of Hebrew thought and language. The answers given to these objections by the defenders of the received belief are (Preston, Ecclesiastes page 7),

 (a) that many of what we call Aramaic or Chaldee forms may have belonged to the period of pure Hebrew, though they have not come down to us in any extant writings; and

 (b) that so far as they are foreign to the Hebrew of the time of Solomon, he may have learned them from his "strange wives," or from the men who came as ambassadors from other countries. (See Davidson, Horne's Introd. new ed. 2:787).

As to the date of Ecclesiastes, these arguments of recent criticism are stronger against the traditional belief than in support of any rival theory, and the advocates of that belief might almost be content to rest their case upon the discordant hypotheses of their opponents. On the assumption that the book belongs, not to the time of Solomon, but to the period subsequent to the captivity, the dates which have been assigned to it occupy a range of more than 300 years. Grotius supposes Zerubbabel to be referred to in Ecc 12:11, as the "One Shepherd" (Comm. in Ecclesiastes in loc.), and so far agrees with Keil (Einleitung in das A.T.). who fixes it in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Ewald and De Wette conjecture the close of the period of Persian or the commencement of that of Macedonian rule; Bertholdt, the period between Alexander the Great and Antiochus Epiphanes; Hitzig, circ. B.C. 204; Hartmann, the time of the Maccabees, etc. The following table will show the different periods to which it has been assigned:

 (B.C.) Nachtigal, between Solomon and Jeremiah — 975-588 Schmidt, Jahn, etc., between Manasseh and Zedekiah — 699-588 Grotius, Kaiser, Eichhorn, etc., shortly after the exile — 536-500 Umbreit, the Persian period — 538-333 Van der Hardt, in the reign of Xerxes II and Darius — 464-404 Rosenmuller, between Nehemiah and Alexander the Great — 450-333 Hengstenberg, Stuart, Keil — 433 Ewald, a century before Alexander the Great — 430 Gerlach, about the year — 400 De Wette, Nobel, etc., at the end of the Persian and the beginning of the Macedonian period — 350-300 Bergst, during Alexander's sojourn in Palestine — 333 Bertholdt, between Alexander and Ant. Epiphanes — 333-164 Zirkel, the Syrian period — 312-164 Hitzig, about the year — 204 Supposing it were proved that Solomon is only introduced as the speaker, the question arises why the another adopted this form. The usual reply is, that Solomon, among the Israelites, had, as it were, the prerogative of wisdom, and hence the author was induced to put into Solomon's mouth that wisdom which he intended to proclaim, without the slightest intention of forging a supposititious volume. This reply contains some truth, but it does not exhaust the matter. The chief object of the author was to communicate wisdom in general; but next to this, as appears from Ecc 1:12 sq., he intended to inculcate the vanity of human pursuits. Now, from the mouth of no one could more aptly proceed the proclamation of the nothingness of all earthly things than from the mouth of Solomon, who had possessed them in all their fullness; at whose command were wisdom, riches, and pleasures in abundance, and who had therefore full opportunity to experience the nothingness of all that is earthly. On the other hand, if we adopt the traditional view that Solomon was the author, we avoid all these doubtful expedients and pious frauds; and, as no other candidate appears, we shall be safest in coinciding with that ancient opinion. The peculiarities of diction may be explained (as in the book of Job) by supposing that the work was written by Solomon during a season of penitence at the close of his life, and edited in its present form, at a later period, perhaps by Ezra.

III. Canonicity. — The earliest catalogues which the Jews have transmitted to us of their sacred writings give this book as forming part of the canon (Mishna, Yadaim, 3:5; Talmud, Baba Bathra, 14). All the ancient versions, therefore — viz. the Septuagint, which was made before the Christian aera; the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which belong to the second century of Christianity, as well as the catalogue of Melito, bishop of Sardis (fl. A.D. 170) — include Ecclesiastes. Some singular passages in the Talmud indicate, however, that the recognition was not altogether unhesitating, and that it was at least questioned how far the book was one which it was expedient to place among the Scriptures that were read publicly. Thus we find the statements (Mishna, Shabbath, c.x, quoted by Mendelssohn in Preston, page 74; Midrash, fol. 114 a; Preston, page 13) that "the wise men sought to secrete the book Koheleth, because they found in it words tending to heresy," and " words contradictory to each other;" that the reason they did not secrete it was "because its beginning and end were consistent with the law;" that when they examined it more carefully they came to the conclusion, "We have looked closely into the book Koheleth, and discovered a meaning in it." The chief interest of such passages is of course connected with the inquiry into the plan and teaching of the book, but they ate of some importance also as indicating that it must have commended itself to the teachers of an earlier generation either on account of the external authority by which it was sanctioned, or because they had a clearer insight into its meaning, and were less startled by its apparent difficulties. (See Bab. Megilla, 7, a; Bab. Talm. Sabbath, 30, a; Midrash, Vayikra Rabba, 28; Mishna, Edayoth, Ecc 1:3; Jerome, Comment. 12:13.) Traces of this controversy are to be found in a singular discussion between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, turning on the question whether the book Koheleth were inspired, and in the comments on that question by R. Ob. de Bartenora and Maimonides (Surenhus. 4:349).

Within the Christian Church, the divine inspiration of Ecclesiastes, the Proverbs, and the Song of Solomon was denied by Theodorus of Mopsuestia. In recent times, the accusers of Ecclesiastes have been Augusti, De Wette, and Knobel; but their accusations are based on mere misunderstandings. They are especially as follows:

1. The author is said to incline towards a moral epicurism. All his ethical admonitions and doctrines tend to promote the comforts and enjoyments' of life. But let us consider above all what tendency and disposition it is to which the author addresses his admonition, serenely and contentedly to enjoy God's gifts. He addresses this admonition to that speculation which will not rest before it has penetrated the: whole depth of the inscrutable councils of God; to that murmuring which bewails the badness of times, and quarrels with God about the sufferings of our terrene existence; to that gloomy piety which wearies itself in imaginary good works and external strictness, with a view to wrest salvation from God; to that avarice which gathers, not knowing for whom; making the means of existence our highest aim; building upon an uncertain futurity which is in the hand of God alone. When the author addresses levity he speaks: quite otherwise. For instance, in Ecc 7:2; Ecc 7:4, " It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men; and the living will lay it to his heart. Sorrow is better than laughter, for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better. The heart of the wise man is in the house of mourning, but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth." The nature of the joy recommended by the author is also misunderstood. Unrestrained merriment and giddy sensuality belong to those vanities which our author enumerates. He says to laughter, Thou art mad, and to joy, What art thou doing? He says, Ecc 7:5-6, "It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise than for a man to hear the song of fools.' For as the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of a fool; this also is vanity." That joy which he recommends is joy in God. It is not the opposite, but the fruit of the fear of God. How inseparable these are is shown in passages like Ecc 5:6; Ecc 7:18; Ecc 3:12 : "I know that there is no good in them, but for a man to rejoice, and to do good in his life ," and in many similar passages, but especially Ecc 11:9-10; Ecc 12:1, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth," etc. In reference to these passages Ewald says (page 186), "Finally, in order to remove every doubt, and to speak with perfect clearness, he directs us to the eternal judgment of God, concerning all the doings of man, and inculcates that man, in the midst of momentary enjoyment, should never forget the whole futurity, the account and the consequences of his doings, the Creator and the Judge." Ewald adds (page 227), in reference to the conclusion, " In order to obviate every possible misunderstanding of this writing, there is, Ecc 12:13, once more briefly indicated that its tendency is not, by the condemnation of murmuring, to recommend an unbridled life, but rather to teach, in harmony with the best old books, the fear of God, in which the whole man consists, or that true singleness of life, satisfying the whole man, and which comprehends everything else that is truly human. It is very necessary to limit the principle of joy which this book recommends again and again in various ways and in the most impressive manner, and to refer this joy to a still higher truth, since it is so liable to be misunderstood.

2. It is objected that in his views concerning the government of the world the author was strongly inclined to fatalism, according to which everything in this world progresses with an eternally unchangeable step; and that he by this fatalism was

3. misled into a moral skepticism, having attained on his dogmatical basis the conviction of the inability of man, notwithstanding all his efforts, to reach his aim. However, this so-called fatalism of our author is nothing else but what our Lord teaches (Mat 6:25): 'Take no thought,' etc. And as to the moral skepticism, our author certainly inculcates that man with all his endeavors can do nothing; but at the same time he recommends the fear of God as the never-failing means of salvation. Man in himself can do nothing, but in God he can do all. It is quite clear from Ecc 7:16; Ecc 7:18, where both self-righteousness and wisdom, when separated from God, are described as equally destructive, and opposite to them is placed the fear of God, as being their common antithesis, that our author, by pointing to the sovereignty of God, did not mean to undermine morality: 'He that feareth God comes out from them all.' If our author were given to moral skepticism, it would be impossible for him to teach retribution, which he inculcates in numerous passages, and which are not contradicted by others, in which he says that the retribution in individual circumstances is frequently obscure and enigmatical. Where is that advocate for retribution who is not compelled to confess this as well as our author?

4. This book has given offense also, by Ecc 3:21, and similar passages, concerning immortality. But the assertion that there is expressed here some doubt concerning the immortality of the soul is based on a wrong grammatical perception. The הcannot, according to its punctuation, be the interrogative, but must be the article, and our author elsewhere asserts positively hiss belief in the doctrine of immortality (Ecc 12:7). How it happens that he did not give to this doctrine a prevailing influence upon his mode of treating his subject has lately been investigated by Heyder, in his essay entitled Ecclesiastae de imortalitate Animi Sententia (Erlangen, 1838)." (See Dr. Nordheimer, on The Philosophy of Ecclesiastes, in the Amer. Bib. Repos. July, 1838.)

IV. Plan and Contents. — The book of Ecclesiastes comes before us as being conspicuously, among the writings of the O.T., the great stumbling- block of commentators. Elsewhere there are different opinions as to the meaning of different passages. Here there is the widest possible divergence as to the plan and purpose of the whole book. The passages already quoted from the Mishna show that some, at least, of the Rabbinical writers were perplexed by its teaching — did not know what to make of it — but gave way to the authority of men more discerning than themselves. The traditional statement, however, that this was among the Scriptures which were not read by any one under the age of thirty (Crit. Sac. Amama in Eccles., but with a "nescio ubi" as to his authority), indicates the continuance of the old difficulty, and the remarks of Jerome (Praef. in Eccles., Comm. in Ecc 12:13) show that it was not forgotten. Little can be gathered from the series of Patristic interpreters. The book is comparatively seldom quoted by them. No attempt is made to master its plan and to enter into the spirit of its writer. The charge brought by Philastrius of Brescia (circ. A.D. 380) against some heretics who rejected it as teaching a false morality, shows that the, obscurity which had been a stumbling-block to Jewish teachers was not removed for Christians. The fact that Theodore of Mopsuestia was accused at the fifth general council of calling in question the authority and inspiration of this book, as well as of the Canticles, indicates that in this respect, as in others, he was the precursor of the spirit of modern criticism. But, with these exceptions, there are no traces that men's minds were drawn to examine the teachings of this book. When, however, we descend to the more recent developments of criticism, we meet with an almost incredible divergence of opinion. Luther, with his broad, clear insight into the workings of a man's heart sees in it (Praef. in Eccle.) a noble "Politica vel OEconomica," leading men in the midst of all the troubles' and disorders of human society to a true endurance and reasonable enjoyment. Grotius (Praef. in Eccles.) gives up the attempt to trace in it a plan or order of thought, and finds in it only a collection of many maxims, connected more or less closely with the great problems of human life, analogous to the discussion of the different definitions of happiness at the opening of the Nicomachean Ethics. Some (of whom Warburton may be taken as the type, Works, 4:154) have seen in the language of Ecc 2:18-21, a proof that the belief in the immortality of the soul was no part of the transmitted creed of Israel. Others (Patrick, Des Voeux, Davidson, Mendelssohn) contend that the special purpose of the book was to assert that truth against the denial of a sensual skepticism. Others, the later Germans critics, of whom Ewald may be taken as the highest and best type, reject these views as partial and one- sided; and, while admitting that the book contains the germs of later systems, both Pharisaic and Sadducaean, assert that the object of the writer was to point out the secret of a true blessedness, in the midst of all the distractions and sorrows of the world, as consisting in a tranquil, calm enjoyment of the good that comes from God (Poet. Buch. 4:180).

The variety of these opinions indicates sufficiently that the book is as far removed as possible from the character of a formal treatise. It is simply what it professes to be — the confession of a man of wide experience looking back upon his past life, and looking out upon the disorders and calamities which surround him. Such a man does not set forth his premises and conclusions with a logical completeness. While it may be true that the absence of a formal arrangement is characteristic of the Hebrew mind in all stages of its development (Lowth, De Sac. Poet. Heb. Proel. 24), or that it was the special mark of the declining literature of the period that followed the captivity (Ewald, Poet. Buch. 4:177), it is also true that it belongs generally to all writings that are addressed to the spiritual rather than the intellectual element in man's nature, and that it is found accordingly in many of the greatest works that have influenced the spiritual life of mankind. In proportion as a man has passed out of the region of traditional, easily-systematized knowledge, and has lived under the influence of great thoughts — possessed by them, yet hardly mastering them so as to bring them under a scientific classification — are we likely to find this apparent want of method. The true utterances of such a man are the records of his struggles after truth, of his occasional glimpses of it, of his ultimate discovery. The treatise De imitatione Christi, the Pensees of Pascal, Augustine's Confessions, widely as they differ in other points, have this feature in common. If the writer consciously reproduces the stages through which he has passed, the form he adopts may either be essentially dramatic, or it may record a statement of the changes which have brought him to his present state, or it may repeat and renew the oscillations from one extreme to another which had marked that earlier experience. The writer of Ecclesiastes has adopted and interwoven both the latter methods, and hence, in part, the obscurity which has made it so pre-eminently the stumbling-block of commentators. He is not a didactic moralist writing a homily on virtue. He is not a prophet delivering a message from the Lord of Hosts to a sinful people. He is a man who has sinned in giving way to selfishness and sensuality, who has paid the penalty of that sin in satiety and weariness of life; in Whom the mood of spirit, over-reflective, indisposed to action, of which Shakespeare has given us in Hamlet, Jacques, Richard II, three distinct examples, has become dominant in its darkest form, but who has through all this been under the discipline of a divine education, and has learnt from it the lesson which God meant to teach him. What that lesson was will be seen from an examination of the book itself.

Leaving it an open question whether it is possible to arrange the contents of this book (as Koster and Vaihinger have done) in a carefully balanced series of strophes and antistrophes, it is tolerably clear that the recurring burden of "Vanity of vanities" and the teaching which recommends a life of calm enjoyment, mark, whenever they occur, a kind of halting-place in the succession of thoughts. It is the summing up of one cycle of experience; the sentence passed upon one phase of life. Taking this, accordingly, as our guide, we may look upon the whole book as falling into four divisions, each, to a certain extent, running parallel with the others in its order and results, and closing with that which, in its position no less than its substance, is "the conclusion of the whole matter."

1. Ecc 1:1-18; Ecc 2:1-26. This portion of the book, more than any other, has the character of a personal confession; The Preacher starts with reproducing the phase of despair and weariness into which his experience had led him (Ecc 1:2-3). To the man who is thus satiated with life, the order and regularity of nature are oppressive (Ecc 1:4-7); nor is he led, as in the 90th Psalm, from the things that are transitory to the thought of One whose years are from eternity. In the midst of the ever- recurring changes he finds no progress. That which seems to be new is but the repetition of the old (Ecc 1:8-11). Then, having laid bare the depth to which he had fallen, he retraces the path by which he had traveled thitherward. First he had sought after wisdom as that to which God seemed to call him (Ecc 1:13) but the pursuit of it was a sore travail, and there was no satisfaction in its possession. It could not remedy the least real evil, nor make the crooked straight (Ecc 1:15). The first experiment in the search after happiness had failed, and he tried another. It was one to which men of great intellectual gifts and high fortunes ere continually tempted to surround himself with all the appliances of sensual enjoyment, and yet in thought to hold himself above it (Ecc 2:1-9), making his very voluptuousness part of the experience which was to enlarge his store of wisdom. This which one may perhaps call the Goethean idea of life was what now possessed him. But this also failed to give him peace (Ecc 2:11). Had he not then exhausted all human experience and found it profitless? (Ecc 2:12). If for a moment he found comfort in the thought that wisdom excelleth folly, and that he was wise (Ecc 2:13-14), it was soon darkened again by the thought of death (Ecc 2:15). The wise man dies as the fool (Ecc 2:16). This is enough to make even him who has wisdom hate all his labor and sink into the outer darkness of despair (Ecc 2:20). Yet this very despair leads to the remedy. The first section closes with that which, in different forms, is the main lesson of the book to make the best of what is actually around one (Ecc 2:24) to substitute for the reckless, feverish pursuit of pleasure the calm enjoyment which men may yet find both for the senses and the intellect. This, so far as it goes, is the secret of a true life; this is from the hand of God. On everything else there is written, as before, the sentence that it is vanity and vexation of spirit.

2. Ecc 2:1-6; Ecc 2:9. The order of thought in this section has a different starting-point. One who looked out upon the infinitely varied phenomena of man's life might yet discern, in the midst of that variety, traces of an order. There are times, and seasons for each of them, in their turn even as there are for the vicissitudes of the world of nature (Ecc 3:1-8). The heart of man, with its changes, is the mirror of the universe (Ecc 3:11), and is, like that, inscrutable. And from this there comes the same conclusion as from the personal experience. Calmly to accept the changes and chances of life, entering into whatever joy they bring, as one accepts the order of nature, this is the way of peace (Ecc 3:13). The thought of the ever-recurring cycle of nature, which before had been irritating and disturbing, now whispers the same lesson. If we suffer, others have suffered before us (Ecc 3:15). God is seeking out the past and reproducing it. If men repeat injustice and oppression, God also in the appointed season repeats his judgments (Ecc 3:16-17). It is true that this thought has a dark as well as a bright side, and this cannot be ignored. If men come and pass away, subject to laws and changes like those of the natural world, then, it would seem, man has no pre-eminence above the beast (Ecc 3:19). One end happens to all. All are of the dust and return to dust again (Ecc 3:20). There is no immediate denial of this conclusion. It was to this that the Preacher's experience and reflection lad led him. But even on the hypothesis that the personal being of man terminates with his death, he has still the same counsel to give. Admit that all is darkness beyond the grave, and still there is nothing better on this side of it than the temper of a tranquil enjoyment (Ecc 3:22).

The transition from this result to the opening thoughts of Ecc 4:1-16 seems at first somewhat abrupt. But the Preacher is retracing the paths by which he had been actually led to a higher truth than that in which he had then rested, and he will not, for the sake of a formal continuity, smooth over its ruggedness. The new track on which he was entering might have seemed less promising than the old. Instead of the self-centered search after happiness he looks out upon the miseries and disorders of the world, and learns to sympathize with suffering (Ecc 4:1). At first this does but multiply his perplexities. The world is out of joint. Men are so full of misery that death is better than life (Ecc 4:2). Successful energy exposes men to envy (Ecc 4:4). Indolence leads to poverty (Ecc 4:5). Here, too; he who steers clear of both extremes has the best portion (Ecc 4:6). The man who heaps up riches stands alone without kindred to share or inherit them, and loses all the blessings and advantages of human fellowship (Ecc 4:8-12). Moreover, in this survey of life on a large scale, as in that of a personal experience, there is a cycle which is ever repeated. The old and foolish king yields to the young man, poor and wise, who steps from his prison to a throne (Ecc 4:13-14). But he too has his successor. There are generations without limit before him, and shall be after him (Ecc 3:15-16). All human greatness is swallowed up in the great stream of time.

The opening thought of Ecc 5:1-20 again presents the appearance of abruptness, but it is because the survey of human life takes a yet wider range. The eye of the Preacher passes from the dwellers in palaces to the worshippers in the Temple, the devout and religious men. Have they found out the secret of life, the path to wisdom and happiness? The answer to that question is that there the blindness and folly of mankind show themselves in their worst forms. Hypocrisy, unseemly prayers, idle dreams. broken vows, God's messenger, the Priest, mocked with excuses — that was what the religion which the Preacher witnessed presented to him (Ecc 5:1-6). The command "Fear thou God," meant that a man was to take no part in a religion such as this. But that command also suggested the solution of another problem, of that prevalence of injustice and oppression which had before weighed down the spirit of the inquirer. Above all tyranny of petty governors, above the might of the king himself, there was the power of the Highest (Ecc 5:8); and his judgment was manifest even upon earth. Was there, after all, so great an inequality? Was God's purpose, that the earth should be for all, really counteracted? (Ecc 5:9). Was the rich man with his cares and fears happier than the laboring man whose sleep was sweet without riches? (Ecc 5:10-12). Was there anything permanent in that wealth of his? Did he not leave the world naked as he entered it? And if so, did not all this bring the inquirer round to the same conclusion as before? Moderation, self-control, freedom from all disturbing passions, these are the conditions of the maximum of happiness which is possible for man on earth. Let this be received as from God. Not the outward means only, but the very capacity of enjoyment is his gift (Ecc 5:18-19). Short as life may be, if a man thus enjoys, he makes the most of it. God approves and answers his cheerfulness. Is not this better than the riches or length of days on which men set their hearts? (Ecc 6:1-5). All are equal in death; all are nearly equal in life (Ecc 6:6). To feed the eyes with what is actually before them is better than the ceaseless wanderings of the spirit (Ecc 6:9).

3. Ecc 6:10 to Ecc 8:15. So far the lines of thought all seemed to converge to one result. The ethical teaching that grew out of the wise man's experience had in it something akin to the higher forms of Epicureanism. But the seeker could not rest in this, and found himself beset with thoughts at once more troubling and leading to a higher truth. The spirit of man looks before and after, and the uncertainties of the future vex it (Ecc 6:12). A good name is better, as being more permanent, than riches (Ecc 7:1); death is better than life, the house of mourning than the house of feasting (Ecc 7:2). Self-command and the spirit of calm endurance are a better safeguard against vain speculations than any form of enjoyment (Ecc 7:8-10). This wisdom is not only a defense, as lower things in their measure may be, but it gives life to them that have it (Ecc 7:12). So far there are signs of a clearer insight into the end of life. Then comes an oscillation which carries him back to the old problems (Ecc 7:15). Wisdom suggests a half-solution of them (Ecc 7:18), suggests also calmness, caution, humility in dealing with them (Ecc 7:22); but this is again followed by a relapse into the bitterness of the sated pleasure seeker. The search after wisdom, such as it had been in his experience, had led only to the discovery that, though men were wicked, women were more wicked still (Ecc 7:26-29). The repetition of thoughts that had appeared before is perhaps the natural consequence of such an oscillation, and accordingly in Ecc 8:1-17 we find the seeker moving in the same round as before. There are the old reflections on the misery of man (Ecc 8:6), and the confusions in the moral order of the universe (Ecc 8:10-11), the old conclusion that enjoyment (such enjoyment as is compatible with the fear of God) is the only wisdom (Ecc 8:15).

4. Ecc 8:16 to Ecc 12:8. After the pause implied in his again arriving at the lesson of Ecc 5:15, the Preacher retraces the last of his many wanderings. This time the thought with which he starts is a profound conviction of the inability of man to unravel the mysteries by which he is surrounded (Ecc 8:17), of the nothingness of man when death is thought of as ending all things (Ecc 9:3-6), of the wisdom of enjoying life while we may (Ecc 9:7-10), of the evils which affect nations or individual man (Ecc 9:11-12). The wide experience of the Preacher suggests sharp and pointed sayings as to these evils (Ecc 10:1-20), each true and weighty in itself, but not leading him on to any firmer standing-ground or clearer solution of the problems which oppress him. It is here that the traces of plan and method in the book seem most to fail us. Consciously or unconsciously the writer teaches us how clear an insight into the follies and sins of mankind may coexist with doubt and uncertainty as to the great ends of life, and give him no help in his pursuit after truth. In Ecc 11:1-10, however, the progress is more rapid. The tone of the Preacher becomes more that of direct exhortation and he speaks in clearer and higher notes. The conclusions of previous trains of thought are not contradicted, but are placed under a new law and brought into a more harmonious whole. The end of man's life is not to seek enjoyment for him self only, but to do good to others, regardless of the uncertainties or disappointments that may attend his efforts (Ecc 11:1-4). His wisdom is to remember that there are things which he cannot know, problems which he cannot solve (Ecc 11:5), and to enjoy, in the brightness of his youth, whatever blessings God bestows on him (Ecc 11:9). But beyond all these there lie the days of darkness, of failing powers and incapacity for enjoyment; and the joy of youth, though it is not to be crushed, is yet to be tempered by the thought that it cannot last forever, and that it too is subject to God's law of retribution (Ecc 11:9-10). The secret of a true life is that a man should consecrate the vigor of his youth to God (Ecc 12:1). It is well to do this before the night comes, before the slow decay of age benumbs all the faculties of sense (Ecc 12:2; Ecc 12:6), before the spirit returns to God who gave it. The thought of that end rings out, once more the knell of the nothingness of all things earthly (Ecc 12:8); but it leads also to "the conclusion of the whole matter," to that to which all trains of thought and all the experiences of life had been leading the seeker after wisdom, that "to fear God and keep his commandments" was the highest good attainable; that the righteous judgment of God would in the end fulfill itself and set right all the seeming disorders of the world (Ecc 12:13-14). (See two articles on the plan and structure of the book of Ecclesiastes, in the Method. Quart. Rev. for April and July, 1849, modified by Dr. M'Clintock from Vaihinger, in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. for July, 1848; also an article by Gurlitt in the Stud. u. Krit. for 1864, 2).

If one were to indulge conjecture, there would perhaps be some plausibility in the hypothesis that Ecc 12:8 had been the original conclusion, and that the epilogue of Ecc 12:9-14 had been added, either by another writer, or by the same writer on a subsequent revision. The verses (Ecc 12:9-12) have the character of a panegyric designed to give weight to the authority of the teacher. The two that now stand as the conclusion may naturally have originated in the desire to furnish a clue to the perplexities of the book, by stating in a broad intelligible form, not easy to be mistaken, the truth which had before been latent.

If the representation which has been given of the plan and meaning of the book be at all a true one, we find in it, no less than in the book of Job, indications of the struggle with the doubts and difficulties which in all ages of the world have presented themselves to thoughtful observers of the condition of mankind. In its sharp sayings and wise counsels it may present some striking affinity to the Proverbs, which also bear the name of the son of David; but the resemblance is more in form than in substance, and in its essential character it agrees with that great inquiry into the mysteries of God's government which the drama of Job brings before us. There are indeed characteristic differences. In the one we find the highest and boldest forums of Hebrew poetry, a sustained unity of design; in the other there are, as we have seen, changes and oscillations, and the style seldom rises above the rhythmic character of proverbial forms of speech. The writer of the book of Job deals with the great mystery presented by the sufferings of the righteous, and writes as one who has known those sufferings in their intensity. In the words of the Preacher, we trace chiefly the weariness or satiety of the pleasure-seeker, and the failure of all schemes of life but one. In spite of these differences, however, the two books illustrate each other. In both, though by very diverse paths, the inquirer is led to take refuge (as all great thinkers have ever done) in the thought that God's kingdom is infinitely great, and that man knows but the smallest fragment of it; that he must refrain from things which are too high for him, and be content with that which is given him to know the duties of his own life, and the opportunities it presents for his doing the will of God. There is probably a connection in the authorship or editorship of these two books that may to some extent account for this resemblance. SEE JOB (BOOK OF).

V. Commentaries. — The following is a full list of separate exegetical works on Ecclesiastes (the most important are indicated by an asterisk prefixed): Olympiodorus, Enarratio (in the Bibl. Max. 18:490; Grynaeus, page 953); Origen, Scholia (in Bibl. Patr. Gall. page 14); Dionysius Alex. Commentarius (in Opp. 1:14; Append. to Bibl. Patr Gall.), Gregory Thaum. Metaphrasis (in Opp. page 77); Gregory Nyssen. Conciones (in Opp. 1:373); Gregory Nazianzen, Metaphrasis (in Opp. Spur. 1:874), OEcumenius, Catena (in Gr., Verona, 1532); Jerome, Commentarius (in Opp. 3:383); Salonius, Explicatio (in Bibl. fax. Patr. page 8); Alcuin, Commentaria (in Opp. 1, 2:410); Rupert, In Ecclesiastes (in Opp. 1:1118); Hugo, Homilia (in Opp. 1:53); Honorius, Commentarius (in Opp. 1); Bonaventiara, Expositio (in Opp. 1:309) Latif, פֵּרוּשׁ (Constpl. n.d. 12mo); Schirwood, Nota (Antw. 1523, 4to); Guidacer, Commentarius (Paris, 1531, 1540, 4to); Arboreus, Commentarius (Paris, 1531, 1537, fol.); Bucer, Commentarius (Argent. 1532, 4to); Moring, Commentarius (Antw. 1533, 8vo); \*Luther, Adnotationes (Wittemb. 1533, 8vo); Borrhaus, Commentarius (Basil. 1539, 1564, fol.); Titelmann, Commentarius (8vo, Par. 1545, 1549, 1577, 1581; Antw. 1552; Lugd. 1555, 1575); Melancthon, Enarratio (Wittemb. 1550, 8vo); Zuingle, Complanatio (in Opp. 3), Brent, Commentarii (in Opp. 8); Cajetanus, Commentarius (Lugd. 1552, fol.); Striegel, Schoia (Lpz. 1565, 8vo); Sforno, פֵּרוּשׁ (Ven. 1567, 4to); Galante, קְהַלִּת יִעֲקֹב (4to, Safet, 1570; Freft. 1681); Sidonius, Commentaria (in Germ., Mogunt. 1571, fol.) De Pomis, Discorso (Ven. 1572, 8vo); Mercer, Commentarius (Genev. 1573, fol.); Taitazak, פּוֹרָת יוֹסֵ (Ven. 1576, 4to); Jaisch, מָקור עִל קֹהֶלֶתetc. (Constpl. 1576, fol.); Id., Commentarius (Antw. 1589, 4to); Jansen, Paraphrasis (Leyd. 1578, fol.); Galicho, קֹהֶלֶת כַּאוּר עִל (Ven. 1578, 4to); Corranus, Paraphrasis (Lond. 1579, 1581, 8vo; ed. Scultet, Frankft. 1618, Heidelb; 1619, 8vo); Senan, Commentarius (Genev. 1580. 8vo in Engl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1585, 8vo); Manse, Explicatio (Flor. 1580, 8Svo; Colon. 1580, 12mo); Lavater, Commentarius (Tigur. 1584, 8vo); Beza, Paraphrasis (Genev. 1588, 1598, 8vo; in Germ., ib. 1599, 8vo); Gifford, Commentarius (Land. 1589, 8vo); Strack, Predigten (4to, Cassel, 1590; Freft. 1618; Goth. 1663); Slangendorp, Commentarius (Hafn. 1590, 8vo); Greenham, Brief Sum (in Works, page 628); Arepol, לֵב חָכָם (Constpl. 1591, 4to); Arvivo, מִקְהַיל קֹדֵלֶת (Salonia 1597, 4to); Baruch ben- Baruch, אֵלֶּה תוֹלְדוֹת אָדָם (Vaen. 1599, fol.); Alscheich, טובַים דְּבָרַים (Ven. 1601, 4to); Leuchter, Erkldrung (Frkft. 1603, 1611, 4to); Broughton, Commentarius (Lond. 1605, 4to); Lorinus, Commentarius (Lugd. 1606, 4to); Bardin, with various titles (in French, Par. 1609, 12mo; 1632, 8vo; in Germ., Guelf. 1662, 8vo); Fay, Commentarius (Genev. 1607, 8vo); Osorius, Commentarius (Lugd. 1611, 8vo); Amama, Notae (in the Crit. Sacri); Sanchez, Commentarius (Barcin. 1619, 4to); \*De Pineda, Commentarius (Antw. 1620, fol.); Ferdinand, Commentarius (Romans 1621, fol.); Granger, Commentarius (Lond. 1621, 4to); Egard, Expositio (Hamb. 1622, 4to); Pemble, Exposition (Lond. 1628, 4to); Dieterich, Predigen (fol., Ulm,, 1632, 1655; Nurnb. 1665); Drusius, Annotationes (Amsterd. 1635, 4to); Guillebert, Paraphrasis (Paris, 16351, 1642, 8vo); A Lapide, In Ecclesiastes (Antw. 1638, fol.); Jermin, Commentary (Lond. 1638, fol.); Cartwright, Metaphrasis (4to, Amsterd. 1.647; 4th edit. ib. 1663), Trapp, Commentary (Lond. 1650, 4to); \*Geier, Commentarius (4to, Lpz. 1653; 5th edit. 1730); Mercado, פֵּרוּשׁ (Amst. 1653, 4to); Cotton, Exposition (London, 1654, 8vo); Gorse, Explication (in French, Par. 1655, 3 vols. 12mo); Lusitano, צָפְנִת פִּעֲנֵחִ (Ven. 1656, 4to); Leigh, Commentarius (Lond. 1657, fol.); Varenius, Gemma Salomonis (Rost. 1659, 4to); Werenfels, Homiliae (Basle, 1666, 4to); \*Reynolds, Annotations (Lond. 1669, 8vo; in "Assembly's Annot. Works," 4:33; also edit. by Washburn, Lond. 1811); De Sacy, L'Ecclesiaste (in his Sainte Bible, 14); Anon. Exposition (Lond. 1680, 4to); Bossuet, Libri Salomonis (Par. 1693, 8vo); Nisbet, Ex. position (Edinb. 1694, 4to); \*Smith, Explicatio (Amst. 2 vols. 4to, 1699, 1704); Leenhost, Verklaarung (Zwolle, 1700, 8vo); Yeard, Paraphrasis (Lond. 1701, 8vo); Martianay, Commentaire (Par. 1705, 12mo); Seebach, Erklarung (Hal. 1705, 8vo); Tietzmann, Erklarung (Nurnb. 1705, 4to); David ben-Ahron, קֹהֶלֶת פֵּרוּשׁ (Prague, 1708, 4to); \*Schmid, Commentarius (Strasb. 1709, 4to); Mel, Predigten (Frkft. 1711, 4to); Zierold, Bedeutung, etc. (Lpz. 1715, 4to); Rambach, Adnotationes (Hal. 1720, 8vo); Wachter, Uebers. m. Anm. (Memmingen, 1723, 4to); Francke, Commentarius (Brandenb. 1724, 4to); Wolle, Auslegung (Lpz, 1729, 8vo); Hardouin, Paraphrase (Par. 1729, 12mo); Bauer, Erlauterung (Lpz. 1732, 4to); Hanssen, Betrachtungen (Lub. 1737, 1744, 4to); Lampe, Adnotationes (in his Medit. Exg. Gronig. 1741, 4to); Michaelis, Entwickelung (8vo, Gott. 1751; Brem. 1762); Anon. Uebers. m. Anm. (Halle, 1760, 8vo); Peters, Append. to Crit. Diss. (Lond. 1760, 8vo); \*Des Voeux, Essay, Analytical Paraphrase, etc. (Lond. 1760, 4to; in Germ., Halle, 17 64, 4to); Carmeli, Spiegamento (Ven. 1765, 8vo3; Judetnes, שְׁנוֹת חִיּים (Amst. 1765, 4to); Anon. Cuheleth, a Poem (Lond. 1768, 4to); \*Mendelssohn, D. Buch Koheleth, etc. (Berlin, 1770, 8vo; 1789, 4to; tr. with notes by Preston, Cambr. 1845, 8vo); De Poix, D'Arras, and De Paris, L'Ecclesiaste, etc. (Par. 1771, 12mo); Anon. Traduct. et Notes (Par. 1771, 8vo); Moldenhauer, Uebers. u. Erlaut. (Lpz. 1772, 8vo); Grotius, Adnotationes (Halle, 1777, 4to); Kleuker, Salomo's Schriften (Lpz. 1777, 8vo); Zinck, Commentarius (Augsb. 1780, 4to); Struensee, Uebersetzung (Halberst. 1780, 8vo); Greenway, Paraphrase (Lond. 1781, 8va); Van der Palm, Eccl. illustratus (Leyd. 1784, 8vo); Doderlein, Uebersetung (8vo, Jen. 1784, 1792); Levison, תּוֹכִחִת מְגֻלָת (Hamb. 1784, 8vo); Schiananer, Auctarium (Gotting. 1785, 4to); Spohn, Uebers. m. Anm. (Lpz. 1785, 8vo); Neunhofer, Versuch (Weissenb. 1787, 8vo); Anon. Paraphrase, etc. (London, 1787, 8vo); Friedlander, Abhandlung (Berl. 1788, 8vo); Bode, Erklarende Umschreibung (Quedlinb. 1788, 8vo); Lowe, קֹהֶלֶת (Berl. 1788, 8vo); Gregory II, Explanatio (Gr. and Lat., Ven. 1791, fol.); Pacchi, Parafrassi (Modena, 1791, 8vo); Zirkel, Uebers. a. Erklar. (Wurzb. 1792, 8vo); Boaretti, Valgarizz. (Ven. 1792, 8vo); Hodgson, Translation (Lond. 1792, 8vo); Schmidt, Versuch (Giess. 1794, 8vo); Loanz, מַכְלוֹל יֹפַי (4to, Amst. 1695; Berl. 1775); Goab, Beytrage, etc. (Tubing. 1795, 8vo); Nachtigal, Koheleth (Halle, 1798, 8vo); Bergst, Bearbeitung (1799, 8vo); Jacobi, Predigerbuch (Celle, 1799, 8vo); Frankel, בַּאוּרַים בְּדַבְרֵי קֹהֶלֶת (Dessau, 1800, 8vo); Middeldorpf, Symbolae (Fr. ad V. 1811, 4to); Kelle, D. Salomon Schriften (Freib. 1815, 8vo); Katzenelubogen, בַּרְכִּת אִבְרָהם (Wars. 1815, 4to); \*Umbreit, Uebers. u. Darstell. (Gotha, 1818, 8vo; also his Koheleth scepticus de summo bono, Gott; 1820, 8vo); Wardlaw, Lectures (Lond. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo; new ed. Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 12mo); Holden, Illustration (Lond. 1822, 8vo); Kaiser, Uebers. u. Erlaut. (Erlang. 1823, 8vo); Henz, Adumbratio (Dorpat. 1827, 4to); Anon. Uebers. u. Erlaut. (Stuttg. 1827, 8vo); Rosenmuller, Scholia (pt. 9, Lips. 1830, 8vo); Heinemann, Commentar (Bera. 1831, 8vo); Koster, Stroph. Uebers. (Schlesw. 1831, 8vo); Ewald, Koheleth (in his Poet. Bilcher, 4); \*Knobel, Commentar (Lpz. 1836, 8vo); Auerbach, סֵפֶר קֹהֶלֶתetc. (Bresl. 1837, 8vo); \*Herzfeld, Uebers. a. Erlaut. (Braunschw. 1838, 8vo); Noyes, Notes (Bost. 1846 [3d ed. 1867], 12mo); Barham, Ecclesiastes (in his Bible revised, 1); \*Hitzig, Erklarung (in the Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb., Lpz. 1847, 8vo); Hamilton, Lectures (Lond. 1851,12mo); \*Stuart, Commentary (N.Y. 1851; Andover, 1862, 12mo); Elster, Commentar (Gotting. 1855, 8vo); Morgan, Metrical Paraphrase  (Lond. 1856, 4to); Macdonald, Explanation (N.Y. 1856, 8vo); Weiss, Exposition (Lond. 1856, 12mo); Plungian, כֶּרֶם לַשְׁלֹמֹה (Wilna, 1857, 8vo); Wangenheim, Auslegung (Berlin, 1858, 8vo); \*Vaihinger, Uebersetz. u. Erklar. (Stuttg. 1858, 8vo; his art. on the subject in the Stud. u. Krit. 1848, was translated in the Meth. Quart. Review, April and July, 1849); Rosenthal, מְגַּלִּת קֹהֶלֶת etc. (Prague, 1858, 8vo); Buchanan, Commentary (Glasg. 1859, 8vo); Bridges, Exposition (London, 1859, 8vo); \*Hengstenberg, Auslegung (Berl. 1859, 8vo; tr. in Clarke's Library, Edinb. 1860, 8vo; also Phila. 1860, 8vo)\* Hahn, Commentar (Lpz. 1860, 8vo); Bohl, De Araismis Koheleth (Erlang. 1860, 8vo); \*Ginsburg, Coheleth translated with a Commentary (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Diedrich, Erlauterung (Neu-Rup. 1865, 8vo); Castelli, Tradotto e note (Pisa, 1866, 8vo); Young, Commentary (Phila. 1866, 8vo). Others are embraced in the Rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Moses Frankfurter (q.v.). For those in general commentaries, SEE COMMENTARY.

Ecclesiastes, Book Of - ADDENDUM (FROM VOLUME 12)

A somewhat fuller discussion of the points relating to the authorship of this composition is appropriate, in view of the confident assertion of many critics, especially in Germany, that the contents forbid its ascription to Solomon. We might fairly offset these opinions of modern scholars by that of the ancient Hebraists, certainly in nowise their inferiors, who seem to have found no such difficulty even in the linguistic peculiarities of the book as to require a later than the Solomonic age for its production. The direct evidence of the writer himself, in the opening verse, has not been fairly treated by these rationalizing critics, for while most of them are compelled to admit that "the Preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem," can only point to Solotnon, they yet evade the argument as if this were merely a none de plume; and Plumptre (Cambridge Bible, introd. ad loc.) does not hesitate to compare this with the pious fraud in the apocryphal book of "The Wisdom of Solomon." The attempt to justify this pseudonym by the modern practice of fictitious authorship will apply very well so far as the assumption of the fancy title Koheleth is concerned, but is a total failure as to the more definite addition “son of David, king in Jerusalem;" for such a precise and misleading designation is unprecedented in the history of trustworthy literature. The book is either Solomon's or a forgery.

The anonymous author of The Authorship of Ecclesiastes (Lond. 1880, 8vo) has nearly exhausted the arguments in favor of the Solomonic date, as derived from a comparison of Solomon's other writings, and he extends the inquiry into the minutiae of style and phraseology with a thoroughness that ought to shake the confidence of the holders of the opposite view. As to alleged Aramaisms in Ecclesiastes, there are certainly none more decided than appear in Deborah's ode (Judges 5; pure Chaldaism יְרִד, Jdg 5:13; בִּר , Psa 2:12).

Delitzsch, in his Commentary on this book (Clark's translation, Edinb. 1877, page 190 sq.) has collected a formidable list of the Hapaxlegomena, and of the Words and Forms in the Book of Koheleth belonging to a more recent Period of the Language" than Solomon; and this has been pointed to by later critics generally as conclusive against the Solomonic authorship. The writer of the above monograph justly remarks (page 32), "A cursory glance at the list, however, seems sufficient to shake one's confidence in it; and if it be faithfully scrutinized, it shrinks down to almost nothing." Accordingly he examines several of these words, as specimens, and shows  conclusively that they do not sustain the position. It is worth our while to analyze this "list," and we shall see what a slender basis it affords for the conclusion based upon it. There are ninety-five of these words enumerated by Delitzsch, of which, by his own showing, fifteen (besides one which he has overlooked) are found, in the same form and sense, more or less frequently, in writings of the early or middle Hebrew (Moses to Isaiah), and may therefore be set aside as wholly irrelevant. Of the rest, twenty-six words occur elsewhere only in the Talmudic writers or the Targums, in the same form and sense, and therefore, if they prove anything, prove entirely too much, for they would argue a rabbinical date, which we know is impossible, since the Sept. translation of Ecclesiastes, now extant, carries the original up to the time of the Ptolemies at least. Still further we may reduce the list by excluding nineteen words which appear in substantially the same or some closely cognate form in confessedly earlier writers, and thirteen others which are. used by them in a slightly different sense. Deducting all these immaterial peculiarities, there remain only twenty-one words, or less than one fourth in the list, that are really pertinent to the question. Of these, again, eleven are found in this book only (strictly hapaxlegomena), and therefore determine nothing as to its age, being such forms as, for aught we know, might have been employed by any writer., Once more, we ought in fairness to exclude certain particles and dubious forms (רְאוּת, רְעוּת, אַלּוּ, בְּכֵן),which .are vague and inconclusive. The actual residuum available thus dwindles down to six words only, namely, בָּטִל (Ecc 12:3), זְמָן (Ecc 3:1), כָּשֵׁר (Ecc 10:10; Ecc 11:6), פֵּשֶׁר (Ecc 8:1), פַּתְגָּם (ibid.) and, רִעְיוֹן (Ecc 1:17; Ecc 2:22; Ecc 4:16), which is no greater number than can be pointed out in Job and some other pre-exilian books. None of these half-dozen words is sufficiently distinctive in known origin and history to determine the date of the writing. The evidence is too negative. They are not like some modern terms, which we can trace to a specific source and occasion when they were first coined or introduced. The cognate dialects exhibit all of them in the same or similar signification, and of most of them (perhaps even the last two are no exceptions) the Hebrew itself has the root in no very remote sense. They are neither foreign nor technical terms. The same line of argument is applicableto the peculiar inflections and constructions adduced by Delitzsch in the same connection. They have been greatly exaggerated in relative mumber and importance. That the book of Ecclesiastes is singular in many ofits forms and phrases no one can doubt, but that these peculiarities are such as specially belong to the later Hebrew  has not been made out. We have several books written in the post-exilian period, but Koheleth does not wear their impress, either in general or in particular. The only other book in the canonical Hebrew Scriptures analogous to it in teaching is Proverbs, and we have nothing in apocryphal Jewish literature that compares.with it, except perhaps The Wisdom of Solomon, which is only extant in Greek (being apparently the original), and was evidently modelled after Koheleth That Solomon was a perfectly classical writer is not to be assumed, either from his aera or what else we know of him. The effort to express philosophical ideas in the inadequate Shemitic tongue may well explain many of the harsh terms and strange constructions of Ecclesiastes. Certainly we gain nothing by attributing the book to some unknown writer of some indefinite age, concerning whom nothing can be proved or disproved. Subjective arguments on a question of authorship are of the most deceptive character, as the well-known attempt to determine who wrote The Letters of Junius has proved. One good historical statement, whether made in the writing itself or by traditionary testimony, outweighs all such speculative and conjectural dicta. Until some candidate better accredited than Solomon shall be brought forward, in deserting him we shall be forsaking the substance for a shadow.

## Ecclesiastic, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Ecclesiastic, Ecclesiastical]]

             of or belonging to the Church (ecclesia). In later times the word ecclesiastic came to be applied solely to clergymen as a name, and ecclesiastical is often confined in use, improperly, to the affairs of the clergy. In the early Church, Christians in general are spoken of by this title, in opposition to Jews, infidels, and heretics. The word means men of the Church, and was applied to Christians as being neither of Jewish synagogues, nor heathen temples, nor heretical conventicles, but members of the Church of Christ; e.g. ἀνδρές ἐκκλησιαστικοί, Eusebius, 4:7, cited by Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 1, chapter 1, § 8.

## Ecclesiasticae Res[[@Headword:Ecclesiasticae Res]]

             (1) The. term is used, in a wide sense, to denote all matters belonging, to the Church, as opposed to things secular or worldly. It also indicates the Priestly office and duties. It is likewise used in reference to "spiritual” things, immaterial or material. To the former class belong the invisible gifts and graces bestowed by God upon the soul; to the latter, the outward acts or objects connected with such gifts, as the sacraments: and other religious rites. From this it is sometimes applied to the vestments of ministers, as well as to the beneficent institutions over which the Church has jurisdiction.

(2) The narrower sense of the term designates the property of the Church.

## Ecclesiastical Commission[[@Headword:Ecclesiastical Commission]]

             in English law, is a standing body invested with very important powers, under the operations of which extensive changes have been made in the distribution of the revenues of the Church of England. In 1835 two committees were appointed "to consider the state of the several dioceses of England and Wales, with reference to the amount of their revenues and the  more equal distribution of epist copal duties, and the prevention of the necessity of attaching by commendam to bishoprics certain benefices with cure of souls; and to consider also the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as might render them conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church, and to ascertain the best mode of providing for the cure of souls, with special reference to the residence of the clergy on their respective benefices." Upon the recommendation of these committees a permanent commission was appointed by 6 and 7 Will. IV, c. 77, for the purpose of preparing and laying before the king in council such schemes as should appear to them to be best adapted for carrying into effect the alterations suggested in the report of the original commission and recited in the act.

The first members of this commission were the two archbishops and three bishops, the lord-chancellor and the principal officers of state, and three laymen named in the act. By a later act, (3 and 4 Vict. c. 113), all the bishops, the chiefs of the three courts at Westminster, the master of the rolls, the judges of the Prerogative Court and Court of Admiralty, and the deans of Canterbury, St. Paul's, and Westminster, were added to the commission; and power was given to the crown to appoint four and the archbishop of Canterbury to appoint two additional lay commissioners, who are required to be "members of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to subscribe a declaration to that effect." Five are a quorum; but two bishops at least must be present at any proceeding under the common seal of the commission, and if only two are present they can demand its postponement to a subsequent meeting. Paid commissioners, under the title of Church estates' commissioners, are also appointed — two by the crown and one by the archbishop of Canterbury. These three are the joint treasurers of the commission, and constitute, along with two members appointed by the commission, the Church estates' committee, charged with all business relating to the sale, purchase, exchange, letting, or management of any lands, tithes, or hereditaments. The schemes of the commission having, after due notice to persons affected thereby, been laid before the queen in council, may be ratified by orders, specifying the times when they shall take effect; and such orders, when published in the London Gazette, have the same force as acts of Parliament. See Encycl. Brit. (9th ed.) s.v.

## Ecclesiastical History[[@Headword:Ecclesiastical History]]

             is that branch of historical theology (q.v.) which treats of the development of the kingdom of God among men on the earth by means of the Church.

I. Idea and Scope of Ecclesiastical History, — The title Ecclesiastical History (Historic Ecclesiastica) was used by all the older writers on this branch of science. German writers began the use, in its stead, of the title Church History (Kirchengeschichte), which has of late been adopted also by most English writers. Its idea and limits depend on the idea which is formed of the Church (ecclesia). SEE CHURCH. 1. If the Church be regarded as a divine institution, existing in all the ages before Christ as well as since, then the field of Church history reaches from the beginnings of the history of the first divine covenant with man down to the present time. It would then be divided into Biblical Church History and Ecclesiastical History, or simply Church History. Biblical Church history, again, could be divided into O.T. and N.T. The entire field of Church history, in its widest sense, would thus be, I. Old Testament Church history. II. New Testament Church History, including (1) the life of Christ; (2) the planting of Christianity by the apostles. (3). Ecclesiastical history, beginning at the close of the canon, and extending to the present time (see Alexander, Notes on N.T. Literature and Ecclesiastical History, N.Y. 1867, page 156 sq.; Stanley, Easters Church, Introduction).

2. If (as it generally is for convenience), on the other hand, the term Church be restricted to the Christian Church, then the field of Church history is limited to the development of the kingdom of God among men through and by means of the Christian Church. "Its proper starting-point is the incarnation of the eternal Word, who dwelt among us and revealed his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; and next to this the miracle of the first Pentecost, when the Church took her place as a Christian institution, filled With the spirit of the glorified Redeemer, and entrusted with the conversion of all nations. Jesus Christ, the God-man and Savior of the world, is the author of the new creation, the soul and the head of the Church, which is his body and his bride. In his person and work lies all the fullness of the Godhead and of renewed humanity, the whole plan of redemption, and the key of all history from the creation of man in the image of God to the resurrection of the body unto everlasting life" (Schaff, Church Hist. volume 1, § 1). Modern writers generally adopt this second view, not only for its practical convenience, but also on the theoretical ground that the sources of the O.T. and N.T. history are inspired; those of Church history, since the closing of the canon, are human. The former is therefore called Sacred History, constituting a department by itself. The relations of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism are generally treated by modern writers in an Introduction or in separate chapters, as the "Preparation for Christianity in the History of the World." The life of Jesus is so treated by some writers; by most others it is relegated to a separate work. Neander makes one work of "The life of Christ" as the ground of the existence of the Christian Church; another work treats of the apostolical Church, or "The Planting and Training of Christianity by the Apostles;" while his great Church History continues the development after the apostolic age. Nevertheless, in treating of "Church Discipline and Constitution," he is compelled to go back to the apostolic age. Dr. Schaff makes "the Church under the Apostles" the first division of his History of the Christian Church, and gives the relations of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism in chapter 1, as "Preparations for Christianity." Hinds (History of the Christian Church, 1st Division, Encycl. Metropolitana) treats in an Introduction of the religion of Jews, Gentiles, and Samaritans, and then makes part 1 the Ministry of Christ; part 2, the Apostolic Age; part 3, Age of the Apostolical Fathers.

3. As to the relations of Church history to general history, dean Stanley remarks: "To a great extent the two are inseparable; they cannot be torn asunder without infinite loss to both... . It is indeed true that, in common parlance, ecclesiastical history is often confined within limits so restricted as to render such a distinction only too easy... . Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire is, in great part, however reluctantly or unconsciously, the history of the rise and progress of the Christian Church.” Never let us think that we can understand the history of the Church apart from the history of the world, any more than we can separate the interests of the clergy from the interests of the laity, which are the interests of the Church at large... . How to adjust the relations of the two spheres to each other is almost as indefinite a task in history as it is in practice and in philosophy. In no age are they precisely the same" (Eastern Church, Introduction). A book written from this point of view, however, would be rather a history of Christianity in its relations to the general development of man than a history of the Church. So Milman's Latin Christianity is, to great extent, a general history of the times rather than of the Christian Church, while, at the same time, the Church is the prominent feature of it. It is well that such a book should be written, and the work has been well done by dean Milman.

II. Method of Church History. — The order and arrangement of the material have varied greatly at different periods. The earliest writers (e.g. Eusebius) wrote generally without scientific method, and their arrangement was arbitrary and fortuitous. In the Church of the Middle Ages history was little studied, and what little was written was put in the form of simple chronicles. The first application of method was really made in the Magdeburg Centuries, projected by Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1559-1574). SEE CENTURIES. The history is divided into centuries, with a topical arrangement under each century of sixteen heads as rubrics, viz.:

1. General view;

2. Extent of the Church;

3. Its external condition;

4. Doctrines;

5. Heresies;

6. Rites;

7. Polity;

8. Schisms;

9. Councils;

10. Bishops and doctors;

11. Heretics;

12. Martyrs;

13. Miracles;

14. Jews;

15. Other religions;

16. Political changes affecting the condition of the Church.

This centurial arrangement (combined with the rubrical subdivision) maintained its ground for two centuries: the last great work which follows it is Mosheim's Institutes of Ecclesiastical History. Mosheim divides the material under each century into external and internal history, and these again as follows: External events into prosperous and adverse; internal history into,

1. State of literature and science;

2. Government of the Church;

3. Theology;

4. Rites and ceremonies;

5. Heresies and schisms.

The later historians divide the whole history into periods, determined by great events, and then arrange the material under each period by topics or rubrics. Each writer, of course, frames his periods according to his own views of the great epochal events of history, but most of them make three great periods-ancient, mediaeval, and modern, the first beginning with the day of Pentecost; the second with Gregory the Great, A.D. 590 (acc. to others, with Constantine, 306 or 311, or the fall of the West Roman empire, 476, or Charlemagne, 800); the third with the Reformation, 1517. Perhaps the best modern division is that of Schaff, who proposes nine periods, viz., three ancient, three mediaeval, three modern, viz.:

I. The Apostolic Church, A.D. 1-100.

II. The Church persecuted as a sect, to Constantine, the first Christian emperor, A.D. 100-311.

III. The Church in union with the Graeco-Roman empire, and amid the storms of the great migration, to pope Gregory I, A.D. 311-590.

IV. The Church planted' among the Germanic nations, to Hildebrand, A.D. 590-1049.

V. The Church under the papal hierarchy and the scholastic theology, to Boniface VIII, A.D. 1049-1294.

VI. The decay of mediaeval Catholicism, and the preparatory movements of Protestantism, A.D. 1294-1517.

VII. The evangelical reformation and the Roman Catholic reaction, A.D. 1517-1600.

VIII. The age of polemic orthodoxy and exclusive confessionalism, A.D. 1600-1750.

IX. The spread of infidelity and the revival of Christianity in Europe and America, from 1750 to the present time (Ch. Hist. 1:14).

Dr. J.A. Alexander (Op. cit. page 214 sq.) objects to the minute and fixed rubrical arrangement on various grounds, and proposes to set it aside altogether " as a framework running through the history and determining its whole form, and to substitute a natural arrangement of the topics by combining a general chronological order with a due regard to the mutual relative importance of the topics themselves, so that what is prominent at one time may be wholly in the background, at another, instead of giving all an equal prominence at all times, by applying the same scheme or formula to all alike. This natural method, so called to distinguish it from every artificial or conventional arrangement, far from being new, is recommended by the practice and example of the best historians in every language and in every age, affording a presumptive, if not a conclusive, proof both of its theoretical consistency and of its practical efficiency and usefulness, and, at the same time, a convenient means of keeping this and other parts of universal history in mutual connection and agreement with each other." See also Baur, Epochen d. kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung (Tubingen, 1852).

III. Branches of Church History. — The number of branches into which the history is divided will of course depend upon the method adopted (see above; but the historian, besides setting forth the progress of Christianity in the world and its vicissitudes, must also treat, more or less fully, of the constitution and government of the Church (ecclesiastical polity); of the history of doctrines; of worship, religious usages, domestic life; of creeds, etc. Some of these are of so great importance as to justify treatment in separate books, and they have, in fact, grown to be independent branches of science: e.g. archaeology, history of doctrines, symbolics, patristics and petrology (the doctrine and literature of the fathers, etc.), history of councils, Church polity, etc.

IV. Sources of Church History. — For the history of the Jewish Church and of the Apostolical Church, we find our sources of information in the O.T and N. Testament. For the history since the closing of the Canon; the sources are given by Kurtz as follows: "They are partly primary (original), such as monuments and original documents; partly secondary (derived), among which we reckon traditions, and reported researches of original sources which have since been lost. Monuments, such as ecclesiastical buildings, pictures, and inscriptions, are commonly only of very subordinate use in Church history. But archives, preserved and handed down, are of the very greatest importance. To this class also belong the acts and decrees of ecclesiastical councils; the regesta and official decrees of the popes (decretals, briefs) and of bishops (pastoral letters); the laws and regesta issuing from imperial chancellories, so far as these refer to ecclesiastical affairs; the rules of monastic orders, liturgies, confessions of faith, letters of personages influential in Church or State; reports of eye- witnesses; sermons and doctrinal treatises of acknowledged theologians, etc. If the documents in existence are found insufficient, we must have recourse to earlier or later traditions, and to the historical investigations of those who had access to original documents which are now no longer extant" (Text-book of Church History, volume 1, § 3). "The private writings of personal actors in the history, the works of the Church fathers for the first six centuries, of the scholastic and mystic divines for the Middle Ages, and of the Reformers and their opponents for the 16th century, are the richest mines for the historian. They give history in its birth and actual movement; but they must be carefully sifted and weighed: especially the controversial writings, where fact is generally more or less adulterated with party spirit, heretical and orthodox" (Schaff, Church History, volume 1, § 3).

V. Literature. —

1. Apostolic Church. The Acts of the Apostles may be regarded as the first Church history, for they describe the planting of the Church among Jews and Gentiles from Jerusalem to Rome. (In what follows we make free use of Dr. Schaff, volume 1)

2. Greek Church. Eusebius (q.v.) won by his Church history (ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία, up to A.D. 324) the title of the Father of Church history, though he was able to make use of the work of a predecessor, Hegesippus (about A.D. 150). Eusebius is learned moderate, and truth-loving, and made use of many sources of information which are now lost. As a work of art his work is inferior to the classic historians. It was continued on the same plan and in a similar spirit by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret in the fifth, and by the Arians Theodorus and Evagrius in the sixth centuries. Among the later Greek Church historians Nicephorus Callistus (about 1333) deserves mention. A Church history in the modern Greek Church was begun in 186 6 by Const. Kontogonis (Ε᾿κκλησιαστικὴὶστορία ἀπὸ τῆς θείας συστάσεως τῆς ἐκκλησίας μέχρι τῶν καθ ἡμᾶς χρόνων, volume 1, Athens, 1866).

3. The Latin Church before the Reformation was long content with translations and extracts from Eusebius and his continuators, and but one work of consequence was produced during the Middle Ages. (4.) The Roman Church after the Reformation. At the head of Roman writers in Church history stands cardinal Baronius (1607), whose Annales Ecclesiastici (Rome, 1588 sq., 12 vols. fol.) come down to the year 1188. They were continued, though with less ability, by Raynaldus, Bzovius, Spondanus, and very recently, from the year 1572, by Theiner (Rome, 1853 sq., fol.). The Annales were designed as a refutation of the Magdeburg Centuries ( SEE CENTURIES ), and were refuted in part not only by several Protestant writers, but also by Roman scholars, e.g. by Pagi. The work of Natalis Alexander (1724), Historia Ecclesiastica V. et N.T. (Par. 1699 sq., 8 vols. fol.; Bingii. 1785-91, 20 vols.), is Gallican, learned, and, on the whole, a very valuable work. Fleury (Histoire Ecclesiastique, Par. 1691-1720, 20C vols. 4to) commends himself by mildness of spirit, fluency of style, and copiousness of material. Bossuet (1704) wrote in a very elegant style a history of the world: Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle depuis le commencement du monde jusque l'empire de Charlemagne (Paris, 1681). Tillemont (1698) compiled, almost entirely in the words of the original authorities, his Memoires pour servir a l'histoire ecclisiastique des six premiers siecles (Paris, 1693 sq., 4to), which is the most thorough of all the French Church histories. The first comprehensive work in Roman Catholic Germany was commenced by count Stolberg, Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi (Hamburg, 1806- 1818, 8vo). The 15 volumes which he completed bring the history down to the year 430. The work is very copious, and written with the enthusiasm of a poet, but is not critical. The continuation, by Kerz (volumes 16-38, 8vo, Mentz, 1824-51, to A.D. 1300) and Brischar (volume 39 sq., 8vo), are still inferior. The work of Katerkamp (Kirchenqeschichte) (1819-30 to 1073, 4 parts, 8vo) is by far more thorough. Rohrbacher's Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise (Par. 1842-48, volume 29, 8vo; a continuation containing the Church history from 1860-1866, by J. Chantrel, Corbeil, 1867) is written from an ultramontane standpoint, and has not made sufficient use of the recent investigations. The best Roman Catholic manuals of Church history are those of Dollinger (Gesch. d. christl. Kirche, volume 1, parts 1 and 2, Landshut, 1833-35; Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch. volume 1, and part 1 of volume 2, up to the Reformation, Ratisbon, 1836 sq.; 2d edit. 1843; Kirchengeschichte, volume 1, part 1, Heidenthum a. Judenthum, Ratisbon, 1857; part 2, Christenthum a. Kirche in der Zeit Airer Grundlegung, 1860), Ritter (Handbuch d. Kirchengesch. Bonn, 1826-35, 3 vols.; 6th edit., 1856, 2 vols.), and especially Alzog (Universal geschichte der christlichen Kirche, Mainz, 1843, 8vo; 8th edit. 2 volumes, 1867-68). Posthumous lectures on Church history by Dr. Mobler (died 1838), the greatest Roman Catholic theologian of Germany in the 19th century, were published thirty years after his death by Dr. Gams (Kirchenyeschichte, 3 volumes, Ratisbon, 1868). (5.) Protestant Writers. The first comprehensive Church history from the Protestant standpoint was compiled by Mathias Flacius (1575), surnamed Illyricus (Ecclesiastica Historia Novi Testamenti, usually called Centuriae Magdeburgenses, Basil, 1559-74, fol.), assisted by ten other theologians. It followed the centurial arrangement, and treated of 13 centuries in as many folio volumes. It remained long the standard work of the Lutheran Church, though it is to a certain extent partial and often uncritical ( SEE CENTURIES ).

Hottinger (1667) published a similar work (from the standpoint of the Swiss Reformed Church), Historia Ecclesiastica N. Testamenti (Zurich, 1655-67, 9 volumes) extending to the 16th century, but it is inferior to that of Flacius. A thorough refutation of Baronius was furnished by Spanheim (Summa Historia Ecclesiastiae, Lugd. Bat. 1689, 4to). An attempt to free Church history from the fetters of confessionalism was made by J.G. Arnold (in his Unparteiische Kirch.-und Ketzerhistorie, 1698-1700, 4 volumes, to 1688), which, however, was often unjust towards the predominant churches through partiality towards the sects. Objective Church history was greatly advanced by Mosheim (1755), a moderate and impartial Lutheran. His Institutiones historia ecclesiastica antiqua et recentioris (Helmstadt, 1755, 4to) is, in the English translation of Murdock (N.Y., 1841, 3 volumes, 3d edit.) and McLaine, a favorite textbook in England and America to the present day. Of the two, Murdock's is far the best. The work of Schrockh, Christliche Kirchengeschichte (45 volumes, to the end of the 18th century, Leipzic, 1768-1812; the last 2 volumes are by Tzschirner), though leaning towards Rationalism, is very valuable for reference. The principal representative of Rationalism among Church historians is Henke, Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Kirche (Braunschweig, 1788-1823, 9 volumes, 8vo, continued by Vater). The work of Gieseler (1854), Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Bonn, 1824- 1857) gives the history as much as possible in the very words of the sources. It is profoundly learned and impartial, but cold and dry. The best English translation of it is by Professor H.B. Smith (New York, 1857 sq.). Neander (1850) is generally considered as the father of modern Church history. His aim was to represent Church history as a continuous proof of the divine power of Christianity, and it is therefore prominently the inner side of ecclesiastical events and their religious signification which he unfolds. His Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion end Kirche (Hamburg, 1825-52, 11 volumes, 8vo, extending to the council of Basle) has been translated into English by Torrey (Boston, 1847-51, 5 volumes, 8vo). Besides these larger works, Germany has produced a great number of excellent manuals. The most important of these are those of Niedner (1846, new ed. 1866), distinguished for fullness and thought; of Hase (9th edit. 1867, translated by Blumenthal and Wing, New York, 1855, 8vo), distinguished for copiousness combined with conciseness; and Guericke (9th edit. 1867, translated by Shedd, volume 1:1857), who wrote the best historical work from the old Lutheran standpoint. More a sketch than a manual of Church history is the Kirchengeschichte of Schleiermacher, published after his death by Bonnell (Berlin, 1840, 8vo). The manual of Engelhardt, of Erlangen (Hasdb. d. Kirchengeschichte, Erlangen, 1832-34, 4 volumes), is an unpretending but valuable arrangement of the subject, as derived from the sources. The manual of Fricke, left incomplete (Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Leipz. 1850, 1 volume), learned but stiff, is a production of the school of Schleiermacher. In Gfrorer's work on ecclesiastical history (Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte, 4 volumes, Stuttgardt, 1841-46 to 1305, Christianity is treated as the natural product of the time in which it originated. Clerical selfishness, political calculations and intrigues, appear the sole principles of ecclesiastical movements which this author can appreciate or discover. Still, the work is of importance; and those volumes especially which detail the history of the Middle Ages give evidence of original study, and contain much fresh information. The manual of Jacobi, a pupil of Neander (Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte, Berlin, 1850, 1 Volume, not completed), breathes the same spirit as that of his teacher. Its tone is elevated; nor is the author content merely to imitate Neander. The prelections of Hagenbach (Die christl. Kirche der 3 ersten Jahrhunderte, 2 volumes, Leipz. 1853-55; D. christl. K. vom 7ten bis lum 15ten Jahrhunderte, Leipz. 1860-61), originally delivered to an educated audience, are somewhat diffuse, but clear and attractive. They breathe throughout a warm Christian spirit, nor is the judgment of the lecturer warped by narrow sectarian prejudices. The works by J.A. Kurtz (Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Mitau, 1842, 5th ed. 1863; Engl. transl. in 2 Volumes, Philadelphia, 1860; Handbuch der allgem. Kirchengesch. — volume 1, in 3 parts, Mitau, 1853-54, volume 2, part 1, 1856) belong among the best productions of the Lutheran school. To the same school belong the manuals of W.B. Lindner (Lehrbach der christl. Kirchengeschichte, Leipz. 1847-54) and H. Schmid (Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte, Nordlingen, 1851). The manual of Ebrard (Handbuch der christl. K.-u. Dogmengesch. Erlangen, 1865-66, 4 volumes) is written from the standpoint of the United Evangelical Church, as is also, the work of Prof. F.A. Hasse (Kirchengesch. Leipz. 1864-65, 3 volumes), published after the author's death by A. K6obler. The works published by F.C. Baur, the founder of the Tubingen school on the Church history of the first six centuries (Das Christenthum u.d. christl. K. der drei ersten Jahrh. Tub. 1853, 3d ed. 1863, and Die christl. K. des 4-6 Jahrh. Tub. 1859, 2d ed. 1863), were after his death completed, so as to form a continuous and complete Church history, by the publication of three volumes, treating severally of the Church history of the Middle Ages, of the time from the Reformation to the end of the 18th century, and of the 19th century. The five volumes appeared together, under the title Geschichte d. christ. Kirche (Tubingen, 1863-64, 5 volumes). A Church history in biographies was published by F. Bohringer (Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, Zurich, 1842-58).

Among the English works we mention Milner (1797), History of the Ch. of Christ to the 16th century (revised edit. by Grantham, Lond. 1847, 4 volumes, 8vo). It has been continued by Dr. Stebbing, The Hist. Of the Church of Christ from 1530 to the Eighteenth Century (London, 1839 sq., 3 volumes, 8vo), and a further continuation by Haweis (Edinb. 1834, 8vo); Waddington, History of the Church from the earliest Ages to the Reformation (Lond. 2d edit. 3 volumes, 8vo), and Hist. of the Reform. on the Continent (Lond. 1841, 3 volumes, 8va), is neither accurate nor profound; Foulkes, Manual of Ecclesiastical Hist. (1851, to the 12th cent.); Robertson, Hist. of the Church (Lond. 2 volumes, 1854-56, 8vo) to 1122; Milman, Hist. of Christianity (Lond. 1840, 3 volumes, 8vo, reprinted in New York), and Hist. of Latin Christianity (Lond. 1854 sq. 6 volumes, to Nicholas V; 4th ed. in 9 volumes, 1867, reprinted in New York), an elaborate and at the same time brilliant work; Hardwick, Hist. of the Christ. Church, volume 1, Middle Age, volume 2, Reformation (Cambridge, 1853 and 1856, 8vo), an admirable manual, but left unfinished by the sudden death of the author; Hinds, Jeremie, and others, Church History, in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana, and in a separate edition (Lond. 1850-58, 4 volumes, 8vo); Killen, The Ancient Church (Belfast and New York, 1859, 8vo), an able work from the Presbyterian standpoint. The best works produced in this field in America are those by Prof. Schaff (Hist. of the Apostolic Age, New York, 1853, 8vo, and Hist. of the Christian Ch. Volume 1 to A.D. 311, New York, 1859, volumes 2 and in to Gregory the Great, New York, 1867. They have also appeared in a German edition, Geschichte der christl. Kirche, volume 1, Mercersburg, 1851, and Leipzic, 1854; volumes 2 and 3, Leipz. 1867). They are distinguished by copiousness of material, philosophical arrangement, and attractive style. A brief work on the history of the Christian Church has been published by Dr. C. M. Butler (Phila. 1868). In Protestant France a luminous sketch of Church history was written by J. Matter (Hist. Universelle de l'Eglise (Chretienne), Strasburg, 1829, 2 volumes, 2d edit. Paris, 1838, 4 vols.).

In addition to the above works, which (unless the contrary is specially mentioned) embrace the whole history of the Christian Church, there is a very copious literature on special periods. The works treating of the primitive Church have been given in the article on the APOSTOLIC AGE SEE APOSTOLIC AGE . An able work on the history of the first three centuries has been published by Ed. de Pressense (Histoire des trois premiers siecles, Paris, 1858, 2 volumes); also handbooks of modern Church history, by Dr. Nippold (Elberfeld, 1867) and Hagenbach (1865). For the ample literature on the period of the Reformation, see the article REFORMATION SEE REFORMATION.

The literature on branches of ecclesiastical history, such as history of heresies, councils, particular religious denominations, popes, saints, countries, monasticism, crusades, etc., and that on prominent men of Church history, is given in the special articles treating of those subjects. Tables of Church history, presenting in parallel columns the various departments of history, have been compiled in Germany by Vater (Halle, 6th ed. 1833), Danz (Jena, 1838), Lange (Jena, 1841), Douay (Leipzic, 1841), Uhlemann (to the Reformation, 2d edit. Berlin, 1865); in England, by Riddle (Ecclesiastical Chronology, London, 1840); in America, by H.B. Smith (Hist. of the Ch. of Christ in chronol. Tables, New York, 1859), which work has considerably improved the plan of all its predecessors, and, in fact, is the most thorough and complete work of the kind extant. Special dictionaries of Church history were compiled by W.D. Fuhrmann (Handworterbuch der christl. Religions-u. Kirchengesch. Halle, 1826-29, 3 volumes) and Neudecker (Allyem. Leax. der Religions-u. christl. Kirchengesch. Weimar, 1834-37, 5 volumes). Periodicals specially devoted to ecclesiastical history have been published by Stoudlin, Tzschirner, and Vater (Magazin fur Religions-u. Kirchengesch, by Staudlin, 4 volumes, Hanover, 1802-5; Archiv fur alte u. neue Kirchengesch. by Staudlin u. Tzschirner, 18131822,5 volumes; Kirchenhist. Archiv, by Staudlin, Tzschirner, u. Vater, 4 vols. Halle, 1823- 26); by Ilgen, Niedner, and Kahnis (Zeitschrift fur hist. Theologie, Leipz. 1832-1868; established by Iligen; since 1845, by Niedner; since 1867 by Kahnis); by Kist and Royaards (Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschidenis, Leyden, 1829 sq.). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7:622; Hagenbach; Theol. Encyklop. page 212 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 6:130; Christian Remembrancer, 43:62; Jortin, Remarks on Ecclesiastical History; Princeton Rev. 26:300; 29:636; Stanley, Eastern Church (Introduction on the Study of Church History); Dowling, Introduction to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History attempted in an Account of the Progress, and a short Notice of the Sources, of the History of the Church (Lond. 1838, 8vo).

Ecclesiastical Polity denotes the principles and laws of Church government. Personal religion is a matter between the individual man and his Maker. But religion necessarily involves social relations; that is to say, it involves society; and no society of men can exist without government. True, there can be no compulsion in religion; but government is not inconsistent with freedom; nay, it is necessary to all true enjoyment of freedom in any society, religious or other. The "two conditions essential to a good religious government are, first, a good system for the formation and organization of authority; and, second, a good system of security for liberty" (Guizot, History of Civilization, N.Y. 12mo, page 121). So Richard Watson: "The Church of Christ being visible and permanent, bound to observe certain rites and to obey certain rules, the existence of government in it is necessarily supposed."

Is any form of Church polity divinely ordained? Perhaps the conclusion on this point most generally adopted at the present day is that, while certain fundamental principles of Church government are laid down in the N.T., no specific form of polity is there enjoined. Compare Mat 20:20-28, with Mar 10:35-45, and Mat 23:1-11. These passages clearly prohibit all arbitrary rule in the Church, and are utterly inconsistent with hierarchical assumptions; there is "but one Master, and all are brethren." The doctrine of these passages is that the members of the Church are on one level in presence of Christ the Head. We gather some elements of polity from the practice of the apostles as recorded in their acts and writings. This polity is not presented as legislative -enactments, but simply as facts, showing how the apostles acted in given cases. In the first account we find the Church composed of the apostles and other disciples, and then of the apostles and "the multitudes of them that believed." Hence it appears that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole body, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them (Neander, Planting and Training, page 32). The Gospel is designed to extend to every climate, in every age, under every variety of race, of national life and character, and of civil institutions; accordingly, its settled, fundamental, necessary rules are few and simple; it establishes principles rather than rules; the very regulations which the apostles made were in many instances of local, temporary use only.

The claim of divine right on the part of the clergy to govern the Church grew up with the hierarchy. SEE EPISCOPACY. Even after the introduction of episcopacy, in the early Church, the bishops and teachers were chosen by the clergy and people; the bishop managed the ecclesiastical affairs of his diocese in council with the presbyters, and "with a due regard to the suffrages of the whole assembly of the people." "In whatever way the control of ecclesiastical affairs by the laity, or, rather, by the whole community, is exercised, there can be no question that it is in them that by the New Testament and by the first ages of Christendom the supremacy over the Church was vested. They elected their ministers. They chose their own faith, they molded their own creed, they administered their own discipline, they were the Ecclesia, 'the Assembly, ‘the Church'" (Dean Stanley Address on Church and State, 1868). But the union of Church and State under Constantine consolidated the hierarchical power, and the rights of the laity gradually fell into abeyance. It is an essential doctrine of the hierarchical system that the duty of teaching includes also the power of ruling; and all Church authority therefore belongs to the clergy, who constitute the ecclesia docens. In the Roman Church the government is entirely in the hands of the organized clerical hierarchy, at the head of which stands the pope (see below).' At the Reformation, Luther adopted the doctrine of the universal priesthood (1Pe 2:5; 1Pe 2:9; Rev 1:6), and this forms the basis of the Lutheran theory of Church polity, in which the rights of the laity are fairly regarded. "Properly, all Christians have a right to teach-every father his own family; and even to administer the sacraments, as even Tertullian truly observes. There is, therefore, truly a jus laicorum sacerdotale, as Grotius, Salmasius, Bohme, and Spener have maintained. Even among the Jews the teachers of the people were not priests, but laymen; and any one who had proper qualifications might teach in the synagogue or in the temple. Among the ancient Israelites the prophets were commonly not from the order of the priesthood, but, for the most part, from other tribes, classes, and orders of the people" (Knapp, Lectures on Christian Theology, Woods' translation, Phila., 1853, 8vo, page 478). Calvin (Institutes, book 4) sets out from the idea of the Church as the body of Christ. He finds a certain "mode of government delivered to us by the pure word of God" (Calvin, 4:1), and traces this form of government in the early Church until its subversion by the papal tyranny" (Calvin, chapter 5). In substance Calvin asserted the following principles:

1. That it is unwarrantable and unlawful to introduce into the government and worship of the Church anything which has not the positive sanction of Scripture.

2. That the Church, though it consists properly and primarily only of the elect or of believers, and though, therefore, visibility and organization are not essential, as Papists allege they are, to its existence, is under a positive obligation to be organized, if possible, as a visible society, and to be organized in all things, so far as possible — its office-bearers, ordinances, worship, and general administration and arrangements — in accordance with what is prescribed or indicated upon these points in the New Testament.

3. That the fundamental principles, or leading features of what is usually called Presbyterian Church government, are indicated with sufficient clearness in the New Testament, as permanently binding upon the Church.

4. That the Church should be altogether free and independent of civil control, and should conduct its own distinct and independent government by presbyters and synods, while the civil power is called upon to afford it protection and support.

5. That human laws, whether about civil or ecclesiastical things, and whether proceeding from civil or ecclesiastical authorities, do not, per se — i.e., irrespective of their being sanctioned by the authority of God — impose an obligation upon the conscience. Calvin professed to find all these principles more or less clearly taught in Scripture (B. and F. Ev. Rev. April, 1860, page 464). On this principle Tulloch remarks (Leaders of the Reformation, page 179 sq.) that Calvin went too far in asserting that Presbyterianism "is the form of the divine kingdom presented in Scripture." "Presbyterianism became the peculiar Church order of a free Protestantism. It rested, beyond doubt, on a true divine order, else it never could have attained this historical success. But it not merely asserted itself to be wise and conformable to Scripture, and therefore divine, but it claimed the direct impress of a divine right for all its details and applications. This gave it strength and influence in a rude and uncritical age, but it planted in it from the first an element of corruption. The great conception which it embodied was impaired at the root by being fixed in a stagnant and inflexible system, which became identified with the conception as not only equally but specially divine" (page 181). "But were not these 'elements,' some will say, really Biblical? Did not Calvin establish his Church polity and Church discipline upon Scripture? and is not this a warrantable course? Assuredly not, in the spirit in which he did it. The fundamental source of the mistake is here. The Christian Scriptures are a revelation of divine truth, and not a revelation of Church polity. They not only do not lay down the outline of such a polity, but they do not even give the adequate and conclusive hints of one; and for the best of all reasons, that it would have been entirely contrary to the spirit of Christianity to have done so; and because, in point of fact, the conditions of human progress do not admit of the imposition of any unvarying system of government, ecclesiastical or civil. The system adapts itself to the life, everywhere expands with it, or narrows with it, but is nowhere in any particular form the absolute condition of life.

A definite outline of Church polity, therefore, or a definite code of social ethics, is nowhere given in the New Testament, and the spirit of it is entirely hostile to the absolute assertion of either the one or the other" (pages 182, 183). Dr. Tulloch, however, goes too far himself in saying that "Presbyterianism not merely asserted itself to be wise and conformable to Scripture, and therefore divine, but it claimed the direct impress of a divine right for all its details and applications.' This statement is untrue. There may be differences of opinion among Presbyterians as to the extent to which a divine right should be claimed for the subordinate features of the system, and some, no doubt, have gone to an extreme in the extent of their claims; but no Presbyterians of eminence have ever claimed 'the direct impress of a divine right for all the details and applications' of their system. They have claimed a divine right, or Scripture sanction, only for its fundamental principles, its leading features. It is these only which they allege are indicated in Scripture in such a way as to be binding upon the Church in all ages. And it is just the same ground that is taken by all the more intelligent and judicious among jure divino prelatists and Congregationalists" (Brit. and For. Ev. Review, April, 1860). Moreover, Calvin did not "unchurch" ecclesiastical bodies which should not choose to adopt the Presbyterian regimen. He introduced his scheme where he had influence to do so; and he employed all the vigor of his talents in pressing upon distant churches the propriety of regulating, in conformity with his sentiments, their ecclesiastical government. But, at the same time, he says, "Wherever the preaching of the Gospel is heard with reverence, and the sacraments are not neglected, there at that time there is a church." Speaking of faithful pastors, he describes them to be "those who by the doctrine of Christ lead men to true piety, who properly administer the sacred mysteries, and who preserve and exercise right discipline."

The Reformers and greatest writers of the Church of England held that no form of Church polity is enjoined in Scripture. Cranmer explicitly declared that bishops and priests were of the same order at the commencement of Christianity; and this was the opinion of several of his distinguished contemporaries. "Holding this maxim, their support of episcopacy must have proceeded from views of expediency, or, in some instances, from a conviction which prevailed very generally at this early period, that it belonged to the supreme civil magistrate to regulate the spiritual no less than the political government; an idea involving in it that no one form of ecclesiastical polity is of divine institution. At a later period, during the reign of queen Elizabeth, we find the same conviction, that it was no violation of Christianity to choose different modes of administering the Church. Archbishop Whitgift, who distinguished himself by the zeal with which he supported the English hierarchy, frequently maintains that the form of discipline is not particularly, and by name, set down in Scripture; and he also plainly asserts "that no form of Church government is by the Scriptures prescribed or commanded to the Church of God" (Watson. s.v.). Hooker maintains this principle with great vigor in his Ecclesiastical Polity (book 3), where the following principles are laid down:

1. The Scripture, though the only standard and law of doctrine, is not a rule for discipline.

2. The practice of the apostles, as they acted according to circumstances, is not an invariable rule for the Church.

3. Many things are left indifferent, and may be done without sin, although not expressly directed in Scripture.

4. The Church, like other societies, may make laws for her own government, provided they interfere not with Scripture.

5. Human authority may interpose where the Scripture is silent.

6. Hence the Church may appoint ceremonies within the limits of the Scriptures. Stillingfleet indicates the same view at large in his Irenicum: "Those things may be said to be jure divino which are not determined one way or other by any positive law of God, but are left wholly as things lawful to the prudence of men, to determine them in a way agreeable to natural right and the general rules of the Word of God." His conclusion is that the reason or ground of Church government, the ratio regiminis ecclesiastici, is of divine right, but that the special mode or system of it is left to human discretion. In other words, it is a thing forever and immutably right that the Church should be under a definite form of government. This is undoubtedly justum. In no other way can the peace and unity of the Church be secured. But it is by no means equally indubitable what this form of government must be. The necessary end may be secured under diverse forms, as in the case of civil government. "Though the end of all be the same, yet monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy are in themselves lawful means for attaining the same common end... . So the same reason of Church government may call for an equality in the persons acting as governors of the Church in one place which may call for superiority and subordination in another" (Irenicum, page 40 sq., Phila. 1840).

In the modern Church the Romanists and High Episcopalians claim divine right for their system of government. The Roman Catholic doctrine is thus stated (The Catechism of the Council of Trent, published by command of pope Pius V, Donovan's translation, Baltimore, n.d., 8vo): "Sitting in that chair in which Peter the prince of the apostles sat to the close of life, the Catholic Church recognizes in his person the most exalted degree of dignity and the full amplitude of jurisdiction — a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on a synodal or other human constitutions, but emanating from no less an authority than God himself. As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate vicar of Jesus Christ, he therefore presides over the universal Church, the father and governor of all the faithful, of bishops also, and of all other prelates, be their station; rank, or power what they may" (page 222). And (page 82), speaking of the power of the keys, "it is a power not given to all; but to bishops and priests only." The following extracts from bishop Forbes' Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles (London and New York, 1867-8, 2 volumes, 8vo) present a High-Church, Episcopalian view of this subject: "Thus one department of the Church is to be called the Ecclesia docens. To the hierarchy, as distinguished from the great body of Christians, is committed the duty of handing down and communicating these truths" (Art. 19, page 268 of volume 1)... . "It having been shown in the preceding article that the Ecclesia docens hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and bath authority in controversies of faith, we come to consider one great channel or organ of that power — the oecumenical council. Given that the Church has this power, by whom or how is it to be exercised? By whom but by the apostolical ministry, who are appointed for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; by those to whom was committed the power of the keys, who had, among: other duties connected with admission to communion, to test the orthodoxy of applicants; by those whose important office it was to hand on the form of sound words which they had received to their successors" (Art. 21 page 288-9 of volume 1)... . "Our Lord is the immediate founder of the hierarchy, because it was he who ordained the apostles bishops when he said to them, 'As my, Father sent me, so send I you; receive the Holy Ghost: go ye into all the world and make disciples of every creature; whatsoever ye shall bind or loose on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven.' These words denote a power without limit; its measure is the wants of humanity, its field of action the world. At the beginning of the Church there was one general episcopate" (Art. 36, page 699 of volume 2). "It is needless to add that the discipline as well as the doctrine of the Church was a purely internal matter, in which the state had no interest nor control... .

The power of binding and loosing was the charter of all Church discipline, for it relegated the sanction of the visible Church into the unseen world. If salvation depended, clave non errante, upon Church membership, and Church membership, under certain laws, was in the hands of the hierarchy, it placed the control of the Church absolutely in their hands" (Art. 37, pages 728-9 of volume 2). The moderate Episcopalians (including Methodists and Moravians) generally hold that episcopacy is in harmony with Scripture, but is not divinely ordained as essential. For a temperate argument in favor of the conformity of the Episcopal Church organization to the Scriptures and the practice of the early Church, see Browne's Exposition on the Thirty-nine Articles (Amer. ed. N.Y. 1865, Art. 23, pages 549-576). Archbishop Whately (The Kingdom of Christ; 2d ed. N.Y. 1843, 12mo) says (page 93): "Thus a further confirmation is furnished of the view that has been taken, viz., that it was the plan of the sacred writers to lay down clearly the principles on which Christian churches were to be formed and governed, leaving the mode of application of those principles undetermined and discretionary." And again (page 213): "They," i.e., reformers compelled to separate, "have an undoubted right, according to the principles I have been endeavoring to establish, to appoint such orders of Christian ministers, and to allot to each such functions as they judge most conducive to the great ends of the society; they may assign to the whole, or to a portion of these, the office of ordaining others as their successors; they may appoint one superintendent of the rest, or several, under the title of patriarch, archbishop, bishop, moderator, or any other that they may prefer; they may make the appointment of them for life or for a limited period by election or by rotation, with a greater or a less extensive jurisdiction." Mr. Wesley (Works, 7:284, N.Y. 1835) says: "As to my own judgment, I still believe the episcopal form of Church government to be scriptural and apostolical. ‘I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is prescribed in Scripture I do not believe.'" Some Presbyterian writers claim that the Presbyterian polity is the only one divinely ordained. (See especially The Divine Right of Church Government, wherein it is proved that the Presbyterian government, by preaching and ruling elders, in sessional, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies, may lay the only lawful claim to a divine right according to the Holy Scriptures, by sundry ministers of Christ within the city of London. With an Appendix, containing extracts from some of the best authors who have written on Church government, N.Y. 1844, 12mo.) The same ground is taken by many of the advocates of the Congregational system (see especially Dexter, On Congregationalism, Boston, 1865, 8vo, chapter 2).

The special forms of ecclesiastical polity adopted by the various churches will be found stated under the name of each Church in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopoedia. We only note, in conclusion, one or two points in which all forms are concerned.

1. Synodical government (by councils, synods, assemblies, conferences, etc.) prevails in all the great churches of the world except the Independent (including Congregationalists and Baptists). Synods have "been the most universally received type of Church government in all ages; even the fact that they have undergone so many modifications only serving to bring out more prominently the unanimity with which they have been upheld on all sides, in the midst of so much discordancy respecting almost every other question connected with ecclesiastical polity. The Greek Church, glorying in its agreement with antiquity, will decide nothing of consequence without them still; in the Latin Church it has never ceased to be customary to appeal to them from the pope; the Church of England, which upholds, and the Church of Geneva, which has abjured episcopacy, have made them part and parcel of their respective ideals; in Russia it is the Holy Governing Synod by which its national Church affects to be ruled. More than this, they were ecclesiastical synods that introduced the principle of representative government to mediaeval Europe" (Foulkes, Christendom's Divisions, 1:11).

2. The right of the laity, as an integral part of the Church, to share in its government, is admitted by all churches except the great hierarchical bodies. In the Church of England, Parliament (a lay body) is the central power in the government of the Church. In the Protestant Episcopal Church lay delegates are admitted to the Diocesan and General Conventions. In the Presbyterian Church they find their place in Presbytery, Synod, and Assembly. In the Independent churches the equality of laymen and ministers as to ecclesiastical rights and powers is fundamental. In the Methodist Episcopal Church the supreme judicatory (the General Conference) is as yet (1869) an exclusively clerical body. But that body has itself admitted the rights of the laity to the fullest extent by submitting to a popular vote (held in June, 1869) the fundamental question whether lay delegation shall be practically incorporated into the ecclesiastical system or not. The vote is by a very large majority in favor of lay delegation, and now (July, 1869) only the concurrence in the proposed changes of the Restrictive Rules of three fourths of all the members of the Annual Conferences, present and voting thereon, is required for the admission of lay delegates to the next General Conference in 1872. In the Methodist Episcopal Church South, this change in its polity was, by the General Conference held in 1866, likewise submitted to the Annual Conferences, and, having received the requisite approval, lay delegation has been incorporated into its economy. This subject of controversy in the Methodist Episcopal churches of the United States seems, therefore, now on the eve of settlement. For other points related to ecclesiastical polity, SEE CHURCH; SEE CHURCH AND STATE; SEE DISCIPLINE; SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE LAITY.

Literature. — Hooker, Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (Works, volume 1); Potter, Discourse of Church Government (Works, volume 2); Stillingfleet, Irenicum (Philad. 1842, 8vo); Watson, Institutes, part 4; Litton, Church of Christ (Lond. 1851, 8vo); Barrett, Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church (Lond. 1854, 12mo); King, Primitive Church (N.Y. 12mo); Stevens, Church Polity (N.Y. 1852, 12mo); Coleman, Primitive Church, page 38-50; Wilson, On Church Government; Davidson (Congregational), Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament (Lond. 1854, 12mo); Morris (Bishop), On Church Polity (18mo); Fillmore Ecclesiastical Polity, its Forms and Philosophy; Ripley (Congregational), Church Polity (Boston, 1867, 18mo); Garratt, Inquiry into the Scriptural View of the Constitution of a Christian Church (Lond. 1848); New Englander, August, 1860, art. 6 (Congregational). Leicester A. Sawyer, Organic Christianity, or the Church of God, saith its Officers and Government, and its Divisions and Variations, both in ancient, mediaeval, and modern Times (Boston, 1854, 12mo; Congregational).

## Ecclesiastical Law[[@Headword:Ecclesiastical Law]]

             SEE CANON LAW.

## Ecclesiasticus[[@Headword:Ecclesiasticus]]

             one of the most important of the apocryphal books of the O.T., SEE APOCRYPHA, being of the class ranked in the second canon. SEE DEUTEPRO-CANONICAL.

I. Title. — The original Hebrew title of this book, according to the authority of the Jewish writings and St. Jerome (Praef. in Libr. Sol. 9:1242), was מְשָׁלַים, Proverbs, or, more fully, מַשְׁלֵי יְשׁוּעִ בֶּן סַירָא, the Proverbs of Jesus, son of Sira, which was abbreviated, according to a very common practice, into בֶּןאּסַירָא Ben-Sira; סַירוּקSiruk, which we find in a few later writers, evidently originated from a desire to imitate the Greek Σιράχ. Hence all the quotations made from this book in the Talmud and Midrashim are under these titles. (Comp. Mishna, Yadaim, 3:15; Chagiga, page 15; Midrash Rabba, page 6, b.; Tanchuma, page 69, a, etc.) The Greek MSS. and fathers, however, as well as the prologue to this book, and the printed editions of the Sept., designate it Σοφία Ι᾿ησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιράχ (v.r. Σειράχ and even Σηράχ), The wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach, or, by way of abbreviation, Σοφία Ξιράχ, The wisdom of Sirach, or simply Sirach; also σοφία ἡπανάρετος, or simply ἡ πανάρετος, The book of all virtues, because of the excellency and diversity of the wisdom it propounds (Jerome, l.c.; comp. Routh, Reli. Sacr. 1:278). In the Syriac version the book is entitled The book of Jesus, the son of Simeon Asiro (i.e., the bound); and the same book is called the wisdom of the Son of Asiro. In many authors it is simply styled Wisdom (Orig. in Mat 13:1-58, § 4; compare Clam. Al. Pad. 1:8, § 69, 72, etc.), and Jesus Sirach (August. ad Simplic. 1:20). The name Ecclesiasticus, by which it has been called in the Latin Church ever since the second half of the fourth century (Rufinus, Vers.; Orig. Hom. in Num 17:3), and which has been retained in many versions of the Reformers (e.g. the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, and [together with the other title] the Authorized Version) is derived from the old Latin version, adopted by Jerome in the Vulgate, and is explained to mean church reading-book. Calmet, however, is of opinion (Preface) that this name was given to it because of its resemblance to Ecclesiastes. But as this explanation of the title is very vague, it is rightly rejected by Luther, and almost all modern critics. The word, like many others of Greek origin, appears to have been adopted in the African dialect (e.g. Tertull. De pudic. c. 22, page 435), and thus it may have been applied naturally in the Vetus Latina to a church reading-book; and when that translation was adopted by Jerome (Profe. in Libro Sal. juxta LXX. 10:404, ed. Migne), the local title became current throughout the West, where the book was most used. The right explanation of the word is given by Rufinus, who remarks that "it does not designate the author of the book, but the character of the writing," as publicly used in the services of the Church (Comm. in Symb. § 38). The special application by Rufinus of the general name of the class (ecclesiastici as opposed to canonici) to the single book may be explained by its wide popularity. Athanasius, for instance, mentions the book (Ep. Fest. s.f.) as one of those "framed by the fathers to be read by those who wish to be instructed (κατηχεῖσθαι) in the word of godliness."

II. Design and Method. — The object of this book is to propound the true nature of wisdom, and to set forth the religious and social duties which she teaches us to follow through all the varied stages and vicissitudes of this life, thus exhibiting the practical end of man's existence by reviewing life in all its different bearings and aspects. Wisdom is represented here, as in Proverbs, as the source of human happiness, and the same views of human life, founded on the belief of a recompense, pervade the instructions of this book also, wherein, however, a more matured reflection is perceptible (De Wette's Einleitung). It is, in fact, the composition of a philosopher who had deeply studied the fortunes and manners of mankind, and did not hesitate to avail himself of the philosophy of older moralists: Ecclesiastes 12:8–13:23; 15:11-20; 16:26–17:20; 19:6-17; 23:16-27; 26:1-18; 30:1-13; 37:27; 38:15, 24:1–39:11, etc. (Ib.). It abounds in grace, wisdom, and spirit, although sometimes more particular in inculcating principles of politeness than those of virtue (Cellerier, Introd. a la Lecture des Liv. Saints). It is not unfrequently marked by considerable beauty and elegance of expression, occasionally rising to the sublimest heights of human eloquence (Christian Remembrancer, volume 9). It has been observed of it by Addison (see Horne's Introd. volume 4) that "it would be regarded by our modern wits as one of the most shining tracts of morality that are extant if it appeared under the name of a Confucius, or of any celebrated Grecian philosopher."

In addition to the fact that no Palestinian production, whether inspired or uninspired, can be reduced to a logically developed treatise according to Aristotelian rules, there are difficulties in tracing the plan of this book, arising from the peculiar circumstances of the author, as well as from the work itself. Ben-Sira brings to the execution of his plan the varied experience of a studious and practical life, and in his great anxiety not to omit any useful lesson which he has gathered, he passes on, after the manner of an Eastern logic, from the nature of heavenly wisdom to her godly teachings, from temptation in her varied forms to filial duties; he discloses before the eyes of his readers the inward workings of the heart and mind, he depicts all passions and aspirations, all the virtues and vices, all the duties towards God and man, in proverbs and apothegms, in sayings which have been the property of the nation for ages, and in maxims and parables of his own creation, with a rapidity and suddenness of transition which even an Eastern mind finds it at times difficult to follow. Add to this that the original Hebrew is lost, that the Greek translation is very obscure, that it has been mutilated for dogmatic purposes, and that some sections are transposed beyond the hope of readjustment, and the difficulty of displaying satisfactorily the method or plan of this book will at once be apparent, and the differences of opinion respecting it will be no matter of surprise. The book (see Fritzsche's proleg. in his Commentar) is divisible into seven parts or sections:

1. Comprising chapters 1–16:21, describes the nature of wisdom, gives encouragements to submit to it, as well as directions for conducting ourselves in harmony with its teachings;

2. 16:22–23:17, shows God in the creation, the position man occupies with regard to his Maker, gives directions how he is to conduct himself under different circumstances, and how to avoid sin;

3. 24:1–30:24; 33:12–36:16a; 30:25-27, describes wisdom and the law, and the writer's position as to the former, gives proverbs, maxims, and admonitions about the conduct of men in a social point of view;

4. 30:28–33:11; 36:16b-22, describes the wise and just conduct of men, the Lord and his people;

5. 36:23–39:11, instructions and admonitions about social matters;

6. 39:12–42:14, God's creation, and the position man occupies with regard to it;

7. 42:11-1, 26, the praise of the Lord, how he had glorified himself in the works of nature, and in the celebrated ancestors of the Jewish people. Thereupon follows an epilogue, chapter 1:27-29, in which the author gives his name, and declares those happy who will ponder over the contents of this book, and act according to it; as well as an appendix, chapter 51:1-30, praising the Lord for deliverance from danger, describing how the writer has successfully followed the paths of wisdom from his very youth, and calling upon the uneducated to get the precious treasures of wisdom. SEE WISDOM PERSONIFIED.

III. Its Unity. — The peculiar difficulties connected both with the plan of the book and the present deranged condition of its text will have prepared the reader for the assertions made by some that there is no unity at all in the composition of this book, and that it is, in fact, a compilation of divers national sayings, from various sources, belonging to different ages (see Davidson, in Horne's Introd. 2:1013 sq.). Encouragement is sought for these assertions from the statement in the spurious prologue of this book, οὐμόνον τὰ ἑτέρων τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συνετῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπαφθέγματα συνήγαγεν, ἀλλἀ καὶ αὐτὸς ἴδιά τινα ἀπεφθέγζατο, as well as from the remark of St. Jerome: "Quorum priorem [πανάρετον Jesu filii Sirach librum] Hebraicum reperi, non Ecclesiasticum ut apud Latinos, sed Parabolas praenenotatum, cui juncti erant Ecclesiastes et Canticum Canticorum, ut similitudinem Salomonis non solum librorum numero, sed etiam materiarum genere cosequaret" (Praef. in Libr. Solom.), which seems to imply that the book of Ben-Sira was intended to answer to all the three reputed works of Solomon. So also Luther. Eichhorn can see in it three different books: the first book consists of chapters 1–23, comprising desultory remarks upon life and morals, and is divisible into two sections, viz. (a) 1–9, and (b) 33; the second book comprises 24–42. 14, begins with a vivid description of wisdom whereupon follow remarks and maxims without any order; and the third book, comprising 42:15-1, 24, is the only portion of Sirach carefully worked out, and contains praise of God and the noble ancestors of the Hebrews (Einleitung in d. Ap. page 50, etc.). Ewald, again, assures us that Ben-Sira made two older works on Proverbs the basis of his book, so that his merit chiefly consists in arranging those works and supplementing them. The first of these two books originated in the fourth century before Christ, extends from chapter 1 to 16:21, and contains the most simple proverbs, written with great calmness. The second book originated in the third century before Christ, extends from 16:22, to 36:22, and displays the excitement of passions as well as some penetrating observations, and has been greatly misplaced in its parts, which Ewald rearranges. The third book, which is the genuine work of Ben-Sira, extends from 36:23, to 51:30, with the exception of the song of praise contained in 39:12-35, which belongs to the author of the second work (Geschichte d. V. Isr. 4:300, etc.; Jahrb. 3:131, etc.). These must suffice as specimens of the opinions entertained by some respecting the unity of this book. Against this, however, is to be urged — I. That the difference in form and contents of some of the constituent parts by no means precludes the unity of the whole, seeing that the writer brought to the illustration of his design the experience of a long life, spent both in study and traveling. 2. That this is evidently the work of the author's life, and was written by him at different periods. 3. That the same design and spirit pervade the whole, as shown in the foregoing section; and, 4. That the abruptness of some portions of it is to be traced to the Eastern style of composition, and more especially to the present deranged state of the Greek translation.

IV. Author and Date. — This is the only apocryphal book the author of which is known. The writer tells us himself that his name is Jesus (Ι᾿ηαοῦς, יְשׁוּעִ, יְהוֹשׁוּעִi.e., Jeshua), the son (Sirach, and that he is of Jerusalem (1:27). Here, therefore, we have the production of a Palestinian Jew. The conjectures which have been made to fill up this short notice are either unwarranted (e.g. that he was a physician, from 38:1-15) or absolutely improbable. There is no evidence to show that he was of priestly descent; and the similarity of names is scarcely a plausible excuse for confounding him with the Hellenizing high-priest Jason (2Ma 4:7-11; Georg. Sync. Chronogr. page 276). In the Talmud, the name of Ben-Sira ( בֶּןאּסַירָאfor which סירוּקis a late error, Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. page 311) occurs in several places as the author of proverbial sayings which in part are parallel to sentences in Ecclesiasticus, but nothing is said as to his date or person, and the tradition which ascribes the authorship of the book to Eliezer (B.C. 260) is without any adequate foundation (Jost, ib.; yet see note 1). The Palestinian origin of the author is, however, substantiated by internal evidence, e.g. 24:10 sq. For the various speculations advanced about the personal character, acquirements, and position of the author, we must refer to the article JESUS, SON OF SIRACH SEE JESUS, SON OF SIRACH . That the book should have been ascribed by the Latin Church to Solomon, notwithstanding this plain declaration of the book itself, the discreditable terms in which Solomon is spoken of, the reference to Solomon's successors, to prophets and other great men who lived before and after the Babylonish captivity, the mention of the twelve minor prophets (49:10), the citation from the prophet Malachi (comp. 48:10, with Mal 4:6), and the description of the high-priest Simon (chapter 1), only shows what the fathers can do.

The age of the book has been, and still is, a subject of great controversy. The life-like description of the high-priest Simon, contained in chapter 1, seems to indicate that the writer had seen this high functionary officiate in the Temple; but there were two high priests of the same name, viz. Simon, son of Onies, surnamed the Just, or the Pious, who lived B.C. cir. 370-300, and Simon 2, son of Onias, who lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philopator, B.C. 217-195 (3Ma 1:2). SEE SIMON. Some interpreters, therefore, are of opinion that Simon 1 is described by Ben-Sira, whilst others think that Simon 2 is intended. The lives and acts of these two pontiffs, however, as well as the esteem in which they were respectively held by the people, as recorded in their national literature, must show to which of these two high- priests the description of Ben-Sira is applicable. 1. The encomiums show beyond doubt that one of Israel's most renowned high-priests is described, whereas Simon 2 was so little distinguished that Josephus cannot relate a single good thing about him. 2. Ben-Sira characterizes him as the deliverer of his people from destruction; whereas in the time of Simon 2 no deliverance of either the people or the Temple was necessary. 3. In the time of Simon 2, Hellenism, the great enemy of Judaism, which was represented by the sons of Tobias, had made great progress; and if Ben- Sira had written about this time, we should have had some censures from this pious poet of these thoughtless and godless innovations, whereas there is no allusion to these throughout the whole of this book. This appears the more strange when it is borne in mind that Simon 2 himself sided with these faithless sons of Tobias, as Josephus distinctly declares (Ant. 12:4, 11). 4. It is utterly impossible that such a man as Simon 2 should be described in such extraordinary terms in the catalogue of national benefactors, and that Simon 1, the personification of goodness, nobility, and grandeur, whom the nation crowned with the title the Just, the Pious, should be passed over with silence. 5. No Jew, on reading so sublime a description of the high-priest, would ever think, with his national traditions before him, of applying it to any one else but the Simon, unless he were distinctly told that it was intended for another Simon. These considerations, therefore, show that Ben-Sira's life-like description refers to Simon 1. Now as Simon 1 died B.C. cir. 300, Ben-Sira must have written his work not earlier than 290-280, as chapter 1 implies that this high-priest was dead. (See also infra, section 6).

V. The original Language of the Book. — The translator of this work into Greek most distinctly declares in his preface that it was written in Hebrew, and St. Jerome assures us that he had seen the Hebrew original (vide supra, section 3). That by the term ῾Εβραϊστί is meant Hebrew, and not Aramaean, is evident from the numerous quotations made from this book both in the Talmud and the Midrashim. Compare

Ben-Sira.   Talmud and Midrashim.

Chapter 3:20      Chagiga, 13; Bereshith Rab. 10.

Chapter 4   Sanhed. 10:100; Yebamoth, 63, b; Erub. 65, a.

Chapter 7:34      Derek Erets, 19, c. 4.

Chapter 9:8 Sanhed. 100, b; Yebamnoth, 63. Chapter 9:12 (Syriac) Aboth, 1:5. Chapter 11:27 Je. Berach. 29, a; Nazir, 18, a; Beresh. Rab. 78, b.

Chapter 11:27     Sanhed. 100.

Chapter 13:15     Baba Kama, 92, b.

Chapter 13:25     Bereshith Rabba, 82.

Chapter 13:31     Bereshith Rabba, 64, b.

Chapter 14:11     Erubin, 54, a.

Chapter 14:17     Erubin, 71.

Chapter 15:8      Pesachim, 66; Erubin, 55, a.

Chapter 18:23     Tanchuma Vayikra, 41, b.

Chapter 25:3, 4   Pesachim, 113.

Chapter 25:13     Sabbath, 11, a.

Chapter 26:1      Sanhed. 100; Yebamoth, 63, b.

Chapter 26:20     Nida, 70.

Chapter 27:9      Baba Kama, 92, b.

Chapter 28:14     Vayikra Rab. 153, a.

Chapter 30:21     Sanhed. 100, b.

Chapter 30:25     Yebamoth, 63, b.

Chapter 38:1      Sanhed. 41; Taanith, 9, a; Shemoth. R, 106, b.

Chapter 38:4, 8         Beresh. Rab. S, a; Yalkut Job, 148.

Chapter 38:16-23  Moed Katon, 27.

Chapter 40:28           Betza. 32, b; Yalkut Job, 149.

Chapter 42:9, 10  Sanhedrin, 100, b.

By some writers, however, it is thought that the Sentences of Ben-Sirach, cited in the Talmud (Sanhed. Gem. 11:42; Bereschith Rabba, 8, f. 10; Baba Kama f. 92, c. 2), and published in Latin by Paul Fagius (1542), and in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Latin by Drusius (1597), though so similar to those in Ecclesiasticus, are, upon the whole, a different work (Eichhorn's and Bertholdt's Introductions).

Almost all of these quotations are in Hebrew, though the works in which they are found are in Aramaan, thus showing beyond doubt that the book of Ben-Sira was written in genuine Hebrew. Besides, some of the blunders in the Greek can only be accounted for from the fact that the original was Hebrew. Thus, for example, in 24:25 we read, "He maketh knowledge to come forth as light, as Gihon in the days of vintage," where the parallelism Γηών῟ גַיחוֹן (Gen 2:13), whereby the Nile was designated in later times, which the Sept. also understands by שַׁיחוֹר (Jer 2:18), shows that ώς φώς in the first hemistich originated from the translator's mistaking the Hebrew כיאורlike a stream, for כאיר, like light. Compare also 49:9, which is most unintelligible in the Greek through the translator's mistaking the Hebrew בזים for בזרם Bishop Lowth, indeed, went so far as to assert that the translator "seems to have numbered the words, and exactly to have preserved their order, so that, were it literally and accurately to be retranslated, I have very little doubt that, for the most part, the original diction would be recovered." The learned prelate has actually retranslated chapter 24 into Hebrew (Hebrew Poet. Lecture 24, Oxford ed. 1821, page 254). This retranslation is also printed by Fritzsche, who has added some corrections of his own, and who also gives a translation of chapter 1.

VI. The Greek and other Translations of this Book. — The Greek translation incorporated in the Sept. was made by the grandson of the author (ὀ πάππος μου Ι᾿ησοῦς), who tells us that he came from Palestine into Egypt in his thirty-eighth year, "in the reign of Euergetes" (ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εùεργέτου βασιλεως). But there were two kings who have borne this name — Euergetes I, son and successor of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, B.C. 247-222, and Euergetes II, i.e., Ptolemy VII, known by the nickname Physcon, the brother of Ptolemy VI, B.C. 145-116, and the question is, which of these two is meant? Now, if Ben-Sira wrote B.C. cir. 290-280, when an old man, and if we take ὀ πάππος μου to mean great-grandfather, a sense which it frequently has, and that the translator was born after the death of his illustrious ancestor, his arrival in Egypt in his thirty-eighth year would be B.C. cir. 230, i.e., in the reign of Euergetes I. On the other hand, the manner in which the translator speaks of the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament, and the familiarity which he shows with its language (e.g. 44:16, Ε᾿νὼχ μετετέθη , Gen 5:24; comp. Linde, ap. Eichhorn, pages 41, 42), is scarcely consistent with a date so early as the middle of the third century. Winer (Deutr. Sirac. atate, Erlang. 1832) maintains that Simon the Just is the person referred to, but that it is not necessary to conclude that the author was his contemporary. He thinks that, although the grammatical construction rather requires ἔτει τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ Εùεργέτου to refer to the age of the monarch's reign, Euergetes the Second was the king in whose reign the translation was made, and that the canon could not have been yet closed under the reign of the first Euergetes, as implied in the preface — "the law, the prophets, and the other books." As there appears to be no special reason for the translator's reference to his own age, the date has been taken to allude to that of the reigning Ptolemy by many critics since Eichhorn, e.g. by Bruch, Palfrey, Davidson, Ewald, Fritzsche, etc. The "thirty-eighth year of his reign," although not applicable to the first Euergetes, may refer to the second, if his regency be included. According to this, which De Wette conceives the most probable hypothesis, the translator would have lived B.C. 130, and the author B.C. 180. But if, with most interpreters, the chronological datum in question refers to the translator's own age, then the grandson of the author was already past middle-age when he came to Egypt; and if his visit took place early in the reign of Ptolemy Physcon, it is quite possible that the book itself was written while the name and person of the last of "the men of the great synagogue" was still familiar to his countrymen. Even if the date of the book be brought somewhat lower than the times of Simon the Just, the importance of the position which that functionary occupied in the history of the Jews would be a sufficient explanation of the distinctness of his portraiture; and the political and social troubles to which the book alludes (2:6, 12; 36, sq.) seem to point to the disorders which marked the transference of Jewish allegiance from Egypt to Syria rather than to the period of prosperous tranquility which was enjoyed during the supremacy of the earlier Ptolemies. On the whole, therefore, we may conclude that the book was probably written B.C. cir. 200, and translated B.C. cir. 140.

The present state of this translation, however, is very deplorable; the text as well as the MSS. are greatly disfigured by numerous interpolations, omissions, and transpositions. The Old Latin version, which Jerome adopted in the Vulgate without correcting it, was made from this Greek translation, and, besides being barbarous in style, is also greatly mutilated, and in many instances cannot be harmonized with its original. Even in the first two chapters the following words occur which are found in no other part, of the Vulgate: defunctio (1:13), religiositas (1:17, 18, 26), compartior (1:24), inhonoratio (1:38), obductio (2:2; 5:1, 10), receptibilis (2:5). The Syriac alone is made direct from the Hebrew, and contains a quotation made by Joseben-Jochanan about 150 B.C. (comp. Aboth, 1:5 with Ben-Sira 9:12), which the secondary versions have not, because it was dropped from the Greek. Notwithstanding the ill treatment and the changes which this version has been subjected to, it is still one of the best auxiliaries for the restoration of the old text. The Arabic seems to have been made from the Syriac; whilst the old English version of Coverdale, as usual, follows the Zurich Bible and the Vulgate, the Bishops' Bible again copies Coverdale; the Geneva version, as is often the case, departs from the other English version for the better. The present A.V. chiefly follows the Complutensian edition of the Greek and the Latin Vulgate. The arrangement, however, of chapters 30:25–36:17 in the Vatican and Complutensian editions is very different. The English version here follows the latter, which is supported by the Latin and Syriac versions against the authority of the Uncial MSS. The extent of the variation may be seen in the following table:

Compl., Lat., Syr, A. V.     Vat., WSS. "A, B, C."

Chapter 30:25     33:13, λαμπρὰ καρδία, κ.τ.λ.

Chapter 31, 32                     34, 35.

Chapter 33:16, 17, ἠγρύπνησα       36:1-16.

Chapter 33:10 sq. ὡς καλαμώμενος   30:25 sq.

Chapter 34, 35                     31, 32.

Chapter 36:1-11, φυλάς Ι᾿ακώβ      33:1-13.

Chapter 36:12 sq καὶ κατεκ-        36:17 sq. ληρονόμησαμησα

The most important interpolations are: 1:5, 7; 18b, 21; 3:25; 4:23b; 7:26b; 10:21; 12:6c, 13:25b; 16:15, 16, 22c; 17:5, 9, 16, 17a, 18, 21, 23c, 26b; 18:2b, 3, 27c, 33c; 19:5b, 6a, 13b, 14a, 18, 19, 21, 25c; 20:3, 14b, 17b, 32; 22:9, 10, 23c; 23:3e, 4c, 5b, 28; 24:18, 24; 26:12, 26c; 26:19-27; 1, 29b.

All these passages, which occur in the A.V. and the Compl. texts, are wanting in the best MSS. The edition of the Syro-Hexaplaric MS. at Milan, which is at present reported to be in preparation (since 1858), will probably contribute much to the establishment of a sounder text.

The name of the Greek translator is unknown. He is commonly supposed to have borne the same name as his grandfather, but this tradition rests only on conjecture or misunderstanding (Jerome, Synops. S. Script. printed as a Prologue in the Compl. ed. and in the A.V.).

VII. Canonicity. — Though this book has been quoted in the Jewish Church as early as B.C. 150 and 100, by Jose ben-Jochanan (Aboth, 1:5) and Simon ben-Shetach (Nazis, Gen 5:3), and references to it are dispersed through the Talmud and Midrashim (aide sup. section 5), yet these latter declare most distinctly that it is not canonical. Thus Yadaim, c. 2, says the book of Ben-Sira, and all the books written from its time and afterwards, are not canonical. We also learn from this remark that Ben-Sira is the oldest of all apocryphal books, thus confirming the date assigned to it in section 4. Again, the declaration made by R. Akiba, that he who studies uncanonical books will have no portion in the world to come (Mishna, Sanhed. 10:1), is explained by the Jeremiah Talmud to mean the books of Ben-Sira and Ben-Laanah (comp. the Midrash on Coheleth 12:12). It was never included by the Jews among their Scriptures; for though it is quoted in the Talmud, and at times like the Kethubim, yet the study of it was forbidden, and it was classed among "the outer books" סְפָרַים חַעוֹנַים, that is, probably, those which were not admitted into the Canon (Dukes, Rabb. Blumenlese, page 24 sq.).

Allusions to this book have been supposed to be not unfrequently discernible in the New Testament (compare, especially, Sir 33:13; Rom 9:21; Rom 11:19; Luk 12:19-20; Luk 5:11; Jam 1:19, etc.; 24:17, 18; Mat 11:28-29; Joh 4:13-14; Joh 6:35, etc.). The earliest clear coincidence with the contents of the book occurs in the epistle of Barnabas (c. 19 = Sir 4:31; compare Const. Apost. 7:11), but in this case the parallelism consists in the thought and not in the words, and there is no mark of quotation. There is no sign of the use of the book in Justin Martyr, which is the more remarkable, as it offers several thoughts congenial to his style. The first distinct quotations occur in Clement of Alexandria; but from the end of the second century the book was much used and cited with respect, and in the same terms as the canonical Scriptures; and its authorship was often assigned to Solomon, from the similarity which it presented to his writings (August. De Cura pro Mort. 18). Clement speaks of it continually as Scripture (Pad. 1:8, § 62; 2:2, § 34; 5, § 46; 8, § 69, etc.), as the work of Solomon (Strom. 2:5, § 24), and as the voice of the great Master (παιδαγωγός, Pad. 2:10, § 98). Origen cites passages with the same formula as the canonical books (γέγραπται, in Johann. 32, § 14; in Mat 16:1-28, § 8), as Scripture (Comm. in Matthew § 44; in Ep. ad Rom 9:1-33, § 17, etc.), and as the utterance of "the divine word" (c. Cels. 8:50). The other writers of the Alexandrine school follow the same practice. Dionysius calls its words "divine oracles" (Frag. de Nat. 3, page 1258, ed. Migne), and Peter Martyr quotes it as the work of "the Preacher" (Frag. 1, § 5, page 515, ed. Migne). The passage quoted from Tertullian (De exhort. cast. 2, "Sicut scriptum est: Ecce posui ante te bonum et malum; gustati enim de arbore agnitionis," etc.; compare Sir 15:17, Vulg.) is not absolutely conclusive; but Cyprian constantly brings forward passages from the book as Scripture (De bono pat. 17; De mortalitate, 9, § 13), and as the work of Solomon (Ep. 65:2). The testimony of Augustine sums up briefly the result which follows from these isolated authorities. He quotes the book constantly himself as the work of a prophet (Serm. 39:1), the word of God (Sermon 87:11), "Scripture" (Lib. de Nat. 33), and that even in controversy (c. Jul. Pelag. 5:36); but he expressly notices that it was not in the Hebrew Canon (De Cura pro Maort. 18), "though the Church, especially of the West, had received it into authority" (De Civit. 17:20; compare Speculum, 3:1127, ed. Paris). Jerome; in like manner (Praef. in Sap. Sir. § 7), contrasts the book with "the canonical Scriptures" as "doubtful," while they are "sure," and in another place (Prol. Galeat.) he says that it "is not in the Canon," and again (Prol. in Libr. Sol.), that it should be read " for the instruction of the people (plebis), not to support the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines." The book is cited by Hippolytus (Opp. p. 192) and by Eusebius (Opp. 4:21, etc.), but is not quoted by Irenaeus; and it is not contained in the Canon of Melito, Origen, Cyril, Laodicea, Hilary, or Rufinus. SEE CANON.

But while the book is destitute of the highest canonical authority, it is a most important monument of the religious state of the Jews at the period of its composition. As an expression of Palestinian theology it stands alone; for there is no sufficient reason for assuming Alexandrine interpolations, or direct Alexandrine influence (Gfrorer, Philo, 2:18 sq.). The translator may, perhaps, have given an Alexandrine coloring to the doctrine, but its great outlines are unchanged (comp. Dahne, Relig. Philos. 2:129 sq.). The conception of God as Creator, Preserver, and Governor is strictly conformable to the old Mosaic type; but, at the same time, his mercy is extended to all mankind (18:11-13). Little stress is laid upon the spirit world, either good (48:21; 45:2; 39:28?) or evil (21:27?), and the doctrine of a resurrection fades away (14:16; 17:27, 28; 44:14, 15. Yet comp. 48:11). In addition to the general hope of restoration (36:1, etc.), one trait only of a Messianic faith is preserved, in which the writer contemplates the future work of Elias (48:10). The ethical precepts are addressed to the middle class (Eichhorn, Einl. page 44 sq.). The praise of agriculture (7:15) and medicine (38:1 sq.), and the constant exhortations to cheerfulness, seem to speak of a time when men's thoughts were turned inwards with feelings of despondency and perhaps (Dukes, u.s. page 27 sq.) of fatalism. At least the book marks the growth of that anxious legalism which was conspicuous in the sayings of the later doctors. Life is already imprisoned in' rules: religion is degenerating into ritualism: knowledge has taken refuge in schools (compare Ewald, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr. 4:298 sq.). — Kitto, s.v.; Smith, s.v.

VIII. Commentaries, etc. — Special exegetical works which have appeared on the whole of this book are the following, of which the chief are designated by an asterisk prefixed: Rabanus Maurus, In Ecclesiasticuna (in his Opp.); Anon. Beschreib. u. Uebers. (in Lorsbach's Archiv, 2:11 sq.); Alexander, De libro Ecclus. (in his Hist. Ecclesiastes 3:690); Bengel, Muthmassliche Quelle, etc. (in Eichhorn's Bibliothek, 7:852-64); De Sacy, L'Ecclesiastique (in his Sainte Bible, 16); Bossuet, Liber Ecclus. (in his OEuvres, 22:1 sq.); Couz, Bemerkangen (in Henke's Hus. 2:177-243); \*Camerarius, Sententiae J.S. (Lips. 1570, 8vo); Sapientia J.S. (Lips. 1570, 8vo); Striegel, in his Libri Sapientiae (Lpz. 15,5, 12mo), page 277 sq.; Drusius, Ecclus. interpretatus (Franecker, 1596, 4to); Hoschel, Sap. Sirachi (Augsb. 1604, 4to; also in the Crit. Sacri, 5); \*a Lapide, Commentarius (Antwerp, 1634, 1687, fol.); Stiffer, Homiliae (Lips. 1676, 4to); Calmet, Commentarius (Paris, 1707, fol.; in Latin, ed. Manse, Wirceb. 1792; 8:351 sq.); \*Arnald, Crit. Commentary (Lond. 1748, fol., and often since); Koken, Das. B. Sirach (Hildesheim, 1756, 12mo); Teleus, Disquisitiones (Hafn. 1779, 8vo); Bauer, Erlaut. m. Anmerk. (Bamberg, 1781, 1793, 8vo); Onymus, Weisheit J.S. (Wtirtzburg, 1788, 8vo); Sonntag, De Jes. Siracide (Riga, 1792, 4to); \*Linde, Sententiae Jes. Sir. (Danz. 1795, 4to); also Glaubens a. Sittenlehre Jes. Sir. (Lpz. 1782, 1795, 8vo); Zange, Denkspruche Jes. Sir. (Amst. 1797, 8vo); Feddersen, Jes. Sir. ubers. (Anst. 1797, 1827, 8vo); BenSeeb, חָכְמִת יְהוֹשֻׁעִ,etc. (8vo, Breslau, 1798; Vienna, 1807, 1818, 1828); 5Bretschneider, Lib. Jesu Sirae (Ratisbon, 1806, 8vo); Gaab, Diss. exegetica (Tubing. 1809, 4to); Luther, Das Buch J.S. (Lpz. 1815, 1816, 12mo); Anon. Jes. S. bearbeit. (Lpz. 1826, 8vo); Howard, Ecclus. tr. from the Vulg. (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Anon. Sirach, ein Spiegel (Kreuznach, 1829, 8vo); Van Gilse, Commentatio (Gran. 1832, 4to); Grimm, Commentar (Lpz. 1837, 8vo); Gutmann, Weisheits-Spruch J.S. (Altona, 1841, 8vo); Dulk, סֵפֶר בֶּןאּסַירָא (Warsaw, 1843, 8vo); Stern, Weisheitsspruche J.S. ('Wien, 1844, 8vo); Hill, Translation (in the Monthly Religious Mag. Bost. 185253); \*Fritzsche, Weish. J.S. erklaut u. ubers. (as part of the Kurtzg. Exag. Handb. z.d. Apokr. Lpz. 1860, 8vo); Cassel, Uebers. (Berl. 1866, 8vo). See also Rabiger, Ethice Apoc. V.T. (Vratislaw, 1838); Bruch, Weisheits- Lehre der Hebraer (Strasb. 1851); Geiger, in the Zeitschr. d. Morgenl. Gesellsch. 1858, page 536 sq.; Horowitz, Das Buch Sirach (Bresl. 1865). SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Ecclesiasticus (2)[[@Headword:Ecclesiasticus (2)]]

             (1), Any person in orders, whether major or minor.

(2) Isidore of Seville speaks of a clerk occupying his dace position in the hiearchy as an "ecclesiastical clerk," in distinction from an irregular clerk.

(3) Those who were so connected with a Church as to be unable to leave; its service were called in a special sense “ecclesiastical men.” They were not slaves.

## Ecclesiecdici[[@Headword:Ecclesiecdici]]

             (Church lawyers), the chancellors (q.v.) of bishops.

## Ecclesiology[[@Headword:Ecclesiology]]

             "a word, of recent use, is the name which has been given in the British Islands to the study of Church architecture and decoration. Besides discriminating the various styles of ecclesiastical architecture, ecclesiology takes account of the ground plan and dimensions of a church; of its orientation, or the deviation of its line from the true east; of its apse, or circular or polygonal east end; of its altar or communion-table, whether fixed or movable, stone or wood; of its reredos, dossel, or altar-screen; of its piscina, or basin and drain for pouring away the water in which the chalice was rinsed, or the priest washed his hands; of the sedilia, or seats for the priest, deacon, and subdeacon, during the celebration of the Eucharist; of the aumbrye, or locker, for the preservation of the communion vessels and elements; of the 'Easter sepulcher,' or recess for the reception of the host from Good Friday till Easter day; of the altar- candlesticks; of the altar-steps; of the altar-rails; of the credence table, or shelf on which to place the communion elements before they were put upon the altar; of the 'misereres,' or elbowed stalls; of seats within and without the chancel walls; of the height of the chaincel as compared with the nave; of the chancel arch; of the rood-screen, rood-staircase, rood- door, and roodloft; of the piers or columns; of the triforium or blindstory; of the clerestory; of the windows; of the parvise-turret, or outside turret leading to the parvise; of the roof or groining; of the eagle-desks and lecturns; of the pulpit; of the hour-glass stand, by which the preacher was warned not to weary the patience of the flock; of the reading pew; of the benches, pews, and galleries; of the aisles; of the shrine, fertour, or reliquary; of the benatura, or holy-water stoup; of the corbels, with special reference to the head-dress figured on them; of the pavement; of the belfry; of the baptismal font, with its accessories, the baptistery, the steps, the kneeling-stone, the chrismatory, the cover, and the desk; of the tower, with its lantern, parapet, pinnacles, louvres, windows, buttresses, and bells; of the porch and doors, with their niches and seats; of the parvise, or priest's chamber, above the porch; of the mouldings; of the pinnacle crosses; of the gurgoyles, or rain-spouts; of the church-yard or village cross; of the church-yard yew; of the lych-gate, or corpse-gate, where the corpse was met by the priest; of the crypt; of the confessional; of the hagioscope, or opening in the chancel arch through which the elevation of the host might be seen; of the lynchnoscope, or low window in the side wall of the. chancel, the use of which is uncertain; of the chest for alms; of the table of the ten commandments; of the church plate; of the faldstool, or litany stool; of the embroidered work; of the images of saints; of the church well; of the sepulchral monuments and brasses, with their inscriptions; of the chapels or sacristies; of the vestry; of the dedication crosses. Ecclesiology has a literature of its own, including a monthly journal, called The Ecclesiologist. There are societies for promoting its study, one of which, ‘The Ecclesiological, late Cambridge Camden, Society,' has published A Handbook of English Ecclesiology (Lond, 1847)."

## Ecclesius[[@Headword:Ecclesius]]

             (1) Bishop of Ravenna; AD, 522-533,

(2) Bishop of Chiusi (Clusium), A.D. 600-602.

## Ecdici[[@Headword:Ecdici]]

             (ἔκδικοι), certain officers appointed in consequence of the legal disability of clergy and monks to represent the Church in civil affairs. SEE ADVOCATE OF THE CHURCH.

## Ecdippa[[@Headword:Ecdippa]]

             SEE ACHZIB.

## Ecfrith[[@Headword:Ecfrith]]

             fifth abbot of Glastonbury, A.D. 719-729.

## Echard[[@Headword:Echard]]

             Jacques, a learned Dominican, was born at Rouen September 22, 1644, and died at Paris March 15, 1724. He published S. Thomae Summa suo autori vindicata, sice de V.F. Vincentii Bellovacensis scriptis dissertation in qua quid de speculo morali sentiendum aperitur (1708, 8vo). He has contributed to illustrate his order by the "Library of Dominican Writers" (Scriptores ordinis Prcedicatorum recens. notisque illustrati, inchoavit J. Quetif, absolvit J. Echard [Par. 1719-21, 2 vols. fol.]), which is held in high esteem by all bibliographers. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gengr. 15:623.

## Echard, Lawrence A.M[[@Headword:Echard, Lawrence A.M]]

             archdeacon of Stowe, was born in Suffolk about 1671, and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge. He was presented to the livings of Welton and Elkinton, Lincolnshire, and was made archdeacon of Stowe and prebendary of Lincoln in 1712. He died August 16, 1730. In his History of England, written on High-Church principles, he relates facts with perspicuity; and the work is rendered entertaining by short characters of the most eminent literary men in the different periods of history. At present his writings are little valued. His chief works are,

(1) A general Ecclesiastical History, from the Nativity of our Savior to the first Establishment of Christianity by human Laws under Constantine (Lond. 1722 2 vols. 8vo, 6th edit.): —

(2) The Roman History, from the building of the City to the removal of the imperial Seat by Constantine the Great (Lond. 1707, 4 volumes, 8yo): —

(3) The History of England to the end of the Revolution (Lond. 1707- 18, 3 volumes, fol.). — Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1:540; Kippis, Biographia Britannica, 5:552.

## Echi[[@Headword:Echi]]

             (Lat. Echea or Achea), an Irish saint, sister of St. Patrick, is commemorated August 5.

## Echlech[[@Headword:Echlech]]

             an Irish saint, son of Daighre and brother of Caemhan, is commemorated August 14.

## Echtach[[@Headword:Echtach]]

             (Lat. Ectacia), an Irish virgin saint, is commemorated February 5.

## Echtbrann[[@Headword:Echtbrann]]

             abbot of Glendalough, County Wicklow, died A.D. 795.

## Eck or Eckius Johannes[[@Headword:Eck or Eckius Johannes]]

              (Johann Mayr von Eck), one of the most capable and violent of Luther's opponents, was born in Suabia, November 13, 1486, the son of a peasant. He was educated at Heidelberg and Tubingen, and in 1516 was made professor and vicechancellor at Ingolstadt. His intense ambition for literary fame stimulated him to unwearied activity and industry. In 1512 he was made vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt. In 1514 he published Centuriae vi de Praedestinatione; and lectured and wrote; on all sorts of subjects from 1514 to 1518. Ranke describes him as follows: "Eck was one of the most eminent scholars or his time, a reputation which he had spared no pains to acquire. He had visited the most celebrated professors in various universities: the Thominist Sustern at Cologne, the Scotists Sumenhard and Scriptoris at Tubingen; he had attended the law lectures of Zasius in Freiburg, those on Greek of Reuchlin, on Latin of Bebel, on cosmography of Reusch. In his twentieth year he began to write and to lecture at Ingolstadt upon Occam and Biel's canon law, on Aristotle's dialectics and physics, the most difficult doctrines of dogmatic theology, and the subtleties of nominalistic morality; he then proceeded to the study of the mystics, whose most curious works had just fallen into his hands: he set himself; as he says, to establish the connection between their doctrines and the Orphicoplatonic philosophy, the sources of which are to be sought in Egypt and Arabia, and to discuss the whole in five parts (Eckii Epistola de rationae studiorum suorum, in Strobel, Miscellanea, 3:97). He was one of those learned men who held that the great questions which had occupied men's minds were essentially settled; who worked exclusively with the analytical faculty and the memory; who were always on the watch to appropriate to themselves a new subject with which to excite attention, to get advancement, and to secure a life of ease and enjoyment. His strongest taste was for disputation, in which he had made a brilliant figure in all the universities we have mentioned, as well as in Heidelberg, Mainz, and Basle: at Freiburg he had early presided over a class (the Bursa zum Pfauen) where the chief business was practice in disputation; he then took long journeys — for example, to Vienna and Bologna — expressly to dispute there. It is most amusing to see in his letters the satisfaction with which he speaks of his Italian journey: how he was encouraged to undertake it by a papal nuncio; how, before his departure, he was visited by the young markgrave of Brandenburg; the very honorable reception he experienced an his way, in Italy as well as in Germany, from both spiritual and temporal lords, who invited him to their tables; how, when certain young men had ventured to contradict him at one of these dinners, he had confuted them with the utmost ease, and left them filled with astonishment and admiration; and lastly, how, in spite of manifold opposition, he had at last brought the most learned of the learned in Bologna to subscribe to his maxims" (Riederer, Nachrichten, 3:47).

With such antecedents, Eck was prepared to take up arms against Luther (as, indeed, he was ready to take up arms against any man). They had been good friends, and Luther sent him his Theses. SEE LUTHER. Against these, in 1518, Eck wrote animadversions under the title Obelisci (given in Loscher, Vollst. Ref. Act. 2:333 sq.), which were freely circulated, though the writer declared they were not meant to be published. Eck was at that time inquisitor for Bavaria, and what he said and wrote had great weight in fixing upon a man the reputation of heresy. Carlstadt (q.v.), at Luther's request, replied in 406 theses, in which he assailed both the learning and the orthodoxy of Eck, and very satirically. The controversy ended in a public Disputation, to which Carlstadt challenged Eck. According to a letter of Luther, written to Eck November 15, 1518, Luther seems to have cherished the hope of a friendly settlement of the difficulty; but Eck was only puffed up by this tenderness of Luther, and in February, 1519, he printed an outline for the expected disputation, in which he endeavored again to impeach the University of Wittenberg, but more especially Carlstadt and Luther, particularly the latter, as holding heretical doctrines on penitence and on the papal power. Malice only could have inspired Eck here, as Luther had at that very time promised to Miltitz to discontinue the dispute. Luther was, of course, relieved from his promise, and he so declared to the elector Frederick on the 13th of March. He wrote at once a reply to Eck, so unanswerable in all its points, and so full of severity, that Eck could no longer remain in doubt as to the fate which awaited him at Leipzig. Eck's aim was undoubtedly not so much to gain the mastery over Carlstadt as over Luther. He published (February, 1519) thirteen theses, which he professed himself willing to defend against Luther. They referred chiefly to the doctrine of penitence and absolution, and the thirteenth especially sought to provoke an answer from Luther which should make him liable to the Inquisition for heresy. It read: "Romanam Ecclesiam non fuisse superiorem aliis Ecclesiis ante tempora Sylvestri, negamus. Sed eum, qui sedem beatissimi Petri habuit et fidem, successorem Petri et Vicarium Christi generalem semper agnovimus." Eck here really gained his object.

Luther accepted the challenge, and answered it by the following: "Romanam Ecclesiam esse omnibus aliis superiorem, probatur ex frigidissimis Rom. Pontificum decretis, intra quadringentos annos natis. CONTRA quae sunt historiae approbatae mille et centum annorum, textus scriptuare divinae et decretum Niceni Concilii omnium sacratissimi." Eck, eager to bring Luther into a still more inextricable position as heretic, advanced, March 14, 1519, the following: "Excusatio adversus criminationes Fr. AM. Lutheri, ordinis Eremitarum," with the accusation that Luther was a coward, and that he only endeavored to advance Carlstadt in order that he might himself safely retreat. To this Luther replied in another "Excusatio FP. Martini Lutheri adversus criminationes Dr. Jo. Eckii," and with the assertion "Ich furchte mich weder vor dem Pabste and des Pabstes Namen noch vor Pabstchen and Pappen" (I am neither afraid of the pope or the pope's name, nor of popelings or puppets"). But Eck succeeded at least in frightening some true friends of Luther, and it was no easy task to quiet Spalatinus, who had grown very doubtful as to the final result of the dispute. But Luther was already decided not to spare the Roman see. The Roman Church he calls (De Wette, Luther's Briefe, 1:260) "Babylon; "the power of the Roman pontiff he counts among worldly powers (ib. 1:264). Meanwhile many causes delayed disputation. At last the personal interference of duke George, who asked of the bishop "not to defend the lazy priests, but to oblige them to meet the battle manfully, unless the pope should interfere," removed all obstacles.

The session opened at Leipsic June 27, 1519, and from that date to July 3 Eck and Carlstadt were the disputants. Eck admitted that the Scriptures were the ultimate rule of doctrine, and maintained a synergistic doctrine as to grace and free-will. Carlstadt supported the doctrine of the impotency of the will, and that good works are from grace alone. The controversy led to no result. "On Monday, the 4th of July, at seven in the morning, Luther arose; the antagonist whom Eck most ardently desired to meet, and whose rising fame he hoped to crush by a brilliant victory, He stood in the prime of manhood, and in the fullness of his strength: he was in his thirty-sixth year; his voice was melodious and clear; he was perfectly versed in the Bible, and its aptest sentences presented themselves unbidden to his mind; above all, he inspired an irresistible conviction that he sought the truth. The battle immediately commenced on the question of the authority of the papacy, which, at once intelligible and important, riveted universal attention. It was immediately obvious that Luther could not maintain his assertion that the pope's primacy dated only from the last four centuries: he soon found himself forced from this position by ancient documents; and the rather, that no criticism had as yet shaken the authenticity of the false decretals. But his attack on the doctrine that the primacy of the pope (whom he still persisted in regarding as the oecumenical bishop) was founded in Scripture and by divine right, was fair more formidable. Christ's words, 'Thou art Peter; feed my sheep,' which have always been cited in this controversy, were brought forward. In the exposition by Nicolas Lyranus also, of which Luther made the most use, there occurs this explanation, differing from that of the curia, of the passage in Matthew, chapter 16: 'Quia tu es Petrus, i.e., confessor verae petrae qui est Christus factus; et super hanc petram, quam confessus es, i.e., super Christum, adificabo ecclesiam meam.' Luther labored to support the already well- known explanation of them, at variance with that of the curia, by other passages which record similar commissions given to the apostles. Eck quoted passages from the fathers in support of his opinions, to which Luther opposed others from the same source. As soon as they got into these more recondite regions, Luther's superiority became incontestable. One of his main arguments was that the Greeks had never acknowledged the pope, and yet had not been pronounced heretics; the Greek Church had stood, was standing, and would stand without the pope; it belonged to Christ as much as the Roman. Eck did not hesitate at once to declare that the Christian and the Roman Church were one; that the churches of Greece and Asia had fallen away, not only from the pope, but from the Christian faith — they were unquestionably heretics in the whole circuit of the Turkish empire, for instance, there was not one soul that could be saved, with the exception of the few who adhered to the pope of Rome. 'How?' said, Luther; 'would you pronounce damnation on the whole Greek Church, which has produced the most eminent fathers, and so many thousand saints, of whom not one had even heard of a Roman primate?

Would Gregory of Nazianzen, would the great Basil, not be saved? or would the pope and his satellites drive them out of heaven?' These expressions prove how greatly the omnipotence and exclusive validity of the forms of the Latin Church, and the identity with Christianity which she claimed, were shaken by the fact that, beyond her pale, the ancient Greek Church, which she had herself acknowledged, stood in all the venerable authority of her great teachers. It was now Eck's turn to be hard pressed: he repeated that there had been many heretics in the Greek Church, and that he alluded to them, not to the fathers — a miserable evasion, which did not in the least touch the assertion of his adversary. Eck felt this, and hastened back to the domain of the Latin Church. He particularly insisted that Luther's opinion — that the primacy of Rome was of human institution, and not of divine right was an error of the poor brethren of Lyons, of Wickliffe and Huss; but had been condemned by the popes, and especially by the general councils wherein dwelt the spirit of God, and recently at that of Constance.

This new fact was as indisputable as the former. Eck was not satisfied with Luther's declaration that he had nothing to do with the Bohemians, nay, that he condemned their schism; and that he would not be answered out of the collectanea of inquisitors, but out of the Scriptures. The question had now arrived at its most critical and important moment. Did Luther acknowledge the direct influence of the divine Spirit over the Latin Church, and the binding force of the decrees of her councils, or did he not? Did he inwardly adhere to her, or did he not? We must recollect that we are here not far from the frontier of Bohemia; in a land which, in consequence of the aunathena pronounced in Constance, had experienced all the horrors of a long and desolating war, and had placed its glory in the resistance it had offered to the Hussites: at a university founded in opposition to the spirit and doctrine of John Huss: in the face of princes, lords, and commoners, whose fathers had fallen in this struggle; it was said that delegates from the Bohemians, who had anticipated the turn which this conflict must take, were also present. Luther saw the danger of his position. Should he really reject the prevailing notion of the exclusive power of the Roman Church to secure salvation? oppose a council by which John Huss had been condemned to the flames, and perhaps draw down a like fate upon himself? Or should he deny that higher and more comprehensive idea of a Christian church which he had conceived, and in which his whole soul lived and moved? Luther did not waver for a moment. He had the boldness to affirm that, among the articles on which the Council of Constance grounded its condemnation of John Huss, some were fundamentally Christian and evangelical. The assertion was received with universal astonishment. Duke George, who was present, put his hands to his sides, and, shaking his bead, uttered aloud his wonted curse, 'A plague upon it!' Eck now gathered fresh courage. It was hardly possible, he said, that Luther could censure a council, since his grace the elector had expressly forbidden any attack upon councils. Luther reminded him that the Council of Constance had not condemned all the articles of Huss as heretical, and specified some which were likewise to be found in St. Augustine. Eck replied that all were rejected; the sense in which these particular articles were understood was to be deemed heretical; for a council could not err. Luther answered that no council could create a new article of faith; how, then, could it be maintained that no council whatever was subject to error? 'Reverend father,' replied Eck, 'if you believe that a council regularly convoked can err, you are to me as a heathen and a publican' (Disputatio Excellentissimorum Theologorum Johannis Eccii et D. Martini Lutheri Augustiniani qua Lipsiae caepta fuit iv die Julii ao 1519. Opera Lutheri, Jena, 1:231). Such were the results of this disputation. It was continued for a time, and opinions more or less conflicting on purgatory, indulgences, and penance were uttered. Eck renewed the interrupted contest with Carlstadt; the reports were sent, after the solemn conclusion, to both universities; but all these measures could lead to nothing further. The main result of the meeting was, that Luther no longer acknowledged the authority of the Roman Church in matters of faith. At first he had only attacked the instructions given to the preachers of indulgences, and the rules of the later schoolmen, but had expressly retained the decretals of the popes; then he had rejected these, but with appeal to the decision of a council; he now emancipated himself from this last remaining human authority also; he recognised none but that of the Scriptures" (Ramake, History of Reformation, Austin's transl., book 2, chapter 3).

After the disputation, in which Eck's pride of intellect had been grievously wounded, he wrote (July 23) a letter to the elector of Saxony exhorting him to discourage the pernicious doctrines of his professor, and to cause his books to be burned. Frederick replied with some delay and great moderation, and Carlstadt with bitterness. A bitter controversy followed, in which Melancthon took part, and Eck got the worst of it. In February, 1S20, Eck also completed a treatise on the primacy, in which he promises triumphantly and clearly to confute Luther's assertion that "it is not of divine right." "Observe, reader," says he "and thou shalt see that I keep my word." Nor is his work by any means devoid of learning and, talent. After obtaining a condemnation of Luther from the universities of Louvain and Cologne, Eck went to Rome (1520) to present his book (De Primatur) to the pope, and to stir up feeling against Luther. His exhortations animated the enemies of Luther, and they at length prevailed upon the pope to summon a congregation on the subject, which passed sentence of condemnation upon Luther. Leo X indiscreetly appointed Eck as his nuncio for the promulgation of his bull in Germany. Elated by vanity, Eck set out with puerile exultation to inflict, as he thought, a fatal blow on his devoted adversary. In September he caused the bull to be fixed up in public places in Meistsen, Merseburg, and Brandenburg. "Everywhere he contended with force and energy, and on more than one occasion with success. Germany was his usual arena, where the brunt of controversy was almost invariably sustained by him. But in Switzerland his voice was likewise heard; and there, indeed, the papal interests were never upheld by any advocate of talent or distinction except himself and Faber. He was confronted in a long series of combats, during a space of twenty years, with all the chieftains of the Reformation; and, though he was defending what we are wont to consider the feebler cause, he never defended it feebly, or was overthrown with shame." He died Feb. 8, 1543. His works against Luther embrace five volumes (Opera contra Lutherum, Augsburg, 1530-35). Besides this, and the work De Primatu already mentioned, Eck published Enchridion Controversiarum (last edit. Cologne, 1600), Apologia contra Bucerum (Ingolstadt, 1543), and others. — Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 4:532; Ranke, Hist. of Reformation; D'Aubigne, Hist. of Reformation, volume 1; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. book 4, c. 16, section 1, chapter 2, § 9, and chapter 3, § 13; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:626 sq.

## Eckard, Heinrich[[@Headword:Eckard, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Wetter, in Hesse, October 19, 1582. He studied at Marburg; was in 1601 pastor at Wildungen, in Waldeck, and in 1608 professor at Giessen; in 1610 he was superintendent at Frankenhausen, and in 1616 general superintendent at Altenburg, where he died, February 22, 1624, leaving, Quaestiones de Quibus inter Augustanae Confessionis Theologos et Calvinianos Disceptatur.: — Theologia Calvinianorum: — Compendium Theologiae Patrum: — Isagoge in Catechismum Lutheri: — Analysis Epistolae Johannis: — De Causa Meritoria Justificationis contra Piscatorem: — De Ordine Ecclesiastico et Politico. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:436. (B.P.)

## Eckard, Heinrich Martin[[@Headword:Eckard, Heinrich Martin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Gossleben, in Thuringia, in 1615, and died April 14, 1669, pastor primarius and general superintendent at Alefeld, in Hildesheim, leaving, Disputatio de Trinitate (Rinteln, 1654): — De Praedestinatione (ibid. 1655): — De Natura et Principio Theologiae (ibid. 1657): — De Sacramentis in Genere, et in Specie de Baptismo et Eucharistia (ibid. 1660): — De Peccati Origine (ibid. 1661): — De Spiritu (ibid. 1662): — De Divinitate Christi contra Photinianos (ibid. 1664): — De Vera et Reali Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia Praesentia (ibid. 1669). See Dollen, Lebenbeschreibung der Rinfelschen Prof. Theol.; Strieders, Hessische Gelehrten Geschichte; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eckart or Eckhardt[[@Headword:Eckart or Eckhardt]]

              (called Master Eckart), a Dominican monk, one of the most profound thinkers of the Middle Ages. Of the time or place of his birth we have no record. He is first mentioned as a teacher at the College of St. James, at Paris. Having gone to Rome, where he received the degree of D.D., he was appointed provincial of Saxony, the appointment being confirmed by a chapter of his order held at Toulouse in 1304. In 1307 he was appointed vicar-general of Bohemia, with power to reform the Dominican convents. We afterwards find him again in Strasburg, preaching in the nunneries, and making acquaintances among the "Brethren of the Free Spirit." Having preached in Cologne, where archbishop Heinrich had already, in 1322, condemned the Beghards, Eckart, who inclined to them, brought upon himself the displeasure of the Church. Cited before the Inquisition in January, 1327, Eckart disclaimed heretical doctrines and professed his willingness to recant any such that could be found in his teachings. A total recantation, however, being demanded of him, he refused, and in consequence was condemned as a heretic. He appealed to the pope, who, out of 28 points acknowledged by Eckart, condemned 17 as heretical and the remainder as suspicious. Notwithstanding this condemnation, Henry Suso's autobiography, published in 1360, calls him "the holy Master Eckert," and praises his "sweet doctrine." He died in 1329. Copies of his sermons were preserved in numerous monasteries. Eckart has been claimed both by speculative philosophers and orthodox theologians; both by Protestants and Romanists. He is perhaps properly to be considered as the father of the modern mystical pantheism. He upheld the doctrines of the Brethren of the Free Spirit, but yet was free from their practical aberrations, as also from their opposition to the rites of the Church and to moral law. His writings have latterly been collected by Pfeiffer (Deutsche Mystiker des 14ten Jahrh. 1857, 2d volume); they consist of 110 sermons, 18 treatises, 70 theses, and the Liber positionum. Before this, some of his sermons and short treatises, appended to Tauler's collection, Basle, 1521, were the only ones of his writings which were generally accessible.

See Schmid, in Theol. Stud. u. Kritik. (1839); Mimoires de l'Acad. des Sciences mor, et polit. (Schmid's Etbud. sur le snysticisme alless. an xivme siecle, Paris, 1847); Martensen, Meister Eckart (Hamburg, 1842); Schmid, in Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie, 3:638. All the writers here cited charge Eckart with pantheistic views. But Preger, in Zeitschriftf. d. hist. Theol. 1864, page 163 sq., and 1866, page 453 sq., publishes a new tract of Eckart's, not found in Pfeiffer's collection, and vindicates Eckart from the charge of pantheism. So also does Bach, in Meister Eckhart, d. Vater d. deutschen Speculations (Wien, 1864), noticed in Jahrb. f deutsche Theologie, 1867, page 363.

## Eckermann Jacob Christoph Rudolph[[@Headword:Eckermann Jacob Christoph Rudolph]]

             was born September 6, 1754, at Wedendorf, in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. In 1782 he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Kiel, and Danish Church councillor. He died May 6, 1836. He is the author of Erklarung aller dunklen Stellen des N.T. (Kiel, 1806-1808, 3 volumes, 8vo): — Joel metrisch ubersetzt mit einer neuen Erklarung (Lub. and Leipz. 1786, 8vo): — Compend. theol. theor. bibl. histor. (Altona, 1792, 8vo); a German edition of the same work, Handb. fur das systemat. Studium der Glaubenslehre, in which he declares that the doctrines of Jesus are only a popular guide to a real adoration of the deity, and that whatever else the New Testament may contain is to be considered true only from an historical point of view (Altona, 1801-2, 4 volumes, 8vo): — Erinnerung an den unvergangl. u. unschatzb. grossen Werth den Reformat. Luthers (Altona, 1817, 8vo), besides a number of other works, which have been collected in 6 volumes, 8vo, under the title of Theologische Beitrage (Altona, 1790-99), and in two additional vols., Vermischte Schriften (ibid. 1799, 1800). — Winer, Theologische Literatur; Kitto, Cyclopaedies, 1:725; Griasse, Allgem. Literargeschichte, 7:872.

## Eckhard, Albert[[@Headword:Eckhard, Albert]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Wetter, in Hesse, in 1577. He studied at Marburg, was in 1607 superintendent at Hildesheim, and died there, August 6, 1609, leaving, Disput. de Conciliis contra Rob. Bellarminum (Marburg, 1597): — De Descensu Christi ad Inferos (ibid.  1599): — De Spiritu Sancto (ibid. eod.): — De Sanctae Trinitatis Mysterio (ibid. 1605): — An Semel Justificati Spiritum Sanctum Amittere Possint (Giessen, 1607): — An Christo θεανθρώπῳ Secundum Humanam Naturam dona Vere Divina et Infinita sint Collata? (Hildesheim, 1608). See Strieders, Hessische Gelehrten Geschichte; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eckhard, Paul Jacob[[@Headword:Eckhard, Paul Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Juterbogk, December 6, 1693. He studied at Zerbst, Quedlinburg, and Wittenberg; was appointed in 1728 deacon at St. Nicolai, in his native city, and died there, March 6, 1753, leaving, among other works, Werdische Kirchen-Historie (Wittenberg, 1739). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eckhard, Tobias[[@Headword:Eckhard, Tobias]]

             the elder, was born at Delitzsch in 1558. In 1614 he was con-rector at Naumburg; in 1624 rector, and in 1634 pastor, at Gross-Jena, where he died, May 9, 1652. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eckhard, Tobias (2)[[@Headword:Eckhard, Tobias (2)]]

             the younger, was born at Juterbogk, November 1, 1662. He studied at Wittenberg, where he also lectured after completing his studies. In 1691 he was called as con-rector to Stade, in 1704 to Quedlinburg, and died there, December 13, 1737, leaving, De Immutabilitate Dei (Wittenberg, 1683): — De Signo S. Pauli Epistolarum ad 2Th 3:17 (ibid. 1687): — De Paulo Athleta ad 1Co 9:26 (ibid. 1688): — De Athenis Superstitiosis ad Actor. 17:22, 23 (ibid. eod.): — De Spiritu, Principes Eris ad Eph 2:2 (ibid. eod.):De Christi Servatoris Resurrectione Rom 1:4, Alterius Nomine Scripta (ibid. eod.): — De Funesto Jude Exitu (ibid. 1689): — De Facto Hielis cum Dispendio Duorum Filiorum Hierichintem ZEdzficantis ad 1 Reg. 16:34 (ibid. eod.): — De Fonte Haeresium ad Col 2:8 (ibid. 1691): — De Justificationis in V. ac N. Test. Ratione Una et Eadem (ibid. eod.), etc. See Jocher, Allgeneines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. i, 132, 394. (B. P.)

## Eckley, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Eckley, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in London, England, October 11 (O.S.), 1750. When about seventeen years of age his father moved with his family to America, and settled in Morristown, N.J. Soon after his arrival Joseph was sent to the College of New Jersey, from which he graduated in 1772; and, in order to prosecute his theological studies, he remained at Princeton, May 7, 1776, he was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New York. The Old South Church, Boston, having been reorganized, after the dispersion occasioned by the Revolution, chose him for their pastor in 1778; and he was ordained October 27, 1779. In 1808 he was provided with a colleague, Reverend Joshua Huntington. He died in Boston, April 30, 1811. In temperament Dr. Eckley was ardent. Although frequently called upon to preach on important occasions, he was not remarkable as a speaker, being inclined to abstraction and possessed of an unmusical voice. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:137.

## Eclectics[[@Headword:Eclectics]]

             1. a sect of ancient philosophers, who professed to select (ἐκλέγειν) from all systems of philosophy what they deemed to be true. The Eclectics were chiefly Neo-Platonists (q.v.), and the philosophers chiefly selected from were Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle. This union of the Aristotelian and Platonic philosophies was attempted first by Potamo of Alexandria, whose principles were taken up and maintained by Ammonius Saccas. It may be doubted, however, if the title of eclectics can be properly given to Potamo or Ammonius, the former of whom was in fact merely a Neo-Platonist, and the latter rather jumbled together the different systems of Greek philosophy (with the exception of that of Epicurus) than selected the consistent parts of all of them. The most eminent of the followers of Ammonius were Plotinus, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Proclus, and the ancient Eclecticism became at last little more than an attempt to reconcile Platonism with Christianity" (Penny Cyclop. 9:265). SEE AMMONIUS.

Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. 1:228) said: "By philosophy I mean neither the Stoic, nor the Platonic, nor the Epicurean, nor the Aristotelian, but Whatever things have been properly said by each of these sects inculcating justice and devout knowledge — this whole selection I call philosophy." "The sense in which this term is used by Clemens" (of Alexandria), says Mr. Maurice (Mor. and Metaphys. Philippians 2:53), "is obvious enough. He did not care for Plato, Aristotle, Pythagoras, as such; far less did he care for the opinions and conflicts of the schools which bore their names; he found in each hints of precious truths of which he desired to avail himself; he would gather the flowers without asking in what garden they grew, the prickles he would leave for those who had a fancy for them. Eclecticism, in this sense, seemed only like another name for catholic wisdom. A man, conscious that everything in nature and art was given for his learning, had a right to suck honey wherever it was to be found; he would find sweetness in it if it was hanging wild on trees and shrubs; he could admire the elaborate architecture of the cells in which it was stored. The Author of all good to man had scattered the gifts, had imparted the skill; to receive them thankfully was an act of homage to him. But once lose the feeling of devotion and gratitude, which belonged so remarkably to Clemens — once let it be fancied that the philosopher was not a mere receiver of treasures which had been provided for him, but an ingenious chemist and compounder of various naturally unsociable ingredients, and the eclectical doctrine would lead to more self-conceit, would be more unreal and heartless than any one of the sectarian elements out of which it was fashioned. It would want the belief and conviction which dwell, with whatever unsuitable companions, even in the narrowest theory. Many of the most vital characteristics of the original dogmas would be effaced under pretense of taking off their rough edges and fitting then into each other. In general the superficialities and formality of each creed would be preserved in the new system; its original and essential characteristics sacrificed" (Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.).

2. "Modern eclecticism is conceived by some to have originated with Bacon and Descartes, but Hegel may be more properly considered its founder. In his Philosophy of History and other works he endeavors, among other things, to point out the true and false tendencies of philosophic speculation in the various ages of the world; but it is to the lucid and brilliant eloquence of Victor Cousin (q.v.) that modern eclecticism owes its popularity. This system, if it can be so called, may best be defined as an effort to expound, in critical and sympathetic spirit, the previous systems of philosophy. Its aim is to apprehend the speculative thinking of past ages in its historical development, and it is the opinion of some that such a method is the only one possible in our day in the region of metaphysics" (Chambers, Encyclopaedia, s.v.). — Murdoch's Mosheim, Ch. Hist. book 1, c. 2, part 1, chapter 1; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1:658; Mosheim, Commaentaries, chapter 1, § 30. SEE AMMONIUS; SEE PLATONISM.

## Ecleston, Thomas[[@Headword:Ecleston, Thomas]]

             a Franciscan of the 14th century, was born at Eclestone, Cheshire; was bred a Franciscan in Oxford, and died in 1340. He wrote a book on the succession of the Franciscans in England, with their work and wonders, from their first coming in to his own time, dedicating the same modestly to a fellow friar. Another work of his is, De Impugnatione Ordinis super Dominicanos. See Fuller, Worthies of England, 1:276.

## Eclipse[[@Headword:Eclipse]]

             An eclipse of the sun is caused by the intervention of the moon when new, or in conjunction with the sun, intercepting his light from the earth, either totally or partially. An eclipse of the moon is caused by the intervention of the earth, intercepting the sun's light from the moon when full, or in opposition to the sun, either totally or partially. An eclipse of either luminary can only take place when they are within their proper limits, or distances, from the nodes or intersections of both orbits. A total eclipse of the moon may occasion a privation of her light for an hour and a half; during her total immersion in the shadow; whereas a total eclipse of the sun can never last in any particular place above four minutes, when the moon is nearest to the earth, and her shadow thickest. SEE SUN; SEE MOON.

No historical notice of an eclipse occurs in the Bible, but there are passages in the prophets which contain manifest allusion to this phenomenon. (Compare Lucan, 1:540 sq.; Virgil, Georg. 1:466; Curt. 4:3; Evang. Nicod. c. 11.) They describe it in the following terms: "The sun goes down at noon, the earth is darkened in the clear day" (Amo 8:9), "the day shall be dark" (Mic 3:6), "the light shall not be clear nor dark" (Zec 14:6), "the sun shall be dark" (Joe 2:10; Joe 2:31; Joe 3:15). Some of these notices have been thought to refer to eclipses that occurred about the time of the respective compositions: thus the date of Amos nearly coincides with a total eclipse which occurred February 9, B.C. 784, and was visible at Jerusalem shortly after noon (Hitzig, Comm. in Proph.); that of Micah with the eclipse of June 5, B.C. 716, referred to by Dionys. Hal. 2:56, to which same period the latter part of the book of Zechariah has been assigned by some. A passing notice in Jer 15:9 nearly coincides in date with the eclipse of September 30, B.C. 610, so well known from Herodotus's account (1:74, 103). The Hebrews seem not to have philosophized much on eclipses, which they considered as sensible marks of God's anger (see Joe 2:10; Joe 2:31; Joe 3:15; Job 9:7). Ezekiel (Eze 32:7) and Job (Job 36:32) speak more particularly, that God covers the sun with clouds when he deprives the earth of its light by eclipses. These passages, however, are highly figurative, and the language they present may simply be borrowed from the lurid look of the heavenly orbs as seen through a hazy atmosphere. Yet, when we read that "the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood," we can hardly avoid discerning an acquaintance with the appearance of those luminaries while under eclipse. The interruption of the sun's light causes him to appear black; and the moon, during a total eclipse, exhibits a copper color, or what Scripture intends by a blood color. SEE ASTRONOMY. The awe which is naturally inspired by an eclipse in the minds of those who are unacquainted with the cause of it rendered it a token of impending judgment in the prophetical books. SEE EARTHQUAKE.

The plague of darkness in Egypt has been ascribed by various neologistic commentators to non-miraculous agency, but no sufficient account of its intense degree, long duration, and limited area, as proceeding from any physical cause, has been given. SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

Josephus mentions (Anst. 17:6, 4 s.f.) an eclipse of the moon as occurring an the night when Herod deprived Matthias of the priesthood, and burnt alive the seditious Matthias and his accomplices. This is of great importance in the chronology of Herod's reign, as it immediately preceded his own death. It has been calculated as happening March 13, B.C. 4. SEE HEROD (THE GREAT).

The darkness ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῦν of Mat 27:45, attending the crucifixion has been similarly attributed to an eclipse. SEE CRUCIFIXION (OF CHRIST). Phlegon of Tralles, indeed, mentions an eclipse of intense darkness, and, beginning at noon, combined, he says, in Bithynia, with an earthquake, which, in the uncertain state of our chronology (see Clinton's Fasti Romani, Olymp. 202), more or less nearly synchronizes with the event. Nor was the account without reception in the early Church. See the testimonies to that effect collected by Whiston (Testimony of Phlegon vindicated; London, 1732). Origen, however, ad loc. (Latin commentary on Matthew), denied the possibility of such a cause, arguing that by the fixed Paschal reckoning the moon must have been about full, and denying that Luk 23:45, by the words ἐσκοτίσθη ὁἣλιος, means to allege that fact as the cause. The genuineness of this commentary has been impeached, nor is its tenor consistent with Origen adv. Cels. page 80; but the argument, unless on such an assumption as that mentioned below, seems decisive, and has ever since been adhered to. He limits πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν to Judaea. Dean Alford (ad loc.), though without stating his reason, prefers the wider interpretation of all the earth's surface on which it would naturally have been day. That Phlegon's darkness, perceived so intense in Tralles and Bithynia, was felt in Judaea, is highly probable; and the evangelist's testimony to similar phenomena of a coincident darkness and earthquake, taken in connection with the near agreement of time, gives a probability to the supposition that the former speaks of the same circumstances as the latter. Wieseler (Chron. Synop. page 388), however, and De Wette (Comment. on Matthew) consider the year of Phlegon's eclipse an impossible one for the crucifixion, and reject that explanation of the darkness. The argument from the duration (three hours) is also of great force, for an eclipse seldom lasts in great intensity more than six minutes. The darkness in this instance, moreover, cannot with reason be attributed to an eclipse, as the moon was at the full at the time of the Passover (q.v.). On the other hand, Seyffarth (Chronolog. Sacs. pages 58, 9) maintains that the Jewish calendar, owing to their following the sun, had become so far out that the moon might possibly have been at new, and thus, admitting the year as a possible epoch, revives the argument for the eclipse as the cause. He, however, views this rather as a natural basis than as a full account of the darkness, which in its degree at Jerusalem was still preternatural (ib. page 138). The pamphlet of Whiston above quoted, and two by Dr. Sykes, Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by Phlegon, and Defense of the same (London, 1733 and 1734), may be consulted as regards the statement of Phlegon. Treatises on the phenomenon in question have been written in Latin by Baier (Regiom. 1718), Engestrom (London, 1730), Fleischer (Viteb. 1692), Frick (Lips. 1692), Lauth (Argent. 1743), Pasch (Viteb. 1683), Posner (Jena, 1661), Schmid (Jena, 1683), Sommel (London, 1774), Topfer (Jen. 1678), Wiedeburg (Helmst. 1687), Ziebich (Viteb. 1741), and in German by Grausbeck (Tubing. 1835). SEE DARKNESS.

## Economist[[@Headword:Economist]]

             (a steward), called by Possidius provost of the church-house, was a priest, as stated by Isidore Pelusiotes, appointed by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, and elected by the clergy in the East, to discharge the same duties as devolved on a mediaeval treasurer, provost of canons, and almoners in an English cathedral. In the Western Church he is mentioned in the 4th century, and was a deacon at Milan in the time of Ambrose. His office was contemporaneous with the restriction of an archdeacon to spiritual duties. In the vacancy of the see, by the councils of Chalcedon and Trent, he acted as receiver-general and administrator of the episcopal revenues. At Kilkenny, St. David's, and Exeter, as now at Windsor, he received the capitular rents, and at Westminster provided the common table and paid the servants' wages. At Hereford two economists, or bailiffs, rendered half- yearly accounts of the great commons,

## Economus[[@Headword:Economus]]

             SEE OECONOMIUS.

## Economy[[@Headword:Economy]]

             "a term which properly means the arrangement of a household (οἰκονομία), but is also frequently employed by ecclesiastical writers for the practical measures adopted in order to give effect to a divine dispensation. The Jewish economy included all the details of spiritual and secular government, but the Christian economy, belonging to a 'kingdom not of this world,' has no direct reference to political arrangements." SEE DISPENSATION.

## Ecphonesis[[@Headword:Ecphonesis]]

             (ἐκφώνησις), that portion of an office which is said audibly in contrast with that which is said silently; especially the doxology, with which the secret prayers generally conclude.

## Ecrar[[@Headword:Ecrar]]

             (confession of sins). The duty of confession of sins is reckoned by Mohammedans to be the fifth capital and fundamental article of their religion. It is the doctrine of the Koran that God will pardon those who confess their sins.

## Ecstatici[[@Headword:Ecstatici]]

             a kind of diviners among the ancient Greeks, who were wont to fall into a trance in which they continued a considerable time, deprived of all sense and motion, and on their recovery they gave marvellous accounts of what they had seen and heard. In Roman Catholic countries, also, many stories have been told of individuals who have been in a state of ecstasis, or trance, during which they are said to have seen and conversed with the Virgin Mary and other saints.

## Ectenia[[@Headword:Ectenia]]

             (ἐκτενία). The liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom begin with a litany, sometimes known by this name. It may also refer to the length or the earnestness of the supplication. Litanies of a similar form are also found in the hour-offices. SEE LITANY.

## Ecthesis[[@Headword:Ecthesis]]

             a proclamation or formula of faith, in the form of an edict, written by Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, published A.D. 639 by the emperor Heraclius, to put an end to the troubles occasioned by the Eutychian heresy. It prohibited all controversies on the question, Whether in Christ there were one or two operations? though in the same edict the doctrine of one will was plainly inculcated. A considerable number of the Eastern bishops declared their assent to this law, which was also submissively received by Pyrrhus, the new patriarch of Constantinople. In the West the case was quite different. The Roman pontiff, John IV, assembled a council at Rome, A.D. 629, in which the ecthesis was rejected, and the Monothelites were condemned (Mosheim's Ecclesiastes Hist. N.Y. ed. 1:453). A copy of it is given in Harduin, Concilia, 3:791. See also Gieseler, Church History, 1, § 126; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 3:154 sq. SEE EUTYCHIANS.

## Ectypomata[[@Headword:Ectypomata]]

             (ἐκτυπώματα) were gifts of a peculiar kind, which began to be made to churches probably about the middle of the 5th century. They are first mentioned by Theodoret, who tells us that when any one obtained the benefit of a signal cure from God in any member of his body, such as his eyes, hands, or feet, he then brought his ectypoma, the image or figure of the part cured, in silver or gold, to be hung up in the church as a memorial of divine favor. Such a practice prevailed among the ancient Greeks and  Romans, and also among the Egyptians. The same custom was known among the Philistines, as we may infer from the case of the "golden emerods" and mice (1Sa 6:4). In Roman Catholic countries representations of parts of the body healed are often seen suspended upon the walls of churches.

## Ecuador[[@Headword:Ecuador]]

              (the Spanish term for Equator), a republic in South America. In lat. it extends from 1° 23' N. to 40 45' S., while in W. long it stretches from 790 to 81° 20'. It measures, therefore, from north to south fully 400 miles, and from east to west nearly 850, presenting an area of about 100,000 square miles. It is bounded by the United States of Colombia, Brazil, Peru, and the Pacific. The population in 1885 was given at 1,004,651, in which the savage and heathen Indians of the eastern province were not included, although estimated at from 100,000 to 150,000. Six cities have a population of more than 10,000. The majority of the population is of the aboriginal race, speaking the Quichua or some cognate language. Ecuador, until the beginning of the present century, belonged to the Spanish viceroyalty of New Granada. After the establishment of the independence of the Spanish colonies, Ecuador formed part, until 1830, of the federal republic of Colombia. Since 1830 it has been an independent republic. The chief cities are Quito, the capital, and Guayaquil, the emporium of foreign trade. The government appears to have been constituted on the model of the United States of North America, having a president and vice-president, with a Senate and a House of Representatives. All the inhabitants belong to the Roman Catholic Church, which contains the following dioceses: 1. The archbishopric of Quito, established as an episcopal see in 1545, erected into an archbishopric in 1861; 2. the bishopric of Guayaquil, established in 1838; 3. the bishopric of Nueva Cuenga. The public exercise of no other religion is allowed by the Constitution of the state. There were, in 1855, 277 parochial and 106 vice-parochial churches, 534 secular priests, 262 monks in 36 and 202 nuns in 11 convents. The University of Quito, established in 1586 by the Jesuits, has 4 colleges and several seminaries. There were 11 high schools, called colleges or seminaries, and 290 primary schools, of which 30 were for girls. Nearly all the scholars were the children of the whites and mulattoes; the Indian population grows up almost without education. — Allgemeine Real-Encycl. 4:1018; Vilavicencio, Geographia de la Republica del Ecuador (N.Y. 1858). (A.J.S.)

## Ed[[@Headword:Ed]]

             i.e., "witness" (for Hebrews id. עֵד), supplied (apparently on the authority of a few MSS. and also of the Syr. and the Arab. versions) in the A.V. as the name of the altar erected by the three tribes east of Jordan in commemoration of their adhesion to the others (Jos 22:34). The commonly received Hebrews text is literally as follows: "And the sons of Reuben and the sons of Gad called the altar [וִיַּקְרְאוּ לִמַּזְבֵּחִ, Sept. ἐπωνόμασαν καὶ εϊvπαν, Vulg. vocaverunt]; for a witness is this [בַּי עֵד הוּא, Sept. ὅτι μαρτύριόν, Vulg. testimonium]," etc., or as it may be rendered ( קָרָא being sometimes used absolutely thus), "gave a name to the altar, [saying]," etc. The gloss is unnecessary (see Maurer, Comment. in loc.), for the latter clause furnishes both the name and the explanation (Keil, Comment. in loc.), i.e., "they named the altar (as follows), that 'This is a witness,'" etc. SEE OREB.

## Ed (2)[[@Headword:Ed (2)]]

             SEE SARTABA.

## Edar[[@Headword:Edar]]

              (Hebrews E'der, עֵדֶר, flock, as often rendered), the name of a tower (מַגְדָּל), beyond (מֵהָלְאָה) which Jacob first halted between Bethlehem and Hebron (Gen 35:21, Sept. Γαδέρ, Vat. omits, Vulg. Eder). In Mic 4:8 (Sept., Vulg., and A.V. translate ποιμνίον, grex, “flock”) it is put for the neighboring village Bethlehem itself, and hence tropically for the royal line of David as sprung thence. It perhaps derived its name from the fact of having been erected to guard, SEE MIGDOL., flocks, or else from some individual of the name of Eder (q.v.). Jerome (who calls it turris Ader) says it lay 1000 paces from Bethlehem (Onomast. s.v. Bethlehem), and intimates that it contained a prophetic anticipation (compare Targum of Pseudo-Jon. in loc.) of the birth of the Messiah on the same spot (Luk 2:7-8). (See Albert, De turri Eder, Lips. 1689.) SEE BETHLEHEM.

## Edayoth[[@Headword:Edayoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Edburg[[@Headword:Edburg]]

             SEE EADBURGA.

## Edda[[@Headword:Edda]]

             SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY.

## Eddius[[@Headword:Eddius]]

             (i.e. eddi, surnamed Stephen), a noted singer in Kent, a friend of Wilfrid, archbishop of York, A.D. 720.

## Eddo[[@Headword:Eddo]]

             sixth bishop of Curia Rhsetorum (now Chur, of;Grisons), cir. A.D. 500- 530.

## Eddy John Reynolds[[@Headword:Eddy John Reynolds]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, son of Reverend Augustus Eddy, was born in Xenia, Ohio, October 10, 1829, obtained a liberal English education, and made some proficiency in the classics. He commenced the study of law, but determined to devote himself to the ministry, and was admitted on trial in the Northwest Indiana Conference in 1856. After filling various appointments acceptably, he accepted in 1862 the chaplaincy of the 72d Indiana Regiment. He immediately joined his regiment at Murfreesborough, Tennessee, and commenced his labors among the soldiers. Sunday, June 21, he preached from Pro 16:32; Wednesday, June 24, during a fight between colonel Wilder's cavalry brigade and a rebel force he was instantly killed by a shell. — Min. of Conference, 1863.

## Eddy, Thomas Mears, D.D[[@Headword:Eddy, Thomas Mears, D.D]]

             a distinguished Methodist Episcopal minister, son of Reverend Augustus Eddy, was born in Newtown, Hamilton County, Ohio, September 7, 1823. He received a careful religious training; consecrated himself to the Savior very early in life; and in 1842 entered the Indiana Conference, filling its most important appointments. In 1856 he was elected editor of The Northwestern Christian Advocate. During his editorial career of fourteen years, this periodical increased from a weekly issue of fourteen thousand to about thirty thousand copies. At its close he re-entered the pastorate, in connection with the Baltimore Conference. In 1872 he was elected missionary secretary, and as such was very laborious and successful to the close of his life, October 7, 1874. Dr. Eddy was a clear, logical, pathetic preacher; a forcible, sprightly writer; a genial companion, and a devout  man. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, page 17; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Eddy, Zachary, D.D[[@Headword:Eddy, Zachary, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Stockbridge, Vermont, December 19, 1815; received his education in the Jamestown (N.Y.) Academy, and studied theology with Reverend James Donnell. He served several churches, retired in 1888, and died November 15, 1891. He was a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. He was the author of Immanuel; or, the Life of Jesus Christ Our Lord: — Hymns of the Church: — Hymns and Songs of the Church: — and many pamphlets. See (Am.) Cong. Yearbook, 1892.

## Edel, J. Low[[@Headword:Edel, J. Low]]

             a famous Talmudist, who died at Slonim in 1827, is the author of איי הים, or Disquisitions on the Haggadas in the Talmud and Explanations of the Haggadic Interpretation of the Scripture (Ostrok, 1835): — שפה לנאמנים, a Hebrew grammar (Lemberg, 1793): also Philosophical Derashas, or homilies, (1802):Commentaries on Maimonides' introduction to the Talmudic tract Tohoroth, etc. See First, Bibl. Jud. 1:220 sq.

## Edelburg[[@Headword:Edelburg]]

             SEE ETHELBURGA.

## Edeles, Samuel Elieser[[@Headword:Edeles, Samuel Elieser]]

             a Talmudist of.the 16th century, rabbi at Ostrok, Lublin, etc., is the author of glosses and novellas on Talmudic treatises, for which see Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:221; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico, page 95 (Germ. transl.), s.v. Eideles. (B. P.)

## Edeling, Christian Ludwig[[@Headword:Edeling, Christian Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1678 at Lobejun, near Halle. He studied at Halle, and was the tutor of the famous count Zinzendorf. In 1706 he was appointed rector at Groningen, and in 1710 was made assistant of the pastor primarius Muller at Schwanebeck, near Halberstadt, whom he succeeded in 1723. He died September 18, 1742, leaving some fine hymns still used in the German Church: “Auf, auf, mein  Geist, betrachte," "Christen erwarten in allerlei Fallen." See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:219 sq. (B.P.)

## Edelinok, Gerard[[@Headword:Edelinok, Gerard]]

             a celebrated Flemish engraver, was born at Antwerp in 1627, studied under Cornelis Galle, and was subsequently elected a royal academician. He died at Paris in 1707. The following are some of his principal works: The Holy Family, with St. John, St. Elizabeth, and Two Angels; The Holy Family, where St. John is Presenting Flowers to the Infant Jesus; The Virgin Mary at the Foot of the Cross; Mary Magdalene, penitent, Trampling on the Vanities of the World; St. Louis Prostrating himself before a Crucifix. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Edelmann Johann Christian[[@Headword:Edelmann Johann Christian]]

             an infidel German writer, was born at Weissenfels in 1698, and studied theology at Jena. From his youth he evinced an unsteadiness of mind, which afterwards led him, after oscillating between the different Christian denominations, to forsake them all and become an opponent of all orthodoxy. He rejected the Christian doctrine, and considered reason as a part of the essence of God, in no way different from him. For some years he abstained from all animal food, in order, as he expressed it, not to eat a part of divinity. He had previously taken part in the translation of the Bible, published at Berleburg (q.v.). His principal works are his Unschuldige Wahrheiten, in which he attempts to prove that no religion is of any importance: — Moses mit aufgedecktem Angesicht (1740, 8vo): — Christ und Belial (1741, 8vo): — die Gottlichkeit d. Vernunft (1742, 8vo). He finally went to Berlin, where Friedrich II tolerated his presence on the plea that he had to put up with many other fools. Edelmann died in Berlin February 15, 1767. A selection of his works appeared at Berne in 1847 (Auswahl aus E.'s Schriften).

"What Edelmann wished was nothing new; after the manner of all adherents of Illuminism, he wished to reduce all positive religions to natural religion. The positive heathenish religions stand, to him, on a level with Judaism and Christianity. He is more just towards heathenism than towards Judaism, and more just towards Judaism than towards Christianity. Everything positive in religion is, as such, superstition. Christ was a mere man, whose chief merit consists in the struggle against superstition. What he taught, and what he was anxious for, no one, however, may attempt to learn from the New Testament writings, inasmuch as these were forged as late as the time of Constantine. All which the Church teaches of his divinity, of his merits, of the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, is absurd. There is no rule of truth but reason, and it manifests its truths directly by a peculiar sense. Whatever this sense says is true. It is this sense which perceives the world. The reality of everything which exists is God. In the proper sense there can, therefore, not exist any atheist, because every one who admits the reality of the world admits also the reality of God. God is not a person, least of all are there three persons in God. If God be the substance in all the phenomena, then it follows of itself that God cannot be thought of without the world, and hence that the world has no more had an origin than it will have an end. One may call the world the body of God, the shadow of God, the son of God. The spirit of God is in all that exists. It is ridiculous to, ascribe inspiration to special persons only; every one ought to be a Christ, a prophet, an inspired man. The human spirit, being a breath of God, does not perish; our spirit, separated from its body by death, enters into a connection with some other body. Thus Edelmann taught a kind of metempsychosis. What he taught had been thoroughly and ingeniously said in France and England; but from a German theologian, and that with such eloquent coarseness, with such a mastery in expatiating in blasphemy, such things were unheard of. But as yet the faith of the Church was a power in Germany!" (Kahnis, German Protestantism, book 1, chapter 2, § 2). An autobiography of Edelmnann was published by Klose (Berlin, 1849). See Pratje, Histor. Nachrichten (Hamb. 1755, 8vo); Elster, Erinnerungen an Edelmnann (Clausthal, 1839); Hurst, History of Rationalism, chapter 5.

## Edelmann, Gottfried[[@Headword:Edelmann, Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born December 20, 1660, at Marolissa, in Upper Lusatia. He studied at Leipsic; was first pastor at Holzkirch, in his native province; in 1693 accepted a call to Lauban, and died there in 1724, leaving a number of hymns. See Hoffmann, Laubanische Prediger Historie, page 287; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:448 sq. (B.P.)

## Edelmann, Hirsh[[@Headword:Edelmann, Hirsh]]

             a Jewish scholar of Germany,who died at Berlin, November 21, 1858, is the author of ההגדה סדר, or the Narrative for the Jewish Passover, with critical notes and scholia (Kbnigsberg,. 1845). He also published the Jewish Prayer-book, with glosses and scholia (ibid.); and edited The Song of Solomon, with Obadja Seforno's commentary (Dantzic, 1845). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:222. (B.P.)

## Eden[[@Headword:Eden]]

              (Hebrews id.), the name of three places and of one or two men.

I. “The garden of EDEN" (עֵדֶן, delight, and so Sept. ἡδονή,Vulg. voluptas) is the most ancient and venerable name in geography, the name of the first district of the earth's surface of which human beings could have any knowledge. 1. The Name. — The word is found in the Arabic as well as in the Hebrew language. It is explained by Firuzabadi, in his celebrated Arabic lexicon (Kamus), as signifying delight, tenderness, loveliness (see Morren, in Edinb. Biblical Cabinet, 11:2, 48, 49). Major Wilford and professor Wilson find its elements in the Sanscrit. The Greek ἡδονἤ is next to identical with it in both sound and sense. It occurs in three places (Isa 37:12; Eze 27:23; Amo 1:5) as the name of some eminently pleasant districts, but not the Eden of this article. Of them we have no certain knowledge, except that the latter instance points to the neighborhood of Damascus. In these cases it is pointed, in the Hebrew text, with both syllables short עֶדֶן but when it is applied to the primitive seat of man, the first syllable is long. The passages in which it occurs in the latter sense are, in addition to Gen 2:2; Gen 4:16, the few following, of which we transcribe the chief, because they cast light upon the primeval term: "He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of Jehovah." "Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God." "All the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him." "This land which was desolate is become like the garden of Eden" (Isa 51:3; Eze 28:13; Eze 31:9; Eze 31:16; Eze 31:18; Eze 36:35; Joe 2:3). All this evidence goes to show that Eden was a tract of country, and that in the most eligible part of it was the Paradise, the garden of all delights, in which the Creator was pleased to place his new and pre-eminent creature, with the inferior beings for his sustenance and solace. SEE GARDEN.

The old translators appear to have halted between a mystical and literal interpretation. The word עדן is rendered by the Sept. as a proper name in three passages only, Gen 2:8; Gen 2:10; Gen 4:16, where it is represented by Ε᾿δέμ. In all others, with the exception of Isa 2:3, it is translated τρυφή. In the Vulgate it never occurs as a proper name, but is rendered "voluptas," "locus voluptatis," or “deliciae." The Targum of Onkelos gives it uniformly עדן, and in the Peshito Syriac it is the same, with a slight variation in two passages. SEE PARADISE.

2. Biblical Description. — The following is a simple translation of the Mosaic account of the situation of the Adamic Paradise (Gen 2:8-17). SEE GENESIS.

Now Jehovah God had planted a garden in Eden eastward, and he placed there the man whom he formed: for Jehovah God had caused to spring from the ground every tree pleasant for sight or good for food; also the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Now a river issued from Eden to water the garden, and thence it was parted, and became four head-[streams]: the name of the first is Pishon; this [is the one] that surrounds all the land of the Chavilah, where [is] the [metal] gold (the gold too of that land [is] good); there [also is] the [substance called bedolach, and a stone [called] the shoham); and the name of the second river [is] Gichon; this [is the one] that surrounds all the land of Cush: and the name of the third river [is] Chiddekel; this [is the one] that flows east of Ashshur: and the name of the fourth river, that [is] Perath.

Thus Jehovah God took the man, and settled him in the garden of Eden, to till it, and to keep it. Then Jehovah God enjoined upon the mans, saying, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, except of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil — thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day of thy eating of it, thou shalt surely die."

The garden of Paradise is here said to be to the east, i.e., in the eastern part of the tract of Eden (see Gesenius, Heb. Lex. s.v.). The river which flowed through Eden watered the garden, and thence branched out into four distinct streams. The first problem to be solved, then, is this: To find a river which, at some stage of its course, is divided into four streams, two of which are the Tigris and Euphrates. The identity of these rivers with the Hiddekel and Perath has never been disputed, and no hypothesis which omits them is worthy of consideration. Setting aside minor differences of detail, the theories which have been framed with regard to the explanation of the above description of the terrestrial paradise naturally divide themselves into two classes. The first class includes all those which place the main river of the garden of Eden below the junction of the Euphrates and Tigris, and interpret the names Pison and Gihon of certain portions of these rivers; the second, those which seek for it in the high table-land of Armenia, the fruitful parent of many noble streams. These theories have been supported by most learned men of all nations, of all ages, and representing every shade of theological belief; but there is scarcely one which is not based in some degree upon a forced interpretation of the words of the narrative. Those who contend that the united stream of the Euphrates and Tigris is the "river" which "goeth forth from Eden to water the garden," have committed a fatal error in neglecting the true meaning of יָצָא, which is only used of the course of a river from its source downwards (compare Eze 47:1). Following the guidance which this word supplies, the description in Eze 47:10 must be explained in this manner: the river takes its rise in Eden, flows into the garden, and from thence is divided into four branches, the separation taking place either in the garden or after leaving it. If this be the case, the Tigris and Euphrates before junction cannot, in this position of the garden, be two of the four branches in question. But, though they have avoided this error, the theorists of the second class have generally been driven into another but little less destructive. Looking for the true site of Eden in the highlands of Armenia, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates, and applying the names Pison and Gihon to some one or other of the rivers which spring from the same region, they have been compelled to modify the meaning of נָהָר the "river," and to give to רָחשַׁים a sense which is scarcely supported by a single passage. In no instance is ראֹשׁ (lit. "head") applied to the source of a river. On several occasions (compare Jdg 7:16; Job 1:17, etc.) it is used of the detachments into which the main body of an army is divided, and analogy therefore leads to the conclusion that רָאשַׁים denotes the "branches" of the parent stream. There are other difficulties in the details of the several theories which may be obstacles to their entire reception, but it is manifest that no theory which fails to satisfy the above- mentioned conditions can be allowed to take its place among things that are probable. What, then, is the river which goes forth from Eden to water the garden? is a question which has often been asked, and still waits for a fully satisfactory answer. That the ocean stream which surrounded the earth was the source from which the four rivers flowed was the opinion of Josephus (Ant. 1, 1, 53) and Johannes Damascenus (De Orthod. Fid. 2:9). It was the Shat el-Arab, according to those who place the garden of Eden below the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, and their conjecture would deserve consideration were it not that this stream cannot, with any degree of propriety, be said to rise in Eden. By those who refer the position of Eden to the highlands of Armenia, the "river" from which the four streams diverge is conceived to mean "'a collection of springs," or a well-watered district. It is scarcely necessary to say that this signification of נָהָר (nahar') is without a parallel; and even if it could, under certain circumstances, be made to adopt it, such a signification is, in the present instance, precluded by the fact that, whatever meaning we may assign to the word in Job 1:10, it must be essentially the same as that which it has in the following verses, in which it is sufficiently definite. Sickler (Augusti, Theol. Monatschrift, 1:1), supposing the whole narrative to be a myth, solves the difficulty by attributing to its author a large measure of ignorance. The "river" was the Caspian Sea, which in his apprehension was an immense stream from the east. Bertheau, applying the geographical knowledge of the ancients as a test of that of the Hebrews, arrived at the same conclusion, on the ground that all the people south of the Armenian and Persian highlands place the dwelling of the gods in the extreme north, and the regions of the Caspian were the northern limit of the horizon of the Israelites (Knobel, Genesis). But he allows the four rivers of Eden to have been real rivers, and not, as Sickler imagined, oceans which bounded the earth east and west of the Nile. The modern Lake Van, or perhaps the ancient stream of which this is now the representative, appears to be the only body of water in this vicinity answering to the Mosaic description. Nor will it do to suppose that in former ages great changes had taken place, which have so disguised the rivers in question that their course connection, and identity are not now traceable; for two of the rivers, at least, remain to this day essentially the same as in all historic times, end the whole narrative of Moses is evidently adapted to the geography as it existed in his own day, being constantly couched in the present tense, and in terms of well-known reference as landmarks. SEE RIVER.

Some, ever ready to use the knife, have unhesitatingly pronounced the whole narrative to be a spurious interpolation of a later age (Granville Penn, Min. and Mos. Geol. page 184). But, even admitting this, the words are not mere unmeaning jargon, and demand explanation. Ewald (Gesch. 1:331, note) affirms, and we have only his word for it, that the tradition originated in the far East, and that in the course of its wanderings the original names of two of the rivers at least were changed to others with which the Hebrews were better acquainted. Hartmann regards it as a product of the Babylonian or Persian period. Luther, rejecting the forced interpretations on which the theories of his time were based, gave it as his opinion that the garden remained under the guardianship of angels till the time of the Deluge, and that its site was known to the descendants of Adam; but that by the flood all traces of it were obliterated. But, as before remarked, the narrative is so worded as to convey the idea that the countries and rivers spoken of were still existing in the time of the historian. It has been suggested that the description of the gardens of Eden is part of an inspired antediluvian document (Morren, Rosemuller's Geogr. 1:92). The conjecture is beyond criticism; it is equally incapable of proof or disproof, and has not much probability to recommend it. The effects of the flood in changing the face of countries, and altering the relations of land and water, are too little known at present to allow any inferences to be drawn from them. (See below.)

Conjectures with regard to the dimensions of the garden have differed as widely as those which assign its locality. Ephraem Syrus maintained that it surrounded the whole earth, while Johannes Tostatus restricted it to a circumference of thirty-six or forty miles, and others have made it extend over Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia. But of speculations like these there is no end.

3. Identifications of the Site. — It would be difficult, in the whole history of opinion, to find any subject which has so invited, and at the same time so completely baffled conjecture, as the garden of Eden. The three continents of the Old World have been subjected to the most rigorous search; from Chine to the Canary Isles, from the Mountains of the Moon to the coasts of the Baltic, no locality which in the slightest degree corresponded to the description of the first abode of the human race has been left unexamined. The great rivers of Europe, Asia, and Africa have in turn done service as the Pison and Gihon of Scripture, and there remains nothing but the New World wherein the next adventurous theorist may bewilder himself in the mazes of this most difficult question. Upon the question of the exact geographical position of Eden dissertations innumerable have been written. Many authors have given descriptive lists of them, with arguments for and against each. The most convenient presentation of their respective outlines has been reduced to a tabulated form, with ample illustrations, by the Reverend N. Morren (annexed to his translation of the younger Rosenmuller's Biblical Geography of Central Asia, pages 91-98, Edinburgh, 1836). He reduces them to nine principal theories, as follows (numbered as in the following table; compare Kalisch, Genesis, page 100 sq.)

a. The opinion which fixes Eden in Armenia we have placed first, because it is that which has obtained most general support, and seems nearest the truth. (See Number 6) For if we may suppose that, while Cain moved to the East (Gen 4:16), the posterity of Seth remained in the neighborhood of the primeval seat of mankind, and that Noah's ark rested not very far from the place of his former abode, then Mount Ararat in Armenia becomes a connecting point between the antediluvian and post- diluvian words (Gen 8:4), and the names of the Phrat, Hiddekel, etc., would readily be given to rivers, which, after the great deluge, seemed to flow in channels somewhat corresponding to the Paradisiacal streams. The opinion in question was first systematically propounded by Reland, and is held by Calmnet, and by his American editor, Professor Robinson, who, however, understands by Cush, Chusistan. Professor Stuart takes the Pishon for the Kur, and Cush for Cushi-Capcoch, i.e., the northern part of the region between the Caspian Lake and the Persian Gulf (Heb. Chrest on Gen 2:10-14). The Cossaei, whom Reland finds in Cush, lived near Media, in the tract now called Dilem, southwest of the Caspian Sea. Link takes the Gihon for the Cur or Cyrus, and Cush for the Caucasus. Verbrugge coincides with Reland, except that he takes the Gihon to be the Gyndes, which flowed between Armenia and Matiana.

b. This opinion was most elaborately defended by Huet, bishop of Avranches; but it is also maintained by Calvin, Bochart, Wells, Steph. Morinus, Vorst, etc. Hales was of this sentiment in the first edition of his Chronology, but in the second he follows the opinion of Reland. The Shat el-Arab is the name of the united streams of the Euphrates and Tigris. Ainsworth says, "It is probable that the united rivers emptied themselves into the gulf at this period (in ancient times) by several distinct mouths, of which the first or greatest was at Teredon, the Ostium Tigris Occidentale of Ptolemy, and the mouth of the Euphrates, according to Nearchus; the second was the Pasitigris of Pliny, probably the Shat el-Arab, and the Ostium Tigris Orientale of the Alexandrian geographer." Cush they compare with the Cutha of 2Ki 17:24; and Havilah with the Chaulataioi of Eratosthenes in Strabo, 16:767. Grotius thinks the Pishon is the Pasitigris, and the Gihon, the Nahr Malikah, or the Chaboras. Hottinger agrees with Grotius as to the Pishon, but takes the Gihon for the Nahr Sura. Hopkinson makes the Pishon and Gihon to be the two canals of the Euphrates, the Nahl Malikah, and the Nahr Sares or Sura.

c. The celebrated Gottingen professor, J.D. Michaelis, originated this hypothesis, though he is doubtful as to some of the points. Gatterer, in the main, agrees with him, only he understands the Hiddekel to be the Indus, and takes the Pishon for the Phasis. Cush is found by Michaelis in the name of the city Cath or Caths, the ancient capital of Chowrasmia, on the Oxus or Jihun, near the site of Balkh. He refers to Quint. Curtius as speaking of the Cusaei or Cusitani being in Bactria upon the Oxus. Wahl sees Cush in the Khousti of Moses of Chorene, meaning the large province between the Caspian and Persian Seas, as far as the Indus and Oxus. The land of Havilah Michaelis connects with the tribe of Chwaliski or Chwalisses, from whom the Russians call the Caspian Sea the Chwalinskoie More.

d. This theory has been proposed by the eminent Orientalist Von Hammer. The Sihon, he says, rises near the town of Cha, and compasses the land of Ilah, famous for the gold and precious stones of Turkistan.

e. That Paradise was in Syria was the opinion of the voluminous Le Clerc, in his valuable Commentary. Havilah is the tract mentioned in 1Sa 15:7. Cush is Cassiotis or Mount Casius, near Seleucia in Syria. This opinion is shared by Lakemacher, who, however, takes the Pishon to be the Jordan. Heidegger thinks the Jordan was the great river of Paradise, an idea adopted by the paradoxical Hardouin, in his Excursus to Pliny's Nat. Hist. lib. 6. Others, who place Eden in Arabia Felix, transform the Pishon into the Persian Gulf, and the Gihon into the Red Sea.

f. This is perhaps the most ancient opinion of any being found in Josephus (Ant. 1:1, 3), and in several of the fathers, e.g. Theophilus Autol, 2:24; Epiphan. (Epp. 2:60); Philostorgus in Nicephor. Hist. Eccl. 9:19, though the latter takes the Pishon for the Indian river Hypasis. The editor of Calmet observes that “the inhabitants of the kingdom of Goiam call the Nile the Gihon." Cush is naturally taken for Ethiopia. This view is embraced by the celebrated Gesenius, with the exception that he maintains the Pishon to be the Indus; in this he is followed in the main by Professor Bush, who likewise observes: "This view of the subject, it is admitted, represents the ancient Eden as a very widely extended territory, reaching from the Indus on the east to the Nile and the Mediterranean on the west, and including the intermediate countries. If the view above given of the topography of Eden be correct, it will be seen that it embraced the fairest portion of Asia, besides a part of Africa, comprising the countries at present known as Cabul, Persia, Armenia, Kurdistan, Syria, Arabia, Abyssinia, and Egypt. The garden, however, which is said to have been 'eastward in Eden,' was probably situated somewhere in the neighborhood of the Euphrates, perhaps not far from the site of Babylon, a region nearer its eastern than its western limits; but the exact position it is apparently vain to attempt to determine." Among the most thorough scholars, the contest seems snow to lie mainly between this view and that in Number 1. g. Captain Wilford, well known for his profound acquaintance with Hindu antiquities, advanced the present view, as being founded upon the Indian Puranas (Asiatic Researches, 6:455, Lond. edit.). It was partly adopted by a late ingenious but fanciful writer, Mr. C. Taylor, editor of Calmet's Dictionary, who, in however, makes the Pishon the Nilab; the Gihon, the western branch of the Oxus; the Hiddekel, the eastern; and the Phrat, the Hirmend.

h. This and the following are given as specimens of the views of the modern German school of neology, which regards the whole narrative as a myth, similar to the Greek tradition of the Hesperides, the Islands of the Blessed, etc. Philip Buttman is the author of the hypothesis under the present number. The Pishon he compares with the Besynga, which is mentioned by Ptolemy as the most considerable river of India east of the Ganges. Ava was early known as a region of gold; and an anonymous geographer, in Hudson's collection, volume 3, speaks of the Eviltae or Evilaei as being near the Senes or Chinese.

i. Another neological theory — the author, A.T. Hartmann, who looks upon the description as a product of the Babylonish or Persian period. The idea of Eden being the far-famed vale of Cashmere had been anticipated by Herder in his work on the History of Mankind. Appropriate accounts of Cashmere may be found in the travels of Burnes and Jacquemont.

Many of the Orientals think that Paradise was in the island of Serendib or Ceylon; while the Greeks place it at Beth-Eden, on Lebanon.

These, indeed, are but a few of the opinions that have been propounded; yet, though many more might be added, it is to be observed that most of them have much in common, and differ only in some of the details. To enumerate the vagaries of German and other writers on this subject would be endless. (See Kittos Scripture Lands, page 1-8.) The fact is that not one of them answers to all the conditions of the problem. It has been remarked that this difficulty might have been expected, and is obviously probable, from the geological changes that may have taken place, and especially in connection with the Deluge. This remark would not be applicable, to the extent that is necessary for the argument, except upon the supposition before mentioned, that the earlier parts of the book of Genesis consist of primeval documents, even antediluvian, and that this is one of them. There is reason to think, however, that since the Deluge the face of the country cannot have undergone any change approaching to what the hypothesis of a post-diluvian composition would require. But we think it highly probable that the principal of the immediate causes of the Deluge, the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep," was a subsidence of a large part or parts of the land between the inhabited tract (which we venture to place in E. long. from Greenwich, 300 to 500, and N. lat. 250 to 400) and the sea which lay to the south, or an elevation of the bed of that sea. SEE DELUGE.

As nearly as we can gather from the Scriptural description, Eden was a tract of country, the finest imaginable, lying probably between the 35th and the 40th degree of N. latitude, of such moderate elevation, and so adjusted, with respect to mountain ranges, and watersheds, and forests, as to preserve the most agreeable and salubrious conditions of temperature and all atmospheric changes. Its surface must therefore have been constantly diversified by hill and plain. In the finest part of this land of Eden, the Creator had formed an enclosure, probably by rocks, and forests, and rivers, and had filled it with every product of nature conducive to use and happiness. Due moisture, of both the ground and the air, was preserved by the streamlets from the nearest hills, and the rivulets from the more distant; and such streamlets and rivulets, collected according to the levels of the surrounding country ("it proceeded from Eden") flowed off afterwards in four larger streams, each of which thus became the source of a great river.

Here, then, in the south of Armenia, after the explication we have given, it may seem the most suitable to look for the object of our exploration, the site of Paradise.

That the Hiddekel (this name is said to be still in use among the tribes who live upon its banks — Col. Chesney, Expedition. to Tigris and Euphrates, 1:13) is the Tigris, and the Phrath the Euphrates, has never been denied, except by those who assume that the whole narrative is a myth which originated elsewhere and was adapted by the Hebrews to their own geographical notions. As the former is the name of the great river by which Daniel sat (Dan 10:4), and the latter is the term uniformly applied to the Euphrates in the Old Testament, there seems no reason to suppose that the appellations in Gen 2:14 are to be understood in any other than the ordinary sense. One circumstance in the description is worthy of observation. Of the four rivers, one, the Euphrates, is mentioned by name only, as if that were sufficient to identify it. The other three are defined according to their geographical positions, and it is fair to conclude that they were therefore rivers with which the Hebrews were less intimately acquainted. If this be the case, it is scarcely possible to imagine that the Gihon, or, as some say, the Pison, is the Nile, for that must have been even more familiar to the Israelites than the Euphrates, and have stood as little in need of a definition.

But the stringent difficulty is to find any two rivers that will reasonably answer to the predicates of the Pishon and the Gihon, and any countries which can be collocated as Havilah and Cush. The latter name, indeed, was given by the Hebrews and other Orientals to several extensive countries, and those very distant both from Armenia and from each other. As for Havilah, we have the name again in the account of the dispersion of the descendants of Noah (chapter 10:29); but whether that was the same as this Havilah, and in what part of Asia it was, we despair of ascertaining. Reland and others, the best writers upon this question, have felt themselves compelled to give to these names a comprehension which destroys all preciseness. So, likewise, the meaning of the two names of natural products can be little more than matter of conjecture the bedolach and the stone shoham. The farmer word occurs only here and in Num 11:7. The Septuagint, our oldest and best authority with regard to terms of natural history, renders it, in our passage, by anthrax, meaning probably the ruby, or possibly the topaz; and in Numbers by crystallos, which the Greeks applied not merely to rock-crystal, but to any finely transparent mineral. Any of the several kinds of odoriferous gum, which many ancient and modern authorities have maintained, is not, likely, for it could not be in value comparable to gold. The pearl is possible, but not quite probable, for it is an animal product, and the connection seems rather to confine us to minerals; and pearls, though translucent, are not transparent as good crystal is. Would not the diamond be an admissible conjecture? The shoham occurs in ten other places, chiefly in the book of Exodus, and in all those instances our version says onyx; but the Septuagint varies, taking onyx, sardius, sardonyx, beryl, prase-stone, sapphire, and smaragdus, which is a green-tinctured rock-crystal. The preponderance seems to be in favor of onyx, one of the many varieties of banded agate; but the idea of value leads us to think that the emerald is the most probable. There are two remarkable inventories of precious stones in Exo 39:10-13, and Eze 28:13, which may be profitably studied, comparing the Septuagint with the Hebrew. SEE HAVILAR. For attempted identifications of the Pison and Gihon, see those names respectively.

4. For the Literature of the subject, SEE PARADISE.

II. (עֶדֶן, Sept. Ε᾿δἐμ, but omits in Isa 37:12, and Eze 27:23; Vulg. Eden), one of the marts which supplied the luxury of Tyre with richly embroidered stuffs. It is associated with Haran, Sheba, and Asshur; and in Amo 1:5, Beth-Eden, or "the house of Eden," is rendered in the Sept. by Charran (Xαῤῥάν). In 2Ki 19:12, and Isa 37:12, "the sons of Eden" are mentioned with Gozan, Haran, and Rezeph, as victims of the Assyrian greed of conquest. Telassar appears to have been the headquarters of the tribe; and Knobel's (Comm. on Isaiah) etymology of this name would point to the highlands of Assyria as their whereabouts. But this has no sound foundation, although the view which it supports receives confirmation from the version of Jonathan, who gives חדיב (Chadib) as the equivalent of Eden. Bochart proved (Phaleg. part 1, p. 274) that this term was applied by the Talmudic writers to the mountainous district of Assyria; which bordered on Media, and was known as Adiabene. But if Gozan be Gausanitis in Mesopotamia, and Haran be Carrhe, it seems more natural to look for Eden somewhere in the same locality. Keil (Comm. on Kings, 2:97) thinks it may be Ma'don, which Assemani (Bibl. Or. 2:224) places in Mesopotamia, in the modern province of Diarbekr. Bochart, considering the Eden of Genesis and Isaiah as identical, argues that Gozan, Haran, Rezeph, and Eden are mentioned in order of geographical position, from north to south; and, identifying Gozan with Gausanitis, Haran with Carrhae, a little below Gausanitis on the Chabor, and Rezeph with Reseipha, he gives to Eden a still more southerly situation at the confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris, or even lower. According to him, it may be Addan or Addana, which geographers place on the Euphrates. . Michaelis (Suppl. No. 1826) is in favor of the modern Aden, a port of Arabia (called by Ptolemy Α᾿ραβίας ἐμπόριον), as the Eden of Ezekiel. SEE VEDAN.

III. (עֶדֶן, Amo 1:5, "house of Eden"). SEE BETH-EDEN.

IV. (Sept. Ι᾿ωδἀν v. r. Ι᾿ωαδάμ.) Son of Joah, and one of the Gershonite Levites who assisted in the reformation of public worship under Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12). B.C. 726. He is probably the same with the Levite appointed in the same connection one of the superintendents of the distribution of the free-will offerings (2Ch 31:15, Sept. Ο᾿δόμ, v.r. •δόντων).

## Eden (2)[[@Headword:Eden (2)]]

             The locality of Paradise has recently been investigated afresh by Friedrich Delitzsch (Wo lag das Paradisus, Leipsic, 1881), who places the garden of Eden in that part of Northern or Upper Babylonia which immediately surrounds the site of Babylon itself. He associates the name Eden with the non-Shemitic edin ("plain"), instead of the well-received Hebraic derivation, and compares the Accadian name Kardunias ("garden of the God Dunias"), of the district around Babylon. He regards "the river going forth from Eden to water the garden" as that system of watercourses, with one general current, which irrigated the isthmus between the Tigris and the Euphrates at its narrowest point, just above Babylon. The other two of the four principal "heads" of the stream he thinks were perhaps half-natural, half-artificial, canals flowing out of the Euphrates — the Pallokopas on the west, and the Shaten-Nil on the east. He has not actually found in the Chaldvean records the names Pishon or Gichon, but he believes the former to be the Accadian pisan ("watervessel"), and the latter is supposed to be the Babylonian Gughan de, possibly pointing to one of these canals. The precariousness of this identification is evident at a glance, and well  comports with the fanciful character of many of that learned Orientalist's interpretations. SEE PARADISE, in this volume.

## Edenius Jordan Nicolas[[@Headword:Edenius Jordan Nicolas]]

             a Swedish theologian, was born in 1624, and became professor of theology at Upsal in 1659. He died in 1666, leaving, among other works, Dissertationes theologicae de Christianae religionis veritate (Abo, 1664): — Epitome historiae ecclesiasticae, published by bishop Gezelius at Abo in 1681. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 15:647.

## Edenus[[@Headword:Edenus]]

             sixteenth bishop of Meaux, cir. A.D. 552. Eder. Lieut. Conder proposes (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336) to identify this with the present Khurbet el- Adar, three miles south of Gaza, consisting only of "ruined rubble cisterns and traces of a town, with immense masses of broken pottery forming mounds at the site" (Memoirs of the Ordinance Survey, 3:251); but the location seems out of place if the list in Joshua begins at the east.

## Eder[[@Headword:Eder]]

              (Hebrews id. עֵדֶר, a flock, as often), the name of a place and also of a man. SEE EDAR; SEE ADER.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿δραίν,Vat. MS. omits; Vulg. Eder.) A city in the extreme south of Judah, on the Idumaean border, mentioned between Kabzeel and Jagur (Jos 15:21); therefore, doubtless, one of those afterwards assigned to Simeon. Schwa z suggests (Palest. page 99) that it may be the same with ARAD SEE ARAD (q.v.), by a transposition of letters; but this is doubtful. Possibly it was situated on the eminence north of the fountain marked as "water" on Van de Velde's Map, in wady el-Ernez, S.W. of the Dead Sea.

2. (Sept. Ε᾿δέρ Vulg. Eder.) The second named of the three "sons" (i.e. descendants) of Mushi appointed to the Levitical offices in the time of David (1Ch 23:23; 1Ch 24:30). B.C. 1013.

## Eder, Georg[[@Headword:Eder, Georg]]

             a Roman Catholic writer, was born at Freysingen in 1524, and studied at Cologne. He was the spiritual adviser of the emperor Ferdinand I, and died May 19, 1586, leaving, (Economia Bibliorum seu Partitionum Theologicarum, etc. (Cologne, 1568; Venice, 1572 ): — Compendium Catechismi Catholici (Cologne, 1570): — De Fide Catholica (1571): — Malleus Haereticorum (Ingolstadt, 1580): — Mataeologia Haereticorum (ibid. 1581). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelhrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Edersheim, Alfred, D.D[[@Headword:Edersheim, Alfred, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was born of Jewish parents at Vienna, March 7, 1825. He was a student at Vienna University. and entered New College, Edinburgh, in 1843. In 1849 he became minister of the Free Church, Old Aberdeen. On account of ill-health he went, in 1861, to Torquay, in England, where a congregation gathered about him and built a church for him. In 1875 he was ordained deacon and priest of the Church of England. In 1876 he became vicar of Loders, Dorsetshire, but resigned in 1883, and removed to Oxford, where he remained until his death, March 16, 1889. In 1880-84 he was Warburtonian lecturer at Lincoln's Inn, London; in 1884- 86 was select preacher of Oxford University. He also lectured in its "Honors School of Theology." He wrote many works, the principal ones being, The Temple: its Ministry and Services as they were in the Time of Christ (1874): — Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (1883, 2 volumes), on which he labored for seven years. At the time of his death he was at work on a Life of St. Paul, and had just completed a series of lectures on the Septuagint.

## Edes[[@Headword:Edes]]

              (rather Edais, ᾿Ηδαϊvς, Vulg. Esmi), one of the "sons of Ethma," who had married foreign wives after the captivity (1Es 9:35); evidently the Jadau (q.v.) of the Hebrews list (Ezr 10:43).

## Edes, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Edes, Henry, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was a native of Boston, and graduated from Harvard College in 1799. He was ordained and installed pastor of the First Church in Providence, R.I., July 17, 1806; dismissed in June 1832, and died in 1851. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:95.

## Edesius[[@Headword:Edesius]]

             a martyr, commemorated April 5. SEE EDESIUS.

## Edessa[[@Headword:Edessa]]

              (modern name Urfah or Orfa; Armenian name Edessia; Arab. Er-Roha; — Syrian, Urhoi), an ancient city of Mesopotamia, 78 miles S.W. from Diarbekir. An old legend attributes its origin to Nimrod, or to Khabiba, a female contemporary of Abraham. The Targums (followed by Jerome and Ephrem Syrus) make it the Erech of Gen 10:10. Another tradition  (Jewish and Arabic) makes it Ur of the Chaldees (Gen 11:28). "With the conquest of Persia by the Greeks the history of Edessa first becomes clear. Seleucus, in particular, is said to have done much for the aggrandizement of the city. Christianity was introduced into Edessa at an early period. In the reign of Trajan the place was made tributary to Rome, and in A.D. 216 became a Roman military colony, under the name of Colonia Marcia Edessenorum. During this period its importance in the history of the Christian Church continued to increase. More than 300 monasteries are said to have been included within its walls. With the extension of the religion of Islam, Edessa fell into the hands of the Arabian caliphs. Christianity declined, and wars at home and abroad during the caliphate destroyed likewise its temporal splendor add prosperity, till, in 1040, it fell into the possession of the Seljuk Turks. The Byzantine emperors succeeded in recovering Edessa, but the viceroy contrived to make himself independent. He was, however, hard pressed by the Turks, and this rendered it easy for the crusader Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey of Bouillon, to gain possession of the city (A.D. 1097), and make it the capital of a Latin principality, and the bulwark of the kingdom of Jerusalem. Under the Frankish princes, Edessa held out valiantly against the Mussulmans, till at length Zengi, ruler of Mosul, succeeded in taking the town and citadel in the year 1144, when all the Christian churches were converted into mosques. After many vicissitudes, in the course of which Edessa fell successively into the hands of the sultans of Egypt, the Byzantines, the Mongols, Turkomans, and Persians, the city was finally conquered by the Turks, and has ever since formed a portion of the Turkish dominions. The population is variously estimated at from 25,000 to 50,000, of whom 2000 are Armenian Christians. The Jacobites, in the last century, had 150 houses and a church. The rest are Turks, Arabians, Kurds, and Jews. Edessa is regarded by the Easterns as a sacred city, because they believe it to have been the residence of Abraham" (Chambers, Encyclopaedia, s.v.). It is still the seat of a Greek archbishop and an Armenian bishop. A dialect of the Aramaic is still spoken at Edessa (comp. Etheridge on the Aramaic Dialects, page 10).

The report of the introduction of Christianity by king Abgar (q.v.), a contemporary of Christ, is probably an unfounded legend; but it is certain that Christianity became firmly rooted in Edessa at a very early period. The twenty-sixth Osrhoenian king (152-187) was, if not a Christian himself, a patron of Christianity, and the Gnostic Bardesanes is said to have been highly esteemed by him. Edessa was an early episcopal see, and in the 4th century became the chief seat of Syrian ecclesiastical learning. The emperor Julian threatened to distribute the large treasure of the churches of Edessa among his soldiers, but his death saved the churches from the execution of this threat. In 363, Ephrem (q.v.), the Syrian, came from Nisibis to Edessa, and by his preaching, teaching, and prolific writings, greatly distinguished himself in the defense of the orthodox doctrines of the Church. After the death of Ephrem, the Arians took possession of all the churches of Edessa, but after five years the ascendency of the orthodox school was restored. Different from the Edessene school established by Ephrem was the Persian school at Edessa, which was intended to be a seminary for the Christian subjects of the Persian king. It attained its highest prosperity in the time of Ephrem, became subsequently a stronghold of Nestorianism, and was on that account dissolved in 489. — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 3:645; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:391; Chronicon Edessenum, in Assemani, Biblioth. Oriental. 1:387-428; Cureton, Ancient Syriac Documents relative to Edessa, etc. (London, 1866); Etheridge, The Syrian Churches (London, 1846), page 35 sq. SEE NESTORIANS.

## Edessa, Martyrs Of[[@Headword:Edessa, Martyrs Of]]

             under Trajan (A.D. 114), especially the bishop, Barsimieus :(according to some), and Sabellius, together with Barbea, the sister of the latter; commemorated together on January 30.

## Edeyrn[[@Headword:Edeyrn]]

             a Welsh saint, commemorated January 6, was a bard of royal descent, who embraced a monastic life in the early days of British Christianity.

## Edgar John Todd, D.D.[[@Headword:Edgar John Todd, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Sussex County, Delaware, April 13, 1792. With the proverbial love for knowledge of the Scotch-Irish, his parents gave him the best education that could be obtained in Kentucky, to which state they removed soon after his birth. He graduated at Princeton in 1816, and was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery. In 1817 he was ordained pastor of the church at Flemingsburg, Ky. He was thence called to Maysville, where he labored unremittingly. In 1829 he was induced to accept a call from the church at Frankfort, Kentucky, where his eloquence soon gathered around him the leading men of the state. Henry Clay said of him, "If you want to hear eloquence, listen to John T. Edgar." In 1833 he became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Nashville, Tennessee and continued to discharge the duties of that office with great fidelity and success up to the year 1859, when an assistant was appointed to aid him. He was distinguished for power in the pulpit, and for a degree of liberality of feeling and public spirit which caused him to be regarded as belonging rather to the whole community than to his particular church. Mr. Edgar wrote little, though at one time he was editor of the American Presbyterian, published at Nashville. He died suddenly of apoplexy November 13, 1860.

## Edgar John, D.D.[[@Headword:Edgar John, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister of Ireland, was born in County Down, Ireland, in 1797, and entered the ministry in 1820. His life from the outset of his ministry in 1820 was one of ceaseless toil. "His energy of character was immense, and his name became a tower of strength to all the Christian enterprises with which he was identified. Upon the union of Presbyterians in 1840 he was made one of the professors of Divinity for the Assembly, and the influence he wielded over its students was very great, and he put forth strenuous and successful efforts for the erection and equipment of its theological college in Belfast. He fired the hearts of his students with his own meal in the work of the evangelization of their country, and spent much of his vacation in personal labors for it. His spirit in church extension was remarkable. His last great effort was in undertaking to raise about $100,000 for erecting additional manses among the churches. By far the greater part of this had been secured before his death." At least fifty of the houses of worship belonging to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland owe their existence to his persevering efforts. He died in Dublin August 26, 1866. See Killen, Memoirs of John Edgar (Belfast and London, 1867); American Annual Cyclopaedia for 1866, page 277.

## Edge[[@Headword:Edge]]

             with reference to the sword, is the rendering ,of פֶּה, peh, mouth (like στόμα, Luk 21:24; Heb 11:34), or fem. פֵּיָה, peyah' (Jdg 3:16); also פָּנַים panim', face (Ecc 10:10); poet. צוּר, tsur, a rock, hence sharpness (Psa 89:43): elsewhere, in the sense of brink or margin; it corresponds to שָׁפָה saphah', ip; and to קָצָה atsah', קָצֶה, kastek', or קצְוֶה kitsveh', extremity (Exo 28:7; Exo 39:4; Exo 13:20; Exo 21:5; Exo 36:12; Num 33:6; Num 33:37; Jos 13:27; Psa 39:4). To “set on edge" is an inaccurate rendering (Jer 31:29-30; Eze 18:2) of קָהָה, kahah, to be blunt (as in Ecc 10:10). SEE SWORD.

## Edgeworth, Roger[[@Headword:Edgeworth, Roger]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Holt Castle, on the borders of Wales. He was educated at Oxford, elected fellow of Oriel College in 1507, and soon after ordained. About 1519l he was appointed canon successively at Salisbury, Wells, and Bristol; in 1554 chancellor of Wells, and also vicar of St. Cuthbert's Church, to which he was admitted October 3, 1543. He died in 1560, leaving a volume of Sermons (Lond. 1557, 4to). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Edhameis[[@Headword:Edhameis]]

             (also Edhamais, Eadhamais, etc.), an Irish saint, daughter of AEdh, is commemorated January 18.

## Edhemi[[@Headword:Edhemi]]

             a monastic order among the Mohammedans, founded by Ibrahim ibn- Edhem, who died at Damascus, A.D. 777. His disciples say that he was a slave, a native of Abyssinia, that he always desired to please God, regularly read the Koran in the mosques, and prayed day and night with his face to the ground. Edhem established a strictly ascetic order, who gave themselves much to prayer and fasting, and professed to discourse with Enoch in the wilderness.

## Edhniuch[[@Headword:Edhniuch]]

             (Lat. Egnacius), an Irish priest, son of Ere, and abbot of Liath, died A.D. 767. Edibius.

(1) Saint, bishop of Soissons, A.D. 451, is commemorated December 10.

(2) Sixth bishop of Amiens, in 511.

## Edias or Eddias[[@Headword:Edias or Eddias]]

              (Ι᾿εζίας, Alex. MS. Ι᾿εδδίας, Vulg. Geddias), the second named of the "sons of Phoros," who took foreign wives after the captivity (1Es 9:26); the JEZIAH SEE JEZIAH (q.v.) of the Hebrews list (Ezr 10:25).

## Edict[[@Headword:Edict]]

             the technical name of a paper read in Presbyterian churches in Scotland, "as a species of guard on the purity of the Christian ministry. It is a public invitation to all who can say anything against the minister elect to come forward for the purpose. The form of the document authorized by the United Presbyterian Church is as follows: 'Whereas the presbytery of —— of the United Presbyterian Church have received a call from this congregation, addressed to A.B., preacher (or minister) of the Gospel, to be their minister, and the said call has been sustained as a regular Gospel call, and been accepted of by the said A.B., and he has, undergone trials for ordination; and whereas the said presbytery having judged the said A.B. qualified for the ministry of the Gospel and the pastoral charge of this congregation, have resolved to proceed to his ordination on the —— day of ——, unless something occur which may reasonably impede it, notice is hereby given to all concerned that if they, or any of them, have anything to object why the said A. B. should not be ordained pastor of this congregation, they may repair to the presbytery, which is to meet at —— on the said —— day of with certification, that if no valid objection be then made, the presbytery will proceed without farther delay. By order of the presbytery."'

## Edict of Nantes[[@Headword:Edict of Nantes]]

             SEE NANTES; SEE FRANCE, SEE REFORMED CHURCH OF.

## Edictius (Edicius, or Hecdicus)[[@Headword:Edictius (Edicius, or Hecdicus)]]

             said to have been thirty-fourth bishop of Vienne (France), A.D. 678; commemorated October 23.

## Edicts, Imperial[[@Headword:Edicts, Imperial]]

             SEE PERSECUTIONS.

## Edification[[@Headword:Edification]]

             "the process by which believers are built up, that is, progressively advanced in knowledge and holiness.

1. The ‘sacred writers perpetually employ this figure as their favorite illustration of the condition of Christians, as forming collectively the temple, succeeding that literal one on Mount Sion; the temple in which the Lord dwells by his holy Spirit; and as being, individually, “living stones, builded up into an habitation for the Lord.”' ‘The words “edify” and “edification” have so completely lost their literal signification in our tongue, that it would be reckoned even an impropriety to use them in speaking of the building of a literal edifice, and thus the reader loses the force and significance of the language of the sacred writers.' The word 'edify,' especially when applied to individual Christians, has often the sense of instruct; though in the 'Preface' to the 'Order of Confirmation' in the English Prayer-book. 'To the end ... to the more edifying,' the word is probably used in the sense already explained, not in the especial sense of 'instruct"' (Eden).

2. "To perceive the full force and propriety of the term as used by the apostles, it is quite necessary to keep in mind the similitudes by which they generally describe a Christian church. All those spiritual gifts, which were bestowed on the Christians were for the building and edifying of the members of the Church. The apostolical power in Church censures was for edification, not for destruction (2Co 10:8); to build, and not to pull down; that is, to preserve the unity of the Church entire, and its communion pure. And we may observe that this edification is primarily applied to the Church: that the Church may receive edifying; that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church; for the edifying of the body of Christ (1Co 14:5; 1Co 14:12; Eph 4:12). And it is very observable wherein the apostle places the edification of the body of Christ, viz., in unity and love: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ (Eph 4:12-13). Till we are united by one faith unto one body, and perfect man. And speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual 'working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love (Eph 4:15-16). This is an admirable description of the unity of the Church, in which all the parts are closely united and compacted together, as stones and timber are to make one house; and thus they grow into one body and increase in mutual love and charity, which is the very building and edification of the Church, which is edified and built up in love, as the apostle adds, that knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth (1Co 8:1). This builds up the Church of Christ; and that not such a common charity as we have for all mankind but such a love and sympathy as is peculiar to the members of the same body, and which none but members can have for each other" (Hook, Ch. Dict. s.v.).

3. "Many professors, and even teachers of religion, not greatly liking such union and its obvious consequences, yet finding much said in the New Testament; of the attainments and comforts of the first Christians have studied to devise means of enjoying these comforts separately. Instead of the objects that chiefly drew the attention of the first believers, they have endeavored to fix the attention of Christians on a multitude of rules respecting the particular conduct of each in his devout exercises his attendance on ordinances, and the frame of his heart therein. But this is a scheme of religion of mere human device. Nothing can be plainer from the whole tenor of the Acts of the Apostles, and their epistles to the churches, than that it is the will of Christ his disciples should unite together, holding fellowship in the institutions of the Gospel; and also that, as he in his infinite wisdom and grace has made abundant provision for their comfort, establishment, and edification, so these blessings can only be effectually enjoyed in proportion as they obey his will in this respect.

## Edifice[[@Headword:Edifice]]

             SEE ARCHITECTURE; SEE HOUSE; SEE TEMPLE; SEE CHURCH.

## Edilfym[[@Headword:Edilfym]]

             eleventh bishop of Llandaff, died in the latter part of the 7th century.

## Edilthryda or Etheldrida St.[[@Headword:Edilthryda or Etheldrida St.]]

             daughter of the Anglo-Saxon queen Anne. She made a vow of chastity in her youth, but was afterwards compelled to marry earl Tondbert, who, at her request, respected her vow. After his death she desired to retire to the island of Ely, but was eventually obliged to marry Egfrid, son of the king of Northumbria. This marriage was dissolved, and in 671 she retired to the convent of Coldingham, and afterwards to the island of Ely, where she erected a convent, of which Wilfrid named her abbess. Here she led a life of asceticism until her death in 679. — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 3:648; Butler, Lives of Saints, June 23.

Edinburgh, the capital of Scotland, and seat of a bishop of the Scotch Episcopal Church. The diocese of Edinburgh had in 1867 24 churches, 2 missions, 33 clergymen, and 20 schools. The population of the city was, in 1861, 168,098. Edinburgh is also the seat of a Roman Catholic vicar apostolic, whose district had in 1860 about 60 parishes and 70,000 Roman Catholics. See Churchman's Calendar for 1868; Neher, Kirchl. Geogr. 1:103. (A.J.S.)

## Editions Printed, Of The Original Texts Fof The Bible[[@Headword:Editions Printed, Of The Original Texts Fof The Bible]]

             SEE SCRIPTURES, HOLY; SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

## Edmeston, James[[@Headword:Edmeston, James]]

             an English architect and poet, was born in London, September 10, 1791, and died at Homerton January 7, 1867. He published, besides some prose works, several volumes of religious lyrical compositions, from which a few pieces have been inserted in most modern hymnals.

## Edmondson, Jonathan, A.M[[@Headword:Edmondson, Jonathan, A.M]]

             an English Wesleyan minister (nephew of Jonathan Catlow, an early Methodist preacher, who withdrew a short time before his death on accountof a disagreement with Wesley on the doctrine of sin in believers; cousin of James Catlow, who died when about taking orders in the Church of England, and of Samuel Catlow, a Socinian minister, and father of Jonathan Edmondson, of the Wesleyan Conference), was born at Keighley, Yorkshire, March 24, 1767. He was converted in 1784, was sent by Wesley to the Epworth Circuit in 1786, and retired a supernumerary at Portsmouth in 1838. He died July 7, 1842. Dr. Edmondson was eminently a holy and laborious minister, and was highly esteemed by his brethren. In 1814 he was made one of the general secretaries of the Missionary Society, in which office he labored beyond his strength. In 1818 he was elected president of the conference sitting in Leeds. He was a voluminous reader, a diligent student, a lucid expositor, an evangelical preacher, and a faithful pastor. During his busy ministry he wrote some valuable books: Short Sermons on Important Subjects ( Lond. 1807, 1829, 2 volumes, 8vo ): — A Concise System of Self-government (ibid. 1815; 3d ed. 1834, 12mo): — Sermons on the Nature and Offices of the Holy Ghost (ibid. 1823; 2d ed. 1837): — Essay on the Christian Ministry (ibid. 1828,12mo): — Scripture Views of the Heavenly World (ibid. 1835, 12mo; 3d ed. 1850, 18mo): — Elements of Revealed Religion (1839, 12mo). See Wesl. Meth. Mag. 1850, pages 1, 113; Minutes of the British Conference, 1842.

## Edmund I[[@Headword:Edmund I]]

             of England, king and martyr, succeeded in 855, when but fifteen years of age, to his father Offa, king of the East Angles. Edmund reigned in meekness, and his whole life was a preparation for martyrdom. About 870 the heathen Danes invaded the kingdom, and, after violating the nuns, killing the priests, and laying waste the country, made him a prisoner. Unwilling to offend God by submitting to the terms of his captors, he was tortured, and finally beheaded (870). In 1122 his anniversary was placed among the English holidays, and the kings of England took him for patron. See his Life by Abbo, and another by John Lydgate. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 3:4648.

## Edmund St., Edmund Rich[[@Headword:Edmund St., Edmund Rich]]

             archbishop of Canterbury in the thirteenth century, studied at Paris, where he became doctor of theology. Returning to England, he preached for the Crusades with such success as to command the approval of the Pope. He was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury April 2, 1234. It fell to his lot as prelate to resist the will of the Pope, and also that of the king of England, and he did resist manfully. He died at the monastery of Soissy, in France, November 16, 1242. The English people, who admired and loved him, demanded his canonization; the papal court at first refused, but finally yielded, and he was canonized by pope Innocent IV in 1249. His Speculum Ecclesia is published in the Bibliotheca Patrum. —Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gingrale, 15:660; Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury (1865, volume 3); Wright, Biographia Literaria (Anglo-Norman period).

## Edmundson, William[[@Headword:Edmundson, William]]

             a noted minister of the English Society of Friends, was born in Westmoreland in 1627. He was apprenticed in York as a carpenter, served in the army under Cromwell, but resigned in 1652, and in 1653 became an earnest Quaker. Subsequently he resided at Antrim, Ireland, and in the spring of 1654 removed to County Armagh, devoting himself to secular pursuits.. He established meetings at his own house, and soon after, in company with John Tiffin, from England, went through Ireland preaching. Subsequently he visited England and urged George Fox to send preachers into Ireland, and when some of these arrived he accompanied them through the country. Having been made a minister himself, he preached: in public places with great effect. At Armagh he was thrown into prison, and subsequently was brought before the justices at the Sessions Court, who ordered his release. In 1655 he travelled into Leinster, holding, meetings in  most of the towns. At Finagh the innkeepers refused to lodge him because he was a Quaker. At Belturbet his meeting was brokenl up, many of his followers were arrested, and he was put in the stocks in the market-place, but eventually was triumphantly acquitted. For several months he suffered confinement in a dungeon at Cavan, where he nearlylost his life from suffocation. Being set at liberty, he visited the North of Ireland. While preaching at Londonlderry, on a market-day, he was arrested and imprisoned. In 1661 the persecution of the Quakers was renewed with increased violence and he was incarcerated at Maryborough. He made three voyages to North America and the West Indies between 1670 and 1684, and died June 30, 1712. See The Friend, 6:167; Reid, Hist. of the Presb. Church in Ireland.

## Edna[[@Headword:Edna]]

              (ςΕδνα, i.e., עֶדְנָהpleasure Vulg. Anna), the wife of Raguel and mother of Sara, the bride of Tobias (Tob 7:2; Tob 7:8; Tob 7:14; Tob 7:16; Tob 10:12; Tob 11:1).

## Edoldus (or Heldoaldus)[[@Headword:Edoldus (or Heldoaldus)]]

             twenty-fourth bishop of Meaux, about the close of the 7th century.

## Edom[[@Headword:Edom]]

              (Hebrews Edom', אֵֹדםor אדֵוֹםso called from his red hair, Gen 25:25, or from the red pottage for which he bartered his birthright, Gen 25:30; Sept. Ε᾿δώμ), the later name of Isaac's son, elder twin-brother of Jacob; more frequently called ESAU SEE ESAU (q.v.). SEE OBED-EDOM.

EDOM (Sept. Ι᾿δουμαία) stands also collectively for the Edomites, the posterity of Edom or Esau; and likewise for their country. SEE EDOMITE.

## Edomite[[@Headword:Edomite]]

              (Hebrews Adomi', אֲדֹמַי Sept. Ι᾿δουμαῖος, fem. plur. אֲדֹמַיֹּת, 1Ki 11:1, Sept. Ι᾿δουμαία; but usually אֵֹדם, Edom, put collectively for the Edomites). The name Edom (fully written אדֵוֹם, red; see Gesenius, Hebrews Thesaur. 1:26) was originally the secondary name of Esau (Gen 25:30, compare Gen 25:25; Gen 36:8), but is used ethnographically in the O.T., his descendants ("children of Edom," בְּנֵי אדֵוֹם being the race who had settled in the south of Palestine, and who at a later period came into conflict with the kindred nation of the Israelites (Deu 23:7; Num 20:14). Comparatively seldom are the appellations children of Esau (Deu 2:4; Deu 2:8; 1Ma 5:3), house of Esau (Oba 1:18), mount Esau (Oba 1:8-9; Oba 1:19; Oba 1:21), or simply Esau (Jer 49:8; Jer 49:10;, Oba 1:6), used in Scripture for the Edomites or Idumaea; the people and country are oftener called merely Edom (Num 24:18; Jos 15:1; 2Sa 8:14; 1Ki 11:14; and especially by the prophets), hence, more fully, land of Edom, (Gen 36:16; Gen 36:21; Num 33:37), or field of Edom (Gen 32:3; Jdg 5:4). The territory of the Edomites was mountainous (Oba 1:8-9; Oba 1:19; Oba 1:21), situated at the southern (Jos 11:17; Jos 12:7), i.e., southeastern border of Palestine (Num 34:3), or more particularly of the tribe of Judah (Jos 15:1; Jos 15:21), in the neighborhood of the Moabites (Jdg 11:18; Isa 11:14; 2Ki 3:8), and was properly called the land or mountain of Seir ( שֵׁעַירGen 26:20; Gen 32:4; Jos 24:2; Eze 35:3; Eze 35:7; Eze 35:15; compare Deu 2:4; Deu 2:29). See SEIR. Lofty and intersected by chasms in the rocks, it formed a natural fastness (Jer 49:16 sq.; Oba 1:3 sq.), yet it was by no means unfruitful (Gen 27:39). It contained, among other cities, the famous rock-hewn Sela (2Ki 14:7), and extended from the AElanitic Gulf to the Red Sea (1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:17). Hence it admits of no doubt that the cleft and craggy region traversed by fruitful valleys, now called el-Shira, which stretches from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea to the eastern arm of the Red Sea, and is separated on the west by the long sandy plain el-Ghor from the desert et- Tib (Seetzen, 18:390, 434; Burckhardt, Trav. 2:683), and bounded on the north by the wady el-Ahsa, which separates it from the land of Moab, near Kerak, in the district of Jebal, is the ancient land of Edom, as Saadias has long ago perceived, for he renders Seir in Gen 36:8 by the same Arabic name Shera (compare Raumer in Berghaus's Annal. d. Erd. u. Volskerkunde, 1:562 sq.). SEE SELA; SEE TEMAN; SEE UZ; SEE BOZRAH.

According to the division in Greek authors, the territory of Edom, Idumaea (Ι᾿δουμαία, a name evidently derived from the Heb.), was reckoned as a part of Arabia Petriea (see Anthon's Class. Diet. s.v.). The early inhabitants of Mount Seir, who were called Horites, were destroyed by the Edomites (Deu 2:12; Deu 2:22), or rather supplanted and absorbed by them. SEE HORITE. Already, in the time of Moses, the Edomites showed a hostile feeling towards the Israelites by forbidding them to pass though their territories, and thus subjecting them to the hardship of journeying around it (Num 20:15-21; Num 21:4; compare Jdg 11:17 sq.; see Hengstenberg, Pent. 2:283); at act which Saul successfully avenged (1Sa 14:47), while David subjugated them (2Sa 8:14; compare 1Ki 11:15 sq.; Psa 60:2; Psa 60:10), and his successor Solomon fitted out a merchant fleet in the Edomitish harbors (1Ki 9:26), although under his reign a partially successful revolt took place (1Ki 11:14 sq.). In the division of the Hebrew commonwealth the Edomites continued under the sway of Judah (probably by means of viceroys, 2Ki 3:9; 2Ki 3:12; 2Ki 3:26; but compare 1Ki 22:48; 2Ki 8:20), so that their ports were at the disposal of Jewish commerce to the time of Joram (1Ki 22:49), under whose reign (B.C. 885) they threw off their allegiance (2Ki 8:20), and maintained their independence by force of arms against several succeeding princes of the weak kingdom of Judah (2Ki 8:21). Amaziah (2Ki 14:7; 2Ch 25:11), in B.C. cir. 836, and also Uzziah (2Ki 14:22; 2Ch 25:11), in B.C. cir. 802, again reduced the Edomites to subjection; but under Ahaz (B.C. cir. 738) they invaded Judaea (2Ch 28:17), while, at the same time, the harbor of Elath was wrested from the Jewish dominions by the Syrians (2Ki 16:6). From this time forward, the Edomites, favored by the increasingly formidable attitude of Assyria, and later of Chaldaea, remained in merely nominal connection with the kingdom of Judah, enjoying real independence, until they too at last were forced to succumb to the Chaldaean power (Jer 27:3; Jer 27:6). The early prophets, nearly contemporary with these events, had already announced Judah's future triumph over these rebellious subjects and persistent enemies (Isa 11:14; Joe 3:19; Amo 1:11); but, after they had made common cause with the foes of Israel at the capture of Jerusalem (Eze 35:15; Eze 36:5; Oba 1:10; Oba 1:13 sq.), the denunciations of the prophets became still more decisive (Jer 49:8; Jer 49:20; Lam 4:21 sq.; Eze 25:12 sq. — compare 35; Obadiah pass.; Psa 137:7; compare Isa 34:5 sq.; Isa 63:1 sq.).

The Edomites, it is true, likewise felt the ravages of the Chaldaean march (Mal 1:3 sq.), but they were left in their own land (in opposition to the view of Eichhorn, Hebr. Proph. 2:618, 624; Bertholdt, Einleit. 4:1440, 1626, who maintain that the Idumaeans were politically annihilated by Nebuchadnezzar; see Gesenius, Comm. on Isaiah 1:906: nor are the predictions of the utter desolation of Edom, e.g. Jer 49:17 sq., to be pressed to their extreme fulfillment; see Heinrich, De Idumaea ejusque vastatione, Lips. 1782), and they even rent away a portion of southern Palestine (comp. Eze 35:10), including the town of Hebron (1Ma 5:65). During the Syrian rule they continued to evince their old ill will against the Jews (1Ma 5:3; 1Ma 5:65; 2Ma 10:15; 2Ma 12:32 sq.), until they were wholly subdued by John Hyrcanus (B.C. cir. 129), and, by a compulsory circumcision, were merged in the Jewish state (Josephus, Ant. 13:9, 1; 15:7, 9; comp. War, 4:5, 5; yet they were invidiously termed half-Jews, Ant. 14:15, 2). From that time Idumaea continued under a Jewish praefect (στρατηγός, Joseph. Ant. 14:1, 3). One of these, Antipater, managed so to ingratiate himself with the Jewish court, and, during the disputes concerning the Maccabaean succession, wielded the procuratorship of all Judaea, with which the friendship of the emperor had invested him, with such efficiency (B.C. 47), that he eventually secured the supreme power instead of Hyrcanus II (Joseph. Ant. 14:8, 5). His son Herod became the acknowledged king of the Jews, and founded an Idumaean dynasty in Palestine. Idumaea formed a province of his dominions, and was under the administration of a special governor (ἄρχων, Joseph. Ant. 15:7, 9). Concerning the farther history of this people, we can here only remark, that the Idumaeans in the last Jewish contest acted the same ruinous part with the Jews themselves (Joseph. War, 4:4, 1 and 5; 7:8, 1). The name of Edom or Edomite is to this day hateful to the Jews (Otho, Lex. Rabb. page 196; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebrews page 693). From the time of the overthrow of the Jewish nation, the name of Idumaea no longer occurs, but passes away in the wider denomination Arabia (comp. Steph. Byz. pages 334, 341; Strabo 16:760, 749); since already for a long period the southern part of the ancient land of the Edomites was reckoned, together with its metropolis Petra, to, Arabia, and entitled separately from (the Jewish province) Idumaea (Joseph. Ant. 14:1, 3; 17:3, 2; War, 1:13, 8); so that Idumaea, while on the north it included in addition a Jewish district (compare the term Idumaean for Jew, especially among the Roman poets, Celsii Hierob. 2:469 sq.), at the same time was contracted in its southern boundary (comp. Ptol. 5:16, 10; 5:17; Strabo, 16:760; Jerome in Oba 1:1); but this does not affect Biblical geography, and it would be difficult to reduce the point to full historical and topographical clearness (see Reland, Palaest. page 69 sq.), SEE ARABIA; SEE PETRA.

The form of government among the Edomitish people was, like that of surrounding nations, tribal (compare Gen 36:15 sq.), yet they originally (or at least earlier than the Israelites) had kings (Gen 36:32 sq.; Num 20:14; see Tuch on Gen 36:9 sq.; Bertheau, Israel. Gesch. page 207), who appear to have been freely chosen from among the clan-chieftains (princes, Gen 36:40; Eze 32:29; compare Isa 34:12, and Gesenius, in loc.; Hengstenberg, Pent. 2:299 sq.), until (in the time of Solomon) a hereditary dynasty had established itself (1Ki 11:14 sq.). While the country remained under Israelitish sway, the native royal government was nearly superseded (1Ki 22:48); although under Jehoshaphat mention is made (2Ki 3:9; 2Ki 3:26) of a king (viceroy) of the Edomites (in alliance with him), and from this time they seem to have had an uninterrupted line of kings (Amo 2:1; Jer 27:3; Eze 32:29). The principal mode of livelihood and employment of the Edomites were commerce by land by means of caravans (Heeren, Ideen, 1:1, page 107; Lengerke, Ken. 1:298; compare Eze 28:16, where, however, the true reading is Aram; see Havernick in loc.), probably to Elath and Ezion-geber, on the Red Sea; the raising of cattle, agriculture, and the cultivation of vines (Num 20:17; Eze 25:13); according to Jerome (Onom. s.v. Fenon), also mining (see C.G. Flade, De re metall. Midianit., Edomit., et Phoenic., Lips. n.d.). Respecting their religion the Old Test. is entirely silent, except that it was some form of polytheism (2Ch 25:20); Josephus (Ant. 15:7, 9) mentions one of their gods by the name of Coze (Κοζέ,? קֹצֶה, the destroyer or ender; see Hitzig, Philist. page 265; and compare Epiphan. Haer. 55; Lengerke, Ken. 1:298). From the earliest times the wisdom of the Edomites, namely, of the Temanite branch, was celebrated (Oba 1:8; Jer 49:7). See Uz. (On the subject generally, see Van Iperen, Hist. crit. Edomaeor. et Amalek. Leonard. 1768; Hoffmann, in the Hall. Encyklop. II, 15:146). SEE IDUMAEA.

## Edrei[[@Headword:Edrei]]

              (Hebrews Edre'i, אֶדְרֶעַי, mighty; Sept. Ε᾿δράείν and Ε᾿δραϊvν), the name of two cities.

1. One of the metropolitan towns (Ashtaroth being the other) of the kingdom of Bashan, beyond the Jordan (Jos 12:4-5; Jos 13:12; Deu 3:10). It was here that Og, the gigantic king of Bashan, was defeated by the Israelites, and lost his kingdom (Num 21:33-35; Deu 1:4; Deu 3:1-3). Edrei afterwards belonged to eastern Manasseh (Jos 13:31; Num 32:33). It is probable that Edrei did not remain long in possession of the Israelites. May it not be that they abandoned it in consequence of its position within the borders of a wild region infested by numerous robber bands? The Lejah is the ancient Argob, and appears to have been the stronghold of the Geshurites; and they perhaps subsequently occupied Edrei (Jos 12:4-5). It was the seat of a bishop in the early ages of Christianity (Reland, Palaest, page 547), and a bishop of Adraa sat in the Council of Seleucia (A.D. 381) and of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). In A.D. 1142 the Crusaders under Baldwin III made a sudden attack upon Adraa, or Adratum, then popularly called also Civitas Berardi de Stampis, but they encountered such obstacles in the difficult nature of the ground, the scarcity of water, and the valor of the inhabitants, that they were compelled to retreat (Will. Tyr. pages 895, 896, 1031). Abulfeda calls it Adsraat (Tab. Syr. 79).

There are two ancient towns in Bashan which now claim the honor of being the representatives of Edrei. The one is called Edhra, and is situated on the southwest angle of the rocky district of Lejah, the Argob of the Hebrews, and the Trachonitis of the Greeks. The ruins of Edhra are among the most extensive in Hauran. The site is a strange one. It is a rocky promontory projecting from the Lejah, SEE TRACHONITIS, having an elevation of some thirty feet above the plain, which spreads out beyond it smooth as a sea, and of unrivaled fertility. The ruins are nearly three miles in circuit, and have a strange, wild look, rising up in black shattered masses from the midst of black rocks. A number of the ancient houses still remain, though half buried beneath heaps of more modern ruins. Their walls, roofs, and doors are all of stone; they are low, massive, and simple in plan; and they bear the marks of the most remote antiquity. Some of them are doubtless as old as the time of the Rephaim, and they are thus specimens of primeval architecture such as no other country could produce. At a later period Edhra was adorned with many public edifices, now mostly in ruins. A large church still stands at the northern end of the town. A Greek inscription over the door informs us that it was originally a heathen temple, was converted into a church, and dedicated to St. George in A.D. 516. There are the walls of another church of St. Elias; and in the center of the town a cloistered quadrangle, which appears to have been at first attached to a forum, and afterwards to a cathedral. On the public buildings and private houses are many Greek inscriptions. Some were copied by Burckhardt, and some by Reverend J.L. Porter. At the time of the visit of the latter in 1854 the population amounted to about fifty families, of which some eight or ten were Christian, and the rest Mohammedan. A full account of the history and antiquities of Edrei is given in Porter's Five Years in Damascus, 2:220 sq., and Handbook for Syria and Palestine, page 532 sq.; also in his Giant Cities of Bashan, page 94 sq. See also Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, page 57 sq.; Buckingham's Travels among the Arab Tribes, page 274.

The other place with which Edrei has been identified is called Dera, and stands in a shallow wady in the open plain of Hauran, about fourteen miles south of Edhra. The following reasons have been assigned in favor of the other site. 1. The name Edrei, which signifies “strength," and the fact that it was the capital of an ancient and warlike nation, naturally lead to the belief that it was a very strong city. Ancient cities were always, when possible, built on the tops of hills, or in rocky fastnesses, so as to be easily defended. Edhra stands on a ridge of jagged rocks, and is so encompassed with cliffs and defiles as to be almost inaccessible. Dera, on the contrary, is in the open plain, and has no traces of old fortifications (G. Robinson, Travels in Palestine, 2:168). It is difficult to believe that the warlike Rephaim would have erected a royal city in such a position. 2. Dera has neither well nor fountain to attract ancient colonists to an un-defended site. Its supply of water was brought by an aqueduct from a great distance  (Ritter, Palest. and Syr. 2:834). 3. The ruins of Edhra are more ancient, more important, and much more extensive than those of Dera. The dwellings of Edhra possess all the characteristics of remote antiquity — massive walls, stone roofs, stone doors. The monuments now existing seem to show that it must have been an important town from the time the Romans took possession of Bashan; and that it, and not Dera, was the episcopal city of Adraa, which ranked next to Bostra (Reland, Pal. page 219, 223, 548). None of the buildings in the latter seem older than the Roman period (Dr. Smith, in Robinson's Bib. Res. 3, App. page 155, 1st ed.). On the other hand, the identification of Dera and Edrei can be traced back to Eusebius and Jerome, who say that Edrei was then called Adara (Α᾿δαρά), and was a noted city of Arabia, twenty-four miles from Bostra (Onomast. s.v. Ε᾿σδραεί, Esdrai). In another place they give the distance at twenty-five miles from Bostra and six from Ashtaroth (ib. s.v. Α᾿σταρώθ, Astaroth, where the place in question is called Α᾿δράα, Ader). Adara is laid down in the Peutinger Tables as here indicated (Reland, Palaest. p. 547; comp. Ptolemy, 5:17, 7). There can be no doubt that the city thus inferred to is the modern Dera; and the statement of Eusebius is too explicit to be set aside on the supposition that he has confounded the two sites in dispute. Moreover, it is improbable that the boundaries of Manasseh East extended so far as the locality of Edhra. Most modern geographers have therefore concluded that Dera marks the real site of Edrei (Reland, Palaest. page 547; Ritter, Palest. and Syr. 2:834; Burckhardt, Syria, page 241; Buckingham, Arab Tribes, page 168; Schwarz, however, declares for the other position, Palest. page 222).

2. A fortified town of northern Palestine, allotted to the tribe of Naphtali, and situated near Kedesh and Hazor (Jos 19:37). About two miles south of Kedesh is a conical rocky hill called Tell Khuraibeh, the "Tell of the ruin," with some remains of ancient buildings on the summit and a rock-hewn tomb in its side. It is evidently an old site, and it may be that of the long-lost Edrei. The strength of the position, and its nearness to Kedesh, give probability to the supposition. Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. 3:365) suggests the identity of Tell Khurmaibeh with Hazor (q.v.). For the objections to this theory, see Porter's Handbook for Syria and Palestine, page 442.

## Edrei (2)[[@Headword:Edrei (2)]]

             of Naphtali. Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work in Palest. 2:366) for this site that of the present Ydter, situated a mile and a half north of Beit-lif (Heleph), and described as "a small stone village, containing about three hundred Metaweleh, situated on a hill-top, with olive-trees and arable land adjacent, having a pool and many cisterns and a spring near it;" also as containing rock-cut tombs, two ruined watch-towers, and other signs of antiquity (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 1:203, 260). The place is not far from Hazor (if at Hazzur), and on the extreme western confines of: the tribe.

## Edris[[@Headword:Edris]]

             (the student), one of the appellations of the prophet Enoch among the Mohammedans. He was the third of the prophets, and, according to the Arabians, the greatest that flourished in the antediluvian world. They represent him as having been commissioned to preach to the Cainites, but they rejected his teaching; and in consequence he waged war upon them and made them slaves to the true believers. He is also said to have ordered the faithful to treat all future infidels in the same way, being thus the originator of religious wars and of the persecution of infidels. To Edris the Arabians attribute the invention of the pen, the needle, the sciences of astronomy and arithmetic, and the arts of magic and divination. He is  alleged to have written thirty treatises, only one of which survives to the present time — The Book of Enoch, an apocryphal work, held in great esteem by the Arabians. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Edson, Theodore, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Edson, Theodore, D.D., LL.D]]

             an Episcopal clergyman, was born at Bridgewater, Massachusetts, August 24, 1793, being descended fifth in the line from Samuel Edson, who came to Salem soon after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, and was one of the original fifteen proprietors of the town of Bridgewater. Theodore received his academic education at the Andover Phillips Academy; graduated at Harvard College in 1822; studied theology with the Reverend Dr. Jarvis of Boston; and in March 1824, conducted the first religious service in East Chelmsford, now Lowell, after John Eliot, the apostle to the Indians. In April of the same year ground was broken for St. Anne's Church, which was consecrated in March 1825, at which time Dr. Edson was admitted to full orders. From that time until within a few days of his last illness he conducted the services of that Church "with dignity, solemnity, and impressiveness." He died in Lowell, after a long, useful, and singularly devoted life, June 25, 1883. — Boston Advertiser, June 26, 1883. (J.C.S.)

## Education Hebrew[[@Headword:Education Hebrew]]

             Although nothing is more carefully inculcated in the Law than the duty of parents to teach their children its precepts and principles (Exo 12:26; Exo 13:8; Exo 13:14; Deu 4:5; Deu 4:9-10; Deu 6:2; Deu 6:7; Deu 6:20; Deu 11:19; Deu 11:21; Act 22:3; 2Ti 3:15; Susanna 3; Josephus, Rev 2:16-17; Rev 2:25), yet there is little trace among the Hebrews in earlier times of education in any other subjects. The wisdom, therefore, and instruction, of which so much is said in the book of Proverbs, is to be understood chiefly of moral and religious discipline, imparted, according to the direction of the Law, by the teaching and under the example of parents (Pro 1:2; Pro 1:8; Pro 2:2; Pro 2:10; Pro 4:1; Pro 4:7; Pro 4:20; Pro 8:1; Pro 9:1; Pro 9:10; Pro 12:1; Pro 16:22; Pro 17:24; Pro 31:1-31). Implicit exceptions to this statement may perhaps be found in the instances of Moses himself, who was brought up in all Egyptian learning (Act 7:22); of the writer of the book of Job, who was evidently well versed in natural history and in the astronomy of the day (Job 38:31; Job 39:1-30; Job 40:1-24; Job 41:1-34); of Daniel and his companions in captivity (Dan 1:4; Dan 1:17; and, above all, in the intellectual gifts and acquirements of Solomon, which were even more renowned than his political greatness (1Ki 4:29; 1Ki 4:34; 1Ki 10:1-9; 2Ch 9:1-8), and the memory of which has, with much exaggeration, been widely preserved in Oriental tradition. The statement made above may, however, in all probability, be taken as representing the chief aim of ordinary Hebrew education, both at the time when the Law was best observed, and also when, after periods of national decline from the Mosaic standard, attempts were made by monarchs, as Jehoshaphat or Josiah, or by prophets, as Elijah or Isaiah, to enforce, or at least to inculcate reform in the moral condition of the people on the basis of that standard (2Ki 17:13; 2Ki 22:8-20; 2Ch 17:7; 2Ch 17:9; 1Ki 19:14; Isa 1:1-31 sq.).

In later times the prophecies, and comments on them as well as on the earlier Scriptures, together with other subjects, were studied (Prol. to Ecclus., and Sir 38:24; Sir 38:26; Sir 39:1-11). St. Jerome adds that Jewish children were taught to say by heart the genealogies (Jerome on Tit 3:9; Calmet, Dict. s.v. Genealogie). Parents were required to teach their children some trade, and he who failed to do so was said to be virtually teaching his child to steal (Mishna, Kiddush. 2:2, volume 3, page 413, Surenhus.; Lightfoot, Chron. Temp. on Act 18:1-28, volume 2, page 79).

The sect of the Essenes, though themselves abhorring marriage, were anxious to undertake, and careful in carrying out the education of children, but confined its subject matter chiefly to morals and the divine law (Josephus, War, 2:8, 12; Philo, Quod omnis probus liber, 2:458, ed. Mangey; § 12, Tauchn.).

Previous to the captivity, the chief depositaries of learning were the schools or colleges, from which, in most cases (see Amo 7:14), proceeded that succession of public teachers who, at various times, endeavored to reform the moral and religious conduct of both rulers and people. (See Werkmeister, De prima scholarus ap. Hebr. origine, Jesuit. 1735; Hegewisch, Ob bei den Alten offentl. Erziehung war, Altona, 1811.) In these schools the Law was probably the chief subject of instruction; the study of languages was little followed by any Jews till after the Captivity, but from that time the number of Jews residing in foreign countries must have made the knowledge of foreign languages more common than before (see Act 21:37). From the time of the outbreak of the last war with the Romans, parents were forbidden to instruct their children in Greek literature (Mishna, Sotah, c. 9:15, volume 3, page 307, 308, Surenhus). Nor had it ever been generally pursued by the Jews (Origen, contra Celsum, 2:34).

Besides the prophetical schools, instruction was given by the priests in the Temple and elsewhere, but their subjects were doubtless exclusively concerned with religion and worship (Lev 10:11; Eze 44:23-24; 1Ch 25:7-8; Mal 2:7). Those sovereigns who exhibited any anxiety for the maintenance of the religious element in the Jewish polity were conspicuous in enforcing the religious education of the people (2Ch 17:7-9; 2Ch 19:5; 2Ch 19:8; 2Ch 19:11; 2Ki 23:2).

From the time of the settlement in Canaan there must have been among the Jews persons skilled in writing and in accounts. Perhaps the neighborhood of the tribe of Zebulun to the commercial district of Phoenicia may have been the occasion of their reputation in this respect. The "writers" of that tribe are represented (Jdg 5:14) by the same word, סֹפֵר, sopher', used in that passage of the levying of an army, or, perhaps, of a military officer (Gesenius, s.v.) as is applied to Ezra in reference to the Law (Ezr 7:6); to Seraiah, David's scribe or secretary (2Sa 8:17); to Shebna, scribe to Hezekiah (2Ki 18:37); Shemaiah (1Ch 24:6); Baruch, scribe to Jeremiah (Jer 36:32), and others filling like offices at various times. The municipal officers of the kingdom, especially in the time of Solomon, must have required a staff of well-educated persons in their various departments under the recorder, מִזְכַּיר, mazkir', or historiographer, whose business was to compile memorials of the reign (2Sa 8:16; 2Sa 20:24; 2Ki 18:18; 2Ch 34:8). Learning, in the sense above mentioned, was at all times highly esteemed, and educated persons were treated with great respect, and, according to Rabbinical tradition, were called " sons of the noble," and allowed to take precedence of others at table (Lightfoot, Chr. Temp. Act 17:1-34, volume 2:79, fol.; Hor. Hebr. Luke 14:8-24; 2:54). The same authority deplores the degeneracy of later times in this respect (Mishna, Sotah, 9:15, volume 3, 308, Surenhus).

To the schools of the prophets succeeded, after the Captivity, the synagogues, which were either themselves used as schools, or had places near them for that purpose. In most places there was at least one, and in Jerusalem, according to some, 394, according to others, 460 (Calmet, Dict. s.v. Eccles). It was from these schools, and the doctrines of the various teachers presiding over them, of whom Gamaliel, Sammai, and Hillel were among the most famous, that many of those traditions and refinements proceeded by which the Law was in our Lord's time encumbered and obscured, and which may be considered as represented, though in a highly exaggerated degree, by the Talmud. After the destruction of Jerusalem, colleges, inheriting and probably enlarging the traditions of their predecessors, were maintained for a long time at Japhne in Galilee, at Lydda, at Tiberias, the most famous of all, and at Sepphoris. These schools, in process of time, were dispersed into other countries, and by degrees destroyed. According to the principles laid down in the Mishna, boys at five years of age were to begin the Scriptures, at ten the Mishna, at thirteen they became subject to the whole Law (see Luk 2:46), at fifteen they entered the Gemara (Mishna, Pirk. Ab. 4:20; 5:21, volume 4, page 460, 482, 486, Surenhus.). Teachers were treated with great respect, and both pupils and teachers were exhorted to respect each other. Physical science formed part of the course of instruction (ib. in, 18). Unmarried men and women were not allowed to be teachers of boys (Mishna, Kiddush. 4:13, volume 3, page 383). In the schools the Rabbins sat on raised seats, and the scholars, according to their age, sat on benches below or on the ground (Lightfoot on Lake 2:46; Philo, at sup. 12, 2:458, Mangey).

Of female education we have little account in Scripture, but it is clear that the prophetical schools included within their scope the instruction of females, who were occasionally invested with authority similar to that of the prophets themselves (Jdg 4:4; 2Ki 22:14). Needlework formed a large, but by no means the only subject of instruction imparted to females, whose position in society and in the household must by no means be considered as represented in modern Oriental including Mohammedan- usage (see Pro 21:16; Pro 21:26; Hist. of Sus. 3; Luk 8:2-3; Luk 10:39; Act 13:50; 2Ti 1:5).

Among modern Mohammedans, education, even of boys, is of a most elementary kind, and of females still more limited. In one respect it may be considered as the likeness or the caricature of the Jewish system, viz. that besides the most common rules of arithmetic, the Koran is made the staple, if not the only subject of instruction. In Oriental schools, both Jewish and Mohammedan, the lessons are written by each scholar with chalk on tablets, which are cleaned for a fresh lesson. All recite their lessons together aloud; faults are usually punished by stripes on the feet. Female children are, among Mohammedans, seldom taught to read or write. A few chapters of the Koran are learned by heart, and in some schools they are taught embroidery and needlework. In Persia there are many public schools and colleges, but the children of the wealthier parents are mostly taught at home; The Koran forms the staple of instruction, being regarded as the model not only of doctrine, but of style, and the text-book of all science. In the colleges, however, mathematics are taught to some extent (Norberg, Opusc. 2:144 sq.; Shaw, Travels, page 194; Rauwolff, Travels, 7:60; Burckhardt, Syria, page 326; Travels in Arabia, 1:275; Porter, Damascus, 2:95; Lane, Mod. Egypt. 1:89, 93; Englishw. in Eg. 2:28, 31; Wellsted, Arabia, 2:6, 395; Chardin, Voyages, 4:224, Langles; Olearius, Travels, page 214, 215; Pietro della Valle, Viaggi, 2:188). Smith, s.v. On the subject generally, see Jahn, Bibl. Arch. § 106, 166; Ursini, Antiquitt. Hebr. scholst. acad. (Hafn. 1702; also in Ugolini Thesaur. 21); Dumor, De scholis et academ vett. Hebr. (Wirceb. 1782 ; uncritical); Purmann, De re scholastica Judaor. (Fref. 1779); Seiferheld, in Beyschlag's Sylloge var. opusc. 1, 582 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 2:917 sq.; Hartmann, Verbind. des A. T. mit den Neuen, page 377 sq.; Gfrorer, Gesch. d. Urchristenth. I, 1:109 sq.; Beer, Skizzen einer Gesch. der Erziehung u. des Unterr. bei den Israeliten (Prague, 1832; a superficial work). SEE SCHOOL. Education For The Ministry.

SEE MINISTRY; SEE THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

## Edumia[[@Headword:Edumia]]

             a place thus described by Eusebius and Jerome (in the Onomasticon, s.v. Ε᾿δουμια, Edomia): "of the tribe of Benjamin; and there is still a village Eduma, Ε᾿δουμά, in Acrabatine, about twelve miles east of Neapolis." From this language, Leclerc (not. in loc.) infers that Adummim is meant; but this lay farther south. Van de Velde finds the locality in the modern village Daumeh, S.E. of Nablous (Narrat. 2:308); a coincidence first pointed out by Robinson (Researches, 3:103), as lying in the prescribed position, although not within the tribe of Benjamin (apparently a conjecture of Euseb.). It is situated on the tableland overlooking the Jordan valley, and contains a fountain and ancient sepulchers in the outskirts (Robinson, Later Researches, pages 292, 293).

## Eduth[[@Headword:Eduth]]

              (עֵדוּת, eduth', precept, as it is often rendered; Sept. and Vulg. translate accordingly) stands (besides being translated elsewhere in its ordinary acceptation) as a part (in connection with "Shushan" either singular or plural) of the inscription of certain poetical compositions, indicating that the contents were of a revealed or sacred character (title of Psa 60:1-12; Psa 80:1-19). SEE SHOSHANNIM.

## Edward[[@Headword:Edward]]

             a Scotch prelate, was formerly a monk of Coupar in Forfarshire, and was promoted to the see of Brechin about 1260. It is said that he walked through the whole kingdom, with Eustathius, abbot of Aberbrothock, preaching the gospel wherever he came. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 160.

## Edward III Confessor[[@Headword:Edward III Confessor]]

             king of the Anglo-Saxons, was born in Oxfordshire in 1004, and died January 5, 1066. He was canonized by Pope Alexander III, and styled "Confessor" in the bull of canonization. The only ground for this was the fact that when, in 1044, he married Editha, daughter of earl Godwin, he informed her that he would make her his queen, but that she should not share his bed. He kept this unnatural vow, and for it, in spite of a licentious life, he was sainted by the Pope.

## Edward VI[[@Headword:Edward VI]]

             king of England, son of Henry VIII by his wife Jane Seymour, was born at Hampton Court, October 12,1537. He is mentioned here rather for the great events of his reign than for his personal qualities, though these were excellent. He was crowned in 1547, and his uncle, Edward Seymour, afterwards earl of Somerset, became Protector of the kingdom. "He was attached to the principles of the Reformation, and during his rule great strides were made towards the establishment of Protestantism in England. The images were removed from the churches; refractory Roman Catholic bishops were imprisoned; the laity were allowed the cup at the ceremony of the Lord's Supper; all ecclesiastical processes were ordered to run in the king's name; Henry's famous six articles (known as the Bloody Statute) were repealed; a new service-book, compiled by Cranmer and Ridley, assisted by eleven other divines, was drawn up, and ordered to be used, and is known as the First Prayer-book of Edward VI, SEE COMMON PRAYERBOOK; and the celibacy of the clergy ceased to be obligatory" (Chambers, Encyclopaedia, s.v.). The young king was in full sympathy with the Reformation; but his plans, and those of his counselors were arrested by his death, July 6,1553.

## Edward, Saint[[@Headword:Edward, Saint]]

             was the son of Edgar, king of the Saxons, and the beautiful Ethelfleda, who died shortly after his birth, in 961. In 975, when Edgar died, Edward, a pious youth, was elected to the crown, much to the discontent of Elfrida, his step-mother, who wished her own son, Ethelred, on the throne. In 979 (or 978), Edward was poisoned at Corfe Castle, by his own people, according to Henry of Huntingdon, or, as was probable, by order of Elfrida, as Florence of Worcester and William of Malmesbury record. Malmesbury says that a light from heaven shone over his grave at Wareham,, and wonders were wrought there and miracles of healing; and that Elfrida, at length terrified and consciencestricken, retired to.the convent of Wherwell to repent of her wickedness. The young Edward was not a martyr for the Christian faith; but being a good youth, and unjustly and cruelly slain, the people looked upon him as a saint and called him Edward the martyr; and so he has a place in the Anglican and Roman martyrologies. He is commemorated on March 18. His body was afterwards translated to the minister at Shaftesbury (June 20), and his  translation is set down on February 18. See Baring-Gould, Lives of the Saints, 3:324 (March 18); Butler, Lives of the Saints (March 18); Fuller, Worthies of England, 1:453; Green, Hist. of English People, 1:96; Knight, Pop. Hist. of England, 1:147, 148.

## Edwards Bela Bates, D.D.[[@Headword:Edwards Bela Bates, D.D.]]

             was born in Southampton, Massachusetts, July 4, 1802, and graduated at Amherst College in 1824, and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1830. He served as a tutor in Amherst College during the years 1827-28, and as assistant secretary of the American Education Society during the years 1828-33. In 1837 he was ordained as a minister of the Gospel, and was also appointed professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary; and in 1848 he was elected associate professor of sacred literature, as successor of Professor Moses Stuart, in the same institution. From 1828 to 1842 he edited the American Quarterly Register. He established in 1833 the American Quarterly Observer. After publishing two volumes of it, he united it with the Biblical Repository, and was sole editor of the combined periodicals from January 1835, to January 1838. From 1844 to 1852 he was the senior editor of the Bibliotheca Sacra. For twenty-three years he was employed in superintending periodical literature, and, with the assistance of several associates, has left thirty-one octavo volumes as the monuments of his enterprise and industry in this department of labor. He also edited several duodecimo volumes, among which are the Eclectic Reader, the Biography of Self-taught Men, the Memoir of Henry Martyn, to which he prefixed an Introductory Essay. He published many articles in the religious newspapers, various pamphlets, and important parts of several volumes, such as the German Selections, by professors Edwards and Park; Classical Studies, by professors Edwards, Sears, and Felton. He injured his constitution by his unremitting toils, and was compelled to make the tour of Europe for his health, and to spend two winters in the South. He died at Athens, Georgia, April 20, 1852, in the fiftieth year of his age. He was distinguished not only for his poetic sentiment, large erudition, soundness of judgment, skill as an instructor, and eloquence as a preacher, but also for his delicacy of taste, his tender sensibilities, and, above all, his deep, earnest, and uniform piety. Some of his discourses and essays, with a memoir of his life by E.A. Park, were published in Boston in 1853 in two duodecimo volumes. (E.A.P.)

## Edwards John, D.D.[[@Headword:Edwards John, D.D.]]

             one of the strongest Calvinistic divines the Church of England has produced. He was born at Hertford February 26, 1637, and was educated at Merchant-Taylor's School, London. In 1653 he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, where he became scholar and fellow. He was minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge, from 1664 to about 1676, when he was made rector of St. Peter's, Colchester. He returned to Cambridge in 1679, and there wrote industriously on controversial theology. He died April 16, 1716. "It may be questioned whether, since the days of Calvin himself, there has existed a more decided Calvinist than Dr. Edwards. He has been termed the Paul, the Augustine, the Bradwardine, the Calvin of his age. Such was his abhorrence of Arminianism that he contended, with the old Puritans, that there is a close connection between it and popery." His principal writings are, Theologia reformata, or the Body and Substance of the Christian Religion, comprised in distinct Discourses or Treatises upon the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments (London 1713-26, 3 volumes, fol.): — A complete History or Survey of all the Dispensations or Methods of Religion (London, 1699, 2 volumes, 8vo): — The Arminian Doctrines condemned by the Scriptures (London 1711, 8vo): — Authority of the Old and N.T. (London 1693, 3 volumes, 8vo): — Exercitations, critical, theological, etc., on important places in the O. and N.T. (London 1702, 8vo): — Socinianism unmasked (London, 1697, 8vo): — The Doctrine of Faith and Justification (London, 1708, 8vo). — Jones, Christ. Biography s.v.; Kippis, Biographia Britannica, volume 5.

## Edwards, John[[@Headword:Edwards, John]]

             a Wesleyan Methodist preacher, was born at Bridford, Devonshire, in 1804. In 1830 he joined the Conference, and in 1832 was sent as a  missionary to South Africa. For seven years he worked in the interior; in 1876 became a supernumerary; and died at Grahamstown, November 11, 1887. He wrote Reminiscences; or, Fifty Years of Mission Life.

## Edwards, Jonathan[[@Headword:Edwards, Jonathan]]

             was born at East Windsor, Connecticut, on the 5th of October, 1703. His great-great-grandfather on the paternal side was the Reverend Richard Edwards, a clergyman in London in the time of queen Elizabeth. His great- grandfather, William Edwards, was born in England, came to America about the year 1640, and was an honorable trader in Hartford, Connecticut. His grandfather, Richard Edwards, was born at Hartford, and spent his life there as a respectable and wealthy merchant. His father, Reverend Timothy Edwards, was born in Hartford May 14, 1669. He entered Harvard College in 1687, "and received the two degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts on the Same day, July 4, 1691, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon, ‘an uncommon mark of respect paid to his extraordinary proficiency in learning.'" He was ordained pastor of the church at East Windsor in May, 1694. In 1711 he was appointed by the Legislature of Connecticut, chaplain of the troops sent on an important expedition to Canada. He was distinguished for his scholarship, devoutness, and general weight of character. He generally preached extempore, and until he had passed his seventieth year he did not often write the heads of his discourses. He lived to enjoy the fame of his son, and died January 27, 1758. On the maternal side, the great-grandfather of President Edwards was Anthony Stoddard, Esq., who emigrated from the west of England to Boston, and was a member of the General Court from 1665 to 1684. The grandfather of Edwards was the Rev. Solomon Stoddard, of Northampton, Massachusetts, one of the most erudite and powerful clergymen of New England. Edwards' mother was Esther, the second child of the Northampton pastor, a lady of excellent education and rare strength of character.

The history of President Edwards cannot be fully understood without considering that both on the paternal end maternal side he was allied with families belonging to the ecclesiastical aristocracy of New England. He was an only son, and had ten sisters, some of whom became the wives of eminent men. He was trained by his father and his four eldest sisters (all of whom were proficient in learning) for Yale College, which he entered in 1716, just before he was thirteen years of age. During the next year his favorite study was Locke on the Human Understanding. "Taking that book into his hand upon some occasion not long before his death, he said to some of his select friends who were then with him, that he was beyond expression entertained and pleased with it when he read it in his youth at college; that he was as much engaged, and had more satisfaction and pleasure in studying it, than the most greedy miser in gathering up handfuls of silver and gold from some new-discovered treasure." When about twelve years of age he wrote a paper which indicates that he had been thoroughly interested in the question of Materialism. At about the same age he composed some remarkable papers on questions in natural philosophy. Having distinguished himself at college as an acute thinker, and also as an impassioned writer, he took his Bachelor's degree in 1720, and delivered the “salutatory, which was also the valedictory oration."

When he was a boy, probably about the age of seven or eight years, he began to develop his religious character. He writes: "I was then very much affected for many months, and concerned about the things of religion and my soul's salvation, and was abundant in religious duties. I used to pray five times a day in secret, and to spend much time in religious conversation with other boys, and used to meet with them to pray together. I experienced I know not what kind of delight in religion. I, with some of my schoolmates, joined together and built a booth in a swamp, in a very retired spot, for a place of prayer; and, besides, I had particular secret places of my own in the woods where I used to retire by myself, and was from time to time much affected. My affections seemed to be lively and easily moved, and I seemed to be in my element when engaged in religious duties." Reflecting on these fervid emotions, Edwards afterward regarded them as no signs of genuine piety. He was keen in his analysis of character, and was wont to encourage, not only in others, but also in himself, the habit of severe self-examination, and of jealous watchfulness against the influence of self-love. Although from his earliest childhood he had been dutiful, docile, and exemplary in his outward demeanor, yet he writes concerning his boyhood and youth: "I was at times very uneasy, especially towards the latter part of my time at college, when it pleased God to seize me with a pleurisy, in which he brought me nigh to the grave, and shook me over the pit of hell. And yet it was not long after my recovery before I fell again into my old ways of sin. But God would not suffer me to go on with any quietness. I had great and violent inward struggles, till, after many conflicts with wicked inclinations, repeated resolutions, and bonds that I laid myself under by a kind of vows to God, I was brought wholly to break off all former wicked ways, and all ways of known outward sin, and to apply myself to seek salvation, and practice many religious duties, but without that kind of affection and delight which I had formerly experienced." With his characteristic fidelity in scrutinizing his motives, he looked with distrust on his seeking the Lord after this "miserable manner, which," he says, "has made me sometimes since to question whether it ever issued in that which was saving, being ready to doubt whether such miserable seeking ever succeeded."

At length, however, but precisely at what period he does not state, he began to entertain an abiding confidence in his having been regenerated by the Holy Ghost. In the poetic and fervid style which often characterizes his writings, he says: "I began to have a new kind of apprehensions and ideas of Christ, and the work of redemption, and the glorious way of salvation by him. This I know not how to express otherwise than by a calm, sweet abstraction of soul from all the concerns of this world, and sometimes a kind of vision, or fixed ideas and imaginations of being alone in the mountains or some solitary wilderness, far from all mankind, sweetly conversing with Christ, and rapt and swallowed up in God." On one occasion "I walked abroad alone in a solitary place in my father's pasture for contemplation. As I was walking there, and looking upon the sky and clouds, there came into my mind so sweet a sense of the glorious majesty and grace of God as I know not how to express. I seemed to see them both in a sweet conjunction, majesty and meekness joined together; it was a sweet, and gentle, and holy majesty, and also a majestic meekness, an awful sweetness, a high, and great, and holy gentleness. After this my sense of divine things gradually increased, and became more and more lively, and had more of that inward sweetness. The appearance of every thing was altered; there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast or appearance of divine glory in almost every thing. God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity, and love, seemed to appear in every thing in the sun, moon, and stars; in the clouds and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the water and all nature which used greatly to fix my mind. I often used to sit and view the moon for a long time, and in the day spent much of my time in viewing the clouds and sky, to behold the sweet glory of God in these things, in the mean time singing forth with a low voice my contemplations of the Creator and Redeemer, and scarce any thing in all the works of nature was so sweet to me as thunder and lightning; formerly nothing had been so terrible to me. Before, I used to be uncommonly terrified with thunder, and to be struck with terror when I saw a thunder- storm rising; but now, on the contrary, it rejoiced me. I felt God, if I may so speak, at the first appearance of a thunder-storm, and used to take the opportunity at such times to fix myself in order to view the clouds, and see the lightnings play, and hear the majestic and awful voice of God's thunder, which oftentimes was exceedingly entertaining, leading me to sweet contemplations of my great and glorious God. While thus engaged it always seemed natural for me to sing or chant forth my meditations, or to speak my thoughts in soliloquies with a singing voice."

The sharpness of his intellect, the activity of his imagination, the liveliness of his sensibilities, and the depth of his piety, were regarded as signs of his being called of God to the ministry of the Gospel. Having, been a resident scholar nearly two years at Yale College after his graduation, and having pursued his theological studies during that period, he was "approbated" as a preacher in June or July, 1722, several months before he was nineteen years of age. From August, 1722, until April, 1723, he preached to a small Presbyterian church in New York city. His eloquence fascinated his hearers, but he felt compelled to decline their urgent invitations to become their pastor. In his solitary walks along the silent banks of the Hudson he learned more and more of “the bottomless depths of secret corruption and deceit" belonging to his heart, and of the beauty and amiableness of true holiness. "Holiness, as I then wrote down some of my contemplations on it, appeared to me to be of a sweet, pleasant, charming, serene, calm nature, which brought an inexpressible purity, brightness, peacefulness, and ravishment to the soul. In other words, that it made the soul like a field or garden of God, with all manner of pleasant flowers, enjoying a sweet calm, and the gentle, vivifying beams of the sun. The soul of a true Christian, as I then wrote my meditations, appeared like such a little white flower as we see in the spring of the year low and humble on the ground, opening its bosom to receive the pleasant beams of the sun's glory; rejoicing, as it were, in a calm rapture; diffusing around a sweet fragrancy; standing peacefully and lovingly in the midst of other flowers round about, all in like manner opening their bosoms to drink in the light of the sun." It was during his residence in New York that he wrote the first thirty-four of his well- known "Resolutions" for the government of his life.

In September, 1723, he was called to a tutorship in Yale College. Having passed the preceding winter and spring in severe study at the college, he entered on his tutorship in June 1724, and left it in September 1726. After laving declined various invitations to take the oversight of churches, he was ordained February 15, 1727, as pastor of the church in Northampton, a colleague with his celebrated grandfather, Solomon Stoddard. He rose at once into eminence as a preacher, especially as a preacher of the divine law, of the divine sovereignty, of man's entire sinfulness by nature, of justification by faith, and of eternal punishment. He often spoke extempore; he seldom made a gesture; his voice was not commanding; his power was that of deep thought and strong feeling. Dr. Trumbull says that when Mr. Edwards was preaching at Enfield, Connecticut, "there was such a breathing of distress and weeping that the preacher was obliged to speak to the people and desire silence that le might be heard." A gentleman remarked to President Dwight that when, in his youth, he heard Mr. Edwards describe the day of judgment, he fully supposed that immediate1y at the close of the sermon "the Judge would descend, and the final separation take place." During the delivery of one of his most overwhelming discourses in the pulpit of a minister unused to such power, this minister is said to have forgotten himself so far as to pull the preacher by the coat, and try to stay the torrent of such appalling eloquence by the question, "Mr. Edwards! Mr. Edwards! is not God a merciful Being?"

In February, 1729, in consequence of the death of Mr. Stoddard, the entire charge of the congregation at Northampton was devolved on Mr. Edwards. In 1734 and 1735 occurred a remarkable "awakening" of religious feeling in his parish; another occurred in 1740, at which period he became a bosom friend of George Whitefield. During both these developments of religious activity he preached with a force which overawed his hearers. While his parochial labors were multifarious and earnest, he studied the phenomena of the revival with the keenness of a philosopher, and they prompted him to write some of his most acute disquisitions. Indeed, nearly all the works which he published during his ministry at Northampton indicate the degree in which he labored for the promotion or the regulation of those religious "awakenings" for which his ministry was distinguished. Some of these works are merely sermons, others are larger treatises. They bear the following titles: God glorified in Man's Dependence (1731): — A divine and supernatural Light imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God (1734; a sermon noted for its spiritual philosophy): — Curse ye Meroz (1735): — A faithful Narrative of the surprising Work of God in the Conversion of many hundred Souls in Northampton, etc. (London, 1736): — Five Discourses prefixed to the American Edition of this Narrative (1738): — Sinners in the Hands of an angry God (1741; one of his most terrific sermons): — Sorrows of the bereaved spread before Jesus (1741): — Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the true Spirit (1741): — Thoughts on the Revival in New, England, etc. (1742): — The Watchman's Duty and Account (1743): — The true Excellency of a Gospel Minister (1744): — A Treatise concerning religious Affections (1745; one of his most spiritual an d analytical works): — An humble Attempt to promote explicit Agreement and visible Union among God's People in extraordinary Prayer (1746): — True Saints, when absent from the Body, present with the Lord (1747): — God's awful Judgments in breaking the strong Rods of the Community (1748): — Life and Diary of the Reverend David Brainerd (1749; a volume which exerted a decisive influence on Henry Martyn, and has affected the missionary spirit of the English as well as American churches): — Christ the Example of Gospel Ministers (1749): — Qualifications for full Communion in the visible Church (1749; a treatise of historical as well as theological importance): — Farewell Sermon to the People of Northampton (1750; called "the best farewell sermon ever written").

The last two publications suggest the most sorrowful event of President Edwards' life. He was dismissed from his Northampton pastorate on the 22d of June, 1750. As early as 1744 he had offended many, and among them some of the most influential families in his congregation, by certain stringent measures which he adopted in regard to alleged immoralities prevalent at Northampton. The whole parish was shaken by his resolute and uncompromising reproofs, and was predisposed to resist any subsequent innovation which he might make. His grandfather, Mr. Stoddard, had favored the principle that unconverted persons who are not immoral have a right to partake of the Lord's Supper. The authoritative influence of Mr. Stoddard had induced not only the Northampton Church, but also many other churches, to adopt that principle. Mr. Edwards, after prolonged deliberation, opposed it. The entire, community was aroused by his boldness in controverting the teachings of a man like Solomon Stoddard, "whose word was law." After a prolonged and earnest controversy, he was ejected from the office which he had adorned for more than twenty-three years. He never saw occasion to change the opinions which were so obnoxious to his people; and two years after his dismission he published a work entitled Misrepresentation corrected and Truth vindicated in a Reply to Mr. Solomon Williams's Book on Qualifications for Communion; to which is add a Letter from Mr. Edwards to his late Flock at Northampton (1752). After his death, and after a disastrous controversy through the land, his principles prevailed among the evangelical churches.

At the present day, when the dismission of pastors is so frequent, we cannot easily imagine the mortification and injury which Edwards suffered in consequence of his difficulties with his parish. He was in his forty- seventh year, and had accumulated no property for the support of his large and expensive family. He was compelled to receive pecuniary aid from his friends in remote parts of this country and in Great Britain. His wife was a descendant from the earls of Kingston, and was a lady of rare accomplishments. The description which he wrote of her in her girlhood was pronounced by Dr. Chalmers to be one of the most beautiful compositions in the language. He was married to her on the 27th of July, 1727, and at the time of his dismission, his eldest son, afterwards judge Timothy Edwards, was about twelve years of age; his second son, afterwards Dr. Jonathan Edwards, was about five years of age; and his youngest son, afterwards judge Pierpont Edwards, was an infant of two or three months; his third daughter, afterwards the mother of Aaron Burr, was in her eighteenth year; and his fourth daughter, afterwards the mother of president Timothy Dwight, was in her sixteenth year. He had a family of three sons and seven daughters, another daughter, Jerusha, having died three years before his dismission. She was betrothed to David Brainerd, who had been a cherished inmate of her father's family.

In July, 1751, about a year after his dismission, Edwards was installed pastor of the small Congregational church in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, and missionary of the Housatonic tribe of Indians at that place. He preached extemporaneously to the Indians through an interpreter. In this uncultivated wilderness he was sadly afflicted with the fever and ague, and other disorders incident to the new settlements. He published a characteristic sermon in 1752, entitled True Grace distinguished from the Experience of Devils. In 1754 he published the most celebrated of his works — his Essay on the Freedom of the Will. Of this essay there are conflicting interpretations. One school of interpreters contend that he believed in a literal inability of the soul to act otherwise than it does act; another school contend that he did not believe in an inability which is natural and literal, but only in one which is moral, figurative, "an inability improperly so called." One school contend that he believed liberty to consist in the mere power of doing what the soul has previously willed, of outwardly executing what the soul has antecedently chosen; another school contend that he believed liberty to consist in the power of electing either of two or more objects — such a power that men are not "at all hindered by any fatal necessity from doing, and even willing and choosing as they please, with full freedom; yea, with the highest kind of liberty that ever was thought of, or that ever could possibly enter into the heart of any man to conceive" (Letter to a Scotch theologian). One school regard Edwards as agreeing with those Calvinists who suppose that "man, in his state of innocency, had freedom and power to do that which is good and well- pleasing to God, but yet mutably so that he might fall from it," and that "man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation;" another school regard Edwards as denying this proposition in its literal, and affirming it only in its figurative sense, and believing that since the Fall man has all the freedom or liberty which he ever had, or can be imagined to have. One class of critics suppose him to believe that motives are the efficient or the necessitating causes of volitions; another class suppose him to believe that the volition is the result of motive as an occasion, rather than the necessary effect of motive as a cause. The latter class interpret his whole theory of the will in the light of the following remark of Edwards to the Scotch divine: "On the contrary, I have largely declared that the connection between antecedent things and consequent ones, which takes place with regard to the acts of men's wills, which is called moral necessity, is called by the name of necessity improperly, and that all such terms as must, cannot, impossible, unable, irresistible, unavoidable, invincible, etc., when applied here, are not applied in their proper signification, and are either used nonsensically and with perfect insignificance, or in a sense quite diverse from their original and propel meaning, and their use in common speech, and that such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills is more properly called certainty than necessity, it being no other than the certain connection between the subject and predicate of the proposition which affirms their existence." It is asserted by many that Edwards makes no distinction between the will and the sensibilities; it is thought by some that he does make a distinction; the acts of the will being acts of moral choice, the processes of the sensibilities being what he elsewhere terms "natural or animal feelings or affections."

During his virtual banishment to the Stockbridge wilderness he wrote another of his more noted works, entitled The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin defended, etc. The work was finished May 26, 1757, but was not published until 1758, several months after his death. Perhaps the distinctive peculiarity of this treatise is his defense of the doctrine that there was a constituted oneness or identity of Adam and his posterity;" that they constituted, "as it were, one complex person, or one moral whole;" that as a tree, when a century old, is one plant with the little sprout from which it grew — as the body of a man, when forty years old, is one with the infant body from which it grew — as the body and soul are one with each other, so there is a divine "constitution" according to which Adam and his posterity are "looked upon as one, and dealt with accordingly;" that in his descendants "the first existing of a corrupt disposition is not to be looked upon as sin belonging to them, distinct from their participation in Adam's first sin;" that "the guilt a man has upon his soul at his first existence is one and simple, viz., the guilt of the original apostasy, the guilt of the sin by which the species first rebelled against God. This, and the guilt arising from the first corruption or depraved disposition of the heart, are not to be looked upon as two things distinctly imputed and charged upon men in the sight of God," but are one and the same thing, according to an arbitrary constitution, like that which causes the continued identity of a river which is constantly flowing, or of an animal body which is constantly fluctuating. "When I call this an arbitrary constitution, I mean that it is a constitution which depends on nothing but the divine will, which divine will depends on nothing but the divine wisdom." During his retirement at Stockbridge, Edwards wrote his Dissertation concerning the End for which God created the World, and also his Dissertation concerning the Nature of true Virtue. On the former of these treatises he had expended much, and on the latter a life-long study. One class of his interpreters suppose that he wrote the first of these treatises with the design, and that the treatise has been followed with the result, of modifying the popular aspect of Calvinism, and of thereby removing some of the popular objections to the system as formerly held. They suppose that he designed to make the sovereignty of God appear the more amiable by showing that it is intent on the highest interests of his creatures; that the glory of God and the well-being of the universe are one and the same thing, and therefore, when God is said to govern the universe for his own glory, he is also said to govern it for its own well-being. In the second of the two last-named treatises, a treatise which, like the first, and like many of his other essays, was designed to reconcile reason with faith — a treatise the rudiments of which were written in his boyhood, and are found scattered through many of his published works — he reduces all moral goodness to ' the love of being in general," and this love he considers an act of the will as distinct from "animal or natural feeling." Those Calvinistic divines who believe that all the virtues, such as faith, justice, etc., are in their nature active, and are mere forms of benevolence, and that all sin is equally active, and is the elective preference of an inferior above a superior good, appeal to Edwards's Dissertation on Virtue as having given a marked impulse to what has been called by various names, such as the new, or the New England, or the Hopkinsian divinity. The two last-named dissertations were not published until 1788, thirty years after his death. In 1764 eighteen of Edwards's sermons were published in a volume, to which was prefixed his memoir by Dr. Samuel Hopkins. In 1777 his celebrated History of Redemption, in 1788, a new volume of his sermons, in 1789 another new volume of his sermons, in 1793 his Miscellaneous Observations on important Theological Subjects, in 1796 his Remarks on important Theological Controversies, were all published at Edinburgh, Scotland. His published works were collected and printed in eight volumes at Worcester, Mass., under the editorship of Dr. Samuel Austin, in 1809, and have been republished repeatedly in England and America. A larger edition of his writings, in ten volumes, including a new memoir, and much new material, especially his Notes on the Bible, was published at New York in 1829, under the editorial care of Rev. Dr. Sereno Edwards Dwight. Parts of this edition have been republished in England. In 1852, his work entitled Charity and its Fruits was published for the first time, and more recently a volume of his writings has been printed in England, which has never been reprinted in America.

One of most interesting aspects in which president Edwards may be viewed is that of his influence over Whitefield, Brainerd, and two of his theological pupils, Bellamy and Hopkins. Another is that of his influence over European scholars and divines. Several of his treatises were published in Great Britain before they were published in America, and the estimate formed of him by Dr. Erskine, Dr. Chalmers, Robert Hall, Dugald Stewart, Sir Henry Moncrief, Sir James Mackintosh, Dr. Priestley, Dr. George Hill, Isaac Taylor, and others, is higher than that expressed by men of the same relative position in this country. It is a remarkable fact that, while living in a kind of exile as a missionary among the Indians at Stockbridge, he was invited to the presidency of the college at Princeton, New Jersey. He was elected to the office on the 26th of September, 1757. In his first response to the trustees he expressed his great surprise at their appointment, and, among other reasons for declining it, he said, with his characteristic simplicity, "I have a constitution in many respects peculiarly unhappy, attended with flaccid solids, vapid, sizy, and scarce fluids, and a low tide of spirits, often occasioning a kind of childish weakness and contemptibleness of speech, presence, and demeanor, with a disagreeable dullness and stiffness much unfitting me for conversation, but more especially for the government of a college." He was dismissed from his Stockbridge pastorate January 4, 1758, after having labored in it six years and a half. He spent a part of January and all of February at Princeton, performing some duties at the college, but was not inaugurated until the 16th of February, 1758. He was inoculated for the small-pox on the 23d of the same month; and after the ordinary effects of the inoculation had nearly subsided, a secondary fever supervened, and he died an the 22d of March, 1758. He had then resided at Princeton about nine weeks, and had been the inaugurated president of the college just five weeks. His age was 54 years, 5 months, and 17 days. His father died in his 89th year, only two months before him; his son-in-law, president Burr, died in his 42d year, only six months before him; his daughter, Mrs. President Burr, died in her 27th year, only sixteen days after him; his wife died in her 49th year, only six months and ten days after him. The three last named are interred in the same burial ground at Princeton. (E.A.P.)

## Edwards, Jonathan D.D.[[@Headword:Edwards, Jonathan D.D.]]

             the second son and ninth child of the President whose history has been sketched in the preceding article, was born at Northampton, Massachusetts, May 26th, 1745. Although each was the president of a college, yet, as the father was not a doctor of divinity, he is familiarly termed the President, and the son is distinguished from him as the Doctor. In his early childhood young Edwards was afflicted with an ocular disease, and therefore did not learn to read at so early an age as his powers and instincts would have inclined him. In consequence also of his father's ecclesiastical troubles at Northampton, he was deprived of some important facilities for his education. "When I was but six years of age," he writes in 1788, "my father removed with his family to Stockbridge, which at that time was inhabited by Indians almost solely, as there were in the town but twelve families of whites, or Anglo-Americans, and perhaps one hundred and fifty families of Indians. The Indians being the nearest neighbors, I constantly associated with them; -their boys were my daily schoolmates and play-fellows. Out of my father's house I seldom heard any language spoken but the Indian. By these means I acquired the knowledge of that language, and a great facility in speaking it. It became more familiar to me than my mother-tongue. I knew the names of some things in Indian that I did not know in English. Even all my thoughts ran in Indian; and, though the true pronunciation of the language is extremely difficult to all but themselves, they acknowledged that I had acquired it perfectly, which, as they said, had never been done before by any Anglo-American. On account of my skill in their language in general, I received from them many compliments applauding my superior wisdom. This skill in their language I have in a good measure retained to this day."

Although the pastor at Stockbridge was nominally the teacher of the Housatonnucks, yet, in fact, he often gave instruction to families of the Mohawks, Oneidas, and Tuscaroras, who had gone to his parish for the sake of its educational advantages. He was a patron and also an intimate companion of Gideon Hawley, a man highly revered as a preacher to the Indian tribes. The elder Edwards desired that his son Jonathan should be trained for a missionary among the aborigines, and he therefore sent the boy, not then eleven years old, to a settlement of the Oneida Indians on the banks of the Susquehanna. The faithful friend, Gideon Hawley, traveled with the boy, and took the charge of him, but, in consequence of the French and Indian war, was obliged to return, with him, after a residence of about six months among the Oneidas. Young Edwards endeared himself to the Oneida tribe, and on one occasion, when they expected an attack from the French, the Indians took the boy upon their shoulders, and bore him many miles through the wilderness to a place of safety. At that early age he exhibited the traits which afterwards distinguished him — courage, fortitude, and perseverance. While traveling through the wilderness in the depths of winter he was sometimes compelled to sleep on the ground in the open air, and he endured the hardness as a good soldier. He spent the two years 1756, 1757, under the parental roof in Stockbridge, but in January, 1758, his father removed to Princeton, and in October, 1758, both his father and mother were removed from the world, and thus, in his fourteenth year, he was left an orphan. He had no pecuniary means for pursuing his education; but, having received promises of aid from the friends of his parents, he entered the Grammar School at Princeton in February, 1760, was admitted to Princeton College in September, 1761, and was graduated there in September, 1765. During the presidency and under the preaching of Dr. Finley, he became, as he thought, a true servant of Christ, and in September, 1763, he became a member of the Church. After having studied theology with Dr. Joseph Bellamy, he was approbated as a preacher in October 1766, by the Litchfield County Association. In 1767 he was appointed to the office of tutor at Nassau Hall, and was continued in the office two years. He was also offered, but he declined to accept, the professorship of languages and logic in the same institution. He had distinguished himself as a linguist and as a logician at Nassau Hall, and at a later day he received the doctorate of divinity from that college. Thus in his earlier years he was honored by his Alma Mater as a man of uncommon promise, and in his mature years as a man of uncommon attainments. His contemporaries speak of him as indefatigably diligent while at college, and as ever afterwards an eager aspirant for knowledge in its various branches.

He was also an instructive and sometimes an eloquent preacher. Accordingly, he was invited to the pastorship of an important church in New Haven, Connecticut, and was ordained there January 5, 1769. It is stated in his memoir, that the ordaining council were so intensely interested in his preparatory examination that they continued it for their own pleasure and profit several hours after the time which had been previously appointed for the public exercises of the ordination. Several members of his, church were advocates of the "half-way covenant;" he, like his father, was decidedly hostile to it. This divergence of views occasioned much trouble to him in his pastorate. The extravagances which had been connected with the "great awakening" in 1740-2 were followed by a disastrous reaction among the New England churches, and the ministry of Dr. Edwards was made in some degree uncomfortable by it. His pastorate was also disturbed by the demoralizing influences of the Revolutionary war. That war introduced a flood of errors among the people. Dangerous heresies were adopted by some members of his parish. The result of all these untoward events was that he was dismissed from his office May 19, 1795, after having labored in it more than twenty-six years. The Connecticut Evangelical Magazine stated that the principal cause "of his dismission was the departure of some of his parishioners from their former faith, but the ostensible cause assigned by the society was their inability to support a minister."

He had already acquired a great reputation as a philosopher and as a philanthropist. He was well known and much beloved by divines in Great Britain, with some of whom he maintained an active correspondence. Such a man could not long remain without some official relations. In January 1796, he was installed pastor of the church in Colebrook, Connecticut. Here, in the bosom of an intelligent, affectionate, and confiding parish, he persevered in his rigorous system of study, and prepared himself for works which he did not live to execute. Having enjoyed his busy retreat a little more than three years, he was surprised by being called in May 1799, to the presidency of Union College, Schenectady, N.Y. After a prolonged examination of his duty, he applied to an ecclesiastical council for their advice, and in accordance with their counsel he accepted the new office. He entered on its duties in the summer of 1799, and was welcomed with unusual demonstrations of joy. Reverend Dr. Andrew Yates, who was associated with Dr. Edwards in the government of the college, says of him: "His discipline was mild and affectionately parental, and his requirements reasonable. Such a character for government in president Edwards was unexpected to some who professed to know his disposition, and had formed their opinions of him in this respect. It was therefore the more noticed. There was an apparent austerity and reserve in his manner, which no doubt arose from the retirement of study and from habits of close thought, and would leave such an impression after a slight acquaintance; but in his domestic intercourse, and with his intimate friends, while conscientiously strict and prompt in his duties, and while he acted with decision, he was mild and affectionate. The same spirit characterized his government of the college. It was probably conducted with greater mildness and affection than would have been exercised had not the prevailing expectations of some intimated the danger of his erring on the side of severity. His pupils, like a well-regulated family under faithful discipline, were respectfully attached to him."

On August 1, 1801, after an illness of about a fortnight, he died, at the age of fifty-six years, two months, and six days. "The blood of Christ is my only ground of hope" were among his last words. A highly eulogistic sermon was preached at his funeral in the Reformed Dutch Church at Schenectady by his friend, Reverend Robert Smith, of Savannah. Dr. Edwards had been greatly affected by the loss of his first wife, who, in June 1782, was drowned. He had also been bereaved of one child; but three of his children survived him.

The influence of Dr. Edwards in the pulpit, although not equal to that of his father, was yet greater than might have been expected from his analytic habits. His eye was piercing, his whole manner was impressive, his thoughts were clear and weighty, and his general character was itself a sermon. He was known to be honest, and a hearty lover of the truth as it is in Jesus. Although not a talker, in the superficial meaning of that phrase, yet he was powerful in conversation with men of letters, and was a prince among disputants; therefore his influence over his theological pupils was perhaps as important as his power in molding the character of his parishioners. He instructed many young men for the Christian ministry, and his influence is yet apparent in the writings of some of them. One of these pupils was his nephew, president Dwight, of Yale College, who was wont to speak of him with filial reverence; another was Dr. Griffin, president of Williams College, who bore frequent testimony to the power of his teacher. A large part of Dr. Edwards's influence arose from his interpretations pf his father's writings. He often said that he had spent his life on those writings, although, in fact, he had more various learning than belonged to his father. He studied the published and the unpublished works of the elder president with peculiar care. He was an early and confidential friend of Dr. Bellamy, one of the most intimate associates of the elder president, and he learned from Bellamy the exact shadings of the father's system. He was also a lifelong friend of Dr. Samuel Hopkins, another of president Edwards's bosom companions, and he obtained from Hopkins many nice discriminations in regard to the president's theories as expounded in his conversations. He was thus well fitted to be an editor of his father's works, and he did prepare for the press the History of the Work of Redemption, two volumes of sermons, and two volumes of Miscellaneous Observations on important Theological Subjects. He was also well fitted to write a commentary on his father's doctrinal system, as that system was originally published by the President, or afterwards modified by Hopkins, Bellamy, Smalley, and others. In this aspect there is great value belonging to Dr. Edwards's treatise entitled Improvements in Theology made by President Edwards and those who have followed his Course of Thought. In 1797, while he was at Colebrook, he published A Dissertation concerning Liberty and Necessity, in reply to the Reverend Dr. Samuel West.

This volume may be regarded as perhaps the fairest exponent of the elder president's theory of the will. It led Dr. Emmons to say that, of the two, the father had more reason than the son, yet the son was a better reasoner than the father. It is accordingly in his published works that the influence of Dr. Edwards has been most conspicuous. He printed numerous articles in the New York Theological Magazine; various sermons, one in 1783, at the ordination of Reverend Timothy Dwight, at Greenfield, Connecticut; one in 1791, on the Injustice and Impolicy of the Slave-trade; one in 1791, on Human Depravity; one in 1792, at the ordination of Reverend Dan Bradley, at Hamden; one in 1792, at the ordination of Reverend William Brown, at Glastenbury; one in 1792, the Concio ad Clerom, preached in the chapel of Yale College on the marriage of a deceased wife's sister; one in 1793, on the death of Roger Sherman; an election sermon in 1794; in 1797, a sermon on the Future State: of Existence and the Immortality of the Soul; in 1799, a Farewell Sermon to the people of Colebrook. The most celebrated of his discourses are the three On the Necessity of the Atonement and its Consistency with Free Grace in Forgiveness. They were "preached before his excellency the governor and a large number of both houses of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, during their sessions at New Haven, in October, 1785, and published by request." They have been frequently republished, and they form the basis of that theory of the atonement which is sometimes called the "Edwardean theory," and is now commonly adopted by what is termed the "New England school of divines." These discourses have great historical as well as theological importance, and they serve to illustrate the fact that some of the most profound treatises in the science of divinity have been originally preached in sermons. One ultimate design of his volume on the Atonement was to refute the argument which some were deriving from that doctrine in favor of universal salvation. Intimately connected with this volume was another larger work, originally published in 1789, but frequently republished, and entitled, The Salvation of all Men strictly examined, and the endless Punishment of those who die impenitent argued and defended against the Reasonings of Dr. Chauncy in his book entitled "The Salvation of all Men." This work alone would have established the fame of Dr. Edwards as a divine of singular acuteness, deep penetration, accuracy and precision of thought and style. At the present day it is more suggestive of the true and the decisive modes of reasoning on this subject than is perhaps any other volume. The preceding works illustrate the metaphysical acumen and the profound judgment of Dr. Edwards; he published one essay which indicates his tact as a philologist, and which elicited the enthusiastic praises of Humboldt.

This is his Observations on the Language of the Muhhekaneew Indians, in which the Extent of that Language in North America is shown, its Genius grammatically traced, and some of its Peculiarities, and some Instances of Analogy between that and the Hebrew are pointed out. These observations were "communicated to the Connecticut Society of Arts and Sciences, and published at the request of the society." One of the most accomplished of American linguists, Honorable John Pickering, who edited one edition of this paper, says of it: "The work has been for some time well known in Europe, where it has undoubtedly contributed to the diffusion of more just ideas than once prevailed respecting the structure of the Indian languages, and has served to correct some of the errors into which learned men had been led by placing too implicit confidence in the accounts of hasty travelers and blundering interpreters. In the Mithridates, that immortal monument of philological research, professor Vater refers to it for the information he has given upon the Mohegan language, and he has published large extracts from it. To a perfect familiarity with the Muhhekaneew dialect, Dr. Edwards united a stock of grammatical and other learning 'which well qualified him for the task of reducing an unwritten language to the rules of grammar." Nearly all of Dr. Edwards's published writings were collected and reprinted in two octavo volumes, each of above 500 pages, in 1842. They were edited, and a memoir was prefixed to them, by his grandson, Reverend Tryon Edwards, D.D.

Although the two Edwards were in various particulars dissimilar, yet in many respects there was a striking resemblance between them. Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton, says "the son greatly resembled his venerable father in metaphysical acuteness, in ardent piety, and in the purest exemplariness of Christian deportment." The son, like the father, was a tutor in the college where he had been a student; was first ordained over a prominent church in the town where his maternal grandfather had been the pastor; was dismissed on account of his doctrinal opinions; was afterwards the minister of a retired parish; was then president of a college, and died soon after his inauguration. His memoir states that both the father and the son preached on the first Sabbath of the January preceding their death from the text, "This year thou shalt die." (E.A.P.)

## Edwards, Jonathan, D.D[[@Headword:Edwards, Jonathan, D.D]]

             an English divine and able writer against Socinianism, was born at Wrexham, Denbighshire, in 1629, and in 1655 became a servitor of Christ Church, Oxford, where he was admitted A.B., October, 1659. He was rector of Kiddington, Oxfordshire, which he exchanged, in 1681, for Hinton, Hampshire; was elected principal of Jesus College in 1686, and treasurer of Llandaff in 1687. He held other important offices, and died July 20, 1712. His publications are, Remarks upon Dr. Sherlock's Examination of the Oxford Decree, etc. (Oxford, 1695, 4to): APreservative against Socinianism (in 4 parts): — A Vindication of the Doctrine of Original Sin (Oxford, 1711, 8vo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Edwards, Justin, D.D[[@Headword:Edwards, Justin, D.D]]

             an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Westhampton, Massachusetts, April 25, 1787. He graduated at Williams College 1810; entered the Theological Seminary in Andover March 1811, and was installed pastor of the South Church in the same place December 2, 1812. In 1825 he was one of the sixteen who founded the "American Society for the Promotion of Temperance." He was installed pastor of the Salem- Street Church, Boston, January 1, 1828, but resigned August 20, 1829, and entered the service of the American Temperance Society as secretary. His zeal, wisdom, and activity contributed, perhaps more than any other agency, to diffuse the principles of the Temperance reform in the United States. He was elected Professor of Theology in the Seminary in New York in February 1836, and President of the Seminary at Andover, 1837. He accepted the latter appointment. In 1842 he was chosen secretary of the newly — formed American and Foreign Sabbath Union, and in this service he spent several laborious and eminently useful years. He died July 24,1853. He published An Address before the Rhetorical Society in the Theological Seminary at Andover (1824): — An Address at the laying of the corner-stone of the new meeting-house in Andover (1826): — A Letter to the friends of Temperance in Massachusetts (1836): — Permanent Temperance Documents, a series of papers (1830-36): — Permanent Documents, a series of papers on The Sabbath; and numerous tracts for the American Tract Society, and a compendious Commentary (N.T. and part of O.T.; Amer. Tract Society). His life was full of varied but always consecrated labor, and few men have contributed more largely to promote Christian ethics in America by laying their foundation wisely in true religion. See Halleek, Life of Justin Edwards (Amer. Tract Society); and Sprague, Annals, 2:572.

## Edwards, Morgan[[@Headword:Edwards, Morgan]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Trevethin parish, Wales, May 9, 1722. He commenced preaching in 1738, supplied for seven years a small congregation in Boston, Lincolnshire, and thence removed to Cork, Ireland, where he was pastor for nine years. After spending one year more at Rye, in Sussex, he emigrated to America, and in May, 1761, became pastor of the Baptist Church in Philadelphia. In 1772 he removed to Newark, Delaware, and preached to several vacant churches until the commencement of the Revolution. After the war he delivered lectures on divinity in Philadelphia and other parts of Pennsylvania, as well as in New Jersey, Delaware, and New England. He died January 28, 1795. Besides various manuscripts, he left behind him forty-two volumes of sermons. He published a number of occasional sermons, addresses, pamphlets, etc. — Sprague, Ann. 6:82.

## Edwards, Peter Cuthbert[[@Headword:Edwards, Peter Cuthbert]]

             a Baptist minister and educator, was born near Society Hill, S.C., February 8, 1819. He was converted in early life, studied in South Carolina College, and graduated from the theological institution at Newton, Massachusetts, in 1844. After studying for a time in the Union Theological Seminary, New York city, he became, in 1845, professor of Biblical literature and exegesis in Furman Theological Institution; and on the remoyal of the seminary from Fairfield District, S.C., to Greenville, he was appointed professor of ancient languages, which office he filled with rare ability until his sudden death, May 15, 1867. See Genesis Cat. of Newton Theol. Institution. (J.C.S.)

## Edwards, Thomas[[@Headword:Edwards, Thomas]]

             on English divine, was born about 1579, passed A.B. at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1605, and A.M. in 1609. He did not become a Nonconformist, but yet was always a Puritan in theology. "I never," says he, "had a canonical coat, declined subscription for many years before the Parliament, though I practiced the old conformity; much less did I bow to the altar and at the name of Jesus,” etc. He was lecturer at Hertford, and afterwards in London. When the Long Parliament declared against Charles I he sided with them, but when the Independents came into power he opposed them with great virulence both by writing and acting. He published Reasons against the Independent Government of particular Congregations (1641, 4to): — Antapologia, or a full answer to the apologetical Narration of Mr. Goodwyn, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, Members of the Assembly of Divines, wherein are handled many of the Controversies of these Times (1644, 4to: the chief design of this work we learn from himself, in the preface to it: "This Antapologia," says he, "I here recommend to you for a true glass to behold the faces of Presbytery and Independency in, with the beauty, order, and strength of the one, and the deformity, disorder, and weakness of the other"): — Gangraena, or a Catalogue and discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this Time (1645, 4to): — Gangraena, part 2 (1646, 4to): — Gangraena, part 3: — The casting down of the last and strongest hold of Satan, or a Treatise against Toleration (part 1:1647): — Of the particular Visibility of the Church: — A Treatise of the Civil Power in Ecclesiastica's, and of Suspension from the Lord's Supper. He died August 24, 1647. He professed himself "a plain, open-hearted man, who hated tricks, reserves, and designs; zealous for the Assembly of Divines, the Directory, the use of the Lord's Prayer, singing of psalms, etc., and so earnest for what he took to be the truth that he was usually called in Cambridge young Luther." — Kippis, Biog. Brit. volume 5.

## Edwards, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Edwards, Thomas, D.D]]

             a learned Arminian divine, born at Coventry, England, in 1729; entered Clare Hall, Cambridge (of which he became fellow), in 1747; master of the Free School, and rector of St. John the Baptist, Coventry, in 1758; vicar of Nuneaton, Warwickshire, in 1770; and died in 1785. His principal writings are,

 (1.) The Doctrine of irresistible Grace proved to have no Foundation in the Writings of the New Testament (Camb. 1759, 8vo): —

 (2.) Prolegomena in libros veteris Testamenti poeticos (Cantab. 1762, 8vo).

## Edwards, Timothy[[@Headword:Edwards, Timothy]]

             a Congregational minister, was born May 14, 1669, at Hartford, Conn. He graduated at Harvard College July 4, 1691, and was ordained May, 1694, as pastor in East Windsor, which relation he sustained until his death, January 27, 1758. Mr. Edwards was father of the distinguished Jonathan Edwards. He published but one sermon (Election Sermon, 1732). — Sprague, Annals, 1:230.

## Edwardston, Thomas[[@Headword:Edwardston, Thomas]]

             an English divine of the 14th century, was so named from his birthplace in Suffolk; was educated at Oxford; became an Augustinian in Clare; was a great scholar; and acted as confessor to Lionel, duke of Clarence, whom he attended to Italy; returned to his native country, and died at Clare in 1396. Pits thinks he had an archbishopric in. Ireland; but this is disowned by the judicious sir James Ware (De Scriptoribus Hiberniae, 2:126). Perhaps Edwardston was temporarily intrusted with an archbishopric in Italy. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:167. Edwen, a female saint of Saxon descent, is commemorated in Wales on November 6.

## Edwy[[@Headword:Edwy]]

             surnamed the Fair, eldest son of king Edmund, succeeded his uncle Eldred as king of England in 955, while his brother Edgar became viceroy of Mercia. Edwy had married Alfriga, the daughter of a noble matron, and was affectionately attached to his young wife. The monks, at the head of whom were Dunstan and archbishop Odo, had, during the reign of Eldred, exerted a great influence at the court; but the young king rejected their councils, and this appears to have made them jealous of Alfriga, believing her to be the cause of this change; and when, on the occasion of his coronation, the king left his court for a time, Dunstan, who had watched for an opportunity to revenge himself on the queen, rushed to her chamber, tore the king from her arms, and brought him back to his courtiers. In revenge for this indignity, Edwy not only banished Dunstan (956), but extended his hatred to the monks generally. Odo declared the marriage unlawful, carried the queen a prisoner to Ireland, and ordered her face to be branded with a red-hot iron. Her wounds soon healing, she recovered her former beauty, and returned to Gloucester. Here she was discovered by Odo's emissaries, and was treated with such cruelty as to cause her death. When Edwy attempted to resist this violence of the monks, Odo formed a conspiracy against him with Edgar, supported by the Mercians and Northumbrians, and he was deprived of the larger part of his kingdom — all England north of the Thames. He survived the partition of his kingdom only a few months, and died before the end of the year 959. While the monks represent king Edwy as licentious and a maladministrator, Huntingdon, who was no party in the quarrel, gives him a handsome character, reports that the country flourished under his administration, and that Odo and Dunstan became his enemies because he was unwilling to submit to the severity of monastic rulers. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 15:692; Mackintosh, History of England, 1:55 sq.; Wright, Biographia Brit. Lit. (A.S.P.) 430 sq.; Collier, Ecclesiastes History, 1:430 sq.; Edinb. Rev. 25 and 42.

## Edzardi, Esra[[@Headword:Edzardi, Esra]]

             a great Hebrew scholar, was born at Hamburg June 28, 1629. He pursued his studies at Leipzig, Wittenberg, and Tubingen, and, in order to become still more proficient, visited many of the larger cities, as Zwickau, where he studied under Daum; Basle, where he enjoyed the instruction of Buxtorf (q.v.); Strasburg, Giessen, Greifswald, and also Rostock, where he was made a licentiate. On his return to Hamburg he gave instruction in Hebrew, and became famous not only for his learning in the Oriental tongues, his thorough acquaintance with Talmudic literature and Hebrew antiquities, but also for his zeal in the conversion of Jews and Romanists. He died January 1, 1708. Most of the works of Edzardi remain in MS. form. The only book mentioned by Graisse is Consensus Antiquit. Judaicae c. explicat. christianorum super Jer 23:5-6, Hebr. Rabb. (Hamb. 1670, fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biograph. Generale, 15:693; Grasse, Allgem. Literargeschichte, 6:886. (J.H.W.)

## Edzardi, Esra Heinrich[[@Headword:Edzardi, Esra Heinrich]]

             a theologian and historian, son of Sebastian Edzardi, was born at Hamburg January 28, 1703. Although his life was very short (he died February 4, 1733), he left a number of works, of which the principal are, Schwedische Kirchengeschichte (Altona, 1720, 8vo): — Ordnung der zehn Gebote in Lutheri Catechismo (Hamburg, 1721, 8vo): — Disputatio de Cycno ante mortem non canente (Wittenb. 1722, 4to): — Wahre Lehre von der Gnadenwahl (1721, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 15:694. (J.H.W.)

## Edzardi, Georg Elieser[[@Headword:Edzardi, Georg Elieser]]

             son of Esra Edzardi, known, like his father, as a great Hebrew scholar, was born at Hamburg January 22, 1661. He studied at the universities of Giessen, Frankfort on the Oder, and Heidelberg, and resided for some time at Worms, where he held many disputations with the Rabbis. After a journey through Germany, he was appointed professor of Greek and history at the gymnasium in Hamburg. In 1717 he was appointed professor of Hebrew, and in this department became the worthy successor of his father, and, like him, was zealous in the conversion of the Jews. He died July 23, 1727. Besides treatises on the Talmud, we have from him Excerpta Gemarae Babyloniae. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 15:693; Grasse, Literargeschichte, 6:886. (J.H.W.)

## Edzardi, Johann Esra[[@Headword:Edzardi, Johann Esra]]

             a German historian, brother of the distinguished Hebraist Georg Eliezer, was born at Hamburg June 23, 1662. He studied at his own native place, at Giessen, and at the leading universities of Germany and Switzerland. He was for a time an instructor at Rostock, and on his return to Hamburg was called to London to preside as pastor over the evangelical Church of the Holy Trinity. He died November 15, 1713. Besides a Funeral Oration to Queen Mary, he left in MS. a History of the Church of England. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 15:693.

## Edzardi, Sebastian[[@Headword:Edzardi, Sebastian]]

             youngest son of Esra, was born at Hamburg August 1, 1673. When only eighteen years old he went to Holland and England, and soon after entered the University of Wittenberg, where he received his M.A. degree in 1695. He then entered upon the study of theology, but in 1696 was appointed professor of logic and metaphysics at the Hamburg Gymnasium. He was a man of vast learning, but his zeal for the Lutherans and his hatred of the Reformed, whom he believed insincere in their professions, engaged him in long and violent controversies. The king of Prussia, Friedrich I (in 1705), ordered five of Edzardi's dissertations written against the Reformed to be burned at Berlin by the hand of the sheriff (Walch, Ketzeir-Historie, 1:512 sq.; 3:1087 sq.). But this punishment was of no avail with Edzardi. He even went so far as to impeach the character of the University of Halle, which he called Holle (Tartarus). After the death of his father he aided his brother Georg Elieser in his efforts for the conversion of the Jews. He died June 10, 1736. A complete catalogue of his numerous polemical writings may be found in Thiessen, Versuch e. Gelehrt. Gesch. von Hamburg, Th. 1:139-154, and in Moller's Cimbria Literata, 1:147-151. His leading dissertations against a union with the Reformed were, Dissertut. de unione cum Reformatis hodiernis fugienda (Hanb. 1703, 4to): — Diatr. de caus. unionis a Calvinianis quaesitae (Hamb. 1704, 4to): — Pelagianismus Calvinianorum commonstratus (Hamb. [Vitab.] 1705, 4to): Manichaeismus Calvinianor. commonstratus, una cum consectario: nullum esse eccl. c. Calvin. unioni locum (Hamb. 1705, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 15:694; Fuhrmann, Handworterb. d. Kirchengesch. 1:672; Aschblach, Allgem. Kirchen-Lexikon, 2:495; Schrockh, Kirchengeschichte s.d. Reform. 8:231, 232; Grasse, Allgem. Literargeschichte, 6:886. (J.H.W.)

## Eeber[[@Headword:Eeber]]

              (Hab. id. עֶבֶר, country beyond), the name of five men.

1. (Sept. ῞Εβερ and ῞Εβερ, Vulg. Heber.) Eber (as the name should be Anglicized) was the son of Salah, and father of Peleg, being the third post- diluvian patriarch after Shem (Gen 10:24; Gen 11:14; 1Ch 1:18; 1Ch 1:25). B.C. 2448-1984. He is claimed as the founder of the Hebrew race (Gen 10:21; Num 24:24). SEE HEBER. In Luk 3:35, his name (Ε᾿βέρ) is Anglicized Heber.

2. (Sept. Ιωβήδ, Vulg. Heber.) The youngest of the seven heads of families of the Gadites in Bashan (1Ch 5:13; A.V. "Heber"). B.C. 782.

3. (Sept. ᾿Ωβήδ, Vulg. Heber.) The oldest of the three sons of Elpaal the Benjamite, and one of those who rebuilt Ono and Lod, with their suburbs (1Ch 8:12). B.C. 535.

4. (Sept. ᾿Ωβήδ, Vulg. Heber.) One of the heads of the families of Benjamites resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:22; A.V. " Heber"). B.C. 535.

5. (Sept. Α᾿βέδ, Vulg. Heber.) The head of the priestly family of Amok, in the time of the return from exile under Zerubbabel (Neh 12:20). B.C. 535.

## Eed el-korban[[@Headword:Eed el-korban]]

             (festival of the sacrifice), a festival celebrated among the Persian Mohammedans in honor of the patriarch Abraham. The day before the feast about four hundred camels are collected from the neighboring country, and the first that rises, after resting, is chosen for the sacrifice, shot, and speared. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Eeunisch, Caspar[[@Headword:Eeunisch, Caspar]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Schweinfurt. He studied at Jena, and died October 18, 1690, a superintendent. He wrote Clavis Apocalyptica et Ezechielica (Rothenburg, 1684): In Canticum Canticorum Commentarius Apocalypticus, (Leipsic, 1688). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:391; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Effectual Calling[[@Headword:Effectual Calling]]

             SEE CALL.

## Effectual Prayer[[@Headword:Effectual Prayer]]

             is the rendering of an expression which occurs Jam 5:16 : "The effectual fervent (ἐνεργουμένη) prayer of a righteous man availeth much." The verb ᾿ενεργέω (the root of the English energy), thus translated, signifies to work in, produce, effect (intransitively, Mat 14:2; Mar 6:15; or transitively, 1Co 12:6; Gal 3:5; Eph 1:11; Php 2:13; or in the "middle voice," Rom 7:5; 2Co 1:6; 2Co 4:12; Gal 5:6; Eph 3:20; Col 1:29; 1Th 2:13;. 2Th 2:7). The participle here, if regarded as used in a neuter sense, adjectively, would signify operative, effective, and such is the interpretation of most commentators (see Wolffi Curei, in loc., for the views and discussions of the older writers); but this produces a tautology with the context (πολὺἰσχύει, availeth much"), which all efforts have failed to remove (such as that of Meyer, who renders adverbially, "The prayer of a righteous man avails much, in that it works [indem es wirkt]," i.e., in its efficiency (so Alford, in loc.). It is better (with Vatablus, Hammond, Whitby, Macknight. Doddridge, and Clarke, to regard it as passive, in its literal sense, inwrought, implying both earnest unction and divine influence, not full inspiration (although the example of Elijah adduced in the following verse would almost warrant that), but such an afflatus as accompanies the supplications of the believing suppliant. SEE PRAYER.

## Efficacious Grace[[@Headword:Efficacious Grace]]

             SEE GRACE; SEE JANSENISM.

## Effrontes[[@Headword:Effrontes]]

             an obscure Transylvanian sect of the sixteenth century, who not only denied the Holy Ghost, but, among other fooleries, cut their foreheads and anointed them with oil as a mode of initiation. Hence their name "exfrons" — out of the brow (Eadie, Eccl. Cyclop. s.v.).

## Effusion Of The Holy Spirit[[@Headword:Effusion Of The Holy Spirit]]

             SEE PENTECOST.

## Egan, Michael[[@Headword:Egan, Michael]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was recommended to the pope, by archbishop Carroll, for the see of Philadelphia, June 17, 1807, as "a man about fifty, endowed with all the qualities to discharge with perfection the function of the episcopacy, except that he lacks robust health, large experience, and eminent firmness in his disposition. He is a learned, modest humble priest, who maintains the spirit of his order in his whole conduct." He was accordingly appointed October 28, 1810. During his short episcopacy the Sisters of Charity were (in 1814) established in his city. Egan died July 22, 1814, and was succeeded by Marechal. See De Courcy and Shea, History of the Catholic Church in the United States, pages 214-217.

## Egara, Council Of (Concilium Egarense)[[@Headword:Egara, Council Of (Concilium Egarense)]]

             was held A.D. 615 at Egara (now Terassa), in Catalonia, to confirm the enactments of Osca and Huesca seventeen years before. Twelve bishops, a presbyter, and a deacon subscribed to it.

## Egbald[[@Headword:Egbald]]

             (1) Abbot, probably of Peterborough, A.D. 671.

(2) Abbot of Waltham (probably Hampshire), early in the 8th century.

(3) Tenth bishop of Winchester, A.D. cir. 778.

## Egbert[[@Headword:Egbert]]

             bishop of Lindisfarne, A.D. 803-821.

## Egbert or Ecbert[[@Headword:Egbert or Ecbert]]

             archbishop of York, was a brother of Eadbert, king of Northumberland, and a pupil, and later a friend, of Beda. As teacher at the cathedral school of York, he became celebrated for extensive knowledge and for his Christian character. Among those who were educated at this school were Alcuin and Aelbert. He became bishop of York in 731, and soon after, in 735, York was made an archbishopric, with metropolitan power over all bishoprics north of the river Humber. Even as bishop and archbishop he continued to give instruction at the cathedral school. He founded a library at York which gained great reputation, but was destroyed by fire in the reign of Stephen. He died in 767, leaving a Dialogus de Ecclesiastica Institutione (Dublin, 1664; Lond. 1693; also in Galland's Bibl. Patr. 13:266), and a collection of canonical prescriptions, De jure sacerdotali, of which only a few fragments are extant (Mansi, 12, fol. 411-431). The treatise De Remediis peccatorum (Mansi, 12:489) is probably an extract from the work just named by some other writers. Some penitential books have also been ascribed to Egbert, but falsely. — Mosheim, Ch. Hist. 2:15; Collier, Eccl. Hist. of England, volume 1; Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. Anglo- Saxon Period, page 297; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 3:658; Hoefer, Biographie Generale, 15:700.

## Egbert, Saint[[@Headword:Egbert, Saint]]

             was born in the 7th century. He was a monk in the convent of Rathmelsing, and in 644, when seized with the plague, he made a vow that, in case of recovery, he would leave his country and preach the Gospel among the pagans. He accordingly set out as a missionary for Germany, but was by a tempest compelled to return. He then took up his abode among the monks of the island of Hy, from where he sent as missionaries to Friesland, first, the learned monk Wictbert, and, when this one returned after two years of fruitless labor, twelve Anglo-Saxons. Egbert had a prominent share in kindling that remarkable missionary zeal which distinguished the Anglo- Saxons in the 8th century. He introduced, in 716, into the monastery of Hy the Roman manner of celebrating Easter, and the Roman tonsure. He died in 729. — Beda, Hist. Eccl. Angl. 3:27; 5:10, 11, 23; Herzog, Real- Encykl. 3:658. (A.J.S.)

## Egbo[[@Headword:Egbo]]

             an idol worshipped by the natives of Old Calabar, in Western Africa. It is a human skull stuck upon the top of a stick, with a few feathers tied to it. One of these idols is yet found in almost every house where the inmates adhere to their former idolatry,

## Egdunus[[@Headword:Egdunus]]

             a presbyter, martyr at Nicomedia with seven others, A.D. 303; commemorated March 12.

## Egede, Hans[[@Headword:Egede, Hans]]

             an eminent Danish missionary, called the "apostle of Greenland," was born at Harstadt, Norway (which at that time belonged to Denmark), January 31, 1686, and became pastor at Drontheim in 1707. Here he conceived the project of a mission to Greenland, having derived from a history of Norway the impression that formerly there had been Christians in Greenland, where now there were only heathens. "Egede, after receiving some suggestions to this effect from a friend in Bergen, became so enthusiastic on the subject that he wrote to the bishops of Bergen and Drontheim in 1710, proposing an expedition to convert the Greenlanders; and on its striking him that such a recommendation would come with an ill grace from one who did not offer to undertake it himself, he made the offer, supposing, however, as he himself tells us, that as it was war-time, and the expedition would require some money, the proposal would not be accepted. He received in reply a strange letter from the bishop of Drontheim, Krog, in which the prelate suggested that 'Greenland was undoubtedly a part of America, and could not be very far from Cuba and Hispaniola, where there was found such abundance of gold;' concluding that it was very likely that those who went to Greenland would bring home 'incredible riches.' Egede had made this offer, very oddly, without acquainting his wife; and as soon as she became aware of it, by the receipt of the bishop's letters, she, with her mother and his mother, assailed Egede with such strong remonstrances, that he says in his own account, he was quite conquered, and repulsed his folly with a promise to remain in the land which 'God had placed him in"' (Eng. Cyclop.). Soon after, his wife, however, gave her consent. In 1717 he threw up his benefice at Vaagen, and went with his family to Bergen, endeavoring to found a company to trade with Greenland. The merchants did not receive this project favorably, and Egede determined to lay his plans before the king at Copenhagen. "Frederick IV of Denmark, who had already, in 1714, founded a college for the propagation of the Gospel, sent Egede back to Bergen with his approbation; a company was formed, to which Egede put down his name for the first subscription of 300 dollars, and finally, on May 3, 1721, a ship called ‘Haabet,' or 'The Hope,' set sail for Greenland, with forty-six souls on board, including Egede and his family. On the 3d of July, after a dangerous voyage, they set foot on shore at Baalsrevier, on the western coast, and were, on the whole, hospitably received by the natives. The very appearance of the Greenlanders at once put a negative on the supposition that they were descended from the Northmen, and their language, which it was now the missionary's business to learn, was found to be entirely of a different kind, being, in fact, nearly related to that spoken by the Esquimaux of Labrador.

The climate and the soil were both harsher and ruder than the Norwegians had expected, and the only circumstance that was in their favor was the character of the inhabitants, which, though at first excessively phlegmatic, so as to give the idea that their feelings had been frozen, was neither cruel, nor, as was found by further experience, unadapted to receive religious impressions. For some years the mission had a hard battle for life. The settlers, unable to obtain sufficient food by fishing and the chase, were entirely dependent on the supply of provisions sent them by annual store-ships from Denmark, and when this supply was delayed, were reduced to short rations and the dread of starvation. On one occasion even Egede's courage gave way, and he had made up his mind to abandon the mission and return to Europe unless the provisions arrived within fourteen days. His wife alone opposed the resolution, and refused to pack up, persisting in predicting that the store-ship would arrive in time; and, ere the time had elapsed, the ships, which had missed the coast, found their way, and brought tidings that, rather than give up the attempt to Christianize Greenland, the king had ordered a lottery in favor of it, and, on the lottery's failing, had imposed a special tax on Denmark and Norway under the name of the Greenland Assessment. In 1727 the Blergen company for trading with Greenland was dissolved, from the losses it had sustained, and the Danish government then resolved on founding a colony in Greenland, and sent in 1728 a ship of war, with a body of soldiers under the command of a Major Paars. The soldiers grew mutinous when they saw to what a country they had been sent, and Egede found his life in more danger from his countrymen than it had ever been from the natives. The death of king, Frederick IV, in 1731, occasioned a change of affairs. The new king, Christian IV, determined to break up the colony and recall all his subjects from Greenland, with the exception of such as chose to remain of their own free-will, to whom he gave directions that provisions were to be allowed for one year, but that they were to be led to expect no further supply.

Egede had then been ten years in Greenland, and his labors were beginning to bear fruit. His eldest son Paul, who was a boy of twelve when they landed, had been of much assistance in learning the language and in other ways; his wife and the younger children had aided greatly in producing a favorable effect on the natives, who had seen no Europeans before except the crews of the Dutch trading vessels. The angekoks, or conjurors, who might almost be called the priests of the native religion, had been awed, some into respect and others into silence by the mildness and active benevolence of the foreign angekok; the natives had seen with wonder the interest he took in their welfare, and, if they refused to believe the new doctrines themselves, had not forbidden them to their children, of whom Egede had a hundred and fifty baptized. The elder Greenlanders, when Egede told them of the efficacy of prayer, asked him to pray that there should be no winter; and when he spoke of the torment of fire, said they should prefer it to frost. Egede, confirmed by his wife, resolved to remain, and this resolution greatly increased his influence over the Greenlanders, who knew that it could only proceed from zeal in their behalf. The king of Denmark, unable to resist his constancy, sent another year's provision beyond what he had promised, and finally, in 1733, announced that he had changed his mind, and determined to devote a yearly sum to the Greenland mission. A dreadful trial was approaching. The Greenland children, of whom some had occasionally been sent to Denmark, almost all died of the small-pox. Two of them were returning home from Copenhagen in the vessel which came in 1733one of them died on the voyage, the other brought the disorder to Greenland, and the mortality was dreadful.

From September 1733, to June 1734, the contagion raged to a degree that threatened to depopulate Greenland. When the trading-agents afterwards went oven the country, they found every dwelling-house empty for thirty leagues to the north of the Danish colony, and the same devastation was said to have extended still farther south: the number of the dead was computed at 3000. That winter in Greenland offered a combination of horrors which could seldom be equaled, but they were met with admirable constancy by Egede and his indefatigable wife. The same ship that brought the small-pox had brought the assistance of some Moravian missionaries. In the year 1734 his son Paul Egede returned from Copenhagen, whither he had been sent to study, and the elder Egede, finding his health begin to fail, applied for leave to return home. The permission reached him in 1735, but his return was delayed from the illness of his wife, who longed to see her native land again, but was denied that gratification, dying finally in Greenland on the 21st of December, 1735, at the age of 62. Egede carried her coffin with him to Denmark, and she was buried in Copenhagen, where she was followed to the grave by the whole of the clergy of the city. A seminary for the Greenland mission was established there in 1740, and Egede was appointed superintendent, with the title of bishop. In the same year he preferred a memorial for an expedition to be sent out to discover the lost 'eastern colony' of the old Norwegians, and offered to accompany it in person, but the proposal was not adopted. In 1747 Egede retired from his office at Copenhagen, and spent most of the remainder of his life at the house of his daughter Christine, who was married to a clergyman of the island of Falster. While he was at Copenhagen he had married a second wife, who accompanied him to Falster, but before his last illness he expressed his wish that he should be buried by the side of his first wife at Copenhagen, and said that if they would not promise to carry this wish into effect, he would go to Copenhagen to die there. He died at Falster on the 5th of November, 1758" (Eng. Cyclop.). He wrote two books on the history of his life's labors. The first was, Relation angaaende den Gronlandske Missions Begyndelse og forsattelse (Copenh. 1738; German, Hamb. 1748). It is rich in materials, but dry in style. Its chief recommendation is its sincerity. The reader is disposed to give entire confidence to the missionary, who not only tells him that on one occasion he labored earnestly in his vocation, but that on another he occupied himself for days in the study of alchemy; who not only speaks of the ardor of his faith at times, but tells us that at others he was seized with a hatred of his task and of religion altogether. Den gamle Gronlands nye Perlustration (Copenh. 1741-4) was translated into French (1763), and into English in 1745, under the title of A Description of Greenland. The translation was reprinted in 1818. It comprises his observations on the geography and natural history of Greenland, and the manners of its inhabitants. See English Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 3:659; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 15:702; Brauer, Beitrag zur Gesch. den Heidenbekehrung (part 3:1839); Rudelbach, Christl. Biogr. (part 6).

## Egede, Paul[[@Headword:Egede, Paul]]

             son of Hans, was born at Waagen, Norway; went to Greenland in 1720, in his twelfth year; afterwards studied at Copenhagen; returned to Greenland in 1704; finally left it in 1740, and was, in reward for his labors, appointed chaplain of the hospital of the Holy Ghost, member of the College of Missions, director of the Hospital of Orphans, and finally (1776) bishop of Greenland. Having retired to the house of his son-in-law, pastor Saabye, he did not cease to urge the Danish government to send new expeditions to that colony, and had the joy of seeing his wishes finally complied with. He died June 3, 1789. He wrote and published a Greenland grammar (Grammatica Graenlandico-Lat.-Dan., Copenh. 1760) and dictionary (Dictionarium Graenlandicum-Dano-Latinum, Copenh. 1754), which have since been improved by Fabricius; translated the New Testament into the language, and was the author of a work, Efterretninger om Gronland (Information on Greenland, Copenh. 1789), which is one of the most interesting in Danish literature. It gives a history of the mission from 1720 to 1788 in a more interesting style than his father was master of. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 15:705.

## Egel[[@Headword:Egel]]

             SEE HEIFER.

## Egemonius (Algemonius, or Ignomus)[[@Headword:Egemonius (Algemonius, or Ignomus)]]

             bishop of Autun, died A.D. 374.

## Eger, Akiba Moses[[@Headword:Eger, Akiba Moses]]

             a famous rabbi and Talmudist, who died at Posen, October 12, 1839, is the author of various disquisitions and novellas on Talmudic treatises. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:224; Kampf, Biographie des hochberiihmten, hochseligen Herrn Akiba Eger (Lissa, 1838). (B.P.)

## Egeredus[[@Headword:Egeredus]]

             bishop of Salamanca, A.D. 646. Egeria (or .Egeria), in Roman mythology, was an Italian spring-nymph, protecting deity of the cityof Rome, who lived in the sacred woods of the Camene, and blessed the peaceful, wise ruler Numa by her useful advice. She is said by some to have been the wife of Numa. When the king died she retreated from Rome, and was so overcome with sorrow that Diana, out of sympathy, changed her into a spring, which has her name.

## Egers, Samuel Levi[[@Headword:Egers, Samuel Levi]]

             a rabbi at Brunswick, .where he died, December 3, 1842, is the author of several novellas on Talmudic treatises and homilies upon Sabbatical sections of the Pentateuch. See First, Bibl. Jud. 1:224. (B.P.)

## Egerton, John[[@Headword:Egerton, John]]

             an English prelate, was born November 30, 1721; educated at Eton school; admitted a gentleman commoner in Oriel College, Oxford, May 20,1740; ordained deacon in Grosvenor Chapel, Westminster, December 21, 1745, and the following day priest. He became pastor of the Church at Ross, in Herefordshire, and January 3, 1746, was collated to the canonry of Cublington, in the Church of Hereford, where he was promoted to the deanery on July 24, 1750. July 4, 1756, he was consecrated bishop of Bangor, at Lambeth; November 12, 1768; translated to the see of Lichfield and Coventry, with which he held a prebend and residentiaryship in St. Paul's, and also the two preferments before mentioned, Ross and Cublington. He was elected to the see of Durham on July 8, 1771, and after enjoying several important positions, died in London, January 18, 1787. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Egg[[@Headword:Egg]]

              (בֵּיצָה, beytsah' so called from its whiteness, ὠόν) occurs, in the plur., of eggs deserted (Isa 10:14), of the eggs of a bird (Deu 22:6), of the ostrich (Job 39:14), or the cockatrice (Isa 59:5). SEE FOWL; SEE OSTRICH; SEE COCKATRICE. It is apparently in this last sense that an egg is contrasted with a scorpion in Luk 11:12, as a desirable article of food. The body of the scorpion is said to be very like an egg; the head can scarcely be distinguished, as it appears to be joined and continued to the breast. Bochart adduces authorities to prove that scorpions in Judea were about the size of an egg (Job 39:14; Isa 10:14; Isa 59:5). The passage in Deu 22:6, humanely prohibits the taking away of a brooding bird from a nest, and is similar in its nature to the provision respecting other animals and their young (Lev 22:28).

Eggs are usually considered a great delicacy in the East, and are served up with fish and honey at their entertainments. Among the ancient Egyptians poultry seems to have been bred in abundance, and the most remarkable thing connected with it is the manner in which the eggs were hatched by artificial means, and which, from the monuments, we have reason to infer, was known and practiced there at a very early period. At the present time there are as many as four hundred and fifty of these establishments, which, being heavily taxed, produce a large revenue to the government. The proprietors of these egg-ovens make the round of the villages in their vicinity, and collect eggs from the peasants, which are given in charge to the rearers, who, without any previous examination, place all they receive on mats strewed with bran, in a room eleven feet square, with a flat roof, and about four feet high, over which is a chamber of the same size, but with a vaulted roof, about nine feet high; a small aperture in the center of the vaulted roof admitting light during the warm weather, and another of larger diameter immediately below, communicating with the oven, through whose ceiling it is pierced. By this the man descends to observe the eggs; but in the cold season both openings are closed, and a lamp is kept burning instead, another entrance at the front part of the oven being then used for the same purpose, and shut immediately on his quitting it. In the upper room, the fire is disposed along the length of two troughs, based with earthern slabs, reaching from one side to the other against the front and back walls. In the oven the eggs are placed in a line corresponding to and immediately below the fire, where they remain half a day. They are then removed to a warmer place, and replaced by others, and so on, till all have taken their share of the warmest positions, to which each set returns, again and again, in regular succession, till the expiration of six days. They are then held up one by one towards a strong light, and if the egg appears clear, and of a uniform color, it is evident it has not succeeded; but if it shows an opaque substance within, or the appearance of different shades, the chicken is already formed; and these last are all returned to the oven for four days more, their positions being changed as before. At the expiration of the fourth day they are removed to another oven, over which, however, there are no fires, where they remain for five days in one heap, the aperture in the roof being closed with tow to exclude air; after which they are placed separately about one, two, or three inches apart, over the whole surface of the mats, which are sprinkled with a little bran. They are now continually turned and shifted from one part of the mats to another for six or seven days, all air being carefully excluded, and are constantly examined by one of the rearers, who applies each singly to his upper eyelid. Those which are cold prove the chickens to be dead; but warmth greater than that of the human skin is the favorable sign that the eggs have succeeded. The average temperature maintained is from 1000 to 1050. The manager, having been accustomed to his art from his youth, knows from experience the exact temperature required for the success of the operation, without having any instrument like our thermometer to guide him. Each ma'amal, or set of ovens, receives about one hundred and fifty thousand eggs during the annual period of its being brought into use, which is only during about two or three months in the spring. Of this number, generally one quarter, or a third, fail to be productive; so that when the peasants bring their eggs to be hatched, the proprietor of the ma'amal returns one chicken for every two eggs. The fowls produced in this way are inferior both in size and flavor to those of Europe (Wilkinson's Anc. Egyptians, 2:170, Am. ed.; Lane's Mod. Egyptians, 2:5).

The word חִלָּמוּתchallamuth', in Job 6:6, which our translators have rendered "the white of an egg," is so rendered by the Hebrew interpreters, and the Targum, or rather, "the slime of the yolk of an egg." The Syriac interpretation gives "a tasteless herb," which is there proverbially used for something unsavory or insipid. SEE PURSLAIN.

## Egg (2)[[@Headword:Egg (2)]]

             as a Christian symbol. Marble eggs have been found in the tombs of some of the saints, and egg-shells occasionally in the loculi of the martyrs, a relic of the celebration of the Agapae. As a Christian symbol it signified the immature hope of the resurrection; the use of it on Easter doubtless has reference to this idea.

## Egg, Mundane[[@Headword:Egg, Mundane]]

             In the cosmogonies of many heathen nations, both ancient and modern, the egg occupies a very prominent place, representing the world in its transition from the chaotic to the fully organized and orderly condition. In the Rig-Veda of ancient Hinduism the supreme spirit is represented as producing an egg, and from the egg is evolved a world. At a later period Brahma is said to have deposited in the primordial waters an egg shining like gold. In ancient Egypt we find Cneph, the creator, producing an egg, the symbol of the world. In the Sandwich Islands an eagle is represented as  depositing an egg in the primordial waters, and among the Finns an aquatic bird. In the ancient Celtic legends the mundane egg was produced by a serpent, which had no sooner brought it forth than it hastened to devour it. But while the mundane egg represents the world in its first creation, it is often found also as emblematic of its renovation, after having been purified by fire. So Herodotus relates that the phoenix buried the body of its father in a mass of myrrh of the form of an egg. Similar fables are related as to the origin of man.

## Eghlionna[[@Headword:Eghlionna]]

             an Irish virgin saint of Cashel, commemorated January 21.

## Egica[[@Headword:Egica]]

             bishop of Segontia (Siguenza), A.D. 655.

## Egidio (or Egiel)[[@Headword:Egidio (or Egiel)]]

             an early missionary, lived in A.D. 964. He was bishop of Tusculum (Frascati), and was sent to Poland about 972 by pope John XIII to propagate the Catholic religion and to regulate its exercises. Egidio sent for prelates from Germany, France, and Italy, and divided them among the new churches. He erected the first archbishoprics and seven bishoprics. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Egidio Antoniini[[@Headword:Egidio Antoniini]]

             surnamed of Viterbo, Latin patriarch of Constantinople, was born at Viterbo in the second half of the 15th century. He was received into the order of the hermits of St. Augustine at the early age of ten years; was professor of philosophy and theology in several towns of Italy, and became one of the most eloquent preachers of his epoch. Having become general of his order in 1507, he was appointed patriarch of Constantinople, and bishop of Viterbo, Nepi, Castro, and Sutri. In 1512 he opened, by order of pope Julius II, the Council of Lateran, and on this occasion severely censured the corruption prevailing in the Church, and, in particular, among the clergy. In 1517 pope Leo X sent him to Germany, and appointed him cardinal; in the following year he was sent as papal legate to Spain. Egidio was well versed in the Oriental languages, and a good Latin poet. He wrote a commentary to the first three chapters of Genesis and to several psalms, Latin dialogues, epistles, and poems, and a treatise De ecclesia incremento. Some of these works are given in Martene et Durand, Amplissima Collectio veterans monumentorum, tom. 3. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 15:718.

## Egidius[[@Headword:Egidius]]

             SEE AEGIDIUS.

## Egidius (2)[[@Headword:Egidius (2)]]

             SEE GIL JUAN.

## Egidius (or Egidius)[[@Headword:Egidius (or Egidius)]]

             nineteenth bishop of Rheims, A.D. 565, not to be confounded with the popular St. Giles (q.v.), was a liberal benefactor of his Church, but one of the most ambitious and intriguing prelates of his time, and was finally deposed for treason.

## Egila[[@Headword:Egila]]

             1. Bishop of Osma, cir. A.D. 633-656.

2. Bishop of Eliberi, about the end of the 8th century; supposed to be the same mentioned by Adrian I in the Adoptionist controversy.

## Egilward (or Egilbert)[[@Headword:Egilward (or Egilbert)]]

             fifth bishop of Wiirzburg, A.D. 803.

## Eginhard or Einhard[[@Headword:Eginhard or Einhard]]

              (sometimes also called Agenhard or Ainhard), the biographer of Charlemagne, was born about 770. The place of his birth is entirely unknown. At an early age he repaired to the court of Charlemagne, and became a pupil of Alcuin. Eginhard gained the favor of the emperor to a high degree, and an intimate friendship sprang up between him and the emperor's children, especially the emperor's oldest son and successor, Louis le Debonnaire. The emperor appointed him his private secretary, and superintendent of public buildings at Aix-la-Chapelle. Eginhard accompanied the emperor in all his marches and journeys, never separating from him excepting on one occasion (806), when he was dispatched by Charlemagne on a mission to pope Leo, in order to obtain the signature of the pope for the document which divided the empire among the sons of Charlemagne. The emperor departed in his case, as in that of Alcuin, Angilbert, and some other friends, from his habit not to cumulate ecclesiastical benefices in one hand, and gave to him the abbeys of St. Bavo and Blardenberg in Ghent, St. Lerontius in Maestricht, Fritzlar in Germany, St. Wandregisil in France, and others. On the death of Charlemagne, he was appointed preceptor of Lothaire, son of Louis le Debonnaire. The latter presented him with a large tract of land in the Odenwald, the center of which was Michelstadt. Here Eginhard spent the last years of his life in retirement. He was in 826 ordained presbyter, and in 827 assumed as abbot the direction of a monastery at Seligenstadt, which he had erected upon his estates. As his wife Emma was still alive at this time, he appears to have agreed with her to consider her only as a sister. The report that his wife was a daughter of Charlemagne is probably untrue. The year of his death is unknown. He was still alive in 848. He probably had no children, and the claim of the counts of Erbach, who trace their descent from him, and in whose castle the coffins of Eginhard and his wife are still shown, is probably unfounded. The reputation of Eginhard rests chiefly upon his life of Charlemagne (Vita et Conversatio Gloriosissimi Imperatoris Karoli Regis Magni, completed about 820), which is generally regarded as the most important historical work of a biographical nature that has come down to us from the Middle Ages. It frequently served as a model for other biographies, and was extensively used as a school-book. The best edition is that of Pertz (1829), in volume 2 of the Monumenta Germaniae historica; another edition, with valuable notes and documents, was published by Ideler, Leben u. Wandel Karl's des Grossen (Gotha, 1839, 2 volumes) Another work, the Annales Regum Francorum, Pippini, Caroli Magni, Hludowici Imperatoris, embraces the period from 741 to 829 (published in Pertz, Monumenta, volume 1). The first part (741-788) is based on the Annals of Lorsch; the second part is original. He also wrote an account of the transfer of the relics of St. Marcellin and St. Peter from Rome to his monastery in Seligenstadt (Historia translationis St. Marcellini et Petri, in Acta Sanctorum, June 2). His Epistolae, 62 in number, are also of considerable value in a historical point of view. They are published in Weinkens, Eginhardus vindicatus (Francf. 1714). Another work, Libellus de adoranda cruce, is lost. The French consider the edition of Eginhard's works by M. Teulot, with a translation and life of Eginhard (Paris, 1840- 43, 2 vols.), to be the best and most complete. — Cave, Hist. Lit., anno 814; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 8, chapter 2, note 43; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 3:725; Dahl, Ueber Eginhard und Emma (Darmstadt, 1817). (A.J.S.)

## Egino[[@Headword:Egino]]

             (1) Twenty-first bishop of Constance, A.D. 781-813.

(2) Bishop of Verona in 796; retired in 799 to the monastery of Reichenau, and died there in 802.

## Eglah[[@Headword:Eglah]]

              (Hebrews Eglah', עֶגְלָה, a heifer, as often; Sept. Αἰγάλ and Α᾿γλά), one of David's wives during his reign in Hebron, and the mother of his son Ithream (2Sa 3:5; 1Ch 3:3). B.C. 1045. In both lists the same order is preserved, Eglah being the sixth and last, and in both is she distinguished by the special title of David's "wife." According to the ancient Hebrew tradition preserved by Jerome (Quest, Hebr. on 2Sa 3:5; 2Sa 6:23), she was MICHAL SEE MICHAL (q.v.), — the wife of his youth, and she died in giving birth to Ithream. A name of this signification is common among the Arabs at the present day. SEE EGLATH.

## Eglaim[[@Headword:Eglaim]]

              (Hebrews Egla'yim, אֶגְלִיַם, two ponds; Sept. Α᾿γαλείμ, Vulg. Gallim), a place named in Isa 15:8, apparently as one of the most remote points on the boundary of Moab. It is probably the same as the EN-EGLAIM SEE EN-EGLAIM (q.v.) of Eze 47:10. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Α᾿γαλλείμ, Agalleim) say that it still existed in their day as a village (Αἰγαλλαιμ), eight miles south of Areoplis, i.e., Ar-Moab. Exactly in that position, however, stands Kerak, the ancient Kir-Moab. A town named Agalla (῎Αγαλλα) is mentioned, by Josephus with Zoar and other places as in the country of the Arabians (Ant. 14:1, 4). Some have also confounded it with GALLIM SEE GALLIM (q.v.). De Saulcy conceives Eglaim to be the same with a place which he names Wady Ajerrah, not far north of the ruins of Rabbah, but on slender grounds (Dead Sea, 1:262, 270). SEE EGLATH; SEE EGLON 3.

## Eglath or Eglah[[@Headword:Eglath or Eglah]]

              (q.v.), in the phrase שְׁלַשַׁוָּה עֶגְלִת, eglath' shelishiyah', Isa 15:5; Jer 48:34, which literally signifies a heifer of the third year; Sept. δάμαλις τριέτης (but v.r. ἀγελία Σαλισία in Jer.); Vulg. vitula conternans; A.V. "a heifer three years old;" and so the Targum, and most modern interpreters (Hitzig, Umbreit, etc.). Others (as Knobel, Winer, etc.) understand the term to be the proper name of a place on the border of Moab, mentioned in connection with Zoar, Luhith, and Horonaim (q.v. respectively), and so compare it with the Agalla of Josephus (Ant. 14:1, 4) and the Necla (or Jecla, Νέκλα or Ι᾿έκλα) of Ptolemy (5:17, 5), which lay in this region (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. page 931), and with the modern region Ajlun north of Jabbok (Abulfeda, Syr. 13, 93; Robinson, Research. in, App. page 162), as the last name has in Arab the same signification as the Hebrews SEE EGLAIM.

## Eglinus, RAPHAEL[[@Headword:Eglinus, RAPHAEL]]

             also called Iconius, a minister of the Reformed Church, was born at Riissicon, in the Swiss canton of Zurich, December 28, 1559. After studying theology at Zurich, Geneva, and Basel, he for some time taught school at Sonders, in the Veltlin (now part of Lombardy,); but, with the Protestants generally, he had to leave this place in 1586. After working for some time as teacher and "diaconus" in Winterscheid, and as "paedagogus" at the college of the alumni at Zurich, he was, in 1592, appointed professor of the New Testament in the latter city. Becoming absorbed in the study of theosophy and alchemy, he spent his whole property in experiments, and in 1601 had to flee on account of debts which he had contracted. Through the intercession of his friends he obtained, however, permission to return, and an honorable dismission. He went to Cassel, where landgrave Moritz, himself a great friend of alchemy, appointed him teacher at the court school, and later, June 13, 1606, professor of theology at Marburg. From the theological faculty of this university he received, in 1607, the title of D.D. Subsequently Moritz also appointed him court preacher at Marburg. He died May 20, 1622. Eglinus was one of the first Reformed theologians in Hesse where landgrave Moritz and his successors endeavored to supplant Lutheranism by the Reformed Church. He wrote in defense of his creed a number of small essays, the most important of which relate to the doctrine of predestination. He is one of those writers in whom the German reformed theology became more scholastic in its character, and was merged in the stricter Calvinistic tendency. In 1618 Eglinus wrote an apology of the Rosicrucians, of which association he had become an active member. He also wrote several books on alchemy and on the Apocalypse. A complete list of his works is given by Strieder, Grundlage zu einer hess. Gelehrten-Gesch. — Heppe, in Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 19:456; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines (edited by Smith), 2:175. (A.J.S.)

## Eglof[[@Headword:Eglof]]

             sixth bishop of Dunwich, in the latter part of the 8th century.

## Eglon[[@Headword:Eglon]]

              (Hebrews Eglon', עֵגְלוֹן, place of heifers, q.d. vituline), the name of a man, and also of two places.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿γλώμ, Josephus Ε᾿γλών,Vulgate Eglon.) An early king of the Moabites (Jdg 3:12 sq.), who, aided by the Ammonites and the Amalekites, crossed the Jordan and took "the city of palm-trees," or Jericho (Josephus). B.C. 1527. Here he built himself a palace (Josephus, Ant. 5:4, 1 sq.), and continued for eighteen years to oppress the children of Israel, who paid him tribute (Josephus). Whether he resided at Jericho permanently, or only during the summer months (Jdg 3:20; Josephus), he seems to have formed a familiar intimacy (συνήθης, Josephus, not Judg.) with Ehud, a young Israelite (νεανίας, Josephus) who lived in Jericho (Josephus, not Judg.), and who, by means of repeated presents, became a favorite courtier of the monarch. Eglon subdued the Israelites beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side the river, and made Jericho the seat, or one of the seats, of his government. This subjection to a power always present must have been more galling to the Israelites than any they had previously suffered. At length (B.C. 1509) they were delivered, through the instrumentality of Ehud, who slew the Moabitish king (Jdg 3:12-31). SEE EHUD.

2. (Sept. Ε᾿γλώμ v.r. Αἰλάμ, but in Jos 10:1-43, Ο᾿δολλάμ; Vulgate Eglon, Aglon.) A city in the maritime plain of Judah, near Lachish (Jos 15:39), formerly one of the royal cities of the Canaanites (Jos 12:12). Its Almoritish king Debir (q.v.) formed a confederacy with the neighboring princes to assist Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, in attacking Gibeon, because that city had made peace with Joshua and the Israelites  (Jos 10:3-4). Joshua met the confederated kings near Gibeon and routed them (Jos 10:11). Eglon was soon after visited by Joshua and destroyed (Jos 10:34-35). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Ε᾿γλώμ, Eglon) erroneously identify it with Odollam or ADULLAM SEE ADULLAM (q.v.), and say it was still "a large village," ten R. miles (Jerome, twelve) east of Eleutheropolis, being misled by the unaccountable reading of the Sept. as above. On the road from Eleutheropolis to Gaza, nine miles from the former and twelve from the latter, are the ruins of Ajlan, which mark the site of the ancient Eglon (Robinson, Researches, 2:392). The site is now completely desolate. The ruins are mere shapeless heaps of rubbish, strewn over a low, white mound (Porter, Handb. for Syria, page 262). The absence of more imposing remains is easily accounted for. The private houses, like those of Damascus, were built of sun-dried bricks; and the temples and fortifications of the soft calcareous stone of the district, which soon crumbles away. A large mound of rubbish, strewn with stones and pieces of pottery, is all we can now expect to mark the site of an ancient city in this plain (Van de Velde, Narrative, 2:188; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:356).

3. Another important place of this name (עגלון), according to Schwarz (Palest; p. 235), is mentioned in Talmudical authorities as situated within the bounds of Gad. He identifies it with the present village Ajlun, one mile east of Kulat er-Rubud, or Wady Rejib, which runs parallel with Jebel Ajlun on the south (see Robinson's Map, and comp. Researches, 2:121). The village is built on both sides of the narrow rivulet Jenne, and contains nothing remarkable except a few ancient mosques (Burckhardt, Syria, page 266).

## Egoaldus[[@Headword:Egoaldus]]

             twenty-fifth bishop of Geneva, in the 7th century.

## Egoism[[@Headword:Egoism]]

             SEE SELFISHNESS.

## Egremont, William[[@Headword:Egremont, William]]

             (otherwise called Egumonde, Egmund, or William of Stamford), an English prelate, was born at Egremont, Cumberland, in the 14th century. He journeyed towards the south, fixed himself at Stamford, became an Augustinian monk and doctor of divinity, went beyond the seas, was made by the pope episcopus Pissinensis, and held the suffraganship under Henry Beaufort, bishop of London. He flourished under Richard II, A.D. 1390, and left many learned works. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 1:345.

## Egrilius[[@Headword:Egrilius]]

             a martyr at Caesarea, in Cappadocia, commemorated November 2.

## Egwald[[@Headword:Egwald]]

             abbot of Tisbury, in Wiltshire, A.D. 759.

## Egwin[[@Headword:Egwin]]

             said to belong to the royal family of Mercia, was made bishop of Worcester in 692, and died December 30, 717. The following three works are attributed to him: a History of the Foundation of Evesham — a Book of Visions: — and a Life of Adhelm. See Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Egwulf[[@Headword:Egwulf]]

             seventh bishop of London, A.D. 745.

## Egypt[[@Headword:Egypt]]

              (or, more strictly, AEgypt, since the word is but anglicized from the Gr. and Lat. Αἴγυπτος, AEgyptus), a region important from the earliest times, and more closely identified with Bible incidents than any other, except the Holy Land itself. For a vindication of the harmony between Scripture history and the latest results of Egyptological research (Brugsch, Aus dem Orient, Berl. 1864), see Volck in the Dorpater Zeitschrift, 1867, 2, art. 2. I. Names. — The common name of Egypt in the Hebrews Bible is Mizraim, מַצְרִיַם, Mitsra'yim (or, more fully; "the land of Mizraim"). In form Mizraim is a dual, and accordingly it is generally joined with a plural verb. When, therefore, in Gen 10:6, Mizraim is mentioned as a son of Ham, some conclude that nothing more is meant than that Egypt was colonized by descendants of Ham. SEE MIZRAIM. The dual number doubtless indicates the natural division of the country into an upper and a lower region, the plain of the Delta and the narrow valley above, as it has been commonly divided at all times. The singular Mazor, מָצוֹר, Matsor', also occurs (2Ki 19:24; Isa 37:25; perhaps as a proper name in Isa 19:6; Mic 7:12; A.V. always as an appellative, "besieged city," etc.), and some suppose that it indicates Lower Egypt, the dual only properly meaning the whole country; but there is no sure ground for this assertion. SEE MAZOR. The mention of Mizraim and Pathros together (Isa 11:11; Jer 44:1; Jer 44:15), even if we adopt the explanation which supposes Mizraim to be in these places by a late usage put for Mazor, by no means proves that, since Pathros is a part of Egypt, Mizraim, or rather Mazor, is here a part also. The mention of a part of a country by the same term as the whole is very usual in Hebrew phraseology. This designation, at all events, is sometimes used for Egypt indiscriminately, and was by the later Arabs extended to the entire country. Josephus (Ant. 1:6, 2) says that all those who inhabit the country call it Mestre (Μέστρη), and the Egyptians Mestraeans (Μέστραιοι). The natives of Modern Egypt invariably designate it by the name Misr, evidently cognate with its ancient Hebrews appellation (Hackett's lllustra. of Scripture, page 120).

Egypt is also called in the Bible אֶרֶוֹ חָם, "the land of Ham" (Psa 105:23; Psa 105:27; compare Psa 78:51), referring to the son of Noah. SEE HAM. Occasionally (Psa 87:4; Psa 89:10; Isa 51:9) it is poetically styled Rahab, רִהִב, i.e., "the proud" or "insolent." SEE RAHAB. The common ancient Egyptian name of the country is written in hieroglyphics. SEE KEM

which was probably pronounced Chem; the demotic form is KEMI (Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften, 1:73, Number 362); and the Coptic forms are Chame or Chemi (Memphitic), Keme or Keme (Sahidic), and Knemi (Bashmuric). This name signifies, alike in the ancient language and in Coptic, "black," and may be supposed to have been given to the land on account of the blackness of its alluvial soil (comp. Plutarch, De Isaiah et Osir. c. 33). It would seem, however, to be rather a representative of the original Hebrews name Ham (i.e. Cham), which likewise in the Shemitic languages denotes sun-burnt, as a characteristic of African tribes. The other hieroglyphic names of Egypt appear to be of a poetical character.

The Greek and European name (ηΑ῾ἴγυπτος, Egyptus), Egypt, is of uncertain origin and signification (Champollion, L'Egypte, 1:77). It appears, however, to have some etymological connection with the modern name Copt, and is perhaps nothing more than "land of the Copts" (the prefix αἰ — being perhaps for αϊvἇγαῖα or γῆ). In Homer the Nile is sometimes (Odys. 4:351, 355; 14:257, 258) called Egypt (Αἴγυπτος).

II. Extent and Population. — Egypt occupies the northeastern angle of Africa, between N. lat. 31° 37' and 24° 1', and E. long. 27° 13' and 34° 12'. On the E. it is bounded by Palestine, Idumaea, Arabia Petraea, and the Arabian Gulf. On the W., the moving sands of the wide Libyan desert obliterate the traces of all political or physical limits. Inhabited Egypt, however, is restricted to the valley of the Nile, which, having a breadth of from two to three miles, is enclosed on both sides by a range of hills: the chain on the 'eastern side disappears at Mokattam, that on the west extends to the sea. Its limits appear to have always been very nearly the same. In Eze 29:10; Eze 30:6, according to the obviously correct rendering, SEE MIGDOL, the whole country is spoken of as extending from Migdol to Syene, which indicates the same limits to the east and the south as at present. Egypt seems, however, to have always been held, except by the modern geographers, to include no more than the tract irrigated by the Nile lying within the limits we have specified. The deserts were at all times wholly different from the valley, and their tribes more or less independent of the rulers of Egypt. Syene, now Aswan, is also assigned by Greek and Arabian writers as the southern limit of Egypt. Here the Nile issues from the granite rocks of the cataracts, and enters Egypt proper. The length of the country, therefore, in a direct line, is 456 geographical miles. The breadth of the valley between Aswan and the Delta is very unequal; in some places the inundations of the river extend to the foot of the mountains; in other parts there remains a strip of a mile or two in breadth, which the water never covers, and which is therefore always dry and barren. Originally the name Egypt designated only this valley and the Delta; but at a later period it came to include also the region between this and the Red Sea from Berenice to Suez, a strong and mountainous tract, with only a few spots fit for tillage, but better adapted to pasturage. It included also, at this time, the adjacent desert on the west, as far as to the oases, those fertile and inhabited islands in the ocean of sand. The name Delta, also, was extended so as to cover the districts between Pelusium and the border of Palestine, and Arabia Petraea; and on the west it included the adjacent tract as far as to the great deserts of Libya and Barca, a region of sand of three days' journey east and west, and as many north and south.

Egypt, in the extensive sense, contains 115,200 square geographical miles, yet it has only a superficies of about 9582 square geographical miles of soil, which the Nile either does or can water and fertilize. This computation includes the river and lakes as well as sandy tracts which can be inundated, and the whole space either cultivated or fit for cultivation is no more than about 5626 square miles. Anciently 2735 square miles more may have been cultivated, and now it would be possible at once to reclaim about 1295 square miles. These computations are those of Colonel Jacotin and M. Esteve, given in the Memoir of the former in the great French work (Description de l'Egypte, 2d edition 18, part 2, page 101 sq.). They must be very nearly true of the actual state of the country at the present time. Mr. Lane calculated the extent of the cultivated land in A.D. 1375-6 to be 5500 square geographical miles, from a list of the cultivated lands of towns and villages appended to De Sacy's Abd-Ahatif. He thinks this list may be underrated. M. Mengin made the cultivated land much less in 1821, but since then much waste territory has been reclaimed (Mrs. Poole, Englishwoman in Egypt, 1:85). The chief differences in the character of the surface in the times before the Christian era were that the long valley through which flowed the canal between the Nile and the Red Sea was then cultivated, and that the Gulf of Suez perhaps extended further north than at present.

As to the number of its inhabitants, nothing very definite is known. Its fertility would doubtless give birth to and support a teeming population. In very remote times as many as 8,000,000 souls are said to have lived on its soil. In the days of Diodorus Siculus they were estimated at 3,000,000. Volney made the number 2,300,000. A late government estimate is 3,200,000, which seems to have been somewhat below the fact (Bowring's Report on Egypt and Candia, page 4). According to the census taken in 1882, the inhabitants number 6,817,265 in Egypt proper. The Copts are estimated at 300,000, the Bedouins being the most in number. Seven eighths of the entire population are native Mohammedans. In Alexandria, at the close of the last century, scarcely 40,000 inhabitants were counted, whereas at present that city contains 300,000, about half of whom are Arabs and half Europeans. The nationality of the latter has been ascertained to be as follows (the figures represent thousands): Greeks, 25; Italians, 18; French, 16; Anglo-Maltese, 13; Syrians and natives of the Levant, 12; Germans and Swiss, 10; various, 6. Cairo, the capital, contains upwards of 400,000 inhabitants; within its walls are 140 schools, more than 400 mosques, 1166 cafes, 65 public baths, and 11 bazaars. The other towns of importance, from their population, are, in Lower Egypt, Damietta, 45,000; Rosetta, 20,000; and in Upper Egypt, Syout, on the left bank of the Nile, numbering 20,000 souls.

III. Geographical Divisions. — Under the Pharaohs Egypt was divided into Upper and Lower, "the two regions" TA-TI? called respectively "the Southern Region" TA-RES, and "the Northern Region" TAMEHIT. There were different crowns for the two regions, that of Upper Egypt being white, and that of Lower Egypt red, the two together composing the pshent. The sovereign had a special title as ruler of each region: of Upper Egypt he was SUTEN, "king," and of Lower Egypt SHEBT, "bee," the two combined forming the common title SUTEN-SHEBT. The initial sign of the former name is a bent reed, which illustrates what seems to have been a proverbial expression in Palestine as to the danger of trusting to the Pharaohs and Egypt (1Ki 18:21; Isa 36:6; Eze 29:6): the latter name may throw light upon the comparison of the king of Egypt to a fly, and the king of Assyria to a bee (Isa 7:18). It must be remarked that Upper Egypt is always mentioned before Lower Egypt, and that the crown of the former in the pshent rises above that of the latter. In subsequent times the same division continued. Manetho speaks of it (ap. Josephus, c. Apion. 1:14), and under the Ptolemies it still prevailed. In the time of the Greeks and Romans, Upper Egypt was divided into the Heptanomis and the Thebais, making altogether three provinces, but the division of the whole country into two was even then the most usual. The Thebais extended from the first cataract at Philae to Hermopolis, the Heptanomis from Hermopolis to the point where the Delta begins to form itself. About A.D. 400 Egypt was divided into four provinces, Augustamnica Prima and Secunda, and AEgyptus Prima and Secunda. The Heptanomis was called Arcadia, from the emperor Arcadius, and Upper Egypt was divided into Upper and Lower Thebais.

From a remote period Egypt was subdivided into nomes (HESPU, sing. HESP), each one of which had its special objects of worship. The monuments show that this division was as old as the earlier part of the twelfth dynasty, which began cir. B.C. 1900. They are said to have been first 36 in number (Diod. Sic. 1:54; Strabo, 17:1). Ptolemy enumerates 44, and Pliny 46; afterwards they were further increased. There is no distinct reference to them in the Bible. In the Sept. version, indeed, מִמְלָכָה (Isa 19:2) is rendered by νόμος, but we have no warrant for translating it otherwise than "kingdom." It is probable that at that time there were two, if not three kingdoms in the country. Two provinces or districts of Egypt are mentioned in the Bible, Pathros (q.v.) and Caphtor (q.v.); the former appears to have been part of Upper Egypt; the latter was evidently so, and must be represented by the Coptite nome, although no doubt of greater extent. The division into nomes was more or less maintained till the invasion of the Saracens. Egypt is now composed of 24 departments, which, according to the French system of geographical arrangement, are subdivided into arrondissements and cantons (Bowring's Report).

IV. Surface, Climate, etc. — The general appearance of the country cannot have greatly changed since the days of Moses. The Delta was always a vast level plain, although of old more perfectly watered than now by the branches of the Nile and numerous canals, while the narrow valley of Upper Egypt must have suffered still less alteration. Anciently, however, the rushes must have been abundant; whereas now they have almost disappeared except in the lakes. The whole country is remarkable for its extreme fertility, which especially strikes the beholder when the rich green of the fields is contrasted with the utterly bare yellow mountains or the sand-strewn rocky desert on either side. Thus the plain of Jordan, before the cities were destroyed, was, we read, "well watered everywhere" ... . "[even] like a garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt" (Gen 13:10). The aspect of Egypt is remarkably uniform. The Delta is a richly cultivated plain, varied only by the mounds of ancient cities and occasional groves of palms. Other trees are seldom met with. The valley in Upper Egypt is also richly cultivated. It is, however, very narrow, and shut in by low hills, rarely higher than 300 feet, which have the appearance of cliffs from the river, and are not often steep. They, in fact, form the border of the desert on either side, and the valley seems to have been, as it were, cut out of a table-land of rock. The valley is rarely more than twelve miles across. The bright green of the fields, the reddish-brown or dull green color of the great river, the tints of the bare yellow rocks, and the deep blue of the sky, always form a pleasant view, and often one of great beauty. The soil consists of the mud of the river, resting upon desert sands; hence this country owes its existence, fertility, and beauty to the Nile, whose annual overflow is indispensable for the purposes of agriculture. The country around Syene and the cataracts is highly picturesque; the other parts of Egypt, and especially the Delta, are exceedingly uniform and monotonous. The prospect, however, is extremely different, according to the season of the year. From the middle of the spring season, when the harvest is over, one sees nothing but a gray and dusty soil, so full of cracks and chasms that he can hardly pass along. At the time of the autumnal equinox, the whole country presents nothing but an immeasurable surface of reddish or yellowish water, out of which rise date-trees, villages, and narrow dams, which serve as a means of communication. After the waters have retreated, which usually remain only a short time at this height, you see, till the end of autumn, only a black and slimy mud. But in winter nature puts on all her splendor. In this season, the freshness and power of the new vegetation, the variety and abundance of vegetable productions, exceed everything that is known in the most celebrated parts of the European continent; and Egypt is then, from one end of the country to the other, nothing but a beautiful garden, a verdant meadow, a field sown with flowers, or a waving ocean of grain in the ear.

The climate is very equable, and, to those who can bear great heat, also healthy; indeed, in the opinion of some, the climate of Egypt is one of the finest in the world. There are, however, unwholesome tracts of salt marsh which are to be avoided. Rain seldom falls except on the coast of the Mediterranean. At Thebes a storm will occur, perhaps, not oftener than once in four years. Cultivation nowhere depends upon rain or showers. This absence of rain is mentioned in Deu 11:10-11) as rendering artificial irrigation necessary, unlike the case of Palestine, and in Zec 14:18 as peculiar to the country. The atmosphere is clear and shining; a shade is not easily found. Though rain falls even in the winter months very rarely, it is not altogether wanting, as was once believed. Thunder and lightning are still more infrequent, and are so completely divested of their terrific qualities that the Egyptians never associate with them the idea of destructive force. Showers of hail descending from the hills of Syria are sometimes known to reach the confines of Egypt. The formation of ice is very uncommon. Dew is produced in great abundance. The wind blows from the north from May to September, when it veers round to the east, assumes a southerly direction, and fluctuates till the close of April. The southerly vernal winds, traversing the arid sands of Africa, are most changeable as well as most unhealthy. They form the simoom or samiel, and have proved fatal to caravans and even to armies (View of Ancient and Modern Egypt, Edin. Cab. Library).

Egypt has been visited at all ages by severe pestilences, but it cannot be determined that any of those of ancient times were of the character of the modern plague. The plague with which the Egyptians are threatened in Zechariah (l.c.) is described by a word, מִגֵּפָה, which is not specially applicable to a pestilence of their country (see Zec 14:12). SEE BOTCH.

Cutaneous disorders, which have always been very prevalent in Egypt, are distinctly mentioned as peculiar to the country (Deu 7:15; Deu 28:27; Deu 28:35; Deu 28:60, and perhaps Exo 15:20, though here the reference may be to the plague of boils), and as punishments to the Israelites in case of disobedience, whereas if they obeyed they were to be preserved from them. The Egyptian calumny that made the Israelites a body of lepers and unclean (Joseph. c. Apion.) is thus refuted, and the traditional tale as to the Exodus given by Manetho shown to be altogether wrong in its main facts, which depend upon the truth of this assertion. Famines are frequent, and one in the Middle Ages, in the time of the Fatimite caliphate El-Mustansir- billah, seems to have been even more severe than that of Joseph. Mosquitoes, locusts, frogs, together with the small-pox and leprosy, are the great evils of the country. Ophthalmia is also very prevalent. SEE DISEASE.

V. The Nile. — Egypt is the land of the Nile, the country through which that river flows from the island of Philas, situated just above the Cataracts of Syene, in lat. 24° 1' 36", to Damietta, in 31° 35' N., where its principal stream pours itself into the Mediterranean Sea. In lat. 30° 15' the Nile divides into two principal streams, which, in conjunction with a third that springs somewhat higher up, forms the Delta, so called from its resemblance to the Greek letter Δ. At Khartum, 160 miles north of Sennar, the Nile forks into two rivers, called Bahr el-Abiad and Bahr el-Azrak, or the white and blue river, the former flowing from the west, the latter from the east. The blue river is the smaller of these, but it possesses the same fertilizing qualities as the Nile, and is of the same color. The sources of this river were discovered by Bruce; those of the white river were, until quite recently, undiscovered. They are now known to flow from lakes situated among the mountains south of the equator (Beke, Sources of the Nile, Lond. 1860). Most ancient writers mention seven mouths of the Nile, beginning from the east: 1, Pelusiac or Bubastic; 2, Saitic or Tanitic; 3, Mendesian; 4, Bucolic or Phatmetic (now of Damietta); 5, Sebennytic; 6, Bolbitine (now of Rosetta); 7, Canopic or Heracleotic.

The Nile is called in the Bible Shichor', שַׁיחוֹר, or "the black (river)”; also eor' , יְאוֹר, יאֹר, "the river." As to the phrases נִהִר מַצְרִיַם, "the river of Egypt," and נִחִל מַצְרִיַם, "the brook of Egypt," it seems unlikely that the Nile should be so specified; and נחל or נהר here more probably denotes a mountain stream, usually dry, on the borders of Egypt and Palestine, near the modern El-Arish (Num 34:5; Jos 13:3, etc.). SEE EGYPT, RIVER OF. Some have thought that נחל is the origin of the word Nile; others have been anxious to find it in the Sanscrit Nila, which means dark blue. The Indus is called Nil-ab, or "the blue river;" the Sutlej also is known as "the blue river." It is to be observed that the Low Nile was painted blue by the ancient Egyptians. The river is turbid and reddish throughout the year, and turns green about the time when the signs of rising commence, but not long after becomes red and very turbid. The Coptic word is iom, "sea," which corresponds to the Arab name for it, bahr, properly sea; thus Nah 3:3, " Populous No (Thebes), whose rampart was the sea." In Egyptian the Nile bore the sacred appellation HAPI, or HAPI-MU, "the abyss," or "the abyss of waters." As Egypt was divided into two regions, we find two Niles, HAPI-RES, "the Southern Nile," and HAPI-MEHIT, "the Northern Nile," the former name being given to the river in Upper Egypt and in Nubia. The common appellation is ATUR, or AUR, "the river," which may be compared with the Hebrews Yeor.

The inundation, HAPI-UR, "great Nile," or "high Nile," fertilizes and sustains the country, and makes the river its chief blessing, a very low inundation or failure of rising being the cause of famine. The Nile was on this account anciently worshipped, and the plague in which its waters were turned into blood, while injurious to the river itself and its fish (Exo 7:21; Psa 105:29), was a reproof to the superstition of the Egyptians. The rise begins in Egypt about the summer solstice, and the inundation commences about two months later. The greatest height is attained about or somewhat after the autumnal equinox. The inundation lasts about three months. During this time, and especially when near the highest, the river rapidly pours along its red turbid waters, and spreads through openings in its banks over the whole valley and plain. The prophet Amos, speaking of the ruin of Israel, metaphorically says that "the land ... shall be drowned, as [by] the flood [river] of Egypt" (Amo 8:8; Amo 9:5). Owing to the yearly deposit of alluvial matter, both the bed of the Nile and the land of Egypt are gradually raised. The river proceeds in its current uniformly and quietly at the rate of two and a half or three miles an hour, always deep enough for navigation. Its water is usually blue, but it becomes of a deep brick-red during the period of its overflow. It is salubrious for drinking, meriting the encomiums which it has so abundantly received. On the river the land is wholly dependent. If the Nile does not rise a sufficient height, sterility and dearth, if not famine, ensue. An elevation of sixteen cubits is essential to secure the prosperity of the country. Such, however, is the regularity of nature, and such the faithfulness of God, that for thousands of years, with but few and partial exceptions, these inundations have in essential particulars been the same. The waters of the stream are conveyed over the surface of the country by canals when natural channels fail. During the overflow the land is literally inundated, and has the appearance of a sea dotted with islands. Wherever the waters reach abundance springs forth. The cultivator has scarcely more to do than to scatter the seed. No wonder that a river whose waters are so grateful, salubrious, and beneficial should in days of ignorance have been regarded as an object of worship, and that it is still revered and beloved. SEE NILE.

VI. Geology. — The fertile plain of the Delta and the valley of Upper Egypt are bounded by rocky deserts covered or strewn with sand. On either side of the plain they are low, but they overlook the valley, above which they rise so steeply as from the river to present the aspect of cliffs. The formation is limestone as far as a little above Thebes, where sandstone begins. The First Cataract, the southern limit of Egypt, is caused by granite and other primitive rocks, which rise through the sandstone and obstruct the river's bed. In Upper Egypt the mountains near the Nile rarely exceed 300 feet in height, but far in the eastern desert they often attain a much greater elevation. The highest is Jebel Gharib, which rises about 6000 feet above the sea. Limestone, sandstone, and granite were obtained from quarries near the river; basalt, breccia, and porphyry from others in the eastern desert between the Thebais and the Red Sea. A geological change has, it is thought, in the course of centuries raised the country near the head of the Gulf of Suez, and depressed that on the northern side of the isthmus. The Delta is of a triangular form, its eastern and western limits being nearly marked by the courses of the ancient Pelusiac and Canopic branches of the Nile: Upper Egypt is a narrow winding valley, varying in breadth; but seldom more than twelve miles across, and generally broadest on the western side. Anciently there was a fertile valley on the course of the Canal of the Red Sea, the Land of Goshen (q.v.), now called Wady Tumeilat: this is covered with the sands of the desert. To the south, on the opposite side, is the oasis now called the Feyum, the old Arsinoite Nome, connected with the valley by a neck of cultivated land.

VII. Agriculture, etc. — The ancient prosperity of Egypt is attested by the Bible, as well as by the numerous monuments of the country. As early as the age of the Great Pyramid it must have been densely populated and well able to support its inhabitants, for it cannot be supposed that there was then much external traffic. In such a climate the wants of man are few, and nature is liberal in necessary food. Even the Israelites in their hard bondage did "eat freely" the fish, and the vegetables, and fruits of the country, and ever afterwards they longed to return to the idle plenty of a land where even now starvation is unknown. The contrast of the present state of Egypt with its former prosperity is more to be ascribed to political than to physical causes. It is true that the branches of the Nile have failed, the canals and the artificial lakes and ponds for fish are dried up; that the reeds and other water-plants which were of value in commerce, and a shelter for wild-fowl, have in most parts perished; that the Land of Goshen, once, at least for pasture, "the best of the land" (Gen 47:6; Gen 47:11), is now sand- strewn and unwatered, so as scarcely to be distinguished from the desert around, and that the predictions of the prophets have thus received a literal fulfillment (see especially Isa 19:5-10), yet this has not been by any irresistible aggression of nature, but because Egypt, smitten and accursed, has lost all strength and energy. The population is not large enough for the cultivation of the land now fit for culture, and long oppression has taken from it the power and the will to advance. Egypt is naturally an agricultural country. As far back as the days of Abraham, we find that when the produce failed in Palestine, Egypt was the natural resource. In the time of Joseph it was evidently the granary — at least during famines — of the nations around (Gen 12:10; compare Exo 16:3; Josephus, Ant. 15:9, 2). The inundation, as taking the place of rain, has always rendered the system of agriculture peculiar; and the artificial irrigation during the time of low Nile is necessarily on the same principle. We read of the Land of Promise that it is "not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst [it] with thy foot, as a garden of herbs: but the land whither thou goest in to possess it, [is] a land of hills and valleys, [and] drinketh water of the rain of heaven" (Deu 11:10-11). Watering with the foot may refer to, some mode of irrigation by a machine, but we are inclined to thinly that it is an idiomatic expression implying a laborious work. The monuments do not afford a representation of the supposed machine. That now called the shaduf, which is a pole having a weight at one end and a bucket at the other, so hung that the laborer is aided by the weight in raising the full bucket, is depicted, and seems to have been the common means of artificial irrigation (q.v.). There are detailed pictures of breaking up the earth, or ploughing, sowing, harvest, threshing, and storing the wheat in granaries. SEE AGRICULTURE.

The threshing was simply treading out by oxen or cows, unmuzzled (compare Deu 25:4). The processes of agriculture began as soon as the water of the inundation had sunk into the soil, about a month after the autumnal equinox (Exo 9:31-32) Vines were extensively cultivated, and there were several different kinds of wine, one of which, the Mareotic, was famous among the Romans. Of other fruit-trees, the date-palm was the most common and valuable. The gardens resembled the fields, being watered in the same manner by irrigation. SEE GARDEN; SEE VINEYARD. On the tenure of land much light is thrown by the history of Joseph. Before the famine each city and large village — for עַיר must be held to have a wider signification than our city" — had its field (Gen 41:48); but Joseph gained for Pharaoh all the land, except that of the priests, in exchange for food, and required for the right thus obtained a fifth of the produce, which became a law (Gen 47:20-26). The evidence of the monuments, though not very explicit, seems to show that this law was ever afterwards in force under the Pharaohs. There does not seem to have been any hereditary aristocracy, except perhaps at an earlier time, and it is not impossible that these lands may have been held during tenure of office or for life. The temples had lands which of course were inalienable. Diodorus Siculus states that all the lands belonged to the crown except those of the priests and the soldiers (1:73). It is probable that the latter, when not employed on active service, received no pay, but were supported by the crown lands, and occupied them for the time as their own. SEE LAND.

The great lakes in the north of Egypt were anciently of high importance, especially for their fisheries and the growth of the papyrus. Lake Menzeleh, the most eastern of the existing lakes, has still large fisheries, which support the people who live on its islands and shore, the rude successors of the independent Egyptians of the Bucolia. Lake Moeris, anciently so celebrated, was an artificial lake between Beni-Suweif and Medinet el- Feyum. It was of use to irrigate the neighboring country, and its fisheries yielded a great revenue. SEE ANGLING. It is now entirely dried up. The canals are now far less numerous than of old, and many of them are choked and comparatively useless. The Bahr Yusuf, or "river of Joseph" — not the patriarch, but the famous sultan Yusuf Salah-ed-deen, who repaired it is a long series of canals, near the desert on the west side of the river, extending northward from Farshut for about 350 miles to a little below Memphis. This was probably a work of very ancient times. There can be no doubt of the high antiquity of the canal of the Red Sea, upon which the Land of Goshen mainly depended for its fertility. It does not follow, however, that it originally connected the Nile and the Red Sea.

VIII. Botany. — The cultivable land of Egypt consists almost wholly of fields, in which are very few trees. There are no forests and few groves, except of date-palms, and in Lower Egypt a few of orange and lemon trees. There are also sycamores, mulberry trees, and acacias, either planted on the sides of roads or standing singly in the fields. The Theban palm grows in the Thebais, generally in clumps. All these, except, perhaps, the mulberry-tree, were anciently common in the country. The two kinds of palm are represented on the monuments, and sycamore and acacia-wood are the materials of various objects made by the ancient inhabitants. The chief fruits are the date, grape, fig, sycamore-fig, pomegranate, banana, many kinds of melons, and the olive; and there are many others less common or important. These were also of old produced in the country. Anciently gardens seem to have received great attention, to have been elaborately planned, and well filled with trees and shrubs. Now horticulture is neglected, although the modern inhabitants are as fond of flowers as were their predecessors. The vegetables are of many kinds and excellent, and form the chief food of the common people. Anciently cattle seem to have been more numerous, and their meat, therefore, more usually eaten, but never as much so as in colder climates. The Israelites in the desert, though they looked back to the time when they "sat by the flesh-pots" (Exo 16:3), seem as much to have regretted the vegetables and fruits, as the flesh and fish of Egypt. "Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely, the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic" (Num 11:4-5). The chief vegetables now are beans, peas, lentils, of which an excellent thick pottage is made (Gen 25:34), leeks, onions, garlic, radishes, carrots, cabbages, gourds, cucumbers, the tomato, and the eggfruit. There are many besides these. The most important field-produce in ancient times was wheat; after it must be placed barley, millet, flax, and, among the vegetables, lentils, peas, and beans. At the present day the same is the case; but maize, rice, oats, clover, the sugar-cane, roses, the tobacco-plant, hemp, and cotton, must be added, some of which are not indigenous. In the account of the plague of hail four kinds of field-produce are mentioned — flax, barley, wheat, and כֻּסֶּמֶת (Exo 9:31-32), which is variously rendered in the A.V. "rye" (l.c.), "spelt" (Isa 28:25), and "fitches" (Isa 28:27). It is doubted whether the last be a cereal or a leguminous product: we incline to the former opinion. SEE RYE.

It is clear from the evidence of the monuments and of ancient writers that, of old, reeds were far more common in Egypt than now. The byblus or papyrus is almost or quite unknown. Anciently it was a common and most important plant: boats were made of its stalks, and of their thin leaves the famous paper was manufactured. It appears to be mentioned under two names in the Bible, neither of which, however, can be proved to be a peculiar designation for it.

(1.) The mother of Moses made תֵּבִת גֹּמֶא, "an ark" or "skiff" "of papyrus," in which to put her child (Exo 2:3), and Isaiah tells of messengers sent apparently from farthest Ethiopia in כְּלֵי9גֹמֶא, "vessels of papyrus" (Isa 18:2), in both which cases גמאmust mean papyrus, although it would seem in other places to signify "reeds" generically.

(2.) Isaiah prophesies, "The papyrus-reeds (עָרוֹת) in the river (יְאוֹר), on the edge of the river, and everything growing [lit. sown] in the river shall be dried up, driven away [by the wind], and [shall] not be" (Isa 19:7). Gesenius renders עָרָה a naked or bare place, here grassy places on the banks of the Nile. Apart from the fact that little grass grows on the banks of the Nile, in Egypt, and that little only during the cooler part of the year, instead of those sloping meadows that must have been in the European scholar's mind, this word must mean some product of the river which with the other water plants should be dried up, and blown away, and utterly disappear. Like the fisheries and the flax mentioned with it, it ought to hold an important place in the commerce of ancient Egypt. In can therefore scarcely be reasonably held to intend anything but the papyrus. SEE PAPER REED.

The marine and fluvial product סוּ, from which the Red Sea was called יִםאּסוּ, will be noticed under RED SEA. The lotus was anciently the favorite flower, and at feasts it took the place of the rose among the Greek and Arabs: it is now very rare.

IX. Zoology. — Anciently Egypt was far more a pastoral country than at present. The neat cattle are still excellent, but lean kine are more common among them than they seem to have been in the days of Joseph's Pharaoh (Gen 41:19). Sheep and goats have always been numerous. Anciently swine were kept, but not in great numbers; now there are none, or scarcely any, except a few in the houses of Copts and Franks. The Egyptian oxen were celebrated in the ancient world (Aristot. Hist. Anim. 8:28). — Horses abounded (1Ki 10:28); hence the use of war- chariots in fight (Isa 31:1; Diod. Sic. 1:45), and the celebrity of Egyptian charioteers (Jer 46:4; Eze 17:15). Under the Pharaohs the horses of the country were in repute among the neighboring nations who purchased them as well as chariots out of Egypt. Thus it is commanded respecting a king of Israel: "He shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way" (Deu 17:16), which shows that the trade in horses was with Egypt, and would necessitate a close alliance. "Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt; and linen yarn: the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price. And a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for six hundred [shekels] of silver, and a horse for a hundred and fifty; and so for all the kings of the Hittites and for the kings of Syria did they bring [them] out by their hand" (1Ki 10:28-29). The number of horses kept by this king for chariots and cavalry was large (1Ki 4:26; 1Ki 10:26; 2Ch 1:14; 2Ch 9:25). Some of these horses came as yearly tribute from his vassals (1Ki 10:25). In later times the prophets reproved the people for trusting in the help of Egypt, and relying on the aid of her horses and chariots and horsemen, that is, probably, men in chariots, as we shall show in speaking of the Egyptian armies. The kings of the Hittites, mentioned in the passage quoted above, and in the account of the close of the siege of Samaria by Benhadad, where we read, "The Lord had made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, [even] the noise of a great host: and they said one to another, Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites and the kings of the Egyptians to come upon us" (2Ki 7:6)-these kings ruled the Hittites of the valley of the Orontes, who were called by the Egyptians SHETA or KHETA. The Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties waged fierce wars with these Hittites, who were then ruled by a great king and many chiefs, and whose principal arm was a force of chariots, resembling those of the Egyptian army. —Asses were anciently numerous: the breed at the present time is excellent. — Buffaloes are common, and not wild. — Dogs were formerly more prized than now; for, being held by most of the Moslems to be extremely unclean, they are only used to watch the houses in the villages. — Cats are as numerous, but less favored. — The camel has nowhere been found mentioned in the inscriptions of Egypt, or represented on the monuments. In the Bible Abraham is spoken of as having camels when in Egypt, apparently as a gift from Pharaoh (Gen 12:16), and before the Exodus the camels of Pharaoh or his subjects were to be smitten by the murrain (Exo 9:3; compare Exo 9:6). Both these Pharaohs may have been shepherds. The Ishmaelites or Midianites who took Joseph into Egypt carried their merchandise on camels (Gen 37:25; Gen 37:28; Gen 37:36), and the land traffic of the Arabs must always have been by caravans of camels; but it is probable that camels were not kept in Egypt, but only on the frontier. On the black obelisk from Nimrud, now in the British Museum, which is of Shalmanubar, king of Assyria, contemporary with Jehu and Hazael, camels are represented among objects sent as tribute by Egypt. They are of the two-humped sort, which, though perhaps then common in Assyria, has never, so far as is known, been kept in Egypt. — The deserts have always abounded in wild animals, especially of the canine and antelope kinds. The wolf, fox, jackal, hyena, wild cat, weasel, ichneumon, jerboa, and hare are also met with. — Anciently the hippopotamus was found in the Egyptian Nile, and hunted. This is a fact of importance for those who suppose it to be the behemoth (q.v.) of the book of Job, especially as that book shows evidence of a knowledge of Egypt. Now this animal is rarely seen even in Lower Nubia. — The elephant may have been, in the remotest historical period, an inhabitant of Egypt, and, as a land animal, have been driven further south than his brother pachyderm, for the name of the island of Elephantine, just below the First Cataract, in hieroglyphics, AB. "Elephant- land," seems to show that he was anciently found there. — Bats abound in the temples and tombs, filling the dark and desecrated chambers and passages with the unearthly whirr of their wings. Such desolation is represented by Isaiah when he says that a man shall cast his idols "to the moles and to the bats" (Isa 2:20). See each animal in its place.

The birds of Egypt are not remarkable for beauty of plumage: in so open a country this is natural. The Rapaces are numerous, but the most common are scavengers, as vultures and the kite. Eagles and falcons also are plentiful. Quails migrate to Egypt in great numbers. The Grallitores and Anseres abound on the islands and sandbanks of the river, and in the sides of the mountains which approach or touch the stream.

Among the reptiles, the crocodile (q.v.) must be especially mentioned. In the Bible it is usually called תִּנַּין, תִּנַּים, "dragon," a generic word of almost as wide a signification as "reptile," and is used as a symbol of the king of Egypt. Thus, in Ezekiel, "Behold, I am against thee, Pharaoh, king of Egypt, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers, which hath said, My river [is] mine own, and I have made [it] for myself. But I will put hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause the fish of thy rivers to stick unto thy scales, and I will bring thee up out of the midst of thy rivers, and all the fish of thy rivers shall stick unto thy scales. And I will leave thee [thrown] into the wilderness, thee and all the fish of thy rivers ... I have given thee for meat to the beasts of the field and to the fowls of the heaven" (Eze 29:3-5). Here there seems to be a retrospect of the Exodus (which is thus described in Isa 51:9-10; Isa 51:15), and with a more close resemblance in Psa 74:13-14, "Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the dragons (תִנַּינַים) in the waters. Thou brakest the heads of leviathan (לַוְיָתָן) in pieces, [and] gavest him [to be] meat to the dwellers in the wilderness" (צַיַּים, i.e., to the wild beasts; comp. Isa 13:21). The last passage is important as indicating that whereas תניןis the Hebrew generic name of reptiles, and therefore used for the greatest of them, the crocodile, לויתןis the special name of that animal. The description of leviathan in Job (Job 41:1-34) fully bears out this opinion, and it is doubtful if any passage can be adduced in which a wider signification of the latter word is required. In Job 26:12 also there is an apparent allusion to the Exodus in words similar to those in Isa 51:9-10; Isa 51:15?), but without mention of the dragon. In this case the division of the sea and the smiting of Rahab, רָהִב, the proud or insolent, are mentioned in connection with the wonders of creation (Isa 51:7-11; Isa 51:13): so, too, in Isaiah (Isa 51:13; Isa 51:15). The crossing of the Red Sea could be thus spoken of as a signal exercise of the divine power. — Frogs are very numerous in Egypt, and their loud and constant croaking in the autumn in "the streams," נְהָרֹת, "the rivers," יְאֹרַים, and "the ponds" or "marshes," אֲגִמַּים (Exo 8:1, A.V. 5), makes it not difficult to picture the Plague of Frogs. — Serpents and snakes are also common, including the deadly cerastes and the cobra di capello; but the more venomous have their home in the desert (comp. Deu 8:15).

The Nile and lakes have an abundance of fishes; and although the fisheries of Egypt have very greatly fallen away, their produce is still a common article of food.

Among the insects the locusts must be mentioned, which sometimes come upon the cultivated land in a cloud, and, as in the plague, eat every herb, and fruit, and leaf where they alight; but they never, as then, overspread the whole land (Exo 10:3-6; Exo 10:12-19). They disappear as suddenly as they come, and are carried away by the wind (Exo 10:19). As to the lice and flies, they are now plagues of Egypt, but it is not certain that the words כַּנָּם and עָרֹב designate them (Exo 8:16-31). The dangerous scorpion is frequently met with. Beetles of various kinds are found, including the sacred scarabaeus. Bees and silkworms are kept, but the honey is not very good, and the silk is inferior to that of Syria.

X. Ancient Inhabitants. — The old inhabitants of Egypt appear from their monuments and the testimony of ancient writers to have occupied in race a place between the Nigritians and the Caucasians. The constant immigrations of Arab settlers have greatly diminished the Nigritian characteristics in the generality of the modern Egyptians. The most recent inquiries have shown that the extreme limit at Philae was only of a political nature, for the natives of the country below it were of the same race as those who lived above that spot — a tribe which passed down into the fertile valley of the Nile from its original abode in the south. These Ethiopians and the Egyptians were not negroes, but a branch of the great Caucasian family. Their frame was slender, but of great strength. Their faces appear to have been oval in shape, and narrower in the men than in the women. The forehead was well-shaped, but small and retiring; the eyes were almond-shaped and mostly black; the hair was long, crisp, and generally black; the skin of the men was dark brown, chiefly from exposure; that of the women was olive-colored or even lighter. The women were very fruitful (Strabo, 15, page 695; Heeren, Ideen, 11:2, 10). The ancient dress was far more scanty than the modern, and in this matter, as in manners and character, the influence of the Arab race is also very apparent. The ancient Egyptians in character were very religious and contemplative, but given to base superstition, patriotic, respectful to women, hospitable, generally frugal, but at times luxurious, very sensual, lying, thieving, treacherous, and cringing, and intensely prejudiced, through pride of race, against strangers, although kind to them. This is very much the character of the modern inhabitants, except that Mohammedanism has taken away the respect for women. The ancient Egyptians are indeed the only early Eastern nation that we know to have resembled the modern Westerns in this particular; but we find the same virtue markedly to characterize the Nigritians of our day. That the Egyptians in general treated the Israelites with kindness while they were in their country, even during the oppression, seems almost certain from the privilege of admission into the congregation in the third generation, granted to them in the Law, with the Edomites, while the Ammonites and Moabites were absolutely excluded, the reference in three out of the four cases being to the stay in Egypt, and the entrance into Palestine (Deu 23:3-8). This supposition is important in its bearing on the history of the oppression.

XI. Language. — The ancient Egyptian language, from the earliest period at which it is known to us, is an agglutinate monosyllabic form of speech. It is expressed by the signs which we call hieroglyphics. The character of the language is compound: it consists of elements resembling those of the Nigritian languages and the Chinese language on the one hand, and those of the Shemitic languages on the other. All those who have studied the African languages make a distinct family of several of those languages, spoken in the north-east quarter of the continent, in which family they include the ancient Egyptian; while every Shemitic scholar easily recognizes in Egyptian, Shemitic pronouns and other elements, and a predominantly Shemitic grammar. As in person, character, and religion, so in language we find two distinct elements, mixed but not fused, and here the Nigritian element seems unquestionably the earlier, Bunsen asserts that this language is "ante-historical Shemitism:" we think it enough to say that no Shemitic scholar has accepted his theory. For a full discussion of the question, see Poole, The Genesis of the Earth and of Man, chapter 6. As early as the age of the 26th dynasty, a vulgar dialect was expressed in the demotic or enchorial writing. This dialect forms the link connecting the old language with the Coptic or Christian Egyptian, the latest phase. The Coptic does not very greatly differ from the monumental language, distinguished in the time of the demotic as the sacred dialect, except in the presence of many Greek words. SEE COPTIC LANGUAGE.

The language of the ancient Egyptians was entirely unknown until the discoveries made by Dr. Young from the celebrated Rosetta stone, now preserved in the British Museum. This stone is a slab of black marble, which was found by the French in August 1799, among the ruins of Fort St. Julien, on the western bank, and near the mouth of the Rosetta branch of the Nile. It contains a decree in three different kinds of writing, referring to the coronation of Ptolemy V (Epiphanes), and is supposed to have been sculptured B.C. cir. 195. As part of the inscription is in Greek, it was easily deciphered, and was found to state that the decree was ordered to be written in sacred, enchorial, and Greek characters. Thence, by carefully comparing the three inscriptions, a key was obtained to the interpretation of the mysterious hieroglyphics. The language which they express closely resembles that which was afterwards called Coptic when the people had become Christians. It is monosyllabic in its roots, and abounds in vowels. There were at least two dialects of it, spoken respectively in Upper and Lower Egypt. SEE ROSETTA STONE.

"The wisdom of Egypt" was a phrase which, at an early period, passed into a proverb, so high was the opinion entertained by antiquity of the knowledge and skill of the ancient Egyptians (1Ki 4:30; Herod. 2:160; Josephus, Ant. 8:25; Act 7:22). Nor, as the sequel of this article will show, were there wanting substantial reasons for the current estimate. If, however, antiquity did not on this point exceed the bounds of moderation, very certain is it that men of later ages are chargeable with the utmost extravagance in the terms which they employed when speaking on the subject. It was long thought that the hieroglyphical inscriptions on the monumental remains of Egypt contained treasures of wisdom no less boundless than hidden; and, indeed, hieroglyphics were, in the opinion of some, invented by the priests of the land, if not expressly to conceal their knowledge from the profane vulgar, yet as a safe receptacle and convenient storehouse for their mysterious but invaluable doctrines. Great, consequently, was the expectation of the public when it was announced that a key had been discovered which opened the portal to these long- concealed treasures. The result has not been altogether correspondent, especially with regard to the presumed secrets of ancient lore. Men of profound learning, great acuteness of mind, and distinguished reputation have engaged and persevered in the inquiry: it is impossible to study without advantage the writings of such persons as Zoega, Akerblad, Young, Champollion, Spohn, Seyffarth, Kosegarten, Ruhle; and equally ungrateful would it be to affirm that no progress has been made in the undertaking; but, after all, the novel conclusions and positions which have been drawn and set forth are only in a few cases (comparatively) definite and unimpeachable (Heeren, Ideen. 2:2,4; Quatremere, Recherches sur la langue et la litterature de l'Egypte). SEE HIEROGLYPHICS. The results in point of history and archaeology, as detailed by Lepsius, Brugsch, and other late Egyptologists, are far more important than in a purely scientific view. See below.

XII. Religion. — The basis of the religion was Nigritian fetichism, the lowest kind of nature-worship, differing in different parts of the country, and hence obviously indigenous. Upon this were engrafted, first, cosmic worship, mixed up with traces of primeval revelation, as in Babylonia; and then a system of personifications of moral and intellectual abstractions. The incongruous character of the religion necessitates this supposition, and the ease with which it admitted extraneous additions in the historical period confirms it. There were, according to Herodotus, three orders of gods — the eight great gods, who were the most ancient, the twelve lesser, and the Osirian group. They were represented in human forms, sometimes having the heads of animals sacred to them, or bearing on their heads cosmic or other objects of worship. The fetichism included, besides the worship of animals, that of trees, rivers, and hills. Each of these creatures or objects was appropriated to a divinity. There was no prominent hero-worship, although deceased kings and other individuals often received divine honors — in one case, that of Osirtasen II, of the 12th dynasty, the old Sesostris, of a very special character. The great doctrines of the immortality of the soul, man's responsibility, and future rewards and punishments, were taught. Among the rites, circumcision is the most remarkable: it is as old as the time of the 4th dynasty.

Wilkinson gives us the following classification of the Egyptian deities (Materia Hieroglyphica, page 58, modified by himself in Rawlinson's Herod. 2:241 sq.):

I. FIRST ORDER.

1. Amen, or Amun-ra, "the king of all the gods."

2. Maut, or Mut (Sanchon. mot), the material principle, sometimes as Buto (=Latona).

3. Noum, Nu, Nef, or Kneph=Mercury.

4. Site=Juno.

5. Pthah, or Ptah, the creative power [a function assigned by others to Kneph]=Vulcan.

6. Neith, self-born and of masculine character=Minerva.

7. Khem, the generative principle (phallus).

8. Pasht=Diana.

II. SECOND ORDER.

1. Re, Ra, or Phrah, the Sun, father of many deities, often combined with those of the others.

2. Seb, the Earth=Saturn, father of the inferior gods.

3. Netpe, wife of Seb, the Sky, mother of gods=Rhea.

4 Khous, son of Amun and Maut, the Moon=Hercules.

5. Anouke [Fire]=Vesta.

6. Atmu [? or Mat], Darkness, or Twilight.

7 Mui, or Shu, son of Re, Light [=Phoebus].

8. Taphne (Daphne), or Tafnet, a lion-headed goddess.

9. Thoth, the Intellect=Hermes and the Moon.

10. Sanak-re, or Sebak.

11. Eilithyia=Lucina.

12. Mandu, or Munt=Mars.

 III. THIRD ORDER.

1. Osiris'

2. Isis, son and daughter of Seb and Netpe.

3. Aroeris, the elder Horus, son of Netpe.

4. Seth, or Typhon, the destructive principle [Death].

5. Nepthys (Nebtei), "lady of the house"=Vesta.

6. Horus the younger, god of Victory=Apollo.

7. Harpocrates, son of Osiris and Isis, emblem of Youth.

8. Anubis, son of Osiris.

IV. MISCELANEOUS.

1. Thmei, or Ma (θέμις), goddess of Truth and Justice, headless.

2. Athor (eit-Hor)=Venus, another daughter of Ra.

3. Nophr-Atmu, perhaps a variation of Atmu above.

4. Hor-Hat, a winged globe, as ἀγαθοδαίμων.

5. Hakte (Hecate), a lion-headed goddess.

6. Selk, a scorpion-headed goddess.

7. Tore, a god connected with Ptah.

8. Amunta, perhaps a female Amun.

9. The, "the heavens."

10. Hapi, or the god of the Nile.

11. Ranno, an asp-headed goddess, as ἀγαθοδαίμων.

12. Hermes Trismegistus, a form of Thoth.

13. Asclepius, Moth, or Imoph, "son of Ptah."

14. Soph, the goddess of Speech.

Together with about 50 more, some of them local divinities, and personifications of cities, besides deified animals, etc

Num, Au, or Kneph, was one of the most important of the gods, corresponding to the "soul" of the universe, to whom was ascribed the creation of gods, men, and the natural world. He is represented as a man with the head of ram and curved horns. The chief god of Thebes was Amen, or Amen-Ra, or Amen-Ra Khem, also worshipped in the great oasis, and sometimes portrayed under the form of Kneph. He was the Jupiter Ammon of the classics. The goddess Mut, or "the mother," is the companion of Amen, and is represented as a female wearing the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt, and the vulture headdress of a queen. Khem was the god by whom the productiveness of nature was symbolized. His name reminds us of the patriarch Ham. The Greeks identified him with Pan, and called Chemmis, a city in the Thebais, where he was worshipped, Panopolis. He is accompanied by a tree or a flower on the sculptures, which may have been, as supposed by Mr. Poole, the asherak or sacred grove spoken of in the Bible. Ptah was the god of Memphis, and worshipped there under the form of a pigmy or child; but, as his temples have been destroyed, little is known of his worship. The goddess Neit or Neith is often associated with Ptah. She was the patron deity of Sais, in the Delta; and the Greeks say that Cecrops, leading a colony from thence to Athens, introduced her worship into Greece, where she was called Athene. This name may be derived from the Egyptian, if we suppose the latter to have been sometimes called Thenei, with the article prefixed like the name of Thebes. She is represented as a female with the crown of Lower Egypt on her head. Ra, or the sun, was worshipped at Heliopolis. His common figure is that of a man with a hawk's head, on which is placed the solar disk and the royal asp. Thoth was the god of science and letters, and was worshipped at Hermopolis Magna. His usual form is that of a man with the head of an ibis surmounted by a crescent. Bast was called Bubastis by the Greeks, who identified her with Artemis. She is represented as a lion or catheaded female, with the globe of the sun on her head. There is a similar goddess called Pasht. Athor was the daughter of Ra, and corresponded to the Aphrodite of the Greeks; the town of Tentyra or Denderah was under her protection. Shu represented solar or physical light, and Ma-t or Thma (Themis) moral light, truth, or justice. Sebak was a son of Ra. He has a crocodile's head.

Osiris is the most remarkable personage in the Egyptian Pantheon. His form is that of a mummied figure holding the crook and flail, and wearing the crown of Upper Egypt, generally with an ostrich feather on each side. He was regarded as the personification of moral good. He is related to have been on earth instructing mankind in useful arts; to have been slain by his adversary Typhon (Set or Seth), by whom he was cut in pieces; to have been bewailed by his wife and sister His; to have been embalmed; to have risen again, and to have become the judge of the dead, among whom the righteous were called by his name, and received his form- a wonderful fore-feeling of the Gospel narrative, and most likely symbolizing the strife between good and evil. Isis was the sister and spouse of Osiris, worshipped at Abydus and the island of Philae. Horus was their son. Apep, Apophis of the Greeks, an enormous serpent, was the only representative of moral evil. The worship of animals is said to have been introduced by the second king of the second dynasty, when the bull Apis, at Memphis, and Mnevis, at Heliopolis, and the Mendesian goat, were called gods. The cat was sacred to Pasht, the ibis to Thoth, the crocodile to Sebak, the scarabaeus to Ptah and a solar god Atum. In their worship of the gods, sacrifices of animals, fruit, and vegetables were used, as well as libations of wine and incense. No decided instance of a human sacrifice has been found. After death a man was brought before Osiris: his heart weighed against the feather of truth. He was questioned by forty-two assessors as to whether he had committed forty-two sins about which they inquired. If guiltless, he took the form of Osiris, apparently after long series of transformations and many ordeals, and entered into bliss, dwelling among the gods in perpetual day on the banks of the celestial Nile. If guilty he was often changed into the form of some base animal, and consigned to a fiery place of punishment and perpetual night. From this abstract it may be seen that the Egyptian religion is to be referred to various sources. There is a trace of some primeval revelation in it; also a strong Sabaean element. (See a full discussion of the subject, with figures of the leading deities, in Kitto's Pictorial Bible, note on Deu 4:16). A more favorable view of the ancient Egyptian theology is taken by Wilkinson in his Ancient Egyptians (see his summary in the abridged ed. 2:327 sq.); and it is probably true, as was the case with the polytheism of the Greeks and Romans likewise, that the more learned and philosophical classes were able to spiritualize to some extent a religion which could have been to the populace nothing but a gross idolatry.

The Israelites in Egypt appear, during the oppression, to have adopted to some extent the Egyptian idolatry (Jos 24:14; Eze 20:7-8). The golden calf, or rather steer, עֵגֶל, was probably taken from the bull Apis, certainly from one of the sacred bulls. Remphan and Chiun were foreign divinities adopted into the Egyptian Pantheon, and called in the hieroglyphics RENPU (probably pronounced Remphu) and KEN. It can hardly be doubted that they were worshipped by the shepherds; but there is no satisfactory evidence that there was any' separate foreign system of idolatry. SEE REMPHAN. Ashtoreth was worshipped at Memphis, as is shown by a tablet of Amenoph II, B.C. cir. 1415, at the quarries of Tura, opposite that city (Vyse's Pyramids, in, "Tourah tablet 2"), in which she is represented as an Egyptian goddess. The temple of "the Foreign Venus," in "the Tyrian camp" in Memphis (Herod. 2:112), must have been sacred to her. Doubtless this worship was introduced by the Phoenician shepherds.

As there are prominent traces of primeval revelation in the ancient Egyptian religion, we cannot be surprised at finding certain resemblances to the Mosaic law, apart from the probability that whatever was unobjectionable in common belief and usages would be retained. The points in which the Egyptian religion shows strong traces of truth are, however, doctrines of the very kind that the Law does not expressly teach. The Egyptian religion, in its reference to man, was a system of responsibility mainly depending on future rewards and punishments. The Law, in its reference to man, was a system of responsibility mainly depending on temporal rewards and punishments. All we learn, but this is of: the utmost importance, is that every Israelite who came out of Egypt must have been fully acquainted with the universally recognised doctrines of the immortality of the 'soul, man's responsibility, and future rewards and punishments, truths which the law does not, and of course could not, contradict. The idea that the Mosaic law was an Egyptian invention is one of the worst examples of modern reckless criticism. XIII. Laws. — We have no complete account of the laws of the ancient Egyptians either in their own records or in works of ancient writers. The passages in the Bible which throw light upon the laws in force during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt most probably do not relate to purely native law, nor to law administered to natives, for during that whole period they may perhaps have been under shepherd rulers, and in any case it cannot be doubted that they would not be subject to absolutely the same system as the Egyptians. The paintings and sculptures of the monuments indicate a very high degree of personal safety, showing us that the people of all ranks commonly went unarmed, and without military protection. We must therefore infer that the laws relating to the maintenance of order were sufficient and strictly enforced. The punishments seem to have been lighter than those of the Mosaic law, and very different in their relation to crime and in their nature. Capital punishment appears to have been almost restricted, in practice, to murder. Crimes of violence were more severely treated than offenses against religion and morals. Popular feeling seems to have taken the duties of the judge upon itself in the case of impiety alone. That in early times the Egyptian populace acted with reference to any offense against its religion as it did under the Greeks and Romans, is evident from the answer of Moses when Pharaoh proposed that the Hebrews should sacrifice in the land. "It is not meet so to do; for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God: lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone, us?" (Exo 8:26.)

XIV. Government. — The rule was monarchical, but not of an absolute character. The sovereign was not superior to the laws, and the priests had the power to check the undue exercise of his authority. The kings under whom the Israelites lived seem to have been absolute, but even Joseph's Pharaoh did not venture to touch the independence of the priests. Nomes and districts were governed by officers whom the Greeks called nomarchs and toparchs. There seems to have been no hereditary aristocracy, except perhaps at the earliest period, for indications of something of the kind occur in the inscriptions of the 4th and 12th dynasties.

XV. Foreign Policy. — This must be regarded in its relation to the admission of foreigners into Egypt and to the treatment of tributary and allied nations. In the former aspect it was characterized by an exclusiveness which sprang from a national hatred of the yellow and white races, and was maintained by the wisdom of preserving the institutions of the country from the influence of the pirates of the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, and the robbers of the deserts. Hence the jealous exclusion of the Greeks from the northern ports until Naucratis was opened to them, and hence, too, the restriction of Shemitic settlers in earlier times to the land of Goshen, scarcely regarded as part of Egypt. It may be remarked as a proof of the strictness of this policy that during the whole of the sojourn of the Israelites they appear to have been kept in Goshen. The key to the policy towards foreign nations, after making allowance for the hatred of the yellow and white races balanced by the regard for the red and black, is found in the position of the great Oriental rivals of Egypt. The supremacy or influence of the Pharaohs over the nations lying between the Nile and the Euphrates depended as much on wisdom in policy as prowess in arms. The kings of the 4th, 6th, and 15th dynasties appear to have uninterruptedly held the peninsula of Sinai, where tablets record their conquest of Asiatic nomads. But with the 18th dynasty commences the period of Egyptian supremacy. Very soon after the accession of this powerful line most of the countries between the Egyptian border and the Tigris were reduced to the condition of tributaries. The empire seems to have lasted for nearly three centuries, from about B.C. 1500 to about 1200. The chief opponents of the Egyptians were the Hittites of the valley of the Orontes, with whom the Pharaohs waged long and fierce wars. After this time the influence of Egypt declined; and until the reign of Shishak (B.C. cir. 990-967), it appears to have been confined to the western borders of Palestine. No doubt the rising greatness of Assyria caused the decline. Thenceforward to the days of Pharaoh Necho there was a constant struggle for the tracts lying between Egypt, and Assyria, and Babylonia, until the disastrous battle at Carchemish finally destroyed the supremacy of the Pharaohs. It is probable that during the period of the empire an Assyrian or Babylonian king generally supported the opponents of the rulers of Egypt. Great aid from a powerful ally can indeed alone explain the strong resistance offered by the Hittites. The general policy of the Egyptians towards their eastern tributaries seems to have been marked by great moderation.

The Pharaohs intermarried with them, and neither forced upon them Egyptian garrisons, except in some important positions, nor attempted those deportations that are so marked a feature of Asiatic policy. In the case of those nations which never attacked them they do not appear to have even exacted tribute. So long as their general supremacy was uncontested they would not be unwise enough to make favorable or neutral powers their enemies. Of their relation to the Israelites we have for the earlier part of this period no direct information. The explicit account of the later part is fully consistent with what we have said of the general policy of the Pharaohs. Shishak and Zerah, if the latter were, as we believe, a king of Egypt or a commander of Egyptian forces, are the only exceptions in a series of friendly kings, and they were almost certainly of Assyrian or Babylonian extraction. One Pharaoh gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon, another appears to have been the ally of Jehoram, king of Israel (2Ki 7:6), So made a treaty with Hoshea, Tirhakah aided Hezekiah, Pharaoh Necho fought Josiah against his will, and did not treat Judah with the severity of the Oriental kings, and his second successor, Pharaoh Hophra, maintained the alliance, notwithstanding this break, as firmly as before, and, although foiled in his endeavor to save Jerusalem from the Chaldaeans, received the fugitives of Judah, who, like the fugitives of Israel at the capture of Samaria, took refuge in Egypt. It is probable that during the earlier period the same friendly relations existed. The Hebrew records of that time afford no distinct indication of hostility with Egypt, nor have the Egyptian lists of conquered regions and towns of the same age been found to contain any Israelitish name, whereas in Shishak's list the kingdom of Judah and some of its towns occur. The route of the earlier Pharaohs to the east seems always to have been along the Palestinian coast, then mainly held by the Philistines and Phoenicians, both of whom they subdued, and across Syria northward of the territories occupied by the Hebrews. With respect to the African nations a different policy appears to have been pursued. The Rebu (Lebu) or Lubim, to the west of Egypt, on the north coast, were reduced to subjection, and probably employed, like the Shayretana or Cherethim, as mercenaries. Ethiopia was made a purely Egyptian province, ruled by a viceroy, "the prince of Kesh (Cush)," and the assimilation was so complete that Ethiopian sovereigns seem to have been received by the Egyptians as native rulers. Further south the negroes were subject to predatory attacks like the slave-hunts of modern times, conducted not so much from motives of hostility as to obtain a supply of slaves. In the Bible we find African peoples, Lubim, Phut, Sukkiim, Cush, as mercenaries or supporters of Egypt, but not a single name that can be positively placed to the eastward of that country.

XVI. Army. — There are some notices of the Egyptian army in the O.T. They show, like the monuments, that its most important branch was the chariot force. The Pharaoh of the Exodus led 600 chosen chariots, besides his whole chariot-force, in pursuit of the Israelites. The warriors fighting in chariots are probably the "horsemen" mentioned in the relation of this event and elsewhere, for in Egyptian they are called the "horse" or "cavalry." We have no subsequent indication in the Bible of the constitution of an Egyptian army until the time of the 22d dynasty, when we find that Shishak's invading force was partly composed of foreigners; whether mercenaries or allies cannot as yet be positively determined, although the monuments make it most probable that they were of the former character. The army of Necho, defeated at Carchemish, seems to have been similarly composed, although it probably contained Greek mercenaries, who soon afterwards became the most important foreign element in the Egyptian forces.

XVII. Customs, Science, and Art. — The sculptures and paintings of the tombs give us a very full insight into the domestic life of the ancient Egyptians, as may be seen in Sir G. Wilkinson's work. What most strikes us in their manners is the high position occupied by women, and the entire absence of the harem system of seclusion. The wife is called "the lady of the house." Marriage appears to have been universal, at least with the richer class; and if polygamy were tolerated it was rarely practiced. Of marriage ceremonies no distinct account has been discovered, but there is evidence that something of the kind was usual in. the case of a queen (De Rouge, Essai sur une Stele Egyptienne, pages 53, 54). Concubinage was allowed, the concubines taking the place of inferior wives. There were no castes, although great classes were very distinct, especially the priests, soldiers, artisans, and herdsmen, with laborers. A man of the upper classes might, however, both hold a command in the army and be a priest; and therefore the caste system cannot have strictly applied in the case of the subordinates. The general manner of life does not much illustrate that of the Israelites from its great essential difference. The Egyptians from the days of Abraham were a settled people, occupying a land which they had held for centuries without question except through the aggression of foreign invaders. The occupations of the higher class were the superintendence of their fields and gardens, their diversions, the pursuit of game in the deserts or on the river, and fishing. The tending of cattle was left to the most despised of the lower class. The Israelites, on the contrary, were from the very first a pastoral people: in time of war they lived within walls; when there was peace they "dwelt in their tents" (2Ki 13:5). The Egyptian feasts, and the dances, music, and feats which accompanied them for the diversion of the guests, as well as the common games, were probably introduced among the Hebrews in the most luxurious days of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. The account of the noontide dinner of Joseph (Gen 43:16; Gen 43:31-34) agrees with the representations of the monuments, although it evidently describes a far simpler repast than would be usual with an Egyptian minister. The attention to precedence, which seems to have surprised Joseph's brethren (Gen 43:33), is perfectly characteristic of Egyptian customs.

The Egyptians were in the habit of eating much bread at table, and fancy rolls or seed-cakes were in abundance at every feast. Those who could afford it ate wheaten bread, the poor alone being content with a coarser kind, made of dura flour or millet. They ate with their fingers, though they occasionally used spoons. The table was sometimes covered with a cloth; and in great entertainments among the rich, each guest was furnished with a napkin. They sat on a carpet or mat upon the ground, or else on stools or chairs round the table, and did not recline at meat like the Greeks and Romans. They were particularly fond of music and dancing. The most austere and scrupulous priest could not give a feast without a good band of musicians and dancers, as well as plenty of wine, costly perfumes and ointments, and a profusion of lotus and other flowers. Tumblers, jugglers, and various persons skilled in feats of agility, were hired for the occasion, and the guests played at games of chance, at mora, and the game of latrunculi, resembling draughts. The latter was the favorite game of all ranks, and Rameses III is more than once represented playing it in the palace at Thebes. The number of pieces for playing the game is not exactly known. They were of different colors on the opposite sides of the board, and were not flat as with us, but about an inch and a half or two inches high, and were moved like chessmen, with the thumb and finger.

The religious festivals were numerous, and some of them were, in the days of Herodotus, kept with great merry-making and license. His description of that of the goddess Bubastis, kept at the city of Bubastis, in the eastern part of the Delta, would well apply to some of the great Mohammedan festivals now held in the country (2:59, 60). The feast which the Israelites celebrated when Aaron had made the golden calf seems to have been very much of the same character: first offerings were presented, and then the people ate; and danced, and sang (Exo 32:5-6; Exo 32:17-19), and even, it seems, stripped themselves (Exo 32:25), as appears to have been not unusual at the popular ancient Egyptian festivals.

The funeral ceremonies were far more important than any events of the Egyptian life, as the tomb was regarded as the only true home. The body of the deceased was embalmed in the form of Osiris, the judge of the dead, and conducted to the burial-place with great pomp and much display of lamentation. The mourning lasted seventy-two days or less. Both Jacob and Joseph were embalmed, and the mourning for the former lasted seventy days.

The Egyptians, for the most part, were accustomed to shave their heads; indeed, except among the soldiers, the practice was probably almost universal. They generally wore skull-caps. Otherwise they wore their own hair, or wigs falling to the shoulders in numerous curls, or done up in the form of a bag. They also shaved their faces; kings, however, and other great personages had beards about three inches long and one inch broad, which were plaited. The crown of Upper Egypt was a short cap, with a tall point behind, which was worn over the other. The king often had the figure of an asp, the emblem of royalty, tied just above his forehead. The common royal dress was a kilt which reached to the ankles; over it was worn a shirt, coming down to the knees, with wide sleeves as far as the elbows: both these were generally of fine white linen. Sandals were worn on the feet, and on the person, armlets, bracelets, and necklaces. The upper and middle classes usually went barefoot; in other respects their dress was much the same as that of the king's, but of course inferior, in costliness. The priests sometimes wore a leopard's skin tied over the shoulders, or like a shirt, with the fore legs for the sleeves. The queen had a particular headdress, which was in the form of a vulture with expanded wings. The beak projected over the forehead, the wings fell on either side, and the tail hung down behind. She sometimes wore the uraeus or asp. The royal princes were distinguished by a side-lock of hair elaborately plaited. The women wore their hair curled or plaited, reaching about half way from the shoulders to the waist.

The Egyptians were a very literary people, and time has preserved to us, besides the inscriptions on their tombs and temples, many papyri of a religious or historical character, and one tale. They bear no resemblance to the books of the O.T., except such as arises from their sometimes enforcing moral truths in a manner not wholly different from that of the book of Proverbs. The moral and religious system is, however, essentially different in its principles and their application. Some have imagined a great similarity between the O.T. and Egyptian literature, and have given a show of reason to their idea by dressing up Egyptian documents in a garb of Hebrew phraseology, in which, however, they have gone so awkwardly that no one who had not prejudged the question could for a moment be deceived. We find frequent reference in the Bible to the magicians of Egypt. The Pharaoh of Joseph laid his dream before the magicians, who could not interpret it (Gen 41:8); the Pharaoh of the Exodus used them as opponents of Moses and Aaron, when, after what appears to have been a seeming success, they failed as before (Exo 7:11-12; Exo 7:22; Exo 8:18-19; Exo 9:11; 2Ti 3:8-9). The monuments do not recognize any such art, and we must conclude that magic was secretly practiced, not because it was thought to be unlawful, but in order to give it importance. SEE MAGIC; SEE JAMBRES; SEE JANNES.

In science, Egyptian influence may be distinctly traced in the Pentateuch. Moses was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Act 7:22), and probably derived from them the astronomical knowledge which was necessary for the calendar. His acquaintance with chemistry is shown in the manner of the destruction of the golden calf. The Egyptians excelled in geometry and mechanics: the earlier books of the Bible, however, throw no light upon the degree in which Moses may have made use of this part of his knowledge. In medicine and surgery, the high proficiency of the Egyptians was probably of but little use to the Hebrews after the Exodus: anatomy, practiced by the former from the earliest ages; was repugnant to the feelings of Shemites, and the simples of Egypt and of Palestine would be as different as the ordinary diseases of the country. In the arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting, the former of which was the chief, there seems to have been but a very slight and material influence. This was natural, for with the Egyptians architecture was a religious art, embodying in its principles their highest religious convictions, and mainly devoted to the service of religion. Durable construction, massive and grand form, and rich, though sober color, characterize their temples and tombs, the abodes of gods, and "homes" of men. To adopt such an architecture would have been to adopt the religion of Egypt, and the pastoral Israelites had no need of buildings. When they came into the Promised Land they found cities ready for their occupation, and it was not until the days of Solomon that a temple took the place of the tent, which was the sanctuary of the pastoral people. Details of ornament were of course borrowed from Egypt; but, separated from the vast system in which they were found, they lost their significance, and became harmless until modern sciolists made them prominent in support of a theory which no mind capable of broad views can for a moment tolerate.

It is hardly needful to observe that the ancient Egyptians had attained to high degrees of civilization and mental culture. This is evidenced by many facts. For instance, the variation of the compass may even now be ascertained by observing the lateral direction of the pyramids, on account of their being placed so accurately north and south. This argues considerable acquaintance with astronomy. Again, we know that they were familiar with the duodecimal as well as the decimal scale of notation, and must therefore have made some progress in the study of mathematics. There is proof that the art of painting upon plaster and panel was practiced by them more than 2000 years before Christ; and the sculptures furnish representations of inkstands that contained two colors, black and red; the latter being introduced at the beginning of a subject, and for the division of certain sentences, showing, this custom to be as old as that of holding the pen behind the ear, which is often portrayed in the paintings of the tombs. Alabaster was a material much used for vases, and as ointment was generally kept in an alabaster box, the Greeks and Romans applied the name alabastron to all vases made for that purpose; and one of them found at Thebes, and now in the museum at Alnwick Castle, contains some ointment perfectly preserved, though from the queen's name in the hieroglyphics it must be more than 3000 years old. In architecture they were very successful, as the magnificent temples yet remaining bear evident witness, though in ruins. The Doric order is supposed to have been derived from columns found at Beni-Hassan, and the arch is at least as old as the 16th century B.C. In medical science, we know from the evidence furnished by mummies found at Thebes that the art of stopping teeth with gold, and probably cement, was known to the ancient Egyptians, and Cuvier found incontestible proof that the fractured bone of an ibis had been set by them while the bird was alive.

Sacred music was much used in Egypt, and the harp, lyre, flute, tambourine, cymbals, etc., were admitted in divers religious services, of which music constituted an important element. Sacred dancing was also common in religious ceremonies, as it seems to have been among the Jews (Psa 149:3). Moses found the children of Israel dancing before the golden calf (Exo 32:19), in imitation probably of rites they had often witnessed in Egypt.

The industrial arts held an important place in the occupations of the Egyptians. The workers in fine flax and the weavers of white linen are mentioned in a manner that shows they were among the chief contributors to the riches of the country (Isa 19:9). The fine linen of Egypt found its way to Palestine (Pro 7:16). That its celebrity was not without cause is proved by a piece found near Memphis, and by the paintings (compare Gen 41:42; 2Ch 1:16, etc.). The looms of Egypt were also famed for their fine cotton and woolen fabrics, and many of these were worked with patterns in brilliant colors, sometimes being wrought with the needle, sometimes woven in the piece. Some of the stripes were of gold thread, alternating with red ones as a border. Specimens of their embroidery are to be seen in the Louvre, and the many dresses painted on the monuments of the 18th dynasty show that the most varied patterns were used by the Egyptians more than 3000 years ago, as they were subsequently by the Babylonians, who became noted for their needle-work. Sir G. Wilkinson states that the secret of dyeing cloths of various colors by means of mordants was known to the Egyptians, as proved by the manner in which Pliny has described the process, though he does not seem to have understood it. They were equally fond of variety of patterns on the walls and ceilings of their houses and tombs, and some of the oldest ceilings show that the chevron, the checker, the scroll, and the guilloche, though ascribed to the Greeks, were adopted in Egypt more than 2000 years before our aera.

A gradual progress may be observed in their choice of fancy ornament. Beginning with simple imitations of real objects, as the lotus and other flowers, they adopted, by degrees, conventional representations of them, or purely imaginary devices; and it is remarkable that the oldest Greek and Etruscan vases have a similarly close imitation of the lotus and other real objects. The same patterns common on Greek vases had long before been introduced on those in Egypt; whole ceilings are covered with them; and the vases themselves had often the same elegant forms we admire in the cilix and others afterwards made in Greece. They were of gold and silver, engraved and embossed; those made of porcelain were rich in color, and some of the former were inlaid or studded with precious stones, or enameled in brilliant colors. Their knowledge of glass-blowing is shown by a glass bead inscribed with the name of a queen of the 18th dynasty which proves it to be as old as 3200 years ago. Among their most beautiful achievements in this art were their richly-colored bottles with waving lines and their small inlaid mosaics. In these last, the fineness of the work is so great that it must have required a strong magnifying power to put the parts together, especially the more minute details, such as feathers, the hair, etc. "They were composed," says Sir G. Wilkinson, "of the finest threads or rods of glass (attenuated by drawing them when heated to a great length), which, having been selected according to their color, were placed upright side by side, as in an ordinary mosaic, in sufficient number to form a portion of the intended picture. Others were then added until the whole had been composed; and when they had all been cemented together by a proper heat, the work was completed. Slices were then sawn off transversely, as in our Tunbridge ware, and each section presented the same picture on its upper and under side."

The more wealthy Egyptians had their large townhouses and spacious villas, in which the flower-garden and pleasure-grounds were not the least prominent features. Avenues of trees shaded the walks, and a great abundance of violets, roses, and other flowers was always to be had, even in winter, owing to the nature of their climate and the skill of their gardeners. A part also was assigned to vines and fruit-trees; the former were trained on trellis-work, the latter were standards. It is a curious fact that they were in the habit of employing monkeys, trained for the purpose, to climb the upper branches of the sycamore-trees, and to gather the figs from them. The houses generally consisted of a ground floor and one upper story; few were higher. They were often placed round an open court, in the center of which was a fountain or small garden. Large houses had sometimes a porch with a flight of steps before the street door, over which latter was painted the name of the owner. The wealthy landed proprietors were grandees of the priestly and military classes (Mr. Birch and M. Ampere may be said to have proved the non-existence of castes, in the Indian sense, in Egypt); but those who tended cattle were looked down upon by the rest of the community. This contempt is often shown in the paintings, by their being drawn unshaven, and squalid, and dressed in the same covering of mats that were thrown over the beasts they tended. None would intermarry with swineherds. It was the custom for the men to milk, as it is still among some Arab tribes, who think it disgraceful for a woman to milk any animal. Potters were very numerous, and the wheel, the baking of cups, and the other processes of their art were prominent on the monuments. It is singular, as affording illustration of Scripture language, that the same idea of fashioning the clay was also applied to man's formation; and the gods Ptah and Num, the creative agencies, are represented sitting at the potter's wheel turning the clay for the human creation. Pottery appears to have furnished employment to the Hebrews during the bondage (Psa 81:6; Psa 68:13; compare Exo 1:14).

The Egyptians were familiar with the use of iron from a very remote period, and their skill in the manufacture of bronze was celebrated. They were acquainted also with the use of the forceps, the blowpipe, the bellows, the syringe, and the siphon. Gold mines were wrought in Upper Egypt (Diod. Sic. 3:12).

Leather was sometimes used for writing purposes, but more frequently paper made from the papyrus, which grew in the marsh-lands of the Delta. The mode of making it was by cutting the pith into thin slices lengthwise, which being laid on a table were covered with similar layers at right angles, and the two sets, being glued together and kept under pressure a proper time, formed a sheet. The dried flower-heads of the papyrus have been found in the tombs.

As illustrating Scripture, it may be mentioned that the gods are sometimes represented in the tombs holding the Tau or sign of life, which was adopted by some of the early Christians in lieu of the cross, and is mentioned by Eze 9:4; Eze 9:6, as the "mark (Tau) set upon the foreheads of the men" who were to be preserved alive. Christian inscriptions at the great oasis are headed by this symbol; it has been found on Christian monuments at Rome.

Egyptian edicts seem to have been issued in the form of a firman or written order; and from the word used by Pharaoh in granting power to Joseph ("According to thy word shall all my people be ruled;" Hebrew kiss, Gen 41:40, alluding evidently to the custom of kissing a firman), we may infer that the people who received that order adopted the usual Eastern mode of acknowledging their obedience to the sovereign. Besides the custom of kissing the signature attached to these documents, the people were doubtless expected to "bow the knee" (Gen 41:43) in the presence of the monarch and chiefs of the nation, or even to prostrate themselves before them. The sculptures represent them thus bowing with the hand stretched out towards the knee. The account of brick-making in Exo 5:7-19 is illustrated in a remarkable degree by a painting in a tomb at Thebes, in which the hardness of the work, the tale of bricks, the straw, and the native taskmasters set over foreign workmen, are vividly portrayed. The making of bricks was a monopoly of the crown, which accounts for the Jews and other captives being employed in such numbers to make bricks for the Pharaohs. SEE BRICK.

Certain injunctions of the Mosaic law appear to be framed with particular reference to Egyptian practices, e.g. the fact of false witness being forbidden by a distinct and separate commandment, becomes the more significant when we bear in mind the number of witnesses required by the Egyptian law for the execution of the most trifling contract. As many as sixteen names are appended to one for the sale of a part of certain properties, amounting only to 400 pieces of brass. It appears that bulls only, and not heifers, were killed by the Egyptians in sacrifice. Compare with this the law of the Israelites (Num 19:2), commanding them to "bring a red heifer, without spot, wherein was no blemish." It was on this account that Moses proposed to go "three days' journey into the desert," lest the Egyptians should be enraged at seeing the Israelites sacrifice a heifer (Exo 8:26); and by this very opposite choice of a victim they were made unequivocally to denounce and separate themselves from the rites of Egypt. The Egyptian common name for Heliopolis was AN, from which was derived the Hebrew On or Aon, pointed in Eze 30:17, Aven, and translated by Bethshemesh (Jer 43:13). So also the Pi- beseth of the same place in Ezekiel is from the Egyptian article Pi, prefixed to Bast, the name of the goddess there worshipped, and is equivalent to Bubastis, a city named after her, supposed to correspond to the Grecian Artemis. The Tahpanhes of Scripture (Jer 43:8; Eze 30:18) was perhaps a place called Daphnae, sixteen miles from Pelusium.

XVIII. Comparison with the Manners of the modern Inhabitants. — The mode of life of the Egyptians has in all ages necessarily been more or less influenced by their locality: those who dwelt on high lands on the east, as well as those who dwelt on the marshy flat country in the Delta, have become shepherds, as their land does not admit of cultivation. The people who live along the Nile become fishermen and sailors. The cultivated part of the natives who live on the plains and over the surface of the country diligently and most successfully practice all the arts of life, and in former ages have left ever-during memorials of their proficiency and skill. On this natural diversity of pursuits, as well as on a diversity of blood — for besides the master and ruling race of Ethiopians there were anciently others who were of nomad origin — was early founded the institution of so-called castes, which Egypt had, although less marked than India, and which pervaded the entire life of the nation. These, according to Herodotus (11:164), were seven in number (compare Diod. Sic. 1:73). The priestly caste was the most honored and influential. It had in every large city a temple dedicated to the deity of the place, together with a high-priest, who stood next to the king and restricted his power. The priesthood possessed the finest portions of the country. They were the judges, physicians, astrologers, architects — in a word, they united in themselves all the highest culture and most distinguished offices of the land, while with them alone lay tradition, literature, and the sacred writings. This class exerted the most decided and extensive influence on the culture not only of their own country, but of the world; for during the brightest periods of Grecian history the love of knowledge carried into Egypt men who have done much to form the character of after ages, such as Solon, Pythagoras, Archytas, Thales, Herodotus, Plato, and others (compare Gen 41:8; Exo 7:11; Exo 8:11; Exo 13:7; Josephus, Ant. 2:9, 2).

The peculiarities of the ancient Egyptians of the lower castes seem to have survived best, and to be represented, at least in some particulars, by the Fellahs of the present day. These Fellahs discharge all the duties of tilling the country and gathering its rich abundance. They are a quiet, contented, and submissive race, always living, through an unjust government, on the edge of starvation, yet always happy, with no thought for the morrow, no care for, no interest in, political changes. "Of the Fellahs it may be said, as was said by Amrou of the ancient Egyptians, 'they are bees always toiling, always toiling for others, not themselves.' The love of the Fellah for his country and his Nile is an all-absorbing love. Remove him, and he perishes. He cannot live a year away from his village; his grave must be where his cradle was. But he is of all men most submissive: he will rather die than revolt; resignation is his primary virtue; impatience under any yoke is unknown to him; his life, his faith, his law is submission. 'Allah Kerim!' is his hourly consolation, his perpetual benediction. He was made for peace, not for war; and, though his patriotism is intense, there is no mingling in it of the love of glory or the passion for conquest. His nationality is in his local affections, and they are most intense. Upon this race, the race of bright eyes and beautiful forms, it is impossible to look without deep interest: of all the gay, the gayest; of all the beings made for happiness, the most excitable. If days of peace and prosperity could be theirs, what songs, what music, what joys!" (Bowring's Report, page 7).

The ruling class consists of Arabs intermingled with Turks, who have been in succession the conquerors of the land, and may be regarded as representing the priestly and military castes.

The only other tribe we have room to notice is that of the Copts; equally with the preceding indigenous. They are Christians by hereditary transmission, and have suffered centuries of cruel persecutions and humiliations, though now they seem to be rising in importance, and promise to fill an important page in the future history of Egypt. In character they are amiable, pacific, and intelligent, having, of course, the faults and vices of dissimulation, falsehood, and meanness, which slavery never fails to engender. In office they are the scribes, the arithmeticians, the measurers, the clerks — in a word, the learned men of the country. The language which they use in their religious services is the ancient Egyptian, or Coptic, which, however, is translated into Arabic for the benefit of tem laity (Bowring's Report). SEE EGYPT, CHRISTIAN; and SEE COPTS.

XIX. Technical Chronology. — That the Egyptians used various periods of time, and made astronomical observations from a remote age, is equally attested by ancient writers and by their monuments. It is, however, very difficult to connect periods mentioned by the former with the indications of the same kind offered by the latter; and what we may term the recorded observations of the monuments cannot be used for the determination of chronology without a previous knowledge of Egyptian astronomy that we have not wholly attained. The testimony of ancient writers must, however, be carefully sifted, and we must not take their statements as a positive basis without the strongest evidence of correctness. Without that testimony, however, we could not at present prosecute the inquiry. The Egyptians do not appear to have had any common aera. Every document that bears the date of a year gives the year of the reigning sovereign, counted from that current year in which he came to the throne, which was called his first year. There is, therefore, no general means of testing deductions from the chronological indications of the monuments.

There appear to have been at least three years in use with the Egyptians before the Roman domination, the Vague Year, the Tropical Year, and the Sothic Year; but it is not probable that more than two of these were employed at the same time. The Vague Year contained 365 days without any additional fraction, and therefore passed through all the seasons in about 1500 years. It was used both for civil and for religious purposes. Probably the Israelites adopted this year during the sojourn in Egypt, and that instituted at the Exodus appears to have been the current Vague Year fixed by the adoption of a method of intercalation. SEE YEAR.

The Vague Year was divided into twelve months, each of thirty days, with five epagomenae, or additional days, after the twelfth. The months were assigned to three seasons, each comprising four months, called respectively the 1Jam 2:1-26 d, 3d, and 4th of those seasons. The names by which the Egyptian months are commonly known, Thoth, Paophi, etc., are taken from the divinities to which they were sacred. The seasons are called, according to our rendering, those of Vegetation, Manifestation, and the Waters, or the Inundation: the exact meaning of their names has, however, been much disputed. They evidently refer to the phenomena of a tropical year, and such a year we must therefore conclude the Egyptians had, at least in a remote period of their history. If, as we believe, the third season represents the period of the inundation, its beginning must be dated about one month before the autumnal equinox, which would place the beginning of the year at the winter solstice, an especially fit time in Egypt for the commencement of a tropical year. The Sothic Year was a supposed sidereal year of 365+ days, commencing with the so-called heliacal rising of Sothis. The Vague Year, having no intercalation, constantly retreated through the Sothic Year, until a period of 1461 years of the former kind, and 1460 of the latter had elapsed, from one coincidence of commencements to another.

The Egyptians are known to have used two great cycles, the Sothic Cycle and the Tropical Cycle. The former was a cycle of the coincidence of the Sothic and Vague years, and therefore consisted of 1460 years of the former kind. This cycle is mentioned by ancient writers, and two of its commencements recorded, the one, called the AEra of Menophres, July 20, B.C. 1322, and the other on the same day, A.D. 139. Menophres is supposed to be the name of an Egyptian king, and this is most probable. The nearest name is Mern-ptah, or Menephthah, which is part of that of Sethi Menptah, a title that seems to have been in one form or another common to several of the first kings of the 19th dynasty. Chronological indications seem to be conclusive in favor of Sethos I. The Tropical Cycle was a cycle of the coincidence of the Tropical and Vague years. We do not know the exact length of the former year with the Egyptians, nor, indeed, that it was used in the monumental age; but from the mention of a period of 500 years, the third of the cycle, and the time during which the Vague Year would retrograde through one season, we cannot doubt that there was such a cycle, not to speak of its analogy with the Sothic Cycle. It has been supposed by M. Biot to have had a duration of 1505 years; but the length of 1500 Vague Years is preferable, since it contains a number of complete lunations, besides that the Egyptians could scarcely have been more exact, and that the period of 500 years is a subdivision of 1500. Ancient writers do not fix any commencements of this cycle. If the characteristics of the Tropical Year are what we suppose, the cycle would have begun B.C. 2005 and 507: two hieroglyphic inscriptions are thought to record the former of these epochs (Poole, Horae AEgyptiacae, page 12 sq., pl. 1, Num 5:1-31; Num 6:1-27). The return of the Phoenix has undoubtedly a chronological meaning. It has been supposed to refer to the period last mentioned, but Poole is of opinion that the Phoenix Cycle was of exactly the same character, and therefore length, as the Sothic, its commencement being marked by the so-called heliacal rising of a star of the constellation BENNU HESAR, "the Phoenix of Osiris," which is placed in the astronomical ceiling of the Rameseium of El-Kurneh six months distant from Sothis. The monuments make mention of Panegyrical Months, which can only, it is supposed, be periods of thirty years each, and divisions of a year of the same kind. Poole has computed the following as dates of commencements of these Panegyrical Years, in accordance with which he has adjusted his chronology: 1st, B.C. 2717, 1st dynasty, aera of Menes (not on monuments); 2d, B.C. 2352, 4th dynasty, Suphis I and II; 3d, B.C. 1986 (12th dynasty, Osirtasen III? not on monuments); the last-mentioned date being also, according to him, the beginning of a Phoenix Cycle, which he thinks comprised four of these Panegyrical Years. The other important dates of the system of panegyrics which occur on the monuments are, in his scheme: B.C. 1442, 18th dynasty, queen Amen-nemt; and B.C. 1412, 18th dynasty, Thothmes III.

Certain phenomena recorded on the monuments have been calculated by M. Biot, who has obtained the following dates: Rising of Sothis in reign of Thothmes III, 18th dynasty, B.C. 1445; supposed vernal equinox, Thothmes III, B.C. cir. 1441; rising of Sothis, Rameses II, 19th dynasty, B.C. 1301; star-risings, Rameses VI and IX (? Meneptah I and II), 20th dynasty, B.C. cir. 1241. Some causes of uncertainty affect the exactness of these dates, and that of Rameses II is irreconcilable with the two of Thothmes III, unless we hold the calendar in which the inscription supposed to record it occurs to be a Sothic one, in which case no date could be obtained.

Egyptian technical chronology gives us no direct evidence in favor of the high antiquity which some assign to the foundation of the first kingdom. The earliest record which all Egyptologers are agreed to regard as affording a date is of the fifteenth century B.C., and no one has alleged any such record to be of an earlier time than the twenty-fourth century B.C. The Egyptians themselves seem to have placed the beginning of the 1st dynasty in the twenty-eighth century B.C., but for determining this epoch there is no direct monumental evidence, and a comparison with Scripture does not favor quite so early a date. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

XX. Historical Chronology. — The materials for this are the monuments and the remains of the historical work of Manetho. Since the interpretation of hieroglyphics has been discovered the evidence of the monuments has been brought to bear on this subject, but as yet it has not been sufficiently full and explicit to enable us to set aside other aid. We have still to look elsewhere for a general framework, the details of which the monuments may fill up. The remains of Manetho are now generally held to supply this want. A comparison with the monuments has shown that he drew his information from original sources, the general authenticity of which is vindicated by minute points of agreement. The information Manetho gives us, in the present form of his work, is, however, by no means explicit, and it is only by a theoretical arrangement of the materials that they take a definite form. The remains of Manetho's historical work consist of a list of the Egyptian dynasties and two considerable fragments, one relating to the Shepherds, the other to a tale of the Exodus. The list is only known to us in the epitome given by Africanus, preserved by Syncellus, and that given by Eusebius. These present such great differences that it is not reasonable to hope that we can restore a correct text. The series of dynasties is given as if they were successive, in which case the commencement of the first would be placed full 5000 years B.C., and the reign of the king who built the Great Pyramid, 4000. The monuments do not warrant so extreme an antiquity, and the great majority of Egyptologers have therefore held that the dynasties were partly contemporary. A passage in the fragment of Manetho respecting the Shepherds, where he speaks of the kings of the Thebais and of the rest of Egypt rising against these foreign rulers, makes it almost certain that he admitted at least three contemporary lines at that period (Josephus, Apion, 1:14).

The naming of dynasties anterior to the time of a single kingdom, and then of later ones, which we know generally held sway over all Egypt — in other words, the first seventeen, distinct from the 18th and following dynasties — lends support to this opinion. The former are named in groups: first a group of Thinites, then one of Memphites, broken by a dynasty of Elephantinites, next a Heracleopolite line, etc., the dynasties of a particular city being grouped together; whereas the latter generally present but one or two together of the same name, and the dynasties of different cities recur. The earlier portion seems therefore to represent parallel lines, the later a succession. The evidence of the monuments leads to the same conclusion. Kings who unquestionably belong to different dynasties are shown by them to be contemporary (see, for example, in Rawlinson's Herod. 2:289). In the present state of Egyptology this evidence has led to various results as to the number of contemporary dynasties, and the consequent duration of the whole history. One great difficulty is that the character of the inscriptions makes it impossible to ascertain, without the explicit mention of two sovereigns, that any one king was not a sole ruler. For example, it has lately been discovered that the 12th dynasty was for the greatest part of its rule a double line; yet its numerous monuments in general give no hint of more than one king, although there was almost always a recognised colleague. Therefore, a fortiori, no notice would be taken, if possible, on any monument of a ruler of another house than that of the king in whose territory it was made. We can therefore scarcely expect very full evidence on this subject. Mr. Lane, as long ago as 1830, proposed an arrangement of the first seventeen dynasties based upon their numbers and names. The subjoined table, after Poole, contains the dynasties thus arranged, with the approximative dates B.C. which he assigns to their commencements.

The monuments will not justify any great extension of the period assigned in the table to the first seventeen dynasties. The last date, that of the commencement of the 18th dynasty, cannot be changed more than a few years. Some Egyptologists, indeed, place it much earlier (Bunsen, B.C. 1625; Bockh, 1655; Lepsius, 1684; Brugsch, 1706), but they do so in opposition to positive monumental evidence. The date of the beginning of the 1st dynasty, which Poole is disposed to place a little before B.C. 2700, is more doubtful, but a concurrence of ethnological evidence points to the twenty-fifth century. The interval between the two dates cannot therefore be greatly more or less than nine hundred years, a period quite in accordance with the lengths of the dynasties according to the better text, if the arrangement here given be correct. Some have supposed a much greater antiquity for the commencement of Egyptian history (Bunsen, B.C. 3623; Lepsius, 3892; Brugsch, 4455; Bockh, 5702). Their system is founded upon a passage in the chronological work of Syncellus, which assigns a duration of 3555 years to the thirty dynasties (Chron. page 51 B). It is by no means certain that this number is given on the authority of Manetho, but apart from this, the whole statement is unmistakably not from the true Manetho, but from some one of the fabricators of chronology, among whom pseudo-Manetho held a prominent place (Encyc. Brit. 8th edit., "Egypt," page 452; Quarterly Review, Number 210, page 395-7). If this number be discarded as doubtful or spurious, there is nothing definite to support the extended system so confidently put forth by those who adopt it.

The importance of this ancient list of Egyptian kings — it being, in fact, the only completely connected line extant — requires a fuller exhibit than we usually give, and especially a somewhat minute examination of the monumental records compared with ancient historical documents. The dates given by us are essentially those assigned by Wilkinson in Rawlinson's Herodotus, volume 2, chapter 8. The identifications are in part made by Kenrick (Egypt under the Pharaohs, volume 2). The names of Manetho exhibit many striking coincidences with the elements afforded by the latest researches and discoveries, especially Mariette's "Apis list" on the tablet of Sakkarah, Diimichen's "Sethos list" on that of Abydos, and the "Turin papyrus," as these are given in detail by Unger (Chronologie des Manetho, Berlin, 1867), although we have not been able to adopt all the conclusions of this author, whose work is the most elaborate on the subject. The fact that the names in all these lists are in continuous order does not prove an unbroken succession of reigns, for such is the case in Manetho's list, although he expressly states that the several dynasties were of different localities. That the dynasties of the monumental lists likewise are not all consecutive is further proved by at least two conclusive circumstances: 1. The sum of the years of those 74 reigns, to which an explicit length is assigned in the Turin roll, is 1060; now if to this we add a corresponding number for the other 160 reigns whose duration is not specified in the same document, and also for the 10 subsequent names in the parallel lists down to Sethi I (B.C. 1322), we obtain a total of 3484 years for the first eighteen dynasties, or a date for Menes of B.C. 4806; but this would be 2144 years before the Flood, even according to the longest computation of the Biblical text. SEE AGES OF THE WORLD.

2. Several dynasties are wholly and designedly omitted in one of these monumental lists, which are given at length in the others (e.g. the 7th, 8th, 9th, 13th, 14th, and 15th), and at least one of them (the 11th) is absent in all of them, not to speak of numerous gaps and discrepancies: they must therefore, if at all trustworthy, be intended as contemporaneous lines in different sections of the empire, precisely as were those of Manetho, who frequently dispatches an entire dynasty without any details whatever, as being of local importance only. SEE MANETHO.

XXI. History. —

1. Traditionary Period. — We have first to notice the indications in the Bible which relate to the earliest period. In Gen 10:1-32 we find the colonization of Egypt traced up to the immediate children of Noah, for it is there stated that Mizraim was the second son of Ham, who was himself the second son of Noah. That Egypt was colonized by the descendants of Noah in a very remote age is further shown by the mention of the migration of the Philistines from Caphtor, which had taken place before the arrival of Abraham in Palestine (Gen 10:14; compare Deu 2:23; Amos 9:27). Before this migration could occur the Caphtorim and other Mizraites must have occupied Egypt for some time. Immediately after these genealogical statements, the sacred narrative (Gen 12:1-20) informs us that the patriarch Abraham, pressed by famine, went down (B.C. 2087) into Egypt, where it appears he found a monarch, a court, princes, and servants, and where he found also those supplies of food which the well- known fertility of the country had led him to seek there; for it is expressly stated that the favor which his wife had won in the reigning Pharaoh's eyes procured him sheep and oxen, as well as he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels. A remarkable passage points to a knowledge of the date at which an ancient city of Egypt was founded: "Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt" (Num 13:22). We find that Hebron was originally called Kirjath-arba, and was a city of the Anakim (Jos 14:15), and it is mentioned under that appellation in the history of Abraham (Gen 23:2): it had therefore been founded by the giant race before the days of that patriarch. In Gen 21:9, mention is made in the case of Ishmael, the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whose mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt (B.C. cir. 2055), of a mixed race between the Egyptians and the Chaldaeans, a race which in after times became a great nation. From this mixture of races it has been supposed the Arabs (עֵרֶב, "mixed people") had their name (Sharpe's Early Hist. of Egypt, 1:11).

The evidence of the Egyptians as to the primeval history of their race and country is extremely indefinite. They seem to have separated mankind into two great stocks, and each of these again into two branches, for they appear to have represented themselves and the negroes, the red and black races, as the children of the god Horus, and the Shemites and Europeans, the yellow and white races, as the children of the goddess Pesht (comp. Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. 2:90, 91). They seem, therefore, to have held a double origin of the species. The absence of any important traditional period is very remarkable in the fragments of Egyptian history. These commence with the divine dynasties, and pass abruptly to the human dynasties. The latest portion of the first may indeed be traditional not mythical, and the earliest part of the second may be traditional and not historical, though this last conjecture we are hardly disposed to admit. In any case, however, there is a very short and extremely obscure time of tradition, and at no great distance from the earliest date at which it can be held to end we come upon the clear light of history in the days of the pyramids. The indications are of a sudden change of seat, and the settlement in Egypt of a civilized race, which, either wishing to be believed autochthonous, or having lost all ties that could keep up the traditions of its first dwelling-place, filled up the commencement of its history with materials drawn from mythology. There is no trace of the tradition of the Deluge which is found in almost every other country of the world. The priests are indeed reported to have told Solon, when he spoke of one deluge, that, many had occurred (Plat. Tim. 23), but the reference is more likely to have been to great floods of the Nile than to any extraordinary catastrophes. SEE DELUGE.

2. Uncertain Period. — The history of the dynasties preceding the 18th is not told by any continuous series of monuments. Except the bare lists indicated in the above table, there are scarcely any records of the age left to the present day, and thence in a great measure arises the difficulty of determining the chronology. From the time of Menes, the first king, until the Shepherd invasion, Egypt seems to have enjoyed perfect tranquility. During this age the Memphite line was the most powerful, and by it, under the 4th dynasty, were the most famous pyramids raised. The Shepherds were foreigners who came from the east, and, in some manner unknown to Manetho, gained the rule of Egypt. Those whose kings composed the 15th dynasty were the first and most important. They appear to have been Phoenicians, and it is probable that their migration into Egypt, and thence at last into Palestine, was part of the great movement to which the coming of the Phoenicians from the Erythraean Sea, and the Philistines from Caphtor, belong. It is not impossible that the war of the four kings — Chedorlaomer and his allies — was directed against the power of the kings of the 15th dynasty. Most probably the Pharaoh of Abraham was of this line, which lived at Memphis, and at the great fort or camp of Avaris on the eastern frontier. The period of Egyptian history to which the Shepherd invasion should be assigned is a point of dispute. It is generally placed after the 12th dynasty, for it is argued that this powerful line could not have reigned at the same time as one or more Shepherd dynasties. Poole is of the opinion that this objection is not valid, and that the Shepherd invasion was anterior to the 12th dynasty. It is not certain that the foreigners were at the outset hostile to the Egyptians, for they may have come in by marriage, and it is by no means unlikely that they may have long been in a position of secondary importance. The rule of the 12th dynasty, which was of Thebans, lasting about 160 years, was a period of prosperity to Egypt, but after its close those calamities appear to have occurred which made the Shepherds hated by the Egyptians. During the interval to the 18th dynasty there seems to have been no native line of any importance but that of the Thebans, and more than one Shepherd dynasty exercised a severe rule over the Egyptians. The paucity of the monuments proves the troubled nature of this period. SEE HYKSOS.

Of these first seventeen dynasties, Menes, the first mortal king of Egypt, according to Manetho, Herodotus, Eratosthenes, and Diodorus, and preceded, according to the first, by gods, heroes, and Manes (?), νέκυες, is accepted on all hands as a historical personage. His hieroglyphic name reads MENI or MENA, and is the first on the list of the Rameseium of el- Kurneh. It is also met with in the hieratic of the Turin Papyrus of Kings. Strong reasons are given by Mr. Stuart Poole for fixing the date of his accession at B.C. 2717 (Horae AEgyptiacae, pages 94-98); but even this date must be somewhat lowered, as it would precede that of the Flood  (B.C. 2515); on the other hand, Unger (ut sup.) raises it to June 27, B.C. 5613. As one step in Poole's argument involves a very ingenious elucidation of a well-known statement of Herodotus, we cannot forbear to mention it. Herodotus says that, in the interval from the first king to Sethon, the priest of Hephaestus, the priests told him that "the sun had four times moved from his wonted course, twice rising where he now sets, and twice setting where he now rises." Upon this Mr. Poole remarks: "It is evident that the priests told Herodotus that great periods had elapsed since the time of Menes, the first king, and that, in the interval from his reign to that of Sethon, the solar risings of stars — that is to say, their manifestations — had twice fallen on those days of the Vague Year on which their settings fell in their time, and vice versa; and that the historian, by a natural mistake, supposed they spoke of the sun itself." Menes appears to have been a Thinite king, of the city of This, near Abydus, in Upper Egypt. Herodotus ascribes the building of the city of Memphis to him, while Manetho says that he made a foreign expedition and acquired renown, and that eventually he was killed by a hippopotamus. Menes, after a long reign, was succeeded by his son Athothis, who was the second king of the first dynasty. Manetho says that he built the palace at Memphis, that he was a physician, and left anatomical books; all of these statements implying that even at this early period the Egyptians were in a high state of civilization. About the time of Athothis, the 3d dynasty is supposed, according to the scheme which seems most reasonable, to have commenced, and Memphis to have become independent, giving its name to five dynasties of kings — 3d, 4th, 6th, 7th, and 8th. The 1st Thinite dynasty probably lasted about two centuries and a half. Of the 2d very little has reached us; under one of the kings it was determined that women could hold the sovereign power; in the time of another it was fabled, says Manetho, that the Nile flowed mixed with honey for the space of eleven days. The duration of this dynasty was probably between 300 and 400 years, and it seems to have come to a close at the time of the Shepherd invasion. The 3d (Memphite) dynasty, after having lasted about 200 years, was succeeded by the 4th, one of the most famous of the lines which ruled in Egypt; while the 5th dynasty of Elephantinite kings arose at the same time. This was emphatically the period of the pyramids, the earliest of which was probably the northern pyramid of Abu Sir, supposed to have been the tomb of Soris or Shurai, the head of the 4th dynasty. He was succeeded by two kings of the name of Suphis, the first of whom, the Cheops of Herodotus, the Shilphu of the monuments, was probably the builder of the great pyramid. On these wondrous monuments we find traces at that remote period of the advanced state of civilization of later ages. The cursive character scrawled on the stones by the masons proves that writing had been long in common use. Many of the blocks brought from Syene are built together in the pyramids of Ghizeh in a manner unrivalled at any period. The same manners and customs are portrayed on them as on the later monuments. The same boats are used, the same costume of the priests, the same trades, such as glassblowing and cabinet-making.

At the beginning of the 4th dynasty, moreover, the peninsula of Sinai was in the possession of the Egyptians, and its copper mines were worked by them. The duration of this dynasty probably exceeded two centuries, and it was followed by the 6th. The 5th dynasty of Elephantinites, as just remarked, began the same time as the 4th. The names of several of its kings occur in the Necropolis of Memphis. The most important of them is Sephres, the Shuphra of the monuments, the Chephren of Herodotus, and Chephren of Diodorus. This dynasty lasted nearly 600 years. Of the 6th dynasty, which lasted about 150 years, the two most famous sovereigns are Phiops or Pepi and queen Nitoeris. The former is said to have ruled for a hundred years. With the latter the dynasty closed; for at this period Lower Egypt was invaded by the Shepherds, who entered the country from the north-east, about 700 years after Menes, and eventually drove the Memphites from the throne. Of the 7th and 8th dynasties nothing is known with certainty; they probably followed the 15th. To the former of them, one version of Manetho assigns a duration of 70 days, and 150 years to the latter. The 9th dynasty of Heracleopelites, or, more properly, of Hermonthites, as Sir G. Wilkinson has suggested (Rawlinson's Herod. 2:293), arose while the 6th was in power. Little is known of either the 9th or 10th dynasties, which together may have lasted nearly 600 years, ending at the time of the great Shepherd war of expulsion, which resulted in the overthrow of all the royal lines except the Diospolite or Theban. With the 11th dynasty commenced the Diospolite kingdom, which subsequently attained to greater power than any other. Amenemhet I was the last and most famous king of this dynasty, and during part of his reign he was co-regent of Osirtasen or Sesertesen I, head of the 12th. An epoch is marked in Egyptian history by the commencement of this dynasty, since the Shepherd rule, which lasted for 500 years, is coeval with it. The three Osirtasens flourished in this dynasty, the second of whom is probably the Sesostris of Manetho. It began about Abraham's time, or somewhat later. In ancient sculptures in Nubia we find kings of the 18th dynasty worshipping Osirtasen III as a god, and this is the only case of the kind. The third Osirtasen was succeeded by Amenemhet III, supposed to be the Moeris of Herodotus, who built the labyrinth. After the reigns of two other sovereigns, this dynasty came to a close, having lasted about 160 years. The 13th dynasty, which lasted some 400 years, probably began before the close of the 12th. The kings of this dynasty were of little power, and probably tributary to the Shepherds. The Diospolites, indeed, did not recover their prosperity till the beginning of the 18th dynasty. The 14th, or Xoite dynasty, seems to have risen with the 12th. It was named from Xois, a town of Lower Egypt, in the northern part of the Delta. It may have lasted for nearly 500 years, and probably terminated during the great Shepherd war. The 15th, 16th, and 17th dynasties are those of the Shepherds. Who these foreigners were who are said to have subdued Egypt without a battle is a question of great uncertainty. Their name is called Hyksos by Manetho, which is variously interpreted to mean shepherd kings, or foreign shepherds. They have been pronounced to have been Assyrians, Scythians, AEthiopians, Phoenicians, and Arabs. The kings of the 15th dynasty were the greatest of the foreign rulers. The kings of the 16th and 17th dynasties are very obscure. Mr. Poole says there are strong reasons for supposing that the kings of the 16th were of a different race from those of the 15th, and that they may have been Assyrians. Having held possession of Egypt 511, or, according to the longest date, 625 years, the Shepherds were driven out by Ames, or Amosis, the first king of the 18th dynasty; and the whole country was then united under one king, who rightly claimed the title of lord of the two regions, or of Upper and Lower Egypt.

3. Period of the Hebrew Sojourn. — In Gen 39:1-23 begins the interesting story of Joseph's being carried down to Egypt, with all its important consequences for the great-grandchildren of Abraham. The productiveness of the country is the allurement, famine the impulse. Attendant circumstances show that Egypt was then famous also for its commercial pursuits; and the entire narrative gives the idea of a complex system of society (about B.C. 1890), and a well-constituted yet arbitrary form of government. As in Eastern courts at later periods of history, elevation to high offices was marked and sudden. The slave Joseph is taken from prison and from impending death, and raised to the dignity of prime vizier, and is intrusted with making provision for an approaching dearth of food, which he had himself foretold, during which he effects in favor of the ruling sovereign one of the greatest revolutions of property which history has recorded. The high consideration in which the priestly order was held is apparent. Joseph himself marries a daughter of the priest of On. Out of respect towards, as well as -by the direct influence of Joseph, the Hebrews were well treated. The scriptural record, however, distinctly states (Gen 46:34) that before the descent of Israel and his sons "every shepherd" was "an abomination unto the Egyptians." The Hebrews, whose "trade had been about cattle," must have been odious in the eyes of the Egyptians, yet they are expressly permitted to dwell "in the best of the land" (Gen 43:6), which is identified with the land of Goshen, the place which the Israelites had prayed might be assigned to them, and which they obviously desired on account of the adaptation of its soil to their way of life as herdsmen. Having settled his father and family satisfactorily in the land, Joseph proceeded to supply the urgent wants of a hungry nation, and at the same time converted the tenure of all property from freehold into tenancy-at-will, with a rent-charge of one fifth of the produce, leaving the priests' lands, however, in their own hands; and thus he gave another evidence of the greatness of their power.

The richness of Goshen was favorable, and the Israelites "grew and multiplied exceedingly," so that the land was filled with them. But Joseph was now dead; time had passed on, and there rose up a new king (probably one of a new dynasty) "which knew (Exo 1:8) not Joseph," having no personal knowledge, and, it may be, no definite information of his services; who, becoming jealous of the increase of the Hebrews, set about persecuting them with the avowed intention of diminishing their numbers and crippling their power. Severe task-masters are therefore set over them; heavy tasks are imposed; the Hebrews are compelled to build "treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses." It is found, however, that they only increase the more. In consequence, their burdens are doubled and their lives made bitter with hard bondage (Exo 1:14), "in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field." SEE BRICK.

Their firstborn males, moreover, are doomed to destruction the moment they come into being. The deepest heartburnings ensue; hatred arises between the oppressor and the oppressed; the Israelites seek revenge in private and by stealth (Exo 2:12). At last a higher power interferes, and the afflicted race is permitted to quit Egypt (B.C. 1658). At this time Egypt appears to have been a well-peopled and well-cultivated country, with numerous cities, under a despotic monarch, surrounded by officers of his court and a life- guard. There was a ceremonial at audience, a distinction of ranks, a state- prison, and a prime minister. Great buildings were carried on. There was set apart from the rest of the people an order of priests who probably filled offices in the civil government; the priest of Midian and the priest of On seem to have ruled over the cities so named. There was in the general class of priests an order — wise men, sorcerers, and magicians — who had charge of a certain secret knowledge; there were physicians or embalmers of the dead; the royal army contained chosen captains, and horsemen, and chariots. The attention which the people at large paid to agriculture, and the fixed notions of property which they in consequence had, made them hold the shepherd or nomad tribes in abhorrence, as freebooters only less dangerous than hunting-tribes. SEE PHARAOH.

According to the scheme of Biblical chronology, which we have adopted as the most probable, the whole sojourn in Egypt would belong to the period before the 18th dynasty. The Israelites would have come in and gone forth during that obscure age, for the history of which we have little or no monumental evidence. This would explain the absence of any positive mention of them on the Egyptian monuments. Some assert that they were an unimportant Arab tribe, and therefore would not be mentioned, and that the calamities attending their departure could not be commemorated. These two propositions are contradictory, and the difficulties are unsolved. If, as Lepsius supposes, the Israelites came in under the 18th dynasty, and went out under the 19th, or if, as Bunsen holds, they came in under the 12th, and (after a sojourn of 1434 years!) went out under the 19th, the oppression in both cases falling in a period of which we have abundant contemporary monuments, sometimes the records of every year, it is impossible that the monuments should be wholly silent if the Biblical narrative is true. Let us examine the details of that narrative. At the time to which we should assign Joseph's rule, Egypt was under Shepherds, and Egyptian kings of no great strength. Since the Pharaoh of Joseph must have been a powerful ruler and held Lower Egypt, there can be no question that he was, if the dates be correct, a Shepherd of the 15th dynasty. How does the Biblical evidence affect this inference? Nothing is more striking throughout the ancient Egyptian inscriptions and writings than the bitter dislike of most foreigners, especially Easterns. They are constantly spoken of in the same terms as the inhabitants of the infernal regions, not alone when at war with the Pharaohs, but in time of peace and in the case of friendly nations. It is a feeling paralleled in our days by that of the Chinese alone. The accounts of the Greek writers, and the whole history of the later period, abundantly confirm this estimate of the prejudice of the Egyptians against foreigners. It seems to us perfectly incredible that Joseph should be the minister of an Egyptian king. In lesser particulars the evidence is not less strong. The Pharaoh of Joseph is a despot, whose will is law, who kills and pardons at his pleasure; who not only raises a foreign slave to the head of his administration, but through his means makes all the Egyptians, except the priests, serfs of the crown. The Egyptian kings, on the contrary, were restrained by the laws, shared the public dislike of foreigners, and would have avoided the very policy Joseph followed, which would have weakened the attachment of their fellow-countrymen by the loosening of local ties and complete reducing to bondage of the population, although it would have greatly strengthened the power of an alien sovereign. Pharaoh's conduct towards Joseph's family points to the same conclusion. He gladly invites the strangers, and gives them leave to dwell, not among the Egyptians, hut in Goshen, where his own cattle seem to have been (Gen 46:34; Gen 47:6). His acts indicate a fellow-feeling, and a desire to strengthen himself against the national party. SEE JOSEPH.

The "new king," "which knew not Joseph," is generally thought by those who hold with us as to the previous history, to have been an Egyptian, and head of the 18th dynasty. It seems at first sight extremely probable that the king who crushed, if he did not expel the Shepherds, would be the first oppressor of the nation which they protected. Plausible as this theory appears, a close examination of the Biblical narrative seems to us to overthrow it. We read of the new king that he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel [are] more and mightier than we: come on, let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and [so] get them up out of the land" (Exo 1:9-10). The Israelites are therefore more and stronger than the people of the oppressor; the oppressor fears war in Egypt, and that the Israelites would join his enemies; he is not able at once to adopt open violence, and he therefore uses a subtle system to reduce them by making them perform forced labor, and soon after takes the stronger measure of killing their male children. These conditions point to a divided country and a weak kingdom, and cannot, we think, apply to the time of the 18th and 19th dynasties. The whole narrative of subsequent events to the Exodus is consistent with this conclusion, to which the use of universal terms does not offer any real objection. When all Egypt is spoken of, it is not necessary either in Hebrew or in Egyptian that we should suppose the entire country to be strictly intended. If we conclude, therefore, that the Exodus most probably occurred before the 18th dynasty, we have to ascertain, if possible, whether the Pharaohs of the oppression appear to have been Egyptians or Shepherds. The change of policy is in favor of their having been Egyptians, but is by no means conclusive, for there is no reason that all the foreigners should have had the same feeling towards the Israelites, and we have already seen that the Egyptian Pharaohs and their subjects seem in general to have been friendly to them throughout their history, and that the Egyptians were privileged by the law, apparently on this account. It may be questioned whether the friendship of the two nations, even if merely a matter of policy, would have been as enduring as we know it to have been, had the Egyptians looked back on their conduct towards the Israelites as productive of great national calamities, or had the Israelites looked back upon the persecution as the work of the Egyptians. If the chronology be correct, we can only decide in favor of the Shepherds. During the time to which the events are assigned there were no important lines but the Theban, and one or more of Shepherds. Lower Egypt, and especially its eastern part, must have been in the hands of the latter.

The land of Goshen was in the eastern part of Lower Egypt: it was wholly under the control of the oppressors, whose capital or royal residence, at least in the case of the Pharaoh of the Exodus, lay very near to it. Manetho, according to the transcript of Africanus, speaks of three Shepherd dynasties, the 15th, 16th, and 17th, the last of which, according to the present text, was of Shepherds and Thebans, but this is probably incorrect, and the dynasty should rather be considered as of Shepherds alone. It is difficult to choose between these three: a passage in Isaiah, however, which has been strangely overlooked, seems to afford an indication which narrows the choice. "My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there, and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause" (Isa 52:4). This indicates that the oppressor was an Assyrian, and therefore not of the 15th dynasty, which, according to Manetho, in the epitomes, was of Phoenicians, and opposed to the Assyrians (Josephus, Apion, 1:14). Among the names of kings of this period in the royal Turin papyrus (ed. Wilkinson) are two which appear to be Assyrian, so that we may reasonably suppose that some of the foreign rulers were of that race. Their exact date, however, is undecided. It cannot be objected to the explanation we have offered that the title Pharaoh is applied to the kings connected with the Israelites, and that they must therefore have been natives, for it is almost certain that at least some of the Shepherd kings were Egyptianized, like Joseph, who received an Egyptian name, and Moses, who was supposed by the daughters of Jethro to be an Egyptian (Exo 2:19). It has been urged by the opponents of the chronological schemes that place the Exodus before the later part of the fourteenth century B.C., that the conquests of the Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 2Cth dynasties would have involved collisions with the Israelites had they been in those times already established in Palestine, whereas neither the Bible nor the monuments of Egypt indicate any such event. It has been overlooked by the advocates of the Rabbinical date of the Exodus that the absence of any positive Palestinian names, except that of the Philistines, in the lists of peoples and places subject to these Pharaohs, and in the records of their wars, entirely destroys their argument; for while it shows that they did not conquer Palestine, it makes it impossible for us to decide on Egyptian evidence whether the Hebrews were then in that country or not. Shishak's list, on the contrary, presents several well-known names of towns in Palestine, besides that of the kingdom of Judah. The policy of the Pharaohs, as previously explained, is the key to their conduct towards the Israelites. At the same time, the character of the portions of the Bible relating to this period prevents our being sure that the Egyptians may not have passed through the country, and even put the Israelites to tribute. It is illustrative of the whole question under consideration that, in the most flourishing days of the sole kingdom of Israel, a Pharaoh should have marched unopposed into Palestine and captured the Canaanitish city Gezer, at no great distance from Jerusalem, and that this should be merely incidentally mentioned at a later time instead of being noticed in the regular course of the narrative (1Ki 9:15-16). SEE EXODE.

4. Definite Period. — With the 18th dynasty, about B.C. 1520, a new and clearer epoch of Egyptian history begins, both as regards the numerous materials for reconstructing it, and also its great importance. In fact, the history of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties is that of the Egyptian empire. Amosis, orAhmes, the head of the first of these, overthrew the power of the Shepherds, and probably expelled them. No great monuments remain of the first king, but from various inscriptions we are warranted in supposing that he was a powerful king. During his reign we first find mention of the horse, and, as it is often called by the Shemitic name sus, it seems probable that it was introduced from Asia, and possibly by the Shepherd kings. If so, they may have been indebted to the strength of their cavalry for their easy conquest of Egypt. It is certain that, while other animals are frequently depicted on the monuments, neither in the tombs near the pyramids, nor at Beni-Hassan, is there any appearance of the horse, and yet, subsequently, Egypt became the great depot for these animals, insomuch that in the time of Solomon they were regularly imported for him, and for "all the kings of the Hittites, and for the kings of Syria;" and when Israel was invaded by Sennacherib, it was on Egypt that they were said to put their trust for chariots and for horsemen. Amenoph I, the next king (B.C. cir. 1498), was sufficiently powerful to make conquests in Ethiopia and in Asia. In his time we find that the Egyptians had adopted the five intercalary days, as well as the twelve hours of day and night. True arches, not "arches of approaching stones," also are found at Thebes, bearing his name on the bricks, and were in common use in his time. See ARCH. Some of the more ancient chambers in the temple of Amen-ra, or El-Karnak, at Thebes, were built by him. In the reign of his successor, Thothmes I (B.C. cir. 1478), the arms of Egypt were carried into Mesopotamia, or the land of "Naharayn:" by some Naharayn is identified with the Nairi, a people south-west of Armenia. Libya also was subject to his sway.

A monument of his reign is still remaining in one of the two obelisks of red granite which he set up at El- Karnak, or Thebes. The name of Thothmes II (B.C. cir. 1470) is found as far south as Napata, or Gebel Berkel, in Ethiopia. With him and his successor was associated a queen, Amense or Amen-numt, who seems to have received more honor than either. She is thought to have been a Semiramis, that name, like Sesostris, probably designating more than one individual. Queen Amen-nemt and Thothmes II and III are the earliest sovereigns of whom great monuments remain in the temple of El-Karnak, the chief sanctuary of Thebes. Thothmes III (B.C. cir. 1463) was one of the most remarkable of the Pharaohs. He carried his arms as far as Nineveh, and reduced perhaps Babylon also to his sway, receiving a large tribute from Asiatic nations over whom he had triumphed. This was a common mode of acknowledging the supremacy of a conqueror, and by no means implied that the territory was surrendered to him; on the contrary, he may only have defeated the army of the nation, and that beyond its own frontier. The Punt, a people of Arabia, the Shupha, supposed to be of Cyprus, and the Ruten, a people of the Euphrates or Tigris, thus confessed the power of Thothmes; and the monuments at Thebes are rich in delineations of the elephants and bears, camelopards and asses, the ebony, ivory, gold, and silver which they brought for tribute. Very beautiful specimens of ancient Egyptian painting belong to the time of this king; indeed his reign, with that of Thothmes II preceding it, and those of Amenoph II (B.C. cir. 1416), Thothmes IV (whose name is borne by the sphinx at the pyramids), and Amenoph III following it, may be considered as comprising the best period of Egyptian art; all the earlier time showing a gradual improvement, and all the later a gradual declension. In the reign of Thothmes IV (B.C. cir. 1410), according to Manetho, the Shepherds took their final departure. The conquests of Amenoph III (B.C. cir. 1403) were also very extensive; traces of his power are found in various parts of Ethiopia; he states on scarabaei, struck apparently to commemorate his marriage, that his northern boundary was in Mesopotamia, his southern in Kara (Choloe?). From his features, he seems to have been partly of Ethiopian origin. His long reign of nearly forty years was marked by the construction of magnificent temples. Of these, the greatest were two at Thebes; one on the west bank, of which little remains but the two great colossi that stood on each side of the approach to it, and one of which is known as the vocal Memnon. He likewise built, on the opposite bank, the great temple, now called that of El-Uksor, which Rameses II afterwards much enlarged. The tomb of this king yet remains at Thebes. For a period of about thirty years after the reign of Amenoph III, Egypt was disturbed by the rule of stranger kings, who abandoned the national religion, and introduced a pure sun-worship. It is not known from whence they came, but they were regarded by the Egyptians as usurpers, and the monuments of them are defaced or ruined by those who overthrew them. Sir G. Wilkinson supposes that Amenoph III may have belonged to their race; but, if so, we must date the commencement of their rule from the end of his reign, as then began that change of the state religion which was the great peculiarity of the foreign domination. How or when the sun-worshippers were destroyed or expelled from Egypt does not appear. Horus, or Harem- heb, who succeeded them (B.C. cir. 1367), was probably the prince by whom they were overthrown.

He was a son of Amenoph III, and continued the line of Diospolite sovereigns. The records of his reign are not important; but the sculptures at Silsilis commemorate a successful expedition against the negroes. Horus was indirectly succeeded by Rameses I, with whom substantially commences the 19th dynasty, about B.C. 1324. His tomb at Thebes marks the new dynasty, by being in a different locality from that of Amenoph III, and being the first in the valley thenceforward set apart as the cemetery of the Theban kings. After a short and unimportant reign, he was succeeded by his son Sethi I, or Sethos (B.C. 1322). He is known by the magnificent hypostyle hall in the great temple of El-Karnak, which he built, and on the outside of the north wall of which are sculptured the achievements of his arms. His tomb, cruelly defaced by travelers, is the most beautiful in the Valley of the Kings, and shows that his reign must have been a long one, as the sepulcher of an Egyptian king was commenced about the time of his accession, and thus indicated the length of his reign. He conquered the Kheta, or Hittites, and took their stronghold Ketesh, variously held to be at or near Emesa, on or near the Orontes, or Kadesh, or even Ashtaroth. His son Rameses II, who was probably for some time associated with him in the throne, became the most illustrious of the ancient kings of Egypt (B.C. cir. 1307). If he did not exceed all others in foreign conquests, he far outshone them in the grandeur and beauty of the temples with which he adorned Egypt and Nubia. His chief campaign, as recorded on his numerous monuments, was against the Kheta or Hittites, and a great confederacy they had formed. He defeated their army, captured Ketesh, and forced them to conclude a treaty with him, though this last object does not seem to have been immediately attained. It is he who is generally intended by the Sesostris of classic writers. He built the temple which is erroneously called the Memnonium, but properly the Rameseum of El-Kurneh, on the western bank of the Nile, one of the most beautiful of Egyptian monuments, and a great part of that of El-Uksor, on the opposite bank, as well as additions to that of El- Karnak.

Throughout Egypt and Nubia are similar memorials of the power of Rameses II, one of the most remarkable of which is the great rock- temple of Abu-Simbel, not far north of the second cataract. The temple of Ptah, at Memphis, was also adorned by this Pharaoh, and its site is chiefly marked by a very beautiful colossal statue of him, fallen on its face and partly mutilated through modern vandalism. He was succeeded by his son Meneptah, who is supposed by the advocates of the Rabbinical date of the Exodus to have been the Pharaoh in whose time the Israelites went out. The monuments tell us little of him or of his successor, which latter was followed by his son Rameses III, perhaps the head of the 20th dynasty (B.C. cir. 1200). With this sovereign the glories of the Theban line revived, and a series of great victories by land and sea raised Egypt to the place which it had held under Rameses II. He built the temple of Medinet-Habu, on the western bank at Thebes, the walls of which are covered with scenes representing his exploits. The most remarkable of the sculptures commemorating them represents a naval victory in the Mediterranean, gained by the Egyptian fleet over that of the Tokkari, probably the Carians, and Shairetana (Khairetana), or Cretans. Other Shairetana, whom Mr. Poole takes to correspond to the Cherethim of Scripture, served in the Egyptian forces. This king also subdued the Pelesatu, or Philistines, and the Rebu (Lebu), or Lubim, to the west of Egypt. Several kings hearing the name of Rameses succeeded Rameses II, but their tombs alone remain. Under them the power of Egypt evidently declined, and towards the close of the dynasty the country seems to have fallen into anarchy, the high- priests of Amen having usurped regal power at Thebes, and a Lower Egyptian dynasty, the 21st, arisen at Tanis. Of these, however, but few records remain.

With the succeeding dynasty occurs the first definite point of connection between the monumental and Che scriptural history of Egypt. The ill feelings which the peculiar circumstances connected with the exode from Egypt had occasioned served to keep the Israelites and the Egyptians strangers, if not enemies, one to another during the lapse of centuries, till the days of David and Solomon, when (1Ki 3:1-28; 1Ki 7:1-51; 1Ki 9:1-28; 1Ki 11:1-43) friendly relations again spring up between the two countries. Solomon marries the daughter of Pharaoh, who burns the city of Gezer, and who, in consequence, must have been master of Lower Egypt (B.C. cir. 1010). "And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn:" six hundred shekels was the price of a chariot, and one hundred and fifty the price of a horse. Probably the Egyptian princess who became Solomon's wife was a daughter of a king of the Tanite dynasty. It was during the reign of a king of this age that "Hadad, being yet a little child," fled from the slaughter of the Edomites by David, and took refuge, together with "certain Edomites of his father's servants," at the court of Pharaoh, who "gave him to wife the sister of his own wife, the sister of Tahpenes the queen" (1Ki 11:17-19), B.C. cir. 1040-1000. The 22d dynasty was of Bubastite kings; the name of one of them has been found among the sculptured remains of the temples of Bubastis; they were probably not of unmixed Egyptian origin, and may have been partly of Assyrian or Babylonian race. The first king was Sheshonk I (B.C. cir. 990), the contemporary of Solomon, and in his reign it was that "Jeroboam arose and fled into Egypt unto Shishak, king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon" (1Ki 11:40), B.C. 973. In the 5th year of Rehoboam, B.C. 969, Sheshonk invaded Judaea with an army of which it is said "the people were without number that came with him out of Egypt, the Lubims, the Sukkiims, and the Ethiopians;" and that, having taken the "fenced cities" of Judah, he "came up against Jerusalem, and took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house," and "the shields of gold which Solomon had made" (2Ch 12:1-16). "The record of this campaign," says Sir G. Wilkinson, "which still remains on the outside of the south wall of the great temple of Karnak, bears an additional interest from the name of Yuda-Melchi (kingdom of Judah), first discovered by Champollion in the long list of captured districts and towns put up by Sheshonk to commemorate his success." Perhaps it was by Jeroboam's advice that he thus attacked Judah. It is doubtful, however, whether Jeroboam did not suffer by the invasion as well as Rehoboam. SEE SHISHAK.

The next king, Osorkon I, is supposed by some to have been the Zerah whom Asa defeated (2Ch 14:9); and in that view, as the army that Zerah led can only have been that of Egypt, his overthrow will explain the decline of the house of Sheshonk. According to others, Zerah was a king of Asiatic Ethiopia. SEE ZERAH. Of the other kings of this dynasty we know scarcely more than the names. It was followed by the 23d dynasty of Tanite kings, so called from Tanis, the Zoan of Scripture. They appear to have been of the same race as their predecessors. Bocchoris the Wise, a Saite, celebrated as a lawgiver, was the only king of the 24th dynasty (B.C. cir. 734). He is said to have been burned alive by Sabaco the Ethiopian, the first king of the 25th or Ethiopian dynasty. Egypt therefore makes no figure in Asiatic history during the 23d and 24th dynasties; under the 25th it regained, in part at least, its ancient importance. This was a foreign line, the warlike sovereigns of which strove to the utmost to repel the onward stride of Assyria. It is not certain which of the Sabacos — Shebake, or his successor Shebateke — corresponded to the So or Seva of the Bible, who made a treaty with Hoshea, which, as it involved a refusal of his tribute to Shalmaneser, caused the taking of Samaria, and the captivity of the ten tribes. SEE SO. The last king of this dynasty was Tirhakah, or Tehrak (B.C. 690), who, probably while yet ruling over Ethiopia or Upper Egypt only, advanced against Sennacherib to support Hezekiah, king of Judah, B.C. 713. It does not appear whether he met the Assyrian army, but it seems certain that its miraculous destruction occurred before any engagement had been fought between the rival forces. Perhaps Tirhakak availed himself of this opportunity to restore the supremacy of Egypt west of the Euphrates. SEE TIRHAKAH.

With him the 25th dynasty closed. It was succeeded by the 26th, of Saite or native kings. The first sovereign of importance was Psammetichus, or Psametik I (B.C. 664), who, according to Herodotus, had previously been one of a dodecarchy which had ruled Egypt. Rawlinson finds in Assyrian history traces of a dodecarchy before Psammetichus. This portion of the history is obscure. Psammetichus carried on a war in Palestine, and is said to have taken Ashdod, or Azotus, i.e., according to Wilkinson, Shedid, "the strong," after a siege of twenty- nine years (Herod. 2:157; see Rawlinson in loc. 2:204). It was probably held by an Assyrian garrison, for a Tartan, or general of the Assyrian king, had captured it apparently when garrisoned by Egyptians and Ethiopians in the preceding century (Isa 20:1-6). Psammetichus was succeeded by his son Neku, the Pharaoh-Necho of Scripture, B.C. 610. In his first year he advanced to Palestine, marching along the sea-coast on his way to Carchemish on the Euphrates, and was met by Josiah, king of Judah, whom he slew at Megiddo, B.C. 609. The remonstrance of the Egyptian king on this occasion is very illustrative of the policy of the Pharaohs in the East (2Ch 35:21), no loss than in his lenient conduct after the defeat and death of the king of Judah. Neku was probably successful in his enterprise, and on his return deposed Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, and set up Jehoiakim in his stead. He apparently wished by this expedition to strike a blow at the falling power of the Assyrians, whose capital was shortly after taken by the combined forces of the Babylonians and Medes. The army, however, which was stationed on the Euphrates by Neku met with a signal disaster three years afterwards, being routed by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish (Jer 46:2). The king of Babylon seems to have followed up his success, as we are told (2Ki 24:7) that "the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt." Neku either commenced a canal to connect the Nile and the Red Sea, or else attempted to clear one previously cut by Rameses II; in either case the work was not completed. SEE NECHO.

The second successor of Neku was the next sovereign of note, Ruahprah, or Vaphrah, called Pharaoh-Hophra in the Bible, and by Herodotus Aprics. He took Gaza and Sidon, and defeated the king of Tyre in a sea-fight. He also worsted the Cyprians. Havinga thus restored the power of Egypt, he succored Zedekiah, king of Judah, and when Jerusalem was besieged, obliged the Chaldaeans to retire (Jer 37:5; Jer 37:7; Jer 37:11). He was so elated by these successes that he thought "not even a god could overthrow him." In Eze 29:3, he is thought to be called "the great dragon (i.e. crocodile?) that lieth in the midst of his rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself." At last, however, Amosis, or Ahmes II, who had been crowned in a military revolt, took him prisoner and strangled him (B.C. 569), so that the words of Jeremiah were fulfilled: "I will give Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt, into the hand of his enemies, and into the hand of them that seek his life" (Jer 44:30). There seems little doubt that at the time of this rebellion, and probably in conjunction with the advance of Amosis, Egypt was invaded and desolated by Nebuchadnezzar. SEE HOPHRA.

The remarkable prophecies, however, in Eze 29:1-21; Eze 30:1-26; Eze 31:1-18 may refer for the most part to the invasion of Cambyses, and also to the revolt of Inarus under Artaxerxes. Amosis, the successor of Apries, reigned nearly fifty years, and, taking advantage of the weakness and fall of Babylon, he somewhat restored the weight of Egypt in the East. But the new power of Persia was to prove even more terrible to his house than Babylon had been to the house of Psammetichus. He was succeeded by his son Psammenitus, held to be the Psametik III of the monuments, B.C. 525. Shortly after his accession this king was attacked by Cambyses, who took Pelusium, or "Sin, the strength of Egypt," and Memphis, and subsequently put Psammenitus to death. With Cambyses (B.C. 525) began the 27th dynasty of Persians, and Egypt became a Persian province, governed by a satrap. The conduct of Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 521) to the Egyptians was favorable, and he caused the temples to be adorned with additional sculptures. The large temple in the Great Oasis was principally built by him, and in it is found his name, with the same honorary titles as the ancient kings. Before the death of Darius, however, the Egyptians rebelled, but were again subdued by Xerxes (B.C. 485), who made his brother Achaemenes governor of the country. Under Artaxerxes Longimanus they again revolted, as above referred to, and in the 10th year of Darius Nothus contrived to throw off the Persian yoke, when Amyrtaeus the Saite became the sole king of the 28th dynasty (B.C. 414). After having ruled six years, he was succeeded by the first king of the 29th or Mendesian dynasty. Of the four kings comprising it little is known, and the dates are uncertain. It was followed by the last, or 30th dynasty of Sebennyte kings. The first of these was Nectanebo, or Nekt-har-heb (B.C. 387), who successfully defended his country against the Persians, had leisure to adorn the temples, and was probably the last Pharaoh who erected an obelisk. His son Teos, or Tachos, was the victim of a revolt, from which he took refuge in the Persian court, where he died, while his nephew Nectanebo II, or Nekt-neb, ascended the throne as the last native king of Egypt (B.C. 361). For some time he successfully opposed the Persians, but eventually succumbed to Artaxerxes Ochus, about B.C. 343, when Egypt once more became a Persian province. "From that time till our own day," says Mr. Poole, "a period of twenty-two centuries, no native ruler has sat on the throne of Egypt, in striking fulfillment of the prophecy, 'There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt' (Eze 30:13)."

Egypt was governed by a Persian satrap till Persia itself was conquered by Alexander the Great, B.C. 332. When Alexander's army occupied Memphis, the numerous Greeks who had settled in Lower Egypt found themselves the ruling class. Egypt became at once a Greek kingdom, and Alexander showed his wisdom in the regulations by which he guarded the prejudices and religion of the Egyptians, who were henceforth to be treated as inferiors, and forbidden to carry arms. He founded Alexandria as the Greek capital. On his death, his lieutenant Ptolemy made himself king of Egypt, being the first of a race of monarchs who governed for 300 years, and made it the second chief kingdom in the world, till it sunk under its own luxuries and vices and the rising power of Rome. The Ptolemies founded a large public library and a museum of learned men. SEE ALEXANDRIA.

After the time of the exile the Egyptian Ptolemies were for a long while (from B.C. 301 to about 180) masters of Palestine, and during this period Egypt became as of old a place of refuge to the Jews, to whom many favors and privileges were conceded; This shelter seems not to have been for ages withdrawn (Mat 2:13). Yet it cannot be said that the Jews were held in esteem by the Egyptians (Philo, c. Apion, 2, page 521). Indeed, it was from an Egyptian, Manetho (B.C. 300), that the most defamatory misrepresentations of Jewish history were given to the world; and, in the days of Augustus, Chaeremon took special pains to make the Jewish people appear despicable (Josephus, Apion, 1:32; comp. Creuzer, Com. Herod. 1:270). SEE PTOLEMY.

In the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, Onias, whose father, the third high- priest of that name, had been murdered, fled into Egypt, and rose into high favor with the king and Cleopatra his queen. The high priesthood of the Temple of Jerusalem, which belonged of right to his family, having passed from. it to the family of the Maccabees, by the nomination of Jonathan to this office (B.C. 153), Onias used his influence with the court to procure the establishment of a temple and ritual in Egypt which should detach the Jews who lived there from their connection with the Temple at Jerusalem. The king complied with the request. To reconcile the Egyptian Jews to a second temple, Onias alleged Isa 19:18-19. He close for the purpose a ruined temple of Bubastis, at Leontopolis, in the Heliopolitan nome, one hundred and fifty stadia from Memphis, which place he converted into a sort of miniature Jerusalem (Josephus, War, 1:1), erecting an altar in imitation of that in the Temple, and constituting himself high-priest. The king granted a tract of land around the temple for the maintenance of the worship, and it remained in existence till destroyed by Vespasian (Josephus, Ant. 13:3; 20:9; War, 7:11). The district in which this temple stood appears to have been, after Alexandria, the chief seat of the Jews in Egypt, and which, from the name of its founder, was called ῾Ον ῾ιου χ ῾ωρα (Josephus, Ant. 14:8; Helon's Pilgrim. page 328). SEE ONIAS, CITY OF.

Under these Alexandrian kings the native Egyptians still continued building their grand and massive temples, nearly in the style of those built by the kings of Thebes and Sais. The temples in the island of Philae, in the Great Oasis, at Latopolis, at Ombos, at Dendera, and at Thebes, prove that the Ptolemies had not wholly crushed the zeal and energy of the Egyptians. An Egyptian phalanx had been formed, armed and disciplined like the Greeks. These soldiers rebelled unsuccessfully against Epiphanes, and then Thebes rebelled against Soter II, but was so crushed that it never again held rank among cities. But while the Alexandrians were keeping down the Egyptians, they were themselves sinking under the Romans. Epiphanes asked for Roman help; his two sons appealed to the senate to settle their quarrels and guard the kingdom from Syrian invasion. Alexander II was placed on the throne by the Romans, and Auletes went to Rome: to ask for help against his subjects. Lastly, the beautiful Cleopatra, the disgrace of her country and the firebrand of the republic, maintained her power by surrendering her person, first to Julius Caesar, and then to Mark Antony. On the defeat of Mark Antony by Augustus, B.C. 30, Egypt became a province of Rome, and was governed by the emperors with jealous suspicion. It was still a Greek state, and Alexandria was the chief seat of Greek learning and science. Its library, which had been burned by Caesar's soldiers, had been replaced by that from Pergamus. The Egyptians yet continued building temples and covering them with hieroglyphics as of old; but on the spread of Christianity the old superstitions lost their sway, the animals were no longer worshipped, and we find few hieroglyphical inscriptions after the reign of Commodus. On the division of the Roman empire, A.D. 337, Egypt fell to the lot of Constantinople. See Smith's Dict. of Class. Geogr. s.v. AEgyptus. Ever since its first occupancy by the Romans Egypt has ceased to be an independent state, and its history is incorporated with that of its different conquerors and possessors. In A.D. 618 it fell under the power of the Persians, but in 640 it was transferred to the Saracens by the victorious Amru, general of the caliph Omar, under whose successors it continued till about 1171, when the Turcomans expelled the caliphs; these again were in their turn expelled in 1250 by the Mamelukes. The latter raised to the throne one of their own chiefs with the title of sultan, and this new dynasty reigned over Egypt till 1517, when the Mamelukes were totally defeated, and the last of their sultans put to death by the Turkish sultan Selim. This prince established the government of Egypt in twenty-four beys, whose authority he subjected to a council of regency, supported by an immense standing army. The conqueror did not, however, entirely suppress the Mameluke government, who continued to be "the power behind the throne" until their massacre in 1811, which made the pacha virtually independent of the Sublime Porte. Great and rapid changes have taken place in this interesting country within the last fifty years. The campaign of the French army in 1800, undertaken with a view to subdue Egypt, and so secure to the French an important share of the East India trade, though it resulted unsuccessfully, was attended with important consequences to the interests of science and learning. Mohammed Ali, the late viceroy, though a perfect despot, did much to elevate his dominions to a rank with civilized nations in arts, commerce, and industry. The works of internal improvement which he undertook, the extensive manufactories he established, and the encouragement he gave to literary institutions, have done much to change the political, if not the moral aspect of Egypt. His successors have carried out his enlightened views by establishing railroads and opening out canals, which, while they increase the commerce of the country, greatly facilitate communication with India by what is called the overland route by the Mediterranean, Egypt, and the Red Sea, to Bombay. See M'Culloch's Gazetteer, s.v. For the history of Christianity in Egypt, SEE EGYPT, CHRISTIAN.

XXII. Monumental Localities. — Of the towns on the northern coast the most western is Alexandria or El-Iskenderiyeh, founded B.C. 332 by Alexander the Great, who gave it the form of a Macedonian chlamys or mantle. Proceeding eastward, the first place of importance is Er-Rashid, or Rosetta, on the west bank of the branch of the Nile named after this town. In ascending the Rosetta branch the first spot of interest is the site of the ancient Sais, on the eastern bank, marked by lofty mounds and the remains of massive walls of crude brick. It was one of the oldest cities of Egypt, and gave its name to the kings of the 26th dynasty. The goddess Neith, supposed to be the origin of Athene, was the local divinity, and in her honor an annual festival was held at Sais, to which pilgrims resorted from all parts of Egypt. On the eastern side of the other branch of the Nile, to which it gives its name, stands the town Dimyat, or Damietta, a strong place in the time of the Crusades, and then regarded as the key of Egypt. It has now about 28,000 inhabitants. To the eastward of Damietta is the site of Pelusium, the Sin of Scripture, and the ancient key of Egypt, towards Palestine. No important remains have been found here. Between this site and the Damietta branch are the mounds of Tanis, or Zoan, the famous Avaris of the Shepherds, with considerable remains of the great temple, of which the most remarkable are several fallen obelisks, some of them broken. This temple was as ancient as the time of the 12th dynasty, and was beautified by Rameses II. Tanis was on the eastern bank of the Tanitic branch of the Nile, now called the canal of El-Moiz. A little south of the modern point of the Delta, on the eastern bank of the river, is the site of the ancient Heliopolis, or On, marked by a solitary obelisk, and the ruins of a massive brick wall. The obelisk bears the name of Osirtasen I, the head of the 12th dynasty. At a short distance south of Heliopolis stands the modern capital, Cairo, or El-Kahireh. The ancient city of Memphis, founded by Menes, stood on the western bank of the Nile, about ten miles above Cairo. The kings and people who dwelt there chose the nearest part of the desert as their burial-place, and built tombs on its rocky edge or excavated them in its sides. The kings raised pyramids, round which their subjects were buried in smaller sepulchers. The site of Memphis is marked by mounds in the cultivated tract. A few blocks of stone and a fine colossus of Rameses II are all that remains of the great temple of Ptah, the local deity. SEE MEMPHIS.

There is not space here for a detailed account of the pyramids; suffice it to say that the present perpendicular height of the great pyramid is 450 feet, 9 inches and its present base 746 feet. It is about 30 feet lower than it was originally, much of the exterior having been worn off by age and man's violence. Like all the other pyramids, it faces the cardinal points. The surface presents a series of great steps, though when first built it was cased, and smooth, and polished. The platform on the summit is about 32 feet square. The pyramid is almost entirely solid, containing only a few chambers, so small as not to be worthy of consideration in calculating its contents. It was built by Rhufa (Cheops), or Shufu (Suphis). The second pyramid stands at a short distance south-west of the great pyramid, and is not of much smaller dimensions. It is chiefly remarkable for a great part of its casing having been preserved. It was built by Khafra or Shafra (Chephren), a king of the same period. The third pyramid is much smaller than either of the other two, though it is constructed in a more costly manner. It was built by Mycerinus or Mencheres, the fourth ruler of the 4th dynasty. Near the three pyramids are six smaller ones; three of them are near the east side of the great pyramid, and three on the south side of the third pyramid. They are supposed to be the tombs of near relatives of the kings who founded the great pyramid. To the east of the second pyramid is the great sphinx. 188 feet in length, hewn out of a natural eminence in the solid rock, some defects of which are supplied by a partial stone casing, the legs being likewise added. SEE PYRAMIDS.

In the tract between the pyramids of Sakkarah and Abu-Sir are the remains of the Serapeum, and the burial place of the bulls Apis, both discovered by M. Mariette. They are enclosed by a great wall, having been connected, for the Serapeum was the temple of Apis. The tomb is a great subterranean gallery, whence smaller passages branch off, and contains many sarcophagi in which the bulls were entombed. Serapis was a form of Osiris, his name being Osir-hapi, or Osiris Apis. In ascending the river we arrive at the ancient Ahnas, supposed by some to be the Hanes of Isaiah, and about sixty miles above Cairo, at Beni-Suweif, the port of the province of the Feyum. In this province are supposed to be the remains of the famous Labyrinth of Moeris, probably Amen-em-ha III, and not far off, also, may be traced the site of the Lake Moeris, near the ancient Arsinoe, or Crocodilopolis, now represented by Medinet el-Feylum. The next objects of peculiar interest are the grottoes of Beni-Hassan, which are monuments of the 12th dynasty, dating about B.C. 2000. Here are found two columns of an order which is believed to be the prototype of the Doric. On the walls of the tombs are depicted scenes of hunting, fishing, agriculture, etc. There is also an interesting representation of the arrival of certain foreigners, supposed to be Joseph's brethren — at least illustrative of their arrival. In the town of Asyrt, higher up the river, is seen the representative of the ancient Lycopolis. It was an important place 3500 years ago, and has thus outlived Thebes and Memphis, Tanis and Pelusium. Further on, a few miles south-west of Girga, on the border of the Libyan desert, is the site of the sacred city of Abydus, a reputed burial-place of Osiris, near which, also, must have been situated the very ancient city of This, which gave its name to the 1Jam 2:1-26 nd dynasties. About forty miles from Abydus, though nearly in the same latitude, is the village of Denderah, famous for the remains of the temple of Athor, the Egyptian Venus, who presided over the town of Tentyra. the capital of the Tentyrite nome. This temple dates from the time of the earlier Caesars, and the names of the last Cleopatra, and Caesarion her son, are found in it. SEE DENDERAH.

About twenty miles still higher up the Nile than Denderah, and on the western bank, are the ruins of Thebes, the No-Amon of the Bible. In the hieroglyphic inscriptions the name of this place is written AP-T, or with the article prefixed T-AP, and AMENHA, the abode of Amen. The Copts write the former name Tape, which becomes in the Memphitic dialect Thaba, and thus explains the origin of the Greek Θ'ηβαι. The time of its foundation is unknown, but remains have been found which are ascribed to the close of the 11th dynasty, and it probably dates from the commencement of that first Diospolite line of kings. Under the 18th and two following dynasties it attained its highest prosperity, and to this period its greatest monuments belong. The following is a description of this celebrated locality by Mr. Poole: "The monuments of Thebes, exclusive of its sepulchral grottoes, occupy a space on both sides of the river, of which the extreme length from north to south is about two miles, and the extreme breadth from east to west about four. The city was on the eastern bank, where is the great temple, or, rather, collection of temples, called after El- Karnak, a modern village near by. The temple of El-Karnak is about half a mile from the river, in a cultivated tract. More than a mile to the south- west is the temple of El-Uksur, on the bank of the Nile. On the western bank was the suburb bearing the name Memnonia. The desert near the northernmost of the temples on this side almost reaches the river, but soon recedes, leaving a fertile plain generally more than a mile in breadth. Along the edge of the desert, besides the small temple just mentioned as the northernmost, are the Rameseum of El-Kurneh, and that of Medinet-Habu less than a mile farther to the south-west, and between them, but within the cultivated land, the remains of the Amenophium, with its two gigantic seated colossi. Behind these edifices rises the mountain, which here attains a height of about 1200 feet. It gradually recedes in a southwesterly direction, and is separated from the cultivated tract by a strip of desert in which are numerous tombs, partly excavated in two isolated hills, and two small temples. A tortuous valley, which commences not far from the northernmost of the temples on this bank, leads to those valleys in which are excavated the wonderful tombs of the kings, near the highest part of the mountain, which towers above them in bold and picturesque forms" (Encyclop. Britannica, art. Egypt, page 506). At the entrance to the temple of El-Uksur stood two very fine obelisks of red granite, one of which is now in the center of the Place de la Concorde, at Paris. There is also a portal with wings 200 feet in width, covered with sculptures of the highest interest, illustrating the time of Rameses II. Within is a magnificent avenue of 14 columns, having capitals of the bell-shaped flowers of the papyrus. They are 60 feet high, and elegantly sculptured.

These are of the time of Amenoph III. — On a south portal of the great temple of El-Karnak is a list of countries subdued by Sheshonk I, or Shishak, the head of the 22d dynasty. Among the names is that of the kingdom of Judah, as before mentioned. The great hypostyle hall in this temple is the most magnificent work of this class in Egypt. Its length is 170 feet, its width 329; it is supported by 134 columns, the loftiest of which are nearly 70 feet in height and about 12 in diameter, and the rest more than 40 feet in height and about 9 in diameter. The great columns, 12 in number, form an avenue through the midst of the court from the entrance, and the others are arranged in rows very near together on each side. There is a transverse avenue made by two rows of the smaller columns being placed further apart than the rest. This great hall is therefore crowded with columns, and the effect is surpassingly grand. The forest of pillars seems interminable in whatever direction one looks, producing a result unequalled in any other Egyptian temple. This great hall was the work of Sethi I, the head of the 19th dynasty, who came to the throne B.C. cir. 1340, and it was sculptured partly in his reign and partly in that of his son and successor Rameses II. — The Rameseum remains to be briefly noticed. This temple on the edge of the desert is perhaps the most beautiful ruin in Egypt, as Karnak is the grandest. It also records the glories of Rameses II, of whom there is in one of its courts a colossal statue hewn out of a single block of red granite, supposed to weigh nearly 900 tons, and transported thither from the quarries of Syene. This temple is also noted for containing the celebrated astronomical ceiling, one of the most precious records of ancient Egyptian science. Not the least interesting among the monuments of Thebes are the tombs of the kings. The sepulchers are 20 or 21 in number. Nineteen are sculptured, and are the mausolea of kings, of a queen with her consort, and of a prince, all of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties. The paintings and sculptures are almost wholly of a religious character, referring chiefly to a future state. Standing on the resting places of kings and warriors who figured in the history of Egypt while the world was yet young, and long before the age of others whom we are accustomed to consider heroes of antiquity, it seems as though death itself were immortalized; and proudly indeed may those ancient Pharaohs, who labored so earnestly to preserve their memory on earth, look down upon the paltry efforts of later aspirants, and their slender claims to be regarded as either ancient or immortal. SEE THEBES.

About twenty miles further south of the site of Thebes is the village of Edfu, representing the town called by the Greeks Apollinopolis Magna, where is still found in a comparatively perfect state a temple of the Ptolemaic period. SEE TEMPLE. Above Edfu, at Jebel es-Silsileh, the mountains on either side, which have for some time confined the valley to a narrow space, reach the river, and contract its course and higher still, about thirty miles, is the town of Aswan, which represents the ancient Syene, and stands among the palm-trees on the eastern bank, opposite to the island of Elephantine. The bed of the river above this place is obstructed by numerous rocks and islands of granite, which form the rapids called the first cataract. During the inundation boats are enabled by a strong northerly wind to pass this cataract without aid, and, in fact, at other times the principal rapid has only a fall of five or six feet, and that not perpendicular. The roaring of the troubled stream, and the red granite islands and rocks which stud its surface, give the approach a wild picturesqueness till we reach the open stream, less than two miles further, and the beautiful island of Philae suddenly rises before our eyes, completely realizing one's highest idea of a sacred place of ancient Egypt. It is very small, only a quarter of a mile long and 500 feet broad, and contains monuments of the time of the Ptolemies. In the desert west of the Nile are situate the great and little wahs (oases), and the valley of the Natron lakes, containing four Coptic monasteries, the remains of the famous anchorite settlement of Nitria, recently noted for the discovery of various Syrian MSS. In the eastern desert the chief town of importance is Es-Suweis, or Suez, the ancient Arsinoe, which gives its name to the western gulf of the Red Sea. XXIII. Prophecies. — It would not be within the province of this article to enter upon a general consideration of the prophecies relating to Egypt; we must, however, draw the reader's attention to their remarkable fulfillment. The visitor to the country needs not to be reminded of them; everywhere he is struck by the precision with which they have come to pass. We have already spoken of the physical changes which have verified to the letter the words of Isaiah. In like manner we recognize, for instance, in the singular disappearance of the city of Memphis and its temples in a country where several primeval towns yet stand, and scarce any ancient site is unmarked by temples, the fulfillment of the words of Jeremiah: 'Noph shall be waste and desolate without an inhabitant" (Jer 46:19), and those of Ezekiel, "Thus saith the Lord God, I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause [their] images to cease out of Noph”? (Eze 30:13).

The principal passages relating to Egypt are as follows: Isa 19:1-25; Jer 43:8-13; Jer 44:30; Jer 46:1-28; Eze 29:1-21; Eze 30:1-26; Eze 31:1-18; Eze 32:1-32, inclusive. In the course of what has been said, several allusions have been made to portions of these prophecies; and it may here be observed that the main reference in them seems to be to the period extending from the times of Nebuchadnezzar to those of the Persians, though it is not easy to elucidate them to any great extent from the history furnished by the monuments. Nebuchadnezzar appears to have invaded Egypt during the reign of Apries, and Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that the story of Amasis' rebellion was invented or used to conceal the fact that Pharaoh-Hophla was deposed by the Babylonians. It is not improbable that Amasis came to the throne by their intervention. The forty years' desolation of Egypt (Eze 29:10) is a point of great difficulty, owing chiefly to the statements of Herodotus (2:161, 177) as to the unexampled prosperity of the reigns of Apries and Amasis (B.C. 588- 25), during which the period in question must have fallen. That the Greek historian was misled by the accounts of the Egyptian priests, who wished to conceal the extent of the national humiliation by Nebuchadnezzar and Cambyses, is made evident by Browne (Ordo Saeclorum? page 191 sq.), who thus arranges the events: "Soon after B.C. 572, Nebuchadnezzar invades Egypt, conquers Apries, and puts him to death, and carries off the spoil of Egypt, together with its chief men, to some other part of his dominions: Amasis is appointed his viceroy. Cyrus, about B.C. 532, 'turns the captivity of Egypt,' as he had before done that of the Jews. On his death Amasis revolts, and Cambyses invades and fully subjugates all Egypt, B.C. 525." SEE EZEKIEL.

XXIV. Literature. — For a very full classified list of works on Egypt, see Jolowicz's Bibliotheca -Egyptiaca (Lpz. 1858, 8vo), with the Supplement thereto (ib. 1861). The following are the most useful, excepting such as relate to the modern history. On Egypt generally: Description de l'E'gypte (2d ed. Par. 1821-9); Encyclopaedia Britannica (8th edit. art. Egypt). Description, Productions, and Topography: Abd-Allatif, Relation de E'gypte (ed. Silvestre de Sacy, Par. 1810); D'Anville, Memoires sur l'Egypte (Par. 1766); Belzoni, Narrative of Operations (London, 1820); Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften d. alt-Egyptischen Denkmaler (Lpz. 1857); Id. Reiseberichte aus AEgypten (ib. 1855); Champollion le Jeune, L'E'gypte sous les Pharaons (Par. 1814); Id. Lettres ecrites pendant son Voyage en Egypte (2d edit. Par. 1833); Ehrenberg and Hemprich, Naturgeschichtliche Reiser — Reisen in AEgypten, etc. (Lpz. 1828); Symbolae Physicae (ib. 1829-1845); Forskal, Descriptiones animalium, etc. (Hafn. 1775-6); Id. Flora AEgyptiaco-arabica (ib. 1775); Harris, Hieroglyphical Standards (London, 1852); Linant de Bellefonds, Memoire sur le lac de Moeris (Paris, 1843); Quatremere, Memoires Geographiques et Historiques (Paris, 1811); Russegger, Reisen (Lpz. 1841-8); Vyse and Perring, Pyramids of Gizeh (Lond. 1839-42); Perring, 58 Large Views, etc., of the Pyramids of Gizeh (Lond. 1841); Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and Thebes (Lond. 1843); Id. Hand-book for Egypt (2d edit. Lond. 1858); Id. Survey of Thebes (plan); Id. on the Eastern Desert (in the Jour. Geogr. Soc. 2:1832, p. 28 sq.); Hartmann, Naturgesch. der Nillander (Lpz. 1865); Kremer, Egypten (modern, Lpz. 1863); Parthey, Erdk. des alten AEgyptens (ib. 1859); Pethorick, Egypt, etc. (Lond. 1861). Monuments and Inscriptions: Champollion le Jeune, Monuments (Paris, 1829-47); Id. Notices descriptives (ib. 1844); Gliddon, Lectures (N.Y. 1843); Lepsius, Denkmaler (Lpz. 1849 sq.); Letronne, Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines d'E'gypte (Par. 1842); Rosellini, Monumenti (Pisa, 1832-44); Dumichen, Altagypt. Inschriften (in three series, Lpz. 1865 -8); Brugsch, Recueil de Monuments Egyptiens (Par. 186263); Leemans, Monuments Egyptiens (ib. 1866); Rhind, Thebes, etc. (Lond. 1862). Language: Brugsch, Grammaire Demotique (Berl. 1855); Id. Hierog.-Demot. Worterb. (Berl. 1867); Id. Zwei bilingue Papyri (ib. 1865); Birch, Dictionary of Hieroglyphics (in Bunsen, volume 5); Champollion le Jeune, Grammaire Egyptienne (Paris, 1836-41); Dictionnaire E'gyptien (ib. 1841); Encyclop. Brit. (8th edit. art. Hieroglyphics); Parthey, Vocabularium Coptico-Latinum, etc. (Berl. 1844); Peyron, Grammatica linguae Copticae (Turin, 1841); Id. Lexicon (ib. 1835); Schwartze, Das Alte Aegypten (Lpz. 1843). Ancient Chronology, History, and Manners: Bunsen, Egypt's Place (London, 1850-59); Cory, Ancient Fragments (2d edit. Lond. 1832); Herodotus (ed. Rawlinson, volumes 1-4, Lond. and N.Y. 1861); Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses (Lond. 1843); Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie (Lpz. 1825); Lepsius, Chronologie der Aegypter (volume 1, Lpz. 1849); Id. Konigsbuch der alten Aegypter (ib. 1858); Poole, Horae Egyptiacae. (Lond. 1851); Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians (ib. 1837, 1841); Id. Popular Account of the Ancient Egyptians (Lond. and N.Y. 1855); Kenrick, Egypt under the Pharaohs (Lond. and N.Y. 1852); Osburn, Monumental History (Lond. 1854); Sharpe, Hist. of Egypt (Lond. 1846); Brugsch, Histoire de l'E'gypte (Paris, 1859 sq.); Hincks, Years of the Egyptians (London, 1865); Lauth, Der Dynast. Manetho's (Leipzig, 1865); Unger, Chronologie des Manetho (Berlin,1867). Ancient Religion: Herodotus; Diodorus of Sicily; Plutarch; Porphyry; Iamblichus, etc.; Jablonski, Pantheon Aegypt. (Frankf. 1750-52, 3 volumes); Schmidt, De sacerdot. et sacrificiis AEgyptiorum (Tub. 1786); Hirt, U. d. Bildung d. agyptischen Gottheiten (1821); Champollion, Pantheon egyptied (Paris, 1832); Haymann, Darstellung d. A.-nr. M. (Bonn, 1837); Roth, Die ag. u. Zoroastrische Glaubenslehre (Manh. 1846); Beauregard, Les divinites E'gyptiennes (Paris, 1866); Sharpe, Egyptian Mythology (Lond. 1863); Lepsius, D. Todtenbuch (Lpz. 1867); Rouge, Ritual des E'gyptiens (Paris, 1866); Birch, The Funeral Ritual (in Bunsen, volume 5); Pleyte, La Religion des Pre-Israelites (Par. 1862). Modern Inhabitants: Lane, Modern Egyptians (3d ed. 1860); Id. Thousand and One Nights (2d edit., by Poole, Lond. 1859); Mrs. Poole, Englishwoman in Egypt (Lond. and N.Y. 1844). The periodicals of Great Britain, France, and Germany contain many valuable papers on Egyptian history and antiquities, by Dr. Hincks, Mr. Birch, M. de Rouge, and others. There is a monthly Egyptological Zeitschrift, edited by M. Brugsch, published at Berlin; and a society called the "Eg. Explor. Fund" of London, has published several Memoirs of new researches.

## Egypt Brook Or River Of[[@Headword:Egypt Brook Or River Of]]

             This is frequently mentioned as the southern limit of the Land of Promise (Gen 15:18; 2Ch 7:8; Num 24:5; Jos 15:4). SEE BROOK. Calmet is of opinion that this was the Nile, remarking that Jos 13:3 describes it by the name of Sihor, which is the true name of the Nile (Jer 2:18), "the muddy river ;" and that Amo 6:14 calls it the river of the wilderness, because the eastern arm of the Nile adjoined Arabia, or the wilderness, in Hebrew Arabah, and watered the district by the Egyptians called Arabian. In answer to this, it is said that this stream was the limit of Judaea toward Egypt, and that the Sept. (Isa 27:12), "unto the river of Egypt," render “to Rhinocorura," an interpretation which is adopted by Cellarius, Bochart, Wells, and others, although that is the name of a town certainly not adjacent to the Nile. SEE NILE. Besides, it is extremely dubious whether the power of the Hebrew nation extended at any time to the Nile, and, if it did, it was over a mere sandy desert. But, as this desert is unquestionably the natural boundary of the Syrian dominions, no reason can be given why the political boundary should exceed it. Most geographers, therefore, understand by "the River of Egypt" the modern Wady el-Arish, which drains the middle of the Sinaitic desert; a few, however, take it to be the brook Besor, between Gaza and Rhinocorura. (See Jos 15:47.) SEE EGYPT.

## Egypt, Christian[[@Headword:Egypt, Christian]]

             1. Church History. The first seeds of Christianity were undoubtedly scattered in Egypt at the time of the apostles. According to some ancient historians, Peter founded the Church of Alexandria and several other Egyptian churches. Mark the Evangelist is said by an old tradition, preserved by Eusebius (Ecclesiastes Hist. 2:16), to have been "the first that was sent to Egypt, and first established churches at the city of Alexandria." SEE ALEXANDRIA. The testimony of Eusebius, that the first Christians of Egypt followed a rigidly ascetic school, is very doubtful, because Philo, to whom he refers, does not speak of Christians, but of a Jewish sect, the Therapeutae, and expressly mentions that they lived, not in Alexandria, but on Lake Moeris. From Lower Egypt Christianity soon spread to Cyrene, Pentapolis, Libya, Central and Upper Egypt. There were at least twenty bishoprics in Egypt about the middle of the third century, for that number of bishops were assembled at a council in 235. Five councils of Egyptian bishops were held before 311; a great many in the fourth and following centuries. As Egypt had been in the times before Christ the seat of philosophy and mysticism, so it now became one of the chief seats of Christian literature. The Alexandrian school was the oldest of the higher class of institutions for Christian education. Jerome and others hold Mark the Evangelist to have been its founder, but the succession of catechists is differently stated. SEE AEXANDRIAN SCHOOL.

Among the scientific men whom it gave to the Church were Clement, Athanasius, Origen, Cyril. Gnosticism found numerous adherents. Basilides, Valentinus, Heracleon, Ptolemaeus, Carpocrates, were Egyptians. The Ophites and Doketism sprang up there; Sabellianism and Arianism were also products of Egypt. The influence of Egypt in the history of Monachism is equally marked; Pachomius, Anthony, and many other celebrated hermits, greatly contributed to the spreading of Monachism in the Christian Church. Monachism (q.v.), in fact, cannot be fully understood without a due appreciation of the Egyptian element. In the history of the constitution of the Christian Church Egypt has also had a considerable influence. In no other country of the East were hierarchical tendencies so early developed, for the patriarch of Alexandria soon sought to. obtain privileges which no other of the superior bishops enjoyed. The Monophysites, who subsequently received the name of Copts, became in Egypt the predominant Church, and gradually wrested nearly all the churches from the orthodox Christians, who, as early as the end of the sixth century, were reduced to a very insignificant number. The patriarchal seat at Alexandria was occupied almost exclusively by Monophysite (Jacobite) patriarchs, with the exception of Cosmas (elected about 726) and Eutychus (elected in 934). The orthodox (Greek) Christians received from their opponents the nickname Melchites (q.v.). In 615 Egypt was invaded by Chosroes, king of Persia, when few bishoprics were spared. The dominion of the Persians lasted only a few years, when the whole country, with the capital city of Alexandria, passed into the power of the Mohammedans in 635 (according to others in 640). Under them Christianity suffered incalculable injuries, and gradually declined so as to become a despised and oppressed sect. SEE COPTS. Better prospects for Christianity did not open till the beginning of the 19th century, when Egypt, under the reign of the enlightened Mehemet Ali, was brought under the influence of European civilization. Since then the educated Egyptians have learned to appreciate the superiority of European nations, especially of England and France; many young men of talent have been sent to European schools; the native Christian population begins to rise from its degradation and despised condition; the large cities, especially Alexandria and Cairo, are filling up with an intelligent and influential population of foreign-born Christians; Christian schools, and other religious and charitable institutions, are multiplying; and the signs of the times seem to indicate that the prospects of Christianity are at present very bright.

An attempt to establish a Protestant mission in Egypt was made by the Moravians in 1769. A missionary, Hocker, who previously had sought to open communication with the Abyssinian Church, but had been compelled to return to Europe in 1761, was in 1768 commissioned, together with a young man named Danke, a carpenter by trade, to return to Egypt, and await any opening that might present itself to penetrate into Abyssinia. "On March 5, 1769, they reached Cairo, Hocker earning a livelihood by practicing as a physician and Danke by working at his trade. The latter soon learned to converse tolerably in Arabic, and when an assistant arrived for Hocker in the person of John Antes, a watchmaker, he set out on his first journey to the Copts, landing at Gizeh, in Upper Egypt. The state of the country at this time was exceedingly disturbed, the Mameluke beys having revolted against the Turkish government, and many of them being also at war with one another. Hocker had been summoned to attend members of the household of Ali Bey (for a time the first chief in Egypt), and Danke's connection with the 'English physician,' as Hocker was called, brought him into favor with the officers and soldiers at Gizeh, who treated him with the greatest kindness. He met a number of Copts in this city, with whom he formed a very intimate friendship. At first several of them invited him to visit their native city, Behnesse, the population of which was exclusively Coptic, but afterwards they endeavored to deter him by describing the danger to which he would expose himself. Danke, however, refused to listen to them, and, after bidding the Copts at Girzeh farewell, he set out September 13th. Danke made in all three visits to the Copts at Behnesse. His labors were by many eagerly accepted, by others they were viewed with suspicion or openly opposed. His testimony for Jesus was not without encouraging effect, and many of the priests even became his firm support. ers, and begged him to remain amongst them. On his third visit he caught a severe cold, upon which followed an attack of malignant fever. Notwithstanding the most careful nursing on the part of the other brethren, the disease increased upon him, and on October 6th, 1772, he died, aged only 38 years. By permission of the Greek patriarch, his body was interred in a vault of St. George's church, in the Old City of Cairo. In May 1775, George Winiger arrived as Danke's successor. He proceeded to Behnesse, and labored faithfully in preaching the Gospel and instructing the people privately. Michael Baschara (the magistrate referred to above) remained faithful to his profession, and was an active and influential assistant. In 1780, three other brethren were sent from Herrrlhut to reinforce the mission, but it had become evident before their arrival that in the present state of the country it would be impossible to continue the work amongst the Copts, and that an effort to penetrate into Abyssinia would be useless. The brethren remained at their post until the Synod of 1782 resolved to discontinue the mission. Hocker, who had labored for its establishment ever since the year 1752, died at Cairo in August, 1781" (Moravian [newspaper], May 7, 1868).

In 1826, the "Church Missionary Society" of London sent out some German missionaries to labor among the Copts. After spending some time in studying the Arabic language, and distributing the Bible and religious tracts, the missionaries fixed the location of the mission at Cairo, where they had two schools, attended by Greek, Coptic, Armenian, Roman Catholic, and even pure Mohammedan children. In 1833 a boarding-school was commenced, designed for training teachers and catechists. In 1834, a chapel was constructed by subscriptions obtained on the spot. In 1835, the mission was interrupted by a terrible visitation of the plague. In 1840, it was reported by the missionaries that in the different quarters of the town no less than six religious meetings had been established by the native Copts for the purpose of reading the Scriptures; that the patriarch had sanctioned both these meetings and a plan for the establishment of an institution in Egypt for the education of the Coptic clergy. In 1841, a pupil of the missionary school of Cairo was appointed by the patriarch Abuna, or head of the Abyssinian Church. Bishop Gobat, who visited Egypt in 1849, expressed in a letter dated January 9, 1850, opinion that the plan on which this mission had been established, to seek the friendship of the higher clergy of the Eastern churches, and to induce them to reform their churches, had failed. The mission was subsequently abandoned.

A mission established by the American Missionary Association has also been again abandoned. The most successful of any of the Protestant missions has been that undertaken by the United Presbyterian Church. It organized a number of congregations and schools, and, through the liberality of the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh, who married a pupil of the mission school, it obtained a press, through which a large amount of useful reading has been scattered throughout the land. The growth of the Church was sufficiently encouraging to organize the churches into the Presbytery of Egypt, in connection with the General Assembly of the Church in the United States. A flourishing theological school has been established at Assifut, for which the Rev. Mr. Hogg, in 1866, raised in Great Britain about $2500. In 1867 the patriarch of the Coptic Church manifested the fiercest hostility to the mission; and obtaining, it is believed, at least the tacit consent and authority of the civil government, he instituted proceedings that at one time threatened the mission churches with great disaster. Finally, however, the Egyptian government, chiefly in consequence of the remonstrances of the English and American consuls, stopped the persecution. The last annual report on this mission, made to the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in May, 1868, states that in nearly all the churches gratifying accessions have been made to the membership during the past year, and that during the persecution only four shrunk back, all of whom subsequently returned. The Presbytery have taken the proper steps for each native church to have a native pastor duly called, ordained, and installed. The churches of Ghifs and Cairo already have called native pastors, and taken steps for providing the necessary salaries. The Presbytery of Egypt, in 1867, also adopted strong resolutions against the slave-trade, which is still carried on in Egypt with the connivance of the government.

2. Statistics. — The large majority of the inhabitants are Mohammedans. The theological school connected with the mosque of Cairo is one of the most frequented schools of the Islam. All the elementary schools and higher institutions for the Mohammedan population are of a strictly religious character. Mehemet Ali established several schools after the European model, in which young Egyptians were to be educated, partly by European teachers, for civil and military offices. Such schools were the medical school at Abu-Zahel, the cadet school at Gizeh, the marine school at Alexandria, the school of engineers at Chanka, the medical college of Casr-el-Ayin, the artillery school of Turrah, and the musical institute in the Citadel of Cairo. A special college for young Egyptians was also established in Paris. Several of these schools were, however, suppressed under the reign of Abbas Pasha. The most numerous body of Christians are the Copts, who have a patriarch, four metropolitans, and seven other bishops, and a. population estimated from 150,000 to 250,000 souls. SEE COPTS.

The number of United Copts, who recognize the authority of the Pope, is about 10,000. They have a vicar apostolic at Cairo. For the Latin Roman Catholics there is another vicar apostolic at Alexandria, who is at the same time delegate for the United Orientals of other rites than the Coptic. According to letters of Roman Catholic missionaries, Alexandria had, in 1853, 7020 Latins, 600 United Copts, 240 Maronites, 350 Melchites (United Greeks), 50 Syrians, 60 Armenians — together 8320. The Roman Catholic population of Cairo at the same time consisted of 4148 Latins, 200 Melchites, 800 Copts, 300 Maronites, 300 Armenians, 200 Syrians, 100 Chaldees. Since then the Roman Catholic population of these two cities has undoubtedly largely increased in consequence of the rapid growth of the total population of the two cities; but no later trustworthy statistics are known. There are Franciscan monasteries at Alexandria, Damietti, Cairo, and two in Upper Egypt. The orthodox Greek Church has in Egypt a population of about 8000 souls. They are under the patriarch of Alexandria, who resides at Alexandria or Cairo, and whose official title is "The most Blessed and Holy Patriarch of the great City of Alexandria, and of all Egypt, Pentapolis, Libya, and Ethiopia, Pope, and (Ecumenical Judge." Four metropolical sees belong to the Greek patriarchate of Alexandria, viz.: 1. Libya; 2. Memphis; 3. Pelusium; 4. Metelis; but the last three appear to have been vacant for some time.

The mission of the American United Presbyterian Church reported at the General Assembly for 1888 the following statistics: missionaries, 12, including one medical missionary; congregations, 24; organized outstations, 85; communicants, 2307. The mission occupies seven central stations, the chief ones being at Alexandria, Cairo, Assifut, Feyum, and Ghifs. The theological school at Assist had in 1888, 20 theological students. Schools for boys and girls are organized in connection with each of the five churches and at each of the out-stations. The distribution of the Bible is prosecuted by the agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by the American missionaries, by the Crischona mission, and by others. There were, in 1889, three depots in Cairo for the sale of the Bible, and the yearly sale of the Scriptures averaged from 7000 to 12,000 copies. The Crischona, or Pilgrim mission, at Basel, Switzerland, intended to establish a so-called "Apostles' Street," or series of twelve stations, from Alexandria far into the heart of Abyssinia. Of these, the following stations were, in 1866, in active operation in Egypt: St. Matthew's in Alexandria; St. Mark's in Cairo; St. Peter's at Assouan, at the falls of the Nile; St. Thomas at Khartoum, at the junction of the White and Blue Niles; and St. Paul's at Matammah, on the borders of Abyssinia. The deaconesses of Kaiserswerth have a hospital in Alexandria, and the first German Protestant church of Egypt was opened in 1866. — Princeton Review, 1850, page 260; 1856, page 715; Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, s.v.; Hardwick. Christ and other Masters, volume 2; Journal of Sac. Lit. 8, 9; Bibliotheca Sacra, 6:707; Christian Yearbook for 1867, page 289; the Annual Reports of the U.P. Foreign Mission Board, in July number of Evangel. Repository (1860- 1868). (A.J.S.)

## Egyptian[[@Headword:Egyptian]]

             (properly מַצְרַי, Mitsri', Αἰγύπτιος; but often in the plur. as a rendering in the A.V. of מַצְרִיסַם, Egypt), a native of the land of Egypt (q.v.); found in the sing. masc. (Gen 39:1, etc.; Act 21:38, etc.), fem. מַצְרַית (Gen 16:1), plur. masc. מַצְרַים (Gen 12:12; Gen 12:14; Act 7:22, etc.), fem. מַצְרַיּוֹת. (Exo 1:19). The Egyptian insurrectionist of Act 21:38, seems to have been a mountebank (γόης, Josephus, War, 2:13, 5), or pretended prophet (Ant. 20:7, 6). See PAUL. That country was proverbial for such characters.

## Egyptian Plagues[[@Headword:Egyptian Plagues]]

             SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.,

Egyptian Versions Of The Holy Scriptures.

After the death of Alexander the Great the Greeks multiplied in Egypt, and obtained important places of trust near the throne of the Ptolemies. The Greek language accordingly began to diffuse itself from the court among the people, so that the proper language of the country was either forced to adapt itself to the Greek both in construction and in the adoption of new words, or was entirely suspended. In this way originated the Coptic, compounded of the old Egyptian and the Greek. (See Tattam, Egyptian Grammar of the Coptic, Sahidic, and Bashmuric Versions, 2d edit. Lond. 1863.) SEE COPTIC LANGUAGE. There is a version in the dialect of Lower Egypt, usually called the Coptic, or, better, the hemphitic version; and there is another in the dialect of Upper Egypt, termed the Sahidic, and sometimes the Thebaic. See Davidson, Bibl. Criticism, 2:206 sq.; Scrivener, Introd. to N.T. page 270 sq.; Westcott, N.T. Canon, page 322 sq.

1. The Memphitic version of the Bible. — The O.T. in this version was made from the Septuagint and not from the original Hebrew. It would appear from Munter (Specim. verss. Daniel Copt. Romae, 1786) that the original was the Hesychian recension of the Sept. then current in the county. There is little doubt that all the O.T. books were translated, though many of them have not yet been discovered. Although this version (not the Thebaic) seems to be that exclusively used in the public services of the Copts, it was not known in Europe till Dr. Marshall, of Lincoln College, contributed some readings from it to bishop Fell's New Testament (Oxford, 1675). The Pentateuch has been published by Wilkins (London, 1731, 4to), by Fallet (Paris, 1854 sq.), and by De Lagarde (Leipz. 1867, 8vo); the Psalms at Rome (1744 and 1749) by the Propaganda Society. In 1837 Ideler published the Psalter more correctly; and in 1844 the best critical .edition, by Schwartze, appeared. The twelve minor prophets were published by Tattam (Oxon. 1836, 8vo), and the major prophets by the same (1852). Bardelli published Daniel (Pisa, 1849). A few pieces of other books were printed at different times by Mingarelli, Quatrembre, and Munter. The N.T., made from the original Greek, was published by Wilkins, with a Latin translation (Oxford, 1716). In 1846 a new and more correct edition was begun by Schwartze, and continued, but in a different manner, after his death, by Botticher (1852, etc.). In 1848-52, the "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge" published the N.T. in Memphitic and Arabic (Lond. 2 volumes, fol.). The text was revised by Lieder. The readings of this version, as may be inferred from the place where it was made, coincide with the Alexandrine family, and deserve the attention of the critic. Unfortunately, the version has not yet been adequately edited. It belongs perhaps to the 3d century. See Davidson, in Home's Introd. 2:66.

2. The Thebaic. — This version was also made from the Greek, both in the O. and N.T., and probably in the 2d century. Only some fragments of the O.T. part have been printed by Munter, Mingarelli, and Zoega. In the N.T. it agrees generally, though not uniformly, with the Alexandrine family. Not a few readings, however, are peculiar; and some harmonize with the Latin versions. Fragments of it have been published by Mingarelli, Giorgi, Munter, and Ford.

3. The Bashmuric, or Ammonian. — Only some fragments of such a version in the O. and N.T. have been published, and very little is known concerning it. Scholars are not agreed as to the nature of the dialect in which it is written, some thinking that it does not deserve the name of a dialect, while others regard the Bashmuric as a kind of intermediate dialect between those spoken in Upper and Lower Egypt. Hug and De Wette are inclined to believe that it is merely the version of Upper Egypt transferred to the idiom of the particular place where the Bashmuric was spoken. The origin of this version belongs to the 3d or 4th century. See Tregelles, in Home's Introduct. 4:287299. SEE VERSIONS (OF THE BIBLE).

## Egyptians, Gospel Of[[@Headword:Egyptians, Gospel Of]]

             SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.

## Ehi[[@Headword:Ehi]]

              (Hebrews Echi', אֵחַי, prob. a modified form of the name AHI; Sept. Α᾿γχίς; Vulg. Echi), one of the "sons" of Benjamin (Gen 46:21), apparently the grandson called AHIRAM SEE AHIRAM (q.v.) in Num 26:38 (from which the name is perhaps contracted). In the parallel passage (1Ch 8:6) he seems to be called EHUD SEE EHUD (q.v.).

## Ehinger, Elias[[@Headword:Ehinger, Elias]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 7, 1573. He studied at Wittenberg and Tilbingen, and was in 1597 court-preacher at Albertsberg, in Lower Austria. Being obliged to leave the country on account of intolerance, he went in 1605 to Rothenburg, on the Tauber, was made rector there, and accepted a call in 1607 to Augsburg. In 1629 he had to leave that place also, and went to Schul-Pforta, in Saxony. Being recalled to Augsburg, he stayed. there only a short time, and went in 1635 to Regensburg, where he died, November 28, 1653. He is the author of a large number of writings, of little value for our time. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Brucker, Commentarius de Vita et Scriptis Ehingeri (1724). (B.P.)

## Ehinger, Johann[[@Headword:Ehinger, Johann]]

             grandfather of Elias, was born at Lauingen in 1488. For some time he was a monk, but professed the Evangelical religion, and in 1537 became preacher at St. Stephen's, in Augsburg. Being obliged, on account of his religion, to leave the place in 1551, he became general superintendent, of Pfalz-Neuburg, assisted in introducing the evangelical doctrine into the Palatinate, and died at Augsburg.in 1572, having been recalled there in 1555, after the treaty of Passau had been signed. See Brucker, Vita Elie Ehingeri; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; (B.P.)

## Ehoarn[[@Headword:Ehoarn]]

             a hermit-martyr in Brittany, cir. A.D. 520, slain in his cell in the diocese of Vannes by robbers, anid commemorated February 11.

## Ehrenfeuchter, Friedrich August Eduard[[@Headword:Ehrenfeuchter, Friedrich August Eduard]]

             an Evangelical theologian of Germany, was born at Leopoldshafen, near Carlsruhe, December 15, 1814. He studied at Heidelberg, and in 1845 was appointed professor and university preacher at Gottingeln, where he died, March 20, 1878. He is the author of Theorie des christlichen Cultus (Hamburg and Gotha, 1840): — Entwickelungsgeschichte der Menschheit (Heidelberg, 1845): — Zeugnisse aus dem akademischen Gottesdienste zu  Gottingen (Gottingen, 1849): — Zur Geschichte des Katechismus (ibid. 1857): — Praktische Theologie (ibid. 1859): — Christenthum und die moderne Weltanschauung (ibid. 1876). He also contributed to different reviews and periodicals. See Wagenmann, in Herzog-Plitt, Real- Encyklop.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:309. (B.P.)

## Ehrhardt, Sigismund Justus[[@Headword:Ehrhardt, Sigismund Justus]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Gemund, September 21, 1733. He studied at Erlangen, Jena, and Halle. In 1754 he was preacher at Markt Burg-Pressach, in Franconia, but the intolerance of the Roman Catholics obliged him to leave the place, and he went to Halle and Berlin, where he gave private lessons. In 1768 he was appointed deacon at Steinau, and died June 6, 1793, pastor at Besching, in the Silesian principality of Wohlau. He wrote, Commentatio de Claudii Tiberii Neronis (Coburg, 1752): Commentationes II de Latinitate S. Pauli (Schleusingen, 1755). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v., (B.P.).

## Ehrlich, Johann Gottlieb[[@Headword:Ehrlich, Johann Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born at Rabenau, in Saxony, in 1719. He studied at Leipsic, where he also lectured for some time; in 1753 was appointed pastor at Poppendorf, and in 1760 preacher at Wezdorf, in Thuringia. He died March 4, 1779, leaving, De Quadragesimae Jejunio (Leipsic, 1744): — De Erroribus Pauli Samosateni (ibid. 1745): — De Genuina Voce אבוס. Significatione (ibid. eod.): — De Opprobrio AEgypti Ablato (ibid. eod.). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ehrlich, Johann Nepomuk[[@Headword:Ehrlich, Johann Nepomuk]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Vienna in 1810. In 1827 he joined the Piarists, received holy orders in 1834, and was in 1836 professor of philosophy, history, and literature at the gymnasium in Krems. In 1850 he was called to Gratzen as professor of ethics, and in 1856 to the chair of fundamental theology at Prague, where he died, October 23, 1864. He wrote, Ueber das christliche Princip der Gesellschaft (Prague, 1856): — Fundamental Theologie (ibid. 1859). (B.P.)

## Ehrmann, Daniel[[@Headword:Ehrmann, Daniel]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born at Muttersdorf, in Bohemia, in 1818, and studied at Prague. In 1843 he was rabbi at Kuttenplan, in 1844 at Hohenems, and in 1852 he accepted a call to BbhmischLeipa. In 1860 he resigned his position and retired to Prague, where he died, December 12, 1882. He published, Betrachtungen uber judische Verhaltnisse (Buda, 1841): — Gebete fur judische Frauenzimmer (Prague, 1842): — Geschichte der Cultur und der Schulen unter den Juden (ibid. 1846): — Die Bibel nach ihrem ganzen Inhalte dargestellt (Feldkirch, 1852; Prague, 1854): — Das Buch Esther ubersetzt (Prague, 1861): — Geschichte der Israeliten (Brunn, 1869; 2d ed. 1873): — Aus Palastina und Babylon (Vienna, 1880). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:225; Kayserling, Bibliothek jud. Kanzelredner, 2:320; Lippe, Bibliographisches Lexikon, page 90 sq., 590 sq. (B.P.)

## Ehud[[@Headword:Ehud]]

              (Hebrews Ehud', אֵהוּד, union), the name of two or three Benjamites, and apparently hereditary in that tribe, like Gera (q.v.).

1. (Sept. ῎Ωδ v.r. Α᾿ώδ; Vulg. Ahod.) A descendant of Benjamin, progenitor of one of the clans of Geba that removed to Manahath (1Ch 13:10). The name is there written אֵהוּד, Echud', either for אֵהוּדas above, or altogether erroneously for אֵחַי, Echi. i.e. EHI SEE EHI (q.v.), the grandson of Benjamin, which appears in the parallel list of Gen 46:21, and as a son of Belah according to the Sept. version of that passage. He seems to be the same as AHI-RAM, אֲחַירָם, in the list in Num 26:38, and, if so; Ahiram is probably the right name, as the family were called Ahiramites. In 1Ch 8:1, the same person seems to be called אֵחְרִח, AHARAH, and perhaps also אֲחוֹחִ, AHOAH, in 1Ch 8:4 (Sept. Α᾿χιά, and in Cod. Vatic. Α᾿χιράν), אֲחַיָּה (Α᾿χιά), Ahiah, 1Ch 8:7, and אִחֵר (Α᾿ᾠρ), Aher, 1Ch 7:12. SEE SHAHARAIM. These fluctuations in the orthography seem to indicate that the original copies were partly effaced by time or injury. SEE BECHER;SEE CHRONICLES.

2. (Sept. Α᾿μείδ v. r. Α᾿ώθ; Vulg. Aod.) The third named of the seven sons of Bilhan, the son of Jediael, and grandson of the patriarch Jacob (1Ch 7:10). B.C. post 1856.

3. (Sept. Α᾿ώδ; Vulg. Aod; Josephus ᾿Ηούδης.) The son of Gera (there were three others of this name, Gen 46:21; 2Sa 16:5; 2 Samuel 1Ch 8:3), of the tribe of Benjamin (Jdg 3:16, marg. "son of Jemini," but vid. Gesenius, Lex. sub v. בַּנְיָמַין), the second judge of the Israelites, or, rather, of that part of Israel which he delivered from the dominion of the Moabites by the assassination of their king Eglon. These were the tribes beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side the river. In the Bible he is not called a judge, but a deliverer (i.e.); so Othniel (Jdg 3:9), and all the judges (Neh 9:27). As a Benjamite he was specially chosen to destroy Eglon, who had established himself in Jericho, which was included in the boundaries of that tribe. SEE EGLON. In Josephus he appears as a young man (νεανίας). He was very strong, and left-handed. So A.V.; but the more literal rendering is, as in the margin, "shut of his right hand." The words are differently rendered: 1. left- handed, and unable to use his right; 2. using his left hand as readily as his right. For 1. Targum, Josephus, Syr. (impotem), Arab. (aridum), and Jewish writers generally; Cajet., Buxtorf, Parkh., Gesen. (impeditus): derivation of אַטֵר from אָטִר, the latter only in Psa 69:16, where it = to shut. For 2. Sept. (ἀμφιδέξιος), Vulg. (qui utraque manu pro dextran utebatur), Corn. a Lap., Bonfrer., Patrick (comp. περιδέξιος, Hom. II. 21:163; Hipp. Aph. 7, 43); Jdg 20:16, sole recurrence of the phrase, applied to 700 Benjamites, the picked men of the army, who were not likely to be chosen for a physical defect. As regards Psa 69:16, it is urged that אָטִרmay = corono = aperio; hence אַטֵר= apertus = expeditus, q.d. expedita dextra; or if "clausus," clausus dextr = cinctus dextra = περιδέξιος, ambidexter (vid. Poli Syn.). The feint of drawing the dagger from the right thigh (Jdg 3:21) is consistent with either opinion. SEE AMBIDEXTER.

Ehud obtained access to Eglon as the bearer of tribute from the subjugated tribes, and being left-handed, or, rather, ambidextrous, he was enabled to use with a sure and fatal aim a dagger concealed under a part of his dress, where it was unsuspected, because it would there have been useless to a person employing his right hand. The circumstances attending this tragical event are somewhat differently given in Judges and in Josephus (see Winkler, Unters. Schurer Schriftst. 1:45 sq.; Redslob, in the Studien v. Krit. 9:912 sq.; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 2:375 sq.). That Ehud had the entree of the palace is implied in Jdg 3:19), but more distinctly stated in Josephus. In Judges the Israelites send a present by Ehud (Jdg 3:15); in Josephus. Ehud wins his favor by repeated presents of his own. Josephus represents this intimacy as having been of long continuance; but in Judges we find no mention of intimacy, and only one occasion of a present being made, viz., that which immediately preceded the death of Eglon. In Judges we have two scenes, the offering of the present and the death scene, which are separated by the temporary withdrawal of Ehud (Jdg 3:18-19); in Josephus there is but one scene. The present is offered, the attendants are dismissed, and the king enters into friendly conversation (ὁμιλίαν) with Ehud. In Judges the place seems to change from the reception-room into the "summer-parlor," where Ehud found him upon his return (comp. Jdg 3:18; Jdg 3:20). In Josephus the entire action takes place in the summer-parlor (δωμάτιον). In Judges the king exposes himself to the dagger by rising apparently in respect for the divine message which Ehud professed to communicate (Patrick, ad loc.); in Josephus it is a dream which Ehud pretends to reveal, and the king, in delighted anticipation, springs up from his throne. The obesity of Eglon, and the consequent impossibility of recovering the dagger, are not mentioned by Josephus (vid. Jdg 3:17, fat, ἀστεῖος, Sept.; but "crassus," Vulg., and so Gesenius, Lex.). The "quarries that were by Gilgal," to which Ehud retired in the interval between the two interviews (Jdg 3:19), are rendered in the margin better, as in Deu 7:25, "graven images" (Patrick, ad loc.; comp. Gesen. Heb. Lex. s.v. פְּסַילַים). SEE EGLON.

After this desperate achievement Ehud repaired to Seirah (improp. Seirath; see Gesen. Lex. s.v.), in the mountains of Ephraim (3:26, 27), or Mount Ephraim (Jos 19:50). To this wild central region, commanding, as it did, the plains east and west, he summoned the Israelites by sound of horn (a national custom according to Josephus; A.V. "a trumpet"). Descending from the hills they fell upon the Moabites, dismayed and demoralized by the death of their king (Josephus, not Judges). The greater number were killed at once, but 10,000 men made for the Jordan with the view of crossing into their own country. The Israelites, however, had already seized the fords, and not one of the unhappy fugitives escaped. As a reward for his conduct Ehud was appointed judge (Josephus, not Judges). The Israelites continued to enjoy for eighty years (B.C. 1509-1430) the independence obtained through this deed of Ehud (Jdg 3:15-30). SEE JUDGES.

## Eibeschutz[[@Headword:Eibeschutz]]

             SEE EYBENSCHUTZ.

## Eicetae[[@Headword:Eicetae]]

             an order of Syrian monks in the 9th century, who held dancing to be an essential part of divine worship, and engaged in this exercise in their public services. They defended their practice by the example of Miriam at the Red Sea and of David at the removal of the ark. They met with few imitators, but John of Damascus thought it best to expose their error.

## Eichelberger, Lewis, D.D[[@Headword:Eichelberger, Lewis, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Frederick County, Maryland, August 25, 1803. At an early age he attended the school in Frederick under the care of David F. Schaeffer, D.D. Subsequently he was taken to Georgetown, D. C., and entered Reverend Dr. Carnahan's classical school. He graduated from Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, in 1826, and with the first class at the Gettysburg Theological Seminary. On October 21, 1828, he was licensed to preach. His first charge was the Lutheran Church in Winchester, Virginia, in connection with which he also served three other congregations. In the spring of 1833 he resigned the pastorate in Winchester, but still preached to the three neighboring churches. At this period he opened a female seminary in Winchester, which he successfully  conducted for several years. He temporarily edited a political weekly journal, and for a time the Evangelical Lutheran Preacher, afterwards merged in the Lutheran Observer. In 1849 he was elected professor of theology in the Lexington (S.C.) Lutheran Seminary, where he labored for nine years. In 1858 he returned to Winchester, devoting himself to literature. At this time he began his History of the Lutheran Church. Among other offices of trust to which he was elected by the synod he was a trustee of Pennsylvania College and a director of the Gettysburg Theological Seminary. He died September 16, 1859. See Evangelical Review, 14:293.

## Eichhorn[[@Headword:Eichhorn]]

             Johann Gottfried, a celebrated German Orientalist and theologian, was born October 16, 1752, at Dorenzimmern, in the principality of Hohenlohe- OEhringen. He received his education at the gymnasium of Heilbronn and at the University of Gottingen, under Michaelis and Heyne. He became professor of Oriental literature at Jena in 1775, and was named court- councillor by the duke of Saxe-Weimar in 1783. In 1788 he succeeded Michaelis as professor of philosophy at the University of Gottingen, and in 1811 he was made professor of theology there, which post he retained until his death, June 25, 1827. Eichhorn was a thoroughly industrious student and a very voluminous writer. His first proof of Oriental knowledge was given in his Geschichte des Ostindischen Handels vor Mohammed (Gotha, 1775, 8vo). This was followed by Monumenta antiquissima historiae Arabum., post Alb. Schultens, arabiae edidit, latine vertit, et animadvers. adjecit J. G. Eichhorn (Gotha, 1775, 8vo): De rei numemarie apud A rabos initiis (Jena, 1776, 4to). At Jena he devoted himself to Biblical literature, and established, as a sort of organ, a magazine entitled Repertoriur fur biblische und morgenliindische Literatur, which lasted from 1777 to 1786 (Leipzig), and was followed by the Allgemeine Bibliothek d. biblischen Literatur (Leipz. 1787-1803, 10 volumes, 8vo). His professorship at Gottingen opened to him a wider field (1788) after the death of J.D. Michaelis. He lectured not only on Oriental literature, and on the exegesis of the O. and N.T., but also in the field of general history, in which he soon appeared as an author. In 1790-93 appeared his Urgeschichte (Primitive History), edited by Gabler from the Repertorium (Nuremb. 8vo). His more important works, in addition, are Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis (Gotting. 1791, 2 volumes, 8vo): Einteitung ins A.T.: Einleitung ins N.T. (also published under the general title of Kritische Schrijfen, Leips. 1804-1814, 8vo, 7 volumes). He also published a number of historical writings, besides many essays, reviews, etc.; and all this time his lectures were kept up in the university. The zealous and continued industry of Eichhorn is one of the marvels of modern literature.

As an interpreter of the Bible, Eichhorn, following Michaelis, transcended him in the boldness of his criticism and in his far-reaching Rationalism. The results of his criticism were that the Bible, as we have it, has only a moral and literary superiority over other, books. The primeval history attributed to Moses was made up of ancient sagas, and gathered up, partly, by Moses into the Pentateuch. His system of interpretation multiplies paradoxes, and tends to uproot the Christian revelation, as such, entirely. In his view the Apocalypse is a prophetic drama, and he comments on it as he would on a play of Aristophanes or Terence. But his vast labors in Biblical literature retain great part of their reputation, while his method of interpretation is fast passing into oblivion, even in Germany. Saintes, History of Rationalism, chapter 11; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:710.

## Eichhorn, Anton[[@Headword:Eichhorn, Anton]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1809. He received holy orders in 1832, was in 1836 professor of the gymnasium at Braunsberg, and in 1838 professor of theology at the Lyceum there. In 1851 he became a member of the chapter at Frauenburg in 1855 vicar- general, and in 1866 was appointed dean. He died February 27, 1869, leaving Der ermlandische Bischof und Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius (Mayence, 1854-55, 2 volumes). (B.P.)

## Eichhorn, Karl Friedrich[[@Headword:Eichhorn, Karl Friedrich]]

             son of Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (q.v.), was born at Jena in 1781. After completing his studies at the University of Gottingen, he became privat- docent of law at the University of Jena. In 1805 he was appointed professor at the University of Frankfort on the Oder, and in 1811 was transferred, with the university, to Berlin, where he edited, with Savigny, Goschen, and, later, with Rudorff, the Zeitschrift firgeschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft. From 1817 to 1828 he was professor of Church law, and other branches, at Gottingen; from 1831 to 1833 professor at the University of Berlin. In 1833 he was appointed a member of the supreme state court, and subsequently filled some other high offices in the civil administration. He was regarded as the head of the historical school of German jurists. He died at Berlin July 4, 1854. Besides a number of law books, which still occupy a high rank in that literature, he wrote a work on Church law (Grundsitze des Kirchen; rechts der kathol. u. evangel. Religionsparteien, Getting. 1831-1833). — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 11:470.

## Eichhorn, Paul[[@Headword:Eichhorn, Paul]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Eckau, in Courland, in 1599. He studied theology in Germany, was in 1621 preacher at Grenzhof for the Lettish population, in 1634 German preacher at Mittau, and in 1636 superintendent of Courland. He died at Mittau, August 8, 1655, leaving, Widerlegung der Abgotterei und nichtigen Aberglaubens (Riga, 1627): — Reformatio Gentis Letticae in Ducatu Curlandiae (ibid. 1636): — Historia Lettica (Dorpat, 1649). The duke Jacob of Courland sent him to the conference held at Thorn, where he also signed the Positiones Theologorun Augustance Confessionis, October 25, 1645. See Kallmeyer, in Ueber die religi6sen Vorstellungen der alten Volker in Lett- und Estland (Riga, 1857); Brockhaus, Conversasions lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eichler, Christian Gottlob[[@Headword:Eichler, Christian Gottlob]]

             a Lutheran theologian, who died at Leipsic, March 10, 1785, is the author of Disp. de Mose, Candidato regni AEgyptii (Leipsic, 1733): — De Patientia Jobi (ibid. 1744): — Visio Eliphazi (ibid. 1751). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eichstadt, Heinrich Carl Abraham[[@Headword:Eichstadt, Heinrich Carl Abraham]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Oschatz, August 7, 1771. He was for some time professor of philosophy at Leipsic, but accepted a call to Jena, where he died in 1849. He is the author of Super Flaviano de Jesu Christo Testimonio (Jena, 1841-45): — Flaviani de Jesu Christo Testimonii Αὐθεντία (ibid. 1840-41): — De Dictione Scriptorum Novi Testamenti (ibid. 1843): — Parabola Jesu Christi de OEconomo Improbo (ibid. 1847). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:312; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:3, 107, 254, 562, 573, 575, 804, 861, 894. (B.P.)

## Eider[[@Headword:Eider]]

             or Elmer, a monk of Canterbury (12th century), was elected bishop of St. Andrew's, in Scotland, 1120, which office he did not accept for the following reason: "The question of lay investiture of ecclesiastical benefices was then in its crisis; there was a controversy between Canterbury and York for jurisdiction over the see of St. Andrew's; that see, again, asserted its independence of either of the English metropolitans; and Eider seems to have added to all these perplexities a difficulty as to his monastic allegiance. 'Not for all Scotland,' he said to the Scottish king, 'will I renounce being a monk of Canterbury.' The king, on his side, was equally unyielding; and the issue was the return of Eadmer to his English monastery, unconsecrated indeed, but still claiming to be bishop of St. Andrew's. He was made precentor of Canterbury, and died, it is supposed, in January, 1124" (Chambers, Encyclopedia, s.v.). Eadmer is one of the most important of the early English historians. He wrote a history of the affairs of England of his own time, from 1077 to 1122 (Historia Novorum sive sui saeculi), in which many original papers are inserted, and many important facts, nowhere else to be found, are preserved. This work has been highly commended, both by old and modern writers, as well for its correctness as for regularity of composition and purity of style. The best edition is that by Selden in 1623. Eadmer wrote the life of Anselin (generally found printed with his works), and the lives of Wilfred, Oswald, Dunstan and others, given in the Acta Sanctorum, and in Warton, Anglia Sacra (volume 2). The Vita Anselmi is prefixed to Anselm's works (Benedictine edition; also in Migne's Patrologia). The Historia Novorum and Eadmer's minor writings are given also in Migne, Patrologia Latina, volume 159-347 sq. — Hook, Eccl. Biographical 4:52; Cave, History Literature (Geneva, 1720) 1:574; Collier, Eccl. History of Great Britain (Barham's edit.), 2:183 sq.; Wright, Biographical Brit. Lit., Anglo-Norman Period, p. 82 sq.

## Eigen[[@Headword:Eigen]]

             the first female saint of Wales, was the daughter of Caractacus, and taken to Rome by Claudius to grace his triumph over Britain.

## Eikin[[@Headword:Eikin]]

             in Norse mythology, is one of the rivers flowing around the land of the gods. It is supplied from the dewdrops which fall from the horns of the reindeer Aeykthyrner.

## Eildtum[[@Headword:Eildtum]]

             (εἰλετόν). According to Germanus of Constantinople it represents the linen cloth in which the body of Christ was wrapped when laid in the tomb. The chalice and paten are placed on it when the priest has unfolded it, immediately before the deacon warns the catechumens to depart.

## Eilmar, Georg Ciristian[[@Headword:Eilmar, Georg Ciristian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Milhlhausen, January 6, 1665, and studied at Wittenberg. In 1689 he was called to the pastorate at Graba, near Salfeld; was in 1691 deacon at Langensalza, in 1696 superintendent at Heldrungen, and in 1698 was made doctor of divinity and pastor primarius at his native place, where he died, October 20, 1715. He wrote, De Voalore Interpretationis Vulgatce (Wittenberg, 1687): — De Consensu Orthodoxo de Christo (ibid. 1698), etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eilunny[[@Headword:Eilunny]]

             a Welsh saint in the first half of the 7th century.

## Eimbetha (or Einbetta), Saint[[@Headword:Eimbetha (or Einbetta), Saint]]

             a virgin, commemorated September 16, is said to have been one of the companions of St. Ursula.

## Eimhin (Emir, or Evin)[[@Headword:Eimhin (Emir, or Evin)]]

             an Irish saint, son of Eoghan, and bishop of Ros-glas and Ros-mic-Triuin, A.D. 580, is commemorated December 22.

## Einari (or Einarsen), Gissur[[@Headword:Einari (or Einarsen), Gissur]]

             an Icelandish theologian, lived about the middle of the 16th century. He studied at Hamburg and Wittenberg, where he heard Luther and Melanchthon, and in 1540 was elected bishop in place of Paulson. In 1541 the government granted the ministers the privilege of marriage, of which they had been deprived since 1272, and this innovation occasioned many disputes. During these troubles Einari died. Such was the animosity against him that by order of the bishop, Jon Areson, his body was disinterred and his ashes scattered to the winds. He left a translation of the Proverbs of Solomon in Norwegian (Holar, 1580). See Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Einem, Johann August Christoph von[[@Headword:Einem, Johann August Christoph von]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Osterweddingen, near Magdeburg, November 25, 1730. He studied at Halle, and in 1754 was appointed teacher at a high-school in Berlin. In 1759 he was also appointed preacher at Trinity Church there, and in 1768 accepted a call to the pastorate at Genthin. He died October 24, 1810, leaving, De Pelagianismo ceque ac Fanaticismo ab Ecclesia Jesu Christi Arcendo (Halle, 1762): — Praktische Lebensbeschreibungen verstorbener und nachlebender Geistlichen (Stendal, 1787). His best work, however, is his continuation of Mosheim's Church history. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:535; 2:52. (B.P.)

## Einem, Johann Just von[[@Headword:Einem, Johann Just von]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Gottingen, August 11,1685. In 1712 he was rector at Bergen, in 1728 pastor at Osterweddingen, near Magdeburg, and died in 1744. He wrote, Anweisung zum Studiren aus Lutheri Schriften gezeigt (Magdeburg, 1727): —  Anweisung zur Hermeneutik aus Lutheri Schriften (ibid. eod.): — Melanchthoniana (Helmstadt, 1730): — Introductio in Bibliothecam Graecam J.A. Fabricii (Magdeburg, 1733): — Introductio in ejusden Bibliothecam Latinam (ibid. 1734). See Mosers, Jetztlebende Theologen; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Einhard[[@Headword:Einhard]]

             SEE EGINHARD.

## Einhard (or Eynardus), Saint[[@Headword:Einhard (or Eynardus), Saint]]

             a solitary of Altona, in Westphalia, is commemorated March 25.

## Einhorn, David[[@Headword:Einhorn, David]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born at Dispeck, in Bavaria, Nov. 10, 1809. He attended the rabbinical school at Firth, and the universities of Erlangen, Winrzburg, and Munich. At the latter place he took his degree as doctor of philosophy in 1834. His first charge was at Hopstadten, and while officiating there he attended the second conference of Reform Jews at Frankfort-on-the-Main, in 1845. A little later he succeeded Holdheim (q.v.) as chief rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. In 1851 he was called to Pesth by the Reformed congregation, where he advocated extreme measures for those days; his liberalism aroused the dissatisfaction of the government, and his temple was closed. In 1855 he landed at Baltimore, and was appointed rabbi of the Har Sinai congregation there. His known opposition to slavery aroused the ire of the Baltimoreans, in the days of '61, and he was called to Philadelphia by the Reform congregation. In 1866 he went to New York to take charge of the temple "Adas Jeshurun," which in 1873 was consolidated with the "Anshe Chesed," under the name of "Beth El." On July 12, 1879, he retired from his office, and died November 2 of that year. He published, Das Prinzip des Mosaismus, etc. (Leipsic, 1854): — Olath Tamid (Baltimore, 1856). After his death two volumes of Sermons were published. See Morais, Eminent Israelites of the 19th Century (Philadelphia, 1880). (B.P.)

## Einsiedel, Georg Hanbold[[@Headword:Einsiedel, Georg Hanbold]]

             a German divine and statesman, was born in 1521. He studied theology, and was one of the zealous hearers of Luther, Melanchthon, and Scharf, defending the Reformation with his word and with the sword in the war of Schmalkalden. He was counsellor of the princes Moritz and August der Starke, of Saxony, from 1576 to 1586. Einsiedel died in 1592. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Einsiedeln[[@Headword:Einsiedeln]]

              (Maria-Einsiedeln, Deiparae Virginis Eremus, Notre Dame des Ermites), a Benedictine monastery in Switzerland, founded in the 9th century by Meinrad of Soleure, who was murdered by robbers A.D. 861. In 934, Eberhard, provost of the cathedral of Strasburg, built a monastery and church here, which the emperor Otto, in 946, endowed with the free right of election. The convent was to be consecrated September 14, 948, by the bishop of Constanz, but the latter claimed to have heard the preceding night the song of angels, and to have seen Christ himself, attended by angels, saying mass and consecrating the chapel; and when, the next morning, he prepared to perform the act of consecration, he was admonished by a voice saying, "Hold on, brother, God himself has dedicated the chapel." The story was believed, and on the sole strength of it the annual pilgrimage to Einsiedeln on September 14, to commemorate the "Angelic Consecration" (Engel-Weihe), 'became, and still is, one of the most famous pilgrimages in the Church of Rome. The popes granted full absolution to all who went in pilgrimage to the church. The congregation consisted mostly of scions of noble families, and the convent steadily increased in power and riches. A new church was built in the beginning of the last century on the model of the Lateran Church, and contains Meinrad's cell and the image of the Virgin. In the time of the Reformation most of the monks left the convent, but it was subsequently reorganized by Ludwig Blarer, a Benedictine monk of St. Gall. In 1710, 260,000 are said to have visited Einsiedeln, and in 1851 the number was over 200,000. The vendors of blessed images, medals, etc., do a thriving business there, and at a large profit. There are at Einsiedeln confessionals for the people of different nations and languages, each bearing an inscription by which it is recognised. In 1867 the convent had 75 priests, and 6 clerical and 17 lay brothers. The "Stiftsschule" ("Gymnasium" and Lyceum) numbered about 200 pupils. Until 1852 the convent had a second "gymnasium” in Bellizona, in the canton of Tessin, but in that year it was suppressed by the Liberal government of the canton. See Placidus, Documenta archivii Eiusidlensis (3 volumes, folio); Annales Heremi Deipares matris (Frib. Brisg. 1612, fol.); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:742; Landolt, Ursprung u. erste Gestaltung des Klosters Einsiedela (Eirisied. 1845); Brandes, Der heil. Meinrad u. die Wallfahrt von Elnsiedln (Einsiedeln, 1861).

## Eirenica[[@Headword:Eirenica]]

             (εἰρηνικά).

(1) The name given to the earlier clauses of the great litany in the Greek liturgies, as being prayers for peace.

(2) SEE PACIFICAE.

## Eisenlohr, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Eisenlohr, Johann Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 3, 1656, at Reutlingen. He studied at Tubingen and Wittenberg, and was pastor and superintendent at his native city from 1680 to 1702. In the latter year he was called to Durlach,.where he died, June 14, 1736. He wrote, De Scientia Dei Media: De Gratia Dei Praeveniente: — Philologemata Sacra in Varia Sacrae Scripturae Loca: — De Theologia in Genere: — De Principio Theologiae Cognoscendi: — De Theologies Objecto, seu de Christiana Religione. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eisenmenger, Johann Andreas[[@Headword:Eisenmenger, Johann Andreas]]

             a German Orientalist, was born at Mannheim in 1654, and studied at the University of Heidelberg, in which, after a journey to England and Holland, he became in 1700 professor of Oriental languages. He died in 1704. His principal work is entitled Entdecktes Judenthum (Frnkf. 1700). The Jews opposed its publication by all means in their power, and even obtained an imperial edict against it. At the time of his death nearly the whole edition of tie work still lay under arrest. The Jews shortly before offered him 12,000 florins for the surrender of all the copies, but he asked 30,000. Friedrich I of Prussia appealed, in behalf of the heirs of Eisenmenger, to the emperors Leopold and Joseph for permission to publish the book, and, when this led to no result, had the book reprinted and published at his own expense (Konigsberg, 1711). Subsequently the Frankfort edition was also permitted to see the light. Eisenmenger also compiled a Lexicon Orientale harmonicum, which has never been printed, and he published, conjointly with Leusden (q.v.), in 1694, an edition (without points) of the Hebrews Bible.-Herzog, Real-Encykl. 3:744; Hoefer, Biog. Genesis 15:776; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 12:311; Jost, Gesch. der Juden. volume 8. (J.H.W.)

## Eisenschmid, Leonhard Martin[[@Headword:Eisenschmid, Leonhard Martin]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Ingolstadt, November 5, 1797, of Roman Catholic parentage. In 1818 he was professor at Neuburg, in 1822 at Munich, and in 1824 at the Aschaffenburg gymnasium. In 1828 he joined the Evangelical Church, was made rector of the gymnasium at Schweinfurt, and died May 27, 1836. He wrote, Unterschied der romisch- katholischen und der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche (Leipsic, 1828): — Das romisch-kathalische Messbuch (Neustadt, 1829): — Ueber die Versuche neuerer Zeit, etc. (ibid. eod.): — Die Gebrauche und Segnungen der romisch-katholischen Kirche (ibid. 1830): — Ueber die Unfehlbarkeit des ersten allgemeinen Concils zu Nicaa (ibid. eod.): —Ueber die Unfehlbarkeit der allgemeinen Concilien der Katholischen Kirche (ibid. 1831). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:315; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:346, 626, 664, 695. (B.P.)

## Eisenstadt, Mei Ben-Isaac[[@Headword:Eisenstadt, Mei Ben-Isaac]]

             a famous Talmudist, was born in Lithuania in 1670. He was rabbi at Eisenstadt, Hungary, and died there in 1744, leaving novellas on some Talmudic treatises, and homilies on the Pentateuch and the five Megilloth  (i.e., Esther, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Ruth, and Ecclesiastes). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:227; Zipser, in Literatur Blatt des Orient, 1847, 12:24. (B.P.)

## Eisiteria[[@Headword:Eisiteria]]

             sacrifices which the senate at Athens were accustomed to offer to Zeus and Athena before they commenced the public deliberations of each session. Libations were offered, and a festival was held.

## Eisler, Tobias[[@Headword:Eisler, Tobias]]

             a German theologian, was born at Nuremberg, April 2, 1683. He received a careful education; studied law at Altorf and at Halle, was appointed secretary to the duchess of Saxe-Eisenach, afterwards returned to Nuremberg, and abandoned the law to devote himself to the education of the poor. At Helmstaidt he founded a school for poor boys, and another for girls. Eisler was strongly pietistic. He died at Helmstadt, October 8, 1753. For the chief among his numerous works see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Eithne (or Ethnea)[[@Headword:Eithne (or Ethnea)]]

             the name of several Irish saints.

(1) Daughter of Bait, of the barony of Nethercross, County Dublin, in the 7th century, is commemorated March 29.

(2) Daughter of king Laeghaire, A.D. 432, commemorated January 11 and February 26.

(3) Virgin, daughter of Cormac or of Marcius, in the 6th century, commemorated July 6.

## Eitzen, Paul De[[@Headword:Eitzen, Paul De]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hamburg, January 25, 1522. He studied at Wittenberg, under Luther and Melanchthon, in 1544 became rector at Coin, in Brandenburg, in 1555 superintendent at 'his native place, in 1562 first courtpreacher at Schleswig, and in 1576 professor at the gymnasium there. He refused to sign the Formula Concordie, which caused him much trouble. In 1593 he resigned his offices, and died February 25, 1598. His writings are mentioned in Jocher,  Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; see also Greve, Memoria Pauli ab Eitzen Instaurata (Hamburg, 1744). (B.P.)

## Ekdach[[@Headword:Ekdach]]

             SEE CARBUNCLE.

## Eker[[@Headword:Eker]]

              (Hebrews id. reqoi, a plant rooted up and transplanted, e.g. metaph. a resident foreigner, Lev 25:47), the youngest of the three sons of Ram, the grandson of Hezron (1Ch 2:27; Sept. 'ΑΚχοπ, Vulg. Achar). B.C. post 1856.

## Ekkehard[[@Headword:Ekkehard]]

             the name of several learned monks of St. Gall. The first of the name, about the middle of the 10th century, was the director of the convent school, and subsequently dean of the convent. He laid the foundation of the literary celebrity of St. Gall, wrote several ecclesiastical hymns, and is honorably mentioned in the history of German literature. Another Ekkehard, a nephew of the former, was also a director of the convent school, and subsequently a chaplain of emperor Otto II. He also composed ecclesiastical hymns, and is supposed to have been familiar with stenography. He died April 23, 990. A third Ekkehard, born about 980, was a pupil of Notker Labeo, and became distinguished for his knowledge of Latin, Greek, German, mathematics, astronomy, and music. Aribo, archbishop of Mentz, appointed him superior of the cathedral school of that city. He continued the Annals of St. Gall, which a monk by the name of Ratpertus had begun and carried to the year 883. This work, Casus Monasterii Sancti Galli (printed in Monumenta Germaniae histor. Scriptor. 2:74-163) is of great importance for the Church history of the 10th century. Ekkehard also compiled a collection of ecclesiastical hymns, under the title Liber Benedictionum. He wrote a poem, De ornatu dictionis, and translated a life of St. Gall, in German verses by Ratpertus, into Latin. He died in 1036. A fourth Ekkehard, who lived at the beginning of the 12th century, wrote a Vita Sancti Notkeri. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 3:745. (A.J.S.)

## Ekrebel[[@Headword:Ekrebel]]

              (Ε᾿κρεβήλ; Pesh. Ecrabat; Vulg. omits), a place named in Jdt 7:18 only, as "near to Chusi, which is on the brook Mochmur," apparently somewhere in the hill country to the south-east of the Plain of Esdraelon and of Dothain. The Syriac reading of the word points to the place Acrabbein, mentioned Ly Eusebius in the Onomasticon as the capital of a district called Acrabatine, and still standing as Akrabah, about six miles south-east of Nablus (Shechem), in the Wady Makfuriyeh, on the road to the Jordan valley (Van de Velde, 2:304, and Map). Though frequently mentioned by Josephus (War, 2:20, 4; 3:3, 5, etc.), neither the place nor the district are named in the Bible, and they must not be confounded with those of the same name in the south of Judah. SEE AKRABBIM; SEE ARABATTINE; SEE MAALEH-ACRABBIM.

## Ekron[[@Headword:Ekron]]

              (Hebrews Ekron', עֶקְרוֹן, eradication, comp. Zep 2:4, which apparently contains a play upon the word; Sept. [usually] and Josephus Α᾿κκαρών, Vulg. Accaron), one of the five towns belonging to the lords of the Philistines, and the most northerly of the five (Jos 13:3). Like the other Philistine cities, its situation was in the maritime plain. In the general distribution of territory (unconquered as well as conquered) Ekron was assigned to Judah, as being upon its border (Jos 13:3), between Bethshemesh and Jabneel (Jos 15:11; Jos 15:45), but apparently was afterwards given to Dan, although conquered by Judah (Jos 15:11; Jos 15:45; Jos 19:43; Jdg 1:18; comp. Josephus, Ant. 5:1, 22; 5:2, 4). But it mattered little to which tribe it nominally belonged, for before the monarchy it was again in full possession of the Philistines (1Sa 5:10). In Scripture Ekron is chiefly remarkable from the ark having been sent home from thence, upon a new cart draw n by two much kine (1Sa 5:10; 1Sa 6:1-8). Ekron was the last place to which the ark was carried before its return to Israel, and the mortality there in consequence seems to have been greater than at either Ashdod or Gath. (The Sept. in both MSS., and Josephus [Ant. 6:1, 1], substitute Ascalon for Ekron throughout this passage [1Sa 5:10-12]. In support of this it should be remarked that, according to the Hebrew text, the golden trespass-offerings were given for Ashkelon, though it is omitted from the detailed narrative of the journeyings of the ark. There are other important differences between the Sept. and Hebrew texts of this transaction. See especially v. 60) From Ekron to Bethshemesh (q.v.) was a straight highway (Thomson, Land and Book, 2:309). After David's victory over Goliath, the Philistines were pursued as far as this place (1Sa 17:52). Henceforward Ekron appears to have remained uninterruptedly in the hands of the Philistines (1Sa 17:52; 2Ki 1:2; 2Ki 1:16; Jer 25:20). Except the casual mention of a noted sanctuary of Baalzebub (q.v.) existing there (2Ki 1:2-3; 2Ki 1:6; 2Ki 1:16), there is nothing to distinguish Ekron from any other town of this district. In later days it is merely named with the other cities of the Philistines in the denunciations of the prophets against that people (Jer 25:20; Amo 1:8; Zep 2:4; Zec 9:5). The name occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.) of the Assyrian monuments. In the Apocropha it appears as Accaron (Α᾿κκαρών, 1Ma 10:89, only), bestowed with its borders (τὰ ὅρια αὐτῆς) by Alexander Balas on Jonathan Maccabaeus as a reward for his services. Eusebius and Jerome describe it (Onomast. s.v. ] Ακκαρών, Accaron) as a large village of the Jews, between Azotus and Jamnia towards the east, or eastward of a line drawn between these two places., The same name Accaron occurs incidentally in the histories of the Crusades (Gesta Dei per Francos, page 404). The site of Ekron has lately been recognized by Dr. Robinson (Bib. Researcher, 3:24) in that of 'Akir, in a situation corresponding to all that we know of Ekron. The radical letters of the Arabic name are the same as those of the Hebrew, and both the Christians and Moslems of the neighborhood regard the site as that of the ancient Ekron. It is a considerable Moslem village, about five miles southwest of Ramleh, and three due east of Yebna, on the northern side of the important valley Wady Surar. It is built of unburnt bricks, and, as there are no apparent ruins, the ancient town was probably of the same materials. It is alleged, however, that cisterns and the stones of hand-mills are often found at Akir and in the adjacent fields. The plain south is rich, but immediately round the village it has a dreary, forsaken appearance (hence perhaps the name = “wasteness"), only relieved by a few scattered stunted trees (Porter, Handb. page 275; and see Van de Velde, 2:169).

## Ekron (2)[[@Headword:Ekron (2)]]

             The latest description of this important place is by Lieut. Conder (Tent Work in Palestine, 2:174):

"North-east of Makkedah, Ekron still stands, on low rising ground — a mud hamlet, with gardens fenced with prickly pears. There is nothing ancient here, any more than at Ashdod or Jamnia; but one point may be mentioned which is of some interest, Ekron means 'barren,' yet the town stood in the rich Philistine plain. The reason is, that north of the Sorek valley there is a Tong, sandy swell reaching to the sea-coast — an uncultivated district, now called Deiran, the Arabic name being equivalent to Its old title, Daroma; Ekron stands close to this dry, barren spur, and above the fertile corn-lands in the valley."

## Ekronite[[@Headword:Ekronite]]

              (Hebrews Ekroni', עֶקְרוֹנַי, Jos 13:3, Sept. Α᾿κκαρωνίτης, Vulg. Accaronite; plur. עֶקְרונַים. 1Sa 5:10, Α᾿σκαλωνίται, Accaronitae), a native of the Philistine town EIRON (q.v.).

## El-[[@Headword:El-]]

              (אֵל, mighty, hence God, either Jehovah or a false deity; sometimes a hero or magistrate, SEE GOD, ) occurs as a prefix (and also as a suffix) to several Hebrews names, e.g. EL-BETH-EL; EL-EL-OHI-ISRA-EL, all of which see in their place. SEE ELI-.

## El-Bethel[[@Headword:El-Bethel]]

             (Hebrews El Beyth-El, אֵל בֵּית9אֵל, God of Bethel; Sept. simply שעאבּ»ל, Vulg. Domus Dei), the name given by Jacob to the altar erected by him as a sanctuary (Gen 35:7), on the spot where he had formerly  experienced the vision of the mystic ladder (chap. Gen 31:13; Gen 28:18). SEE BETHEL.

## El-elohe-Israel[[@Headword:El-elohe-Israel]]

             (Hebrew El Elohey' Yisral', אֵל אלֵהֵי יַשְׂרָאֵל Mighty One, God of Israel; Sept. ὁ θεὸς Ισραήλ; Vulg. Fortissimus Deus Israel), the name bestowed by Jacob on the altar which he erected facing the city of Shechem, in the piece of cultivated land upon which he had pitched his tent, and which he afterwards purchased from the Bene-Hamor (Gen 33:20). This compound term designates God as the being who can do whatever seems good to him, and who, in the recent experience of Jacob, had peculiarly manifested his power in overcoming the deep-rooted enmity of Esau, and thereby averting the most alarming evil which Jacob had ever been called to encounter. SEE JACOB.

## Ela[[@Headword:Ela]]

              (᾿Ηλά, Vulg. Jolaman), one of the heads of clans (or places) whose "sons" had taken foreign wives after the Babylonian exile (1Es 9:27); evidently the ELAM SEE ELAM (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:26). SEE ELAH.

## Eladah[[@Headword:Eladah]]

              (Hebrews Eladah', אֶלַעָדָה, whom God has put on, i.e., fills with himself; Sept. Ε᾿λαδά v.r. Ε᾿λεαδά, Vulg. Elada), one of the sons (rather than grandson or later descendant, as the text seems to state) of Ephraim (1Ch 7:20), perhaps the same as ELEAD SEE ELEAD (q.v.) of 1Ch 7:21, since several of the names [SEE TAHATH] in the list appear to be repeated (compare Num 26:36, where the only corresponding name is ERAN). SEE BERIAH.

## Eladius (or Heladius), Saint[[@Headword:Eladius (or Heladius), Saint]]

             fourth bishop of Auxerre, cir. A.D. 387, is commemorated May 8.

## Elaeth[[@Headword:Elaeth]]

             (surnamed "the king"), a Welsh bard and saint of the 6th or 7th century, is commemorated November 10.

## Elah[[@Headword:Elah]]

              (Hebrews Elah', אֵלָה, terebinth or oak [q.v.]), the name of a place, and also of five men.

1. The VALLEY OF ELAH- (עֵמֵק הָאֵלָה, vale of the terebinth or oak; Sept. ἡ κοιλὰς ᾿Ηλά, but translates ἡ κοιλὰς τῆς δρυός in 1Sa 17:2; 1Sa 17:19; Vulg. likewise vallis terebinthi), a valley in (not "by," as the A.V. has it) which the Israelites were encamped against the Philistines when David killed Goliath (1Sa 17:2; 1Sa 17:19; 1Sa 21:9). It lay somewhere near Shocoh of Judah, and Azekah, and was nearer Ekron than any other Philistine town (1Sa 17:1-58). Shocoh has been with great probability identified with Shuweikeh, near Beit Netif, some 14 miles S.W. of Jerusalem, on the road to Beit Jibrin and Gaza, among the more western of the hills of Judah, not far from where they begin to descend into the great Philistine plain. The village stands on the south slopes of the wady es-Sumt, or valley of the acacia, which runs off in a N.W. direction across the plain to the sea just above Ashdod. Above Shuweikeh it branches into two other wadys. Large, though inferior in size to itself, and the junction of the three forms a considerable open space of not less than a mile wide cultivated in fields of grain. In the center is a wide torrent bed thickly strewed with round pebbles, and bordered by the acacia bushes from which the valley derives its present name. There seems to le no reason to doubt that this is the Valley of the Terebinth. It has changed its name, and is now called after another kind of tree (the sumt, or acacia), but the terebinth (butm) appears to be plentiful in the neighborhood, and one of the largest specimens in Palestine still stands in the immediate neighborhood of the spot, in wady Sur, the southernmost of the branch wadys. Four miles E. of Shuweikeh, along wady Musur, the other branch, is the khan and ruined site Akbeh, which van de Velde proposes to identify with Azekah. These identifications are confirmed by that of Ephesdammim (q.v.), the site of the Philistine camp. Ekron is 17 miles, and Bethlehem 12 miles distant from Shocoh. (For the valley, see Robinson, Researches, 2:350; Van de Velde, Narrative, 2:191; Porter, Handbook, pages 249, 250, 280; Schwarz, Palest. page 77.)

There is a point in the topographical indications of 1Sa 17:1-58 which it is very desirable should be carefully examined on the spot. The Philistines were between Shocoh and Azekah, at Ephesdammim, or Pasdammim, on the mountain on the S. side of the wady, while the Israelites were in the "valley" (qemoi) of the terebinth, or, rather, on the mountain on the N. side, and "the ravine" or "the glen" (הִגִּיְאְ) was between the two armies (1Sa 17:2-3). Again (1Sa 17:52), the Israelites pursued the Philistines "till you come to 'the ravine'" (the same word). There is evidently a marked difference between the "valley" and the "ravine," and a little attention on the spot might do much towards elucidating this, and settling the identification of the place. In the above location, the distance between the armies was about a mile, and the vale beneath is flat and rich. The ridges rise on each side to the height of about 500 feet, and have a uniform slope, so that the armies ranged along them could see the combat in the vale. The Philistines, when defeated, fled down the valley towards Gath and Ekron.

The traditional "Valley of the Terebinth" is the wady Beit-Hanina, which lies about 4 miles to the N.W. of Jerusalem, and is crossed by the road to Nebi Samwil. The scene of David's conflict is pointed out a little N. of the "Tombs of the Judges," and close to the traces of the old paved road. In this valley olive trees and carob-trees now prevail, and terebinth-trees are few; but the brook is still indicated whence the youthful champion selected the "smooth stones'"' wherewith he smote the Philistine. The brook is dry in summer, but in winter it becomes a mighty torrent, which inundates the vale (Kitto, Pictorial Palestine, page 121). But this spot is in the tribe of Benjamin, and otherwise does not correspond with the narrative of the text (see Thenius, Sachs exeg. Stud. 2:151).

2. (Sept. ῾Ηλάς, but ᾿Ηλάς in Chron.; Vulg. Ella.) One of the Edomitish "dukes" or chieftains in Mount Seir (Gen 36:41; 1Ch 1:52), B.C. post 1963. By Knobel (Comment. zu Genesis in loc.) he is connected with Elath (q.v.) on the Red Sea.

3. (Sept. Α᾿δά v.r. Α᾿λά.) The middle one of the three sons of Caleb the son of Jephunneh (1Ch 4:15), B.C. 1618. In that passage his sons are called Kenaz or Uknaz, but the words may be taken as if Kenaz was, with Elah, a son of Caleb. It is a singular coincidence that the names of both Elah and Kenaz also appear among the Edomitish "dukes."

4. (Properly ELA, Hebrews Ela', אֵלָא; Sept. ᾿Ηλά.) The father of Shimei ben-Ela, Solomon's commissariat officer in Benjamin (1Ki 4:18), B.C. 1013.

5. (Sept. ᾿Ηλά, Josephus ῎Ηλανος, Vulg. Ela.) The son and successor of Baasha, king of Israel (1Ki 16:8-10); his reign lasted for little more than a year (compare 1Ki 16:8 with 10), B.C. 928-7. He was killed while drunk by Zimri, in the house of his steward Arza, who was probably a confederate in the plot. This occurred, according to Josephus (Ant. 8:12, 4),while his army and officers were absent at the siege of Gibbethon. He was the last king of Baasha's line, and by this catastrophe the predictions of the prophet Jehu were accomplished (1Ki 16:6-7; 1Ki 16:11-14).

6. (Sept. ᾿Ηλά.) The father of Hoshea, last king of Israel (2Ki 15:30; 2Ki 17:1), B.C. 729, or ante.

7. (Sept. ᾿Ηλά v.r. ᾿Ηλώ, Vulg. Ela.) The son of Uzzi, and one of the Benjamite heads of families who were taken into captivity (1Ch 9:8), or rather, perhaps, returned from it. B.C. 516.

## Elah (2)[[@Headword:Elah (2)]]

             SEE OAK; SEE TEREBINTH.

## Elah (3)[[@Headword:Elah (3)]]

             We extract some interesting details concerning this noted valley from the latest description, that of Lieut. Conder (Tent Work in Palestine, 2:187,190): "The Great Valley of Elah (Wady es-Sunt) is the highway from Philistia to Hebron; it has its head not far froml Terkumieh, and runs down northwards, past Keilah and Hareth, dividing the low hills of the Shephelah from the rocky mountains of Judah; eight miles from the valley-head stands Shochoh, and Wady es-Sunt is here a quarter of a mile across; just north of this ruin it turns round westward. and so runs, growing leeper and deeper, between the rocky hills covered with brushwood, becoming an open vale of  rich corn-land, flanked by ancient fortresses, and finally debouching at the cliff of Tell esSafieh. About two and a half miles south of the great angle near Shochoh there is a very large and ancient terebipth, one of the few old trees of the species along the course of the valley, which took its Hebrew name of Elah from them. This terebinth is towards the west side of the vale, just where a small tributary ravine joins Wfidy es-Sunt; and near it are two ancient wells, not unlike those at Beersheba, with stone water-troughs Tound them; south of the ravine is a high, rounded hill, almost isolated by valleys, and covered with ruins, a natural fortress, not unlike the well- known Tells which occur lower down the Valley of Elah."

"Two points require to be made clear as to the episode of David's, battle with Goliath; one is the meaning of the expression, Gai or 'ravine', the other is the source whence David took the 'smooth stones.' A visit to the spot explains both. In the middle of the broad, open valley we found a deep trench. with vertical sides, inpassable except at certailn places — a valley in a valley, and a natural barrier between the two hosts; the sides and bed of this trench are strewn with rounded and water-worn pebbles, which would have been well fitted for David's sling. Here, then, we may picture to ourselves the two hosts, covering the low, rocky hills opposite to each other, and half hidden among the lentisk bushes; between them was the rich expanse of ripening barley and the red banks of the torrent, with its white, shingly bed; behind all were the distant blue hill-walls of Judah, whence Saul had just come down. The mail-clad champion advanced from the west, through the low corn, with his mighty lance perhaps tufted with feathers, his brazen helmet shining in the sun; from the east, a ruddy boy, in his white shirt and sandals, armed with a goat's-hair sling, came down to the brook, and, according to the poetic fancy of the rabbis, the pebbles were given voices, and cried: 'By us shalt thou overcome the giant.' The champion fell from an unseen cause, and the wild Philistines fled to the mouth of the valley, where Gath stood towering on its white chalk-cliff, a frontier fortress, the key to the high-road leading to the corn-lands of Judah, and to the vineyards of Hebron." (See cut on next page.)

## Elair[[@Headword:Elair]]

             (Lat. Helarius), an Irish saint, anchorite, and scribe of Loch-Crea, died A.D. 807, and is commemorated September 7.

## Elais[[@Headword:Elais]]

              (Ε᾿λαϊvς), a Phoenician city mentioned by Dionysius (Perieg. 910) and other ancient authors as lying between Joppa and Gaza, but apparently merely an appellative (see Reland, Palaest. page 747) for some place noted for olives (ἐλαία), which abound in that entire region.

## Elam[[@Headword:Elam]]

              (Hebrews Eylam', עֵילָם, corresponding to the Pehlvi Airjama [see Gesenius, Thesaur. page 1016]), the name of a man and of the region settled by his posterity, also of several Hebrews, especially about the time of the Babylonian captivity.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λάμ; Josephus ῎Ελαμος, Ant. 1:6, 4; Vulg. AElam.) Originally, like Aram, the name of a man — the son of Shem (Gen 10:22; 1Ch 1:17). B.C. post 2514. Commonly, however, it is used as the appellation of a country (Gen 14:1; Gen 14:9; Isa 11:11; Isa 21:2; Jer 25:25; Jer 49:34-39; Eze 32:24; Dan 8:2). In Gen 14:1, it is introduced along with the kingdom of Shinar in Babylon, and in Isa 21:2, and Jer 25:25, it is connected with Media. In Ezr 4:9, the Elamites are described among the nations of the Persian empire; and in Dan 8:2, Susa is said to lie on the river Ulai (Eulaeus or Choaspes), in the province of Elam. This river was the modern Karun (Layard, Nineveh and Bab. page 146), and the capital of Elam was Shushan (q.v.), one of the most powerful and magnificent cities of the primeval world. The name Elam occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.) found on the bulls in Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh. The country was also called Nuvaki, as we learn from the monuments of Khorsabad and Besutun (Layard, Nin. and Bab. page 452).

The Elam of Scripture appears to be the province lying south of Assyria and east of Persia Proper, to which Herodotus gives the name of Cissia (3:91; v. 8:49, etc.), and which is in part termed Susis or Susiana by the geographers (Strab. 15:3, § 12; Ptolem. 6:3, etc.). It includes a portion of the mountainous country separating between the Mesopotamian plain and the high table-land of Iran, together with a fertile and valuable low tract at the foot of the range, between it and the Tigris. The passage of Daniel (8:2) which places Shushan (Susa) in "the province of Elam," may be regarded as decisive of this identification, which is further confirmed by the frequent mention of Elymseans in this district (Strab. 11:13, § 6; 16:1, § 17; Ptolem. 6:3; Plin. H.N. 6:26, etc.), as well as by the combinations in which Elam is found in Scripture (see Gen 14:1; Isa 21:2; Eze 32:24). It appears from Gen 10:22, that this country was originally peopled by descendants of Shem, closely allied to the Aramaeans (Syrians) and the Assyrians; and from Gen 14:1-12, it is evident that by the time of Abraham a very important power had been built up in the same region. Not only is "Chedorlaomer, king of Elam," at the head of a settled government, and able to make war at a distance of two thousand miles from his own country, but he manifestly exercises a supremacy over a number of other kings, among whom we even find Amraphel, king of Shinar, or Babylonia. It is plain, then, that at this early time the predominant power in Lower Mesopotamia was Elam, which for a while held the place possessed earlier by Babylon (Gen 10:10), and later by either Babylon or Assyria. Discoveries made in the country itself confirm this view. They exhibit to us Susa, the Elamitic capital, as one of the most ancient cities of the East, and show that its monarchs maintained, throughout almost the whole period of Babylonian and Assyrian greatness, a quasi-independent position. Traces are even thought to have been found of Chedorlaomer himself, whom some are inclined to identify with an early Babylonian monarch, who is called the "Ravager of the West," and whose name reads as Kudur-mapula. The Elamitic empire established at this time was, however, but of short duration. Babylon and Assyria proved, on the whole, stronger powers, and Elam during the period of their greatness can only be regarded as the foremost of their feudatories. Like the other subject nations she retained her own monarchs, and from time to time, for a longer or a shorter space, asserted and maintained her independence. But generally she was content to acknowledge one or other of the two leading powers as her suzerain.

Towards the close of the Assyrian period she is found allied with Babylon, and engaged in hostilities with Assyria; but she seems to have declined in strength after the Assyrian empire was destroyed, and the Median and Macedonian arose upon its ruins. Elam is clearly a "province" of Babylonia in Belshazzar's time (Dan 8:2), and we may presume that it had been subject to Babylon at least from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. The desolation which Jer 49:30-34 and Eze 32:24-25 foresaw was probably this conquest, which destroyed the last semblance of Elamitic independence. It is uncertain at what time the Persians added Elam to their empire. Possibly it only fell under their dominion together with Babylon; but there is some reason to think that it may have revolted and joined the Persians before the city was besieged. The prophet Isaiah in two places (Isa 21:2; Isa 22:6) seems to speak of Elam as taking part in the destruction of Babylon; and, unless we are to regard him with our translators as using the word loosely for Persia, we must suppose that, on the advance of Cyrus and his investment of the Chaldaean capital, Elam made common cause with the assailants. She now became merged in the Persian empire, forming a distinct satrapy (Herod. 3:91), and furnishing to the crown an annual tribute of 300 talents. Susa, her capital, was made the ordinary residence of the court, and the metropolis of the whole empire. This mark of favor did not, however, prevent revolts. Not only was the Magian revolution organized and carried out at Susa, but there seem to have been at least two Elamitic revolts in the early part of the reign of Darius Hystaspis (Behistun Inscr. Col 1:1-29, part 16, and Col 2:1-23, part 3). After these futile efforts, Elam acquiesced in her subjection, and, as a Persian province, followed the fortunes of the empire. These historic facts illustrate the prophecy of Jer 49:35-39, "And upon Elam will I bring the four winds from the four quarters of heaven, and I will scatter them towards all these winds." The situation of the country exposed it to the invasions of Assyrians, Medes, and Babylonians; and it suffered from each in succession before it was finally embodied in the Persian empire. Then another part of the prophecy was also singularly fulfilled: "I will set my throne in Elam, and I will destroy from thence the king and princes." The present state of the Persian empire, in which Elam is included, may be a fulfillment of the concluding words of the passage: "But it shall come to pass in the latter days that I will bring again the captivity of Elam" (Vaux, Nineveh and Persepolis, page 85 sq.). SEE PERSIA.

Herodotus gives the name Cissia to the province of; which Susa was the capital (3:91); Strabo distinguishes between Susiana and the country of the Elymamans. The latter he extends northwards among the Zagros mountains (11:361; 15:503; 16:507). Pliny says Susiana is separated from Elymais by the River Eulaeus, and that the latter province extends from that river to the confines of Persia (Hist. Nat. 6:27). Ptolemy locates Elymais on the coast of the Persian Gulf, and regards it as part only of Susiana (Georgr. 6:3). According, to Josephus, the Elymaeans were the progenitors of the Persians (Ant. 1:6, 4); and Strabo refers to some of their scattered tribes as far north as the Caspian Sea. From these various notices, and from the incidental allusions in Scripture, we may conclude that there was a little province on the east of the Lower Tigris called Elymais; but that the Elymaeans, as a people, were anciently spread over and ruled a much wider district, to which their name was often attached. They were a warlike people, trained to arms, and especially skilled in the use of the bow (Isa 21:2; Jer 49:35); they roamed abroad like the Bedawin, and like them, too, were addicted to plunder (Strabo, 11:361). Josephus mentions a town called Elymais, which contained a famous temple dedicated to Diana, and rich in gifts and votive offerings (Ant. 22:9, 1); Appian says it was dedicated to Venus (Bochart, Opp. 1:70 sq.). Antiochus Epiphanes attempted to plunder it, but was repulsed (1Ma 6:1-63). It is a remarkable fact that little images of the goddess, whose Assyrian name was Anaitis, were discovered by Loftus in the mounds of Susa (Chaldea, page 379). The Elamites who were in Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost were probably descendants of the captive tribes who had settled in Elam (Act 2:9).

It has been repeatedly observed above that Elam is called Cissia by Herodotus, and Susiana by the Greek and Roman geographers. The latter is a term formed artificially from the capital city, but the former is a genuine territorial title, and probably marks an important fact in the history of the country. The Elamites, a Shemitic people, who were the primitive inhabitants (Gen 10:22), appear to have been invaded and conquered at a very early time by a Hamitic or Cushite race from Babylon, which was the ruling element in the territory from a date anterior to Chedorlaomer. These Cushites were called by the Greeks Cissians (Κίσσεοι) or Cossaeans (Κοσσαῖοι), and formed the dominant race, while the Elamites or Elymseans were in a depressed condition. In Scripture the country is called by its primitive title without reference to subsequent changes; in the Greek writers it takes its name from the conquerors. The Greek traditions of Memnon and his Ethiopians are based upon this Cushite conquest, and rightly connect the Cissians or Cossaeans of Susiana with the Cushite inhabitants of the upper valley of the Nile.

The fullest account of Elam, its physical geography, ruins, and history, is given in Loftus's Chaldaea and Susiana (London 1856; N.Y. 1857). The southern part of the country is flat, and towards the shore of the gulf marshy and desolate. In the north the mountain ranges of Backhtiari and Luristan rise gradually from the plain in a series of calcareous terraces, intersected by ravines of singular wildness and grandeur. Among these mountains are the sources of the Ulai (Loftus, page 308, 347 sq.). The chief towns of Elymais are now Shuster ("little Shush") and Dizful; but the greater part of the country is overrun by nomad Arabs. SEE ELAMIT.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ενουηλωλάμ v.r. Ι᾿ωλάμ, also ᾿Ωλάμ and Αἰλάμ; Vulg. Elnam.) A Korhite Levite, fifth son of Meshelemiah, one of the Bene- Asaph, and superintendent of the fifth division of Temple wardens in the time of king David (1Ch 26:3), B.C. 1014.

3. (Sept. Α᾿ηλάμ v.r. Αἰλαμ, Vulg. AElam.) A chief man of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the sons of Shashak, resident at Jerusalem at the captivity or on the return (1Ch 8:24), B.C. 536 or ante.

4. (Sept. Α᾿ϊλάμ, ᾿Ηλάμ, Vulg. AElam.) "Children of Elam," Bene-Elam, to the number of 1254, returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezr 2:7; Neh 7:12; 1Es 5:12), and a further detachment of 71 men with Ezra in the second caravan (Ezr 8:7; 1Es 8:33). It was one of this family, Shechaniah, son of Jehiel, who encouraged Ezra in his efforts against the indiscriminate marriages of the people (Ezr 10:2, text

עֵוֹלָם. i.e., עוֹלָם, Olam), and six of the Bene-Elam accordingly put away their foreign wives (Ezr 10:26). The lists of Ezra ii and Nehemiah vii contain apparently an irregular mixture of the names of places and of persons. In the former, Ezr 10:21-34, with one or two exceptions, are names of places; 3419, on the other hand, are not known as names of places, and are probably of persons. No such place as Elam is mentioned as in Palestine, either in the Bible or in the Onomasticon of Eusebius, nor has since been discovered as existing in the country, although Schwarz endeavors (Palest. page 143) to give the word a local reference to the grave of a Samaritan priest Eli, at a village named by him as Charim ben- Elim, on the bay, 8 miles N.N.E. of Jaffa. SEE HARIM. Most interpreters have therefore concluded that it was a person. B.C. ante 536. It is possible, however, that this and the following name have been borrowed from number 1, perhaps as designating Jews who resided in that region of the Babylonian dominions during the captivity.

5. In the same lists is a second Elam, whose sons, to the same number as in the former case, returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:31; Neh 7:34), and which, for the sake of distinction, is called "the other Elam" (עֶילָם אִחֵר; Sept. ᾿Ηλαμάρ, ᾿Ηλαμαάρ, Vulg. AElam alter). The coincidence of the numbers is curious, and also suspicious, as arguing an accidental repetition of the foregoing name. B.C. ante 536. 6. (Sept. Αἰλάμ, Vulg. AElam.) One of the sacerdotal or Levitical singers who accompanied Nehemiah at the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem (Neh 12:42). B.C. 446.

7. (Sept. ᾿Ηλάμ, Vulg. AElam.) One of the chiefs of the people who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:14), B.C. 410.

## Elamite[[@Headword:Elamite]]

             (Chald. Elemay', עֵַלְמִי, in the plural עֵלְמָיֵא; Gr. Ε᾿λυναῖοι, Strabo, Ptolemy; or Ε᾿λαμῖται, Act 2:9; Vulg. AElamitae). This word is found in the O.T. only in Ezr 4:9, and is omitted in that place by the Sept. translators, who probably regarded it as a gloss upon "Susanchites," which had occurred only a little before. The Elamites were the original inhabitants of the country called Elam; they were descendants of Shem, and drew their name from an actual man, Elam (Gen 10:22). It has been observed in the preceding article that the Elamites yielded before a Cossaean or Cushite invasion. SEE ELAM.

They appear to have been driven in part to the mountains, where Strabo places them (11:13, § 6; 16:1, § 17), in part to the coast, where they are located by Ptolemy (6:3). Little is known of their manners and customs, or of their ethnic character. (See Muller, in the Journal Asiatique, 1839, 7:299; Wahl, Asien, page 603; Mannert, Geogr. 5:2:158; comp. Plutarch, Vit. Pomp. 36; Justin. 36:1; Tacit. Annul. 6:44). Strabo says they were skillful archers (15:3, § 10; comp. Xenoph. Cyrop. 2:1, 16; Livy, 35:48; Appian, Syr. 32), and with this agree the notices both of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the latter of whom speaks of "the bow of Elam" (Jer 49:35), while the former says that "Elam bare the quiver" (Jer 22:6). Isaiah also adds in this place that they fought both on horseback and from chariots. They appear to have retained their nationality with peculiar tenacity, for it is plain from the mention of them on the day of Pentecost (Act 2:9) that they still at that time kept their own language, and the distinct notice of them by Ptolemy more than a century later seems to show that they were not even then merged in the Cossaeans. — (See Hassel, Erdbeschr. v. Asien, 2:769 sq.; Assemani, Bibl. Or. III, 2:419, 744; comp. Herod. 1:102; Arrian, Ind. 42; Pliny, 6:31; Strabo, 15:728.) In Jdt 1:6, the name is given in the Greek form as Elymaeans, and in 1Ma 6:1, mention is made of a city ELYMAYS SEE ELYMAYS (q.v.).

## Elapius[[@Headword:Elapius]]

             fifteenth bishop of Poictiers, cir. A.D. 535-540.

## Elasah[[@Headword:Elasah]]

             [some Ela'sah] (Hebrews Elasah', עֶלְעָשָׁה, whom God made; Vulg. Elasa), the name of four men (variously Anglicized in the A.V.). SEE ELEASA.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λεασά.) The son of Helez, and father of Sisamai; one of the descendants of Judah, of the family of Hezron (1Ch 2:39, A.V. "Eleasah"). B.C. post 1046.

2. (Sept. Ε᾿λεασά v.r. Ε᾿λασά, A.V. "Eleasah.") A son of Rapha or Repharah, and father of Azel; descendant of king Saul through Jonathan and Meribbaal or Mephibosheth (1Ch 8:37; 1Ch 9:43). B.C. considerably ante 588.

3. (Sept. Ε᾿λεασάρ v.r. Ε᾿λεασάν, A.V. "Elasah.") The son of Shaphan; one of the two men who were sent on a mission by king Zedekiah to Nebuchadnezzar at Babylon after the first deportation from Jerusalem, and who at the same time took charge of the letter of Jeremiah the prophet to the captives in Babylon (Jer 29:3). B.C. 594.

4. (Sept. ᾿Ηλασά, A.V. "Elasah.") One of the Bene-Pashur, a priest, who renounced the Gentile wife whom he had married after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:22). B.C. 458.

## Elasippus[[@Headword:Elasippus]]

             a Cappadocian martyr in the reign of Aurelian, with his triplet brothers, Melassippus and Speusippus, is said to have been a horse-breaker: by profession, to have been converted at twenty-five years of age, and to have been burned in a furnace. They are commemorated January 17.

## Elasius (or Elaphius), Saint[[@Headword:Elasius (or Elaphius), Saint]]

             seventeenth bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne, died cir. A.D. 580, and is commemorated August 19.

## Elath[[@Headword:Elath]]

             (Hebrews Eylath', אֵילִת, grove, perhaps of TEREBINTH-trees; occurs in this form Deu 2:8; 2Ki 14:22; 2Ki 16:6; also in the plur. form אֵילוֹת, ELATH SEE ELATH [q.v.], 1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:17; 2Ch 26:2; "Elath," 2Ki 16:6; in the Sept. Αἰλάθ and Αἰλών; in Joseph. [Ant. 8:6,4] Αἰλανή; in Jerome, Ailath [who says that in his day it was called Ailah, to which its appellation in Arabic writers corresponds]; by the Greeks and Romans, Elana or AElana, Ε᾿λάνα [Ptol. 5:17, [Αἴλανα [Strabo, 16:768; comp. Pliny, 5:12; 6:32]; in Arabic authors Ailah), a city of Idumaea, having a port on the eastern arm or gulf of the Red Sea, which thence received the name of Sinus Elaniticus (Gulf of Akabah). According to Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. ῾Ηλάθ), it was ten miles east from Petra. It must have been situated at the extremity of the valley of El-Ghor, which runs at the bottom of two parallel ranges of hills, north and south, through Arabia Petraea, from the Dead Sea to the  northern parts of the Elanitic Gulf; but on which side of the valley it lay has been matter of dispute (see M'Culloch's Geog. Dict. s.v. Akabah). In the geography of Arabia it forms the extreme northern limit of the province of the Hijoz (El-Makrizi, Khitat; and Maraisid, s.v.; SEE ARABIA ), and is connected with some points of the history of the country. According to several native writers the district of Ailah was in very ancient times peopled by the Sameyda, said to be a tribe of the Amalekites (the first Amalek). The town itself, however, is stated to have received its name from Eyleh, daughter of Midian (El-Makrizi's Khitat, s.v.; Caussin's Essai sur l'Histoire des Arabes, 1:23). The Amalekites, if we may credit the writings of Arabic historians, passed in the earliest times from the neighborhood of the Persian Gulf through the peninsula (spreading over the greater part of it), and thence finally passed into Arabia Petraea. Future researches may trace in these fragments of primeval tradition the origin of the Phoenicians. Herodotus seems to strengthen such a supposition when he says that the latter people came from the Erythrean Sea. Were the Phoenicians a mixed Cushite settlement from the Persian Gulf, who carried with them the known maritime characteristics of the peoples of that stock, developed in the great commerce of Tyre, and in that of the Persian Gulf, and, as a link between their extreme eastern and western settlements, in the fleets that sailed from Ezion-geber and Elath, and from the southern ports of the Yemen? SEE ARABIA; SEE CAPHTOR; SEE MIZRAIM. It should be observed, however, that Tyrian sailors manned the fleets of Solomon and of Jehoshaphat (see Jour. Sac. Lit. October 1851, page 153, n.).

The first time that Elath is mentioned in Scripture is in Deu 2:8, in speaking of the journey of the Israelites towards the Promised Land: "When we passed by from our brethren the children of Esau, which dwelt in Seir, through the way of the plain from Elath, and from Ezion-geber." These two places are mentioned together again in 1Ki 9:26 (compare 2Ch 8:17), in such a manner as to show that Elath was more ancient than Ezion-geber, and was of so much repute as to be used for indicating the locality of other places: the passage also fixes the spot where Elath itself was to be found: "and king Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion-geber, which is beside Elath, on the shore (Num 33:35) of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom." SEE EZION-GEBER.

The use which David made of the vicinity of Elath shows that the country was at that time in his possession. Accordingly, in 2Sa 8:14, we learn that he had previously made himself master of Idumaea, and garrisoned its  strong-holds with his own troops. Under Joram, however (2Ki 8:20), the Idumaeans revolted from Judah, and elected a king over themselves. Joram thereupon assembled his forces, "and all the chariots with him," and, falling on the Idumaeans by night, succeeded in defeating and scattering their army. The Hebrews, nevertheless, could not prevail, but ''Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day;" thus exemplifying the striking language employed (Gen 27:40) by Isaac: "By thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." From 2Ki 14:22, however, it appears that Uzziah recovered Elath, and, having so repaired and adorned the city as to be said to have built, that is, rebuilt it, he made it a part of his dominions. This connection was not of long continuance; for in chapter 16, 2Ki 14:6 of the same book, we find the Syrian king Rezin interposing, who captured Elath, drove out the Jews, and annexed the place to his Syrian kingdom, and “the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day." At a later period it fell under the power of the Romans, and was for a time guarded by the tenth legion, forming part of Palaestina Tertia (Jerome, Onomast. s.v. Ailath; Strabo, 21:4, 4; Reland, Palaest. page 556). It subsequently became the residence of a Christian bishop. Bishops of Elath were at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and at that of Constantinople (A.D. 536). At the Council of Chalcedon, Beryllus thus wrote his designation as "bishop of Ela of Third Palestine" (Α᾿ϊλᾶ τῆς Παλαιστίνης τρίτης). In the days of its prosperity it was much distinguished for commerce, which continued to flourish under the auspices of Christianity (Cellarii Notit. 2:686 sq.).

In the 6th century it is spoken of by Piocopius as being inhabited by Jews subject to the Roman dominion (De Bell. Pers. 1:19). In A.D. 630 the Christian communities of Arabia Petraea found it expedient to submit to Mohammed, when John, the Christian governor of Ailah, became bound to pay an annual tribute of 300 gold pieces (Abulfeda, Ann. 1:171). Henceforward, till the present century, Ailah lay in the darkness of Islamism. It is merely mentioned by the supposed Ibn-Haukal (Engl. translation of D'Arvieux, Append. page 353), perhaps in the 11th century; and, after the middle of the 12th, Edrisi describes it as a small town frequented by the Aral s, who were now its masters, and forming an important point in the route between Cairo and Medina. In A.D. 1116, king Baldwin of Jerusalem took possession of it. Again it was wrested from the hands of the Christians by Saladin I, A.D. 1157, and never again fully recovered by them, although the reckless Rainald of Chatillon, in A.D.  1182, seized, and for a time held, the town. In Abulfeda's day, and before A.D. 1300, it was already deserted. He says, "In our day it is a fortress, to which a governor is sent from Egypt. It had a small castle in the sea, but this is now abandoned, and the governor removed to the fortress on the shore." Such as Ailah was in the days of Abulfeda, is Akabah now. Mounds of rubbish alone mark the site of the town, while a fortress, occupied by a governor and a small garrison under the pasha of Egypt, serves to keep the neighboring tribes of the desert in awe, and to minister to the wants and protection of the annual Egyptian Haj, or pilgrim caravan. Under the Roman rule it lost its former importance with the transference of its trade to other ports, such as Berenice, Myos Hormos, and Arsinoe; but in Mohammedan times it again became a place of some note. It is now quite insignificant. It lies on the route of the Egyptian pilgrim-caravan, and the mountain-road or Akabah named after it was improved or reconstructed by Ahmad Ibn-Tulun, who ruled Egypt from A.D. cir. 840 to 848. This place has always been an important station upon the route of the Egyptian Haj. Such is the importance of this caravan of pilgrims from Cairo to Mecca, both in a religious and political point of view, that the rulers of Egypt from the earliest period have given it convoy and protection. For this purpose a line of fortresses similar to that of Akabah has been established at intervals along the route, with wells of water and supplies of provisions (Robinson's Biblical Researches, 1:250). The first Frank who visited this place in modern times was Ruppell, in 1822 (Reise, page 248 sq.). Laborde (Journey through Arabia Petraea, London, 1836) was well received by the garrison and inhabitants of the castle of Akabah, of which he has given a view (1:116). The fortress, he states, is built on a regular plan, and is in a pretty good condition, though within several good habitations have been suffered to fall to decay. It has only two guns fit for service (Bartlett, Forty Days in the Desert, page 99 sq.). The ancient name of the place is indicative of groves in the vicinity, and Strabo speaks of its palm-woods (16:776), which appear still to subsist (Niebuhr, Beschr. Page 400; Schubert, 2:379)

## Elbodus, Saint[[@Headword:Elbodus, Saint]]

             bishop of Bangor, A.D. 755-809, induced the people of North Wales to use the Roman cycle of Easter.

## Elcesaites[[@Headword:Elcesaites]]

             SEE ELKISAITES.

## Elchanan Ben-Menachem[[@Headword:Elchanan Ben-Menachem]]

             SEE PAULUS OF PRAGUE.

## Elcia[[@Headword:Elcia]]

             (Ε᾿λκία), one of the forefathers of Judith, and therefore belonging to the tribe of Simeon (Jdt 8:1); what Hebrew name the word represents is doubtful. Hilkiah is probably Chelkias, two steps back in the genealogy. The Syriac version has Elkana. In the Vulgate the names are hopelessly altered.

## Elcilley, Horace, LL.D[[@Headword:Elcilley, Horace, LL.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Salisbury, Connecticut, February 12, 1781. He was fitted for college at Williamstown, Massachusetts; graduated from Yale in 1803; studied law for a few months; and then commenced the study of divinity under president Dwight. He was licensed to preach in December 1804, and was ordained and installed minister of the congregation in Greenfield, September 13, 1805. He resigned this charge September 13, 1808, and was installed as pastor of the Hollis Street Church, Boston, March 8, 1809. He accepted an invitation to the presidency of Transylvania University in 1818, and held that office till 1827, when he resigned it, with a view to taking charge of a seminary in Louisiana, but was attacked with yellow fever in New Orleans, and died July 31, 1827. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:265.

## Eldaah[[@Headword:Eldaah]]

             [some Elda'ah] (Hebrews Eldaah', אֵלְדָּעָה, whom God called; Sept. גאדלןֵ£, דאדלֵָ£; Josephus דלןֵᾶצ, Ant. 1:15, 1), the last-named of the five sons of Midian, Abraham's son by Keturah (Gen 25:4; 1Ch 1:33). B.C. post 2063.

## Eldad[[@Headword:Eldad]]

             (Heb. Eldad', אֵלְדָּד, whom God has loved; comp. Theophilus; Sept. Ε᾿λδάδ), one of the seventy elders who had been appointed under Moses to assist in the administration of justice among the people. B.C. 1658. He is mentioned along with Medad, another elder, as having on a particular occasion received the gift of prophecy, which came upon them in the camp, while Moses and the rest of the elders were assembled around the door of the tabernacle. The spirit of prophecy was upon them all; and the simple peculiarity in the case of Eldad and Medad was that they did not lose their share in the gift, though they abode in the camp, but they prophesied there. It appeared, however, an irregularity to Joshua, the son of Nun, and seems to have suggested the idea that they were using the gift with a view to their own aggrandizement. He therefore entreated Moses to forbid them. But Moses, with characteristic magnanimity, replied, "Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!" (Num 11:24-29). — Fairbairn, s.v. The great fact of the passage is the more general distribution of the spirit of prophecy, which had hitherto been concentrated in Moses;  and the implied sanction of a tendency to separate the exercise of this gift from the service of the tabernacle, and to make it more generally available for the enlightenment and instruction of the Israelites, a tendency which afterwards led to the establishment of "schools of the prophets." The circumstance is in strict accordance with the Jewish tradition that all prophetic inspiration emanated originally from Moses, and was transmitted from him by a legitimate succession down to the time of the captivity. The mode of prophecy in the case of Eldad and Medad was probably the extempore production of hymns, chanted forth to the people (Hammond); comp. the case of Saul, 1Sa 10:11. From Num 11:25, it appears that the gift was not merely intermittent, but a continuous energy, though only occasionally developed in action. SEE PROPHECY.

## Eldad (2)[[@Headword:Eldad (2)]]

             the name of two Welsh saints.

(1) Son of Arth, of the, 7th century.

(2) Son of Geraint, afterwards bishop of Gloucester, A.D. 600-634, slain by the pagan Saxons.

## Eldad Had-Dani[[@Headword:Eldad Had-Dani]]

             a famous Jewish traveller, flourished about 880-890. In his interesting but fabulous narrative, Sefer Eldad had-Dani, he pretends to tell of the remnants of. the ten tnribes, their laws, customs, and their condition. His narrative has been translated into Latin by Genebrard, into French by Carmoly, and into Judaeo-German by Men. bel-Salomo. Extracts are given by Bartolocci in Biblioth. Magna Rabbinica, 1:101, and Eisenmenger, Neuentdeckses Judenthum, 2:527-539. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:230 sq.; Zunz, Gottesd. Vortroge der Luden, page 139;. Lanldauer, in Literaturblatt  des Orients, 1846, page 121 sq.; Rapaport, Bikkure ha-ittim, 1824, pages 63, 68. (B.P.)

## Elder[[@Headword:Elder]]

             (properly זָקֵן, zaken'; πρεσβύτερος, a term which is plainly the origin of our word "priest;" Saxon preoster and presfe, then priest, High and Low Dutch priester, French prestre and pretre, Ital. prete, Span. presbytero), literally, one of the older men; and because, in ancient times, older persons would naturally be selected to 'hold public offices, out of regard to their presumed superiority in knowledge and experience, the term came to be used as the designation for the office itself, borne by an individual of whatever age. (See Gesenius, Hebrews Lex. s.v.) Such is the origin of the words γερουσία (a council of elders), senatus, alderman, etc.

I. In the O.T. — The term elder was one of extensive use, as an official title, among the Hebrews and the surrounding nations. It applied to various offices; Eliezer, for instance, is described as the "old man of the house," i.e., the major-domo (Gen 24:2); the officers of Pharaoh's household (Gen 1:1-31; Gen 7:1-24), and, at a later period, David's head servants (2Sa 12:17) were so termed; while in Eze 27:9 the "old men of Gebal" are the master-workmen. But the term "elder" appears to be also expressive of respect and reverence in general, as signore, seigneur, seseor, etc. The word occurs in this sense in Gen 1:7, "Joseph went up to bury his father, and with him went up all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt" (Sept. πρεσβύτεροι, Vulg. senes). These elders of Egypt were probably the various state officers. As betokening a political office, it applied not only to the Hebrews and Egyptians, but also to the Moabites and Midianites (Num 22:7). The elders of Israel, of whom such frequent mention is made, may have  been, in early times, the lineal descendants of the patriarchs (Exo 12:21). To the elders Moses was directed to open his commission (Exo 3:16 . They accompanied Moses in his first interview with Pharaoh, as the representatives of the Hebrew nation (Exo 3:18); through them Moses issued his communications and commands to the whole people (Exo 19:7; Deu 31:9); they were his immediate attendants in all great transactions in the wilderness (Exo 17:5); seventy of their number were selected to attend Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, at the giving of the law (Exo 24:1), on which occasion they are called the nobles (אֲצַילַים, lit. deep-rooted. i.e., of high-born stock; Sept. ἐπίλεκτοι) of the children of Israel, who did eat and drink before God, in ratification of the covenant, as representatives of the nation (Exo 24:11). In Num 11:16-17, we meet with the appointment of seventy elders to bear the burden of the people along with Moses; these were selected by Moses out of the whole number of the elders, and are described as being already officers over the children of Israel. It is the opinion of Michaelis that this council chosen to assist Moses should not be confounded with the Sanhedrim, which, he thinks, was not instituted till after the return from the Babylonish captivity. SEE SANHEDRIM.

He observes that these seventy elders were not chosen to be judges of the people, who had already more than 60,000 judges. He also argues that the election of seventy additional judges would have done but little towards suppressing the rebellion which led Moses to adopt this proceeding; but that it seems more likely to have been his intention to form a supreme senate to take a share in the government, consisting of the most respectable persons, either for family or merit, which would materially support his power and influence among the people in general; would unite large and powerful families, and give an air of aristocracy to his government, which had hitherto been deemed too monarchical. He further infers that this council was not permanent, not being once alluded to from the death of Moses till the Babylonish captivity; that Moses did not fill up the vacancies occasioned by deaths, and that it ceased altogether in the wilderness. Wherever a patriarchal system is in force, the office of the elder will be found as the keystone of the social and political fabric; it is so at the present day among the Arabs, where the sheik (=the old man) is the highest authority in the tribe. That the title originally had reference to age is obvious; and age was naturally a concomitant of the office at all periods (Jos 24:31; 1Ki 12:6), even when the term had acquired its secondary sense. At what period the transition occurred, in other words,  when the word elder acquired an official signification, it is impossible to say. The earliest notice of the elders acting in concert as a political body is at the time of the Exodus. We need not assume that the order was then called into existence, but rather that Moses availed himself of an institution already existing and recognised by his countrymen, and that, in short, "the elders of Israel" (Exo 3:16; Exo 4:29) had been the senate (Sept. γερουσία) of the people ever since they had become a people. The position which the elders held in the Mosaic constitution, and more particularly in relation to the people, is described under CONGREGATION SEE CONGREGATION.

They were the representatives of the people, so much so that elders and people are occasionally used as equivalent terms (comp. Jos 24:1 with 2, 19, 21; 1Sa 8:4 with 7, 10, 19). Their authority was undefined, and extended to all matters concerning the public weal; nor did the people question the validity of their acts, even when they disapproved of them (Jos 9:18). When the tribes became settled the elders were distinguished by different titles, according as they were acting as national representatives ("elders of Israel," 1Sa 4:3; 1Ki 8:1; 1Ki 8:3; "of the land," 1Ki 20:7; "of Judah," 2Ki 23:1; Eze 8:1), as district governors over the several tribes (Deu 31:28; 2Sa 19:11), or as local magistrates in the provincial towns, appointed in conformity with Deu 16:18, whose duty it was to sit in the gate and administer justice (Deu 19:12; Deu 21:3; Deu 22:15; Rth 4:9; Rth 4:11; 1Ki 21:8; Jdg 10:6); their number and influence may be inferred from 1Sa 30:26 sq. They retained their position under all the political changes which the Jews underwent: under the judges (Jdg 2:7; Jdg 8:14; Jdg 11:5; 1Sa 4:3; 1Sa 8:4); in the time of Samuel (1Sa 16:4); under Saul (1Sa 30:26), David (1Ch 21:16), and the later kings (2Sa 17:4; 1Ki 12:6; 1Ki 20:8; 1Ki 21:11); during the captivity (Jer 29:1; Eze 8:1; Eze 14:1; Eze 20:1); subsequently to the return (Ezr 5:5; Ezr 6:7; Ezr 6:14; Ezr 10:8; Ezr 10:14); under the Maccabees, when they were described sometimes as the senate (γερουσία; 1Ma 12:6; 2Ma 1:10; 2Ma 4:44; 2Ma 11:27; Josephus, Ant. 12:3, 3), sometimes by their ordinary title (1Ma 7:33; 1Ma 11:23; 1Ma 12:35); and, lastly, at the commencement of the Christian aera, when they are noticed as a distinct body from the Sanhedrim, but connected with it as one of the classes whence its members were selected, and always acting in conjunction with it and the other dominant classes. SEE COUNCIL.

Thus they are associated sometimes with the chief priests (Mat 21:23),  sometimes with the chief priests and the scribes (Mat 16:21), or the council (Mat 26:59), always taking an active part in the management of public affairs. Luke describes the whole order by the collective term πρεσβυτηριον, i.e. eldership (Luk 22:66; Act 22:5).. Like the scribes, they obtained their seat in the Sanhedrim by election, or nomination from the executive authority. SEE AGE.

II. In the New Testament and in the Apostolical Church. — In the article BISHOP SEE BISHOP (1:818 sq.), the origin and functions of the eldership in the N.T. and in the early Church are treated at some length, especially with regard to the question of the original identity of bishops and presbyters (or elders). Referring our readers to that discussion, we add here the following points.

1. Origin of the office. — No specific account of the origin of the eldership in the Christian Church is given in the N.T. "The demand for it arose, no doubt, very early; as, notwithstanding the wider diffusion of gifts not restricted to office, provision was to be made plainly for the regular and fixed instruction and conduct of the rapidly multiplying churches. The historical pattern for it was presented in the Jewish synagogue, namely, in the college or bench of elders (πρεσβύτεροι, Luk 7:3; ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, Mar 5:22; Act 13:15), who conducted the functions of public worship, prayer, reading, and exposition of the Scriptures. We meet Christian presbyters for the first time (Act 11:30) at Jerusalem, on the occasion of the collection sent from the Christians of Antioch for the relief of their brethren in Judaea. From thence the institution passed over not only to all the Jewish Christian churches, but to those also which were planted among the Gentiles. From the example of the household of Stephanas at Corinth (1Co 16:15) we see that the first converts (the ἀπαρχαί) ordinarily were chosen to this office, a fact expressly confirmed also by Clemens Romanus" (1 Corinthians c. 13). Schaff, in Meth. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1851; Apostolic Church, § 132. "The creation of the office of elder is nowhere recorded in the N.T., as in the case of deacons and apostles, because the latter offices were created to meet new and special emergencies, while the former was transmitted from the earliest times. In other words, the office of elder was the only permanent essential office of the Church under either dispensation" (Princeton Review, 19:61). The Jewish eldership, according to this view, was tacitly transferred from the Old Dispensation to the New, without  express or formal institution, except in Gentile churches, where no such office had a previous existence (comp. Act 11:30; Act 14:23).

2. Functions of the Elders. — The "elders" of the N.T. Church were plainly the "pastors" (Eph 4:11), "bishops, or overseers" (Act 20:28, etc.); "leaders" and rulers" (Heb 13:7; 1Th 5:12, etc.) of the flock. But they were not only leaders and rulers, but also the " regular teachers of the congregation, to whom pertained officially the exposition of the Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. That this function was closely connected with the other is apparent, even from the conjunction of 'pastors and teachers,' Eph 4:11, where the terms, as we have already seen, denote the same persons. The same association of ruling and teaching occurs Heb 13:7 : 'Remember them which have the rule over you (ἡγούμενοι), who have spoken unto you the word of God (οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ), whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation' (comp. Heb 13:17). Especially decisive, however, are the instructions of the pastoral epistles, where Paul, among the requirements for the presbyterate, in addition to a blameless character and a talent for business and government, expressly mentions also ability to teach (1Ti 3:2): 'A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach' (διδακτικόν), etc.; so also Tit 1:9, where it is required of a bishop that he shall hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught (ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου), that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers'" (Schaff, 1.c.). It is not improbable (indeed, several passages in the New Testament seem clearly to favor the notion) that many persons were ordained elders in the apostolical age who were not, and could not be, separated from their temporal occupations. "At first, those who held office in the Church continued, in all probability, to exercise their former trades for a livelihood. The churches would scarcely be able (as they were mostly poor) to provide stipends at first for their pastors" (Neander). Nevertheless, men specially called and fitted for the work, and devoted to it, were entitled by the Christian law, as set forth by the apostles, to be supported by the people; but there was no distinction of rank, honor, or authority between those elders who had stipends and those who had none, unless, indeed, the latter, who, following Paul's example, "worked with their own hands" that they might not be chargeable to the churches, were  held in greater honor for the time. The principle that full ministerial title may stand apart from stipend is fully recognised in modern times in the system of local preachers (q.v.) in the Methodist Episcopal Church (see Steward, On Church Government, Lond. 1853, page 128).

"After the pattern of the synagogues, as well as of the political administration of cities, which from of old was vested in the hands of a senate or college of decuriones, every church had a number of presbyters. We meet them everywhere in the plural and as a corporation: at Jerusalem, Act 11:30; Act 15:4; Act 15:6; Act 15:23; Act 21:18; at Ephesus, 20:17, 28; at Philippi, Php 1:1; at the ordination of Timothy, 1Ti 4:14, where mention is made of the laying on of the hands of the presbytery; and in the churches to which James wrote, Jam 5:14 : 'Is any sick among you? let him call for the presbyters of the congregation, and let them pray over him,' etc. This is implied also by the notice (Act 14:23) that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders for every church, several of them of course; and still more clearly by the direction given to Titus (Tit 1:5) to ordain elders, that is, a presbytery of such officers, in every city of Crete. Some learned men, indeed, have imagined that the arrangement in the larger cities included several congregations, while, however, each of these had but one elder or bishop; that the principle of congregational polity thus from the beginning was neither democratic nor aristocratic, but monarchical. But this view is contradicted by the passages just quoted, in which the presbyters appear as a college, as well as by the associative tendency which entered into the very life of Christians from the beginning. The household congregations (ἐκκλησίαι κατ᾿ οϊvκον), which are often mentioned and greeted (Rom 16:4-5; Rom 16:14-15; 1Co 16:19; Col 4:15; Phm 1:2), indicate merely the fact that where the Christians had become very numerous they were accustomed to meet for edification at different places, and by no means exclude the idea of their organized union as a whole, or of their being governed by a common body of presbyters. Hence, accordingly, the apostolical epistles also are never addressed to a separate part, an ecclesiola in ecclesia, a conventicle, but always to the whole body of Christians at Rome, at Corinth, at Ephesus, at Philippi, at Thessalonica, etc., treating them in such case as a moral unity (comp. 1Th 1:1; 2Th 1:1; 1Co 1:2; 1Co 5:1 sq.; 2Co 1:1; 2Co 1:23; 2Co 2:1 sq.; Col 4:16; Php 1:1, etc.). Whether a full parity reigned among these collegiate presbyters, or whether one, say the eldest, constantly presided  over the rest, or whether, finally, one followed another in such presidency as primes inter pares by some certain rotation, cannot be decisively determined from the N.T. The analogy of the Jewish synagogue leads here to no entirely sure result, since it is questionable whether a particular presidency belonged to its eldership as early 'as the time of Christ. Some sort of presidency, indeed, would seem to be almost indispensable for any well-ordered government and the regular transaction of business, and is thus beforehand probable in the case of these primitive Christian presbyteries, only the particular form of it we have no means to determine" (Schaff, 1.c.).

III. In the early Church (post-apostolic). — Very soon after the apostolic age the episcopacy arose, first in the congregational form, afterwards in the diocesan episcopacy. SEE EPISCOPACY. Until the full development of the latter, elders or presbyters were the highest order of ministers. No trace of ruling elders, in the modern sense, is to be found in the early Church. There was a class of seniores ecclesie in the African Church, whom some writers have supposed to correspond to the ruling elder; but Bingham clearly shows the contrary. The name occurs in the writings of Augustine and Optatus. In the Diocletian persecution, when Mensurius was compelled to leave his church, he committed the ornaments and utensils to such of the elders as he could trust, fidelibus senioribus commendabit (Optatus, lib. I, page 41) In the works of Optatus there is a tract called "the Purgation of Felix and Caecilian," where is mention of these seniores. Augustine inscribes one of his epistles, Clero, senioribus, et universae plebi: "To the clergy, the elders, and all the people" (Epist. 137). According to Bingham, some of these seniores were the civil optimates (magistrates, aldermen); the Council of Carthage (A.D. 403) speaks of magistratus vel seniores locorum. Others were called seniores ecclesiastici, and had care of the utensils, treasures, etc., of the church, and correspond to modern churchwardens or trustees (Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 2, chapter 19, § 19; Hitchcock, in Amer. Presb. Review, April 1868).

IV. In the modern Church. —

1. In the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the word "priest" is generally used instead of "presbyter" or "elder" to designate the second order of ministers (the three orders being bishops, priests, and deacons). SEE PRESBYTER;SEE PRIEST.

2. In the Methodist Episcopal Church but two orders of ministers are recognised, viz. elders and deacons, the bishop being chosen as primus inter pares, or superintendent. SEE EPISCOPACY. For the election, ordination, duties, etc., of elders, see the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, part 2, chapter 2, § 15, and part 4, chapter 6, § 2. The presiding elder is appointed by the bishop, once in four years, to superintend a district. For the nature and functions of this office, SEE PRESIDING ELDER.

3. Among Congregationalists, the only Church officers now known are elders (or ministers) and deacons. Ruling elders were recognised in the Cambridge platform (q.v.), and their duties particularly pointed out; but neither the office itself nor the reasons by which it was supported were long approved. Ruling elders never were universal in Congregationalism, and the office was soon everywhere rejected (Upham, Ratio Disciplinae, 1844, § 38, 39; Dexter, On Congregationalism).

4. Among Presbyterian churches (i.e. all which adopt the Presbyterian form of government, whether designated by that name or not) there are generally two classes of elders, teaching and ruling elders. The teaching elders constitute the body of pastors; the ruling elders are laymen, who are set apart as assistants to the minister in the oversight and ruling of the flock. Together with the minister, they constitute "the Session," the lowest judicatory in the Church. SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. They cannot administer the sacraments, but aid at the Lord's Supper by distributing the elements to the communicants.

1. In Scotland, ruling elders constitute, with the ministers, the "Kirk Session." The Form of Government annexed to the Confession of Faith asserts that 'as there were in the Jewish Church elders of the people, joined with the priests and Levites in the government of the Church, so Christ, who hath instituted government and governors ecclesiastical in the Church, besides the ministers of the Word, with gifts for government, and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the minister in the government of the Church, which officers reformed churches commonly call elders." "These elders are chosen from among the members, and are usually persons of tried character. After their acceptance of office, the minister, in the presence of the congregation, sets them apart to their office by prayer, and sometimes by imposition of hands, and concludes the ceremony of ordination with exhorting both elders and  people to discharge their respective duties. They have no right to teach or to dispense the sacraments. 'They generally discharge the office, which originally belonged to the deacons, of attending to the interests of the poor; but their peculiar function is expressed by the name "ruling elders;" for in every question of jurisdiction they are the spiritual court of which the minister is officially moderator, and in the presbytery of which the pastors within the bounds are officially members — the elders sit as the representatives of the several sessions or consistories' (Hill's Theolog. Instit. part 2, section 2, part 171). In the Established Church of Scotland elders are nominated by the Session, but in unestablished bodies they are freely chosen by the people" (Eadie, Eccl. Cyclop. s.v.). The United Presbyterian Church has the following rules on the subject:

"1. The right of electing elders is vested solely in the members of the congregation who are in full communion.

2. No fixed number of elders is required, but two, along with the minister, are required to constitute a Session. 3. When the Session judge it expedient that an addition should be made to their number, the first step is to call a meeting of the congregation for the purpose of electing the required number....

6. At the meeting for election a discourse is generally delivered suitable to the occasion. Full opportunity is first of all given to the members to propose candidates. The names are then read over, and, after prayer, the votes are taken, and the individuals having the greatest number of votes are declared to be duly elected.

7. After the election the call of the congregation is intimated to the elders elect, and on their acceptance the Session examines into their qualifications, and, if satisfied, orders an edict to be read in the church.

8. At the time mentioned in the edict, which must be read on two Sabbath days, the Session meets, the elders elect being present. After the Session is constituted, if no objections are brought forward, the day of ordination is fixed. If objections are made, the Session proceeds to inquire into and decide on them.

9. On the day of ordination, the moderator calls on the elders elect to stand forward, and puts to them the questions of the formula. Satisfactory answers being given, the minister proceeds to ordain or set  them apart by prayer to the office of ruling elder. Immediately afterwards the right hand of fellowship is given to the persons thus ordained by the minister and by the other elders present, and the whole is followed by suitable exhortations."

2. The Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (book 1, chapter 5) contains the following: "Ruling elders are properly the representatives of the people, chosen by them for the purpose of exercising government and discipline, in conjunction with pastors or ministers. This office has been understood, by a great part of the Protestant reformed churches, to be designated in the holy Scriptures by the title of governments, and of those who rule well, but do not labor in the word and doctrine" (1Co 12:28). Chapter 13 gives the rules for the election and ordination of ruling elders. Each congregation elects "according to the mode most approved and in use in that congregation;" and the whole procedure is very similar to that of the U.P. Church recited above. The ordination is "by prayer" and the "right hand of fellowship," not by imposition of hands. The office is perpetual. The elders, with the pastor, constitute the Session; one elder from each church is a member of Presbytery and Synod; and one for every twenty-four ministers in each presbytery is sent to the General Assembly.

In the Reformed Church the elders are chosen for two years only, by the congregation or by the Consistory (Constitution of the Ref. Dutch Church, chapter 1, art. 3). They are entitled to membership in Classis and Synod as delegates (Constitution, chapter 2, art. 3). There is a form given in the book for their ordination, without imposition of hands. So also in the new liturgy prepared for the German Reformed Church.

3. Ruling Elders. — The distinction between teaching and ruling elders originated with Calvin, and has diffused itself very widely among the churches which adopt the Presbyterian form of government; and the authority of the N.T. is claimed for it (see above, 2) in the Presbyterian "Form of Government" (book 1, chapter 5); in the Reformed Church Form of Ordination (Constit. page 118); in the Lutheran Church Formula of Government (chapter 3, § 6). The Congregationalists of New England admitted this distinction for a while (see above), but soon abandoned it.

Calvin (Institutes, book 4, chapter 3, § 8) seeks a scriptural basis for lay eldership as follows: "Governors (1Co 12:2) I apprehend to have been persons of advanced years, selected from the people to unite  with the bishops in giving admonition, and exercising discipline. No other interpretation can be given of 'He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence' (Rom 12:8)... . Now that this was not the regulation of a single age experience itself demonstrates." This passage, however, occurs first in the 3d edition of the Institutes, 1543; it is not found in the editions of 1536 or 1539. The office of lay elders had existed before among the Unitas Fratrum, who were supposed to have borrowed it from the Waldenses; but these lay elders were only trustees or churchwardens. Calvin himself organized a lay eldership in Geneva, to be elected yearly, and seems afterwards to have sought a scriptural warrant for it. In so doing he formed a novel theory, viz. that of a two-fold eldership. "This cardinal assumption of a dual presbyterate was controverted by Blondel, himself a Presbyterian, in 1648, and again in 1696 by Vitringa, who, as Rothe says in his Anfange, 'routed from the field this phantom of apostolic lay elders.' Even the Westminster Assembly, when, in 1643, it debated the question of Church government, as it did for nearly four weeks, was careful not to commit itself to Calvin's theory of lay presbyters, refused to call them ruling elders, and in its final report in 1644 spoke of them as 'other Church governors,' 'which reformed churches commonly call elders.' Calvin's theory has also been controverted by James P. Wilson in his Primitive Government of Christian Churches (1833), and by Thomas Smyth in his Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders (1845). The drift of critical opinion is now decidedly in this direction. It is beginning to be conceded, even among Presbyterians of the staunchest sort, that Calvin was mistaken in his interpretation of 1Ti 5:17; that two orders of presbyters are not there brought to view, but only one order, the difference referred to being simply that of service, and not of rank. And if this famous passage fails to justify the dual presbyterate, much less may we rely upon the ὁ προϊστάμενος, έν σπουδῇ, 'he that ruleth with diligence,' of Rom 12:8, or the κυβερνήσεις, 'governments,' of 1Co 12:28.

In short, the jure divino theory of the lay eldership is steadily losing ground. A better support is sought for it in the New-Testament recognition throughout of the right and propriety of lay participation in Church government; in the general right of the Church, as set forth by Hooker in his Ecclesiastical Polity, to govern itself by whatsoever forms it pleases, provided the great end of government be answered; and in the proved fitness and efficiency of our present Presbyterian polity, as compared either with prelacy on the one side, or Congregationalism on the other" (Hitchcock, in Am. Presb. Rev. 1868, page 255). Dr. Thornwell (Southern  Presb. Review, 1859; Spirit of the XIXth Century, December 1843; reprinted in Southern Presb. Rev. July, 1867) sets forth a peculiar theory of the divine right of the ruling eldership, viz. that the ruling elder is the presbyter of the N.T., whose only function was to rule, while the preachers were generally selected from the class of elders. This view is also maintained by Breckinridge (Knowledge of God, subjectively considered, page 629); and is refuted by Dr. Smyth, Princeton Review, volume 33 (see also Princeton Review, 15:313 sq.). Principal Campbell (Theory of Ruling Elderships, Edinb. and Lond. 1866) aims to show that "elder" in the N.T. always means pastor, and never means the modern "ruling elder" (see Brit. and For. Elvan. Review, January 1868, page 222). He shows that the Westminster Assembly, after a long discussion, refused to sanction Calvin's view; but he seeks to find lay elders, under another name, in Rom 12:8; 1Co 12:28, etc., and also in early Church History. For a criticism of his view, and a luminous statement of the whole subject of lay eldership, with a conclusive proof that there is no trace of it in the N.T., see Dr. Hitchcock's article in the Amer. Presb. Review, April 1868, page 253 sq. See also an able critical and historical discussion of the subject in Dexter, Congregationalism (Boston, 1865), page 120 sq. The scriptural right of lay elders is maintained in The divine Right of Church Government, with Dr. Owen's Argument in favor of Ruling Elders (New York, 1844, 12mo); in Miller, On Ruling Elders (Presb. Board, 18mo). See also King, Eldership in the Christian Church (N.Y. 1851); Muhlenberg, On the Office of Ruling Elders; M'Kerrow, Office of Ruling Elders (London, 1846); Engles, Duties of Ruling Elders (Presb. Board); Smyth, Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders (N.Y. 1845, 12mo); Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 2, chapter 20, § 19; Gieseler, Church History, volume 1, § 29; Neander, Planting and Training, book 1, chapter 2; Davidson, Eccl. Polity of N.T.; Watson, Theol. Institutes, part. 4, chapter 1; Schaff, Apostolic Church, § 132, 113; Rothe, Anfange d. christlichen Kirche, § 28, 29; Bilson, Perpetual Government of Christ's Church; Owen, Works (Edinb. 1851), 15:504.

## Eldhrimner[[@Headword:Eldhrimner]]

             in Norse mythology, is the iron pot in which the boar Sahrimner, in Walhalla, is cooked, which after every meal revives, in order, on the following day, to be slaughtered and served up again by the cook Andhrimner.

## Eldridge, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Eldridge, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Yarmouth, Massachusetts, July 18, 1804. After a preliminary course at Phillips Academy, he graduated from Yale College in 1829, and in 1832 from Yale Divinity School. He was ordained pastor of the Church at Norfolk, Connecticut, April 25, 1832, and continued to serve in that parish until November 2, 1874. He died there, March 31, 1875. From 1847 he was a member of the corporation of Yale College; from 1867 of the American Boards for Foreign Missions. See Cong. Quarterly, 1876, page 424.

## Eldunen[[@Headword:Eldunen]]

             (or Elduuen), fifteenth bishop of St. Davids.

## Elead[[@Headword:Elead]]

             (Hebrews Eled , אֶלְעָד, whom God has applauded; Sept., Ε᾿λεάδ Vulg. Elad), a descendant of Ephraim (1Ch 7:21), but whether through Shuthelah (q.v.), or a son of the patriarch (the second Shuthelah being taken as a repetition of the first, and Ezer and Elead as his brothers),  is not determined (see Bertheau, Comment. zu Chronik, page 82). B.C. ante 1856. Perhaps he is the same with ELADAH SEE ELADAH (q.v.) in the preceding verse, who appears to have survived, if identical with ERAN (Num 26:36).

## Eleatic School[[@Headword:Eleatic School]]

             the designation given to an early and brilliant sect of Greek philosophers. The name was bestowed in consequence of the residence or birth of the chiefs of the school at Elea or Velia, a town on the western coast of Italy, founded in 544 by the Phocaeans, who abandoned their Ionian home rather than submit to the arms of Cyrus. The general characteristic of this type of speculation is the maintenance of a broad and irreconcilable distinction between the apparent and the intellectual universe — between transitory phenomena and eternal truth. It is thus contrasted with the earlier Ionic School, which assumed material principles as the origin of the world, and with the Pythagorean School, which assigned a mathematical basis for the creation. But it exhibited several points of contact with these more ancient doctrines, and hence both Empedocles and Democritus are sometimes enumerated among the Eleatics. In its wider acceptation, the Eleatic philosophy includes the pantheistic idealism of Xenophanes and Parmenides, and the skeptical materialism of Leucippus and Epicurus, embracing both extremes of metaphysical thought. It may thus be distributed into two main divisions:

I. The Eleatic School proper, which asserted a divine unity to be the origin and essence of all things, regarded multiplicity as only the manifestation of the incessant activity of this divine unity, considered all change as merely phenomenal, and all temporal facts as only the transitory and deceitful shows of things, believing that the only true existence was the one indiscrete divine Essence, which underlay, determined, animated, and enclosed the whole sensible and intelligible order of the universe.  II. The Atomistic or Epicurean School, which confined attention to the earthly and material side of the problem, not denying the immaterial and spiritual, but renouncing it as unattainable. Its position may be appreciated by comparing it with the modern schemes of Moleschott, Herbert Spencer, and Comte. It took note only of the temporal and perishable side of the universe, and established a foundation for its reasonings by supposing the eternity and indestructibility of the elementary constituents of matter.

Esse immortali primordia corpore debent,

Dissolvi quo quae que supremo tempore possint,

Materies ut suppeditet rebus reparandeis.

Thus the two branches of the school, or the two schools, starting from the same point, but pursuing divergent courses, arrived at exactly opposite conclusions. The Eleatics disregarded the sensible, the Epicureans the divine element; the former contemplated the imperishable, the latter the perishable aspects of the universe. But neither denied what they renounced. In the present article, the Eleatic School proper will alone be considered; for a notice of the other branch, reference is made to the title EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY SEE EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY .

History of the Eleatic Philosophy. — The shadowy and impalpable character of the Eleatic doctrine renders it peculiarly difficult of determination, because it admits of many modifications, and of a great variety of expositions and limitations. Another difficulty arises from the fact that the sources of our knowledge are confined to a few metrical fragments of Xenophanes and Parmenides, to the statements of their adversaries, Plato and Aristotle, to Diogenes Laertius, who is by no means a reliable witness, and to a few other relics of antiquity. There is, consequently, more uncertainty in regard to the tenets of this school, and to the interpretation given to them by their advocates, than in regard to any other of the Greek sects except the Pythagorean. After all the diligence of Fulleborn, Brandis, Karsten, Cousin, and other inquirers, there is much doubt whether we are ascribing to the Eleatic leaders positions which they deliberately held, or are imposing our own conjectural interpretations upon their doctrines. The general complexion of the school is, however, readily recognized.

The Eleatic School is rather united by a common principle than by agreement in the application of the principle (v. Aristotle, Metaphysica, 1:5). Each distinguished philosopher of the sect creates his own scheme,  and differs in procedure and in doctrine from the rest: hence it is impracticable to give any general exposition which will be true for its whole development, and it therefore becomes necessary to consider the peculiar modifications which it assumed in the hands of its successive teachers. The principal expounders of the Eleatic philosophy were Xenophanes, Parmenides, Zeno, and Melipus: the first of these was its founder. The period during which they flourished may be considered to extend over the century preceding the Peloponnesian War. But the chronological data are confused and uncertain.

Xenophanes. — Xenophanes of Colophon, in Asia Minor, an exile from his native land, migrated to Sicily, and may have resided in Elea, whose foundation he celebrated in verse. The dates are uncertain; but Cousin, in an elaborate essay, fixes his birth in the 40th Olympiad (B.C. 620-616), and he lived nearly a century. His philosophy was presented in a metrical form in his poem On Nature, of which fragments remain, though they are too broken and obscure to give any clear revelation of his tenets. His leading doctrines, as far as they can now be ascertained, appear to have constituted an indistinct, confused, and undeveloped idealism, remarkable at the period of their introduction, but requiring expansion and rectification before they could be arranged in any harmonious system. They are rather germs of thought than precise principles. They needed the acute logical intellect of Parmenides to give them consistency, as the Socratic speculations received definite form from Plato. Parmenides probably deviated as far from the simple, reveries of Xenophanes as Plato did from the practical maxims of Socrates. Xenophanes apparently adopted from Pythagoras, either directly or indirectly, the conviction that there must be an ultimate term of being, which was not the sensible universe, but the divine intelligence. But Pythagoras distinguished between God and nature; while Xenophanes, by exaggerating, confused this distinction, and resolved everything into a single divine essence. He denied all beginning, and therefore denied that anything could become what it had not always been. The doctrine ex nihilo nihil fit had with him a broader and deeper significance than it received from Epicurus, and his Roman expositor, Lucretius. If nothing commences and nothing becomes, then all things are eternal, and all things are one. The unity of the God-head is thus asserted against polytheism; the individuality of the Deity against the dualism of conflicting forces. This antagonism to the current creed and prevalent speculations is developed in his attacks on Homer, Hesiod, and the whole Hellenic mythology, and by his earnest  repudiation of all anthropomorphism. The substantial reality of the sensible world is necessarily rejected: God and the universe are identified, and a close approximation is made to Spinozism, though not without essential differences. The only reality is the divine intelligence, σύμπαντά to εϊvναι νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν (Diogenes Laert. 9, 19).

Everything cognizable by the human senses represents merely the accidents and shows of things. The sensible world is in an unceasing flux, but the divine essence is unchanging, unchangeable, unmoving, incapable of being moved, impassive, eternal, infinite, though possessing spherical dimensions, uncompounded, one (αἴδιον-ἄπειρον-πᾶν-×ν-ž ν-μέτριον-ἀκίνητον-ἀνώδυνον- ἀνάλγητον-ἄνοσον-οὔτεἑτεροιούμενον εἴδει, οὔτε μιγνύμενον ἄλλῳ, Aristot. De Xenoph. 1: "unum esse omnia, neque id esse mutabile, et id esse Deum, neque natum umquam, et sempiternum, conglobata figura," Cicero, Acad. Pr. 2, 37.). All change is but apparent — the restless play of colors on the surface of the immutable Existence — the incessant agitation of the waves on the bosom of the boundless and unalterable deep. There is no denial of the actuality of sensible facts and changes; there is a denial of their reality; they are shadows of the eternal, the mists and vapors that disguise and conceal the infinite One.

Unquestionably there are contradictions involved in this scheme, but the acceptance of antinomies is one of the most striking characteristics of the doctrines of Xenophanes. Naturally and necessarily he is brought to declare all things incomprehensible. Certain knowledge is thus impossible; all truth evaporates into opinion; skepticism is introduced — the skepticism which disregards the sensible as a delusion — the skepticism which excludes the eternal and the divine as unintelligible, or the skepticism which regards truth as unattainable. Thus the fundamental positions of the Eleatics prognosticate the age of the Sophists, and the; theories of the Epicureans the Pyrrhonists and the Neo-Platonists.

It is not easy to discover the exact mode in which Xenophanes interpreted the order of the sensible creation. The remarkable feature in his cosmogony is that he anticipated geology, and made it the basis of some of his deductions. He thus contributed to science the commencements of that marvelous investigation, as Pythagoras contributed the theory of the geometrical harmonies of the universe, and divined the Copernican system. It may appear a remarkable incongruity that, after identifying God and the universe, and asserting the infinity, immutability, and eternity of the divine existence, Xenophanes and Parmenides should both have held the  periodicity of the destruction of the world — the former by water, the latter by fire. This conclusion may have been suggested to the earlier philosopher by the fossil remains which he recognised as aqueous deposits; but it also results from the dogma that all things are in a perpetual flux except the one eternal existence. The phenomena change recurrently, the One remains unchanged.

The Eleatic philosophy, in its first enunciation, was a crude idealism, extravagant in expression, if moderate in design. It was an anxious attempt to unite the operation of the omnipotence, omnipresence, and unity of the divine Intelligence with the recognition of his continual support and government of the creation. It was a protest alike against the vain abstractions, the materialistic tendencies, and the polytheistic creed of the Hellenic world; but in the endeavor to avoid popular and philosophical errors, it fell into the opposite extreme, and became in tendency, though not in purpose, distinctly pantheistic. It is impossible to explain the connection between the Creator and the creation — the distinction and the union of the intelligible and the sensible universe. To these heights the mind of man cannot soar. There is a truth of things sensible and a truth of things spiritual. Neither can be safely disregarded or misapprehended. The world of matter, with all its changes — the world of mind, with all its intuitions and reasonings, are as essentially real as the divine Being on whom they depend. But what the degree and mode of the dependence — when the dependence is interrupted and the laws imposed upon creation come into action — what is the hidden spring of natural forces, who shall define? If Xenophanes ran into errors as hazardous as those which he resisted, he is entitled to indulgent censure when it is considered that he was the first, or among the first, to introduce into Greek speculation worthy, if inadequate, conceptions of the grandeur, and glory, and ineffable sovereignty of the divine Intelligence.

Parmenides. — The most illustrious name produced by the Eleatic School is that of Parmenides, the disciple, probably, of the founder of the sect. He was, by all accounts, a native of Elea (about 536 B.C.), and may have furnished, by his birthplace, the chief cause for the designation habitually bestowed upon this type of philosophy. He is frequently represented as the founder of dialectics, though this distinction is given by Aristotle to his pupil Zeno. He is, however, entitled to the credit of having given a more logical development to the views of his supposed teacher. So far as any authoritative exposition of his doctrines is concerned, we are in nearly as  unfortunate a position as in the case of his predecessor. Insufficient fragments of his philosophical poem are preserved, but the rest of our knowledge must be obtained from the polemics of his adversaries, and from the statements of late compilers. He is commended by Aristotle for his perspicacity, and certainly gave greater coherence to the system espoused by him. In doing so he may have improved its form at the expense of its elevation. The divinity of the universal Existence disappears; for his point of departure is not the all-embracing Intelligence, but the abstract conception of being. In the main he agrees with Xenophanes, though he presents his tenets in a different order and connection. He states precisely the antagonism between the judgments of the senses and the conclusions of the reason, but he leaves it undeveloped. This has been regarded as his most important addition to the Eleatic metaphysics, though the principle is latent and presupposed in the whole speculations of the earlier philosopher. The fundamental position of his scheme is the contradiction of entity and nonentity. What is cannot be non-existent; what is non-existent is not. But everything that is, exists. Hence the universality and unity of existence must be admitted; and as nothing can spring from nothing, or proceed from non-existence to existence, all existence is eternal and unchangeable. There is nothing but being; therefore there is aplenum without any vacuum, and all being is thought. Being is limited, but limited only by itself, and embodied in a perfect sphere. It is independent of time, space, and motion, all of which are denied to have any absolute existence. It is a state of everlasting repose. All changes and motions are apparent only; they are mere semblances. On this system being is indestructible-a dogma which has returned upon us unexpectedly in the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, and those with whom he coincides. There is no loss or cessation of existence, only variation of species, or change of apparent condition. Everything is determined by an indwelling necessity — a law which is involved in the existence by which it is revealed.

There is a singular accordance in the procedure of Parmenides and that of Des Cartes. The highest speculations of man roll, like the world on which he dwells, in one self-repeating orbit around the center of attraction, deviating by slight deflections from the precisely-described track, but never departing so far as to destroy the uniformity of the course. Contrasted but connected schemes of thought succeed each other in each revolution like the seasons, and all "lead up the golden year."  In the physical application of his principles Parmenides recurred, like Xenophanes, to the procedure of the Ionic and Pythagorean schools, admitting antagonistic elements and forces, whose collisions and conjunctions produced the phenomena of the universe.

In all these speculations, one main cause of bewilderment and exaggeration is the oscitancy and impalpability of abstract terms. We are at the mercy of the abracadabra with which the enchantments are attempted. The perplexity and hallucination resulting from loose and elastic phrases was of course most perilous and least suspected before logical science arose, and before metaphysicians distinguished between rigorous thought and current expression.

Such defects exposed the doctrines of Parmenides to the attacks of acute contemporaries, and led to the recognition of the necessity of precision in statement, and to the consequent examination of the strict import of terms and of the Validity of arguments. Hence they furnished to his disciple the occasion of inaugurating logic.

Zeno. — The relation of Zeno to Parmenides is the most certain fact connected with the filiation of the Eleatic School. He was pupil, friend, companion, and apologist. He was the only prominent member of the sect who was unquestionably a native of Elea. He defended and explained the dogmas of his preceptor; but the mode of his exposition led to notable changes in the career of philosophy, and prepared the way for the Socratic irony, the Platonic dialectics, the Organon of Aristotle, and other developments scarcely less important. He became the inventor of regular dialectic procedure but his claims in this respect are limited by the remarkable declaration of the Stagyrite in regard to his own labors, that his predecessors had only furnished examples of the forms of reasoning, while he had created the art (Sophist. Elench. sub fin,).

Increase of logical precision may give greater consistency and intelligibility to a philosophical system, but it renders its errors and dangers more prominent. This was the case with Zeno's presentation of the views of Parmenides. In urging the unreliability of the senses, and of inferences from observation, he arrayed experience against reason, and denied the validity of the former. He acknowledged, at the same time, the impossibility of recognizing in things sensible the unity which was alone real existence, and thus invited skepticism and provoked the age of the Sophists.  Melissus. — There is no reason for believing that Melissus of Samos was directly or consciously connected with the Eleatic family, but he is habitually included in their number in consequence of substantial identity of doctrine. He confined his attention almost exclusively to the negative aspects of the system, endeavoring to demonstrate the unreality of the phenomenal world, and the inconsistency of ascribing time, motion, change, divisibility or limitation to the solitary Existence. In representing being as infinite, he recoiled from the position of Parmenides and Zeno, and in some degree also from Xenophanes. He differed from them also in asserting that we can have no knowledge of the gods; and, according to Aristotle, inclined to materialism in his conception of the universal One. The Eleatic idealism was thus verging towards the form of doctrine propounded by Epicurus. It had completed its course, and had swung round nearly to the opposite extreme from the point where it started.

Whatever extravagances may be justly charged upon this celebrated school, its services to speculation and to the cause of truth should be neither denied nor underrated. It was surely a splendid and meritorious office, in the dawn of systematic philosophy, to awaken the minds of men to the recognition of the vain and evanescent character of all temporal things; to protest against the delusions of Polytheism; to direct attention to a supreme and omnipresent Intelligence, perfect in all attributes; to unveil the everlasting truth which was latent, but active, beneath all material and transitory forms; and to bring the reason of man into direct communion with the sovereign Power of the universe, in which he and all things else "lived, and moved, and had their being." In discharging this high function, the Eleatics promoted physical speculation, laid the foundations of logic, and perhaps of rhetoric, and introduced the argumentative dialogue which was employed with such consummate genius by Plato.

There is a most profound significance in the observation made by Aristotle in regard to Parmenides, that, "looking up to the whole heavens, he declared the one only Being to be God." This seems to have been the distinctive purport of the Eleatic School, though it was soon obscured, and ultimately discarded; but it propagated itself by a secret growth, and allied itself with other forms of speculation.

Literature. — Plato, Sophista, Parmsenides; Aristotle, De Xenophane, Zenone et Gorgia; Metaphysica, lib. 1, cap. 5; Diogenes Laertius; Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Crit. s.v. Xenophane; Roschmann, Diss. Hist. Philosoph. de  Xenophane (Altona, 1729); Fulleborn, Liber de Xenophane, Zenone, Gorgia, Aristoteli vulgo tributus, partim illustratus commentario (Hal. 1789); Fragments of Xenophanes and Parmenides (Zullichau, 1795); Van der Kemp, Parmenides (Edmee, 1781); Gundling, Observations on the Philosophy of Parmenides; Brandis, Comm. Eleaticarum pars i (Altona, 1813); V. Cousin, Nouveaux Essais Philosophiques (Paris, 1828); Rosenberg, De Eleaticae philos. primordiis (Berl. 1829); Karsten, Philosophorum Graec. veterum Reliquiae (Bruxelles, 1830); Mullach, Aristotelis de Melisso lib. Disputationes (Berol. 1846); Lewes, Hist. of Philosophy (Lond. 1867, 1:67 sq.); Ueberweg, Gesch. d. Philosophie, 1:47; and the various historians of Greek philosophy. (G.F.H.)

## Eleazar[[@Headword:Eleazar]]

             (Hebrews Elazar', אֶלְעָזָר, whom God has helped; Sept. and N.T. Ε᾿λεάζαρ; from the Graecized form Ε᾿λεάζαρος ῾found in Maccabees and Josephus], came by contraction the later name Λάζαρος, Lazarus), a common name among the Hebrews, being borne by at least six persons mentioned in Scripture, besides several in the Apocrypha and Josephus. SEE ELIEZER.

1. The third son of Aaron, by Elisheba, daughter of Amminadab, who was descended from Judah, through Pharez (Exo 6:23; Exo 28:1; for his descent, see Gen 38:29; Gen 46:12; Rth 4:18; Rth 4:20). He married a daughter of Putiel, who bore him Phinehas (Exo 6:25). After the death of Nadab and Abihu without children (Lev 10:1; Num 3:4), Eleazar was appointed chief over the principal Levites, to have the oversight of those who had charge of the sanctuary (Num 3:32). With his brother Ithamar he ministered as a priest during their father's lifetime, and immediately before the death of their father he was invested on Mount Hor with the sacred garments, as the successor of Aaron in the office of high-priest (Num 20:28). B.C. 1619. One of his first duties was, in conjunction with Moses, to superintend the census of the people (Num 26:3). He also assisted at the inauguration of Joshua, and at the division of spoil taken from the Midianites (Num 27:22; Num 31:21). After the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, he took part in the distribution of the land (Jos 14:1). The time of his death is not mentioned in Scripture; Josephus says it took place about the same time as Joshua's, 25 years after the death of Moses. He is said to have been buried in "the hill of Phinehas" his son (Jos 24:33),  where Josephus says his tomb existed (Ant. 5:1, 29), or possibly a town called Gibeath-Phinehas (Gesenius, Thesaur. pages 260, 261,). The high- priesthood is said to have remained in the family of Eleazar until the time of Eli, a descendant of Ithmar, into whose family, for some reason unknown, it passed until it was restored to the family of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (1Sa 2:27; 1Ch 6:8; 1Ch 24:3; 1Ki 2:27; Josephus, Ant. 8:1, 3). SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

2. An inhabitant of Kirjath-jearim, on the "hill" (גַּבְעָה), who was set apart by his fellow-townsmen to attend upon the ark, while it remained under the roof of his father Abinadab, after it had been returned to the Hebrews by the Philistines (1Sa 7:1-2). B.C. 1124. His service in this capacity was doubtless somewhat irregular, but justifiable under the circumstances; for there is no evidence that he belonged to the priestly order, although it is probable that he was of a Levitical family (who were not allowed to touch the ark, but had only the general charge of it, Num 3:31; Num 4:15). He seems to have continued to exercise this sole care of the sacred deposit for the twenty years that intervened till the judgeship of Samuel (1Sa 7:1), although the ark remained in the same place much longer (1Ch 13:7).

3. A Levite, son of Mahli, and grandson of Merari. B.C. cir. 1618. He is mentioned as having had only daughters, who were married by their "brethren" (i.e., their cousins) (1Ch 23:21-22; 1Ch 24:28).

4. The son of Dodo the Ahohite (בֶּן9אֲחֹחַי, i.e., possibly a descendant of Ahoah, of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:4); one of the three most eminent of David's thirty-seven distinguished heroes (1Ch 11:12), who "fought till his hand was weary" in maintaining with David and the other two a daring stand against the Philistines after "the men of Israel had gone away." He was also one of the same three when they broke through the Philistine host to gratify David's longing for a drink of water from the well of his native Bethlehem (2Sa 23:9-10; 2Sa 23:13). B.C. cir. 1046. SEE DAVID.

5. Son of Phinehas, and associated with the priests and Levites in taking charge of the sacred vessels restored to Jerusalem after the Exile (Ezra 8:38). B.C. 459. He is probably the same with one of those who encompassed the walls of Jerusalem on their completion (Neh 12:42). B.C. 446. It does not appear from these passages, however, that he was necessarily a priest or even a Levite.

6. One of the descendants (or citizens) of Parosh, an Israelite (i.e., layman) who renounced the Gentile wife whom he had married on returning from Babylon (Ezr 10:25). B.C. 410. Possibly he is the same with Number 5.

7. The first-named of the "principal men and learned" sent for by Ezra to accompany him to Jerusalem (1Es 8:43); evidently the ELIEZER SEE ELIEZER (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 8:16).

8. According to Josephus, the Jewish high-priest, brother, and successor of Simon the Just, and son of Onias I, whose correspondence with Ptolemy Philadelphus resulted in the Septuagint (q.v.) translation being made (Ant. 12:2, 5 sq.; 4, 4). SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

9. Surnamed AVARAN (1Ma 2:5, Αὐαράν, or Αὐράν, and so Josephus, Ant. 12:6, 1; 9:4. In 1Ma 6:43, the common reading ὁ Σαυαράν arises either from the insertion of C by mistake after O, or from a false division of Ε᾿λεάζαρος Αὐαράν), the fourth son of Mattathias, who fell by a noble act of self-devotion in an engagement with Antiochus Eupator, being crushed to death by the fall of an elephant which he stabbed under the belly in the belief that it bore the king, B.C. 164 (1Ma 6:43 sq.; Josephus, Ant. 12:19, 4; War, 1:1, 5; Ambrose, De offic. min. 40). In a former battle with Nicanor, Eleazar was appointed by Judas to read "the holy book" before the attack, and the watchword in the fight — "the help of God" — was his own name (2Ma 8:23).

The surname "Avaran" is probably connected with Arab. havar, "to pierce an animal behind" (Michaelis, s.v.). This derivation seems far better than that of Rediger (Ersch u. Gruber, s.v.) from Arab. khavaran, "an elephant- hide." In either case the title is derived from his exploit.

10. A distinguished scribe (Ε᾿λεάζαρος ... τῶν πρωτευόντων γραμματέων, 2Ma 6:18) of great age, who suffered martyrdom during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (2Ma 6:18-31). B.C. cir. 167. His death was marked by singular constancy and heroism, and seems to have produced considerable effect. Later traditions embellished the narrative by representing Eleazar as a priest (De Macc. 5), or even high- priest (Grimm, ad; Macc. 1.c.). He was also distinguished by the nobler  title of "the proto-martyr of the old covenant," "the foundation of martyrdom" (Chrysost. Hom. 3 in 1 Macc. init. Comp. Ambrose, De Jacob. 2:10). For the general credibility of the history comp. Grimm, Excurs. uler 2Ma 6:18-28, in Exeg. Handb.; also Ewald, Gesch. 4:341, 532. SEE MACCABEES.

The name Eleazar in 3Ma 6:1-41 appears to have been borrowed from this Antiochian martyr, as belonging to one weighed down by age and suffering, and yet "helped by God." — Smith, s.v.

11. The father of Jason, ambassador from Judas Maccabeaus to Rome (1Ma 8:18). B.C. 161.

12. Son of Eliud and father of Matthan, which last was the grandfather of Joseph, Christ's reputed father (Mat 1:15). B.C. cir. 150.

13. A priest mentioned by Josephus as having charge of the Temple treasures, who sought to divert Crassus from pillaging the sanctuary by the largess of a beam of gold (Ant. 14:7, 1).

14. A son of Boethus, whom Archelaus put into the high-priesthood in place of his brother Joazar, but soon displaced by Jesus the son of Sie (Josephus, Ant. 17:13, 1).

15. Son of Ananus (or Ananias), made high-priest in the room of Ishmael (son of Phabi) by Gratus, who deposed him after one year in favor of Simon son of Camithus (Josephus, Ant. 18:2, 2). While a youth, his boldness led him, as prefect of the Temple, to advise the Jews to refuse all foreign presents (Josephus, War, 2:17, 2). He had been seized by the Sicarii as a hostage for ten prisoners of their own number (Ant. 20:9, 3). He was one of the generals chosen by the Jews for Idumaea during the revolt under Cestius (War, 2:20, 4).

16. Son of Dinseus, a robber who for many years infested the mountains of Samaria, whose troop was at length broken up by Cumanus (Josephus, Ant. 20:6, 1). He was himself captured by stratagem and sent to Rome by Felix (ib. 8, 5). He seems to be the same with the notorious rebel commander of Massada, at whose instigation the desperate garrison committed suicide (War, 7:8-9; comp. Ant. 20:1, 1; War, 2:13, 2).

17. A companion of Simoni of Gerasa; sent by the latter to endeavor to persuade the garrison of Herodium to capitulate, but indignantly put to death by them (Josephus, War, 4:9, 5).

18. A young Jew of great valor in the siege of Machaerus by Bassus; captured by Rufus, but released by the Romans on condition of the surrender of the fortress (Josephus, War, 7:6, 4).

19. A Jewish conjuror whom Josephus speaks of having seen exorcise daemons in the presence of Vespasian and his officers by means of a magical ring (Ant. 8:2, 5).

20. A son of Sameas, and born in Saab in Galilee, who performed a heroic act of valor and self-devotion during the final siege of Jerusalem (Josephus, War, 3:7, 21).

21. Son of Simon, and ringleader of the Zealots in the final convulsions of the Jewish nation (Josephus, War, 4:4, 1). He first appears as possessor of a large amount of plunder from the Romans under Cestius, which gave him control of public affairs (ib. 2:20, 3). During the siege by Titus he held the Temple against the other factions (ib. 5:1, 2), being supplied by the sacred stores of provisions (ib. 3); but at length he formed a coalition with one of these opponents, John of Gischala, who occupied the remainder of the eastern part of the city (ib. 5:6, 1), having lost his vantage by a stratagem of the latter (ib. 3, 1). See the full account under JERUSALEM SEE JERUSALEM .

## Eleazar (2)[[@Headword:Eleazar (2)]]

             (in Armenian Eghiazar), an Armenian patriarch, was born at Anthab, in Syria. In 1650, David, the patriarch of Constantinople, was ejected from his seat, and Eleazar elected in his place. He held this position only for two years, for in 1652 Philip, the patriarch of Etchmiadzin, and supreme head of the Church, arrived at Constantinople, expelled Eleazar, and consecrated John of Meghin, who, in turn, was soon ejected by the intrigues of Eleazar. The see then remained vacant for some time. Eleazar went to Jerusalem, in compliance with an invitation of the patriarch of that city, Azduadzadur, who wished his assistance in a quarrel with the Greeks, and promised to make him his successor. While residing in the convent of St. James, Eleazar discovered a treasure of 100,000 pieces of gold and 100,000 pieces of silver. After many troubles with Turkish officials and several  imprisonments, he succeeded in obtaining possession of the convent. He built a church, called after the residence of the chief patriarch of the Armenians, Etchmiadzin, and caused himself to be elected independent patriarch of Jerusalem. He was expelled in 1664, and again, after having regained possession of the dignity, in 1668, when he was succeeded by a personal enemy, Martyr. The people, dissatisfied with this change, replaced Azduadzadur, after whose death Eleazar took forcible possession of the patriarchal see. He maintained himself in this position until 1680, when, after the death of James IV, the patriarch of Etchmiadzin, he assumed the title of patriarch of all the Armenians. A subsequent election confirmed him in this position, and in 1682 he took up his residence in Etchmiadzin. His chief aim as head of the Armenian Church was to put an end to internal dissensions. He died at Etchmiadzin in 1691. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 15:791.

## Eleazar (3)[[@Headword:Eleazar (3)]]

             a teacher of the Maccabees, is commemorated as a saint, August 1 (July 29).

## Eleazar Ben-Arak[[@Headword:Eleazar Ben-Arak]]

             a famous Jewish teacher of the 18t century. of our aera, was one of the most celebrated disciples of Jochaanan ben-Zachai (q.v.). One of his recorded maxims is found in Aboth, 2:19: "Be quick to study the law, and know what thou shouldst return inl answer to the Epicurean, and remember before whom thou laborest; for the master who employed 'thee is. faithful, and will recompense thee the reward of thy toil." As a teacher, he was so highly esteemed that to attend his lectures was regarded like fulfilling a commandment (Cholin, fol. 106). See Hamburger, Real- Encyclop. 2:155 sq.; Bacher, in Frankel-Graitz's Monatsschrift, 1882, page 241. (B.P.)

## Eleazar Ben-Azaria[[@Headword:Eleazar Ben-Azaria]]

             a Talmudic teacher of the 1st. century of our sera, belonged to a noble priestly family. When Gamaliel the younger was deposed at Jabneh. Eleazar was elected president of the college, although, only seventeen years of age. One of his first measures was to remove the doorkeeper and give free admission to the college to all, whereas Gamaliel had excluded every disciple who was not "the same inwardly as outwardly." It is added that when anything is recorded as having happened בו ביוםon that day," the occasion of Azaria's accession is referred to; and the day is described as one in which all the pending controversies; were decided. When Gamaliel was reinstated, Ben-Azaria acted as vice-president, and, according to the Talmud. matters were so arranged that on three Sabbathsin the month Gamaliel acted as president, whereas the fourth was given to Eleazar. Hence the saying "Whose Sabbath is it? The Sabbath of rabbi Eieazar ben- Azaria." A saying of his is recorded in Aboth, 3:26: "No Torah, no culture; no culture, no Torah; ino wisdom, no fear of God; no fear of God, no wisdom; no knowledge, no discernment; no discernment, no knowledge; no meal, no Torah; no Torah, no meal." See Hamburger, Real-Encyclop. 2:156 sq.; Bacher, in Frankel-Gratz's Monatsschrift, 1883, page 6 sq. (B.P.)

## Eleazar Ben-Azkari (or Askari)[[@Headword:Eleazar Ben-Azkari (or Askari)]]

             a rabbi of the 16th century, is the author of an exposition of the six hundred and thirteen precepts, ספר חרדים(Venice, 1601; Zolkiew, 1778; Bunn, 1795). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:65. (B.P.) Eleazar BEN- CHISA, a disciple of the famous rabbi Akiba (q.v.), was noted alike as a Talmudist and an astronomer. His recorded maxim (Aboth, 3:28),

"Qinnim and Pitche Nidda are essentials of the Torah; canons of astronomy and geometry are after-courses of wvisdom," shows his delight in astronomical and mathematical problems. See Bacher, in Frankel-Gratz's Monatsschrift, 1883, page 538. (B.P.)

## Eleazar Ben-Jehuda[[@Headword:Eleazar Ben-Jehuda]]

             SEE ELIEZER BEN-JUDAH.

## Eleazar Ben-Shamna[[@Headword:Eleazar Ben-Shamna]]

             a Jewish teacher of the 2d century, was a pupil of the famous rabbi Akiba. During the-persecution by Hadrian he went to Nisibis, in Babylonia. His recorded maxim was: "Let the honor of thy disciple be dear unto thee as the honor of thine associate; and the honor of thine associate as the fear of thy master; and the fear of thy master as the fear of heaven" (Aboth, 4:17). See Hamburger, Real-Encyclop. 2:159. (B.P.)

## Eleazar Ben-Yishai[[@Headword:Eleazar Ben-Yishai]]

             a converted Jew of the 17th century, is the author of a Brief Compendium of the Vain Hopes of the Jews' Messias (Lond. 1652). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebraea, 4:786; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eleazar Hak-Kalir[[@Headword:Eleazar Hak-Kalir]]

             SEE KALIR, ELEASAR.

## Eleazar Of Modin[[@Headword:Eleazar Of Modin]]

             a Jewish teacher of the 2d century. He was a relative of Bar Cochab, and not only upheld his messianic pretensions, but also stimulated the religious energy and encouraged the hopes of the defenders of Bethar. Weighed down by years and emaciated by fasts, the aged ascetic was daily to be seen on the ramparts, where, clad in sackcloth and covered with ashes, he would, in the sight of all, implore heavenly aid with tears and by continual fastings. As long as the defenders of Bethar saw Eleazar at his post ithey felt secure under the canopy of his piety, and in the assurance of divine aid. Even the treacherous Samaritans felt the awe of his presence, and were wont to say that Bethar could not be taken "so long as this cock remained to crow in ashes." At last one of them succeeded in rendering Eleazar an object of suspicion to Bar Cochab, who rudely pushed the old man aside with his foot. Eleazar fell to the ground a corpse. His recorded maxim is: "He that profanes things sacred, and contemns the festivals, and annuls the covenant of Abraham our Father, and acts barefacedly against the Torah, even though he be a doer of good works, has no portion in the world to come " (Aboth, 3:17). See Hamburger, Real-Encyclop. 2, page 161 sq.; Bacher, Die Agada der Tanaiten, in Frankel-Gratz's Monatschrift, 1882, p. 529 sq. (B.P.)

## Eleazarus[[@Headword:Eleazarus]]

             a martyr at Lyons, with his eight children and Minervius; commemorated August 23.

## Eleazurus[[@Headword:Eleazurus]]

             (a strange rendering for Ε᾿λιάσεβος, Alex. MS. Ε᾿λιάσιβος, Vulg. Eliasib), one of the Levitical musicians who married a Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (1Es 9:24); evidently the ELIASHIB SEE ELIASHIB (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:24).

## Elect[[@Headword:Elect]]

             a term sometimes applied in the ancient Church

(1) to the whole body of baptized Christians, who were called ἄγιοι, ἐκλεκτοί, saints, elect;

(2) to the highest class of catechumens elected to baptism;

(3) at other times to the newly baptized, as especially admitted to the full privileges of their profession, and sometimes called the perfect.

Ascetics, who at one time were considered the most eminent of Christian professors, were called the elect of the elect. — Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 10, chapter 2, § 5. SEE CATECHUMENS.

## Electa Or Eclecta[[@Headword:Electa Or Eclecta]]

             (Ε᾿κλεκτή, Auth. Vers. "elect" lady). According to Grotius, Wetstein, and some other critics, this word is used as a proper name in the address of John's second epistle, ῾Ο Πρεσβύτερος Ε᾿κλεκτῇ κυριᾷ — "The  Presbyter to the Lady Eclecta." This meaning is advocated by bishop Middleton, in his treatise on the Doctrine of the Greek Article (2d edit. Cambridge, 1828, pages 626-629). He adduces in support of it several epistolary inscriptions from Basil, in which the name precedes, and the rank or condition in life is subjoined, such as Εὐσταθίῳ ἰατρῷ-Λεοντίῳ σοφιστ῝Ê-Βοσπορίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ-Μαγνημιανῷ κόμητι: none of these, however, are purely honorary titles. To meet the objection that the sister of the person addressed is also called Eclecta in Ezr 10:13, he suggests that the words τ῝ῆς Ε᾿κλεκτῆς are a gloss, explanatory of σοῦ. But this is mere conjecture, unsupported by a single manuscript; and such a gloss, if occasioned (as bishop Middleton supposes) by the return to the singular number, would more naturally have been inserted after se, in which position, however unnecessary, it would at least produce no ambiguity. Some writers, both ancient and modern, have adopted a mystical interpretation, though contrary to the usus loquendi, and ,to all apostolic usage, and suppose with Jerome that the term ἐκλεκτή referred to the Church in general, or with Cassiodorus, to some particular congregation. The last-named writer (born A.D. 470, died 562), in his Complexiones in Epistolas, etc. (London, 1722, page 136), says, "Johannes — electae dominae scribit ecclesiae, filiisque ejus, quas sacro fonte genuerat." Clemens Alexandrinus, in a fragment of his Adumbrationes, attempts to combine the literal and the mystical meanings — "Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine, significat autem electionem ecclesiae sancta" (Opera, ed. Klotz, 4, page 66). The Auth. Version translates the words in question "the elect lady," an interpretation approved by Castalio, Beza, Mill, Wolf, Le Clerc, and Macknight. Most modern critics, however — Schleusner and Breitschneider, in their lexicons; Bourger (1763),Vater (1824), Goschen, and Tischendorf (1841), in their editions of the New Testament; Neander (Planting of the Church, 2:71), De Wette (Lehrbuch, page 339), and Lucke (Commentary on the Epistles of St. John, pages 314-320, Eng. transl.) — agree with the Syriac and Arabic versions in making Κᾷοτα a proper name, and render the words "to the elect Cyria.' (See Gruteri Inscript. page 1127.) Lardner has given a curious account of critical opinions in his History of The Apostles and Evangelists, c. 20 (Works, 6:284-288). See also Heumann, De Cyria (Gotting. 1726); Rittmeier, De ἐκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾷ (Helmst. 1706); Knauer, Ueber ἐκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾷ (in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 6:452 sq.); Amer. Presb. Rev., January 1867. SEE JOHN (THIRD EPISTLE OF).  Election of Clergy. How far the people had a right in the election of ministers in the early Church is a question that has been much disputed.

1. The account in Act 1:15 of the choice of an apostle in place of Judas is cited as proof that even the apostles would not elect without the voice of the Church at Jerusalem. So in the choice of the deacons (Act 6:1-15), the people "chose Stephen and set him before the apostles." On the other hand, the apostles themselves appointed elders, and St. Paul empowered Titus and Timothy to do the same (Act 14:23; 2Ti 2:1; Tit 1:5); though some interpret the word χειροτονεῖν, in these passages, as implying ordination only and not excluding a previous election by the people. Compare also Act 15:1; 1Co 5:2; 2Co 8:19.

2. Clemens Romanus (t 100) (Epist. ad Corinth. 1, § 44) asserts that the apostles appointed bishops and deacons with the concurrence of the whole Church. It is clear, from Clement's statement, that in his time the Church had a share in the appointment of its ministers. Cyprian (t 258) testifies to the share of the people in the election of bishops and elders, calling it matter of divine authority that "sacerdos plebe presente sub omnium oculis deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur" (Epist. 68). Bingham cites Lampridius (Vit. Alex. Severi, c. 45) as stating that the emperor (A.D. 222-235) gave the people a negative vote in the appointment of procurator, on the express ground that "what the Christians did in the election of their priests and ministers, should certainly be allowed the people in the appointment of governors of provinces."

3. Even after the establishment of the hierarchy, it seems to have been usual for the clergy or presbytery, or the sitting bishop or presbyter, to nominate a person to fill the vacant office, and then for the suffrages of the people — not merely testimonial, but really elective suffrages — to be taken. Bingham sums up the facts (Orig. Ecclesiastes book 4, chapter 2) in substance as follows:

1. No bishop could be obtruded upon an orthodox people against their consent (in case a majority were heretics or schismatics, the case was otherwise provided for): when they agreed upon a deserving bishop, they were usually gratified in their choice. The emperor Valentinian III held it to be a crime in Hilary of Aries that the ordained bishops against the consent and will of the people."  2. In many cases the voices of the people prevailed against the nominations of the bishops.

3. The modes of voting illustrate the power of the people in the elections; if they were unanimous for or against a man, they cried out "worthy" or "unworthy" (ἄξιος, ἀνάξιος; dignus, indignus).

If they were divided, they expressed their dissent in accusations, or even in tumults. There are instances in which persons were brought by force to the bishop to be ordained, or were elected to the office by acclamation. It was decided by the fourth Council of Carthage, that as the bishop might not elect clerks without the advice of his clergy, so likewise he should secure the consent, cooperation, and testimony of the people. The popular elections, however, became scenes of great disorder and abuse. A remarkable passage from Chrysostom (De Sacerd.) has been frequently quoted, and applies more or less to such elections, not only in Constantinople, but also in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and other large cities. He says: "Go and witness the proceedings at our public festivals, in which, more especially, according to established rule, the election of ecclesiastical officers take place. You will find there complaints raised against the minister as numerous and as various in their character as the multitude of those who are the subject of Church government. For all those in whom the right of election is vested split into factions. It is evident that there is no good understanding, either among themselves, or with the appointed president, or with the presbytery; One supports one man, and one another and the reason of this is, that they all neglect to look at that point which they ought to consider, namely, the intellectual and moral qualifications of the person to be elected. There are other points by which their choice is determined. One, for instance, says, 'It is necessary to elect a person who is of a good family.' Another would choose a wealthy person, because he would not require to be supported out of the revenues of the Church. A third votes for a person who has come over from some opposite party. A fourth uses his influence in favor of a relative or friend; while another lends his influence to one who has won upon him by fair speeches and plausible pretensions." In order to set aside these abuses, some bishops claimed an exclusive right of appointing to spiritual offices. In this way they gave offense to the people. In the Latin and African churches an attempt was made to secure greater simplicity in elections by introducing interventors or "visitors." This did not, however, long continue. Another plan was to vest the election in members of the lay aristocracy. But the  determining who these should be was left to caprice or accident; and the result was, that the right of election was taken out of the hands of the people, and vested partly in the hands of the ruling powers, and partly with the clergy, who exercised their right, either by the bishops, their suffragans and vicars, or by collegiate meetings, and this very often without paying any regard to the Church or diocese immediately concerned. Sometimes the extraordinary mode of a bishop's designating his successor was adopted; or some one unconnected with the diocese, to whom a doubtful case had been referred for decision, was allowed to nominate. But in these cases the consent of the people was presupposed. Patronage has prevailed since the fifth century; but the complete development of this system was a work of the 8th and 9th centuries. —Bingham, Origines Ecclesiasticae, book 4, chapter 2; Farrar, Ecclesiastical Dict. s.v.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, book 3, chapter 15; Coleman, Christian Antiquities, chapter 5. SEE PATRONAGE.

Election of Grace. On the history of the doctrine of Election, SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE PREDESTINATION. We present here,

I. A statement of the doctrine from the Augustinian or Calvinistic point of view, by the Reverend C. Hodge, D.D., of Princeton;

II. A statement of the doctrine from the Methodist point of view;

III. Some other conceptions of the doctrine.

I. Election from the Calvinistic Point of View. — The Scriptures speak, first, of the election of individuals to office, or to positions of honor and privilege. Thus Abraham was chosen to be the father of the faithful, and the depositary of the promise of redemption. Thus Jacob was chosen, in preference to Esau, to be the progenitor of the chosen people. In like manner, Saul was chosen by God to be king over Israel, and subsequently David, and after him Solomon, were selected for the same high dignity. Thus also the prophets, and, under the new dispensation, the apostles, were chosen by God for the work assigned them. 2d. The Bible speaks of the election of nations to special privileges. The Hebrews were chosen from all the nations of the earth to be God's peculiar people. To them were committed the oracles of God. They were his inheritance. They received from him their laws and their religion, and were under his special guidance and protection, In Deu 7:6, it is said, "Thou art an holy people  unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth;" Deu 32:9, "The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance;" Rom 9:4, "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving to the law, and the service of God, and the promises." 3d. Besides this election of individuals and of nations to external advantages, the Scriptures speak of an election to salvation: 2Th 2:13, "We are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

Of this election to eternal life all Augustinians teach, first, that its objects are not nations, nor communities, nor classes of persons, but individuals.

1. Because neither the nations nor communities, as such, are saved. God did not choose all the nation of the Jews to salvation. Neither does he choose the nations of Christendom to eternal life; nor any organized Church, whether Papal or Protestant. The heirs of salvation are individual men.

2. Because those chosen to salvation are chosen to “sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.” They are chosen "to be holy and without blame before him in love" (Eph 1:4). They are elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1Pe 1:2). But nations and communities are not sanctified, or obedient, or unblameable before God in love.

3. We accordingly find that the elect are always addressed as individuals. Paul, when writing to a number of persons residing in Thessalonica, says, "God hath chosen you to salvation." Writing to the Ephesians, he says, "God hath chosen us," "having predestinated us." Our Lord (Joh 13:18) says, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen;" and again (Joh 6:37), "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." Joh 17:2, " Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." Joh 17:9, "I pray not for the world, but for those which thou hast given me." The Scriptures, therefore, clearly teach that the elect are certain individuals chosen out of the world to be the heirs of salvation.  Secondly. Augustinians hold that the ground of this election is the good pleasure of God. That is, that the reason why one person and not another is chosen to eternal life is to be found, not in what he is or does, distinguishing him favorably from his fellow-men, but simply because so it seems good in the sight of God. All being equally guilty and unworthy, God, for the manifestation of his glory, and for the attainment of the highest ends, chooses some, and not others, to be vessels of mercy prepared beforehand unto glory.

That such is the doctrine of the Scriptures on this subject is argued,

1. Because the Bible expressly says that election is of grace and not of works. It is not of works means that it is not what a man does that determines whether he is to be one of the elect or not. The apostle, in Rom 9:11, teaches that the choice of Jacob instead of Esau was made and announced before their birth, "that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth." It matters not whether the election here spoken of be to eternal life or to temporal advantages. The apostle refers to this incident in proof of God's sovereignty, and therefore he infers from it, " It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (Rom 9:16). In like manner, in chapter 11 of the same epistle, he refers to the declaration made in the Old Testament to Elias! "I have reserved unto myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal;" and adds, "Even so, then, at this present time there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace" (Rom 9:4-6). The mass of the Jews were cast off. A remnant was saved. That remnant consisted of those whom God chose. His choice was a sovereign one. It was of grace, and not of works. It was determined by the good pleasure of God, and not by what the objects of that choice had done. Paul himself belonged to that remnant. He was an illustrious example of the sovereignty of God in election. He had done nothing to secure the favor of God. He Was chosen to eternal life not because he repented and believed. He was converted not because he had faithfully used the means of securing a knowledge of Christ. On the contrary, he was converted in the midst of his wicked career of persecution. He was brought to faith and repentance because, as our Lord says, "He was a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Act 9:15).

Paul's experience, as well as the teaching of the Holy Spirit, impressed upon his mind a deep conviction of the sovereignty  of God in the salvation of men. He knew he had been chosen not for, but notwithstanding, his previous character and conduct. And he knew that, had he not been thus chosen, he would have perished forever. It is not surprising, therefore, that he valued this doctrine, or that he so often refers to himself as a monument of the grace of God in the election and salvation of sinners. In his epistle to the Galatians, after referring to the fact that he had beyond measure persecuted the Church of God," he adds, "It pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me" (Gal 1:15). See also Act 22:14; 1Co 15:9; 1Ti 1:15-16 : "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe in him to life everlasting." Nothing could have pained the apostle more than that any one should attribute his conversion in any form or in any measure to himself. His constant and grateful acknowledgment was; "By the grace of God I am what I am." The negative statement that election is "not of works," is often, as in the passages above cited, connected with the positive assertion that it is of grace, or due to the sovereign pleasure of God.

2. It is not, however, merely in isolated passages that this doctrine is taught; it is elaborately proved and vindicated. Thus, in 1Co 1:17-31, the opponents of Paul in Corinth had urged against him that he was neither a philosopher nor a rhetorician; he came neither with "the wisdom of men" nor with enticing words." Paul's answer to this objection is twofold. First, he shows that philosophy, or the wisdom of men, had never led to the saving knowledge of God (1Co 1:18-21); secondly, that when the true method of salvation was revealed, it was rejected by the wise. “Look at your calling, brethren," he says; see whom it is that God hath chosen. It is not the wise, the noble, or the great; but God hath chosen the foolish, the weak, and the base. This was done with the design that no flesh should glory in his presence; no man was to be allowed to refer his conversion to himself. It is of God ye are in Christ Jesus, that he that glorieth may glory in the Lord (1Co 1:26-31).

Thus, also, in Eph 1:3-6, the apostle reminds his readers that God had blessed them with every spiritual blessing (Eph 1:3). This he had done because he had chosen them in Christ before the foundation of the world, to be holy and without blame before him in love (Eph 1:4). He had thus chosen them to holiness, because he had, according to the good pleasure of  his will, predestined them to the high dignity of sonship (Eph 1:5). He had thus predestined them to be his sons, in order to glorify his grace or unmerited love (Eph 1:6). In these few verses the whole Augustinian doctrine on this subject is stated with the utmost clearness and precision.

In the 8th chapter of the epistle to the Romans, the design of the apostle is to show the security of believers. Those who are in Christ shall never be condemned; because they are justified; because they have the principle of spiritual life through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; because they are the children of God; because the Spirit makes intercession for them; because those whom God foreknows, he predestinates: whom he predestinates, he calls: whom he calls, he justifies: whom he justifies, he glorifies. This is a chain which cannot be broken. Those in whom he fixes his choice, he predestines, as said in the Ephesians, to be his sons and daughters; and those whom he thus predestinates, he effectually calls or regenerates; and those whom he regenerates, he will certainly save. All this the apostle confirms by a reference to the infinite and immutable love of God. "If God se loved us," he argues, "that he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for "is, how shall he not with him freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justified. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for US."

It was a natural objection to the apostle's doctrine that God had rejected the Jews and called the Gentiles; that it involved a violation of his promise to the patriarch Abraham. To this objection he gives, in the ninth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, a twofold answer. The one is, that the promise of salvation pertained not to the natural, but to the spiritual children of Abraham; not to the Ι᾿σραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα, but to the Ι᾿σραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα. The other is, that God acts as a sovereign in the dispensation both of temporal and of spiritual blessings. This he illustrates in the choice of Isaac instead of Ishmael, and of Jacob instead of Esau. Besides, he expressly claims this prerogative, saying to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion."

To the objection that it is unjust thus to dispense or withhold mercy at his own good pleasure, Paul's answer is, that any attribute which the Scriptures ascribe to God, and any prerogative which he actually exercises, we must admit rightfully to belong to him. If God, in his Word, claims this  prerogative of having mercy on whom he will have mercy, and if he actually exercises it in his providence, and in the dispensation of his grace, it is vain for us to deny or to protest. The judge of all the earth must do right.

Besides, as the inspired writer continues his argument, if the potter has the right of the same mass of clay to make one vessel to honor and another to dishonor, has not the infinite God the same right over his fallen creatures? Can any one complain if, to manifest his mercy, he saves some of the guilty children of men, and to manifest his justice he allows others to bear the just recompense of their sins? This is only doing what every good and wise human sovereign is expected and required to do.

It cannot fail to be noticed that the character of the apostle's doctrine is determined by the objections to it. Had he taught that God chooses as vessels of mercy those who he foresees will believe, and leaves to perish those who he foresees will reject the Gospel, there had been no pretext for the charge of injustice. It was because he taught that God gave repentance and faith to some and not to others that his opponents charged him with teaching what was inconsistent with impartial justice on the part of God.

3. That God is sovereign in the election of the heirs of salvation is plain, because men are chosen to holiness; faith and repentance are gifts of God, and fruits of his Spirit. If it is election to salvation which secures repentance and faith, repentance and faith cannot be the ground of election. The passages of Scripture already quoted distinctly assert that election precedes and secures the exercise of faith. In Eph 1:4, it is said, We were chosen, before the foundation of the world, to be holy. In Eph 2:8, of the same epistle, it is said, "Faith is the gift of God;" and in Eph 2:10, that we were foreordained unto good works. In Colossians, faith is said to be " of the operation of God" (Col 2:12). In Eph 1:19, it is referred to "the mighty power of God," which wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. In 1Pe 1:2, it is said, we are elected "unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Vocation, that is, regeneration, the fruits of which are faith and holy living, follows election, as taught in Rom 8:30, "whom he did predestinate, them he also called." In a preceding verse of that chapter, it is said, we are predestinated '' to be conformed to the image of his Son." But conformity to the image of Christ includes all that is good in us. Christ was exalted "to give repentance and forgiveness of sin"  (Act 5:31). "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth" (2Ti 2:25). "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world to be rich in faith" (Jam 2:5). "It is of him ye are in Christ Jesus" (1Co 1:30). It is, however, unnecessary to multiply quotations. The Bible is full of the doctrine that regeneration is the gift of God; that all holy exercises are due to the working of his Spirit. All Christians recognize this truth in their prayers. They pray earnestly for the conversion of those dear to them. This takes for granted that God can and does change the heart; that all that pertains to salvation, the means as well as the end, are his gifts. If he gives us repentance — if the fact be due to him that we, and not others, turn from our sins to the living God, then surely he does not choose us and not others because of such repentance.

4. Salvation is by grace. Grace is not mere benevolence, nor is it love in the form in which God loves the holy angels. It is love to the unholy, the guilty, to enemies. It is mysterious love. It is compared to the instinctive love of a mother for her child, which is independent of its attractions. This is the most wonderful, and, perhaps, the most glorious of all the known attributes of God. We are distinctly told that the special object of the redemption of man was the revelation of this divine perfection; it was for the manifestation "of the glory of the riches of his grace" (Eph 1:6). He hath quickened us, raised us up, made us sit in heavenly places, "that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness to us through Christ Jesus" (Eph 2:5-7). Such being the design of redemption, it must, in all its stages, be a work of grace. It was a matter of grace that redemption was provided for man and not for angels; it was a matter of grace that God gave his Son for our salvation. To make the mission of Christ a matter of justice, something to which our fallen race had a righteous claim, would alter the whole character of the Bible. The incarnation, sufferings, and death of the Son of God are everywhere set forth as manifestations of the unmerited and infinite love of God. But if a matter of grace that salvation was provided for the children of men, it was a matter of grace that the knowledge of the plan of salvation was communicated to some and not to others — to the Jews and not to the Gentiles. It is of grace that any sinner is justified, that he is sanctified and saved. From first to last salvation is of grace. To introduce the element of works or merit into any part of the plan vitiates its character. It is expressly taught that regeneration or conversion, the fact  that one man is converted and not another, is a matter of grace. This is what the apostle specially insists upon in the first chapter to the Corinthians, already referred to. He calls upon his readers to look at their calling, to see who among them were called. It was not the wise or the great, but the foolish and the insignificant, whom God chose, for the very purpose that no flesh should glory in his presence. — It was necessary that the subjects of salvation should feel and acknowledge that they were saved by grace; that it was not for any merit of their own, not for anything favorably distinguishing them from others, but simply that God, and the riches and sovereignty of his grace, should be magnified in them. Such is the form of apostolic Christianity, and such is the form in which it reveals itself in the heart of the believer. His theory may be one thing, but his inward and, it may be added, his delightful consciousness is that he owes his salvation to the grace of God alone.

5. The doctrines of the Bible are so related that one of necessity implies others. If the Scriptures teach that men, since the Fall, are born in a state of sin and condemnation, and are spiritually dead until renewed by the Holy Ghost; if this death in sin involves entire helplessness, or inability to any spiritually good; if regeneration, or effectual calling, is effected, not by the moral influence of the truth, or by those divine influences common to all who hear the Gospel, but "by the mighty power of God," then of necessity the calling and consequently the election of those who are sated is a matter of sovereignty. If Christ, when on earth, raised some from the dead and not others, it was not anything in the state of one dead body as distinguished from others which determined which should rise and which should remain in their graves. As this connection between doctrines exists, all the evidence which the Bible contains of one of the truths just mentioned is so much evidence in favor of the others.

6. The system of doctrine with which these views are connected is frequently designated as Pauline. But this is a misnomer. Although clearly taught by the apostle Paul, these views are far from being peculiar to his writings. They not only pervade the Scriptures, but were inculcated with greater solemnity, clearness, and frequency by our blessed Lord himself than by any other of the messengers of God. He constantly addressed men as in a hopeless and helpless state of sin and misery, from which nothing but the almighty power of God could deliver them. Of the mass of mankind thus lying under the just displeasure of God, he speaks of those whom the Father had given him, who should certainly come to him, and whom he  would without fail bring into his heavenly kingdom. He constantly refers to the good pleasure of God as the only assignable reason why one is saved and not another. "Many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias... . but unto none of them was Elias sent save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman, and she was a widow. And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet, and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman the Syrian" (Luk 4:25-27). "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight" (Mat 11:25-26). "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand" (Luk 8:10). "All that the Father hath given me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out... . And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that if all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but raise it up again at the last day" (Joh 6:37; Joh 6:39). "No man can come to me except the Father draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day" (Joh 6:44). "No man can come to me except it were given unto him of my Father" (Joh 6:65). "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world" (Joh 15:19). "Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one" (Joh 10:26-28). "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him" (Joh 17:2). "Thine they were, and thou gavest them me" (Joh 17:6). " I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine" (Joh 17:9). ' Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me" (Joh 17:11). "Father, I will that they also, whom thon hast given me, be with me where I am." Our Lord thus teaches that those who are saved are certain persons chosen out of the world and given to him by the Father; that those thus given to him certainly come to him; that this certainty is secured by the drawing of the Father; and that those thus given to him are certainly saved.

7. There is an intimate relation between truth and Christian experience. The one accords with the other. What the Bible teaches of the sinfulness of  man, the believer feels to be true concerning himself. What it teaches of the helplessness and dependence of the sinner, his own experience teaches him to be true; what is said of the nature and effects of faith answers to what he finds in his own heart. If, therefore, the Bible teaches that it is of God, and not of himself, that the believer is in Christ Jesus; that he, and not others, repent and believe; that he has been made to hear the divine voice, while others remain deaf — this will find a response in the bosom of the experienced Christian. We consequently find all these truths impressed upon the common consciousness of the Church, as it finds expression in its liturgies, its prayers, praises, and confessions. "Not unto us, not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be the glory," is the spontaneous language of the believer's heart. It is not in experimental religion, in the theology of the heart, that the children of God differ, but in the form in which the understanding undertakes to reduce these facts of Scripture experience to logical consistency.

8. As there is this correspondence between the truths of the Bible and religious experience, there is a like analogy between the providence of God and the dispensations of his grace. He is not more sovereign in the one than in the other. It is of him that we were born in a Christian land and not heathendom; among Protestants instead of in Spain or Italy; of Christian parents and in the bosom of the Church instead of being the children of the irreligious and immoral. It is the "Lord that maketh poor and maketh rich; he bringeth low and lifteth up" (1Sa 2:7). "God putteth down one and setteth up another" (Psa 75:7). " It is he giveth power to get wealth" (Deu 8:18). "He giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them who know understanding" (Dan 2:12). "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he wills" (Dan 4:17). The Bible is full of this doctrine. God governs all his creatures and all their actions. "He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (Eph 1:11). This is a truth of even natural religion; at least it is recognised by all Christians. They pray for favorable seasons, for protection from disease and accident, and from the malice of their enemies. When the pestilence sweeps over the land, and one is taken and another left, we all say, " It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth right in his sight." All that Augustinians teach concerning election is, that God acts in the dispensation of grace as he does in his providential government of the world. If sovereignty be consistent with justice and goodness in the one case, it must be in the other.  The difficulty which is usually felt on this subject arises from looking at only one aspect of the case. It is true that God gives health, wisdom, riches, power, the knowledge of the truth, saving grace, and life everlasting, according to his good pleasure. He exercises the prerogative of having mercy upon whom he will have mercy. It is true that what in fact occurs God intended to permit. Although he can, as all Christians admit, control the acts of free agents, he permitted the fall of man. He permits the present amount of sin and misery in the world. If so be that multitudes perish in their sins, it is undeniable that God intended, for wise reasons, to permit them to perish. While all this is true, it is no less true that he never interferes with the free agency of his rational creatures. If a man of the world determines to make the acquisition of wealth the end of his life, he is perfectly free in forming that determination. If he determines by diligence and honesty to accomplish his object, or if he chooses to resort to deceit and fraud, he is in both cases free and responsible. On the other hand, if a man determines to make the salvation of his soul and the service of Christ the great end of his being, he also is perfectly free in the choice he makes. If God makes him willing, he does not act unwillingly. Paul was never more free in his life than when he made a complete surrender of himself to Christ, saying, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" No man, we may well believe, ever sought Christ with the diligence and constancy, under the guidance of the Gospel, which the men of the world exhibit who failed of being saved. All who perish under the knowledge of the truth perish because they deliberately prefer the world to God.

The importance of the doctrine in question arises from the fact that, in the present state of human nature, if God by his almighty power did not convert some from the error of their way, no man would be saved. If he left all to themselves, and to those influences of the Spirit common to all who hear the Gospel, all would continue in their sins. Had not Christ by his omnipotence healed some lepers, none would have been healed; had he not opened some sightless eyes, all the blind would have continued in darkness.

The practical effect of the doctrine that we are entirely helpless in our sin and guilt, lying at the mercy of God, is to lead us to cast ourselves at his feet, saying, God be merciful to us sinners! As the deaf, and blind, and leprous, under a sense of helplessness and misery, crowded to Christ for healing, so souls burdened with the leprosy of sin are constrained to look to him for help, and those who come to him he will in no wise cast out. (C.H.)

II. The Doctrine of Election from the Arminian Point of View. —

1. John Wesley sums up his view of election as follows: "I believe it commonly means one of these two things:

(1.) A divine appointment of some particular men to do some particular work in the world. And this election I believe to be not only personal, but absolute and uncondition: 2. Thus Cyrus was elected to rebuild the Temple, and St. Paul, with the twelve, to preach the Gospel. But I do not find this to have any necessary connection with eternal happiness. Nay, it is plain it has not; for one who is elected in this sense may yet be lost eternally. 'Have I not chosen (elected) you twelve,' saith our Lord, 'yet one of you hath a devil?' Judas, you see, was elected as well as the rest; yet is his lot with the devil and his angels.

(2.) I believe election means, secondly, a divine appointment of some men to eternal happiness. But I believe this election to be conditional, as well as the reprobation opposite thereto. I believe the eternal decree concerning both is expressed in these words: 'He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.' And this decree, without doubt, God will not change, and man cannot resist. According to this, all true believers are in Scripture termed elect; as all who continue in unbelief are so long properly reprobates, that is, unapproved of God, and without discernment touching the things of the Spirit. Now God, to whom all things are present at once, who sees all eternity at one view, 'calleth the things that are not as though they were,' the things that are not as yet as though they were now subsisting. Thus he calls Abraham 'the father of many nations' before even Isaac was born. And thus Christ is called 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' though he was not slain, in fact, till some thousands of years after. In like manner God calleth true believers 'elect from the foundation of the world,' although they were not actually elect or believers till many ages after, in their several generations. Then only it was that they were actually elected when they were made 'the sons of God by faith.' Then were they in fact chosen and taken out of the world; 'elect,' saith St. Paul, 'through belief of the truth;' or, as St. Peter expresses it, 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God, through sanctification of the Spirit.' This election I as firmly believe as I believe the Scripture to be of God. But unconditional election I cannot believe; not only because I cannot find it in Scripture, but also (to waive all other considerations)  because it necessarily implies unconditional reprobation. Find out any election which does not imply reprobation, and I will gladly agree to it. But reprobation I can never agree to while I believe the Scriptures to be of God, as being utterly irreconcilable to the whole scope of the Old and New Testaments" (Works, N.Y. edition, 6:28, 29).

2. The following summary statement is from the Reverend Dr. Whedon: "All God's choices are elections. Some of these elections are unconditional, viz. those which relate to material objects, the absolute disposing of which violates no flee agency. But there is also a class of conditional elections or predeterminations by God, which are so far contingent as that they are conditioned upon the actual performance of certain free acts by the finite agent as foreseen. Those free acts, required by God as conditions to this election, are by divine grace placed in the power of every responsible agent, so that the primary reason why any are not elected is that they do not exercise their power of meeting those conditions. And since every responsible agent has the power to make his own calling and election sure, and every elect person has full power to reject the conditions, so it is not true that the number of the elect can be neither increased nor diminished. Every man has gracious powers to be elected according to the eternal purpose of God. All men may be saved. Every individual, by grace divine, may place himself in the number of those who are chosen from before the foundation of the world. The reprobates are those who, abusing the conferred grace of God, resisting the Holy Spirit, reject the conditions of salvation, and so fail to present the necessary tests to their election. The elect are chosen unto good works, to holy faith, to persevering love, to a full manifestation of the power of the Gospel during their probationary life, and upon their full performance of this their work and mission, they attain, through grace divine, to a rich, unmerited salvation" (Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1862, page 268).

3. The following statement and argument is chiefly abridged from Watson, Theological Institutes, part 2, chapter 26: Three kinds of election are mentioned in Scripture, viz.:

i. The election of individuals to perform some particular service, which has no necessary connection with their salvation. Cyrus was God's chosen servant to promote the rebuilding of his Temple. The apostles of our Lord were elected to their office: "Have I not chosen you twelve?" This was an act of sovereign choice for which Christ gave no reason. He made no  apologies to those disciples who were not chosen, and he never allowed any one who had the call to refer to anything meritorious in himself as the cause. He is the Lord of his Church. Great mischief has been done by confounding this election to office, which in its nature must be unconditional, with personal election to salvation, dependent upon faith and perseverance. St. Paul had an unconditional election to the same office from which Judas fell. He was a "chosen" vessel to be the apostle of the Gentiles.

ii. The second kind of election is that of communities or bodies of people to eminent religious privileges to accomplish, through their means, the merciful purposes of God in benefiting other nations. This was once applicable to the Jews, as it is now to the Christians. "You only have I chosen of all the families of the earth." "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." This fact may in part account for the frequent and familiar use of the terms elect, chosen, and peculiar in the New Testament, when the apostles are writing to the churches. This, however, does not explain fully the reason for the use of these terms. The abrogation of the church-state of the Jews, and the admission of Gentiles to an equality with Jews as the people of God, will account for the adoption of this phraseology. The reason of their peculiar existence as a nation ceased with the coming of Christ, for he was a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the glory of his people Israel. There was a new election of a new people of God, to be composed of Jews, not by virtue of their natural descent, but by faith in Christ; and of Gentiles of all nations, also believers, and placed on an equal ground with the believing Jews (see Rom 11:1-36). It is easy therefore, to see what is the import of the 'calling' and 'election' of the Christian Church, as spoken of in the New Testament. It was not the calling and the electing of one nation in particular to succeed the Jews, but it was the calling and the electing of believers in all nations, wherever the Gospel should be preached, to be in reality what the Jews typically, and therefore in an inferior degree, had been the visible Church of God, 'his people,' under Christ 'the head;' with an authenticated revelation; with an appointed ministry, never to be lost; with authorized worship; with holy days and festivals; with instituted forms of initiation; and with special protection and favor.

Now what were the effects of this election?

(1.) Plainly the ancient election of the Jews to be God's peculiar people did not secure the salvation of every Jew individually, nor did it exclude the non-elect Gentiles from adequate means of salvation; nay, the election of the Jews was intended for the benefit of the Gentiles — to restrain idolatry and diffuse spiritual truth.

(2.) As to the election of the Christian Church, it does not infallibly secure the salvation of every member of the Church, nor does it conclude anything against the saving mercy of God being still exercised as to those who are out of the Church; nay, the very election of Christians (who are the "salt" of the earth) is intended to bring those who are still in "the world" to Christ.

This collective election is often confounded by Calvinists with personal election. This is especially done in the interpretation of Paul's argument in Rom 9:1-33; Rom 10:1-21; Rom 11:1-36. But a just exegesis of these chapters shows that they can be interpreted only of collective election, not of personal election (see the full examination of this in Watson, Institutes, 2:312-325). The apostle does, indeed, treat of unconditional election in this discourse, but it is of unconditional collective election.

iii. The third kind is personal election of individuals to be the children of God. Our Lord says, "I have chosen you out of the world." St. Peter says, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Then election must take place in time, and must be subsequent to the administration of the means of salvation. The " calling" goes before the “election," and the "sprinkling of the blood of Christ" before that "sanctification" through which they become "the elect" of God. In a word, "the elect" are the body of true believers; and personal election into the family of God is through personal faith. All who truly believe are elected; and all to whom the Gospel is sent have, through the grace that accompanies it, the power to believe placed within their reach; and all such might, therefore, attain to the grace of personal election. The doctrine of personal election is therefore brought down to its true meaning. Actual election cannot be eternal; for from eternity the elect were not actually chosen out of the world, and from eternity they could not be "sanctified unto obedience." The phrases "eternal election' and "eternal decree of election" can therefore mean only "an eternal purpose" to elect, a purpose formed in eternity to choose and sanctify in time “by the Spirit and the  blood of Jesus." But when Calvinists graft on this the doctrine that God hath from eternity chosen in Christ unto salvation a set number of men (certam quorundam hominum multitudinem) unto holiness and eternal life, without cause or condition except his arbitrary will, they assert a doctrine not to be found in the Word of God. It has two parts:

(1) the choosing of a determinate number of men, which cannot be increased or diminished;

(2) this choice is unconditional. Let us consider these two points.

a. As to the choosing of a determinate number of men, it is allowed by Calvinists that they have no express scriptural evidence for this tenet. And,

(1.) As to God's eternal purpose to elect, we know nothing except from revelation, and that declares

(a) that he willeth all men to be saved;

(b) that Christ died for all men, in order to the salvation of all; and

(c) the decree of God is, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned:" and if God be unchangeable, this must have been his decree from all eternity:

(d) if the fault of men's destruction lies in themselves, then the number of the elect is capable of increase and diminution.

(2.) This doctrine necessarily carries with it that of the unconditional reprobation of all mankind, except the elect, which cannot be reconciled with the moral attributes of God, i.e., with his love, wisdom, grace, compassion, justice, or sincerity; nor with the scriptural doctrine that God is no respecter of persons; nor with the scriptural doctrine of the eternal salvation of infants; nor, finally, with the proper end of punitive justice, which is, to deter men from sin, and to add strength to the law of God.

b. As to the second branch of this doctrine, viz. that personal election is unconditional.

(1.) According to this doctrine, the Church of God is constituted on the sole principle of the divine purpose, not upon the basis of faith and obedience, which manifestly contradicts the Word of God, according to which Christ's Church is composed not merely of men, as Peter, James,  and John, but of Peter, James, and John believing and obeying; while all who “believe not," and obey not, are of "the world," not of "the chosen."

(2.) This doctrine of election without respect to faith contradicts the history of the commencement and first constitution of the Church of Christ. The first disciples became such by believing; and before baptism men were required to believe, so that their actual election had respect to faith.

(3.) There is no such doctrine in Scripture as the election of individuals unto faith, and it is Inconsistent with several passages which speak expressly of personal election, e.g. Joh 15:19; 1Pe 1:2; 2Th 2:13-14.

(4.) There is another class of texts in which the term election occurs, referring to believers, not personally, but as a body forming the Church of Christ, which texts, containing the word election, are ingeniously applied to the support of the doctrine of unconditional personal election, when in fact they do not contain it. Such is Eph 1:4-6. Now in regard to this text, it might be shown

(a) that if personal election were contained in it, the choice spoken of is not of men merely, but of believing men; but

(b) it does not contain the doctrine of personal election, but that of the eternal purpose of God to constitute his visible Church no longer upon the ground of descent from Abraham, but on that of faith in Christ,

(5.) Finally, the Calvinistic doctrine has no stronger passage to lean upon. We conclude by asking if this doctrine be true,

(a) Why are we commanded "to make our election sure?"

(b) Where does Scripture tell us of elect unbelievers?

(c) and how can the Spirit of truth convince such of sin and danger, when they are, in fact, in no danger?

The fundamental objection made by Calvinists to the Arminian doctrine is that it "subverts grace!” How? Because "it is not an act of grace for the Most High to do justice!" Does this mean that God cannot be at once gracious and just? Grace, in this discussion, is not opposed to God's  justice, but to man's desert. If, indeed, human merit alone had entered into the question, the race would have ended with Adam; and it was only in virtue of the covenant of grace that descendants were born to him. Under that covenant God is bound, not, indeed, by any desert of man (for that would preclude grace), but by his own faithfulness, to offer salvation in Christ to all who fell in Adam. This is the doctrine of Arminians; this, too, is the doctrine of Scripture. The Gospel system is called by St. Paul the " grace of God, given to us in Christ Jesus." And he tells us that "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men (ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις) hath appeared" (Tit 2:11); that "the living God is the Savior of all men, especially those that believe" (1Ti 4:10); that he "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (1Ti 2:4). According to the Gospel scheme, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." This θέλημα Θεοῦ is his determinate counsel — a decree "of his good pleasure." "Not, however, that it would have been consistent for God to desert the human race, and leave it to perish; the divine goodness forbids such a supposition. The simple meaning is that no external necessity compelled him to it, and that it was his free grace, without desert or worthiness on the part of man" (Knapp, Theol. § 88). Were God bound, by any merit in man, to restore freedom of will and moral power to man, there would be no grace in the act. But God may be bound by the perfections of his own character, and, in accordance with the scheme of human salvation which he in his infinite goodness has devised and announced, to do many things for man, which, so far as the recipient is concerned, are pure acts of grace. The Augustinian doctrine holds, in effect, that God displays his mercy in saving a portion of mankind by irresistible grace, and in "destroying the rest by the simple rule of his own sovereignty." The Methodist doctrine is that God, of his boundless philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία, Tit 3:4), provides means for the salvation of the whole human race, gives grace to enable each man to appropriate that salvation to himself, and destroys none but those who willfully refuse that grace. The former, in its fatalistic elements, is as much the doctrine of Mohammed as of Christ; the latter is the very grace of the Gospel." SEE GRACE.

III. Other Views on Election. — It is undeniable that the Augustinian doctrine has been held by many of the greatest and subtlest intellects from Augustine's time until now. It has a sort of fascination, especially for masculine and vigorous natures. Is not the explanation probably to be  found in the fact that such natures find "a deep peace in the belief that their own greatest efforts are not really efforts at all, but the natural fruits of a divine necessity; that they can neither fail nor succeed so long as they obey implicitly, but only transmit the energies and register the decrees of a diviner might and wisdom? No doubt there is A great fascination in a mode of thought which almost obliterates the human instrument in the grandeur of the inevitable purpose. Calvinism is a personal and Christian way of merging the individual in the grandeur of a universal destiny" (Spectator, July 2, 1864), Perhaps the greatest danger in the tendencies of modern thought is that of the subversion of the mora) freedom of man by the general acceptance of the doctrine that physical law is just as valid in the moral world as in the material. That the Calvinistic doctrine tends in this direction cannot be denied. And this tendency is doubtless one of the grounds, if not the chief ground, of the modern reaction against Augustinianism among spiritual thinkers (as distinguished from materialists) on the one hand, and of the various schemes of modified Augustinianism which have been proposed within the theological sphere as substitutes for extreme Calvinism, as Baxterianism, the so-called moderate Calvinism (q.v.) and the New-England Theology (q.v.).

1. Dr. Nevin (Mercersburgh Review, April, 1857, not writing from the Arminian point of view) compares the New Testament idea of election with the Calvinistic as follows: "Are the references to the idea of election in the New Testament such, as a general thing, that they may be fairly construed in the known and established sense of the Calvinistic dogma; or are they so circumstanced and conditioned as to require plainly a different interpretation? On this point there is no room for any serious doubt. The New Testament doctrine of election, as it meets us, for instance, in the epistles of St. Peter, and rules continually the thinking and writing of St. Paul, is something essentially different from the doctrine of election which is presented to our view in Calvin's Institutes. The proof of this is found sufficiently in one single consideration. The Calvinistic election involves, beyond the possibility of failure, the full salvation at last of all those who are its subjects; there is no room to conceive of their coming short of this result in any single instance, made certain as it is in the form of a specific purpose and predetermination in the divine mind from all eternity. Election and glorification, the beginning and the end of redemption, are so indissolubly bound together that they may be considered different sides only of one and the same fact. The 'elect' in Calvin's sense have no power  really to fall from grace, or come short of everlasting life: But, plainly, the 'elect' of whom the New Testament speaks, the 'chosen and called of God' in the sense of St. Peter and St. Paul, are not supposed to possess any such advantage; on the contrary, it is assumed in all sorts of ways that their condition carries with it, in the present world, no prerogative of certain ultimate salvation whatever.

They may forget that they were purged from their old sins, lose the benefit of their illumination, make shipwreck of their faith, and draw back to everlasting perdition. They have it in their power to throw away the opportunities of grace, just as much as it lies in the power of men continually to waste in like manner the opportunities of mere nature. Their salvation is, after all, hypothetical, and suspended upon conditions in themselves which are really liable to fail in every case, and which with many do eventually fail in fact. Hence occasion is supposed to exist, in the sphere of this election itself, for all sorts of exhortation and warning to those who are the subjects of it, having the object of engaging them to 'make their calling and election sure.' The tenor of all is, Walk worthy of your vocation. Only such as endure unto the end shall be saved. So run that ye may obtain.' Plainly, we repeat, the two conceptions are not the same. The difference here brought into view is such as to show unanswerably that the Calvinistic dogma is one thing, and the common New Testament idea of election altogether another. The Calvinistic election terminates on the absolute salvation of its subjects; that forms the precise end and scope of it, in such so that there is no room to conceive of its failing to reach this issue in any single case. The New Testament election, as it enters into the thinking of St. Peter and St. Paul, terminates manifestly on a state or condition short of absolute salvation. Whatever the distinction may involve, for those who are its subjects, in the way of saving grace, it does not reach out at once to the full issue of eternal life. The fact it serves to establish and make certain for them is of quite another character and kind; it sets them in the way of salvation, but it does not make their salvation sure."

2. Martensen (Christian Dogmatics, Edinb. 1866), a modern Lutheran divine, remarks — that Calvin "confounds predestination with the election of grace. The separation which is only temporal he made eternal, be. cause he laid its foundations in the eternal counsel of God. God, according to him, made from eternity a twofold election, because he hath foreappointed certain persons to faith and to blessedness, and certain others to unbelief and everlasting damnation. This awful election he further maintained to be  purely unconditional, and thus he mistook the true relations between the divine and the human... . From Calvin's point of view man has no history — at least so far as history includes the idea of a temporal and free life in which what is as yet undecided will be decided; all is decided beforehand — existence, life, destiny... . The true basis of the doctrine of election is given in the Lutheran doctrine of universal grace and conditional decrees" (§ 206-210).

3. Browne, bishop of Ely, in his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles (N.Y. 1865, 8vo), gives a pretty full history of the doctrine of election, and maintains, in substance, the theory of "ecclesiastical election," viz. that, as the "Jews of old were God's chosen people, so now is the Christian Church; that any baptized member of the Church is one of God's elect, and that this election is from God's irrespective and unsearchable decree. Here, therefore, election is to baptismal privileges, not to final glory; and the elect are identical with the baptized; and the 'election' constitutes the Church" (page 402). His conclusion, from an examination of the passages of Scripture bearing on the question, is, "that the revelation which God has given us concerns his will and purpose to gather together in Christ a Church chosen out of the world, and that to this Church, and to every individual member of it, he gives the means of salvation. That salvation, if attained, will be wholly due to the favor of God, which first chooses the elect soul to the blessings of the baptismal covenant, and afterwards endues it with power to live the life of faith. If, on the other hand, the proffered salvation be forfeited, it will be in consequence of the faults and wickedness of him that rejects it. Much is said in Scripture of God's will that all shall be saved. and of Christ's death as sufficient for all men; and we hear of none shut out from salvation but for their own faults and demerits. More than this cannot with certainty be inferred from Scripture, for it appears most probable that what we learn there concerns only predestination to grace, there being no revelation concerning predestination to glory" (page 442). See also, for views somewhat similar, Faber, Primitive Doctrine of Election (New York, 1840, 8vo); Fry, Essay on Election (London 1864). For the further literature, SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE PREDESTINATION.

## Electi[[@Headword:Electi]]

             a name sometimes applied to Christians in the early ages of the Christian Church.

Among the Manichaeans the term denoted the higher or more holy of the two classes into which believers were divided, the lower being styled simply "auditores."

## Election of Pope[[@Headword:Election of Pope]]

             SEE CARDINALS; SEE CONCLAVE; SEE POPE.

## Electoral College[[@Headword:Electoral College]]

             is a committee of clergy and inotables convened to elect bishops and other clergy, as a means of avoiding the tumult of a popular election, following the advice of Clement of Rome and the Coumicil of Laodicea.

## Eledanus[[@Headword:Eledanus]]

             legendary bishop of Dumbarton, said to have been appointed by king Arthur, A.D. 519.

## Eleemosynarius[[@Headword:Eleemosynarius]]

             (1) SEE ALMS.

(2) The word also designates the "executor" of a will, when distributed for pious purposes.

## Eleeson[[@Headword:Eleeson]]

             SEE KYRIE.

## Eleileh[[@Headword:Eleileh]]

             (Hebrews Elaleh', אֶלְעָלֵה, whither God has ascended, once Elale', אֶלְעָלֵא, Num 32:37; Sept. Ε᾿λεαλή), a place on the east of Jordan, in the pastoral country, taken possession of and rebuilt by the tribe of Reuben (Num 32:3; Num 32:37). We lose sight of it till the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah, by both of whom it is mentioned as a Moabitish town, and, as before, in close connection with Heshbon (Isa 15:4; Isa 16:9; Jer 48:34). It apparently lay close to the border of Reuben and Gad (Jos 13:26). On the decline of Jewish power, Elealeh, with the whole Mishor, fell into the hands of the Moabites, and is thus included in the woes pronounced by Isaiah on Moab (Isa 16:9): "I will water thee with my tears, O Heshbon and Elealeh; for the alarm is fallen upon thy summer fruits, and thy harvest." Elealeh was still a large village in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, one mile from Heshbon (Onomast. s.v. Ε᾿λεάλε, Eleale). The extensive ruins of the place are still to be seen, bearing very nearly their ancient name, El-A'al, though with a modern signification, "the high," a little more than a mile north of Heshbon (Robinson, Researches, 2:278). It stands on the summit of a rounded hill commanding a very extended view of the plain, and the whole of the southern Belka (Burckhardt, Syria, page 365; Seetzen, 1854, page 407). The whole surrounding plain is now desolate. The statements of all travelers who have visited it show how fully the prophetic curses have been executed (Irby and Mangles, 1st ed. page 471; Ritter, Pal. und Syr. 2:1172.; G. Robinson's Palest. and Syr. 2:180 sq.).

## Eleisa[[@Headword:Eleisa]]

             (Ε᾿λεασά, Alex. MS. Α᾿λασά; Vulg. Laisa), a place at which Judas Maccabeus encamped before the fatal battle with Bacchides, in which he lost his life (1Ma 9:5). It was apparently not far from Azotus (comp. 1Ma 9:15). Josephus (Ant. 12:11, 1) has Bethzetho (Βηθζηθώ), by which he elsewhere renders Bezeth. But this may be but a corrupt reading of Berzetha or Bethzetha, which is found in some MSS. for Berea in 1 Mace. 9:4. Elsewhere (War 1:1, 6), however, Josephus states that Judas lost his  life in a battle with the generals of Antiochus Eupator at Adasa (q.v.), which is probably the correct reading here, since Adasa was where Judas had encamped on a former memorable occasion (1Ma 7:40). It is singular that Bezeth should be mentioned in this connection also (see 1Ma 7:19).

## Eleisah[[@Headword:Eleisah]]

             [many Elea 'sah], the name (in the A.V.) of two men (1Ch 2:39; 1Ch 8:37; 1Ch 9:43), identical (in the Hebrew) with that of two others (Jer 29:3; Ezr 10:22), more properly Anglicized ELASAH SEE ELASAH (q.v.).

## Elem-Rechokim[[@Headword:Elem-Rechokim]]

             SEE JONATH-ELEM-RECHO KIM.

## Elements[[@Headword:Elements]]

             (στοιχεῖα). The etymon both of the English and Greek word conveys their primary meaning: thus, elements, from "elementa," the alimenta from which things are m de, and στοιχεῖα, from στείχω, "to go up by steps" — the first principles whence the subsequent parts of things (στοιχοῦσι) proceed in order. It seems to have been believed, from a very early period, that all bodies consist of certain first, specific ingredients (στοιχεῖα), into which they are all resolvable, although different opinions prevailed respecting the number and nature of these primary constituents of things. Hesychius explains στοιχεῖα βψ πῦρ, ὕδωρ, γῆ, καὶ ἀήρ, ἀφ᾿ ῏ων τὰ σώματα — fire, water, earth, and air, of which bodies are formed. This, which is the simplest, may be called the primary sense of the word. A secondary use of the word relates to the organized parts of which anything is framed, as the letters of the alphabet (Hesychius gives also γράμματα), these being the elements of words; also the elements, rudiments, or first principles of any art or science.

The word occurs in its primary sense, Wis 7:17, σύστασιν κόσμου καὶ εὐέργειαν στοιχείων, "the constitution of the world and the operation of the elements;" also 19:18. It is used in the same sense, 2Pe 3:10, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσονται, and 2Pe 3:12, τήκεται, " the elements burning will be dissolved and melted." The Jews, in Peter's time, spoke of four elements (Josephus, Ant. 3:7, 7).

The word occurs in a secondary sense in Gal 4:3-9, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, "the elements or rudiments of the world," which the apostle  calls ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, "weak and poor elements." He introduces the word to preserve the unity of his comparison of the law to a pedagogue (3:24), and of persons under it to children under tutors; and by the elements or rudiments of the world he evidently means that state of religious knowledge which had subsisted in the world, among Jews and Gentiles, before Christ; the weakness of which, among the Jews, may be seen in Heb 7:18-19; Heb 10:1; and among the Gentiles, in the epistle to the Romans, passim. "The elements of the world" occurs again, Col 2:8-20, in the same sense, as appears from the various allusions both to the terms used in Grecian philosophy, and the dogmas of the Judaizers in the subsequent verses; the phrase being possibly suggested to the apostle by his previous use of it to the Galatians. The word στοιχεῖα, in Heb 5:12, is restricted, by the addition τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, to the rudiments of Christianity (see Rosenmuller and Benson on the passages).

II. In the Sacraments. — The materials used in the sacraments are called the elements. Water is the element of baptism, bread and wine are the elements of the Eucharist. "This use of the word 'elements' (στοιχεῖα) sprung from the philosophy of the school divines, and evidently had reference to the change supposed to take place after consecration. The Church of England has discarded the term in her services, and has introduced instead the word 'creatures' ('These thy creatures of bread and wine') in the communion-service, though the word 'elements' is found in one of the rubrics of that office" (Eden). "In all the Jewish sacrifices of which the people were partakers, the viands or materials of the feast were first made God's by a pious oblation, and then afterwards eaten by the communicants, not as man's, but as God's provisions, who, by thus entertaining them at his own table, declared himself reconciled, and again in covenant with them. And therefore our blessed Savior, when he instituted the new sacrament of his own body and blood, first gave thanks and blessed the elements — that is, offered them up to God as Lord of the creatures, as the most ancient fathers expound that passage; who for that reason, whenever they celebrated the holy Eucharist, always offered the bread and wine for the communion to God upon the altar by this or some short ejaculation: 'Lord, we offer thee thine own out of what thou hast bountifully given us' " (Bishop Patrick, cited by Hook, Church Dictionary, s.v.).

## Elements, Eucharistic[[@Headword:Elements, Eucharistic]]

             The Latin word elementa does not appear to have been used in this technical sense in the early ages of the Church, though it is a very natural word to express the component parts of anything. The unconsecrated elements on the altar are called, in Eastern liturgies, "the Mysteries;" the bread alone, "the Seal," from its being divided by lines in the form of a cross. When the elements have been placed on the altar they acquire other  names, having more distinct reference to sacrifice, as "the Lamb," or "the First-born." The elements are also called "symbols," "types," "visible forms," as outward representations of inward and spiritual grace.

Throughout the Church, bread and wine have always been recognized as the elements in the eucharist, with but few exceptions. An obscure sect, called the Artotyritse, added cheese to the bread. Some sects used no wine, but water alone; while others used wine in the evening service, but not in the morning.

I. Composition of the Bread. — The Church has been unanimous in using wheat as the material for the bread, it being regarded as the superior grain. The great controversy has been, Shall the bread be leavened or unleavened? The principal arguments bearing on this question are the following: It has generally been assumed in the West that the Last Supper was eaten at the feast of the Passover, and that therefore the bread used was unleavened, which was the only kind the Jews were allowed to eat at that time. But it is contended by some writers of the Greek Church that the Last Supper was held on the 13th Nisan, when leavened bread was still used; and there is no direct statement, either in the New Test. or in the writings of the early fathers, to indicate that unleavened bread was used; on the contrary, the fact that only "bread" was mentioned would lead to the inference that only common bread was meant. Justin Martyr simply speaks of bread, and as he is giving: a particular description of the Christian rites, it seems most probable that he would have mentioned the fact had any particular kind of bread, been used.

Epiphanius says that the Ebionites, in imitation of the saints in the Church, celebrate mysteries yearly in the Church with unleavened cakes. Innocent I sent to the bishops leavened bread, said to have been called by him "fermentum," in distinction from the unleavened. Cyprian, and still later, Isidore of Seville, in their discussions, leave out all mention of leaven as an ingredient in the eucharistic bread, which they would hardly have done had it been in use. But Alcuin (A.D. 790) says that the bread should be perfectly free from leaven of any kind. Rabanus Maurus (A.D. 819) likewise directs that the bread should be unleavened according to the Hebrew custom. It has been inferred by some that the eucharistic bread was introduced between the latter part of the 9th and the 11th centuries, for the reason that Photius of Constantinople (A.D. 867) never mentioned the use of unleavened bread; while Michael Cwerularius, also patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 1054), frequently does. The silence of Photius would only show that either the use of it was  unknown to him, or that he regarded it as a thing of no consequence. But John Maro, writing, at any rate, before the Trullan Council, says that those who made the eucharistic offering in leavened bread reproached the Western churches, the Armenians, and the Maronites, with offering "unleavened cakes," which were not bread at all; a clear proof that the Western churches generally, in the 7th century, were thought to agree with the Maronites and the Armenians in this respect.

On the whole, then, there is distinct evidence that unleavened bread was. used in the eucharist by the Latins, and by some eastern sects, in the 7th and 8th centuries; and there is strong evidence that it was used in the 3d. In the orthodox Eastern Church, there can be no doubt that leavened bread has been used from a very early period indeed; if not from the very first, at any rate from the time when Judaizing sects insisted on using unleavened cakes, like those of the Passover, in the Lord's Supper.

The Syrian Christians, besides the leaven which is common to almost all Oriental communions, mix with the bread a little oil and salt, a practice which they defend by many mystical reasons. The modern Greeks eagerly advocate the mixture of salt, which (they say) represents the life; so that a sacrifice without salt is a dead sacrifice.

In regard to, the character of, the bread, the sixth canon of the Council of Toledo (A.D. 693) enacts that no other bread: than such as is whole and clean and especially prepared shall be placed on the altar of the Lord.

The form of the loaf used by the Jews was round, and somewhat less than an inch thick, and six or eight inches in diameter. Oblates were frequently used, and impressed with a cross.

II. Composition of the Cup. — With regard to the element of wine there has been less controversy, though it Is an interesting and unsettled question whether the cup was mixed at the institution of the sacrament by our blessed Lord himself. Lightfoot (Temple Service, 1:691) says that he that drank pure wine performed his duty; so that, although it seems probable that our Lord used the mixed cup, yet it is not certain that he did so. The Babylonian Talmud calls water mixed with wine "the fruit of the vine;" but it would appear that the same term is used for pure wine in Isa 32:12; Hab 3:17; so that nothing positive call be ascertained from the use of that term. On the whole, it seems probable that our Lord used a mixed cup, and it is acknowledged on all hands that, with the exception of  a few heretics, the Charch used wine mixed with water.

Justin Martyr and Cyprian both justify the mixing of the two. The third Council of Carthage orders "that in the sacrament of' the body and blood of the Lord, nothing else be offered but what the Lord himself commanded; that is, read, and wine mixed with water." The African code, both Greek and Latin, has this same canon. The liturgies of James and Mark contain like words, while the liturgies of Basil and Chyrsostom order the deacon to put wine and water into the cup before the priest places it on the altar. In like manner, in some form or another, the mixing is mentioned in the liturgies of Ethiopia, Nestorius, Severus, of the Roman and the Gallican churches. A peculiar rite of the Byzantine Church is the mixing of hot water with the wine. In the liturgy of Chrysostom, after the fraction of the oblate, the deacon, taking up the vessel of boiling water, says to the priest, "Sir, bless the boiling water;" the priest then says, "Blessed be the fervency of thy saints forever, now and always, and for ages of ages;" then the deacon pours a small quantity of the boiling water into the chalice, saying, "The fervency of faith, full of the Holy Spirit. Amen." The principal deviations from the received practice of the Church in this matter have been the opposite usages of the Aquarians and Ebionites, who used no wine at all in the eucharist, and of the Armenians, who mixed no water with the wine.

Some in the 7th century offered milk for wine in the eucharist; others communicated the people not with wine pressed from grapes, but with the grapes themselves.

A peculiar instance of an addition to the cup is the dropping of milk and honey into it, according to the Roman rite, on Easter eve, the great day for the baptism of catechumens.

The wine in use in the Church has in general been red, apparently from a desire to symbolize as much as possible the blood of our Lord. Various mystical reasons have been given for the mixture of the water with the wine. Besides the presumption that our Lord used the mixed cup at the first institution, the liturgies generally allege as a further reason thatn blood and water flowed from his pierced side. In the comment on Mark, ascribed to Jerome, another is given: that by one we might be purged from sin, by the other redeemed from punishment. Alcuin (Epist. 90) finds in the three things, water, flour, and wine,, which may be placed on the altar, a mystical resemblance to the three heavenly witnesses of 1Jn 5:7.

## Elenara (or Elevara)[[@Headword:Elenara (or Elevara)]]

             a virgin martyr with. Sponsaria, in Gaul, in the reign of Diocletian, is commemorated May 2.

## Elenog[[@Headword:Elenog]]

             a Welsh saint of the 7th century.

## Eleph[[@Headword:Eleph]]

             (Hebrews with the art. ha-Eleph, הָאֶלֶ, Vulg. Eleph), one of the second group of towns allotted to Benjamin, and named between Zelah and Jerusalem (Jos 18:28). It is possibly the ruined site marked as Katamon on Van de Velde's "Map of the environs of Jerusalem," about one mile S.W. of Jerusalem. The Sept. unites the preceding name with this, under the compound form Σηλαλέφ (Vat. MS. Σελεκάν), and accordingly assigns only thirteen (δεκατρεῖς) cities to this group. Eusebius and Jerome (in their Onomasticon, s.v.) mention Sela (Σελά, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν) as distinct from Eleph. The Peshito strangely renders the name as Gebira. From the occasional use of אלin the bucolic sense of "ox," it has been conjectured that "Eleph and its villages" was a pastoral district. The extremely frequent numerical sense, however, of אל, a thousand, points rather to the populousness of these towns, which lay in the neighborhood of Jebus or Jerusalem. Schultens (Proverbs Solom. 2:17) refers to the Arabic alaph, "union," in illustration of both the numerical and the domestic sense of the Hebrews root. (See further Meier, Hebrews W. w. b. page 379.) Simonis (in his Oonomasticon, page 141) refers to the name of the Cilician town Μυρίανδρος in illustration, and to Deu 1:11; Psa 91:7, etc., for an indefinite use of אל, to designate a great multitude. Furst, in his Hebraisches Worterb. (1:91, 98), finds in Zec 9:7 another mention of our town Eleph, under the form אִלּוּor אִלֻּ, Alluph; which, like Jebusi, he makes a frontier city belonging to Benjamin and Judah. He quotes from Jephet (or Jefet ben-Ali), a Jewish commentator who lived at Jerusalem in the 10th century, a statement that the words of Jos 18:28; Jos 18:6 לֶ הִיְבוּסַי צֵלִע, are, in fact, the designation of but a single city — or still less, apparently, than even that, for he further quotes Jefet as saying that in his time a ward of Jerusalem bore that aggregate name, in which was the sepulcher of Zechariah. We reject this view as not only doing violence to the distinct enumeration of the group of cities given in Jos 18:28, but as disturbing the sense of the passage in Zec 9:7 (see Hengstenberg, Christology, 3:392-394). The phrase אִלֻּ בַּיהוּדָה (tribe-prince in Judah), used by the prophet in this passage, is by him repeated twice (see  Zec 12:5-6). In the Pentateuch and 1 Chronicles the same noun, אִלֻּ, in the plural, designates the chieftains or "dukes" of Edom. For some valuable remarks on the phrase, as indicating the genuineness of the passages in Zechariah, see also Hengstenberg, 4:67, note.

## Eleph (2)[[@Headword:Eleph (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder identifies this place with the present village of Lifta, west of Jerusalem (Quar. Report of the "Palest. Explor. Fund," January 1881, page 51), a site which he elsewhere (Tent Work in Palest. 2:339) assigns to Nephtoah (q.v.).

## Elephant[[@Headword:Elephant]]

             (ἐλέφας) does not occur in the text of the canonical Scriptures of the A. V., except in the adj. ἐλεφάντινος, "of ivory," Rev 18:12. But the animal is believed to be referred to in the Hebrew שֶׁנְאּהַבִּים, elephant's tooth, i.e., "ivory," 1Ki 10:22; 2Ch 9:21. SEE IVORY. Some have also regarded it as identical with the BEHEMOTH SEE BEHEMOTH (q.v.), as in the margin of Job 40:15. Elephants, however, are repeatedly mentioned in the 1Jam 2:1-26 d books of Maccabees as being used in warfare. The way in which they were used in battle, and the method of exciting them to fight, is described in 1Ma 6:1-63. The essential syllable of the Greek (and modern) name seems to be derived from that which all the nations of the south and west of Asia have for many ages generally used, namely, fil, feel, pheel, phil, פיל; for we find it in the Chaldee פַּילָא, pila', Buxtorf, Lex. Talin. col. 1722), Syriac, Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, extending to the east far beyond the Ganges, where, nevertheless, in the indigenous tongues, anei, waranam, and hatti are existing names. See Cassel, De variis eleph. denomi. natt. in the Symbol. lit. Brem. I, 1:136 sq.; Zeitschr. f. Kunde des Morgenl. IV, 1:12 sq.

It is well known that these animals were anciently employed in battles, originally in India (Aristotle, Anim. 9:1; Pliny, 6:22; AElian, Anim. 13:8, 22; comp. Ritter, Erdk. col. 1722:903 sq.), where they are commonly stronger and more sagacious than in Africa (Diod. Sic. 2:16; Pliny, 6:22; Philostr. Apol. 2:12; Curtius, 8:9, 17; AElian, Anim. 16:15; yet see Herod. 4:191; comp. Burmeister, in the Hall. Encycl. 33:265 sq.); next in Persia (although only indirectly before the times of Alexander, Arrian, Alex. in, 11, 6); later also in Asia Minor and even in the West (Flor. 1:18; Livy, 31:36; 37:40; 38:39; Hirtius, Bell. Afr. 48:86; Pliny, 8:5; Veget. Mil. 3:24; comp. Pausanias, 1:12, 4); and the Maccabees had to contend with such trained elephants in the Syrian armies of the Seleucidae (compare Plutarch, Demetr. 28 sq.; Appian, Syr. 46; Polybius, 11:32) in immense numbers (comp. Livy, 37:39; Pliny, 6:22; Polybius, 5:53). Military elephants were  accustomed to carry on their backs a wooden tower (Pliny, 8:7; Philostr. Apoll. 2:6; Juvenal, 12:110; Livy, 37:40), in which were a number of soldiers (four in the Syrian army of Antiochus the Great, according to Livy, l.c.; according to Philostr. Apoll. 2:12, about ten to fifteen; in India only three, Elian, Anim. 13:19; comp. Pliny, l.c.; certainly not thirty-two, as is stated in 1Ma 6:37 : in modern India only four or five persons are placed in the elephant-tower, Munro, Hist. of War in East India, page 91 [comp. Schlegel, Ind. Bibl. I, 2:176; Bochart, 1:262; and see Wernsdorf, De fide Macc. page 119 sq.], although an elephant can easily travel with 4000 pounds on his back); and their courage was artificially stimulated by wine (,Elian, Anim. 13:8; on the fondness of these animals for spirituous drinks, see Thevenot, Voyage, 3:89). This illustrates 3Ma 5:2; also 1Ma 6:34. Each equipped elephant was surrounded in battle by more than a hundred soldiers, to protect him on the side (1Ma 6:35 sq.), and thus were these animals conveniently distributed along the whole line (1Ma 6:35; comp. Livy, 37:40; Curtius, 8:12, 7). Occasionally, however, the elephant, becoming frightened, did his master more harm than the enemy (Curtius, 3:13, 15; 8:14, 16; 9:2, 20). The driver of a single armed elephant was called Ι᾿νδός, i.e., an Indian (1Ma 6:37), while the commander of a battalion of such was styled ἐλεφαντάρχης, an elephantarch (2Ma 14:12; 3Ma 5:4). See generally Bochart, Hieroz. 1:233 sq.; Schlegel, Indische Bibliothek, I, 2:129 sq.; Armandi, Histoire militaire des ilephants (Par. 1844); Oken, Lehrb. der Naturgesch. III, 2:783 sq.; Tavernier, Voyage, 2:72 sq.; Philippians a. S. Trinitate, Reisebeschr. page 386 sq.; fig. in Schreber's Saugethiere, 6, pl. 317.

The elephant's tusks, growing from the upper jaw (Aristotle, Anim. 2:4; AElian, Anim. 11:37), which the ancients sometimes mistook for horns (AElian, Anim. 4:31; 7:2; 11:37; Pausan. 5:12, 1; Pliny, 8:4; 18:1; Philostr. Apoll, 2:13; perhaps the קִרְנוֹת שֵׁן of Eze 27:15; comp. Ludolf, Hist. AEthiop. 1:10, 29; but see Havernick, in loc.) or ivory (שֶׁנְהָבַים, or simply low; comp. Pott, in the Zeitschro f. Morgenl. IV, 1:13 sq.), much earlier known in Asia Minor and Europe than the animal itself, were used by the Hebrews from the time of Solomon for ornamenting (overlaying, Pliny, 16:84) furniture (especially the divan, Amo 6:4; Philo, Opp. 2:478; 1Ki 10:18; Apulej. Metam. 2, page 37, ed. Bip.) and chambers (1Ki 20:39; Amo 3:15; Psa 45:9; comp. Homer, Odyss. 4:73; Diod. Sic. 3:47; Pausan. 1:12, 4; Petron. 135; Horace, Od. 2:18, 1; Lucan, 10:119; Herodian, 4:2, 3; Elian, Var. Hist.  12:39; Avien. 1200), also weapons (Curtius, 8:5, 1). Likewise vessels and images of the gods (Pausan. 5:12, 1; 2:17, 4; Virgil, Georg. 1:480; Pliny, 36:4; comp. Hermann, Ad Lucian. conscrib. hist. Page 303) were constructed of it (Rev 18:12); while the Tyrians, who disposed of ivory as an article of commerce (Eze 27:15), carried luxury so far as to make the rowers' benches of their ships of boxwood inlaid with ivory. For the estimation in which ivory was anciently held, and its various uses among the Greeks and Romans, see Heyne, Antiquar. Aufs. 2:149 sq. (also in the Nov. commentatt. Soc. Goetting. I, 2:96 sq.); Schlegel, ut sup. page 137 sq.; Kype, Observv. 2:461 sq.; Muller, Archdol. page 418 sq.; Bottiger, Archaol. Andeut. 1:108 sq. Solomon brought it by sea from Ophir (1Ki 10:22; comp. 1Ki 10:11).

The animals of this genus consist at present of two very distinct species, one a native of Southern Asia, once spread considerably to the westward of the Upper Indus, and the other occupying southern and middle Africa to the edge of the great Sahara. In a fossil state, however, there are six more species clearly distinguished. The elephant is the largest of all terrestrial animals, sometimes attaining above eleven feet of vertical height at the shoulders, and weighing from five to seven thousand pounds: he is of a black or slaty-ash color, and almost destitute of hair. The head, which is proportionably large, is provided with two broad pendulous ears, particularly in those of the African species, which are occasionally six feet in length. This species has also two molar teeth on each side of the jaw, both above and below, and only three toenails on each of the hind feet, whereas the Asiatic species is provided with only one tooth on each side above and below, and, though both have tusks or defences, the last mentioned has them confined solely to the males: they are never of more than 70 pounds in weight, often much less, and in some breeds even totally wanting; while in the African both sexes are armed with tusks, and in the males they have been known seven feet in length, and weighing above 150 pounds each.

The forehead of the African is low, that of the Asiatic high; in both the eyes are comparatively small, with a malevolent expression, and on the temples are pores which exude a viscous humor; the tail is long, hanging nearly to the heels, and distichous at the end. But the most remarkable organ of the elephant, that which equally enables the animal to reach the ground and to grasp branches of trees at a considerable height, is the proboscis or trunk — a cylindrical elastic instrument, in ordinary condition reaching nearly down to the ground, but contractile to two thirds  of its usual length, and extensile to one third beyond it; provided with nearly 4000 muscles crossing each other in such a manner that the proboscis is flexible in every direction, and so abundantly supplied with nerves as to render the organ one of the most delicate in nature. Within is the double canal of the nostrils, and at the terminal opening a finger. like process, with which the animal can take up very minute objects and grasp others, even to a writing pen, and mark paper with it. By means of the proboscis the elephant has a power of suction capable of raising nearly 200 pounds; and with this instrument he gathers food from trees and from the earth, draws up drink to squirt it down his throat, draws corks, unties small knots, and performs numberless other minute operations; and, if necessary, tears down branches of trees more than five inches in diameter with no less dexterity than strength. The gait of an elephant is an enormous slide, performed with his high and ponderous legs, and sufficiently rapid to require brisk galloping on horseback to outstrip him. Elephants are peaceable towards all inoffensive animals; sociable among themselves, and ready to help each other; gregarious in grassy plains, but more inclined to frequent densely-wooded mountain glens; at times not unwilling to visit the more and wastes, but fond of rivers and pools, where they wallow in mud and water among reeds and under the shade of trees.

They are most assuredly more sagacious than observers, who, from a few visits to menageries, compare them with dogs, are able to appreciate, for on this question we must take into account, on the one hand, the physical advantages of the proboscis added to the individual experience gained by an animal slow in growth, and of a longevity exceeding a century, but still placed in contact with man after a birth free in every sense, where his powers expand without human education; while, on the other hand, dogs are the offspring of an immense number of generations, all fashioned to the will of a master, and consequently with innate dispositions to acquire a certain education. In Griffith's Cuvier are found several anecdotes illustrating the sagacity of these animals, to which we shall add only a single one, related by the late Captain Hobson, R.N., as observed by himself at Travancore, where several of these animals were employed in stacking teak-timber balk. They had scarcely any human aid or direction, but each beam being successively noosed and slung, they dragged it to the stack, raised one end up, contrived to shove it forward, nicely watching when, being poised by its own weight, the lower end would rise, and then, placing their foreheads against the butt end, they pushed it even on the stack; the sling they unfastened and carried back to have it fitted again. In a  wild state no other animal has the sagacity to break off a leafy branch, hold it as a fan, and use it as a brush to drive away flies.

The Asiatic species, carrying the head higher, has more dignity of appearance, and is believed to have more sagacity and courage than the African, which, however, is not inferior in weight or bulk, and has never been in the hands of such experienced managers as the Indian mohauts are, who have acquired such deep knowledge of the character of these beasts that they make them submit to almost incredible operations; such, for example, as suffering patiently the extraction of a decayed part of a tooth, a kind of chisel and mallet being the instruments used for the purpose. Elephants walk under water as long as the end of the proboscis can remain above the surface, but when in greater depth they float with the head and back only about a foot beneath it. In this manner they swim across the broadest streams, and guide themselves by the sense of smelling till they reach footing to look about them and land. They are steady, assiduous workmen in many laborious tasks, often using discretion when they require some dexterity and attention in the performance. Good will is all man can trust to in directing them, for correction cannot be enforced beyond their patience; but flattery, good treatment, kind words, promises, and rewards, even to the wear of finery, have the desired effect. In history they appear most conspicuous as formidable elements of battle. From the remotest ages they were trained for war by the nations of India, and by their aid they no doubt acquired and long held possession of several regions of High Asia westward of the Indus. They are noticed in the ancient Mahabarata.

According to Sauti, the relative force of elephants in an akshaushini, or great army corps, was one to each chariot of war, three horsemen, and five foot soldiers, or, rather, archers mounted on the animal's back within a defensible howdah-in the West denominated a castle. Thus one armed elephant, one chariot, and three horsemen, formed a patti or squad of at most eleven men, and, if there were other bodies of infantry in the army, they are unnoticed. This enumeration is sufficient to show that in India, which furnished the elephants and the model of arming them, there were only four or five archers, with or without the mohaut or driver, and that, consequently, when the successors of Alexander introduced them in their wars in Syria, Greece, and even Italy, they could not be encumbered more than perhaps momentarily with one or two additional persons before a charge; for the weight carried by a war-elephant is less than that of one used for burden, which seldom equals 2000 pounds. In order to ascend his  back when suddenly required, the animal will hold out one of his hind legs horizontally, allowing a person to step upon it until he has grasped the crupper and crept up. In the West, where they were considered for a time of great importance, no doubt the squad or escort was more considerable than in the East, and may have amounted to thirty-two foot-soldiers, the number given, by some mistake, as if actually mounted, in 1Ma 6:37. Although red colors are offensive to many animals, it may be observed that the use of mulberry-juice or grapes must have been intended as an excitement to their taste, for they are all fond of fruit. Wine, so as to cause an approach to intoxication, would render them ungovernable, and more dangerous than when in a state of fear. They do not require stimulants to urge them on in a modern battle, with all its flashes of fire, smoke, and explosion; and red colors usually employed for their trappings produce more of a satisfactory feeling than rage. Judicious and long-continued training is the only good remedy against sudden surprises caused by objects not yet examined by their acutely-judging senses, or connected with former scenes of danger, which are alone apt to make them turn. It is likely that the disciplined steadiness of well-armed ranks frightened them by their novelty more than the shouts of Macedonian thousands, which must have been feeble in the ears of elephants accustomed to the roar of hundreds of thousands of Indians. It is probable that the Carthaginians made the experiment of training African elephants in imitation of Ptolemy Philadelphus: they are noticed in their army only in the first Punic war; and, from what appears of the mode of managing them, there is reason to believe, as already noticed, that they were never so thoroughly subdued as the Indian elephants (see Penny Cyclopcedia, s.v.).

## Elephantus[[@Headword:Elephantus]]

             eleventh bishop of Uzes, A.D. 810.

## Elephas[[@Headword:Elephas]]

             said to have been seventh bishop of Valence, at. the close of the 6th century.

## Eleri (or Melcri)[[@Headword:Eleri (or Melcri)]]

             the name of two Welsh saints.

(1) Daughter of Bry-chan, in the middle of the 5th century.

(2) Daughter of Dingad, at Pennach (Denbighshire), at the end of the 6th century.

## Elerius[[@Headword:Elerius]]

             a Cambrian monk (different from the martyr in Jersey), died cir. A.D. 660, and is commemorated June 13.

## Eleshaan[[@Headword:Eleshaan]]

             an Ethiopian king, hermit, and saint (commemorated in Rome, October 22; in Ethiopia, May 15), concerning whom the early hagiographers tell discordant stories, seems to have lived in the 6th century.

## Eleuchadius[[@Headword:Eleuchadius]]

             bishop of Ravenna, A.D. 100-112, commemorated February 14, is said to have been originally an eminent Platonic philosopher, converted by Apollinaris on a visit to Rome.

## Eleusinian Mysteries[[@Headword:Eleusinian Mysteries]]

             the sacred rites with which the annual festival of Ceres was celebrated at Eleusis, a town in Attica, situated to the northwest of Athens, and opposite the island of Salamis. They were the most ancient and most venerated mysteries of Greece, and were probably at first a national and harvest festival instituted to thank Demeter for the gift of fruit, to remember the barbaric times preceding the introduction of agriculture, and to rejoice at the progress made since. Both the founder of the mysteries and the time of their foundation are unknown. It is probable that the first foundation of them was laid by Thracians, who from Boeotia, spread over Western Attica; and that they were farther developed by the Athenians themselves, especially at the tinge of the Pisistratidae. The place in which they were  celebrated was the temple of Demeter at Eleusis, a spacious, almost quadratic structure, which had been erected by the architect Iktinos, and was surrounded with a double vestibule (peribolos). At the time when Heracles came to Athens to be initiated into the mysteries it was not yet permitted to admit any foreign Greek. In order not to violate the traditional laws, and at the same time not to offend the great hero, who was not less feared than venerated, the lesser mysteries were transferred to Agrae, a suburb of Athens, and with them Heracles had to be content. From this time the lesser mysteries served as a preparation for the greater.

The initiation into the mysteries was preceded by some devotional exercises, sacred rites, and symbolic actions, the object of which was to divert the candidates for initiation for a time from the world, its pleasures and occupations, and to bring about in them a change of mind, and a longing for the disclosures to be made to them. Between initiation into the lesser and initiation into the greater one year had to elapse. The lesser were celebrated from the 19th to the 21st of the month Anthesterion (beginning of April); the greater one, the Eleusinian mysteries, were celebrated from the 16th to the 25th of Boedromion (beginning of October). "On the first day (called agurmos, the assembling), the neophytes, already initiated at the preparatory festival, met, and were instructed in their sacred duties. On the second day (called Halade, mystae, To the sea, ye initiated!), they purified themselves by washing in the sea. On the third day, sacrifices, comprising, among other things, the mulletfish, and cakes made of barley from the Rharian plain, were offered with special rites. The fourth day was devoted to the procession of the sacred basket of Ceres (the Kalathion). This basket-containing pomegranates, salt, poppy seeds, etc., and followed by bands of women carrying smaller baskets similarly filled-was drawn in a consecrated cart through the streets, amid shouts of 'Hail, Ceres!' from the onlookers. The fifth day was known as the 'day of the torches,' and was thought to symbolize the wanderings of Ceres in quest of her daughter. On it the mystae, led by the 'daduchus,' the torch-bearer, walked two by two to the temple of the goddess, and seem to have spent the night there. The sixth day, called Iacchus, in honor of the son of Ceres, was the great day of the feast. On that day the statue of Iacchus was borne in pomp along the sacred way from the Ceramnicus at Athens to Eleusis, where the votaries spent the night, and were initiated in the last mysteries. Till this stage of the proceedings they had been only mystae; but on the night of the sixth day they were admitted into the innermost sanctuary of the temple, and, from being allowed to behold the sacred things, became entitled to be called  'epoptse,' or 'ephori,' i.e., spectators, or contemplators.

They were once more purified, and repeated their original oath of secrecy with an imposing and awful ceremonial, somewhat resembling, it is believed, the forms of modern free-masonry. On the seventh day the votaries returned to Athens with mirth and music, halting for a while on the bridge over the Cephisus, and exercising their wit and satire against the spectators. The eighth day was called Epidauria, and was believed to have been added to the original number of the days for the convenience of those who had been unable to attend the grand ceremonial of the sixth day. It was named in honor of AEsculapius, who arrived on one occasion from his native city of Epidaurus too late for the solemn rites, and the Athenians, unwilling to disappoint so distinguished a benefactor of mankind, added a supplementary day. On the ninth day took place the ceremony of the 'Plemochose,' in which two earthen vessels filled with wine were turned one towards the east and the other towards the west. The attendant priests, uttering some mystic words, then upset both vessels, and the wine so spilt was offered as a libation. Slaves, prostitutes, and persons who had forfeited their citizenship were excluded from the rites. During the period of the festival, none of those taking part in it could be arrested for any offense. Lycurgus, with a view to destroying distinctions of class, forbade any woman to ride to the Eleusinia in a chariot, under a penalty of 6000 drachmae. The mysteries were celebrated with the most scrupulous secrecy. No initiated person might reveal what he had seen under pain of death, and no uninitiated person could take part in the ceremonies under the same penalty. The priests were chosen from the sacred family of the Eumolpidae, whose ancestor, Eumolpus, had been the special favorite of Ceres. The chief-priest was called the 'Hierophant,' or 'Mystagogue;' next in rank to him was the Daduchus, or Torch-bearer; after whom came the 'Hiero-Ceryx,' or Sacred Herald, and the priest at the altar. Besides these leading ministers, there was a multitude of inferior priests and servants" (Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.). It was undoubtedly one chief aim of these mysteries to spread among the educated classes of the people more elevated religious ideas than were held by the mass of the people, especially with regard to the immortality of the soul, the punishment of the wicked, and the rewards of the good. The initiated were supposed to be especially protected by the gods, and to be sure of the joys of the future life. — See Ouwaroff, Essai sur les Mysteres d'Eleusis (3d edit. Paris, 1816; Preller, Demeter und Persephone (Hamb. 1837); Mommsen,  Heortoloqie. Antiquar. Untersuchungen iuber die stfdtischez Feste der Athener (Leipz. 1864). (A.J.S.)

## Eleusius[[@Headword:Eleusius]]

             bishop of Cyzicus, one of the most influential members of the Semi-Arian party in the second half of the 4th century, was a man of high personal, character. At the instance of Acacius he was deposed, A.D. 360, but returned the next year, and finally seems to have fallen under the general condemnation of the Macedonian heretics, A.D. 383.

## Eleutherius[[@Headword:Eleutherius]]

             (1) Bishop of Illyricum, martyred together with his mother, Anthia, in the reign of Hadrian; commemorated April 13 or 18.

(2) One of the fourteen bishops (sees not named) who composed the synod of Diospolis (Lydda), A.D. 415

(3) Bishop of Geneva in the 5th century.

(4) Saint, eighth in the list of bishops of Terracina, cir. A.D. 443; commemorated Sept. 6.

(5) Bishop of Chalcedon at the time of the council, A.D. 451.

(6) Said to have been elected patriarch of Alexandria by the orthodox party, A.D. 484.

(7) Saint, commemorated February 20, was third bishop of Tournay in the 8th or 9th century.

(8) Saint, fifteenth bishop of Auxerre, A.D. 532-561, commemorated August 16.

(9) Bishop of Cordova, A.D. 589.

(10) The first known bishop of Salamanca, A.D. 589.

(11) Bishop of Lucca, A.D. 680.

(12) Martyr in Persia Under Sapor II, commemorated April 13.

(13) Soldier and martyr at Nicomedia, under Diocletian, commemorated October 2.

(14) Martyr at Paris, A.D. 272; commemorated October 9.

(15) Martyr at Tarsus, in Bithynia. commemorated Aug. 4.

(16) A martyr at Byzantium, A.D. 311.

(17) Abbot of St. Mark's, Spoleto, in the 6th century.

(18) Exarch of Ravenna, cir. A.D. 616-620.

## Eleutheropolis[[@Headword:Eleutheropolis]]

             (Ε᾿λευθερόπολις, free city), a place not named in Scripture, but which was an episcopal city of such importance in the time of Eusebius and Jerome that they assumed it as the point whence to estimate the distances and positions of other cities in southern Palestine (Onomast. s.v. Estherne, Sephela, Jermus, etc.; see Reland, Palaest. page 410, 411). It appears from these and many other notices that Eleutheropolis was the capital of a large province during the fourth and fifth centuries of our era. It was also an episcopal city of Palaestina Prima (St. Paulo, Geogr. Sac. page 306; Notitive Ecclesiasticae, page 6). Its site remained unknown for many centuries, though defined by several ancient writers with much minuteness. Eusebius states that the plain of Shepheleh extends from Eleutheropolis westward and southward (Onomast. s.v. Sephela), and hence it must have stood at the southwestern base of the mountains of Judah. He also states that Bethshemesh was ten miles distant from it, on the road to Nicopolis; and Jedna, six miles on the road to Hebron; and Sochoh, nine miles on the road to Jerusalem. All these places are now known, and the lines of road being traced and the distances measured, we find that the site indicated is Beit Jibrin (Robinson, Bib. Res. 2:348, 359, 398, 404 420, 642-646). In the Acta Sanctorum Martyrum, published by Assemani in Syriac, Greek, and Latin, Peter Abselama the martyr is said to have been born at Anea, which lay, according to the Syriac version, in the district of Beth Gubrin, while both the Greek and Latin read in the district of Eleutheropolis (ib. page 66). This establishes the identity of Beth Gubrin and Eleutheropolis. Josephus mentions a town in this neighborhood called Betaris, which some copies read Βήγαβρις, and it appears to be the same place (War, 4:8, 1). Under its ancient name Baetogabra (Βαιτογάβρα, i.e., house of Gabra or Gabriel?), it is enumerated by Ptolemy among the cities of Palestine (1Ma 6:16), and it is also laid down as Betogabri in the Peutinger tables (Reland, Palaest. page 421). The name Eleutheropolis first appears on coins of this city inscribed to Julia Donna, the wife of Septimius Severns, in A.D. 202-3 (Eckhel, 3:488). The emperor had been in Syria about that time, and had conferred important privileges on various cities among which was Betogabris, which appears to have been then called Eleutheropolis, as being made a free city. Epiphanius, the well-known writer, was born in a village three miles from the city in the beginning of the 4th century, and is  often called an Eleutheropolitan (Reland, page 751,752). In the year A.D. 796, little more than a century and a half after the Saracenic conquest, Eleutheropolis was razed to the ground, and left completely desolate. The Greek language now gave place to the Arabic, and this city lost its proud name and its prouder rank together (Reland, page 987). Like so many other cities, the old Aramaic name, which had probably never been lost to the peasantry, was revived among writers, and we thus find Beigeberin, or some form like it, constantly in use after the 8th century (Reland, Palaest. p. 222, 227; Gesta Dei per Francos, page 1044). In the 12th century the Crusaders found it in ruins, and called by the Arabs Bethgebrim (doubtless a Frank corruption of Beit Jibrin). They built a strong fortress on the old foundations to guard against the incursions of the Moslems, the remains of which, and the chapel connected with it, still exist. After the battle of Hattin it fell into the hands of Saladin, but was retaken by Richard of England. It was finally captured by Bibars (see Will. Tyr. 14:22; Jac. de Vit. in Gesta Dei, pages 1070, 1071; Bohaeddin, Vit. Salad. page 229). It has since crumbled to ruin under the blight of Mohammedan rule.

The modern village of Belt Jibrin is about twenty-five miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Gaza. It contains between two and three hundred inhabitants, and is situated in a little nook or glen in the side of a long green valley, which is shut in by low ridges of limestone partially covered with dark copse. The ancient ruins are scattered around it, and are of considerable extent. The principal one is a large irregular enclosure, formerly surrounded by a massive wall, still in part standing, and containing the remains of the Crusaders' castle. A great part of this outer wall is completely ruinous; but the north side, which skirts the bank of the valley, is still several feet high. The enclosure is about 600 feet in diameter. The fortress is about 200 feet square, and is of a much later date than the outer wall. In the castle, along the south side, are portions of the walls and the groined roof and clustered columns of a fine old chapel — the same, doubtless, which was built by the Crusaders. An Arabic inscription over the castle-gate bears the date A.D. 958 A.D. 1551 — probably the time when it was last repaired. A short distance eastward are other massive ruins and a deep well; while about a mile up the valley are the picturesque remains of the church of St. Anne (Porter, Handbook for Syr. and Pal. page 256 sq.). Several curious traditions have found a "local habitation" at Beit Jibrin. One places here the miraculous fountain which sprang from the jaw-bone  Samson wielded with such success against the Philistines (Anton. Mant. Itin. pages 30, 32).

The valley, on the side of which the ruins of Eleutheropolis lie, runs up among the hills for two miles or more south-by-east. On each side of it are low ridges of soft limestone, which rises here and there in white bare crowns over the dark shrubs. In these ridges are some of the most remarkable caverns and excavations in Palestine, rivaling in extent and interest the catacombs of Rome and Malta. They are altogether different in character from the rock-tombs of Jerusalem and the grottos of Petra. They were examined and described by Dr. Robinson, and they have since been more fully explored by Mr. Porter. They are found together in clusters, and form subterranean villages. Some are rectangular, 100 feet and more in length, with smooth walls and lofty arched roofs. Others are bell-shaped- from 40 to 70 feet in diameter, by nearly 60 feet in height-all connected together by arched doorways and winding subterranean passages. A few are entirely dark, but most of them are lighted by a circular aperture at the top. They occur at short intervals along both sides of the whole valley, and may also be seen at several other neighboring villages. The origin and object of these singular excavations are easily ascertained. During the Babylonian captivity the Edomites overran and occupied the whole of southern Palestine, which is hence called by Josephus Idumaea. Jerome calls the Idumaeans Horites, and says they inhabited the whole country extending from Eleutheropolis to Petra and Elah, and that they dwelt in caves — preferring them both on account of their security and their coolness during the heat of summer (Comm. in Oba 1:1). The original inhabitants of Edom were Horites, that is, Troglodytes, "dwellers in caves." The descendants of Esau adopted the habits of their predecessors, and when they took possession of southern Palestine excavated rock dwellings wherever practicable (see Robinson's Biblical Researches, 2d ed. 2:23, 57 sq.; Van de Velde, Narrative, 2:147 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:358 sq.).

## Eleutheropolis (2)[[@Headword:Eleutheropolis (2)]]

             For a copious exhibit of the antiquities of Beit-Jibiin, see the Memoirs accompanying the Ordinance Survey (3:266 sq.).

## Eleutherus[[@Headword:Eleutherus]]

             (Ε᾿λεύθερος, free; see Simonis, Onom. page 58), a river of Syria mentioned in 1Ma 11:7; 1Ma 12:30. In early ages it was a noted border stream (Pliny, 5:17; 9:12; Ptolemy, 5:15, 4). According to Strabo, it separated Syria from Phoenicia (16:753), and formed the northern limit of Coele-Syria. Josephus informs us that Antony gave Cleopatra "the cities  that were within the river Eleutherus, as far as Egypt, except Tyre and Sidon" (Ant. 15:4, 1; War, 1:18, 5). A careful examination of the passages in Num 34:8-10, and Eze 47:15-17, and a comparison of them with the features of the country, lead Mr. Porter to the conclusion that this river also formed in part the northern border of the " Promised Land" (Five Years in Damascus, 2:354 sq.). Pliny says that at a certain season of the year it swarmed with tortoise (9:10). Of the identity of the Eleutherus with the modern aihr el-Kebir, "Great River," there cannot be a doubt. Its highest source is at the northeastern base of Lebanon; it sweeps round the northern end of the range, through the opening called in Scripture "the entrance of Hamath" (Num 34:8), and, after receiving several small tributaries from the heights of Lebanon, it falls into the Mediterranean about eighteen miles north of Tripolis. It still forms the boundary between the provinces of Akkar and elHusn. During summer and autumn it is but a small stream, easily forded, but in winter it swells into a large and rapid river (Maundrell, p. 33; Burckhardt, page 270; Paulus, Samml. 1:35, 303).

## Eleutherus (2)[[@Headword:Eleutherus (2)]]

             or Eleutherius, a native of Nicopolis, elected bishop of Rome after the death of Soter, May 3, 177. He is previously (168) mentioned as a deacon of bishop Anicetus of Rome. He opposed with much zeal the errors of the Valentinians during his tenure of office. Two events are reported to have rendered his pontificate memorable: the glorious death of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne (Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 5:4), and an embassy from Lucius, king of Great Britain, to demand a missionary to teach the Britons the Christian religion (Bede, Hist. Eccl. 3:25; Collier, Eccl. Hist. 1:35). The churches of Lyons and Vienne sent to him the acts of those of their members who had Just suffered martyrdom. Their messenger was the; presbyter Irenaeus, subsequently celebrated as one of the pillars of the Church in Gaul. As the letter of these churches to Eleutheo us warns against the Montanists, some have inferred, though without being supported by any other proof, that Eleutherus was an adherent of the Montanist sect. The legend about the embassy of king Lucius, and the subsequent mission of two Roman missionaries to England, is doubted by many historians. Eleutherus died A.D. 192. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome as a saint on the 26th of May. See Mosheim, Comment. 1:273; Neander, Planting and Training, 2:518; Smith. Religion of Ancient Britain, pages 121, 122; Herzog, Real-Encykl. in, 753. (A.J.S.)

## Eleutherus (3)[[@Headword:Eleutherus (3)]]

             martyr at Caesarea, in Cappadocia, perhaps under Hadrian, commemorated September 27.

## Elevation of the Host[[@Headword:Elevation of the Host]]

             SEE HOST AND MASS.

## Elevation of the Host (2)[[@Headword:Elevation of the Host (2)]]

             The lifting up of the paten and consecrated element of bread was instituted by pope Honorius III (cir. 1210), and he directed that it should be adored when elevated, or carried to the sick, the people reverently bowing. Casalius quotes as his authority for this custom Psa 72:16. Anastasius Sinaita alludes to this ceremony; and it appears as early as, perhaps, the fourth century in the Greek Church; it has been traced in England in the 11th, in France in the 12th, and in Germany and Italy before the 13th century. Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura mention the elevation of the paten only; the elevation of the chalice was of later date. The ringing of little bells at this time was introduced by William of Paris, and generally enjoined by Gregory XI.

## Elf[[@Headword:Elf]]

             (old Scandinavian, Alfar; Anglo-Saxon, AElf; Danish, Elv; German, Alp; apparently meaning white), in Norse, British, and German popular superstitious belief, is a being between deity and man. The Edda names three classes of elves: Light, Dark, and Black; the first of whom inhabit the pure regions of light, the second mountain-grottoes and caves, the third the infernal regions. But this threefold division seems to have been soon abandoned for a dualism. Snorre Sturleson (died 1241) says: "In Alfheim there live the people of Light-Alfs, and under the earth are the Dark-Alfs, both entirely different from each other in appearance and powers; the former shining with a brightness that eclipses the sun, the latter darker than pitch." The light elves are cheerful, pleasant beings, sometimes visible, sometimes invisible; they enjoy the company of men and gods. On the contrary, the dark elves shun the light, and only leave their gloomy habitations at night; and in case the sun finds them still on earth, they become petrified by his rays. The dark elves are greatly misformed. They have monstrous noses and bellies, bones thin as a spindle, bald or horned heads.

However, they are quite skilful, and not only expert in all powers of magic, but possess a rare knowledge in all metallic works; but with all their labors there is always an accompanying curse. The dwelling of these is ever in the thickest darkness;. but they light up their dismal habitations by means of brilliant precious stones and shining metals. Some dwell in stones, others in the earth, still others in the sea. They eagerly steal unbaptized children of Christians, rear them in their earthen or rocky dwellings, and bring some of their own hateful, malformed children as substitutes, which can only be got rid of by rubbing their feet with fat and roasting them over the fire. The child cries unmercifully, whereupon the elves return and bring back the stolen child, in order to save their own from the tortures. The light elves are entirely different in every respect; justice and fairness are sacred to them. They never harm any one; even when they have been wronged they only revenge themselves by teasing. They find great pleasure in associating with Christians.

As they have human forms and are extraordinarily beautiful, it is not seldom that they form intimate relations with men. If children follow from such intimacy, these must be bathed entirely in the sacred water for baptism, as otherwise they will not be endowed with- immortal souls. The time of the elves' appearance is after sundown, in  cheerful, summer moonlight nights; then they often appear in swarms, to enjoy themselves and follow every imaginable sport. Their favorite pastime is the dance; they pass whole nights occupied with this amusement, and wherever in the field or pasture a company of elves have danced, there the grass grows greener and fresher. We are accustomed to suppose the elves to be very small, but they can take on any form or size they choose.

Sometimes they are hateful, sometimes beautiful; sometimes large, at other times small; just as suits their purpose. The Scots and Irish still hold to the belief that their respective countries are pre-eminently loved and. visited by the elves. The most pleasant and animating stories may be found there relating to these beings; and whenever a cloud of dust is seen to rise from the road, the people, believing that the elves are changing their dwelling- places, bow in reverence before them. They often teach men their arts of magic; and, although the information they impart is very meagre, still the persons so instructed become powerful, and are feared and dreaded. Music is loved by the elves above everything else, and although their music is simple, still it exerts upon man a most wonderful influence. The piece of music entitled "Elf-king" forces every listener, and even the table and chairs, to dance as long as the music lasts; but the player cannot stop playing, for the arm and hand using the instrument is likewise charmed and bewitched: either he must play the piece backward exactly, or somebody must come from behind and cut the strings of the violin. Some have said that the elves are angels banished from heaven, who have notsunk into hell, and in this respect there is great similarity between them and the peris of the Persians. The latter are also pleasant, supernatural beings, but deprived of heaven, still not banished to hell. The elves often, in their songs, express a hope of a coming deliverance; this song immediately becomes a weeping and wailing if any one is so cruel as to disturb them in their hopes. The belief in elves has given German poets of modern days material for the loveliest and most animating representations. Compare the fable "The Elves," in Ludwig Tieck's book Phantasus; also the novel of the same, entitled Die Vogelscheuche; and especially a passage in the story of "Cordelia," by A. Treublurg (Friedrich Vischer), in the Jahrbuch schwabischer Dichter, by Morike and Zimmermann. Some myths of dwarfs, witches, sprites, etc., make all these appear as the nearest relatives of elves.

## Elfan[[@Headword:Elfan]]

             (Lat. Alvanius) appears in the legend of king Lucius, in his application to pope Eleutherus for Christian instruction, and is said in Welsh writers to have been abbot of Glastonbury; by others, of London, in the 2d century.

## Elfege[[@Headword:Elfege]]

             SEE ALPHAGE.

## Elfeio[[@Headword:Elfeio]]

             (or Ailvym), a Welsh saint of the 9th century.

## Elffin[[@Headword:Elffin]]

             (Elphinus), a Welsh saint of the college of St. Illtyd in the beginning of the 6th century.

## Elfleda[[@Headword:Elfleda]]

             (or AElbfled), abbess of Whitby (born A.D. 655, died at the age of fifty- nine), commemorated February 8, was daughter of Oswy, king of Northumbria, and a friend of St. Cuthbert.

## Elfric[[@Headword:Elfric]]

             SEE AJLFRIC.

## Elga, Saint[[@Headword:Elga, Saint]]

             a Welsh hermit, said to have been born in Devonshire and taken by pirates to Ireland, but to have escaped to Bardsey, off Carnaryonshire. His remains were removed to Llanidaff in 1120.

## Elgu[[@Headword:Elgu]]

             a Welsh saint of the 6th century.

## Elhaearn[[@Headword:Elhaearn]]

             (or Ailhaiarn), a Welsh saint of Carnarvonshire, is commemorated November 1. Eliab, deacon and martyr of Ethiopia, A.D. 375, is commemorated December 2.

## Elhanan[[@Headword:Elhanan]]

             (Hebrews Elchanan', אֶלְחָנָן, whom God has graciously bestowed [compare Hananeel, Hanananiah, Johanan, Phoen. Hannibal; also Baal- hanan, etc.]; Sept. Ε᾿λεανάν; Vulg. Adeodatus, but Chanan, Elchanan, in Chron.), a distinguished warrior in the time of king David, who performed a memorable exploit against the Philistines, though in what that exploit exactly consisted, and who the hero himself was, it is not easy to determine. B.C. cir. 1020.

1. 2Sa 21:19, says that he was the "son of Jaare Oregim the Bethlehemite," and that he "slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam." Here, in the A.V., the words "the brother of" are inserted, to bring the passage into agreement with,

2. 1Ch 20:5, which states that "Elhanan, son of Jair (or Jaor), slew Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear," etc.

Of these two statements the latter is probably the more correct, the differences between them being much smaller in the original than in English (see Kennicott, Dissertation, page 78). SEE LAHMI.

(a.) The word Oregim (q.v.) exists twice in the verse in Samuel, first as a proper name, and again at the end — "weavers." The former has probably been taken in by an early transcriber from the latter, i.e., from the next line of the MS. To the end of the verse it certainly belongs, since it is found in the parallel passage of Chronicles, and also forms part of what seems to have been a proverbial description of Goliath (compare 1Sa 17:7).

(b.) The statement in Samuel is in contradiction to the narrative of 1Sa 17:1-58, according to which Goliath the Gittite was killed by David. True, Ewald (Gesch. 3:91 sq.) — from the fact that David's antagonist is, with only three exceptions (one of them in the doubtful verses, 1Sa 17:12-32), called "the Philistine," and for other linguistic reasons has suggested that Elhanan was the real victor of Goliath, and that after David became king the name of Goliath was attached to the nameless champion whom he killed in his youth. But against this is the fact that Goliath is named thrice in 1Sa 17:1-58; 1Sa 21:1-15 — thrice only though it be; and also that Elhanan's exploit, from its position both in Samuel and in Chronicles, and from other indications, took place late in David's reign, and when he had been so long  king, and so long renowned, that all the brilliant feats of his youth must have been brought to light, and well known to his people. It is recorded as the last but one in the series of encounters of what seems to have been the closing struggle with the Philistines. It was so late that David had acquired among his warriors the fond title of "the light of Israel" (2Sa 21:17), and that his nephew Jonathan was old enough to perform a feat rivaling that of his illustrious uncle years before. It was certainly after David was made king, for he goes down to the fight, not with his "young men," as when he was leading his band during Saul's life, but with his " servants," literally his "slaves," a term almost strictly reserved for the subjects of a king. The vow of his guard, on one of these occasions, that it should be his last appearance in the field, shows that it must have been after the great Ammonitish war, in which David himself had led the host to the storming of Rabbah (2Sa 12:29). It may have been between this last event and the battle with Absalom beyond Jordan, though there are other obvious reasons why David staid within the walls of Mahanaim on that occasion. SEE DAVID.

Jerome, in his Quaest. Hebr. on both passages — he does not state whether from ancient tradition or not translates Elhanan into A ‘do-datus, and adds filius saltus Polymitarius Bethlehemites — the son of a wood, a weaver, a Bethlehemite." Adeodatus, he says, is David, which he argues not only by considerations drawn from the meaning of each of the above words, but also from the statement in the concluding verse of the record that all these giants "fell by the hand of David and by the hand of his servants," and as Elhanan slew Goliath, Elhanan must be David.

3. Elhanan is elsewhere called the son of Dodo of Bethlehem, one of "the thirty" of David's guard, and named first on the list (2Sa 23:24; 1Ch 11:26). See Kennicott's Dissertation, page 179. Perhaps his father had both names. SEE JAIR.

## Eli[[@Headword:Eli]]

             (Hebrews Eli', עֵלַי. i.e., עֵַלי, ascent; Sept. ᾿Ηλι [so N.T. SEE HELI ], Josephus Ηλεί,Vulg. Heli), the high-priest of the Jews when the ark was in Shiloh (1Sa 1:3; 1Sa 1:9). He was descended from Aaron through Ithamar, the youngest of his two surviving sons (Lev 10:1-2; Lev 10:12), as appears from the fact that Abiathar, who was certainly a lineal descendant of Eli (1Ki 2:27), had a son Ahimelech, who is expressly stated to have been "of the sons of Ithamar" (1Ch 24:3; compare 2Sa 8:17). With this accords the circumstance that the names of Eli and his successors in the high-priesthood up to and including Abiathar are not found in the genealogy of Eleazar (1Ch 6:4-15; compare Ezr 7:1-5). As the history makes no mention of any high-priest of the line of 4thamar before Eli, he is generally supposed to have been the first of that line who held the office (Josephus, Ant. 8:1, 3). From him, his sons having died before him, it appears to have passed to his grandson Ahitub (1Sa 14:3; compare however Josephus, Ant. 5:11, 2), and it certainly remained in his family till Abiathar, the grandson of Ahitub, was "thrust out from being priest unto the Lord" by Solomon for his share in Adonijah's rebellion (1Ki 2:26; 1Ki 2:2-7; 1Ki 1:7), and the high-priesthood passed back again to the family of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (1Ki 2:35). How the office ever came into the younger branch of the house of Aaron we are not informed; perhaps it was through the incapacity or minority of the then sole representative of the elder line, for it is very evident that it was no unauthorized usurpation on the part of Eli (1Sa 2:27-28; 1Sa 2:30). SEE ITHAMAR.

Eli also acted as regent or civil judge of Israel after the death of Samson, being the immediate predecessor of his pupil Samuel (1Sa 7:6; 1Sa 7:15-17), the last of the judges. This function, indeed, seems to have been intended, by the theocratical constitution, to devolve upon the high-priest, by virtue of his office, in the absence of any person specially appointed by the divine King to deliver and govern Israel. He is said to have judged Israel 40 years (1Sa 4:18): the Septuagint makes it 20. It has been suggested, in explanation of the discrepancy, that he was sole judge for 20 years, after having been co-judge with Samson for 20 years (Jdg 16:31). But the probability is that the number 40 is correct, but that it comprehends only  the period of his administration as judge; for not only does the whole tenor of the narrative imply that this immediately succeeded the judgeship of Samson (as indeed Josephus evidently understood it; a fact apparent not only from his history, but also from the summing up of his numbers as computed by himself, Ant. 5:9; 10:3; title to book 5), but this view is evidently taken by Paul in his assignment of the period of 450 years to the judges (Act 13:20), a number that immediately results from simply adding together the items as given in the O.T. history, including Samson and Eli as continuous to the others. SEE JUDGES. As Eli died at the age of ninety-eight (1Sa 4:15), the forty years (B.C. 1165-1125) must have commenced when he was fifty-eight years old. (See Lightfoot's Works, 1:53, 907, fol. Lond. 1684; Selden, De Success. in Pontif. Hebr. lib. 1, cap. 4). SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

Eli seems to have been a religious man, and the only fault recorded of him was an excessive easiness of temper, most unbefitting the high responsibilities of his official character. His sons Hophni and Phinehas, whom he invested with authority, misconducted themselves so outrageously as to excite deep disgust among the people, and render the services of the tabernacle odious in their eyes (1Sa 2:27-36; 1Ki 2:27). Of this misconduct Eli was aware, but contented himself with mild and ineffectual remonstrances (1Sa 2:22-25), where his station required severe and vigorous action (1Sa 3:13). For this neglect the judgment of God was at length denounced upon his house, through the young Samuel (q.v.), who, under peculiar circumstances, had been attached from childhood to his person (1Sa 2:29; 1Sa 3:18). Some years passed without any apparent fulfillment of this denunciation, but it came at length in one terrible crash, by which the old man's heart was broken. The Philistines had gained the upper hand over Israel, and the ark of God was taken to the field, in the confidence of victory and safety from its presence. But in the battle which followed the ark itself was taken by the Philistines, and the two sons of Eli, who were in attendance upon it, were slain. The high-priest, then blind with age, sat by the wayside at Shiloh, awaiting tidings from the war, "for his heart trembled for the ark of God." A man of Benjamin, with his clothes rent, and with earth upon his head, brought the fatal news: and Eli heard that Israel was defeated-that his sons were slain-that the ark of God was taken — at which last word he fell heavily from his seat, and died (1Sa 4:1-22). According to Schwarz (Palest. page 142), an erroneous tradition locates his grave in an elegant  building at the village Charim ben-Elim, eight miles N.N.E. of Jaffa, on the shore. The ultimate doom upon Eli's house was accomplished when Solomon removed Abiathar (the last high-priest of this line) from his office, and restored the line of Eleazar, in the person of Zadok (1Ki 2:27). SEE ABIATHAR. Another part of the same sentence (1Sa 2:31-33) appears to have been taking effect in the reign of David, when we read that "there were more chief men found of the sons of Eleazar than of the sons of Ithamar" — sixteen of the former, and only eight of the latter (1Ch 24:4).

## Eli (2)[[@Headword:Eli (2)]]

             (ἠλί, for Hebrews אֵלַי[Psa 22:2], eli', my God, as it is immediately rendered), an exclamation used by our Savior on the cross, in appeal to his heavenly Father (Mat 27:46). SEE AGONY. In the parallel passage (Mar 15:34) it is written Ε᾿λωϊv, ELOI SEE ELOI (q.v.).

## Eli-[[@Headword:Eli-]]

             (אֵַלי, an old form of the "construct state" of אֵל, the Mighty, i.e., Almighty, the union vowel i being used as in ABI-, AHI-, etc.) often occurs as the first element of proper names (comp. Elihu, Elijah, and many others here following), as referring to the highest notion of the Deity among the Shemitic races. As such epithet it is sometimes interchangeable with BAAL SEE BAAL - (q.v.) (see 2Sa 5:16; 1Ch 14:7), or even JEHO SEE JEHO - (q.v.) (see 2Ki 23:34). This constructive form is also sometimes interchanged with the abbreviation of the simple אל into אלאּ(1Ch 3:6; 1Ch 14:5; compare Exo 6:22; Num 3:30), or it even exchanges places with the other element of the name, e.g. Eliam (2Sa 11:3) becomes Ammiel (1Ch 3:5). As in the words beginning with Abi-, Ahi-, etc., this element often melts into the other member, not strictly in a genitive sense, but as a sort of liturgical invocation or eulogium of the Deity, as is found to be the case with similar names used as religious formulae, especially among the ancient Phoenicians (SEE ELHANAN).

## Eliab[[@Headword:Eliab]]

             [usually Eli'ab] (Heb). Eliab', אֶלַיאָב, to whom God is father; Sept. Ε᾿λιάβ, Vulg. Eliab), the name of seven men.  1. A Reubenite, son of Pallu or Phallu, whose family was one of the principal in the tribe, and father or progenitor of Dathan and Abiram, the leaders in the revolt against Moses (Num 26:8-9; Num 16:1; Num 16:12; Deu 11:6). B.C. post. 1856. Eliab had another son named Nemuel; and the record of Num 26:1-65 is interrupted expressly to admit a statement regarding his sons.

2. A son of Helen, and phylarch of the tribe of Zebulun at the time of the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Num 1:9; Num 2:7; Num 7:24; Num 7:29; Num 10:16). B.C. 1657.

3. An ancestor of Samuel (q.v.) the prophet, being a Kohathite Levite, son of Nahath and father of Jeroham (1Ch 6:27 [12]). B.C. cir. 1250. In the other statements of the genealogy this name appears to be given as ELIHU SEE ELIHU (1Sa 1:1) and ELIEL SEE ELIEL (1Ch 6:34 [19]).

4. The eldest son of Jesse and brother of David (1Sa 16:6; 1Sa 17:13; 1Ch 2:13). It was he that made the contemptuous inquiry, by which he sought to screen his own cowardice, when David proposed to fight Goliath, "With whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness?" (1Sa 17:28.) B.C. 1063. His daughter Abihail married her second cousin Rehoboam, and bore him three children (2Ch 11:18); although, taking into account the length of the reigns of David and Solomon, it is difficult not to suspect that the word "daughter" is here used in the less strict sense of granddaughter or descendant. In 1Ch 27:18, we find mention of "ELIHU, of the brethren of David," as "ruler" (נָגַיד) or "prince" (שִׂר) of the tribe of Judah. According to the ancient Hebrew tradition preserved by Jerome (Quaest. Hebr. ad loc.), this Elihu was identical with Eliab. "Brethren" is, however, often used in the sense of kinsman, e.g. 1Ch 12:2.

5. The third of the Gadite heroes who joined David in his stronghold in the wilderness (1Ch 12:9). B.C. 1061;

6. A Levite in the time pf David, who was both a "porter" (שׁוֹעֵר, shoer, i.e. a door-keeper) and a musician on the "psaltery" (1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:20; 1Ch 16:5). B.C. 1013.

7. Son of Nathanael, one of the forefathers of Judith, and therefore belonging to the tribe of Simeon (Jdt 8:1).

## Eliada[[@Headword:Eliada]]

             (Hebrews Elyada', אֶלְיָדָע, whom God has known), the name of three men.

1. (Sept., in Kings, Ε᾿λιδαέ, and repeated, Βααλιμάθ; in Chron. Ε᾿λιαδά, v.r. Ελιέδα; Vulg. Elioda, E`iada.) One of David's sons; according to the list, the youngest but one of the family born to him after his establishment in Jerusalem (2Sa 5:16; 1Ch 3:8). B.C. post 1033. From the latter passage it appears that he was the son of a wife and not of a concubine. In 1Ch 14:7, the name appears in the form of בְּעֶלְיָדָע, BEELIADA SEE BEELIADA (q.d. whom the Master has known; see Simonis, Onomast. page 460; בְּעֶלbeing the Syriac form of בִּעִל, Lord). This curious reading of the Masoretic text is not, however, indisputable; De Rossi's Cod. 186 (prima manu) reads idyla, the Sept. Ε᾿λιαδέ, and the Peshito Elidaa.: On the strength of these authorities, De Rossi (after Dathius, Lib. Hist. V.T. page 654) pronounces in favor of assimilating this passage to the other two, and refers to the improbability of David's using the names אלand בּעלpromiscuously (see De Rossi's Var. Lect. V.T. Hebraicae, 4). We must not, however, in the interest of careful criticism, too hastily succumb to arguments of this kind. As to MSS., the four or five which Kennicott adduces all support the text of 1Ch 14:7; the authority of the Sept. is neutralized by Codd. Alex. and Frid. August., the former of which has Βαλλιαδά, and the latter Βαλεγδαέ, evidently corroborating the Masoretic text, as does the Vulg. Baaliada. As to the difficulty of David's using a name which contained lib for one of its elements, it is at least very doubtful whether that word, which literally means master, proprietor, husband, and is often used in the earlier Scriptures inoffensively (see Gesenius, Thes. page 224), in David's time had acquired the bad sense which Baal-worship in Israel afterwards imparted to it. It is much to the present point that in this very chapter (1Ch 14:11) David does not object to employ the word lib in the name Baal- perazim, in commemoration of a victory vouchsafed to him by the Lord (see 2Sa 5:20, where the naming of the place is ascribed to David himself). It is possible that this appellation of his son might itself have had reference to that signal victory. The name appears to be omitted by Josephus in his list of David's family (Ant. 7:3, 3), unless he be there called Elien (Ε᾿λιήν).

2. (Sept. דאעלֵ, v.r. Ε᾿λιαδαὲ; Vulg. Eliada.) Apparently an Aramite of Zobah, the father of Rezon, which latter was captain of a marauding band that annoyed Solomon (1Ki 11:23, where the name is Anglicized "Eliadah"). B.C. ante 975.

3. (Sept. Ε᾿λιαδά, Vulg. Eliada.) A mighty man of war (גַּבּוֹר חִיַל), a Benjamite, who led 200,000 (?) archers of his tribe to the army of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:17). B.C. 945. SEE JEHOSHAPHAT.

## Eliadah[[@Headword:Eliadah]]

             (1Ki 11:23), a less correct mode of Anglicizing the name Eliada (q.v.).

## Eliadas[[@Headword:Eliadas]]

             (Ε᾿λιαδάς, Vulg. Eliadas), one of "the sons of Zamoth" who divorced his Gentile wife after the restoration from Babylon (1Es 9:28); evidently the ELIOENAI SEE ELIOENAI (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:27).

## Eliadun[[@Headword:Eliadun]]

             (᾿Ηλιαδούς v.r. ᾿Ηλιαδούν, Vulg. omits), a name given as that of the father of Joda, whose sons and brethren assisted in rebuilding the Temple after the return from Babylon (1Es 5:58); apparently a corruption for the HENADAD SEE HENADAD (q.v.) of the Hebrew narrative (Ezra 3:19).

## Eliah[[@Headword:Eliah]]

             (1Ch 8:27; Ezr 10:26), a less correct mode of Anglicizing the name of ELIJAH SEE ELIJAH (q.v.), but referring to others than the prophet.

## Eliahba[[@Headword:Eliahba]]

             (Hebrews Eliyachba', אֶלַיִחְבָּא, but in Chron. Elyachba', אֶלְיָחְבָּא, whom God will hide; Sept. Ε᾿λιαβά, Vulg. Eliaba), a Shaalbonite; one of David's' thirty chief warriors (2Sa 23:32; 1Ch 11:33). B.C. 1046.

## Eliakim[[@Headword:Eliakim]]

             (Hebrews Elyakim', אֶלְיָקַיַם whom God will raise up; Sept. Ε᾿λιακίμ and Ε᾿λιακείμ; N.T. Ε᾿λιακείμ; Josephus, Ε᾿λιάκιμος, Ant. 10:1, 2; Vulg. Eliacim), the name of five men.

1. The son of Melea and father of Jonan, in the genealogy (q.v.) of Christ (Luke in, 30); probably the grandson of Nathan, of the private line of David's descent (Strong's Harm. and Expos. page 16). B.C. considerably post 1013.

2. Son of Hilkiah, and praefect of the palace under king Hezekiah, who sent him to receive the message of the invading Assyrians, and report it to Isaiah (2Ki 18:18; 2Ki 19:2; Isa 36:3; Isa 36:11; Isa 36:22; Isa 37:2). B.C. 713. He succeeded Shebna in this office after the latter had been ejected from it (Grotius thinks by reason of his leprosy) as a punishment for his pride (Isa 22:15-20). Eliakim was a good man, as appears by the title emphatically applied to him by God, "my servant Eliakim" (Isa 22:20), and as was evinced by his conduct on the occasion of Sennacherib's invasion (2Ki 18:37; 2Ki 19:1-5), and also in the discharge of the duties of his high station, in which he acted as a "father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah" (Isa 22:21). It was as a special mark of the divine approbation of his character and conduct, of which, however, no further details have been preserved to us, that he was raised to the post of authority and dignity which he held at the time of the Assyrian invasion. What this office was has been a subject of some perplexity to commentators. The ancients, including the Sept. and Jerome, understood it of the priestly office, as appears by the rendering of סֹכֵן (Isa 22:15; A.V. "treasurer") by παστοφόριον, the "priest's chamber," by the former, and of עִל9הִבִּיַת("over the house," as Isa 36:3) by "praepositus templi," by the latter. Hence Nicephorus, as well as the author of the Alexandrian Chronicle, includes in the list of high priests Somnas or Sobnas (i.e., Shebna), and Eliakim, identifying the latter with Shallum or Meshullam. But it is certain from the description of the office in Isa 22:1-25, and especially from the expression in Isa 22:22, "The key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder," that it was the king's house, and not the house of God, of which Eliakim was praefect, as Ahishar had been in the reign of Solomon (1Ki 4:6), and Azrikam in that of Ahaz (2Ch 28:7). With this agrees both all that is said, and all that is not  said, of Eliakim's functions. The office seems to have been the highest under the king, as was the case in Egypt, when Pharaoh said to Joseph, "Thou shalt be over my house (עִלבֵּיתַי) ... only in the throne will I Le greater than thou" (Gen 41:40; compare 39:4). In 2Ch 28:7, the officer is called "governor (נָגַרד) of the house." It is clear that the "scribe" was inferior to him, for Shebna, when degraded from the prefecture of the house, acted as scribe under Eliakim (2Ki 18:37). The whole description of it too by Isaiah implies a place of great eminence and power. This description is transferred in a mystical or spiritual sense to Christ the son of David in Rev 3:7, thus making Eliakim in some sense typical of Christ. The true meaning of סֹכֵן, soken', is very doubtful. "Friend," i.e., of the king, and "steward of the provisions," are the two most probable significations. SEE TREASURER. Eliakim's career was a most honorable and splendid one. Most commentators agree that Isa 22:25 does not apply to him, but to Shebna.

3. The original name of Jehoiakim (q.v.), king of Judah (2Ki 23:34; 2Ch 36:4).

4. Son of Abiud and father of Azor, of the posterity of Zerubbabel (Mat 1:13). He is probably identical with the SHECHANIAH SEE SHECHANIAH (q.v.) of 1 Chronicles in, 21 (Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels, page 11). SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).

5. A priest in the days of Nehemiah, who assisted at the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem (Neh 12:41). B.C. 446.

## Eliali[[@Headword:Eliali]]

             (Ε᾿λιαλι v.r. Ε᾿λιαλεί, Vulg. Dielus), one of "the sons of Maani" who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1Es 9:34); apparently a corruption for the BINNUI SEE BINNUI (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:38).

## Eliam[[@Headword:Eliam]]

             [usually El'am] (Hebrews Eliam', אֵַלועָם, God is [his] people, i.e., friend; Sept. Ε᾿λιάβ, Vulg. Eliam), the father of Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah and afterwards of David (2Sa 11:3). In the list of 1Ch 3:5, the names of both father and daughter are altered, the former to the equivalent AMMIEL SEE AMMIEL (q.v.), and the latter to Bathshua, both  the latter names being also those of non-Israelite persons, while Uriah was a Hittite (comp. Gen 38:12; 1Ch 2:3; also 2Sa 17:27). 'The same name Eliam also occurs as that of a Gilonite, the son of Ahithophel, and one of David's "thirty" warriors (2Sa 23:34). It is omitted in the list of 1Ch 11:1-47, but is now probably discernible as "AHIJAH the Pelonite" (1Ch 11:36) (see Kennicott, Dissertation, p. 207). The ancient Jewish tradition preserved by Jerome (Qu. Hebr. on 2Sa 11:3, and 1Ch 3:5) is that the two Eliams are the same person. An argument has been founded on this to account for the hostility of Ahithophel to king David, as having dishonored his house and caused the death of his son-in-law (Blunt, Coincidences, part 2, 10). But he would perhaps have rather been proud of this alliance with royalty. B.C. 1046.

## Elian[[@Headword:Elian]]

             a Welsh saint, confused with St. Hilary, is celebrated in August.

## Eliaonias[[@Headword:Eliaonias]]

             [many Eliaoni'as] (Ε᾿λιαωνίας, Vulg. Moabilionis, including the preceding name), a son of Zaraias of Pahath-Moab, leader of two hundred exiles from Babylon (1Es 8:31); evidently the ELIHOENAI SEE ELIHOENAI (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 8:4).

## Elias[[@Headword:Elias]]

             (᾿Ηλίας, in Maccabees, elsewhere and in N.T. ᾿Ηλίας, Vulg. Elias, but in Cod. Amiat. Helias), the Graecized form in which the name of ELIJAH SEE ELIJAH (q.v.) is given in the A.V. of the Apocrypha and N.T. (Sir 48:1; Sir 48:4; Sir 48:12; 1Ma 2:58; Mat 11:14; Mat 16:14; Mat 17:3-4; Mat 17:10-12; Mat 27:47; Mat 27:49; Mar 6:15; Mar 8:28; Mar 9:4-5; Mar 9:11-13; Mar 15:35-36; Luk 1:17; Luk 4:25-26; Luk 9:8; Luk 9:19; Luk 9:30; Luk 9:33; Luk 9:54; Joh 1:21; Joh 1:25; Rom 11:2; Jam 1:17). In Rom 11:2, the reference is not to the prophet, but to the portion of Scripture designated by his name, the words being ἐν ᾿Ηλιᾷ; "in Elias," not as in A.V. "of Elias." — Smith, s.v.

## Elias (2)[[@Headword:Elias (2)]]

             (Armen. Eghia).

(1) Patriarch OF ARMENIA, was born at Arjich. He was bishop of the Peznounians, and was raised to the dignity of a patriarch in 703, after the death of Sahag or Isaac III. He showed himself as one of the most violent adversaries of the Council of Chalcedon. At this time, the princess who governed the Aghovans (Albanians) took pains to make her subjects adopt the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, and to unite them with the Romish Church; but this displeased the nobility, at whose suggestion Elias wrote three letters to the bishop and to the princess, in order to induce them to renounce the enterprise. But as these remonstrances remained without effect, he resorted to violence and persecution. The Arabians were then masters of Armenia, and the patriarch addressed himself to the emir, or kaliph, accusing his adversaries of forming a conspiracy with the emperor of the Greeks, in order to escape from the authority of the  Moslems. In consequence Nerses and the princess were laid in chains, by the order of Omar II, and a new bishop was given to the Albanians. Elias died A.D. 718.

(2) Occupied the patriarchate from A.D. 760 to 797. with the exception of an interval, during which he was expelled by the patriarch Theodoret. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Elias (or Helias)[[@Headword:Elias (or Helias)]]

             (1) Bishop of Lyons, second after Irenaeus.

(2) Bishop of Sedunum (Setten), in the Valais, about the beginning of the 5th century.

(3) A Syrian bishop who endeavored to dissuade Nestorius from his heresy.

(4) Bishop of Bolandus, in Lydia, A.D. 451.

(5) Bishop of Seleuco-belus, on the Orontes, A.D. 458.

(6) Bishop of Majorca, A.D. 484.

(7) Bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, deposed by Anastasius I before A.D. 512.

(8) A martyr of the 5th century, commemorated January 14.

(9) Prior of a nunnery in Athribis, in the Delta, said to have been remarkably sanctified from carnal passion by a dream.

(10) A solitary near Antinoiis, in the Thebaid, in the 4th century.

(11) A hermit near the Dead Sea, noted for hospitality.

(12) Abbot of a monastery in Syria, celebrated for his holiness and wisdom.

(13) Abbot of Isania, near Antioch, near the close of the 6th century.

## Elias Ben-Moses Ashkenasi[[@Headword:Elias Ben-Moses Ashkenasi]]

             SEE LOANZ.

## Elias Ben-Moses Baal-Shem[[@Headword:Elias Ben-Moses Baal-Shem]]

             SEE LOANZ.

## Elias Ben-Moses Beshitzi[[@Headword:Elias Ben-Moses Beshitzi]]

             SEE BESHITZI, ELIAS.

## Elias Ben-Moses de Vidas[[@Headword:Elias Ben-Moses de Vidas]]

             SEE VIDAS, ELIAS.

## Elias Ben-Salorso Abraham hak-Kohen[[@Headword:Elias Ben-Salorso Abraham hak-Kohen]]

             who died in 1729, is the author of שבט מוסר, or Ethics, in fifty-two chapters (Constantinople, 1692): — מדרש אליהו, a Commentary on Midrash Rabba (ibid. 1693): — אליהו על אסתר מדרש, a Commentary and Homilies on Esther (Smyrna, 1759). He also wrote cabalistic treatises, comments upon the hagadoth of the Palestinian Talmud, etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:238; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Elias Hal-Levi Ben-Benjamin Of Constantinople[[@Headword:Elias Hal-Levi Ben-Benjamin Of Constantinople]]

             who flourished in the 16th century, is the author of a ritual for the Jewish congregations in Greece, printed at Constantinople in 1602. He also wrote various Talmudic decisions. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:236 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Elias Levita[[@Headword:Elias Levita]]

             (properly ELIJAH the Levite, son of Asher), one of the greatest Jewish scholars of modern times, was born in the latter half of the fifteenth century. Both the year and the place of his birth have been the subject of literary controversy. The former point seems to have been settled by the learned Rossi (see below), who showed that Elias was born in 1471 or 1472, not, as Hirt maintains, in 1469, or, as Nagel undertook to prove, in 1477. The second point is still a point of dispute, both Italians and  Germans being desirous to claim this great writer for their country. The chief argument of the former is that Elias, in one of his works, speaks of Italy as "my country" and Venice as "my city;" the chief arguments of the Germans are that Elias, on the title pages of several of his books, calls himself Ashkenazi (אִשְׁכְּנָזַי), or "the German," and that, according to the express testimony of his friend and pupil, Sebastian Minster (q.v.), he was born at Neustadt, on the Aich, not far from Nuremberg. The margrave of Neustadt expelled Elias, together with several other Jews, from that town. He then went to Italy, lived in several places as teacher of the Hebrew language, especially (from 1504) at Padua, where he lectured on the Hebrew grammar of Moses Kimchi, and wrote a commentary on it. When Padua, in 1509, was captured and plundered, Elias lost all his property and went to Venice, which city, in 1512, he again left for Rome. There he met with a very friendly reception from cardinal Egidio of Viterbo, who even received him and his family into his own house. For many years Elias instructed the cardinal in the Hebrew language, who, in turn, made him better acquainted with the classical languages. Through Egidio, Elias entered into intimate relations with a number of other cardinals and bishops, who so warmly recommended him that he received an honorable call from king Francois I of France, which he, however, declined. When Rome, in 1527, was plundered by the troops of Karl V, Elias again lost his whole property. He again went to Venice, where he remained until 1540, when he accepted a call from Paul Fagius to assist him in the establishment of a new Hebrew printing office, and in the publication of several Hebrew books, at Isny, in Suabia. He remained in Isny until 1547, when he returned to Venice, where he died in 1549. Elias rejected many of the Jewish traditions, and always spoke favorably of the Christians; but he expressly denied that he had secretly become a Christian, and averred that, "thanks to God, he was still a Jew." He was universally esteemed both for his character and his extraordinary scholarship; only some fanatical Jews hated him, as they suspected his fidelity to Judaism. His celebrated works on Hebrew grammar procured him the surname of "the Grammarian" (הִמְּדִקְדֵּק). His first work was a commentary on the מָהֲלָךְ(Mahalak), or grammar of the rabbi Moses Kimchi, first published by a certain Benjamin who had stolen the MS. (at Pesaro, 1508; frequently reprinted, with a Latin translation by Sebastian Munster, Basel, 1527, 1531; and another by L'Empereur, Leyd. 1631).

This is a different work from his scholia on Kimchi's פֵּתָח דְּבָרִי (Pethach Debaray), or brief grammatical  introduction, the text of which had appeared at Naples in 1492, and Levita's scholia on it at Pesara in 1507, and later editions. At Rome he composed a grammar entitled הִבָּחוּר (hab-Bachur, Rome, 1518), and a work on "Composition" הִהִרְכָּבָה, Rome, 1519), in which he treats of the irregular words of the Bible. Both works were translated by Minster (the former first at Basel in 1518, and the latter in 1536). He also wrote a more extensive grammatical treatise in four parts, entitled. פַּרְקֵי אֵַליָּהוּ, "Elijah's Sections" (Soncino, 1520, and later elsewhere; trans. by Munster, Basel, 1527, and later). After his return to Venice he wrote a book on the accents (טוּב טִעִם) Tezb Taam (Ven. 1538, and other eds.; likewise translated by Minster, Basel, 1539), and, the most celebrated of all his works, a critical book on the Biblical text and its authors (מָסוֹרֶת הִמָּסוֹרֶת),Masoreth ham-Masoreth (Venice, 1538, 1546; Basel, 1539 [with a Latin summary of the work by Munster; Sulzbach, 1769 and 1771]). This work, remarkable alike for literary merit, although it anticipated the judgments of the highest modern criticism on the questions of which it treats, and although it was, in fact, the father of the great Buxtorf and Cappel controversy, which raged round the Hebrew Scriptures for more than a hundred years after Levita's death, had, until recently, never been actually translated either into Latin or any modern language. Nagel translated into Latin the three introductions (Altdorf, 1757-1771); and there is a so-called German translation of Levita's book, published at Halle in 1772, and commonly known as Semler's. But Semler was not really, as indeed he did not profess to be, the translator of Levita. The translation, such as it was, was executed by a young Jewish convert to Christianity of the name of Meyer, and all that Semler did was to supervise and annotate the German rendering. After all, the work was full of errors, and many valuable passages of the original are altogether omitted. A complete and very carefully executed translation into English, together with a critical edition of the original, was in 1867 published by Dr. Ginsburg (The Masoreth ha-Masoreth of Elias Levita, in Hebrew, with an English Translation and Explanatory Notes, London, 1867). Among the works compiled by him at Isny is a Chaldaic-Rabbinical Dictionary (]fm2g2rVt2m, Methurgeman, Isny, 1541; Ven. 1560). Elias also prepared a German translation of the Psalms (Ven. 1545), and was, according to Sabtai, the author of a Hebrew-German novel, Baba. A full list of these and other works of Elias, with their editions, translations, etc., also bibliographical treatises on them and their author, may be found in Furst's  Bibliotheca Judaica, 2:239 sq. A valuable biography of Elias is found in Dr. Ginsburg's edition of Masoreth ham-Masoreth, cited above; see also Herzog, Real-Encycl. 3:758; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gin. 15:810; Rossi, Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei (German transl. [Hist. Handworterbuch der juid. Schriftsteller] by Dr. Hamberger, Leipz. 1839); Hirt, Oriental. und Exeget. Bibliothek, part 7, Jena, 1755; Wolffi Bibliotheca Hebrea, Hamburg, 1715, 1:153. (A.J.S.)

## Elias Misrachi[[@Headword:Elias Misrachi]]

             SEE MISRACHI.

## Elias Montalto[[@Headword:Elias Montalto]]

             SEE MONTALTO.

## Elias Of Radnor[[@Headword:Elias Of Radnor]]

             SEE WILLIAM OF RADNOR.

## Elias Of Trekingham[[@Headword:Elias Of Trekingham]]

             a monk of the 13th century, was born at Trekingham, Lincolnshire — a village since depopulated — was a monk of Peterborough, doctor of divinity in Oxford, a learned man, and a great lover of history, writing a chronicle from A.D. 625 to 1270, when he probably died. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 2:287.

## Elias Wilna[[@Headword:Elias Wilna]]

             SEE WILNA.

## Elias, Apocalypse of[[@Headword:Elias, Apocalypse of]]

             Under this title an apocryphal work was current in the 2d century, from which, according to Origen (Homily 35 on Matthew 27, volume 3:916), the Pauline quotation "Eye hath not seen," etc. (1Co 2:9), is said to have been taken. The same was repeated by Zacharias Chrysopolitanus (Harmoniae Evangelicae, chapter 166); and by Georgius Syncellus, who writes that it was taken ἐκ τῶν ῾Ηλία ἀποκρύφων. This view was, however, early controverted by Jerome, who, referring to 1Co 2:9, says: "Solent hoc loco Apocryphorum quidam deliramenta sectari, et dicere quod de Apocalypsi Elite testimonium sumtum sit, cum in Esaia juxta Hebraicum ita legatur: A soeculo non audierint neque auribus perceperunt" (Epistola 101 ad Pammachium; comp. also, on Isa 64:4 in lib. 17 in Isaiam, 4:761, ed. Vallars.). It is probably the same work which is rejected in the Apostolic Constitutions 6:16, and in the Synopsis Sac. Script. ascribed to Athanasius, 2:154. See Fabricius, Codex Pseudepigraphus, 1:1072 Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v. (B.P.)

## Elias, bishop Of Jerusalem[[@Headword:Elias, bishop Of Jerusalem]]

             (1) A.D. 494-513. He was an Arab by birth, and received his education in one of the Nitrian monasteries; but being expelled by Timothy AElurus in A.D. 457, he took refuge with St. Euthymius. He afterwards resided in a cell at Jericho. He was a strict ascetic, and took an active part in the Athanasian controversy, in consequence of which he was finally banished to AEla, on the Red Sea.

(2) Cir. A.D. 760-797. He was for a time deposed on the charge of image- worship, brought by Theodorus, an ambitious monk, in 763. He was represented at the second General Council at Nice, in 787, by John, a priest, and Thomas, a prior of the convent of St. Arsena, near Babylon, in Egypt, who also represented the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch.

(3) Died about 907. In 881 he sent a letter to Charlemagne; likewise, also, to the prelates, princes, and nobles of Gaul. A Latin translation of the letter (it is not probable that the original was in this language) may be found in the Spicilegium of D'Achery (Paris, 1723, volume 3).

## Eliasaph[[@Headword:Eliasaph]]

             (Hebrew Elyasaph', [אֶלְיָסָ, whom God has added; Sept. Ε᾿λισάφ), the name of two Israelites at the time of the Exode.

1. Son of Reuel or Deuel, and phylarch of the tribe of Dan (Num 1:14; Num 2:14; Num 7:42; Num 7:47; Num 10:20). B.C. 1657.

2. Son of Lael, and chief of the family of the Gershomite Levites (Num 3:24). B.C. 1657.

## Eliashib[[@Headword:Eliashib]]

             (Hebrew Elyashib', אֶלְיָשַׁיב, whom God will restore; Sept. Ε᾿λιασεβών, Ε᾿λιαβί, Ε᾿λιασείβ, Ελιασούβ, etc.; Josephus Ε᾿λιάσιβος; (Vulg. Eliasub, Eliasib), a common name of Israelites, especially at the later period of the O.T. history.

1. A priest in the time of king David; head of the eleventh "course" in the order of the "governors" (שָׂדִיס) of the sanctuary (1Ch 24:12). B.C. 1013.

2. A Levitical singer who repudiated his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:24). B.C. 458.

3. An Israelite of the lineage of Zattu, who did the same (Ezr 10:27). B.C. 458.

4. An Israelite of the lineage of Bani, who did the same (Ezr 10:36). B.C. 458.

5. The high-priest of the Jews in the time of Nehemiah (Neh 12:28). B.C. 446. With the assistance of his fellow-priests, he rebuilt the eastern city wall adjoining the Temple (Neh 3:1). His own extensive mansion was doubtless situated in the same vicinity, probably on  the ridge Ophel (Nehemiah in, 20,21). SEE JERUSALEM.

Eliashib was in some way allied (קָיוֹב=near) to Tobiah the Ammonite, for whom he had prepared an ante-room in the Temple, a desecration which excited the pious indignation of Nehemiah (Neh 13:4; Neh 13:7). One of the grandsons of Eliashib had also married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite (Neh 13:28). There seems no reason to doubt that the same Eliashib is referred to in Ezr 10:6, as the father of Johanan, who occupied an apartment in the Temple (comp. Josephus, Ant. 11:5, 4). He is evidently the same with the son of Joiakim and father of Joiada (Josephus, "Judas," Ant. 11:7, 1), in the succession of high-priests (Neh 12:10; Neh 12:22). SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

6. A son of Elioenai, and member of the latest family of the lineage of Zerubbabel, mentioned in the Old Test. (1Ch 3:24). B.C. 406.

## Eliasib[[@Headword:Eliasib]]

             (Ε᾿λιάσιβος), the Graecized form (1Es 9:1) of the name of the high- priest ELIASHIB SEE ELIASHIB (q.v.).

## Eliasis[[@Headword:Eliasis]]

             (Ε᾿λιάσις v.r. Ε᾿λιάσεις), a name given (1Es 9:34) as that of one of the " sons of Maani" who divorced their Gentile wives after the captivity, and corresponding in position to MATTENAI SEE MATTENAI (q.v.) of the Hebrews list (Ezr 10:33); but probably a merely erroneous repetition of ENASIBOS SEE ENASIBOS (q.v.) preceding in the same verse.

## Eliathah[[@Headword:Eliathah]]

             (Hebrew Elia'thah, אְֵליא תָה, 1Ch 25:4, or Eliya'thah, אֵַליּ תָה, 1Ch 25:27, to whom God will come; Sept. Ε᾿λιαθά v.r. Ε᾿λιάθ, Vulg. Eliatha), the eighth named of the fourteen sons of the Levite Heman, and a musician in the Temple in the time of king David (1Ch 25:4), who, with twelve of his sons and brethren, had the twentieth division of the Temple-service (25:27). B.C. 1013. In Jerome's Quaest. Hebr. on 1Ch 25:27, the name is given as Eliaba, and explained accordingly; but not so in the Vulgate.

## Eliberis[[@Headword:Eliberis]]

             SEE ELVIRA.

## Elidad[[@Headword:Elidad]]

             (Hebrew Elidad', אֵַלידָד, whom God has loved; Sept. Ε᾿λδάδ, Vulg. Eldad), the son of Chislon, and phylarch of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the commissioners appointed, to portion out the promised land among the tribes (Num 31:7; Num 31:21). B.C. 1619.

## Elidius[[@Headword:Elidius]]

             (1) Saint, from whom one of the Scilly Isles was named, now corrupted into St. Helen's Isle. He is also called St. Lyde, and is sometimes confounded with Eligins, bishop of Noyon.

(2) Martyr in Auvergne, under Childeric II (A.D. 674); commemorated January 25.

## Eliel[[@Headword:Eliel]]

             (Hebrew Eliel', ץלֵיץֵל, to whom God is might), the name of some nine Israelites.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λιήλ.) A valiant phylarch of the tribe of Manasseh east (1 Chronicles v. 24). B.C. post 1612.

2. (Sept. Ε᾿λιήλ.) Son of Toah and father of Jerohan, ancestors of Heman the singer and Levite (1Ch 6:34); probably identical with the ELIAB of 1Ch 6:34, and the ELIHU of 1Sa 1:1. B.C. cir 1250. SEE SAMUEL.

3. (Sept. Ε᾿λιηλί.) One of the descendants of Shimhi, and head of a Benjamite family in Jerusalem (1Ch 8:20). B.C. between 1612 and 588.

4. (Sept. Ε᾿λεήλ.) One of the descendants of Shashak, and likewise head of a Benjamite family at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:22). B.C. eod.

5. (Sept. Ε᾿λιήλ v.r. Ε᾿λιάβ.) The seventh of the Gadite heroes who joined David in his stronghold in the wilderness (1Ch 12:11), possibly the same with No. 6 or 7. B.C. 1061.

6. (Sept. Ε᾿λιήλ v.r. Ι᾿ελιήλ.) A Mahanite (q.v), and one of David's distinguished warriors (1Ch 11:46). B.C. 1046.

7. (Sept. Α᾿λιήλ v.r. Δαλιήλ.) Another of David's distinguished warriors (1Ch 11:47). B.C. eod.

8. (Sept. Ε᾿λιήλ.) Chief of the 80 Hebronite Levites assembled by David to assist in bringing the ark to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:9; 1Ch 15:11). B.C. 1043.

9. (Sept. Ε᾿λιήλ.) One of the Levites appointed by Hezekiah to have charge of the offerings for the Temple services (2Ch 31:13). B.C. 726.

## Elienai[[@Headword:Elienai]]

             (Hebrew Elieynay', אֵַליעֵינִי, perh. contracted for ELIOENAI SEE ELIOENAI [q.v.]; Sept. Ελιωηναϊv v.r. Ε᾿λιωναϊv, Vulg. Elioenai), one of the Bene-Shimhi Benjamite heads of families resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:20). B.C. between 1618 and 588.

## Eliezer[[@Headword:Eliezer]]

             (Hebrew id. אֵַליעֶזֶר, God is his help, a modification of the name Eleazar [see LAZARUS]; Sept, Ε᾿λιέζερ and Ε᾿λιέζερ, N.T. Ε᾿λιέζερ), the name of eleven men.

1. "ELIEZER OF DAMASCUS," mentioned in Gen 15:2-3, apparently as a house-born domestic, SEE SLAVE and steward of Abraham, and hence likely, in the absence of direct issue, to become the patriarch's heir. B.C. 2088. The Sept. interprets the terms thus: "But the son of Masek, my house-born maid, is this Heliezer of Damascus." It appeared even thus early that the passage of Scripture in which the name of Eliezer occurs is one of some difficulty. Abraham, being promised a son, says, "I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus (דִּמֶּשֶׂק אֵַליעֶזֶר הוּא, he of Damascus, Eliezer) ... Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in mine house is mine heir" (Gen 15:2-3). The common notion is that Eliezer was Abraham's house-born slave, adopted as his heir, and meanwhile his chief and confidential servant, and the same who was afterwards sent into Mesopotamia to seek a wife for Isaac (q.v.). This last point we may dismiss with the remark that there is not the least evidence that 'the elder servant of his house" (Gen 24:2), whom Abraham charged with this mission, was the same as Eliezer. The obvious meaning is that Eliezer was born in Damascus, and how is this compatible with the notion of his being Abraham's house-born slave, seeing that Abraham's household never was at Damascus? It is true that there is a tradition, quoted by Josephus from Nicolaus of Damascus (Ant. 1:7, 4), that Abraham "reigned in Damascus;" but the tradition was probably founded on this very passage, and has no claim on our belief. The Mohammedans call him Dameshak, or Damascennis, and believe him to  have been a black slave given to Abraham by Nimrod, at the time when he saw him, by virtue of the name of God, walking out of the midst of the flames (Ur), into which he had been cast by his orders. SEE ABRAHAM.

The expression, "the steward of mine house," in Gen 24:2, בֶּן מֶשֶׁק בֵּיתַּי(note the alliteration between the obscure term meshek and Dammesek), literally translated, is "the son of possession of my house," i.e., one who shall possess my house, my property, after my death, and is therefore exactly the same as the phrase in the next verse, "the son of my house (בֶּןבֵּיתַי, paraphrased by "one born in mine house") is mine heir." This removes every objection to Eliezer's being of Damascus, and enables us to dispense with the tradition; for it is no longer necessary to suppose that Eliezer was a house-born slave, or a servant at all, and leaves it more probable that he was some near relative whom Abraham regarded as his heir-at-law. It is by no means certain that "this Eliezer" was present in Abraham's camp at all; and we, of course, cannot know in what degree he stood related to Abraham, or under what circumstances he was born at, or belonged to Damascus. It is possible that he lived there at the very time when Abraham thus spoke of him, and that he is hence called "Eliezer of Damascus." This view removes another difficulty, which arises from the fact that, while Abraham speaks of Eliezer as his heir, his nephew Lot was in his neighborhood, and had until lately been the companion of his wanderings. If Eliezer was Abraham's servant, it might well occasion surprise that he should speak of him and not of Lot as his heir; but this surprise ceases when we regard Eliezer as also a relative, and if so, a nearer relative than Lot, although not, like Lot, the companion of his journeys. Some have supposed that Lot and Eliezer were, in fact, the same person; and this would be an excellent explanation if the Scriptures afforded sufficient grounds for it. (See Gesenius, Thes. Hebrew s.v. מֶשֶׁק; Rosenmuller, on Gen 15:1-21; Knobel, Comment. in loc.)

2. A son of Becher, and grandson of Benjamin (1Ch 7:8). B.C. post 1856.

3. (Josephus Ε᾿λεάζαρος, Ant. 2:13, 1.) The second of the two sons of Moses and Zipporah, born during the exile in Midian, to whom his father gave this name, "because, said he, the God of my fathers was my help, that delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh" (Exo 18:4; 1Ch 23:15; 1Ch 23:17). B.C. cir. 1690. He remained with his mother and brother Gershom, in the care of Jethro his grandfather, when Moses  returned to Egypt (Exo 4:18), she having been sent back to her father by Moses (Exo 18:2), though she set off to accompany him, and went part of the way with him. Jethro brought back Zipporah and her two sons to Moses in the wilderness, after he heard of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt (18). Eliezer had one son, Rehabiah, from whom sprang a numerous posterity (1Ch 23:17; 1Ch 26:25-26). Shelomith, in the reigns of Saul and David (1Ch 26:28), who had the care of all the treasures of things dedicated to God, was descended from Eliezer in the 6th generation, if the genealogy in 1Ch 26:25, is complete.

4. One of the priests who blew with trumpets before the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:24). B.C. 1043.

5. Son of Zichri, and chief of the Reubenites under David (1Ch 27:16). B.C. ante 1013.

6. A prophet (son of Dodavah of Mareshah), who foretold to Jehoshaphat (q.v.) that the merchant fleet which he fitted out in partnership with Ahaziah should be wrecked, and thus prevented from sailing to Tarshish (2Ch 20:37). B.C. 895.

7. Son of Jorim, and father of Joseh, of the private lineage of David prior to Salathiel (Luk 3:29). B.C. ante 588.

8. One of the chiefs of the Jews during the exile, sent by Ezra, with others from Ahava, to Casiphia, to induce some Levites and Nethinim to join the party returning to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16). B.C. 459.

9. One of the priests (of the kindred of Jeshua) who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:18). B.C. 458.

10. A Levite who did the same (Ezr 10:23). B.C. 458.

11. An Israelite of the lineage of Harim, who did the same (Ezr 10:31). B.C. 458.

## Eliezer Ben-Isaac of Worms[[@Headword:Eliezer Ben-Isaac of Worms]]

             who flourished in the 11th century, is the author of an ascetic work entitled, ארחות חיי, also called צואת ר8 אליעזר הגדול, The Testament of Rabbi Eliezer the Great. It was edited by Chajim Cesarini, Constantinople, 1519, and often since. In a Judaeo-German translation it was published at Amsterdam in 1649. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:233. (B.P.)

## Eliezer ben-Elias Aschenazi[[@Headword:Eliezer ben-Elias Aschenazi]]

             (i.e. son of Elijah, the German), a distinguished Rabbi, was born about the opening of the 16th century, and practiced medicine at Cremona. Obliged to leave that town, he went to Constantinople, and was intrusted with the care of the synagogue at Naxos, in the Archipelago. Finally he went to Poland, and was made chief Rabbi of the synagogue at Posen. His  coreligionists regard him as one of the most learned men of the 16th century. He died at Cracow in 1586. He "published יוֹסַ לֶקִח(Cremona, 1576, and often), a commentary on Esther:— מִעֲשֵׂה יי(Work of Jehovah), in which he describes the historical events of the Pentateuch (Venice, 1583; Cracow, 1584, and later), and one or two less important works. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 15:827.

## Eliezer ben-Hyrkanos[[@Headword:Eliezer ben-Hyrkanos]]

             surnamed the Great, was born about the middle of the 1st century. He was of a good family, but his early education was very much neglected, and at the age of 28, urged by an awakened impulse after knowledge, he left his father's house and became a disciple of Jochanan ben-Zachai. Eliezer soon repaired his deficiencies, and became one of the distinguished Rabbins of his age. Profound in the Cabala (q.v.), he made many practical acquisitions in magical science, and became the thaumaturgist of the school. During the controversies between Gamaliel (q.v.) and the rival doctors at Jamnia, he founded a school at Lydda, where his teaching appears to have assumed so mystical a character as to involve him in difficulties with the rabbinical authorities. The Karaites regarded Eliezer as one of the defenders of their doctrines. He died about 73 A.D., at Caesarea, in Palestine. His principal work is Pirke R. Eliezeris (edit. Princ. Hebraice. Venet. 1544, 4to), translated into Latin with notes by Vorstius (Leyd. 1644, 4to), ed. by Abr. Aaron Broda, with a Heel. commentary (Wilna, 1838, 4to), and often republished. See Boraitha der R. Elieser, by Leop. Zunz (Berlin, 1832), a critical account of the work and its author. He is regarded also as the author of Orcothchaiim (The Way of Life), which has been often reprinted. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 15:825-6; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrews Literature, page 60 sq.; Grasse, Allgem. Iterirgesch. 1:1108 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Eliezer ben-Judah[[@Headword:Eliezer ben-Judah]]

             (sometimes called ELEAZAR GARMIZA, but apparently without good reason), of Worms, the son of Kalonymos of Mentz, was one of the most distinguished Rabbins of the 13th century. He was a pupil of Judah the Saint, and died in 1238; He wrote thirty works, of which only a few have been printed. The principal ones are: Yoreh Chatcinz חֲטָאַים יוֹרֶה, "he will instruct sinners") a liturgical and ascetic formulary (Venice, 1589, 8vo, and often):Yeyn ha-Rekach (יֵין הָרֶקִח, "wine of spicery"), a cabalistic commentary on Canticles and Ruth (Lublin, 1608, 4to): — Sepher  Rokeach (סֵפֶר רֹקֵחִ, "spiced book"), on the fear of God and repentance (Fano, 1505, fol., and often since): — פֵּרוּשׁ, etc., a commentary on the cabalistic book Jezirah (Mantua, 1562, 4to, and since): — לַמּוּטַים, etc., a cabalistic exposition of the Pentateuch (extracts in Azulai's נִחִל קְדוּמַים, Leghorn, 1800): — סוֹדֵי רָזִיָּא, on angelology (in pait, Amst. 1701, 4to). Several of his works in MS. are at the Bibliotheque de l'Oratoire at Paris. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 15:826-7; Grasse, Allgem. Literargesch. 3:521; Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 1:228. (J.H.W.)

## Eliezer ben-Nathan[[@Headword:Eliezer ben-Nathan]]

             sometimes also surnamed Metz, from his native place, was a contemporary of Rashi, and eminent in the cabalistic science. His renown is greatly due to a work on Talmudical law which he composed in 1152, under the title אֶבֶן הָעֶזֶר(stone of help), printed at Prague in 1610. The Rabbins Jachia and Wolf ascribe to him also the authorship of Tsophnath Paaneach, but Rossi asserts that Eliezer of Spain was the real author of that work. It appears to be only another title of the preceding work. He wrote also פַּסַקֵי דַינַים (Constantinople, 1520, and later) and מִאֲמִר הִשְׂכֵּל(Cremona, 1554, and later); both relating to the Jewish ritual. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 15:826; Grasse, Allgem. Literargesch. 3:502.

## Elifantus (or Alephantus)[[@Headword:Elifantus (or Alephantus)]]

             thirty-third archbishop of Arles, near the close of the 8th century,

## Eligius, Eloi, or Eloysius[[@Headword:Eligius, Eloi, or Eloysius]]

             (ST.), bishop of Novon, one of the most eminent names in the ecclesiastical history of France, was born at Cadillac, near Limoges, in or shortly before the year 588. He learned the trade of a goldsmith, and became the most skillful artist of the day, especially in ornaments for churches and tombs. He gained the confidence of Clotaire II, and stood high at his court. While working at his art, he always had an open Bible before him. He devoted his gains to works of piety, especially to the redemption of slaves from captivity, sometimes emancipating a hundred at one time. As a layman, he instructed the common people constantly. Dagobert, the son and successor of Clotaire, made him his treasurer, and employed him for important missions, in which he was always successful. Thus he brought about a treaty of peace between Dagobert and Judicahill, duke of Brittany. Eligius availed himself of his influence with the weak and licentious Dagobert to obtain large donations, which he used for the establishment of churches, monasteries, and hospitals. In 640, two years  after the death of Dagobert, the majordomo Herchenoald, who was regent during the minority of Clodvig II, in order to get rid of the influence of Eligius, appointed him bishop of Noyon. In this office he was in labors abundant for eighteen years, preaching, taking missionary tours, and founding churches and monasteries. Eligius seems to have been a thoroughly converted man, and his life is indeed a light in a dark place. Eligius, together with his friend Audoenus (St. Ouen), archbishop of Rheims, had a predominating influence upon the churches of Gaul; and although most of the bishops disliked the rigor and severity of Eligius, they yielded to his zeal and authority. Thus, in 644, at a synod of Chalons sur Saone, very strict rules were given for the appointment of bishops and abbots; and the metropolitan Theodosius of Aries, who had violated many Church laws, was suspended from his office. When bishop Martin of Rome, in the Monothelitic controversy, was imprisoned and exiled by the emperor, the majority of the Gallic bishops, at a council held in Orleans, under the leadership of Eligius and Audoenus, declared for the pope and against the Monothelites, who were cruelly persecuted. After the death of Clodvig II and Herchenoald, Eligius was recalled by the queen dowager Bathilde to the court, where he remained until shortly before his death. He died at Noyon Nov. 30, 658 (or 659), and the people soon after began to venerate him as a saint. His life (Vita S. Eligii), written by his disciple Audoenus (St. Ouen), will be found in D'Achery, Spicilegium, 2:76-123, and in Migne, Patrol. Latin. 89:474. The extracts from sermons of Eligius which are included in this biography are almost verbally taken from the sermons of Caesarius of Aries. In its present form this work is undoubtedly of a later origin. Sixteen homilies are given to him in Bib. Max. Patr. 12:300; also in Migne, Patrol. Latin. 97:595; but their genuineness is questioned. A letter from Eligius to bishop Desiderius of Cahors is given in Canisii Antiquit. Lection. ed. Basnage, tom. 1, and in Migne, 87:657. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:760; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 15:904; Neander, Ch. Hist. 3:41, 42; Neander, Light in Dark Places; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. book 2, chapter 7, part 2, chapter 2, n. 24.

## Elihoinai[[@Headword:Elihoinai]]

             (Hebrew Elyehoeynay', אֶלְיַהוֹעֵינִי, toward Jehovah are my eyes), the name of two men. SEE ELIOENAI and SEE ELIENAI.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λιωηναϊv v.r. Ε᾿λιωναϊv, Vulg. Elioenai.) The seventh and youngest son of Meshelemiah (q.v.) the Levite, of the time of David (1  Chronicles 26:3, where the name is improperly Anglicized "Elioenai"). B.C. 1043-13.

2. (Sept. Ε᾿λιαανά v.r. Ε᾿λιανά', Vulg. Elioenai.) Son of Zerahiah of the "sons of Pahath-Moab," who returned with 200 males from the exile (Ezr 8:4). B.C. 459.

## Elihoreph[[@Headword:Elihoreph]]

             (Hebrew Elicho'reph, ׃אֵַליחֹרֶ, God is his recompense; Sept. Ε᾿λιχόρεφ v.r. Ε᾿λάφ and Ε᾿ναρέφ), son of Shisha, and appointed, with his brother Ahiah, royal scribe (סוֹפֵר) by Solomon (1Ki 4:3). B.C. 1012.

## Elihu[[@Headword:Elihu]]

             (Hebrew Elihu', םאֵַַליהוּא. [but abbreviated ץלֵיתּוּin Job 32:4; Job 35:1; 1Ch 26:7; 1Ch 27:18], whose God is He, i.e., Jehovah), the name of five men.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λιούς.) One of Job's friends, described as "the son of Barachel, a Buzite, of the kindred of Ram" (Job 32:2). This is usually understood to imply that he was descended from Buz, the son of Abraham's brother Nahor, from whose family the city called Buz (Jer 25:23) also took its name. The Chaldee paraphrase asserts that Elihu was a relation of Abraham. Elihu's name does not appear among those of the friends who came in the first instance to condole with Job, nor is his presence indicated till the debate between the afflicted man and his three friends had been brought to a conclusion. Then, finding there was no answer to Job's last speech, he comes forward with considerable modesty, which he loses as he proceeds, to remark on the debate, and to deliver his own opinion on the points at issue (Job 32:1-22; Job 37:1-24). B.C. cir. 2200. It appears, from the manner in which Elihu introduces himself (Job 32:3-7), that he was much the youngest of the party; and it is evident that he had been present from the commencement of the discussion, to which he had paid very close attention.\* This would suggest that the debate between Job and his friends was carried on in the presence of a deeply-interested auditory, among which was this Elihu, who could not forbear from interfering when the controversy appeared to have reached an unsatisfactory conclusion (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. in loc.). He expresses his desire to moderate between the disputants; and his words alone touch upon, although they do not thoroughly handle, that idea of the disciplinary nature of suffering,  which is the key to Job's perplexity and doubt; but, as in the whole book, the greater stress is laid on God's unsearchable wisdom, and the implicit faith which he demands (see Velthuysen, De Elice carmine, Rotterdam, 1789-90). He does not enlarge on any supposable wickedness in Job as having brought his present distresses upon him, but controverts his replies, his inferences, and his arguments. He observes on the mysterious dispensations of Providence, which he insists, however they may appear to mortals, are full of wisdom and mercy; that the righteous have their share of prosperity in this life no less than the wicked;. that God is supreme, and that it becomes us to acknowledge and submit to that supremacy, since "the Creator wisely rules the world he made;" and he draws instances of benignity from the constant wonders of creation, of the seasons, etc. His language is copious, glowing, and sublime; and it deserves notice that Elihu does not appear to have offended God by his sentiments; nor is any sacrifice of atonement commanded for him as for the other speakers in the poem. It is almost pardonable that the character of Elihu has been thought figurative of a personage interposed between God and man — a mediator — one speaking "without terrors," and not disposed to overcharge mankind. This sentiment may have had its influence on the acceptability and preservation of the book of Job (see Hodges's Elihu, Oxford, 1750). SEE JOB (BOOK OF).

2. (Sept. ᾿Ηλιού.) Son of Tohu, and grandfather of Elkanah, Samuel's father (1Sa 1:1). In the statements of the genealogy of Samuel in 1 Chronicles vi the name ELIEL SEE ELIEL (q.v.) occurs in the same position — son of Toah, and father of Jeroham (6:34 [Hebrews 1Sa 6:19]); and also ELIAB SEE ELIAB (6:27 [Hebrews 12:1-29]), father of Jeroham, and grandson of Zophai. The general opinion is that Elihu is the original name, and the two latter forms but copyists' variations of it.

3. (Sept. Ε᾿λιούδ v.r. Ε᾿λιμούθ.) One of the chiliarchs of Manasseh who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:20), after he had left the Philistine army on the eve of the battle of Gilboa, and who assisted him against the marauding band (גְּדוּד) of the Amalekites (comp. 1Sa 30:1-31). B.C. 1053.

4. (Sept. Ε᾿λιού.) One of the eminently able-bodied members of the family of Obed-edom (apparently a grandson by Shemaiah), who were appointed porters of the Temple under David (1Ch 26:7). B.C. 1043. Terms are applied to all these doorkeepers which appear to indicate that  they were not only "strong men," as in A.V., but also fighting men. (See 1Ch 26:6-8; 1Ch 26:12, in which occur the words חִיַל= army, and גַּבּוֹרַים— warriors or heroes.)

5. (Sept. Ε᾿λιάβ.) A chief of the tribe of Judah, said to be "of the brethren of David" (1Ch 27:18), and hence supposed by some to have been his oldest brother ELIAB SEE ELIAB (1Sa 16:6). B.C. 1013 or ante.

## Elijah[[@Headword:Elijah]]

             (Hebrews Eliyah', אֵלַיָּה, whose God is Jehovah, 2Ki 1:3-4; 2Ki 1:8; 2Ki 1:12; 1Ch 8:27; Ezr 10:21; Ezr 10:26; Mal 4:5; elsewhere in the prolonged form Eliya'hu, אֵלַיָּהוּ; Sept. ᾿Ηλιού v.r. ᾿Ηλίας; N.T. ῾Ηλίας; Josephus, ᾿Ηλίας, Ant. 8:13, 4; Vulg. Elias), the name of several men in the O.T., but the later ones apparently all namesakes of the famous prophet.

I. “ELIJAH THE TISHBITE," the Elias" of the N.T., a character whose rare, sudden, and brief appearances, undaunted courage and fiery zeal — the brilliancy of whose triumphs — the pathos of whose despondency-the glory of whose departure, and the calm beauty of whose reappearance on the Mount of Transfiguration — throw such a halo of brightness around him as is equalled by none of his compeers in the sacred story.

1. Origin. — This wonder-working prophet is introduced to our notice like another Melchizedek (Gen 10:4; Gen 10:18; Heb 7:3), without any mention of his father or mother, or of the beginning of his days — as if he had dropped out of that cloudy chariot which, after his work was done on earth, conveyed him back to heaven. "Elijah the Tishbite, of the inhabitants of Gilead," is literally all that is given us to know of his parentage and locality (1Ki 17:1). The Hebrew text is אֵלַיָּהוּ הִתַּשְׁבַּי מַתּשָׁבְי גַלְעָד. The third word may be pointed (1), as in the present Masoretic text, to mean "from the inhabitants of Gilead," or (2) "from Tishbi of Gilead," which, with a slight change in form, is what the Sept. has (ὁ ἐκ θεσσεβῶν). The latter is followed by Ewald (Isr. Gesch. 3:486, note). Lightfoot assumes, but without giving his authority, that Elijah was from Jabesh-Gilead. By Josephus he is said to have come from Thesbon — ἐκ πολεως θεσβώνης τῆς Γαλααδίτιδος χώρας (Ant. 8:13, 2). Perhaps this may have been read as Heshbon, a city of the priests, and given rise to  the statement of Epiphanius that he was "of the tribe of Aaron," and grandson of Zadok. (See also the Chron. Pasch. in Fabricius, Cod. Pseudep. V.T. p. 1070, etc.; and Quaresmius, Elucid. 2:605.) According to Jewish tradition — grounded on a certain similarity between the fiery zeal of the two-Elijah was identical with Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the priest. He was also the angel of Jehovah who appeared in fire to Gideon (Lightfoot on Joh 1:21; Eisenmenger, 1:686). Arab tradition places his birthplace at Gilhad (Jalud), a few miles north of es-Salt (Irby, page 98), and his tomb near Damascus (Mislin, 1:490). The common assumption — perhaps originating with Hiller (Onom. page 947) or Reland (Pal. page 1035) — is that he was born in the town of Thisbe (q.v.), mentioned in Tob 1:2. But, not to insist on the fact that this Thisbe was not in Gilead, but in Naphtali, it is nearly certain that the name has no real existence in that passage, but arises from a mistaken translation of the same Hebrew word which is rendered "inhabitants" in 1Ki 17:1. SEE TISHBITE.

2. Personal Appearance. — The mention of Gilead, however, is the key- note to much that is most characteristic in the story of the prophet. Gilead was the country on the further side of the Jordan — a country of chase and pasture, of tent-villages and mountain castles, inhabited by a people not settled and civilized like those who formed the communities of Ephraim and Judah, but of wandering, irregular habits, exposed to the attacks of the nomad tribes of the desert, and gradually conforming more and more to the habits of those tribes; making war with the Hagarites, and taking the countless thousands of their cattle, and then dwelling in their stead (1Ch 5:10; 1Ch 5:19-22). SEE GILEAD.

With Elijah this is seen at every turn. Of his appearance as he "stood before" Ahab — with the suddenness of motion to this day characteristic of the Bedouins from his native hills — we can perhaps realize something from the touches, few, but strong, of the narrative. Of his height little is to be inferred — that little is in favor of its being beyond the ordinary size. His chief characteristic was his hair, long and thick, and hanging down his back, and which, if not betokening the immense strength of Samson, yet accompanied powers of endurance no less remarkable. SEE HAIR. His ordinary clothing consisted of a girdle of skin round his loins, which he tightened when about to move quickly (1Ki 18:46). But in addition to this he occasionally wore the "mantle" (q.v.), or cape, of sheep-skin, which has supplied us with one of our most familiar figures of speech. In this mantle, in moments of emotion, he would hide his face (1Ki 19:13), or when excited would roll it up as into a  kind of staff. On one occasion we find him bending himself down upon the ground with his face between his knees. Such, so far as the scanty notices of the record will allow us to conceive it, was the general appearance of the great prophet — an appearance which there is no reason to think was other than uncommon even at that time. The solitary life in which these external peculiarities had been assumed had also nurtured that fierceness of zeal and that directness of address which so distinguished him. It was in the wild loneliness of the hills and ravines of Gilead that the knowledge of Jehovah, the living God of Israel, had been impressed on his mind, which was to form the subject of his mission to the idolatrous court and country of Israel.

3. History. — The northern kingdom had at this time forsaken almost entirely the faith in Jehovah. The worship of the calves had been a departure from him, it was a violation of his command against material resemblances; but still it would appear that even in the presence of the calves Jehovah was acknowledged, and they were at any rate a national institution, not directly imported from the idolatries of any of the surrounding countries. SEE CALF.

They were announced by Jeroboam as the preservers of the nation during the great crisis of its existence: "Behold thy gods, O Israel, that brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (1Ki 12:28). But the case was quite different when Ahab, not content with the calf-worship — "as if it had been a light thing to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat" — married the daughter of the king of Sidon, and introduced on the most extensive scale (Josephus, Ant. 9:6, 6) the foreign religion of his wife's family, the worship of the Phoenician Baal. What this worship consisted of we are ignorant — doubtless it was of a gay, splendid, and festal character, and therefore very opposite to the grave, severe service of the Mosaic ritual. Attached to it and to the worship of Asherah (A.V. "Ashtaroth," and "the groves") were licentious and impure sites, which in earlier times had brought the heaviest judgments on the nation (Num 15:1-41; Jdg 2:13-14; Jdg 3:7-8). But the most obnoxious and evil characteristic of the Baal religion was that it was the worship of power, of mere strength, as opposed to that of a God of righteousness and goodness — a foreign religion, imported from nations the hatred of whom was inculcated in every page of the law, as opposed to the religion of that God who had delivered the nation from the bondage of Egypt, had "driven out the heathen with his hand, and planted them in," and through whom their forefathers had "trodden down their enemies, and  destroyed those that rose up against them." It is as a witness against these two evils that Elijah comes forward. (B.C. cir. 907.)

(1.) What we may call the first act in his life embraces between three and four years — three years and six months for the duration of the drought, according to the statements of the New Testament (Luk 4:25; Jam 5:17), and three or four months more for the journey to Horeb and the return to Gilead (1 Kings 17:50–19:21). His introduction is of the most startling description: he suddenly appears before Ahab, as with the unrestrained freedom of Eastern manners he would have no difficulty in doing, and proclaims the vengeance of Jehovah for the apostasy of the king. This he does in the remarkable formula evidently characteristic of himself, and adopted after his departure by his follower Elisha — a formula which includes everything at issue between himself and the king — the name of Jehovah — his being the God of Israel — the Living God — Elijah being his messenger, and then — the special lesson of the event — that the god of power and of nature should be beaten at his own weapons. "As Jehovah, God of Israel, liveth, before whom I stand," whose constant servant I am, "there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word." Before, however, he spoke thus, it would seem that he had been warning this most wicked king as to the fatal consequences which must result both to himself and his people from the iniquitous course he was then pursuing, and this may account for the apparent abruptness with which he opens his commission. What immediate action followed on this we are not told; but it is plain that Elijah had to fly before some threatened vengeance, either of the king, or more probably of the queen (compare 19:2). Perhaps it was at this juncture that Jezebel "cut off the prophets of Jehovah" (1Ki 18:4). We can imagine Ahab and Jezebel being greatly incensed against Elijah for having foretold and prayed that such calamities might befall them. For some time they might attribute the drought under which the nation suffered to natural causes, and not to the interposition of the prophet; and, therefore, however they might despise him as a vain enthusiast, they would not proceed immediately to punish him. When, however, they saw the denunciation of Elijah taking effect far more extensively than had been anticipated, they would naturally seek to wreak their vengeance upon him as the cause of their sufferings. But we do not find him taking one step for his own preservation till the God whom he served interposed. He was directed to the brook Cherith, either one of the torrents which cleave the high table-lands of his native hills, or on the west  of Jordan, more in the neighborhood of Samaria, perhaps the present wady Kelt. SEE CHERITH. There, in the hollow of the torrent-bed, he remained, supported in the miraculous manner with which we are all familiar, till the failing of the brook obliged him to forsake it. How long he remained in the Chelith is uncertain. The Hebrew expression is simply "at the end of days;" nor does Josephus afford us any more information. A vast deal of ingenuity has been devoted to explaining away Elijah's "ravens." The Hebrew word, עֹרְבִים, orebim', has been interpreted as "Arabians," as "merchants," as inhabitants of some neighboring town of Orbo or Orbi. By others Elijah has been held to have plundered a raven's nest, and this twice a day regularly for several months! SEE RAVEN.

His next refuge, under the divine guidance (1Ki 17:9), was at Zarephath, a Phoenician town lying between Tyre and Sidon, certainly the last place at which the enemy of Baal would be looked for. The widow woman in whose house he lived is thought, however, to have been an Israelite, and no Baal-worshipper, by some who take her adjuration by "Jehovah thy God" as an indication. But the obvious circumstances of the case, and her mention by our Savior (Luk 4:26), imply her heathen character. Here Elijah performed the miracles of prolonging the oil and the meal, and restored the son of the widow to life after his sudden death. The traditional scene of his meeting with the widow was in a wood to the south of the town (Mislin, 1:532, who, however, does not give his authority). In the time of Jerome the spot was marked by a tower (Jerome, Ep. Paulk). At a later period a church dedicated to the prophet was erected over the house of the widow, in which his chamber and her kneading-trough were shown (Anton. Martyr and Phocas, in Reland, p. 985). This church was called τὸ χηρεῖον (Acta Sanctorum). The Jewish tradition, quoted by Jerome, was that the resuscitated boy was the servant who afterwards accompanied Elijah, and finally became the prophet Jonah (Jerome, Pref. to Jonah; and see the citations from the Talmuds in Eisenmenger, 2:725).

The drought continued, and at last the full horrors of famine, caused by the failure of the crops, descended on Samaria. During this time the prophet was called upon passively to suffer God's will; now he must once again resume the more active duties of life; he must make one great public effort more to reclaim his country from apostasy and ruin. According to the word of the Lord, he returned to Israel; Ahab was yet alive, and unreformed; Jezebel, his impious consort, was still mad upon her idols; in a word, the prophets of Baal were prophesying lies, the priests were bearing rule by  their means, and the people loved to have it so. The king and his chief domestic officer had divided between them the mournful duty of ascertaining that neither round the springs, which are so frequent a feature of central Palestine, nor in the nooks and crannies of the most shaded torrent-beds, was there any of the herbage left, which in those countries is so certain an indication of the presence of moisture. No one short of the two chief persons of the realm could be trusted with this quest for life or death — "Ahab went one way by himself, and Obadiah went another way by himself." It is the moment for the reappearance of the prophet. Wishing not to tempt God by going unnecessarily into danger, he first presented himself to good Obadiah (1Ki 18:7). There, suddenly planted in his path, is the man whom he and his master have been seeking for more than three years. Before the sudden apparition of that wild figure, and that stern, unbroken countenance, Obadiah could not but fall on his face. Elijah requested him to announce to Ahab that he had returned. Obadiah, apparently stung by the unkindness of this request, replied, "What have I sinned, that thou shouldest thus expose me to Ahab's rage, who will certainly slay me for not apprehending thee, for whom he has so long and so anxiously sought in all lands and in confederate countries, that they should not harbor a traitor whom he looks upon as the author of the famine," etc.

Moreover, he would delicately intimate to Elijah how he had actually jeoparded his own life in securing that of one hundred of the Lord's prophets, and whom he had fed at his own expense. Satisfied with Elijah's reply to this touching appeal, wherein he removed all his fears about the Spirit's carrying him away (as 2Ki 2:11-16; Eze 3:4; Act 8:39), he resolves to be the prophet's messenger to Ahab. Intending to' be revenged on him, or to inquire when rain might be expected, Ahab now came forth to meet Elijah. He at once charged him with troubling Israel, i.e., with being the main cause of all the calamities which he and the nation had suffered. But Elijah flung back the charge upon himself, assigning the real cause to be his own sin of idolatry. Regarding, however, his magisterial position, while he reproved his sin, he requests him to exercise his authority in summoning an assembly to Mount Carmel, that the controversy between them might be decided by a direct miracle from heaven (compare Mat 16:1). Whatever were his secret motives, Ahab accepted this proposal. As fire was the element over which Baal was supposed to preside, the prophet proposes (wishing to give them every advantage), that, two bullocks being slain, and laid each upon a distinct altar, the one for Baal, the other for Jehovah, whichever should be  consumed by fire must proclaim whose the people of Israel were, and whom it was their duty to serve. The people consent to this proposal, because, it may be, they were not altogether ignorant how God had formerly answered by fire (Gen 4:4; Lev 9:24; Jdg 6:21; Jdg 13:20; 1Ch 21:26; 2Ch 7:1).

Elijah will have summoned not only all the elders of Israel, but also the four hundred priests of Baal belonging to Jezebel's court, and the four hundred and fifty who were dispersed over the kingdom. The former, however, did not attend, being, perhaps, glad to shelter themselves under the plea that Jezebel would not allow them to do so. Why Mount Carmel, which we do not hear of until now, was chosen in preference to the nearer Ebal or Gerizim, is not evident. Possibly Elijah thought it wise to remove the place of the meeting to a distance from Samaria. Possibly in the existence of the altar of Jehovah (18:30) — in ruins, and therefore of earlier erection — we have an indication of an ancient sanctity attaching to the spot. On the question of the particular part of the ridge of Carmel which formed the site of the meeting, there cannot be much doubt. SEE CARMEL.

There are few more sublime stories in history than this. On the one hand the solitary servant of Jehovah, accompanied by his one attendant, with his wild shaggy hair, his scanty garb, and sheepskin cloak, but with calm dignity of demeanor, and the minutest regularity of procedure; on the other hand, the prophets of Baal and Ashtaroth, doubtless in all the splendor of their vestments (2Ki 10:22), with the wild din of their "vain repetitions" and the maddened fury of their disappointed hopes, and the silent people surrounding all — these things form a picture which brightens into fresh distinctness every time we consider it. Having reconstructed an altar which had once belonged to God, with twelve stones — as if to declare that the twelve tribes of Israel should again be united in the service of Jehovah — and having laid thereon his bullock, and filled the trench by which it was surrounded with large quantities of water, lest any suspicion of deceit might occur to any mind, the prophet gives place to the Baalites- allows them to make trial first. In vain did these deceived and deceiving men call, from morning till evening, upon Baals — in vain did they now mingle their own blood with that of the sacrifice: no answer was given — no fire descended. Elijah having rebuked their folly and wickedness with the sharpest irony, and it being at last evident to all that their efforts to obtain the wished-for fire were vain, now, at the time of the evening sacrifice, offered up his prayer. The Baalites' prayer was long, that of the  prophet is short — charging God with the care of his covenant, of his truth, and of his glory — when, "behold, the fire came down, licked up the water, and consumed not only the bullock, but the very stones of the altar also." The effect of this on the mind of the people was what the prophet desired: acknowledging the awful presence of the Godhead, they exclaim, as with one voice, " The Lord, he is God; the Lord, he is God!" Seizing the opportunity while the people's hearts were warm with the fresh conviction of this miracle, he bade them take those juggling priests and kill them at Kishon, that their blood might help to fill that river which their idolatry had provoked God to empty by drought.

All this Elijah might lawfully do at God's direction, and under the sanction of his law (Deu 13:5; Deu 18:20). Ahab having now publicly vindicated God's violated law by giving his royal sanction to the execution of Baal's priests, Elijah informed him that he may go up to his tent on Carmel to take refreshment, for God will send the desired rain. In the mean time he prayed earnestly (Jam 5:17-18) for this blessing: God hears and answers: a little cloud arises out of the Mediterranean Sea, in sight of which the prophet now was, diffuses itself gradually over the entire face of the heavens, and now empties its refreshing waters upon the whole land of Israel! Here was another proof of the divine mission of the prophet, from which, we should imagine, the whole nation must have profited; but subsequent events would seem to prove that the impression produced by these dealings of God was of a very partial and temporary character. Impressed with the hope that the report of God's miraculous actings at Carmel might not only reach the ear, but also penetrate and soften the hard heart of Jezebel, and anxious that the reformation of his country should spread in and about Jezreel also, Elijah, strengthened, as we are told, from on high, now accompanies Ahab thither on foot. The ride across the plain to Jezreel was a distance of at least 16 miles; the prophet, with true Arab endurance, running before the chariot, but also, with true Arab instinct, stopping short of the city, and going no further than the "entrance of Jezreel."

So far the triumph had been complete; but the spirit of Jezebel was not to be so easily overcome, and her first act is a vow of vengeance against the author of this destruction. "God do so to me, and more also," so ran her exclamation, "if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by tomorrow about this time." It was no duty of Elijah to expose himself to unnecessary dangers, and, as at his first introduction, so now, he takes refuge in flight. The danger was great, and the refuge must be distant. The first stage on  the journey was Beersheba — "Beersheba which belongeth to Judah," says the narrative, with a touch betraying its Israelitish origin. Here, at the ancient haunt of those fathers of his nation whose memory was so dear to him, and on the very confines of cultivated country, Elijah halted. His servant — according to Jewish tradition, the boy of Zarephath — he left in the town, while he himself set out alone into the wilderness — the waste uninhabited region which surrounds the south of Palestine. The labors, anxieties, and excitement of the last few days had proved too much even for that iron frame and that stern resolution. His spirit is quite broken, and he wanders forth over the dreary sweeps of those rocky hills wishing for death — "It is enough! Lord, let me die, for I am not better than my fathers." The man whose prayer had raised the dead, had shut and opened heaven, he who had been so wonderfully preserved by God at Cherith and Zarephath, and who dared to tax Ahab to his face with being Israel's troubler, is now terrified and disconsolate, thus affording a practical evidence of what the apostle James says of him, that he was a man of like passions with us. His now altered state of mind would seem to have arisen out of an exaggerated expectation of what God designed to effect through the miracles exhibited to, and the judgments poured upon this guilty nation. He seems to have thought that, as complete success did not crown the last great effort he had made to reform Israel, there could not be the slightest use in laboring for this end any longer. It is almost impossible not to conclude from the terms of the story that he was entirely without provisions for this or any journey. But God, who had brought his servant into this difficulty, provided him with the means of escaping from it. He now, alone in the wilderness and at Mount Horeb, will at once touch his heart and correct his petulancy by the ministration of his angel, and by a fearful exhibition of his divine power. The prophet, in a fit of despair, laid himself down beneath a lone "juniper-tree" (Hebrew רֹתֶם אֶחָד, one Rothem-tree). SEE JUNIPER.

The indented rock opposite the gate of the Greek convent Deir Mar-Elyas, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, which is now shown to travelers as the spot on which the prophet rested on this occasion, appears at an earlier date not to have been so restricted, but was believed to be the place on which he was "accustomed to sleep" (Sandys, lib. 3, page 176; Maundrell, Ear. Trav. page 456), and the site of the convent as that where he was born (Gaysforde, 1506, in Bonar, page 117). Neither the older nor the later story can be believed; but it is possible that they may have originated in some more trustworthy tradition of his having rested here on his southward journey, in all probability taken along this  very route. (See a curious statement by Quaresmius of the extent to which the rock had been defaced in his own time "by the piety or impiety" of the Christian pilgrims, Elucidatio, 2:605; comp. Doubdan, Voyage, etc. page 144.) In this position the prophet was wakened from his despondent dream beneath the solitary bush of the wilderness, was fed with the bread and the water which to this day are all a Bedouin's requirements, and went forward, "in the strength of that food," a journey of forty days, "to the mount of God, even to Horeb." Here, in "the cave" (הִמְּעָרָה), one of the numerous caverns in those awful mountains — perhaps some traditional sanctuary of that hallowed region, at any rate well known — he remained for certainly one night (וִיֶּלֶן). In the morning came the "word of Jehovah" — the question, "What doest thou here, Elijah? Driven by what hard necessity dost thou seek this spot, on which the glory of Jehovah has in former times been so signally shown?" In answer to this invitation the prophet opens his griefs. He has been very zealous for Jehovah; but force has been vain; one cannot stand against a multitude; none follow him, and he is left alone, flying for his life from the sword which has slain his brethren. The reply comes in that ambiguous and indirect form in which it seems necessary that the deepest communications with the human mind should be couched to be effectual. He is directed to leave the cavern and stand on the mountain in the open air, face to face with Jehovah.

Then, as before with Moses (Exo 34:6), "the Lord passed by;" passed in all the terror of his most appalling manifestations. The fierce wind tore the solid mountains and shivered the granite cliffs of Sinai; the earthquake crash reverberated through the defiles of those naked valleys; the fire burnt in the incessant blaze of Eastern lightning. Like these, in their degree, had been Elijah's own modes of procedure, but the conviction is now forced upon him that in none of these is Jehovah to be known. Then, penetrating the dead silence which followed these manifestations, came the fourth mysterious symbol — "the still small voice." What sound this was — whether articulate voice or not, we cannot determine; but low and still as it was, it spoke in louder accents to the wounded heart of Elijah than the roar and blaze which had preceded it. To him, no less unmistakably than to Moses centuries before, it was proclaimed that Jehovah was “merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth." Elijah knew the call, and at once stepping forward and hiding his face in his mantle, stood waiting for the divine communication. It is in the same words as before, and so is his answer; but with what different force must the question have fallen on his ears, and the answer left his lips! "Before his  entrance to the cave he was comparatively a novice; when he left it he was an initiated man. He had thought that the earthquake, the fire, the wind, must be the great witnesses of the Lord. But He was not in them; not they, but the still small voice had that awe in it which forced the prophet to cover his face with his mantle. What a conclusion of all the past history! What an interpretation of its meaning!" (Maurice, Prophets and Kings, page 136). Not in the persecutions of Ahab and Jezebel, nor in the slaughter of the prophets of Baal, but in the 7000 unknown worshippers who had not bowed the knee to Baal, was the assurance that Elijah was not alone as he had seemed to be.

Three commands were laid on him — three changes were to be made. Instead of Ben-hadad, Hazael was to be king of Syria; instead of Ahab, Jehu the son of Nimshi was to be king of Israel; and Elisha the son of Shaphat was to be his own successor. These per. sons shall revenge God's quarrels: one shall begin, another shall prosecute, and the third shall perfect the vengeance on Israel. Of these three commands, the first two were reserved for Elisha to accomplish; the last only was executed by Elijah himself. It would' almost seem as if his late trials had awakened in him a yearning for that affection and companionship which had hitherto been denied him. His first search was for Elisha. Apparently he soon found him; we must conclude at his native place, Abel-meholah, probably somewhere about the center of the Jordan valley. SEE ABEL-MEHOLAH.

Elisha was ploughing at the time, and Elijah "passed over to him" — possibly crossed the river — and, without uttering a sword, cast his mantle, the well-known sheepskin cloak, upon him, as if, by that familiar action (which was also a symbol of official investiture), claiming him for his son. A moment of hesitation — but the call was quickly accepted; and then commenced that long period of service and intercourse which continued till Elijah's removal, and which after that time procured for Elisha one of his best titles to esteem and reverence — "Elisha the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah." SEE ELISHA.

(2.) For about six years from this calling of Elisha we find no notice in the sacred history of Elijah, till God sent him once again to pronounce sore judgments upon Ahab and Jezebel for the murder of unoffending Naboth (1Ki 21:17, etc.). How he and his associate in the prophetic office employed themselves during this time we are not told. We may conceive, however, that they were much engaged in prayer for their country, and in imparting knowledge in the schools of the prophets, which were at Jericho  and Beth-el. Ahab and Jezebel now probably believed that their threats had been effectual, and that they had seen the last of their tormentor. At any rate, this may be inferred from the events of chapter 21. SEE AHAB. Foiled in his wish to acquire the ancestral plot of ground of Naboth by the refusal of that sturdy peasant to alienate the inheritance of his fathers, Ahab and Jezebel proceed to possess themselves of it by main force, and by a degree of monstrous injustice which shows clearly enough how far the elders of Jezreel had forgotten the laws of Jehovah, how perfect was their submission to the will of their mistress. At her orders Naboth is falsely accused of blaspheming God and the king, is with his sons (2Ki 9:26; romp. Jos 7:24) stoned and killed, and his vineyard then — as having belonged to a criminal-becomes at once the property of the king. SEE NABOTH.

Ahab loses no time in entering on his new acquisition. Apparently the very next day after the execution he proceeds in his chariot to take possession of the coveted vineyard. Behind him — probably in the back part of the chariot — ride his two pages Jehu and Bidkar (2Ki 9:26). But the triumph was a short one. Elijah had received an intimation from Jehovah of what was taking place, and rapidly as the accusation and death of Naboth had been hurried over, he was there to meet his ancient enemy, and as an enemy he does meet him — as David went out to meet Goliath — on the very scene of his crime; suddenly, when least expected and least wished for, he confronts the miserable king. Then follows the curse, in terms fearful to any Oriental — peculiarly terrible to a Jew, and most of all significant to a successor of the apostate princes of the northern kingdom — "I will take away thy posterity; I will cut off from thee even thy very dogs; I will make thy house like that of Jeroboam and Baasha; thy blood shall be shed in the same spot where the blood of thy victims was shed last night; thy wife and thy children shall be torn in this very garden by the wild dogs of the city, or as common carrion devoured by the birds of the sky" — the large vultures which in Eastern climes are always wheeling aloft under the clear blue sky, and doubtless suggested the expression to the prophet. How tremendous was this Scene we may gather from the fact that after the lapse of at least twenty years Jehu was able to recall the very words of the prophet's burden, to which he ,and his companion had listened as they stood behind their master in the chariot. The whole of Elijah's denunciation may possibly be recovered by putting together the words recalled by Jehu, 2Ki 9:26; 2Ki 9:36; 2Ki 9:7, and those given in 1Ki 21:19-25. Fearing that these predictions would prove true, as those about the rain and fire had done, Ahab now assumed the manner of a penitent; and, though subsequent acts proved the insincerity of his repentance, yet God rewarded his temporary abasement by a temporary arrest of judgment. We see, however, in after parts of this sacred history, how the judgments denounced against him, his abandoned consort, and children took effect to the very letter. SEE JEZEBEL.

(3.) A space of three or four years now elapses (compare 1Ki 22:1; 1Ki 22:51; 2Ki 1:17) before we again catch a glimpse of Elijah. The denunciations uttered in the vineyard of Naboth have been ,partly fulfilled. Ahab is dead, and his son and successor, Ahaziah, has met with a serious accident, after a troubled reign of less than two years (2Ki 1:1-2; 1Ki 22:51). Fearing a fatal result, as if to prove himself a worthy son of an idolatrous parentage, he sends to an oracle or shrine of Baal at the Philistine town of Ekron to ascertain the issue of his illness. But the oracle is nearer at hand than the distant Ekron. An intimation is conveyed to the prophet, probably at that time inhabiting one of the recesses of Carmel, and, as on the former occasions, he suddenly appears on the path of the messengers, without preface or inquiry utters his message of death, and as rapidly disappears. The tone of his words is as national on this as on any former occasion, and, as before, they are authenticated by the name of Jehovah — "Thus saith Jehovah, Is it because there is no God in Israel that ye go to inquire of Baalzebub, god of Ekron?" The messengers returned to the king too soon to have accomplished their mission. They were possibly strangers; at any rate they were ignorant of the name of the man who had thus interrupted their journey. But his appearance had fixed itself in their minds, and their description at once told Ahaziah, who must have seen the prophet about his father's court or have heard him described in the harem, who it was that had thus reversed the favorable oracle which he was hoping for from Ekron. The "hairy man" (אַישׁ בִּעִל עָרשֵׂ, a man, a lord of hair), with a belt of rough skin round his loins, who came and went in this secret manner, and uttered his fierce words in the name of the God of Israel, could be no other than the old enemy of his father and mother; Elijah the Tishbite. But, ill as he was, this check only roused the wrath of Ahaziah, and, with the spirit of his mother, he at once seized the opportunity of possessing himself of the person of the man who had been for so long the evil genius of his house. A captain was dispatched, with a party of fifty, to take Elijah prisoner. He was sitting on the top of "the  mount" (הָהָר), i.e., probably of Carmel. The officer approached and addressed the prophet by the title which, as before noticed, is most frequently applied to him and Elisha — "O man of God, the king hath spoken: come down." "And Elijah answered and said, If I be a man of God, then let fire come down from heaven, and consume thee and thy fifty! And there came down fire from heaven, and consumed him and his fifty." A second party was sent, only to meet the same fate. The altered tone of the leader of a third party, and the assurance of God that his servant need not fear, brought Elijah down. But the king gained nothing. The message was delivered to his face in the same words as it had been to the messengers, and Elijah, so we must conclude, was allowed to go harmless. This was his last interview with the house of Ahab. It was also his last recorded appearance in person against the Baal-worshippers. It was this occasion to which the fiery sons of Zebedee alluded (Luk 9:51-56) in a proposal that brought out from the lips of the Savior the contrast with his own benign mission (Trench, Miracles, chapter 4).

(4.) It must have been shortly after the death of Ahaziah that Elijah made a communication with the southern kingdom. It is the only one of which any record remains, and its mention is the first and last time that the name of the prophet appears in the Books of Chronicles. Mainly devoted, as these books are, to the affairs of Judah, this is not surprising. The alliance between his enemy Ahab and Jehoshaphat cannot have been unknown to the prophet, and it must have made him regard the proceedings of the kings of Judah with more than ordinary interest. When, therefore, Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, who had married the daughter of Ahab, began "to walk in the ways of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab, and to do that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah," Elijah sent him a letter (מַכְתָּב, a writing, different from the ordinary word for an epistle, סֵפֶר, a book), denouncing his evil doings, and predicting his death (2Ch 21:12-15). This letter has been considered as a great difficulty, on the ground that Elijah's removal must have taken place before the death of Jehoshaphat (from the terms of the mention of Elisha in 2Ki 3:11), and therefore before the accession of Joram to the throne of Judah. But, admitting that Elijah had been translated before the expedition of Jehoshaphat against Moab, it does not follow that Joram was not at that time, and before his father's death, king of Judah, Jehoshaphat occupying himself during the last eight or ten years of his life in going about the kingdom (2Ch 19:4-11), and in conducting some important  wars, amongst others that in question against Moab, while Joram was concerned with the more central affairs of the government (2Ki 3:7, etc.). That Joram began to reign during the lifetime of his father Jehoshaphat is stated in 2Ki 8:16. According to one record (2Ki 1:17), which immediately precedes the account of Elijah's last acts on earth, Joram was actually on the throne of Judah at the time of Elijah's interview with Ahaziah; and though this is modified by the statements of other places (2Ki 3:1; 2Ki 8:16), yet it is not invalidated, and the conclusion is almost inevitable that Joram ascended the throne as viceroy or associate some years before the death of his father. SEE JORAM; SEE JEHOSHAPHAT; SEE JUDAH. The ancient Jewish commentators get over the apparent difficulty by saying that the letter was written and sent after Elijah's translation. Others believed that it was the production of Elisha, for whose name that of Elijah had been substituted by copyists. The first of these requires no answer. To the second, the severity of its tone, as above noticed, is a sufficient reply. Josephus (Ant. 9:5, 2) says that the letter was sent while Elijah was still on earth. (See Lightfoot, Chronicle, etc., "Jehoram." Other theories will be found in Fabricius, Cod. Pseudepig. page 1075, and Otho, Lex. Rabb. page 167). In its contents the letter bears a strong resemblance to the speeches of Elijah, while in the details of style it is very peculiar, and quite different from the narrative in which it is imbedded (Bertheau, Chronik, ad loc.).

(5.) The prophet's warfare being now accomplished on earth, God, whom he had so long and so faithfully served, will translate him in a special manner to heaven. Conscious of this, he determines to spend his last moments in imparting divine instruction to, and pronouncing his last benediction upon, the students in the colleges of Bethel and Jericho; accordingly, he made a circuit in this region (2Ki 2:1, etc.). It was at Gilgal (q.v.) — probably not the ancient place of Joshua and Samuel, but another of the same name still surviving on the western edge of the hills of Ephraim — that the prophet received the divine intimation that his departure was at hand. He was at the time with Elisha, who seems now to have become his constant companion. Perhaps his old love of solitude returned upon him, perhaps he wished to spare his friend the pain of a too sudden parting, or perhaps he desired to test the affection of the latter; in either case he endeavors to persuade Elisha to remain behind while he goes on an errand of Jehovah. "Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jehovah hath sent me to Bethel." But Elisha will not so easily give up his master — "As Jehovah  liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee." They went together to Bethel. The event which was about to happen had apparently been communicated to the sons of the prophets at Bethel, and they inquire if Elisha knew of his impending loss. His answer shows how fully he was aware of it. "Yea," says he, with emphasis, "indeed I do know it (יָדִעִתַּי גִּם9אֲנַי): hold ye your peace." But, though impending, it was not to happen that day. Again Elijah attempts to escape to Jericho, and again Elisha protests that he will not be separated from him. Again, also, the sons of the prophets at Jericho make the same unnecessary inquiries, and again he replies as emphatically as before. Elijah makes a final effort to avoid what they both so much dread. "Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jehovah hath sent me to the Jordan." But Elisha is not to be conquered, and the two set off across the undulating plain of burning sand to the distant river-Elijah in his mantle or cape of sheep-skin, Elisha in ordinary clothes (בֶּגֶד, 2Ki 2:12).

Fifty men of the sons of the prophets ascend the abrupt heights behind the town — the same to which a late tradition would attach the scene of our Lord's temptation — and which command the plain below, to watch with the clearness of Eastern vision what happens in the distance. Talking as they go, the two reach the river, and stand on the shelving bank beside its swift brown current. But they are not to stop even here. It is as if the aged Gileadite cannot rest till he again sets foot on his own side of the river. He rolls up (נָּלסְ) his mantle as into a staff, and with his old energy strikes the waters as Moses had done before him — strikes them as if they were an enemy (נָכָה); and they are divided hither and thither, and they two go over on dry ground. What follows is best told in the simple words of the narrative. "And it came to pass when they were gone over, that Elijah said to Elisha, 'Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee.' And Elisha said, 'I pray thee let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me.' And he said, 'Thou hast asked a hard thing: if thou see me taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so.' And it came to pass as they still went on and talked, that, behold, a chariot of fire and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up by the whirlwind into the skies." The tempest (סְעָרָה), which was an earthly substratum for the theophany, was accompanied by a fiery phenomenon, symbolizing the translation, which appeared to the eyes of Elisha as a chariot of fire with horses of fire, in which Elijah rode to heaven (Keil). Well might Elisha cry with bitterness (צָעִק), "My father, my father." He had gone who, to the discerning eye and loving heart of his disciple, had been "the chariot of  Israel and the horsemen thereof" for so many years; and Elisha was at last left alone to carry on a task to which he must often have looked forward, but to which in this moment of grief he may well have felt unequal. He saw him no more; but his mantle had fallen, and this he took up — at once a personal relic and a symbol of the double portion of the spirit of Elijah with which he was to be clothed. Little could he have realized, had it been then presented to him, that he whose greatest claim to notice was that he had "poured water on the hands of Elijah" should hereafter possess an influence which had been denied to his master — should, instead of the terror of kings and people, be their benefactor, adviser, and friend, and that over his death-bed a king of Israel should be found to lament with the same words that had just burst from him on the departure of his stern and silent master, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" (2Ki 13:14).

4. Traditionary Views and Character. — Elijah and Moses are the only men whose history does not terminate with their departure out of this world. Elijah appeared with Moses on Mount Hermon at the time of our Lord's transfiguration, and conversed with him respecting the great work of redemption which he was about to accomplish (Mat 17:1-3). The author of the book of Ecclesiasticus (chapter 48) justly describes him as a prophet "who stood up as a fire, and whose word burned as a lamp." But, with the exception of the eulogiums contained in that catalogue of worthies, and 1Ma 2:58, and the passing allusion in Luk 9:54, none of the later references allude to his works of destruction or of portent. They all set forth a different side of his character from that brought out in the historical narrative. They speak of his being a man of like passions with ourselves (Jam 5:17); of his kindness to the widow of Sarepta (Luk 4:25); of his "restoring all things" (Mat 17:11); “turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just" (Mal 4:5-6; Luk 1:17). In the sternness and power of his reproofs, however, he was a striking type of John the Baptist, and the latter is therefore prophesied of under his name: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mal 4:5-6). Our Savior also declares that Elijah had already come in spirit, in the person of John the Baptist. Many of the Jews in our Lord's time believed him to be Elijah, or that the soul of Elijah had passed into his body (Luk 9:8). SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST.

How deep was the impression which he made on the mind of the nation may be  judged from the fixed belief which many centuries after prevailed that Elijah would again appear for the relief and restoration of his country. The prophecy of Malachi was possibly at once a cause and an illustration of the strength of this belief. Each remarkable person, as he arrives on the scene, be his habits and characteristics what they may — the stern John, equally with his gentle Successor — is proclaimed to be Elijah (Mat 16:14; Mar 6:15; Joh 1:21). His appearance in glory on the Mount of Transfiguration does not seem to have startled the disciples. They were "sore afraid," but not apparently surprised. On the contrary, Peter immediately proposes to erect a tent for the prophet whose arrival they had so long been expecting. 'Even the cry of our Lord from the cross, containing as it did but a slight resemblance to the name of Elijah, immediately suggested him to the bystanders. "He calleth for Elijah." "Let be, let us see if Elijah will come to save him."

In the Talmud (see the passages cited by Hamburger, Real-Encykl. s.v. Eliahu) he is recorded as having often appeared to the wise and good rabbis — at prayer in the wilderness, or on their journeys — generally in the form of an Arabian merchant (Eisenmenger, 1:11; 2:402-7). At the circumcision of a child a seat was always placed for him, that, as the zealous champion and messenger of the "covenant" of circumcision (1Ki 19:14; Mal 3:1), he might watch over the due performance of the rite. During certain prayers ,the door of the house was set open that Elijah might enter and announce the Messiah (Eisenmenger, 1:685). His coming will be three days before that of the Messiah, and on each of the three he will proclaim, in a voice which shall be heard all over the earth, peace, happiness, salvation, respectively (Eisenmenger, 2:696). So firm was the conviction of his speedy arrival, that when goods were found and no owner appeared to claim them, the common saying was, "Put them by till Elijah comes" (Lightfoot, Exercit. Mat 17:10; Joh 1:21). The same customs and expressions are even still in use among the stricter Jews of this and other countries (see Revue des deux Mondes, 24:131, etc.).

Elijah has been canonized in both the Greek and Latin churches. Among the Greeks Mar Elygis is the patron of elevated spots, and many a conspicuous summit in Greece is called by his name (Clark, Peloponnessus, p. 190). The service for his day — ᾿Ηλίας μεγαλώνυμος — will be found in the Menaion on July 20, a date recognized by the Latin Church also. (See the Acta Sanctorum, July 20). By Cornelius h Lapide it is maintained  that his ascent happened on that day, in the 19th year of Jehoshaphat (Keil, On Kings, page 331). The convent bearing his name, Deir Mar Elyas, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, is well known to travelers in the Holy Land. It purports to be situated on the spot of his birth, as already observed. Other convents bearing his name once existed in Palestine: in Jebel Ajlun, the ancient Gilead (Ritter, Syrien, page 1029, 1066, etc.); at Ezra, in the Hauran (Burckhardt, Syria, page 59), and the more famous establishment on Carmel.

It is as connected with the great Order of the barefooted Carmelites that Elijah is celebrated in the Latin Church. According to the statements of the Breviary (Off. B. Marim Virginis de Monte Carmelo, Julii 16), the connection arose from the dedication to the Virgin of a chapel on the spot from which Elijah saw the cloud (an accepted type of the Virgin Mary) rise out of the sea. But other legends trace the origin of, the order to the great prophet himself, as the head of a society of anchorites inhabiting Carmel; and even as himself dedicating the chapel in which he worshipped to the Virgin! (St. John of Jerusalem, as quoted by Mislin, Lieux Saints, 2:49; and the bulls of various popes enumerated by Quaresmius, volume 2) These things are matters of controversy in the Roman Church, Baronius and others having proved that the order was founded in 1181, a date which is repudiated by the Carmelites (see extracts in Fabricius, Codex Pseudepig. page 1077).

In the Mohammedan traditions Ilyas is said to have drank of the Fountain of Life, "by virtue of which he still lives, and will live to the day of judgment." He is by some confounded with St. George, and with the mysterious el-Khidr, one of the most remarkable of the Moslem saints (see Lane's Arabian Nights, Introd. note 2; also Selections from the Kuran; page 221, 222). The Persian Sojis are said to trace themselves back to Eli. jah (Fabricius, page 1077); and he is even held to have been the teacher of Zoroaster (D'Herbelot, Bib. Or. s.v.).

Among other traditions, it must not be omitted that the words "Eye hath not seen," etc., 1Co 2:9, which are without doubt quoted by the apostle from Isa 64:4, were, according to an ancient belief, from " the Apocalypse, or mysteries of Elijah," τὰ ᾿Ηλία ἀπόκρυφα. The first mention of this appeal to Le Origen (Hon. on Mat 27:9), and it is noticed with disapproval by Jerome, ad Pammachium (see Fabricius, page 1072).  By Epiphanius, the words "Awake, thou that sleepest," etc., Eph 5:14, are inaccurately alleged to he quoted "from Elijah," 1:e. the portion of the O.T. containing his history — παρὰ τῷ ᾿Ηλίᾷ (comp. Rom 11:2).

5. Literature. — On the general subject, Anon. Lectures on Elijah (Lond. 1865); Kitto, Daily Bible Illustrations, Solomon and Kings, 45-47th week. Ephraem Syrus, In Eliam (Opp. 3:240); Basil, In Eliam (Opp. page 61); Ambrose, De Elia (Opp. 1:535); Chrysostom, In Heliam (Opp. Spuria, 6:708); Alexander, De Elia (Hist. Eccl. 3:335); Zouch, Life of Elijah (Works, 2:219); Robinson, Elijah (Script. Char. 2); Krummacher, Elijah the Tishbite (from the Germ., Lond. 1840; N.Y. 1847); Anderson, Discourses on Elijah (Lond. 1835); Evans, Elijah (Script. Biog. 1); Williams, Elijah (Char. of O.T. page 222); Frischmuth, De Elia (Critici Sacri, 2); Camartus, Elias Thesbites (Par. 1631); Simpson, Lectures on Elijah (Lond. 1836); Berr, Notice sur E lie (Nancy, 1839); Niemeyer, Charakt. 5:350; Schreiber, Allgem. Religionslehre, 1:194; Knobel, Prophet. 2:73; Rodiger, in the Hall. Enycl. 1:33, page 320; Menken, Gesch. des Elias (in his Schriften, 2:17 sq.); Hall, Contemplations, book 18, 19; Stanley, Jewish Church, 2:321 sq. On the "ravens," Schulen, De Elia corvorum alumno (Wittenb. 1717); id. ib. (Altorf, 1718); Mayer, Elias corvorum convictor (Viteb. 1685); Van Hardt, Corbeaux d'Elie (Helmst. 1709); Heumann, Dissertt. syllog. 1:896; Beykert, Dee ערביםEliam alentib. (Argent. 1774); Berg, in the Duisb. Wochenbl. 1768, No. 52; 1769, No. 1; Gumpach, Alttestam. Stud. page 200 sq.; Deyling, Obs. Sacra, part 1, No. 25. On his "mantle," Brockmann, Comment. philol. (Gryph. 1750). On Elijah's "coming," Hartung, De El. adventu (Jen. 1659); Jour. Sac. Lit. July, 1852, page 420 sq. On his proceedings at Carmel, Klausing, De sacrificio Eite (Lips. 1726); Jour. Sac. Lit. Jan. 1867. On his vision at Horeb, Verschuir, De apparitione Elice (Dissertt. phil. p. 85 sq.). On his stay at Cherith, at Zarephath, Jour. Sac. Literature, 1860, p. 1; Unters. eiiger Verstorbzene (Lips. 1793). On his ascension, Hergott, De curru. Eliae (Wittenb. 1676); Muller, Eliae ascensio (Lpz. 17—); Pfaff, De raptu Eliae (Tib. 1739). On his letter to Joram, Pfaff, De litteris El. ad. Jor. (Tib. 1755); Berg, in the Duisb. Wochenbl. 1774, No. 5, 6.

II. (Sept. Ηλία v.r. Ε᾿ρία.) One of the "sons of Jeroham," and heads of Benjamite families resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:27, where the name is inaccurately Anglicized " Eliah"). B.C. post 1612.  III. (Sept. ᾿Ηλία.) One of the "sons of Elim" (q.v.), who divorced his Gentile wife on returning from the exile (Ezr 10:21, where the name is likewise wrongly Anglicized "Eliah"), B.C. 458.

## Elijah (2)[[@Headword:Elijah (2)]]

             the prophet, is commemorated as a saint July 4 (July 20, November 27).

## Elijah Bachur[[@Headword:Elijah Bachur]]

             SEE ELIAS LEVITA.

## Elijah Ben-Chayim[[@Headword:Elijah Ben-Chayim]]

             of Constantinople, who flourished in the beginning of the 17th century, is the author of אמרי שפר, or Homilies on the Pentateuch (Venice, 1630): — מים חיים, or Decisions (ibid. 1647). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:236; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.) page 95. (B.P.)

## Elijah Hab-Babli[[@Headword:Elijah Hab-Babli]]

             (i.e., the Babylonian), a Jewish rabbi, who flourished in Babylonia in the 10th century, is the author of an haggadic work, entitled אליהו תנא דבי. It was first published at Venice in 1550; latest edition at Warsaw in 1883. Comp. Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vortriige (Berlin, 1832), pages 112-117; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:235. (B.P.)

## Elika[[@Headword:Elika]]

             [some El'ika] (Hebrews Elika', אֵַליקָא, God is his rejecter; Sept. Ε᾿λικά v.r. Ε᾿νακά (Vulg. Eica), a Harodite (q.v.), one of David's thirty-seven distinguished warriors (2Sa 23:25). B.C. 1046. His name is omitted in the parallel list of 1Ch 11:27 (see Kennicott's conjecture, Dissertatioz, page 182). SEE SHAMMOTH.

## Elilim[[@Headword:Elilim]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Elim[[@Headword:Elim]]

             (Hebrews Eylim', אֵילִים, trees [so called from their strength; SEE OAK ]; perh. here palm-trees; Sept. Αἰλείμ), a place mentioned in Exo 15:27; Num 33:9, as the second station where the Israelites encamped after crossing the Red Sea. (See Huldrich or Ulrich, De fontibus in Elim repertis, Brem. 1728). SEE BEER-ELIM. It is distinguished as having had "twelve wells (rather "fountains," ינוֹת) of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees." Laborde (Geographical Commentary on Exo 15:27) supposed wady Useit to be Elim, the second of four wadys lying between 29° 7' and 29° 20', which descend from the range of et- Tih (here nearly parallel with the shore) towards the sea. The route of the Israelites, however, cannot well be mistaken at this part. It evidently lay along the desert plain on the eastern shore of the Red Sea. Elim must consequently have been in this plain, and not more than about fifty miles from the place of passage. With these data, and in a country where fountains are of such rare occurrence, it is not difficult to identify Elim. Near the south-eastern end of this plain, and not far from the base of Jebel Hummam, the outpost of the great Sinai mountain-group, a charming vale, called wady Ghurundel, intersects the line of route. It is the first of the four wadys noticed above, and is, in fact, the most noted valley of that region, and the only one in the vicinity containing water (Robinson, Researches, 1:100, 105). In the dry season it contains no stream, but in the rainy season it becomes the channel of a broad and powerful mountain current, being  bounded by high ridges, and extending far into the interior. It has no soil, but drifting sand, which has left but one of the "wells" remaining, the others anciently existing being doubtless filled up. This principal fountain springs out at the foot of a sandstone rock, forming a pool of sparkling water, and sending out a tiny but perennial stream. This, in fact, is one of the chief watering places in the peninsula of Sinai (Bartlett, Forty Days in the Desert, page 33 sq.). There are no palm-trees at present here, but the place is fringed with trees and shrubbery, stunted palms, with their hairy trunks and dishevelled branches; tamarisks, their feathery leaves dripping with what the Arabs call manna; and the acacia, with its gray foliage and white blossoms (Stanley, Palestine, page 68). These supply the only verdure, which, however, in contrast with the naked desert, is quite refreshing (Olin's Travels, 1:362). Well might such a wady, in the midst of a bare and treeless waste, be called emphatically Elim, "the trees." Lepsius takes another view, that Ghurundel is Mara, by others identified with Howara (2 hours N.W. from Ghurundel, and reached by the Israelites, therefore, before it), and that Elim is to be found in the last of the four above named, wady Shubeikeh (Travels, Berlin, 1845, page 27 sq.). SEE EXODE.

## Elimelech[[@Headword:Elimelech]]

             (Hebrews Elime'lek, אלִֵימֶלֶךְGod is his king; Sept. Ε᾿λιμέλεκ; Josephus, Ε᾿λιμέλεχος, Ant. 5:9, 1), a man of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of the Hezronites and kinsman of Boaz, who dwelt in Bethlehem-Ephratah in the days of the judges. B.C. cir. 1368. In consequence of a great dearth in the land he went with his wife Naomi, and his two sons, Mahlon and Chilion, to dwell in Moab, where he and his sons died without posterity (Rth 1:2-3; Rth 2:1; Rth 2:3; Rth 4:3; Rth 4:9). SEE RUTH.

## Elined (AElivedha, Luned, or Enid)[[@Headword:Elined (AElivedha, Luned, or Enid)]]

             a Welsh virgin saint, commemorated August 1, was daughter of earl Ynywl and granddaughter of Brychan, in Brecknockshire, and is said to have been slain for refusing marriage with a prince.

## Elinga, Francis Janssens[[@Headword:Elinga, Francis Janssens]]

             a Dominican, who died at Bruges, November 22, 1715, is the author of Auctoritas Thomae Aquinatis: — Suprema Romani Pontificis Auctoritas: — Doctrina de Romani Pontificis Auctoritate et Infallibilitate: — Dissertationes Theol. Selectae: — Summa Conciliorum Barth. Carranzae Aucta et Additionibus Illustrata. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Elionai[[@Headword:Elionai]]

             (Hebrews Elyoenay', אֶכְיוֹ נֵי, a contracted form of the name Elihoenai, the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λιωηναϊv v.r. Ε᾿λιθενάν, Vulg. Elioenai.) Fourth son of Becher, son of Benjamin (1Ch 7:8). B.C. post 1856.

2. (Sept. Ε᾿λιωναϊv v.r. Ε᾿λιωνηί, Vulg. Elioenai.) A chief of the posterity of Simeon (1Ch 4:36) B.C. post 1618.

3. (1Ch 26:3.) SEE ELIHOENAI. 4. (Sept. Ε᾿λιωηναϊv v.r. Ε᾿λιωναϊv, Vulg. Elioenai.) A priest of the sons of Pashur, who had married a foreign wife after the return from Babylon, but who, at Ezra's instigation, put her away with the children born of her, and offered a ram for a trespass offering (Ezr 10:22). B.C. 458. He is perhaps the same mentioned in Neh 12:41, as one of the priests who accompanied Nehemiah with trumpets at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem. B.C. 446.

5. (Sept. Ε᾿λιωηναϊv v.r. Ε᾿λιωαϊv, Vulg. Elioenai.) An Israelite of the sons of Zattu, who likewise divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:27). B.C. 458.

6. (Sept. Ε᾿λιωηναϊv v.r. Ε᾿λιωνναϊv and Ε᾿λιθενάν, Vulg. Elioenai.) Eldest son of Meariah, son of Shemaiah, of the descendants of Zerubbabel; his family are the latest mentioned in the Old Test. (1Ch 3:23-24). B.C. ante 280. He appears to be the same with ESLI SEE ESLI , of the maternal ancestry of Christ (Luk 3:25). (See Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp. page 16.) According to the present Hebrews text he is in the seventh generation from Zerubbabel, or about contemporary with Alexander the Great; but lord Hervey thinks that Shemaiah is identical with Shimei (Luk 3:19), Zerubbabel's brother (Geneal. of our Lord, pages 107-109, and chapter 7).

## Elionas[[@Headword:Elionas]]

             the name of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. (Ε᾿λιωνάς v.r. Ε᾿λιωναϊvς, Vulg. omits.) One of the sons of "Phaisur," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1Es 9:22); evidently the ELIOENAI SEE ELIOENAI (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:22).

2. (Ε᾿λιωνάς, Vulg. Noneas.) One of the sons of "Annas," who did the same (1Es 9:32); doubtless the ELIEZER SEE ELIEZER (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:31).

## Elionseus[[@Headword:Elionseus]]

             (Ε᾿λιωναῖος, doubtless a Graecized form of Elioenai), a high-priest of the Jews, who succeeded Matthias, son of Ananus (A.D. 42), and was the next year succeeded by Simon Cantheras (Josephus, Ant. 19:8, 1). SEE HIGH- PRIEST.

## Eliot, Andrew, D.D[[@Headword:Eliot, Andrew, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Boston December 25, 1719 (O.S.), and graduated at Harvard College in 1737. In 1742 he was ordained pastor (as colleague with Mr. Webb) of the New North Church in Boston, in which service he remained until his death. In 1757 he was made D.D. by the University of Edinburgh. In 1773 he was elected president of Harvard College, but declined to leave his pastoral work. He died September 13, 1778. Besides occasional sermons, he published a volume of Discourses (1774). — Sprague, Annals, 1:417.

## Eliot, Jared, M.D[[@Headword:Eliot, Jared, M.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of Reverend Joseph Eliot, was born at Guilford, Connecticut, November 7, 1685. While Yale College was yet located at Killingworth, he graduated from it in 1706. In October 1709, he was ordained pastor of the Killingworth Church, as successor to the Reverend Mr. Pierson, and retained this position until his death, April 22,  1763. From 1730 to 1762 he was a fellow of Yale College. In 1722, the day after commencement at Yale, a number of prominent men assembled in the college library to consider a paper signed by some of the leading clergymen of Connecticut, among whom was Dr. Eliot, in which doubts regarding the validity of Presbyterian ordination were expressed. In October following, according to arrangement, the divine right of Episcopacy was discussed before a large number of clergy and laity. As the result, some avowed themselves Episcopalians, while Dr. Eliot and others were convinced of the truth of Presbyterianism. It is said of him that he was the chief physician of his time in the colony, being eminent also as a botanist and. as a scientific agriculturist. Through him the white mulberry was -introduced into Connecticut, and with it the silkworm, concerning which he published a treatise. In 1761 he received a gold medal from a society in London for his process of extracting iron from black sand, for he was likewise a mineralogist. His linguistic acquirements were also of a superior order. His agricultural tastes led him to devise various ways for draining swamps and reclaiming marshes, and, he published several essays on agriculture. A large number of farms in the colony belonged to him. So conscientious, however, was he as a clergyman that he neverfomitted preaching on the Sabbath during forty successive years. Benjamin Franklin frequently visited him. and the two maintained a correspondence. Socially he was very agreeable, and among his people he was regarded as a great preacher. A few of his sermons were published. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:270.

## Eliot, John[[@Headword:Eliot, John]]

             styled "the apostle of the Indians," was born in the county of Essex, England, in 1604, and studied at the University of Cambridge. Emigrating to New England in 1631, he joined the Church in Boston. He was settled over the Church in Roxbury November 5, 1632. Here he studied the Indian language, with the view of converting the natives to Christianity. "The first Indian Church, established by the labors of Protestants in America, was formed at Natick in 1660, after the manner of the Congregational churches in New England. Those who wished to be organized into a Christian body were strictly examined as to their faith and experience by a number of the neighboring ministers, and Mr. Eliot afterwards administered to them baptism and the Lord's Supper. Other Indian churches were planted in various parts of Massachusetts, and he frequently visited them; but his pastoral care was more particularly over that which he first established. He made every exertion to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes; he stimulated many servants of Jesus to engage in the missionary work; and, although he mourned over the stupidity of many who preferred darkness to light, yet he lived to see twenty-four of the copper-colored aborigines fellow-preachers of the precious Gospel of Christ. In 1661 he published the New Testament in the Indian language, and in a few years the whole Bible, and several other books best adapted for the instruction of the natives. When he reached the age of fourscore years he offered to give up his salary, and desired to be liberated from the labors of his office as a teacher of the Church at Roxbury. It was with joy that he received Mr. Walter as his colleague in 1688. When he was bending under his infirmities, and could no longer visit the Indians, he persuaded a number of families to send their negro servants to him once a week, that he might instruct them in the truths of God. He died May 20, 1690, saying that all his labors were poor  and small, and exhorting those who surrounded his bed to pray. His last words were, 'Welcome joy'" (Allen). In 1649 Mr. Eliot published The glorious Progress of the Gospel among the Indians; in 1653, Tears of Repentance; in 1655, A further Manifestation of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians; and in 1670, A brief Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel. Baxter says, in one of his letters, "There was no man on earth whom I honored above him." A handsome memorial to the "Apostle of the Indians, and the pastor for fifty-eight years of the first Church in Roxbury," has been erected in the Forest Hills Cemetery, Roxbury. — Life and Death of John Eliot, by Cotton Mather (1691); Mather's Magnalia, 3:270; Francis, Life of John Eliot (Edinb. 1828); Sprague, Annals, 1:18; Allen, American Biography.

## Eliot, John, D.D[[@Headword:Eliot, John, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born in Boston, May 31, 1754. He prepared for college in the North Grammar-school in Boston, and in 1772 graduated from Harvard College. Soon after his graduation he took charge of a school in Roxbury, where he remained one year. He studied theology at Cambridge. In 1775 he commenced his labors as a preacher at Dover. In 1776 he received an earnest request from several leading members of the Episcopal Church at Halifax, N.S., to become an assistant to their aged pastor, but declined. He officiated for a short time as chaplain to the recruits of colonel Marshall's regiment, then raised in Boston for the expedition to Canada. After this he passed several months at Littleton as the assistant of Reverend Daniel Rogers, and during the winter of 1778-79 supplied the First Church in Salem. In 1779 he was ordained and installed pastor of the New North Church in the same town. In 1804 he was chosen  a member of the corporation of Harvard College. He was also a member of most of the literary and charitable societies in Boston and vicinity, and in some of them he held important offices. Dr. Eliot died February 14, 1813. He published several single Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:92.

## Elipandus[[@Headword:Elipandus]]

             archbishop of Toledo in the 8th century. He shared the opinions of Felix, bishop of Urgel, with regard to the person of Christ, viz. that, with respect to his human nature, he was only the adoptive Son of God, thus giving rise to the sect of Adoptianists. Elipandus disseminated his views in Spain, France, and Germany. Adosinde, queen of Gallicia, induced bishop Etherius of Osma and the priest Beatus to write against him. They published against him two books, the originals of which are said to be still extant in Toledo. Elipandus replied by several letters, but he was condemned at the council which Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileja, convened at Ciudad de Friuli in 791. In the following year the doctrines of Elipandus and Felix were again condemned at a synod which Charlemagne held at Ratisbon. Pope Adrian confirmed the sentence, to which Felix submitted; but Elipandus, and several other bishops of Spain, persisted in their views, and wrote against Felix. This letter was refuted, and condemned by Adrian in a council held in Italy, and in the Council of Frankfort in 794. Charlemagne himself wrote a letter (still extant) to Elipandus urging him to submit; but the letter seems to have had little effect, for shortly before his death (in 799) Elipandus wrote a reply maintaining his views. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 15:832; Neander, Ch. Hist. 3:156-158; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. book 3, c. 8, part 2, chapter 5, § 3. SEE ADOPTIANISM.

## Eliphal[[@Headword:Eliphal]]

             (Hebrews Eliphal', אלִֵיפִּל, God is his judge; Sept. Ε᾿λιφαάλ v.r. Ε᾿λφάτ, Vulg. Eliphal), son of Ur (q.v.), and one of David's famous guard (1  Chronicles 11:35). B.C. 1046. In the parallel passage (2Sa 23:34) he seems to be called "ELIPHELET SEE ELIPHELET , the son of Ahasbai (q.v.), the son of the Maachathite ;" but the names are here greatly confused. SEE DAVID.

## Eliphalat[[@Headword:Eliphalat]]

             (Ε᾿λιφαλάτ, Vulg. Eliphalach), one of the sons of "Asom," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1Es 9:33); evidently the ELIPHELET SEE ELIPHELET (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:33).

## Eliphalet[[@Headword:Eliphalet]]

             a less correct mode of Anglicizing (2Sa 5:16; 1Ch 14:7) the name ELIPHELET SEE ELIPHELET (q.v.). It also occurs in the Apocrypha (Ε᾿λιφαλέτ) as the name of one of the sons of Adonicam, who returned from the exile (1Es 8:39); the ELIPHELET SEE ELIPHELET of the Hebrews text (Ezr 8:13).

## Eliphaz[[@Headword:Eliphaz]]

             (Hebrew Eliphaz', אלִֵיפִּז, God is his strength; Sept. Ε᾿λιφάξ, but in Genesis Ε᾿λιφάς, Vulg. Eliphaz), the name of two men.

1. The leading one of the "three friends" who came to condole with Job in his affliction (Job 4:1), and who took part in that remarkable discussion which occupies the book of Job. B.C. cir. 2200. He is called "the Temanite;" hence it is naturally inferred that he was of the region substantially known as Teman (q.v.), in Idumaea; and as Eliphaz, the son of Esau, had a son called Teman, from whom the place took its; name, many have concluded that this Eliphaz was a descendant of the other Eliphaz. Some, indeed, even go so far as to suppose that the Eliphaz of Job was no other than the son of Esau. This view is of course confined to those who refer the age of Job to the time of these patriarchs. But it is doubtful whether even this gives a date sufficiently early. SEE JOB.

Eliphaz is the first of the friends to take up the debate, in reply to Job's passionate complaints. He appears to have been the oldest of the speakers, from which circumstance, or from natural disposition, his language is more mild and sedate than that of the others (see Eichler, De visione E'iphazi [4:12-31], Lpz. 1781). He begins his orations with delicacy, and conducts his part of the controversy with considerable address (chapter 4, 5, 15, 22).  On him falls the main burden of the argument, that God's retribution in this world is perfect and certain, and that consequently suffering must be a proof of previous sin. His words are distinguished from those of Bildad and Zophar by greater calmness and elaboration, and, in the first instance, by greater gentleness towards Job, although he ventures afterwards, apparently from conjecture, to impute to him special sins. The great truth brought out by him is the unapproachable majesty and purity of God (4:12- 21; 15:12-16). But still, with the other two friends, he is condemned for having, in defense of God's providence, spoken of him "the thing that was not right," i.e., by refusing to recognize the facts of human life, and by contenting himself with an imperfect retribution as worthy to set forth the righteousness of God. On sacrifice and the intercession of Job all three are pardoned. SEE JOB, BOOK OF.

2. The son of Esau by one of his first wives, Adah, and father of several Edomitish tribes (Gen 36:4; Gen 36:10-11; Gen 36:16; 1Ch 1:35-36). B.C. post 1963.

## Elipheleh[[@Headword:Elipheleh]]

             (Hebrews in the prolonged form Eliphele'hu, אלִֵיפְּלֵהוּ, God will distinguish him; Sept. Ε᾿λιφαλά and Ε᾿λιφαλού v.r. Ε᾿λιφενά and Ε᾿λιφαλαίας; Vulg. Eliphalu), a Merarite Levite; one of the gatekeepers (שׁוֹ רִים, A.V, porters") appointed by David to play on the harp "on the Sheminith," on the occasion of bringing up the ark to the city of David (1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:21). B.C. 1043.

## Eliphelet[[@Headword:Eliphelet]]

             (Hebrew Eliphe'let, אלֵיפֶּלֶט, in pause Elipha'let, אלִֵיפָּלִט, God is his deliverance); the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λιφαλάτ v.r. Α᾿λιφαλέθ and Α᾿λιφαλετ, Vulg. Elipheleth.) One of David's distinguished warriors, styled "the son of Ahasbai, the son of the Maachathite" (2Sa 23:34); but, by some error and abbreviation, ELIPHAT SEE ELIPHAT (q.v.), the son of Ur, [and] Hepher, the Mecherathite," in the parallel passage (1Ch 11:35-36.)

2. (Sept. Ε᾿λιφαλέτ v.r. Ε᾿λιφαλέθ, Vulg. Eliphaleth.) The third of the nine sons of David, born at Jerusalem, exclusive of those by Bathsheba  (1Ch 3:6; 1Ch 14:5, in which latter passage the name is written Elpalet). B.C. post 1044.

3. (Sept. Ε᾿λιφαλέτ v.r. Ε᾿λιφαλά, Vulg. Eliphelet.) The ninth of the same (1Ch 3:8; 1Ch 14:7; 2Sa 5:16, in which two latter passages the name is Anglicized "Eliphalet"). It is believed that there were not two sons of this name, but that, like Nogah, one is merely a transcriber's repetition. The two are certainly omitted in Samuel, but, on the other hand, they are inserted in two separate lists in Chronicles, and in both cases the number of sons is summed up at the close of the list. Josephus mentions but one Eliphale (Ε᾿λιφαλέ), as the last of David's eleven sons, and states that the last two were born of concubines (Ant. 7:3, 3). SEE DAVID.

4. (Sept. Ε᾿λιφαλέτ, Vulg. Eliphalet.) The third of the three sons of Eshek, of the posterity of Benjamin, and a descendant of king Saul through Jonathan (1Ch 8:39). B.C. ante 536.

5. (Sept. Ε᾿λιφαλάθ v.r. Ε᾿λιφαλάτ, Vulg. Eliphelet.) One of the sons of Adonikam, who returned from Babylon with his two brothers and 60 males (Ezr 8:13). B.C. 459.

6. (Sept. Ε᾿λιφαλέτ,Vulg. Elipheleth.) An Israelite of the lineage of Hashum, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:33). B.C. 458.

## Elisabeth[[@Headword:Elisabeth]]

             (Ε᾿λισάβετ), wife of Zacharias or Zachariah, and mother of John the Baptist (Luk 1:5). She was a descendant of Aaron, or of the race of the priests; and of her and her husband this exalted character is given by the evangelist: "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luk 1:7; Luk 1:13). They had remained childless till the decline of life, when an angel foretold to her husband Zachariah the birth of John, and Zachariah returning home, Elisabeth conceived. During five months she concealed the favor God had granted her; but the angel Gabriel discovered to the Virgin Mary this miraculous conception, as an assurance of the birth of the Messiah by herself. SEE ANNUNCIATION. Mary visited Elisabeth, and when she saluted her, Elisabeth felt the quickening of her unborn babe. When her child was circumcised she named him John, according to previous  instructions from her husband (Luk 1:39-63). B.C. 7. SEE ZACHARIAS.

The name in this precise shape does not occur in the Old Testament, where the names of few females are given. But it is a Hebrew name, the same in fact as ELISHEBA SEE ELISHEBA (q.v.). It is perhaps etymologically connected with Elissa or Elisa, the Phoenician name of queen Dido (Virgil, AEn. 4:335), whence the modern Eliza, Elizabeth.

## Elisaeus[[@Headword:Elisaeus]]

             (Ε᾿λισαῖος or Ε᾿λισσαῖος), the Graecized form of the name of ELISHA SEE ELISHA (q.v.) in the N.T. (Luk 4:27) and Apocrypha (Ε᾿λισαιέ, Sir 48:12), as well as Josephus (Ant. 8:13, 7 etc.).

## Elisaeus (2)[[@Headword:Elisaeus (2)]]

             (1) Bishop of Arezzo, A.D. 713.

(2) Bishop of Bologna, cir. A.D. 716.

(3) Thirtieth bishop of Noyon, A.D. 747.

(4) Forty-third bishop of Auch, about the close of the 8th century.

(5) A Scotch prelate, promoted to the see of Galloway about 1405, and still holding that office in 1412.

## Elisha[[@Headword:Elisha]]

             (Hebrews Elisha', (אלִֵישָׁ, for אֶלִיאּיֶשִׁ , God is his salvation; Sept. Ε᾿λισαιέ or Ε᾿λισσαιέ, Josephus and N.T. Ε᾿λισσαῖος, Vulg. Elisaeus, A.V. in N.T. and Apocr. "Elisaeus"), the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah (1Ki 19:16-19), who became the attendant and disciple of Elijah (Josephus, Ant. 8:13, 7), and his successor as prophet in the kingdom of Israel. SEE ELIJAH.

I. History. — The earliest mention of Elisha's name is in the command to Elijah in the cave at Horeb (1Ki 19:16-17). But our first introduction to the future prophet is in the fields of his native place (B.C. cir. 900). Abel-meholah-the "meadow of the dance" — as probably in the valley of the Jordan, and, as its name would seem to indicate, in a moist or watered situation. SEE ABEL. Elijah, on his way from Sinai to Damascus by the Jordan valley, lights on his successor engaged in the labors of the field, twelve yoke before him, i.e., probably eleven other ploughs preceding him along the same line (see Thomson, Land and Book, 1:108). To cross to him, to throw over his shoulders the rough mantle — a token at once of investiture with the prophet's office, and of adoption as a son — was to Elijah but the work of an instant, and the prophet strode on as if what he had done were nothing — "Go back again, for what have I done unto thee?" So sudden and weighty a call, involving the relinquishment of a position so substantial, and family ties so dear, might well have caused hesitation. But the parley was only momentary. To use a figure which we may almost believe to have been suggested by this very occurrence, Elisha  was not a man who, having put his hand to the plough, was likely to look back; he delayed merely to give the farewell kiss to his father and mother, and preside at a parting feast with his people, and then followed the great prophet on his northward road to become to him what in the earlier times of his nation Joshua had been to Moses. Of the nature of this connection we know hardly anything. "Elisha the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah," is all that is told us. The characters of the two men were thoroughly dissimilar, but how far the lion like daring and courage of the one had infused itself into the other, we can judge from the few occasions on which it blazed forth, while every line of the narrative of Elijah's last hours on earth bears evidence how deep was the personal affection which the stern, rough, reserved master had engendered in his gentle and pliant disciple.

Seven or eight years must have passed between the call of Elisha and the removal of his master, and during the whole of that time we hear nothing of him. But when that period had elapsed he reappears, to become the most prominent figure in the history of his country during the rest of his long life.

Being anxious, after his remarkable appointment to receiving the robe as a symbol of inheriting the prophetic spirit of his ascended master, to enter at once upon the duties of his sacred office, Elisha determined to visit the schools of the prophets which were on the other side of the Jordan. Accordingly, returning to that river, and wishing that sensible evidence should be afforded, both to himself and others, of the spirit and power of his departed master resting upon him, he struck its waters with Elijah's mantle, when they parted asunder and opened a way for him to pass over on dry land. Witnessing this miraculous transaction, the fifty sons of the prophets, who had seen from the opposite side Elijah's ascension, and who were awaiting Elisha's return, now, with becoming reverence, acknowledged him their spiritual head. These young prophets are not more full of reverence for Elisha than of zeal for Elijah: they saw the latter carried up in the air — they knew that this was not the first time of his miraculous removal. Imagining it therefore possible that the Spirit of God had cast him on some remote mountain or valley, they ask permission to go and seek him. Elisha, though fully aware that he was received up into glory, but yet fearful lest it should be conceived that he, from any unworthy motives, was not anxious to have him brought back, yielded to their request. The unavailing search confirmed Elisha's fame. (B.C. cir. 892.)  There are several considerations from which the incompleteness of the records of Elisha's life may be inferred:

(a.) The absence of marks by which to determine the dates of the various occurrences. — The "king of Israel" is continually mentioned, but we are left to infer what king is intended (2Ki 5:5-7, etc.; 6:8, 9, 21, 26; 7:2; 8:3, 5, 6, etc.). This is the case even in the story of the important events of Naaman's cure, and the capture of the Syrian host at Dothan. The only exceptions are 2Ki 3:12 (compare 6), and the narrative of the visit of Jehoash (2Ki 13:14, etc.), but this latter story is itself a proof of the disarrangement of these records, occurring as it does after the mention of the death of Jehoash (2Ki 13:13), and being followed by an account of occurrences in the reign of Jehoahaz his father (2Ki 13:22-23).

(b.) The absence of chronological sequence in the narratives. The story of the Shunammite embraces a lengthened period, from before the birth of the child till he was some years old. Gehazi's familiar communication with the king, and therefore the story which precedes it (2Ki 8:1-2), must have occurred before he was struck with leprosy, though placed long after the relation of that event (2Ki 5:27)

(c). The different stories are not connected by the form of words usually employed in the consecutive narrative of these books. (See Keil, Comment. on Kings, page 348, where other indications will be found.) The call of Elisha seems to have taken place about four years before the death of Ahab. He died in the reign of Joash, the grandson of Jehu, B.C. cir. 835. Hence his public career embraces a period of not less than 65 years, for certainly 55 of which he held the office of "prophet in Israel" (2Ki 5:8).

1. After the departure of his master, Elisha returned to dwell (ישֵׁב) at Jericho (2Ki 2:18). The town had lately been rebuilt (1Ki 16:34), and was the residence of a body of the "sons of the prophets" (2Ki 2:5; 2Ki 2:15). Among the most prominent features of that place are still the two perennial springs which, rising at the base of the steep hills of Quarantania behind the town, send their streams across the plain towards the Jordan, scattering, even at the hottest season, the richest and most grateful vegetation over what would otherwise be a bare tract of sandy soil. At the time in question, part, at least, of this charm was wanting. One  of the springs was noxious — had some properties which rendered it unfit for drinking, and also prejudicial to the land (2:19, דָ דם, bad, A.V. "naught"). At the request of the men of Jericho, Elisha remedied this evil. He took salt in a new vessel, and cast it into the water at its source in the name of Jehovah. From the time of Josephus (War, 4:8, 3) to the present (Saewulf, Mod. Trav. page 17), the tradition of the cure has been attached to the large spring N.W. of the present town, and which now bears, probably in reference to some later event, the name of Ain es-Sultan (Robinson, Researches, 2:383 sq.). SEE JERICHO.

2. We next meet with Elisha at Bethel, in the heart of the country, on his way from Jericho to Mount Carmel (2Ki 2:23). His last visit had been made in company with Elijah on their road down to the Jordan (2Ki 2:2). Sons of the prophets resided there, but still it was the seat of the calf-worship, and therefore a prophet of Jehovah might expect to meet with insult, especially if not so well known and so formidable as Elijah. The road to the town winds up the defile of the wady Suweinit, under the hill which still bears what in all probability are the ruins of Ai, and which, even now retaining some trees, was at that date shaded by a forest, thick, and the haunt of savage animals (comp. Amo 5:19). SEE BETHEL.

Here the boys of the town were clustered, waiting, as they still wait at the entrance of the villages of Palestine, for the chance passer-by. In the scanty locks of Elisha, how were they to recognize the successor of the prophet, with whose shaggy hair streaming over his shoulders they were all familiar? So, with the license of the Eastern children, they scoff at the newcomer as he walks by — "Go up ( לֵה, hardly ascend, as if alluding to Elijah, but pass on out of the way), bald-head (קֵרֵהִ, devoid of hair on the back of the head, as opposed to גִּבֵּחֵ, bald on the forehead)!" For once Elisha assumed the sternness of his master. He turned upon them and cursed them in the name of Jehovah. There was in their expressions an admixture of rudeness, infidelity, and impiety. But the inhabitants of Bethel were to know, from bitter experience, that to dishonor God's prophets was to dishonor himself, for Elisha was at the moment inspired to pronounce the judgment which at once took effect. God, who never wants for instruments to accomplish his purposes, caused two she-bears to emerge from the neighboring wood and punish the young delinquents. It is not said that they were actually killed (the expression is (נָּקִ, to rend, which is peculiarly applicable to the claws of the bear). This fate may indeed have befallen  some of the party, but it is by no means probable in regard to the greater number.

Ehlenberg says that the bear is seen only on one part of the summit of Lebanon, called Mackmel, the other peak, Jebel Sanin, being, strangely enough, free from these animals. The Syrian bear is more of a frugiverous habit than the brown bear (Ursus arctos), but when pressed with hunger it is known to attack men and animals; it is very fond of a kind of chick-pea (Cicer arietinus), fields of which are often laid waste by its devastations. Most recent writers are silent respecting any species of bear in Syria, such as Shaw, Volney, Hasselquist, Burckhardt, and Schulz. Seetzen, however, notices a report of the existence of a bear in the province of Hasbeiya, on Mount Hermon. Klaeder supposed this bear must be the Ursus arctos, for which opinion, however, he seems to have had no authority; and a recent writer, Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, 2:373), says that the Syrian bear is still found on the higher mountains of this country, and that the inhabitants of Hermon stand in great fear of him. Hemprich and Ehrenberg (Symbole Phys. part 1) inform us that during the summer months these bears keep to the snowy parts of Lebanon, but descend in winter to the villages and gardens; it is probable, also, that at this period in former days they extended their visits to other parts of Palestine; for, though this species was in ancient times far more numerous than it is now, yet the snowy summits of Lebanon were probably always the summer home of these animals. It is not improbable, therefore, that the attack upon the forty-two children who mocked Elisha took place some time in the winter, when these animals inhabited the low lands of Palestine. SEE BEAR.

3. Elisha extricates Jehoram, king of Israel, and the kings of Judah and Edom, from their difficulty in the campaign against Moab, arising from want of water (2Ki 3:4-27). The revolt of Moab occurred very shortly after the death of Ahab (2Ki 3:5; comp. 1:1), and the campaign followed immediately —"the same day" (2Ki 3:6; A.V. "time"). The prophet was with the army; according to Josephus (Ant. 9:3, 1) he "happened to be in a tent outside the camp of Israel." Joram he refuses to hear, except out of respect for Jehoshaphat, the servant of the true God; but a minstrel is brought, and at the sound of music the hand of Jehovah comes upon him, and he predicts a fall of rain, and advises a mode of procedure in connection therewith which results in the complete discomfiture of Moab. This incident probably tool place at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea. SEE JEHORAM.

4. The widow of one of the sons of the prophets according to Josephus, of Obadiah, the steward of Ahab — is in debt, and her two sons are about to be taken from her and sold as slaves by her creditors, as by an extension of the law (Exo 21:7, and Lev 25:39), and by virtue of another (Exo 22:3), they had the power to do; and against this hard-hearted act she implores the prophet's assistance. God will not, without a cause, depart from the general laws of his administration: Elisha therefore inquires how far she herself had the power to avert the threatened calamity. She replies that the only thing of which she was possessed was one pot of oil. This Elisha causes (in his absence, 4:5) to multiply (after the example of Elijah at Zarephath), until the widow has filled with it all the vessels which she could borrow, and thus procured the means of payment (2Ki 4:1-7). No place or date of the miracle is mentioned.

5. The next occurrence is at Shunem and Mount Carmel (2Ki 4:8-37). The account consists of two parts,

[a.] Elisha, probably on his way between Carmel and the Jordan valley, calls accidentally at Shunem, now Solam, a village on the southern slopes of Jebel ed-Duhy, the little Hermon of modern travelers. Here he is hospitably entertained by a woman of substance, apparently at first ignorant of the character of her guest. Wishing that he should take up, more than occasionally, his abode under her roof, she proposed to her husband to construct for him a chamber which he might have for his own accommodation. The husband at once consented, and, the apartment being fitted up in a way that showed their proper conception of his feeling, the prophet becomes its occupant. Grateful for such disinterested kindness, Elisha delicately inquired of her if he could prefer her interest before the king or the captain of his host; for he must have had considerable influence at court, from the part he had taken in the late war. But the good woman declined the prophet's offer by declaring that she would rather "dwell among her own people," and in the condition of life to which she had been accustomed. Still, to crown her domestic happiness, she lacked one thing — she had no child; and now, by reason of the age of her husband, she could not expect such a blessing. In answer, however, to the prayer of the prophet, and as a recompense for her care of him, she was saved from that childless condition which was esteemed so great a calamity by every Jewish wife, and permitted to "embrace a son" (2Ki 4:8-17).

[b.] After an interval of several years, the boy is old enough to accompany his father to the corn-field, where the harvest is proceeding. The fierce rays of the morning sun are too powerful for him, and (affected apparently by a sun-stroke) he is carried home to his mother only to die at noon. She says nothing of their loss to her husband, but depositing her child on the bed of the man of God, at once starts in quest of him to Mount Carmel. The distance is fifteen or sixteen miles-at least four hours' ride; but she is mounted on the best ass (הָאָתוֹן, the she-ass, such being noted for excellence), and she does not slacken rein. Elisha is on one of the heights of Carmel commanding the road to Shunem, and from his position opposite to her (מִנֶּגֶר) he recognizes in the distance the figure of the regular attendant at the services which he holds here at "new moon and sabbath" (comp. 2Ki 4:23). He sends Gehazi down to meet her, and inquire the reason of her unexpected visit. But her distress is for the ear of the master, and not of the servant, and she presses on till she comes up to the place where Elisha himself is stationed (הָהָר, the mount, 2Ki 4:27, i.e., Carmel, 2Ki 4:25); then throwing herself down in her emotion, she clasps him by the feet. Misinterpreting this action, or perhaps with an ascetic feeling of the unholiness of a woman, Gehazi attempts to thrust her away. But the prophet is too profound a student of human nature to allow this — "Let her alone, for her soul is vexed within her, and Jehovah hath hid it from me, and bath not told me." "And she said'' — with the enigmatical form of Oriental speech — "did I desire a son of my lord? Did I not say, do not deceive me?" No explanation is needed to tell Elisha the exact state of the case. The heat of the season will allow of no delay in taking the necessary steps, and Gehazi is at once dispatched to run back to Shunem with the utmost speed. He takes the prophet's walking-staff in his hand which he is to lay on the face of the child. The mother and Elisha follow in haste. Before they reach the village the sun of that long, anxious summer afternoon must have set. Gehazi meets them on the road, but he has no reassuring report to give; the placing of the staff on the face of the dead boy had called forth no sign of life. Then Elisha enters the house, goes up to his own chamber, "and he shut the door on them twain, and prayed unto Jehovah." It was what Elijah had done on a similar occasion, and in this and his subsequent proceedings Elisha was probably following a method which he had heard of from his master. The child is restored to life, the mother is called in, and again falls at the feet of the prophet, though with what different emotions — "and she took up her son and went out" (2  Kings 4:18-37). There is nothing in the narrative to fix its date with reference to other events.

We here first encounter Gehazi, the "servant" (נִ ר, lad) of the man of God. It must of course have occurred before the events of 2Ki 8:1-6, and therefore before the cure of Naaman, when Gehazi became a leper.

6. The scene now changes to Gilgal, apparently at a time when Elisha was residing there (2Ki 4:38-41). The sons of the prophets are sitting round him. It is a time of famine, possibly the same seven years' scarcity which is mentioned in 2Ki 8:1-2, and during which the Shunammite woman of the preceding story migrated to the Philistine country. The food of the party must consist of any herbs that can be found. The great caldron is put on at the command of Elisha, and one of the company brings his blanket (בֶּגֶד; not "lap" as in A.V.) full of such wild vegetables as he has collected, and empties it into the pottage. But no sooner have they begun their meal than the taste betrays the presence of some noxious herb, SEE GOURD, and they cry out, "There is death in the pot, oh man of God!" In this case the cure was effected by meal which Elisha cast into the stew in the caldron (2Ki 4:38-41).

7. The next miracle in all probability belongs to the same time, and also to the same place as the preceding. A man from Baal-shalisha (q.v.) brings the man of God a present of the first-fruits, which under the law (Num 18:8; Num 18:12; Deu 18:3-4) were the perquisite of the ministers of the sanctuary — 20 loaves of the new barley, and some delicacy, the exact nature of which is disputed, but which seems most likely to have been roasted ear of corn not fully ripe (כִּרְמֶל, perhaps elliptically for גֶּרֶשׁ כִּרְמֶל; comp. Lev 23:4), brought with care in a sack or bag (צִקְלוֹן, Sept. πήρα). This moderate provision is by the word of Jehovah rendered more than sufficient for a hundred men (2Ki 4:42-44). This is one of the instances in which Elisha is the first to anticipate in some measure the miracles of Christ.

8. The simple records of these domestic incidents amongst the sons of the prophets are now interrupted by an occurrence of a more important character (2Ki 5:1-27). The chief captain of the army of Syria, to whom his country was indebted for some signal success (the tradition of the Jews is that it was Naaman who killed Ahab, Midrash Tehillim, page 29 b, on Psa 78:1-72), was afflicted with leprosy, and that in its most  malignant form, the white variety (Psa 78:27). In Israel this would have disqualified him from all employment and all intercourse (2Ki 15:5; 2Ch 26:20-21). But in Syria no such practice appears to have prevailed; Naaman was still a "great man with his master," "a man of countenance." One of the members of his establishment is an Israelitish girl, kidnapped by the marauders (גְּדוּדִים) of Syria in one of their forays over the border, and she brings into that Syrian household the fame of the name and skill of Elisha. "The prophet in Samaria," who had raised the dead, would, if brought into the presence of (לִפְנִי) the patient, have no difficulty in curing even this dreadful leprosy. The news is communicated by Naaman himself (וִיָּבא, not "one told") to the king. Benhadad had yet to learn the position and character of Elisha. He writes to the king of Israel a letter very characteristic of a military prince, and curiously recalling words uttered by another military man in reference to the cure of his sick servant many centuries later — "I say to this one, go, and he goeth. and to my servant. do this, and he doeth it." "And now" — so ran Benhadad's letter after the usual complimentary introduction had probably opened the communication — "and now, when this letter is come unto thee, behold, I have sent Naaman, my slave, to thee, that thou mayest recover him of his leprosy." With this letter, and with a present, in which the rich fabrics (לְבוּשׁ, i.e., a dress of ceremony) for which Damascus has always been in modern times so famous form a conspicuous feature, and with a full retinue of attendants (13, 15, 23), Naaman proceeds to Samaria. The king of Israel — his name is not given, but it was probably Joram — is dismayed at the communication. He has but one idea, doubtless the result of too frequent experience — "Consider how this man seeketh a quarrel against me!" The occurrence soon reaches the ears of the prophet, and with a certain dignity he "sends" to the king "Let him come to me, and he shall know that there is a prophet in Israel." To the house of Elisha Naaman goes with his whole cavalcade, the "horses and chariot" of the Syrian general fixing themselves particularly in the mind of the chronicler. Elisha still keeps in the background, and while Naaman stands at the doorway, contents himself with sending out a messenger with the simple direction to bathe seven times in the Jordan. The independent behavior of the prophet, and the simplicity of the prescription — not only devoid of any ceremonial, but absolutely insulting to the native of a city which boasted, as it still boasts, of the finest water-supply of any city of the East, all combined to enrage Naaman.

His slaves, however, knew how to deal with the quick but not  ungenerous temper of their master; and the result is that he goes down to the Jordan and dips himself seven times, "and his flesh came again like the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." His first business after his cure is to thank his benefactor. He returns with his whole train (מִחֲנֶה, i.e., "host" or "camp"), and this time he will not be denied the presence of Elisha, but, making his way in, and standing before him, he gratefully acknowledges the power of the God of Israel, and entreats him to accept the present which he had brought from Damascus. But Elisha is firm, and refuses the offer, though repeated with the strongest adjuration. Naaman, having adopted Jehovah as his God, begs, to be allowed to take away some of the earth of his favored country, of which to make an altar. He then consults Elisha on a difficulty which he foresees. How is he, a servant of Jehovah, to act when he accompanies the king to the temple of the Syrian god Rimmon? He must bow before the god; will Jehovah pardon this disloyalty? Elisha's answer is “Go in peace," and with this farewell the caravan moves off. But Gehazi, the attendant of Elisha, cannot allow such treasures thus to escape him. "As Jehovah liveth" — an expression, in the lips of this vulgar Israelite, exactly equivalent to the oft-repeated Wallah — " by God" — of the modern Arabs, "I will run after this Syrian and take somewhat of him." So he frames a story by which the generous Naaman if made to send back with him to Elisha's house a considerable present in money and clothes. He then went in and stood before his master as if nothing had happened. But the prophet was not to be so deceived. His heart had gone after his servant through the whole transaction, even to its minutest details, and he visits Gehazi with the tremendous punishment of the leprosy, from which he has just relieved Naaman. The date of the transaction must have been 'at least seven years after the raising of the Shunammite's son. This is evident from a comparison of 2Ki 8:4 with 1, 2, 3. Gehazi's familiar conversation with the king must have taken place before he was a leper. SEE NAAMAN.

9. We now return to the sons of the prophets, but this time the scene appears to be changed, and is probably at Jericho, and during the residence of Elisha there. Whether from the increase of the scholars consequent on the estimation in which the master was held, or from some other cause, their habitation had become too small — "The place in which we sit before thee is too narrow for us." They will therefore move to the close neighborhood of the Jordan, and cutting down beams — each man one, as with curious minute ness the text relates — make there a new dwelling place. Why Jordan was selected is not apparent.. Possibly for its distance  from the distractions of Jericho — possibly the spot was once sanctified by the crossing of Israel with the ark, or of Elijah, only a few years before. Urged by his disciples, the man of God consents to accompany them. When they reach the Jordan, descending to the level of the stream, they commence felling the trees (הָ צִים) of the dense belt of wood in immediate contact with the water. SEE JORDAN. As one of them was cutting at a tree overhanging the stream, the iron of his axe (a borrowed tool) flew off and sank into the water. His cry soon brought the man of God to his aid. The stream of the Jordan is deep up to the very bank, especially when the water is so low as to leave the wood dry, and is, moreover, so turbid that search would be useless. But the place at which the lost axe entered the water is shown to Elisha; he lops off (קָצִב) a stick and casts it into the stream, and the iron appears on the surface, and is recovered by its possessor (2Ki 6:1-7).

10. Elisha is now residing at Dothan, half way on the road between Samaria and Jezreel. The incursions of the Syrian marauding bands (comp. 2Ki 6:2) still continue, but apparently with greater boldness, and pushed even into places which the king of Israel is accustomed to frequent (comp. Josephus, Ant. 9:4, 3). But their maneuvers are not hid from the man of God, and by his warnings he saves the king "not once nor twice." So baffled were the Syrians by these repeated failures as to make their king suspect treachery in his own camp. But the true explanation is given by one of his own people — possibly one of those who had witnessed the cure wrought on Naaman, and could conceive no power too great to ascribe to so gifted a person: "Elisha, the prophet in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bedchamber." So powerful a magician must be seized without delay, and a strong party with chariots is dispatched to effect his capture. . They march by night, and before morning take up their station round the base of the eminence on which the ruins of Dothan still stand. Elisha's servant — not Gehazi, but apparently a newcomer, unacquainted with the powers of his master — is the first to discover the danger. But Elisha remains unmoved by his fears; and at his request the eyes of the youth are opened to behold the spiritual guards which are protecting them, horses and chariots of fire filling the whole of the mountain. But this is not enough. Elisha again prays to Jehovah, and the whole of the Syrian warriors are struck blind. He then descends, and offers to lead them to the person and the place which they seek. He conducts them to Samaria. There, at the prayer of the prophet, their sight is restored,  and they find themselves, not in a retired country village, but in the midst of the capital of" Israel, and in the presence of the king and his troops. His enemies thus completely in his grasp, the king of Israel is eager to destroy them. "Shall I slay? shall I slay, my father?" But the end of Elisha has been answered when he has shown the Syrians how futile are all their attempts against his superior power. "Thou shalt not slay. Thou mayest slay those whom thou hast taken captive in lawful fight, but not these [literally, "Are these what thou hast captured with thy sword and bow, that thou art for smiting them?": feed them, and send them away to their master." After such a repulse it is not surprising that the marauding forays of the Syrian troops ceased (2Ki 6:8; 2Ki 6:23). SEE BENHADAD.

11. But the king of Syria could not rest under such dishonor. He abandons his marauding system, and gathers a regular army, with which he lays siege to Samaria. The awful extremities to which the inhabitants of the place were driven need not here be recalled. Roused by an encounter with an incident more ghastly than all, and which remained without parallel in Jewish records till the unspeakable horrors of the last days of Jerusalem (Josephus, War, 5:10, 3; 13, 7, etc.), the king vents his wrath on the prophet, probably as having, by his share in the last transaction (so Josephus, Ant. 9:4, 4), or in some other way not recorded, provoked the invasion; possibly actuated by the spite with which a weak bad man in difficulty often regards one better and stronger than himself. The king's name is not stated in the Bible, but there can be no doubt that Josephus is correct in giving it as Joram; and in keeping with this is his employment of the same oath which his mother Jezebel used on an occasion not dissimilar (1Ki 19:2), "God do so to me and more also, if the head of Elisha, the son of Shaphat, shall stand on him this day." No sooner is the word out of the king's mouth than his emissary starts to execute the sentence. Elisha is in his house, and round him are seated the elders of Samaria, doubtless receiving some word of comfort or guidance in their sore calamity. He receives a miraculous intimation of the danger. Ere the messenger could reach the house, he said to his companions, “See how this son of a murderer (alluding to Ahab in the case of Naboth) hath sent to take away my head! Shut the door, and keep him from entering: even now I hear the sound of his master's feet behind him (hastening to stay the result of his rash exclamation!" interprets Josephus, Ant. 9:4, 4).

As he says the words the messenger arrives at the door, followed immediately, as the prophet had predicted, by the king and by one of his officers, the lord on whose  hand he leaned. What follows is very graphic. The king's hereditary love of Baal burst forth, and he cries, "This evil is from Jehovah," the ancient enemy of my house: "why should I wait for Jehovah any longer?" To this Elisha answers: "Hear the word of Jehovah" — he who has sent famine can also send plenty — "tomorrow at this time shall a measure of fine flour be sold for a shekel, and two measures of barley for a shekel, in the gate of this very city." "This is folly," says the officer; "even if Jehovah were to make windows in heaven and pour down the provisions, it could not be." "It can, it shall," replies Elisha; "and you, you shall see it all, but shall not live even to taste it" (2Ki 6:24-33; 2Ki 7:1-2). The next night God caused the Syrians to hear the noise of chariots and horses; and conceiving that Jehoram had hired against them the kings of the Hittites and the king of Egypt, they fled from before the walls of Samaria — leaving their tents filled with gold and provisions — in the utmost panic and confusion. In this way did God, according to the word of Elisha, miraculously deliver the inhabitants of Samaria from a deadly enemy without, and from sore famine within, its walls: another prediction moreover was accomplished; for the distrustful lord was trampled to death by the famished people in rushing through the gate of the city to the forsaken tents of the Syrians (2Ki 7:1-20). SEE SAMARIA.

12. We now go back several years to an incident connected with the lady of Shunem, at a period antecedent to the cure of Naaman and the transfer of his leprosy to Gehazi (2Ki 5:1; 2Ki 5:27). Elisha had been made aware of a famine which Jehovah was about to bring upon the land for seven years; and he had warned his friend the Shunammite of it that she might provide for her safety. Accordingly she had left Shunem with her family, and had taken refuge in the land of the Philistines, that is, in the rich corn- growing plain on the sea-coast of Judah, where, secure from want, she remained during the dearth. At the end of the seven years she returned to her native place, to find that during her absence her house with the field- land attached to it — the corn-fields of the former story — had been appropriated by some other person. In Eastern countries kings are (or were) accessible to the complaints of the meanest of their subjects to a degree inconceivable to the inhabitants of the Western world. To the king, therefore, the Shunammite had recourse, as the widow of Tekoah on a former occasion to king David (2Sa 14:4). Thus occurred one of those rare coincidences which it is impossible not to ascribe to something more than mere chance. At the very moment of the entrance of the woman  and her son-clamoring, as Oriental suppliants alone clamor (צָעִק), for her home and her land — the king was listening to a recital by Gehazi of "all the great things which Elisha had done," the crowning feat of all being that which he was then actually relating — the restoration to life of the boy of Shunem. The woman was instantly recognised by Gehazi. — "My lord, O king, this is the woman and this is her son whom Elisha restored to life." From her own mouth the king hears the repetition of the wonderful tale, and, whether from regard to Elisha, or struck by the extraordinary coincidence, orders her land to be restored, with the value of all its produce during her absence (2Ki 8:1-6).

13. Hitherto we have met with the prophet only in his own country. We now find him at Damascus. (The traditional spot of his residence on this occasion is shown in the synagogue at Jobar [? Hobah], a village about two miles E. of Damascus. The same village, if not the same building, also contains the cave in which Elijah was fed by ravens and the tomb of Gehazi [Stanley, Palest. page 412; Quaresmius, 2:881— "vana et mendacia Hebraeorum"].) He is there to carry out the command given to Elijah on Horeb to "anoint Hazael to be king over Syria." At the time of his arrival Benhadad was prostrate with his last illness. This marks the time of the visit as after the siege of Samaria, which was conducted by Benhadad in person (compare 2Ki 6:24). The memory of the cure of Naaman, and of the subsequent disinterestedness of the prophet, were no doubt still fresh in Damascus; and no sooner does he enter the city than the intelligence is carried to the king — "The man of God is come hither." The king's first desire is naturally to ascertain his own fate; and Hazael, "he appears to have succeeded Naaman, is commissioned to be the bearer of a present to the prophet, and to ask the question on the part of his master, "Shall I recover of this disease?" The present is one of royal dimensions — a caravan (of 40 camels, according to Josephus, Ant. 9:4, 6) laden with the riches and luxuries which that wealthy city alone could furnish. The terms of Hazael's address show the respect in which the prophet was held even in this foreign and hostile country. They are identical with those in which Nasman was addressed Ly his slaves, and in which the king of Israel in a moment of the deepest gratitude and reverence had addressed Elisha himself. "Thy son Benhadad hath sent me to thee, saying, 'Shall I recover of this disease?'" The reply, probably originally ambiguous, is doubly uncertain in the present doubtful state of the Hebrew text, but the general conclusion was unmistakable: "Jehovah hath showed me that he shall  surely die."

But this was not all that had been revealed to the prophet. If Benhadad died, who would be king in his stead but the man who now stood before him? The prospect was one which drew forth the tears of the man of God. This man was no rash and imprudent leader, who could be baffled and deceived as Benhadad had so often been. Behind that "steadfast," impenetrable countenance was a steady courage and a persistent resolution, in which Elisha could not but foresee the greatest danger to his country. Here was a man who, give him but the power, would "oppress" and "cut Israel short," would "thresh Gilead with threshing instruments of iron," and "make them like the dust by threshing" as no former king of Syria had done, and that at a time when the prophet would be no longer alive to warn and to advise. At Hazael's request Elisha confesses the reason of his tears. But the prospect is one which has no sorrow for Hazael. How such a career presented itself to him may be inferred from his answer. His only doubt is the possibility of such good fortune for one so mean. "But what is thy slave, dog that he is (עִבְדְּךָ הִכֶּלֶב, thy servant, THE dog, i.e., insignificant object), that he should do this great thing?" To this Elisha replies, "Jehovah hath showed me that thou wilt be king over Syria." Returning to the king, Hazael tells him only half the dark saying of the man of God — "He told me that thou shouldest surely recover." But that was the last day of Benhadad's life. What were the circumstances attending his death, whether in the bath as has recently been suggested (Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 3:523 note), is not clear, except that he seems to have been smothered. The general inference, in accordance with the account of Josephus, is that Hazael himself was the murderer, but the statement in the text does not necessarily bear that interpretation (הִמִּכְבֵּר יִיַּקִּח, may well be rendered "one took the [not a] hair-cloth," i.e., perhaps divan-mattress); and, indeed, from the mention of Hazael's name at the end of the passage, the conclusion is rather the reverse (2Ki 8:7-15). SEE HAZAEL.

14. Two of the injunctions laid on Elijah had now been carried out, but the third still remained. Hazael had begun his attacks on Israel by an attempt to recover the stronghold of Ramoth-Gilead (2Ki 8:28), or Ramah, among the mountains on the east of Jordan. But the fortress was held by the kings of Israel and Judah in alliance, and, though the Syrians had wounded the king of Israel, they had not succeeded in capturing the place (2Ki 8:28; 2Ki 9:15). One of the captains of the Israelitish army in the garrison was Jehu, the son of Jehoshaphat, the son of Nimshi. At the time  his name was mentioned to Elijah on Horeb he must have been but a youth; now he is one of the boldest and best known of all the warriors of Israel. He had seen the great prophet — once, when with his companion Bidkar he attended Ahab to take possession of the field of Naboth, and the scene of that day, and the words of the curse then pronounced, no subsequent adventure had been able to efface (2Ki 9:25; 2Ki 9:36). The time had now come far the fulfillment of that curse by his being anointed king over Israel. Elisha's personal share in the transaction was confined to giving directions to one of the sons of the prophets, and the detailed narrative may be found in 2Ki 9:1-37 (see Maurice, Prophets and Kings, sermon 9). SEE JEHU.

15. Beyond this we have no record of Elisha's having taken any part in the revolution of Jehu, or the events which followed it. He does not again appear till we find him on his death-bed in his own house (2Ki 13:14-19). Joash, the grandson of Jehu, is now king, and he has come to weep over the approaching departure of the great and good prophet. His words are the same as those of Elisha when Elijah was taken away — "My father! my father! the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" But it is not a time for weeping. One thought fills the mind of both king and prophet. Syria is the fierce enemy who is gradually destroying the country, and against Syria one final effort must be made before the aid of Elisha becomes unobtainable. What was the exact significance of the ceremonial employed, our ignorance of Jewish customs does not permit us to know, but it was evidently symbolic. The window is opened towards the hated country, the bow is pointed in the same direction, and the prophet laying his hands on the string as if to convey force to the shot, "the arrow of Jehovah's deliverance, the arrow of deliverance from Syria" is discharged. This done, the king takes up the bundle of arrows, and, at the command of Elisha, beats them on the ground. But he does it with no energy, and the successes of Israel, which might have been so prolonged as completely to destroy the foe, are limited to three victories. SEE JEHOASH.

16. The power of the prophet, however, does not terminate with his death. Even in the tomb (Josephus embellishes the account by stating that he had a magnificent funeral, Ant. 9:8, 6) he restores the dead to life. Moab had recovered from the tremendous reverse inflicted on her by the three kings at the opening of Elisha's career (2Ki 3:1-27), and her marauding bands had again begun the work of depredation which Syria so long pursued (2Ki 5:2; 2Ki 6:23). The text perhaps infers that the spring — that is, when the early crops were ripening — was the usual period for these attacks;  but, be this as it may, on the present occasion they invaded the land "at the coming in of the year." A funeral was going on in the cemetery which contained the sepulcher of Elisha. Seeing the Moabitish spoilers in the distance, the friends of the dead man hastened to conceal his corpse in the nearest hiding-place. They chose — whether by design or by accident is not said — the tomb of the prophet, and, as the body was pushed (יָלִךְ) into the cell which formed the receptacle for the corpse in Jewish tombs, it came in contact with his bones. The mere touch of those hallowed remains was enough to effect that which in his lifetime had cost Elisha both prayers and exertions — the man "revived and stood up on his feet." Other miracles of the prophet foreshadow, as we have remarked, the acts of power and goodness of our Savior, but this may rather be said to recall the marvels of a later period — of the early ages of the Christian Church. It is in the story of Gervasius and Protasius (Augustine's Confessions, 9, § 16), and not in any occurrence in the life of our Lord or of the apostles, that we must look for a parallel to the last recorded miracle of Elisha (2Ki 13:20-22).

II. Characteristics and Traditional Views. — In almost every respect Elisha presents the most complete contrast to Elijah. The copious collection of his sayings and doings which are preserved in the 3d to the 9th chapter of the 2d book of Kings, though in many respects deficient in that remarkable vividness which we have noted in the records of Elijah, is yet full of testimonies to this contrast. Elijah was a true Bedouin child of the desert. The clefts of the Cherith, the wild shrubs of the desert, the cave at Horeb, the top of Carmel, were his haunts and his resting-places. If he enters a city, it is only to deliver his message and be gone. Elisha, on the other hand, is a civilized man, an inhabitant of cities. He passed from the translation of his master to dwell at Jericho (2Ki 2:18); from thence he "returned" to Samaria (2Ki 2:25). At Samaria (2Ki 5:3; 2Ki 6:32; comp. 2Ki 6:24) and at Dothan (2Ki 6:14) he seems regularly to have resided in a house (2Ki 5:9; 2Ki 5:24; 2Ki 6:32; 2Ki 13:17) with "doors" and "windows," in familiar intercourse with the sons of the prophets, with the elders (2Ki 6:32), with the lady of Shunem, the general of Damascus, the king of Israel Over the king and the "captain of the host he seems to have possessed some special influence, capable of being turned to material advantage if desired (2Ki 4:13). The touches of the narrative are very slight, but we can gather that his dress was the ordinary garment of an Israelite, the beged, probably similar in form to the long  abbeyeh of the modern Syrians (2Ki 2:12), that his hair was worn short (if not naturally deficient) behind, in contrast with the long locks of Elijah (2Ki 2:23), and that he used a walking-staff (2Ki 4:29) of the kind ordinarily carried by grave or aged citizens (Zec 8:4). What use he made of the rough mantle of Elijah, which came into his possession at their parting, does not anywhere appear, but there is no hint of his ever having worn it. Elijah was emphatically a destroyer. His mission was to slay and to demolish whatever opposed or interfered with the rights of Jehovah, the Lord of Hosts. The nation had adopted a god of power and force, and they were shown that he was feebleness itself compared with the God whom they had forsaken.

But after Elijah the destroyer comes Elisha the healer. "There shall not be dew nor rain these years" is the earliest proclamation of the one. "There shall not be from thence any dearth or barren land" is the first miracle of the other. What may have been the disposition of Elijah when not engaged in the actual service of his mission we have unhappily no means of knowing. Like most men of strong, stern character, he probably had affections not less strong. But it is impossible to conceive that he was accustomed to the practice of that beneficence which is so strikingly characteristic of Elisha, and which comes out at almost every step of his career. Still more impossible is it to conceive him exercising the tolerance towards the person and the religion of foreigners for which Elisha is remarkable in communication, for example, with Naaman or Hazael; in the one case calming with a word of peace the scruples of the new proselyte, anxious to reconcile the due homage to Rimmon with his allegiance to Jehovah; in the other case contemplating with tears, but still with tears only, the evil which the future king of Syria was to bring upon his country. That Baal-worship was prevalent in Israel even after the efforts of Elijah, and that Samaria was its chief seat, we have the evidence of the narrative of Jehu to assure us (2Ki 10:18-27), but his mission is not so directly to rebuke and punish it. In the eulogium of Elisha contained in the catalogue of worthies of Sir 48:12-14 — the only later mention of him save the passing allusion of Luk 4:27 — his special character is more strongly brought out than in the earlier narrative: "Whilst he lived he was not moved by the presence of any prince, neither could any bring him into subjection. No word could overcome him, and after his death his body prophesied. He did wonders in his life, and at his death were his works marvelous."  This thaumaturgic view of Elisha is indeed the true key to his Biblical history, for he evidently appears in these records chiefly as a worker of prodigies, a predictor of future events, a revealer of secrets, and things happening out of sight or at a distance. The working of wonders seems to be a natural accompaniment of false religions, and we may be sure that the Baal-worship of Samaria and Jezreel was not free from such arts. The story of 1Ki 22:1-53 shows that even before Elisha's time the prophets had come to be looked upon as diviners, and were consulted, not on questions of truth and justice, nor even as depositaries of the purposes and will of the Deity, but as able to foretell how an adventure or a project was likely to turn out, whether it might be embarked in without personal danger or loss. But if this degradation is inherent in false worship, it is no less a principle in true religion to adjust itself to a state of things already existing, and out of the forms of the alien or the false to produce the power of the true. Thus Elisha appears to have met the habits of his fellow-countrymen. He wrought, without reward and without ceremonial, the cures and restorations for which the soothsayers of Baalzebub at Ekron were consulted in vain: he warned his sovereign of dangers from the Syrians which the whole four hundred of his prophets had not succeeded in predicting to Ahab, and thus in one sense we may say that no less signally than Elijah he vanquished the false gods on their own field.

The frequency and unparalleled nature of his miracles also furnish perhaps the best explanation of Elijah's behest of "a double portion of his own spirit" upon Elisha (2Ki 2:9), The ordinary meaning put upon this phrase (see, for example, J.H. Newman, Subj. of the Day, page 191) is that Elisha possessed double the power of Elijah. This, though sanctioned by the renderings of the Vulgate and Luther, and adopted by a long series of commentators from Ephraem Syrus to Krummnacher, would appear not to be the real force of the words. The expression is פַּי שְׁנִיִם, literally "a mouth of two" — a double mouthful — the same phrase employed in Deu 21:17 to denote the amount of a father's goods which were the right and token of a first-born son. Thus the gift of the "double portion" of Elijah's spirit was but the legitimate conclusion of the act of adoption which began with the casting of the mantle at Abel-meholah years before. It was this which Elisha sought — not a gift of the spirit of prophecy twice as large as Elijah himself possessed. This carries improbability on the very face of it; for with what propriety could a man be asked to leave as an inheritance to another double of what he himself  possessed? Nor did Elisha get any such superlative endowment; his position as a prophet was altogether of a dependent and secondary nature as compared with Elijah's; and the attempts that have been made to invert the relation of the one to the other, proceed upon arbitrary and superficial considerations. Not less arbitrary is the view of Ewald, that the request of Elisha must be understood as indicating a wish for two thirds only of Elijah's spirit (Gesch. 3:507) — a view that requires no refutation. The proper explanation is, that Elisha here regarded Elijah as the head of a great spiritual household, which included himself as the first-born and all who had since been added to the fraternity under the name of "the sons of the prophets;" and what he now sought was, that he might be constituted Elijah's heir in the spiritual vineyard, by getting the first-born's double portion, and therewith authority to continue the work. For a curious calculation by Peter Damianus that Elijah performed twelve miracles and Elisha twenty-four, see the Acta Sanctorum, July 20.

Elisha is canonized in the Greek Church; his day is the 14th of June. Under that date, his life, and a collection of the few traditions concerning him-few indeed when compared with those of Elijah — may be found in the Acta Sanctorum. In the time of Jerome a "mausoleum" containing his remains were shown at Samaria (Reland, Palaest. page 980). Under Julian the bones of Elisha were taken from their receptacle and burned. But, notwithstanding this, his relics are heard of subsequently, and the church of St. Apollinaris at Ravenna still boasts of possessing his head. The Carmelites have a special service in honor of Elisha.

III. Literature. — On the subject generally, Kitto, Daily Bible Illustrations, "Solomon and Kings," 47th to 49th week; Niemeyer, Charakt. 5:364 sq.; Blunt, History of Elisha (new ed. Lond. 1862); Krummacher, Elisha (from the German, Lond. 1838); Anon. Short Meditations on Elisha (Lond. 1848); Cassel, Der Prophet Elisa (Berlin, 1860); Stanley, Jewish Church,: 2:353 sq. On the fate of the Bethelite youths, Michaelis, De Elisaso vindicato (Fref. A.D. 1734). On the miracle of the axe-helve, Freise, Ferrum natans (Jen. 1689). On the Shunammitess, Thomson, Land and Book, 2:177 sq.

Elisha (in Armenian Eghische), one of the most celebrated Armenian historians, was born at the beginning of the 5th century. He was a pupil of the patriarch St. Sahag (Isaac) and of St. Mesrob, by whom he was sent to the schools of Athens, Alexandria, and Constantinople. Subsequently he  became almoner and secretary of prince Vartan, who, in the religious war of the Armenians against the Persians, was chief commander of the Armenian army. He died in 480. Probably he is the same person with bishop Elisha of Amathunik, who in 449 was present at the Synod of Artishat, at which the bishops of Armenia replied to the summons of the Persian ruler Yesdegerd II to adopt the faith of Zoroaster. This reply, to which was added a brief apology of the Christian religion, led to the religious war which is described by Elisha. So great was the reputation of this work that its author received the surname of the Armenian Xenophon. It begins with the accession to the throne of Yesdegerd in 439, describes in full the schemes of persecution devised by the Persian king against the Armenians, the resistance of the Armenian bishops and princes, the "holy alliance" concluded by the latter, and its operation and fate until the unfortunate battle at the river Techrnut, in the province of Artas, in 451, in consequence of which the leaders of the holy alliance and most of the bishops were captured and taken to Persia. The first, edition of this work was printed at Constantinople in 1764 (new ed. 1833); other editions appeared at Nakhidchevan (1764), Calcutta (1816), and Venice (1823 and 1838). The last Venice edition, which is the best, contains also commentaries to the books of Joshua and Judges, a recommendation of monastic life, an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, several homilies, and a work on the ecclesiastical canons. An English translation of the work was published by Fr. Neumann (The History of Vartan and of the Battle of the Armenians, containing an Account of the religious Wars between the Persians and Armenians, by Elisaeus, bishop of the Amadunians, etc., Lond. 1830). It has also been translated into French by abbe G.K. Garabed (Soulevement national de l'Armenie chretienne, Par. 1844, 8vo), and into Italian by G. Cappelletti (Ven. 1841). Elisha is also the author of a history of Armenia, which, however, appears to be lost. — Wretzer u. Welte, Kirchten-Lex. 3:540; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 15:884; Neumann, Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Litter. page 69, 70. (A.J.S.)

## Elisha (2)[[@Headword:Elisha (2)]]

             the prophet is commemorated as a saint in various Christian calendars on June 14 (October 12, October 16).

## Elisha Ben-Abuja[[@Headword:Elisha Ben-Abuja]]

             (surnamed Acher, i.e., "the other one," after his apostasy) was a pupil of the famous rabbi Akiba (q.v.). He was the son of a wealthy citizen of Jerusalem, and was early initiated in the study of the law, but afterwards apostatized from Judaism it is related of him that while attending the  Jewish college he had often been noticed to carry with him writings of the “Minim" (probably of Gnostics), and that he had even been in the habit of quoting Greek poetry. One of the most intimate friends and pupils of Elisha was the famous rabbi, Meir (q.v.), who seized every opportunity to invite his friend to return into the bosom of the synagogue-a proposition to which Elisha refused to accede, as forgiveness could not be granted to one who had so wantonly abused the gifts bestowed upon him. When Acher lay on his deathbed, Meir hastened to his side, and renewed, this time effectually, his solicitations on this subject. Legend has it that Meir spread his cloak over the grave of Acher; a cloud of smoke rose from it, and Meir turned away with the somewhat blasphemous application of Rth 3:13, "Tarry this night (of time), and it shall be in the morning (of immortality) that he the All-merciful will deliver and ransom thee; but if he be unwilling, then I will redeem thee." See Hamburger, Real-Encyklop. 2:168 sq.; Bacher, in Frankel-Gratz's Monatsschrift, 1884, page 234 sq.; Jellinek, Elischa ben- Abujja, genannt Acher (Leipsic, 1847). (B.P.)

## Elisha Galicho[[@Headword:Elisha Galicho]]

             SEE GALICHO.

## Elisha Of Armenia[[@Headword:Elisha Of Armenia]]

             (1) Elected patriarch A.D. 936, after the death of Theodorus (Asdouadzadour) I, and established the seat of his administration at Agathomar, on lake Van. His enemies deposed him by means of intrigues and betrayals in 941, and he died A.D. 943.

(2) Born A.D. 1451. Being first bishop of Erivan and then vicar-general of the patriarch of Armenia, he became patriarch in 1503, after the death of Thaddaeus I, and ruled with wisdom. He was well versed in theology, rhetoric, and sacred history. He died in 1575, leaving in MS. a Commentary on Genesis: — Life of St. Gregory, in verse: — and forty- five Sermons. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Elishah[[@Headword:Elishah]]

             (Hebrew Elishah', אלִֵישָׁהderiv. unknown; Sept. Ε᾿λισά and Ε᾿λισαί; Josephus, Ε᾿λισᾶς, Vulg. Elisa), the oldest of the four sons of Javan (Gen 10:4; 1Ch 1:7). B.C. cir. 2450. He seems to have given name to a region on the Mediterranean, "the isles (אִיּיס, shores) of Elishah," which are described as exporting fabrics of purple and scarlet to  the markets of Tyre (Eze 27:7). If the descendants of Javan peopled Greece, we may expect to find Elishah in some province of that country. The circumstance of the purple suits the Peloponnesus, for the fish affording the purple dye was caught at the mouth of the Eurotas, and the purple of Laconia was very celebrated. SEE PURPLE. The name seems kindred to Elis (Bochart, Phaleg, 3:4), which, in a wider sense, was applied to the whole Peloponnesus; and some identify Elishah with Hellas (Michaelis, Spicileg. 1:79). — Kitto, s.v. Josephus, however, identified the race of Elishah with the AEolians (Ant. 1:6, 1). His view is adopted by Knobel (Volkertrfel, page 81 sq.). It appears correct to treat it as the designation of a race rather than of a locality; and if Javan represents the Ionians, then Elishah the AEolians, whose name presents considerable similarity (Αίολεῖς having possibly been Αίλεῖς), and whose predilection for maritime situations quite accords with the expression in Ezekiel. In early times the AEolians were settled in various parts of Greece, Thessaly, Boeotia, AEtolia, Locris, Elis, and Messenia: from Greece they emigrated to Asia Minor, and in Ezekiel's age occupied the maritime district in the N.W. of that country, named after them AEolis, together with the islands Lesbos and Tenedos. The purple shell-fish was found on this coast, especially at Abydus (Virgil, Georg. 1:207), Phocaea (Ovid, Metam. 6:9), Sigeum and Lectum (Athenaeus, 3:88). Not much, however, can be deduced from this as to the position of the "isles of Elishah," as that shell- fish was found in many parts of the Mediterranean, especially on the coast of Laconia (Pausan. 3:21, § 6). Schulthess (Paradies, page 264), without the slightest probability, argues in favor of a position on the western coast of Africa, on the ground of the resemblance to Elisa as the Phoenician name of Carthage. SEE ETHNOLOGY.

## Elishama[[@Headword:Elishama]]

             (Hebrew Elishama', אלִֵישָׁמָ , whom God has heard), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λισαμά v.r. in Chron. Ε᾿λισαμαϊv.) Son of Ammihud, and "prince" or "captain" (both נָשִׂיא, i.e., phylarch) of the tribe of Ephraim at the Exode (Num 1:10; Num 2:18; Num 7:48; Num 7:53; Num 10:22). B.C. 1658. From the genealogy in 1Ch 7:26, we find that he was the grandfather of Jos 2:1-24. (Sept. Ε᾿λισαμά v.r. Ε᾿λισά.) The second of the nine sons of David born at Jerusalem, exclusive of those by Bathsheba (1Ch 3:6); called in the parallel passages (2Sa 5:15; 1Ch 14:5) by apparently the more correct name ELISHUA SEE ELISHUA (q.v.).

3. (Sept. Ε᾿λισαμά.) The seventh of the same series of sons (2Sa 5:16; 1Ch 3:8; 1Ch 14:7); being one of the thirteen, or, according to the record of Samuel, the eleven, sons born to David of his wives after his establishment in Jerusalem. B.C. post 1044. The list in Josephus (Ant. 7:3, 3) has no similar name. SEE DAVID.

4. (Sept. Ε᾿λισαμά.) One of the two priests sent by Jehoshaphat with the Levites to teach the Law through the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:8). B.C. 912.

5. (Sept. Ε᾿λισαμά᾿.) Son of Jekamiah, a descendant of Judah (1Ch 2:41). In the Jewish traditions preserved by Jerome (Qu. Hebr. on 1Ch 2:41) he appears to be identified with

6. (Sept. Ελισαμά v.r. in Jeremiah Ε᾿λασά and Ε᾿λεασά.) A member of the royal line of Judah; father of Nethaniah, and grandfather of Ishmael who slew Gedaliah, provisional governor of Jerusalem after its capture by the Babylonians (2Ki 25:25; Jer 41:1). B.C. considerably ante 588.

7. (Sept. Ε᾿λισαμά.) A royal scribe in whose chamber the roll of Jeremiah was read to him and other assembled magnates, and afterwards deposited for a time (Jer 36:12; Jer 36:20-21). B.C. 605.

## Elishaphat[[@Headword:Elishaphat]]

             (Hebrews Elishaphat', אלִֵישָׁפָּטּ, whom God has judged; Sept. Ε᾿λισαφάτ v.r. Ε᾿λισαφάν), son of Zichri, and one of the "captains of hundreds" whom Jehoiada associated with himself in the league to overthrow the usurpation of Athaliah (2Ch 23:1). B.C. 877.

## Elisheba[[@Headword:Elisheba]]

             (Hebrew Elishe'ba, אלִֵישֶׁכִ , God is her oath, or she swears by God, i.e., worshipper of God, comp. Isa 19:8; Sept. Ε᾿λισάβετ, Vulg. Elisabeth; as in Luk 1:7), the daughter of Amminadab, phylarch of the tribe of Judah, and sister of Nahshon, the captain of the Hebrew host  (Num 2:3); she became the wife of Aaron (q.v.), and hence the mother of the priestly family (Exo 6:23). B.C. 1658.

## Elishua[[@Headword:Elishua]]

             (Hebrew id. אלִֵישׁוּ , God is his salvations, Sept. Ε᾿λισουέ v.r. Ε᾿λισαύ and Ε᾿λισά, Vulg. Elisua), one of the sons of David, born at Jerusalem (2Sa 5:15; 1Ch 14:5); called ELISHAMA SEE ELISHAMA (q.v.) in the parallel passage (1Ch 3:6). B.C. post 1044.

## Elisimus[[@Headword:Elisimus]]

             (Ε᾿λιάσιμος; Vulg. Liasumus), an Israelite of the "sons of Zamoth," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1Es 9:28); evidently the ELIASHIB SEE ELIASHIB (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:27).

## Elissaeus[[@Headword:Elissaeus]]

             (1) Bishop of Diocletianopolis, in Palestine, A.D. 359.

(2) A priest condemned to slavery by the Council of Seville (A.D. 619), for ingratitude to his bishop.

## Elithur[[@Headword:Elithur]]

             the name of three saints in the Irish calendar, at April 25, May 12; and December 23. Elivager, celebrated rivers which occupy a conspicuous place in the cosmogony of the ancient Scandinavians. They are the source, whence came the original cosmical matter or substance from, which the worlds: were formed, as well as the giants and men. SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY.

## Eliu[[@Headword:Eliu]]

             (᾿Ηλιού, i.e., Elihi), one of the forefathers of Judith (Jdt 8:1), and therefore of the tribe of Simeon. SEE JUDITH.

## Eliud[[@Headword:Eliud]]

             (Ε᾿λιούδ, prob. for Hebrews אלִֵיהרּד, God is his praise, but not found in O.T.), son of Achim, and father of Eleazar, being the fifth in ascent in Christ's paternal genealogy (Mat 1:14-15). B.C. cir. 200. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

## Elizabeth[[@Headword:Elizabeth]]

             queen of England, ascended the throne on the death of her sister, the bloody Mary, November 17, 1558, and died March 24 (April 3, New Style), 1603. She was the daughter and only living child of Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII. She was born September 7,1533, and was therefore "full five-and-twenty years old when she came to the crown." Before she was three years of age her mother was beheaded by her father, who, according to his own declaration, "never spared man in his anger, nor woman in his lust." On the 8th of June of the same year, 1536, the Parliament declared the divorces of Catharine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn legal, and bastardized the issue of both marriages. The same decision had been previously pronounced by archbishop Cranmer in the Star-Chamber, and  confirmed by the Convocation. The Parliament also empowered Henry to settle the succession by testamentary disposition. In January, 1544, Elizabeth was restored to the line of royal inheritance.

During the lifetime of her father her education was carefully encouraged, especially by queen Catharine Parr; and it was continued after his death. She was instructed in Latin and Greek by William Grindal and Roger Ascham. The latter commends her masculine power of application, quick apprehension, and retentive memory. "She spoke French and Italian with fluency, was elegant in her penmanship, and was skillful in music, though she did not delight in it." She seems also to have had some acquaintance with German. Her position was at all times exceedingly dubious, and rarely free from peril.

On the accession of her brother Edward VI she encountered other risks than those she had been previously exposed to. In her infancy her hand had been designed for the duke of Orleans, third son of Francis I; it was offered to the earl of Arran, and declined by him; it was then proposed for Philip of Spain. Under Edward VI, admiral Seymour, the brother of the lord protector, hesitated between seeking the hand of Mary, Elizabeth, or the lady Jane Grey. He finally accepted that of the queen dowager, but did not discontinue his amorous attentions, and renewed his addresses to the princess Elizabeth on his wife's death. Her fair fame was impeached by her encouragement of his devotions; and this furnished one of the charges against him which resulted in his execution.

New dangers encompassed her on the death of her brother. Dudley, earl of Northumberland, father of the earl of Leicester, the subsequent favorite, had persuaded the boy-king, in his last illness, to set aside both his sisters on the ground of their illegitimacy, and to bequeath the crown to the lady Jane Grey (great-niece of Henry VIII), who had recently been married to his fourth son, lord Guilford Dudley. Ridley, bishop of London, preached vehemently in favor of lady Jane, and against any supposed title of Mary and Elizabeth, both of whom were regarded as Roman Catholic, and favorable to the restoration of the old religion. Northumberland offered lands and money to Elizabeth to induce her to renounce her claims, but she adroitly evaded his proposals.

The legitimacy of Mary was declared by Parliament, which thus stigmatized anew the birth of Elizabeth. She conformed to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church with some reluctance, but was viewed with  suspicion. In 1554 she was implicated, in connection with her dissolute suitor, Courtenay, earl of Devonshire, in Wyats conspiracy, and was confined to the Tower for two months. Her death was demanded; but Philip II, now the husband of Mary, interposed, and she was put under surveillance at Woodstock. Philip proposed to bestow her upon Emanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, who afterwards married, according to the provisions of the treaty of Cateau-Cambresis, Margaret of France.

These points may appear trivial in a rapid notice of the life and reign of Elizabeth, but they affected both the development of her character and the policy of her government. The death of queen Mary exposed her to untried difficulties, requiring discernment, resolution, and singular good fortune. Her accession to the throne was unchallenged in Parliament, and was heard with demonstrations of joy by the populace of London. She herself, however, in her retirement at Hatfield, recognized the gravity of the occasion. She had been declared illegitimate and incapable of the crown by her father, by her brother, by the Star-Chamber, by the Convocation, and twice by act of Parliament. For the last twenty years the religion of England had been determined by royal edicts and parliamentary enactments. The majority of the people were Roman Catholic in consequence of the measures of the late reign. Elizabeth, in the presence of her dying sister, had "prayed God that the earth might open and swallow her alive if she were not a true Roman Catholic." But, if Roman Catholicism remained the national creed, her tenure of the crown would the wholly precarious, as the illegitimacy of her birth would be inevitably and irrefragably maintained. The superior title of Mary, queen of Scots, would prevail, perhaps, with the aid of French arms, while the Brandon or Suffolk line might seek Spanish support. Roman Catholic her government could not be; but, if she renounced Rome, she united the religious with the political enthusiasm of France, under the instigation of the Guises, against her reign, and alienated or provoked Philip II, then aspiring to universal dominion, and having in his own person some claims to the English throne, which he afterwards advanced. He had hastened to tender his widowed heart and hand to the new queen immediately on the death of her sister. Could she venture to reject it at once, while his party was still strong, and in possession of all places of influence in England — while her own throne was still uncertain? She temporized, she coquetted, she entertained his proposals till she could reject them. She did not fully renounce the old and lately restored religion. She retained the crucifix and lights in her private  chapel, and throughout her life addressed prayers to the Virgin. But she gradually abolished the most distinctive practices of the Papal Church, and established by act of Parliament her ecclesiastical supremacy. Her own Protestantism was always political rather than religious; the creed was less important to her than the political submission of the people. Her first measures were very cautious, and were adroitly introduced by her great minister, Sir William Cecil, who guided her councils till his death, forty years after. So insecure was her hold upon the scepter, that in the year of her coronation her title was denied by pope Paul IV, and also by John Knox, who had written a diatribe against the intolerable regimen of women, and who at this time addressed a letter to the queen to persuade her to surrender her crown.

Nearly all omens were adverse. The state was divided into factions — all opposed to her. Foreign states were hostile or indifferent in interest and in sentiment. Her title was most questionable, if not utterly invalid. She had no support but her own brave heart, the patriotic antipathy of her people to foreign rule, the civil wars and discords prevailing or in prospect in the kingdoms around her, and the sagacity of the advisers whom she might choose. She had to knit together her own people into a nation, to win popular support by suppressing all factions at home, to avert foreign dangers by creating a party for herself, and provoking occupation for her enemies in the realms by which she was menaced. The character and conduct of Elizabeth present a most interesting, but most difficult moral and historical study. No hasty and sweeping censures, whether of praise or blame, can exhibit the complicated intertexture of threads of various material and hue in that strange fabric. All was not virtue, all was not vice. The virtues were obscured, soiled, or dwarfed by supposed state necessities; the vices were darkened or deepened by ceaseless provocations and harassing perplexities. Never, perhaps, was an illustrious character composed of a more undistinguishable admixture of fine gold, and dross, and clay, and never was there one better calculated to invite and reward curious examination.

In the earlier years of her reign she could trust only to those political friends whose fortunes were indissolubly connected with her own, and to her relatives, principally by her mother's line — the descendants of Mary Boleyn. As her throne became more assured, she attracted to her court the young men of ancient gentry, of adventurous spirit, of chivalrous bearing, of great but restricted ambition, and of high physical and intellectual  advantages. Gentle birth, great talents, and good looks were the passports to the favor of the court. She thus created supporters and officers for her crown. The old nobility she did not and could not trust. They were powers in the land which despised, envied, and menaced her own. She accumulated favors on Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, from compassion for the fate of his father and brother, from regard for his courtly manners, perhaps for a tenderer feeling, which she deemed it unregal and unsafe to gratify. Leicester, like his father, was ever scheming for a crown. Essex she petted, indulged, spoiled, as a bright, petulant, promising youth, who was one of her nearest male relatives, and the chief hope of her lonely old age.

Her crown was at first held merely by the acquiescence of the nation; it was not confirmed by any parliamentary sanction till the fourteenth year of her reign. Civil and religious disorder desolated Scotland, France, and the Netherlands: she prevented such commotions in her own realm. She promptly suppressed the commencements of revolt; she arrested the numerous conspiracies against her life and throne before they had time to explode; and she left her people a united, if not a harmonious nation — prosperous, intelligent, powerful, independent, and free.

Menaced by the claims of Mary, and by their prospective advocacy by France or Spain, she placed herself at the head of the Protestant movement, and aided, openly or secretly, the Protestant lords in Scotland, the Huguenots in France, William of Orange, and the Gueux in the Netherlands. She assisted all; she gave no decisive aid to any.

In the midst of perils and successes at home and abroad, she made head against the incessant revolts of Ireland, which has been a thorn in the side of Britain from the fabulous days of king Arthur to the current year of queen Victoria. Throughout her reign she was harassed by its state of chronic though intermittent rebellion, but in the year preceding her death she received its submission through lord Mountjoy.

The important results achieved in the long reign of Elizabeth were mainly due to the impulses communicated by herself and the policy pursued by her ministers. All portentous stars were in conjunction in her horoscope. Internal and external hazards envisoned her. Industry was disorganized, agriculture disordered, trade inactive, enterprise stagnant, fortunes were shattered, ranks confused, beggars and vagabonds multiplied by the confiscation and private appropriation of Church lands, by the enclosure of commons, and the extension of pasturage. These social evils were  aggravated by the growth of colossal fortunes alongside of increasing destitution among the masses, as commerce rapidly advanced under her rule. They were augmented also by the progressive depreciation of the precious metals, which grievously affected the public revenue, and the condition of families with fixed and moderate means.

All these circumstances must be considered in order to appreciate justly the otherwise suspicious and unintelligible policy of Elizabeth. They explain the meaning, if they do not evince the propriety of her ecclesiastical measures; they illustrate the spirit of her internal government; they interpret her severity to the beautiful and unfortunate queen who sought as a kinswoman an asylum and protection in her realm. They enable us to see how she fostered the high emprise and the transcendent genius of the Elizabethan Age; and how, in the midst of all the clouds and mists which obscured her career, she remained a right royal woman, created the national spirit of England, established the English Church, maintained the Protestant cause, and spread such blessings over the land that to this day the popular imagination still fondly looks back to "the merry days of good queen Bess."

Her religious policy was hostile alike to Roman Catholics and Puritans; yet Howard of Effingham, who commanded the navies of England against the Spanish Armada, belonged to the Roman communion; and nearly all her chief ministers were supporters of the Puritan doctrine. There seems to be substantial truth in the declaration of lord Bacon, who had ample opportunities of forming a correct judgment, who was Puritan by family and political connections, but tolerant by disposition. He says, with an affirmation of "certain knowledge," "Most certain it is that it was the firm resolution of this princess not to offer any violence to consciences; but then, on the other side, not to suffer the state of her kingdom to be ruined under pretense of conscience and religion." Her aim was to maintain her ascendency in Church and State, in order to prevent internal divisions which would invite external aggressions. It was impossible, in the turmoil and religious acrimony of the period, to draw precisely the line of discrimination between religious belief and political intrigue. There is reason to believe that the persecutions which darkened her reign did not contemplate capital penalties till her crown and life had both been endangered by papal excommunications, by Papist plots, and by Spanish or domestic schemes of assassination.  These principles also controlled in large measure her harsh, unsympathizing treatment of her beautiful and accomplished cousin, Mary of Scotland, whose graces have been employed, like the charms of Aspasia and Phryne in an Athenian court, to secure acquittal when the evidence compels a condemnation. If Mary was innocent of the murder of her husband; if she was not involved in the Northern rebellion; if she did not beguile the duke of Norfolk; if she did not connive at Babington's conspiracy and other similar transactions; if she did not instigate Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh to murder her royal jailor; if she practiced no collusion with Philip of Spain — all these things might have been readily credited by the English queen and her council, and such belief would remove the atrocity, if not the formal illegality, of their procedure. But if all, or most of these suspicions were well founded; if they have been confirmed by the most dispassionate historians, and by the most recent and diligent investigations, the action of Elizabeth may still be illegal, but it ceases to be iniquitous. It should be remembered, too, that Elizabeth did not consent to the trial of Mary till after repeated and urgent demands from the lords and commons of England in Parliament assembled; that her signature of the death warrant is by no means certain; that it was issued and carried into effect without her consent, and contrary to her orders; and that the execution caused her bitter agony and horror. This plea is, indeed, counterbalanced by the suspicion that she sought the removal of her royal captive by secret murder. Such a design is, of course, infamous, though in accordance with the spirit and practices of the age.

To these habits of indirect procedure may be referred much of that matrimonial coquetting which furnished occasion for the malignant censures of hostile contemporaries. There was much female vanity in the frequent and not always coy reception of tender addresses. The Tudor blood displayed its licentious warmth in Margaret and Mary, the sisters of Henry VIII, and in their female descendants, as well as in "bluff king Harry." But there was much also of policy in Elizabeth's demeanor. It introduced a courtly language which has often been misconstrued. It cannot have been entirely unworthy, degrading, or vicious, when it inspired the compliments of Sidney, and Raleigh, and Spenser, and Shakespeare, and Bacon. There is a fashion in language and manners as well as in dress, and the fashion must be regarded if we would interpret their significance.

The supposition of a warmer attachment to Essex than the natural attachment of an aged relative for the hopeful representative of an almost  extinct line has neither foundation nor probability. Just as little truth is there in the fancy that her life was overcast and her death hastened by the execution of Essex. The misguided earl had been guilty of the grossest breach of trust and treachery at the head of the government and armies of Ireland; he had repeated his treason, and menaced her existence and crown, in the midst of her capital. He had a solemn trial, and was inevitably condemned. He confessed the enormity of his guilt, and the queen shortly after assured the ambassador of Henry IV that she felt no scruples in regard to his punishment.

Whatever may be thought on these points, which will always be disputed, the spirit, the conduct, and the measures of Elizabeth encouraged and produced the most splendid outburst of national prowess and of varied abilities that any age has ever witnessed. Strong men surrounded her from the first — men of marked capacity as statesmen, of eminent qualities as precursors of the approaching splendor — Sir William Cecil, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Ralph Sadler, the earl of Sussex, and lord Sackville. But she had been a quarter of a century on the throne, more than half her reign was passed, and she was verging to old age before the great names which immortalized her times commenced those achievements which have immortalized themselves. It was under the inspiration of her rule, and of the results attained by her rule, that the brilliant generation grew up which has left to all future admiration the names of Sidney, and Spenser, and Shakespeare, and Bacon — of Raleigh, and Vere, and Essex, and Grenville — of Hooker and Gilbert — the generation which confirmed the independence of England and of Europe, which invented new arts, extended and applied the principles of law and government, secured the Protestant ascendency, founded colonies, extended commerce, glorified letters, discovered new sciences, and established the political eminence, the industrial wealth, and the intellectual empire of England.

The first twenty years of Elizabeth's reign were occupied in consolidating her throne, by averting foreign aggression through the encouragement given by her to the insurgents in each neighboring state, by suppressing disorder and divisions at home, and by promoting Protestant interests at home and abroad. The next twenty years, which terminated with the peace of Vervins, was a period of secret or open contention with Philip of Spain. The execution of Mary, queen of Scots, 1587, and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, 1588, marked the culmination of this perilous struggle. It was closed by the death of the great minister, lord Burleigh. The last five  years of her reign were free from serious apprehensions of foreign dangers, but they were distracted by the disturbances in Ireland, by the treacherous intrigues of the court, and by the ambitious designs of the reckless and ungrateful Essex. Her whole life was one long succession of hazards, and after all her glories she died lonely, unloved, and without friends.

Few sovereigns have ever impressed themselves more strongly than Elizabeth upon the imaginations and hearts of their people; few ever bestowed greater or more permanent benefits upon them; yet few have met with blinder admiration or more undistinguishing vituperation. The presumptions are all adverse to this great queen. Contemporary slanders, designed for political objects, have crystallized themselves into commonly accepted facts. But with each addition to our knowledge of the period, the perception of her heroism, and even of her virtues, becomes clearer, and the exaggeration or false coloring of her frailties diminishes. It was an age of great crimes and of multitudinous vices, and Elizabeth did not escape the contamination; but a minute study of the fearful difficulties of her position from infancy to old age will produce profound commiseration rather than bitter censure.

It is only in the diaries and journals of Parliament; in the state papers of the time; in the records of the religious and political intrigues of the period; in the reports of Venetian, French, and Spanish ambassadors; in contemporaneous memoirs, and in the numerous miscellaneous letters and papers of the age, that the true characteristics of Elizabeth and her reign can be discovered. Perhaps a definite conclusion cannot be reached until the voluminous calendars and other records, now in process of publication under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls, have been given to the world. Certainly the portrait offered by the latest historian of her reign, Mr. Froude, cannot be accepted with any confidence, for it is as strangely distorted and miscolored as his picture of Henry VIII. The commendation of her earliest eulogist, lord Bacon, who knew her well, is still appropriate: "To say the truth, the only commender of this lady's virtues is time, which, for as many ages as it hath run, hath not yet showed us one of the female sex equal to her in the administration of a kingdom."

The literature of this subject is so extensive that it is scarcely necessary to enumerate particular works. Any or all of the historians of England may be consulted; but further researches may be aided by examining Camden, Annals of Queen Elizabeth; Strype's Annals of the Reformation in  England; Harrison's Description of England in Hall's Chronicle; Sir Robert Naunton, Fragmenta Regalia; Symonds d'Ewes's Diary; Rushworth's Collections; Harleian Miscellany; Felicities of Queen Elizabeth, in the works of Lord Bacon; Egerton, Sidney, and Burleigh Papers; Miss Strickland's Life of Queen Elizabeth; Miss Aiken's Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth; Wright's Elizabeth; Mignet, Hist. Mary, Queen of Scots; Caird, Mary Stuart; Froude's Hist. England, and the Calendars of State Papers for the period published by the British government. A very able essay on queen Elizabeth and queen Mary appeared in the Edinburgh Review for October, 1866. (G.F.H.)

## Elizabeth (2)[[@Headword:Elizabeth (2)]]

             (1) Mother of John the Baptist, commemorated February 10.

(2) A wonder-worker of Constantinople, commemorated April 24.

## Elizabeth, Albertine[[@Headword:Elizabeth, Albertine]]

             countess of the Palatinate, was born at Heidelberg December 26, 1618. She was the eldest daughter of the unfortunate Friedrich V,: king of Bohemia, and of Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of James I. The misfortunes of her family led to her becoming abbess of the institution of Herford, in Westphalia, where she died February 11, 1680. She was no less distinguished for her high attainments in literature and science than for her sincere and active piety. All true Christians in need of help were sure to receive it from her. She was the intimate friend of Fox, Keith, Barclay, Malebranche, Leibnitz, Des Cartes, Gichtel, etc. Penn, in a passage of his "No Cross, no Crown," pays a fitting tribute to her piety and virtue. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:769. See Guhrauer, Pfalzgrafin Elisabeth (Raumner's Historisches Taschenbuch, 1851); Goebel. Gesch. d. christlichen Lebens in d. rhein.-westphal. evang. Kirche (Coblentz, 1852).

## Elizabeth, Saint[[@Headword:Elizabeth, Saint]]

             of Thuringia, was a daughter of king Andrew II, of Hungary, and was born at Pressburg in 1207. When only four years old she was destined by her father to become the wife of Ludwig, oldest son of landgrave Hermann of Thuringia. She was immediately sent to the court of the landgrave, at the Wartburg; for her education, and on her arrival was betrothed to Ludwig. She early showed a remarkable inclination for ascetic exercises. Several efforts were on that account made to have her sent back to her father, but Ludwig, who in 1215 succeeded his father as landgrave, refused to dismiss her, and in 1221 married her. As landgravine she continued her ascetic manners, and refused all the comforts of life. At the same time, she was indefatigable in all works of charity. She spun and sowed garments for the  poor, and, at the time of a famine, fed as many as 900 people daily. Her confessor, Konrad von Marburg, not only encouraged her asceticism, but made her vow absolute obedience, and that, in the case of her husband's death, she would not marry again. Ludwig died in 1227, at Otranto, while taking part in the crusade of emperor Friedrich II. In consequence of the opposition of her mother-in-law Sophia, and most of the members of the family, as well as the courtiers generally, Elizabeth was deprived of the regency during the minority of her oldest son, and her brother-in-law, Heinrich Raspe, assumed the administration of the landgravate. Soon Elizabeth, with her son Hermann, and her two daughters, was expelled from the Wartburg, and for a time had to beg in the streets of Eisenach for the necessaries of life. At length she found a refuge at one of the castles of her maternal uncle, the bishop of Bamberg. Repeated offers of a second marriage (even, it is said, from the emperor Friedrich), which were made to her she refused. When the knights who had accompanied her husband returned from the crusade, they compelled Heinrich Raspe to restore to Elizabeth the Wartburg, and the revenue to which she could lay claim as the widow of the landgrave. Subsequently Heinrich gave her the town of Marburg, with a number of adjoining villages, and an annual income of 500 marks in silver. Elizabeth took up her residence at Marburg in 1229, and again devoted her whole time to asceticism and benevolence. Her confessor Konrad not only continued to be very severe, but several times was even guilty of acts of great cruelty with regard to her. Nevertheless, she declined an invitation from her father to return to him. Exhausted by her ascetic life, she died in a hospital which had been erected by her, November 19, 1231. The fame of her ascetic life had already pervaded all Europe, and, as was usual in such cases, the people soon ascribed to her relics a number of miracles, about the details of which there is, however, the greatest discrepancy, among the contemporaneous writers, showing how little they rested on careful investigation. No longer than four years after her death, in 1235, she was canonized by pope Gregory IX. In 1236 her relics were transferred with great solemnity to a new church (St. Elizabeth's) which landgrave Konrad erected at Marburg. The emperor Friedrich II placed a golden crown on the head of the saint, and an immense crowd ,of people, estimated at 200,000, came to see the relics while exhibited to public view. After the Reformation, landgrave Philip, in order not to countenance the veneration of relics, had them removed from the church; subsequently the Teutonic knights obtained permission to send them to various Roman Catholic churches and convents. Her head is  preserved in the church of St. Elizabeth at Breslau. — See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 3:767; Wetzer und Welte, Kirch.-Lex. 3:531; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 15:875; Justi, Elisabeth die Heilige (Zurich, 1797, 2d ed. Marb. 1835); Schmerbauch, Elisabeth die Heilige (Erfurt, 1828); Montalembert, Vie de St. Elisabeth (Par. 1835); Simon, Ludwig IV und s. Gemahlin, die heil. Elisab. (Frankf. 1854); Kahnis, Die heil. Elis. in Zeitschriftfur histor. Theol. 1868. SEE KONRAD VON MARBURG. (A.J.S.) Elizabethines.

(1.) Associations of women whose object it was to imitate the ascetic life and the benevolent zeal of Elizabeth (q.v.) of Thuringia. They did not retire from the world, and only met for prayer and some ascetic exercises.

(2.) A branch of nuns of the third order of St. Francis, so called after Elizabeth of Hungary, who, after the death of her husband, is said to have joined of the third order of St. Francis. Modern writers on monastic orders generally doubt or deny the report that Elizabeth ever was a member of the third order of Franciscans, but the name Elizabethines is still in use to designate Franciscan nuns of the third order. In France they have also been designated by the name of Scaurs or Filles de la Misisericorde (Sisters of Charity). The real foundress of the monastic community is said to have been Angelina di Corbaro, daughter of the count of Corbaro and Tisigniano. She was born in 1377, married the count de Civitelle, with whom she lived as a sister, and immediately after the death of her husband (1393) joined the third order of Franciscans. She founded the first monastery of Franciscan Tertiarians in 1395 at Foligno. In 1428 the monasteries of this order were organized into a congregation, which was authorized to elect at the triennial conventions ("Chapters General") a general. In 1459 the congregation was placed under the general of the Franciscan Observants. In the middle of the 16th century the Elizabethines had 135 monasteries and 3872 nuns. In 1843 the number of members was estimated at 1000. — Helyot, Dict. des Ordres Relig. (ed. Migne), 2:144; Fehr, Geschichte der Monchsorden, 1:275. (A.J.S.)

## Elizaphan[[@Headword:Elizaphan]]

             (Hebrew Elitsaphan', אלִֵיצָפָּן, whom God has protected; Sept. Ε᾿λισαφάυ), the name of two men.  1. Second son of Uzziel, and chief of the Kohathite Levites at the Exode (Numbers in, 30; Exo 6:22). B.C. 1657. He, with his elder brother, was directed by Moses to carry away the corpses of their sacrilegious cousins Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10:4). In these two last-cited passages the name is written contracted into ELZAPHAN SEE ELZAPHAN . — His family was known and represented in the days of king David (1Ch 15:8), and took part in the revival of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:13).

2. Son of Parnoch, and phylarch (נָשִׂיא, “prince") of the tribe of Zebulon at the Exode, being one of the men appointed to assist Moses in apportioning the land of Canaan.

## Elizur[[@Headword:Elizur]]

             (Hebrew Elitsur', אלִֵיצוּר, God is his rock; Sept. Ε᾿λισούς), son of Shedeur, and phylarch ( גָשִׂיא"prince") of the tribe of Reuben at the Exode (Num 1:5; Num 2:10; Num 7:30; Num 7:35; Num 10:18). B.C. 1657.

## Elkanah[[@Headword:Elkanah]]

             [some El'kanah] (Hebrew, Elkanah', אְֵלקָנָה, whom God has gotten; Sept. Ε᾿λκανά but Ε᾿λκανά in Exod., and ᾿Ηλκανά v.r. Ε᾿λκανά in 1Ch 12:6; 1Ch 15:23; Josephus, Ε᾿λκάνης and Ε᾿λκάν; Vulg. Elcana), the name of several men, all apparently Levites.

1. Second son of Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi, according to Exo 6:24,where his brothers are represented as being Assir and Abiasaph. But in 1Ch 6:22-23 (Heb 7:1-28; Heb 8:1-13) Assir, Elkanah, and Ebiasaph are mentioned in the same order, not as the three sons of Korah, but as son, grandson, and great-grandson respectively; and this seems to be correct. If so, the passage in Exodus must he understood as merely giving the families of the Korhites existing at the time the passage was penned, which must in this case have been long subsequent to Moses. In Num 26:58, "the family of the Korhites" (A.V. "Korathites") is mentioned as one family. As regards the fact of Korah's descendants continuing, it may be noticed that we are expressly told in Num 26:11, that when Korah and his company died, "the children of Korah died not." SEE KORAH. On the above view, this Elkanah becomes the son of Assir (q.v.). grandson of Korah, and father of  Ebiasaph (q.v.). B.C. cir. 1700. SEE SAMUEL. A writer in the Journal of Sacred Lit. (April, 1852, page 200), however, proposes to reject both Assir and this first Elkanah from the list in Chronicles.

2. Son of Shaul or Joel, being father of Amasai, and sixth in descent from Ebiasaph, son of the foregoing (1Ch 6:25; 1Ch 6:36). B.C. cir. 1445.

3. Son of Ahimoth or Mahuth, being father of Zuph or Zophai, and great grandson of the one immediately preceding (1Ch 6:26; 1Ch 6:35), B.C. cir. 1340. (See Hervey, Genealogies, page 210, 214, note.)

4. Another Kohathite Levite, in the line of Heman the singer. B.C. cir. 1190. He was the fifth in descent from the foregoing, being son of Jeroham, and father of Samuel, the illustrious judge and prophet (1Ch 6:27-28; 1Ch 6:33-34). Josephus (Ant. 5:10, 2) calls him a man "of middle condition among his fellow-citizens" (τῶν έν μέσῳ πολιτῶν). All that is known of him is contained in the above notices and in 1Sa 1:1; 1Sa 1:4; 1Sa 1:8; 1Sa 1:19; 1Sa 1:21; 1Sa 1:23; 1Sa 2:2; 1Sa 2:20, where we learn that he was of a Bethlehemite stock (an "Ephrathite;" the Levites not being confined to their cities), but lived at Ramathaim-Zophim in Mount Ephraim, otherwise called Ramah; that he had two wives, Hannah and Peninnah, but had no children by the former, till the birth of Samuel in answer to Hannah's prayer. We learn also that he lived in the time of Eli the high priest, and of his sons Hophni and Phinehas; that he was a pious man, who went up yearly from Ramathaim-Zophim to Shiloh, in the tribe of Ephraim, to worship and sacrifice at the tabernacle there; but it does not appear that he performed any sacred functions as a Levite; a circumstance quite in accordance with the account which ascribes to David the establishment of the priestly and Levitical courses for the Temple service. He seems to have been a man of some wealth from the nature of his yearly sacrifice, which enabled him to give portions out of it to all his family, and from the costly offering of three bullocks when Samuel was brought to the house of the Lord at Shiloh. After the birth of Samuel, Elkanah and Hannah continued to live at Ramah (where Samuel afterwards had his house, 1Sa 7:7), and had three sons and two daughters. SEE SAMUEL.

5. Another man of the family of the Korhites who joined David while he was at Ziklag (1Ch 12:6). B.C. 1054. From the terms of 1Ch 12:2, some have thought it doubtful whether this can be the well-known Levitical family of Korhites; but the distinction there seems merely to refer to residents within the tribe of Benjamin, which included the Levitical  cities. Perhaps he was the same who was one of the two doorkeepers for the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:23). B.C. 1043.

6. An officer in the household of Ahaz, king of Judah, and slain by Zichri the Ephraimite, when Pekah invaded Judah; apparently the second in command under the praefect of the palace (2Ch 28:7). B.C. 739. Josephus says that he was the general of the troops of Judah, and that he was merely carried into captivity by "Amaziah," the Israelitish general (Ant. 9:12, 1). SEE AHAZ.

7. Father of one Asa, and head of a Levitical family resident in the "villages of the Netophathites" (1Ch 9:16). B.C. long ante 536.

## Elkanah Ben-Jerochan Ben-Abigdor[[@Headword:Elkanah Ben-Jerochan Ben-Abigdor]]

             a Jewish writer of the 15th century, is the author of a cabalistic work entitled, קנה חכמה וקנה בינה, which was first published at Prague in 1610:- ס8 הפליאה, also called ס8 סתרי תורה, a cabalistic Midrash on Gen 5:29, published first in 1784. See First, Bibl. Jud. 1:239 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Elkesaites[[@Headword:Elkesaites]]

             a sect of Jewish Christians, which sprang up in the 2d century. The origin of the name is uncertain. Delitzsch (in Rudelbach u. Guericke, Zeitschrift, 1841) derives it from a hamlet, Elkesi, in Galilee. The Church fathers derived it from the name of a pretended founder, Elxai, which name, according to Epiphanius, denotes "a hidden power" (הֵיל כֵּסָי). Elxai is probably not the name of a person, but the name of a book which was the chief authority for this sect. Gieseler thinks that the name signifies the Holy Ghost, which in Hom. Clem. 17:16, is called δὐναμις ἄσαρκος, "the incorporeal power." At all events, the sect held as highest doctrinal authority a book which is brought into connection with Elxai. This book, which appears to have been the chief authority of all the Gnostic sects of Jewish Christians, was known to Origen (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 6:38), and the Syrian Alcibioades of Apamea brought it with him to Rome. Epiphanius shows its influence among all sects of Jewish Christians. As Origen reports, this book was believed to have fallen from heaven; according to an account in the Philosophoumena, it was revealed by an angel, who was the Son of God. Elxai is said to have received it from the Seri, in Parthia, in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 101), and its contents were communicated to no one except upon an oath of secrecy. Ritschl puts the origin of the book in the last third of the second century, while Uhlhorn thinks that it must have originated soon after the beginning of the second century, as it served as the basis of the doctrinal system of the Clementine Homilies, which were nearly completed about A.D. 150.  The best account of the standard book of the Elkesaites is to be found in the Philosophoumena, and its main points are confirmed by the statements of Origen. Epiphanius, as usual, is somewhat confused in his exposition of the sect, and his report seems in many points to refer to a modified, and not the original system. According to the Philosophoumesa, there was in the Elkesaite system a pagan element of naturalism, mixed with Jewish and Christian elements. The pagan element shows itself in particular in the ablutions. A remission of sins is proclaimed upon the ground of a new baptism, consisting without doubt in oft-repeated ablutions, which were also used against sickness, and were made in the name of the Father and the Son. In connection with these ablutions appear seven witnesses — the five elements, and oil and salt (also bread), the latter two denoting baptism and the Lord's Supper. The same pagan element appears in the use made by the Elkesaites of astronomy and magic; even baptismal days were fixed in accordance with the position of the stars. The Jewish element appears in the obligatory character of the law, and in circumcision. They rejected, however, sacrifices, and also several parts of the Old and New Testaments (of the latter, the Pauline epistles). Their views of Christ seem not to have been settled. On the one hand, their Christ is described as an angel; on the other, they taught a repeated, continuous incarnation of Christ, although his birth of a virgin seems to have been retained. The Lord's Supper was celebrated with bread and salt; the eating of meat was forbidden; marriage was highly esteemed; renunciation of the faith in time of persecution was allowed. A prayer, which is preserved by Epiphanius (19:4), is entirely unintelligible.

The Elkesaite doctrine probably arose among the Jewish Christians, who, in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, coalesced with the Essenes, and were to some extent influenced by Oriental paganism. Under bishop Callistus of Rome, a certain Alcibiades of Apaemea went to that city as an Elkesaite teacher, and in 274 Origen met a missionary of the sect at Caesarea. These efforts appear, however, to have met with but little success. The Clementine Homilies contain a further development of Elkesaite doctrines, with a stronger predominance of the Christian element. At the time of the emperor Constantius, Epiphanius found Elkesaites to the east of the Dead Sea, in Nabathaea, Ituraea, and Moabitis. He calls them Σαμψαῖοι, which name he explains as ἡλιακοί, and therefore seems to have derived from שֶׁמֶשׁ, "sun." From the circumstance that in Epiphanius Elxai appears among nearly all parties of Jewish Christians, Uhlhorn infers that the  Elkesaites were not so much a separate sect as a school among all sects of Jewish Christians. Rilschl regards them as antipodes of the Montanists, and, as their chief peculiarity, the setting forth of a new theory of remission of sins by a new baptism. Hefele, in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. art. Ebioniten, 3:359, takes the Elkesaites for the highest of four classes of Jewish Essenes, from whom, or, rather, from a member of whom (the Elxai of Epiphanius), a party of Ebionites received about the middle of the second century a gnosis or theosophic secret system, which was fully developed in the Clementine Homilies. See Uhlhorn, in Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 3:771 (which article is the basis of our account); Ritschl, Ueber d. Sekte. der Elkesaiten, in Zeitschriftfur histor. Theologie, 1853; Hefele, in Wetzer u. Welte, KirchenLex. [art. Ebioniten], 3: 358; and [art. Clement 1] 2:590; Schaff, Hist. of the Christ. Church, § 69; Lipsius, Zur Quellen- Kritik des Epiphanius (Vien. 1865); Mosheim, Ch. list. Luk 1:1-80, c. 2, part 2, chapter 5:3, 5-7. (A.J.S.)

## Elkosh[[@Headword:Elkosh]]

             (אֶלְקשׁ, i.e., God is its bow, see Furst, Hebr. Handw. s.v.), the birthplace of the prophet Nahum, hence called "the Elkoshite" (Nah 1:1). Two widely differing Jewish traditions assign as widely different localities to this place. In the time of Jerome it was believed to exist in a small village of Galilee. The ruins of some old buildings were pointed out by his guide as the remains of the ancient Elkosh (Jerome, on Nah 1:1). Cyril of Alexandria (Comm. on Nahum) says that the village of Elkosh was somewhere or other in the country of the Jews. Pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vitis prophetarum, in his Opp. 2:247) places Elkosh on the east of the Jordan, at Bethabara (είς Βηγαβάρ, Chron. Pasch. page 150, Cod. B, has εἰς βηταβαρήν), where he says the prophet died in peace. According to Schwartz (Palestine, page 188), the grave of Nahum is shown at Kefr Tanchum, a village 2½ English miles north of Tiberias. A village of the name El-Kauzah is found about 2 hours S.W. of Tibnin, which seems to correspond with Jerome's notice. Another village of that name, also an ancient site, lies on a high hill rather more than 2 hours S. of Nablous (Van de Velde, Memoir, page 309). But medieval tradition, perhaps for the convenience of the Babylonian Jews, attached the fame of the prophet's burial place to El-Kush, or Alkosh, a village on the east bank of the Tigris, near the monastery of Rabban Hormuzd, and about two miles north of Mosul. It is situated on a stony declivity, has a few gardens, and contains  about 30 papal Nestorian families (Perkins, in the Biblioth. Sacra, July, 1852, page 643). Benjamin of Tudela (page 53, ed. Asher) speaks of the synagogues of Nahum, Obadiah, and Jonah at Asshur, the modern Mosul. R. Petachia (page 35, ed. Benisch) was shown the prophet's grave, at a distance of four parasangs from that of Baruch, the son of Neriah, which was itself distant a mile from the tomb of Ezekiel. It is mentioned in a letter of Masius, quoted by Assemani (Bibl. Orient. 1:525). Jews from the surrounding districts make a pilgrimage to it at certain seasons. The synagogue which is built over the tomb is described by Colonel Shiel, who visited it in his journey through Kurdistan (Journ. Geog. Soc. 8:93). Rich evidently believed in the correctness of the tradition, considering the pilgrimage of the Jews as almost sufficient test (Kurdistan, 1:101). Layard, however, speaks less confidently (Nineveh, 1:197). Gesenius doubts the genuineness of either locality (Thes. Hebrews page 1211 b). The. tradition which assigns Elkosh to Galilee is more in accordance with the internal evidence afforded by the prophecy, which gives no sign of having been written in Assyria (Knobel, Prophet. 2:208; Hitzig, Kl. Prorh. page 212; Edwards, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, August 1848, page 557 sq.). SEE NAHUM.

## Elkoshite[[@Headword:Elkoshite]]

             (Hebrews Elkoshi', אֶלְקשִׁי, the regular patrial form; Sept. Ε᾿λκεσαῖος, Vulg. Elcesaeus), an epithet (Nah 1:1) of the prophet Nahum (q.v.), apparently as an inhabitant of ELKOSH SEE ELKOSH (q.v.).

## Ella, bishop of Siguenza (Segontia)[[@Headword:Ella, bishop of Siguenza (Segontia)]]

             cir. A.D. 680-685. Eilbrigh, abbess of Cluain-Bronaigh (Clonbroney, County Longford), died A.D. 785.

## Ellasar[[@Headword:Ellasar]]

             (Hebrews Ellasar', אֶלָּסָרFurst suggests [Hebrews Handwb. s.v.] that it may be compounder of אֶל= תֶּלand אָסָר=אשׁוּר; Sept. Ε᾿λλασάρ), a territory in Asia, whose king, Arioch, was one of the four who invaded Canaan in the time of Abraham (Gen 14:1; Gen 14:9). The association of this king with those of Elam and Shinar indicates the vicinity of Babylonia and Elymais as the region in which the kingdom should be sought; but nothing further is known of it, unless it be the same as THELASAR mentioned in 2Ki 19:12, the TELASSAR of Isa 37:12. Symmachus and the Vulg. understand Pontus. The Jerusalem Targum renders the name by Telasar. The Assyro-Babylonish name of the king Arioch (q.v.) would seem to point to some province of Persia or Assyria (compare Dan 2:14). Colossians Rawlinson thinks (see Jour. Sac. Lit.  October 1851, page 152 note) that Ellasar is the Hebrew representative of the old Chaldaean town called in the native dialect Larsa or Larancha, and known to the Greeks as Larissa (Λάρισσα) or Larachon (Λαράχων). This suits the connection with Elam and Shinar (Gen 14:1), and the identification is orthographically defensible. Larsa was a town of Lower Babylonia or Chaldaea, situated nearly half way between Ur (now Mugheir) and Erech (Warka), on the left bank of the Euphrates. It is now Senkereh. The inscriptions show it to have been one of the primitive capitals, of earlier date, probably, than Babylon itself; and we may gather from the narrative in Gen 14:1-24, that in the time of Abraham it was the metropolis of a kingdom distinct from that of Shinar, but owning allegiance to the superior monarchy of Elam. That we hear no more of it after this time is owing to its absorption into Babylon, which took place soon afterwards. SEE ABRAHAM.

## Ellendorf, Johann Otto[[@Headword:Ellendorf, Johann Otto]]

             a Roman Catholic writer, was born at Wiedenbruck, in Westphalia, in 1805. In 1826 he was rector at the gymnasium of his native place, and in 1841 was called to Berlin as professor of jurisprudence. He wrote, Der heilige Bernhard von Clairvaux (Essen, 1837): — Die Katholische Kirche Preussens (Rudolstadt, 1837): — Thomas Becket (Essen, 1838): — Die Karolinger (ibid. 1838,1839, 2 volumes): — Die Moral und Politik der Jesuiten (Darmstadt, 1840:Das Primat der romischen Pdpste (ibid. 1841, 1846, 2 volumes): — Ist Petmus in Rom gewesen? (ibid. 1841): — Die Stellung, der spanischen Kirche, etc. (ibid. 1843). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:316 sq. (B.P.)

## Ellenius, abbot of Llancarvan[[@Headword:Ellenius, abbot of Llancarvan]]

             A.D. 570-577

## Eller, Elias[[@Headword:Eller, Elias]]

             chief of a fanatical sect known under the name of the Ellerians, or "Communion of Ronsdorf." He was born in 1690 (according to others, in the beginning of the 18th century). He was the son of a poor peasant in the village of Ronsdorf, in the duchy of Berg, where at that time not only Pietism, but Millenarianism and "Philadelphian" mysticism had numerous adherents. He early went to Elberfeld to find employment in a manufactory, and while there he won the confidence of a rich widow, Bolckhaus, to so high a degree that she married him. Eller at this time had already gained a great influence among the Separatists in Elberfeld, as he was thoroughly acquainted with the writings of all the leading Mystics. Having become rich by his marriage, he soon (1726) organized, together with a Reformed pastor, Schleiermacher, a society of Apocalyptic Millenariars who regularly met in his house, and on meeting and separating greeted each other with a "seraphic" kiss. Among the regular attendants at these meetings was Anna von Buchel, the beautiful daughter of a baker in Elberfeld, who soon astonished the whole society by her ecstasies and visions, and by the wonderful prophecies which she proclaimed while in this condition. She claimed to hold frequent conversations with the Lord, and announced the beginning of the millennium to take place in 1730. The new doctrine found many adherents, and numbered upwards of 50 families; but the relations of Anna with Eller became at the same time so intimate that Eller's wife openly accused the two of illicit intercourse, and declared the prophecies of Anna to be a deliberate fraud. Eller declared his wife to be insane, and had  her locked up, while Anna claimed to have received a revelation that Eller's wife was possessed by an evil spirit, and would soon be carried off by Satan. The whole society, even the sons of Eller's wife from her first marriage, believed this announcement, and the unfortunate woman was consequently subjected to the utmost indignities and tribulations for about six months, when death put an end to her sufferings. Almost immediately after her burial Eller married Anna von Buchel. His society was now deemed sufficiently strong to appear in public. Eller maintained, in union with the prophecies of Professor Horch in Marburg, that in accordance with Rev 3:1; Rev 3:7, the Church of Sardis would cease in 1729, and the Church of Philadelphia begin in 1730.

The revelations and visions of his wife increased rapidly. What she announced as a new revelation was laid down in a writing, which was subsequently communicated to the initiated under the name of the "Hirtentasche" ("The Shepherd's Bag"). The chief points of the new doctrines were, The Bible is the Word of God, but a new revelation has become necessary, and this is laid down in the Hirtentasche. Not only the ancient saints, but the Savior himself, will reappear upon earth. The person of the Father dwelt in Abraham, the person of the Son in Isaac, the person of the Holy Ghost in Sarah, but the fullness of the Deity in Eller. Moses, Elias, David, and Solomon were prototypes both of Christ and of Eller. The children of Anna were not the natural children of Eller, but begotten by God himself. The faithful, whose number had largely increased, were divided into three classes. To the first class belonged those who expressed belief, but were not yet made acquainted with all doctrines and secrets; to the second those who, being initiated, were called in the congregations "Persons of Rank" ("Standespersonen") to the third, the most trustworthy among the initiated, who had reached the temple, and were called "gifts" (Geschenke). The society believed that from Anna the Savior would be born a second time, and there was therefore some dissatisfaction when her first child was a daughter. Her second child, born 1733, was a son, Benjamin, and he was believed by the sect to be the Savior, manifested a second time in the flesh, but he died when only a year old. Eller, in the mean while, had sent out missionaries throughout Germany, Switzerland, and Scandinavia, but the investigations which in 1735 were made in Elberfeld concerning the meetings held by him induced him to depart in 1737, with his family, for Ronsdorf, his native place. Many of his adherents followed him immediately, and fifty new houses arose in Ronsdorf in a short time.

The missionaries sent out by Eller collected large amounts of money for the new church to be built in Ronsdorf, and in 1741  Schleiermacher was called as pastor. Eller himself was elected burgomaster, and soon established a theocratic despotism. His wife Anna died in 1744, in a mysterious manner, and Eller proclaimed that all the supernatural gifts which had been possessed by Anna had been transferred to him. But now Schleiermacher began to lose his faith and even to oppose Eller, who, however, to neutralize the sermons of Schleiermacher, caused one of his most fanatical adherents, Pastor Wulffing, of Solingen, to be called as second pastor. In 1749 Eller married the widow of a rich merchant at Ronsdorf, Bosselmann, who had died under suspicious circumstances; and in the same year he procured the removal of Schleiermacher from his position of first pastor, and the election of Pastor Rudenhaus, of Rattingen, who, since 1738, had been a fanatical adherent of the sect, as his successor. Schleiermacher was, even after his departure from Ronsdorf, persecuted by Eller, who lodged with the government a formal charge of sorcery against him; and so great was still Eller's influence, that Schleiermacher deemed it best to flee to Holland. Eller died on May 16, 1750, and soon after him died also Wulffing. After the death of these two men the sect seems to have soon become extinct. Schleiermacher's innocence was, chiefly owing to the efforts of his friend J.W. Knevel, fully established by the declarations of the theological faculties of Marburg and Herborn, and the Synod of Berg. This fanaticism singularly resembles that of the Buchanites (q.v.). See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 20:606; Knevel, Grauel d. Verwustung an heil. Statte od. d. Geheimnisse der Bosheit d. Ronsdorfer Sekte (Frankf. 1750); Wulffing, Ronsdoffischer Catechismus (Dusseldorf, 1756); Joh. Bolckhaus (step-son of Eller), Ronsdorf's gerechte Sache (Dusseldorf, 1757); Das jubelirende Ronsdorf (compiled by Wulffing, but edited by Bolckhaus, Muhlheim, 1761); Wulffing, Ronsdorf's silberne Trompete (Muhlheim, 1761); Engels, Versuch einer Gesch. d. relig, Schwarmerei im ehemal. Herzogthum Berg (Schwelm, 1826); Hase, Ch. Hist. § 421. The Hirtentasche may be found in the Histoire des Sectes Religieuses. (A.J.S.)

## Eller, Moritz M[[@Headword:Eller, Moritz M]]

             a Jewish preacher, was born at Mannheim in 1801. He studied at Bonn and Heidelberg. From 1834 to 1844 he was teacher at the Maier. Michel-David Free School in Hanover, accepted in the latter year a call as rabbi to Celle, and died January 4, 1848. See Heimbiirger, M.M. Eller nach seinem Leben und Wirken, nebst einigen Vortrdgen des Verewigten (Celle, 1848); Kayserling, Bibliothekjiidischer Kanzedredner, 2:248. (B.P.)

## Ellerians[[@Headword:Ellerians]]

             SEE ELLER.

## Elli[[@Headword:Elli]]

             abbot of Whitton, in the 6th century.

## Ellingwood, John Wallace, D.D[[@Headword:Ellingwood, John Wallace, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Beverly, Massachusetts, May 2, 1782. For several years he pursued the business of a silversmith, relinquishing that occupation in 1810 to enter the Andover Theological Seminary. In 1812 he was ordained over the Church in Bath, Maine, where he labored with great fidelity and success until 1843, when ill-health compelled him to resign his charge. He died at Bath, August 19, 1860. Dr. Ellingwood was a man of great wisdom and prudence, firmness and independence of opinion, benevolence and self-control; he took a deep interest in the great religious and moral enterprises of his day, and held responsible positions on the Boards of his Church. Eight revivals of religion resulted from his labors. Three of his sermons were published in 1851. See Cong. Quarterly, 1860, page 420.

## Elliott, Arthur W[[@Headword:Elliott, Arthur W]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland in 1784; emigrated to Butler County, Ohio, in 1805, and was converted in 1806. In 1818 he  entered the itinerancy, and rapidly rose to eminence and usefulness. He filled many important charges in his Conference until his health failed. He was supernumerary eight years, and superannuated seventeen during his ministry. In 1854 he removed to Paris, Illinois, where he died in January, 1858. Mr. Elliott had a "wonderful power over the multitude, and thousands of souls will call him blessed in eternity." — Minutes of Conferences, 1858, page 296.

## Elliott, Charles, D.D[[@Headword:Elliott, Charles, D.D]]

             See volume 3, page 1042.

## Elliott, Charles, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Elliott, Charles, D.D (2)]]

             a Presbyterian educator, was born at Castleton, Scotland, March 18, 1815. After graduating from Lafayette College in 1840, he spent one year in Princeton Theological Seminary, and then taught two years in an academy at Xenia, Ohio. From 1847-49 he was professor of belles-lettres in the Western University of Pennsylvania at Pittsburg; 1849-63 professor of Greek in Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; 1863-82 professor of biblical literature and exegesis in the Presbyterian Seminary at Chicago, Illinois; thereafter professor of Hebrew in Lafayette College. He died February 14, 1892. He was the author of The Sabbath (1866): — A Treatise on the Inspiration of the Scriptures (1877): — Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch: — and translated Cellerier's Biblical Hermeneutics.

## Elliott, David, DD., LL.D[[@Headword:Elliott, David, DD., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Sherman's Valley, Perry County, Pennsylvania, February 6, 1787. To the age of sixteen he had only the educational advantages of the rural district in which he lived but in 1802 he entered the classical school in Tuscarora Valley, and in the spring of 1804 went to another in the town of Mifflin, where he spent one year. In 1805 he became an assistant of Reverend Matthew Brown, in the academy of Washington, at the same time making preparation to enter the junior class of Dickinson College, where he graduated September 28, 1808. He studied theology with Reverend John Linn, Reverend Dr. Culbertson, of Zanesville, Ohio, and Reverend Joshua Williams, D.D., of Newville, Pennsylvania. He was licensed to preach as a probationer by the Presbytery of Carlisle, September 26, 1811; and February 19, 1812, received a call to settle as pastor of the Church of Mercersburg, where he served until October 29, 1829. His second pastorate was at Washington, lasting until 1836. For a time he was acting president of Washington College and professor of moral philosophy. In 1836 the Assembly called him to take a professorship in the Western Theological Seminary of Pennsylvania. In 1849 he was again solicited to become president of Washington College, but declined. He was often sent as a member to the General Assembly, and. was moderator of the synod in 1831, 1834, and 1838. He died March 18,  1874. Dr. Elliott was successful as a preacher and pastor, a thorough student, successful educator, wise in the management of all affairs in the assembly, equal to the nost trying crisis, a man greatly loved and honored by all. See Brownson, Memorial.

## Elliott, James H., D.D[[@Headword:Elliott, James H., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, brother of bishop Elliott of Georgia, was born in Charleston, S.C., in 1819; ordained deacon in 1849; ministered successively at Beaufort, Grahamville, St. Michael's, Charleston, Madison, Georgia, and St. Paul's, Charleston; was editor of the Christian Witness, Boston, from 1868 to 1870; and died at Charleston, June 11, 1877. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1878, page 168.

## Elliott, Jared Leigh, D.D[[@Headword:Elliott, Jared Leigh, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, D.C., June 24, 1807. Most of his boyhood was spent as a sailor. He afterwards studied in the academy at Princeton, N.J.; graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1831; spent two years at Auburn Theological Seminary, N.Y.; then one year in Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed by the Presbytery of New York, April 13, 1834; and was ordained an evangelist by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, October 26, 1835. His successive fields of labor were, as stated supply at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., 1834; of the Mariners' Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1835; of the first and second churches of Washington, and of the Church at Frederick, Maryland, 1836-39; chaplain, in the U.S. Navy, 1849; army, 1861-81. He made many long sea voyages, and was attached to the South Arctic Exploring Expedition in 1840. Dr. Elliott died at Washington, D.C., April 16, 1881. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sen. 1882.

## Elliott, John, D.D[[@Headword:Elliott, John, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Killingworth, Connecticut, August 24, 1768, graduated at Yale College 1786, entered the ministry 1791, and was installed pastor in East Guilford November 2, 1791, in which place he remained until the close of his life, December 17, 1824. Dr. Elliott was made fellow of Yale College 1812, and one of the prudential committee 1816. He published An Oration on the Death of Thomas Lewis (1804), and a few sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 2:321.

## Elliott, Miss Charlotte[[@Headword:Elliott, Miss Charlotte]]

             an English poetess, sister of the author of Horae Apocalypticae, was born in 1789, and died at Brighton, September 22, 1871. She wrote several volumes of religious poems, of which a number may be found in recent hymnals, especially "Just as I am, without one plea," which was composed after she had become a permanent invalid. Her sister-in-law, Mrs. Julia Anne Elliott, who died in 1841, also contributed several hymns to one of her earliest publications.

## Elliott, Stephen[[@Headword:Elliott, Stephen]]

             D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Georgia, was born in Beaufort, South Carolina, August 31, 1806. At sixteen he entered the sophomore class at Harvard University, but returned during the junior year to South Carolina College, Columbia, where he graduated A.B. in 1825. In 1827 he engaged in the practice of law. "In 1832, under the pressure of a newly-awakened devotion to the cause of Christ, he abandoned his profession, and became a candidate for holy orders. He was ordained by bishop Bowen in 1835, served as deacon one month in the church at Wilton, and was then elected professor of sacred literature and the evidences of Christianity in the South Carolina College. Five years later he was chosen first bishop of Georgia. He was consecrated in February 1841, removed to Savannah, and became rector of St. John's Church. In 1844 he became provisional bishop of Florida. In 1845 he removed to Montpellier, to direct in person the work of female education. Here he spent about seven years of his life, and, like many other bishops, expended his whole fortune in the noble effort. In 1853 he removed to Savannah, and took charge of Christ Church in that city as rector. This office he continued to hold, with the exception of one brief interval, till his death. His numerous home duties did not hinder his visitation of his diocese at least once each year, often much more frequently. But two hours before his decease he had  returned, in cheerfulness and apparent health, from one of those long episcopal journeys. Instantly, not to him 'suddenly,' in the midst of his labors, and at the height of his power," he died at his home in Savannah December 21, 1866. — Amer. Quart. Church Review, April 1867, and April 1868.

## Ellis, Clement[[@Headword:Ellis, Clement]]

             an English divine, was born in 1630, near Penrith, in Cumberland, and was educated at Oxford. In 1693 he was appointed a prebendary of Southwell. He died in 1700. He published a number of sermons and theological treatises (1661-1700), and some were issued after his death: Discourse on the Parable, with an Account of his Life and Writings (1704, 8vo): — The Scripture Catechist. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ellis, Reuben[[@Headword:Ellis, Reuben]]

             an early Methodist Episcopal minister. The dates of his early life are wanting. He was a native of North Carolina, entered the itinerancy in 1777, and died in Baltimore, February 1796. "He was a man of very sure and solid parts, weighty and powerful in preaching, and full of simplicity and godly sincerity." — Minutes of Conferences, 1:67; Stevens, History of Methodist Episcopal Church, page 39 et al.

## Ellis, Robert Fulton[[@Headword:Ellis, Robert Fulton]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Topsham, Maine, October 16, 1809; studied at Bowdoin College, and at Newton Theological Institution, where he graduated in 1838. He was pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Springfield, Mass., from 1838 to 1845. He then spent two and a half years in the State of Missouri, preaching, establishing Sunday-schools, and furnishing them with libraries. In 1847 he became pastor of the First Baptist Church of Alton, Illinois, but, becoming associate editor of the Western Watchman, published at St. Louis, Missouri, he again took an itinerant agency in that state, and, while thus employed, he died, July 24, 1854. — Sprague, Annals, 6:827.

## Ellis, William[[@Headword:Ellis, William]]

             an English Congregationalist minister, was born at Wisbeach, August 29, 1794. Being converted when quite young, he offered his services to the London Missionary Society; was educated for mission work at Gosport, and, in January 1816, was sent to Tahiti, the largest of the Society Islands. In 1822 he went to the Sandwich Islands, and greatly assisted in establishing Christianity there, preaching frequently in Hawaiian; he assisted in the arrangement of the alphabet; wrote the first hymns; baptized the first convert, the queen-mother, Keo-puo-lani; and shortly afterwards preached her funeral sermon. In 1824 his wife's health gave way and compelled their return to England. He went by way of Boston, and. spent three months in the northern states, rendering great service to the American Foreign Mission Board by telling the story of the Hawaii mission. For six years after his arrival in England, Mr. Ellis was agent of the London Missionary Society among the county auxiliaries. In 1841 broken health compelled him to resign official life, and he settled at Hoddesdon to the quiet duties of a country pastor. In 1862 he went to Madagascar, reorganized the mission which had been nearly ruined by the persecutions of the late queen, saw the native church and its agencies resettled on a healthy system, the schools reopened and the press at work, and in 1865 returned to Hoddesdon, where he died, July 9, 1872. Mr. Ellis published, Missionary Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii, or Owhyhee (Lond. 1826, 8vo; 4th ed. 1827, 8vo): — Polynesian Researches (1829, 2 volumes, 8vo; last ed. 1853, 4 volumes, 12mo): — Vindication of the South Sea Missions (1831, 8vo): — History of Madagascar (1832, 2 volumes, 8vo): — History of the London Missionary Society (1844, 8vo), and other valuable works. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1873, page 325; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Life, by his son (Lond. 1873).

## Elloc[[@Headword:Elloc]]

             an Irish saint of Killmalloch, is commemorated July 13 (or 24).

## Ellora[[@Headword:Ellora]]

             a decayed town in the dominions of the Nizam, not far from the city of Dowlatabad, in lat. 200 2 degrees N., and long. 750 13 degrees E., which are in this respect the most noted even in India. It is celebrated for its wonderful rock-cut temples. Their number has not been precisely ascertained, but Erskine reckoned 19 large ones, partly of Hindu and partly of Buddhist origin. Some are cave-temples proper — i.e., chambers cult out in the interior of the rock — but others are vast buildings hewn out of the solid granite of the hills, having an exterior as well as an interior architecture, and being, in fact, magnificent monoliths. In executing the  latter, the process was first to sink a great quadrangular trench or pit, leaving the central mass standing, and then to hew and excavate this mass into a temple. The most beautiful of these objects is the Hindu temple Kailasa. At its entrance the traveler passes into an antechamber 138 feet wide by 88 deep, adorned by numerous rows of pillars. Thence he proceeds along a colonnade over a bridge into a great rectangular court, which is 247 feet in length and 150 broad, in the center of which stands the temple itself, a vast mass of rock richly hewn and carved. It is supported by four rows of pilasters, with colossal elephants beneath, and seems suspended in the air. The interior is about 103 feet long, 56 broad, and 17 feet high, but the entire exterior forms a pyramid 100 feet high, and is overlaid with sculpture. In the great court are numerous ponds, obelisks, colonnades, sphinxes, and on the walls thousands of mythological figures of all kinds, from ten to twelve feet in height. Of the other temples, those of Indra and Dumarheyna are little inferior to that of Kailasa. Regarding their antiquity and religious significance, authorities are not agreed; but at all events they must be subsequent to the epic poems Ramoyama or Mahabharata, because they contain representations taken from these poems, and also to the cave-temples at Elephanta, because they exhibit a richer and more advanced style of architecture.

## Ellparan[[@Headword:Ellparan]]

             [many Ellpa'ran] (Hebrew Eyl Paran, אֵיל פָּארָן, oak of Paran; Sept. ἡ τερέβινθός [v.r. τερέμιμθος] τῆς Φαράν, Vulg. campestria Pharan), a spot (hounding on the south the territory of the Rephaimn smitten by Chedorlaomer) on the edge of the wilderness bordering the territory of the Horites or Idumaea, probably marked by a noted tree (Gen 14:6). SEE OAK; SEE PARAN. An ingenious writer in the Jour. of Sac. Lit. (October 1851, page 153 note) argues, from the rendering of the Sept., for the identity of El-paran with Elath, but inconclusively.

## Elltin[[@Headword:Elltin]]

             (1) An Irish saint of Shancoe, County. Sligo, commemorated January 11.

(2) A confessor of Kinsale, commemorated December 11.

## Ellwood, Thomas[[@Headword:Ellwood, Thomas]]

             a Quaker writer of some reputation, was born at Crowell, near Thame, in Oxfordshire, in August, 1639, where he was educated. He united with the Friends in 1658; became a preacher, and died March 1, 1713. The following are some of his publications: Forgery no Christianity (1674, 12mo): — The Foundation of Tithes Shaken (1682, 1720, 8vo; Wickham, 1690, 4to): — Sacred History (1705-09). He was an intimate friend of Milton. After perusing the MS. of Paradise Lost, he returned it to the author with the remark, "Thou hast said much here of Paradise lost, but what hast thou to say of Paradise found." To this timely hint the world is indebted for Paradise Regained. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ellys Anthony[[@Headword:Ellys Anthony]]

             bishop of St. David's, was born in 1693. He was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he took his master's degree in 1716. In 1724 he was presented to the vicarage of St. Olave, Jewry, and to the rectory of St. Martin's, Ironmonger's Lane. In 1725 he obtained a prebend of Gloucester, and in 1728 was created D.D. at Cambridge. He was next promoted to the bishopric of St. David's, and died at Gloucester in 1761. His writings are as follows: 1. A Plea for the Sacramental Text: — 2. Remarks on Hume's Essay concerning Miracles, and sermons preached on public occasions (4to): — 3. Tracts on the Liberty, Spiritual and Temporal, of Protestants in England (1767, 4to): — 4. Tracts on the Liberty, Spiritual and Temporal, of Subjects in England: the two last-mentioned are collections of tracts, and form one great and elaborate work, which was the principal object of the bishop's life. They were published posthumously. — Hook, Ecclesiastes Biography, volume 4; Kippis, Biographia Britannica, 5:581.

## Elm[[@Headword:Elm]]

             stands in the Authorized Version as the translation of אֵלָה, elah', in Hos 4:13; elsewhere rendered " OAK” SEE OAK (q.v.).

## Elmacin (or Elmakyn), George[[@Headword:Elmacin (or Elmakyn), George]]

             an Egyptian historian, known in the East by the name of Ibn-Amid, was born in 1223. He was a Christian, and occupied the place of ketib, or, secretary, at the court of the sultans of Egypt, an office usually filled by Christians. In 1238 he succeeded his father, Yaser el-Amid, who had held the office of secretary to the council of war under the sultans of Egypt for forty-five years. Elmacin died at Damascus in 1273. He wrote a History of the Saracens, consisting of annals which extend from the time of Mohammed to the year 1117. It is principally occupied with the affairs of the Saracen empire, but contains some passages relating to the eastern Christians. It was published, in Arabic and Latin, at Leyden, in 1625. Other editions have also appeared. See Encyclop. Brit. 9th ed. s.v.

## Elmendorf, Anthony, D.D[[@Headword:Elmendorf, Anthony, D.D]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Ulster County, N.Y., in 1813; graduated from Rutgers College in 1836, and from the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1839. The first eight years of his ministry were passed in quiet country churches (Hurley, N.Y., 1840, Hyde Park, 1843). He then removed to Brooklyn, and after three years of earnest work in the new Church on Bedford Avenue (1848-51), started in his own house the Sunday-school and congregation of the North Reformed Church, Brooklyn, which is the monument of his courageous, indefatigable, and successful labors. Worn out with toil and feeble health, he resigned his charge but a few months before his death, which occurred in 1866. He was  a careful sermonizer, a diligent student, and an eloquent preacher. His pastoral efficiency was wonderful. (W.J.R.T.)

## Elmenhorst, Heinrich[[@Headword:Elmenhorst, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born October 19, 1632, at Parchim, in Mecklenburg, studied at Leipsic and Wittenberg, and accepted a call in 1660 to Hamburg, where he died May 21, 1704. He is the author of Geistliche Lieder (Hamburg, 1681): — Geistreiche Lieder (ibid. 1700). See Molleri, Cimbria Literata (Copenh., 1744), 2:183 sq.; Schroder, Lexikon der Hamburgischen Schritsteller, volume 2; Wezel, Hymnopoetica, 4:103 sq.; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:365 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Elmerus (or Ermelius)[[@Headword:Elmerus (or Ermelius)]]

             patron saint of a church at Molhanium, diocese of Liege, is assigned to the 7th or 8th century, and commemorated August 28.

## Elmo, Saint[[@Headword:Elmo, Saint]]

             SEE ERASMUS.

## Elmodam[[@Headword:Elmodam]]

             (Ε᾿λμωδάμ; perhaps for אִלְמוֹדָד, Almodad), son of Er and father of Cosam; one of the ancestors of Christ, in the private line of David. and great-grandfather of Maamfiah, the great-grandfather of Salathiel (Luk 3:28). B.C. cir. 700. He is not mentioned in the Old Test.

## Elmsley, Peter, D.D[[@Headword:Elmsley, Peter, D.D]]

             an English scholar and divine, was born in 1773, and educated at Westminster School and at Merton College, Oxford. In 1798 he was presented to Little Horkesley, a small chapelry in Essex, but becoming master of a fortune by the death of an uncle, he devoted himself to literary studies, and particularly to Greek literature. He lived for a while in Edinburgh, where he was intimately associated with the founders of the Edinburgh Review, and contributed to that periodical several articles. He also edited with consummate ability several classical works. In 1816 he made a voyage to Italy in search of manuscripts, and passed the winter of 1818 in researches in the Laurentian library at Florence. The next year he was appointed to assist sir Humphry Davy in the unavailing task of trying to decipher some of the papyri found at Herculaneum. He died March 8, 1825. Dr. Emsley was one of the most accomplished Greek scholars of his day. See The New Amer. Cyclop. 7:111; (Lond.) Annual Register, 1825, page 232; Hart, English Literature, page 439.

## Elnaam[[@Headword:Elnaam]]

             [many El'naan] (Hebrews Elna'am, אֶלְנ — ם [in pause םןאֶלְנִ ם; God is his delight; Sept. Ε᾿λναάμ v.r. Ε᾿λλαάμ, Vulgate Elnaem) father of Jeribai and Joshaviah, two of David's distinguished warriors (1Ch 11:46). B.C. 1044. In the Sept. the second warrior is said to be the son of the first, and Elnaam is given as himself a member of the guard.

## Elnathan[[@Headword:Elnathan]]

             [some El'nathan] (Hebrews Enlzathan', אֶלְנָתָן, whom God has given; compare John, Theodore, Diodati), the name of four leading men.  1. An inhabitant of Jerusalem, father of Nehushta, the mother of king Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:8. Sept. Ε᾿λνασθάν v.r. Ε᾿λλανασθάν). B.C. ante 598. He was perhaps the same with the son of Achbor, sent by Jehoiakim to bring the prophet Urijah out of Egypt (Jer 26:22, Sept. Ε᾿λδαθάν), and in whose presence the roll of Jeremiah was read, for the preservation of which he interceded with the king (Jer 36:12; Jer 36:25, Sept. Ναθάν v.r. Ι᾿ωναθάν). B.C. 605.

2, 3, 4, (Sept. Ε᾿λναθάμ, Ναθάν, and Ε᾿λναθάν respectively). Three of the Israelites, of established prudence and integrity, sent by Ezra to invite the priests and Levites to accompany him to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16). B.C. 459.

## Eloaeus[[@Headword:Eloaeus]]

             (or AEloaeus), one of the seven ruling spirits in the Ophite (q.v.) system.

## Elodia[[@Headword:Elodia]]

             a virgin martyr with Nunilo at Osca (Huesca); commemorated October 22.

## Elohim[[@Headword:Elohim]]

             is the Hebrews plural (Elohim', אלֵהִים), of which the sing. form, אלֵוֹהִּ, Elo'dh, is also employed to designate in general any deity, but likewise the true God. The word is derived, according to Gesenius (Thes. Hebrews page 94), from an obsolete root, אָלָה, alah', to revere; but is better referred by First (Hebrews Handw. page 90) to the kindred אֵל[see EL-], the name of God as mighty (from the extensive root אָלָהor אוּל, to be firm); and has its equivalent in the Arabic Allah, i.e., God. The plur. Elohim is sometimes used in its ordinary sense of gods, whether true or false (e.g. of the Egyptians, Exo 12:12; Exo 35:2; Exo 35:4; Deu 20:18; Deu 32:17; including Jehovah, Psa 86:8; Exo 18:11; Exo 22:19; or distinctively of actual deity, Isa 44:6; Isa 45:5; Isa 45:14; Isa 45:21; Isa 46:9; 1Ch 13:9); once of kings (Psa 82:1; Psa 82:6); but Gesenius thinks not of angels (Psa 8:6; Psa 91:7; Psa 138:1), nor judges (Exo 21:6; Exo 22:7-8). But it is especially spoken of one true God, i.e., Jehovah, and in this sense it is always construed as a sing., especially when it has the article prefixed (הָאלֵהִים). SEE SACK, Commentatt. theol. hist. (Bonn, 1821), 1; Reinhard, De notione Dei, etc. (Vitemb. 1792); Edzard, Utrum "Elohim" a Canaanaeis orig. ducet (ib. 1696); Michaelis, Num Deus dicatur אלֵהִיםinito faedere (ib. 1723); Sennert, Exercitt. philol. (ib. 1678). SEE GOD.

## Elohist[[@Headword:Elohist]]

             the name technically given in theology and sacred criticism to the assumed authors of those parts of the Pentateuch (q.v.) in which the Deity is styled ELOHIM SEE ELOHIM rather than JEHOVAH SEE JEHOVAH (q.v.).

## Eloi[[@Headword:Eloi]]

             (έλωϊv for Aramoean אלֵהִי, my God), an exclamation quoted thus by our Savior (Mar 15:34) on the cross from Psa 22:2 (where the Sept. has ὁθεὀς μου), for the Heb. אֵלִי, which is more literally Graecized ἠλί, ELI, by Mat 26:46.

## Eloi, Saint[[@Headword:Eloi, Saint]]

             SEE ELIGIUS.

## Elon[[@Headword:Elon]]

             a name occurring in two forms in the Hebrews (but both having the primitive sense of oak [q.v.]), as that of a place, and also of three men.

1. (Hebrews Eylon', אֵילון; Sept. Ε᾿λών.) A city of Dan, mentioned between Jethlah and Timnath (Jos 19:43); probably the same elsewhere (1Ki 4:9) more fully called ELON-BETH-HANAN SEE ELON-BETH-HANAN (q.v.).

2. (Hebrews Eylon', אֵילןֹand אֵילוֹן; Sept. ῾Ελών and Αἰλὸμ v.r. Ε᾿λώμ.) A Hittite, father of Bashemath (Gen 26:34) or Adah (Gen 36:3), the first wife of Esau (q.v.). B.C. ante 1963.

3. (Hebrews Elon', אֵלוֹן; Sept. Α᾿λλών and Α᾿λλῶν v.r. Α᾿ορών.) The second of the three sons of Zebulon (Gen 46:14), and father of the family of the Elonites (Num 26:26). B.C. 1856.

4. (Hebrews Eylon', אֵילוֹן; Sept. Ε᾿λών, Josephus ᾿Ηλών, Vulg. Ahialon.) A native of the tribe of Zebulon (perhaps a descendant of the preceding), and the 11th of the Hebrew judges for ten years (Jdg 12:11-12), B.C. 1243-34; which are simply noted as a period of tranquility (comp. Josephus, Ant. 5:7, 14). SEE JUDGES.

## Elon (2)[[@Headword:Elon (2)]]

             SEE OAK.

## Elon (3)[[@Headword:Elon (3)]]

             Lieut. Conder (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336) proposes to identify this site with that of Beit Ello, a village marked on the Ordnance Map (sheet 14) at eleven miles northeast of Jimzu (Gimzo), in a plain, without any traces of antiquity; and Tristram (Bible Places, page 51) concurs in this location, which, however, is without the boundaries of Dan. But Elon-beth-hanan, which is probably the same place, the former identifies much more plausibly with Beit Andn, which is laid down at two and a quarter miles south of Beit-ur el-Foka (Upper Bethhoron), and described (Memoirs to the Survey, 3:16) as "a small village on the top of a flat ridge; near the main road to the west are the remains of a khan, with water, and about a mile to the east is- a spring. It was a fief of the Holy Sepulchre in the 12th century."

## Elon -beth -hanan[[@Headword:Elon -beth -hanan]]

             [some E'lon-beth'hanan] (Hebrews Eylon' beyth-Chanan', כֵּיתאּתָנָן אֵילוֹןoak of Beth-hanan, i.e., of the house of Hanan; Sept. Ε᾿λών [v.r. ] Αἰαλὼμ] ἕως Βηθανάν, Vulg. Elon et in Bethhanan), one of the Danite cities in the commissary district of Ben-Dekar, the third of Solomon's purveyors (1Ki 4:9). It is simply called ELON SEE ELON in  Jos 19:43, being probably a site marked from early times by a particular tree [SEE OAK] of traditional fame. For "Beth-hanan" some Hebrew MSS. have "Benhanan," and some "and Beth-hanan;" the latter is followed by the Vulgate. To judge from the order of the list in Joshua, its situation must have been on the border of Dan, between Ajalon and Ekron. Thenius suggests (Exeg. Handb. in loc.) that Beth-hanan can be no other than the village Beit-Hunun, in the rich plain near Gaza (Robinson, Researches, 2:371); but this is entirely out of the region in question. Possibly it may be the modern Beit-Susin, a “small village, looking old and miserable," on a ridge near an ancient well, about half way between the sites of Nicopolis and Zorah (Robinson, Later Researches, page 152).

## Elonite[[@Headword:Elonite]]

             (Hebrews with the art. and collectively, ηαΕλονῖ, ψΙνλοαφη; Sept. ὸ Α᾿λλωνίι), the patronymic designation (Num 26:26) of the descendants of ELON SEE ELON (q.v.), the son of Zebulon.

## Eloquence Of The Pulpit[[@Headword:Eloquence Of The Pulpit]]

             SEE HOMILETICS.

## Eloquius[[@Headword:Eloquius]]

             abbot of Lagny, commemorated as a saint December 3, was a Hibernian or Scot who accompanied St. Fursev to Belgium as a missionary about the middle of the 7th century.

## Eloth[[@Headword:Eloth]]

             (Hebrews Eyloth', אֵילוֹת, trees; Sept. Αἰλάθ v.r. in Chron. Α᾿ἰλάμ), another (plur.) form (1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:17; 2Ch 26:2) of the name of the city ELATH SEE ELATH (q.v.).

## Elotherius (or Eleutherius)[[@Headword:Elotherius (or Eleutherius)]]

             twenty-seventh bishop of Avignon, A.D. 475.

## Elpaal[[@Headword:Elpaal]]

             [many El'paal] (Hebrews Elpa'al, אֶלְפִּ ל, in pause אֶלְפָּ ל, God is his wages; Sept. Α᾿λφαάλ and Ε᾿λφαάλ), the second named of the two sons of Shaharaim (a descendant of Benjamin residing in the region of Moab) by his wife Hushim, and progenitor of a numerous posterity (1Ch 8:11-12; 1Ch 8:18). B.C. cir. 1618. The Bene-Elpaal appear to have lived in the neighborhood of Lydda (Lod), and on the outposts of the Benjamite hills as far as Ajalon (8:12-18), near the Danite frontier.

## Elpalet[[@Headword:Elpalet]]

             [many El'palet] (Heb. Elpe'let, אֶלְפֶּלֶט, in pause Elpa'let, אֶלְפָּלֶט; Sept. ]Ελιφαλέτ v.r. Ε᾿λιφαλήθ, Vulg. Eliphalet), a contracted form (1Ch 4:5) of the name ELIPHALET SEE ELIPHALET (q.v.).

## Elpedephorus[[@Headword:Elpedephorus]]

             bishop of Cuiculis or Cuizis in Numidia, A.D. 349.

## Elpenipsa[[@Headword:Elpenipsa]]

             one of the forty-eight martyrs of Lyons (q.v.).

## Elphegus[[@Headword:Elphegus]]

             SEE ALPHAGE.

## Elphinston, William[[@Headword:Elphinston, William]]

             was born at Glasgow in 1431, studied in the university of that city, and obtained the rectory of Kirkmichael. He subsequently was professor of civil and canon law at Paris and Orleans for nine years, and on his return (1471) was appointed rector of the University of Glasgow. He afterwards became successively member of Parliament and of the Privy Council, ambassador of James III to France, and bishop of Ross, from whence he was transferred to Aberdeen in 1484. As bishop of Aberdeen he was twice sent on a diplomatic mission to England. In 1488 he was for several months lord chancellor of the kingdom, and subsequently, on returning from an embassy to Germany, he was appointed to the office of lord privy seal. He secured the foundation of the University at Aberdeen, for which pope Alexander VI gave a bull dated February 10, 1494. King's College was in consequence erected in 1506, and Elphinston contributed 10,000 pounds Scots towards it, and the building of a bridge over the Dee. He died October 25th, 1514, while negotiations were pending with the court of Rome for his elevation to the primacy of St. Andrew's. He wrote a book of canons, the lives of some Scottish saints, and a history of Scotland, which is preserved among Fairfax's MSS. in the Bodleian Library. — Hook,  Ecclesiastes Biography, volume 4; Oudin, De Script. Ecclesiastes 3:2670.

## Elpidiphorus[[@Headword:Elpidiphorus]]

             and companions, martys in Persia, A.D. 320; commemorated November 2.

## Elpidius[[@Headword:Elpidius]]

             (1) Bishop and martyr in Cherson under Diocletian, commemorated March 8.

(2) Bishop of Comana in Cappadocia, A.D. 325.

(3) Bishop of Palestine, A.D. 347.

(4) Bishop of Satala in Armenia, deposed A.D. 360.

(5) Bishop of a maritime town in the East, A.D. 375, excommunicated by Eustathius.

(6) Bishop of Dionysia in Bostra, A.D. 381.

(7) Bishop of Laodicea in Syria, deposed A.D. 404 for attachment to the cause of Chrysostom, but restored in 414.

(8) Bishop of Lyons, cir. A.D. 424.

(9) Two bishops of Thermae in Galatia, one A.D. 451, the other A.D. 692.

(10) Saint, first of the four recorded bishops of Atella in Campania, cir. A.D. 400.

(11) A bishop who, with eleven companions, is commemorated September 1.

(12) Bishop of Damietta, who fled to Constantinople, A.D. 487, to escape the Eutychians.

(13) Bishop of Volterra, A.D. 501.

(14) Bishop of Ancyra in-the early part of the 6th century.

(15) One of four brothers, all Spanish bishops in the first half of the 6th century.

(16) Bishop of Thebee in Thessaly, A.D. 531.

(17) Bishop of Catania, cir. A.D. 580.

(18) A bishop, probably of some eastern see, censured by Gregory the Great, A.D. 597.

(19) Bishop of Tarazona (Turiasso), A.D. 633-638.

(20) Bishop of Astorga, A.D. 654.

(21) Patron saint of the town of St. Elpidia in Pisenum, said by some to have been a Cappadocian by birth, and to have died A.D. 393.

(22) Abbot of the monastery founded by Timotheus in Cappadocia, where he died before A.D. 420.

(23) Archimandrite of Constantinople, A.D. 448.

(24) Surnamed Rusticus, a deacon of Lyons, a skilful physician, and a friend of Ennodius, in the time of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths; the author of somepoems'still extant (see Migne, Patr. Lat. 62:545).

(25) Martyr under Julian with several others, commemorated November 16.

## Elpidophorus[[@Headword:Elpidophorus]]

             (1) An apostate during the persecution by the Vandal king Hunneric, A.D. 484.

(2) Bishop of Anastasiopolis in Caria, A.D. 553.

## Elpis[[@Headword:Elpis]]

             (Ε᾿λπίς, hope); one of the wives of Herod the Great, who had by her and another wife Phedra two daughters, Roxana and Salome (Josephus, Ant. 17:1, 3; War, 1:28, 4).

## Elpis (2)[[@Headword:Elpis (2)]]

             (hope), one of the aeons in the system of Valentinus (q.v.).

## Elpis (3)[[@Headword:Elpis (3)]]

             a (mythical) martyr, daughter of Sophia;. commemorated with her sisters, Pistis and Agape, September 17.

## Elrington The Right Rev. Thomas[[@Headword:Elrington The Right Rev. Thomas]]

             lord bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, obtained a scholarship in the University of Dublin in 1778, and in 1781 was elected fellow. In 1794 he was appointed Donellan lecturer all his alma mater; in 1795, professor of mathematics, and in 1806, rector of Ardtree, in the county of Tyrone. In 1811 he was raised to the highest literary rank in Ireland by appointment as provost of Trinity College. This position he held with high credit to himself until 1820, when he was consecrated bishop of Limerick. In 1822 he was transferred to the see of Leighlin and Ferns, He died in 1835. Besides editing several of the classics, he published his lectures delivered while Donellan lecturer: "The proof of Christianity derived from the miracles recorded in the New Testament," under the title, Sermons preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, etc. (Dublin, 1796, 8vo): — Reflections on the Appointment of Dr. Milner as the Political Agent of the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland (1809, 8vo): — The Clergy of the Church of England truly ordained (1809, 8vo), and a number of other polemical writings. — Annual Biography and Obituary, 20 (1836); Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, pages 1084-5.

## Elsner Jacob, D.D.[[@Headword:Elsner Jacob, D.D.]]

             was born at Saalfeld, Prussia, in March, 1692. He studied at the University of Konigsberg, and in 1715 became "corrector" of the Reformed school in that city. Two years later he visited Utrecht and Leyden. In 1720 he was appointed professor of theology and philology at Bingen; in 1722, rector and first professor of the Joachimsthal Gymnasium at Berlin. Subsequently he became pastor at one of the Berlin churches. From 1742 to 1744 he was director of the class of belles-lettres at the Royal Society. He died Oct. 8,1750. His principal works are: Observationes sacrce in novi foederis libros (Traj. 17201728, 2 volumes 8vo): — Comm. sacro-philologicus in evang. Matthei (Zwollse, 1767-69, 2 volumes 4to): — Commentarius in  evang. Marci (Traj. 1733, 4to). —Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica; Doering, die gelehrten Theolog. Dcutschlands, 1:366; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 15:919.

## Elstob, William[[@Headword:Elstob, William]]

             an English clergyman and antiquary, was born at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, January 1, 1673, and was educated at Eton and Catharine Hall, Cambridge. In 1696 he became a fellow of University College. In 1792 he was appointed rector of the united parishes of St. Swithin and St. Mary Bothan, London. In 1703 he published an edition of Ascham's Latin letters. He died  in 1714. The following are some of his. publications: An Essay on the Great Affinity and Mutual Agreement between the Two Professions of Law, and Divinity (Lond. 8vo): — Sermons (1704, 4to): — A Translation into Latin of the Saxon Homily of Lupus, with Notes by Dr. Hickes (1701).

## Elswich, Johann Hermann[[@Headword:Elswich, Johann Hermann]]

             a Lutheran divine,. was born at Rendsburg, in Holstein, June 19,1684, and was educated at Lubeck, Rostock, Leipsic, Jena, and Wurtemberg, at which last university he took his master's degree. In 1717 he was invited to become pastorof the Church of Sts. Cosmo and Damian, at Stade. Hedied there, June 10, 1721. For a list of some of his works, see Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

## Eltekeh[[@Headword:Eltekeh]]

             [some Elte'keh] (Hebrews Eltekeh', אֶלתְּקֵהִ, God is its fear, i.e., object of awe; but Elteke', אֶלְתְּקֵא in Jos 21:23; Sept. Ε᾿λθεκώ v.r. Α᾿λθακά and ή Ε᾿λκωθαίυ, Vulg. Elthece and Eltheco), a city in the tribe of Dan, apparently near the border, and mentioned between Ekron and Gibbethon (Jos 19:44) With its "suburbs" it was assigned as a city of refuge and Levitical city to the Kohathites (Jos 21:23); but it is omitted in the parallel list (1Ch 6:1-81). The site is possibly now represented by El-Mansurah (“the victorious"), "a miserable little village" near a copious spring, in the plain between Ramleh and Akir (Robinson, Researches, 3:21). Schwarz (Palest. page 141) confounds Eltekeh with Eltekon, and locates both at a village which he calls "Althini, not far from Beilin (Baalath)."

## Eltekeh (2)[[@Headword:Eltekeh (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336; see Quar. Statement of "Palest. Explor. Fund," January 1881, page 51) that this is the present Beit Likia, which is laid down on the Ordinance Mapone and three quarter miles south-west of Beit-ur elTahta (Lower Bethhoron), and described in the Memoirs to the Survey (3:16) as "a small village on a main road at the foot of the hills, supplied by cisterns; with ancient foundations among the houses;" and in this identification Tristram concurs (Bible Places, page 51).

## Eltekon[[@Headword:Eltekon]]

             [some Elte'kon] (Hebrews Eltekon' אֶלְתֶּקן, God is its foundation; Sept. Ε᾿λθεκούν v.r. Ε᾿λθεκεν and Θέκουμ, Vulg. Eltecon), a city of Judah, in the mountain-district, mentioned last in order after Maarath and Beth- Anoth (Jos 15:59), being in the group north of Hebron (Keil, Comment. in loc.). SEE JUDAH. It is perhaps identical in site with the present Deit Sahur el-Atikah, a little S.E. of Jerusalem. SEE ELTEKEH. It is perhaps the Altaqu mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions. SEE HEZEKIAH.

## Eltinge, Wilhelmus, D.D[[@Headword:Eltinge, Wilhelmus, D.D]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born near Kingston, N.Y., in 1778, graduated at Princeton College in 1796, and pursued theological studies with Dr. Theodorick Romevn at Schenectady, N.Y. He was licensed in 1798, and passed his. long ministry at Paramus, N.J. From 1799 to 1811 he likewise served the adjoining church of Saddle River, and from 1816 to 1833 the First Church of Totown, now Paterson. He resigned the latter in 1850, and died in 1851. Dr. Eltinge was a man of respectable attainments, and of great firmness and decision. He was a very prominent actor in the ecclesiastical troubles in. Bergen County which led to the secession in 1822, and the organization of the "True Reformed Dutch Church," of which he was a strong and life-long opponent. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America, page 255. (W.J.R.T.)

## Eltolad[[@Headword:Eltolad]]

             [many Et'tolad] (Hebrews Eltolad', אֶלְתּוֹלִד, perhaps meaning God is its race or posterity; but, according to Furst [Hebr. Handw. s.v.], whose God is Mylitta, the Phoenician deity, SEE MOLADAH; Sept. Ε᾿λθωδάδ and Ε᾿λθωλάθ v.r. Ε᾿ρβωυδάδ and Ε᾿ρθουλά; Vulg. Eltholad), a city in the south of Judah, mentioned between Azem and Chesil (Jos 15:29), but afterwards assigned to Simeon, and mentioned between Azem and Bethul (Jos 19:4). It remained in possession of the latter tribe in the time of David (1Ch 4:29, where it is called simply TOLAD). It  is possibly the ruined site Tell-Melaha, observed by Van de Velde (Memoir, page 113) along the N. branch of wady Sheriah, which empties into the Mediterranean a little S. of Gaza.

## Elton, Romeo, D.D[[@Headword:Elton, Romeo, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister and scholar, was born at Burlington, Connecticut, in 1790. He graduated from Brown University in 1813, engaged in teaching for two or three years; was ordained at Newport, R.I., June 11, 1817; became pastor of the Second Baptist Church there, but resigned in 1822 on account of his health, and two years after was settled in Windsor, Vermont. Being professor of Greek and Latin in Brown University, he spent about two years abroad, chiefly in Germany, in study, and assumed his chair in 1827. He retired from his office in 1843, and in 1845 took up his residence in Exeter, in the south of England, where he remained twenty-two years; then removed to Bath, where he lived two years, during all which period he preached almost constantly in the vacant pulpits of Baptist and Independent churches, and wrote for the press. For several years he was one of the editors of the Eclectic Review. He returned to America in 1869, and died in Boston, Massachusetts, February 5, 1870. He left by his will, among other bequests, one of $20,000 to Brown University to establish a professorship of natural theology, and nearly as much to Columbian University to establish a professorship of intellectual and moral philosophy. Among his published writings may be found an edition of Callender's Century Sermon: — a volume of President Maxcy's Remains (1844): — and a Life of Roger Williams (1853). (J.C.S.)

## Elul[[@Headword:Elul]]

             (Hebrews Elui', אלֵוּל, Neh 6:15; Sept. Ε᾿λούλ, also in 1Ma 14:27; the Macedonian Γορπιαῖυς) is the name of that month which was the sixth of the ecclesiastical, and the twelfth of the civil year of the Jews, and in which began with the new moon of our August or September, and consisted of 29 days. Several unsatisfactory attempts have been made to find a Syro-Arabian etymology for the word, as it occurs in a similar form in both these languages (see Gesenius, Thes. Hebr. page 1036). The most recent derivation, that of Benfey, deduces it, through many commutations and mutilations, from an original Zend form haurvatat (Monutsnamen, p. 126). According to the Talmud, the following are the days devoted to religious services. SEE CALENDAR.

1. The new moon The propitiatory prayers are commenced in the evening service after the new moon

7. The festival of the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem by Nehemiah.

17. A fast because of the death of the spies who brought up the evil report of the Land of Promise (Num 14:36-37).

21. The festival of wood offering (Xy'ophoio1o). According to others, this occurred during the previous month.

22. A fast in memory of the punishment of the wicked and incorrigible Israelites.

29. This is the last day of the month, on which the Jews reckoned up the beasts that had been born, the tenths of which belonged to God. They chose to do it on this day because the first day of the month Tisri was a festival, and therefore they could not tithe a flock on that day.

## Elurion[[@Headword:Elurion]]

             an Egyptian bishop, A.D. 347.

## Elusa[[@Headword:Elusa]]

             (῎Ελοσα, apparently for the Aramaean חֲליּצָה; see Jerome, Comment. in Esa. 15:4), an ancient city of Idumaea, frequently mentioned by writers of the fourth to the sixth centuries (see the citations in Reland, Palaest. page 755-7) as an episcopal city of the Third Palestine (Concil. Gen. 3:448); the  E'lysa of the Peutinger Table, 71 Roman miles S. of Jerusalem (Ritter, Erdk. 14:120); recognized by D. Robinson (Bib. Res. 1:296 sq.) as the present ruins el-Khulaseh, 5 hours S.S.W. of Hebron on the way to Egypt, ant consisting of walls, a fine well, and enclosures sufficient to have contained a population of 15,000 or 20,000 persons (see also Stewart, Tent and Khan, page 205). SEE CHELLUS.

## Eluzai[[@Headword:Eluzai]]

             (Hebrews Eluzay', אֶלְ וּזִי, God is my praises, i.e., object of praise; Sept. Ε᾿λιωζί v.r. Α᾿ζαϊv, Vulg. Eluzai), one of the Benjamite warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:5). B.C. 1054.

## Elvetus[[@Headword:Elvetus]]

             bishop of Arezzo, A.D. 775.

## Elvira Council Of[[@Headword:Elvira Council Of]]

             (Concilium Eliberitanum or Illiberitanum), held in the town of Elvira (or Illiberis, Iliberi, or Liberini), in the Spanish province of Baetica. The town, which no longer exists, was situated not far from the modern Granada. That it was not Illiberis, in Gallia Narbonensis, is shown by the fact that all the signers were Spanish bishops. The council was most probably held at the beginning of the fourth century, but the year (303, 305, 309) is uncertain. Some of the early Protestant writers (as the authors of the Magdeburg Centuries) inferred, from the resolutions concerning pictures and the lighting of candles, that the synod took place as late as the year 700; but this opinion has now been abandoned. The Synod of Elvira is the most ancient among those of which all the canons (eighty-one) are extant. It was attended by nineteen bishops, among them Hosius of Cordova, and twenty-six priests. Some of the canons show that the Church of Spain was at that time strongly under the influence of Novatian and Montanist principles. The most important of the resolutions were, 1, depriving of communion, i.e., of absolution, even in death, those who, after baptism, have voluntarily sacrificed to idols; 3, relaxing the penalty in canon 1 in favor of those who have not gone beyond offering a present to the idol. It allows of admitting such to communion at the point of death, if they have undergone a course of penance; canons 6 and 7 forbid communion even at the point of death to those who have caused the death of another maliciously, and to adulterers who have relapsed after entering upon the course of penance; 12 and 13 forbid communion even in death to mothers who prostitute their own daughters, and to women who, after consecrating themselves in virginity to God, forsake that state; 33 prohibits the clergy  from the use of marriages; 34 prohibits the lighting of candles during daytime in cemeteries, "for the spirits of the saints must not be disturbed;" 36 declares that pictures ought not to be in a church, lest the object of veneration and worship be depicted upon walls; 63 and 64 forbid communion even in death to adulteresses who have willfully destroyed their children, or who abide in a state of adultery up to the time of their last illness; 65 forbids communion even in death to one who has falsely accused of a crime a bishop, priest, or deacon. The canons may be found in Mansi, 2:2 sq., and in Routh, Reliquiae, volume 4. Special treatises on the canons were written by the bishop Ferdinand de Mendoza (De Confirmando concil. Illiberitano, in Mansi. l.c.), and bishop Aubespine of Orleans (Mansi. l.c.). The canons, together with some explanatory remarks, may also be found in the Tibingen Theolog. Quartalschriff, 1821, page 144. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:775; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:543; Gams, Kirchengesch. von Spanien ; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 1:122 sq. (A.J.S.)

## Elwandus[[@Headword:Elwandus]]

             bishop of Treviso, in 452.

## Elwert, Eduard[[@Headword:Elwert, Eduard]]

             an evangelical theologian of Germany, was born at Cannstadt, February 22, 1805. In 1830 he commenced his academical career at Tubingen, was in 1836 appointed professor at Zurich, and from 1839 to 1841 acted as professor at Tubingen. Bodily infirmities obliged him to retire from his academic activity, and he accepted the pastorate at Motzingen. In 1850 he  was placed at the head of the Schonthal Seminary, where he labored until 1864, when he was obliged to retire entirely from active work. He died June 9, 1865, at his native place, having published, De Antinomia Joh. Agricolce (Zurich, 1836): — Annotationes in Gal 2:1-10, etc. (Tubingen, 1852): — Quaestiones et Observationes ad Philologiam Sacram N. Test. Pertinentes (ibid. 1860). He also contributed to several theological reviews. See Kubel, in Herzog-Plitt, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:318. (B.P.)

## Elwin (or Alunus), Saint[[@Headword:Elwin (or Alunus), Saint]]

             one of Breaca's companions in her voyage from Ireland to Cornwall; commemorated February 22.

## Elwoed[[@Headword:Elwoed]]

             abbot of St. lltyd's (now Lantwit Major), in the 6th century.

## Elwog[[@Headword:Elwog]]

             (Lat. Eluogus), bishop of Llandaff, in the second half of the 8th century.

## Elwystyl[[@Headword:Elwystyl]]

             (or Elgistil), suffragan bishop of Llandaff, in the first half of the 6th century. Ely, Alfred, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at West Springfield, Massachusetts, November 8, 1778. Leaving a clerkship at the age of twenty-one, he prepared for college at the Hartford (Connecticut) grammar-school, and graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1804. After a tutorship at the college for one year, he was ordained over the Church in Monson, Massachusetts, in 1806, where he was an active minister for thirty-six years, and died July 6, 1866. Dr. Ely was an able preacher and theologian, and his ministry was greatly blessed to the spiritual and moral elevation of his people. Twenty-one of his sermons and addresses were published. See Cong. Quarterly, 1867, page 137.

## Elxai, Elxaites[[@Headword:Elxai, Elxaites]]

             SEE ELKESAITES.

## Ely[[@Headword:Ely]]

             so called from a Saxon word, elig, an eel, or helig, a willow, a cathedral town in that part of the fen country of Cambridgeshire called the Isle of Ely. Pop. about 6000.

Ely Cathedral. — About the year 673, Etheldreda, daughter of the king of East Anglia, and wife of Oswy, king of Northumberland, founded a monastery here, and took on herself the government of it. A new church was begun in 1081, which was converted into a cathedral, and the abbey erected into a see in 1109. The possessions of the abbey were divided between the bishop and the community. Among the celebrated names connected with Ely are abbot Thurstan, who defended the isle against William the Conqueror for seven years, and bishop Andrews. The bishops of Ely, like the bishops of Durham, formerly enjoyed a palatine jurisdiction, and appointed their own chief justice, etc., but this privilege was taken from them by the 6th and 7th William IV. The bishop of Ely is visitor to St. Peter's, St. John's, and Jesus colleges, Cambridge, of which last he also appoints the master. There is a grammar-school attached to the cathedral, founded by Henry VIII. The diocese of Ely belongs to the province of Canterbury, and embraces Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, Huntingdonshire, and the archdeaconry of Sudbury. in Suffolk. The income of the bishop is £5500. The present (1890) incumbent is Alwyne Compton. The diocese has 26 deaneries and 172,263 church sittings. The total population within the territory of the diocese was, in 1861, 480,716. — Chambers, Encyclop. s.v.; Churchman's Calendar for 1868.

## Ely Ezra Stiles, D.D.[[@Headword:Ely Ezra Stiles, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian (O.S.) minister, was born in Lebanon, Conn., June 13, 1786. At twelve years of age he made a profession of religion. He graduated at Yale College in 1803. His theological studies were pursued under his father, the Reverend Z. Ely. In 1806 he was ordained, and installed as pastor of the church in Colchester, Connecticut, which he left some time after to become chaplain to the New York City Hospital. In 1811 the Old Pine Street Church, Philadelphia, became vacant. Its pulpit had been filled by the most eloquent ministers of the day, and it was necessary to choose a man of commanding intellect and power. The choice fell most wisely upon Dr. Ely. He entered upon his field of labor with earnestness and zeal. He was the principal founder of the Jefferson Medical College. He was stated clerk and moderator of the General Assembly in 1825 and 1828, and was constantly engaged in works of charity and schemes of benevolence. In 1834 he conceived the plan of establishing a college and theological seminary in Missouri. He entered into this with great zeal, and for a while with success, but the crisis of 1837 made it a failure. In this enterprise he lost his large fortune; and returned to Philadelphia a poor man — his  intellect and oratorical powers unimpaired — but failed to receive that degree of attention he commanded when in affluence. In 1844 he became pastor of the church in Northern Liberties, Philadelphia, where he labored until prostrated by paralysis in 1851. He lingered ten years, his intellect being so impaired as to preclude activity of any kind. He died June 18, 1861. He published Memoirs of the Rev. Z. Ely (his father):Collateral Bible, or Key to the Holy Scriptures (in connection with Bedell and M'Corkle): — Ely's Journal: — Sermons on Faith: —Visits of Mercy. He was also editor of The Philadelphian. — Wilson, Presb. Historical Almanac, 1862.

## Ely, David, D.D[[@Headword:Ely, David, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Lyme, Connecticut, July 7 (O.S.), 1749. In 1769 he graduated from Yale College; in October 1771, was licensed to preach; and October 27, 1773, was ordained colleague with Reverend Jedediah Mills in Huntington, Connecticut. He died there,  February 16, 1816. During the Revolution he was a zealous patriot. Though he made no pretensions to style, he had a talent for communicating the truth, which strongly impressed it upon the memory. His facility and felicity' in quoting Scripture were excelled by few. About a hundred pupils were prepared by him for Yale College. From 1778 he was a member of the corporation of Yale; was, for a long time, secretary of the same, and one of the prudential committee. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:4.

## Ely, Samuel Rose, D.D[[@Headword:Ely, Samuel Rose, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at West Springfield, Massachusetts, December 29, 1803. He graduated from Williams College in 1830, studied theology for two years in Princeton Theological Seminary, and was ordained by the Presbytery of Westchester, N.Y., December 4, 1834. He served as pastor at Carmel, from 1834 to 1836; at Easthampton, from 1836 to 1846; at Brooklyn, in 1850; and as stated supply at Roslyn, from 1853 until his death, May 11, 1873. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 82.

## Elymaean[[@Headword:Elymaean]]

             (Ε᾿λυμαῖος), the Graecized form (Jdt 1:6) of the designation usually Anglicized ELAMITE SEE ELAMITE (q.v.).

## Elymais[[@Headword:Elymais]]

             (Ε᾿λυμαϊvς), a general designation (Tob 2:10) of that province of the Persian empire. See Smith, Diet. of Class. Geog. s.v.) termed ELAM SEE ELAM (q.v.) in the Bible. In 1Ma 6:1, however, the word is used (incorrectly) in a more specific or local sense of some Persian city, as we are there informed that Antiochus Epiphanes, understanding there were very great treasures in the temple at Elymais, determined to plunder it; but the citizens resisted him successfully. 2Ma 9:2 calls this city Persepolis, probably because it formerly had been the capital of Persia; for Persepolis and Elymais were very different cities; the former situated on the Araxes, the latter on the Eulaeus. The temple which Antiochus designed to pillage was that of the goddess Nannaea, according to 2Ma 1:13; Appian says (Syr. page 66) a temple of Venus (i.e., probably the goddess Anubis); Polybius (31:11), Diodorus, Josephus (Ant. 12:9, 1), and Jerome say a temple of Diana. SEE ANTIOCHUS (EPIPHANES).

## Elymas[[@Headword:Elymas]]

             (Ε᾿λύμας), an appellative commonly derived from the Arabic Aliman ("a wise man," see Pfeiffer, Dubia vex. page 941; like the Turkish title Ulema, see Lakemacher, De Elyma Mago, in his Observatt. 2:162), which Luke interprets by ὸ μάγος, the Magian or "sorcerer:" it is applied to a Jew named BAR-JESUS, who had attached himself to the proconsul of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus, when Paul visited the island (Act 13:6 sq.). A.D. 44. On his attempting to dissuade the proconsul from embracing the Christian faith, he was struck with miraculous blindness by the apostle (see Neander's History of first Planting of the Christian Church, 1:125). A very different but less probable derivation of the word is given by Lightfoot in his Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations on the Acts (Works, 8:461), and in his Sermon on Elymas the Sorcerer (Works, 7:104). Chrysostom observes, in reference to the blindness inflicted by the apostle on Bar-Jesus, that the limiting clause, for a season, "shows that it was not intended so much for the punishment of the sorcerer as for the conversion of the deputy (Chrysost. in Acta Apost. Homeil. 28; Opera, 9:241). On the practice generally then prevailing, in the decay of faith, of consulting  Oriental impostors of this kind, see Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 1:177-180, 2d ed. SEE MAGIC.

## Elymas (2)[[@Headword:Elymas (2)]]

             a presbyter, martyred in Persia under Decius; commemorated April 22.

## Elysium[[@Headword:Elysium]]

             in Greek and Roman mythology, is the abode of the blessed. According to Homer, it lies in the mild sunlight, this side of Oceanus; whether it is an island or not is not mentioned. Hesiod speaks of islands of the blessed, where on the Oceanus river the heroes live in peace, and where the earth yearly brings forth three harvests of fruits. According to Pindar, the citadel, Kronos (Saturn), is on the islands of the blessed. Here cool, refreshing sea- breezes blow, gold-glittering flowers bloom on the trees, and along the springs. The heroes decorate their persons with them. They only reach this blessed abode who pass a threefold test in Hades and on earth by keeping themselves unstained by crimes. Besides Rhadamanthus, whom Kronos selected as his successor, Pindar mentions Peleus, Cadmus, and Achilles as being here. Virgil gives another description of the Elysium: "Laughing aether fills the fields with a purple light; a distinct sun and distinct stars shed their light upon them." AEneas there finds those who received wounds in battling for their country, priests who led a spotless life, sacred  poets who sung the worth of Phoebus, discoverers who benefited mankind by their arts, etc.

## Elzabad[[@Headword:Elzabad]]

             [some Elza'bad] (Heb. Elzabad', אֶלְוָכָד, whom God has bestowed, i.e., Theodore; Sept. Ε᾿λεζαβάδ and Ε᾿λζαβάδ, v.r. ῾Ελιεζέρ and Ε᾿λζαβάθ), the name of two men.

1. The ninth of the eleven Gadite heroes who joined David in his fastness in the wilderness of Judah (1Ch 12:12) B.C. 1061.

2. One of the able-bodied sons of Shemaiah, the son of Obed-edom the Levite; he served as a porter to the "house of Jehovah" under David (1Ch 26:7). B.C. 1014.

## Elzaphan[[@Headword:Elzaphan]]

             [some Elzaphan] (Hebrews Eltsaphan', אֶלְצָפָן), a contracted form (Exo 6:22; Lev 10:4) of the name ELIZAPHAN SEE ELIZAPHAN (q.v.).

## Elzevir[[@Headword:Elzevir]]

             is the name of a family, the members of which are known by their publications of theological works, more especially of the New Test. Louis Elzevir, who had embraced Calvinism in France, had to leave his country in 1580, and went to Levyd-en, where he established a book-store, which soon became known by the publication of Drusii Ebraicarum Quaestionum libri duo (1583). The descendants of Louis established themselves at Utrecht, Amsterdam, and at other places. His grandson, Isaac, was appointed in 1620 university printer at Leyden, and this privilege remained with the family until 1712. The Elzevirs published such works as La Pegrere's Praeadamitae in 1655, and Richard Simoi's Histoire Crit. du Vieux Testament, in 1680, which the Church of Rome tried to suppress. What assures the Elzevirs an honorable place in the history of theology is the fact that they issued several editions of the Greek New Test., which became popular and authoritative for a long period. The preface to the second edition, published in 1633, boldly proclaims, "Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum; in quo nihil immutatum ant corruptum damus;" hence the name textus receptus, or commonly received standard text. All the Holland editions were scrupulously copied from the Elzevir text, and Wetstein could not get authority to print his famous Greek Test. (1751-52) except on condition of following it. See Bernus, in Lichtenberger's Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; but more especially Alphons Willems's Histoire et Annales Typographiques (Brussels and Paris, 1880, 2 volumes), where a history of the Elzevir family and a list of their publications is given. (B.P.)

## Ema (or Ama)[[@Headword:Ema (or Ama)]]

             a martyr, with six other nuns, captives with Eliabus (q.v.), commemorated May 22.

## Emanation[[@Headword:Emanation]]

             (Latin emanatio, a flowing forth), a religious theory concerning the relation of the universe to the Deity, which lies at the basis of some of the Oriental religions, and from them found its way into several philosophical systems. Emanation denotes a development, descending by degrees, of all things from the Supreme Being, the universe constituting in general, as well as in particular, a chain of revelations, the individual rings of which lose the divine character the more the farther they are remote from the primary source, the Deity. A system of emanation is different from a system of evolution, because in the latter the revelation of the Deity in the universe has for the Deity itself the signification of a process of self-cognition which grows in a progressive ratio. Emanation was the basis of the religions of India, in the northern provinces of which country it developed from the original religion of nature even before the compilation of the Vedas. The cause of all things was found in a universal world-soul. SEE ANIMA MUNDI.

The world-soul was identified with Brahma, and, viewed as the eternal spiritual unit, the mysterious source of all life. The ancient gods were explained as the first rays of Brahma, whom he had constituted the guardians of the world. The creation was an emanation from Brahma,  which became the more gross, dense, materialized, the farther it removed from the primitive source. Those who give themselves up to the corporeal world sink deeper and deeper, and only rise again upward when purified by the fire of hell; but those who renounce all sensuality, and direct all their thoughts to the one divine substance, are gradually absorbed by it. The religion of the Parsees is also based upon emanation. From the Zeruane akherene (the uncreated one), Ormuzd and Ahriman proceed as the highest revelation. From Ormuzd and Ahriman all other substances emanate, from the ministering angels down to the beings of the material world. But the Persians did not teach, like the Indians, a self-destruction of personality for the purpose of obtaining a reunion with the original unit; in the Parsee system the good is perfected and completed by overcoming the bad, and the series of the imperfect emanations is closed by a reunion of Ahriman with Ormuzd. In the Western countries, Plato is the first in whose writings we find, though not yet distinctly, traces of the doctrine of emanation. More developed, it appears in the writings of Philo. It is a prominent feature of the Neoplatonic school, and through Valentinus (q.v.) it was introduced into the Gnostic schools. Finally, it is to be found in the philosophy of the Arabs, which was more or less an Aristotelism mixed with Neoplatonic views.-Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:548; Muller, Gesch. der Kosmologie in der griech. Kirche bis auf Origenes (Halle, 1860); Neander, Ch. Hist. volume 1. (A.J.S.)

## Emancipation[[@Headword:Emancipation]]

             1. In the Roman Church, Emancipatio canonicarum is the raising of some member of a convent to an ecclesiastical dignity, by virtue of which he is no longer subject to his former superior. The Emancipatio canonica is the release of a young canon from the obligation of visiting the foundation school when about to receive a prebend.

2. The term is also used to denote the act whereby a government or Legislature delivers from a state of slavery, or sets at political liberty, any classes of persons who have previously been declared ineligible for certain offices or privileges, on account of their religious peculiarities, e.g. emancipation of Jews in Christian countries, SEE JEWS; Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829 in England, SEE TESTS.

3. The freeing of slaves from bondage, SEE SLAVERY.

## Emant[[@Headword:Emant]]

             of Cluain, an Irish saint, said by some to have been a bishop; commemorated July 1.

## Emanuel Ben-Salomo[[@Headword:Emanuel Ben-Salomo]]

             SEE IMMANUEL.

## Emanus[[@Headword:Emanus]]

             slain by thieves at Chartres in the 6th century, is said to have been a Cappadocian pilgrim to Rome and other cities of Italy; commemorated May 16.

## Embalm[[@Headword:Embalm]]

             (הָנִט, chanat', to spice; hence spoken of the ripening of fruit, on account of its aromatic juice, improperly rendered "putteth forth" in Son 2:13), the process of preserving a corpse by means of aromatics (Gen 1:1-31; Gen 2:1-25; Gen 3:1-24; Gen 26:1-35; Sept. ἐνταφάζω). This art was practiced among the Egyptians from the earliest times, and arrived at great perfection in that country, where, however, it has now become lost, the practice apparently having gradually fallen into disuse in consequence of the change of customs affected by the introduction of Christianity in that part of the Roman empire. It is in connection with that country that the above instances occur, and later examples (2Ch 16:14; Joh 9:39-40) seem to have been in imitation of the Egyptian custom. The modern method of embalming is in essential points similar.

I. Egyptian. —

1. The feeling which led the Egyptians to embalm the dead probably sprang from their, belief in the future reunion of the soul with the body. Such a reunion is distinctly spoken of in the Book of the Dead (Lepsius, Todtenbuch, chapter 89 and passing), and Herodotus expressly mentions the Egyptian belief in the transmigration of souls (2:123). This latter idea may have led to the embalming of lower animals also, especially those deemed sacred, as the ox, the ibis, and the cat, mummies of which are frequent. The actual process is said to have been derived from "their first merely burying in the sand, impregnated with natron and other salts, which dried and preserved the body" (Rawlinson, Herod. 2:122). Drugs and bitumen were of later introduction, the latter not being generally employed before the 18th dynasty. When the practice ceased entirely is uncertain.

2. Herodotus (2:86-89) describes three modes, varying in completeness and expense, and practiced by persons regularly trained to the profession, who were initiated into the mysteries of the art by their ancestors. The most costly mode, which is estimated by Diodorus Siculus (1:91) at a talent of silver (over $1000), was said by the Egyptian priests to belong to him whose name in such a matter it was not lawful to mention, viz. Osiris. The embalmers first removed part of the brain through the nostrils by means of a crooked iron, and destroyed the rest by injecting caustic drugs. An incision was then made along the flank with a sharp Ethiopian stone, and the whole of the intestines removed. The cavity was rinsed out with  palm-wine, and afterwards scoured with pounded perfumes. It was then filled with pure myrrh pounded, cassia, and other aromatics, except frankincense. This done, the body was sewn up and steeped in natron for seventy days. When the seventy days were accomplished, the embalmers washed the corpse and swathed it in bandages of linen, cut in strips and smeared with gum. They then gave it up to the relatives of the deceased, who provided for it a wooden case, made in the shape of a man, in which the dead was placed, and deposited in an erect position against the wall of the sepulchral chamber. Diodorus Siculus gives some particulars of the process which are omitted by Herodotus. When the body was laid out on the ground for the purpose of embalming, one of the operators, called the scribe (γραμματεύς), marked out the part of the left flank where the incision was to be made. The dissector (παρασχίστης) then, with a sharp Ethiopian stone (black flint, or Ethiopian agate, Rawlinson, Herod. 2:121), hastily cut through as much flesh as the law enjoined, and fled, pursued by curses and volleys of stones from the spectators. When all the embalmers (ταριχευταί) were assembled, one of them extracted the intestines, with the exception of the heart and kidneys; another cleansed them one by one, and rinsed them in palm-wine and perfumes. The body was then washed with oil of cedar, and other things worthy of notice, for more than thirty days (according to some MSS. forty), and afterwards sprinkled with myrrh, cinnamon, and other substances, which possess the property not only of preserving the body for a long period, but also of communicating to it an agreeable shell. This process was so effectual that the features of the dead could be recognized. It is remarkable that Diodorus omits all mention of the steeping in natron. Porphyry(De Abst. 4:10) supplies an omission of Herodotus, who neglects to mention what was done with the intestines after they were removed from the body. In the case of a person of respectable rank they were placed in a separate vessel and thrown into the river. This account is confirmed by Plutarch (Sept. Sap. Conv. c. 16).

The second mode of embalming cost about 20 minae. In this case no incision was made in the body, nor were the intestines removed, but cedar- oil was injected into the stomach by the rectum. The oil was prevented from escaping, and the body was then steeped in natron for the appointed number of days. On the last day the oil was withdrawn, and carried off with it the stomach and intestines in a state of solution, while the flesh was consumed by the natron, and nothing was left but the skin and bones. The body in this state was returned to the relatives of the deceased.  The third mode, which was adopted by the poorer classes, and cost but little, consisted in rinsing out the intestines with syrmaea, an infusion of senna and cassia (Pettigrew, Hist. of Mummies, page 69), and steeping the body for the usual number of days in natron.

Although the three modes of embalming are so precisely described by Herodotus, it has been found impossible to classify the mummies which have been discovered and examined under one or other of these three heads. Pettigrew, from his own observations, confirms the truth of Herodotus's statement that the brain was removed through the nostrils. But in many instances, in which the body was carefully preserved and elaborately ornamented, the brain had not been removed at all, while in some mummies the cavity was found to be filled with resinous and bituminous matter. M. Rouyer, in his Notice sur los Embaumements d.s Anciens Egyptiens (Description de l'Egypte, page 471), endeavored to class the mummies which he examined under two principal divisions, which were again subdivided into others. These were,

I. Mummies with the ventral incision, preserved, 1, by balsamic matter, and, 2, by natron. The first of these are filled with a mixture of resin and aromatics, and are of an olive color — the skin dry, flexible, and adhering to the bones. Others are filled with. bitumen or asphaltum, and are black, the skin hard and shining. Those prepared with natron are also filled with resinous substances and bitumen.

II. Mummies without the ventral incision. This class is again subdivided, according as the bodies were, 1, salted and filled with pisasphaltum, a compound of asphaltum and common pitch; or, 2, salted only. The former are supposed to have been immersed in the pitch when in a liquid state. The medicaments employed in embalming were various. From a chemical analysis of the substances found in mummies, M. Rouelle detected three modes of embalming: 1, with asphaltum, or Jew's pitch, called also funeral gum, or gum of mummies; 2, with a mixture of asphaltum and cedria, the liquor distilled from the cedar; 3, with this mixture, together with some resinous and aromatic ingredients. The powdered aromatics mentioned by Herodotus were not mixed with the bituminous matter, but sprinkled into the cavities of the body. Pettigrew supposes that after the spicing "the body must have been subjected to a very considerable degree of heat; for the resinous and aromatic substances have penetrated even into the innermost structure of the bones, an effect which could not have been produced  without the aid of a high temperature, and which was absolutely necessary for the entire preservation of the body" (page 62). M. Rouyer is of the same opinion (page 471). The surface of the body was in one example covered with "a coating of the dust of woods and barks, nowhere less than one inch in thickness," which '"had the smell of cinnamon or cassia" (Pettigrew, pages 62, 63). At this same stage plates of gold were sometimes applied to portions of the body, or even its whole surface. Before enwrapping, the body was always placed at full length, with no variety save in the position of the arms.

The principal embalming material in the more costly mummies appears to have been asphalt, either alone or mixed with a vegetable liquor, or so mixed with the addition of resinous and aromatic ingredients. Pettigrew supposes resinous matters were used as a kind of varnish for the body, and that pounded aromatics were sprinkled in the cavities within. The natron, in a solution of which the mummies were placed in every method, appears to have been a fixed alkali. It might be obtained from the Natron Lakes and like places in, the Libyan desert. Wax has also been discovered (Pettigrew's History, page 75 sq.).

3. The embalming having been completed, the body was wrapped in bandages. There has been much difficulty as to the material; but it seems certain that linen was invariably used. Though always long, they vary in this respect; and we know no authenticated instance of their exceeding 700 yards, though much greater measures are mentioned. The width is also very various, but it is generally not more than seven or eight inches. The quantity of cloth used is best ascertained from the weight. The texture varies, in the cases of single mummies, the coarser material being always nearer to the body. The bandages are found to have been saturated with asphalt, resin, gum, or natron; but the asphalt has only been traced in those nearest the body: probably the saturation is due to the preparation of the mummies, and does not indicate any special preparation of the clothes. The beauty of the bandaging has been the subject of great admiration. The strips were very closely bound, and all directions were adopted that could carry out this object. Pettigrew is of opinion that they were certainly applied wet. Various amulets and personal ornaments are found upon  mummies and in their wrappings; the former were thought to be of use to the soul in its wanderings, and they were placed with the body from the belief in the relation between the two after death. With these matters, and the other particulars of Egyptian mummies, we have little to do, as our object is to show how far the Jewish burial-usages may have been derived from Egypt. The body in the cases of most of the richer mummies, when bandaged, has been covered with what has been termed by the French a cartonage, formed of layers of cloth, plastered with lime on the inside. The shape is that of a body of which the arms and legs are not distinguishable. In this shape every dead person who had, if we may believe Diodorus, been judged by a particular court to be worthy of the honor of burial, was considered to have the form of Osiris, and was called by his name. It seems more probable, however, that the tribunal spoken of was that of Amenti, "the hidden," the Egyptian Hades, and that the practice of embalming was universal. The cartonage of the more costly mummies is generally beautifully painted with subjects connected with Amenti. Mummies of this class are enclosed in one or even two wooden cases, either of sycamore, or, rarely, of cedar. The mummies of royal and very wealthy persons were placed in an outer stone case, within which there was a wooden case, and, probably, sometimes two such cases. SEE MUMMY. It would seem that the features of the face, as well as the other parts of the body, were covered over with the bandage, and that it was only through this, and latterly through the coffin, which commonly took the form of the features, that these could be recognized.

II. Hebraeo-Egyptian. — The records of the embalming of Jacob and Joseph are very brief. In the former case we read, "And Joseph commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father: and the physicians embalmed Israel. And forty days were fulfilled for him; for so are fulfilled the days of embalming: and the Egyptians mourned for him threescore and ten days" (Gen 50:1-3). Of Joseph we are only told that "they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt" (Gen 50:26). It should be remarked, that in Joseph's case the embalming must have been thorough, as Moses at the Exodus carried his body into Canaan. The motive of embalming in these instances was evidently that the strong desire of these patriarchs to be buried in the Land of Promise might be complied with, although, had this not been so, respect would probably have led to  the same result. That the physicians were employed by Joseph to embalm his father may mean no more than the usual embalmers, who must have had medical and surgical knowledge, but it is not unlikely that the kings and high officers were embalmed by household physicians. The periods of forty days for embalming, and seventy for mourning, are not easily reconciled with the statement of Herodotus, who specifies seventy days as the time that the body remained in natron. Hengstenberg (Egypt and the Books of Moses, page 69) attempts to reconcile this discrepancy by supposing that the seventy days of Herodotus include the whole time of embalming, and not that of steeping in natron only. But the differences in detail which characterize the descriptions of Herodotus and Diodorus, and the impossibility of reconciling these descriptions in all points with the results of scientific observation, lead to the natural conclusion that, if these descriptions are correct in themselves, they do not include every method of embalming which was practiced, and that, consequently; any discrepancies between them and the Bible narrative cannot fairly be attributed to a want of accuracy in the latter.

Perhaps the periods varied in different ages, or the forty days may not include the time of steeping in natron. Diodorus Siculus, who, having visited Egypt, is scarcely likely to have been in error in a matter necessarily well known, speaks of the anointing of the body at first with oil of cedar and other things for above thirty or forty days (ἑφ᾿ ἡμέρας πλείους τῶν τριάκοντα ; some MSS. τεσσαράκοντα. This period would correspond very well with the forty days mentioned in Genesis, which are literally "the days of spicing," and indicate that the latter denoted the most essential period of embalming. Or, if the same period as the seventy days of Herodotus be meant by Diodorus, then there would appear to have been a change. It may be worth noticing, that Herodotus, when first mentioning the steeping in natron, speaks of seventy days as the extreme time to which it might be lawfully prolonged (ἡμέρας ἑβδομήκοντα: πλεῦνας δὲ τουτέων οὐκ ἔξεστι ταριχεύειν), that (according to Pettigrew, page 61) "appearing to be precisely the time necessary for the operation of the alkali on the animal fiber." This would seem to render it possible that the seventy days in the time of Herodotus was the period of mourning, as it was not to be exceeded in what appears to have been the longest operation of embalming. The division of the seventy days mentioned in Genesis into forty and thirty may be suggested if we compare the thirty days' mourning for Moses and for Aaron, in which case the seventy days in this instance might mean until the end of seventy days. It is also to be remarked that Diodorus speaks of the time of  mourning for a king being seventy- two days, apparently ending with the day of burial (1:72). Joseph's coffin was perhaps a stone case, as his mummy was to be long kept ready for removal. SEE COFFIN.

III. Jewish. — It is not until long after the Exodus that we find any record of Jewish embalming, and then we have, in the O.T., but one distinct mention of the practice. This is in the case of king Asa, whose burial is thus related: "And they buried him in his own sepulchers, which he had digged for himself in the city of David, and laid him in the bed [or rather "coffin," not "bier"] which he had filled [or "which was filled"] with perfumes and spices compounded by the apothecaries' art; and they made for him an exceeding great burning" (2Ch 16:14). The burning is mentioned of other kings of Judah. From this passage it seems that Asa had prepared a bed, probably a sarcophagus, filled with spices, and that spices were also burnt at his burial. In the accounts of our Savior's burial the same or similar customs appear to be indicated, but fuller particulars are given. We read that Nicodemus "brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred, pound [weight]." The body they wound "in linen clothes with the sweet spices, as the manner of the Jews is to prepare for burial" (Joh 19:39-40). Mark specifies that fine clothes were used (Mar 15:46), and mentions that the women who came to the sepulcher on the morning of the resurrection “had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him" (Mar 16:1). Luke relates that the women went to see the sepulcher. "And they returned, and prepared sweet spices and ointments" (Luk 23:56). Immediately afterwards he speaks of their "bringing the sweet spices which they had prepared" (Luk 24:1) on the second day after. Our Lord himself referred to the use of ointment in burial-ceremonies (πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάζειν) "for the preparation for burial," when he commended the piety of the woman who had anointed his head with "very precious ointment" (Mat 26:6-13), and spoke in like manner in the similar case of Mary, the sister of Lazarus (Joh 12:3-8). The customs at this time would seem to have been to anoint the body and wrap it in fine linen, with spices and ointments in the folds, and afterwards to pour more ointment upon it, and perhaps also to burn spices. In the case of our Savior, the hurried burial and the following of the Sabbath may have caused an unusual delay. Ordinarily everything was probably completed at once.

Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus speak of the use of myrrh in Egyptian embalming, but we do not find any mention of aloes. The wrapping in fine  linen is rather contrary to the Egyptian practice than like it, when we remember that the coarser mummy-bandages are those which immediately enfold the body, and would best correspond to the clothes used by the Jews.

The Jewish custom has therefore little in common with the Egyptian. It was, however, probably intended as a kind of embalming, although it is evident from what is mentioned in the case of Lazarus, who was regularly swathed (Joh 11:44), that its effect was not preservation (Joh 11:39). The use of aromatics may naturally have been a harmless relic of the Egyptian custom, which, however, was very different in all else that relates to the disposal of the corpse. SEE BURIAL.

Among the later Jews a sort of embalming by means of honey occurs (Josephus, Ant. 14:7, 4; see Strabo, 16:746; compare Pliny, 22:50). Wax is said to have been employed for a similar purpose by the ancient Persians (Herodotus, 1:140; comp. Cicero, Tusc. Quest. 1:45; Xenophon, Hellen. 5:3, 19).

IV. Literature. — See Pettigrew, History of Egyptian Mummies (Lond. 1840, 4to); Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, 2d series, 2:451 sq.; Rosellini, Monumenti dell' Egitto, II, 3:334 sq., and pl. 121; Jablonski, Opusc. ed. Water, 1:472; Caylus, Abhand. zur Gesch. u. Kunst. 1:334 sq.; Heyne, in the Commentt. Soc. Goett. 1780, 3:89 sq.; Winekler, Animadverss. 1:105 sq.; Creuzer, Comment. in Herod. 1:14 sq., 361 sq.; Sethus, De alimentor. facultatibus (Par. 1658), 10, page 74; Ritter, in the Hall. Encyclop. 7:374 sq.; Brande's Encyclopedia, and the Penny Cyclopcedia, s.v. Mummy.

## Embalming the Dead[[@Headword:Embalming the Dead]]

             in the Christian Church. It was the custom of the early Church to bestow the honor of embalming upon the bodies of martyrs at least. According to an intimation of Tertullian (Apol. cap. 42), the usage appears to have been even generally adopted by Christians in burying their dead. One of the chief ingredients used was myrrh; in imitation of the Jewish custom, which was followed by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, who "brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight, and took the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury" (Joh 19:39). There was supposed to be some mystic  meaning in the presents made by the wise men to our Savior at his birth when they offered to him gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh: gold as to a king, frankincense as to a God, and myrrh as to a man that must die and be buried. In addition to the Jewish custom and the mode of our Savior's burial, another reason which rendered the use of myrrh important was that the ancient Christians were often compelled to bury their dead in the places in which they assembled for divine worship, and the embalming would tend to preserve them from corruption, and render the burial-places less offensive.-Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 23, chapter 2, § 5.

## Ember Days[[@Headword:Ember Days]]

             These are days of fasting occurring quarterly, in commemorationi of'the seasons (Lat, quatuor temporum, whence by contraction the German Quatember, and the English Ember). We find them at an early period associated with. the invoking of God's blessing on each of the four seasons in turn, and the special striving by prayers and fasting to merit such blessings. They were celebrated at Nativity, Easter, Epiphany, and Pentecost. About the time of Gelasius they were selected as the most fitting for the ordination of the clergy. In the Eastern Church there is no trace whatever of an observance of the Ember seasons. The passage of Athanasius, which some have quoted in support of a different conclusion, merely proves the existence of a fast at Pentecost. As regards the Gallican Church, the Ember seasons do not seem to have been established much before the time of Charlemagne. The second Council of Tours (A.D. 567), in prescribing the fasts to be observed by monks, makes no mention whatever of the fasts of the four seasons.

The observance of the Ember days is purely a Western institution. It was, doubtless, at first a rite merely of the local Roman Church, whence it gradually spread throughout the West. The history of the development of the custom is probably thus: Fasts were celebrated at the times of Lent, Pentecost, and the Nativity; these periods would roughly correspond with three of the four seasons, and thus some bishop of Rome, Leo or one of his predecessors, may have conceived the idea of making them symbolize the return of the seasons, and so added the one necessary to complete the four. It would soon come to pass, then, that they would be spoken of as originally ordained with that view; the length of celebration settled, the fasts then became associated with the seasons, and were regarded as independent of Lent, etc. Thus they might occasionally fall outside of these seasons, and finally such irregularity may have caused the settlement of the matter as at present.

## Ember Weeks[[@Headword:Ember Weeks]]

             The weeks in which the ember days fall. These are certain days set apart in the Roman and Anglican churches for imploring God's blessing upon the ordinations which are appointed to be held in the church on the Sundays next following these weeks. The ember days are the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday-in Lent; after Whit-Sunday; after the 14th of September; and after the 13th of December. These days were settled by the Council of Placentia, A.D. 1095. The name is derived by some from a German word signifying "abstinence;" by others it is supposed to signify "ashes;" the most probable derivation, however, is from a Saxon word (ymbren or embren) signifying "a circuit or course," because these fast-days return at certain periods (Eden, s.v.). The ember weeks in the Roman Church are called the quatuor tempora, the fast so called being observed at the beginnings of the four seasons. In the French Church it is called the fast of quatre-temps. It is observed at the same dates, nearly, as in the English Church. It was first distinctly fixed in the Church year by Gregory VII. — Thomassin, Traite des Jeunes, part 1, chapter 21; Bingham, Orig. Eccl. book 21, chapter 2; Eden, Churchman's Dictionary, s.v.; Palmer, Orig. Liturg. 1:305; Procter, On Common Prayer, page 261.

## Embla[[@Headword:Embla]]

             in Norse mythology, was the first, woman created by the Asas, from a tree- trunk (Embla, "the pine," while Ask, "the ash," was the name of the first man). She was endowed with feeling, motion, spirit, life, the senses of hearing and seeing, and was gifted with the power of speech. By Ask, her husband, she became mother of the human race.

## Emblem[[@Headword:Emblem]]

             "a device or figure employed to represent some moral notion. There are various opinions as to the lawfulness and expediency of emblems in religious matters, some considering it to be both allowable and useful thus to represent spiritual ideas to the bodily eye; others, again, holding it to be both presumptuous and dangerous, if not superstitious, to use any emblems of sacred things not warranted and enjoined by Scripture. This, at least, is certain, that it is quite as likely to lead to idolatry (answering to that of the  Hindoos, Egyptians, etc.) as pictures or images giving a simple resemblance. The golden calf was meant for an emblem, but it was the occasion of gross idolatry."

Emblems are to be distinguished from symbols. Symbols are generally intended to represent revealed doctrines; emblems are "arbitrary representations of an idea of human invention" (Walcott). Thus a sword is the emblem of St. Paul. A lion, as indicating solitude, was chosen as the emblem of Jerome as a recluse. SEE IDOLATRY;SEE IMAGE.

## Embolism[[@Headword:Embolism]]

             (also Embolis and Embolun).

(1) An inserted prayer; the name given to the prayer which in almost all ancient liturgies follows the Lord's prayer, founded on one or both of the two last petitions. It is so called because it is interposed there, and what had been already asked in the Lord's prayer is expanded, and it is more clearly expressed what evils we seek to be delivered from, viz. past, present, and future. There are also added the names of the saints by whose intercession we strengthen our prayers, viz. the Virgin Mary, Peter, Paul, and Andrew. The embolism was usually repeated by the priest in a low voice, symbolizing the silence during the period that our Lord lay in the grave; but in the Ambrosian rite it was always pronounced aloud. This practice, which has left very faint traces in the Western Church, holds a more important place in Oriental liturgies. The embolism is not, however, found in the liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil, but appears in those of James, Mark, and Theodore the Interpreter, as well as in the Armenian, Mozarabic, and Coptic Basil. As examples of the shorter embolism we give that of the Church of Jerusalem:

"And lead us not into temptation, O Lord, the Lord of Hosts, who knowest our infirmity; but deliver us from the Evil One, and his works, and every assault and will of his, for the sake of Thy Holy name which is called upon our lowliness;"

and the Syriac Liturgy of St. James:

"O Lord our God, lead us not into temptation, which we devoid of strength are not able to bear, but also with the temptation make a way of escape, that we may be able to bear it, and deliver us from evil, through Jesus Christ," etc.

(2) Embolism also designates the excess of the solar year over twelve lunar months, commonly called the Epact.

## Embolus[[@Headword:Embolus]]

             a covered portico or cloister; in ecclesiastical language a cloister surrounding the external walls of a church, serving as an ambulatory in hot, rainy, and dirty weather, and also affording a convenient passage for the priests and ministers of the church from the bema and diaconicum to the narthex. These porticos were generally vaulted, and highly ornamented with mosaic pictures. Such porticos were found at St. Sophia, Constantinople; St. Michael, at Anaplus; and the Deipara, at Jerusalen.

## Embroider[[@Headword:Embroider]]

             (רָקִם, rakam', to variegate, Exo 35:35; Exo 38:23; elsewhere “needle- work," etc.; שָׁבִוֹ, shabats', to interweave, Exo 28:39; "set," Exo 38:20). SEE BROIDERED. If these passages are correctly rendered, the Israelites must have known the art of embroidery. In several passages, also, an equivalent expression is used — needle-work — and used so as to imply that not plain sewing, but ornamental work, was evidently meant (Exo 26:36; Jdg 5:30; Psa 45:14, etc.). The Hebrew women were undoubtedly indebted to their residence in Egypt for that perfectness of finish in embroidery which was displayed in the service of the tabernacle, and in the preparation of the sacerdotal robes directed to be worn by the high-priest (Exo 28:29). The colored figures in the cloth of the Hebrews are thought by most authors to have been partly the product of the weaver in colors, whose art appears the superior, and partly that of the embroiderer in colors. The notices of Egyptian history, confirmed by the monumental remains, give reason for believing that at a comparatively early period they had made wonderful attainments in this line. For example, a corslet is mentioned by Herodotus as having been presented by Amasis, king of Egypt, to the Lacedaemonians, which was of linen, each thread composed of 360 finer threads, and ornamented with numerous figures of animals, worked in gold and cotton (Herod. 3:47). This was many centuries indeed after the Exodus; but its testimony reaches back to a much earlier time, as such a beautiful and elaborate piece of workmanship could not have been produced without ages of study and application to the art. Wilkinson says, "Many of the Egyptian stuffs presented various patterns worked in colors by the loom, independent of those produced by the dyeing or printing  process; and so richly composed that they vied with cloths embroidered by the needle. The art of embroidery," he adds, "was commonly practiced in Egypt" (3:128) referring in proof, however, simply to passages in Scripture, and taking them in the sense put upon them in the authorized version, sanctioned by Gesenius and the rabbins. The Egyptian sails, says the same author, were some of them embroidered with fanciful devices, representing the phoenix, flowers, and other emblems. This, however, was confined to the pleasure-boats of the nobles and king. That this was done even in the early ages is evident from the paintings at Thebes, which show sails ornamented with various colors, of the time of Rameses III. The devices are various; the most common is the phoenix (Eze 27:7). The Egyptian ladies of rank wore splendid dresses of needle-work (Psa 45:13-14). (See Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, abridgm. 2:81; Gesenius, Hebrews Thesaur., s.v., ut sup.)

The art of embroidery became hereditary in certain families of the Israelites, but finally fell into desuetude (1Ch 4:21).

In later times, the Babylonians were the most noted of all the Asiatic nations for the weaving of cloth of different colors, with gold threads introduced into the woof. These Assyrian dresses are mentioned as an article of commerce by Eze 27:24, and occur even as early as the time of Jos 7:21. They formed, perhaps, the “dyed attire and broidered work" so often mentioned in Scripture as the garments of princes and the costly gifts of kings. The ornaments upon them may either have been dyed, worked in the loom, or embroidered with the needle (Jdg 5:30) (See Layard's Nineveh, 1st series, 2:313.) SEE WOMAN; SEE WEAVING. (See further in Adam's Roman Antiquities, page 372; Miss Lambert's Hand-book of Needlework, London and New York, 1846.) SEE NEEDLEWORK.

## Embury, PHILIP[[@Headword:Embury, PHILIP]]

             the first Methodist minister in America, was born in Ballygaran, Ireland, September 21, 1728 or 1729. His parents were Germans of the Palatinate, and he was educated at a school near Ballygaran. In 1752 he was converted, and in 1758 he was entered upon the roll of the Irish  Conference as a preacher. In 1760 he emigrated to America, but it is not known whether he preached or not during the first few years of his life in New York. In 1766, stimulated by the advice of Barbara Heck, a pious Methodist, he organized a class, and commenced preaching, first in his own house, then in a hired room, and soon after (1767) in the "Rigging Loft," famous as the birth-place of Methodism in New York. A chapel became necessary, and in 1768 the pioneer Methodist church was erected on the site of the present Johnstreet Church. New York at this time had a population of twenty thousand. Embury continued to serve the Church in this chapel gratuitously until the arrival of the first missionaries sent out by John Wesley in 1769, when he surrendered the charge, and, with a party of fellow-Methodists, emigrated to Washington County. He there continued his labors as a "local preacher, and formed a society, chiefly of his own countrymen, at Ashgrove, the first Methodist organization within the bounds of the present Troy Conference, now numbering twenty-five thousand communicants, and more than two hundred traveling preachers. Embury died suddenly in August 1775, in consequence of an accident in mowing. He was buried on a neighbor's farm, but in 1832 his remains were taken up and deposited in Ashgrove church-yard, with funeral ceremonies, and an address by John N. Maffitt. In 1866, the centenary year of American Methodism, his remains were transferred, by order of the Troy Conference, to the Woodland Cemetery, Cambridge, Washington County, N.Y., with impressive services, conducted by bishop Janes and the Reverend S.D. Brown. See a good sketch of his life by Saxe, Ladies' Repository, May, 1859; also Bangs, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, volume 1; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, volume 2; Wakeley, Heroes of Methodism; Stevens, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, volume 1; Wakeley, Lost Chapters.

## Emden, Jacob Israel[[@Headword:Emden, Jacob Israel]]

             a Jewish writer of Germany, was born in 1696, and died at Altona in 1776. He is the author of numerous treatises, among which are, בית אל, a ritual for the whole year (Altonra, 1745, 4 parts, and often; latest ed. Lemberg, 1860): — A Life of Jon. Eybenschftz, entitled, בית יהונתן(Altona, 1752):- מטפחת ספרים, The Wrapper of Books (ibid. 1763); a critique on the Sohar: — צצים ופרחיםOn the Fundamental Doctrines of the Cabala (ibid. 1756): — תורת הקנאות, A Collection of Accounts Referring to Sabbathai Zewi, his Pupils and Adherents (ibid. 1752; Lemberg, 1870). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:240 sq.; Gritz, Geschichte der Juden, 10:396 sq.; Ginsburg, The Kabbalah, page 141 sq.; Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums u.s. Sekten, 3:194, 252,308; Furst, Jacob Emden, in Literaturbl. des Orients, 1846, c. 442; also the art. EYBENSCHUTZ. (B.P.)

## Emek[[@Headword:Emek]]

             SEE BETH-EMEK;SEE KEZIZ.

## Emerald[[@Headword:Emerald]]

             (נפֶךְ, nophek, of uncertain signif.; Sept. ἄνθραξ, N.T. and Apocr. σμάραγδος), a precious stone, named first in the second row on the breast-plate of the high-priest (Exo 28:18; Exo 39:11), imported to Tyre from Syria (Eze 27:16), used as a seal or signet (Sir 32:6), as an ornament of clothing and bedding (Eze 28:13; Judges 10:21),  and spoken of as one of the foundations of Jerusalem (Rev 21:19; Tob 13:16). The rainbow round the throne is compared to emerald in Rev 4:9 (ὅμοιος ὁράσει σμαραγδίνῳ). The Sept., Josephus, and Jerus. Targum understand by it the carbuncle. This name (in Greek denoting a live coal) the ancients gave to several glowing red stones resembling live coals (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 32:20; comp. Theophrast. De Lapid. 18), particularly rubies and garnets. SEE CARBUNCLE. The most valued of the carbuncles seems, however, to have been the Oriental garnet, a transparent red stone, with a violet shade, and strong vitreous luster. It was engraved upon (Theophrast. 31), and was probably not so hard as the ruby, which, indeed, is the most beautiful and costly of the precious stones of a red color, but is so hard that it cannot easily be subjected to the graving-tool. The Hebrew nophek, in the breast-plate of the high-priest, was certainly an engraved stone; and there is no evidence that the ancients could engrave the ruby, although this has in modern times been accomplished (Rosenmuller, Biblical Mineralogy, pages 32, 33; Braunius, De Vest. Sacerdot. page 523; Bellermann, Ueber die Urim u. Thummim, page 43). SEE BERYL.

The smaragdus of the New Testament was the generic name of twelve varieties of gems, some of which were probably true emeralds, while others seem to have been rather stones of the prasius or jasper kind, and still others no more than colored crystals and spars from copper mines. The statues, etc., of emerald mentioned by several ancient authors appear to have been nothing more than rock crystals, or even colored glass (Hill on Theophrast. de Lapid. 44; Moore's Anc. Mineral. page 150). SEE GEM.

The modern emerald is a species of beryl, of a beautiful green color, which occurs in primitive crystals, and is much valued for ornamental jewelry. The finest are obtained from Peru. The mines from which the ancients obtained emeralds are said to have existed in Egypt, near Mount Zabarah. (See the Penny Cyclopadia, s.v. Beryl.)

## Emeran, Saint [[@Headword:Emeran, Saint ]]

             SEE EMMERAN.

## Emerentiana [[@Headword:Emerentiana ]]

             a virgin martyr at Rome, A.D. 304, foster-sister of St. Agnes; commemorated January 23.

## Emeria[[@Headword:Emeria]]

             daughter of St. Patrick, and abbess of Clonbroney, commemorated July 11.

## Emeric[[@Headword:Emeric]]

             SEE EYMERIC.

## Emerinus (or Eamenus)[[@Headword:Emerinus (or Eamenus)]]

             bishop of Limoges in the 3d century.

## Emerita[[@Headword:Emerita]]

             (1) Supposed sister of the British king Lucius, whom she followed in his missionary journeys; she was martyred at Coir of the Grisons in Switzerland, and is commemorated December 4.

(2) Virgin martyr at Rome, cir. A.D. 257, commemorated September 22.

## Emeritense, Concilium[[@Headword:Emeritense, Concilium]]

             SEE MERIDA, COUNCIL OF.

## Emeritus[[@Headword:Emeritus]]

             (1) Donatist bishop of Julia Caesarea (now Shershell) in Morocco, largely concerned in the Council at Carthage, in June, A.D. 411.

(2) Bishop of Macri, in Mauritania, banished by the Council of Car thage, A.D. 484.

(3) Eleventh archbishop of Embrun, A.D. 585-610.

(4) A reader and martyr at Abitina, in Africa, A.D. 303, commemorated February 11 or 12.

## Emerius[[@Headword:Emerius]]

             (1) Eighth bishop of Sainte's, A.D. 562 or 563, and seated by order of king Charibert, although irregularly elected.

(2) Saint, son of St. Candia, and first abbot of Banyoles, in Catalonia, A.D. 739, commemorated January 27.

## Emerods[[@Headword:Emerods]]

             SEE HEIEMORRHOIDS.

## Emerson, Daniel Hopkins, D.D[[@Headword:Emerson, Daniel Hopkins, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Salem, Massachusetts, January 23, 1810. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1830, studied two years at Andover Theological Seminary, graduated from Yale Divinity School in 1833, taught school in Richmond, Virginia, was ordained pastor at Northborough, Mass., in 1836, in 1840 became pastor in East Whiteland, Pennsylvania, in 1845 at York, in 1855 at St. George's, Del., in 1869 of the Eastern Mariners' Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1873 general  secretary of the Young Mens' Christian Association of Oswego, N.Y., in 1878 missionary of the First Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, and died July 6, 1883.

## Emerson, John S[[@Headword:Emerson, John S]]

             a Congregational minister and missionary, was born at Chester, N.H., in 1802; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1826, and studied theology at  Andover. He had studied with special reference to the missionary work, and went, under the auspices of the American Board, to the Sandwich Islands, and was appointed to Waialua, Oahu, where he spent nearly the whole of his missionary life, laboring with zeal and success. For four years he was professor in the Lahainaluna seminary, and while there he prepared (with other writers) an English-Hawaiian Dictionary. He died at Waialua March 28, 1867. — American Annual Cyclopcedia, 7:559.

## Emerson, Ralph, D.D[[@Headword:Emerson, Ralph, D.D]]

             a Congregational divine and scholar, was born at Hollis, N.H., August 18, 1787, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1811 with the highest honors of his class. After studying theology at Andover until 1814, he was tutor at Yale for a short time, and in 1816 became pastor at Norfolk, Conn. In 1827 he was chosen professor of Church history and pastoral theology at Andover, which office he held until 1854. He lived for five years at Newburyport, and then removed to Rockford, Illinois, where some of his children resided, and where he died, May 26, 1863. As a teacher, he maintained a high character during his long service at Andover. —Congregational Quarterly, July 1863.

## Emery, Jacques Andri[[@Headword:Emery, Jacques Andri]]

             an eminent French Roman Catholic divine, was born at Gex, August 27, 1732, and studied in the Jesuits' College at Macon, and also at St. Sulpice, Paris. He was ordained in 1756; became professor of theology at Orleans 1759; and afterwards he held the chair of philosophy at Lyons; in 1776, superior of the seminary at Angers; 1784, head of the abbey of Boisgroland, and also head of the congregation of St. Sulpice. In 1789 he founded a seminary of his congregation at Baltimore, Maryland.

During the French Revolution he was imprisoned both at St. Pelagie and at the Conciergerie. In 1802 he resumed his place among the clergy of Paris, and devoted himself to the restoration of the scattered and broken congregation of St. Sulpice. He died April 18, 1811. Among his numerous writings are L'Esprit de Leibnitz (Lyons, 1772, 2 volumes, 12mo; Paris, 1804, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Esprit de St. Therese (3d edit. Avignon, 1825, 2 volumes, 12mo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 15:943; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 12:315.

## Emery, Samuel Moody, D.D[[@Headword:Emery, Samuel Moody, D.D]]

             an Episcopal minister, was born in West Newbury, Massachusetts, in 1803, and graduated from Harvard College in 1830. He was ordained by the bishop of Connecticut in 1836, and was called to be rector of the Church in  Portland, where he remained in the discharge of his ministerial and parochial duties for the long period of thirty-seven years. Having resigned in 1873, he did not accept another pastorate, but after a time removed to his native place, where he resided about ten years, and died August 16, 1883. See Boston Advertiser, August 18, 1883. (J.C.S.)

## Emeterius Agricola (St. Madir or Matinus)[[@Headword:Emeterius Agricola (St. Madir or Matinus)]]

             is said to have suffered martyrdom near Barcelona, cir. A.D. 680; commemorated March 3. Emetherius (or Heematerius), martyr at Calahorro, on the Ebro, commemorated March 3. Emigdius, first bishop and tutelary saint of Ascolin, in Picenum, suffered martyrdom A.D. 303 or 304, and is commemorated August 5.

## Emila[[@Headword:Emila]]

             (1) Bishop of Barcelona, cir. A.D. 600-615.

(2) Bishop of Mentesa, consecrated before A.D. 589.

(3) Bishop of Ilici (Elche), A.D. 688.

(4) Last bishop of Coimbra under the Goths, A.D. 693.

(5) Deacon and martyr at Cordova, under the Saracens, commemorated September 5.

## Emilianus (or AEmilianus)[[@Headword:Emilianus (or AEmilianus)]]

             (1) First bishop of Valence, in Gaul, A.D. 374.

(2) Eleventh bishop of Vercelli, cir. A.D. 500, commemorated September 11.

(3) Twenty-second bishop of Vercelli, A.D. 653.

(4) Patriarch of Grado, A.D. 749.

(5) An Irish bishop, patron of Faenza, in the north of Italy.

(6) A hermit in the forest of Ponticiacum, in Auvergne, who died at the age of ninety, in A.D. 538.

(7) Called San Millan, one of the most famous of Spanish saints, is said to have been born about 473 in Old Castile, and to have been converted by a  dream while a shepherd; instructed by St. Felix; fixed his hermitage first at Verdeyo, afterwards in the remotest parts of Burgds, where he passed forty years of ascetic life; was drawn into public life by Didymus, bishop of Tarrazona, and ordained a presbyter; but his utter unworldliness drew upon him the odium of his colleagues, and he finally withdrew to a monastery near Vergegium, where he died, after the most rigorous asceticism cir. A.D. 572. He is commemorated November 12. His Life was written by St. Braulio (who died in A.D. 657), and first published by Sandoval in 1601. There is much legend connected with him.

(8) Abbot of Lagny, cir. A.D. 648, commemorated March 10.

(9) Martyr in Numidia, A.D. 259, commemorated April 29.

(10) Martyr at Dorostorum, in Mcesia, under Julian, commemorated July 18.

(11) Deacon, martyred at Cordova, is commemorated September 17.

(12) Presbyter and confessor in Tarragona. commemorated Nov. 12.

## Emilius (or AEmilius)[[@Headword:Emilius (or AEmilius)]]

             (1) Martyr at Capua under Diocletian, commemorated October 6.

(2) A bishop, father of Ia, who was married to Julian of Elana.

(3) Saint, bishop of Beneventum, A.D. 405; perhaps the same with No. 2.

## Emim[[@Headword:Emim]]

             (Hebrews Eynim', אֵימַים, terrors; Sept. Ο᾿μμαῖοι and Ο᾿μμείν; Auth. Vers. "Emims"), a numerous and warlike tribe of the ancient Canaanites, of gigantic stature, defeated by Chedorlaomer and his allies in the plain of Kiriathaim; they occupied, in the time of Abraham, the country east of the Jordan, afterwards possessed by the Moabites (Gen 14:5; Deu 2:10-11). SEE CANAAN. An ingenious writer in the Jour. of Sac. Lit. (April, 1852, page 55 sq.; January 1853, page 296) argues, but upon rather slender grounds, that their original title was Shittim, and identifies them with the Chetta so often referred to in the Egyptian inscriptions. It would appear, from a comparison of Gen 14:5-7 with Deu 2:10-12; Deu 2:20-23, that the whole country east of Jordan was, in primitive times, held by a race of giants, all probably of the same stock, comprehending the Rephaim on the north, next the Zuzim, after them the Emim, and then the Horim on the south; and that afterwards the kingdom of Bashan embraced the territories of the first; the country of the Ammonites, the second; that of the Moabites, the third; while Edom took in the mountains of the Horim. The whole of them. were attacked and pillaged by the Eastern kings who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. SEE REPHAIM. The Emim were related to the Anakim, and were generally called by the same name; but their conquerors, the Moabites, termed them Emimthat is, "Terrible men" (Deu 2:11) — most probably on account of their fierce aspect. SEE ANAKIM.

## Eminence[[@Headword:Eminence]]

             a title of the Romish cardinals, first given to them by Urban VIII, to endow them with a rank equal to that of the spiritual princes of Europe, and of the grand masters of the knights of St. John and of Malta. SEE CARDINALS.

## Eminentius[[@Headword:Eminentius]]

             a Donatist bishop in A.D. 411.

## Emitericus (or Emiterius)[[@Headword:Emitericus (or Emiterius)]]

             twelfth bishop of Tarentaise, in the middle of the 7th century.

## Emlyn, Thomas[[@Headword:Emlyn, Thomas]]

             an English Nonconformist theologian, was born May 27, 1663, at Stamford, in Lincolnshire; made chaplain 1683 by the countess of Donegal. In 1691 he became assistant to Mr. Boyce in the congregation of Nonconformists in Wood Street, Dublin. Having imbibed and preached Arian doctrines, he was deprived of his functions, and fined and imprisoned for two years. Restored to liberty, he continued to preach and to write in favor of Arianism until his death, July 30, 1743. His Works were collected  and published in London, 1746 (3 volumes, 8vo). Waterland notices Emlyn's writings frequently (see the Index to his works, 6 volumes, 8vo). See also Dorner, Person of Christ (Edinb. transl.), div. 2, volume 3, 357.

Emman'uel (Ε᾿μμανουήλ), a Graecized form (Mat 1:23) of the name IMMANUEL SEE IMMANUEL (q.v.).

## Emmaiis[[@Headword:Emmaiis]]

             (Ε᾿μμαούς, prob. from יֵמַים, hot baths, see Gen 36:24), the name of three places in Palestine.

1. A village (κώμη) 60 stadia (A.V. "furlongs") or 7 miles from Jerusalem, noted for our Lord's interview with two disciples on the day of his resurrection (Luk 24:13). The same place is mentioned by Josephus (War, 7:6, 6), and placed at the same distance from Jerusalem, in stating that Vespasian left 800 soldiers in Judaea, to whom he gave the village of Ammaiis (Α᾿μμαοῦς). The direction, however, is not given in either passage. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Ε᾿μμαοῦς, Emmaus) hold that it is identical with Nicopolis [see Number 2, below]; and they were followed by all geographers down to the commencement of the 14th century (Reland, Palaest. page 758). Then, for some reason, it began to be supposed that the site of Emmaus was at the little village of Kubeibeh, about 3 miles W. of Neby Samwil, the eminence N.W. of Jerusalem (Maundeville, in Early Travels in Palestine, page 175; Ludolph. de Suchem, Itiner.; Quaresmius, 2:719; Robinson, Bib. Res. 3:66, note). Mr. Williams regards Kuriet el-Enab as the true location (Journal of Philology, 4:26), and Thomson inclines to the same position (Land and Book, 2:308); but this view has little to recommend it, and the locality is otherwise appropriated. SEE KIRJATH-JEARIM. Schwarz thinks it different from Nicopolis, and that it is mentioned in the Talmud as Barur Chayil ( בָּרוּר חִיַל, i.e., chosen of the army) or Gibbor Chayil (גַּבּוֹר חִיל, i.e., heroes of the army, as being occupied by Roman veterans), a name that he finds in "some ruins which the Arabs call Barburaia, S. of Saris, 7½ Eng. miles from Jerusalem" (Palest. pages 117, 118); but no such name appears on Van de Velde's Map (which lays down Saris at 7 miles N. of W. from Jerusalem). In this uncertainty, the monkish identification with el-KubeiLeh ("the little dome") may for the present be acquiesced in. This corresponds sufficiently in distance from Jerusalem (Raumer, Paldat. page 169), being 7500 paces (Cotovicus, page 315), or 21 hours to the N.W. (Van de  Velde, Memoir, page 309); and containing the ruins of a convent and church (Tobler, Topooroph. von. Jerus. 2:540), although Dr. Robinson describes it (Bib. Res. 2:394) as “a village built up by the government of Gaza on a stony, barren hill, without anything to mark it particularly as an ancient site." On the evangelical incident at this place there are treatises in Latin by Harenberg (in his Otia Gandersh. page 41-60); Walch (Jen. 1754). Zschokke (Das neutest. Emmaus beleuchtet, Schaffh. 1865) argues at length in favor of the modern traditionary site; and the chief building on the spot, known as the "castrum Arnoldi," has lately been bought by some zealous Catholics as a "holy place" (Bibliotheca Sacra. July, 1866, page 517).

2. EMMAUS (Ε᾿μμαούς, 1Ma 3:40, etc; Α᾿μμαούς, Josephus, War, 2:20, 4) or NICOPOLIS, a town in the plain of Philistia, at the foot of the mountains of Judah (Jerome, in Dan 8:1-27), 22 Roman miles from Jerusalem, and 10 from Lydda (Itin. Hieros. ed. Hessel, page 600; Reland, Palest. page 309). The name does not occur in the O.T.; but the town rose to importance during the later history of the Jews, and was a place of note in the wars of the Asmonaeans. It was fortified by Bacchides, the general of Antiochus Epiphanes, when he was engaged in the war with Jonathan Maccabaeus (Josephus, Ant. 13:1, 3; 1Ma 9:50). It was in the plain beside this city that Judas Maccabaeus so signally defeated the Syrians with a mere handful of men, as related in 1Ma 3:57; 1Ma 4:3; 1Ma 9:50. Under the Romans, Emmaus became the capital of a toparchy (Josephus, War, 3:3, 5; Pliny, 5:14). It was burned by the Roman general Varus about A.D. 4. In the 3d century (about A.D. 220) it was rebuilt through the exertions of Julius Africanus, the well-known Christian writer, and then received the name Nicopolis. Eusebius and Jerome frequently refer to it in defining the positions of neighboring towns and villages (Chron. Pas. ad A.C. 223; Reland, page 759). Early writers mention a fountain at Emmaus, famous far and wide for its healing virtues (Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 5:21); the cause of this Theophanes ascribes to the fact that our Lord on one occasion washed his feet in it (Chron. page 41). The Crusaders still called it Nicopolis, but confounded it with a small fortress farther south, on the Jerusalem road, now called Latron (Will. Tyr. Hist. 7:24). A small, miserable village called 'Amwas still occupies the site of the ancient city. It stands on the western declivity of a low, rocky hill commanding the plain, and contains the ruins of an old church a little south of the village, also two copious fountains, one of which is doubtless the ancient medicinal spring  (Robinson, Researches, 2:363; Later Res. page 146, 147; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:290).

Dr. Robinson has recently revived the old theory that the Emmaus of Luke is identical with Nicopolis, and has supported it with his wonted learning, but not with his wonted conclusiveness (Bib. Res. 3:65, 66; Later Res. page 148). He endeavors to cast doubts on the accuracy of the reading ἑξήκοντα in Luk 24:13, because several uncial MSS. and a few unimportant cursive MSS. insert έκατόν, thus making the distance 160 stadia, which would nearly correspond to the distance of Nicopolis. But the best MSS. have not this word, and the best critics regard it as an interpolation. There is a strong probability that some copyist who was acquainted with the city, but not the village of Emmaus, tried thus to reconcile Scripture with his ideas of geography. The opinions of Eusebius, Jerome, and their followers, on a point such as this, are not of very great authority. When the name of any noted place agreed with one in the Bible they were not always careful to see whether the position corresponded in like manner. Emmaus-Nicopolis being a noted city in their day, they were led somewhat rashly to confound it with the Emmaus of the Gospel. The circumstances of the narrative are plainly opposed to the identity. The two disciples, having journeyed from Jerusalem, to Emmaus in part of a day (Luk 24:28-29), left the latter again after the evening meal, and reached Jerusalem before it was very late (Luk 24:33; Luk 24:42-43). Now, if we take into account the distance, and the nature of the road, leading up a steep and difficult mountain, we must admit that such a journey could not be accomplished in less than from six to seven hours, so that they could not have arrived in Jerusalem till long past midnight. This fact seems conclusive against the identity of Nicopolis and the Emmaus of Luke (Reland, Palest. page 427 sq.; Van de Velde, Memoir, page 309).

3. The name Emmaus, or Ammaus (Α᾿μμαούς), was also borne by a village of Galilee close to Tiberias; probably the ancient HAMMATH SEE HAMMATH (q.v.), i.e., hot springs of which name Emmaus was but a corruption. The hot springs still remained in the time of Josephus, and are mentioned by him as giving name to the place (War, 4:1, 3; Ant. 18:2, 3).

## Emmaus[[@Headword:Emmaus]]

             of Luk 24:13. The Sinaitic MS. here reads, one hundred and sixty furlongs, which has been eagerly seized upon as confirming the identification with Nicopolis; but Tischendorf in his last edition of the MS. does not adopt the reading, and the distance as stated by Josephus (War,  7:6, 6) confirms the number sixty. Lieut. Conder is inclined to fix the site of this Emmaus at Khurbet el-Khamasa, eight miles from Jerusalem towards Beit-Jibrin, containing ruins of an ancient church (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:36).

A full description of the interesting remains at Amwas (the Emmaus of 1Ma 3:40) is given in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (iii, 63 sq.). Emmerich, Anna Katharina, a German visionary, was born at Flansk (duchy of Munster), September 8, 1774. In 1802 she joined the Augustinians of Dulmen. She had visions when quite young, and in 1798 declared that she had seen Jesus Christ placing on her forehead a crown of thorns. On the suppression of her convent she retired to, a private house, where she became subject to new visions, during which she claimed to have received the stigmata of the crucifixion, and a crossmark on her chest. The facts were investigated in 1813 by a physician and an ecclesiastical commission, who seem to have been convinced of their reality, and recorded them, in 1814, in a journal of Salzburg. She died February 9, 1824. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Emmer[[@Headword:Emmer]]

             (Ε᾿μμήρ), given (1Es 9:21) as the name of one of the priests whose "sons" had married foreign wives after the exile, in place of the IMMER SEE IMMER (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:20).

## Emmeran or Emmeram[[@Headword:Emmeran or Emmeram]]

             a bishop of Poitiers in the 7th century. He left his see for the purpose of missionary labors in Hungary, but is said to have stopped in Bavaria three years, at the request of duke Theodo, to purify the Christianity of that duchy, where it was sadly mixed with paganism. After this he continued his journey to Rome, and was waylaid and murdered by a son of the duke (September 22, 652), because the daughter of the latter, Uta, claimed to have been dishonored by Emmeran. After his death, a clergyman, Wulflaich by name, maintained the innocence of Emmeran, saying that the latter, shortly before his death, had told him that, in order to help Uta, he had allowed her to name him as seducer, though the real culprit was Sieghart, the son of a judge. This statement of Wulflaich is said to have induced Theodo to bury him with great honors, and to exile his son to Hungary. Emmeran was soon venerated as a saint, and became one of the patron saints of the city and diocese of Ratisbon. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome on the 22d of September. On pictures he is represented as a bishop with a ladder. The accounts of Emmeran are very confused and conflicting; the best one is given by Canisius, Lectiones Antique, 3:1. See Neander, Ch. Hist. 3:39; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 3:779; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:558.

## Emmerich, Frederic Charles Timothee[[@Headword:Emmerich, Frederic Charles Timothee]]

             a French theologian, was born at Strasburg, February 25, 1786. After a journey through Germany he went to Paris, and on his return to Strasburg in 1809 was appointed superior of the College of St. Thomas; and professor of ancient languages in the gymnasium, whence he was transferred in 1812 to the Protestant school, and to the theological faculty in 1819. He died June 1, 1820, leaving, De Evangeliis secundum Hebraeos, Egypteos atque Justinuni Martyrem: — Choix de Sermons (1824). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Emmerling, Christian August Gottfried[[@Headword:Emmerling, Christian August Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born June 6, 1781. He. studied at Leipsic, was in 1805 catechist, and in 1810 preacher there; in 1811 became assistant to the pastor of Probstheyda, near Leipsic, and in 1814 was appointed to the pastorate of that place. He died January 22, 1827, leaving, De Paulo Felicem Institutionis suae Successum Praedicante, 2Co 2:14-17 (Leipsic, 1809): — C.A. Th. Keilii Elementa Hermeneutices Novi Testamenti (ibid. 1811): — Pauli Epistola ad Corinthios posterior (ibid. 1823). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:107, 260. (B.P.)

## Emmons, Nathanael, D.D[[@Headword:Emmons, Nathanael, D.D]]

             one of the founders of a new school in Calvinistic theology, was born April 20 (O.S.), 1745, at East Haddam, Connecticut, a town which was also the birthplace of the missionary brothers David and John Brainerd, of President Edward Dorr Griffin and his brother George D. Griffin, Esq., of the jurist Jeremiah Gates Brainard and the poet James Brainard Taylor. He was the sixth son, and the twelfth and youngest child of his parents. He entered Yale College in 1763, and was graduated with honor in 1767. Among his classmates were Governor John Treadwell, the poet John Trumbull, Professor Samuel Wales, and Dr. Joseph Lyman, who, as long as they lived, exhibited a high degree of reverence for Dr. Emmons. He studied theology first with Reverend Nathan Strong, of Coventry, Connecticut, and  afterwards with Reverend Dr. John Smalley, of Berlin, Connecticut, a divine who had been a pupil of Dr. Joseph Bellamy, and who exerted more influence than perhaps any other man in shaping the theological opinions of young Emmons. — In 1769 Emmons was approbated as a preacher, and on the 20th of April, 1773, was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Franklin, Mass. He remained sole pastor of this church fifty-four years, and an active member of it sixty-seven years and five months. Among the members of the council which ordained him were his two special friends, Rev. Dr. Hopkins, of Newport, Rhode Island, and Reverend Dr. Hart, of Preston, Connecticut, a son-in-law of Dr. Bellamy. During his active pastorate at Franklin he was favored with three revivals of religion, one in 1784, one in 1794, and one in 1808-9. In the first of these revivals about seventy persons, in the second about thirty, and in the third about forty were thought to have consecrated themselves to Christ. One of his aphorisms was, "The seed which a faithful laborer sows is apt to come up when he retires from the field;" and as soon as Dr. Emmons was relieved of his sole pastorate at Franklin, he was gladdened by a fourth revival, in which thirty-six persons were added to his church, and after nine or ten years he rejoiced in a fifth ingathering of the fruits which he had planted. He lived to see nearly four hundred of his parishioners profess their faith in Christ. One of them, Reverend Dr. Blake, has recorded: "Hardly a case of defection from the truth has ever occurred among those who were turned unto God under Dr. Emmons's ministry." His examinations of candidates for church membership were very rigid. — A large part of his influence on the churches has been exerted through his theological pupils. Between eighty-six and a hundred young men were guided by him in their studies preparatory to the Christian ministry. Of these pupils several became useful as professors in our colleges and theological seminaries; many, as sound and strong preachers. Forty-six of them are noticed in the biographical dictionaries of eminent men. His impress upon them was decided and permanent. They were often called Emmonites. — Although he was an adept in metaphysical abstractions; yet he aimed to be a practical man, not only in his influence on his pupils, but also in the general affairs of the Church and the. State. He was the first president, and a father, if not the father of the Massachusetts Missionary Society; which was the parent of many philanthropic institutions. He was also one of the original editors of the Massachusetts Missionary Magazine, which was the germ of the present Missionary herald. He was among the foremost in starting various trains of influence which have now become  parts of our history. When the masonic fraternity was most popular, he was a zealous and mason. When anti-slavery was most generally denounced, he was an active abolitionist. It was often his lot to be an advocate of the weaker party. He was a decided Federalist in politics, and produced a great excitement by some of his political writings. He seldom visited his parishioners, still he was remarkable for his knowledge of their secular as well as religious affairs. He was a man of authority in his parish, faithful, often stern, yet beloved. — It is as an author, however, that he has exerted his greatest influence on the churches. He published during his life more than seven thousand copies of nearly two hundred sermons, besides four elaborate dissertations and more than a hundred essays for the magazines of his day. He must have preached nearly or quite six thousand times, and at his death a part only of his discourses were collected and published in six octavo volumes; to these a seventh volume was afterwards added. At a still subsequent period a new and enlarged edition of his sermons was published in six volumes. The first edition of his works was introduced with a memoir by his son-in-law, Reverend Jacob Ide, D.D., of Medway, Massachusetts; the second edition with a memoir by E.A. Park, of Andover, Massachusetts. — He began to study in 1762; he ceased to preach in 1827: during these sixty-five years he was an earnest, patient, and singularly methodical applicant to books. During ten of the years which followed his resignation of his active pastorate he continued to be an assiduous reader, although he relaxed his habits of intense energetic study. It may be safely affirmed, then, that he devoted seventy-five years to the perusal of books, the meditation on their contents, and the writing on themes suggested by them. He was accustomed to spend ten, twelve, or fourteen hours daily in his room with his book or pen in hand. He had a place for everything, and kept everything in its place. He was temperate in his diet, regular in all his habits, and, although he took no physical exercise, he enjoyed uninterrupted health during his long and laborious life. He was distinguished for his punctuality, precision, definiteness, and sharpness of mind, keen analysis, self-consistency, wit, frankness, honesty, profound reverence for the truth. He was tenacious of old usages, and went so far as to continue to wear the antique dress, even the three-cornered hat, as long as he appeared in public. He was an original thinker, and formed his theological system with rare independence of mind. He coincided in opinion with Dr. Samuel Hopkins, of Newport, more nearly than with any preceding divine. A sketch of his theological system will be given in the subsequent notice of Dr. Hopkins. It may be here remarked, however, that  he considered himself not a high, nor a low, but a consistent Calvinist; and, so far as his speculations were novel, they were mainly designed to make the Genevan scheme consistent with itself. On one Sabbath, for instance, he would use so bold language in advocating the doctrine of decrees as might induce some to call him a Fatalist; and on a following Sabbath he would use so bold language in advocating the doctrine of free-will as might induce some to call him a Pelagian; and on a third Sabbath he would employ his ingenuity in reconciling his statements on the agency of God with his statements on the free agency of man. This ingenuity in harmonizing such views as are often pronounced irreconcilable, was a main source of the interest excited in him. — Dr. Emmons died on the 23d of September, 1840 at the age of ninety-five years and five months. He retained his faculties to a surprising degree until his death, and few men have ever left the world with a more unfaltering and solid faith in Christ. — In 1775 he was married to his first wife, who, with her two children, died in 1778. In 1779 he was married to his second wife, by whom he had five children, two of whom survived him. She was the step-daughter of Reverend Dr. Samuel Hopkins, of Hadley, Mass., and thus he became the brother-in-law of Reverend Dr. Spring, of Newburyport, Mass., Reverend Dr. Austin, president of Burlington College, Reverend Leonard Worcester, and Reverend Mr. Riddel, four strong Hopkinsian divines. In 1831, when he was eighty-six years of age, he was married to his third wife, the widow of his former friend, Reverend Mr. Mills, of Sutton, Mass. (E.A.P.)

## Emmor[[@Headword:Emmor]]

             (Ε᾿μμόρ v.r. Ε᾿μμώρ), a Graecized form (Act 7:16) of the name of HAMOR SEE HAMOR (q.v.), the father of Shechem (Gen 34:2).

## Emory, John, D.D[[@Headword:Emory, John, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Queen Anne County, Maryland, April 11, 1789. After completing his academical education at Washington College, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar at nineteen years of age. His great ability was soon manifest; he came rapidly into practice, and had every prospect of early success. But he had passed through a decided religious experience before his admission to the bar, and soon after decided, in opposition to the will of his father, to enter the ministry. In 1810 he was received on trial in the Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He soon established a reputation for pre-eminence in all the qualities of a true Christian minister. From 1813 to 1824 he filled the most important pastoral stations in the Methodist Connection in America, his appointments being as follows: 1811, Cambridge Circuit; 1812, Talbot Circuit; 1813-14, Philadelphia; 1815, Wilmington; 1816-17, Union Church, Philadelphia; 1818-19, Washington; 182021, Annapolis; 1822, Hagerstown; 1823, Baltimore. In 1816 he was elected to the General Conference, and he was a member of every subsequent General Conference until his death, except that of 1824. In 1820 he was sent as a delegate from the American to the British Conference, and discharged the delicate duties of his mission to the entire satisfaction of the churches. From 1824 to 1832 he was book-agent and editor for the Methodist Episcopal Church at New York. In this post his rare combination of intellectual power and culture with business habits was pre-eminently displayed. To none of the eminent men who have held this office is the Methodist Book Concern more indebted for its present greatness than to Dr. Emory. In the language of Bishop Waugh, "The two great objects which Dr. Emory aimed to accomplish were, first, the extinguishment of the debts due from the concern, and, second, the actual sale of the stock on hand, and especially that pait of it which was daily depreciating, because of the injuries which were constantly being sustained by it, in the scattered and exposed state in which most of it was found. The ability, skill, diligence, and perseverance which he displayed in the measures devised by him for the accomplishment of these objects have seldom been equaled, and perhaps never surpassed by the most practiced business man. His success was complete. Before the meeting of the General Conference he had canceled all the obligations of the institution which had been so opportunely intrusted to his supervision. He had greatly enlarged the annual dividends to an increased number of conferences. He  had purchased several lots of ground for a more enlarged and eligible location of the establishment, and had erected a large four story brick building as a part of the improvements intended to be put on them, for the whole of which he had paid. It was his high honor, and also his enviable satisfaction, to report to the General Conference, for the first time, that its Book Concern was no longer in debt." He originated the "Publishing Fund" and "The Methodist Quarterly Review," and abolished entirely the sale of books on commission. In 1832 he was elected a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and entered upon his duties at once, not only by attending the annual Conferences, but also by general attention to the interests of the Church. He was especially active with regard to education, and had a large share in the organization of Dickinson College. In addition to this, he drew up the outline of a plan for an education society in the Methodist Episcopal Church, which he designed to aid ministers and others in educating their sons. Soon after his election to the episcopacy Dr. Emory devised a course of study for candidates for deacons' and elders' orders, in which, with his usual discretion, he did not hazard everything by attempting too much. The Troy Conference of 1835 was the last which he attended. On the 16th of December in that year he was thrown from his carriage, about two miles from his own house (Reisterstown, Maryland.), at seven o'clock A.M., and at half past seven in the evening he died.

Bishop Emory was a man of great talent and large cultivation. As a scholar, he was accurate and profound; as a preacher, he was clear and convincing: as an administrative officer, he hardly had a superior in any church. As a controversial writer, he was distinguished for logical directness and for fairness to his adversaries. In 1817 he published two pamphlets in reply to bishop White's Objections against Personal Assurance by the Holy Spirit; and in 1818, another, entitled The Divinity of Christ vindicated against the Cavils of Mr. John Wright. The period from 1818 to 1830 was one of great excitement in the Methodist Episcopal Church on various points of Church polity, and in all the controversy Dr. Emory bore a distinguished part. A large party wished to have the office of presiding elder made elective; he fell into the ranks of that party, and, at the General Conference of 1820, he opposed vigorously a theory which gave the bishops a right to veto the acts of the General Conference. In the later conferences as to lay representation he was the principal writer, publishing, in 1824, The Defence of our Fathers, in reply to A. M'Caine, a very vigorous and powerfully written work. After his death there appeared from  his pen The Episcopal Controversy Reviewed (New York, 1838, 8vo), edited by his son, Robert Emory, from an unpublished manuscript; it is a luminous sketch, in reply to bishop Onderdonk's Episcopacy tested by Scripture. Most of the original articles in the first two volumes of the Methodist Quarterly Review were written by him. — Life of Bishop Emory, by his eldest son (N.Y. 1840, 8vo); M'Clintock, in Methodist Quarterly Review, 1842, page 62 sq.; Sprague, Annals, 7:486; Stevens, History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, volume 4.

## Emory, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Emory, Robert, D.D]]

             son of the preceding, an eminent Methodist minister and scholar, was born in Philadelphia, July 29, 1814. His early education was superintended by his father. In 1827 he entered Columbia College, New York, where he graduated in 1831 with the highest honors and medals of his class. He then entered upon the study of law, first in the law school of Yale College, and afterwards in the office of the Hon. Reverdy Johnson, of Baltimore. In 1834 he was elected professor of ancient languages at Dickinson College, Carlisle, and entered upon his duties there with great zeal. In 1839 he was admitted on trial in the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; in 1841 he was appointed to the Baltimore city station; and in 1842 he was appointed acting president of Dickinson College, during the absence of the president (Dr. Durbin). In 1844 he was appointed presiding elder of the Carlisle District; and in 1845 he was made president of Dickinson College. In the same year the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Columbia College. In 1847 he attended the session of the Evangelical Alliance held at London, and few of the delegates made a greater impression upon the body. His health showed signs of failure during this year, and he spent the winter following in the West Indies. But he continued to decline, and on his return homeward he died in Baltimore, May 18, 1848 Dr. Emory was one of those rare men in whom the human faculties, both moral and intellectual, seem to approach perfection, and to reach almost complete harmony of action. His classical scholarship was thorough and accurate; his mind was at once logical and comprehensive, and his general culture was wide and generous. His religious experience was, in many respects, similar to that of President Edwards, and ripened into similar fullness and serenity. As a preacher he was luminous, earnest, and successful. As a college officer he was seldom rivaled. "His power of government was unsurpassed: he seemed born to command. In him prudence and independence met to form that rare combination so essential  to one who rules. This remark finds its illustration and proof in his government of the college, to whose interests he devoted so much of his brief earthly life. While he shrunk from no responsibility of his position, he was still careful to maintain that position by devising the best means to meet responsibility. Though many felt the weight of the scepter in his hand, yet the conviction that it was wielded by a strong man, and in the fear of the Lord, conciliated esteem. As president of the college, as in every other position, he rose rapidly, both before the public and in the college; and the last year in which his name appeared in connection with that office was the most prosperous in the history of the institution. The students honored him even to reverence, and regarded him as standing on a moral and intellectual eminence toward which the indolent and unworthy must not even look, and to which the noblest and best among them ought eagerly to aspire." In 1841 he published A Life of the Rev. John Emory, D.D. (N.Y. 8vo); in 1843, an elaborate History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (N.Y. 12mo). He left unfinished an Analysis of Butler's Analogy, which was completed by the Rev. G. R. Crooks, D.D. (N.Y. Harpers, 1856, 8vo), and which is the best analysis of the Analogy that has ever appeared. — Minutes of Conferences, 1849; Sprague, Annals, 7:828.

## Emotion[[@Headword:Emotion]]

             (emoveo, to move out) "is often used as synonymous with feeling. Strictly taken, it means a ‘state of feeling which, while it does not spring directly from an affection of body, manifests its existence and character by some sensible effect upon the body.' An emotion differs from a sensation by its not originating in a state of body; and from a cognition, by its being pleasurable or painful. Emotions, like other states of feeling, imply knowledge. Something beautiful or deformed, sublime or ridiculous, is known and contemplated; and on the contemplation springs up the appropriate feeling, followed by the characteristic expression of countenance, or attitude, or manner. In themselves considered, emotions can scarcely be called springs of action. 'The feelings of beauty, grandeur, and whatever else is comprehended under the name of taste, do not lead to action, but terminate in delightful contemplation, which constitutes the essential distinction between them and the moral sentiments, to which, in some points of view, they may doubtless be likened' (Mackintosh, Dissert. page 238). Emotions tend rather, while they last, to fix attention on the objects or occurrences which have excited them. In many instances, however, emotions are succeeded by desires to obtain possession of the  objects which awaken them, or to remove ourselves from the presence of such objects. When an emotion is thus succeeded by some degree of desire, it forms, according to Lord Kames, a passion, and becomes, according to its nature, a powerful and permanent spring of action. Emotions, then, are awakened through the medium of the intellect, and are varied and modified by the conception we form of the objects to which they refer. Emotions manifest their existence and character by sensible effects upon the body. Emotions, in themselves and by themselves, lead to quiescence and contemplation rather than acaccity; but they combine with springs of action, and give to them a character and a coloring. What is said to be done from surprise or shame has its proper spring — the surprise or shame being concomitant" (Dr. Chalmers, Sketches of Mental and Moral Philosophy, page 88. — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.

## Empedocles[[@Headword:Empedocles]]

             an ancient philosopher of Agrigentum, "distinguished himself by his knowledge of natural history and medicine, and his talents for philosophical poetry. It is generally believed that he perished in the crater of Atna. Some suppose him to have been a disciple of Pythagoras or Aichytas (Diog. Laert. 8:54 sq.); others, of Parmenides. He cannot have been an immediate scholar of the first, inasmuch as Aristotle (Met. 1:3) represents him as contemporary with, but younger than Anaxagorar, and because he appears to have been the master of Corgias. His philosophy, which he described in a didactic poem, of which only fragments have come down to us, combined the elements of various systems, most nearly approaching that of Pythagoras and Heraclitus, but differing from the latter, principally,

1. Inasmuch as Empedocles more expressly recognizes four elements, earth, water, air, and fire: these elements (compare his system, in this respect, with that of Anaxagoras) he affirmed not to be simple in their nature, and assigned the most important place to fire.

2. Besides the principle of concord (φιλία), opposed to that of discord (νεῖκος) (the one being the source of union and good, the other of their opposites), he admitted into his system necessity also, to explain existing phenomena. To the first of these principles he attributed the original composition of the elements. The material world (σφαῖρος, μῖγμα) he believed, as a whole, to be divine, but in the sub lunar portion of it he detected a considerable admixture of evil and imperfection. He taught that  at some future day all things must again sink into chaos. He advanced a subtle and scarcely intelligible theory of the active and passive affections of things (comp. Plato, Menon. ed. Steph. page 76, C. D.; Arist. De Gener. et Corr. 1:8; Fraym. ap. Sturz. 5:117), and drew a distinction between the world as presented to our senses (κὀσμος αἰσθητός), and that which he presumed to Le the type of it, the intellectual world (κόσμος νοητός). He looked for the principle of life in fire, admitting, at the same time, the existence of a Divine Being pervading the universe. From this superior intelligence he believed the daemones to emanate, to whose nature the human soul is allied. Man is a fallen daemon. There will be a return to unity, a transmigration of souls, and a chancre of forms. The soul he defined to consist in a combination of the four elements (because cognition depends upon the similarity of the subject and object), and its seat he pronounced to be principally the blood" (Tennemann, Manual Hist. Philippians § 106). Lewes differs from all other historians respecting the place occupied by Empedocles, making his system to include elements from the Pythagorean, Eleatic, Heraclitic, and Anaxagorean systems (History of Philosophy, Lond. 1867, 2 volumes, 8vo, 1:89 sq.). See Sturz, Empedocles Agrigentinus, De Vita et Philo: ophia ejus exposuit, Carminum Reliquias er Antiquis Scriptoribus collegit, recensuit, illustraiit Fr. Guil. Sturz (Lips. 1805, 8vo); J.G. Neumanni Pror. de Empedocle Philosopho (Viteb. 1790, fol.); Lommatzsch, Die Weisheit des Emped. (Berlin, 1830); Stein, Emped. Agrigent. fragmnenta (Bonn, 1852); Winnefeld, Die Philosophie des Emped. (Rastadt, 1862); Steinhart, in Ersch und Gruber, Alygem. Encyklop. s.v. Empedocles.

## Empereur, Constantine Le[[@Headword:Empereur, Constantine Le]]

             SEE LEMPEREUR.

## Emperor[[@Headword:Emperor]]

             (Lat. imperator, general), a title common (in its Latin form) to all governors who had paramount jurisdiction within a given province (Smith, Diet. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Imperium), but technically assumed as a praenomen first by Julius Caesar (Sueton. Jul. 76), as affecting supreme power, and historically attributed to his successors, the heads of the so- styled ROMAN EMPIRE SEE ROMAN EMPIRE (q.v.). They were also designated as CAESAR SEE CAESAR (q.v.). We are here chiefly concerned with them as they came in contact with the Christian religion in the character of persecutors or patrons. SEE PERSECUTION. (See  Baldwin, Edicta vett. principum Roman. de Christianis, Hal. 1727 [also in Heineccii Jurispr. Romans 1:1374 sq.]; Crause, De Romanorum imperatoribus haereticis, viz. 1674; Hebenstreit, De primis Christianis imperatoribus, Jen. 1702; Heineccius, De ministris Caesarun Christianis, Hal. 1712; also Hirt, De imperatorun ante Constant. erga Christianos favore, Jen. 1758; Koepke, De statu Christianorum sub impp. Berol. 1828).

The following is a complete list of the Roman emperors, with their respective dates of accession.

Julio-Claudians

(31 or) 27 B.C. - 14 A.D. Augustus

14 - 37 Tiberius

37 - 41 Caligula

41 - 54 Claudius

54 - 68 Nero

Year of the 4 Emperors

(ends with Vespasian)

68 - 69 Galba

69 Otho

69 Vitellius

Flavian Dynasty

69 - 79 Vespasian

79 - 81 Titus

81 - 96 Domitian

5 Good Emperors

96 - 98 Nerva

98 - 117 Trajan

117 - 138 Hadrian

138 - 161 Antoninus Pius

161 - 180 Marcus Aurelius

(161 - 169 Lucius Verus)

(The next cluster of emperors is not part of a specific dynasty or other common grouping, but includes 4 from the year of the 5 emperors, 193.)

177/180 - 192 Commodus

193 Pertinax

193 Didius Julianus

193 - 194 Pescennius Niger

193 - 197 Clodius Albinus

Severans

193 - 211 Septimius Severus

198/212 - 217 Caracalla

217 - 218 Macrinus

218 - 222 Elagabalus

222 - 235 Severus Alexander

(More emperors without a dynastic label, although it includes the year of the 6 emperors, 238.) For more on this age of chaos, read Brian Campbell's excellent synopsis in The Romans and Their World.

235 - 238 Maximinus

238 Gordian I and II

238 Balbinus and Pupienus

238 - 244 Gordian III

244 - 249 Philip the Arab

249 - 251 Decius

251 - 253 Gallus

253 - 260 Valerian

254 - 268 Gallienus

268 - 270 Claudius Gothicus

270 - 275 Aurelian

275 - 276 Tacitus

276 - 282 Probus

282 - 285 Carus Carinus Numerian

Tetrarchy

285-ca.310 Diocletian

295 L. Domitius Domitianus

297-298 Aurelius Achilleus

303 Eugenius

285-ca.310 Maximianus Herculius

285 Amandus

285 Aelianus Iulianus

286?-297? British Emperors

286/7-293 Carausius

293-296/7 Allectus

293-306 Constantius I Chlorus

Dynasty of Constantine

293-311 Galerius

305-313 Maximinus Daia

305-307 Severus II

306-312 Maxentius

308-309 L. Domitius Alexander

308-324 Licinius

314? Valens

324 Martinianus

306-337 Constantinus I

333/334 Calocaerus

337-340 Constantinus II

337-350 Constans I

337-361 Constantius II

350-353 Magnentius

350 Nepotian

350 Vetranio

355 Silvanus

361-363 Julianus

363-364 Jovianus

(More emperors without a dynastic label)

364-375 Valentinianus I

375 Firmus

364-378 Valens

365-366 Procopius

366 Marcellus

367-383 Gratian

375-392 Valentinianus II

378-395 Theodosius I

383-388 Magnus Maximus

384-388 Flavius Victor

392-394 Eugenius

395-423 Honorius [Division of the Empire - Honorius' brother Arcadius ruled the East 395-408]

407-411 Constantine III usurper

421 Constantius III

423-425 Johannes

425-455 Valentinian III

455 Petronius Maximus

455-456 Avitus

457-461 Majorian

461-465 Libius Severus

467-472 Anthemius

468 Arvandus

470 Romanus

472 Olybrius

473-474 Glycerius

474-475 Julius Nepos

475-476 Romulus Augustulus

## Emphotium[[@Headword:Emphotium]]

             (ἐυφώτιον) is one of the names for the white robe with which persons were invested at baptism. The name is no doubt derived from the "enlightening" attributed to the baptismal ceremony. SEE BAPTISM.

## Emphytensis[[@Headword:Emphytensis]]

             (ἐμφύτενσις) is a contract by which the beneficial ownership of real property is transferred by the proprietor to another, either for a term of not less than ten years, or for a life or lives, or in perpetuity, in consideration of an annual payment. It differs from letting in that it applies only to real property, and must last for at least ten years; while in letting only the use and enjoyment of produce is transferred. It is unlike feudal tenure in that it requires periodical payment, not personal service.

Ecclesiastical emphytensis is a contract by which property belonging to a church, monastery, or other religious foundation, is granted. It requires the assent of the bishop, and must be for the benefit of the body granting it. This precaution is taken to check the alienation of church property. SEE ALIENATION.

## Empie, Adam, D.D[[@Headword:Empie, Adam, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Schenectady, N.Y. He graduated from Union College; studied medicine at Columbia College; then studied theology; was ordained deacon in 1809, and his first charge was in Hempstead, L.I., where he also taught the classics; became pastor of St. James's, Wilmington, Delaware, in 1811; in 1814 received an appointment as chaplain and professor of rhetoric in the United States Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.; became rector again at St. James's parish, Wilmington, in 1815; president of the College of William and Mary, Virginia, in 1827; resigned the presidency in 1836; was temporarily principal of the diocesan school at Raleigh, N.C.; removed in 1837 to Richmond, Virginia, becoming rector of St. James's, where he remained until declining health compelled his retirement. He returned to Wilmington in 1859, and died there November 6, 1860, aged seventy-five years. Dr. Empie led a laborious life. He represented his church in Virginia on several  occasions in the General Convention. Among his literary remains is a volume of Sermons, published in 1856. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1861, page 698.

## Empire, Roman[[@Headword:Empire, Roman]]

             SEE ROMAN EMPIRE.

## Empiricism, Empirism, Empiric[[@Headword:Empiricism, Empirism, Empiric]]

             Empiricism, in its primary meaning, signifies the method or habit of judging from observation or trial; and an empiric is one who forms his conclusions in this manner. Empiricism may thus be employed to denote either inductive reasoning, in which observation and experiment furnish the data for the conclusions drawn by the reason, or that unscientific mode of procedure which accepts the phenomena as they are observed, without analysis or accurate determination. In the former case the term is used in a good sense, and is equivalent to experimental science; in the latter it is used in a bad sense, and this is its ordinary employment.

The relation of experience to science, and to art or practice, is precisely exhibited by Aristotle in the opening chapter of his Metaphysics; but the  peculiar terseness of the Aristotelian phraseology renders expansion and restatement of his positions necessary, in order to adapt them to modern views.

Art, or systematic action, is founded upon observation, but upon observation reduced to theory, or to consonance with theory. That is to say, observation furnishes the facts, but they must be coordinated and interpreted in order to constitute valid knowledge (science), or a reliable rule of action (art). If the observations be indistinct or perplexed, or if they be not sufficiently numerous to establish a general conclusion, or if a general conclusion be drawn prematurely, the induction is deceptive, and obnoxious to the censures passed by Lord Bacon upon the simple enumeration of examples (Nov. Org. 1, aph. 69, cv; Instaur. Sei. tom. 9, page 146; Distr. Op. page 167, ed. Montagu). The true nature of the induction required is briefly stated by Campanella: "Inductio est argumentatio a partibus sufficienter enumeratis ad suum totum universale." What is a sufficient exposition of the particulars may be learned from the Second Book of the Novum Organon, or more satisfactorily from Whewell's Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, Comte's Political Philosophy, and Mill's Logic.

When the observations are sufficiently multiplied and varied, and when they have been analyzed and sifted so as to eliminate all illusions, and everything which does not bear distinctly upon the point under consideration, then they justify a definite conclusion. This is the "nul implicatio et vindemiatio instantiarum" so strenuously urged by Lord Bacon. But, even in this case, the general experience authorizes a universal conclusion only by assuming a law latent under each of the concordant instances by which all are governed. In establishing or accepting the conclusion there is need for the introduction of a purely rational element — if none other, at least the principle that nature acts uniformly, and that what is true of all observed instances is true of all similar phenomena. Thus theory is needed to permit and to complete induction, or inference from observation.

This accumulation, collation, and appreciation of instances is disregarded by undisciplined and impatient minds. A few recurrences loosely noted, or a single undigested observation, is made the foundation for a universal conclusion, without reference to any rational principle. The designation derived from experience and inquiry is still retained, but, in consequence of  want of validity in the process, and of method, reliability, and rationality in the corresponding practice, it receives an unfavorable import, and empiricism commonly denotes that mode of reasoning which is based upon hasty and inadequate observation, and which neglects scientific principle and scientific precision.

This exposition of the derivation and deflection of the meaning is illustrated and confirmed by the history of the term. In the middle of the 3d century before Christ a revolution in medical practice was inaugurated by Philinus of Cos and Serapion of Alexandria. They revolted against the maxims of the Dogmatists, and repudiated the course pursued by the Methodists of treating all cases of disease according to fixed theoretical rules. They observed the symptoms of disorders, and the specific effects of remedial agents; they considered the idiosyncrasies of their patients as affected by climates and localities; and they employed the therapeutics which hidden found effectual in analogous instances. They recognized three kinds of experience: chance, experiment, and imitation, but relied principally upon the last, which is a sort of blind observation. They thus introduced into medical practice the whole train of inductive reasoning, and were in consequence designated Empirics. The school flourished for nearly five centuries, and its duration attests its merit and success. It had started, however, with sundry hazardous hypotheses, such as the doctrine of Homoeopathy, and in its best period had trusted mainly to disguised analogies, which were usually obscure, and too often delusive. The Empirics rejected formal science; they contemned theoretical views and rational deductions, and thus drifted into close approximation to the Skeptics. Their original doctrine was an extravagance in the manner of its assertion, but it was a wholesome reaction against a more perilous excess. With the succession of generations, however, their cardinal principle of depending exclusively on observation was pushed so far as to engender the wildest fantasies. Hence no confidence could be placed in their treatment of diseases. It was thus that the term Empiricism received the opprobrious signification which is habitually attached to it. The meaning of a word is perpetuated in the last perversion which it has received from popular use.

The name originating in this way in the schools of medicine was readily transferred to the corresponding procedure in other departments of knowledge. Empiricism is opposed to science in the same way that a paralogism is opposed to a syllogism: it is the abuse, or the imperfect use of a procedure which is valid when correctly pursued. It is confused  observation developed into unreliable induction. But the distortion of the process, and the consequent degradation of the word denoting the process, evince the partial agreement between empiricism and scientific reasoning. It becomes, therefore, expedient to point out more explicitly the relation which observation and experience bear to theory, or philosophical reasoning.

Science is the systematic coordination of observed facts, and the exhibition of their dependence upon general principles. Observation collects particulars, which should be compared and tested, so as to eliminate all discrepancies and all accidental agreements, and to disentangle from the complex phenomena the single point of positive and habitual concordance. When this is adequately achieved, the regular association of the facts under consideration is established. This, however, provides only what Bacon designates axiomata media — those inductions which ascertain the character and direct connections of the phenomena. A further generalization is required; these intermediate axioms must be traced to precise laws. Such is the nature and procedure of strict inductive science, with which empiricism is more immediately contrasted, though it arose originally out of the antagonism to dogmatic deduction. The empiric disregards these careful comparisons and gradual approximations, and leaps at once from loosely-observed data, from casual coincidences, or from a few disconnected instances to a general conclusion. He has no principle to restrain him, no recognised law for his guidance. From the absence of all certainty, and the consequent liability to error, empiricism has come to denote rash and ignorant generalization leading to hazardous and unreasoning applications.

Another important point demands attention. Certain phenomena are so complex and so inapprehensible by the processes of rigid observation, comparison, and experiment, that they scarcely admit of rigorously scientific treatment. Moreover, from the want of opportunity for applying the methods of science, and from the multiplicity of concurrent, interacting, and irregularly varying influences involved in the production of the result, scientific induction and philosophical deduction fail to include or to exclude everything which should be embraced or rejected. The subject either does not yet admit of scientific treatment, but must be governed by the suggestions of unanalyzed experience, or there is a large discordance between the scientific conclusions and the observed facts. In these cases the indications of experience cannot be disregarded, and the procedure, to  be adopted, must be in greater or less measure empirical. History, politics, social organization, agriculture, and many of the applications of physical science to human requirements demand, in a greater or less degree, this subordination of scientific results to observed facts. But the insufficiency of the procedure should be recognised; for empiricism, even in its most favorable form, is tentative and problematical, because it is the renunciation of the guidance of the reason, and the acceptance of imperfect or imperfectly-digested observation for the prescriptions of ascertained and immutable law. Empiricism is available only in consimili casu; and, as this exact similitude can never be assured, but is always precarious, it is necessarily attended with insecurity. If the conditions or concomitances vary so as to modify the result, it is a blind leader of the blind. The only protection in changed circumstances, or under novel conditions, is a knowledge of the general principles which govern the facts, and this knowledge is obtained only from science, inductive or deductive. Theory and experience have distinct but associated functions: theory is the abstract rationale of the phenomena; experience is their undiscriminating representation: theory degenerates into rash inexperience when not checked by careful observation; experience runs into wild and pernicious fantasies when not illuminated by speculative discernment. The two must be combined and conciliated in order to afford any absolute confidence in the rectitude of our conclusions, and the procedure founded thereon. If they be separated, and to the extent to which they are separated, experience is valid only in matters of mere routine; theory or science is always required under novel combinations. Theory, unregulated by experience, is as arbitrary and capricious as experience unenlightened by reason, and misleads hopelessly, because it never awakens any suspicion of the possibility of error. But theory, which systematizes the conclusions drawn from an adequate range and degree of observation, furnishes guidance under all changes of circumstance; while empiricism only misleads and betrays in every case when it is necessary to deviate in any respect from a procedure already adopted and approved.

Empiricism is thus at all times an irrational procedure, though it may furnish a practical rule within a very limited sphere. Theory may beguile, in consequence of its imperfect constitution or rash application, but is always requisite to insure the recognition of established law, and obedience to the immutable prescriptions of reason in the individual or in the order of creation. An empirical procedure may often be indispensable, but, when  most necessary, it is provisional only. A theoretical procedure may be demanded before adequate experience has been acquired, but this must be confirmed or reformed by the observation of facts. It is only when theory is sustained by facts, and facts are explained by theory, that knowledge becomes entirely trustworthy. Many departments of practical knowledge are not yet, and may never be, capable of thorough scientific organization. In these we must continue to. be guided by empirical conclusions; but they are received, not because they are sufficient, but because nothing better is attainable. Empiricism is, therefore, always inadequate, and usually deceptive. (G.F.H.)

## Emporagius, Eric Gabriel[[@Headword:Emporagius, Eric Gabriel]]

             a Swedish theologian, studied at Upsal, and taught physics there in 1637, and theology in 1641; was received as doctor by that faculty in 1647, and in 1654, after having filled other ecclesiastical positions, was appointed bishop of Strengnas. He died March 14, 1674, leaving, among other writings, Admonitio Consolatoria, etc. (Upsal, 1629): — De Rerum Duratione (ibid. 1631): — Hexilogica (ibid. 1636): — De Disciplina Ecclesiastica (Stockholm, 1661). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Empyrean[[@Headword:Empyrean]]

             (Gr. ἐν, in, and πῦρ,fjre), a name some-times given to heaven, the special residence of deity, from the burning splendor with which it is supposed. to be invested.

## Ems Congress[[@Headword:Ems Congress]]

             a meeting of plenipotentiaries of the archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, Treves, and Salzburg, held in the watering-place of Ems, in August 1786, for the purpose of defining the rights belonging to bishops and archbishops, and of opposing the exorbitant demands of the papal nuncio. The agreement which was arrived at, and which consists of 23 articles, is called the Ems Punctation. The archbishops of Germany, as well as the emperors, had long been dissatisfied with the endeavors made by the popes, under the pretext of securing the execution of the decrees of the Council of Trent, to steadily enlarge the rights of papal nuncios and legates in Germany at the expense of the bishops. A serious conflict was brought on by the elector Karl Theodor of Bavaria, who, in order to supersede as much as possible the episcopal jurisdiction of other princes of the empire, such as the archbishops of Salzburg and Cologne, over his subjects, induced the Pope to appoint a papal nuncio at the court of Munich. The archbishop of Salzburg in 1785 requested the archbishop of Mentz, as primate of the German Catholic Church, to avert the new danger threatening the authority of the archbishops. The primate remonstrated in Rome, and his example was soon followed by the bishops of Eichstidt and Freising. But Pope Pius VI declared that the new nuncio in Munich, Zoglio, would be clothed with the same authority which had heretofore been exercised by the nuncio in Cologne. The archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg appealed to the emperor Joseph II for aid against this encroachment of the Pope upon their rights. The emperor replied, October 12, 1785, that the Pope would at once be notified that the emperor would never allow an infringement upon the diocesan rights of the German bishops. Nevertheless, the new nuncio Zoglio made his appearance in Munich in March 1786; informed all archbishops and bishops whose dioceses embraced part of Bavaria of his  arrival; exercised all the prerogatives which the Pope claimed for his nuncios; and even appointed a subnuncio at Dusseldorf. The archbishop of Cologne remonstrated against these proceedings to the emperor, and the latter ordered the elector Karl Theodor to forbid the nuncio the further exercise of functions which did not belong to him. At the same time, the archbishops of Cologne, Treves, Mentz, and Salzburg forbade their subjects to receive any orders from the nuncios of Munich and Cologne. In order to organize a combined resistance to the papal encroachments, the archbishop of Mentz invited the archbishops of Cologne, Treves, and Salzburg to send deputies to a congress to be held at Ems. The invitation was accepted, and accordingly the Ems congress met in August 1786. It was composed of the assistant bishop Heimes, of Mentz, the official Beckt of Treves, the official Von Tautphaeus, of Cologne, and the consistorial councillor Bonike, of Salzburg. These deputies, on the 25th of August, agreed upon the Ems Punctation, the most important points of which are the following:

1. All those papal prerogatives and reservations which were unknown in the first centuries, but derived from the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, must now be abandoned.

2. The bishops, having, received from Christ the power to bind and to loose, the persons living within their dioceses must not pass over their immediate ecclesiastical superiors in order to have recourse to Rome. No exemptions must any more be allowed except such as have been confirmed by the emperors. The members of monastic orders are forbidden to receive any orders from their generals, or any superiors living outside of Germany.

3. As the bishops have the power to grant dispensations, the so-called facultates quinquennales shall no longer be asked from the papal court; and the bulls, briefs, and rescripts of the popes, as well as all the declarations, rescripts, and orders of the Roman congregations, shall not be received in Germany without their express recognition by the bishops.

4. The nuncios shall have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but shall be merely ambassadors of the Pope.

The Punctation, signed by the four archbishops, was sent to the emperor Joseph, who assured the archbishops of his assistance, but also declared, perhaps influenced by the nuncio Caprara at Vienna, that the execution would depend upon an agreement between the archbishop on the one hand,  and the exempts, the suffragan bishops, and the government on the other. The papal party, in the mean while, endeavored to excite the jealousy of the bishops against the four archbishops, charging the latter with an intention of extending their rights at the expense of those of the bishops. The archbishop of Mentz was in particular charged with a desire to establish a primatical authority over all archbishops and bishops of Germany. Among the bishops who came forward to attack the Punctation, those of Spires, Hildesheim, and Wurzburg were prominent. Soon particular interests caused disagreement among the signers of the Punctation. The archbishop of Mentz approached the Pope with a request to have baron von Dalberg appointed his coadjutor; the archbishop of Treves (1787) appealed to Rome for a renewal of the facultates quinquennales; and finally, in 1789, all the four archbishops declared that they desired a settlement of the controversy, and that they recognized the right of the Pope to send nuncios and to grant dispensations. The literature on the Congress and the Punctation of Ems is very copious. The results of the congress were at once published in the work Resultate des Emser Congresses (Francf. 1787) [also in Die neuesten Grundlagen der deutsch- kath. Kirchen-Vefassung, Stuttgardt, 1821]. The official reply of Rome is entitled Responsio ad Metropolitanos Mogunt. Trevir. Colon. et Salisb. super Nuntiaturis (Rome, 1789). See also Neudecker, in Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 3:784; Munich, Gesch. des Emser Congresses; Pacca (papal nuncio at Cologne), Histor. Denkuiirdigkeiten (Augsburg, 1832); Stigloher, Die Errichtung der pabstl. Nuntiatur in, Munchen und der Emser Congress (Ratisbon, 1866). (A.J.S.)

## Emser, Hieronymus[[@Headword:Emser, Hieronymus]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, and one of the most Violent of Luther's opponents in the Reformation, was born at Ulm March 26, 1477. After having begun his studies at Tubingen, he went to continue them at Basle, where he applied himself to jurisprudence, theology, and Hebrew. He accompanied cardinal Raymond de Gurk, who had appointed him his chaplain and secretary, through Germany and Italy in 1500-1502. Some time after he became lecturer at Erfurt, which he quitted (1504) to reside at the University of Leipzic, where he taught canonical law. About the same time, George, duke of Saxony, took him as his private secretary. The duke, who had a desire to procure the canonization of bishop Benno, of Meissen, employed Emser to visit a number of convents, especially in Bohemia, to collect information concerning Benno; and in 1510 sent him to Rome. On  his return from Rome he received from the duke two prebends, at Dresden and Meissen. About this time he' also appears to have been consecrated a priest. His recovery from a severe sickness he ascribed to the intercession of bishop Benno, and was thereby induced to write a eulogy of him (Divi Bennonis Vita, Lips. 1512). With Luther, whose reformatory zeal had already begun to attract attention, Emser remained on good terms until the time of the Leipzig disputation (1519). Luther called him Emser noster (our Emser), and was kindly received by Eraser when he had to preach before duke George at Dresden. The literary controversy between Emser and Luther commenced soon after the Leipzic disputation with a letter from Emser to Dr. Zack, provost at Leitmneritz, in which the opinion was expressed that Luther had nothing in common with the Bohemian Hussites, and an intimation was given that Luther was ready to abandon his reformatory views. As Emser, who was descended from a noble family, used in this letter his escutcheon, the forepart of a he-goat, Luther addressed his very bitter reply to the "Wild-goat Emser" (ad AEgocerotem Emseranum, Wittenberg, 1519), and in his subsequent writings generally called him "the he-goat of Leipzic," or "He-goat Emser." In his reply, Emser called Luther's theology "novel and cynic," and represented Luther's reformatory labors as merely the result of the jealousy of the Augustinian monks against the Dominicans. Emser also attacked Carlstadt, Zwingle, Pirkheimer, and other reformers; was soon joined by Eck, and thus helped to kindle a violent controversy all through Germany. In 1520 Luther burned Emser's writings along with the papal bull and the decretals. As Emser's works were almost wholly personal invectives, the interest in them soon ceased, and in the history of the Reformation they are of little significance. As duke George forbade Luther's translation of the Bible, Emser, in 1527, published another German translation made from the Vulgate. Emser branded Luther's version as a horrible corruption; but at present even the Roman Catholic writers of Germany acknowledge that Emser's version is of no value, and, in a literary point of view, greatly inferior to that of Luther. Emser died November 8, 1527, where and how is not known. The titles of the numerous works of Emser may be found in Waldau, Nachrichten von Emser's Leben und Schriften (Anspach, 1783). See Neudecker, in Herzog, Real-Encykl. 3:782; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 16:17. (A.J.S.)

## En-[[@Headword:En-]]

             (Hebrews Eyn-, עֵין, constr. of עִין, a fountain), a prefix to many names of places in Hebrews (e.g. En-gedi, En-gammin, En-dor, En-haddah, En- hazor, En-harod, En-mishpah; En-eglaim, En-shemesh, En-rogel, Entannim [Neh 2:13], En-tappuah); all so called from a living spring in the vicinity; and corresponding to the Arabic prefix Ain- (Robinson, Researches, 3:225), in which language, as also in the Syriac and Ethiopic, it has the same signification; in two instances (Jos 21:16; Num 34:11) it stands alone as the name of a place (q.d. "the spring"); also in the dual, ENAM SEE ENAM (q.v.), and plural ANIM SEE ANIM (q.v.), the latter likewise in the Aramaic form Enon (q.v.). SEE AIN.

## En-Tannim[[@Headword:En-Tannim]]

             (Hebrews Eyn hat-tannim', עֵין הִתִּנַּים, fountain of the dragons or jackals; Sept. πηγὴ τῶν συκῶν), a reservoir on the west side of Jerusalem (Neh 2:13). probably the present upper pool of Gihon; Anglicized DRAGON-WELL SEE DRAGON-WELL (q.v.).

## En-dor[[@Headword:En-dor]]

             (Heb. Eyn-Dor', עֵן דּוֹר, fountain of Dor, i.e., of the age, 1Sa 28:7, Sept. Ε᾿νδώρ v.r. Α᾿ενδώρ; but defectively עֵן דֹּר in Jos 17:11, Sept. Δώρ, v.r. Ε᾿νδώρ; and ρ0αΔ9᾿οι in Psa 83:10 [11], Sept. Α᾿ενδώρ; Josephus ῎Ενδωρον᾿, Ant. 6:14, 2), a place which, with its "daughter-towns" (בָּנוֹת), was in the territory of Issachar, and yet possessed by Manasseh (Jos 17:11). This was the case with five other places which lay partly in Asher, partly in Issachar, and seem to have formed a kind of district of their own, called "the three, or the triple Nepheth" (q.v.). The Israelites were unable to expel the Canaanites from it until a late period. Endor was long held in memory by the Jewish people as connected with the great victory of Deborah and Barak over Sisera and Jabins. Taanach, Megiddo, and the torrent Kishon all witnessed the discomfiture of the huge host, but it was emphatically to Endor that the tradition of the death of the two chiefs attached itself (Psa 83:9-10). Possibly it was some recollection of this, some fame of sanctity or good omen in Endor, which drew the unhappy Saul thither (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2:161) on the eve of his last engagement with an enemy no less hateful and no less destructive than the Midianites (1Sa 28:7). Endor is not again mentioned in the Scriptures; but it was known to Eisebius and Jerome, who describe it (by the same name, Α᾿ενδώρ and Ε᾿νδώρ, AEndor and Endor) as a large village in the plain of Jezreel or Esdraelon, 4 miles S. of Tabor (Onomast. s.v. Α᾿ηνδώρ, AEndor), near Nain and Scythopolis (ib. s.v. ᾿Ηνδώρ, Endor). It was recognized during  the Crusades (Brocardus, c. 6, page 176; Marin. Sanut. page 248), but was then partially lost sight of till the 17th century (Doubdan, page 580; Nau, page 632; Maundrell, Apr. 19). On the bleak northern slope of Jebel Duhy (the "Little Hermon" of travelers) the name still lingers, attached to a considerable but now deserted village (Burckhardt, Trav. page 342; Robinson, Res. 3:218; Schwarz, Palest. page 149). The rock of the mountain, on the slope of which Endur stands, is hollowed into caves, one of which, containing a little fountain, the entrance narrow, between rugged rocks, and partly covered with a fig-tree, may well have been the scene of the incantation of the witch (Van de Velde, Narrative, 2:383). The distance from the slopes of Gilboa to Endor is 7 or 8 miles, over difficult ground (Porter, Handb. 2:358).

## En-eglaim[[@Headword:En-eglaim]]

             [many En-egla'imi] (Hebrews Eyn Egla'yim, עֵין עֶגְלִיַםfountain of two calves, unless for עֵין עֶגְלִיַם, fountain of two pools; Sept. Ε᾿ναγαλείμ v.r. Εναγαλλείμ), a place named only by Ezekiel (Eze 47:10), apparently as on the Dead Sea, but whether near to or far from Engedi, on the west or east side of the sea, it is impossible to ascertain from the text: "The fishers shall stand upon it from En-gedi even to En-eglaim: they shall be a place to spread forth nets." In his comment on the passage, Jerome places it at the northern end of the Deed Sea, at the influx of the Jordan. M. de Saulcy thinks it identical with AinAjlah, situated towards the northern point of the Dead Sea, between Jericho and the Jordan (Narrative, 1:163). SEE BETH- HOGLAH. En-eglaim is probably another name for the EGLAIM SEE EGLAIM (q.v.) of Isa 15:8.

## En-gannim[[@Headword:En-gannim]]

             (Hebrews Eyn Gannim'עֵין גִּנַּים ם, fountain of gardens), the name of several places in Palestine, for, besides those mentioned below, there was said, according to Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. ᾿Ηγαννί, Engannim), then to be a third village called Engannim (᾿Ηγαννά, Eganna) near Gerasa, beyond the Jordan.

1. (Sept. ᾿Ηνγονείμ v.r. unrecognizable; Vulg. AEngannim.) A town in the plains of Judah, mentioned between Zanoah and Tappuah (Jos 15:34). Eusebius and Jerome state (Onomast. s.v. ῾Ηγανίμ, Engannim) that it was still extant in their day near Bethel; but there must have been some mistake in this, as the place in question lay in the group N.W. of Jerusalem (Keil, Comment. on Joshua in loc.), possibly at the site of the present agricultural village Rana, north of Eleutheropolis (Robinson, Researches, 2:354). Schwarz, however, thinks (Palest. page 102) that "En- gannim is certainly identical with the village Jenin, 3 Eng. miles S.E. of Ashkelon;" but this is not in the quarter indicated by the associated names, and is, moreover. with greater probability appropriated to another ancient locality. SEE ZENAN.

2. A city on the border of Issachar (Jos 19:21; Sept. Ι᾿εών καὶ Τομμάν, Alex. ῏῏ην Γαννίμ; Vulg, En(annimni); allotted with its "suburbs" to the Gershonite Levites (21:29; Sept. ρλσψσ) Πηγὴ γραμμάτων; Vulg. En-Gannim); probably the same (see Reland, Palest. page 812) as the Ginaea (Γιναία) or Geman (Γημάν) of Josephus, of the borders of the great plain toward Samaria (Ant. 20:6, 1; War, 3:3, 4; comp. 2:12, 3), which Biddulph (in Purchas, 2:135) identifies with the present Jenin, a town 15 miles south of Mount Tabor, and which he and others describe as still a place of gardens and abundant water (Wilson, Lands of Bible, 2:84; Van de Velde, Narrative, 2:359; Schwarz, Palest. page 167). In the lists of Levitical cities in 1Ch 6:1-81, ANEM is substituted for Engannim, apparently by contraction. The position of Jenin is in striking agreement with the requirements of BETHHAG-GAN (A.V. "the garden- house;" Sept. Βαιθγάν) in the direction of which Ahaziah fled from Jehu (2Ki 9:27). The rough road of the ascent was probably too much for his chariot, and, keeping the more level ground, he made for Megiddo, where he died (Stanley, Palest. page 942). The place is several times noticed by Arabian writers in connection with thee march of Saladin, and has been visited by many modern travelers (Robinson, Researches, 3:156). The only remains of Ginea are a few foundations of walls close to the mosque of the present town (De Saulcy, Narrative, 1:78, 79). The town is high enough to overlook the broad plain, and low enough to have its houses encircled by its verdure. The hills rise steeply behind, dotted with bushes, and here and there clothed with the somber foliage of the olive. Rich gardens, hedged with prickly pear, extend along their base, and a few palm-trees give variety to the scene. The "fountain," front which the town took the first part of its Scripture name (En), is in the hills a few hundred yards distant; and' its abundant waters flow over and fertilize the "gardens" (Gannim) from which the second and chief part of the name is derived. The leading road from Jezreel and the north to Samaria and Jerusalem passes Jenin. It contains about 2000 inhabitants, and is the capital of a large district (Porter, Handbook, page 351; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:189).

## En-gannim of Judah[[@Headword:En-gannim of Judah]]

             For this site Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336; comp. Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Soc." January 1881, page 51) the small ruin called Khurbet Um-Jina, laid down' on the Ordinance Map on the south edge of Wady Surar, about three fourths of a mile south-west of Ain-Shems (Belh-shemesh), and in this identification Tristram concurs (Bible Places, page 48).

## En-gedi[[@Headword:En-gedi]]

             [many En'-gedi, some En-ged'i] (Hebrews Eyn Gedi,', עֵין גְּדַי, fountain of the kid; Sept. in Joshua Ηνγαδδί v.r. Α᾿γκαδής, in Sam. Ε᾿νγαδδί, in Chron. and Cant. Ε᾿νγαδδεί v.r. Ι᾿γγαδδί and έν Γαδδί, in Ezekiel Ε᾿νγαδδείν v.r. Ι᾿νγαδείν, Apocr. ENGADDI; Josephus Ε᾿γγαδδί;  Ptolemy Ε᾿γγαδαί, 5:16, 8; Stephanus Byz. Ε᾿γγαδά, page 333; Eusebius ᾿Ηγγαδδί, Onomast. s.v.; Pliny, Engadd, Hist. Nat. 5:17), a town in the wilderness of Judah (Jos 15:62), on the western shore of the Dead Sea (Eze 47:10), which gave its name to a part of the desert whither David withdrew for fear of Saul (Jos 15:62; 1Sa 24:1-4). Its more ancient name was HAZEZON-TAMAR SEE HAZEZON-TAMAR (q.v.), and by that name it is mentioned before the destruction of Sodom, as being inhabited by the Amorites, and near the cities of the plain (Gen 14:7); a title ("the pruning of the palm") doubtless derived from the palm-groves that surrounded it (Sir 24:14). It was immediately after an assault upon the "Amorites, that dwelt in Hazezon- tamar," that the five Mesopotamian kings were attacked by the rulers of the plain of Sodom (Gen 14:7; comp. 2Ch 20:2). Saul was told that David was in the "wilderness of En-gedi;" and he took "3000 men, and went to seek David and his men upon the rocks of the wild goats" (1Sa 24:1-4). These animals still frequent the cliffs above and around the fountain; the Arabs call them Beden. At a later period En- gedi was the gathering-place of the Moabites and Ammonites who went up against Jerusalem, and fell in the valley of Berachah (2Ch 20:2). It is remarkable that this is the usual route taken in the present day by such predatory bands from Moab as make incursions into Southern Palestine. They pass round the southern end of the Dead Sea, then up the road along its western shore to the pass at Ain-Jidy (“the ascent by the cliff Ziz," 2Ch 20:16), and thence toward Hebron, Tekoa, or Jerusalem, as the prospects of plunder seem most inviting. The vineyards of Engedi were celebrated by Solomon (Son 1:14); its balsam by Josephus (Ant. 9:1, 2). Stephanus of Byzantium places it near Sodom; Jerome at the south end of the Dead Sea (Comm. in Eze 47:1-23); but Josephus more correctly upon the Lake Asphaltites, at the distance of 300 stadia from Jerusalem (Ant. 9:1, 2; comp. 16:13, 4; War, 3:3, 5). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome, En-gedi was still a large village on the shore of the Dead Sea, but it must have been abandoned very soon afterwards, for there is no subsequent reference to it in history, nor are there any traces of recent habitation (Porter's Handbook, page 242). There is a curious reference to it in Mandeville (Early Trav. page 179), who says that the district between Jericho and the Dead Sea is "the land of Dengadda" (Fr. d'Engadda), and that the balm-trees were "still called vines of Gady." En- gedi has always, until recently, been sought at the north end of the Dead Sea (Reland, Palaest. page 449); but in 1805 Seetzen recognised the  ancient name in the Ain-Jidy of the Arabs, and lays it down in his map at a point of the western shore nearly equidistant from both extremities of the lake. This spot was visited by Dr. Robinson, and he confirms the identification (Researches, 2:209-216). The site lies among the mountains, a considerable way down the descent to the shore. Here is a rich plain, half a mile square, sloping very gently from the base of the mountains to the water, and shut in on the north by a lofty promontory. About a mile up the western acclivity, and at an elevation of some 400 feet above the plain, is the fountain of Ain-Jidy, bursting forth at once in a fine stream upon a sort of narrow terrace or shelf of the mountain, having an abrupt margin towards the lake. The water is sweet, but warm, and strongly impregnated with lime. The stream rushes down the steep descent of the mountain below, and its course is hidden by a luxuriant thicket of trees and shrubs belonging to a more southern clime. Near this fountain are the remains of several buildings, apparently ancient, although the main site of the town seems to have been farther below. The whole of the descent below seems to have been once terraced for tillage and gardens, and near the foot are the ruins of a town, exhibiting nothing of particular interest, and built mostly of unhewn stones. This we may conclude was the town which took its name from the fountain. On reaching the plain, the brook crosses it in nearly a straight line to the sea. During a great part of the year it is absorbed in the thirsty soil. Its banks are now cultivated by a few families of Arabs, who generally pitch their tents near this spot. The soil is exceedingly fertile, and in such a climate it might be made to produce the rarest fruits of tropical climes; but vineyards no longer clothe the mountainside, and neither palm-tree nor balsam is seen on the plain.

THE WILDERNESS OF EN-GEDI is doubtless the immediately neighboring part of the wild region west of the Dead Sea, which must be traversed to reach its shores. It was here that David and his men lived among the "rocks of the wild goats," and where the former cut off the skirts of Saul's robe in a cave (1Sa 21:1-4). "On all sides," says Dr. Robinson, "the country is full of caverns, which might then serve as lurking-places for David and his men as they do for outlaws at the present day." He adds that, as he came in sight of the ravine of the Ghor; a mountain-goat started up and bounded along the face of the rocks on the opposite side (Researches, 2:203). M. de Saulcy imagines that he has identified the particular cave in question with one in that vicinity now called Bir el-Makukieh (Narrative, 1:162).

## En-gedi (2)[[@Headword:En-gedi (2)]]

             SEE ZIZ.

## En-haddah[[@Headword:En-haddah]]

             (Hebrew Eyn Chiaddah', ין חִדָּה, swift fountain; Sept. ᾿Ηναδδά), a city on the border of the tribe of Issachar, mentioned between Engannim and Beth-pazzez (Jos 19:21). Van de Velde (Narrative, 1:315) and Thomson (Land and Book, 2:248) would identify it with Ain-Haud, on the western brow of Carmel, and about two miles from the sea; but this is out of the limits of the tribe of Issachar. Its site is possibly to be sought in that of the modern village Ain-Mahil, not far N.E. of Nazareth (Robinson, Researches, 3:209).

## En-haddah (2)[[@Headword:En-haddah (2)]]

             As the modern representative of this site Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336; comp. Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," January 1881, page 51) Kefr Adsdn, on the south edge of the plain of Esdraelon, three miles north-west of Jenin (Engannim), which the Memohis to the Ordinance Survey (2:45) describe as "a village of moderate size on the slope of the hills, built of stone, with olives below and a well on the west. This appears to be the Kefr Outheni of the Talmud, a village on the border between Samaria and Galilee (Mishna, Gittin, 7:7)."

## En-hakkore[[@Headword:En-hakkore]]

             (Hebrews Eyn hak-kore', ין הקּורֵא, fountain of to caller; Sept. Πηγὴ τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου), a name given by Samson to the spring that burst forth in answer to his prayer in a dell of Lehi, when he was exhausted with  the slaughter of the Philistines (Jdg 15:19). The word מִכְתֵּשׁ, maktesh', which in the narrative denotes the "hollow place" (literally the "mortar") or socket in the jaw, and also that for the “jaw" itself, lechi, are both names of places. SEE LEHI. Van de Velde (Memoir, page 343) endeavors to identify Lehi with Tell el-Lekiyeh, 4 miles N. of Beersheba, and En-lakkore with the large spring between the tell and Khewelfeh. But Samson's adventures appear to have been confined to a narrow circle, and there is no ground for extending them to a distance of some 30 miles from Gaza, which Lekiyeh is, even in a straight line. It appears to have been the same place later known (Neh 11:29) as EN-RIMMON SEE EN- RIMMON (q.v.).

## En-hakkore (2)[[@Headword:En-hakkore (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder is inclined to find this spot in a series of springs to which he gives the name of Ayuin Kacra (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336), and which are laid down on the Ordinance Map three and one half miles north-west of Ain-Shemis (Beth-shemesh). But the identification is precarious. SEE LEHI.

## En-harod[[@Headword:En-harod]]

             (Hebrews E4n Charod, עֵין חֲרדֹfountain of Harod; Sept. πηγὴ Α᾿ρώδ), a spring in the vicinity of the town of Harod (Jdg 7:1, where the name is translated "well of Harod"). SEE HAROD:

## En-hazor[[@Headword:En-hazor]]

             (Hebrews Eyn Chatsor', ין חָצוֹר, focntain of Hazor, i.e., of the village; Sept. πηγὴ Α᾿σώρ), a fortified city of the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned between Edrei and Iron (Jos 19:37), but apparently different from Hazor (Jos 19:36). It has been identified by Schwarz (Palest. page 183) and Thomson (Land and Book, 1:515) with the Ain-Hazur not far N.W. of TellHfazr (between Rameh or Ramah and Yakuk or Hukkok), which latter (being marked as a ruined site by Van de Velde, although Dr. Robinson, who visited it, denies that there are any traces of structures on the summit; Later Researches, page 81), was probably the location of the city itself. SEE HAZOR.

## En-mishpat[[@Headword:En-mishpat]]

             (Hebrews Eyn Mishpat', ין מִשְׁפָּט, fountain of judgment; Sept. ἡ πηγὴ τῆς κρίσεως), the earlier name (Gen 14:7) for KADESH SEE KADESH (q.v.), in the borders of Idumaea (comp. Num 20:13-14). According to Schwarz (Palest. page 214), there is found, about 10 miles  south of Petra, a large spring, still called by the Bedouins Ain el-Sedaka, or spring of justice, which he holds to be the same as the ancient En-mishpat; but this would be very far south for the required locality, SEE EXODE; and the spot he names is doubtless the Ain el-Usdakah markedon Robinson's Map as identical with the Zodocatha of the Roman post-routes (Reland, Palest. page 230).

## En-rimmon[[@Headword:En-rimmon]]

             (Hebrews Eyn Rimmon', עֵין רַמַּוֹן, fountain of Rimmon; Sept. ἐν ῾Ρεμμών v. r. ἐν ῾Ρεμαών, Vat. MS. omits, Vulg. et in Remmon), a place occupied by the descendants of Judah after the exile (Neh 11:29). It appears from the associated places to be the same with the "Ain and Rimmon" of Jos 15:32 (comp. Jos 19:7; 1Ch 4:32), where perhaps, in like manner, but one place is referred to, a spring adjoining the town of Rimmon. SEE AIN. Yet the enumeration ("five cities") of 1Ch 4:32 ("Ain, Rimmon") requires them to be taken as distinct. In fact, there appears to have been a Levitical city en-Rimmon near to, but originally distinct from the nonLevitical Rimmon, and indicated by a remarkable reservoir still extant in the vicinity. SEE RIMMON.

## En-rogel[[@Headword:En-rogel]]

             (Hebrews Eyn Rcgel', עֵין רֹגֵל, fount of the treader, q.v. foot-fountain; construed by Furst, after the Targums, with the Arabic and Syriac versions, "Fullers' Spring," because fullers trode the clothes in the water; but Gesenius renders "fountain of the spy;" Sept. πηγὴ ῾Ρωγήλ, Vulg. fons Rogel), a spring which formed one of the landmarks on the boundary-line between Judah (Jos 15:7) and Benjamin (18:16). It was the point next to Jerusalem, and at a lower level, as is evident from the use of the words " ascended" and "descended" in these two passages. Here, apparently concealed from the view of the city, Jonathan and Ahimaaz remained, after the flight of David, awaiting intelligence from within the walls (2Sa 17:17), and here, "by the stone Zoheleth, which is 'close to' (אֵצֶל) En-rogel," Adonijah held the feast, which was the first and last act of his attempt on the crown (1Ki 1:9). By Josephus, on the last incident (Ant. 7:14, 4), its situation is given as "without the city, in the royal garden," and it is without doubt referred to by him in the same connection, in his description of the earthquake which accompanied the sacrilege of Uzziah (Ant. 9:10, 4), and which, "at the place called Erove" (Ε᾿ρωγῆ v.r. Ε᾿ῤῤωγῆ), shook down a part of the Eastern hill, "so as to obstruct the roads, and the royal gardens." In more modern times, a tradition, apparently first recorded by Quaresmius, would make En-rogel identical with what is now called by the Franks the well of Nehemiah, and by the natives that of Job (Bir-Eyub). Robinson describes it as "a deep well situated just below the junction of the valley of Hinnom with that of  Jehoshaphat. The small oblong plain there formed is covered with an olive- grove, and with the traces of former gardens extending down the valley from the present gardens of Siloam. Indeed, this whole spot is the prettiest and most fertile around Jerusalem. The vell is very deep, of an irregular quadrilateral form, walled up with large squared stones, terminating above in an arch on one side, and apparently of great antiquity. There is a small rude building over it, furnished with one or two large troughs or reservoirs of stone, which are kept partially filled for the convenience of the people. The well measures 125 feet in depth, 50 feet of which was now full of water. The water is sweet, but not very cold, and is at the present day drawn up by the hand. In the rainy season the well becomes quite full, and sometimes overflows at the mouth. Usually, however, the water runs ,off under the surface of thie ground, and finds an outlet some forty yards below the well, whence it is said to flow for sixty or seventy days in winter, and the stream is sometimes large" (Researches, 1:490). In favor of this identification is the fact that in the Arabic version of Jos 15:7 the name of Ain-Eyub, or "spring of Job," is given for En-rogel, and also that in an early Jewish Itinerary (Uri of Biel, in Hottinger's Cippi Hebraici, page 48) the name is given as "well of Joab," as if retaining the memory of Joab's connection with Adonijah — a name which it still retains in the traditions of the Greek Christians (Williams, Holy City, 2:490). Against this general belief the following strong but not conclusive arguments are urged by Bonar in favor of identifying En-rogel with the present "Fountain of the Virgin," 'Ain Ummed-Daraj — “spring of the mother of steps"-the perennial source from which the Pool of Siloam is supplied (Land of Promise, App. 5):

1. The Bir Eyub is a wel and not a spring (En), while, on the other hand, the "Fountain of the Virgin" is the only real spring close to Jerusalem. This objection, however, as the above description shows, but partially applies.

2. The situation of the Fountain of the Virgin agrees somewhat better with the course of the boundary of Benjamii than that of the Bir Eyub, which is rather too far south. This objection, however, does not apply to the original boundary of Benjamin, which necessarily followed the valley of Siloam. SEE TRIBE.

3. Bir Eyub does not altogether suit the requirements of 2Sa 17:17. It is too far off both from the city, and from the direct road over Olivet to the Jordan, and is in full view of the city (Van de Velde, 1:475),  which the other spot is not. But we may readily suppose that a more retired route and a secluded spot would have been chosen for concealment.

4. The martyrdom of St. James (q.v.) was effected by casting him down from the temple wall into the valley of Kedron, where he was finally killed by a fuller with his washing-stick (Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 2:23). The natural inference is that the martyred apostle fell near where the fullers were at work. Now Bir Eyub is too far off from the site of the temple to allow of this, but it might very well have happened at the Fountain of the Virgin. (See Stanley's Sermons on the Apost. Age, page 333-4). But this is too remote and indirect an agreement, and one based upon a vague tradition.

5. Daraj and Rogel are both from the same root, and therefore the modern name may be derived from the ancient one, even though at present it is taken to allude to the "steps" by which the reservoir of the fountain is reached.

6. The Fountain of the Virgin is still the great resort of the women of Jerusalem for washing and treading their clothes.

7. The level of the king's gardens must 'have been above the Bir Eyub, even when the water "is at the mouth of the well, and it is generally seventy or eighty feet below; while they must have been lower than the Fountain of the Virgin, which thus might be used without difficulty to irrigate them. The last considerations, however, have little weight (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2:528). SEE JERUSALEM.

## En-shemesh[[@Headword:En-shemesh]]

             (Hebrews Eyn-She'mesh (עֵיןאּשֶׁמֶשׁ, fountain of the sun; Sept. ἡ πηγὴ ἡλίου and πηγὴ Σάμες; Vulgate, Ensemes, id est, Fons Solis), a spring which formed one of the landmarks on the north boundary of Judah (Jos 15:7) and the south boundiry of Benjamin (Jos 18:17). From these notices it appears to have been between the "ascent of Adummim" the road leading up from the Jordan valley south of the wady Kelt and the spring of En-rogel, in the valley of Kedron. It was therefore east of Jerusalem and of the Mount of Olives. The only spring at present answering to this position is the Ain-Haud or Ain-Chot — the "Well of the Apostles" — about a mile below Bethany, the traveler's first halting-place on the road to Jericho (Tobler, Topog. von Jerus. 2:400). The aspect of this spring is such that the rays of the sun are on it the whole day. This is not inappropriate in a cfountain dedicated to that luminary. Dr. Robinson thinks that En-shemesh must have been either this spring or the fountain near St. Saba (Researches, 1:493).

## En-tappuah[[@Headword:En-tappuah]]

             (Hebrews Eyn Tappu'ach, עֵין תִּפּוּחִ), fountain of Tappuah; Sept. ἡ πηγὴ Θαπφουέ v.r. Θαφθώθ), a spring near the city Tappuah (q.v.), put for that place in Jos 17:7 (comp. Jos 17:8).

## Enaim[[@Headword:Enaim]]

             SEE ENAM.

## Enam[[@Headword:Enam]]

             (Hebrews with the art. ha-Eynam', הָעֵינָם, doubtless a contraction for

הָעֵינִיַם, the two springs; Sept. ᾿Ηνάϊμ v.r. ᾿Ηναείμ and Μαιανί, Vulg. Enaim), a city in the lowlands of Judah, mentioned between Tappuah and Jarmuth (Jos 15:34). From its mention with towns (Jarmuth and Eshtaol for instance) which are known to have been near Timnath, this is very probably the place in the "entrance" of which (perhaps at a fork of the road) Tamar sat to intercept her father-in-law on his way to Timnath (Gen 38:14), (פֶּתִח עֵינִיַם, pe'thach Eyna'yim, i.e., doorway of Enaim, or the double spring; Sept. αἱ πύλαι Αἰνάν, Vulg. bivium itineris, A.V. "an open place;" comp. Reland, Palest, page 761). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. ᾿Ηναίμ, Enaim) state that it was "still a village Betheninm (Βεθενίμ) near the terebinth;" meaning probably "Abraham's oak," 22 miles S. of Jerusalem (ib. s.v. Α᾿ρκώ, Arboch), near Hebron (Robinson, Res. 2:443). Schwarz in like manner identifies Enam with "the village Beth-Ani, distant 21 English miles from Saafir" (Palest. page 102); meaning apparently Beit-Anur, which is laid down on Van de Velde's Map at that distance S.W. of Bir es-Zafaraneh, in the region N.E. of Hebron. But this site is appropriated to Beth-anoth (q.v.), with which the similarity of names has doubtless caused these authors to confuse Enam. The place in question lay in the group of cities situated N.W. of Hebron, on the border of the tribe of Dan (Keil, Comment. on Joshua in loc.). It is perhaps the  present Deir el-Butm, with a well adjoining, laid down by Van de Velde (Map) a little beyond Deir Dubibai, N. of Eleutheropolis.

## Enam (2)[[@Headword:Enam (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336; comp. Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," January 1881, page 51) for this place "the ruin Alln, in the low hills south-west of Jerusalem," meaning apparently the insignificant Khurbet 'Alia marked on the ordnance map at three and one quarter miles southwest of Bethlehem, but there is nothing striking in the identification.

## Enan[[@Headword:Enan]]

             (Hebrews Eynan', עֵינָן, born at a fountain, q.d. fontanus; Sept. Αἰνάν), the father of Ahira, which latter was phylarch of the tribe of Naphtali at the Exode (Num 1:15; Num 2:29; Num 7:78; Num 7:83; Num 10:27). B.C. ante 1657. SEE HAZAR-ENAN.

## Enander, Samuel[[@Headword:Enander, Samuel]]

             a Swedish prelate, was born at Eneby in 1607. After fulfilling several ecclesiastical function, she was appointed bishop of Linkping. He died in 1670. His principal works are, De Intellectu et Voluntate Hominis (Upsal, 1629): — De Sensibus Interioribus (ibid. 1632): — De Mundo (ibid. 1634). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Enasibus[[@Headword:Enasibus]]

             (Ε᾿νάσιβος, Vulgate Eliasib), given (1Es 9:34) as the name of one of "the sons of Moani" who had married a Gentile wife after the exile, in place of the ELIASHIS SEE ELIASHIS (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:36).

## Encaenia[[@Headword:Encaenia]]

             (ἐγκαίνια).

1. When heathen temples were converted to Christian use, they were purified by a solemn dedication, called Encaenia, and by the sign of the cross; they also received new and appropriate names (Riddle, Antiq. 6:2).

2. At a later period encaenia denoted festivals kept in memory of the dedication of churches. In the church of Jerusalem, built by Constantine to the honor of our Savior, it was customary to observe an anniversary festival which lasted eight days, during which divine service was performed. The practice was soon adopted by other churches. In England the first Saxon bishops allowed the people liberty on the annual feasts of the dedication of their churches, to build themselves booths round the church, and to entertain themselves with eating and drinking. In German such a feast is called Kirchzweiho, church-consecration, whence the English name CHURCHWAKE. The ceremonies and solemnities instituted at Oxford in honor of founders and benefactors of colleges are called encaenia. — Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 20, chapter 8, § 1. SEE DEDICATION.

## Encamp[[@Headword:Encamp]]

             (חָנָהּ, chanah', to decline, e.g. of the day, Jdg 19:9, i.e., evening; hence to "pitch" a tent, Gen 26:17, especially to "camp" down at night, as often rendered), among the Hebrews, primarily denoted the resting of an army or company of travelers at night (Exo 13:20; Num 1:50; comp. Exo 16:13; Gen 32:21), and hence the derivative noun (מִחֲנֶה, michaneh', camp, once מִחֲנוֹת, mackanoth', 2Ki 6:8) is applied to the army or caravan when on its march (Exo 14:19; Jos 10:5; Jos 11:4; Gen 32:7-8). SEE MAHANAIM. Sometimes the verb refers to the casual arrangement of a siege (Psa 29:3) or campaign (1Sa 4:1), and occasionally it is extended to the signification of a permanent abode (Isa 29:1). Among nomadic tribes war never attained the dignity of a science, and their encampments were consequently devoid of all the appliances of more systematic warfare. SEE WAR.

1. The description of the camp of the Israelites, on their march from Egypt (Num 2:3), supplies the greatest amount of information on the subject: whatever else may be gleaned is from scattered hints. The tabernacle, corresponding to the chieftain's tent of an ordinary encampment, was placed in the center; and around and facing it (Num 2:1), arranged in four grand divisions, corresponding to the four points of the compass (but not necessarily in the strict quadrangular form usually represented, since modern Arab caravans are ranged at night in a nearly circular manner), lay the host of Israel, according to their standards (Num 1:52; Num 2:2). On the east the post of honor was assigned to the tribe of Judah, and round its standard rallied the tribes of Issachar and Zebulon, descendants of the sons of Leah. On the south lay Reuben and Simeon, the representatives of Leah, and the children of Gad, the son of her handmaid. Rachel's descendants were encamped on the western side of the tabernacle, the chief place being assigned to the tribe of Ephraim. To this position of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin, allusions are made in Jdg 5:14, and Psa 80:2. On the north were the tribes of Dan and Napthali, the children of Bilhah, and the tribe of Asher, Gad's younger brother. All these were encamped around their standards, each according to the ensign of the house of his fathers. In the center, round the tabernacle, and with no standard but the cloudy or fiery pillar  which rested over it, were the tents of the priests and Levites. The former, with Moses and Aaron at their head, were encamped on the eastern side. On the south were the Kohathites, who had charge of the ark, the table of shew bread, the altars and vessels of the sanctuary. The Gershonites were on the west, and when on the march carried the tabernacle and its lighter furniture; while the Merarites, who were encamped on the north, had charge of its heavier appurtenances. The order of encampment was preserved on the march (Num 2:17), the signal for which was given by a blast of the two silver trumpets (Num 10:5). The details of this account supply Prof. Blunt with some striking illustrations of the undesigned coincidences of the books of Moses (Undes. Coincid. pages 75-86).

In this description of the order of the encampment no mention is made of sentinels, who, it is reasonable to suppose, were placed at the gates (Exo 32:26-27) in the four quarters of the camp. This was evidently the case in the camp of the Levites (comp. 1Ch 9:18; 1Ch 9:24; 2Ch 31:2).

The sanitary regulations of the camp of the Israelites were enacted for the twofold purpose of preserving the health of the vast multitude, and the purity of the camp as the dwelling-place of God (Num 5:3; Deu 23:14). With this object the dead were buried without the camp (Lev 10:4-5); lepers were excluded till their leprosy departed from them (Lev 13:46; Lev 14:3; Num 12:14-15), as were all who were visited with loathsome diseases (Lev 14:3). All who were defiled by contact with the dead, whether these were slain in battle or not, were kept without the camp for seven days (Num 31:19). Captives taken in war were compelled to remain for a while outside (Num 31:19; Jos 6:23). The ashes from the sacrifices were poured out without the camp at an appointed place, whither all uncleanness was removed (Deu 23:10; Deu 23:12), and where the entrails, skins, horns, etc., and all that was not offered in sacrifice, were burnt (Lev 4:11-12; Lev 6:11; Lev 8:17).

The execution of criminals took place without the camp (Lev 24:14; Num 15:35-36; Jos 7:24), as did the burning of the young bullock for the sin offering (Lev 4:12). These circumstances combined explain Heb 13:12, and Joh 19:17; Joh 20:2. The encampment of the Israelites in the desert left its traces in their subsequent history. The temple, so late as the time of Hezekiah, was still "the camp of Jehovah" (2Ch 31:2; comp. Psa 78:28); and the multitudes who flocked to David were " a great camp, like the camp of God" (1Ch 12:22).

High ground appears to have been uniformly selected for the position of a camp, whether it were on a hill or mountain side, or in an inaccessible pass (Jdg 7:18). So, in Jdg 10:17, the Ammonites encamped in Gilead, while Israel pitched in Alizpeh. The very names are significant. I he camps of Saul and the Philistines were alternately in Gibeah, the "height" of Benjamin, and the pass of Michmash (1Sa 13:2-3; 1Sa 13:16; 1Sa 13:23). When Goliath defied the host of Israel, the contending armies were encamped on hills on either side of the valley of Elah (1Sa 17:3); and in the fatal battle of Gilboa Saul's position on the mountain was stormed by the Philistines he had pitched in Shunem (1Sa 28:4), on the other side of the valley of Jezreel. The carelessness of the Midianites in encamping in the plain exposed them to the night surprise by Gideon, and resulted in their consequent discomfiture (Jdg 6:33; Jdg 7:8; Jdg 7:12). But another important consideration in fixing upon a position for a camp was the propinquity of water; hence it is found that in most instances camps, were pitched near a spring or well (Jdg 7:3; 1Ma 9:33). The Israelites at Mount Gilboa pitched by the fountain in Jezreel (1Sa 29:1), while the Philistines encamped at Aphek, the name of which indicates the existence of a stream of water in the neighborhood, which rendered it a favorite place of encampment (1Sa 4:1-22, 2 Kings 20:26; 2Ki 13:17). In his pursuit of the Amalekites David halted his men by the brook Besor, and there left a detachment with the camp furniture (1Sa 30:9). One of Joshua's decisive engagements with the nations of Canaan was fought at the waters of Merom, where he surprised the confederate camp (Jos 11:5; Jos 11:7; comp. Jdg 5:19; Jdg 5:21). Gideon, before attacking the Midianites, encamped beside the well of Harod (Jdg 7:1), and it was to draw water from the well at Bethlehem that David's three mighty men cut their way through the host of the Philistines (2Sa 23:16).

The camp was surrounded by the מִעְגָּלָה, magalah' (1Sa 17:20) or מִעִגָּל, magal' (1Sa 26:5; 1Sa 26:7) which some, and Thenius among them, explain as an earthwork thrown up round the encampment,  others as the barrier formed by the baggage-wagons. The etymology of the word points merely to the circular shape of the enclosure formed by the tents of the soldiers pitched around their chief, whose spear marked his resting-place (1Sa 26:5; 1Sa 26:7; see Thomson, Land and Book, 2:20 sq.), and it might with propriety be used in either of the above senses, according as the camp was fixed or temporary. We know that, in the case of a siege, the attacking army, if possible, surrounded the place attacked (1Ma 13:43), and drew about it a line of circumvallation (דָּיֵק, dayek', 2Ki 25:1), which was marked by a breastwork of earth (מְסַלָּה, Mesillah', Isa 62:10; סלְלָה, solelah', Eze 21:27 [22]; comp. Job 19:12), for the double purpose of preventing the escape of the besieged and of protecting the besiegers from their sallies. But there was not so much need of a formal entrenchment, as but few instances occur in which engagements were fought in the camps themselves, and these only when the attack was made at night. Gideon's expedition against the Midianites took place in the early morning (Jdg 7:19), the time selected by Saul for his attack upon Nahash (1Sa 11:1 l), and by David for surprising the Amalekites (1Sa 30:17; comp. Jdg 9:33). To guard against these night attacks, sentinels (שׁוֹמְרַים, shomerhim') were posted (Jdg 7:20; 1Ma 12:27) round the camp, and the neglect of this precaution by Zebah and Zalmunna probably led to their capture by Gideon and the ultimate defeat of their army (Jdg 7:19).

The valley which separated the hostile camps was generally selected as the fighting ground (שָׂדֶה, "the battle-field," 1Sa 4:2; 1Sa 14:15; 2Sa 18:6), upon which the contest was decided, and hence the valleys of Palestine have played so conspicuous a part in its history (Jos 8:13; Jdg 6:33; 2Sa 5:22; 2Sa 8:13, etc.). When the fighting men went forth to the place of marshaling מִעֲרָכָהmaarakah', 1Sa 17:20), a detachment was left to protect the camp and baggage (1Sa 17:22; 1Sa 30:24). The beasts of burden were probably tethered to the tent pegs (2Ki 7:10; Zec 14:15).

The מִחֲנֶהmachaneh', or movable encampment, is distinguished from the

מִצָּב, matstsab', or נְצַיב, בַעשׂתֶנ(2Sa 23:14; 1Ch 11:16), which appears to have been a standing camp, like those which Jehoshaphat established throughout Judah (2Ch 17:2), or an  advanced post in an enemy's country (1Sa 13:17; 2Sa 8:6), from which skirmishing parties made theor predatory excursions and ravaged the crops. It was in resisting one of these expeditions that Shammah won himself a name among David's heroes (2Sa 23:12). Vachaneh is still farther distinguished from מַבְצָר, mibtsur', "a fortress" or "walled town" (Num 13:19).

Camps left behind them a memorial in the name of the place where they were situated, as among ourselves (comp. Chester, etc., from the Lat. castsra). Mahaneh-Dan (Jdg 13:25) was so called from the encampment of the Danites mentioned in Jdg 18:12. The more important camps at Gilgal (Jos 5:10; Jos 9:6) and Shiloh (Jos 18:9; Jdg 21:12; Jdg 21:19) left no such impress; the military traditions of these places were eclipsed by the greater splendor of the religious associations which surrounded them. (See Ker Porter, Travels in Persia, 2:147 sq., 300 sq.; Rhodes, Tent life and Encampment of Armies in ancient and modern Times, Lond. 1858.)

Among the Ancient Egyptians, "the field encampment was either a square or a parallelogram, with a principal entrance in one of the faces, and near the center was the general's tent and those of the principal officers. The general's tent was sometimes surrounded by a double rampart or fosse inclosing two distinct areas, the outer one containing three tents, probably of the next in command, or of the officers on the staff; and the guards slept or watched in the open air. Other tents were pitched outside these enclosures; and near the external circuit a space was set apart for feeding horses and beasts of burden, and another for ranging the chariots and baggage. It was near the general's tent, and within the same area, that the altars of the gods, or whatever related to religious matters, the standards, and the military chest, were kept; and the sacred emblems were deposited beneath a canopy within an enclosure similar to that of the general's tent" (Wilkinson, 1:409, abridgm.).

## Enchantment[[@Headword:Enchantment]]

             stands in the Authorized Version as the representative of several Hebrews words: usually some form of נָחִשׁ, nachash' (2Ki 17:17; 2Ki 21:6; 2Ch 33:6; Lev 19:26; Deu 18:10; Num 23:23; Num 24:1), literally to whisper a spell, hence to practice divination in general; לָחִשׁ, lachash' (Ecc 10:11), of cognate form and  signification, especially incantation; לוּט, lut, literally to muffle up, hence to use magic arts (Exo 7:13; Exo 7:22; Exo 8:7; Exo 8:18); עָנִן, anan', literally to cover with a cloud, hence to practice sorcery (Jer 27:9); and חָבִר, chabar', to bind, i.e., with a spell, to charm (Isa 47:9; Isa 47:12). The following are the specific forms which the black art assumed among the Hebrews. SEE AMULET; SEE DIVINATION.

1. לָטַים, latim', or לְהָטַים, lehatim', Exo 7:11; Exo 7:22; Exo 8:7; Sept. φαρμακίαι (Grotius compares the word with the Greek λιται); secret arts, from וּטl, to coves; though others incorrectly connect it with לִהִטflame, or the glittering blade of a sword, as though it implied a sort of dazzling cheironomy which deceives spectators. Several versions render the word by "whisperings," insusurrationes, but it seems to be a more general word, and hence is used of the various means (some of them no doubt of a quasi-scientific character) by which the Egyptian chartummim imposed on the credulity of Pharaoh. SEE MAGICIAN.

2. פְּשָׁפַים., keshaphim'; Sept. φαρμακείαι, φάρμακα (2Ki 9:22; Mic 5:12; Nah 3:4); Vulg. veneficia, maleficia; "maleficae artes," "praestigiae," "muttered spells." Hence it is sometimes rendered by ἐπαοιδαί, incantations, as in Isa 47:9; Isa 47:12. The belief in the power of certain formulae was universal in the ancient world. Thus there were carmina to evoke the tutelary gods out of a city (Macrob. Saturnal, 3:9), others to devote hostile armies (Id.), others to raise the dead (Maimon. De Idol. 11:15; Senec. (Edip. 547), or bind the gods (δεσμοὶ θεῶν) and men (AEsch. Fur. 331), and even influence the heavenly bodies (Ovid, Met. 7:207 sq.; 12:263; "Te quoque Luna traho," Virg. Ecc 8:1-17; AEn. 4:489 Hor. Epod. 5:45). They were a recognized part of ancient medicine, even among the Jews, who regarded certain sentences of the law as efficacious in healing. The Greeks used them as one of the five chief resources of pharmacy (Pind. Pyth. 3:8, 9; Soph. Aj. 582), especially in obstetrics (Plat. Theaet. page 145) and mental diseases (Galen, De Sanitattuenda, 1:8). Homer mentions them as used to check the flow of blood (Od. 19:456), and Cato even gives a charm to cure a disjointed limb (De Re Rust. 160; comp. Plin. H. N. 28:2). The belief in charms is still all but universal in uncivilized nations; see Lane's Modern AEgypt. 1:300, 306, etc.; 2:177, etc.; Beeckman's Voyage to Borneo, chapter 2; Meroller's Congo (in Pinkerton's Voyages, 16, pages 221, 273); Huc's China, 1:223; 2:326; Taylor's New Zealand, and Livingstone's Africa, passim, etc.; and hundreds  of such remedies still exist, and are considered efficacious among the uneducated. SEE INCANTATION.

3. לְחָשַׁים, lechashim' (Ecc 10:11), Sept. ψιθυρισμός, is especially used of the charming of serpents, Jer 8:17 (comp. Psa 58:5; Sir 12:13; Ecc 10:11; Lucan, 9:891 — a parallel to "cantando rumpituranguis," and "Vipereas rumpo verbis et carmine fauces," Ov. Metam. l.c.). Maimonides (De Idol. 11:2) expressly defines an enchanter as one "who uses strange and meaningless words, by which he imposes on the folly of the credulous. They say, for instance, that if one utter the words before a serpent or scorpion it will do no harm" (Carpzov, Alnot. in Godwynumn, 4:11). An account of the Marsi, who excelled in this art, is given by Augustine (ad Gen 9:28), and of the Psylli by Arnobius (ad Nat. 2:32); and they are alluded to by a host of other authorities (Pliny, 7:2; 28:6; AElian, H.A. 1:5; Virg, AEn. 7:750; Sil. Ital. 8:495. They were called Ο᾿φιοδιώκται). The secret is still understood in the East (Lane, 2:106). SEE CHARM.

4. The word נְחָשַׁים, nechashim', is used of the enchantments sought by Balaam (Num 24:1). It properly alludes toophiomancy, but in this place has a general meaning of, endeavoring to gain omens (Sept. εἰς συνάντησιν τοῖς οἰωνοῖς). SEE SOOTHSAYER.

5. חֶבֶר, che'ber, is used for magic (Isa 47:9; Isa 47:12). It means generally the process of acquiring power over some distant object or person; but this word seems also to have been sometimes used expressly of serpent charmers, for R. Sol. Jarchi, on Deu 17:11, defines the חוֹבֶר חֶבֶרto be one "who congregates serpents and scorpions into one place." SEE MAGIC.

Any resort to these methods of imposture was strictly forbidden in Scripture (Lev 19:26; Isa 47:9, etc.), but to eradicate the tendency is almost impossible (2Ki 17:17; 2Ch 33:6), and we find it still flourishing at the Christian aera (Act 13:6; Act 13:8; Act 8:9; Act 8:11, γοητεία; Gal 5:20; Rev 9:21). SEE WITCHCRAFT.

The chief "sacramenta daemoniaca" were a rod, a magic circle, dragon's eggs, certain herbs, or "insane roots," like the henbane, etc. The fancy of poets, both ancient and modern, has been exerted in giving lists of them  (Ovid and Hor. l.c); Shakspeare's Macbeth, Act 4:1; Kirke White's Gondoline; Southey's Curse of Kehama, Son 4:1-16, etc.). SEE SORCERY.

## Encheirium[[@Headword:Encheirium]]

             (ἐγχείριον) is the napkin with which the priest wipes his hands, and which he wears at the girdle. Germanus of Constantinople describes it as above, and says that "to have a napkin at the girdle is typical of him who washed his hands and said, 'I am innocent' (Mat 27:24)."

## Encinas[[@Headword:Encinas]]

             SEE ENZINAS.

## Encolpium[[@Headword:Encolpium]]

             (ἐγκόλπιον) is a portable reliquary, worn around the neck. Such ornaments are of the highest antiauity. Chrysostom speaks of particles of the true cross, encased in gold, being suspended from the neck. The pectoral cross (q.v.), worn by the bishops, was also called Encolpium. Such are first mentioned by Gregory the Great. He sent one to Theodelinda containing a fragment of the cross; it still exists at Monza, and is used by the provost of that ancient church when he officiates pontifically. Two amulets, given to this princess by the same pontiff for the use of her children, are preserved in the treasures of Monza. From Gregory we also learn that filings from St. Peter's chains were sometimes enclosed in golden keys. Gregory himself had sent one of these consecrated keys to Childebert, king of the Franks, to protect him from all evils. SEE RELIQUARY.

## Encolpium [[@Headword:Encolpium ]]

             SEE RELIQUARY.

## Encratis, Saint[[@Headword:Encratis, Saint]]

             SEE ENGRATIA.

## Encratites [[@Headword:Encratites ]]

             (Εγκρατεῖς Ε᾿γκρατίαι, Contanentes), a name given by several Church fathers (Irenaeus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret) to a particular Gnostic sect, but which, in the opinion of most of the modern Church historians (Neander, Hase), either designates collectively several Gnostic sects, or, in general, the tendency of Gnostic asceticism in the ancient Church. The Encratites condemned marriage, forbade the eating of flesh or drinking of wine, and used even at the celebration of the Lord's Supper water instead of wine, on which account they were called ὑδροπαραστάται, aquarii. They were, in general, representatives of the Gnostic asceticism lased upon the principle of Dualism, in opposition to the asceticism of the Ebionites, Montanists, and others which kept within the limits of the Church. The Church fathers who regarded the Encratites as one sect of Gnostics, called Tatian (q.v.) its founder; but it is certain that there were Encratites before Tatian, and that subsequently there were Encratites who in some points differed from Tatian. Prominent men among the Encratites were, besides Tatian, Saturninus, Marcion, Julianus, Cassianus, and Severus, who is called the founder of a particular sect, the Severians, and made himself known as a violent opponent of the apostle Paul and of the Pauline epistles. In the 12th century the name of the Encratites was used. together with the names of several other ancient heresies, to designate and condemn the Bogomiles. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 4:29; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. (N.Y. 3 volumes) 1:149, 282; Mosheim, Comment. 1:482; Hase, Chz. Hist. pages 64, 83; Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy, page 42; Lardner, Works (10 volumes, 8vo), 2:148 sq.; Schaff. Ch. Hist. 1:245; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 4:67; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch.-Lex. 3:575. SEE SACCOPHORI; SEE TATIAN.

## Encyclica, Encyclical Letters[[@Headword:Encyclica, Encyclical Letters]]

             (from the Gr. ἐγκύκλιος, letters which have to go the rounds of a certain number of men — literae encyclicae, literae circulares), in the ancient Church, letters sent by bishops to all the churches of a particular circuit. At present the name is exclusively used for letters addressed by the Pope to all the bishops of the Roman Catholic world. In the encyclicals the Pope lays down his views of the general wants of the Church, or of some prevailing demands and sentiments; he warns against dangerous movements within the Church, as well as against dangers threatening the Church from abroad. He urges the bishops to be watchful, and points to the proper antidotes for existing evils. Among modern encyclicals, none attracted greater attention than that issued by Pope Pius IX, in December 1864, against modern civilization. — Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:540. SEE LITERAE ENCYCLICAE.

## Encyclopedia French[[@Headword:Encyclopedia French]]

             and the ENCYCLOPEDISTS. The Dictionnaire Encyclopedique was a publication of the 18th century, which exerted a great influence not merely on general science and literature but also on theology and religion. Its full title is Encyclopadie ou Dictionnaire raisonne des Sciences, des Arts, et des Metiers, par une societe de gens de Lettres; mis en ordre et public par DIDEROT; et quant a la parie Mathematique par D'ALEMBERT SEE D'ALEMBERT (Par. and Amst. 1751-80, 35 volumes, fol.). This great work was projected by Diderot (q.v.), and carried through, in the midst of difficulties, chiefly by his indomitable industry and perseverance. The name of D'Alembert (q.v.) added luster to the publication; and these two called to their aid all the skeptical and free-thinking talent of France. A great aim of the Encyclopedists was to establish what they called philosophy instead of religion; and the higher intellect of France seemed to become thoroughly imbued with their views, social, moral, and political. The Encyclopedia was a product of the same causes which generated the Revolution, but the publication itself doubtless greatly hastened the catastrophe. It was only one stage in the development of that one-sided realism which commenced with Locke; expanded into the deism of England; and, crossing over to France, found a powerful advocate in Condillac. The progress of this  development was very rapid. Among the Encyclopedists a single lifetime produced startling changes. Diderot, the editor and leading philosophical spirit of the Encyclopedia, "was at first only a doubter, next he became a deist, lastly an atheist. In the first stage he only translated English works, and even condemned some of the English deists. His views seem gradually to have altered, probably under the influence of Voltaire's writings and of the infidel books smuggled into France, and he thenceforth assumed a tone bolder and marked by positive disbelief. Diderot's atheism is a still farther development of his unbelief. It is expressed in few of his writings, and presents no subject of interest to us, save that it seeks to invalidate the arguments for the being of God drawn from final causes" (Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought, page 179). D'Alembert, the scientific editor of the Encyclopedia, was “the author of the celebrated Discours Preliminaire des Editeurs, which was issued in separate form, and became a text-book of infidelity not only in France, but also in England. D'Alembert's reputation in the department of science was very great over the entire continent of Europe, and he gave to the Encyclopedia its high scientific character and value. SEE ALEMBERT, D.

There has been much discussion as to whether the Encyclopedia proper really was issued in the interests of atheism. Many of the articles are entirely Christian in their tone and spirit. Others are as decidedly atheistic, while the Discours Preliminaire can hardly be called doubtful as to its character and aims. The true view seems to be that the Encyclopedists endeavored clandestinely to accomplish what more honest infidels had long attempted openly. They endeavored to undermine both religion and the state, while seeming to be in favor of them. Voltaire doubtless stands at the head of the coterie which furnished the articles for the Encyclopedia, although he wrote little for it himself. More than any other man he was the educator of the Encyclopedists. His principles are too well known to need statement. Helvetius derived his philosophy from Locke. "He was the moralist of the sensational philosophy, one who applied the philosophy of Condillac to morals. His philosophy is expressed in two works: the one on the spirit, the other on man; the former a theoretical view of human nature, the latter a practical view of education and society. His primary position is, that man owes all his superiority over animals to the superior organization of his body. Pleasure is the only good, and self-interest the true ground of morals, and the frame-work of individual and political right" (Farrar, History of Free Thought, page 180). Next come the authors of the Systeme de la Nature, a work issued by the encyclopedists. It has been attributed to  baron d'Holbach, his tutor Lagrange, Diderot, Grimm, Helvetius, and Robinet. It was doubtless a joint work, and expressed the views of all these men, or was a compromise creed to which they could all subscribe, for they held widely different opinions in other respects. The great object of the System of Nature was to banish God from the universe. It is devoted to the boldest materialism. "There is, in fact, nothing but matter and motion, says this book. Both are inseparably connected. If matter is at rest, it is only because hindered in motion, for in its essence it is not a dead mass" (Schwegler, History of Philosophy). The first part of this work undertakes to disprove the existence of mind; the second part is directed against religion. This System of Nature was the boldest achievement of infidelity, a work which even Voltaire pronounced "illogical in its deductions, absurd in its physics, and abominable in its morality." To those already named we may add Rousseau, whose Political Essays became the text-book of the French Revolution. He did for the state what the others had done for the Church. Such, then, were the views of those who projected and carried forward the Encyclopedia. If in the Encyclopedia itself we find those views covered up, or at least offset by thoroughly Christian ones, we are justified in believing that they were concealed and balanced by contrary opinions only to make the Encyclopedia acceptable to the unthinking masses of the French nation. The fact, as some hold, that the French nation was ripening for a revolution both in Church and State, and would have rushed into such a catastrophe at all hazards, proves nothing respecting the motives of the encyclopedists; and the terrible quickening which their great popular work gave to infidelity is perhaps the best test by which to judge the purposes of its authors.

Let us now look at the Encyclopedia itself, and its spirit can perhaps be best read from the Discours Preliminaire. D'Alembert was its author, although he probably secured both the approval and assistance of Diderot in its form and contents. The object of this Discours is to set forth the philosophy underlying the Encyclopedia, and this is nothing more than the sensationalism of Locke. D'Alembert declares that "all our abstract knowledge may be reduced to what we receive through our senses," Showing that this may be the case, he thence argues that it is so. Sensations are the only things about which he cannot raise a doubt. With regard to ethics, the following is his underlying principle. Our ideas of good and evil "arise from the oppression which, by nature, the stronger practices upon the weaker, and the latter bears the more reluctantly the  more violent it is, because he feels that there is no reason why he should submit to it; the evils which befall us through the vices of our fellow-men lead to the indirect knowledge of antagonistic virtues." These are the grounds upon which his philosophy is based. And yet this Discours made infidelity more popular to the unthinking masses than the writings of Locke, Condillac, Helvetius, De la Mettrie, or Holbach had done.

Such is the sensualistic materialism contained in the Discours Preliminaire, containing the ethical principle that we feel a sense of oppression only because we can see no reason why we should submit to it. And yet, by the side of this, in the same Discours, we find the following statement: "Nothing, therefore, is more necessary than a revealed religion, which instructs us concerning so many things. Designed for the completion of our natural knowledge, it shows us a portion of what was concealed from us; but confines itself to that which is most needful, while all the rest remains forever hidden. A few points of faith, and a small number of practical precepts, is all to which the revealed religion refers; yet, thanks to the light which it communicates to the world, since then the people are more firm and decided concerning a great number of interesting questions than the philosophers of any school ever were." In this way infidelity and religion were woven into the same system, religion being always held subordinate, a something to accomplish an end which science and philosophy could not quite reach. This being once admitted, it was not difficult to persuade the French people that, when philosophy could accomplish all that is necessary, religion might be set aside.

In the body of the Encyclopedia itself, many of the articles upon religious subjects are apparently in full sympathy with catholicity, and even orthodoxy. For instance, the article "Trinite" defends the orthodox dogma from attacks of Socinians, Jews, and infidels of all kinds. In the article "Dieu" the arguments for the existence of God are ably summed up, and objections are refuted. Quotations are made from Christian authorities, and the writer of the article seems to have been in full sympathy with the Christian view of the subject. The existence of angels and devils is recognised. The article "Christianisme" pronounces Christianity the only true revealed religion, and the Old and New Testaments are recognised as divine. It declares that the severest criticism has not been able to invalidate their authenticity. Reason and philosophy must accord to them the honor of setting forth facts beyond their reach. The hand of God is seen in the style of the sacred writings. Articles on Protestantism condemn severely  every innovation in doctrine, every departure from the established creeds of the various denominations. The errors of the Romish Church are pointed out and severely castigated. It is not necessary to suppose these articles written in a spirit of hypocrisy. Their authors doubtless held the views expressed. The fact that they did does not invalidate the opinion that the Encyclopedia was secretly issued in the interests of atheism. Its authors could well afford to give Christian men a voice within its pages, when there was so much to counteract all they might say. It was not that Christianity had no advocates in the Encyclopedia, but that it was allowed only a feeble defense, and was often defended on principles which directly tended to its overthrow. Its very defenders, in many cases, were its worst enemies, and only erected fortifications on the side of religion to show how easily they could be carried by infidelity. The defense is made chiefly to rest on eudaemonism. Christianity should be upheld because it brings us more good than any other system of religion. Whatever system is most advantageous for man in his worldly relations is the system to which he should adhere. Whenever men can be made to believe that Christianity fails to do this, then it must be set aside. For example, in the article "Christianisme," Christ is placed side by side with the other lawgivers, his only superiority being that, while they kept the useful in view, he aimed at the true as well as the useful. "Though he set forth, as its first object, the happiness of another life, he also meant it to make us happy in this world." In other places morality is preferred to faith, "because he who does good and makes himself useful to the world is in a better condition through morality without faith than through faith without morality." Theism is better than atheism, because it is more advantageous for nations to admit the existence of God than to reject it.

The work began to appear in 1751, and was concluded in 1765, in 17 volumes, fol., besides 11 volumes of plates. A supplement, in 5 volumes, appeared at Amsterdam, 1776-1777, and a Table analytique et raisonne des matieres, in 2 volumes, at Paris, in 1780. The publication was stopped two or three times by the government, and the last volumes were distributed privately, though the king himself was one of the purchasers. Diderot himself said of the Encyclopedia that he had had "neither time nor means of being particular in the choice of his contributors, among whom some were excellent, but most of the rest were very inferior; moreover the contributors, being badly paid, worked carelessly; in short, it was a patch- work composed of very ill-sorted materials, some masterpieces by the side  of school-boys' performances; and there was also considerable neglect in the arrangement of the articles, and especially in the references." In spite of all its defects, the Encyclopedia was the pride of France, and is in many respects a very able production. See La Porte, Esprit de l'Encyclopedie (Paris, 1768); Voltaire, Questions sur l'Encyclopedie (Paris, 1770); Van Mildert, Boyle Lecture, 1:378; Kurtz, Church History, 2:236; Farrar, Hist. of Free Thought, pages 166-178; Tennemann, Manual Hist. Philosophy, page 378; Schwegler, Hist. Philosophy, translated by Seelye, page 206; Chambers, Encyclopaedia; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:1; Morell, Hist. Philippians page 111. (H.G.)

## Encyclopedia of Theology[[@Headword:Encyclopedia of Theology]]

             a branch of theological science of comparatively recent origin. Its aims are to furnish

(1) a sketch of the different branches of theology in their organic connection and relations with each other; showing the fitness of the various branches to theological science as a whole, and the relative importance of these branches; and

(2) a plan of theological study, showing the order in which the topics should be taken up, and indicating the best methods of study and necessary books and helps of all kinds. This second branch, including the practical application of encyclopedia, is generally called Methodology, and the whole science taken together is called by the double name Encyclopedia and Methodology. Of these, Encyclopedia is the objective side, the outline of the science itself; Methodology is the subjective side, having reference to the work of the student of the science.

I. History of the Science. — In form, this branch of science is modern. When theology as a science was in its infancy, theological encyclopedia as science was impossible. But at an early period helps for students were prepared. Such were the treatise by Chrysostom, De Sacerdotio, the De officiis ministrorum of Ambrosius, De doctrina christiana of Augustine,  and a work of the same kind as the latter, De disciplina scholarium, attributed to Boethius (t 525), but probably written after his time. Cassiodorus (t 562) wrote De Institutione Divinacrum Literarum, an introduction to the profitable study of Scripture, for the use of monks. In the 7th century Isidor of Seville wrote a larger work, a kind of general encyclopedia, wherein he also treats of theology, Originum sive Etymologiarum Libr. xx, but it is more in the shape of pastoral theology, as is the De institutione clericorum of Rabanus Maurus in the 9th century. The latter contains, however (volume 3), a sketch of the different branches of information necessary to a minister. The Didascalion (eruditio didascalica) of Hugo of St. Victor (t 1141) comes nearer to the character of a theological encyclopedia — its 1Jam 2:1-26 d, and 3d books treating on the preparatory studies, and the others, 4th to 6th, on the exposition of Scripture and the study of the fathers (Liebner, Hugo v. St. Victor, page 96). In the 13th century, Vincent of Beauvais (t 1264), in his Speculuon doctrinale, gave a scientific exposition of several subjects, including theology. After these we find the writings of Nicolas of Clemanges (De stud o theologico, d'Achery, 1:473), and Jean Charlier Gerson (De reformatione theologaie, and Epistolae duce ad studentes Collegii Navarrae Parisiensis, quid et qualiter studere debeat novus theologies auditor).

But the real origin of theological encyclopedia is to be found in the time when the Reformation, in the 16th century, breaking through the bonds of scholastic divinity, brought in a new era for science, particularly for theology. Erasmus first led the way in the new direction by his Ratio s. methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam (1519-1522), giving to theological studies a solid philosophical foundation, promoting the study of the Scriptures, and requiring from the theologian a knowledge of natural sciences. In the Lutheran Church we first find Melancthon giving a short guide to theological studies in his Brevis ratio discendae Theologie (Opp., Bas. 7541, 2:287), This was followed by a work of his pupil, Theobald Thamer, Adhortatio ad theologies studium in aademia Marburgensi. 1543. After these we find the Oratio de studio theol. recte inchoando, 1577, and Regulae studiorum seu de ratione discendi in praecipuis artibus recte instituenda (Lips. 1565), both by David Chytrius; the Consilium de theologiae studio recte constituendo (Nuremb, 1565), by Hieronymus Weller, the pupil and friend of Luther; the systematic Methodus studii theologi publicis praelectionibus in academia Jenensi a.  1617 exposita, (1620, 1622, 1654), by John Gerhard; as also the works of Jacob Andreoe, De Stud. Sacr. Litt. (Lips. 1567); Nicholas Selnecker (Notatio de Stud. Theologiae (Lips. 1579); and Abr. Calov (Isagoge ad Theoilogicam). First in the list of encyclopedic works of the Reformed Church stands Bullinger's Ratio stadii theologici, and the latter part of Conrad Gessner's Pandectarum universalium liber ultimus. But more important than either of those is the work of Andreas Gerhard of Ypern (Hyperius), professor at Marburg (t 1564), Theologus, seu de ratione studii theologici (Basal, 1572, 1582), in which we find a first attempt to arrange the matter of the Encyclopedia, dividing it into different departments, exegetical, dogmatical, historical, and practical, though the exact limits of each were not yet well defined. The writers on dogmatics often prefixed an encyclopedic essay to their works, as did J.H. Alsted in his Methodus sacrossanctae Theologies (Hanov. 1623) which contains two prefatory books on the study of theology. From the school of Saumur came Steph. Gaussin's Dissertationes de studii theologici ratione, etc. (1678, 6th ed., by Rambach, Hal. 1726). Calixtus (t 1656) wrote a copious Appaeratus Theologicus (Helmst., edited by his son, 1661); and Spener (t 1705) gave acute advice and discriminations in several of his writings.

The term encyclopedia, in its present meaning, we find for the first time in the title of a work by the Reformed theologian S. Mursinna, Primae lineae ENCYCLOPAEDAE, THEOLOGICAE, (Hal. Magd. 1764; 2d ed. 1794). But this, like all the works heretofore mentioned, has now only a historical interest. Herder's Briefe u. d. Stadium d. Theologie (1785, 4 volumes) is, on the other hand, even now of value in this field. A new era in the history of theological encyclopedia was inaugurated by Schleiermacher in his Darstellung d. theologischen Stadiums z. Behufe einleitender Vorlesungen (Berlin, 1811); but the full effect of the book was not felt until its 2d edition appeared in 1830, although Bertholdt (Theol. Wissenschaftskunde, Erlangen, 1821, 2 volumes), Francke (Theol. Encyclopaedie, 1819), and Danz (Encyclopaedie and Methodologie, Wein. 1832) had been stimulated and guided by Schleiermacher's remarkable sketch. The powerful grasp of the whole science, and the luminous statement of the relations of all the parts, given by Schleiermacher, give his Darstellung the foremost place in this branch of science. (There is an English translation by Farrar, not very well done, under the title Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, Edinb. 1850, 12mo). Its practical fault lies in the divisions, made of the whole science (see below). It was followed by Hagenbach's Encyclopaedie au.  Methodologie d. Theol. Wissenschaften (Leips. 1833, 8vo), a work of great practical value, which has maintained its position as the most useful manual on the subject (7th edition, Leips. 1864, 8vo). The Encyclopaedie d. theol. Wissenschaften of K. Rosenkranz (Halle, 1845) is thoroughly speculative and Hegelian. Harless's Enryclopadie u. Methodologie (Nurnb. 18371) is a Lutheran work, and is really valuable for its historical sketch of the development of theology and for its copious literature. The Anleitung z. Studium d. christl. Theologie of Lobegott Lange (Jena, 1841) advocates Biblical rationalism. Pelt's Theologische Encyklopadie (Hamb. 1843, 8vo) follows Schleiermacher's method closely, but is a thorough and scholarly work, careful in statement, broad in range, and accurate in literature. Holland has produced a valuable compendium in Clarisse, Encyclopedice Theologicae Epitome (2d edit. Lugd. Bat. 1835, 8vo), which has a copious literature, especially full in reference to English books, a matter in which the German writers on the subject are all signally deficient.

Among Roman Catholic books in this field are to be mentioned Possevinus, Bibliotheca selecta de ratione studiorum (Colon. 1607); Ellies du Pin, Methode pour etudier la theologiae (1716), translated into several languages. In the 18th century, Denina (1758), Gerbert (1764), Braun (1777), Brandmeier (1783), and specially Oberthur, labored in this field. The influence of the later Protestant writers is manifest in such works as Drey, Kurze Einl. in das Stud. d. Theologie (Tubing. 1819); Klee, Encyklopaedie (Mainz, 1832); Staudenmaier, Encyclopadie der theol. Wissenschaften als System d. gesammfen Theologie (Mentz, 1834-1840); Gengler, D. Ideale d. Wissenschaft. o. d. Encyclopadie d. Theologie (Bamb. 1834); Buchner, Enc. u. Method. (Sulzb. 1837); A. von Sieger, De natura fidei et methodo theologiae ad ecclesiae catholicae Theologos (Monast. 1839).

No book properly to be called Encyclopedia of Theology has appeared in English, and no book is more needed, as the English theological literature is almost wholly neglected by the Germans. (We are glad to see, as this article goes to press, 1868, an Encyclopedia and Methodology announced as in preparation by Dr. H.B. Smith.) But there are many excellent remarks in English books of pastoral theology on the best methods of study, and some special treatises which deserve notice. Among them are Dodwell, Advice on Theological Studies (Lond. 1691); Bennet, Directions for Studying (Lond. 1727, 3d edit. 8vo); Cotton Mather, Manuductio in Ministerium (Boston, 1726, 12mo; republished, with additions, as Mather's  Student and Preacher, by Ryland (Lond. 1781); Mason, Student and Pastor (Lond. 1755); Marsh, Course of Lectures on Divinity (Cambridge, 1809, 8vo), which gives good practical hints, and also attempts an encyclopaedic outline; Doddridge, Lectures (Works, Lond. 1830, 215 sq.); Bickersteth, Christian Student (Lond. 4th edit. 1844), contains much information and good advice, but is destitute of scientific form or spirit. There are many compends, such as Preston's Theological Manual (1850), Smith's Compendium (1836), etc., which are superficial sketches of theology, designed to aid students in cramming rather than in thorough work. Many good hints are given in books of pastoral theology, for which SEE PRACTICAL THEOLOGY. There is a good list of books in Lowndes's British Librarian, page 813 sq.

II. Method of Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology. —

1. Some writers hold that encyclopedia should be treated entirely apart from methodology: so Kienlen, Encyclopadie (Strasb. 1842), confines the former to the exposition of the relation of the several branches of theology to the science as a whole; making methodology a separate work, aiming not to set forth the science at all, but to show how it should be studied. This view is correct, if encyclopedia be taken in its broadest sense, as not merely an introductory science, taking the beginner by the hand at the portals of theology, and showing, him the way to enter, and the plan of the edifice, but also as forming the conclusion of the course of study, in which all the branches are exhibited in their natural relations to the central trunk. But in view of practical use, most of the recent writers blend methodology with encyclopedia in one connected whole.

2. We give here the methods of the chief writers on the subject:

(1.) Schleiermacher (§ 31) divides theology as science into three branches, Philosophical, Historical, and Practical. Philosophical theology includes, 1. Apologetics; 2. Polemics. Historical theology includes, 1. Exegetics, or the knowledge, of primitive Christianity; 2. Church history, or the knowledge of the earthly career of Christianity; 3. the knowledge or the present condition of Christianity (a) as to doctrine (Dogmatic theology), (b) as to social condition and extension (Ecclesiastical statistics). Practical theology includes, 1. Church service (Liturgy, Worship, Homiletics, Pastoral care); 2. Church government. parts, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical. Exegetical theology includes a knowledge of the sacred books, as the primary source of Christian doctrine, and the record of the original facts of Christianity. This knowledge presumes a knowledge of the languages of the sacred books, and requires also an apparatus (1) of criticism; (2) of history, viz. archaeology, geography, etc.; (3) of interpretation (Hermeneutics).

Historical theology includes Bible history of Old and New Testament, Biblical theology, Church history, Doctrine history, Patristics, Symbolics, Archaeology, Statistics. Systematic theology includes Dogmatics, Apologetics, Polemics, and Ethics. Practical theology embraces Catechetics, Worship, Homiletics, Pastoral care, Church government. — Pelt gives a very complete outline (founded on Schleiermacher's) in his Encyclopaedie (1843, 8vo), which he modifies somewhat in his article Theologie, in Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie, 15:748 (compare also his article in Studien u. Kritiken, 1849, page 27). — Godet (Bulletin Theologique, Paris, 1863, art. 1) divides theology into,

1. Speculative, or the knowledge of salvation;

2. Practical, or the art of saving men. Under the first he classes Exegetical, Systematic, and Historical theology; under the second, Ecclesiastical economy, Missions, Apologetics (compare a criticism on this outline by Pronier, in the same journal, May, 1863, page 76 sq.).

Thomas (Bullet. Theol. September 1865) proposes to arrange as follows:

1. Apologetics (historical and philosophical);

2. Historical theology (Biblical sciences, Church history, Statistics);

3. Systematic theology (Dogmatics, Polemics, Speculative theology);

4. Practical theology (the individual, the family, the nation, civilization, the Church, (a) as to its base, (b) as to its organization, (c) as to its active working. — Dr. W.F. Warren, of the Boston Theological Seminary, gives a philosophical but luminous outline in Jahrbicherf. Deutsche Theologie, 1867, page 318, as follows: doctrines: Mosaic, Jewish, and New Test.; Biblical Church history; auxiliary sciences: philology, archeology, geography, chronology, etc.).

2. The Church in its development in time (Literature, History of doctrines, System of Christian doctrines, Church history, Church economy, auxiliary sciences, with Polemics as a concluding discipline).

3. The Church in its consummation (the scientific exposition of what the Word of God tells us concerning the future development and final consummation of the Church). In a note to Dr. Warren's article (page 321), Dr. Wagenmann gives another outline, to which we refer the reader.

Literature. — Besides the authors already cited, see Tholuck's Lectures on Encyclopedia, translated in the Bibliotheca Sacra, volume 1; Biblical Repository, edited by Dr. Robinson, 1:613; 4:127; Zyro, in Studien u.Kritiken, 1837, page 689 sq.; Shedd, Essays, Essays on Method and Influence of Theological Studies; Vincent, Du Protestantisme en France, 1:314 sq. (Paris, 1860,12mo); Credner, Preface to Kitto's Cyclopcedia.

## End of the World[[@Headword:End of the World]]

             SEE ESCHATOLOGY.

## Endemann, Samuel[[@Headword:Endemann, Samuel]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born March 18, 1727, at Carlsdorf. He studied at Marburg and Rinteln, was in 1750 preacher at Jesberg, in Hesse, and in 1753 at Hanau. In 1766 he was appointed member of consistory, and in 1767 became professor of theology and Hebrew at the gymnasium in the latter place. In 1782 he accepted a call as professor of theology to Marburg, and died there May 31, 1789, leaving, Institutiones Theologiae Dogmatical (Hanover, 1777, 2 volumes): — Institutiones Theologiae Moralis (Frankfort, 1780, 2volumes): — Compendium Theologiae (ibid. 1782): — Sciagraphia (Marburg, 1783): — Compendium Theologiae Moralis (Frankfort, 1784). His Compendium Theologiae Dogmaticae was edited and published by A.J. Arnoldi  (Hanover, 1790). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:305, 313. (B.P.)

## Endowment[[@Headword:Endowment]]

             in ecclesiastical phrase; is the property given by the founder of a church for its maintenance, including the pay of the clerks. Justinian compelled those who built churches to endow them; without competent provision for support no clerk was ordained to any church; whoever desired a parish church on his estate was to set apart a landed endowment for its clerks (A.D. 541); a bishop was not to consecrate a church until the endowment of it had been regularly secured by a deed or charter (A.D. 572); founders of churches were to understand that they had no further authority over property which they had given to the Church, but that both the Church and its endowment were at the disposition of the bishop, to be employed according to the canons (A.D. 633). According to the ninth Council of Toledo, A.D. 655, a bishop was not to confer on any monastic. church in his diocese more than a fiftieth part of the Church funds; and on a non- monastic church, or church designed for his own burial-place, not more than a one-hundredth part. The royal confirmation was required if one who held a fief from the king endowed a church.

## Endress, Christian, D.D[[@Headword:Endress, Christian, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March 12, 1775. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1790; in 1792 was appointed tutor in the same university; preached his first sermon at Zion's Church, Philadelphia, in 1793; in 1795 was elected principal of the Congregational school of Zion and St. Michael; in 1801 resigned and removed to Easton, having accepted a call to the Lutheran Church in that place, and while there preached frequently to neighboring congregations. Until 1799 he was subject to the superintendence of the minister or ministers of the Church in Philadelphia, but at the last-mentioned date he received a license from the ministerium of Pennsylvania, and was ordained at Reading in 1802. In 1815 he was chosen pastor of the Lutheran congregation at Lancaster, and died there in September, 1827. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, IX, 1:107; Evangelical Review, 6:22.

## Eneas[[@Headword:Eneas]]

             SEE AJEEAS.

## Enee[[@Headword:Enee]]

             a French prelate and theologian, was notary or secretary to Charles the Bald, and was famed for his honesty and merit. In A.D. 853 he was elected bishop of Paris. On June 14, 859, he assisted at the Council of Savonnieres, near Toul; in 861 at that of Pitres-sur-Seine, near Rouen; in 862 at that of Soissons; in 864 at the second at Pitres-sur-Seine; in August 866, at that of Soissons, and October 867, that of Troyes. He was also at the Council of Verberie on April 24, 869; in August, the same year, at that of Pitres-sur- Seine; and finally, in May 870, at that of Attigny. After various other services to the Church and State, Enee was made abbot of St. Denis and grand chancellor of the palace. He died December 27, 870, leaving a book against Photius and the errors of the Greeks (printed in volume 7 of the Spicilegium of D'Achery and in volume 8 of Labbe and Cossart's Concilia). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Enemessar[[@Headword:Enemessar]]

             (Ε᾿νεμέσσαρος and Ε᾿νεμεσσάρ) is the name under which SHATMIANESER SEE SHATMIANESER (q.v.) appears in the book of Tobit (1:2,13, 15, 16). The change of the name is a corruption, the first syllable Shal being dropped (compare the Bupalussor of Abydenus, which represents Nabopolassar), and the order of the liquids m and n being reversed. The author of Tobit makes Enemessar lead the children of Israel into captivity (2Ki 1:2), following the apparent narrative of the  book of Kings (2Ki 17:3-6; 2Ki 18:9-11). "He regards Sennacherib not only as his successor, but as his son (2Ki 1:15), for which he has probably no authority beyond his own speculations upon the text of Scripture. SEE TOBIT.

## Enenius[[@Headword:Enenius]]

             (Ε᾿νηνής v.r. Ε᾿νήνιος, Vulg. Emmanius), one of the leaders of the people who returned from captivity with Zorobabel (1Es 5:8); corresponding to the NAHAMANI SEE NAHAMANI (q.v.) of Neh 7:7.

## Energici[[@Headword:Energici]]

             a sect in Germany in the 16th century, so called because — they held that the Eucharist was the energy of Jesus Christ — not his body, nor a representation thereof. — Buck, Theol. Dictionary, s.v.

## Energumens[[@Headword:Energumens]]

             (ἐνεργούμενοι), persons possessed, and, in the narrower and more usual sense, persons possessed by an evil spirit. In the early Church such persons constituted a distinct class, bearing some relation to the catechumens and the faithful, but differing from them in this, that they were under the special care of exorcists, while they took part in some of the religious exercises of both classes. Catechumens who became disordered in mind during their term of probation were not baptized until thoroughly recovered, except in cases of sickness. Should any among the baptized become thus afflicted, they were excluded from the Christian assembly during the worst stages of their disease, being compelled to remain in the area of the church. From this circumstance they were called χειμαζόμενοι, exposed to the weather. When partially recovered they were permitted to join in public worship, but were not permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper till they were properly restored, except in the immediate prospect of death. — Bingham, Orig. Eccl. book 3, chapter 4, § 6, 8.

## Enfantin Barthelemy Prosper[[@Headword:Enfantin Barthelemy Prosper]]

             more commonly called father Enfantir, one of the founders of Saint Simonism (q.v.), was born at Paris February 8, 1796. He received his education at a lyceum, and subsequently (1813) at the Polytechnic School. After the fall of Napoleon he engaged in commercial and industrial pursuits. Towards the close of the year 1825 Enfantin became intimately  acquainted with Olinde Rodriguez, and through him with Saint Simon, who converted him to his theories of an industrial and religious reformation. He accepted from his dying master the mission to spread and develop his doctrines. The work was begun with the establishment of a journal called Le Producteur (1825-26, 5 volumes), which closed its career with the celebrated epitaph, The golden age, which a blind tradition has formerly placed in the past, is still before us. The Liberal party at first saw in this periodical the application of its own ideas to the material order, and supported it but the support was withdrawn when Benjamin Constant denounced it as theocratic. In 1828 Enfantin had about a dozen co laborers, among whom were Blanqui, Duveyrier, Buchez (in 1818 president of the Constituent Assembly), and Pereire. The revolution of 1830 filled Enfantin with enthusiastic hopes. He signed, on the 30th of July, a proclamation, in which he demanded community of goods, abolition of inheritage, and the emancipation of woman. He organized "centers of action" at Toulouse, Montpellier, Lyons, Metz, and Dijon; provided for regular preaching at Paris, and frequently addressed the learned, the artists, and the industrials. In 1830 he secured the support of the Globe newspaper. Soon he was made by acclamation (the sacred word was acclame) one of the supreme fathers, with Bazard. The two chiefs disagreed, however, on one important point: Bazard wished to pay prominent attention to political agitation, while Enfantin occupied himself only with ethics, art, religion, and social reform. He desired first of all to regulate individual relations, to emancipate woman and the pauper, and to sanctify the flesh by labor and pleasure. He expected to obtain control of society by dispossessing the Church, not the state. In November, 1831, he issued a manifesto to the forty thousand adherents of the new doctrine in France, that Bazard and Rodriguez had separated from him, and that the new dogma had become incarnate in him alone, as the living law and the messiah. But his attempt to establish communistic colonies failed, and the researches made for finding a female messiah, to share with him the leadership of the communion, made the whole movement ridiculous. The Globe, which was gratuitously distributed, had to be discontinued. In 1832 the government suppressed the association. Enfantin, followed by about forty of his disciples, among whom were Michael Chevalier (subsequently a member of the senate), Duveyrier, and Gustave d'Eichthal, retired to an estate which he possessed on the coast of Menilmontant, and there organized a model community. There the new brethren, divided into groups of laborers, wore a peculiar garb, and passed the day in work,  religious conferences, and symbolical ceremonies. The "father" (Enfantin) had this name conspicuously inscribed upon his breast, superintended, preached, encouraged; he wrote articles for Les Feuilles Populaires, and the Livre Nouveau; composed mystical hymns, and developed some mystical pantheism. It cost him great efforts to refute the attacks of Carnot, J. Reynaut, and others. He was then summoned before the assizes of the Seine, being charged with having held forbidden meetings, and outraged public morality, and was condemned to a year of imprisonment (August 28, 1832). The Saint Simonians now dispersed. Enfantin, who after a few months was set at liberty, left with about a dozen of his disciples for Egypt. Most of them, turning Mohammedans, received appointments from the pasha of Egypt; but Enfantin refused to profess Mohammedanism, and after remaining in Egypt for two years, returned to France. He was for a time postmaster, and in 1841, through the influence of his friends, some of whom had obtained high offices, was appointed member of a scientific commission sent to Algeria. In 1845 he received the chief direction of the Lyons railroad. In November, 1848, Enfantin, conjointly with Duveyrier, established a daily paper, Le Credit, which was continued until 1850. Subsequently Enfantin became connected with the administration of the railroad from Lyons to the Mediterranean. He died May 31, 1864. Shortly before his death he appointed Arles Dufour head of the sect. Enfantin developed the socialistic views of his master and his own in the works E'conomie politique et St. Simonienne (Paris 1831) and Morale (Paris 1832). The latter work was at once condemned by to Courd'assises. Another work of the same class, Le Livre nouveau (completed in 1832), has never been printed. His philosophical and theological views were set forth at length in the Correspondance philosophique et religieuse (Paris 1847), of which the Correspondance politique (Paris, 1849) is a supplement, and in a pamphlet against the Jesuit orator, father Felix (Reponse au Pere Felix, Paris, 1856). His last work was La Vie Eternelle passee, presente, future (Paris, 1861: also republished in the Bibliothique utile, Paris, 1864). In 1865 a collective edition of his socialistic works was published. Vapereau, Dictionnaire des Contemporains, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 16:37. (A.J.S.)

## Enfield William, LL.D.[[@Headword:Enfield William, LL.D.]]

             an English Dissenter and voluminous writer, was born at Sudbury March 29, 1741, and was educated at Daventry under Dr. Ashworth. On leaving the seminary he became pastor to a congregation at Liverpool. He  afterwards became resident tutor and lecturer on belles-lettres at Warrington Academy. In 1785 he became minister of the Unitarian Church at Norwich, where he died November 3, 1797. Among his numerous publications were

(1) A History of Philosophy, drawn up from Brucker (London 1819, 2 volumes, 8vo): —

(2) The Preachers' Directory (London, 1771, 4to): —

(3) Sermons for Families (London 1778, 2 volumes, 12mo): —

(4) The English Preaches (London 9 volumes, 12mo). He was a frequent contributor to periodicals, and shared with Dr. Aikin in the preparation of the General Biographical Dictionary.

## Engaddi[[@Headword:Engaddi]]

             (ἐν αἰγιαλοῖς v r. Ε᾿νγάδδι and ἐν Γάδδι or ἐν Γάδοις, Vulg. in Cades), Sir 24:14. SEE ENGEDI.

## Engadine, Upper And Lower Version[[@Headword:Engadine, Upper And Lower Version]]

             SEE ROMANESE VERSION.

## Engastrimythi[[@Headword:Engastrimythi]]

             (Gr. ἐν, in, γαστήρ, the belly, and μῦθος, an utterance), a name given to the priestesses of Apollo, from a species of ventriloquism which they practiced, speaking from within, while not the slightest motion of the lips could be observed. The voice was supposed to proceed from a spirit within the body of the Pythoness (q.v.).

## Engel[[@Headword:Engel]]

             (Music of the most Ancient Nations, particularly of the Assyrians, Egyptians, and Hebrewes [1864]) observes that the Hebrews had various kinds of sacred and secular musical compositions, differing according to the occasions on which they were employed. These he enumerates as follows:

(a) Sacred music in divine worship, which was evidently regarded as of the highest importance;

(b) Sacred songs, and instrumental compositions, which were performed also in family circles (Isa 30:29; Jam 5:13);

(c) Military music, sacred as well as secular (2Ch 20:21; 2Ch 13:12; 2Ch 13:14);

(d) Triumphal songs (Exodus 15; Jud 1:5; 2Ch 20:27-28);

(e) Erotic songs, alluded to in title of Psalms 45, "A song of loves" (Isa 5:1);

(f) Music at bridal processions (Jer 7:34);

(g) Funeral songs (2Ch 35:25; Ecc 12:5; Amo 5:16; 2Sa 1:19);

(h) Popular secular songs, such as the songs of the vintners (Isa 16:10; Jer 48:33)

(i) Convivial songs (Isa 24:8-9; Luk 15:25; Isa 5:11-12; Amo 6:4-5);

(j) Performances of itinerant musicians (Isa 23:15-16; Ecc 9:4).  For the literature of the subject, SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

## Engel, Arnold[[@Headword:Engel, Arnold]]

             a Dutch poet and theologian, was born at Maestricht in 1620. He belonged to the Jesuits, taught theology, and died at Prague in 1676, leaving several works in Latin verse, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Engel, Moritz Erdmann[[@Headword:Engel, Moritz Erdmann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Plauen, July 29, 1767, where he also died, February 10, 1836. He wrote, Geist der Bibel fur Schule und Haus (13th ed. Leipsic, 1846): — Die Religion nach Vernunft und Schrift (8th ed. Plauen, 1848): — Die Augsburgische Confession als des Evangeliums Kern und Zeugniss (Leipsic, 1830). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:320; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:232, 248, 261, 266, 316, 368. (B.P.)

## Engelbert[[@Headword:Engelbert]]

             abbot of Admont, of the Benedictine order in Styria, was born of noble parents about 1250. He became abbot of Admont about 1297, and died 1331, leaving a great number of works, of which the principal are: De ortu, progressu et fine imperii Romani, published by Gaspard Brusch (Basle. 1553, 8vo; Mentz, 1603, 8vo): — Tractatus super passionem secundum Maatthceum; de statu defunctorum; de Providentia; de causa longaevitatis hominum ante diluvium: — Speculum virtutum. Several of his works were published by the learned Benedictine monk Pez, partly in the Thesaurus Anecdotoraum Novissimus (Augsb. 1721), partly in the Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova (Ratisbon, 1723-25). A biography of Engelbert, and a complete list of all his works, are given by Pez, both in an introductory essay in the 1st volume of the Thesaurus and in the preface to the 3d volume of the Bibliotheca. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 16:48; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:589. (A.J.S.)

## Engelbert Saint[[@Headword:Engelbert Saint]]

             archbishop of Cologne, was a son of count Engelbert I of Berg-Gelderi, and was born in 1185. When he was twenty-two years old the diocese of Munster was offered to him, but he declined it on the ground of youth and inexperience. In 1215 he was elected archbishop of Cologne. With great energy he reorganized the electorate, which, under the administration of his predecessors, had become quite disordered. He extinguished its debt, recovered those portions of its territory which had been lost, and acquired new ones. When the emperor Friedrich II was called to Italy, Engelbert was appointed head of the regency to which was intrusted the administration of the empire. As archbishop, Engelbert made the utmost endeavors to reform the corrupt habits of the clergy, and to repel the interference of the nobility in ecclesiastical affairs. The rigor with which he carried through his principles made him many enemies, and on November 7, 1225, he was surprised and assassinated at Gevelsberg by his nephew, count Friedrich von Isenburg. The murderer was captured and broken on the wheel; the bishops of Munster and Osnabruck, who were charged with complicity, were excommunicated; and Engelbert, on account of his zeal for enlarging the power of the Church, was enrolled in the number of saints. A life of Engelbert, by Caesar of Heisterbach (q.v.), was, in 1630, edited by Gelenius, with many learned remarks and additions (Vindex libertatis ecclesiae et martyr St. Engelbertus, Coloni; 1630); see also  Ficker, Engelbert der Heilige, Cologne, 1853; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen- Lex. 3:590. SEE COLOGNE. (A.J.S.)

## Engelbert the Frank[[@Headword:Engelbert the Frank]]

             SEE ANGILBERT.

## Engelbrecht, Johann[[@Headword:Engelbrecht, Johann]]

             a visionary religionist, was born in Brunswick 1599. He was sickly from his youth, and suffered dreadfully from melancholy, caused by physical pain as well as by mental disturbance. He believed himself (after 1623) the subject of revelations and visions, and went from house to house preaching and narrating his supernaturally acquired knowledge of heaven and hell. Some preachers, like Paul Egard, in Holstein, gave very favorable testimonials of his character and his preaching; but the larger number took offense at his pretended revelations, and persecuted him. In Hamburg, where he spent several years, he was imprisoned. During the last years of his life he lived in great retirement in his native city. He died in 1644. Though unlettered, he wrote several books, especially a View of Heaven (Brunswick, 1625); and they were collected in 1640, and again in 1697, into editions of his Werke und Offenbarungen (Brunsw. and Alnsterd.). Some of his writings have been translate41 into French and English. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:32.

## Engelbrechtsen (or Engelberts), Cornelis[[@Headword:Engelbrechtsen (or Engelberts), Cornelis]]

             an old Dutch painter, was born at Leyden in 1468, and studied the works of Hans van Eyck. The following are some of his noted pieces: The Taking down from the Cross; Abraham about to Sacrifice Isaac; Scenes from the Life of the Virgin. His best work, however, was an altar-piece in the Church of St. Peter, at Leyden, representing the Adoration of the Lamb, as described in the Apocalypse. He died at Leyden in 1533. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Engelcken, Heinrich Ascanius[[@Headword:Engelcken, Heinrich Ascanius]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Rostock, August 15, 1675. He studied at the universities of his native place and Leipsic, was in 1704 professor at Rostock, in 1713 superintendent and pastor of St. George's at Parchim, and died Jan. 13, 1734. He published a number of theological dissertations. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Engelcken, Hermann Christoph[[@Headword:Engelcken, Hermann Christoph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Jennervitz, in Mecklenburg, June 9, 1679. He studied at different universities, was in 1709 pastor of St. John's at Rostock, in 1710 doctor of divinity, and in  1716 professor of theology there. He died January 2, 1742, leaving, Miraculum Dilacerati a Simsone Inermi Leonis: — De Deo Israelis Perditore ad Hos 13:9.: — Vindicatio Psalms 103, 145, et 149: — De Dogmate Transubstantiationis: — De Resurrectione Mystica: — De Gentilium Salute non Speranda: — De Expulsione Principis Mundi Joh 12:31 : — De die Christi Viso ab Abrahamo, Joh 8:56 : — De Paulo Christi Cognitionem Omnibus aliis Rebus Anteponente De Jesaia de Vita Christi Resuscitati Vaticinante cap. 53:8. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Neubauer, Nachricht von jetzstlebenden Gottesgelehrten, s.v.; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v. (B.P.)

## Engelen (Lat. Angelis), Willem Van[[@Headword:Engelen (Lat. Angelis), Willem Van]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Bois-le-Duc, September 1, 1583. He commenced his studies in his native town, and finished them at Louvain, under the direction of Rausin, Follega, and Malderus. In 1606 he taught both Greek and philosophy at the College of Porc;. was received into orders in 1607; in 1614 appointed canon of St. Pierre and professor of morals; in 1616 elected president of the College of Viglius, and was made doctor of theology on October 11 of the same year; in 1646 became president of the College of Pope Adrian VI; in 1648 was appointed to the bishopric of Ruremond, but died at Louvain, February 3, 1649, without having received his bulla from Rome, He was celebrated in dogmatical theology and scholastics, and vigorously opposed the doctrines of Jansenius. He left, Den Deckmantel des Catholyckenaems, etc. (Louvain, 1630), which specially attacked Vaet, Udemans, van Swalmen, and AEverwyn: — Relation des Troubles a Louvain, etc. (1641): — Protestatio Theologarumi Lovani (1642). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Engelgrave, Assuerus[[@Headword:Engelgrave, Assuerus]]

             a Belgian monk, brother of the following, was born at Antwerp. He took the habit of a Dominican there, and gained great reputation as a preacher in Brabant and Flanders. He died in the prime of life, July 21, 1640, leaving Conciones Variei. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Engelgrave, Hans Baptist[[@Headword:Engelgrave, Hans Baptist]]

             a Belgian theologian, was born at Antwerp in 1601. He joined the Jesuits in 1619, assisted at the ninth general assembly of the society at Rome,  became rector of the College of Bruges, was twice provincial of Flanders, and finally superior of the house at Antwerp, where he died, May 3, 1658, leaving, Meditationes in Onnes Dominicas (Antwerp, 1658): — Dominicales et Festivales (Cologne, 1659). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genirale, s.v.

## Engelgrave, Hendrik[[@Headword:Engelgrave, Hendrik]]

             a Belgian theologian, brother of the preceding, was born at Antwerp in 1610. He joined the society of Jesus in 1628; became successively director and then prsefect of the lower classes; directed for fifteen years several convents; became rector of the colleges of Oudenarde, Cassel, and Bruges, being surnamed the Magazine of Sciences, on account of his extended knowledge; and died at Antwerp, March 8, 1670, leaving, Coeleste Pantheon (Cologne, 1647): — Lux Evangelica, etc. (Antwerp, 1648; inserted in the Index at Rome on July 27,1686, but reprinted several times): — Coeleste Empyreum (Cologne, 1668): — Meditatien ofte Saete Bemerkingen (Antwerp, 1670): — Divum Domus Facta, etc. (Cologne, 1688): — Commentaria in Evangelia Quadragesimae (ibid. 1725): — and several pieces of poetry in Latin, 4to. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Engelhardt Johann Georg Veit[[@Headword:Engelhardt Johann Georg Veit]]

             a German theologian, was born at Neustadt on the Aich, November 12, 1791. After studying for three years at the University of Erlangen, and being for several years a tutor in two noble families, he was in 1817, appointed deacon at a church in Erllangen and professor at the gymnasium. In 1820 he became lecturer at the University of Erlangen, and obtained the degree of doctor of divinity; the next year he was advanced to an extraordinary, and in 1822 to an ordinary professorship at the university. The latter position lie retained until his death, September 13, 1855. For several years he held the office of university preacher, and five terms he was elected rector of the university. From 1846 to 1848 he was deputy of the university in the Bavarian diet. The king of Bavaria conferred upon him the title of ecclesiastical councillor and the order of St. Michael, and the city of Erlangen the right of honorary citizenship. In the history of theological literature, Engelhardt has secured a lasting place by his manuals of Church history and history of doctrines (Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 4 volumes, Erlangen, 1833-34; Dogmengeschichte, 2 volumes, Neustadt, 1839). He gave special attention to the study of the history of mystic theology. His intention to write a comprehensive history  of this theology he did not find time to carry out, but he wrote a number of separate articles on the subject. Among the most important of this class of his works are those on Dionysius Areopagita (Dissertatio de Dionysio plotinizante, Erlangen, 1820; De origine scriptorum Areopagiticorum, Erlang. 1823; Die angebl. Schriften des Areopagiten Dionysius, ubersetzt u. mit Abhandlungen begleitet, Erlang. 1823, 2 volumes); on Plotinus (Plotin's Enneaden, ubersetzt u. mit Anmerkungen, part 1, Erlangen, 1820, incomplete); on Richard of St. Victor and Ruysbroek (Rich. von St. Victor u. Joh. Ruysbroek, Erlang. 1838). Several other works on kindred topics are preserved in MS. in the library of the Erlangen University. Next to mystic theology, the study of the Church fathers was one of his favorite occupations, to which we owe a work on patristics (Leitfaden zu Vorlesungen uber Patristik, Erlang. 1823). He also left in MS. a complete translation of Irenaeus. A biographical sketch of Engelhardt is given in the funeral sermon by his colleague, professor Thomasius (Erlang. 1855). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19:479.

## Engelhardt, Daniel[[@Headword:Engelhardt, Daniel]]

             SEE ANGELOCRATOR.

## Engelhardt, Moritz von[[@Headword:Engelhardt, Moritz von]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born July 8, 1828, at Dorpat, where he also completed his theological studies. Being advised by his teachers, Philippi, Th. Harnack, and K.F. Keil, to pursue an academical career, he went to Erlangen, where he attended the lectures of Hofmann, Thomasius, and Delitzsch; then to Bonn, where Rothe and Dorner were his teachers, and finally to Berlin, where Hengstenberg lectured. Thus prepared, he returned to his native city, taking the magister-degree by presenting his monograph on Valentin Ernst Loscher nach seinem Leben und Wirken (Dorpat, 1853; 2d ed. 1856), and commenced his lectures as a privat-docent. In 1855 he was appointed professor of Church history, and in the following year was made doctor of theology on presenting his De Tentatione Christi. In 1864 he published his Schenkel und Strauss, Zwei Zeugen der Wahrheit, and in 1878 Das Christenthum Justins des  Martyrers (Erlangen; reviewed in Schurer's Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1878, 632 sq.). In 1880 his Sermons, delivered at the university church, were published, and in 1881 Die ersten Versuche zur Aufrichtung des wahren Christenthums in einer Gemeinde der Heiligen (Riga). He died December 5, 1881. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Engelschall, Carl Gottfried[[@Headword:Engelschall, Carl Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 5, 1675. He studied at Leipsic and Wittenberg, was in 1698 pastor at Embskirchen, in Bavaria, in 1701 archdeacon at Reichenbach, and in 1707 court-preacher at Dresden. He died March 23,1738, leaving many ascetical writings. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Engenhagen, Heinrich[[@Headword:Engenhagen, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Libeck, April 26, 1615. In 1643 he was appointed deacon at St. James's, in his native place, became its pastor in 1662, and died September 1, 1685. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Engestrom, Johann[[@Headword:Engestrom, Johann]]

             a Lutheran doctor of theology, of Sweden, and bishop of Lund, who was born in 1699, and died May 16, 1777, is the author of Grammatica Hebraea Biblica (Lund, 1734). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrtena- Lexikon, s.v.; Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, s.v. (B.P.)

## Enghein, Francois De[[@Headword:Enghein, Francois De]]

             a Belgian theologian, was born at Brussels in 1648. He took the habit of a Dominican at Ghent, and finished his studies at Louvain, where he was made doctor of theology, January 21, 1685, and taught successively philosophy and theology. Having become director of the studies of his order, he assisted at the chapter-general which assembled at Rome in 1694, and after a very long sojourn with pope Clement XI. came back in 1703 to take up again his functions at Louvain. In 1706 he refused the bishopric of Antwerp, and retired to Ghent, where he spent the rest of his days in study, and died November 9, 1722, leaving, De Potestate Ecclesiastica (Cologne, 1685): — Auctoritas Sedis Apostolicae (ibid. 1689): — Vindiciae Adversus Avitum Academicum: — De Doctrina S. Thomae ad Gratiam  Eficacem (Louvain, 1703): — Contra Constitutionena Sedis Apostolicae Unigenitus (Ghent, 1715). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Engil[[@Headword:Engil]]

             a word which very frequently occurs in the Koran, and denotes the Gospel or New Test. as distinguished from the Taourat, the Law or Old Test. Mohammedans generally understand by Engil, as used in the Koran, an imaginary gospel, which they say was sent by God from heaven to Jesus Christ, and of which nothing remains but what is cited in the Koran; while the gospel which is in the hands of Christians they regard as corrupted.

## Engilbert[[@Headword:Engilbert]]

             SEE ANGILBERT.

## Engine[[@Headword:Engine]]

             (μηχανή, machine, 1Ma 5:30, etc.; 2Ma 12:15, etc.), a term exclusively applied in Scripture to military affairs. Such instruments were certainly known much earlier than the Greek writers appear to admit, since figures of them occur in Egyptian monuments, where two kinds of the testudo, or penthouse, used as shelters for the besiegers, are represented, and a colossal lance, worked by men who, under the cover of a testudo, drive the point between the stones of a city wall. SEE FORT.

The Hebrew חַשָּׁבוֹן, chishshabon' (2Ch 26:15), lit. invention (as in Ecc 7:29), is its counterpart in etymological meaning, each referring to the ingenuity (engine, from ingenium) displayed in the contrivance. The engines to which the term is applied in 2 Chronicles were designed to propel various missiles from the walls of a besieged town; one, like the balista, was for stones, consisting probably of a strong spring and a tube to give the right direction to the stone; another, like the catapulta, for arrows, an enormous stationary bow. The invention of these is assigned  to Uzziah's time a statement which is supported both by the absence of such contrivances in the representations of Egyptian and Assyrian warfare, and by the traditional belief that the balista was invented in Syria (Pliny, 7:56). Of the balistae and catapultae it may be proper to add that they were of various powers. For battering walls there were some that threw stones of fifty, others of one hundred, and some of three hundredweight; in the field of battle they were of much inferior strength. Darts varied similarly from small beams to large arrows, and the range they had exceeded a quarter of a mile, or about 450 yards. All these engines were constructed upon the principle of the sling, the bow, or the spring, the last being an elastic bar, bent back by a screw or a cable of sinews, with a trigger to set it free, and contrived either to impel darts by its stroke, or to throw stones from a kind of spoon formed towards the summit of the spring. (See Smith's Diet. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Tormentum.) SEE WAR.

2. Another military engine with which the Hebrews were acquainted was the battering-ram, described in Eze 26:9 as מְחַי קָבַלּוֹ, mechi' kobollo' lit. a beating of that which is in its front, hence a ram for striking walls; and still more precisely in Eze 4:2; Eze 21:22 as כִּר, kar, a ram. The use of this instrument was well known both to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1:359) and the Assyrians. The references in Ezekiel are to the one used by the latter people, consisting of a high and stoutly- built framework on four wheels, covered in at the sides in order to protect the men moving it, and armed with one or two pointed weapons. Their appearance was very different from that of the Roman armies with which the Jews afterwards became acquainted (Joseph. War, 3:7,19). No notice is taken of the testudo or the vinea (comp. Eze 26:9, Vulg.), but it is not improbable that the Hebrews were acquainted with them (comp. Wilkinson, 1:361). The marginal rendering ' engines of shot" (Jer 6:6; Jer 32:24; Eze 26:8) is incorrect. An engine for battering the wall is mentioned in the reign of king David (2Sa 20:15); but the instrument itself for throwing it down may have been that above noticed, and not the battering-ram. The ram was, however, a simple machine, and capable of demolishing the strongest walls, provided access to the foot was practicable, for the mass of cast metal which formed the head could be fixed to a beam lengthened sufficiently to require between one and two  hundred men to lift and impel it; and when it was still heavier and hung in the lower floor of a movable tower, or helepolis, it became a most formidable engine of war — one used in all great sieges from the time of Demetrius, about B.C. 306, till long after the invention of gunpowder. Towers of this kind were largely used at the destruction of Jerusalem (q.v.) by the Romans. SEE BATTERING-RAM.

## England, Church of[[@Headword:England, Church of]]

             The proper designation of this church since the Act of Union in 1801 is "The United Church of England and Ireland." The Reformed Church of England dates from the 16th century; but it is convenient to treat in this article of the rise of Christianity in England, and of its growth under the protection of the State. (The free churches of England are given under their several titles in this work.)

I. HISTORY. —

(I.) Early Period (to the mission of Augustine, A.D. 596).

1. To the Saxon Invasion, A.D. 449. It is generally believed that Christianity was introduced into Britain before the end of the 2d century. Tertullian (t about 220) speaks of places in Britain not reached by the Romans, but yet subject to Christ (Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita). Eusebius, indeed, declares that some of the apostles preached in Britain (Dem. Evang. 3:7); Stillingfleet (Origines Britannicae, c. 1), Cave (Lives of the Apostles), and others, insist that St. Paul was the founder of British Christianity. Clemens Romanus (A.D. 101) says that Paul went to the limits of the West (το τέρμα τῆς δύσεως, I Epist. ad Cor.); and Theodoret (t 457) says that Paul brought salvation to the isles of the ocean (ταῖς ἐν τῷ πελάγει διακειμέναις νήσοις, in Psa 116:1-19). But none of these hints amount to proof. Other traditions use the names of St. James, of Simon Zelotes, and of Joseph of Arimathea; asserting that the latter came over A.D. 35, or about the twenty-first year of Tiberius, and died in England. Of all this there is no proof (Fuller, Ch. Hist. of Britain, 1:13; Stillingfleet, Orig. c. 4; Short, Ch. History of England, 1, § 2). Another legend is that an English king, Lucius, sent messengers to Eleutherius (t 192), bishop of Rome, asking for Christian instruction; that the messengers were converted and ordained, one a bishop and the other a teacher; and that on their return king Lucius and his chief men were baptized, and a regular Church order established (Collier, Eccl. History, volume 1, chapter 1; Smith, Religion of Ancient Britain, chapter 5). But it is very doubtful whether there ever was a king Lucius, and the whole story is now generally discredited.

The Gospel having been introduced into Britain, a Christian Church subsisted there, though not always in an equal degree of vigor, till the persecution of Diocletian. It then acquired new strength from the fortitude  of its martyrs. Though the names of only three have been recorded (St. Alban, Aaron, and Julius), yet all historians agree that numbers suffered in Britain with the greatest constancy and courage (compare Gildas, § 8; Bede, 1:6, 7). The first martyr is said to have been St. Alban, who lived in the town of Verulam, which had a Roman colony; he had been converted from paganism by a teacher to whom he had afforded protection from the general persecution. Though Constantius, the Roman governor of Britain, had an inclination to favor the Christians, yet it was' not in his power to dispense with the edicts of the emperors, and he complied so far with them as to demolish the churches. Though he died a pagan, yet he granted to the Christians the free exercise of their religion, and protected them from injury or insult. This emperor died at York, and was succeeded by his son Constantine, A.D. 306 (Carwithen, Hist. of Christian Church, chapter 16). The best illustration of the early organization of Christianity in Britain is the fact that three British bishops attended the council at Arles, A.D. 314, the canons of which have among their signers Eborius episcopus, de civitate Eboracensi, provincia Britannia; Restitutus episcopus, de civitate Londinensi, provincia suprascripta; Adelius episcopus, de civitate colonia Londinensium (perhaps Colonia Lindi. i.e., Lincoln); compare Jac. Usserii Brit. eccles. antiq. (London 1687); Bingham, Orig. Eccl. 3:557 sq. British bishops also attended the councils of Sardica (A.D 347) and of Ariminum (A.D. 359).

Little is accurately known of the real state of Christianity in this period. Pelagianism took root in Britain (the native country of Pelagius), and the British bishops called in Germanus and Lupus from Gaul, who refuted Pelagius at the conference of Verulam (A.D. 446). They also founded a cathedral at Llandaff, making Dubricius bishop, with extensive jurisdiction. The monastery of Banchor (Bangor), near Chester, was founded at about the same time.

2. From the Saxon Invasion,449, to the Invasion of Augustine, 596. — Hengist and Horsa, retained by Vortigern, A.D. 449, to aid him with 5000 men in expelling the Scots and Picts from Britain, remained in the island as conquerors. The greater part of Britain was again plunged into barbarism, and Christianity kept its ground only in Wales and Cornwall. (Its history in Ireland and Scotland is given in separate articles.) The patron saint of Wales, St. David (6th century), is said to have been consecrated a bishop at Jerusalem; he held a synod against Pelagianism at Brevy, and became archbishop of Caerleon SEE DAVID, ST. In Cornwall the British rites and  usages were preserved until near the end of the 7th century. Iona, where Columba (q.v.) established his foundations about 565, was a center of light not only for Scotland, but also for north Britain SEE IONA.

(II.) Middle Age: Era of Submission to the Papacy (6th to 16th century). Up to the 6th century British Christianity had been independent of Rome. But at that time Gregory the Great determined to seek the conversion of the English Saxons to Christianity. Ethelbert, king of Kent, had married. a Christian wife, Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of the Franks. She induced her husband to favor Christianity, and thus prepared the way for the mission of Augustine (sent by Gregory), who, with a number of monks, landed in 596. They converted Ethelbert, who was not only king of Kent, but Braetwalda, or chief of the Saxon monarchs. His example was soon followed by the kings of Essex and East Anglia, and gradually by the other chieftains of England. It is said that 10,000 English were baptized within the year of Augustine's arrival. In 597 Augustine went over to Aries, in France, where he was consecrated by bishop Virgilius, and on his return he became the first bishop of Canterbury. His see was immediately endowed by king Ethelbert, who likewise established the dioceses of Rochester and London. Another portion of the Anglo-Saxons were converted by Aidan and other Scottish missionaries. But the ecclesiastical system set up by the Roman missionaries was entirely of the Roman type, which differed from that of the Irish and of the old British Church in various points, e.g. the reckoning of Easter, the clerical tonsure, chrism, etc. More important were the questions of the marriage of the clergy and of the papal jurisdiction. Wherever the Romish influence prevailed, the Roman view, of course, was adopted. But Scottish and Irish missionaries were also at work in the kingdom, and up to the 7th century the converts of the latter were probably in the majority. In 664, king Oswy of Northumberland held a conference at Whitby, where Colman (q.v.) of Lindisfarne maintained the old British and Irish views, and Wilfrid (q.v.) took the Roman side. The king was persuaded by Wilfrid (or perhaps by his queen, who was a Romanist), and went over to the Roman party. Colman and all his clergy then went to Ireland. In 668 the pope sent over Theodore to be primate of England, and under his administration (668-689) the Roman and British Christians (what remained of them) were fused into one body. SEE THEODORE.

But for many ages we hear little of any exercise of jurisdiction ,by the popes in England: the English bishops and kings did not permit appeals to Rome. When Wilfrid, bishop of York, appealed, A.D. 680, against an English  synod which had deposed him from his diocese, and obtained a decree in his favor from the pope, that decree was disregarded in England, even Theodore himself refusing to obey it. From this period England was in formal connection with the see of Rome up to the time of the Reformation. A few great names shine amid the general gloom, e.g. Bede (t 735), Alcuin (t 804), king Alfred (t 900). The Anglo-Saxon Church, from the time of Alfred, grew more and more Romish. "At length, from the time of Gregory VII (A.D. 1073), the papal jurisdiction was pushed into England, as it was into other countries; legates made frequent visits, held councils, exacted subsidies. Appeals, dispensations, mandates, reserves, annates, bulls, and all the other inconveniences of papal usurpation, followed each other in rapid succession; and for four centuries no country in Europe suffered more, and with greater reluctance, than England. But the popes and the kings of England had, after much disputation, made their agreement, and the Church was their prey" (Palmer, Ch. History, chapter 22).

The Norman Conquest took place A.D. 1066. From this period, for several centuries, the history of England is full of struggles between the ecclesiastical and royal power for supremacy. William the Conqueror refused to acknowledge the pope as his feudal superior, and declared his right to retain in his own hand the investiture of bishops and abbots which the early Saxon kings had possessed. He prohibited the publishing of papal bulls and letters of advice till they had been submitted to and approved of by him; and, further, he deprived the clergy of the right of excommunicating any of his nobles except with his express permission. On the other hand, "he confirmed by charter a law of Edward the Confessor, granting to the clergy tithe of cattle and profits, in addition to the ancient tithe of produce," and committed a still greater error in establishing ecclesiastical courts, to which alone clerical persons were thenceforth to be amenable. The "spiritual courts" became an enormous power in supporting the Roman domination. In 1076 celibacy was first made imperative on the English clergy. "Under Henry Beauclere a synod met at Westminster, 1102, which passed various reforming measures, the nature of which attests the existing depravity and degradation of the Church. This synod prohibited simony, and the pope ruled that lay investiture was simony, and on this question a rupture between the pope and the king soon occurred. After a struggle to maintain the rights of investiture, which he had received with the crown, Henry felt himself compelled to relinquish them to the pope, and only got permission from the pope for bishops to do homage to  him, if they chose, without being on that account removed from their sees.

None of the proposed measures of reform accomplished any result. The morals of the clergy were thoroughly relaxed; murder by a person in holy orders was quite a usual occurrence; against such offenders there was no resort to common law, and ecclesiastical courts rarely interfered with them. A case of this kind gave rise to the protracted struggle between Thomas a Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, on the side of the pope, and Henry II for himself and people" (Eadie, Cyclopaedia, s.v. The "Constitutions of Clarendon" SEE CLARENDON were intended to secure the rights of the civil against the ecclesiastical power; but the resistance of Becket (q.v.), his murder, and the repentant fears of the king, caused their speedy revocation in all the points to which the pope objected. "It was not, however, till the reign of John, when England was laid under an interdict, and the king resigned his crown to the pope, that the papal encroachments rose to their height; and the weak reign of Henry III, which followed, did nothing to abate them. Edward I gave a check to the power of the clergy, subjected them to taxation, and passed the statute of mort main (1279), which prohibited the transfer of land without the king's consent. There is little to be said as to innovations in doctrine during these three centuries; but it may be noted that about the middle of this period, viz. 1213, the Council of St. John Lateran declared transubstantiation, or the bodily presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, to be a tenet of the Church" (Chambers, s.v.). In 1350 the important statute of Provisors was passed. It was provoked by the fact that most of the valuable English benefices were reserved to the pope or to alien clergy, and it provided that the pope should confer no English benefice on any one without consent of the king. The statute of Praemunire (1389; enlarged 1393) forbade any interference of the Church with the statute of Provisors, and also all appeals from English civil courts to the pope. The statute of Mort main (in Magna Charta), and the various amendments and additions to it, all aimed to prevent the accumulation of property in the Church. SEE MORTMAIN.

In the reign of Henry II certain German Church reformers found their way to England — probably Waldensian Christians; and, though they were bitterly persecuted, all the good seed did not perish. In 1327 John Wycliffe was born. As rector of Lutterworth he preached until his death against the supremacy of the pope, the abuses of the hierarchy, and the Romish doctrine of the sacraments. In 1377 he was arrested for heresy, but no harm came to him. His translation of the Scriptures, and other writings,  made a great impression upon the more educated classes, but his labors had little effect upon the mass of the people. After his death more fruit appeared; and by 1400 his followers were numerous enough to form a party and to get the designation of Lollards (q.v.), and for a century persecution for Lollardism was common in England. "Henry IV thought it necessary to fortify his usurped position by assisting the bishops against the Lollards, and from this time to the Reformation there was an uninterrupted succession of confessors and martyrs. Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, was the most illustrious of these sufferers. Fox gives a detailed account of nearly twenty individuals burned for heresy between the death of lord Cobham and 1509, when Henry VIII ascended the throne. To some extent, the blood of these martyrs was the seed of the Reformed Church; but we must not overlook the 'hidden seed,' which was growing secretly from the time that Wycliffe gave to his countrymen a translation of the Scriptures in their own tongue. The progress of learning, and especially the study of Greek, led to a better understanding of the sacred books, whilst the invention of printing (1442) caused a wider circulation of them" (Chambers, s.v.). SEE WYCLIFFE; SEE LOLLARDS.

(III.) From the Reformation to the present Time. The Church of Rome, however, was to all outward appearance fairly established in England at the time of the accession of Henry VIII in 1509 SEE HENRY VIII, and his minister, cardinal Wolsey, maintained the splendor of the Church to a degree unexampled in England. Nevertheless, the great edifice was already undermined. In view of the facts cited in the last paragraph, it is absurd to say, as Roman writers do, that the source of the English Reformation is to be found in the vices of Henry VIII. However, it was not till the reign of that monarch that the Reformation in England in reality commenced. When Luther declared war against the pope, Henry wrote his treatise on the seven sacraments against Luther's book, Of the Captivity of Babylon, and was repaid by the pontiff with the title of "Defender of the Faith" (1521). The king had married his brother's widow, Catharine of Aragon, and was weary of her. Wolsey at first favored a divorce, "to revenge himself on Charles V for having disappointed him of the papacy; but after the king began to look with favor on Anne Boleyn, one of a house from whom Wolsey had everything to fear, he adopted a covert policy of opposition to the divorce he had suggested. When at last he was pressed on every side, with no open way before him, and his own ruin imminent, his course became tortuous, and was marked by a constant endeavor to protract the  proceedings, and delay any sentence being pronounced on this question by the pope. The issue was, in consequence of the advice of Cranmer, an appeal to the universities, and to the learned men of Christendom; for their opinion on this point, which was given in favor, for the most part, of Henry. The disgrace of Wolsey followed thereon. SEE WOLSEY.

Henry's quarrel with the pope daily became more palpable Convocation was summoned in 1531, and charged with breaking the statutes of provisors and praemnunire. They humbly offered to pay a fine. The first step towards a schism was made by this Convocation, but it was under the pressure of the court. They proclaimed the king of England only and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ permits, even the supreme head of the Church of England." In 1533, on the elevation of Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, he pronounced sentence of divorce between Henry VIII and Catharine; and the marriage of Anne Boleyn to Henry was publicly notified. The pope declared this illegal, and threatened, unless these doings were undone, that he would pronounce excommunication on Henry. To prevent any such proceedings affecting the stability of his throne and his succession, in the following year Henry caused Parliament to abolish all papal authority in England, and to stop all payments to the Roman exchequer. After this came, under Thomas Cromwell, acting as vice-regent, a blow upon popish power in England from which it never recovered-namely, first a visitation, and then, as a consequence, the suppression of the monasteries, because 'they had long and notoriously been guilty of vicious and abominable living.' Among the bishops there were two parties; one whose sympathies were with the pope, the other with reform; to the former belonged Bonner and Gardiner, to the latter Cranmer and Latimer. But it was necessary to have some authoritative declaration of what the Church of England held since it had rejected the pope; and hence, in 1536, the king, as head of the Church, issued a proclamation on this subject, and in 1539 Parliament passed an act for establishing the Creed, under the rather characteristic title, 'An act for abolishing diversity of opinions.' By this the doctrine of transubstantiation was taught, and the penalty of death by burning was attached to the denial of it. All who stood out for 'the necessity of the communion in both kinds, or for the marriage of priests, or against the observance of vows of chastity, or the propriety of private masses, or the fitness of auricular confession; all priests who shall marry after having advisedly made vows of chastity, shall suffer the pains of death as felons; and all those who maintain the same errors under any other manner may be imprisoned during the  king's pleasure'" (Mackintosh). Henry felt compelled to go on and increase the 'distance which separated him from Rome.

There was in the Church a powerful party (Cranmer, Latimer, and many others of less note) that were of progressive tendencies, and to this party Thomas Cromwell, during his continuance in power, lent all his influence. His favor shown to the Protestant cause was one ground of his fall. About this time, too, several editions of the English Bible were printed and circulated with the permission of Henry. They were based upon Coverdale's translation. To Cranmer and Cromwell the permission to circulate them is due, and the command to place them in the cathedrals for public use, and for ministers to instruct their people in them. But the tide of political power now turned in favor of the Romanist party, and these permissions were withdrawn: the Bible became again for a time a prohibited book, and many who had received enlightened views of truth suffered bitter persecution. "In 1540 Cranmer persuaded Henry to appoint a commission, of which he was made a member, to draw up a formal confession. This appeared under the title, The Erudition of a Christian Man. It indicates some progress, since it only recommends prayers for the dead as 'good and charitable; and because it is not known what condition departed souls are in, we ought only to recommend them to the mercy of God.' It affirms justification by faith, though it modifies this declaration so far as to add, 'Yet man, prevented by grace, is by his free consent and obedience a worker toward the attaining of his own justification.' It forbids the worship of images, though it allows their use to excite devotional feeling. It altered some minor matters also in the service. Such was the character of the Church of England's first confession. The Reformers were gaining strength, and under Edward VI and the Protector Somerset their triumph was undoubted. Thirty commissioners were sent through the country to abolish superstitious practices. Cranmer drew up twelve homilies, which were appointed to be read in the churches where the ministers could, not preach. This was one of the provisions made for the diffusion of sound religious knowledge. This step, and the sermons themselves, elicited the unqualified approbation of the Continental Reformers. Cranmer wrote also a catechism, which was generally circulated. Such theologians as Bucer and Peter Martyr were invited to come and lecture in the English universities; and the most strenuous exertions were made to provide preaching; 'one sermon every quarter of the year at least' in every church being imperative. But such was the state of the Romish clergy that even this much they could hardly accomplish. In 1547 Parliament repealed the various persecuting acts of  Henry VIII and earlier reigns, leveled against the new opinions, as they are often called. As Convocation was inclined in favor of the Romish party, Parliament assumed to itself the task of reforming the Church. It passed that year acts 'concerning the sacrament,' ordaining 'the communion to be received in both kinds,' forbidding the priest to communicate alone, and requiring him to prepare the people for worthily communicating by an exhortation on the day preceding its celebration. In 1548 there was a commission appointed for the revision of the offices of public worship. One of its first fruits was a new communion service. Confession was no longer made imperative. At the same time a new liturgy was compiled. At the end of it occurs the petition — 'From the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, good Lord, deliver us.' SEE COMMON PRAYER. In 1551 a farther series of emendations was made in the Prayer- book: in it very few alterations have since been introduced. The same year the Articles, then forty-two in number, were published. SEE ARTICLES, THIRTY-NINE.

The commission appointed in 1552 to prepare a canon law, in consequence of the death of Edward, was discontinued before its work was done. Under his reign the progress of reformation had been rapid, but it was to be sorely tried. Mary ascended the throne (1553) and re-established Romanism. Bonner and Gardiner were restored; the Book of Common Prayer and Catechism were declared heretical; the kingdom was reconciled to the see of Rome; a persecution of the chief reformers commenced — Rogers was burned at Smithfield, Hooper at Gloucester, Saunders at Coventry, Taylor at Hadley. The prisons were filled with 'heretics;' many fled beyond sea; some purchased safety by an outward conformity. Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley perished in the flames at Oxford. Cardinal Pole was made primate. One benefit was conferred on the Church by Mary — she surrendered all the Church lands, as well as the first-fruits and tenths, which had been seized by Henry. At last the death of Mary (1558), with which that of the cardinal was all but simultaneous, delivered the Church from its oppressors. Under Elizabeth (1558-1603) Protestantism was again in the ascendant; and by the various measures which were taken, the Reformation in England was completed. The Convocation of 1562, besides drawing up the Thirty-nine Articles, published two volumes of homilies by Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, and caused Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, to draw up a catechism for general use. SEE NOWELL.  "About this time the more extreme reforming party began to appear SEE PURITANS, and to exert their influence specially in all the questions which arose about the various ceremonies of the Church. Elizabeth's extreme jealousy of her supreme authority often obstructed the plans for reform which the more zealous clergy contrived — a jealousy which brought her into collision with the primate himself, as on the subject of 'the prophesyings.' The works of the great Continental divines, as Calvin and Bullinger, were studied in England; and the great standard work of Richard Hooker on Ecclesiastical Polity — which may be styled the apology of the Church of England — was published 1594-97.

"When James ascended the throne, both the Puritans and the Church party calculated on having his support. The Puritans hastened to present to him the famous Millenary Petition, which embodied a statement of those things in the Church which they desired to see amended. This elicited from the universities a counter-petition, and James held a conference with both parties at Hampton Court (q.v.), January 1604. It resulted in no good to the Puritans, for king James now thought Episcopacy was most conformable to monarchy, and the reply to their arguments he pithily put in the form 'No bishop, no king.' One advantage which ensued from this conference was the revision of the translation of the Bible, instituted at the suggestion of the leader of the Puritans, and the result was the present authorized version. During the, reign of James the famous Synod of Dort met, and four English divines were sent thither by James. SEE DORT, SYNOD OF. Henceforward the Calvinistic party in the Church of England began to decline, and king James himself turned against it. James first issued the Book of Sports in 1618, and offended very many, because he thereby legally sanctioned certain amusements on the Sabbath day. Under Charles it was republished in 1663, the declaration affirming that it was done 'out of a pious care for the service of God... . and the ease, comfort, and recreation of our well-deserving people.' It was received with manifest disgust, and many of the clergy refused to obey the ordinance requiring its publication in the churches. In 1644 the House of Commons caused it to be burnt by the hangman. SEE SPORTS, BOOK OF." Under Charles, the High-Church party, with Laud at their head, rose to the highest power. The court of High Commission and the Star Chamber never had more constant employment, and their hateful tyranny most thoroughly roused the people. The severity of Laud occasioned the greatest discontent; and the Puritan party, as they could not maintain themselves in the Church, began to found  special lectureships; but, on Laud's advice, the king issued instructions to the bishops to suppress all such. Forbearance at last came to an end. Then came the great rebellion and civil war, which led to the putting down of Episcopacy, and the establishment of Presbyterianism on the basis of the Westminster Confession, though afterwards Independency took the lead. Laud was condemned the day after the House of Commons established Presbyterianism, and executed January 10, 1645.

"With the restoration of Charles II occurred the restoration of Episcopacy in England. The Sunday after his return heard the liturgy read in almost every parish church. The Puritans, who are henceforward known as Presbyterians (q.v.), having greatly contributed to the restoration, were treated at first by Charles with kindness, and several of their number were offered high ecclesiastical preferments. In 1661 the famous Savoy Conference (q.v.) met, with Baxter as leader of the Presbyterian party, and Sheldon as that of the bishops, to try, if possible, to unite both sides. As might have been expected, the plan failed. In 1662 the Act of Uniformity was passed; and, rather than take the test it prescribed, 2000 Puritan clergy left the Church of England. Then, in quick succession, followed those persecuting acts, the Corporation, Conventicle, and Five-miles Acts. Still further grievances were inflicted by the Test Act of 1672. Next arose another school of divines — 'Christian philosophers rather than divines.' Their lives were moral, but they eviscerated the Gospel of all that was characteristic of it. When a plan for 'comprehension' was revived in 1668, the House of Commons prohibited such a measure being introduced. When James, duke of York, professed Roman Catholicism, Charles at once proclaimed complete toleration. This was in 1672; but the Commons the year following compelled him to withdraw his indulgence. Popery they were determined to resist. When James came into power he proclaimed similar indulgences, and forbade preaching against Romanist errors; nay, in defiance of the enactment of 1651, he re-created the court of High Commission. These measures the clergy resisted. In consequence of his resistance, the bishop of London was suspended for a time. The University of Cambridge came into collision with the king, and also Magdalen College, Oxford. Rather than do what might advantage Rome, the Nonconformists did not avail themselves of the royal indulgence. But James renewed his declaration, and commanded that it should be published in the churches. Eighteen out of twenty-five bishops refused to do so, and nearly all the clergy. The bishops were commanded to cite the recusants,  but they refused. Seven of them — Sancroft, Lloyd, Ken, Turner, Lake, White, and Trelawney — even drew up a remonstance, and, as a consequence, were sent to the Tower. Their committal to it had rather the appearance of a triumphal entry, from the enthusiasm displayed by the people on their behalf. They were tried at Westminster Hall, and the news of their acquittal was received with rapturous delight on all hands, for all felt that they were committed to a struggle against an insidious attempt to restore Popery. The royal career of James was now ending, and his further schemes were not developed, for that very year the Prince of Orange landed (5th of November, 1688). One of William's first acts was the passing of a toleration bill in 1689; but an act of comprehension was rejected in the Commons. In September of that year a commission was appointed to revise the liturgy and canons, and reform ecclesiastical abuses; but all their proposals were rejected by Convocation. Three of the seven bishops mentioned above refused the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. They headed the party known as the Nonjurors, which ceased to exist as an independent Episcopalian Church in 1780; but many of them became attached to the Scottish Episcopalians" (Chambers, s.v.). SEE NONJURORS.

During the period just described a school of divines was formed who, in seeking to avoid Puritanism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other, became Latitudinarians. "They became Christian philosophers rather than divines; and, except an occasional dissertation on the Trinity or a Whitsunday sermon, in which the work of the Holy Spirit was carefully guarded against fanatical abuses, they scarcely interfered with matters of Christian doctrine. Still they were men of blameless lives, and in a slothful age remarkable for pastoral diligence. Amongst the leaders were Whitchcote, Cudworth, Wilkins, and Worthington; some of these were known to be men of eminent piety, but it was more apparent in their lives (and, since their deaths, by their private diaries) than in their preaching. They were equally afraid of superstition on the one hand, and enthusiasm on the other. They loved the constitution of the Church, and were well satisfied. with the liturgy; but they did not think all other forms unlawful. They wished to see a spirit of greater moderation. They continued on good terms with Nonconformists, and allowed great freedoms, not only in philosophical speculations, but in religion; and the boldness of their inquiries into the reasonableness, rather than the scriptural warrant of the truths of religion, led them to be regarded as Socinians. They were all  zealous against Popery; and the Papists cried them down, in return, as Atheists, Deists, or, at best, Socinians, and men of no principles at all. In the society of these men, Tillotson, Patrick, Lloyd, and Stillingfleet were trained — the greatest divines of the next generation, but still with the faults of the school in which they had been educated. They received, and long bore, the title of the Latitudinarian divines; and, in the sense in which we have explained it, the charge was just. They attempted a divorce between evangelical doctrine and Christian practice. The former they at first neglected, and at length lost out of sight; the latter they displayed with admirable clearness, and, if any other principles than those of the Gospel could possibly have enforced it, they would not have so completely failed. But the founders of the school made no deep impression in the days of Charles II, and their still more gifted pupils saw religion in the Church of England almost expiring in spite of all their efforts" (Marsden, Churches and Sects, 1:286). "In 1698 the Church of England gave birth to two noble philanthropic schemes — the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which circulates Bibles, Prayer-books, and Tracts; and in 1701 the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was chartered." In 1747 Convocation was dissolved. SEE CONVOCATION.

"That the Church of England, after fighting for its very existence against Popery on the one hand, and against Puritanism on the other, should have subsided into inactivity during the dull reigns of the Georges, is less a matter of surprise than of regret. The peaceful enjoyment of her temporalities in a dull, irreligious, not to say infidel age, may easily account for, though it cannot excuse, her idleness. But that in the rise of John Wesley, 1730, she should have failed to see a grand opportunity for herself, is a matter of both surprise and regret; she, however, let it pass; nor can she hope that such another will ever again present itself. SEE METHODISM; SEE WESLEY. The utmost that can be hoped is that she has seen her error.

"The next important event in the history of the Church is the Act of Union, which came into effect on the 1st of January, 1801, and united the churches of England and Ireland in all matters of doctrine, worship, and discipline. The Reformation had made some progress in Ireland under Edward VI. Five Protestant bishops were appointed in 1560, and the English Bible and Liturgy were introduced in 1551; but, from a variety of causes, the Reformed doctrines have never found much acceptance with the native population, and, although a Protestant Church was established by law, it  was and is the Church of the minority. SEE IRELAND. In 1635 the English Articles were received. and in 1662 the English Book of Common Prayer was adopted by Convocation. Before the political union of the countries, the two churches were in full communion. By an act of the imperial Parliament in 1833, ten of the Irish bishoprics were suppressed, and the funds thus obtained were applied to the augmentation of small livings, and the building and repair of churches" (Chambers, Cyclopcedia, s.v.). It is now proposed (1868) to "disestablish" the Episcopal Church in Ireland, and the proposal will doubtless be carried into effect. '

In the progress of the 19th century great changes have passed over the Church of England. The formation of the Church Missionary Society SEE MISSIONARY SOCIETIES, of the Bible Society, etc., and especially the influence of Methodism, awakened the long dormant spirit of aggressive Christianity. Since 1800 more than 300C churches have been erected. About 1830 several earnest young men in the University of Oxford gave signs of profound theological study, and of deep interest in Church questions. In reaction, perhaps, from the latitudinarianism of the 18th century, their studies lay chiefly in the fathers and mediaeval writers, and in 1833 they began the publication of the Oxford tracts, calling for a revival of obsolete usages, and bringing up again Romanist or quasi-Romanist views in theology. A brief history of this movement is given under PUSEYISM SEE PUSEYISM ; it must suffice to say here that many young clergymen, as the result ofthe movement, went over to Rome; and those of the school who remained gave rise to the modern RITUALISM SEE RITUALISM (q.v.), which tends to import the spirit, doctrines, and practices of the Church of Rome into the Church of England. In the autumn of 1867 a conference of bishops of the Church of England, and of the churches in communion with the English, was held at Lambeth. The chief object of this synod was to promote a closer union between all branches of the Anglican Church. A resolution censuring bishop Colenso, of Natal, for his deviation from the doctrine of the Church, was adopted by all save three votes. The pastoral letter, signed by the bishops, warned the people against Romanizing tendencies, but made no reference to controversies within the Church. A Greek translation of the pastoral letter was officially transmitted by the archbishop of Canterbury to all the patriarchs and bishops of the Greek Church. SEE PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD.

In order to promote the interest of intelligent laymen in the affairs of the Church, a "Church Congress" was called in 1860, which from that  time has held annual sessions. SEE CHURCH CONGRESS. Several attempts were made by the High-Church party to introduce monastic institutions. Thus the Reverend Mr. Lyne, assuming the name of father Ignatius, endeavored to establish an Anglican branch of the Benedictine order, but the first monastery of the order at Norwich had, after a trial of a few years, to be abandoned. At Bristol a community of the Third Order of St. Benedict was organized. The Reverend Mr. Mackonochie, in 1867, established a Society of the Holy Cross, of which he was the first master. But thus far (1868) all these attempts have met with but little success. SEE MONASTICISM. The High-Church party exhibited a great desire to bring on a closer union with the Eastern churches. A special society, the Eastern Church Association (see below, Statistics), was established to promote the cause, and the Convocations of Canterbury and York gave their official approval of the scheme. SEE EASTERN CHURCHES, GREEK CHURCH, AND PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH. Official communications for the same purpose were also opened with the Church of Sweden, but this step was strenuously opposed by one portion of the High-Church party on the ground that the Swedish Church held some heretical doctrines.

II. CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT. —

1. Church and State. —The constitution of the Reformed Church of England is that "of an authorized and paid establishment, which is not allowed to persecute those who dissent from it" (Short). The union of Church and State was completely secured by the statutes that followed the Reformation up to the Revolution of 1688. The English Church constitution remained nearly unchanged by the Reformation, only that the crown took the place of the pope. The course of subsequent legislation brought in, however, many important modifications of detail. The old statutes, though rarely enforced, were still law, excepting when expressly abrogated. One of the most important of these was the Prnmunire (see above). The statute 25 of Henry VIII (1534), chapter 21, declares entire independence of Rome, and calls the king supreme hede of the Church of England, according to the recognition of its prelate: and clergy. This statute abolishes Peter's pence, and provides for the visitation of monasteries by royal commission.

During the reign of Mary Popery was restored, but all the statutes to that effect were repealed by stat. 1 of Elizabeth (1558-9), which transfers the headship of the Church from the pope to the English crown, and declares  the royal supremacy perpetual. Every form of spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction and prerogative is included in the declaration. The crown can exercise this authority through such officers as it may select, provided they be British subjects appointed by letters-patent. The act prescribes the oath of supremacy, to be taken by all civil and spiritual officers. SEE OATH OF SUPREMACY. The Act of Uniformity (1559) restored the Common Prayer, and required the clergy to conform strictly to it. The statute 13 Eliz. c. 11 (1571), incorporated the 39 articles which had been agreed upon by the Convocation of 1562 into the law of the land. This act, with the laws of supremacy and uniformity, and the articles, settled the government, the worship, and the doctrines of the Church. The queen, though subject to the Church order and doctrines, was invested with full power to govern the Church, and to fill the highest ecclesiastical offices. Church and State were fused together, for all citizens of the State were made members of the Church; the officers of the Church were officers of the State, and the head of the State was made head of the Church. The Revolution made several changes in the constitution of the Church. By stat. 1 William and Mary chapter 6 (April, 1689), the coronation oath was modified. In it the king swore not merely to govern according to the old laws and customs, but also to maintain the laws of God and the true confession of the Gospel, and of the Protestant Reformed religion as by law established; and to "present ye unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them." The 8th chapter substituted a new form of the oath of allegiance, in which the recognition of the king's ecclesiastical supremacy is left out, and in its place stands a promise to obey the king truly; with an anathema of the impious doctrine that princes excommunicated by the pope should be deposed and executed, and that a foreign potentate can have ecclesiastical authority within the realm. The same statute (chapter 18) removed some penalties from Dissenters, and made them eligible to office, provided they took the oath of allegiance personally, or by proxy, in case of conscientious objection to taking the especial oaths of office. During the present century a number of acts have been passed annulling disabilities of Papists and Dissenters; and it is now the case that Dissenters and Romanists have religious freedom, are eligible to civil office, and are admitted to Parliament.

2. Government. —

(1.) The king is the supreme head of the Church on earth, at least in name and form. Formerly the clergy made the following subscription: "That the king's (queen's) majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal," etc.; but by an act of Parliament of July 5, 1865 (28th and 29th Vict. cap. 122), persons to be ordained deacons or priests are required (1) to make a "Declaration of Assent" to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; (2) to take the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy (21st and 22d Vict. cap. 48), by which they swear to be faithful and bear true allegiance to the queen, and declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre- eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. "The highest Church offices are filled by the ministry in the name of the crown. The Privy Council, in which only temporals vote, is the highest court of appeal."

(2.) The management of the Church is in the hands of a hierarchy of archbishops and bishops, subject to the authority of the king and Parliament. The United Church of England and Ireland is divided into four provinces: two English, Canterbury and York; two Irish, Armagh and Dublin. These are under four mutually independent archbishops. The bishops, as well as the archbishops, are spiritual peers, excepting the bishop last consecrated, and the bishop of Sodor and Man, who does not sit in the House of Lords unless he happens to be a peer in his own right. Archbishops are chosen by the crown from among the bishops. The sovereign also nominates the bishops. The Church is governed, "under her majesty, by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same" (Son 7:1-13). The archbishops and bishops alone have the power to ordain clergymen; and these ordinations take place, according to canon law, at "allotted certain times," and "only on the Sundays immediately following jejunia quatuor temporum, commonly called Ember weeks." Candidates for the ministry are usually graduates of Cambridge or Oxford, or Trinity College, Dublin, or else of Durham, Lampeter, or St. Bees; but the bishops are not bound to restrict ordination to members of any university or college. Approved candidates take "the oath of supremacy," sign a declaration that they will conform to the liturgy, and subscribe three articles: the first affirming the supremacy of the sovereign  in the Church; the second asserting that the Book of Commnon Prayer contains nothing contrary to the word of God, and that the ordained person will use the form of the said book; and the third, that they hold all "the Thirty-nine Articles." The candidate is first ordained a deacon, and so continues for one year. At the expiration of this term he undergoes an examination; and when this is satisfactory, he is admitted by the bishop to the order of priest, or presbyter. Several of the presbyters, as well as the bishop, lay their hands simultaneously on the head of every candidate, while the bishop repeats the form prescribed in the ordination service. When once ordained a presbyter, he is competent to take any duty or to hold any preferment in the Church.

(3.) The country is divided into parishes, and many of these have been of late years subdivided. SEE PARISH. The property of the Church of England is obtained through many different channels, and is very valuable: the total revenues are estimated as being not under seven millions a year; and yet so unequal is the distribution, that there are, out of 10,500 benefices, not less than 6800 with incomes under £300 a year; and of these there are 3460 livings whose annual value is under £150. The curates have a very inadequate compensation, the ordinary pay ranging, in large towns, from £70 to £150.

The total number of benefices in 1890 was 14,200. Of late some reforms have been effected by the Parliament. There is a special board of "ecclesiastical commissioners for England to administer the state patronage of ecclesiastical benefices. In their twentieth report, issued in 1868, they state that in the current year they expect to complete the scheme which, in their report of 1864, they proposed to accomplish within five years. Every living with less income than £300 a year which then existed, and contained, according to the census of 1861, a population of 4000 persons, will, on the 1st of March, 1869, have had its income raised to £300 a year, except those cases in private patronage where the one half of the augmentation which the patrons were required to provide from non-ecclesiastical sources has not been forthcoming. In their report of 1853 the commissioners referred to an arrangement which had been entered into with the dean and chapter of York, whereby the capitular estates (subject to subsisting leases) had become vested in the commissioners, and inlieu thereof the dean and chapter were to receive an annuity until the commissioners should restore to them real estates in possession calculated to produce an income equal to such annuity; and it was estimated that the arrangement would at a future  date yield a considerable surplus for the augmentation of small livings. At the close of 1852 the chapter of Carlisle effected a similar commutation. In 1855 the Cathedral Commission advised that all the improved revenue derived from the better management of capitular property should be appropriated to the augmentation of capitular incomes, and to the improvement of cathedral institutions. In 1856 a committee of the House of Commons sat to consider the proceedings of the ecclesiastical commissioners, and in their third report set out the details of the York chapter commutation, and observe, 'Such agreements tend to facilitate enfranchisement, and to provide funds for the endowment of poor livings, as well as to afford a ready means of providing estates in possession for the ecclesiastical corporations.' In the year 1854 the chapters of Peterborough and Chester; in 1855, the chapter of Gloucester; in 1856, St. Asaph; in 1857, Worcester; in 1860, Chichester; in 1861, Winchester and Salisbury; in 1862, Bristol, Canterbury, and Exeter; in 1866, Wells, Rochester, and St. David's; and in 1867, the chapters of Llandaff and Windsor, effected similar commutations of their capitular estates. All these arrangements have been successively sanctioned by orders in council. Commutations have thus been effected with no fewer than eighteen chapters. Under these commutations the chapters gave up their ancient estates in consideration of annual money payments to be received by them, pending their re- endowment with real estates in possession: and in 1862 the permanent estate of the chapter of York; in 1863, that of Peterborough; in 1865, those of Carlisle and Chichester; in 1866, those of Chester, Cloucester, and Canterbury; and in 1867, that of Winchester, were reassigned. As a consequence, the commissioners, in the period between 1864 and 1868, considered the local claims of the parochial cures upon the estates of the chapters of York, Peterborough, Carlisle, and Chichester, and, so far as the value of the property would permit, the requisite grants were made to such parochi;al cures." See below, Patronage and Statistics.

(4.) The only ecclesiastical assembly of the English Church is Convocation (q.v.), which is a convention of the clergy to discuss Church affairs in time of Parliament. As the Parliament consists of two distinct houses, so does this Convocation; the one called the upper house, where the archbishops and bishops sit severally by themselves; the other the lower house, where the rest of the clergy are represented by their deputies. The power of the Convocation is limited by a statute of Henry VIII. They are not to make any canons or ecclesiastical laws without the royal license; nor, when  permitted to make any, can they put them in execution but under severe restrictions. In the year 1661 the English Convocation granted a subsidy to king Charles II, which was the last tax of this nature paid by the English clergy; for, by an arrangement made between archbishop Sheldon and lord chancellor Clarendon in 1664, the Convocation of the clergy thenceforward gave up the privilege of taxing themselves to the House of Commons, in consideration of being allowed to vote at the election of members of that house (Eden). Of late, the Convocations, both of Canterbury and York, have again been permitted to meet, talk, vote addresses to the crown, etc., but they have no real power. SEE CONVOCATION.

(5.) Canons. — In the Convocation which met at the time of the Parliament of 1604, the canons by which the Church of England is still governed were passed. They are said to have been collected by Bancroft from the canons of the ancient Church, and the articles, injunctions, and acts of Convocation during the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. They received the royal sanction, but were not carried through the two houses of Parliament, and are not, therefore, laws of the realm. They bind the clergy only, and that by virtue of their promise of canonical obedience. Many of them have been virtually repealed by subsequent enactments, especially the Toleration Act. Many of those that remain are such that the best and wisest members of the Church would gladly see them repealed. SEE CANONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

(6.) Patronage. — The theory of the Church of England is that whoever originally built a church is entitled to choose its minister in perpetuity — i.e., is the patron of the living. What follows on this point is from a Church of England writer (Marsden, Churches and Sects, 1:332): "In a few instances this right is still vested in the descendants of the original patron, but these must be rare. The right of patronage is now a salable commodity, transferred, or sold by auction, to the highest bidder, like any other real property, and the patronage of the Church "of England is consequently dispersed wherever wealth has found its way: 1144 benefices are in the gift of the crown; 1853 in that of the bishops; 938 in that of cathedral chapters and other dignitaries: 770 in that of the universities and collegiate bodies; 6092 in private persons; and 931 (vicarages or perpetual curacies) in the incumbent of the mother church. The good and evil of this system are so nearly balanced that thoughtful and wise men are to be met with every day who, as they look at the favorable or dark side of the question, are  disposed to cherish it as the nearest approach that is ever likely to be made in practice to a perfect theory; or, on the other hand, to reject it as unjust and full of danger. Its evils lie upon the surface, and they are by no means slight. It has a tendency to promote a subservient spirit, inconsistent with the courage and simplicity of the Christian minister, towards those in whose hands patronage is vested, for upon them advancement in the Church depends. It excludes many valuable men from livings of importance, and thrusts many incompetent men into stations for which they are but meanly qualified. It fills our choicest parishes with men rather well bred than deeply learned — men of courtesy and benevolence rather than a fervent zeal; and, consequently, the parish church wears to the poor man too frequently something of a cold and aristocratic air. He is spoken to by his superior in the presence of his superiors, and he retires to the dissenting chapel, not that he prefers dissent, but that he meets with sympathy and feels himself at home. Patronage is either held by individuals, or vested in corporations or in trustees; but the individual may have little sense of religion; he may give away his church on considerations of friendship, or he may look upon it merely as a provision for a younger son. Corporate bodies have less conscience than individuals. Previous to the act for reforming municipal corporations twenty years ago, most of the livings in our ancient towns and boroughs were in the gift of our municipal corporations. Their appointments, on an average, were certainly not better than those of private patrons; religion slumbered in our great towns not less profoundly than in our country villages. Several trusts have been formed of late years for the purchase of advowsons (an advowson is the right of presentation in perpetuity), and none can deny them at least the praise of pure disinterestedness. They have expended large sums to obtain in return the right of placing zealous ministers of evangelical principles in populous places. But all these various methods of patronage labor under the same defect — the congregation whose spiritual interests are to be committed to the new pastor, and the parishioners amongst whom, as their friend or their example, he is to live and die, have no voice whatever in the momentous choice. The party most interested looks on with indifference, or hope, or silent resignation. The English lay churchman, in the most important event that can effect his parish during his lifetime, finds everything done for him; it is only on trifling matters that he is consulted. He may help to build the school, he may discharge the duties of churchwarden, but with regard to the appointment of the minister he has no right to speak." A remarkable illustration of the way in which  ecclesiastical wealth is monopolized by certain families is afforded in the case of Richard and George Pretyman, sons of the bishop of Lincoln, which is stated in the Methodist Quarterly, 1853, page 157.

III. DOCTRINES. —

(1.) The doctrinal standards of the united Church of England and Ireland are, after the Scriptures, the Book of Homilies, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Prayer-book.

(a) The Homilies (q.v.) were composed by Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, men of unexceptionable learning and orthodoxy; or, according to others, the first book was written principally by Cranmer, and the second by Jewel. They were appointed to be read in churches at the beginning of the Reformation, when, by reason of the scarcity of learned divines, few ministers were found who could safely be trusted to preach their own compositions.

(b) The first draught of the Articles was composed by archbishop Cranmer, assisted by bishop Ridley, in the year 1551; and after being corrected by the other bishops, and approved by the Convocation, they were published in Latin and English in 1553, and amounted to forty-two in number. In 1562 they were revised and corrected. Being then reduced to thirty-nine, they were drawn up in Latin only; but in 1571 they were subscribed by the members of the two houses of Convocation, both in Latin and English, and therefore the Latin and English copies are to be considered as equally authentic. SEE ARTICLES, XXXIX.

(c) During the last century disputes arose among the clergy respecting the propriety of subscribing to any human formulary of religious sentiments. Parliament, in 1772, was applied to for the abolition of the subscription by certain clergymen and others, whose petition received the most ample discussion, but was rejected by a large majority. It has been generally held by most, if not all Calvinists, both in and out of the Church, that the doctrinal parts of the articles are Calvinistic. This opinion, however, has been warmly controverted. It is no doubt nearer the truth to conclude that the articles are framed with comprehensive latitude, and that neither Calvinism nor Arminianism was intended to be exclusively established (Watson, s.v. Church). See Puller's Moderation of the Church of England considered, 1679 (new edit. Lond. 1843, 8vo); and also SEE ARMINIANISM, SEE ARTICLES LAMBETH,.

The articles contain,  however, what the Church of England holds to be a fair scriptural account of the leading doctrines of Christianity, together with a condemnation of what she considers to be the principal errors of the Church of Rome and of certain Protestant sects. As far as they go (and there are many things unnoticed by them), they are a legal definition of the doctrines of the Church of England and Ireland; though the members of that communion look to the Prayer-book as well as to the articles for the genuine expression of her faith. The articles are far more thoroughly Protestant than the Prayer-book, taken as a whole. Although the articles expressly assert that the Church of Rome has erred, attempts have repeatedly been made by the High-Church party of the Church of England to show that there is no irreconcilable difference between the Thirty-nine Articles and the decrees of the Council of Trent, and that a construction can be put upon them fully harmonizing them. To show this was, in particular, the object of Dr. Newman's celebrated tract (Tracts for the Times, No. 90, Oxf. 1839), and more recently of Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon (Lond. 1865; N.Y. 1866). See also Christ. Remembrancer, January 1866, art. 6.

(2.) For the preservation of doctrine and discipline in the Church of England, many provisions are made both by the civil and canon law. Whoever shall come to the possession of the crown of England shall join in communion with the Church of England, as by law established (12 and 13 Will. III, chapter 2, § 3). By the 1 Will. III, chapter 6, an oath shall be administered to every king or queen who shall succeed to the imperial crown of this realm, at their coronation; to be administered by one of the archbishops or bishops; to be thereunto approved by such king or queen, that they will do the utmost in their power to maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and Protestant Reformed religion established by law; and will preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them, or any of them. And by the 5 Anne, chapter 5, the king, at his coronation, shall take and subscribe an oath to maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by law established (§ 2).

(3.) In practice there is no definite creed or system of theology in the Church of England. Its members have always been divided into parties. There has always been a Sacramentarian party, approximating in doctrine to the teachings of Rome, though it has never had great influence since  Laud's time until the recent rise of Puseyism (q.v.). And, on the other hand, there have never been wanting representatives of the Puritan or Evangelical school. The latter party finds its stronghold in the Articles, the former in the Liturgy. At present a division prevails into three great sections, which are styled High-Church, Low-Church (or Evangelical), and Broad-Church. The first party holds to apostolical succession, the divine right of episcopacy, and generally adheres to the sacramentarian view of the Church's life. The Puseyites have been drawn chiefly from this party. The Low-Church, or Evangelical party, holds, in general, that episcopacy is not essential to the being of the Church, though some evangelicals, so called, hold it in as high esteem as High-churchmen. The Low-churchmen recognize the claims of Presbyterians and dissenters as members of Christ's body. In doctrine they are chiefly Calvinists. The Broad-Church party, though of recent origin, embraces a large number of the most cultivated men in the Church, such as'Kingsley, Maurice, Stanley, and, in fact, most of Dr. Arnold's pupils and sympathizers. The tendency of this party is towards what is called liberal Christianity.

At the present time (1868) the Church of England is agitated by proposals of change on many sides. Archdeacon Wilberforce, who went over to Rome some years ago, issued an "explanation," in which he inquires how far the popular principle of subscription to the English formularies is compatible with the rule of Church authority. The system he believes to be altogether bad, while it has not even the merit of being able to settle the differences which exist among individual churchmen. He says: "The difficulty becomes greater when it is considered that the clergy are divided into various parties, who are widely opposed to one another in almost every particular. It may be allowable, perhaps, to employ the phraseology of a recent reviewer, who has distributed them into three classes, which he designates as High, Low, and Broad. The last may be expected to be comparatively inattentive to matters of doctrine, regarding the Church chiefly as a social institution, designed merely to raise the standard of morals and ameliorate the manners of men. But the High and Low agree in one point, if in nothing else, that to contend for the truth is the first duty of Christians. They differ, however, respecting almost every point of doctrine. One believes the Church to be the body of Christ, inhabited by his Spirit; the other supposes it to be little more than a religious club. One believes in baptismal regeneration and in the real presence; the other speaks of the sacraments as if they were only acted sermons. One affirms Christ to speak  by the voice of his priests, and that deadly sin requires absolution; the other affirms that the priest's words are no more effective than those of his parish clerk. Yet both parties, as well at the Broad, who lie between them, subscribe to the same formularies, which they interpret avowedly in contradictory senses, and from which they deduce the most opposite results. If all this does not arise from the laxity of those who subscribe, but from the ingenuity of those who devised our formularies, they must certainly have been the greatest masters of equivocal expression whom the world has known." Subscription to the English formularies, he says, was originally imposed, and is still rendered by High-churchmen, on the principle that the Church's judgment should guide her members; but the Gorham case showed that the Church of England has transferred the decision respecting doctrines to the civil power, and that the most opposite statements respecting matters of faith are taught under her sanction. SEE GORHAM CASE. There exists in England a "Liturgical Revision Society," from whose "Declaration of Principles and Objects" we extract the following: "The members of this society are moved by such 'weighty and important considerations' as arise from 'the exigencies' of these present times, to seek farther 'changes and alterations in the Prayer-book;' some of which, as the most necessary, they now proceed to specify:

1. The Rubric: the word priest to be changed.

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

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

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

5. The Catechism to be revised.

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

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

8. The Apocryphal Lessons to be replaced by Scripture."

The chief aim of this society is "to bring the Book of Common Prayer into closer conformity with the written word of God and the principles of the Reformation, by excluding all those expressions which have been assumed to countenance Romanizing doctrine or practice."

At present (1868) Romanizing tendencies are plainly on the increase in the Church of England, and there is apparent danger of a total separation of  many ministers and members of this Church from the common faith of the reformed churches organized in the 16th century. The High-Church party has several schools, one of which (the Old School), while gladly concurring in all efforts for widening the breach between "the Church" and the "sects," yet continues in earnest opposition to the errors of Rome. Others, looking more at what is common to the Church of Rome and the Church of England than at what separates them, hope that the Church of Rome, by means of an "Episcopalian" movement, will gradually come over to the Anglican ground. This party builds great hopes especially upon the movements in Italy of such men as cardinal Andrea and Passaglia. There is, finally, an extreme party, which makes every other consideration subordinate to the desire to establish the union with Rome, and which has of late proceeded farther in this direction as a party than has ever been done before. It is this party which in 1867 sent a letter to cardinal Patrizi asking for some kind of recognition from Rome. It also aims at re- establishing monastic orders, and is specially conspicuous by "Ritualistic" innovations in divine worship, endeavoring to conform the service altogether to that of the Roman and Eastern churches. Until recently this party was more noted for zeal and fervor than for intelligence and ecclesiastical standing, but of late they have gained an immense advantage by the open declaration of Dr. Pusey in their favor. In his Eirenicon (1866, 12mo) he explains away the chief doctrinal differences between the Articles and the Catechism of Trent, though, at the same time, he treats severely the personal infallibility of the pope, and the increasing Mariolatry of the Roman Church. Dr. Pusey also advocates the confessional and monastic life. The latest development of this school is to be found in the series of volumes entitled The Church and the World (edited by the Reverend Orby Shipley).

On the other hand, there is a large party of Rationalists in the Church of England whose type of opinion is to be found in the Essays and Reviews (1860), and whose extreme representative is perhaps bishop Colenso, of Natal, who has published several volumes of so-called criticisms, in which the inspiration and authenticity of the Old Testament are repudiated. No power has been discovered, either in the Church of England or in the laws of the land, to deal with the Romanizers on the one hand, or the Rationalists on the other.

IV. STATISTICS. — The Established Church of England is divided into two ecclesiastical provinces, Canterbury and York. Each province has a  Convocation (q.v.) consisting of two houses, the upper house embracing the archbishop and all the bishops of the provinces, and the lower house a number of deans, archdeacons, and proctors. The bishops of the Church in England, in 1868, were as follows :

I. Province of Canterbury. —

1. Canterbury (archbishop); 2. London; 3. Winchester; 4. Exeter; 5. St. David's; 6. Chichester; 7. Lichfield; 8. Oxford; 9. St. Asaph's; 10. Hereford; 11, Llandaff; 12. Lincoln; 13. Bath and Wells; 14. Salisbury; 15. Norwich; 16. Bangor; 17. Rochester; 18. Worcester; 19. Gloucester; 20. Ely; 21. Peterborough.

II. Province of York. —

1. York (archbishop); 2. Durham; 3. Manchester; 4. Ripon; 5. Carlisle; 6. Chester; 7. Sodor and Man (each diocese is treated of in a special article of the Cyclopaedia, where full statistics and the name of the present incumbents are given).  The 32 dioceses of Ireland, formerly divided into four provinces) were reduced to 12 by.the ChurchTemporality Act (passed 1833). — Armagh has 6 dioceses: Armagh, Derry, Down, Kilmore, Meath, Tuam. Dublin, 6: Dublin, Cashel, Cloyne, Killaloe, Limerick, Ossory. SEE IRELAND. In connection with the Church of England are also a number of colonial and missionary bishops. They were, in 1890, as follows:

I. Europe. — Gibraltar.

II. Asia. —

1. Calcutta (metropolitan); 2. Bombay; 3. Travacore and Cochin; 4. Madras; 5. Colombo; 6. Rangoon; 7. Lahore.

III. Africa. —

1. Capetown (metropolitan); 2. Mauritius; 3. Grahamstown; 4. St. Helena; 5. Orange River State; 6. Central Africa; 7. Natal; 8. Sierra Leone; 9. Niger region.

IV. Australia. —

1. Sydney (metropolitan); 2. Adelaide; 3. Melbourne; 4. Newcastle; 5. Perth ; 6. Brisbane; 7. Goulburn; 8. Tasmania; 9. New Zealand (metropolitan);  10. Christ Church; 11. Nelson; 12. Wellington; 13. Waiapu; 14. Dunedin; 15. Melanesia; 16. Honolulu: 17. Grafton and Armidale.

V. America. —

1. Montreal; 2. Toronto; 3. Newfoundland; 4. Frederickton (metropolitan); 5. Nova Scotia; 6. Huron; 7. Colombia; 8. Quebec; 9. Ontario; 10. Rupert's Land; 11. New Westminster; 12. Jamaica; 13. Barbadoes; 14. Antigua; 15. Nassau; 16. Guiana.

The following is a list of the principal Church Societies, with a brief account of their work:

1. Society for promoting the Employment of additional Curates in populous Places (established in 1837). This society, besides making annual grants towards the maintenance of additional clergymen, grants sums, not exceeding £500 in any single grant, in aid of endowments. Income for 1867-68, £32,4 64.

2. The Church Pastoral Aid Society (1836) aims at providing means for maintaining curates and lay agents in largely peopled districts. Total receipts in the year 1866-67, £47,829; in 1886-87, £54,226.

3. The Incorporates Society for promoting the Enlargement, Building, and Repairing of Churches and Chapels in England and Wales (1818) had, in 1867-68, an income of £8422. This society was incorporated by act of Parliament in 1828; until 1851 it was supported by a triennial royal letter, which produced about £30,000; since then it has been dependent on annual subscriptions, donations, church collections, and legacies.

4. The London Diocesan Church Building Society and Metropolis Church Fund (1854) had, in 1867-68, an income of £45,130.

5. The Church of England Scripture Readers' Association provides lay readers of the Scriptures to the poor, under the superintendence of the parochial clergy. Its income was, in 1867-68, £13,440.

6. The National Association for promoting Freeom of Worship (1858) has for its object "to promote the restoration of the ancient freedom of parish churches as the true basis of the parochial system, and the only means of relieving spiritual destitution; and the scriptural system of weekly offerings as the most excellent way, especially enjoined by the Church of England, of raising money for Church purposes, and as a substitute for pew-rents where endowments are not obtainable."

7. Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. This is the oldest society in the country. It supplies Bibles and Prayer-books either gratuitously or far below cost price, issues boks and tracts of a "sound Church tone," suitable for schools, lending libraries, workingmen's clubs and readingrooms, hospitals, workhouses, jails, etc.; also for the use of soldiers, sailors, and emigrants. The income (independent of sales) for 1866-67 was £28,547; for 1888-89, £40,290.

8. National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church (instituted 1811, incorporated 1817). The operations of this society embrace building schoolrooms and teachers' dwelling-houses, maintaining colleges for the training of teachers, granting money towards paying the sales of certificated teachers, etc. The National Society, during the time of its existence, has made rants to the amount of more than £400,000, and this amount has been supplemented by at least £1,200,000 of private contribution for the building of schools, besides originating the expenditure of an immense annual sum for their sustentation. The total number of schools in connection with this society in 1865 was 12,421, in which there were 1,186,515 scholars. The total  number of scholars in the Sunday schools was 1,818,476. The number of schoolmasters and mistresses trained in the colleges of the society is about 140 a year, and about 4750 have been sent out during the last twenty-two years. The income of the society for 1864-65 was £20,267.

9. The Prayer-book and Homily Society desires to promote the circulation of the "Book of Common Prayer and the Homilies" of the Church, which it has had translated into thirty-three languages. Its income for 1866-67 was £1163; for 1867-68, £1247.

10. The Poor Clergy Relief Society has, since its establishment in 1856, assisted 1165 poor clergymen, and widows and orphans of clergymen, with the sum of £8254. In 1864-65 the income was £2062, and grants were made to 101 applicants.

11. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (incorporated in 1701) is the oldest of all the English, and one of the oldest of all the Protestant missionary societies of the world. The society aims as much as possible at establishing complete churches, with bishops at their head, and which shall ultimately become altogether independent of the society, wherever England has any territorial possessions. Its income in 1866-67 was £91,1816; in 1887-88, £105,712.

12. The Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East was founded in 1799. Its work is chiefly among the natives of the countries in which its missions are established. Its income in 1866-67 was £150,357, and in 1886-87, £234,639.

13. The Colonial and Continental Church Society. Its leading object is to send clergymen, catechists, and teachers of the Church of England to settlers in the English colonies, and to British subjects in other parts of the world. The income for 1866-67 was £31,079; for 1886-87, £16,501.

14. The English Church Union was formed in 1859 for the purpose of "watching over the interests of the Church of England; of resisting, by a combination of its members, the attempts of dissenters and others to alienate the rights and injure the position of the Church; and also for the purpose of developing its internal energies." It is intended to be the central organ of the High-Church party. The union is managed by a council of twenty-four elected and five ex-officio members, thirteen of these being clergymen and the remaining sixteen laymen.  15. The Association for the promotion of the Unity of Christendom was formed in 1857 for the purpose of uniting in a bond of intercessory prayer members both of the clergy and the laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican communions. The members promise to use daily a brief prayer for the peace and unity of the Church. In 1865 the association numbered 8827 members, divided as follows: Roman Catholics, 1271; Orientals, including Servians and Armenians, 360; uncertain or miscellaneous, 75; Anglicans, 7121.

16. The Eastern Church Association was founded in 1864. Its objects were stated to be to inform the English public as to the state and position of the Eastern Christians; to make known the principles and doctrines of the Anglican Church to the Christians of the East; to take advantage of all opportunities which the providence of God shall afford for intercommunion with the orthodox Church, and also for friendly intercourse with the other ancient churches of the East; to assist, as far as possible, the bishops of the orthodox Church in their efforts to promote the spiritual welfare and the education of their flocks. It counts among its members English, Scotch, American, colonial, and Greek bishops.

17. The Anglo-Continental Society has for its object to make the principles of the English Church known in the different countries of Europe and throughout the world, and to aid in the reformation of national churches and other religious communities.

18. The English Church Association was established in 1865 as the central organization of Low-Churchmen. Its chief object is to counteract and prevent the spreading of High-Church and Romanizing tendencies in the Church.

19. The South American Mission Society, established in 1852. Its object is to send out missionaries to the native tribes of South America, to Englishmen in spiritual destitution there, and to take advantage of any opening for evangelization. Its means was in 1866-67, £7431, and in 1886- 87, £12,008. 20. Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics. According to the nineteenth annual report, published in May, 1868, the income was £25,577; the year before it was £22,507. 21. The London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, established in 1809. The officers must be members of the United Church of England and Ireland, or, if foreigners, of a Protestant Church. Its income was in 1666- 67, £33,327, and in 1887-88, £33,925.  At the last official census taken in Great Britain in 1881, in England and Scotland no inquiries were made as to the creed of the inhabitants. For Ireland, the population connected with the Established Church was, in 1861, according to the official census, 678,661. As in England the Church herself makes no attempt to find out her statistics, nothing but estimates can be given on this point. As regards places of worship, number of sittings, and estimates of Church attendants, the statistics of the Established Church compared as follows with the aggregate statistics of all other religious bodies:

Religious Bodies  Places of worship Number of Sittings      Estimate of Attendants

Church of England 14,077      5,317,915   3,773,474

All other Religious Denominations  20,390      4,894,648   3,487558

According to this table, of all the church sittings, 51.9 percent belonged to the Church of England, and 48.1 percent to the other religious denominations; and of the Church attendants, likewise about 52 percent to the Church of England, and 48 to others. Other statistics, as, for instance, the annual marriage statistics, give to the population connected with the Church of England from 65 to 70 percent of the population. The two statements can may be reconciled by taking 52 percent as that portion of the total population which is practically and actively connected with the Church, while it is, on the other hand, probable that fully 65 percent sustain a nominal connection with the Church. Since the beginning of the present century, the progress of the Church of England in point of places of worship and Church attendants has been less rapid than that of the other religious denominations taken together. For detailed comparative statistics, SEE GREAT BRITAIN.

Besides the national universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Durham University and King's College, London, the Church of England has the following theological training institutions: St. Bees (Cumberland), with 80 students, and St. Aidan's (Birkenhead), with 63 students; also a training  department at Birmingham College, the London College of Divinity at St. John's Wood, and Lampeter College, Wales.

The following table gives the number of parishes and the number of clergy in each of the English dioceses; also the total population of the territory embraced in each diocese.

For farther accounts of the statistics of the Church of England, see the annual Clergy List (which also contains a complete list of all the benefices, with names of patrons, etc.); Rivington's Ecclesiastical Year-book for 1865; Christian Year-book (Lond. 1867 and 1868); Schem, Amer. Ecclesiastes Year-book for 1859 (N.Y. 1860), and Amer. Ecclesiastes Almanac for 1868 (N.Y. 1868).

V. Literature. — The early historians are Gildas (6th century), De Britanniae excidio, etc. (transl. by Gills, Lond. 1841, 8vo); Bede, Hist. Ecclesiastes Anglorum (Opera, ed. Giles 12 volumes, 1843, volume 2); Giraldus Camzbrensis, Vitae Episcoporum, in Wharton, Anglia Sacra, volume 2; Eadmer, Vitae, Wharton, Anglia Sacra, volume 2, and in Migne, Patrol. Lat. volume 159; Ingulphus, and William of Malmesbury, in Fulman, Rer. Anglicar. Script. Vet. (Oxon, 1684); and in Gale, Historiae Britannicae, etc. (Oxon, 1691, 2 vols. fol.). The History of Engulph, the History of Gaimar, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and the Chronicle of Florence of Worcester, are reprinted in The Church Historians of England (Lond. 1853).

Historians: Stillingfleet, Origines Britannicae (1710; mew edit. Oxford, 1842, 2 volumes, 8vo); Usher, Brit. Ecclesiarum Antiquitates (1638, 4to; Works, 16 volumes, Dublin, 1847, volumes 5, 6); Smith, Religion of Ancient Britain (Lond. 1846, 12mo); Churton, Early English Church (London, 1858, 3d edit. 18mo); Soames, Anglo-Saxon Church (Lond. 1828, 2d edit. 8vo); Ib. Doctrines of Anglo-Saxon Church (Bampton Lecture, 1830); Ib. Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Ib. Elizabethan Religious History (London, 1839, 8vo); Ib. Reformation (London, 1826-8, 4 volumes, 8vo); Fuller, Church History of Great Britain (1655, fol.; new edit. Lond. 1837, 3 volumes, 8vo; Warner, Ecclesiastical History of England (1765, 2 volumes, fol.); Inett, Origines Anglicanae, History from 6th century to death of King John, 1216 (London, 1704-10, 2 volumes, fol.; new edit. Oxford, 1855, 3 volumes,  8vo); Carwithen, History of the Church of England (Oxford, 1849, 2d edit 2 volumes, 12mo); Grant, Summary of the History of the English Church and of the Sects, etc. (Lond. 1811-1826, 4 volumes, 8vo); Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain (1708, fol.; new ed. by Barham, Lond. 1840, 9 volumes, 8vo); Brown, Compendious History of the British Churches (Edinb. 1820; 2d edit. 1823, 2 volumes, 8vo); Baxter, Church History of England (2d ed. Lond. 1849, 8vo); Short, Sketch of the History of the Church of England to 1688 (Lond. 1840, 3d edit. 8vo); Anderson, History of the Church of England in the Colonies (Lond. 1856, 2d edit. 3 vols. Svo); Annual American Cyclopadie, 1863, and all the following volumes, art. Anglican Church.

On the history of the English Reformation, SEE REFORMATION. For general statistics of Christianity in the British Islands, SEE GREAT BRITAIN; SEE IRELAND: SCOTLAND.

## England, John[[@Headword:England, John]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Cork, Ireland, September 23, 1786, and was educated at Carlow. He was ordained priest October 9, 1808, and appointed lecturer at the North Chapel in Cork, and chaplain of the prisons. In May, 1808, he began the publication of a monthly magazine called The Religious Repertory. He was made president of the theological college of St. Mary in 1812, and in 1817 parish priest at Brandon; 1820, was appointed bishop of the new diocese of Charleston, S.C., where he established an academy and theological seminary, and taught in both of them. He went to Rome in 1832, and was appointed by the pope apostolic legate to Hayti. He died at Charleston, April 11, 1842. Bp. England founded several religious and charitable institutions at Cork, and left a number of writings, most of which appeared in the periodical press. A complete edition of his works was prepared by bishop Reynolds (Baltimore, 1849, 5 volumes, 8vo).

## Englert, Johann[[@Headword:Englert, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Schweinfurt, December 29, 1688. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1713 preacher at Oberdorf, and in 1715 sub-deacon at his native place. In 1725 he was appointed professor of theology and of Hebrew at the gymnasium there, and in 1732 he succeeded his father, Johann Matthbus (q.v.), as pastor primarius and inspector of the gymnasium, and died February 25, 1751. He published, Disp. de Paschate Jesu Christu Ultimo (Schweinfurt, 1725; Jena, 1726): — Disp. de  Singulari Dei Providentia Circa Scholas (Schweinfurt, 1734): — Quaestiones in Tria Prima Capita Geneseos (ibid. 1744). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Neubauer, Jetztlebende Theologen, s.v.. (B.P.)

## Englert, Johann Matthaus[[@Headword:Englert, Johann Matthaus]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germaly, was born January 14, 1661, at Schweinfurt; studied at Giessen, Leipsic, and Wittenberg; was in 1687 called to his native place as teacher of the high-school; in 1709, accepted the appointment as deacon, and died in 1732, pastor primarius and inspector of the gymnasium. He is the author of several hymns. See Wezel, Anal. Hymn. 1:53 sq.; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchen liedes, 5:410 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Englert, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Englert, Johann Wilhelm]]

             was born at Schweinfurt, December 10, 1706, where he was also appointed pastor of St. Saviour in 1732. In 1737 he was made subdeacon of St. John's, in 1751 deacon and professor of theology, in 1754 archdeacon, and in 1764 pastor primarius and inspector of the gymnasium. He, died in 1768, leaving, among other treatises, Disp. de Indulgentiae Judaeorum Paschalis Tempore Modoque (Giessen, 1731). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Engles, Joseph Patterson, D.D[[@Headword:Engles, Joseph Patterson, D.D]]

             was born in Philadelphia January 3, 1793. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, and graduated in July, 1811. In 1813 he was appointed co-master of the grammar-school in the same institution with Reverend Dr. S.B. How. In 1817, Reverend Dr. S.B. Wylie and Mr. Engles founded an academy, under the name of the Classical Institute, which Mr; Engles continued until February, 1845, when he was elected publishing agent of the Presbyterian Board of Publication. He continued in this position until his death. Mr. Engles was a member and elder of the Scots Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, having joined that church at the age of twenty, and very soon after having been chosen an elder of the same. Besides writinig everal smaller volumes for children and youth, he edited an edition of the Greek Testament, with various readings. He died suddenly on the night of April 14, 1861, of a disease of the heart from which he had been suffering for about a year.

## Engles, William Morrison, D.D[[@Headword:Engles, William Morrison, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia October 12, 1797, and was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, where he graduated A.B. in 1815. After studying theology under the Reverend Dr. S.B. Wylie (q.v.), he was licensed to preach in 1818, and in 1820 became pastor of the Seventh Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, which office he filled faithfully until his health failed in 1834, when he became editor of The  Presbyterian. He edited that journal for over thirty years. In 1838 the Presbyterian Board of Publication made him their editor of books and tracts, and he continued in that work with great success till 1863. In one of their publications, it is stated that "the Board of Publication is probably more largely indebted to Dr. Engles than to any other one man for its existence and its usefulness, especially during the first twenty years of its history." Besides his constant editorial work, he wrote a number of small books on practical religion, many of which had a wide circulation. Of one of them, the Soldier's Pocket-book, in English and German, 300,000 were circulated among our soldiers during the civil war. He died in Philadelphia November 27, 1867. — American Annual Cyclopeadia, 7:296.

## English Nuns[[@Headword:English Nuns]]

             a society founded in the 17th century, by Maria Ward, and originally intended for the education of youth. The first convent was established at St. Omer; there were soon others opened at Rome, in other parts of Italy, and in Munich. Doubts concerning the orthodoxy of the opinions held by the founder led to their suppression by Urban VIII in 1630. Yet they were not destroyed, and were formally reestablished by Clement XI in 1703. Aside from education, they also devoted themselves to the care of the sick. The congregation recognises three degrees: noble ladies, civilian maidens, and serving sisters; yet they. make no difference in their dress or mode of life. The superiors are always chosen from the first degree. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v

## English Versions Of The Bible[[@Headword:English Versions Of The Bible]]

             Passing over the lives of the individual translators, the long struggle with the indifference or opposition of men in power, the religious condition of the people as calling for, or affected by, the appearance of the translation, the time, and place, and form of the successive editions by which the demand, when once created, was supplied — all of which is given under more appropriate titles — we shall here aim to give an account of the several versions as they appeared; to ascertain the qualifications of the translators for the work which they undertook, and the principles on which they acted; to form an estimate of the final result of their labors in the received version, and, as consequent on this, of the necessity or desirableness of a new or revised translation; and, finally, to give such a survey of the literature of the subject as may help the reader to obtain a fuller knowledge for himself. In doing this we shall substantially adopt so much of Prof. Plumtre's art. in Smith's Diet. of the Bible, s.v. Versions, as relates to the subject. The present article has been carefully revised by the Reverend T.J. Conant, D.D., of Brooklyn.

I. Early Translations. — It was asserted by Sir Thomas More, in his anxiety to establish a point against Tyndal, that he had seen English translations of the Bible which had been made before Wycliffe, and that these were approved by the bishops, and were allowed by them to be read by laymen, and even by devout women (Dialogues chapter 8-14, col. 82). There seem good grounds, however, for doubting the accuracy of this statement. No such translations versions, i.e., of the entire Scriptures are now extant. No traces of them appear in any contemporary writer. Wycliffe's great complaint is that there is no translation (Forshall and  Madden, Wycliffe's Bible, Pref. page 21, Prol. page 59). The Constitutions of archbishop Arundel (A.D. 1408) mention two only, and these are Wycliffe's own, and the one based on his and completed after his death. More's statement must therefore be regarded either as a rhetorical exaggeration of the fact that parts of the Bible had been previously translated. or as arising out of a mistake as to the date of MSS. of the Wycliffe version. The history of the English Bible will therefore begin, as it has begun hitherto, with the work of the first great reformer. One glance, however, we may give, in passing, to the earlier history of the English Church, and connect some of its most honored names with the great work of making the truths of Scripture, or parts of the books themselves, if not the Bible as a whole, accessible to the people. We may think of Caedmon as embodyingthe whole history of the Bible in the alliterative metre of Anglo-Saxon poetry (Bede, Hist. Eccl. 4:24); of Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, in the 7th century, as rendering the Psalter; of Bede, as translating in the last hours of his life the Gospel of John (Epist. Cuthberti); of Alfred, setting forth in his mother tongue, as the great ground-work of his legislation, the four chapters of Exodus (20-23) that contained the first code of the laws of Israel (Pauli's Life of Alfred, chapter 5). The wishes of the great king extended further. le, desired that "all the free-born youth of his kingdom should be able to read the English Scriptures" ["Enslisc gewritt," which, however, may merely denote English literature in general] (Ibid.). Portions of the Bible, some of the Psalms, and extracts from other books, were translated by him for his own use and that of his children. The traditions of a later date, seeing in him the representative of all that was good in the old Saxon time, made him the translator of the whole Bible (Ibid., supp. to chapter 5).

The work of translating was, however, carried on by others. One Anglo- Saxon version of the four gospels, interlinear with the Latin of the Vulgate, known as the Durham book, is found in the Cottonian MSS. of the British Museum, and is referred to the 9th or 10th century. Another, known as the Rushworth Gloss, and belonging to the same period, is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Another, of a somewhat later date, is in the same collection, and in the library of Corpus-Christi College, Cambridge. The name of Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, is connected with a version of the Psalms, that of Aelfric with an epitome of Scripture history, including a translation of many parts of the historical books of the Bible (Lewis, Hist. of Transl. chapter 1; Forshall and Madden, Preface; Bagster's English  Hexapla, Pref.). The influence of Norman ecclesiastics, in the reigns that preceded and followed the Conquest, was probably adverse to the continuance of this work. They were too far removed from sympathy with the subjugated race to care to educate them in their own tongue. The spoken dialects of the English of that period would naturally seem to them too rude and uncouth to be the channel of divine truth. Pictures, mysteries, miracle plays, rather than books, were the instruments of education for all but the few who, in monasteries under Norman or Italian superintendence, devoted themselves to the study of theology or law. In the remoter parts of England, however, where their influence was less felt, or the national feeling was stronger, there were those who carried on the succession, and three versions of the Gospels, inthe University Library at Cambridge, in the Bodleian, and in the British Museum, belonging to the 11th or 12th century, remain to attest their labors. The metrical paraphrase of the Gospel historyknown as the Ormulum, in alliterative English verse, ascribed to the latter half of the 12th century, is the next conspicuous monument, and may be looked upon as indicating a desire to place the facts of the Bible within reach of others than the clergy. The 13th century, a time in England, as throughout Europe, of religious revival, witnessed renewed attempts. A prose translation of the Bible into Norman-French, circ. A.D. 1260, indicates a demand for devotional reading within the circle of the court, or of the wealthier merchants, or of convents for women of high rank. Farther signs of the same desire are found in three English versions of the Psalms — one towards the close of the 13th century; another by Schorham, circ. A.D. 1320; another, with other canticles from the O.T. and N.T., by Richard Rolle, of Hampole, circ. 1349; the last being accompanied by a devotional exposition and in one of the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and of all Paul's epistles (the list includes the apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans), in the library of CorpusChristi College, Cambridge. The fact stated by archbishop Arundel in his funeral sermon on Anne of Bohemia, wife of Richard II, that she habitually read the Gospels in the vulgar tongue, with divers expositions, was probably true of many others of high rank. It is interesting to note these facts, not as detracting from the glory of the great reformer of the 14th century, but as showing that for himself also there had been a preparation; that what he supplied met a demand which had for many years been gathering strength. It is almost needless to add that these versions started from nothing better than the copies of the Vulgate, more or less accurate, which each translator had before him (Lewis; chapter 1; Forshall and Madden, Preface).  II. WYCLIFFE (born 1324, died 1384). —

1. It is singular, and not without significance, that the first translation from the Bible connected with the name of Wycliffi should have been that of part of the Apocalypse. The Last Age of the Church (A.D. 1356) translates and expounds the vision in which the reformer read the signs of his own times, the sins and the destruction of "Antichrist and his meynee" (=multitude). Shortly after this he completed a version of the Gospels, accompanied by a commentary, "so that pore Cristen men may some dele know the text of the Gospel, with the comyn sentence of the olde holie doctores" (Preface). Wycliffe, however, though the chief, was not the only laborer in the cause. The circle of English readers was becoming wider, and they were not content to have the book which they honored above all others in a tongue not their own. Another translation and commentary appear to have been made about the same time, in ignorance of Wycliffe's work, and for the "manie lewid men that gladlie would kon the Gospelle, if it were draghen into the Englisch tung." The fact that many MSS. of this period are extant, containing in English a Monotessaron' or Harmony of the Gospels, accompanied by portions of the Epistles, or portions of the O.T., or an epitome of Scripture history, or the substance of Paul's epistles, or the Catholic Epistles at full length, with indications more or less distinct of Wycliffe's influence, shows how widespread was the feeling that the time had come for an English Bible (Forshall and Madden, Pref. pages 13-17). These preliminary labors were followed up by a complete translation of the N.T. by Wycliffe himself. The O.T. was undertaken by his coadjutor, Nicholas de Hereford, but was interrupted probably by a citation to appear before archbishop Arundel in 1382, and ends abruptly (following so far the order of the Vulgate) in the middle of Baruch. Many of the MSS. of'this version now extant present a different recension of the text, and it is probable that the work of Wycliffe and Hereford was revised by Richard Purvey, circ. A.D. 1388. To him also is ascribed the interesting Prologue, in which the translator gives an account both of his purpose and his method (Forshall and Madden, Pref. page 25).

2. The former was, as that of Wycliffe had been, to give an English Bible to the English people. He appeals to the authority of Bede, of Alfred, and of Grostete, to the examples of "Frenshe, and Beemers (Bohemians), and Britons." He answers the hypocritical objections that men were not holy enough for such a work; that it was wrong for "idiots" to do what the great  doctors of the Church had left undone. He hopes "to make the sentence as trewe and open in Englishe as it is in Latine, or more trewe and open."

It need hardly be said, as regards the method of the translator, that the version was based upon the Vulgate (comp. Gen 3:15 : “She shall trede thy head"). If, in the previous century, scholars like Grostete and Roger Bacon, seeking knowledge in other lands, and from men of other races, had acquired, as they seem to have done, some knowledge both of Greek and Hebrew, the succession had, at all events, not been perpetuated. The war to be waged at a later period with a different issue between scholastic philosophy and “humanity" ended, in the first struggle, in the triumph of the former, and there was probably no one at Oxford among Wycliffe's contemporaries who could have helped him or Purvey in a translation from the original. It is something to find at such a time the complaint that "learned doctoris taken littel heede to the lettre," the recognition that the Vulgate was not all sufficient, that "the texte of oure bokis" (he is speaking of the Psalter, and the difficulty of understanding it) "discordeth much from the Ebreu" (which knowledge is, however, at second hand, "bi witnesse of Jerom, of Lire, and other expositouris"). The difficulty which was thus felt was increased by the state of the Vulgate text. The translator complains that what the Church had in view was not Jerome's verslon, but a later and corrupt text; that "the comune Latyne Bibles ban more neede to be corrected as manie as I have seen in my life, than hath the Englishe Bible late translated." To remedy this he had recourse to collation. Many MSS. were compared, and out of this comparison the true reading ascertained as far as possible. The next step was to consult the Glossa Ordinaria, the commentaries of Nicholas de Lyra, and others, as to the meaning of any difficult passages. After this (we recognize here, perhaps, a departure from the right order) grammars were consulted. Then came the actual work of translating which he aimed at making idiomatic rather than literal. As he went on, he submitted his work to the judgment of others, and accepted their suggestions. It is interesting to trace these early strivings after the true excellence of a translator; yet more interesting to take note of the spirit, never surpassed, seldom equalled, in later translators, in which the work was done. Nowhere do we find the conditions of the work, intellectual and moral, more solemnly asserted. "A translator hath grete nede to studie well the sentence, both before and after," so that no equivocal words may mislead his readers or himself, and then also "he hath nede to lyve a clene life, and be ful devout  in preiers, and have not his wit occupied about worldli things, that the Holie Spiryt, author of all wisedom, and cunnynge, and truth, dresse (=train) him in his work, and suffer him not for to err" (Forshall and Madden, Prol. page 60).

3. The extent of the circulation gained by this version may be estimated from the fact that, in spite of all the chances of time, and all the systematic efforts for its destruction made by archbishop Arundel and others, not less than 150 copies are known to be extant, some of them obviously made for persons of wealth and rank, others apparently for humbler readers. It is significant as bearing, either on the date of the two works or on the position of the writers, that while the quotations from Scripture in Langton's Vision of Piers Plowman are uniformly given in Latin, those in the Persone's Tale of Chaucer are given in English, which for the most part agrees substantially with Wycliffe's translation.

4. The following characteristics may be noticed as distinguishing this version:

(1) The general homeliness of its style. The language of the court or of scholars is as far as possible avoided, and that of the people followed. In this respect the principle has been acted on by later translators. The style of Wycliffe is to that of Chaucer as Tyndale's is to Surrey's, or that of the A.V. to Ben Jonson's.

(2) The substitution,in many cases, of English equivalents for quasi- technical words. Thus we find "fy" or "fogh" instead of "Raca" (Mat 5:22); "they were washed" in Mat 3:6; "richesse" for "mammon" (Luk 16:9; Luk 16:11; Luk 16:13); "bishop" for "high-priest" (passim).

(3) The extreme literalness with which, in some instances, even at the cost of being unintelligible, the Vulgate text is followed, as in 2Co 1:17-19.

III. TYNDALE. — The work of Wycliffe stands by itself. Whatever power it exercised in preparing the way for the Reformation of the 16th century, it had no perceptible influence on later translations. By the reign of Henry VIII its English was already obsolescent, and the revival of classical scholarship led men to feel dissatisfied with a version which had avowedly been made at second-hand, not from the original. With Tyndale, on the  other hand, we enter on a continuous succession. He is the patriarch, in no remote ancestry, of the Authorized Version. With a consistent, unswerving purpose, he devoted his whole life to this one work, and, through dangers and difficulties, amid enemies and treacherous friends, in exile and loneliness, accomplished it. More than Cranmer or lidley, he is the true hero of the English Reformation. While they were slowly moving onwards, halting between two opinions, watching how the courtwinds blew, or, at the best, making the most of oppor. tunities, he set himself to the task without which, he felt sure, reform would be impossible, which, once accomplished, would render it inevitable. "Ere many years," he said, at the age of thirty-six (A.D. 1520), he would cause "a boy that driveth the plough" to know more of Scripture than the great body of the clergy then knew (Foxe, in Anderson's Annals of English Bible, 1:36). We are able to form a fairly accurate estimate of his fitness for the work to which he thus gave himself. The change which had come over the universities of Continental Europe since the time of Wycliffe had affected those of England. Greek had been taught in Paris in 1458. The first Greek Grammar, that of Constantine Lascaris, had been printed in 1476. It was followed in 1480 by Craston's Lexicon. The more enterprising scholars of Oxford visited foreign universities for the sake of the new learning. Grocyn (d. 1519), Linacre (d. 1524), Colet (d. 1519), had, in this way, from the Greeks whom the fall of Constantinople had scattered over Europe, or from their Italian pupils, learned enough to enter, in their turn, upon the work of teaching. When Erasmus visited Oxford in 1497, he found in these masters a scholarship which even he could admire.

Tyndale, who went to Oxford cir. 1500, must have been within the range of their teaching. His two great opponents, Sir Thomas More and bishop Tonstal, are known to have been among their pupils. It is significant enough that, after some years of study, Tyndale left Oxford and went to Cambridge. Such changes were, it is true, common enough. The fame of any great teacher would draw around him men from other universities, from many lands. In this instance, the reason of Tyndale's choice is probably not far to seek (Walter, Biog. Notice to Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises). Erasmus was in Cambridge from 1509 to 1514. All that we knew of Tyndale's character and life, the fact especially that he had made translations of portions of the N.T. as early as 1502 (Offor, Life of Tyndale, page 9), leads to the conclusion that he resolved to make the most of the presence of one who was emphatically the scholar and philologist of Europe. It must be remembered, too, that the great scheme of cardinal Ximenes was just then beginning to interest the  minds of all scholars. The publication of the Complutensian Bible, it is true, did not take place till 1520; but the collection of MSS. and other preparations for it began as early as 1504. In the mean time Erasmus himself, in 1516, brought out the first published edition of the Greek Testament, and it was thus made accessible to all scholars. Of the use made by Tyndale of these opportunities we have evidence in his coming up to London (1522), in the vain hope of persuading Tonstal (known as a Greek scholar, an enlightened Humanist) to sanction his scheme of rendering the N.T. into English; and bringing a translation of one of the orations of Isocrates as a proof of his capacity for the work. The attempt was not successful. "At the last I understood not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the N.T., but also that there was no place to do it in all England"' (Pref. to Five Books of Moses).

It is not so easy to say how far at this time any knowledge of Hebrew was attainable at the English universities, or how far Tyndale had used any means of access that were open to him. It is probable that it may have been known, in some measure, to a few bolder than their fellows, at a time far earlier than the introduction of Greek. The large body of Jews settled in the cities of England must have possessed a knowledge, more or less extensive, of their Hebrew books. On their banishment, to the number of 16,000, by Edward I, these books fell into the hands of the monks, superstitiously reverenced or feared by most yet drawing some to examination, and then to study. Grostete, it is said, knew Hebrew as well as Greek.

Roger Bacon knew enough to pass judgment on the Vulgate as incorrect and misleading. Then, however, came a period in which linguistic studies were thrown into the background, and Hebrew became an unknown speech even to the best-read scholars. The first signs of a revival meet us towards the close of the 15th century. The remarkable fact that a, Hebrew Psalter was printed at Soncino in 1477 (forty years before Erasmus's Greek Testament), the Pentateuch in 1482, the Prophets in 1486, the whole of the O.T. in 1488, that by 1496 four editions had been published, and by 1596 not fewer than eleven (Whitaker, Hist. and Crit. Inquiry, page 22), indicates a demand on the part of the Christian students of Europe, not less than on that of the more learned Jews. Here also the progress of the Complutensian Bible would have attracted the notice of scholars. The cry raised by the "Trojans" of Oxford in 1519 (chiefly consisting of the friars, who from the time of Wycliffe had all but swamped the education of the  place) against the first Greek lectures — that to study that language would make men pagans, that to study Hebrew would make them Jews — shows that the latter study as well as the former was the object of their dislike and fear (Anderson, 1:24; Hallam, Lit. of Eur. 1:403).

Whether Tyndale had in this way gained any knowledge of Hebrew before he left England in 1524 may be uncertain. The fact that in 1530-31 he published a translation of Genesis, Deuteronomy, and Jonah (see a letter by the ven. lord Arthur Hervey to the Bury Post of February 3, 1862, transferred shortly afterwards to the Athenaeum), may be looked on as the firstfruits of his labors, the work of a man who was giving this proof of his power to translate from the original (Anderson, Annals, 1:209-288). We may perhaps trace, among other motives for the many wanderings of his exile, a desire to visit the cities Worms, Cologne, Hamburg, Antwerp (Anderson, pages 48-64), where the Jews lived in greatest numbers, and some of which were famous for their Hebrew learning. Of at least a fair acquaintance with that language we have, a few years later, abundant evidence in the table of Hebrew words prefixed to his translation of the five books of Moses, and in casual etymologies scattered through his other works, e.g. "Mammon" (Parable of Wicked Mammoen, page 68), "Cohen" (Obedience, page 255), "Abel Mizraim" (page 347), "Pesah" (page 353). A remark (Preface to Obedience, page 148) shows how well he had entered into the general spirit of the language. "The properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the Englishe than with the Latine. The manner of speaking is in both one, so that in a thousand places thou needest not but to translate it into Englishe word for word." When Spalatin describes him in 1534, it is as one well-skilled in seven languages, and one of these is Hebrew (Anderson, 1:397).

The N.T. was, however, the great object of his care. First the gospels of Matthew and.Mark were published tentatively, then in 1525 the whole of the N.T. was printed in 4to at Cologne, and in small 8vo at Worms (reproduced in facsimile in 1862 by Mr. Francis Fry, Bristol). The work was the fruit of a self-sacrificing zeal, and the zeal was its own reward. In England it was received with denunciations. Tonstal, bishop of London, preaching at Paul's Cross, asserted that there were at least 2000 errors in it, and ordered all copies of it to be bought up and burnt. An act of Parliament (35 Hen. VIII, cap. 1) forbade the use of all copies of Tyndale's "false translation." Sir T. More (Dialogues, 1.c. Supplication of Souls, Confutation of Tindal's Answer) entered the lists against it, and accused  the translator of heresy, bad scholarship, and dishonesty, of "corrupting Scripture after Luther's counsel." The treatment which it received from professed friends was hardly less annoying. Piratical editions were printed, often carelessly, by trading publishers at Antwerp. One of his own pupils, George Joye, undertook (in 1534) to improve the version by bringing it into closer conformity with the Vulgate, and made it the vehicle of peculiar opinions of his own, substituting "life after this life'" or "verie life," for "resurrection," as the translation of ἀνάστασις. (Comp. Tyndale's indignant protest in Pref. to edition of 1534.) Even the most zealous reformers in England seemed disposed to throw his translation overboard, and encouraged Coverdale (see below) in undertaking another. In the mean time the work went on. Editions were printed one after another, namely, at Halmburg, Cologne,Worms, in 1525; Antwerp in 1526, '27, '28; Marlborow (=Marburg) in 1529; Strasburg (Joye's edition) in 1531; Bergen-op-Zoom in 1533 (Joye's); Joh 6:1-71 at Nuremberg in 1533; Antwerp in 1534 (Cotton, Printed Editions, pages 4-6). The last appeared in 1535, just before his death, "diligently compared with the Greek," presenting for the first time systematic chapter-headings, and with some peculiarities in spelling specially intended for the pronunciation of the peasantry (Offor, Life, pages 82). His heroic life was brought to a close in 1536. We may cast one look on its sad end — the treacherous betrayal, the Judas-kiss of the false friend, the imprisonment at Vilvorden, the last prayer, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes." He was tied to the stake, then strangled to death, and finally burnt. (See Offor's memoir prefixed to his edition of Tyndale's New Testament.)

The work to which a life was thus nobly devoted was as nobly done. To Tyndale belongs the honor of having given the first example of a translation based on true principles, and the excellence of later versions has been almost in exact proportion as they followed his. Believing that every part of Scripture had one sense and one only, the sense in the mind of the writer (Obedience, page 30), he made it his work, using all philological helps that were accessible to attain that sense. Believing that the duty of a translator was to place his readers as nearly as possible on a level with those for whom the books were originally written, he looked on all the later theological associations that had gathered round the words of the N.T. as hindrances rather than helps, and sought, as far as possible, to get rid of them. Not "grace," but "favor," even in Joh 1:17 (in edition of 1525); not "charity," but "love;" not "confessing," but "acknowledging;"  not "penance," but "repentance;" not "priests," but "seniors" or "elders;" not "salvation," but "health;" not "church," but "congregation," are'instances of the changes which were then looked on as startling and heretical innovations (Sir T. More, 1.c.). Some of them we are now familiar with. In others the later versions bear traces ofa reaction in favor of the older phraseology. In this, as .in other things, Tyndale was in advance, not only of his own age, but of the age that followed him. To him, however, it is owing that the versions of the English Church have throughout been popular, and not scholastic. All the exquisite grace and simplicity which have endeared the A.V. to men of the most opposite tempers and contrasted opinions — to J.H. Newman (Dublin Review, June, 1853) and J.A. Froude — is due mainly to his clear-sighted truthfulness. The testimony of a Roman Catholic scholar is worth quoting: 'In point of perspicacity and noble simplicity, propriety of idiom and purity of style, no English version has as yet surpassed it" (Geddes. Prospectus for a new Translation, page 89). The desire to make the Bible a people's book led Tyndale in one edition to something like a provincial rather than a national translation; but, on the whole, it kept him free from the besetting danger of the time, that of writing for scholars, not for the people; of a version full of "inkhorn" phrases, not in the spoken language of the English nation. And throughout there is the pervading stamp, so often wanting in other like works, of the most thorough truthfulness. No word has been altered to court a king's favor, or please bishops, or make out a case for or against a particular opinion. He is working freely, not in the fetters of prescribed rules. With the most entire sincerity he could say, 'I call God to record, against the day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus to give a reckoning of our doings, that I never altered one syllable of God's Word against my conscience, nor would this day, if all that is in the world, whether it be pleasure, honor, or riches, might be given me" (Anderson, 1:349).

IV. COVERDALE. —

1. A complete translation of the Bible, different from Tyndale's, bearing the name of Miles Coverdale, printed probably at Zurich, appeared in 1535. The undertaking itself, and the choice of Coverdale as the translator, were probably due to Cromwell. Tyndale's controversial treatises, and the polemical character of his prefaces and notes, had irritated the leading ecclesiastics, and embittered the mind of the king himself against him. All that he had written was publicly condemned. There was no hope of obtaining the king's sanction to anything that bore his name. But the idea of  an English translation began to find favor. The rupture with the see of Rome, the marriage with Anne Boleyn, made Henry willing to adopt what was urged upon him as the surest way of breaking forever the spell othehe pope's authority. The bishops even began to think of the thing as possible. It was talked of in Convocation. They would take it in hand themselves. The work did not, however, make much progress. The great preliminary question whether "venerable" words, such as hostia, penance, pascha, holocaust, and the like, should be retained, was still unsettled (Anderson, 1:414). Not till "the day after doomsday" (the words are Cranmer's) were the English people likely to get their English Bible from the bishbps (ib. 1:577). Cromwell, it is probable, thought it better to lose no further time, and to strike while the iron was hot. A divine whom he had patronized, though not, like Tyndale, feeling himself called to that special work (Pref. to Coverdale's Bible), was willing to undertake it. To him accordingly it was intrusted. There was no stigma attached to his name, and, though a sincere Reformer, neither at that time nor afterwards did he occupy a sufficiently prominent position to become an object of special persecution.

2. The work which was thus executed was done, as might be expected, in a very different fashion from Tyndale's. Of the two men, one had made this the great object of his life; the other, in his own language, "sought it not, neither desired it," but accepted it as a task assigned him. One prepared himself for the work by long years of labor in Greek and Hebrew; the other is content to make a translation at second hand "out of the Douche (Luther's German Version) and the Latine." The one aims at a rendering which shall be the truest and most exact possible; the other loses himself in weak commonplace as to the advantage of using many English words for one and the same word in the original, and in practice oscillates between "penance" and "repentance," "love" and '"charity," priests" and "elders," as though one set of words were as true and adequate as the other (Preface, page 19). In spite of these weaknesses, however, there is much to esteem in the spirit and temper of Coverdale. He is a second-rate man, laboring as such contentedly, not ambitious to appear other than he is. He thinks it a great gain that there should be a diversity of translations. He acknowledges, though he dare not name.it, the excellence of Tyndale's version, and regrets the misfortune which left it incomplete. He states frankly that he had done his work with the assistance of that and of five others. The five were probably:  (1.) The Vulgate; (2.) Luther's; (3.) The German Swiss version of Zurich; (4.) The Latin of Pagninus; (5.) Tyndale's.

Others, however, have conjectured a German translation of the Vulgate earlier than Luther's, and a Dutch version from Luther (Whit. aker, Hist. and Crit. Inquiry, page 49). If the language of his dedication to the king, whom he compares to Moses, David, and Josiah, seems to be somewhat fulsome in its flattery, it is, at least, hardly more offensive than that of the Dedication of the A.V., and there was more to palliate it.

3. An inspection of Coverdale's version serves to show the influence of the authorities he followed. The proper names of the O.T. appear for the most part in their Latin fotm, "Elias," "Eliseus," "Ochozias;" sometimes, as in "Esay" and "Jeremy," in that which was familiar in spoken English. Some points of correspondence with Luther's version are not without interest. Thus "Cush," which in Wycliffe, Tyndale, and the A.V. is uniformly rendered "Ethiopia," is in Coverdale "Morians' land" (Psa 68:31; Act 8:27, etc.), after the "Mohrenlande" of Luther, and appears in this form accordingly in the P.B. version of the Psalms. The proper name Rabshakeh passes, as in Luther, into the "chief butler" (2Ki 18:17; Isa 36:11). In making the sons of David "priests" (2Sa 8:18) he followed both his authorities. Ε᾿πίσκοποι are "bishops" in Act 20:28 ("overseers" in A.V.). "Shiloh," in the prophecy of Gen 49:10, becomes "the worthy," after Luther's "der Held." "They houghed oxen" takes the place of "they digged down a wall," in Gen 49:6. The singular word "Lamia" is taken from the Vulg., as the English rendering of Ziim ("wild beasts," A.V.) in Isa 34:14. The "tabernacle of witness," where the A.V. has "congregation," shows the same influence. In spite of Tyndale, the Vulg. "plena gratia," in Luk 1:28, leads to "full of grace;" while we have, on the other hand, "congregation" throughout the N.T. for ἐκκλησία, and "love" instead of "charity" in 1Co 13:1-13. It was the result of the same indecision that his language as to the Apocrypha lacks the sharpness of that of the more zealous reformers. "Baruch" is placed with the canonical books, after "Lamentations." Of the rest he says that they are "placed apart," as "not held by ecclesiastical doctors in the same repute" as the other Scriptures, but this is only because there are "dark sayings" which seem to differ from the "open Scripture."  He has no wish that they should be "despised or little set by." "Patience and study would show that the two were agreed."

4. What has been stated practically disposes of the claim which has sometimes been made for this version of Coverdale's, as though it had been made from the original text (Anderson, 1:564; Whitaker, Hist. and Crit. Inquiry, page 58). It is not improbable, however, that as time went on he added to his knowledge. The letter addressed by him to Cromwell (Renains, page 492, Parker Soc.) obviously asserts, somewhat ostentatiously, an acquaintance "not only with the standing text of the Hebrew, with the interpretation of the Chaldee and the Greek," but also with "the diversity of reading of all sects." He, at any rate, continued his work as a pains-taking editor. Fresh editions of his Bible were published, keeping their ground in spite of rivals, in 1537, 1539, 1550, 1553. He was called in at a still later period to assist in the Geneva version. Among smaller facts connected with this edition may be mentioned the appearance of Hebrew letters-of the name Jehovah-in the title-page (יהוה), and again in the margin of the alphabetic poetry of Lamentations, though not of Psa 119:1-176. The plural form "Biblia" is retained in the title-page, possibly, however, in its later use as a singular feminine, SEE BIBLE. There are no notes; no chapter-headings, no divisions into verses. The letters A, B, C,D in the margin, as in the early editions of Greek and Latin authors, are the only helps for finding places. Marginal references point to parallel passages. The O.T., especially in Genesis, has the attraction of wood-cuts. Each book has a table of contents prefixed to it. A careful reprint, though not a facsimile, of Coverdale's version has been published by Bagster (London 1838).

V. MATTHEW. —

1. In the year 1537, a large folio Bible appeared as edited and dedicated to the king, by Thomas Matthew. No one of that name appears at all prominently in the religious history of Henry VIII, and this suggests the inference that the name was pseudonymous, adopted to conceal the real translator. The tradition which connects this Matthew with John Rogers, the protomartyr of the Marian persecution, is all but undisputed. It rests

(1) on the language of the indictment and sentence which describe him (Foxe, Acts and Monuments, page 1029, 1563; Chester, Life of  Rogers, pages 418-423) as Joannes Rogers, alias Matthew, as if it were a matter of notoriety;

(2) the testimony of Foxe himself, as representing, if not personal knowledge, the current belief of his time;

(3) the occurrence, at the close of a short exhortation to the study of Scripture in the preface, of the initials J.R.; (4) internal evidence. This last subdivides itself.

(a.) Rogers, who had graduated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1525, and had sufficient fame to be invited to the new Cardinal's College at Oxford, accepted the office of chaplain to the merchant adventurers of Antwerp, and there became acquainted with Tyndale two years before the latter's death. Matthew's Bible, as might be expected, if this hypothesis were true, reproduces Tyndale's work, in the N.T. entirely, in the O.T. as far as 2 Chronicles, the rest being taken, with occasional modifications, from Coverdale.

(b.) The language of the Dedication is that of one who has mixed much, as Rogers mixed, with foreign reformers ("the godlie in strange countries").

2. The printing of the book was begun apparently abroad, and was carried on as far as the end of Isaiah., At that point a new pagination begins, and the names of the Lond6n printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, appear. The history of the book was probably something like this: Coverdale's translation had not given satisfaction — least of all were the more zealous and scholar-like reformers contented with it. As the only complete English Bible, it was, however, as yet, in possession of the field. Tyndale and Rogers, therefore, in the year preceding the imprisonment of the former, determined on another, to include O.T., N.T., and Apocrypha, but based throughout on the original. Left to himself, Rogers carried on the work, probably at the expense of the same Antwerp merchant who had assisted Tyndale (Poyntz), and thus got as far as Isaiah. The enterprising London printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, then came in (Chester, Life of Rogers, page 29). It would be a good speculation to enter the market with this, and so drive out Coverdale's, in which they had no interest. They accordingly embarked a considerable capital, £500, and then came a stroke of policy which may be described as a miracle of audacity. The name of Rogers, known as the friend of Tyndale, is suppressed, and the simulacrum of  Thomas Matthew disarms suspicion. The book is sent by Grafton to Cranmer. He reads, approves, rejoices. He would rather have the news of its being licensed than a thousand pounds (Chester, pages 425-427). Application is then made both by Grafton and Cranmer to Cromwell. The king's license is granted, but the publisher wants more. Nothing less than a monopoly for ave years will give him a fair margin of profit. Without this, he is sure to be undersold by piratical, inaccurate editions, badly printed on inferior paper. Failing this, he trusts that the king will order one copy to be bought by every incumbent, and six by every abbey. If this was too much, the king might, at least, impose that obligation on all the popishly-inclined clergy. That will bring in something, besides the good it may possibly do them (Chester, pages 430). The application was to some extent successful. A copy was ordered, by royal proclamation, to be set up in every church, the cost being divided between the clergy and the parishioners. This was, therefore, the first Authorized Version. It is scarcely conceivable, however, that Henry could have read the book which he thus sanctioned, or known that it was substantially identical with what had been publicly stigmatized in his Acts of Parliament (ut supra). What had before given most offense had been the polemical character of Tyndale's annotations, and here were notes bolder and more thorough still.. Even the significant "W.T." does not appear to have attracted notice.

3. What has been said of Tyndale's version applies, of course, to this. There are, however, signs of a more advanced knowledge of Hebrew. All the technical words connected with the Psalms, Neginoth, Shiggaion, Sheminith, etc., are elaborately explained. Psa 2:1-12 is printed as a dialogue. The names of the Hebrew letters are prefixed to the verses of Lamentations. Reference is made to the,Chaldee Paraphrase (Job 6:1-30), to Rabbi Abraham (Job 19:1-29), to Kimchi (Psa 3:1-8). A like range of knowledge is shown in the N.T. Strabo is quoted to show that the magi were not kings, Macrobius as testifying to Herod's ferocity (Matthew ii), Erasmus's Paraphrase on Mat 13:15. The popular identification of Mary Magdalene with "the woman that was a sinner" is discussed, and rejected (Luk 10:1-42). More noticeable even than in Tyndale is the boldness and fullness of the exegetical notes scattered throughout the book. Strong and earnest in asserting what he looked upon as the central truths of the Gospel, there was in Rogers a Luther-like freedom in other things which has not appeared again in any authorized translation or popular commentary. He guards his readers against looking on the narrative of Job 1:1-22 as literally true. He recognises a definite historical starting-point for Psa 41:1-13 ("The sons of Korah praise Solomon for the beauty, eloquence, power, and nobleness, both of himself and of his wife"), Psa 22:1-31 ("David declareth Christ's dejection ... and all, under figure of himself"), and the Song of Solomon ("Solomon made this balade for himself and his wife, the daughter of Pharaoh, under the shadow of himself, figuring Christ," etc.).

The chief duty of the Sabbath is "to minister the fodder of the Word to simple souls," to be "pitiful over the weariness of such neighbors as labored sore all the week long." "When such occasions come as turn our rest to occupation and labor, then ought we to remember that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Jer 17:1-27). He sees in the prophets of the N.T. simply "expounders of Holy Scripture" (Act 15:1-41). To the man living in faith, " Peter's fishing after the resurrection, and all deeds of matrimony are pure spiritual;" to those who are not, "learning, doctrine, contemplation of high things, preaching, study of Scripture, founding of churches and abbeys, are works of the flesh" (Pref. to Romans). "Neither is outward circumcision or outward baptism worth a pin of themselves, save that they put us in remembrance to keep the covenant" (1Co 7:1-40). "He that desireth honor gaspeth after lucre ... castles, parks, lordships... . desireth not a work, much less a good work, and nothing less than a bishop's" (1Ti 3:1-16). Eze 34:1-31 is said to be "against bishops and curates that despise the flock of Christ." The ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας of Rev. ii and in appears (as in Tyndale) as "the messenger of the congregation." Strong protests against Purgatory are found in notes to Eze 18:1-32 and 1Co 3:1-23, and in the "Table of Principal Matters" it is significantly stated under the word Purgatory that " it is not in the Bible, but the purgation and remission of our sins is made us by the abundant mercy of God." The Preface to the Apocrypha explains the name, and distinctly asserts the inferiority of these books. No notes are added to them, and the translation of them is taken from Coverdale, as if it had not been worth while to give much labor to it.

4. A few points of detail remain to be noticed. In the order of the books of the N.T. Rogers follows Tyndale, agreeing with the A.V. as far as the Epistle to Philemon. This is followed by the Epistles of John, then that to the Hebrews, then those of Peter, James, and Jude. Wood-cuts, not very freely introduced elsewhere, are prefixed to every chapter in the Revelation. The introduction of the "Table" mentioned above gives Rogers a claim to be the patriarch of Concordances, the "father" of all such as  write in Dictionaries of the Bible. Reverence for the Hebrew text is shown by his striking out the three verses which the Vulgate has added to Psa 14:1-7. In a later edition, published at Paris, not by Rogers himself, but by Grafton, under Coverdale's superintendence, in 1539, the obnoxious prologue and prefaces were suppressed, and the notes systematically expurgated and toned down. The book was in advance of the age. Neither booksellers nor bishops were prepared to be responsible for it.

VI. TAVERNER (1539). —

1. The boldness of the pseudo-Matthew had, as has been said, frightened the ecclesiastical world from its propriety. Coverdale's version was, however, too inaccurate to keep its ground. It was necessary to find another editor, and the printers applied to Richard Taverner. But little is known of his life. The fact that, though a layman, he had been chosen as one of the canons of the Cardinal's College at Oxford indicates a reputation for scholarship, and this is confirmed by the character of his translation. It professes, in the title-page, to be "newly recognized, with great diligence, after the most faithful exemplars." The editor acknowledges the labors of others (i.e., Tyndale, Coverdale, and Matthew, though he does not name them) who have neither undiligently nor unlearnedly traveled," owns that the work is not one that can be done "absolutely" (i.e., completely) by one or two persons, but requires "a deeper conferring of many learned wittes together, and also a juster time and longer leisure;" but the thing had to be done; he had been asked to do it. He had "used his talent" as he could.

2. In most respects this may be described as an expurgated edition of Matthew's. There is a table of principal matters, and there are notes; but the notes are briefer and less polemical. The passages quoted above are, e.g. omitted wholly or in part. The epistles follow the same order as before.

VII. CRANMER. —

1. In the same year as Taverner's, and coming from the same press, appeared an English Bible, in a more stately folio, printed with a more costly type, bearing a higher name than any previous edition. The title-page is an elaborate engraving, the spirit and power of which indicate the hand of Holbein. The king, seated on his throne, is giving the Verbum Dei to the bishops and doctors, and they distribute it to the people, while doctors and people are all joining in cries of "Vivat Rex." It declares the book to be "truly translated after the verity of the Hebrew and Greek texts" by "divers  excellent learned men, expert in the foresaid tongues." A preface, in April 1540, with the initials "T.C.” implies the archbishop's sanction. In a later edition (November 1540) his name appears on the title-page, and the names of his coadjutors are given, Cuthbert (Tonstal), bishop of Durham, and Nicholas (Heath), bishop of Rochester; but this does not exclude the possibility of others having been employed for the first edition.

2. Cranmer's version presents, as might be expected, many points of interest. The prologue gives a more complete ideal of what a translation ought to be than we have as yet seen. Words not in the original are to be printed in a different type. They are added, even when "not wanted by the sense," to satisfy those who have "missed them" in previous translations, 1:e. they represent the various readings of the Vulgate where it differs from the Hebrew. The sign \* indicates diversity in the Chaldee and Hebrew. It had been intended to give all these, but it was found that this would have taken too much time and space, and the editors purposed therefore to print them in a little volume by themselves. The frequent hands in the margin, in like manner, show an intention to give notes at the end; but Matthew's Bible had made men cautious, and, as there had not been time for the "king's council to settle them," they were omitted, and no help given to the reader beyond the marginal references. In the absence of notes, the lay- reader is to submit himself to the "godly-learned in Christ Jesus." There is, as the title-page might lead us to expect, a greater display of Hebrew than in any previous version. The books of the Pentateuch have their Hebrew names given, Bereschith (Genesis), Velle Schemoth (Exodus), and so on. 1 and 2 Chronicles in like manner appear as Dibre Haiamim. In the edition of 1541, many proper names in the O.T. appear in the fuller Hebrew form, as e.g., Amaziahu, Jeremiahu. In spite of this parade of learning, however, the edition of 1539 contains, perhaps, the most startling blunder that ever appeared under the sanction of an archbishop's name. The editors adopted the preface which, in Matthew's Bible, had been prefixed to the Apocrypha. In that preface the common traditional explanation of the name was concisely given. They appear, however, to have shrunk from offending the conservative party in the Church by applying to the books in question so damnatory an epithet as Apocrypha. They looked out for a word more neutral and respectful, and found one that appeared in some MSS. of Jerome so applied, though in strictness it belonged to an entirely different set of books. They accordingly substituted that word, leaving the preface in all other respects as it was before, and the result is the somewhat ludicrous  statement that the "books were called Hagiographa," because "they were read in secret and apart!"

3. A later edition in 1541 presents a few modifications worth noticing. It appears as "authorized" to be "used and frequented" in every church in the kingdom. The introductionwith all its elaborate promise of a future perfection, disappears, and in its place there is a long preface by Cranmer, avoiding as much as possible all references to other translations, taking a safe via media tone, blaming those who "refuse to read" on the one hand, and "inordinate reading" on the other. This neutral character, so characteristic of Cranmer's policy, was doubtless that which enabled it to keep its ground during the changing moods of Henry's later years. It was reprinted again and again, and was the authorized version of the English Church till 1568 — the interval of Mary's reign excepted. From it, accordingly, were taken most, if not all, the portions of Scripture in the Prayer-books of 1549 and 1552. The Psalms as a whole, the quotations from Scripture in the Homilies, the sentences in the Communion services, and some phrases elsewhere (such as "worthy fruits of penance"), still preserve the remembrance of it. The oscillating character of the book is shown in the use of "love" instead of "charity" in 1Co 13:1-13; and "congregation" instead of "church" generally, after Tyndale; while in 1Ti 4:14, we have the singular rendering, as if to gain the favor of his opponents, "with authority of priesthood." The plan of indicating doubtful texts by a smaller type was adhered to, and was applied, among other passages, to Psa 14:5-7, and the more memorable text of 1Jn 5:7. The translation of 1Ti 3:16, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable," etc., anticipated a construction of that text which has sometimes been boasted of, and some. times attacked as an innovation. In this, however, Tyndale had led the way.

VIII. GENEVA. —

1. The experimental translation of the Gospel of Matthew by Sir John Cheke into a purer English than before (Strype, Life of Cheke, 7:3) had so little influence on the versions that followed that it hardly calls for more than a passing notice, as showing that scholars were as yet unsatisfied. The reaction under Mary gave a check to the whole work, as far as England was concerned; but the exiles who fled to Geneva entered upon it with more vigor than ever. Cranmer's version did not come up to their ideal. Its size made it too costly. There were no explanatory or dogmatic notes. It  followed Coverdale too closely; and where it deviated, did so, in some instances, in a retrograde direction. The Genevan refugees — among them Whittingham, Goodman, Pullain, Sampson, and Coverdale himself — labored "for two years or more, day and night." They entered on their "great and wonderful work" with much "fear and trembling." Their translation of the N.T. was "diligently revised by the most approved Greek examples" (MSS. or editions?) (Preface). The N.T., translated by Whittingham, was printed by Conrad Badius in 1557, the whole Biule in 1560.

2. In point of general correctness in expressing the true sense of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, the Geneva version shows a very marked advance on all that preceded it, and for more than sixty years it was the most popular of all the English versions. Largely imported in the early years of Elizabeth, it was printed in England in 1561, and a patent of monopoly was given to James Bodleigh. This was transferred in 1576 to Barker, in whose family the right of printing Bibles remained for upwards of a century. Not less than eighty editions, some of the whole Bible, were printed between 1558 and 1611. It kept its ground for some time even against the later version of king James, and gave way, as it were, slowly and under protest. In the Soldiers' Pocket Bible, published in 1643 for the use of Cromwell's army, almost all the selections of Scripture were taken from the Geneva version. The causes of this general acceptance are not difficult to ascertain. The volume was, in most of its editions, cheaper and more portable — a small quarto, instead of the large folio of Cranmer's "Great Bible." It was the first Bible which laid aside the adolescent black letter, and appeared in Roman type. It was the first which, following the Hebrew example, recognised the division into verses, so dear to the preachers or hearers of sermons. It was accompanied, in most of the editions after 1578, by a Bible Dictionary of considerable merit. The notes were often really helpful in dealing with the difficulties of Scripture, and were looked upon as spiritual and evangelical. It was accordingly the version specially adopted by the great Puritan party through the whole reign of Elizabeth, and far into that of James. As might be expected, it was based on Tyndale's version, often returning to it where the intermediate renderings had had the character of a compromise.

3. Some peculiarities are worthy of special notice:

(1) It professes a desire to restore the "true writing" of many Hebrew names, and we meet accordingly with forms like Izhak (Isaac), Jaacob, and the like.

(2) It omits the name of Paul from the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and, in a short preface, leaves the authorship an open question.

(3) It avows the principle of putting all words not in the original in italics.

(4) It presents, in a Calendar prefixed to the Bible, something like a declaration of war against the established order of the Church's lessons, commemorating Scripture facts, and the deaths of the great reformers, but ignoring saints' days altogether.

(5) It was the first English Bible which entirely omitted the Apocrypha.

(6) The notes were characteristically Swiss, not only in their theology, but in their politics. They made allegiance to kings dependent upon the soundness of their faith, and in one instance (note on 2Ch 15:16) at least seemed, to the easily startled James I, to favor tyrannicide.

4. The circumstances of the early introduction of the Geneva version are worth mentioning, if only as showing in how different a spirit the great fathers of the English Reformation, the most conservative of Anglican theologians, acted from that which has too often animated their successors. Men talk now of different translations and various readings as likely to undermine the faith of the people. When application was made to archbishop Parker, in 1565, to support Bodleigh's application for a license to reprint the Geneva version in 12mo, he wrote to Cecil in its favor. He was at the time looking forward to the work he afterwards accomplished, of one other special Bible for the churches, to be set forth as convenient time and leisure should permit" but in the mean time it would "nothing hinder, but rather doo much good, to have diversity of translations and readings" (Strype, Life of Parker, 3:6). Many of the later reprints, instead of the Geneva version from the Greek, have Tomson's translation of Beza's Latin version; and the notes are said to be taken from Joac. Camer, P. Leseler, Villerius, and Fr. Junius. The Geneva version, as published by  Barker, is that popularly known as the Breeches Bible, from its rendering of Gen 3:7. It had, however, been preceded in this by Wycliffe's.

IX. THE BISHOPS' BIBLE. —

1. The facts just stated will account for the wish of archbishop Parker, in spite of his liberal tolerance, to bring out another version which might establish its claims against that of Geneva. Great preparations were made. The correspondence of Parker with his suffragans presents some points of interest, as showing how little agreement there was as to the true theory of a translation. Thus, while Sandys, bishop of Worcester, finds fault with the "common translation" (Geneva?), as "following Munster too much," and so "swerving much from the Hebrew," Guest, bishop of St. David's, who took the Psalms, acted on the principle of translating them so as to agree with the N.T. quotations, "for the avoiding of offense;" and Cox, bishop of Ely, while laying down the sensible rule that "inkhorn terms were to be avoided," also went on to add "that the usual terms were to be retained so far forth as the Hebrew will well bear" (Strype, ,Parker, 3:6). The principle of pious frauds, of distorting the truth for the sake of edification, has perhaps often been acted on by other translators. It has not often been so explicitly avowed as in the first of these suggestions.

2. The bishops thus consulted, eight in number, together with some deans and professors, brought out the fruit of their labors in a magnificent folio (1568 and 1572). Everything had been done to make it attractive. A long erudite preface vindicated the right of the people to read the Scriptures, and (quoting the authority of bishop Fisher) admitted the position which later divines have often been slow to admit, that "there be yet in the Gospel many dark places which, without all doubt, to the posterity shall be made much more open." Wood-engravings of a much higher character than those of the Geneva Bible were scattered profusely, especially in Genesis. Three portraits of the queen, the earl of Leicester, and lord Burleigh, beautiful specimens of copperplate engraving, appeared on the title-pages of the several parts. A map of Palestine was given, with degrees of latitude and longitude, in the edition of 1572. It also contained more numerous illustrated initials. Some of these caused very great dissatisfaction, being grossly offensive representations of heathen mythology; for which, however, the printer alone was responsible, who used such ornamental initials as he chose, following the taste of the age. From one of them, the initial letter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this version is popularly known  as the Leda Bible. A most elaborate series of genealogical tables, prepared by Hugh Broughton, the great rabbi of the age (of whom more hereafter), but ostensibly by Speed the antiquary (Broughton's name being in disfavor with the bishops), as prefixed (Strype, Parker, 4:20; Lightfoot, Life of Broughton). In some points it followed previous translations, and was avowedly based on Cranmer's. "A new edition was necessary." "This had led some well-disposed men to recognize it again, not as condemning the former translation, which has been followed mostly of any other translation, excepting the original text" (Pref. of 1572). Cranmer's Prologue was reprinted. The Geneva division into verses was adopted throughout.

3. Some peculiarities, however, appear for the first and last time.

(1.) The books of the Bible are classified as legal, historical, sapiential, and prophetic. This was easy enough for the O.T., but the application of the same idea to the N.T. produced some rather curious combinations. The Gospels, the catholic Epistles, and those to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, are grouped together as legal, St. Paul's other epistles as sapiential; the Acts appear as the one historical, the Revelation as the one prophetic book.

(2.) It is the only Bible in which many passages, sometimes nearly a whole chapter, have been marked for the express purpose of being omitted when the chapters were read in the public service of the Church.

(3.) In the edition of 1572, Cranmer's version of the Psalms, as being the one used in the Book of Common Prayer (which could not be changed without an act of Parliament), was printed along with the Bishops' version in parallel columns. In the editions subsequent to this date the Bishops' version is omitted altogether, and that of Cranmer is substituted in its place, in order that the Bible and the Prayer-book might have the same version. They are so far worthless, therefore, as editions of the Bishops' Bible.

(4.) The initials of the translators were attached to the books which they had severally undertaken. The work was done on the plan of limited, not joint liability.

(5.) Here, as in the Geneva, there is the attempt to give the Hebrew proper names more accurately, as e.g. in Heva, Isahac, Uziahu, etc.

4. Of all the English versions, the Bishops' Bible had probably the least success. It did not command the respect of scholars, and its size and cost were far from meeting the wants of the people. Its circulation appears to have been practically limited to the churches which were ordered to be supplied with it. It had, however, at any rate, the right to boast of some good Hebrew scholars among the translators, one of whom, bishop Alley, had written a Hebrew Grammar; and, though vehemently attacked by Broughton (Townley, Literary History of the Bible, 3:190), it was defended as vigorously by Fulke, and, together with the A.V., received from Selden the praise of being "the best translation in the world" (Table Talk, Works, 3:2009).

X. RHEIMS AND DOUAY. —

1. The successive changes in the Protestant versions of the Scriptures were, as might be expected, matter of triumph to the controversialists of the Latin Church. Some saw in it an argument against any translation of Scripture into the spoken language of the people. Others pointed derisively to the want of unity which these changes displayed. There were some, however, who took the line which Sir T. More and Gardiner had taken under Henry VIII. They did not object to the principle of an English translation. They only charged all the versions hitherto made with being false, corrupt, heretical. To this there was the ready retort that they had themselves done nothing; that their bishops in the reign of Henry had promised, but had not performed. It was felt to be necessary that they should take some steps which might enable them to turn the edge of this reproach. Accordingly, the English refugees who were settled at Rheims- Martin, Allen (afterwards cardinal), and Bristow —undertook the work. Gregory Martin, who had graduated at Cambridge, had signalized himself by an attack on the existing versions, and had been answered in an elaborate treatise by Fulke, master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge (A Defience of the Sincere and True Translation, etc.).

The charges are mostly of the same kind as those brought by Sir T. More against Tyndale. " The old time-honored words were discarded. The authority of the Septuagint and Vulgate was set at naught when the translator's view of the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek differed from what he found in them." The new model translation was to avoid these faults. It was to command  the respect at once of priests and people. After an incubation of some years, it was published at Rheims in 1582. Though Martin was competent to translate from the Greek, it professed to be based on "the authentic text of the Vulgate." Notes were added, as strongly dogmatic as those of the Geneva Bible, and often keenly controversial. The work of translation was completed somewhat later by the publication of the O.T. at Douay in 1609. The language was precisely what might have been expected from men who adopted Gardiner's ideal of what a translation ought to be. At every page we stumble on "strange inkhorn words," which never had been English, and never could be, such, e.g. as "the Pasche and the Azymes" (Mar 16:1), "the arch-synagogue" (Mar 5:35), "in prepuce" (Rom 4:9), "obdurate with the fallacie of sin" (Heb 3:13), "a greater hoste" (Heb 11:4), "this is the annuntiation" (1Jn 5:5), "pre- ordinate" (Act 13:48), "the justifications of our Lord" (Luk 1:6), " what is to me and thee" (Joh 2:4), "longanimity" (Rom 2:4), "purge the old leaven that you may be a new paste, as you are azymes" (1Co 4:7), "you are evacuated from Christ" (Gal 5:4), and so on.

2. A style such as this had, as might be expected, but few admirers. Among those few, however, we find one great name. Bacon, who leaves the great work of the reign of James unnoticed, and quotes almost uniformly from the Vulgate, goes out of his way to praise the Rhemish version for having restored "charity" to the place from which Tyndale had expelled it, in 1Co 13:1-13 (Of the Pacification of the Church). Even Roman Catholic divines have felt the superiority of the A.V., and Challoner, in his editions of the N.T. in 1748, and the Bible, 1763, often follows it in preference to the Rheims and Douay translations.

XI. KING JAMES'S VERSION. —

1. The position of the English Church in relation to the versions in use at the commencement of the reign of James was hardly satisfactory. The Bishops' Bible was sanctioned by authority. That of Geneva had the strongest hold on the affections of the people. Scholars, Hebrew scholars in particular, found grave fault with both. Hugh Broughton, who spoke Hebrew as if it had been his mother tongue, denounced the former as being full of "traps and pitfalls," "overthrowing all religion," and proposed a new revision to be effected by an English Septuagint (72), with power to consult gardeners, artists, and the like, about the words connected with  their several callings, and bound to submit their work to "one qualified for difficulties." This ultimate referee was, of course, to be himself (Strype, Whitgft, 4:19, 23). Unhappily, neither his temper nor his manners were such as to win favor for this suggestion. Whitgift disliked him, worried him, drove him into exile. Broughton's views were, however, shared by others; and among the demands of the Puritan representatives at the Hampton-Court Conference in 1604 (Dr. Reinolds being the spokesman), was one for a new, or, at least, a revised translation. The special objections which they urged were neither numerous (three passages only — Psa 105:28; Psa 106:30; Gal 4:25 — were referred to) nor important, and we must conclude either that this part of their case had not been carefully got up, or that the bullying to which they were exposed had had the desired effect of throwing them into some confusion. The bishops treated the difficulties which they did raise with supercilious scorn. They were "trivial, old, and often answered." Bancroft raised the cry of alarm which a timid conservatism has so often raised since. "If every man's humor were to be followed, there would be no end of translating" (Cardwell, Conferences, page 188). Cranmer's words seemed likely to be fulfilled again. Had it been left to the bishops, we might have waited for the A.V. "till the day after doomsday." Even when the work was done, and the translators acknowledged that the HamptonCourt Conference had been the starting- point of it, they could not resist the, temptation of a fling at their opponents. The objections to the Bishops' Bible had, they said, been nothing more than a shift to justify the refusal of the Puritans to subscribe to the Communionbook (Preface to A.V.). But the king disliked the politics of the Geneva Bible. Either repeating what he had heard from others, or exercising his own judgment, he declared that there was as yet no good translation, and that the Geneva was the worst of all., Nothing, however, was settled at the Conference beyond the hope thus held out.

2. But the king was not forgetful of what he thought likely to be the glory of his reign. The work of organizing and superintending the arrangements for a new translation was one specially congenial to him, and in 1606 the task was accordingly commenced. The selection of the fifty-four scholars to whom it was intrusted seems, on the whole, to have been a wise and fair one. Andrews, Saravia, Overal, Montague, and Barlow represented the "higher" party in the Church; Reinolds, Chaderton, and Lively that of the Puritans. Scholarship unconnected with party was represented by Henry Savile and John Boys. One name, that of Broughton, is indeed conspicuous  by its absence. The greatest Hebrew scholar of the age — the man who had, in a letter to Cecil (1595), urged this very plan of a joint translation — who had already translated several books of the O.T. (Job, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Lamentations), was ignominiously excluded. This may have been, in part, owing to the dislike with which Whitgift and Bancroft had all along regarded him. But in part, also, it was owing to Broughton's own character. An unmanageable temper, showing itself in violent language, and the habit of stigmatizing those who differed from him, even on such questions as those connected with names and dates, as heretical and atheistic, must have made him thoroughly impracticable; one of the men whose presence throws a committee or conference into chaos. Only forty- seven names appear in the king's list (Burnet, Reform. Records). Seven may have died or declined to act; or it may have been intended that there should be a final committee of revision. A full list is given by Fuller (Ch. Hist. 10); and is reproduced, ,with biographical particulars, by Todd and Anderson. The Puritan side was, however, weakened by the death of Reinolds and Lively during the progress of the work.

3. What reward other than that of their own consciences and the judgment of posterity were the men thus chosen to expect for their long and laborious task? The king was not disposed to pay them out of his state revenue. Gold and silver were not always plentiful in the household of the English Solomon, and from him they received nothing (Heywood, State of Auth. Bibl. Revision). There remained, however, an ingenious form of liberality, which had the merit of being inexpensive. A king's letter was sent to the archbishops and bishops, to be transmitted by them to their chapters, commending all the translators to their favorable notice. They were exhorted to contribute in all 1000 marks, and the king was to be informed of each man's liberality. If any livings in their gift, or in the gift of private persons, became vacant, the king was to be informed of it, that he might nominate some of the translators to the vacant preferment. Heads of colleges, in like manner, were enjoined to give free board and lodging to such divines as were summoned from the country to labor in the great work (Strype, Whitgift, 4). That the king might take his place as director of the whole, a copy of fifteen instructions, was sent to each translator, and apparently circulated freely in both universities.

4. The instructions thus given will be found in Fuller (1.c.), and with a more accurate text in Burnet (Reform. Records). It will not be necessary to  give them here in full; but it will be interesting to note the bearing of each clause upon the work in hand, and its relation to previous versions.

(1) The Bishops' Bible was to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit. This was probably intended to quiet the alarm of those who saw in the proposed new version a condemnation of that already existing.

(2) The names of prophets and others, were to be retained as nearly as may be in the form vulgarly used. This was to guard against forms like Izhak, Jeremiahu, etc., which had been introduced in some versions, and which some Hebrew scholars were willing to introduce more copiously. To it we owe probably the forms Jeremy, Elias, Osee, Core, in the N.T.

(3) The old ecclesiastical words were to be kept, as the word “church" not to be translated "congregation." The rule was apparently given for the sake of this special application. "Charity," in 1Co 13:1-13, was probably also due to it. The earlier versions, it will be remembered, had gone on the opposite principle.

(4) "When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith." This, like the former, tends to confound the functions of the preacher and the translator, and substitutes ecclesiastical tradition for philological accuracy.

(5) The division of the chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as possible. Here, again, convenience was more in view than truth and accuracy, and the result is that divisions are perpetuated which are manifestly arbitrary and misleading.

(6) No marginal notes to be affixed but only for the explanation of Hebrew and Greek words. This was obviously directed against the Geneva notes, as the special objects of the king's aversion. Practically, however, in whatever feeling it originated, we may be thankful that the A.V. came out as it did, without note or comment. The open Bible was placed in the hands of all readers. The work of interpretation was left free. Had an opposite course been adopted, we might have had the tremendous evil of a whole body of exegesis imposed upon the Church  by authority, reflecting the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort, the absolutism of James, the highflying prelacy of Bancroft.

(7) "Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as may serve for fit reference of one Scripture to another." The principle that Scripture is its own interpreter was thus recognised, but practically the marginal references of the A.V. of 1611 were somewhat scanty, most of those now printed having been added in later editions.

(8 and 9) State plan of translation. Each company of translators is to take its own books; each person to bring his own corrections. The company to discuss them, and, having finished their work, to send it on to another company, and so on.

(10) Provides for differences of opinion between two companies by referring them to a general meeting.

(11) Gives power, in cases of difficulty, to consult any scholars.

(12) Invites suggestions from any quarter.

(13) Names the directors of the work: Andrews, dean of West. minster; Barlow, dean of Chester; and the regius pro. fessors of Hebrew and Greek at both universities.

(14) Names translations to be followed when they agree more with the original than the Bishops' Bible, namely, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, Whitchurch's, (Cranmer's), and Geneva.

(15) Authorizes universities to appoint three or four overseers of the work.

5. It is not known that any of the correspondence connected with this work, or any minute of the meetings for conference, is still extant. Nothing is more striking than the silence with which the version that was to be the inheritance of the English people for at least two centuries and a half was ushered into the world. Here and there we get glimpses of scholars coming from their country livings to their old college haunts to work; diligently at the task assigned them (Peck. Desiderata Curiosa, 2:87). We see the meetings of translators, one man reading the chapter which he has been at work on, while the others listen, with the original, or Latin, or German, or Italian, or Spanish versions in their hands (Selden, Table Talk). We may represent to ourselves the differences of opinion, settled by the casting vote  of the "odd man," or by the strong overbearing temper of a man like Bancroft, the minority comforting themselves with the thought that it was no new thing for the truth to be outvoted (Gell, Essay towards Amendment of last English transl. of Bible, page 321). Dogmatic interests were in some cases allowed to bias the translation; and the Calvinism of one party, the prelatic views of another, were both represented at the expense of accuracy (Gell, 1.c.). The following passages are those commonly referred to in support of this charge:

(1.) The rendering "such as should be saved," in Act 2:47.

(2.) The insertion of the words "any man" in Heb 10:38 ("the just shall live by faith, but if any man draw back," etc.), to avoid an inference unfavorable to the doctrine of Final Perseverance.

(3.) The use of "bishopric," in Act 1:20, of "oversight," in 1Pe 5:2, of "bishop," in 1Ti 3:1, etc., and "overseers,” in Act 20:28, in order to avoid the identification of bishops and elders.

(4.) The chapter-heading of Psa 149:1-9 in 1611 (since altered), "The prophet exhorteth to praise God for that power which he hath given the Church to bind the consciences of men." Blunt (Duties of a Parish Priest, lect. 2) appears, in this question, on the side of the prosecution, Trench (On the A.V. of the N.T. chapter 10) on that of the defense. The charge of an undue bias against Rome in 1Co 11:27; Gal 5:6; Heb 13:4, is one on which an acquittal may be pronounced with little or no hesitation.

6. For three years the work went on, the separate companies comparing notes as directed. When the work drew towards its completion, it was necessary to place it under the care of a select few. Two from each of the three groups were accordingly selected, and the six met in London to superinted the publication. Now, for the first time, we find any more definite remuneration than the shadowy promise held out in the king's letter of a share in the 1000 marks which deans and chapters would not contribute. The matter ,had now reached its business stage, and the Company of Stationers thought it expedient to give the six editors thirty pounds each, in weekly payments, for their nine months' labor. The final correction, and the task of writing the arguments of the several books, was given to Bilson, bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Miles Smith, the latter of  whom also wrote the Dedication and the Preface. Of these two documents, the first is unfortunately familiar enmough to us, and is chiefly conspicuous for its servile adulation. James I is "that sanctified person," "enriched with singular and extraordinary graces," that had appeared "as the sun in his strength." To him they appeal against the judgment of those whom they describe, in somewhat peevish accents, as "popish persons or self- conceited brethren." The Preface to the Reader is more interesting, as throwing light upon the principles on which the translators acted. They "never thought that they should need: to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one." "Their endeavor was to make a good one better, or, out of many good ones, one principal good one." They claim credit for steering a middle course between the Puritans who "left the old ecclesiastical words," and the obscurity of the Papists "retaining foreign words of purpose to darken the sense." They vindicate the practice, in which they indulge very freely, of translating one word in the original by several English words, partly on the intelligible ground that it is not always possible to find one word that will express all the meanings of the Greek or Hebrew, partly on the somewhat childish plea that it would be unfair to choose some words for the high honor of being the channels of God's truth, and to pass over others as unworthy.

7. The version thus published did not all at once supersede those already in possession. The fact that five editions were published in three years' shows that there was a good demand. But the Bishops' Bible probably remained in many churches (Andrews takes his texts from it in preaching before the king as late as 1621), and the popularity of the Geneva version is shown by not less than thirteen reprints, in whole or in part, between 1611 and 1617. It is not easy to ascertain the impression which the A.V. made at the time of its appearance. Probably, as in most like cases, it was far less for good or evil than friends or foes expected. The Puritans, and the religious portion of the middle classes generally, missed the notes of the Geneva book (Fuller, Church History, 10:50, 51). The Romanists spoke, as usual, of the unsettling effect of these frequent changes, and of the marginal readings as leaving men in doubt what was the truth of Scripture. Whitaker's answer, by anticipation, to this charge is worth quoting: "No inconvenience will follow if interpretations or versions of Scripture, when they have become obsolete or ceased to be intelligible, may be afterwards changed or corrected" (Dissert. on Script, page 232, Parker Soc. ed.). The wiser divines of the English Church had not then learned to raise the cry of  finality. One frantic cry was heard from Hugh Broughton, the rejected (Works, page 661), who “would rather be torn in pieces by wild horses than impose such a version on the poor churches of England." Selden, a few years later, gives a calmer and more favorable judgment. It is "the best of all translations as giving the true sense of the original." This, however, is qualified by the remark that "no book in the world is translated as the Bible is, word for word, with no regard to the difference of idioms. This is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it. but when it comes among the common people, Lord, what gear do they make of it!" (Table Talk). The feeling of which this was the expression led, even in the midst of the agitations of the Commonwealth, to proposals for another revision, which, after being brought forward in the Grand Committee of Religion in the House of Commons in January, 1656, was referred to a sub-committee, acting under Whitelocke, with power to consult divines and report. Confeiences were accordingly held frequently at Whitelocke's house, at which we find, mingled with less illustrious names, those of Walton and Cudworth. Nothing, however, came of it (Whitelocke, Memorials, page 564; Collier, Ch. Hist. 2:9). No report was ever made; and with the Restoration the tide of conservative feeling, in this as in other things, checked all plans of further alteration. Many had ceased to care for the Bible at all. Those who did care were content with the Bible as it was. Only here and there was a voice raised, like R. Gell's (ut sup.), declaring that it had defects, that it bore in some things the stamp of the dogmatism of a party (page 321).

8. The highest testimony of this period is that of Walton. From the editor of the Polyglot, the few words "inter omnes eminet" meant a good deal (Pref.). With the reign of Anne the tide of glowing panegyric set in. It would be easy to put together a long catena of praises stretching from that time to the present. With many, of course, this has been only the routine repetition of a traditional boast. "Our unrivalled Translation" and "our incomparable Liturgy" have been equally phrases of course. But there have been witnesses of a far higher weight. In proportion as the English of the 18th century was infected with a Latinized or Gallicized style, did those who had a purer taste look with reverence to the strength and purity of a better time as represented in the A.V. Thus Addison dwells on its ennobling the coldness of modern languages with the glowing phrases of Hebrew (Spectator, No. 405), and Swift confesses that "the translators of the Bible were masters of an English style far fitter for that work than any  we see in our present writings" (Letter to Lord Oxford). Each half century has naturally added to the prestige of these merits. The language of the A.V. has intertwined itself with the controversies, the devotion, the literature of the English people. It has gone, wherever they have gone, over the face of the whole earth. The most solemn and tender of individual memories are, for the most part, associated with it. Men leaving the Church of England for the Church of Rome turn regretfully with a yearning look at that noble "well of English undefiled" which they are about to exchange for the uncouth monstrosities of Rheims and Douay. In this case, too, as in so many others, the position of the A.V. has been strengthened, less by the skill of its defenders than by the weakness of its assailants. While from time to time scholars and divines (Lowth, Newcome, Waterland, Trench, Ellicott) have admitted the necessity of a revision, those who have attacked the present version and produced new ones have been, for the most part, men of narrow knowledge and defective taste (Purver, Harwood, Bellamy, Conquest, Sawyer), just able to pick out a few obvious faults, and committing others equally glaring. There have also generally entered on the work of translating or revising the whole Bible single-handed. One memorable exception must not, however, be passed over. Hallam (Lit. of Europe, 3, chapter 2, ad fin.) records a brief but emphatic protest against the "enthusiastic praise" which has been lavished on this translation. "It may, in the eyes of many, be a better English, but it is not the English of Daniel, or Raleigh, or Bacon... . It abounds, in fact, especially in the O.T., with obsolete phraseology, and with single words long since abandoned, or retained only in provincial use." The statement may, however, in some sense be accepted as an encomium. If it had been altogether the English of the men of letters of James's reign, would it have retained, as it has done for two centuries and a half, its hold on the mind, the memory, the affections of the English people?

XII. Schemes for a Recision. —

1. A notice of the attempts which have been made at various times to bring about a revision of the A.V., though necessarily brief and imperfect, may not be without its use for future laborers. The first half of the 18th century was not favorable for such a work. An almost solitary Essayfor a New Translation by H.R. (Ross), 1702, attracted little or no notice (Todd, Life of Walton, 1:134). A Greek Testament, with an English translation, singularly vulgar and offensive, was published in 1729, of which extracts are given by Lewis (Hist. of Transl. chapter 5). With the slight revival of  learning among the scholars of the latter half of that period the subject was again mooted. Lowth in a visitation sermon (1758), and Secker in a Latin speech intended for Convocation (1761), recommended it. Matthew Pilkington, in his Remarks (1759), and Dr. Thomas Brett, in an Essay on Ancient Versions of the Bible (1760), dwelt on the importance of consulting them with reference to the O.T. as well as the N.T., with a view to a more accurate text than that of the Masoretic Hebrew, the former insisting also on the obsolete words which are scattered in the A.V., and giving a useful alphabetic list of them. A folio new and literal translation of the whole Bible by Anthony Purver, a Quaker (1764), was a more ambitious attempt. He dwells at some length on the "obsolete, uncouth, clownish" expressions which disfigure the A.V. He includes in his list such words as "joyous," "solace," "damsel," "day-spring," bereaved," "marvels," "bondmen." He substitutes "he hearkened to what he said" for "he hearkened to his voice;" "eat victuals" for "eat bread” (Gen 3:19); "was in favor with" for "found grace in the eyes of;" "was angry" for "his wrath was kindled." In spite of this defective taste, however, the work has considerable merit, is based upon a careful study of the original and of many of the best commentators, and may be contrasted favorably with most of the single-handed translations that have followed. It was, at any rate, far above the depth of degradation and folly which was reached in Harwood's Literal Translation of the N.T. "with freedom, spirit, and elegance" (1768). Here, again, a few samples are enough to show the character of the whole. “The young lady is not dead" (Mar 5:39). "A gentleman of splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons" (Luk 15:11). "The clergyman said, You have given him the only right and proper answer" (Mar 12:32). "We shall not pay the common debt of nature, but by a soft transition," etc. (1Co 15:51).

2. Biblical revision was happily not left entirely in such hands as these. A translation by Worsley "according to the present idiom of the English tongue" (1770) was, at least, less offensive. Durell (Preface to Job), Lowth (Pref. to Isaiah), Blayney (Pref. to Jeremiah, 1784), were all strongly in favor of a new or revised translation. Durell dwells most on the arbitrary additions and omissions in the A.V. of Job, on the total absence in some cases of any intelligible meaning. Lowth speaks chiefly of the faulty state of the text of the O.T., and urges a correction of it, partly from various readings, partly from ancient versions, partly from conjecture. Each of the three contributed, in the best way, to the work which they had little  expectation of seeing accomplished, by laboring steadily at a single book, and committing it to the judgment of the Church. Kennicott's labors in collecting MSS of the O.T. issued in his State of the present Hebrew Text (1753-59), and excited expectations that there might before long be something like a basis for a new version in a restored original.

A more ambitious scheme was started by the Roman Catholic Dr. Geddes, in his Prospectus for a New Translation (1786). His remarks on the history of English translations, his candid acknowledgment of the excellences of the A.V., and especially of Tyndale's work as pervading it, his critical notes on the true principles of translation, on the A.V. as falling short of them, may still be read with interest. He too, like Lowth, finds fault with the superstitious adherence to the Masoretic text, with the undue reference to lexicons, and disregard of versions shown by our translators. The proposal was well received by many Biblical scholars, Lowth, Kennicott, and Barrington being foremost among its patrons. The work was issued in parts, according to the terms of the Prospectus, but did not get further than 2 Chronicles in 1792, when the death of the translator put a stop to it. Partly, perhaps, owing to its incompleteness, but still more from the extreme boldness of a Preface, anticipating the conclusions of a later criticism, Dr. Geddes's translation fell rapidly into disfavor. A sermon by White (famous for his Bampton Lectures) in 1779, and two pamphlets by J.A. Symonds, professor of modern history at Cambridge — the first on the Gospels and the Acts, in 1789; the second on the Epistles, in 1794 — though attacked in an Apology for the Liturgy and Church of England (1795), helped to keep the discussion from oblivion.

3. The revision of the A.V., like many other salutary reforms, was hindered by the French Revolution. In 1792, archbishop Newcome had published an elabe rate defense of such a scheme, citing host of authorities (Doddridge,Wesley, Campbell, in addition to those already mentioned), and taking the same line as Lowth, Revised translations of the N.T. were published by Wakefield in 1795, by Newcome himself in 1796, by Scarlett in 1798. Campbell's version of the Gospels appeared in 1788, that of the Epistles by Macknight in 1795. But in 1796 the note of alarm was sounded. A feeble pamphlet by George Burges (Letter to the Lord Bishop of Ely) took the ground that "the present period was unfit," and from that time conservatism, pure and simple, was in the ascendant. To suggest that the A.V. might be inaccurate was almost as bad as holding "French principles." There is a long interval before the question again comes into anything like  prominence, and then there is a new school of critics in the Quarterly Review and elsewhere, ready to do battle vigorously for things as they are. The opening of the next campaign was an article in the Classical Journal (No. 36), by Dr. John Bellamy, proposing a new translation, followed soon afterwards by its publi.cation under the patronage of the prince regent (1818). The work was poor and unsatisfactory enough, and a tremendous battery was opened upon it in the Quarterly Review (Nos. 37 and 38), as afterwards (No. 46) upon an unhappy critic, Sir J.B. Burges, who came forward with a pamphlet in its defense (Reasons in favor of a new Translation, 1819). The rash assertion of both Bellamy and Burges that the A.V. had been made almost entirely from the Septuagint and Vulgate, and a general deficiency in all accurate scholarship, made them easy victims.

The personal element of this controversy may well be passed over, but three less ephemeral works issued from it, which any future laborer in the same field will find worth consulting. Whitaker's Historical and Critical Inquiry was chiefly an able exposure of the exaggerated statement just mentioned. H.J. Todd, in his Vindication of the Authorized Translation (1819), entered more fully than any previous writer had done into the history of the A.V., and gives many facts as to the lives and qualifications of the translators not easily to be met with elsewhere. The most masterly, however, of the manifestoes against all change was a pamphlet (Remarks on the Critical Principles, etc., Oxford, 1820), published anonymously, but known to have been written by archbishop Laurence. The strength of the argument lies chiefly in a skillful display of all the difficulties of the work, the impossibility of any satisfactory restoration of the Hebrew of the O.T., or any settlement of the Greek of the N.T.; the expediency, therefore, of adhering to a Textus receptus in both. SEE VARIOUS READINGS. The argument, if conclusive, would unsettle our confidence in the text of the Holy Scriptures. Happily, more thorough critical research has fully refuted the archbishop's positions. But the scholarship and acuteness with which the subject is treated make the book instructive, and any one entering on the work of a translator ought at least to read it, that he may know what difficulties he has to face. About this period, also (1819), a new edition of Newcome's version was published by Belsham and other Unitarian ministers, and, like Bellamy's attempt on the O.T., had the effect of stiffening the resistance of the great body of the clergy to all proposals for a revision.

4. A correspondence between Herbert Marsh, bishop of Peterborough, and the Reverend H. Walter, in 1828, is the next link in the chain. Marsh had spoken (Lectures on Biblical Criticism, page 295) with some contempt of the A.V. as based on Tyndale's, Tyndale's on Luther's, and Luther's on Miinster's lexicon, which was itself based on the Vulgate. There was, therefore, on this view, no real translation from the Hebrew in any one of these. But it is evident that the Christian Hebraists of the period of the Reformation depended quite as much on the traditional learning of their Jewish teachers, often erroneous indeed, as on the earlier tradition preserved in the Latin Vulgate, and that they followed, as far as they were able, the Masoretic punctuation, a much surer guide than the ancient versions, or the later rabbinic interpretation.

5. The last five-and-twenty years have seen the question of a revision from time to time gaining fresh prominence. If men of second-rate power have sometimes thrown it back by meddling with it in wrong ways, others, able scholars and sound theologians, have admitted its necessity and helped it forward by their work. Dr. Conquest's Bible, with "20,000 emendations" (1841), has not commanded the respect of critics, and is almost self- condemned by the silly ostentation of its title. The motions which have from time to time been made in the House of Commons by Mr. Heywood have borne little fruit beyond the display of feeble liberalism, and yet feebler conservatism, by which such debates are, for the most part, characterized; nor have the discussions in Convocation, though opened by a scholar of high repute (professor Selwyn), been muich more productive. Dr. Beard's essay, A revised English Bible the Want of the Church (1857), though tending to overstate the defects of the A.V., is yet valuable as containing much information, and representing the opinions of the more learned Nonconformists. Far more important, every way, both as virtually an authority in favor of revision and as contributing largely to it, are professor Scholefield's Hints for an improved Translation of the N.T. (1832). In his second edition, indeed, he disclaims any wish for a new translation, but the principle which he lays down clearly and truly in his preface, that if there is "any adventitious difficulty resulting from a defective translation, then it is at the same time an act of charity and of duty to clear away the difficulty as much as possible," leads legitimately to at least a revision; and this conclusion Mr. Selwyn, in the last edition of the Hints (1857), has deliberately adopted. To bishop Ellicott also belongs the credit of having spoken at once boldly and wisely on this matter. Putting  the question whether it would be right to join those who oppose all revision, his answer is. "God forbid... . It is in vain to cheat our own souls with the thought that these errors (in A.V.) are either insignificant or imaginary. There are errors, there are inaccuracies, there are misconceptions, there are obscurities ... and that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will ... have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable word of God" (Pref. to Pastoral Epistles).

The translations appended by Dr. Ellicott to his editions of Paul's epistles proceed on the true principle of altering the A.V. "only where it appears to be incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obscure," uniting a profound reverence for the older translators with a bold truthfulness in judging of their work. The copious collation of all the earlier English versions makes this part of his book especially interesting and valuable. Dr. Trench (On the A.V. of the N.T., 1858), in like manner, states his conviction that "a revision ought to come," though as yet, he thinks, "the Greek and theEnglish necessary to bring it to a successful issue are alike wanting" (page 3). The work itself, it need hardly be said, is the fullest contradiction possible of this somewhat despondent statement, and supplies a good store of materials for use when the revision actually comes. The Revision of the A.V. by five Clergymen (Dr. Barrow, Dr. Moberly, dean Alford, Mr. Humphry, and Dr. Ellicott) represents the same school of conservative progress, has the merit of adhering to the clear, pure English of the A.V., and does not deserve the censure which Dr. Beard passes on it as "promising little and performing less." As yet, this series includes only the Gospel of John, and the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. The publications of the American Bible Union are signs that there also the same want has been felt. The translations given respectively by Alford, Stanley, Jowett, and Conybeare and Howson, in their respective commentaries, are in like manner at once admissions of the necessity of the work and contributions towards it. Mr. Sharpe (1840) and Mr. Highton (1862) have ventured on the wider work of translations of the entire N.T. Mr. Sawyer (1858) has done the same, and proposes to continue the task over the whole Bible; but he lacks both the scholarship and the judgment necessary. Mr. Cookesiey has published the Gospel of Matthew as Part I of a like undertaking. It might almost seem as if at last there was something like a consensus of scholars and divines on this question. That assumption would,  however, be too hasty. Partly the vis inertia, which, in a large body like the clergy of the Church, is always great, partly the fear of ulterior consequences, partly also the indifference of the majority of the laity, would probably, at the present moment, give at least a numerical majority to the opponents of a revision. Writers on this side are naturally less numerous, but the feeling of conservatism, pure and simple, has found utterance in four men representing different Sections, and of different calibre-Mr. Scrivener (Supp. to A. Eng. Ver. of N.T.), Dr. M'Caul (Reasons for holding fast the Authorized English Version), Mr. C.S. Malan (A Vindication, etc.), and Dr. Cumming (Revision and Translation). A high American authority, Mr. Geo. P. Marsh, may also be referred to as throwing the weight of his judgment into the scale against any revision at the present moment (Lectures on the English Language, lect. 28).

XIII, Present State of the Question. —

1. To take an accurate estimate of the extent to which the A.V. requires revision would call for nothing less than an examination of each single book, and would therefore involve an amount of detail incompatible with our present limits. To give a few instances only would practically fix attention on a part only of the evidence, and so would lead to a false rather than a true estimate. No attempt, therefore, will be made to bring together individual passages as needing correction. A few remarks on the chief questions which must necessarily come before those who undertake a revision will not, perhaps, be out of place. Examples, classified under corresponding heads, will be found in the book by Dr. Trench already mentioned, and, scattered in the form of annotations, in that of professor Scholefield.

2. The translation of the N.T. is from a text confessedly imperfect. What editions were used i's a matter of conjecture; most probably one of those published with a Latin version by Beza between 1565 and 1598, and agreeing substantially with the Textus receptus of 1633. It is clear, on principle, that no revision ought to ignore the results of the textual criticism of the last hundred years. To shrink from noticing any variation, to go on printing as the inspired Word that which there is a preponderant reason for belieying to be an interpolation or a mistake, is neither honest or reverential. To do so for the sake of greater edification is simply to offer to God the unclean sacrifice of a lie. The authority of the A.V. is, at any rate, in favor of the practice of not suppressing facts. In Mat 1:11; Mat 26:26; Luk 17:36; Joh 8:6; Act 13:18; Eph 6:9; Heb 2:4; Jam 2:18; 1Jn 2:23; 1Pe 2:21; 2Pe 2:11; 2Pe 2:18; 2Jn 1:8, different readings are given in the margin, or, as in 1Jn 2:23, indicated by a different type. In earlier versions, as has been mentioned, 1Jn 5:7 was printed in smaller letters. The degree to which this should be done will, of course, require discernment. An apparatus like that in Tischendorf or Alford would obviously be out of place. Probably the useful Greek Testament edited by Mr. Scrivener might serve as an example of a middle course.

3. Still less had been done at the commencement of the 17th century for the text of the O.T. The Jewish teachers, from whom Protestant divines derived their knowledge, had given currency to the belief that in the Masoretic text were contained the ipsissima verba of revelation, free from all risks of error, from all casualties of transcription. The conventional phrases, "the authentic Hebrew," "the Hebrew verity," were the expression of this undiscerning reverence. They refused to apply the same rules ofjudgment here which they applied to the text of the N.T. They assumed that the Masorites were infallible, and were reluctant to acknowledge that there had been any variations since. Even Walton did not escape being attacked as unsound by the great Puritan divine, Dr. John Owen, for having called attention to the fact of discrepancies (Proleg. chapter 6). The materials for a revised text are, of course, scantier than with the N.T.; but the labors of Kennicott, De Rossi, J.H. Michaelis, and Davidson have not been fruitless, afil here, as there, the older versions must be admitted as at least evidence of variations which once existed, but which were suppressed by the rigorous uniformity of the later rabbis. Conjectural emendations, such as Newcome, Lowth, and Ewald have so freely suggested, ought to be ventured on in such places only as are quite unintelligible without them. SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

4. All scholars worthy of the name are now agreed that as little change as possible should be made in the language of the A.V. Happily there is little risk of an emasculated elegance such as might have infected a new version in the last century. The very fact of the admiration felt for the A.V., and the general revival of a taste for the literature of the Elizabethan period, are safeguards against any like tampering now. Some words, however, absolutely need change, as be. ing altogether obsolete; others, more numerous, have been slowly passing into a different, often into a lower or a  narrower meaning, and are therefore no longer what they once were, adequate renderings of the original.

5. The self-imposed law of fairness, which led the A.V. translators to admit as many English words as possible to the honor of representing one in the Hebrew or Greek text, has, as might be expected, marred the perfection of their work. Sometimes the effect is simply the loss of the solemn emphasis of the repetition of the same word; sometimes it is more serious, and affects the meaning. While it would be simple pedantry to lay down unconditionally that but one and the same word should be used throughout for one in the original, there can be no doubt that such a limitation is the true principle to start with, and that instances to the contrary should be dealt with as exceptional necessities. Side by side with this fault there is another just the opposite of it. One English word appears for several Greek or Hebrew words, and thus shades of meaning, often of importance to the right understanding of a passage, are lost sight of. Taken together, the two forms of error, which meet us in Wvellnigh every chapter, make the use of an English Concordance absolutely misleading. Technical terms especially should be represented in as exact and uniform a manner as possible.

6. Grammatical inaccuracy must be noted as a defect pervading, more or less, the whole extent of the' present version of the N.T. Instances will be found in abundance in Trench and Scholefield (passinm), and in any of the better Commentaries. Such Gallicisms as "I am come," "Babylon is fallen," etc., to say nothing of outright French words, e.g. "bruit" for noise (Nah 3:19), have often escaped detection. The true force of tenses, cases, prepositions, articles, is continually lost, sometimes at the cost of the finer' shades which give vividness and emphasis, but sometimes also entailing more serious errors. In justice to the translators of the N.T., it must be said that, situated as they were, such errors were almost inevitable. They learned Greek through the medium of Latin. Lexicons and grammars were alike in the universal language of scholars; and that language was poorer and less inflected than the Greek, and failed utterly to represent, e.g., the force of its article, or the difference of its aorist and perfect tenses. Such books of this nature as were used by the translators were necessarily based upon a far scantier induction, and were therefore more meager and inaccurate than those which have been the fruits of the labors of later scholars. Recent scholarship may in many things fall short of that of an earlier time, but the introduction of Greek lexicons and grammars in English has been beyond all doubt a change for the better.

7. The field of the O.T. has been far less adequately worked than that of the N.T., and Hebrew scholarship has made far less progress than Greek. Relatively, indeed, there seems good ground for believing that Hebrew was more studied in the early part of the 17th century than it is not. It was newer and more popular. The reverence which men felt for the perfection of the "Hebrew verity" made them willing to labor to learn a language which they looked upon as half-divine. But here, also, there was the same source of error. The early Hebrew lexicons represented partly, it is true, a Jewish tradition, but partly also were based upon the Vulgate (bishop Marsh, Lectures, 2, App. 61). The forms of cognate Shemitic languages had not been applied as a means for ascertaining the precise value of Hebrew words. The grammars, also in Latin, were defective. Little as Hebrew professors have, for the most part, done in the way of exegesis, any good commentary on the O.T. will show that here also there are errors as serious as in the N.T. In one memorable case, the inattention, real or apparent, of the translators to the force of the Hiphil form of the verb (Lev 4:12) has led to a serious attack on the truthfulness of the whole narrative of the Pentateuch (Colenso, Pentateuch critically Examined, part 1, chapter 7).

8. The poetical character of many portions of the O.T. is wholly obscured by the arrangement of the A.V., and, indeed, its authors and editors seem to have ignored the poetical element altogether. This is a defect of very great importance, and should be remedied by a proper distribution of the clauses according to the Heb, laws of parallelism (q.v.), as well as by a more careful observance of that system of transposition of the terms of each hemistich that is characteristic of all poetry.

9. The division into chapters and verses is a matter that ought not to be passed over in any future revision. The former, it must be remembered, does not go further back than the 13th century. The latter, though answering, as far as the O.T. is concerned, to a long-standing Jewish arrangement, depends, in the N.T., upon the work of Robert Stephens. Neither in the O.T. nor in the N.T. did the verse-division appear in any earlier edition than that of Geneva. The inconveniences of changing both are probably too great to be risked. The habit of referring to chapter and verse is too deeply rooted to be got rid of. Yet the division, as it is, is not seldom artificial, and sometimes is absolutely misleading. No one would think of printing any other book, in prose or poetry, in short clauses like the verses of our Bibles, and the tendency of such a division is to give a  broken and discontinuous knowledge, to make men good textuaries but bad divines: An arrangement like that of the paragraph Bibles of our own time, with the verse and chapter divisions relegated to the margin, ought to form part of any authoritative revision.

10. Other points of detail remain to be noticed briefly:

(1.) The chapter-headings of the A.V. often go beyond their proper province. If it is intended to give an autnoritative commentary to the lay reader, let it be done thoroughly. But if that attempt is abandoned, as it was deliberately in 1611, then for the chapter. headings to enter, as they do, upon the work of interpretation, giving, as in Canticles, Psalms, and Prophets, passim, mystical meanings, is simply an inconsistency. What should be a mere table of contents becomes a gloss upon the text.

(2.) The use of italics in printing the A.V., if of advantage in point of minute criticism, is at least open to some risks. At first they seem an honest confession on the part of the translators of what is or is not in the original. On the other hand, they tempt to a loose translation. Few writers would think it necessary to use them in translating other books. If the words do not do more than represent the sense of the original, then there is no reason for treating them as if they were added at the discretion of the translators. If they go beyond that, they are of the nature of a gloss, altering the force of the original, and have no right to be there at all, while the fact that they appear as additions frees the translator from the sense of responsibility.

(3.) Good as the principle of marginal references is, the margins of the A.V., as now printed, are somewhat inconveniently crowded, and the references, being often merely verbal, term to defeat their own purpose, and to make the reader weary of referring. They need, accordingly, a careful sifting; and though it would not be desirable to go back to the scanty number of the original edition of 1611, something intermediate between that and the present overabundance would be an improvement.

(4.) Marginal readings, on the other hand, indicating variations in the text, or differences in the judgment of translators, might be profitably increased in number. The results of the labors of scholars would thus be  placed within the reach of all intelligent readers, and so many difficulties and stumbling-blocks might be removed.

In all these points there has been, to a much larger extent than is commonly known, a work of unauthorized revision. Neither italics, nor references, nor readings, nor chapter-headings, nor, it may be added, punctuation, are the same now as they were in the A.V. of 1611. The chief alterations appear to have been made first in 1683, and.afterwards in 1769, by Dr. Blayney, under the sanction of the Oxford delegates of the press (Gentleman's Magazine, November 1789). A like work was done about the same time by Dr. Paris at Cambridge. There had, however, been some changes previously. The edition of 1638, in particular, shows considerable augmentations in the italics (Turton, Text of the English Bible, 1833, page 91, 126). To Blayney also we owe most of the notes on weights and measures, and coins, and the explanation, where the text seems to require it, of Hebrew proper names. The whole question of the use of italics is discussed elaborately by Turton in the work just mentioned. The late issues of the American Bible Union (q.v.) have, too uniformly perhaps, rejected this mode of distinction; discarding it on the ground that, if the italicized words are not necessary to the sense, they have no business there; if necessary, then the reader is misled by marking them as though they were not.

11. What has been said will serve to show at once to what extent a new revision is required, and what are the chief difficulties to be encountered. The work, it is believed, ought not to be delayed much longer. Names of men competent to undertake the work, as far as the N.T. is concerned, will occur to every one; and if such alterations only were to be introduced as commanded the assent of at least two thirds of a chosen body of twenty or thirty scholars, while a place in the margin was given to such renderings only as were adopted by at least one third, there would be, it is believed, at once a great change for the better, and without any shock to the feelings or even the prejudices of the great mass of readers. Men fit to undertake the work of revising the translation of the O.T. are confessedly fewer, and, for the most part, occupied in other things. The knowledge and the power, however, are there, though in less measure; and, even though the will be for the tine absent, a summons to enter on the task fron those whose authority they are bound to respect, would, we cannot doubt, be listened to. It might have tie result of directing to their proper task, and to a fruitful issue, energies which are too often withdrawn to ephemeral and  unprofitable controversies. As the revised Bible would be for the use of English-speaking people, the men appointed for the purpose ought not to be taken exclusively from any one Church, and the learning of all denominations should at least be fairly represented. The changes recommended by such a body of men, under conditions such as those suggested, might safely be allowed to circulate experimentally for two or three years. "When they had stood that trial, they might, without risk, be printed in the new Authorized Version. Such a work would unite reverence for the past with duty towards the future. In undertaking it we should be not slighting the translators on whose labors we have entered, but following in their footsteps. It is the wisdom of the Church to bring out of its treasures things new and old.

XIV. Literature. — In addition to the works cited above, see especially Johnson's Account of the several English Trans. of the Bible (Lond. 1730, 8vo; reprinted in Bp. Watson's Theolog. Tracts); Bp. Marsh's Hist. of the Translations which have been made of the Scriptures, fromn the earliest to the present Age (Lond. 1812, 8vo); Lewis' History of the principal Translations of the Bible (3d ed. London, 1818, 8vo); Newcome's Historical View of the English Biblical Translations (Dublin, 1792, 8vo); Cotton's List of Editions of the Bible (2d ed. Oxford, 1852, 8vo): Walter's Letter on the Independence of the Authorized Version of the Bible (Lond. 1823, 8vo); Todd's Vindication of our Authorized Translation, etc. (Lond. 1819, 8vo); and especially Anderson's Annas of the English Bible (Lond. 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo; in part reprinted, N.Y. 1856, 8vo); also Beard, Revised English Bible the Want of the Church (new ed. Lond. 1860, 8vo); Mrs. Conant, History of the English Bible (N.Y. 1856; Lond. 1859, 8vo); Bp. Hinds, Scripture and the Authorized Version (Lond. 1853, 12mo); Malan, Vindication of the Authorized Versions of the Bible (London, 1856, 8vo); Anon. Renderings of the principal English Translations of the Bible (Lond. 1849, 4to); Scholefield, Hints for an improved Translation of the New Testament (London, 1857, 12mo); Dewes, Plea for translating the Scriptures (Lond. 1866, 8vo); comp. Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1858; Ch. of Eng. Quarterly, October 1856; Christian Review, April, 1857; Jour. of Sac. Lit. July 1857. July, 1858; South. Presb. Review, January 1858; Br. For. Evangelical Rev. July 1857, January 1858, April 1858, October 1859, July 1863; Prot. Episc. Quart. Rev. January 1859; North Am. Rev. January 1859; New Englander, Februry 1859, May 1859; United Presb. Quart. Rev. January 1860; Freewill Bapt. Quart. Rev. July 1863; Meth. Quart.  Review, July 1864; Jour. Sac. Lit. April 1867. SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

## Engratia (Encratis, or Eugracia)[[@Headword:Engratia (Encratis, or Eugracia)]]

             a Spanish saint, lived at Saragossa in 304. She was persecuted as a Christian under the emperors Diocletian and Maximin Hercules, and suffered, as reported by Prudentius, most fearful tortures. Nevertheless Engratia "recovered with the time," and in spite of her wounds died at an advanced age. Her relics are preserved at Saragossa, and she is commemorated April 16. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Engrave[[@Headword:Engrave]]

             (פָּתִח, pathach', to open, hence [in Piel] to carve or grave, whether on wood, gems, or stone; thrice חָרָשׁ, charash', Exo 28:11; Exo 35:35; Exo 38:23, elsewhere artificer in general; έντυπόω, 2Co 3:7). The latter term, חָרָשׁ, so translated in the A.V., applies broadly to any artficer, whether in wood, stone, or metal: to restrict it to the engraver in Exo 35:35; Exo 38:23, is improper: a similar latitude must be given to the other term פַּתֵּחִ, which expresses the operation of the artificer; in Zec 3:9, ordinary stone-cutting is evidently intended. The specific description of an engraver was חָרִשׁ אֶבֶן (Exo 28:11), lit. a stone- graver, and his chief business was cutting names or devices on rings and seals; the only notices of engraving are in connection with the high-priest's dress, — the two onyx-stones, the twelve jewels, and the mitre-plate having inscriptions on them (Exo 28:11; Exo 28:21; Exo 28:36). The previous notices of signets (Gen 38:18; Gen 41:42) imply engraving. The art was widely spread throfighout the nations of antiquity (For. Quar. Rev. 26:32, 27:40), particularly among the Egyptians (Diod. 1:78; Wilkinson, 3:373), the Ethiopians (Her. 7:69), and the Indians (Von Bohlen, Indien, 2:122). SEE GRAVING.

## Engstfeld, Peter Friedrich[[@Headword:Engstfeld, Peter Friedrich]]

             a German hymn writer, was born June 6, 1793, at Heiligenhaus, near Elberfeld, and died October 4, 1848, His hymns are published in Zeugnisse aus dme verborgenen Leben (Essen, 1840; 2d ed. 1846). See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:296 sq. (B.P.)

## Enimia (or Emmia), Saint[[@Headword:Enimia (or Emmia), Saint]]

             a Frankish princess, lived in 631. She was, according to some hagiographers, the sister or daughter of king Dagobert I. She retired about 631 into the mountains of Gevaudan, near the source of the Tarn, and constructed there a double monastery for both sexes. After having been consecrated by St. Llare, bishop of Javoux (now Mende), Enimia took the  title of an abbess, and died in the government of her communities. She is commemorated October 6. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Enjedin, Georg[[@Headword:Enjedin, Georg]]

             a Transylvanian Socinian, who was born about 1550, and died November 28, 1597, superintendent of the Socinian congregations in Transylvania, is the author of, Explicatio Locorum Scripturae Vet. et Novi Test. ex quibuis Trinitatis Dogma Stabiliri Solet: — Explicatio Locorum Catechesis Raccoviensis. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Enlightenment[[@Headword:Enlightenment]]

             SEE ILLUMINATI.

## Enmity[[@Headword:Enmity]]

             "opposition; very bitter, deep-rooted, irreconcilable hatred and variance. Such a constant enmity there is between the followers of Christ and Satan; nay, there is some such enmity between mankind and some serpents (Gen 3:15). Friendship with this world, in its wicked members and lusts, is enmity with God — is opposed to the love of him, and amounts to an actual exerting of ourselves to dishonor and abuse him (Jam 4:4; 1Jn 2:15-16). The carnal mind, or minding of fleshly and sinful things, is enmnity against God — is opposed to his nature and will in the highest degree, and, though it may be removed, cannot be reconciled to him, nor he to it (Rom 8:7-8). The ceremonial law is called enmity: it marked God's enmity against sin by demanding atonement for it; it occasioned men's enmity against God by its burdensome services, and was an accidental source of standing variance between Jews and Gentiles: or perhaps the enmity here meant is the state of variance between God and men, whereby he justly loathed and hated them as sinful, and condemned them to punishment; and they wickedly hated him for his holy excellence, retributive justice, and sovereign goodness: both are slain and abolished by the death of Christ (Eph 2:15-16)."

## Enna (Lat. Endeus)[[@Headword:Enna (Lat. Endeus)]]

             is the name of several Irish saints, the most noted of whom was the son of Conall Derg, chief of the Oriels, whom he succeeded on thethrone, and became a famous warrior. Being suddenly converted to Christianity, he renounced the throne, and after studying in the monastery of Mansenus, in Britain, thence went to Rome, and, returning to his native land, became abbot of Aran, in Killeany bay, where he probably died, cir. A.D. 542. He is commemorated March 21.

## Ennathas, Saint[[@Headword:Ennathas, Saint]]

             a virgin, martyred in Palestine under Diocletian, by being scourged through the streets of Caesarea, and then burned. She is commemorated November 13.

## Ennemond, Saint[[@Headword:Ennemond, Saint]]

             SEE ANNEMONDUS.

## Ennodius Magnus Felix[[@Headword:Ennodius Magnus Felix]]

             one of the Latin fathers, was born about A.D. 473, at Arles (according to others at Milan), of a noble Gallic family, having such names as Faustus and Boethius on its registers. His parents dying early, he was sent, on the invasion of the Visigoths, to an aunt in Milan, who took good care of his education. Soon after her death (A.D. 489) he married a rich wife, and lived very freely until a severe illness brought him to reflection; and on his restoration he was ordained deacon, and his wife became a nun. (One account says that he had been ordained deacon before, and lived a bad life as deacon.) In 494 he accompanied Epiphanius of Pavia on a mission to Burgundy to ransom some Italian prisoners. In 496 he went to Rome,  where he soon gained great reputation. In 502 he wrote in vindication of pope Symmachus against his rival, pope Laurentius. In this defense he first asserted that the bishop of Rome is subject to no earthly tribunal (Gieseler, 1, § 115); He was the first to give to the bishop of Rome exclusively the name of "Papa" (pope), and was, in general, very eager to enlarge the papal authority. After he had been chosen, about A.D. 511, to succeed Maximus as bishop of Pavia (Ticinum), he went, under direction of pope Hormisdas, on two missions (515 and 517) to the emperor Anastasius with reference to the union between the Eastern and Western churches. Both missions failed. Ennodius died at Pavia July 17, 521. Among his writings are, Epistolarum ad Diversos lib. ix: — Libellus adv. eos, qui contra Synodum scribere praesumserunt, containing the defense of Symmachus named above: — Vita Epiphanii Episcopi: — Vita Antonii Monachi Lirinensis: — Eucharisticon de vita sua, an autobiography: —Paraenesis didascalica ad Ambrosium et Beatum: — Orationes: —Carmina. His writings were published in Basle, 1569, fol.; Tournay, 1610; and by Sirmond (best ed.), Paris, 1611. They are also in Migne, Patrol. Lat. vol. 63:Ennodius wrote strongly in favor of free will, and has been therefore styled a Semipelagian. — Cave, Hist. Lit. (Geneva, 1720), 1:322; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacres (Paris, 1861), 10:473 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:68; Wetzer Welte, Kirch. Lex. 3:595.

## Enoch[[@Headword:Enoch]]

             (Hebrews Chanok', חֲנוֹךְ, initiated; according to Philo, De poet. Caini, § 11, from חֵן, with the suffix ךָ= חִנֵּךְ[ἑρμηνευεται Ε᾿νὼχ χάρις σου], i.e., thy favor; Sept. and N.T. Ε᾿νώχ, Josephus ῎Ανωχος, Vulg. Henoch), the name of several men.

1. The eldest son of Cain (Gen 4:17), who called the city which he built after his name (Gen 4:18). B.C. post 4041. It is there described as being east of Eden, in the land of Nod, to which Cain retired after the murder of his brother. SEE NOD. Ewald (Gesch. 1:356, note) fancies that there is a reference to the Phrygian Iconium, in which city a legend of "Αννακος was preserved, evidently derived from the biblical ac count of the father of Methuselah (Steph. Byz. s.v. Ι᾿κόνιον; Suid. s.v. Νάννακος). Other places have been identified with the site of Enoch with little probability; e.g. Anuchta (Ptolemy, 6:3, 5) in Susiana, the Heniochi (Ptolemy, 5:9, 25; Strabo, 11:492; Pliny, 6:10, 12) in the Caucasus, etc. (Huetius, De Paradiso, c. 17; Hasse, Entdeckung, 2:35; Gotter, De  Henochia urbe, Jen. 1705 [of little value]; Sticht, De urbe Hanochia, Jen. 1727).

2. Another antediluvian patriarch, the son of Jared and father of Methuselah (Gen 5:21 sq.; Luk 3:28 : in 1Ch 1:3, the name is Anglicized "Henoch"). — B.C. 3550-3185. He was born when Jared, was 162 years old, and after the birth of his eldest son in his 65th year he lived 300 years. From the period of 365 years assigned to his life, Ewald (Isrl. desch. 1:356), with very little probability, regards him as "the god of the new year," but the number may have been not without influence on the later traditions which assigned to Enoch the discovery of the science of astronomy (ἀστρολογία, Eupolemus ap. Euseb. Praep. Ev. 9:17, where he is identified with Atlas). After the birth of Methuselah it is said (Gen 5:22-24) that Enoch "walked with God 300 years ... and he was not; for God took him" (לָקִח). The phrase "walked with God" (הַתְהִלֵּךְ אֶתאּה אֵֹלהַים) is elsewhere only used of Noah (Gen 6:9; comp. Gen 17:1, etc.), and is to be explained of a prophetic life spent in immediate converse with the spiritual world (Book of Enoch, 12:2, "All his action was with the holy ones, and with the watchers during his life"). There is no farther mention of Enoch in the O.T., but in Ecclesiasticus (49:14) he is brought forward as one of the peculiar glories (οὐδὲ ε‹ς ἐκτίσθη ο‹ος Ε᾿.) of the Jews, for he was taken up (ἀνελήφθη, Alex. μετετέθη) from the earth. "He pleased the Lord and was translated [Vulg. into Paradise], being a pattern of repentance" (Sir 44:14). In the Epistle to the Hebrews the spring and issue of Enoch's life are clearly marked. "By faith Enoch was translated (μετετέθη), that he should not see death . . for before his translation (μετάθεσις) he had this testimony, that he pleased God." The contrast to this divine judgment is found in: the constrained words of Josephus: " Enoch departed to the Deity (ἀνεχώρησε πρὸς τὸ θεῖον), whence [the sacred writers] have not recorded his death" (Ant. 1:3, 4). In the Epistle of Jude, Jud 1:14; (comp. Enoch 60:8) he is described as " the seventh from Adam;" and the number is probably noticed as conveying the idea of divine completion and rest (comp. August. c. Faust. 12:14), while Enoch was himself a type of perfected humanity, "a man raised to heaven by pleasing God, while angels fell to earth by transgression" (Ireneus, 4:16, 2). Elijah was in like manner translated; and thus was the doctrine of immortalitypalpably taught under the ancient dispensation.

The biblical notices of Enoch were a fruitful source of speculation in later times. Some theologians disputed with subtilty as to the place to which he was removed, whether it was to Paradise or to the iimmedLate presence of God (comp. Feuardentius, ad Iren. 5:5), though others more wisely declined to discuss the question (Thilo, Cod. Apocr. N.T. page 758). On other points there was greater unanimity. Both the Latin and Greek fathers commonly couple Enoch and Elijah as historic witnesses of the possibility of a resurrection of the body and of a true human existence in glory (Iren. 4:5, 1; Tertull. de Resurr. Carn. page 58; Jerome, c. Joan. Hierosol. § 29, 32, pages 437, 440); and the voice of early ecclesiastical tradition is almost unanimous in regarding them as "the two witnesses" (Rev 11:3 sq.) who should fall before "the beast," and afterwards be raised to heaven before the great judgment (Hippol. Fragm. in Daniel 22; de Antichr. 43, Cosmas Indic. page 75, ap. Thilo, κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν; Tertull. de Anima, page 59; Amzbros. in Psa 45:4; Evang. Nicod. c. 25, on which 'Thilo has almost exhausted the question, Cod. Apoc. N.T. page 765 sq.). This belief removed a serious difficulty which was supposed to attach to their translation, for thus it was made clear that they would at last discharge the common debt of a sinful humanity, from which they were not exempted by their glorious removal from the earth (Tertull de Anima, 1.c.; August. Op. imp. c. Jul. 6:30). In later times Enoch was celebrated as the inventor of writing, arithmetic, and astronomy (Euseb. Prcp. Ev. 9:17). He is said to have filled 300 books with the revelations which he received, and is commonly identified with Edris (i.e., the learned), who is commemorated in the Koran (cap. 19) as one "exalted [by God] to a high place" (comp. Sale, ad loc.; Hottinger, Hist. Orient. page 30 sq.). Visions sand prophecies were commonly ascribed to him, which he is said to have arranged in a book. This book was delivered to his son, and preserved by Noah in the ark. After the Flood it was made known to the world, and handed down from one generation to another (see Yuchasin, f. 134; Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 7:32; Cedren. Hist. page 9; Barhebr. Chron. page 5). But these traditions were probably due to the apocryphal book “which bears his name (comp. Fabric. Cod. Pseudep. V.T. 1:215 sq.). See below. Some (Buttm. Mythol. 1:176 sq.; Ewald, 1.c.) have found a trace of the history of Enoch in the Phrygian legend of Annacus (῎Αννακος, Νάννακος), who was distinguished for his piety, lived 300 years, and predicted the deluge of Deucalion. See Heber, De pietate et fatis Enochi (Bamb. 1789); Bredenkamp, in Paulus, Memor. 2:152; Danz, in Meuschen's N.T. Talm. Page 722; Schmieder, Comment. in  Gal 3:19 (Nurnbn, 1826), page 23; Buddei Hist. Ecclesiastes V.T. 1:162; Drusius, De Henoch, in the Crit. Sacri. 1, 2; Pfeiffer, Decas select. exerc. page 12; D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Or. 1:624; Robertson, The Prophet Enoch (Lond. 1860); Pfaff, De raptu Henochi (Tub. 1739); Hall, Works, 11:185; Alexander, Hist. Ecclesiastes 1:142; Calmet, Commentary, 8:10, 27; Hunter, Sacred Biog. page 24 sq.; Robinson, Script. Char. 1; Rudge, Lect. on Genesis 1:72; Evans, Script. Biog. 3:1; Kitto, Bible Illust. 1:123; Bell, Enoch's Walk (Lond. 1658); Heidegger, Hist. Patriarcharum, i; Saurin, Disc. 1:65; Boston, Sermons, 1:230; Doddridge, Works, 3:329; Slade, Sermons, 2:447; Williams, Sermons, 2:367.

3. The third son of Midian, and grandson of Abraham by Keturah (Gen 25:4, A.V. "Hanoch;" 1Ch 1:33, "Henoch"). B.C. post 1988.

4. The eldest son of Reuben (A.V. "Hanoch," Gen 46:9; Exo 6:14; 1Ch 5:3), from whom came "the family of the Hanochites" (Num 26:5). B.C. 1873.

5. In 2Es 6:49; 2Es 6:51, "Enoch" stands in the Lat. (and Eng.) version for one of the two famous amphibious monsters, doubtless correctly Behemoth in the Ethiopic.

## Enoch (2)[[@Headword:Enoch (2)]]

             the translated patriarch, is commemorated in some calendars of saints on January 22 or July 19.

## Enoch, Book Of[[@Headword:Enoch, Book Of]]

             one of the most important remains of early apocalyptic literature. The interest that once attached to it has now partly subsided; yet a document quoted, as is generally believed, by an inspired apostle (Jud 1:14-15), can never be wholly devoid of importance or utility in sacred literature. From its vigorous style and wide range of speculation, the book is well worthy of the attention which it' received in the first ages, and recent investigations have still left many points for further inquiry.

I. History of the Book. — The first trace of its existence is generally found in the epistle of Jud 1:14-15; (comp. Enoch, 1:9), but the words of the apostle leave it uncertain whether he derived his quotation from tradition (Hoffmann, Schriftbeweis, 1:420) or from writing (ἐπροφήτευσεν ... . Ε᾿νὼχ λέγων), though the wide spread of the book in the 2d century seems almost decisive in favor of the latter supposition. In several of the fathers mention is made of Enoch as the author, not only of a  prophetic writing, but of various productions. Some such work appears to have been known to Justin (Apol. 2:5), Irenaeus (adv. Haer. 4:16, 2), and Anatolius (Eusel. H.E. 7:32). Clement of Alexandria (Eclog. page 801) and Origen (yet comp. c, Cels. 5, page 267, ed. Spenc.) both make. use of it, and nu. merous references occulr to the "writing," books, and "words" of Enoch in the Testament of the XII Patriarchs (q.v.) — a document which Nitzsch has shown to belong to the latter part of the 1st century or the beginning of the second, and which presents more or less resemblance to passages in the present book (Fabricii Cod. Pseudep. V.T. 1:161 sq.; Gfrorer, Proph. Pseudep. 273 sq.). Tertullian (De cultu faem. 1:3; compare De Idol. 4) expressly quotes the book as one which was "not received by some, nor admitted into the Jewish canon" (in armarium Judaicum), but defends it on account of its reference to Christ ("legimus omnem scripturam sedificationi habilem divinitus inspirari"). Augustine (De Civ. 15:23, 4) and an anonymous writer, whose work is printed with Jerome's (Brev. in Psa 132:2; compare Hil. ad Psa 1:1-6.c.), were both acquainted with it; but from their time till the revival of letters it was known in the Western Church only by the quotation in Jude (Dillmann, Einl. 46). In the Eastern Church it was known some centuries later. In the 8th century, Georgius Syncellus, in a work entitled Chronographia, that reaches from Adam to Diocletian, made various extracts from "the first book of Enoch." In the 9th century, Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, at the conclusion of his Chronographice Compendium, in his list of canonical and uncanonical books, refers to the book of Enoch, and assigns 4800 στίχοι as the extent of it. After this time little or no mention appears to have been made of the production until Scaliger printed the fragments of Syncellus regarding it, which he inserted in his notes to the Chronicus Canon of Eusebius. In consequence of such extracts, the book of Enoch excited much attention and awakened great curiosity. At the beginning of the 17th century an idea prevailed that it existed in an Ethiopic translation. A Capuchin monk from Egypt assured Peiresc that he had seen the book in Ethiopic, a circumstance which excited the ardor of the scholar of Pisa so much that he never rested until he obtained the tract. But when Job Ludolph went afterwards to Paris to the Royal Library, he found it to be a fabulous and silly production. In consequence of this disappointment, the idea of recovering it in Ethiopic was abandoned. At length, in 1773, Bruce brought home three copies of the book of Enoch from Abyssinia in MSS., containing the Ethiopic translation complete. "Amongst the articles," he states, "I consigned to the library at Paris was a  very beautiful and magnificent copy of the prophecies of Enoch in large quarto. Another is amongst the books of Scripture which I brought home, standing immediately before the book of Job, which is its proper place in the Abyssinian Canon; and a third copy I have presented to the Bodleian Library at Oxford by the hands of Dr. Douglas, bishop of Carlisle." As soon as it was known in England that such a present had been made to the Royal Library at Paris, Dr.Woide, librarian of the British Museum, set out for France with letters from the secretary of state to the ambassador at that court, desiring him to assist the learned bearer in procuring access to the work. Dr. Woide accordingly transcribed it, and brought back with him the copy to England. The Parisian MS. was first publicly noticed by the eminent Orientalist De Sacy in 1800, who translated into Latin chapters 1, 2, 3, 4-15; also 22 and 31. These he also published in the Magasin Encyclopedique (VI, 1:382 sq.). Mr. Murray, editor of Bruce's Travels, gave some account of the book from the traveler's own MS. The Ethiopic text, however, was not published till the edition of archbishop Laurence from the Bodleian MS. in 1838 (Libri Enoch versio Ethiopica ... Oxon.). But in the interval Laurence published an English translation, with an introduction and notes, which passed through three editions (The Book of Enoch, etc., by R. Laurence; Oxford, 1821, 1833, 1838). The translation of Laurence formed the basis of the German edition of Hoffmann (Das Buch Henoch ... A. E. Hoffmann, Jena, 1833-38); and Gfrorer, in 1840, gave a Latin translation constructed from the translations of Laurence and Hoffmann (Prophetae veteres Pseudepigraphi ... ed. A. F. Gfrorer, Stuttgartiae, 1840). According to Angelo Mai, there is a MS. copy of the book of Enoch among the Ethiopic codices of the Vatican, which must have been brought into Europe earlier than Bruce's MSS. In 1834 Dr. Riippell procured another MS. of Enoch from Abyssinia, from which Hoffmann made the second part of his German version. All these editions were superseded by those of Dillmann, who edited the AEthiopic text from five MSS. (Liber Henoch, LEthiopice, Lipsiae, 1851), and afterwards gave a German translation of the book with a good introduction and commentary (Das Buch Henoch ... von Dr. A. Dillmann, Leipzig, 1853). The work of Dillmann gave a fresh impulse to the study of the book. Among the essays which were called out by it, the most important were those of Ewald (Ueber des Ethiopischen Buches Henoch Entstehung, etc., Gottingen, 1856) and Hilgenfeld (D. Juidische Apokalyptik, Jena, 1857). The older literature on the subject is reviewed by Fabricius (Cod. Pseudep. V.T. 1:199 sq.).  The Greek translation, in which it was known to the fathers, appears to be irrecoverably lost. There is no trace of it after the 8th century. The last remnant of it is preserved by Syncellus.

II. Identity of the extant Forms. — There can be no doubt that the Ethiopic translation exhibits the identical book which, as most believe, Jude quoted, and which is also mentioned or cited by many of the fathers. The fragment preserved by Syncellus (reprinted by Laurence and Hoffmann) is obviously the same as chapter 7, etc., the deviations being of little importance (though one considerable passage quoted by George Syncellus is wanting in the present book, Dillm. page 85), and probably accidental. It is manifest, also, to any one who will compare the quotations made by the fathers with the Ethiopic version, that both point to the same original. The extracts in question could not have been interpolations, as they are essential to the connections in which they are found. The mention of books of Enoch in the Testament of Judah, in the Testament of Benjamin, in Origen (c. Cels. and Homil. in Num.), and of the "first book" of Enoch in the fragments preserved by Syncellus, consist with the idea that the whole was then, as now, divided into different books. Tertullian leads us to believe that it was of the same extent in the Greek text then existing as it is in the present Ethiopic.

III. Canonicity. — Notwithstanding the quotation in Jude, and the wide circulation of the book itself, the apocalypse of Enoch was uniformly and distinctly separated from the canonical Scriptures. Tertullian alone maintained its authority, while he admitted that it was not received by the Jews: his arguments, however, are exceedingly puerile (De cultu foeminarum, 1:3). Origen, on the other hand (c. Cels. 5:267, ed. Spenc.), and Augustine (De Civ. 15:23, 4), definitively mark it as apocryphal, and it is reckoned among the apocryphal books in the Apostolic Constitutions (6:16), and in the catalogues of the Synops. S. Scripturce, Nicephorus (Credner, Zur Gesch. d. Kan. page 145), and Montfaucon (Bibl. Coislin. page 193).

IV. Original Language. — The book of Zohar, in which are various allusions to Enoch, seems to speak of it as an important Hebrew production which, have been handed down from generation to generation. The Cabbalists, whose opinions are embodied in Zobar, thought that Enoch was really the author, a sentiment quite at variance with any other hypothesis' than that of a Hebrew original. At all events, a Hebrew book of  Enoch was known and used by Jewish writers till the 13th century (Dillmann, Einl. 47). One of the earliest references to the book occurs in the Hebrew Book of Jubilees (Dillmann, in Ewald's Jahrb. 1850, page 90). The careful reader soon sees that the work was composed at first in Hebrew, or rather Hebrew-Aramaan. This was long ago perceived by Joseph Scaliger, though he had before him nothing but the Greek fragments preserved by Syncellus. Hottinger, however, observed, in opposition to Scaliger, that a Hebraizing style is no sure proof of a Hebrew original. Hoffmann adduces the Hebrew-Aramaean etymology of names, especially the names of angels, as an evidence of the Aramsean original — an argument which is more pertinent; and Laurence infers from the book of Zohar that Hebrew was its primitive language. The writer's thorough acquaintance with the canonical Scriptures of the Jews in the tongue in which they were composed; their use of them in the original, not the Greek translation of the Septuagint; their Hebrew etymologies of names, especially the appellations of angels and archangels; the fact that all words and phrases can easily be rendered back into Hebrew and Aramaean, and the many Hebrew idioms and terms that occur, prove that neither Greek nor Ethiopic was the original language, but the later Palestinian Hebrew. Thus Tamiel (8:7) is compounded of תםand אל, the upright of God; Samyaza of שׁםand עזא, the name of the strong. The same conclusion follows from the term Ophanin (60:13), which is evidently identical with the Hebrew אפנין. It is remarkable; also, that as Ophanin occurs in connection with, the Cherubim, so the Hebrew term אפניןis found in the same association (1Ki 7:30; Eze 1:15-16; Eze 1:19-21; Eze 10:2; Eze 10:6; Eze 10:9; Eze 10:1, etc.; Murray's Enoch Restitutus, page 33 sq.). The names of the sun are Oryares: and Tomas (77:1), from אוֹר חֶרֶסand תִּמָּה. In 77:1, 2, we read that "the first wind is called the eastern, because it is the first," which can only be explained by the Hebrew קֶדֶם, קִדְמוֹנִי; "the second is called the south, because the Most High there descends," i.e., דָּרוֹם, from יָּרִד רָם(Dillmann, Das Buch Henoch, pages 235, 236). The names of the conductors of the month are also Hebrew (82:13), as Murray (page 46) and Hoffmann (page 690) remark. See Joseph hal-Lewi, in the Journal Asiatique, 1867, page 352 sq.

At what time the Greek version was made from the original can only be conjectured. It could not have been long after the final redaction of the whole, probably about the time of Philo. Having appeared in Greek, it soon  became widely circulated. The Ethiopic version was made from the Greek probably about the same time as the Ethiopic translation of the other parts of the Bible with which it was afterwards conrnected, or, in other words, towards the middle or close of the 4th century. SEE ETHIOPIC VERSIONS.

V. Contents. — The book of Enoch is divided in the Ethiopic MSS. into twenty sections, which are subdivided into 108 chapters; but copies differ in their specification of chapters. Dillmann has properly departed from the MSS., and endeavored to make divisions of sections, chapters, and verses which may represent the text pretty nearly as it is preserved among the Abyssinians.

In its present shape the book consists of a series of revelations supposed to have been given to Enoch and Noah, which extend to the most varied aspects of nature and life, and are designed to offer a comprehensive vindication of the action of Providence. SEE ENOCH. It is divided into five parts. The first part (chapters 1-36, Dillm.), after a general introduction (characterizing the book to which it belongs as a revelation of Enoch the seer respecting the future judgment of the world, and its results both towards the righteous and rebellious sinners, written to console the pious in the times of final tribulation), contains an account of the fall of the angels (Gen 6:1), and of the judgment to come upon them and upon the giants, their offspring (6-16); and this is followed by the description of the journey of Enoch through the earth and lower heaven in company with an angel, who showed to him many of the great mysteries of nature, the treasure-houses of the storms, and winds, and fires of heaven, the prison of the fallen, and the land of the blessed (17-26). The second part (37-71) is styled "a vision of wisdom," and consists of three "parables," in which Enoch relates the revelations of the higher secrets of heaven and of the spiritual world which were given to him. The first parable (38-44) gives chiefly a picture of the future blessings and manifestation of the righteous, with further details as to the heavenly bodies; the second (45-57) describes in splendid imagery the coming of Messiah, and the results which it should work among "the elect" and the gainsayers; the third (58-69) draws out at further length the blessedness of "the elect and holy," and the confusion and wretchedness of the sinful rulers of the world. The third part (72-82) is styled "the book of the course of the lights of heaven," and deals with the motions of the sun and moon, and the changes of the seasons; and with this the narrative of the journey of Enoch closes. The fourth part (83-91) is not  distinguished by any special name, but contains the record of a dream which was granted to Enoch in his youth, in which he saw the history of the kingdoms of God and of the world up to the final establishment of the throne of Messiah. The fifth part (92-110) contains the last addresses of Enoch to his children, in which the teaching of the former chapters is made the groundwork of earnest exhortation. 'The signs which attended the birth of Noah are next noticed (111-112); and another short "writing of Enoch" (113) forms the close to the whole book (comp. Dillmann, Einl. 1 sq.; Licke, Versuch einer vollstand. Einl. 1:93 sq.).

VI. Design. — The leading object of the writer, who was manifestly imbued with deep piety, was to comfort and strengthen his contemporaries. He lived in times of distress and persecution, when the enemies of religion oppressed the righteous. The outward circumstances of the godly were such as to excite doubts of the divine equity in their minds, or, at least, to prevent it from having that hold on their faith which was necessary to sustain them in the hour of trial. In accordance with this, the writer exhibits the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. To give greater authority to his affirmations, he puts them into the mouths of Enoch and Noah. Thus they have all the weight belonging to the character of an eminent prophet and saint. Various digressions are not without their bearing on the author's main purpose. The narrative of the fallen angels and their punishment, as also of the flood, exemplifies the retributive justice of Jehovah; while the Jewish history, continued down to a late period, exhibits the final triumph of His people, notwithstanding all their vicissitudes. Doubtless the author lived amid a season of fiery trial. and, looking abroad over the desolation, sought to cheer the sufferers by the consideration that they should be recompensed in the Messianic kingdom. As for their wicked oppressors, they were to experience terrible judgments. The writer occasionally delights in uttering dire anathemas against the wicked. It is plain that the book grew out of the times and circumstances by which he was surrounded. It gives us a glimpse not only of the religious opinions, but also of the general features which characterized the whole period. The book belongs to the apocalyptic literature of the period between the close of the O.T. canon and the advent of Messiah. It is therefore of the same class of composition as the fourth book of Esdras and the Jewish Sibyllines. The principal interest attaching to it arises from its contributing to our knowledge of the development of Jewish Messianic ideas subsequently to the writings of inspired prophets. In tracing the gradual  unfolding and growth of those ideas among the Jewish people, we are the better prepared for the revelation of the N.T.

VII. Doctrines. — In doctrine the Book of Enoch exhibits a great advance of thought within the limits of revelation in each of the great divisions of knowledge. The teaching on nature is a curious attempt to reduce the scattered images of the O.T. to a physical system. The view of society and man, of the temporary triumph and final discomfiture of the oppressors of God's people, carries out into elaborate detail the pregnant images of Daniel. The figure of the Messiah is invested with majestic dignity as "the Son of God" (105:2 only), "whose name was named before the sun was made" (48:3), and who existed "aforetime in the presence of God" (62:6; comp. Laurence, Prel. Diss. 51 sq.). At the same time, his human attributes as "the son of man," "the son of woman" (62:5 only), "the elect one," "the righteous one," "the anointed," are brought into conspicuous notice. The mysteries of the spiritual world, the connection of angels and men, the classes and ministries of the hosts of heaven, the power of Satan (40:7; 65:6), and the legions of darkness, the doctrines of resurrection, retribution, and eternal punishment (22; comp. Dillm. page 19), are dwelt upon with growing earnestness as the horizon of speculation was extended by intercourse with Greece. But the message of the book is emphatically one of "faith and truth" (comp. Dillm. page 32), and while the writer combines and repeats the thoughts of Scripture, he adds no new element to the teaching of the prophets. His errors spring from an undisciplined attempt to explain their words, and from a proud exultation in present success. For the great characteristic by which the book is distinguished from the later apocalypse of Ezra, SEE Ezra , 2D BOOK, is the tone of triumphant expectation by which it is pervaded. It seems to repeat in every form the great principle that the world, natural, moral, and spiritual, is under the immediate government of God. Hence it follows that there is a terrible retribution reserved for sinners, and a glorious kingdom prepared for the righteous, and Messiah is regarded as the divine mediator of this double issue (90, 91). Nor is it without a striking fitness that a patriarch translated from earth, and admitted to look upon the divine majesty, is chosen as "the herald of wisdom, righteousness, and judgment to a people who, even in suffering, saw in their tyrants only the victims of a coming vengeance."

As in the canonical prophecies of the O.T., so here, the final establishment of the Messianic kingdom is preceded by wars and desolations. In the  eighth ofthe ten weeks into which the world's history is divided, the sword executes judgment upon the wicked, at the end of which God's people have built a new temple, in which they are gathered together. The tenth week closes with the eternal judgment upon angels (90, 91).

With respect to the doctrine of a general resurrection, it is certainly implied in the work. But the mode of the resurrection of the wicked and the righteous is differently presented. The spirits of the former are taken out of Shed and thrown into the place of torment (98:3; 103:8; 108:2-5); whereas the spirits of the righteous raised again will be reunited to their bodies, and share the blessedness of Messiah's kingdom on earth (61:5; 91:10; 92:3; 100:5). The reunion of their bodies with their spirits appears a thing reserved for the righteous.

As various sects in Jerusalem were tolerably developed at the time of some of the writers, it has been a subject of inquiry whether the peculiar doctrines of any appear in the work. According to Jellinek (Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenlind Gesellschaft, 7:249), the work originated in the sphere of Essenism. We learn from Josephus that the Essenes preserved as sacred the names of the angels; and put up certain prayers before sunrise, as if they made supplication for that phenomenon (War, 2:8). Now there is a very developed angel-doctrine in the work before us, and we also find the following passage: "When I went out from below and saw the heaven, and the sun rise in the east, and the moon go down in the west, a few stars, and everything as he has known it from the beginning, I praised the Lord of judgment and magnified him, because he has made the sun go forth from the windows of the east," etc., 83:11). This certainly reminds one of Essenism showing its influence on the mind of the writer. The 108th chapter is more plainly Essenic. The pious, whom God rewards with blessings, are described as having lived a life of purity, self-denial, and asceticism like to that of the Essenes. Yet Dillmann appears disinclined to find any reflection of Essenism in 83:11, or elsewhere (Das Buch Henoch, Allgemeine Einleitung, page 53). We admit that the other parts of the bookare free from it. It is obvious that the writer did not belong to the school of the Pharisees. He was tolerably free from the sects of his people; rising above the narrow confines of their distinctive peculiarities, which were not then fully developed.

VIII. Style. — It is obvious that the author was a poet of no mean order. His inspiration was high, his ideas elevated and pure. He had a creative  fancy which could body forth new forms and shapes. Speaking out of the midst of his own time, he could throw himself back into the past, and mould it suitably to his purpose. His language, too, has the living freshaess of a master. He was well acquainted with the book of Daniel, as is obvious from the spirit of his production. Not that he was an imitator of that bookfar from it; his mind was too powerful and independent. It is characteristic of him that he calls Jehovah Lord of Spirits, that he specifies as the seven spiritual beings that stand before God the four highest angels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, Phanuel; and the three highest hosts, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim; that he speaks of the Elect by way of eminence, the Son of Man, i.e., the Messiah. The charm of the writer's descriptions is irresistible, transporting the reader into the highest regions of the spiritual world. With a genuine glow of feeling, and the elevation of purest hope, he carries us away, till we are lost in wonder at the poetic inspiration of one living at a period comparatively so late. His work must have crested a new branch of writing at the time, leading to numerous imitations.

IX. Authorship. — The general unity which the book possesses in its present form marks it, in the main, as the work of one man. The several parts, while they are complete in themselves, are still connected by the development of a common purpose. But internal coincidence shows with equal clearness that different fragments were incorporated by the author into his work, and some additions have been probably made afterwards. Different "books" are mentioned in early times, and variations in style and language are discernible in the present book. To distinguish the original elements and later interpolations is the great problem which still remains to be solved, for the different theories which have been proposed are barely plausible. In each case the critic seems to start with preconceived notions as to what was to be expected at a particular time, and forms his conclusions to suit his prejudices. Hoffmann and Weisse place the composition of the whole work after the Christian aera, because the one thinks that Jude could not have quoted an apocryphal book (Hoffmann, Schriftbeweis, 1:420 sq.), and the other seeks to detach Christianity altogether from a Jewish foundation (Weisse, Evangelienfrage, page 214 sq.). Stuart (Am. Bibl. Repos. 1840) so far anticipated the argument of Weisse as to regard the Christology of the book as a clear sign of its post- Christian origin. Ewald, according to his usual custom, picks out the different elements with a daring confidence, and leaves a result so  complicated that no one can accept it in its details, while it is characterized in its great features by masterly judgment and sagacity. He places the composition of the groundwork of the book at various intervals between B.C. 144 and B.C. cir. 120, and supposes that the whole assumed its present form in the first half of the century before Christ. Licke (2d ed.) distinguishes two great parts, an older part including chapteres 1-36, and 72-105, which he dates from the beginning of the Maccabaean struggle, and a later, chapters 37-71, which he assigns to the period of the rise of Herod the Great (B.C. 141, etc.). He supposes, however, that later interpolations were made without attempting to ascertain their date. Dillmann at first (ut sup.) upheld more decidedly the unity of the book, and assigned the chief part of it to an Aramean writer of the time of John Hyrcanus (B.C. cir. 110). To this, according to him, "historical" and "Noachian additions" were made, probably in the Greek translation (Einl. 52). Latterly, however (in Herzog's Encyklop. 12:309), he has greatly modified this opinion. Kostlin (in Zeller's Jahrb. 1856, page 240 sq., 370 sq.) assigns chapters 1-16, 21-36, 72-05 to about B.C. 110; chapters 37-71 to B.C. cir. 100-64; and the "Noachian additions" and chapter 108 to the time of Herod the Great. Hilgenfeld himself places the original book (chapters 1-16, 20-36, 72-90, 91:1-19; 93:105) about the beginning of the first century before Christ (vt sup. page 145 n.). This book he supposes to have passed through the hands of a Christian writer who lived between the times "of Saturninus and Marcion" (page 181), who added the chief remaining portions, including the great Messianic section, chapters 37, 71. In the face of these conflicting theories it is evidently impossible to dogmatize, and the evidence is insufficient for conclusive reasoning. The interpretation of the Apocalyptic histories (chapters 76, 77, 85-90), on which the chief stress is laid for fixing the date of the book, involves necessarily minute criticism of details, which belongs rather to a commentary than to a general Introduction; but, notwithstanding the arguments of Hilgenfeld and Jost (Gesch. Jud. 2:218 n.), the whole book appears to be distinctly of Jewish origin. Some inconsiderable interpolations may have been made in successive translations, and large fragments of a much earlier date were undoubtedly incorporated into the work, but, as a whole, it may be regarded as describing an important phase of Jewish opinion shortly before the coming of Christ. That the entire production appeared before the Christian aera is clearly deducible from the fact that the Roman empire never appears as a power dangerous to Israel. Volkmar, however,-contends (in the Zeitschr. der morg. Gesellsch. 1860,  page 87 sq.) that it was written by a disciple of Akiba to encourage the Jewish revolt under Bar-Cocheba; a view which is ably controverted by Hilgenfeld (Ib. page 111 sq.).

Stuart has laid considerable stress on the Christology of the book as indicative of an acquaintance on the authors' part with the N.T., especially the Apocalypse. But the Christological portions do not possess sufficient distinctness to imply a knowledge of the N.T. The name JESUS never occurs. Neither are the appellations Lord, Lord Jesus, Jesus Christ, or even Christ employed. The words faith, lelievers, God and his anointed, deny, etc., can hardly be claimed as Christian terms, because they occur in the Ethiopic O.T. as the representatives of Hebrew-Greek ones. All that can be truly deduced from the Christology is that it is highly developed, and very elevated in tone, yet fairly derivable from the O.T. in all its essential and individual features. Nor is there anything in the eschatology or angelology to necessitate a Christian origin. We allow that the Messiah is spoken of in very exalted terms. His dignity, character, and acts surpass the descriptions presented in other Jewish books. But they are alike in the main, colored by the highly poetical imagination of the writers, in conformity with the sublimity and animation of their creations. We must therefore reject Stuart's opinion of a JewishChristian origin. All the arguments adduced on its behalf are easily dissipated, since Dillman's edition and Ewald's criticisms have led to a better acquaintance with the text of the work itself. Nor is Hilgenfeld's attempt to show that the so- called first Enoch book (37-71) proceeded from Christian Gnostics more successful, as Dillmann has remarked (Pseudepigraphen des A.T. in Herzog's EEncyklopaidie, 12:309, 310). Equally futile is Hoffmann's endeavor to show that the work did not appear till after the destruction of Jerusalem in the first century, when both Jude's epistle and the Apocalypse had been written (Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellschaft, 6:87 sq.). Not very dissimilar is Bdttcher's view, that the book, like the Sybilline oracles, was made up in the first and second centuries after Christ of pieces belonging to different times (De Inferis, 1, § 505). Nothing is more certain than that the work belongs to an ante-Christian world; and therefore the only problem is how to distribute the different books incorporated, and when to date them separately and collectively. After Laurence, Hoffmann and Gfrorer had erred in placing the whole under Herod the Great; Krieger and Lucke assigned different portions to different times, putting chaps. ixxxvi and lxxii-cviii to the early years of the Maccabaean struggle, and xxxvii-lxxi to  B.C. 38-34. How far this apportionment is correct will be seen from the preceding statements (see Krieger's Beitrage z. Kritik und Exegese, 1845, and Licke's Versuch einer vollstandigen Einleitung in die Ojfenbarung des Johannes, § 11).

X. The Place where it was written. — The place where the author lived and wrote is Palestine. This alone seems to suit the circumstances implied in the work, which is largely pervaded by the spirit of persons whose power, religion, and independence had been overborne by foreign interference. Laurence, however, endeavors to show from the 72d chapter (71st Laurence), where the length of the days at various periods of the year is given, that the locality must have been between the 45th and 49th degrees of north latitude, in the northern districts of the Caspian and Euxine seas. Hence he conjectures that the writer was one of the Jews who had been carried away by Shalmaneser and did not return. Krieger supposes (Beitrage, page 53) that Enoch, the imaginary writer, drew from the astronomical traditions or writings of northern Asia, regardless of the difference of Palestine's geographical position. Murray has shown (page 63 sq.) that one passage favors the idea that the author lived in Abyssinia; whence he infers that the production proceeded from various persons belonging to countries removed from one another. But De Sacy has remarked that as the authors' astronomical system is partly imaginary, their geography may also be visionary. Neither Egypt, nor Chaldaea, nor Palestine, suits the astronomy of the book. The scientific knowledge of the Israelites was imperfect. It is therefore idle to look for accuracy in geography or astronomy. The writer or writers systematized such knowledge as they had of natural phenomena after their own fashion, as appears from the fact that to every third month thirty-one days are assigned. The allusions to the Oriental theosophy and the opinions of Zoroaster do not necessarily commend a Chaldaean origin, at least of the astronomical part, since the images of fire, radiance, light, and other Oriental symbols may be satisfactorily accounted for by the Jews' intercourse with other nations, and their residence there for a time. The Oriental philosophy of Middle Asia was evidently not unknown to the authors. Zoroastrian doctrines are embodied in the work because Persian influences had been felt by the Israelites since the Babylonian captivity.

XI. Did Jude really quote the Book of Enoch? — A simple comparison of the language of the apostle and that found in the corresponding passage of  the extant book seems to settle this question conclusively in the affirmative, especially as the Scripture citation is prefaced with the direct acknowledgment of quotation: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying," etc. The following are the words respectively:

EPISTLE OF JUDE, verses Jud 1:14-15; Authorized Version.

"Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.”

BOOK OF ENOCH, chapter 2;

Laurence's Version.

“Behold, he comes with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon them, and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal for everything which the sinful and ungodly have done, and committed against him.”

Some, however, are most unwilling to believe that an inspired writer could cite an apocryphal production. Such an opinion destroys, in their view, the character of his writing, and reduces it to the level of an ordinary composition. But this is preposterous. The apostle Paul quotes several of the heathen poets, yet who ever supposed that by such references he sanctions the productions from which his citations are made, or renders them of greater value? All that can be reasonably inferred from such a fact is, that if the inspired writer cites a particular sentiment with approbation, it must be regarded as just and right, irrespective of the remainder of the book in which it is found. The apostle's sanction extends no farther than the passage to which he alludes. Other portions of the original document may exhibit the most absurd and superstitious notions. It has always been the current opinion that Jude quoted the book of Enoch, and there is nothing to disprove it. It is true that there is some variation between the quotation and its original, but this is usual even with the N.T. writers in citing the Old.

Others, as Cave, Simon, Witsius, etc., suppose that Jude quoted a traditional prophecy or saying of Enoch, and we see no improbability in the assumption. Others, again, believe that the words apparently cited by  Jude were suggested to him by the Holy Spirit. But surely this hypothesis is unnecessary. Until it can be shown that the book of Enoch did not exist in the time of Jude, or that his quoting it is unworthy of him, or that such knowledge was not handed down traditionally so as to be within his reach, we abide by the opinion that Jude really quoted the book. While there are probable grounds for believing that he might have become acquainted with the circumstance independently of inspiration, we ought not to have recourse to the hypothesis of immediate suggestion. On the whole, it is most likely that the book of Enoch existed before the time of Jude, and that the latter really quoted it in accordance with the current tradition. Whether the prophecy ascribed to Enoch was truly ascribed to him is a question of no importance in this connection. SEE JUDE.
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## Enoch, City Of[[@Headword:Enoch, City Of]]

             SEE ENOCH, 1.

## Enon[[@Headword:Enon]]

             SEE AENON.

## Enos[[@Headword:Enos]]

             (Hebrews Enosh', אֵֹנושׁ, poet. a man; Sept. and N.T. Ε᾿νώς ; Josephus ῎Ενωσος, Ant. 1:3, 2), the son of Seth, and grandson of Adam (Gen 5:6-11; Luk 3:38). He lived 905 years (B.C. 3937-3032), and is remarkable on account of a singular expression used respecting him in Gen 4:26, "Then began men to call on the name of the Lord." This isnot to be taken absolutely, as it would be absurd to suppose that none called on the name of the Lord before that time, and accordingly there are two interpretations given of the passage: one is the marginal reading of the A.V., "Then began men to call themselves by the name of the Lord," in order, it would seem, to distinguish themselves from those who were already idolators, and were termed children of men; the other, "Then men profanely called on the name of the Lord," intimating that at that period idolatry began to be practiced among men. The latter is the interpretation adopted by the Jewish expositors generally, but the former has more currency among Christian commentators. It may be observed that they both unite in the common idea of the widening difference between the pious and the wicked. In either case the passage may be regarded as implying that divine worship, which till that time had been confined to private families, now became public — that is, religious services were held on fixed days and in public assemblies. In 1Ch 1:1, the name is Anglicized ENOSH.

## Enosh[[@Headword:Enosh]]

             a more correct mode of Anglicizing (1Ch 1:1) the name ENOS SEE ENOS (q.v.).

## Enrolment[[@Headword:Enrolment]]

             or ἀπογραφή (Luk 2:1, "taxing"). SEE CENSUS.

## Ens[[@Headword:Ens]]

             is "either ens reale or ens rationis. Ens rationis is that which has no existence but in the idea which the mind forms of it, as a golden mountain. Ens reale, in philosophical language, is taken late et stricte, and is distinguished as ens potentiale, or that which may exist, and ens actuale, or that which does exist. It is sometimes taken as the concrete of essentia, and signifies what has essence and may exist as a rose in winter; sometimes as the participle of esse, and it then signifies what actually exists. Ens without intellect is res a thing." — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.

## Ens (or Enzo), Giuseppe[[@Headword:Ens (or Enzo), Giuseppe]]

             called the Younger, was a court painter to Ridolfo II, and flourished about. 1660. In his celebrated Tomb of Christ, at Ognissanti, he styled himself Jos. Heinsius. He gained such an immense reputation in his time for his pictures, that pope Urban VIII made him a chevalier of the Order of the  Holy Cross. He painted several altar-pieces for the churches of Venice. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Ens, Jan[[@Headword:Ens, Jan]]

             a Protestant theologian of Holland, was born at Quadyck in West Frisia, May 9, 1682. He studied at Leyden, was in 1720 professor of theology at Utrecht, where he died, January 6, 1723, leaving, Bibliotheca Sacra: — Aanmerkinger over lesaias 11 en 12: — Oratio Inauguralis de Persecutione Juliani. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:332. (B.P.)

## Ensample[[@Headword:Ensample]]

             SEE EXAMPLE.

## Ensign[[@Headword:Ensign]]

             is the renderinn in the Auth. Vers. for two Hebrew words: אוֹת, oth (the flag of a single tribe, Num 2:2), a sign or token, as elsewhere rendered; נֵס, nes (a lofty signal, e.g. a "pole," Num 21:8-9), a ship's standard or flag ("sail," Isa 33:23; Eze 27:7), a beacon or signal on a hill, chiefly on the irruption of an enemy, in order to point out to the people a place of rendezvous. There is a third and more emphatic word relating to the subject, namely, דֶּגֶל, de'gel (from דָּגִל, to cover), which, however, is in. variably rendered "standard" (except Son 2:1-17, "banner"). The distinction between these three Hebrew terms is sufficiently marked by their respective uses: NES is a signal; DEGEL, a military standard for a large division of an army; and OTH, the same for a small one. Neither of them, however, expresses the idea which "standard" conveys to our minds, viz. a flag; the standards in use among the Hebrews  probably resembled those of the Egyptians and Assyrians — a figure or device of some kind elevated on a pole. SEE BANNER.

1. The notices of the nes or "ensign" are most frequent; it consisted of some well-understood signal which was exhibited on the top of a pole from a bare mountain top (Isa 13:2; Isa 18:3) — the very emblem of conspicuous isolation (Isa 30:17). Around it the inhabitants mustered, whether for the purpose of meeting an enemy (Isa 5:26; Isa 18:3; Isa 31:9), which was sometimes notified by the blast of a trumpet (Jer 4:21; Jer 51:27); or as a token of rescue (Psa 60:4; Isa 11:10; Jer 4:6); or for a public proclamation (Jer 1:1-19; Jer 2:1-37); or simply as a gathering point (Isa 49:22; Isa 62:10). What the nature of the signal was we have no means of stating; it has been inferred from Isa 33:23, and Eze 27:7, that it was a flag: we do not observe a flag depicted either in Egyptian or Assyrian representations of vessels (Wilkinson, 3:211; Bonomi, pages 166,167); but, in lieu of a flag, certain devices, such as the phoenix, flowers, etc., were embroidered on the sail, whence it appears that the device itself, and perhaps also the sail bearing the device, was the nes or "ensign." It may have sometimes been the name of a leader, as implied in the title which Moses gave to his altar, "Jehovahnissi" (Exo 17:15). It may also have been, as Michaelis (Suppl. page 1648) suggests, a blazing torch. The important point, however, to be observed is, that the nes was an occasional signal, and not a military standard, and that elevation and conspicuity are implied in the use of the term: hence it is appropriately applied to the "pole" on which the brazen serpent hung (Num 21:8), which was indeed an "ensign" of deliverance to the pious Israelite: and again to the censers of Korah and his company, which became a "sign" or beacon of warning to Israel (Num 16:38). SEE SIGNAL.

2. The term degel is used to describe the standards which were given to each of the four divisions of the Israelitish army at the time of the Exodus (Num 1:52; Num 2:2; Num 10:14 sq.). Some doubt indeed exists as to its meaning in these passages, the Sept. and Vulgate regarding it not as the standard itself, but as a certain military division annexed to a standard, just as a vexilumi is sometimes used for a body of soldiers (Tacitus, Hist. 1:70; Livy, 8:8). The sense of compact and martial array does certainly seem to lurk in the word; for in Son 6:4; Son 6:10, the brilliant glances of the bride's eyes are compared to the destructive advance of a well. arrayed host, and a similar comparison is employed in reference to the bridegroom  (Son 5:10); but, on the other hand, in Son 2:4, no other sense than that of a "banner" will suit, and we therefore think the rendering in the A.V. correct. No reliance can be placed on the term in Psa 20:5, as both the sense and the text are matters of doubt (see Olshausen and Hengstenberg, in loc.). A standard implies, of course, a standard-bearer; but the supposed notice to that officer in Isa 10:18, is incorrect, the words meaning rather "as a sick man pineth away;" in a somewhat parallel passage (Isa 59:19) the marginal version is to be followed rather than the text. The character of the Hebrew military standards is quite a matter of conjecture; they probably resembled the Egyptian, which consisted of a sacred emblem, such as an animal, a boat, or the king's name (Wilkinson, 1:294). Rabbinical writers state the devices to have been as follows: for the tribe of Judah, a lion; for Reuben, a man; for Ephraim, an ox; and for Dan, an eagle (Carpzov, Crit. Ap. page 667); but no reliance can be placed on this. As each of the four divisions, consisting of three tribes, had its standard, so had each tribe its " sign" (oth) or "ensign," probably in imitation of the Egyptians, among whom not only each battalion, but even each company, had its particular ensign (Wilkinson, 1.c.). We know nothing of its nature. The word occurs figuratively in Psa 74:4, apparently in reference to the images of idol gods. SEE STANDARD.

## Entablature[[@Headword:Entablature]]

             (Lat. In, tabula), "the superstructure which lies horizontally upon the columns in classic architecture: it is divided into architrave, the part immediately above the column; frieze, the central sp,; and cornice, the upper projecting mouldings. Each of the orders has its appropriate entablature, of which, both the general height and the subdivisions are regulated by a scale of proportions derived from the diameter of the column."

## Entalma[[@Headword:Entalma]]

             (ἔνταλμα) is the Greek name of the document by which a bishop confers on a monk the privilege of hearing, confessions.

## Entelechy[[@Headword:Entelechy]]

             (ἐντελέχεια, from ἐντελές, perfect; and ἔχειν, to have; in Latin perfectihabia). "In one of the books of the Pythagoreans, viz. Ocellus Lucanus, Περὶ τοῦ πάντος, the word συντέλεια is used in the same sense. Hence it has been thought that this was borrowed from the Pythagoreans" (Monboddo, Ancient Metaphysics, book 1, chapter 3, page 16, note). Cicero (Tuscul. Qucest. lib. 1, quaest. 1) interprets it to mean quandam quasi continuatam motionem et perennem. Melancthon (Opera, 13:12-14, ed. 1846) gives two interpretations of endelechy, as he writes it. He says that ἐνδελεχές signifies continuus, and ἐνδελέχεια continuitas. According to him, Aristotle used it as synonymous with ἐνἑργεια. Hence Cicero translated it by continuous movement or agitation. Argyropolus blames Cicero for this, and explains it as meaning "interior perfection," as if it were τὸ ἐντὸς τελειοῦν. But Melancthon thinks Cicero's explanation in accordance with the philosophy of Aristotle. According to others, ἐνδελέχεια means continuance, and is a totally different word from ἐντελέχεια, which means actuality (Arist. Metaphys. Bohn's Libr. page 68, 301; Donaldson, New Cratylus, pages 339-344). According to Leibnitz, "entelecheia is derived apparently from the Greek word which signifies perfect, and therefore the celebrated Hermolaus Barbarus expressed it in Latin, word for word, by perfecti habia, for act is the accomplishment of power; and he needed not to have consulted the devil, as he did, they say, to tell him this much (Leibnitz, Theodicae, part 1, § 87). You may give the name of entelechies to all simple substances or created monads, for they have in them a certain perfection (ἔχουσι τὸ ἐντελές), they have a sufficiency (αὐτάρχεια) which makes them the source of their internal actions, and, so to say, incorporeal automatons" (Monadologie, § 18).. He calls a nomad an autarchic automaton, or first entelechie, having life and force in itself. "Entelechy is the opposite to potentiality, yet would be ill translated by that which we often oppose to potentiality, actuality. Εϊvδος expresses the substance of each thing viewed in repose — its form or constitution; ἐνέργεια its substance; considered as active and generative; ἐντελέχεια seems to be the synthesis or harmony of  these two ideas. The effectio of Cicero, therefore, represents the most important side of it, but not the whole" (Maurice, Mor. and Metaphys. Philosophy, page 191, note). Ε᾿ντελέχεια ce qui a en soi sa fin, qui par consequent. ne releve que de soi-m-'m, et constitue une units indivisible (Cousin, note to his transl. of Aristotle, in taph. book 12, page 212). " L'Entelechie est opposee a la simple puissance, comme la forme a la matiere, l'etre au possible. C'est elle qui, par la vertu de la fin, constitue l'essence meme des choses, et imprime le mouvement a la matiere aveugle; et c'est en ce sens qu' Aristote, a pu donner de l'ame cette celebre definition, qu'elle est l'entelechie ou forme premiere de tout corps naturel qui possede la vie en puissance" (Diet. des Sciences Philosophiques). Aristotle defines the soul of man to be an entelechy, a definition of which Dr. Reid said he could make no sense. — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.

## Entertainment[[@Headword:Entertainment]]

             (מַשְׁתֶּה, a "feast," comp. ξενιζω, to "entertain" a stranger, Heb 13:2). This took place among the Hebrews sometimes in connection with a public festival (Deu 16:1-22; Tob 2:1) and accompanied by offerings, SEE SACRIFICIAL FESTIVAL, (1Sa 9:13; 1Sa 16:3; 1Ki 1:9; 1Ki 3:15; in token of alliance, Gen 26:30; Gen 31:54); sometimes with a domestic or social occurrence, and, so faras the latter reference is concerned, they were chiefly held at the weaning of children (Gen 21:8; comp. Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 6:243 sq.), at weddings (Gen 29:22; Jdg 14:10; Joh 2:1 sq.), on birthdays (Job 1:4), particularly in royal courts (Gen 40:20 [?Hos 7:5]; Mat 19:6; comp. Herod. 1:133; 9:109; Lucian, Gall. 9; Athen. 4:143; see Dougtaei, Analect. 1:44; 2:33; Laurent, De notalit. convitiisque quae in iisdem agitabantur, in Gronovii Thesaur. 8), on the reception and departure of dear friends or else respected personages (Gen 19:3; 2Sa 3:20; 2Sa 20:4; 2Ki 6:23; Tob 7:9; Tob 8:20 sq.; 1Ma 16:15; 2Ma 2:28; Luk 5:29; Luk 15:23 sq.; Joh 12:2), at sheepshearing (2Sa 13:23; 1Sa 25:2; 1Sa 25:36), and vintage (Jdg 9:27), also at funerals (2Sa 3:35; Jer 16:7; Tob 4:18 [the לֶחֶם אוֹנַיםof Hos 9:4]; comp. Josephus, War, 2:1, 1; Homer, II. 23:29; 24:802; see Harmer, 3:203), and mostly occurred in the evening (Josephus, War, 1:17, 4). The guests were invited by servants (Pro 9:3; Mat 22:3 sq.), in more, honorable instances a  second time (Mat 22:4; comp. Luk 14:7; comp. Eskuche, Erlduter. 2:410 sq.), and these summoners (like the Roman vocatores or invitatores) seem to have had the business of assigning the guests their relative position (Walch, Observ. in Matthew ex inscript. page 62). On their arrival the guests were kissed (Tob. 9:8; Luk 7:45), their feet were washed (Luk 7:44; comp. Homer, II. 10:576 sq.; Odyss. 3:476; 8:454; Petron. Sat. 31; see Dougtaei Anal. 1:52); the hair of their head and beard, even their clothes, oftentimes their feet (Luk 7:38; Joh 12:3; comp. Athen. 12:553), anointed with costly oil (Psa 23:5; Amo 6:6; comp. Homer, II. 10:577; Plutarch, Sympos. 3:6, page 654; Petron. Sat. 65; Lucret. 4:1125; see Walch, De unctionibus vet. Ebrceor. convivialibus, Jen. 1751), and their persons decked with garlands, with which their head was especially adorned (Isa 28:1; Wis 2:7 sq.; comp. Joseph. Ant. 19:9, 1; Athen. 15:685; Plutarch, Sympos. 3:1 page 645; 3:6, page 654; Philostr. Apoll. 2:27; Aristoph. Av. 460; Horace, Od. 2:7, 23; Sat. 2:3, 256; Plautus, Mencechm. 3:1, 16; Lucretius, 4:1125; Juvenal, 5:36; Petron. 65; Ovid, Fast. 5:337); and then, with consideration to the rank (Josephus, Ant. 15:2, 4); comp. Becker, Charicles, 1:427), they were assigned their respective places (1Sa 9:22; Luk 14:8; Mar 12:39; Philo, 2:78; comp. Buckingham, Mesopot. 1:279). All received, as a rule, like portions sent by the master of the house (1Sa 1:4; 2Sa 6:19; 1Ch 16:3; comp. Homer, Odyss. 20:280 sq.; II. 24:626; Plutarch, Sympos. 2:10, pages 642, 644), which, however, when special honor was intended, was doubled, or even increased fivefold (Gen 43:34; comp. Herod. 6:57), or a tidbit sent in place of it (1Sa 9:24; compare Homer, II. 7:321; see Koster, Erlauter. page 197 sq.).

The management of the entertainment was in the hands of the architriclinus (q.v.) (Joh 2:8), generally a friend of the family (comp. Sir 32:1; Sir 32:23; see Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 5:223). The pride of the entertainer exhibited itself partly in the number of the guests (Gen 29:22; 1Sa 9:22; 1Ki 1:9; 1Ki 1:25; Luk 5:29; Luk 14:16), partly in expense of the eating and drinking vessels (Est 1:6 sq.; compare Curtius, 8:12, 16; see Kype, De apparatu conviv. regis Persar. Regiom. 1755), partly and especially in the variety and excellence of the viands (Gen 27:9; Isa 25:6; Amo 6:4; Job 8:21; comp. Psa 23:5; Job 28:16; Niebuhr, Trav. 3:385), as well as their richness (Gen 18:6; 1Sa 9:24; Jdg 6:19). Such banquets also lasted longer than with Occidentals (3Ma 6:28; comp. Est 1:3 sq.; Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 3:294), and in Persia weighty state  interests were discussed and determinations reached at the royal table (Est 1:15; Est 7:1 sq.; Herod. 1:113; Plutarch, Sympos. 7:9; Ammian. Marc. 18:5, page 169, Bip. ed.; Athen. 4:144; comp. Tacit. Germ. 22). The amusement consisted in part of music eand song (Isa 5:12; Amo 6:5; Psa 69:13; Sir 32:7; comp. Homer, Odyss. 17:358; Rosenmiller, Morgenl. 5:200), also the dance (Mat 14:6), in part of jests and riddles (Jdg 14:12 sq.; compare Athen. 10:452, 457). At their departure the guests "were again perfumed, especially on the beard (Maundrell, page 400 sq.). The women feasted on such occasions probably not with the men (Buckingham, 2:404), but in a separate apartment (Est 1:9; see Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 3:296; Bachelor, Chron. page 98; comp. the later meretricious custom, Dan 5:2; Jdt 12:11 sq.; Herod. 5:18); but in plebeian homes the sexes were intermingled (Joh 12:8). The Israelites were forbidden heathenish sacrificial entertainments (Exo 34:15; yet see Num 25:1 sq.), partly because these were in honor of false worship, and partly because they would thus be liable to partake of unclean flesh (1Co 10:28). See Buxtorf, De conviv. Ebr. in Ugolini Thesaurus 30; Geier, De Vet. Ebr. ratione ccenandi, in the Biblioth. Lubec. vi, sq.; Stuck, Antiquit. conviv. (Tigur. 1597); Mercurial. De arte gymnast. page 75 sq. ed. Amst. SEE MEAL- TIME.

An especial sort of entertainment were the κῶμοι, or comissationes (“revellings"), which played so conspicuous a part in the sensual times during which the apostles labored (Rom 13:13; Gal 5:21; 1Pe 4:3). Young men assembled to banquetings on festival occasions, or in the crowd of public associations, became excited with song or music, and traversed the streets inspired with wine, jubilating, and committing many extravagances (comp. Wetstein, 2:85 sq.; Bos, Observ. in N.T. page 117 sq.; Schwarz, De comessatione vet. Altdorf, 1744; Ilgen, De poesi scol. p. 197 sq.; Apulej. ed. Oudenorp. 1:133 sq.). On the luxury and wantonness of entertainments generally in the Roman period, see Philo, 2:477 sq. The rich Jews followed the example of their pagan masters. SEE FEAST.

## Enthronistic Letters[[@Headword:Enthronistic Letters]]

             were letters anciently addressed by newly installed bishops to foreign bishops, announcing their promotion to the episcopal office, and giving an account of their faith and orthodoxy. They received in return letters of peace and Christian fellowship. A failure to send such messages was regarded as an indication of a withdrawal from communion withi the rest of the Christian world.

## Enthronistic Sermon[[@Headword:Enthronistic Sermon]]

             is the sermon preached by a bishop on the occasion of his enthronization (q.v.)

## Enthronization[[@Headword:Enthronization]]

             (1) The solemn placing of a bishop on his throne. SEE BISHOP.

(2) The word is also, used to designate the placing or "enthroning" of relics of the saints in the altar of a church, on consecration. SEE CONSECRATION OFCHURCHES.

(3) The installation of a presbyter is sometimes designated by the same word.

## Enthusiasm[[@Headword:Enthusiasm]]

             (ἐνθουσιασμός from ἔνθεος, inspired; God-possessed; rapt) is used both in a good and a bad sense.

1. In the first, which springs from its derivation, it signifies divine inspiration in general; or, secondarily, any extraordinary mental or moral exaltation. "The raptures of the poet, the deep meditations of the philosopher, the heroism of the warrior, the devotedness of the martyr, and the ardor of the patriot, are so many different phases of enthusiasm." In this sense it "is almost a synonyme of genius; the moral life in the intellectual light, the will in the reason; and without it, says Seneca, nothing truly great was ever achieved" (Coleridge). "There is a temper of mind called enthusiasm, which, though rejecting the authority neither of reason nor of virtue, triumphs over all the vulgar infirmities of men, contemns their ordinary pursuits, braves danger, and despises obloquy, which is the parent of heroic acts and devoted sacrifices, and which devotes ease, pleasure, interest, ambition, and life to the service of one's fellow-men" (Mackintosh, Miscellaneous Works, London 1851, page 731).

2. The bad sense of the word was formerly in much more common use than now. According to it, an enthusiast is one who substitutes his own fancies for reason and truth, especially in matters of religion. "Every enthusiast is properly a madman; yet his is not an ordinary, but a religious madness. The enthusiast is generally talking of religion, of God, or of the things of God, but talking in such a manner that any reasonable Christian may discern the disorder of his mind. Such enthusiasm may be described, in general, as a religious madness arising from some falsely imagined influence or inspiration of God; at least, from imputing something to God which ought not to be imputed to him, or expecting something from God which ought not to be expected from him" (Wesley, Sermon on Enthusiasm, Works, 2:331 sq.). Warburton similarly defines enthusiasm as "that temper of mind in which the imagination has got the better of the judgment" (Div. Leg. book 5, Appendix). James Blair (Sermons, 1740, 4:274) makes religious enthusiasm to consist especially in "' setting up the private spirit to assert anything contrary to Scripture." So Waterland (Works, Oxford, 1843, 4:422) says that “enthusiasm, in the bad sense, is a subtle device of Satan upon ill-meaning or unmeaning instruments, making use of their ambition, self-admiration, or other weakness, to draw them by some plausible suggestions into a vain conceit that they have something within them either of equal authority with Scripture, or superior to it." On the stupid misapplication of the term enthusiasm by worldly men to designate true Christian life, see Wesley's sermon above, and also Taylor, Natural Hist. of Enthusiasm (N.Y. 1834, 4th ed. 12mo).

## Enthusiastae[[@Headword:Enthusiastae]]

             Those who pretended to prophesy by the motion of an indwelling daemon, which they thought to be the Holy Spirit. SEE EUCHITES.

## Entity[[@Headword:Entity]]

             (entitas), "in the scholastic philosophy, was synonymous with essence or form. To all individuals of a species there is something in conmmon — a nature which transiently invests all, but belongs exclusively to none. This essence, taken by itself and viewed apart from any individual, was what the scholastics called an entity. It denoted the common nature of the individuals of a species or genus. It was the idea or model according to which we conceived of them. The question whether there was a reality corresponding to this idea divided philosophers into Nominalists and Realists (q.v.). Entity is also used to denote anything that exists, as an object of sense or of thought. SEE ENS." — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, page 162.

## Entrance[[@Headword:Entrance]]

             Two of the most remarkable ceremonies of the Eastern Liturgies are the Lesser and the Greater Entrance — that of the word and that of the sacrament.

I. The Lesser Entrance is the bearing in of the book of the gospels in solemn procession.

Then the priest and the deacon, standing before the holy table, make three genuflections. Then the priest, taking the holy book of the Gospels, gives it to the deacon; and so, going out by the north side, with lights going befre. them, they make the lesser entrance." That is, the deacon and priest pass from the sanctuary into the chapel of the prothesis, which is to the north of it, and so out into the body of the church, where, by a devious path, they return to the holy doors, which are open; the volume, often decorated with great magnificence is laid on the holy table, whence it is again taken to the ambo, when the gospel is to be read.

This "Entrance" corresponds to the carrying of the gospel by the deacon to the ambo or rood-loft in the Western Church, once a rite of great importance; for the book was preceded not only by tapers, but by a crucifix.

II. The Greater Entrance. This ceremony has, like others, been developed from very small beginnings into great prominence and magnificence.

The liturgy of St. James simply alludes, in passing, to the bringing in of the elements. St. Mark's liturgy is even more vague.

In the Armenian rite the celebrant lies prostrate before the altar while the Great Entrance is made; in this rite (anomalously) the elements are spoken of as the body and blood of Christ before consecration.

In the much more developed rite of Constantinople, after the chanting of the Cherubic hymn, the ceremony proceeds as follows:  During the previous part of the eucharistic office, the elements have remained on the table in the chapel of the prothesis. At the proper point, the deacon censes the altar and the sanctuary, and then goes before the priest in to the prothesis. The priest then lifts the "aer," or covering, from the chalice and paten, and lays it on the deacon's shoulder, and then places upon it the paten, covered with the asterisk and veil. The deacon takes hold of these with his left hand, bearing the censer in his right; the priest takes the chalice and follows the deacon, and so, preceded by tapers, they move round to the holy doors, as in the lesser entrance. In great chuiches, where there are dignified clergy and many attendants, this procession is one of great magnificence. Where there is but a single priest and no deacon, he bears cthe paten on his shoulder, supporting it by his left hand, and the chalice in his right hand before his breast.

In the Coptic St. Basil, the Great Entrance is made at the very beginning of the liturgy; the directions for it are very curious and minute.

The priest goes to the Takaddemet (Prothesis) from which he shall take the lamb (i.e., loaf), looking attentively that there be no flaw in it... When he hath all that he needs, the lamb, the wine, and the incense,... he takes the lamb in his hand and wipes it lightly, as Christ the Lord was first washed with water before he was presented to Simeon the priest; then he shall bear it round to the altar in his hands, as Sineon bare him round the temple. At last the priest shall lay it down on the altar and shall place it on the paten, which signifies the cradle; and shall cover it with a linen cloth, as the Virgin did at his Nativity." A deacon seems to have borne the cruet. SEE INTROIT.

## Entrance into the Church[[@Headword:Entrance into the Church]]

             Certain ceremonies early grew into use as signs of reverence on the part of Christians on entering the church building. They washed their hands and faces in the fountains or cisterns which were generally found in the atrium or court before the church; probably referring to the Psalmist's expression, "I will wash my hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar." Many took off their shoes or sandals, especially when they went to receive the Eucharist; interpreting as applicable to themselves the command to Moses, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." In some instances bowing towards the altar was practiced; and when emperors or kings went into the house of God, they not only left their arms and guard, but also their crowns, behind them. It was also not uncommon for men to kiss the doors, threshold, or pillars in token of their love. The germ of many of the absurd practices and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church may be found in these customs. — Farrar, Ecclesiastes Diet. s.v.; Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 8, chapter 10, § 12.

## Entry Into Jerusalem[[@Headword:Entry Into Jerusalem]]

             This event in our Lord's life is very frequently represented in the earlier art of the Christian Church, occurring on some of the first sarcophagi, though not, it seems, in fresco or mosaic in the catacombs or elsewhere, except in an ancient mosaic of the Vatican, and one from the basilica at Bethlehem. The earliest MS. representation of it is probably that in the Rabula or Laurentian Evangeliary. The treatment is almost always the same; the Lord is mounted on the ass, sometimes accompanied by her foal, and the multitude with their palmbranches follow, or lay their garments before him. His right hand is generally raised in the act of blessing, The multitude  frequently raise their hands in thanksgiving. In one of the oldest MSS. of the New Test. in existence, the Gregorian Evangeliary of St. Cuthbert, the Lord is represented mounted on an ass, and bearing a large whip — evidently with reference to the scourge of small cords used in the expulsion of buyers and sellers from the temple. There is a certain variety in the examples taken from the different carvings. Sometimes Zacchaeus is represented in the "fig or sycamore tree" behind the Lord, as if to call attention to the beginning of his last journey at Jericho.

## Entwisle, Joseph[[@Headword:Entwisle, Joseph]]

             a Wesleyan Methodist minister, was born in Manchester, England, April 15, 1767. At sixteen he began to preach, and in 1787 Mr. Wesley called him into the itinerant ministry. He devoted himself to his work, studying theology, under many difficulties, and also the ancient languages. He filled acceptably a number of the most important appointments, and in 1812 was chosen president of the Conference. In 1834 he was made governor of the  Wesleyan Theological Institution, in which office he remained until 1838, when his infirm health compelled him to retire. He died at Tadcaster in 1841. See Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Entwisle, by his Son (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Methodist Quarterly Review, April 1851, page 305.

## Entychites[[@Headword:Entychites]]

             a sect of the followers of Simon, who, according to Clemens Alex. (Stromatavii, 17; page 900), derived this name from their promiscuous (ἐντυγχάνω,) sexual intercourse at the night meetings. Others write the name Eutychites or Euchites. Envy was always reckoned an odious sin, and one of the first magnitude; but there are no distinct penalties attached to it, inasmuch as, before it could bring a man under public discipline, it required to be displayed in some outward and vicious action, which received its appropriate punishment.

## Enzinas[[@Headword:Enzinas]]

             (or Encinas), Francisco de, a Spanish Protestant, was born at Burgos about 1520. He is commonly named Dryander, and also used the names Duchesne, Van Eyck, Eichman, all of the same meaning (oak-man) as the Spanish name Enzinas. After completing his academical studies in Italy, he went to Louvain, and studied there, and also spent some time with Melancthon at Wittemberg. Having wealthy relatives in the Netherlands, he fixed his abode there, and openly embraced the Reformed cause. He published a Spanish version of the N.T., dedicated to Charles V (1543). He was arrested December 13, 1543, and imprisoned at Brussels. He escaped in February 1545, to Antwerp, thence to Germany and England (1548). He carried letters of commendation from Melancthon to Edward VI and to Cranmer, who received him warmly, and gave him a post at Oxford. After somer time he returned to the Continent, and continued his literary labors at Strasburg, Basle, and Geneva. He died about 1570. — McCrie, Reformation in Spain, chapter 5; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 15:122.

## Enzinas Jayme de[[@Headword:Enzinas Jayme de]]

             a Spanish Protestant, brother of the preceding (known, like his brother, bythe name Dryander), studied at Louvain and Paris, and embraced Reformed principles. At the request of his father he returned to Italy, and remained there in great uneasiness for some years. He was preparing to rejoin his brother in Germany when he was denounced before the Inquisition as a heretic. He was tried, condemned, and burnt alive in 1546. — McCrie,, Reformation in Spain, chapter 5.

## Eodicius[[@Headword:Eodicius]]

             (1) An intruding bishop of Parnasus (Cappadocia Tertia), A.D. 375.

(2) Bishop of the island of Tenos, in the AEgean, A.D. 553.

## Eon[[@Headword:Eon]]

             SEE GNOSTICISM.

## Eon or Eudo de Stella[[@Headword:Eon or Eudo de Stella]]

             a fanatic nobleman who lived in the middle of the 12th century. He was a native of the Bretagne, and a man without education. In the form used in exorcising evil spirits he heard these words, "per Eum, qui venturus es tjudicare vivos et mortuos," and concluded, from the resemblance between the word Eum and his own name, that he was the person who should judge the quick and the dead. His views seem to be connected with those of the  Cathari. He is said to have taught that baptism was of value only for believers; that the only true baptism was that of the Spirit by the imposition of hands; that the hierarchy had not been instituted by God; that the Church of Rome was not the true Church, because her priests did not lead a holy life. He denied the resurrection of the body, and rejected marriage as a sacrament. He went about preaching these doctrines, found many adherents, and was reported to possess thepower of working miracles. In 1145 the cardinal-legate Albericus came from Ostia to the Bretagne, and preached against Eon and his adherents at Nanteso. He also induced archbishop Hugo, of Rouen, to write a work against him, which is, however, rather a diffuse explanation of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, than a refutation of Eon (Dogmatum Christianae idei contra haereticos sui temporis libri tres; Bibl. Patru. Max. tom. 22). At the same time troops were sent out against the new heretics, and in the diocese of Alet many were burned. Eon withdrew into the province of Guienne; in 1148 he repaired to Champagne, where his band was scattered, and he, together with some of his prominent adherents, was captured. He was taken before the council at Rheims, and asked, who he was. He replied, Is qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. The synod declared him to be insane, and charged the archbishop of Rheims to take care of him. Many of his followers were sentenced to be burned. After Eon's death the sect soon died out. — Schmidt, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 4:212; Wetzeru. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:602; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. book 3, cent. 12 part 3, chapter 5, § 16; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. per. 3, div. 3, chapter 7, § 84. (A.J.S.)

## Eonian[[@Headword:Eonian]]

             SEE EON.

## Eonus (or Eolnius)[[@Headword:Eonus (or Eolnius)]]

             a French saint, was of noble birth, and became bishop of Arles, A.D. 492. He assisted, September 2, 499, at the conference between the Catholic bishops of Burgundy and the Arian prelates at Lyons, in the presence of Gondeband, king of Burgundy, who favored Arianism. About the same time Eonus was involved in the dispute with Avitus of Vienne, concerning the primatial right of their respective churches, which was brought before pope Symmaihus, and finally decided in favor of the see of ATres. Eonus was allied with Ruricius of Limoges, and with Pomerus, abbot of Arles, and has left us his correspondence with those saints. He died August 16, 502, and is commemorated on August 30. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Eoquinians[[@Headword:Eoquinians]]

             a sect of the 16th century; socalled from one Eoquinus, who taught that Christ did not die for the wicked, but for the faithful only.

## Epact[[@Headword:Epact]]

             "in chronology, is the excess of the solar month above the lunar synodical month; or of the solar year above the lunar year of twelve synodical  months; or of several solar months above as many synodical months; or of several solar years above as many periods, each consisting of 12 synodical months. The menstrual epact is the excess of the civil calendarmonth above the lunar month. For a month of 31 days, this epact is 1 day 11 hours 15 minutes 57 seconds, if we suppose new moon to occur on the first day of the month. The annual epact is the excess of the solar year above the lunar. As the Julian solar year is (nearly) 365 days, and the Julian lunar year is (nearly) 354 days, the annual epact is nearly 11 days. The epact for two Julian years is, therefore, nearly 22 days; for three years, 33 days; and so on. When, however, the epact passes 30 days, 30 falls to be deducted from it, as making an intercalary month. For three years, then, the epact is properly 3; and for 4 years, adding 11 days, it is 14 days; and so on. Following the cycle, starting from a new moon on the 1st of January, we find that the epact becomes 30 or 0 in the 19th year. The epact for the 20th year is again 11; and so on. The years in the cycle are marked by Roman numerals I, II, III, etc., called the Golden Numbers; and a table of the Julian epacts exhibits each year in the cycle with its golden number and epact. As the Gregorian year, SEE CALENDAR, differs from and is in advance of the Julian by 11 days (the number lost on the Julian account before the Gregorian computation of time was introduced in England), and as 11 days is the difference between the solar and lunar years, it follows that the Gregorian epact for any year is the same with the Julian epact for the year preceding 1."

## Epact (2)[[@Headword:Epact (2)]]

             In determining the epact we either find the number of days required to make up the lunar to the solar year, and so the numeral of the moon's age on January 1, or, with Scaliger, we may use March 1, which comes to the same thing, and has the advantage of avoiding the ambiguity of leap-year.  The old Latin cycles of eighty-four years indicated Easter by means of the epacts of January 1, and the day of the week on which January 1 fell.

The method of determining the months (lunar) was as follows: For the first month of the year, that month was taken whose age was expressed by the epact. The day of December on which it commenced is found by subtracting the epact (when more than one) from thirty-three. The first month was always counted full, then hollow and full succeeded by turns, so that the last month in the year, in a common lunar year, was hollow, in an intercalary year full. From the last begins the new moon of the following year.

The Easter new moon being found, Easter-day was, according to the Latin rules, that Sunday which fell on or next after the 16th of the moon, not therefore later than the 22d of the moon. The choice of the month was determined thus: New moon must not be earlier than March 5, and full moon not later than March 21; the first of these rules sometimes having to give way to save the violation of the latter.

The following rule is given for the epact of January 1, viz., multiply the golden number by eleven, and divide the product by thirty, the remainder is the epact. But this rule will not give the epacts mentioned above, which were constructed as we have just described with a saltus lunae, or addition of twelve after the 19th year of the cycle, etc.

## Epaon[[@Headword:Epaon]]

             Synod of, Concilium Epaonense or Epaunense, a general synod of the Catholic bishops of Burgundy, held in 517. A great change in the relation of the Catholic Church of Burgundy to the state government took place in 516, when the new king Sigmond, son of the Arian king Gundobald, joined it. The Catholic Church thus became the State Church, though it does not appear that Sigmond, like so many kings of his times, aspired to exercise a controlling influence upon Church affairs. The Council of Epaon, which was to establish Church discipline in the .new Catholic kingdom upon a permanent basis, was not called by the king, but by Avitus, bishop of Vienne, and Viventiolus, metropolitan of Lyons. The letters of both bishops are still extant. That of Viventiolus is addressed to all bishops, clergymen, lords, and notables of the land, complains of want of discipline among the clergy, and invites every one who has to bring charges against the moral conduct of any clergyman to appear before the council. The clergymen are commanded to be present, and the laymen are permitted to attend in order that the people may receive information of what the bishops will decree. The letter of Avitus complains that the Church law ordering the holding of two synods every year had entirely fallen into disuse, and states that he had been censured by the Pope on this account, and had been commanded to assemble a synod, to renew and enforce the old Church laws, as far as they were still applicable, and to add, if necessary, new ones. As no such censure can be found in a letter of the Pope to Avitus, written in February 517, nor in any other papal letter extant, it has been inferred  (Vogel, in Herzog's Real-Enycklop. s.v.) that Avitus, in order to secure the meeting of the council, used the papal authority to a greater extent than he was authorized to do. In compliance with the letters of invitation, 24 bishops appeared personally at Epaon, and one sent representatives.

Their deliberations were of but short duration, and on September 14, 517, the bishops signed the acts upon which, "under divine inspiration," they had agreed. The acts consist of a brief preface and 40 canons which concern the conduct of bishops, clergymen, monks, secular authorities, and laymen, the intercourse with the Arian heretics, the property and discipline of the Church. . The provisions concerning the heretics are of special importance. Catholic clergymen, under severe penalties, are forbidden to sit at table with heretics. With a Jew no layman shall dine, under penalty of being never admitted to a clergyman's table. Heretics who wish to join the Church must apply to the bishops personally; only when they are on the death-bed they may be received by a priest. The church edifices of the heretics are declared to be objects worthy of special horror, and their purification is declared impossible. The 30th canon forbids marriages with near relatives, in particular with the sister of a deceased wife. This canon directly concerned a prominent officer at the royal court, Stephanus, who was married to his sister-in-law Palladia. The bishops seem to have anticipated trouble from the opposition of Stephanus, for, after the dissolution of the Council of Epaon, eleven bishops, among whom was Apollinaris, bishop of Valence and brother of Avitus, went to Lyons, where, under the presidency of Viventiolus, they agreed upon a line of conduct for the enforcement of the canon, providing even for the case that the king should leave the Church, and appoint Arian bishops for some of the episcopal sees.

A part of the canons of Epaon remained in force in Southern France, as canons of the Council of Agde ("Agathenses"). This council had been held in 504, and established 47 canons, to which subsequently, for the purpose of obtaining a complete code of discipline, 24 canons of other councils were added; of these 24, 13 were taken from the Council of Epaon.

The site of Epaon cannot be established with certainty. According to some, it is the little town of Yenne, in Savoy, on the left bank of the Rhone; according to others, a little village, Ponas, about half way between Lyons and Vienne. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:75; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen- Lex. 3:603; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 2:660; Landon, Manual of  Councils, page 224; Mansi, Coll. Concil. 8:310; Labbe, Dissertatio de Concil. Epaunensi. (A.J.S.)

## Epaphras[[@Headword:Epaphras]]

             (Ε᾿παφρᾶς, usually considered a contraction of Epaphroditus, but the last syllable in that case is hardly regular), an eminent teacher in the Church at Colossae, denominated by Paul "his dear fellow-servant," and "a faithful minister (διάκονος) of Christ" (Col 1:7; Col 4:12). A.D. 57. It has been inferred from Col 1:7 that he was the founder of the Colossian Church; and Dr. Neander supposes that the apostle terms him ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος Χριστοῦ (a servant of Christ in our stead) because he committed to him the office of proclaiming the Gospel in the three Phrygian cities Colossae, Hierapolis, and Laodicea, which he could not visit himself (Hist. of Planting, 1:200, 373). This language, however, is by no means decisive; yet most probably Epaphras was one of the earliest and most zealous instructors of the Colossian Church (see Alford's prolegomena to that epistle, Gr. Test. 3:35 sq.). Lardner thinks that the expression respecting Epaphras in Coloss. 4:12, ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν, is quite inconsistent with the supposition of his being the founder of the Church, since the same phrase is applied to Onesimus, a recent convert (Hist. of the Apostles and Evangelists, c. 14; Works, 6:153). But in both cases the words in question seem intended simply to identify these individuals as the fellow-townsmen of the Colossians, and to distinguish them from others of the same name in Rome (see Macknight on Col 4:2). He was at that time with Paul at Rome (Col 4:12), and seems by the expression there used to have been at least a Colossian by birth. We find him again mentioned in the epistle to Philemon (Col 4:23), which was sent at the same time as that to the Colossians. Paul there calls him ὁ συναιχμαλωτός μου, my fellow-prisoner; but some regard the word there as only a tender and delicate expression of Epaphras's attention to the apostle in his imprisonment (comp. Rom 16:13). The martyrologies make Epaphras to have been first bishop of Colossee, and to have suffered martyrdom there. SEE EPAPHRODITUS.

## Epaphroditus[[@Headword:Epaphroditus]]

             (Ε᾿παφρόδιτος, belonging to Aphrodite, or Venus), a messenger (ἀπόστολος) of the Church at Philippi to the apostle Paul during his imprisonment at Rome, who was intrusted with their contributions for his  support (Php 2:25; Php 4:18). A.D. 57. Paul's high estimate of his character (see Evans, Script. Biog. 2:300) is shown by an accumulation of honorable epithets (τὸν ἀδελφόν, καὶ συνεργόν, καὶ συστρατιώτην μου), and by fervent expressions of gratitude for his recovery from a dangerous illness brought on in part by a generous disregard of his per. sonal welfare in ministering to the apostle (Php 2:30). Epaphroditus, on his return to Philippi, was the bearer of the epistle which forms part of the canon. Grotius and some other critics conjecture that Epaphroditus was the same as the Epaphras mentioned in the epistle to the Colossians (see Sirk. De Epaphrodito Philippensiumn apostolo, Lips. 1741; Strohbach, De Epaphra Colossensi, Lips. 1710). But, though the latter name may be a contraction of the former, the fact that Epaphras was most probably in prison at the time, sufficiently marks the distinction of the persons. The name Epaphroditus was by no means uncommon (see Tacit. Ann. 15:55; Sueton. Domit. 14; Joseph. Life, 76), as Wetstein has shown (Nov. Test. Gr. 2:273).

## Eparch[[@Headword:Eparch]]

             (ἔπαρχος, ruler over a district), a commander (e.g. of vessels, AEschylus, Ag. 1227), hence praefect of a province (comp. ἐπαρχία, Act 23:24; Act 25:1); applied as a title to Sisinnes (q.v.), the Persian satrap of Syria (1Es 7:1, "governor"). SEE TOPARCHY, etc.

## Eparchy[[@Headword:Eparchy]]

             (ἐπαρχία) was the official term of a province in the administration of the Roman empire. It consisted of a number of communities, and was a subdivision of a diocese (διοίκησις). In the organization of the Church, the ecclesiastical heads of communities were called bishops, those of the capitals of eparchies, metropolitans; those of the dioceses, patriarchs. The term eparchy is thus used in Son 4:1-16 of the Council of Nice, and by Macarius of Ancyra (Suicer, Thesaur. Ecces. s.v.). The meaning of the term was subsequently changed in the Greek Church, so as to denote, in general, the diocese of any bishop, archbishop, or metropolitan). In Russia the eparchies are divided into three classes, the first of which comprised in 1866 the four metropolitan sees of Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and Novgorod; the second twenty sees, the incumbents of which, with the exception of one, had the title archbishop; the third twenty-nine sees, six of which had the title archbishop, while the others were merely bishops.  Eparchies can be transferred at the pleasure of the czar from one class to the other. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:80; Wetzeru. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:604; Churchman's Calendar for 1868. SEE GREEK CHURCH AND RUSSIA. (A.J.S.)

## Epee Charles Michel De L[[@Headword:Epee Charles Michel De L]]

             born in Versailles November 25, 1712, was distinguished for his labors in behalf of the deaf and dumb. He entered into orders as a Roman Catholic priest, but, having been interdicted from the exercise of his functions, he devoted himself to the care of deaf mutes. Two young girls, mutes, had been under the care of father Vanin, at whose death L'Epee took charge of them. From this time his talents, time, and property were all consecrated to this cause. He framed a series of signs (the basis of the system now in use), and his success induced the due de Penthievre and others to aid him. He organized an asylum, which, after his death, was taken under the patronage of the French government, and placed under Sicard (q.v.), the worthy successor of L'Epee. He died at Paris December 23, 1789. ' His writings give full accounts of his method; among them are Institution des Sourds et des Muets, 1774, 12mo; enlarged edition, 1776, 12mo; and again improved, 1784, 12mo. See especially his Art d'enseigner a parler aux Sourds Muets, with notes by Sicard, and the eloge of L'Epee by M. Bebian (Paris, 1820, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Ggner. 30:829.

## Epeenetus[[@Headword:Epeenetus]]

             (Ε᾿παίνετος, commendable), a Christian resident at Rome when Paul wrote his epistle to the Church in that city, and one of the persons to whom he sent special salutations (Rom 16:5). A.D. 55. In the received text he is spoken of as being "the first-fruits ofAchaia" (ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Α᾿χαϊvας); but "the first-fruits of Asia" (τῆς Α᾿σίας) is the reading of the best MSS. ( אA B C D E F G 67), of the Coptic, Armenian, AEthiopic, Vulgate, the Latin fathers, and Origen (In Ep. ad Romans Comment. lib. 10, Opera, 7, page 431; In Numer. Hom. 11, Opera, 10, page 109). This reading is preferred by Grotius, Mill, Bengel,Whitby, Koppe, Rosenmuller, Ruckert, Olshausen, and Tholuck; and admitted into the text by Griesbach, Knapp, Tittmann, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorff; also by Bruder, in his edition of Schmidt's Concordance, Lips. 1842. Dr. Bloomfield, who also adopts it in his Greek Testaments (2d ed. 1836), remarks that "the  very nature of the term ἀπαρχή suggests the idea of one person only (see 1Co 15:20), and, as in 1Co 16:15, Stephanas is called the ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Α᾿χαϊvας, Epaenetus could have no claim to the name." With respect to the former part of this statement, the learned writer has strangely overlooked such passages as Jam 1:18, " that we should be a kind of first-fruits" (ἀπαρχήν τινα), and Rev 14:4, "These were redeemed from among men, being the first-fruits" (ἀπαρχή): and as to the latter part, not Stephanas alone, but his house, is said to be the first- fruits, and to have addicted themselves (ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς) to the ministry of the saints.' Macknight's remark in favor of the received reading, that if Epsenetus was one of that house, he was a part of the first-fruits of Achaia, seems somewhat forced. The synopsis of the pseudo-Dorotheus makes him first bishop of Carthage, but Justinian remarks that the African churches do not recognize him.

## Epefanoftschins[[@Headword:Epefanoftschins]]

             a Russian sect, followers of a monk of Kiev who was ordained bishop through forged letters of recommendation. He died in prison, but is esteemed a martyr by his followers. Their sentiments are nearly the same as the Starobredsi, or Old Ceremonialists. Pinkerton's Greek Church, page 304. SEE RUSSIA; SEE RUSSIAN SECTS.

## Epenetus[[@Headword:Epenetus]]

             SEE EPAENETUS.

## Ephah[[@Headword:Ephah]]

             (Hebrews Eyphah', עֵיפָה, gloom), the name of a tribe (including that of the founder), also of a woman and of a Man 1:1. (Sept. Γεφάρ v.r. in Chron. Γαιφάρ, Isaiah Γαιφά.) The first in order of the five sons of Midian (Gen 25:4; 1Ch 1:33), B.C. cir. 1988; afterwards mentioned by Isaiah in the following words: "The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; all they from Sheba shall come: they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify tlhe house of my glory" (Isa 60:6-7). This passage clearly connects the descendants of Ephah with the Midianites, the Keturahite Sheba, and the Ishmaelites, both in the position of their settlements and in their wandering habits, and shows that, as usual, they formed a tribe bearing his name. But no satisfactory identification of this tribe has been discovered. The Arabic word Gheyfeh, which has been supposed to be the same as Ephah, is the name of a town, or village, near Pelusium, or Bulbeys (the modern Bilbeys), a place in Egypt, in the province of Sharklyeh, not fai from Cairo; but the tradition that Ephah settled in Africa does not rest on sufficient authority. SEE MIDIAN.

2. (Sept. Γαιφά.) A concubine of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, by whom she had several sons (1Ch 2:46). B.C. post 1856.

3. (Sept. Γαιφά.) A son of Jahdai, who was apparently the grandson of the oldest of the foregoing sons (1Ch 2:47). B.C. long post 1856.

## Ephah (2)[[@Headword:Ephah (2)]]

             (אֵיפָה, eyphah', rarely אֵפָה, ephah'), a measure of grain, containing "three seahs or ten omers," and equivalent in capacity to the bath for liquids (Exo 16:36; 1Sa 17:17; Zec 5:6; Jdg 6:19; Rth 2:17; the "double ephah," Pro 20:10; Deu 25:14; Amo 8:5, means two ephahs, the one just, the other false). According to Josephus (Ant. 8:2, 9), the ephah contained 72 sextarii, equal to the Attic (liquid) metretes, or 1933.95 Paris cubic inches, about 1 and one-twelfth bushels English (see Bockh, Metrolog. Untersuch. pages 259, 278). This is also confirmed by other testimony; so that there is doubtless an error in another passage of Josephus (Ant. 15:9, 2), where the ephah seems to be equal to 96 sextarii, or the Attic medimnus. The origin of this word is to be sought in the Egyptian language, where it signifies a measure, especially of corn, from which comes the Sept. rendering οἰφί  (see Rediger, in Allg. Encyklop. s.v.; Gesenius, Thes. Ling. Hebrews in Append.). SEE MEASURES.

## Ephai[[@Headword:Ephai]]

             (Hebrews Ephay' עֵיפִיtoxt עֵוֹפִיfor עוֹפִי, Ophay'], languid, hence gloomy; Sept. Ι᾿ωφέ v.r. ᾿Ωφέ, ᾿Ωφή, and ᾿Ωφέτ, Vulg. Ophi), a Netophathite, whose sons were among the "captains (שָׂרַים) of the forces" left in Judah after the deportation to Babylon, and who warned the Babylonian governor of the plots against him (Jer 40:8). B.C. 588. They submitted themselves to Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor, and were apparently massacred with him by Ishmael (41:3; comp. 40:13).

## Epheh[[@Headword:Epheh]]

             SEE VIPER.

## Epher[[@Headword:Epher]]

             (Hebrews id. עֵפֶר, the gopher, so called from its gray or ashy color), the name of a tribe (including that of its founder) and of two men.

1. (Sept. Α᾿φείρ v.r. Ο᾿φείρ, in Chron. Ο᾿φέρ, Vulg. Opher and Epher.) The second in order of the sons of Midian (Gen 25:4; 1Ch 1:33), Abraham's son by Keturah. B.C. post 1988. According to Gesenius, the name is equivalent to the Arabic Ghifr, signifying "a calf," and "a certain little animal, or insect, or animalcule." Two tribes bear a similar appellation, Ghifar; but one was a branch of the first Amalek, the other of the Ishmaelite Kinaneh (comp. Caussin, Essai sur l'Hist. des Arabes, 1:20, 297, 298; and Abulfeda, Hist. Anteislamica, edit. Fleischer, page 196): neither is ascribed to Midian. The first settled about Yethrib (El-Medineh); the second in the neighborhood of Mekkeh. SEE MIDIAN.

2. (Sept. Α᾿φέρ v.r. Γαφέρ, Vulg. Epher.) The third son of Ezra, a descendant of the tribe of Judah, and apparently of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (1Ch 4:17). B.C. cir. 1618.

3. (Sept. Ο᾿φέρ, Vulg. Epher.) The head of one of the families of Manasseh cast, who were carried away by Tiglath-Pileser (1Ch 5:24). B.C. ante 740. The name may be compared with that of Ophrah (q.v.), the native place of Gideon, in Manasseh, on the west of Jordan.

## Ephes-dammim[[@Headword:Ephes-dammim]]

             (Heb. E'phes Dammim', דִּמַּים אֶפֶס, appar. boundary of blood; Sept. Α᾿φεσδομίν or Α᾿φεσδομμείν v.r. Ε᾿φερμόν, Vulg. fines Dommin), a place in the tribe of Judah between Shochoh and Azekah, where the Philistines were encamped when David fought with Goliath (1Sa 17:1). The similar, but not parallel passage (1Ch 11:13), has the shorter form Pas-Dammim. The name was probably derived from its being the scene of frequent sanguinary encounters between Israel and the Philistines. On his way from Beit-Jibrin to Jerusalem, Van de Velde came past a ruined site on the high northward-looking brow of wady Musur, about one hour E. by S. of Beit-Netif, called Khirbet Damun, which he has no doubt represents the ancient Ephes-Dammim, and "which fixes the place of the camp of Goliath just at its foot, where the valley contracts, and may, indeed, be called the pass [or extremity] of Dammim" (Memoir, page 290). In that case the narrative of 1Sa 17:1-58, becomes plain: "the gorge" (הִגִּיְא) between the battle-lines of the two armies (1Sa 17:3), and along which the first rout and pursuit occurred (1Sa 17:52), was no other than the wady Musur itself, which is so narrow immediately at this spot. SEE ELAH (VALLEY OF).

## Ephes-damnum[[@Headword:Ephes-damnum]]

             The ruined site, Damun, proposed by Van de Velde for this place does not appear on the Ordinance Map; and Lieutenant Conder suggests as an identification (Tent Work in Palestine, 2:336), a place in the same general vicinity called Beit-Fased, lying one and three quarter miles south of Beit- Nettif.

## Ephesian[[@Headword:Ephesian]]

             (Ε᾿φέσιος), a native or resident of the city of Ephesus (q.v.), in Asia Minor (Act 19:28; Act 19:34-35; Act 21:29). The similar adj. Ephesine (Ε᾿φεσῖνος, "of Ephesus") also occurs (Rev 2:1).

## Ephesus[[@Headword:Ephesus]]

             (῎Εφεσος, according to one legend from ἔφεσις, the permission given by Hercules to the Amazons to settle here), an illustrious city (Athen. 8:361) in the district of Ionia (πόλις Ι᾿ωνίας ἐπιφανεστάτη, Steph. Byz. s.v.), on the western coast of the peninsula commonly called Asia Minor — not that this geographical term was known in the first century. The ASIA of the N.T. was simply the Roman province which embraced the western part  of the peninsula. Of this province Ephesus was the capital. SEE ASIA MINOR.

1. History. — It was one of the twelve Ionian cities in Asia Minor in the mythic times (Herod. 1:142), and said to have been founded by the Amazons, but in later times inhabited by the Carians and Leleges (Strabo, 14:640), and taken possession of by the Ionians under Androclus, the son of Codrus (Cramer, Asia Miswr, 1:363). Besides the name by which it is best known, it bore successively those of Samorna, Trachea, Ortygia, and Ptelea. Being founded by Androclus, the legitimate son of Codrus, it enjoyed a pre-eminence over the other members of the Ionian confederacy, and was denominated the royal city of Ionia. The climate and country which the colonists from Attica had selected as their future abode surpassed, according to Herodotus (1:142), all others in beauty and fertility; and, had the martial spirit of the Ionians corresponded to their natural advantages, they might have grown into a powerful independent nation. The softness, however; of the climate, and the ease with which the necessaries of life could be procured, transformed the hardy inhabitants of the rugged Attica into an indolent and voluptuous race: hence they fell successively under the power of the Lydians (B.C. 560) and the Persians (B.C. 557); and, though the revolt of Histioeus and Aristagoras against the Persian power was for a time successful, the contest at length terminated in favor of the latter (Herod. 6:7-22). The defeat of the Persians by the Greeks gave a temporary liberty to the Ionian cities; but the battle of Mycale transferred the virtual dominion of the country to Athens. During the Peloponnesian war they paid tribute indifferently to either party, and the treaty of Antalcidas (B.C. 387) once more restored them to their old masters the Persians. They beheld with indifference the exploits of Alexander and the disputes of his captains, and resigned themselves without a struggle to successive conquerors. Ephesus was included in the dominions of Lysimachus; but, after the defeat of Antiochus (B.C. 190), it was given by the Romans to the kings of Pergamum. In the year B.C. 129 the Romans formed their province of Asia. The fickle Ephesians took part with Mithridates against the Romans, and massacred the garrison: they had reason to be grateful for the unusual clemency of L. Cornelius Sulla, who merely inflicted heavy fines upon the inhabitants. Thenceforward the city formed part of the Roman empire. While, about the epoch of the introduction of Christianity, the other cities of Asia Minor declined, Ephesus rose more and more. It owed its prosperity in part to the favor of  its governors, for Lysimachus named the city Arsinoe in honor of his second wife, and Attalus Philadelphus furnished it with splendid wharves and docks; in part to the favorable position of the place, which naturally made it the emporium of Asia on this side the Taurus (Strabo, 14:641, 663). Under the Romans, Ephesus was the capital not only of Ionia, but of the entire province of Asia, and bore the honorable title of the first and greatest metropolis of Asia (Bockh, Coap. Inscript. Graec. 2968-2992). The bishop of Ephesus in later times was the president of the Asiatic dioceses, with the rights and privileges of a patriarch (Evagr. Hist. Ecc 3:6). Towards the end of the 11th century Ephesus experienced the same fate as Smyrna; and, after a brief occupation by the Greeks, it surrendered in 1308 to sultan Saysan, who, to prevent future insurrections, removed most of the inhabitants to Tyriaeum, where they were massacred

2. Biblical Notices. — That Jews were established there in considerable numbers is known from Josephus (Ant. 14:10, 11), and might be inferred from its mercantile eminence; but it is also evident from Act 2:9; Act 6:9. In harmony with the character of Ephesus as a place of concourse and commerce, it is here, and here only, that we find disciples of John the Baptist explicitly mentioned after the ascension of Christ (Act 18:25; Act 19:3). The case of Apollos (Act 18:24) is an exemplification further of the intercourse between, this place and Alexandria. The first seeds of Christian truth were possibly sown at Ephesus immediately after the great Pentecost (Act 2:1-47). Whatever previous plans Paul may have entertained (Act 16:6), his first visit was on his return from the second missionary circuit (Act 18:19-21), and his stay on that occasion was very short; nor is there any proof that he found any Christians at Ephesus, but he left there Aquila and Priscilla (Act 18:19), who both then and at a later period (2Ti 4:19) were of signal service. In Paul's own stay of more than two years (Act 19:8; Act 19:10; Act 20:31), which formed the most important passage of his third circuit, and during which he labored, first in the synagogue (Act 19:8), and then in the school of Tyrannus (Act 19:9), and also in private houses (Act 20:20), and during which he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we have the period of the chief evangelization of this shore of the AEgean. The direct narrative in Act 19:1-41 receives but little elucidation from the Epistle to the Ephesians, which was written after several years from Rome; but it is supplemented in some important particulars (especially as regards the apostle's personal habits of  self-denial, Act 20:34) by the address at Miletus. This address shows that the Church at Ephesus was thoroughly organized under its presbyters. On leaving the city, the apostle left Timothy in charge of the Church there (1Ti 1:3), a position which he seems to have retained for a considerable period, as we learn from the second epistle addressed to him. SEE TIMOTHY. Among Paul's. other companions, two, Trophimus and Tychicus, were natives of Asia (Act 20:4), and the latter probably (2Ti 4:12), the former certainly (Act 21:29), natives of Ephesus. In the same connection we ought to mention Onesiphorus (2Ti 1:16-18) and his household (4:19). On the other hand must be noticed certain specified Ephesian antagonists of the apostle, the sons of Sceva and his party (Act 19:14), Hymenaeus and Alexander (1Ti 1:20; 2Ti 4:14), and Phygellus and Hermogenes (2Ti 1:15). SEE PAUL. Ephesus is also closely connected with the apostle John, not only as being the scene (Rev 1:11; Rev 2:1) of the most prominent of the churches of the Apocalypse, but also in the story of his later life as given by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3:23, etc.). According to a tradition which prevailed extensively in ancient times, John spent many years in Ephesus, where he employed himself most diligently for the spread of the Gospel, and where he died at a very old age, and was buried. SEE JOHN (THE APOSTLE). Possibly 'his Gospels and Epistles were written here. There is a tradition that the mother of our Lord was likewise buried at Ephesus, as also Timothy. Some make John bishop of the Ephesian communities, while others ascribe that honor to Timothy. In the book of Revelation (Rev 2:1) a favorable testimony is borne to the Christian churches at Ephesus. Ignatius addressed one of his epistles to the Church of this place (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾷ τῇ ἀξιομακαρίστῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Ε᾿φέσῳ τῆς Α᾿σίας, Hefele, Pat. Apostol. page 154), which held a conspicuous position during the early ages of Christianity, and was in fact, the metropolis of the churches of this part of Asia.

3. Location. — Ephesus lay on the Egoean coast, nearly opposite the island of Samos, 320 stadia from Smyrna (Strabo, 14:632). The ancient town seems to have been confined to the northern slope of Coressus (Herod. 1:26), but in the lapse of time the inhabitants advanced farther into the plain, and thus a new town sprang up around the temple (Strabo, 14:640). All the cities of Ionia were remarkably well situated for the growth of commercial prosperity (Herod. 1:142), and none more so than  Ephesus. With a fertile neighborhood (Strabo, 14:637) and an excellent climate, it was also most conveniently placed for traffic with all the neighboring parts of the Levant. In the time of Augustus it was the great emporium of all the regions of Asia within the Taurus (Strabo, 14:950); its harbor (named Panormus), at the mouth of the Cayster, was elaborately constructed, though alluvial matter caused serious hinderances both in the time of Attalus and in Paul's own time (Tacitus, Ann. 16:23). The apostle's life alone furnishes illustrations of its mercantile relations with Achaia on the W., Macedonia on the N., and Syria on the E. At the close of his second missionary circuit, he sailed across from Corinth to Ephesus (Act 18:19), when on his way to Syria (Act 18:21-22): some think that he once made the same short voyage over the AEgaean, in the opposite direction, at a later period. SEE CORINTHIANS, FIRST EP. TO. On the third missionary circuit, besides the notice of the journey from Ephesus to Macedonia (Act 19:21; Act 20:1), we have the coast voyage on the return to Syria given in detail (20, 21), and the geographical relations of this city with the islands and neighboring parts of the coast minutely indicated (Act 20:15-17). To these passages we must add 1Ti 1:3; 2Ti 4:12; 2Ti 4:20; though it is difficult to say confidently whether the journeys implied there were by land or by water. See likewise Act 19:27; Act 20:1.

As to the relations of Ephesus to the inland regions of the continent, these also are prominently brought before us in the apostle's travels. The "upper coasts" (τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη, Act 19:1), through which he passed when about to take up his residence in the city, were the Phrygian table- lands of the interior; and it was probably in the same district that on a previous occasion (Act 16:6) he formed the unsuccessful project of preaching the Gospel in the district of Asia. Two great roads at least, in the Roman times, led eastward from Ephesus; one through the passes of Tmolus to Sardis (Rev 3:1), and thence to Galatia and the N.E., the other round the extremity of Pactyas to Magnesia, and so up the valley of the Mieander to Iconium, whence the communication was direct to the Euphrates and to the Syrian Antioch. There seem to have been Sardian and Magnesian gates on the E. side of Ephesus corresponding to these roads respectively. There were also coast-roads leading northwards to Smyrna, and southwards to Miletus. By the latter of these it is probable that the Ephesian elders traveled when summoned to meet Paul at the latter city (Act 20:17-18). Part of the pavement of the Sardian road has been  noticed by travelers under the cliffs of Gallesus. SEE LEAKE'S ASIA MINOR, AND MAP.

Among the more marked physical features of the peninsula are the two large rivers, Hermus and Mseander, which flow from a remote part of the interior westward to the Archipelago, Smyrna (Rev 2:8) being near the mouth of one, and Miletus (Act 20:17) of the other. Between the valleys drained by these two rivers is the shorter stream and smaller basin of the Cayster, called by the Turks Kutschuk-Mendere, or the Little Maeander. Its upper level (often called the Caystrian meadows) was closed to the westward by the gorge between Gallesus and Pactyas, the latter of these mountains being a prolongation of the range of Messogis, which bounds the valley of the Maeander on the north, the former more remotely connected with the range of Tmolus, which bounds the valley of the Hermus on the south. Beyond the gorge and towards. the sea the valley opens out again into an alluvial flat (Herod. 2:10), with hills rising abruptly from it. The plain is now about 5 miles in breadth, but formerly it must have been smaller, and some of the hills were once probably islands. Here Ephesus stood, partly on the level ground and partly on the hills.

Of the hills, on which a large portion of the city was built, the two most important were Prion and Coressus, the latter on the S. of the plain, and being, in fact, almost a continuation of Pactyas, the former being in front of Coressus and near it, though separated by a deep and definite valley. Further to the N.E. is another conspicuous eminence. It seems to be the hill mentioned by Procopius (De AEdif. 5:1) as one on which a church dedicated to the apostle John was built; and its present name Ayasaluk is absurdly thought to have reference to him, and to be a corruption of his traditionary title ὁ ἄγιος θεόλογος. (See generally Cellarii Notit. 2:80.)

4. Government. — It is well known that Asia was a proconsular province; and in harmony with this fact we find proconsuls (ἀνθύπατοι, A.V. "deputies") specially mentioned (Act 19:38). Nor is it necessary to inquire here whether the plural in this passage is generic, or whether the governors of other provinces were present in Ephesus at the time. Again, we learn from Pliny (5:31) that Ephesus was an assize-town (Jorum or conventus); and in the N.T. narrative (Act 19:38) we find the court- days alluded to as actually being held (ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται , A.V. " the law is open") during the uproar; though perhaps it is not absolutely necessary to give the expression this exact reference as to time (see Wordsworth in  loc.). Ephesus itself was a "free city," and had its own assemblies and its own magistrates. The senate (γερουσία, or βουλή) is mentioned not only by Strabo, but by Josephus (Ant. 14:10, 25; 16:6, 4 and 7); and Luke, in the narrative before us, speaks of the δῆμος (Act 19:30; Act 19:33, A.V. "the people") and of its customary assemblies (ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾷ, Act 19:39, A.V. "a lawful assembly"). That the tumultuary meeting which was gathered on the occasion in question should take place in the theater (Act 19:29; Act 19:31) was nothing extraordinary. It was at a meeting in the theater at Caesarea that Agrippa I received his death-stroke (Act 12:23), and in Greek cities this was often the place for large assemblies (Tacitus, Hist. 2:80; Val. Max. 2:2).

We even find conspicuous mention made of one of the most important municipal officers of Ephesus, the "town-clerk" (q.v.) (γραμματεύς), or keeper of the records, whom we know from other sources to have been a person of great influence and responsibility. It is remarkable how all these political and religious characteristics of Ephesus, which appear in the sacred narrative, are illustrated by inscriptions and coins. An ἀρχεῖον, or state-paper office, is mentioned on an inscription in Chishull. The γραμματεύς frequently appears; so also the Α᾿σιάρχαι and ἀνθύπατοι. Sometimes these words are combined in the same inscription; see, for instance, Bockh, Corp. Inscr. 2999, 2994, 2996. The later coins of Ephesus are full of allusions to the worship of Diana in various aspects. The word νεωκόρος (warden, A.V. "worshipper") is of frequent occurrence. That which is given last below has also the word ἀνθύπατος (proconsul, A.V. "deputy"); it exhibits an image of the temple, and, bearing as it does the name and head of Nero, it must have been struck about the time of Paul's stay in Ephesus. The one immediately preceding it bears the name (Cusinius) of the acting γραμματεύς ("town-clerk") at the time.

5. The Asiarchs. — Public games were connected with the worship of Diana at Ephesus. The month of May was sacred to her. The uproar mentioned in the Acts very probably took place at this season. Paul was certainly at Ephesus about that time of the year (1Co 16:8), and Demetrius might well be peculiarly sensitive if he found his trade failing at the time of greatest concourse. However this may be, the Asiarchs (Α᾿σιάρχαι, A.V. "chiefs of Asia") were present (Act 19:31). These were officers appointed, after the manner of the aediles at Rome, to  preside over the games which were held in different parts of the province of Asia, just as other provinces had their Galatarchs, Lyciarchs, etc. Various cities would require the presence of these officers in turn. In the account of Polycarp's martyrdom at Smyrna (Hefele, Pat. Apost. page 286) an important part is played by the Asiarch Philip. It is a remarkable proof of the influence which Paul had gained at Ephesus that the asiarchs took his side in the disturbance. See Dr.Wordsworth's note on Act 19:31. SEE ASIARCH.

6. Religion. — Conspicuous at the head of the harbor of Ephesus was the great temple of Diana or Artemis, the tutelary divinity of the city. She was worshipped under the name of Artemis. There was more than one divinity which went by the name of Artemis, as the Arcadian Artemis, the Taurian Artemis, as well as the Ephesian Artemis. (See Dougtsei Analect. 2:91; Miinter, Relig. d. Karthag. page 53.) Her worship in this instance was said to have originated in an image that fell from heaven (διοπετές, Act 19:35; comp. Clem. Alex. Protrept. page 14; Wetstein in loc.), and believed to have been an object of reverence from the earliest times (Pliny, 16:79). The material of which it was composed is disputed, whether ebony, cedar, or otherwise (see Spanheim, ad Callim. Dian. verse 239). She was represented as many-breasted (πολύμαστος, multimamia, see Gronovii Thesaur. 7; Zorn, Biblioth. Antiq. 1:439 sq.; Creuzer, Symbol. 2:176 sq.), although different explanations are given of her figure in this respect. The following is the description given by Mr. Falkener (Ephesus, pages 290, 291) of an antique statue of the Ephesian Diana now in the Naples Museum: "The circle round her head denotes the nimbus of her glory; the griffins inside of which express its brilliancy. In her breast are the twelve signs of the zodiac, of which those seen in front are the ram, bull, twins, crab, and lion; they are divided by the hours. Her necklace is composed of acorns, the primeval food of man. Lions are on her arms to denote her power, and her hands are stretched out to show that she is ready to receive all who come to her. Her body is covered with various beasts and monsters, as sirens, sphinxes, and griffins, to show she is the source of nature, the mother of all things. Her head, hands, and feet are of bronze, while the rest of the statue is of alabaster, to denote the ever-varying light and shade of the moon's figure... . Like Rhea, she was crowned with  turrets, to denote her dominion over terrestrial objects." It will be seen, from the figure given, that this last differed materially from the Diana, sister of Apollo, whose attributes are the bow, the quiver, the girt-up robe, and the hound; whose person is a model of feminine strength, ease, and grace, and whose delights were in the pursuits of the chase. SEE DIANA.

Around the image of the goddess was erected, according to Callimachus (Hymn. in Dian. 248), her large and splendid temple. This building was raised (about B.C. 500) on immense substructions, in consequence of the swampy nature of the ground. The earlier temple, which had been begun before the Persian war, was burnt down in the night when Alexander the: Great was born (B.C. 355), by an obscure person of the name of Eratostratus, who thus sought to transmit. his name to posterity (Strabo, 14:640; Plutarch, Alex. 3; Solin, 43; Cicero, De Nat. Deor. 2:27); and, as it seemed somewhat unaccountable that the goddess should permit a place which redounded so much to her honor to be thus recklessly destroyed, it was given out that Diana was so engaged with Olympias in aiding to bring Alexander into the world that she had no time nor thought for any other concern. At a subsequent period Alexander made an offer to rebuild the temple, provided he were allowed to inscribe his name on the front, which the Ephesians refused. Aided, however, by the whole of Asia Minor, they succeeded in erecting a still more magnificent temple, which the ancients have lavishly praised and placed among the' seven wonders of the world. It took two hundred and twenty years to complete. Pliny (Hist. Nat. 36:21), who has given a description of it, says it was 425 feet in length, 220 broad, and supported by 127 columns, each of which had been contributed by some prince, and were 60 feet high; 36 of them were richly carved. Chersiphron, the architect, presided over the undertaking, and, being ready to lay violent hands on himself in consequence of his difficulties, was restrained; by the command of the goddess, who appeared to hint during the night, assuring him that she herself had accomplished that which had brought him to despair. The altar was the work of Praxiteles. The famous sculptor Scopas is said by Pliny to have chiselled one of the columns. Apelles, a native of the city, contribated a splendid picture of Alexander the Great.

The rights of sanctuary, to the extent of a stadium in all directions round the temple, were also conceded, which, in consequence of abuse, the emperor Tiberius abolished. The temple was built of cedar, cypress, white marble, and even gold, with which it glittered (Spanh. Observat. in Hymn. in Dian. 353). Costly and magnificent offerings of various kinds were  made to the .goddess and treasured in the temple, such as paintings, statues, etc., the value of which almost exceeded computation. The fame of the temple, of the goddess, and of the city itself, was spread not only through Asia, but the world, a celebrity which was enhanced and diffused the more readily because sacred games were practiced there, which called competitors and spectators from every country. In style, too, this famous structure constituted an epoch in Greek art (Vitruv. 4:1), since it was here first that the graceful Ionic order was perfected. The magnificence of this sanctuary was a proverb throughout the civilized world (Philo Byz. Spect. Mund. 7). All these circumstances give increased force to the architectural allegory in the great epistle which Paul wrote in this place (1Co 3:9-17), to the passages where imagery of this kind is used in the epistles addressed to Ephesus (Eph 2:19-22; 1Ti 3:15; 1Ti 6:19; 2Ti 2:19-20), and to the words spoken to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Act 20:32). The temple was frequently used for the safe custody of treasure. Of more questionable character was the privilege which, in common with some other Greek temples, it enjoyed of an asylum, within the limits of which criminals were safe .from arrest (Strabo, 14:641; Plutarch, De cere al. c. 3; Apollon. Ephesians epist. 65). By Alexander this asylum was extended to a stadium, and by Mithridates somewhat further; fmark Antony nearly doubled the distance; but the abuses hence arising became so mischievous, that Augustus was compelled to abolish the privilege, or at least restrict it to its ancient boundary. Among his other enormities, Nero is said to have despoiled the temple of Diana of much of its treasure. It continued to conciliate no small portion of respect till it was finally burnt by the Goths in the reign of Gallienus. (See Hirt, Der Tempel der Diana zu Ephesus, Berlin, 1809.)

The chief points connected with the uproar at Ephesus in the case of Paul (Act 19:23-41) are mentioned in the articles DIANA SEE DIANA and PAUL SEE PAUL ; but the following details must be added. In consequence of this devotion, the city of Ephesus was called νεωκόρος (Act 19:35) or " warden" of Diana (see Van Dale, Dissert. page 309; Wolf and Kuinol, in loc.). This was a recognized title applied in such cases, not only to individuals, but So communities. In the instance of Ephesus, the term is abundantly found both on coins and on inscriptions. Its neocorate was, in fact, as the "town-clerk" said, proverbial. Another consequence of the celebrity of Diana's worship at Ephesus was that a large manufactory grew up there of portable shrines (ναοί, Act 19:24, the ἀφιδρύματα of  Dionys. Halicarn, 2:2, and other writers), which strangers purchased. and devotees carried with them on journeys or set up in their louses. Of the manufacturers engaged in this business, perhaps Alexander the "coppersmith" (ὁ χαλκεύς, 2Ti 4:14) was one. The case of Demetrius the "silversmith" (ἀργυροποῖος in the Acts) is explicit. He was alarmed for his trade when he saw the Gospel, under the preaching of Paul, gaining ground upon idolatry and superstition, and he spread a panic among the craftsmen of various grades, the τεχνίται (2Ti 4:24) or designers, and the ἐργάται (2Ti 4:25) or common workmen, if this is the distinction between them. (See Schmid, Templa Denmetrii argentei, Jena, 1695; Wilisch, Ναϊvδια vett. Lips. 1716.) SEE DEMETRIUS.

6. Magical Arts. — Among the distinguished natives of Ephesus in the ancient world may be mentioned Apelles and Parrhasius, rivals in the art of painting, Heraclitus, the man-hating philosopher, Hipponax, a satirical poet, Artemidorus, who wrote a history and description of the earth. The claims of Ephesus, however, to the praise of originality in the prosecution of the liberal arts are but inconsiderable, and it must be content with the dubious reputation of having excelled in the refinements of a voluptuous and artificial civilization. With culture of this kind, a practical belief in and a constant use of those arts which pretend to lay open the secrets of nature, and arm the hand of man with supernatural powers, have generally been found conjoined. Accordingly, the Ephesian multitude were addicted to sorcery; indeed, in the age of Jesus and his apostles, adepts in the occult sciences were numerous: they traveled from country to country, and were found in great numbers in Asia, deceiving the credulous multitude and profiting by their expectations. They were sometimes Jews, who referred their skill and even their forms of proceeding to Solomon, who is still regarded in the East as head or prince of magicians (Josephus, Ant. 8:2,5; Act 8:9; Act 13:6; Act 13:8). In Asia Minor Ephesus had a high reputation for magical arts (Ortlob, De Ephes. Libris combustis, Lips. 1708). This also comes conspicuously into view in Luke's narrative (Act 19:11-20). The peculiar character of Paul's miracles (δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχούσας, Act 19:11) would seem to have been intended as antagonistic to the prevalent superstition. The books mentioned as being burned by their possessors in consequence of his teaching were doubtless books of magic. How extensively they were in use may be learned from the fact that "the price of them" was "fifty thousand pieces of silver" (more than $30,000). Very celebrated were the Ephesian letters (Ε᾿φέσια γράμματα), which appear  to have been a sort of magical formulae written on paper or parchment, designed to be fixed as amulets on different parts of the body. such as the hands and the head (Plut. Sym. 7; Lakemacher, Obs. Philol. 2:126; Deyling, Observ. 3:355). Erasmus (Adag. Cent. 2:578) says that they were certain signs or marks which rendered their possessor victorious in every thing. Eustathius (ad Hom. Odys. 10:694) states an opinion that Croesus, when on his funeral pile, was very much benefited by the use of them; and that when a Milesian and an Ephesian were wrestling in the Olympic games, the former could gain no advantage, as the latter had Ephesian letters bound round his heel; but, these being discovered and removed, he lost his superiority, and was thrown thirty times. The faith in these mystic syllables continued, more or less, till the sixth century (see the Life of Alexander of Tralles, in Smith's Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.). We should enter on doubtful ground if we were to speculate on the Gnostic and other errors which grew up at Ephesus in the later apostolic age, and which are foretold in the address at Miletus, and indicated in the epistle to the Ephesians, and more distinctly in the epistles to Timothy. SEE CURIOUS ARTS.

7. Modern Remains. — The ruins of Ephesus lie two short days' journey from Smyrna, in proceeding from which towards the south-east the traveler passes the pretty village of Sedekuy; and two hours and a half onwards he comes to the ruined village of Danizzi, on a wide, solitary, uncultivated plain, beyond which several burial-grounds may be observed; near one of these, on an eminence, are the supposed ruins of Ephesus, consisting of shattered walls, in which some pillars, architraves, and fragments of marble have been built. The soil of the plain appears rich. It is covered with a rank, burnt-up vegetation, and is everywhere deserted and solitary, though bordered by picturesque mountains. A few corn-fields are scattered along the site of the ancient city, which is marked by some large masses of shapeless ruins and stone walls. Towards the sea extends the ancient port, a pestilential marsh. Along the slope of the mountain and over the plain are scattered fragments of masonry and detached ruins, but nothing can now be fixed upon as the great temple of Diana. There are some broken columns and capitals of the Corinthian order of white marble: there are also ruins of a theater, consisting of some circular seats and numerous arches, supposed to be the one in which Paul was preaching when interrupted by shouts of "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." The ruins of this theater present a wreck of immense grandeur, and the original must have been of the largest and most imposing dimensions. Its form alone can now be  spoken of, for every seat is removed, and the proscenium is a hill of ruins. A splendid circus (Fellows's Reports, page 275) or stadium remains tolerably entire, and there are numerous piles of buildings, seen alike at Pergamus and Troy as well as here, by some called gymnasia, by others temples; by others again, with more propriety, palaces. They all came with the Roman conquest. No one but a Roman emperor could have conceived such structures. In Italy they have parallels in Adrian's villa near Tivoli, and perhaps in the pile upon the Palatine. Many other walls remain to show the extent of the buildings of the city, but no inscription or ornament is to be found, cities having been built out of this quarry of worked marble. The ruins of the adjoining town, which arose about four hundred years ago, are entirely composed of materials from Ephesus. There are a few huts within these ruins (about a mile and a half from Ephesus), which still retain the name of the parent city, Asaluk — a Turkish word, which is associated with the same idea as Ephesus, meaning the City of the Moon (Fellows). A church dedicated to St. John is thought to have stood near, if not on the site of the present mosque. Arundell (Discoveries, 2:253) conjectures that the gate, called the Gate of Persecution, and large masses of brick wall which lie beyond it, are parts of this celebrated church, which was fortified during the great Council of Ephesus. The tomb of St. John was in or under his church, and the Greeks have a tradition of a sacred dust arising every year, on his festival, from the tomb, possessed of miraculous virtues: this dust they term manna. Not far from the tomb of St. John was that of Timothy. The tomb of Mary and the seven παιδία (boys, as the Synaxaria calls the Seven Sleepers) are found in an adjoining hill. At the back of the mosque, on the hill, is the sunk ground-plan of a small church, still much venerated by the Greeks. The sites of two others are shown at Asaluk. There is also a building, called the Prison of St. Paul, constructed of large stones without cement. The situation of the temple is doubtful, but it probably stood where certain large masses remain on the low ground, full in view of the theater. The disappearance of the temple may easily be accounted for, partly by the rising of the soil, and partly by the incessant use of its materials for medieval buildings. Some of its columns are said to be in St. Sophia at Constantinople, and even in the cathedrals of Italy.

Though Ephesus presents few traces of human life, and little but scattered and mutilated remains of its ancient grandeur, yet the environs, diversified as they are with hill and dale, and not scantily supplied with wood and water, present many features of great beauty. Arundell (2:244) enumerates  a great variety of trees, which he saw in the neighborhood, among which may be specified groves of myrtle near Ephesus. He also found heath in abundance, of two varieties, and saw there the common fern, which he met with in no other part of Asia Minor. Dr. Chandler (page 150, 4to) gives a striking description of Ephesus, as he found it on his visit in 1764: "Its population consisted of a few Greek peasants, living in extreme wretchedness, dependence, and insensibility, the representatives of an illustrious people, and inhabiting the wreck of their greatness — some the substructure of the glorious edifices which they raised, some beneath the vaults of the stadium, once the crowded scene of their diversions; and some in the abrupt precipice, in the sepulchers which received their ashes. Such are the present citizens of Ephesus, and such is the condition to which that renowned city has been reduced. It was a ruinous place when the emperor Justinian filled Constantinople with its statues, and raised the church of St. Sophia on its columns. Its streets are obscured and overgrown. A herd of goats was driven to it for shelter from the sun at noon, and a noisy flight of crows from the quarries seemed to insult its silence. We heard the partridge call in the area of the theater and of the stadium. The pomp of its heathen worship is no longer remembered; and Christianity, which was then nursed by apostles, and fostered by general councils, barely lingers on, in an existence hardly visible." However much the Church at Ephesus may (Rev 2:2), in its earliest days, have merited praise for its "works, labor, and patience," yet it appears soon to have "left its first love," and to have received in vain the admonition — "Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove: thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." If any repentance was produced by this solemn warning, its effects were not durable, and the place has long since offered an evidence of the truth of prophecy, and the certainty of the divine threatenings, as well as a melancholy subject for thought to the contemplative Christian. Its fate is that of the once flourishing seven churches of Asia: its fate is that of the entire country — a garden has become a desert. Busy centers of civilization, spots where the refinements and delights of the age were collected, are now a prey to silence, destruction, and death. Consecrated first of all to the purposes of idolatry, Ephesus next had Christian temples almost rivaling the pagan in splendor, wherein the image of the great Diana lay prostrate before the cross; and, after the lapse of some centuries, Jesus gave place to Mohammed, and the crescent glittered on the dome of the recently  Christian church. A few more scores of years, and Ephesus had neither temple, cross, crescent, nor city, but was 6a desolation, a dry land, and a wilderness." Even the sea has retired from the scene of devastation, and a pestilential morass, covered with mud and rushes, has succeeded to the waters which brought up ships laden with merchandise from every part of the known world. (See Herod. 1:26; 2:148; Livy, 1:45; Pausanias, 7:2. 4; Philo Byz. Deu 7:1-26 Orb. Mirac.; Creuzer, Symbol. 2:13; Hassel, Erdbeschr. 2:182.)

7. Literature. — The site of ancient Ephesus has been visited and examined by many travelers during the last 200 years, and descriptions, more or less copious, have been given by Pococke, Tournefort, Spon and Wheler, Chandler, Poujoulat, Prokesch, Beaujour, Schubert, Arundell (Seven Churches, Lond. 1828, page 26), Fellows (Asia Minor, Lond. 1839, page 274), and Hamilton. The fullest accounts are, among the older travellers, in Chandler (Travels, Oxford, 1775, page 131), and, among the more recent, in Hamilton (Researches, Lond. 1842, 2:22). Some views are given in the second volume of the Ionian Antiquities, published by the Dilettanti Society. Leake, in his Asia Minor (Lond. 1824, pages 258, 346), has a discussion on the dimensions and style of the temple. In Kiepert's Hellas is a map, more or less conjectural, the substance of which will be found in Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v. Ephesus. The latest and most complete work is Falkener's Ephesus and the Temple of Diana (London, 1862, 8vo). A railway now renders Ephesus accessible from Smyrna (Pressense, Land of Gospel, page 215). To the works above referred to must be added Perry, De rebus Ephesiorum (Gott. 1837), a slight sketch; Guhl, Ephesiaca (Berl. 1843), a very elaborate work, although his plans are mostly from Kiepert; Hemsen's Paulus (Gott. 1830), which contains a good chapter on Ephesus; Biscoe, On the Acts (Oxf. 1829), pages 274- 285; Mr. Akerman's paper on the Coins of Ephesus in the Trans. of the Numismatic Soc. 1841; Gronovius, Antiq. Graec. 7:387-401; and an article by Ampere in the Rev. des Deux Mondes for January 1842. Other monographs are Anon. Acta Pauli cum Ephesiis (Helmst. 1768); Epinus, De duplici bapt. discip. Ephesinor. (Altorf, 1719); Benner, De bapt. Ephesiorum in nonzen Christi (Giess. 1733); Bircherode, De cultu Diance Ephes. (Hafn. 1723); Conrad, Acta Pauli Ephes. (Jena, 1710); Deyling, De tumultu a Demetrio (in his Obss. sacr. in, 362 sq.); Lederlin, De templis Diance Ephesiorum (Argent. 1714); Schurzfleish, De literis Ephesior. (Viteb. 1698); Siber, De περιεργἱᾷ Ephesiorum (Viteb. 1685); Wallen,  Acta Pauli Ephes. (Grybh. 1783); Stickel, De Ephesiis literis linguae Semiticae vindicandis (Jeh. 1860). SEE EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO.

Ephesus, General Council Of.

The third oecumenical council, convoked by the emperor Theodosius II, was held at Ephesus in 431, upon the controversy raised by Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, who objected to the application of the title of Θεοτόκος to the Virgin Mary. For the circumstances which led to the convocation of this council, see the articles NESTORIUS SEE NESTORIUS , NESTORIANS SEE NESTORIANS , PELAGIUS SEE PELAGIUS . Celestine, the pope, not seeing fit to attend in person, sent three legates, Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philip, a priest. Among the first who arrived at the council was Nestorius, with a numerous body of followers, and accompanied by Ireneus, a nobleman, his friend and protector. Cyril of Alexandria also, and Juvenal of Jerusalem came, accompanied by about fifty of the Egyptian bishops; Memnon of Ephesus had brought together about forty of the bishops within his jurisdiction; and altogether more than two hundred bishops were present. Candidianus, the commander of the forces in Ephesus, attended, by order of the emperor, to keep peace and order; but by his conduct he greatly favored the party of Nestorius. The day appointed for the opening of the council was June 7th; but John of Antioch, and the other bishops from Syria and the East not having arrived, it was delayed till the 22d of the same month. At the first session of the council (June 22), before the Greek and Syrian bishops had arrived, Cyril and the bishops present condemned the doctrines of Nestorius, and deposed and excommunicated him. This sentence was signed by one hundred and ninety-eight bishops, according to Tillemont, and by more than two hundred according to Fleury; it was immediately made known to Nestorius, and published in the public places. At the same time, notice of it was sent to the clergy and people of Constantinople, with a recommendation to them to secure the property of the Church for the successor of the deprived Nestorius. As soon, however, as Nestorius had received notice of this sentence, he protested against it, and all that had passed at the council, and forwarded to the emperor an account of what had been done, setting forth that Cyril and Memnon, refusing to wait for John and the other bishops, had hurried matters on in a tumultuous and irregular way. On the 27th of June twenty-seven Syrian bishops arrived, chose John of Antioch for their president, and deposed Cyril in their turn. In August, count John, who had been sent by Theodosius, arrived at  Ephesus, and directed the bishops of both synods to meet him on the following day.

Accordingly, John of Antioch and Nestorius attended with their party, and Cyril with the orthodox; but immediately a dispute arose between them the latter contending that Nestorius should not be present, while the former wished to exclude Cyril. Upon this, the count, to quiet the dispute, gave both Cyril and Nestorius into custody, and then endeavored, but in vain, to reconcile the two parties. And thus matters seemed as far from a settlement as ever. The emperor at last permitted the fathers of the council to send to him eight deputies, while the Orientals or Syrians, on their part, sent as many. The place of meeting was Chalcedon, whither the emperor proceeded, and spent five days in listening to the arguments on. both sides; and here the Council of Ephesus may, in. fact, be said to have terminated. Nothing is known of what passed at Chalcedon, but the event shows that Theodosius sided with the Catholics, since upon his return to Constantinople he ordered, by a letter, the Catholic deputies to come there, and to proceed to consecrate a bishop in the place of Nestorius, whom he had already ordered to leave Ephesus, and to confine himself to his monastery near Antioch. Afterwards he directed that all the bishops at the council, including Cyril and Memnon, should return to their respective dioceses. The judgment of this council was at once approved by the whole Western Church, and by far the greater part of the East, and was subsequently confirmed by the (Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, consisting of six hundred and thirty bishops. Even, John of Antioch and the Eastern bishops very soon acknowledged it. But Nestorius protested to the last that he did not hold the heretical opinions anathematized by the council. SEE NESTORIUS.

Of the other councils of Ephesus, the following are all that need be mentioned: 1, in 245 (?), against the Patropassian Noetus; 2, in 400, under Chrysostom, where Heraclidus was consecrated bishop of Ephesus, and six simoniacal bishops deposed; and the ROBBER COUNCIL (see next article). — Landon, Manual of Councils, page 235; Mansi, Conc. 4:1212, 1320, et al.; Gieseler, Ch. History, § 88; Neander, Church Hist. 2:468 sq.; Murd. Mosheim, Church Hist. 1:358; Palmer, On the Church, 1:385 sq.; Cunningham, Historical Theology, 1:328 sq.; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 2:161 sq. ; Smith, Tables of Church History; Christian Examiner, 54:49.

## Ephesus, Robber Council Of[[@Headword:Ephesus, Robber Council Of]]

             (σύνοδος λῃστρική, latrocinium Ephesinum), the so-called second general council at Ephesus, A.D. 449. Eutyches (q.v.), whom Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, had in the, preceding year deposed on account of heretical opinions, appealed to a general council, at which the patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and other heads of the Church should be present, and prevailed upon the emperor to convoke the council immediately. Theodosius wrote to Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, desiring him to attend at Ephesus on the1st of August, with ten metropolitan and as many Egyptian bishops, and no more, in order to inquire into a question of faith in dispute between Flavianus and Eutyches, and to remove from the Church the favorers of Nestorius. In the same manner he wrote to other bishops, always fixing the same number of metropolitans and bishops, and especially forbidding: Theodoret to leave his diocese. He sent his own officers, Elpidus and Eulogius, with authority to provide such troops as they might deem necessary, in order to carry into effect what might be required. The bishops who had sat in judgment upon Eutyches at the council held by Flavianus at Constantinople in 448 were present at the council, but were allowed to take no part in the debates, and Dioscorus was allowed to take the lead in everything relating to the council.

The council met August 8, and about 130 bishops attended. Dioscorus and his party ruled throughout; Eutyches was declared orthodox, and re-established in his priesthood and office of abbot; and sentence of deposition was pronounced upon Flavianus. Flavianus appealed from this decision to the bishop of Rome, whose legate, Hilary, boldly opposed the sentence; at; the same time many of the bishops on their knees implored Dioscorus to reconsider the matter, but he, determined to carry it through, cried out for the imperial officers, upon which the proconsul Proclus entered, followed by a band of soldiers, armed with swords and sticks, and carrying chains, who by threats and blows compelled the bishops to sign the sentence of deposition. This, at last, ninety-six of them did, many, however, being first severely wounded; Flavianus himself was treated with such excessive violence that he died of the injuries he had received within three days; it is said that Dioscorus jumped upon him as he lay upon the ground, and that Barsumas and the monks kicked him with the utmost brutality. To the condemnation of Flavianus that of Eusebius of Dorylaeum was added, which ended the first session; after which the legate Hilary, dreading fresh scenes of violence, fled secretly to Rome. In the  following sessions Theodoret of Tyre was deposed, also Domnus of Antioch .and Ibas of Edessa; after which Dioscorus departed, and the bishops withdrew from Ephesus. Thus ended the σύνοδος λῃστρική, as the Greeks justly named this disgraceful assembly, in which violence and injustice were carried on to the utmost excess. — Landon, Manual of Councils, page 236; Mansi, Concil 6:588 et al.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:509 sq.; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. § 89; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 2:350 sq.; Schaff, Church Hist. 2:348; 3:738; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 1:278; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 4:81; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:610; Lewald, Die sogenannte Raubersynode, in Illgen's Zeitschriftfiir d. histor. Theol. 1838, page 39. SEE DIOSCORUS.

## Ephesus, Seven Sleepers Of[[@Headword:Ephesus, Seven Sleepers Of]]

             SEE SEVEN SLEEPERS.

## Ephlal[[@Headword:Ephlal]]

             (Hebrews Ephlal', אֶפְלָל, judicator; Sept. Ο᾿φλάδ v.r. Α᾿φαμήλ, Vulg. Ophlal), son of Zabad and father of Obed, of the lineage of Sheshan, of Judah (1Ch 2:37). B.C. post 1618.

## Ephod[[@Headword:Ephod]]

             (Hebrews Ephod', אֵפֹד, an ephod [q.v.]; Sept. Οὐφίδ v.r. Σουφί, Vulg. Ephod), the father of Hanniel, which latter, as head of the tribe of Manasseh, was one of the men appointed to assist Joshua and Eleazar in the apportionment of the land of Canaan (Num 34:23). B.C. ante 1618.

## Ephod (2)[[@Headword:Ephod (2)]]

             ( אֵפוֹד[rarely אֵפֹד], ephod', twice [Exo 28:8; Exo 39:5] in the fem. אֲפֻדָּה, aphuddah', something girt; ἐπωμίς, Sir 45:8), a sacred vestmerit originally appropriate to the high-priest (Exo 28:4), but afterwards worn by ordinary priests (1Sa 22:18), and deemed characteristic of the office (1Sa 2:28; 1Sa 14:3; Hos 3:4). A kind of ephod was worn by Samuel (1Sa 2:18), and by David when he brought the ark to Jerusalem (2Sa 6:14; 1Ch 15:27); it differed from the priestly ephod in material, being made of ordinary linen (בִּד), whereas the other was of fine linen (שֵׁשׁ); it is noticeable that the Sept. does not give ἐπωμίς or Ε᾿φούς in the passages last quoted, but  terms of more general import, στολὴ ἔξαλλος, στολὴ βυσσίνη. Attached to the ephod of the high-priest was the breast-plate with the Urim and Thummim; this was the ephod by eminence, which Abiathar carried off (1Sa 23:6) from the tabernacle at Nob (1Sa 21:9), and which David consulted (1Sa 23:9; 1Sa 30:7). The importance of the ephod as the receptacle of the breast-plate led to its adoption in the idolatrous forms of worship instituted in the time of the judges (Jdg 8:27; Jdg 17:5; Jdg 18:14 sq.). The amount of gold used by Gideon in making his ephod (Jdg 8:26) has led Gesenius (Thesaur. page 135), after Vatke (Bibl. Theol. 1:267), following the Peshito version, to give the word the meaning of an idol-image, as though that, and not the priest, was clothed with the ephod: but there is no evidence that the idol was so invested, nor does such an idea harmonize with the general use of the ephod. Idols of wood were often thus overlaid with plates of gold or silver, and are probably alluded to in Jdg 17:5; Jdg 18:17-20; Hos 3:4; Isa 30:22. The ephod itself, however, would require a considerable amount of gold (Exo 28:6; Exo 39:2 sq.), but certainly not so large a sum as is stated to have been used by Gideon; may we not therefore assume that to make an ephod implied the introduction of a new system of worship with its various accessories, such as the graven image, which seems, from the prominence assigned to it in Jdg 18:31, to represent the Urim and Thummim, the molten image, and the Teraphim (Jdg 17:4-5), and would require a large consumption of metal? The ephod was worn over the tunic and outer garment or pallium (Exo 28:31; Exo 29:5), without sleeves, and divided below the armpits into two parts or halves, of which one was in front, covering the breast and belly, and the other behind, covering the back. These were joined above on the shoulders by clasps or buckles of gold and precious stones, and reached down to the middle of the thighs; they were also made fast by a belt around the body (Exo 18:6-12). The ancient Egyptian priests appear to have been arrayed in white garments of the same materials. The hierogramnat, or sacred scribe, especially wore, over the kelt or apron (corresponding to the Jewish sacerdotal "6 breeches" or drawers) which constituted the universal nether undergarment, a loose upper robe with full sleeves, which in all cases was of the finest linen, and was secured by a girdle round the loins. Sometimes a priest who offered incense was clad in like manner. At other times the priests wore, in addition to the apron, a shirt with short tight sleeves, over which was thrown a loose robe, leaving the right arm exposed (Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt. 1:334). SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

## Ephori[[@Headword:Ephori]]

             (Gr. Eipopot, inspectors), a name sometimes applied by ancient-Christian writers to bishops.

## Ephphatha[[@Headword:Ephphatha]]

             (ἐφφαθά, a Graecized form of the Syro-Chaldee imperative הַפָּתִחor אַפְּתִח, strictly אֵתְפָּתָח, meaning be opened, as it is immediately interpreted), an exclamation uttered by Christ in curing the deaf-mute (Mar 7:34).

## Ephraem Manuscript[[@Headword:Ephraem Manuscript]]

             (CODEX EPHRAEMI, usually designated as C. of the New Test.), a very important uncial palimpsest, which derives its name from having been (about the 12th century), rewritten over with a portion of the Greek works of Ephraem the Syrian (q.v.). It seems to have been brought from the East by Andrew John Lascar, at whose death; (A.D. 1535) it passed into the hands of cardinal Nicolas Ridolfi, and thence, through Pietro Strozzi, into the possession of Catharine de Medici, who deposited it in the Royal Library at Paris, where it still remains (numbered MS. 9). The old Greek writing, which is barely legible (having been partly effaced to, make room for the later matter) contains portions of the Sept. version of the O.T. on 64 leaves, and fragments(enumerated in Scrivener's. Introd. page 94 note) of every part of the N.T. on 145 leaves. It is elegantly written, very much resembling in form and arrangement of the books and general appearance the Codex Alexandrinus, and has but one column on a page, consisting of 40 to 46 lines. The characters vary in size, are somewhat elaborate, and have the characteristics of the Alexandrian recension, and of the 5th century. The Ammonian sections stand in the margin, but not the Eusebiancanons; the latter, perhaps, having been washed out, as they were usually in red ink. There are no chapter divisions, and but few punctuation marks. Traces of at least three later correctors may be discovered; the first, perhaps of the 6th century, inserted many accents, and the rough breathing; by him or the third hand (whose changes are but few), small crosses were interpolated as; stops; the second reviser, not earlier than the 9th century, appears to have clumsily added the ecclesiastical notes in the margin. A chemical preparation, applied to the MS. at the instance of Fleck in 1834, though it revived much that was before illegible, has defaced the vellum with stains of various color. The  older writing was first, noticed by Peter Allix nearly two centuries ago; various readings extracted from it were communicated by Boivin to Kuster, who published them in his edition of Mill's N.T., 1711. A complete collation of the N.T. portion was first made by Wetstein in 1716, for Bentley's projected edition, and used by Wetstein in his own Greek Test. of 1751-2. In 1843 Tischendorf published the N.T. part fully, and the O.T. in 1845, in a splendid and accurate form, page for page and line for line, in capital but not fac-simile letters, with valuable prolegomena, etc. — Tregelles, in Horne's Introd. 4:166 sq.; Christian Remembrancer, October 1862; Tischendorf, Nov. Test. Gr. 7th edit. page 149 sq. SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

## Ephraim[[@Headword:Ephraim]]

             (Hebrews Ephra'yim, אֶפְרִיַם, a dual form; Gesenius suggests=twin-land; Fürst derives from a sing. אֵפְרִי=פְּרִי, fruitful; Sept. Ε᾿φραϊvμ), the name of a man (including the tribe and tract named from him, with other kindred objects), and of one or two other places of doubtful authenticity and certainly of much less note.

1. (Josephus Graecizes Ε᾿φραϊvμης, Ant. 2:7, 4.) The second son of Joseph by Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah (Gen 46:20), born during the seven years of plenteousness (B.C. cir. 1878), and an allusion to this is possibly latent in the name, though it may also allude to Joseph's increasing family: "The name of the second he called Ephraim (i.e., double fruitfulness), for God hath caused me to be fruitful (הַפְרִנַי, hiphrani) in the land of my affliction" (Gen 41:52). Josephus (Ant. 2:6, 1) gives the derivation of the name somewhat differently —"Restorer, because he was restored to the freedom of his forefathers" (ἀποδιδούς ... διὰ τὸ ἀποδοθῆναι). The first incident in his history, as well as that of his elder brother Manasseh, is the blessing of the grandchildren by Jacob, "Gen 48:1-22 — a passage on the age and genuineness of which the severest criticism has cast no doubt (Tuch, Genesis, page 548; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 1:534, note). Like his own father, on an occasion not dissimilar, Jacob's eyes were dim so that he could not see (Gen 48:10; comp. Gen 27:1). The intention of Joseph was evidently that the right hand of Jacob should convey its ampler blessing to the head of Manasseh, his first-born, and he had so arranged the young men. But the result was otherwise ordained. Jacob had been himself  a younger brother, and his words show plainly that he had not forgotten this, and that his sympathies were still with the younger of his two grand- children. He recalls the time when he was flying with the birthright from the vengeance of Esau; the day when, still a wanderer, God Almighty had appeared to him at "Luz in the land of Canaan," and blessed him in words which foreshadowed the name of Ephraim ("I will make thee fruitful," מִפְרְךָ, maphreka, Gen 48:4; "Be thou fruitful," פְּרֵה, pereh, Gen 35:11; both from the same root as the name Ephraim); the still later day when the name of Ephrath (comp. Ewald, Gesch. 1:493, n.) became bound up with the sorest trial of his life (Gen 48:7; Gen 35:16). SEE EPHRAIMITE. Thus, notwithstanding the prearrangement and the remonstrance of Joseph, for the second time in that family, the younger brother was made greater than the elder — Ephraim was set before Manasseh (Gen 48:19-20). Ephraim would appear at that time to have been about twenty-one years old (comp. Gen 47:28). Before Joseph's death Ephraim's family had reached the third generation (Gen 1:23), and it may have been about this time that the affray mentioned in 1Ch 7:21, occurred, when some of the sons were killed on a plundering expedition along the sea-coast to rob the cattle of the men of Gath, and when Ephraim named a son Beriah, to perpetuate the memory of the disaster which had fallen on his house. SEE BERIAH. Obscure as is the interpretation of this fragment, it enables us to catch our last glimpse of the patriarch, mourning inconsolable in the midst of the circle of his brethren, and at last commemorating his loss in the name of the new child, who, unknown to him, was to be the progenitor of the most illustrious of all his descendants — Jehoshua, or Joshua, the son of Nun (1Ch 7:27 : see Ewald, 1:491). To this early period, too, has been referred the circumstance alluded to in Psa 78:9, when the "'children of Ephraim, armed bowmen (רוֹמֵיקֶשֶׁת נוֹשְׁקֵי, A. V. "being armed [and] carrying bows," which Gesenius and others support, from the Sept. and Vulg.; although Ewald strikingly renders ‘carrying slack bows'), turned back in the day of battle." Others, however, assign this defection to the failure of the tribe (in common with the rest of the Israelites) to expel the Canaanites (Jdg 1:29).

1. TRIBE OF EPHRAIM. This tribe, although, in accordance with the ancient laws of primogeniture, inferior, as being the junior, yet received precedence over that descended from the elder Manasseh by virtue of the blessing of Jacob (Gen 41:52; Gen 48:1). That blessing was an adoptive act, whereby Ephraim and his brother Manasseh were counted as sons of  Jacob, in the place of their father; the object being to give to Joseph, through his sons, a double portion in the brilliant prospects of his house. Thus the descendants of Joseph formed two of the tribes of Israel, whereas every other of Jacob's sons counted but as one. There were thus, in fact, thirteen tribes of Israel; but the number twelve is usually preserved, either by excluding that of Levi (which had no territory) when Ephraim and Manasseh are separately named, or by counting these two together as the tribe of Joseph when Levi is included in the account. The intentions of Jacob were fulfilled, and Ephraim and Manasseh were counted as tribes of Israel at the departure from Egypt, and, as such, shared in the territorial distribution of the Promised Land (Num 1:33; Jos 17:14; 1Ch 7:20). The precise position of the immediate descendants of Joseph in Egypt might form an interesting subject for speculation. Being the sons of one in eminent place, and through their mother connected with high families in Egypt, their condition could not at once have been identified with that of the sojourners in Goshen; and perhaps they were not fully amalgamated with the rest of their countrymen until that king arose who knew not Joseph.

The numbers of the tribe did not at all times correspond with the promise of the blessing of Jacob. At the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Num 1:32-33; Num 2:19) its numbers were 40,500, placing it at the head of the children of Rachel — Manasseh's number being 32,200, and Benjamin's 35,400. But forty years later, on the eve of the conquest (Num 26:37), without any apparent cause, while Manasseh had advanced to 52,700, and Benjamin to 45,600, Ephraim had decreased to 32,500, the only smaller number being that of Simeon, 22,200. At this period the families of both the brother tribes are enumerated, and Manasseh has precedence over Ephraim in order of mention. It is very possible that these great fluctuations in number may, in part at least, have been owing to the various standards under which the "mixed multitude" (עֶרֶב), i.e., mongrel population of semi-Hebrew Egyptians that followed the emigrating host (Exo 12:38), ranged itself in its fickleness at different times (Meth. Quart. Rev. April 1863, page 305 sq.). During the march through the wilderness the position of the sons of Joseph and Benjamin was on the west side of the tabernacle (Num 2:18-24), and the prince of Ephraim was Elishama, the son of Ammihud (Num 1:10).  It is at the time of the sending of the spies that we are first introduced to the great hero to whom the tribe owed much of its subsequent greatness. The representative of Ephraim on this occasion was "Oshea, the son of Nun," whose name was at the termination of the affair changed by Moses to the more distinguished form in which it is familiar to us. As among the founders of the nation Abram had acquired the name of Abraham, and Jacob of Israel, so Oshea, "help," became Jehoshua or Joshua, "the help of Jehovah" (Ewald, 2:306).

According to the arrangement of the records of the book of Joshua-the " Domesday book of Palestine" — the two great tribes of Judah and Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh) first took their inheritance; and after them the seven other tribes entered on theirs (Jos 15:1-63; Jos 16:1-10; Jos 17:1-18; Jos 18:5). The boundaries of the portion of Ephraim are given in  Jos 16:1-10, and a part of it apparently in duplicate in Jos 16:5; Jos 16:7. The south boundary was coincident for part of its length with the north boundary of Benjamin (q.v.), which latter, however, is somewhat more exactly stated in Jos 18:12 sq. SEE TRIBE. Commencing at the Jordan, at the reach opposite Jericho (strictly Jordan of Jericho, יִרְדֵּן יְרַיחוֹ, an expression that would lead as to locate the boundary at the point nearest that city, did not the necessity of including within Benjamin certain other pretty well identified places compel us to carry it somewhat farther up the river), it ran to the "water of Jericho," probably the vicinity of the Ras el-Ain; thence by one of the ravines, perhaps the wady Samieh, it ascended through the wilderness Xidbar, the uncultivated waste hills-to Mount Bethel and Luz; and thence by Ataroth, "the Japhietite," Bethhoron the lower, and Gezer-places two of which are known-along the northern boundary of Dan (q.v.) to the Mediterranean, probably about Joppa. This agrees with the enumeration in 1Ch 7:1-40, in which Bethel is given as the eastern, and Gezer- somewhere east of the present Ramleh-as the western limit. In Jos 16:6; Jos 16:8, we apparently have fragments of the northern boundary (compare 17:10), and as at least three of the points along that line (Asher, Tappuah, and Janohah) are pretty well identified (see each name), we are tolerably safe in fixing the eastern extremity on the Jordan at about the mouth of wady Fasail, and the western, or the torrent Kanah, at the modern Nahr Falaik, north of Apollonia. But it is possible that there never was a very definite subdivision of the territory assigned to the two brother tribes. Such an inference, at least, may be drawn from Jos 17:14-18, in which the two are represented as complaining that only one 'portion had been allotted  to them. Among the towns named as Manasseh's were Bethshean in the Jordan valley, Endor on the slopes of the "Little Hermon," Taanach on the north side of Carmel, and Dor on the sea-coast south of the same mountain. Ephraim thus occupied the very center of Palestine, embracing an area about 40 miles in length from E. to W., and from 6 to 25 in breadth from N. to S. It extended from the Mediterranean on the W. to the Jordan on the E. on the N. it had the half-tribe of Manasseh, and on the S. Benjamin and Dan (Jos 16:5; Jos 17:7 sq.). This fine country included most of what was afterwards called Samaria, as distinguished from Judaea on the one hand, and from Galilee on the other. SEE SAMARIA.

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities within this tribe, with the probable modern sites; those not identified by any modern traveler are enclosed in brackets:

Antipatris.       Town.       Kefr-Saba.

Archi.                  do.         [Kefr-Musr]?

Arumah.           do.         El-Ormah.

Ataroth (-addar). do.         Atara.

Baal-hamon.       Vineyard.   [S.E. of Jenin]?

Baal-shalisha.          Town.       SEE SHALISHA.

Beth-horon.       do.         Beit-Ur.

Bochim.           Altar Stone.      [Khurbet-Jeradeh]?

Ebal.             Mount.            [Jebel Sitti-Salamiyeh]

Gaash.                  do.         [Sepulchral Hill S. of Tibneh]?

Gazer.                  Town.       SEE GEZER.

Gerizim.          Mount.            Jebel et-Tur.

Gezer.                  Town.       Abu Shusheh.

Gibeah.                 do.         Khurbet-Jibia?

Gilgal (2Ki 2:2). do.         Jiljilia.

Gilgal (Jos 12:23).     do.         Jiljuliyeh.

Gob   do.   SEE GEZER.

Jacob's Well.     Well. Bir-Yakub.

Janohah.    Town. Yanun.

Japhleti.   Village.    [Beit Unia]?

Jeshanah.   Town. [Ain-Sinia]?

Kanah.      Brook.      Nahr Fulaik?

Lasharon.   Plain.      SEE SHARON.

Lebonah.    Town. Lubbban.

Luz.  do.   [N. of Beitin]?

Michmethah. do.   [On Wady Bidan]?

Moreh.      Hill. [S. spur of Jebel Duhy]?

Pirathon.   Town. Ferata.

Salim.      do.   Sheikh Salim.

Samaria.    do.   Sebustiyeh.

Saron.      Region.     SEE SHARON.

Shalem.     Town. Salim.

Shalisha.   Region.     [Khurbet Hatta].

Sharon.     do.   N. part maritime plain.

Shechem.    Town. Nablus.

Shiloh.     do.   Seilun.

Sychem or Sychar. do.   SEE SHECHEM.

Tappuah.    do.   ‘Atuf?

Thebez.     do.   Tubas.

Timnath (-heres or}     do.   Tibneh. -serah.)

Tiphsah.    do.   [Asira]?

Tirzah.     do.   Talusa.

Uzzen-sherah.     do.   [Suffa]?

Zalmon.     Mount.      [Jebel Sleiman].

Central Palestine consists of an elevated district which rises from the flat ranges of the wilderness on the south of Judah, and terminates on the north with the slopes which descend into the great plain of Esdraelon. On the west a flat strip separates it from the sea, and on the east another flat strip forms the valley of the Jordan. Of this district the northern half was occupied by the great tribe we are now considering. This was the Haar- Ephraim, or "Mount Ephraim," a district which seems to extend as far south as Ramah and Bethel (1Sa 1:1; 1Sa 7:17; 2Ch 13:4; 2Ch 13:19, compared with 15:8), places but a few miles north of Jerusalem, and within the limits of Benjamin. (See below.) In structure it is limestone — rounded hills separated by valleys of denudation, but much less regular and monotonous than the part more to the south, about and below Jerusalem; with "wide plains in the heart of the mountains, streams of running water, and continuous tracts of vegetation" (Stanley, Palest. p. 225). All travelers bear testimony to the "general growing richness" and beauty of the country in going northwards from Jerusalem, the "innumerable fountains" and streamlets, the villages more thickly scattered than anywhere in the south, the continuous corn-fields and orchards, the moist, vapory atmosphere (Martineau, pages 516, 521; Van de Velde, 1:386-8). These are the "precious things of the earth, and the fullness thereof," which are invoked on the "ten' thousands of Ephraim" and the "thousands of Manasseh" in the blessing of Moses. These it is which, while Dan, Judah, and Benjamin are personified as lions and wolves, making their lair and tearing their prey among the barren rocks of the south, suggested to the lawgiver, as they had done to the patriarch before him, the patient "bullock" and the "bough by the spring, whose branches ran over the wall" as fitter images for Ephraim (Gen 49:22; Deu 33:17). And centuries after, when its great disaster had fallen on the kingdom of Israel, the same images recur to the prophets. The "flowers" are still there in the "olive valleys," "faded" though they be (Isa 28:1). The vine is an empty, unprofitable vine, whose very abundance is evil (Hos 10:1); Ephraim is still the  "bullock," now "unaccustomed to the yoke," but waiting a restoration to the "pleasant places" of his former "pasture" (Jer 31:18; Hos 9:13; Hos 4:16) — "the heifer that is taught and loveth to tread out the corn," the heifer with the "beautiful neck" (Hos 10:11), or the "kine of Bashan on the mountain of Samaria" (Amo 4:1).

The wealth of their possession had not the same immediately enervating effect on this tribe that it had on some of its northern brethren, e.g., Asher (q.v.). Various causes may have helped to avert this evil.

1. The central situation of Ephraim in the highway of all communications from one part of the country to another. From north to south, from Jordan to the Sea — from Galilee, or still more distant Damascus, to Philistia and Egypt — these roads all lay more or less through Ephraim, and the constant traffic along them must have always tended to keep the district from sinking into stagnation.

2. The position of Shechem, the original settlement of Jacob, with his well and his "parcel of ground," with the two sacred mountains of Ebal and Gerizim, the scene of the impressive and significant ceremonial of blessing and cursing; and the tomb and patrimony of Joshua, the great hero not only of Ephraim, but of the nation — the fact that all these localities were deep in the heart of the tribe, must have made it always the resort of large numbers from all parts of the country — of larger numbers than any other place, until the establishment of Jerusalem by David. Moreover, the tabernacle and the ark were deposited within its limits, at Shiloh; and the possession of the sacerdotal establishment, which was a central object of attraction to all the other tribes, must, in no small degree, have enhanced its importance, and increased its wealth and population. It is, perhaps, to this fact that David alludes in Psa 132:6, if by "Ephratah" this tribe is there meant. 3. But there was a spirit about the tribe itself which may have been both a cause and a consequence of these advantages of position. That spirit, early domineering and haughty (Jos 17:14), though sometimes taking the form of noble remonstrance and reparation (2Ch 28:9-15), usually manifested itself in jealous complaint at some enterprise undertaken or advantage gained in which they had not a chief share. To Gideon (Jdg 8:1), to Jephthah (Jdg 12:1), and to David (2Sa 19:41-43), the cry is still the same in effect — almost the same in words — "Why did ye despise us that our advice should not have been first had?" "Why hast thou served us thus that thou calledst us  not?" The unsettled state of the country in general, and of the interior of Ephraim in particular (Jdg 9:1-57), and the continual incursions of foreigners, prevented the power of the tribe from manifesting itself in a more formidable manner than by these murmurs during the time of the Judges and the first stage of the monarchy.

Samuel, though a Levite, was a native of Ramah in Mount Ephraim, and Saul belonged to a tribe closely allied to the family of Joseph, so that during the priesthood of the former and the reign of the latter the supremacy of Ephraim may be said to have been practically maintained. Certainly in neither case had any advantage been gained by their great rival in the south. But when the great tribe of Judah produced a king in the person of David, the pride and jealousy of Ephraim were thoroughly awakened, and it was doubtless chiefly through their means that Abner was enabled for a time to uphold the house of Saul; for there are manifest indications that by, this time Ephraim influenced the views and feelings of all the other tribes. They were at length driven by the force of circumstances to acknowledge David upon conditions; and were probably not without hope that, as the king of the nation at large, he would establish his capital in their central portion of the land. Again, the brilliant successes of David, and his wide influence and religious zeal, kept matters smooth for another period, even in the face of the blow given to both Shechem and Shiloh by the concentration of the civil and ecclesiastical capitals at Jerusalem. Twenty thousand and eight hundred of the choice warriors of the tribe, "men of name throughout the house of their father," went as far as Hebron to make David king over Israel (1Ch 12:30). Among the officers of his court we find more than one Ephraimite (1Ch 27:10; 1Ch 27:14), and the attachment of the tribe to his person seems to have been great (2Sa 19:41-43). But as he not only established his court at Jerusalem, but proceeded to remove the ark thither, making his native Judah the seat both of the theocratic and civil government, the Ephraimites, as a tribe, became thoroughly alienated, and longed to establish their own ascendency. The building of the temple at Jerusalem, and other measures of Solomon, strengthened this desire; and although the minute organization and vigor of his government prevented any overt acts of rebellion, yet the train was then laid, and the reign of Solomon, splendid in appearance but oppressive to the people, developed both the circumstances of revolt and the leader who was to turn them to account. Solomon saw through the crisis, and if he could have succeeded in killing Jeroboam, as he tried to do (1Ki 11:40), the disruption might have been postponed for another century. As it was, the outbreak  was deferred for a time, but the irritation was not allayed, and the insane folly of his son brought the mischief to a head. Rehoboam probably selected Shechem — the old capital of the country — for his coronation, in the hope that his presence and the ceremonial might make a favorable impression, but in this he failed utterly, and the tumult which followed shows how complete was the breach — "To your tents, O Israel! now see to thine own house, David!" Rehoboam was certainly not the last king of Judah whose chariot went as far north as Shechem, but he was the last who visited it as a part of his own dominion, and he was the last who, having come so far, returned unmolested to his own capital. Jehoshaphat escaped, in a manner little short of miraculous, from the risks of the battle of Ramoth-Gilead, and it was the fate of two of his successors, Ahaziah and Josiah — differing in everything else, and agreeing only in this — that they were both carried dead in their chariots from the plain of Esdraelon to Jerusalem.

Thenceforth the rivalry of Ephraim and Judah was merged in that between the two kingdoms; although still the predominance of Ephraim in the kingdom of Israel was so conspicuous as to occasion the whole realm to be called by its name, especially when that rivalry is mentioned. This title is particularly employed in the prophetical books (Isa 9:8; Isa 17:3; Isa 28:3; Hos 4:17; Hos 5:3; Hos 9:3). When the land of Ephraim is meant, the word is fem. in the original (Hos 5:9); when the people, masc. (Isa 7:8). Thus in two senses the history of Ephraim is the history of the kingdom of Israel, since not only did the tribe become a kingdom, but the kingdom embraced little besides the tribe. This is not surprising, and quite susceptible of explanation. North of Ephraim the country appears never to have been really taken possession of by the Israelites. Whether from want of energy on their part, or great stubbornness of resistance on that of the Canaanites, certain it is that of the list of towns from which the original inhabitants were not expelled, the great majority belong to the northern tribes, Manasseh, Asher, Issachar, and Naphtali. In addition to this original defect there is much in the physical formation and circumstances of the upper portion of Palestine to explain why those tribes never took any active part in the kingdom. They were exposed to the inroads and seductions of their surrounding heathen neighbors — on one side the luxurious Phoenicians, on the other the plundering Bedouins of Midian; they were open to the attacks of Syria and Assyria from the north, and Egypt from the south; the great plain of Esdraelon, which communicated  more or less with all the northern tribes, was the natural outlet of the no less natural high roads of the maritime plain from Egypt, and the Jordan valley for the tribes of the East, and formed an admirable base of operations for an invading army. But, on the other hand, the position of Ephraim was altogether different. It was one at once of great richness and security. Her fertile plains and well-watered valleys could only be reached by a laborious ascent through steep and narrow ravines, all but impassable for an army. There is no record of any attack on the central kingdom, either from the Jordan valley or the maritime plain. On the north side, from the plain of Esdraelon, it was more accessible, and it was from this side that the final invasion appears to have been made. But even on that side the entrance was so difficult and so easily defensible — as we learn from the description in the book of Judith (Jdt 4:6-7) — that, had the kingdom of Samaria been less weakened by internal dissensions, the attacks even of the great Shalmaneser might have been resisted, as at a later date were those of Holofernes. There are few things more mournful in the sacred story than the descent of this haughty and jealous tribe, from the culminating point at which it stood when it entered on the fairest portion of the Land of Promise the chief sanctuary and the chief settlement of the nation within its limits, its leader the leader of the whole people — through the distrust which marked its intercourse with its fellows, while it was a member of the confederacy, and the tumult, dissension, and ungodliness which characterized its independent existence, down to the sudden captivity and total oblivion which closed its career. Judah had her times of revival and of recurring prosperity, but here the course is uniformly downward — a sad picture of opportunities wasted and personal gifts abused. 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt... . I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms, but they knew not that I healed them. I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love ... but the Assyrian shall be their king, because they refused to return... . How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim?" (Hos 11:1-8). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

2. MOUNT EPHRAIM, a mountain or group of mountains in Central Palestine, in the tribe of the same name, on or towards the borders of Benjamin (Jos 17:15; Jos 19:50; Jos 20:7; Jdg 7:24; Jdg 17:1; 1Sa 9:4; 1Ki 4:8). From a comparison of these passages it may be collected that the name of "Mount Ephraim" was applied to the whole  of the ranges and groups of hills which occupy the central part of the southernmost border of this tribe, and which are prolonged southward into the tribe of Benjamin. (See above.) In the time of Joshua these hills were densely covered with trees (Jos 17:18), which is by no means the case at present. In Jer 1:19, Mount Ephraim is mentioned in apposition with Bashan, on the other side of the Jordan, as a region of rich pastures, suggesting that the valleys among these mountains were well watered and covered with rich herbage, which is true at the present day. Joshua was buried in the border of his own inheritance in Timnath-heres, "in the mount of Ephraim, on the north side of the hill Gaash" (Jdg 2:9).

## Ephraim Ben-Simson[[@Headword:Ephraim Ben-Simson]]

             a Jewish rabbi, who flourished at the beginning of the 13th century in France, is the author of a commentary on the Pentateuch. Excerpts are made from it by Azulai in his נחל קדומים, and in תורה אור. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:223; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico, page 94 (Germ. transl.). (B.P.)

## Ephraim, Gate Of[[@Headword:Ephraim, Gate Of]]

             (שִׁעִר אֶפְּרִיַם; Sept. πύλη Ε᾿φραϊvμ), one of the gates of the city of Jerusalem (2Ki 14:13; 2Ch 25:23; Nehemiah 8:16; 13:39), doubtless, according to the Oriental practice, on the side looking towards the locality from which it derived its name, and therefore on the north, probably at or near the position of the present "Damascus gate." SEE JERUSALEM.

## Ephraim, Wood Of[[@Headword:Ephraim, Wood Of]]

             (יִעִר אֶפְרִיַם; Sept. δρυμὰς Ε᾿φραϊvμ), a forest (the word yaar imploring dense growth), in which the fatal battle was fought between the armies of David and of Absalom (2Sa 18:6), and the entanglement in which added greatly to the slaughter of the latter (2Sa 18:8). It would be very tempting to believe that the forest derived its name from the place near which Absalom's sheep-farm was situated (2Sa 13:23), and which would have been a natural spot for his headquarters before the battle, especially associated as it was with the murder of Amnon. Moreover, there appears to have been another woodland of Ephraim in the mountains belonging to that tribe in this neighborhood (Jos 17:15-18).

But the statements of Joshua 17:24, 26, and also the expression of Jos 18:3, "That thou succor us out of the city," i.e., Mahanaim, allow no escape from the conclusion that the locality was on the east side of Jordan, though it is impossible to account satisfactorily for the presence of the name of Ephraim on that side of the river. The suggestion is due to Grotius that the name was derived from the slaughter of Ephraim at the fords of Jordan by  the Gileadites under Jephthah (Jdg 12:1; Jdg 12:4-5); but that occurrence took place at the very brink of the river itself, while the city of Mahanaim and the wooded country must have lain several miles away from the stream, and on the higher ground above the Jordan valley. Is it not at least equally probable that the forest derived its name from this very battle? The great tribe of Ephraim, though not specially mentioned in the transactions of Absalom's revolt, cannot fail to have taken the most conspicuous part in the affair, and the reverse was a more serious one than had overtaken the tribe for a very long time, and possibly combined with other circumstances to retard materially their rising into an independent kingdom. But others suppose that it was because the Ephraimites were in the habit of bringing their flocks into this quarter for pasture; for the Jews allege that the Ephraimites received from Joshua, who was of their tribe, permission to feed their flocks in the woodlands within the territories of any of the tribes of Israel; and that, as this forest lay near their territories on the other side the Jordan, they were wont to drive their flocks over to feed there (see Jarchi, Kimchi, Abarbanel, etc., on 2Sa 18:6). It is probably referred to under the name EPHRATAH SEE EPHRATAH (q.v.) in Psa 132:6, where the other member of the verse has "fields of the wood." Others, however, not unreasonably suppose this to be a different locality. SEE FOREST.

2. In "Baal-hazor, which is 'by' Ephraim," was Absalom's sheep-farm, at which took place the murder of Amnon, one of the earliest precursors of the great revolt (2Sa 13:23). The Hebrew particle עִם, rendered above "by" (A.V. "beside"), always seems to imply actual proximity, and therefore we should conclude that Ephraim was not the tribe of that name, but a town. The cities of Dan and Asher are other instances of localities beyond the tribes, yet bearing their names; and the former suggests that the appellation may in all these cases have arisen by colonization. Ewald conjectures that the place here in question is identical with EPHRAIN, EPHRO, and OPHRAH of the O.T., and also with the EPHRAIM which was for a time the residence of our Lord (Gesch. 3:219, note). But with regard to the first three names there is the difficulty that they are spelt with the guttural letter ayin, and this is very rarely exchanged for the aleph, which commences the name before us. The Sept. makes the following addition to 2Sa 13:34 : "And the watchman went and told the king, and said, I have seen men on the road of the Oronen (τῆς ὠρωνῆν, Alex. τῶν ὀρεωνῆν) by the side of the mountain." Ewald considers this to be a  genuine addition, and to refer to Beth-horon, N.W. of Jerusalem, off the Nablus road, but the indication is surely too slight for such an inference. Any force it may have is against the identity of this Ephraim with that in Joh 11:54, which was probably in the direction N.E. of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, the best solution of the question appears to be to identify this place with the one following. SEE BAAL-HAZOR.

3. A city (Ε᾿φραϊvμ λεγομένην πόλιν) "in the district near the wilderness," to which our Lord retired with his disciples when threatened with violence by the priests in consequence of having raised Lazarus from the dead (Joh 11:54). By the "wilderness" (ἔρημος) is probably meant the wild uncultivated hill-country N.E. of Jerusalem, lying between the central towns and the Jordan valley (see Lightfoot, Hor. Hebrews pages 97, 953). In this case the conjecture of Dr. Robinson is very admissible, that OPHRAH SEE OPHRAH (q.v.) of Benjamin (Jos 18:23) and Ephraim are identical, and that their modern representation is et-Taiyibeh, a village on a conspicuous conical hill, commanding a view "over the whole eastern slope, the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea" (Researches, 2:121). It is placed by Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Ε᾿φρών) eight Roman miles north of Jerusalem, while Jerome, with more probability, makes the distance 20 Roman miles. This indication would seem to make it the same with the EPHRAIN or EPHRON which is mentioned in 2Ch 13:19, along with Bethel and Jeshanah, as towns taken from Jeroboam by Abijah. This, again, is doubtless the same which Josephus also names (Ε᾿φραϊvμ) along with Bethel as "two small cities" (πολίχνια), which were taken and garrisoned by Vespasian while reducing the country around Jerusalem (War, 4:9, 9). It is likewise probably identical with the EPHRAIM (see above) near Baal-Hazor (2Sa 13:23). SEE APHAEREMA.

## Ephraimite[[@Headword:Ephraimite]]

             as a designation of a descendant of the patriarch Ephraim, is properly denoted in the Hebrews by the patronymic בֶּןאּאֶפְרִיַם, son of Ephraim (Num 10:22, plur. A.V. "children of Ephraim"), or simply Ephraim (often rendered " Ephraimites" in the A.V.);. but in Jdg 12:5 it appears as a rendering of אֵפְרָתַי, an Ephrathite (q.v.), meaning thereby, however, an Ephraimite, which is apparently likewise the meaning of the same Hebrews word in 1Sa 1:1; 1Ki 11:26, in both which passages, however, the A.V. regularly Anglicizes "Ephrathite." The  narrative in Judges raises the inquiry whether the Ephraimites had not a peculiar accent orpatois, similar to that which in later times caused "the speech" of the Galilaeans to "betray" them to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Mat 26:73).

## Ephrain[[@Headword:Ephrain]]

             (Hebrews in the margin Ephra'yin, עֶפְרִיַן, but in the text Ephron', עֶפְרִוַֹן. ְe. עֶפְרוֹן, which latter appears to be the genuine reading, SEE EPHRON; Sept. Ε᾿φρών, Vulg. Ephron), a city of Israel, which, with its dependent hamlets ( בָּנוֹת= “daughters," A.V. "towns"), Abijah and the army of Judah captured from Jeroboam with Bethel and Jeshanah (2Ch 13:19). It appears to be mentioned in the Talmud (Menach. 9:1) as Ephraim (עֶפְרִיַם). It has been conjectured that this Ephrain or Ephron is identical with the EPH-RAIM by which Absalom's sheep-farm of Baalhazor was situated (2Sa 13:23); also with the city called EPHRAIM, near the wilderness in which our Lord lived for some time (Joh 11:54); and with OPHRAH (עָפְרָה), a city of Benjamin, apparently not far from Bethel (Jos 18:23; comp. Josephus, War, 4:9, 9), and which has been located by Dr. Robinson (Researches, new ed. 1:447), with much probability, at the modern village of et-Taiyibeh. (See Ewald, Geschichte, 3:219, 466; 5:365; Stanley, Palestine, page 210.) SEE EPHRAIM 3.

## Ephratah[[@Headword:Ephratah]]

             [some Ephra'tah] (Hebrews Ephra'thah, אֶפְרָתָה, Gen 35:16; Gen 35:19; Gen 48:7 twice; Psa 132:6; Mic 5:1; 1Ch 2:50; 1Ch 4:4; Sept. Ε᾿φραθά or Ε᾿φραθᾶ,Vulg. Ephrata, A.V. "Ephratah" in all but Genesis and the last-named passage of Chron., where it gives " Ephrath"), a prolonged [or sometimes "directive"] form of Eph'rath (Hebrew Ephrath', אֶפְרָת, probably fruitful, 1Ch 2:19; Sept. Φράθ, Vulg. Ephrata), the name of a woman and of one or two places.

1. The second wife of Caleb, the son of Hezron, mother of Hur, and grandmother of Caleb the spy, according to 1Ch 2:19; 1Ch 2:50, and probably 24 SEE CALEB-EPHRATAH, and 4:4, in which last passage Hur is apparently called "the father (i.e., founder) of Bethlehem" (see below). B.C. post 1856.  2. The ancient name of Bethlehem in Judah, as is manifest from Gen 35:16; Gen 35:10; Gen 48:7, both which passages distinctly prove that it was called Ephrath or Ephratah in Jacob's time, and use the regular formula for adding the modern name, הַיא בִיתאּלֶחֶם, which is Bethlehem (comp. e.g. Gen 23:2; Gen 35:27; Jos 15:10). It cannot, therefore, have derived its name from Ephratah, the mother of Hur, as the author of Quaest. Hebr. in Paraleip. says, and as one might otherwise have supposed from the connection of her descendants, Salma and Hur, with Bethlehem, which is somewhat obscurely intimated in 1Ch 2:50-51; 1Ch 4:4. It seems obvious, therefore, to infer that, on the contrary, Ephratah, the mother of Hur, was so called from the town of her birth, and that she probably was the owner of the town and district; in fact, that her name was really gentilitious. But if this be so, it would indicate more communication between the Israelites in Egypt and the Canaanites than is commonly supposed. When, however, we recollect that the land of Goshen was the border country on the Palestine side; that the Israelites in Goshen were a tribe of sheep and cattle drovers (Gen 47:3); that there was an easy communication between Palestine and Egypt from the earliest times (Gen 12:10; Gen 16:1; Gen 21:21, etc.); that there are indications of communications between the Israelites in Egypt and the Canaanites, caused by their trade as keepers of cattle (1Ch 7:21); and that, in the nature of things, the owners or keepers of large herds and flocks in Goshen would have dealings with the nomad tribes in Palestine, it will perhaps seem not impossible that a son of Hezron may have married a woman having property in Ephratah. Another way of accounting for the connection between Ephratah's descendants and Bethlehem, is to suppose that the elder Caleb was not really the son of Hezron, but merely reckoned so as the head of a Hezronite house.

He may in this case have been one of an Edomitish or Horite tribe an idea which is favored by the name of his son Hur, SEE CALEB, and have married an Ephrathite. Caleb the spy may have been their grandson. It is singular that "Salma, the father of Bethlehem," should have married a Canaanitish woman. Could she have been of the kindred of Caleb in any way? If she were, and if Salma obtained Bethlehem, a portion of Hur's inheritance, in consequence, this would account for both Hur and Salma being called "father of Bethlehem." Another possible explanation is, that Ephratah may have been the name given to some daughter of Benjamin to commemorate the circumstance of Rachel his mother having died close to Ephrath. This would receive some support from the son of Rachel's other son Joseph being called Ephraim, a  word of identical etymology, as appears from the fact that אֶפְרָתַיmeans indifferently an Ephrathite, i.e., Bethlehemite (Rth 1:1-2), or an Ephraimite (1Sa 1:1). But it would not account for Ephratah's descendants being settled at Bethlehem. From Rth 1:2, where the sons of Naomi are called" Ephrathites of Bethlehem [of] Judah," it would seem that Ephrath was the name of a district of which Bethlehem was the chief town; and the designation of Mic 4:2 as "Bethlehem [of] Ephratah," is rendered in Mat 2:6, "Bethlehem [in the] land (γ'η) of Judah," as if to distinguish it by adding the name of a district, although a larger one (Lange, Comment. on Matthew in loc.). At all events we should note that in Genesis, and perhaps in Chronicles, it is called Ephrath or Ephratah; in Ruth, Bethlehem-Judah, but the inhabitants Ephrathites; in Micah, Bethlehem-Ephratah; in Matthew Bethlehem in the land of Juda. The Sept. supplies [Ε᾿φραθά (αὕτη ἐστὶ Βηθλέεμ)] its omission among the cities of Judah in Jos 15:60 (see Reineccius, Progr. on this point, Weissenfels, 1723). Jerome, and after him Kalisch, observe that Ephratah,.fruitful, has the same meaning as Bethlehem, house of bread, a view which is favored by the neighboring cornfields. Ver Poortenn has written monographs entitled Tabernacula Dei in Ephrata [Psa 133:1-3 (Coburg, 1739); Initia Bethlehemi (ib. 1728); also two: entitled Fata Bethlehemi (both ib. eod.). SEE BETHLEHEM.

3. Gesenius and others think that in Psa 132:6, "Ephratah" means EPHRAIM SEE EPHRAIM (q.v.). The meaning of that passage, however, is greatly disputed. The. most obvious reference is to Bethlehem, which is elsewhere known by that name (see above), and may herebe spoken of as the residence of David at the time when as a youth he first heard of the sacred ark (so Hengstenberg, in loc.). Others consider the name asequivalent to the tribe Ephraim (comp. Ephrathite for Ephraimite, Jdg 12:5), which contained Shiloh, the depository of Jehovah's early favor (so Good, in loc., as most interpreters; Delitzsch, Commentar. itber d. Psalter, 2:265, argues at length in favor of this view). Perhaps the best explanation is that which refers the word to Matthew Ephraim (as a special designation of that part of the tribe which contained Shiloh), in parallelism with the other part of the verse alluding to the forest. Hupfeld (in loc.), however, considers it as; merely a poetical term for fruitful field, e.g. Beth- shemesh, the latter part of the verse alluding to Kirjathjearim as the " wood" (יִעִר, yaar).

## Ephrathite[[@Headword:Ephrathite]]

             (Hebrews Ephrathi', אֶפְרָתַי), the designation of the inhabitants of two widely different localities.

1. Properly BETHLEHEMITE, or citizen of Ephrathl (q.v.) or Bethlehem (Rth 1:2; 1Sa 17:12; Sept, Ε᾿φραθαῖος, Vulg. Ephratceus).

2. By some confusion or analogy, an EPHRAIMITE, or inhabitant of the tribe of Ephraim (q.v.) (Jdg 12:5, with the art. הָאֶפְרָתַי, Sept. ἐκ τοῦ Ε᾿φραίμ v.r. Ε᾿φραθίτης, Vulg. Ephratheus, A.V. "an Ephraimite" [the last clause; in the two previous occurrences of the verse, as well as in the context, the original is Ephraim]; 1Sa 1:1, Ε᾿φραίμ, Ephrathceus, "an Ephrathite;" Kings 40:26, ὀ Ε᾿φραθί, Ephratceus, "an Ephrathite").

Ephrem or Ephraem Syrus, an eminent Churchfather, and the greatest light of the Syrian Church, was born at Nisibis (Sozom. H. E. 3:16), Syria, or at Edessa, and flourished A.D. 370. The accounts of his early life are variant and unreliable. His parents were heathen, according to one account, and drove him from home for becoming a Christian; but, according to other accounts, he was bred a Christian by his Christian parents. Jacob of Nisibis took care of his education, and took him to the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325. In 363 Nisibis was ceded .by the emperor Jovinian to the Persians, and Ephrem went to Edessa, whither the most distinguished Syrians came to receive his instruction. Here he lived as a hermit, only coming from his seclusion to teach and preach. His repute for piety and learning became so great that he was elected bishop; but when he heard of it he rushed forth into the market-place, and acted in such a manner that the people thought he was out of his senses. "He then absconded until another had been appointed; to the office of bishop in his place. He now went to Caesarea in Cappadocia to see Basilius the Great, who formed the highest opinion of his learning and piety. Ephrem spent the greater part of his life in writing and preaching on devotional and moral subjects, and, especially against the Arian heresy; but he was equally energetic whenever there was any occasion to show by his acts that he really was the benevolent man that he appeared to be. This was especially manifest at the time when Edessa was suffering from famine: he, gave his assistance everywhere; he called upon the rich to help the poor, and he himself undertook the care of seeing that the poor received what was intended for them. He was looked up to with  admiration and reverence by his contemporaries, who distinguished him by the honorable designation of 'the prophet of the Syrians.' He died about 378, having ordered in his will that no one should praise him, according to the common practice, in a funeral oration, that his body should not be wrapped up in costly robes, and that no monument should be erected on his tomb" (English Cyclopaedia, s.v.). This "will" of Ephrem is, however, generally held to be spurious.

All accounts unite in testifying to the virtues of Ephrem. Sozomen (Hist. Ecc 3:16) tells the fol'lowing story to illustrate his command of a naturally irascible temper. After a fast, his servant, presenting some food to him, let fall the dish on which it was placed. Ephrem, seeing him overwhelmed with shame and terror, said to him, "Take courage; as the food has not come to us, we will go to it." Whereupon Ephrem sat down on the floor, and ate the fragments left in the broken dish.

He was a voluminous author, writing commentaries, practical religious works, sermons, and numerous poems. The commentaries and hymns are in Syriac; the other writings exist only in Greek and other versions. It is doubtful whether he understood Greek; Sozomen (i.c.) expressly says that he knew only Syriac, but that his writings "were translated into Greek during his life, and preserve much of their original force and power, so that they are not less admired in Greek than in Syriac." One of the legends tells that in his visit to Basil both were miraculously enabled to speak the other's language — Basil the Syriac, and Ephrem the Greek. "His commentaries extended over the whole Bible, 'from the book of creation to the last book of grace,' as Gregory of Nyssa says. We have his commentaries on the historical and phrophetical books of the Old Testament and the book of Job in Syriac, and his commentaries on the epistles of Paul in an Armenian translation. They have been but little used thus far by commentators. He does not interpret the text from the original Hebrew, but from the old Syriac translation, the Peshito, though he refers occasionally to the original. His sermons and homilies, of which, according to Photius, he composed more than a thousand, are partly expository, partly polemical, against Jews, heathen, and heretics. They evince a considerable degree of popular eloquence; they are full of pathos, exclamations, apostrophes, antitheses, illustrations, severe rebuke, and sweet comfort, according to the subject; but also full of exaggerations, bombast, prolixity, and the superstitions of his age, such as the over-estimate of ascetic virtue, and excessive veneration of the Virgin Mary, the saints, and relics. Some of his  sermons were publicly read after the Bible lesson in many Oriental, and even Occidental churches. His hymns were intended to counteract the influence of the heretical views of Bardesanes and his son Harmonius, which spread widely by means of popular Syrian songs. 'When Ephrem perceived,' says Sozomen, 'that the Syrians were charmed with the elegant diction and melodious versification of Harmonius, he became apprehensive lest they should imbibe the same opinions; and therefore, although he was ignorant of Greek learning, he applied himself to the study of the metres of Harmonius, and composed similar poems in accordance with the doctrines of the Church, and sacred hymns in praise of holy men. From that period the Syrians sang the odes of Ephrem, according to the method indicated by Harmonius.' Theodoret gives a similar account, and Jays that the hymns of Ephrem combined harmony and melody with piety, and subserved all the purposes of valuable and efficacious medicine against the heretical hymns of Harmonius. It is reported that he wrote no less than three hundred thousand verses. But, with the exception of his commentaries, all his Syriac works are written in verse, i.e., in lines of an equal number of syllables, and with occasional rhyme and cassonance, though without regular metre (Schaff. History of the Christian Church, 3:952 sq.)."

The best edition of his collected works is Ephraemi Syri Opera omnia, Gr., Syr., et Lat., edita cum praefationibus, notis, var. lectionibus, studio J.S. Assemanni et P. Benedetti (Romae, 1732-46, 6 volumes, fol). Before this edition, many of his writings had been collected and translated from Greek into Latin by Gerard Voss, who published them (1) at Rome, A.D. 1589-93-97; (2) at Cologne in 1603 and 1616; and (3) at Antwerp in 1619 (3 volumes, in one). "The first volume consists of various treatises, partly on subjects solely theological, as the priesthood, prayer, fasting, etc., with others partly theological and partly moral, as truth, anger, obedience, envy. The second volume contains many epistles and addresses to monks, and a collection of apophthegms. Vol. in consists of several treatises or homilies on parts of Scripture, and characters in the Old Testament, as Elijah, Daniel, the three children, Joseph, Noah. Photius gives a list of 49 homilies of Ephrem (Cod. 196), but which of these are included in Voss's edition it is impossible to ascertain, though it is certain that many are not" (Smith, Dictionary of Biography, s.v.).

Of separate works there are numerous editions, of which lists may be found in Hoffmann, Bibliographisches Lexikon, 2:3 sq., and in Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, ed. Harles, 8:217 sq. An edition containing only the  Greek writings of Ephrem was published by Thwaites (Oxford, 1709), edited from 28 MSS. in the Bodleian Library. An English translation from the Syrian by J.B. Morris (Oxf. 1847) contains 13 pieces of verse on the Nativity, 1 against the Jews, and 90 on the faith. The Reverend H. Burgess has published Select metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus, translated from the original Syriac, with an Introduction, and historical and philological notes (Lond. 1853). In his introduction Mr. Burgess mentions, as extant in Syriac verse, "eleven exegetical discourses, more than a hundred controversial sermons, and nearly as many practical hortatory homilies, all in poetry; four pieces on the freedom of the will, not only in meter, but the strophes arranged in alphabetic order, like the verses of the 119th Psalm; and he assures us that all these compositions show a high degree of poetic talent, and are distinguished for their 'sonorousness and grace,' and have 'a charm which no translation can express.' Indeed, almost all the three folios of St. Ephraem's printed works in Syriac are poetical. In this volume the author gives us translations of 35 of Ephraem's Syriac hymns, and 9 of his metrical homilies or sermons. They are illustrated by a learned introduction and very instructive notes. More than half the hymns relate to death and eternity, and the others are on various topics pertaining to the Christian life. The subjects of the poetical sermons are the following:

(1) Paradise, (2) Satan, (3) to the clergy, (4) the Trinity, (5) matter not eternal, (6) error counterfeits truth, (7) the Trinity, (8) two natures of Christ, (9) man ignorant of himself" (Biblioth. Sacra, October 1853, page 835).

M. Caillau published a Latin version of Ephrem in 8 volumes, 8vo (Paris, 1832-35, forming volumes 34-41 of the Patres Selecti), in which the following order is used:

1. Commentaries; 2. Exegetical homilies; 3. Sermons;  4. Epistles; 5. Prayers.

The writings of Ephrem in Armenian were published at Venice, 4 volumes, 8vo, 1836. Hahn und Sieffert's Chrestomathia Syriaca (Leipsic, 1825, 8vo) contains 19 select hymns of Ephrem; see also Hahn, Bardesanes Gnosticus (Leips. 1819). A German version of many of his poems is given by Zingerle, Ausg. Schriften des hell. Ephraem (Innspr. 1830-37, 6 volumes). His funeral sermons are translated into Italian (Innifunebri di S. Efrem Siro, tradotti par Angelo Paggi e Fausto Lasinio, Firenze, 1851). In 1853 J. Alsleben announced a complete edition of the Syriac works of Ephrem, in a pamplilet (Berl. 8vo) containing a sketch of Ephrem's life, and some literary remarks of value. Many writings of Ephrem remain in MS., of which there is a valuable collection in the British Museum; among them a Chronicle, from Creation to the time of Christ, is ascribed to him.

See Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev. 1720), 1:149 sq.; Oudin, De Script. Ecclesiastes 1:493 sq.; Dupin, Auteurs Eccls. (Paris, 1593), 2:145 sq.; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacres (Par. 1860), volume 6, chapter 1; Lardner, Works, 4:304 sq.; Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature, 1:403; Von Lengerke, Comm. de Ephraemo Syr. interprete (Halle, 1828); the same, De Ephesians Syr. art. hermeneutica (Kinigsb. 1831); Villemain, Tableau de l'Iloquence Chret. au 4me Siecle (Paris, 1849, 12mo), page 242; Neve, De la Renaissance des etudes Syriaques (Annales de Philosophie, 1854); North British Review, August 1853, page 247; Jour. of Sacred Literature July 18553, page 389; Rödiger, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:85 sq.

## Ephrem (or Ephraim)[[@Headword:Ephrem (or Ephraim)]]

             patriarch OF ANTIOCH, a Greek theologian, was born in the second part of the 5th century. If the epithet of Amidian (ὀ Αμίδιος), which Theophanes gives him, indicates the place of his birth, he was born at Amida, in Armenia, near the source of the Tigris. He first had civil employments, and under the reign of Justin I obtained the high dignity of a count of the Orient. In the years 525 and 526 Antioch was almost wholly destroyed by earthquakes, and by fires, which were the consequences of them. The inhabitants, who were touched by the compassion which Ephrem showed for their disasters, and by the help which he extended to them, appointed him successor to the patriarch Euphrasius, who was buried under the ruins of the city. All the writers on Church history praise his conduct as a patriarch, his charity towards the poor, the zeal and vigor with which he opposed heretics. Not satisfied with condemning, in a synod at Antioch, those who tried to revive the errors of Origen, he also wrote divers treatises against the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the Severians, the Acephali, and in favor of the Council of Chalcedon. Towards the end of his life he was forced by the emperor Justinian to subscribe to the condemnation of three of the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, which he had there so warmly defended. Ephrem died A.D. 545. His works are known to us only by their analysis, which Photius has given in his Bibliotheca; they made together three volumes, which were consecrated to the defense of the dogmas of the Church, and particularly of the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon. The first volume contained a letter to Zenobius, advocate of Emessa, and member of the sect of the Acephali; letters to the emperor Justinian; to Anthimnus, bishop of Trapezus; to Dometianus Syncleticus, metropolitan of Tarsus; to Brazes the Persian, and to others. The acts of a synod (συνοδιχὴ) were kept by Ephrem, on the subject of certain' heterodox books, panegyrics, and other discourses. The second volume contained a treatise in four books, in defense of Cyril of Alexandria, and of the Synod of Chalcedon, against the Nestorians, the  Eutychians, and responses on the theological subjects to the advocate Anatolius. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Ephrem, Patriarch Of Armenia[[@Headword:Ephrem, Patriarch Of Armenia]]

             was born at Sis in 1734. The objects of his study were poetry, eloquence, theology, history, and chronology. The pope appointed him bishop in partibus, on account of his talent and of the influence which he possessed with the united Armenians. After the death of his brother, Gabriel, in 1771, he was raised to the, patriarchal see of Sis, and died in 1784, leaving, Explanation of the Psalms of David: — Collection of Sacred and Profane Poetry: — A Poem on Genesis: — Rules of Armenian Versification: — Collection of Letters, both in prose and in verse: — Chronological History of the Armenian Patriarchs of Cilicia. See Hoefer; Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ephrem, Saint, bishop Of Mylasa[[@Headword:Ephrem, Saint, bishop Of Mylasa]]

             in Caria, lived anterior to the 5th century, and is commemorated January 24 at Leuca, near Mylasa, where he had been interred. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ephron[[@Headword:Ephron]]

             (Hebrews Ephron', עֶפְרוֹן, signif. doubtful; Sept. Ε᾿φρών, Vulg. Ephron), the name of a man and also of two or three places.

1. The son of Zohar, a Hittite; the owner of a field which lay facing Mamre or Hebron, and of the cave contained therein, which Abraham bought from him for 400 shekels of silver (Gen 23:8-17; Gen 25:9; Gen 49:29-30; Gen 1:1-31; Gen 13:1-18). B.C. 2027. By Josephus (Ant. 1:14) the name is given as Ephraim (Ε᾿φράιμος, and the purchase-money 40 shekels. SEE ABRAHAM.

2. The textual reading (but with initial א) in the Masoretic Bible, and the marginal in the A.V. for EPHRAIM SEE EPHRAIM (q.v.), a city within the borders of the kingdom of Israel (2Ch 13:19).  3. A mountain, the "cities" of which formed one of the landmarks on the northern boundary of the tribe of Judah (Jos 15:9), between the "water of Nephtoah" and Kirjath-jearim. As these latter are with great probability identified with Ain Yalo and Kuriet el-enab, Mount Ephron is probably the elevated region on the south side of wady Beit-Hanina (traditional valley of the Terebinth), near its junction with wady Ain- Haniyeh or wady el-Werd. This seems to be the "high plain" indicated by Schwarz (Palest. page 96) as appropriately called Mount Ephron, in comparison with the deep valleys adjoining. The "cities of Mount Ephron" may then be denoted by such ruined sites as el-Sus and Mar-Zakaria in this vicinity.

4. A very strong city (πόλις μεγάλη ὀχυρά σφόδρα) on the east of Jordan, between Carnaim (AshterothKarnaim) and Bethshean, attacked and demolished by Judas Maccabaeus (1Ma 5:46-52; 2Ma 12:27-28; Josephus, Ant. 12:8, 5). From the description in these two passages it appears to have been situated in a defile or valley, and to have completely occupied 'the pass. It was possibly near the outlet of the Jabbok into the Jordan. Kildens conjectures (Landes, kunde von Palistina, Berl. 1817, page 75) that it was the present Kulat er-Rubud, a strong Saracenic castle on the top of a hill up the wady Rajib, and the residence of the chief of Jebel Ajlun (Burckhardt, Syria, page 266 sq.; Robinson, Researches, 2:121; 3:166).

## Epicrates[[@Headword:Epicrates]]

             (Ε᾿πικράτης, controller, a common Gr. name), one of the generals left by Antiochus Grypus, in connection with Callimander, in charge of the Syrian forces besieging Hyrcanus in Samaria, but whose cupidity led him to betray Scythopolis into the hands of the Jews (Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 2, 3).

## Epictetus[[@Headword:Epictetus]]

             a Roman Stoic philosopher, was born at Hierapolis, Phrygia, in the 1st century, and while young was a slave of Epaphroditus. When he became a freedman is not known. He was involved in the proscription by which Domitiani banished all philosphers from Rome, and retired to Nicopolis, in Epirus, where he opened a school of Stoic philosophy, and held those conversations which have been preserved in, the Manual and philosophical lectures, compiled from his discourses by his pupil Arrian. His teachings are summed up in the formula, "Bear and forbear." Recognizing only will and reason, his highest conception of life was to be passionless under whatever circumstances. "Man,” he said, "is but a pilot; observe the star, hold the rudder, and be not distracted on thy way.” He is supposed to have committed nothing to writing.

## Epicurean Philosophy - Epicurus[[@Headword:Epicurean Philosophy - Epicurus]]

             The Epicurean philosophy received its name and its complete development from its founder Epicurus. Little was added to the system by its disciples. It was a reaction against the Socratic School, and constituted one of the most marked forms of speculation during the period of Greek decline. It exercised considerable influence over the Latin world in the decay of the Roman republic, and during the first two centuries of the empire. With important changes of form, but with little modifications of spirit, it survived the overthrow of ancient civilization, perpetuated itself through,  out the Middle Ages, reappeared with the revival of philosophy, and may still be recognized in many recent theories.

The Epicurean philosophy, which has survived so many successions of empire, and so vast mutations of thought, is intimately connected with the earlier speculations of the Greeks. Its ethical views are directly deducible from the Cyrenaic School; but its dependence on the Eleatics is unmistakable. SEE ELEATIC SCHOOL.

In physics it displayed an inclination to return to the Ionic method. It is, however, in immediate affiliation with the doctrines of Democritus and Leucippus. From them it derived its atoms, and the casual formation of the universe.

Notwithstanding its connections with previous modes of thought, the Epicurean philosophy is so definite in principle and form that it may be more readily treated without regard to its descent than almost any other type of speculation, ancient or modern.

The Epicurean philosophy was fully developed by its founder, and was long contained almost entirely in his numerous productions. These perished early. Fragments only have been preserved in the philosophical treatises of Cicero, the moral lectures of Seneca, and the late compilation of Diogenes Laertius. Epicurus's physical theory of the universe, which formed the basis of his theological and ethical conclusions, is transmitted to us in its integrity in the abstruse but brilliant poem of Lucretius. In consequence of the reverence of the disciples for the instructions of the master, and their abstinence from development of his teachings, Epicurus occupies a more prominent position in the exposition of his doctrine than any other Greek philosopher except Pythagoras. It is, accordingly, expedient to consider the circumstances of his life and the peculiarities of his character before entering upon the details of his system.

Life of Epicurus. — Epicurus was of pure Athenian descent; of a good family, though reduced to poverty; and settled in Samos, where his father Neocles was a cleruchus, and eked out a scanty support by the occupation of a school-master. His mother, Charestrata, added to the resources of a poor household by practicing enchantments and by other superstitious pretenses, in which she was aided by her son, who may thus have acquired an early contempt for the current theology and superstition. Epicurus was born at Samos, A.C. 342-1, seven years after the death of Plato, and within a year of Aristotle's acceptance of the office of tutor to Alexander the Great. About the time of Alexander's death, Epicurus came to Athens, at  the age of 18, where he is supposed to have attended the instructions of Xenocrates in the academy. Aristotle was still teaching in the lyceum. Epicurus made no long stay at this time in the metropolis, but removed to Colophon and opened a school. He adopted the atomistic doctrine of Democritus, and during five years undertook to teach philosophy at Mitylene and Lampsacus. At the age of 35 he returned to Athens, taught philosophy there for a period of 36 years till his death, and became the founder of a sect, having at first been content with declaring himself a follower of Democritus. The groves of the academy were frequented by the Platonists under Xenocrates; "the shady spaces" around the lyceum were occupied by the Peripatetics under Theophrastus, who possessed a house and garden of his own within the precincts, which were bequeathed to his successors.

Epicurus imitated the Peripatetic example, and purchased a garden in the heart of the city for 80 minae (about $1400 in gold). This abode, the celebrated horti Epicuri, became the place of instruction and of convivial assemblage, and gave name to the school, "the philosophy of the Garden." The life of Epicurus was "simple, temperate, and cheerful;" he was "a kind-hearted friend, and even a patriotic citizen." He kept aloof from the political distractions of the time, and took no part in public affairs. His maxim was λάθε βιώσας — avoid notice in life. The political and social disorders of the time, amid the wars of the Diadochi and the factious contentions of a city where liberty was supplanted by tyranny or anarchy, might suggest the philosophy which is supposed to have regulated his conduct, viz. that the mind alone is free; all without is at the mercy of capricious violence or incalculable contingencies. In the progress of civil discords and convulsions the only hope of tranquillity must be sought in absolute seclusion and disregard of public transactions.

In his quiet and graceful retreat, surrounded by affectionate pupils and admiring friends, enlivened by the frequent presence of brilliant hetaerae, one half of the long life of Epicurus was passed. His intercourse was characterized by genial good-humor, and his establishment was conducted with frugal elegance. His temperament and his doctrine, his habits and his precepts, were in entire unison. He sought and obtained for himself the gentle pleasure, the unruffled serenity which he preached to his hearers. He was laborious in the dissemination of his opinions. He is designated as πολυγραφώτατος by Diogenes, and is said to have written three hundred volumes, filled, of course, with repetitions. This copious authentic promulgation of his philosophy dispensed with any necessity for expansion  or commentary. The theory was, indeed, so simple and perspicuous that nothing remained to be stated after the first exposition.

Before the death of Epicurus in A.C. 270, a rival school had arisen in Athens under the colonnades of the Painted Porch, and nearly every one of his tenets was directly opposed by Zeno of Citium and the Stoic philosophy, The reaction excited by the extreme materialism and fortuitism of Epicurus occasioned an equal extravagance on the other side. With Epicurus the universe was an aggregate of blind atoms compacted and diversified by an equally blind chance; with Zeno it was a divine organism, vital in all its parts, and governed by the immutable decrees of fate. With Epicurus the deities were incognizant or regardless of temporal affairs; with Zeno everything was controlled by a superintending Providence, whose will was an unalterable necessity, and manifested by the heavenly orbs (sidera conscia fati).

The Philosophy of Epicurus divides itself naturally into three parts, Theology, Ethics, and Physics. The last alone received any thoroughly systematic development. It was devised as a scientific basis for the two former, which were rather foregone conclusions, in which "the wish was father to the thought," than strictly logical deductions from established principles. The philosophy of Epicurus was designed for his own immediate satisfaction, and for the practical uses of life. The logomachies of Eleatics and Sceptics, Sophists and Socratics, had produced no settled convictions, and had arrested neither public calamities nor private wretchedness; a doctrine was desired which might bring peace to the individual, and restore happiness or enjoyment to life. The canonization of pleasure, the regulation and sanctification of natural passions, seemed to afford the solution required, and Epicurus was to his time what Fourier was to the last generation. In order to sanction pleasure as the guide of existence, it was necessary to get rid of the menaces of conscience and the terrors of heaven. Hence Epicurus practically denied the gods by relegating them to the eternal isolation of unconcerned indolence and reverie. This was regarded by his votaries as the most essential service of his career (Lucret. 1:63-80). But to exorcise the divinities and to abrogate religion, it was necessary to explain the marvelous order, economy, and variety of the creation, without recourse to a creator; to furnish, like La Place, a system of the world which should exclude the notion of a divine architect. This task Epicurus undertook, with such materials as were at hand. The Eleatic School had asserted an absolute severance of the divine and the transitory,  and had devoted their regards to the former. Epicurus repudiated the former, and confined his attention to the material and sensible, disproving all creative or divine agency by his physical doctrine, and maintaining the: authority of carnal impulses and earthly pleasures by the repudiation of the gods and of their worship.

Theology of Epicurus. — Epicurus acquiesced in the existence of the gods, but denied them any participation in the process of the universe. He ascribed to them immortality and human form, and assigned to them attenuated and spectral bodies, as Milton also, appears to have done ("negat esse corpus deorum, sed tamquam corpus, nec sanguinem, sed tamquam sanguinem," Cic. De. Nat. Deor. 1:25). He accords to them indestructibility, immutability, and the serene happiness of eternal repose. Their tranquillity would have been disturbed by any care; accordingly, they are entirely unconcerned with everything that falls under human apprehension. This mode of recognizing and at the same time cashiering divinity has been recently imitated by Herbert Spencer. So far as human actions or thoughts are concerned, the gods are practically non-existent, and religion is nothing better than a vague and irrational superstition, founded upon dreams, and cherished by ignorant fear.

Ethics of Epicurus. — Without divine sanction, without responsibility or existence hereafter, with either reward nor penalty in a future life for "deeds done in the body," no real system of ethics is conceivable. There is no constraint, no obligation to rectitude; there is no moral compulsion; there is no domain for conscience; there can only be a more or less judicious and provident adaptation of actions to the judgments or dispositions of men, and to the supposed satisfaction of the individual. Morality without religion is a pretense and a delusion. A tranquil and pleasurable existence becomes the summum bonum of the sage; the gratification of every passion as it arises the sole duty of an eager and undisciplined nature. Every restraint is removed except such as may be voluntarily imposed; and though cool, impassive, and indolent dispositions may maintain an external propriety of demeanor when exposed to no temptation, there can be no guarantee for rectitude of conduct, and the license of all passions will be gratified by the unclean beasts who wallow in the Epicurean style. The insufficiency of the doctrine as a rule of conduct was exhibited from the very first. Epicurus placed the highest pleasure in undisturbed repose, but he considered every pleasure to be good in: itself; and his favorite disciple, Metrodorus, asserts that the dictates of natural  reason would limit all care to the satisfaction of the belly, thus taking as the cornerstone of the system the declaration of Ecclesiastes, "All a man's labor is for his mouth." The stories which circulated in regard to the connection of Epicurus and his companions with Leontium, Marmarium, and other notorious ladies of the like persuasion, show that the tendencies of the doctrine were at once recognized, even if they were not illustrated in practice.

As all the religious foundations of virtue were removed, no logical foundation remained. The canonic of Epicurus, which was at once his logic and his metaphysics, amounted to the negation of any absolute or immutable truth. The sensible impression was the sole criterion of truth. Every sensation, as every general conception, was necessarily true; and we are here reminded, though in different modes and degrees, of the positions assumed by Des Cartes and by Hume. No guidance is accorded for the conduct of the understanding more assured than the immediate impression or the unregulated fancy, and the passions are thus left without any valid control by the reason. A life according to natural impulses becomes therefore the aim and the duty of a philosopher.

The Physics of Epicurus were devised as a means of escape from all divine authority and superintendence. They constitute the most elaborate, coherent, and original portion of the Epicurean system. Even here there was little real originality. Epicurus was a man of little learning, of little logical perspicacity; but he was actuated by a distinct purpose, and possessed of a clear rather than a penetrating mind. He diligently availed himself of everything subservient to his aims in previous systems, and worked out whatever accorded with his plans into a plausible and superficial scheme, in which consistency was little regarded, and acceptability assured by addressing the natural inclinations of men. The Physical Theory of Epicurus acquired more reputation in antiquity from its connection with theology and ethics, and from its exposition of Lucretius, than from any estimation in which it was held by the real students of science. The object of Epicurus was to explain, like Des Cartes, how the universe might have been formed and perpetuated without any foreign agency, though he went further than Des Cartes in rejecting even a divine agency for its first creation.

The leading lines of his physical doctrine are that matter is uncreated and indestructible. Its primitive elements are indivisible particles — atoms —  which are eternal and imperishable, passing through various combinations, and assuming new properties and forms according to these mutable compositions. These atoms are infinite in number, and solid, though so small as to be imperceptible by the senses. They possess gravity, and move downwards in an infinite vacuum. Their descent, however, is not in a uniform line; they are deflected by a spontaneous impulse, due to mere contingency, and come into collision, conjunction, composition with each other. Thus worlds, infinite in number, and infinitely varied in their phenomena, are formed. These atoms are in a continual state of vibration or oscillation, and from their concretions and dissolutions, their coherences and dissidencies, all the multitudinous changes of inorganic and organic nature are derived. All, however, are governed by chance alone; there is no compulsion, no necessity, no external law, no decree of fate. The cause of being is not extrinsic, but is involved in the process and act of being. No room is allowed for the operation of any conscious and ordaining intelligence; the world is nothing more than the curious result of uncomprehending, undesigning accidents. It will be observed that this theory of Epicurus differs from the vortices of Des Cartes in little more than in ascribing a straight, downward, but variable motion to the atoms in a vacuum, while Cartesianism assigns to them a gyratory movement and denies a vacuum. The difference is more obvious between this system and the recent doctrine of evolution, but the logical principle is the same — the construction and continuation of the universe by simple elements and simple forces generated within its own sphere, and independent of foreign determination. It is consequently not surprising that an attempt has been very recently made to bring the Epicurean Physics into harmony with modern science, whose present tendencies are in the direction of similar irrational self-sufficiency. A like attempt was made by Gassendi more legitimately, but without any permanent acceptance, in the 17th century; and it may be confidently asserted that, in an age of infidel appetencies, there will always be a revival of the Epicurean philosophy and Epicurean proclivities.

Authorities. — The historians of ancient philosophy: Bayle, tit. "Leucippi Lucrece;” Gassendi, De Vita et Moribus Epicuri (Hag. Comit. 1656, 4to); Syntagma philosophiae Epicuri (1659); Bremer, Versuch einer Apologie des Epicur (Berlin, 1776, 8vo); Rondel, La Vie d'Epicure (Par. 1679); Warnekros, Apologie und Leben Epicurs (Greifswald, 1795, 8vo); Munro, Lucretius, with a Translation and Notes (Cambridge and London, 1864, 2  volumes, 8vo); Lange, Gesch. des Materialismus (Iserlohn, 1866); North Brit. Rev. March, 1868. (G.F.H.)

## Epicureans[[@Headword:Epicureans]]

             (Ε᾿πικουρεῖοι, Act 17:18), followers of Epicurus or adherents of the Epicurean philosophy (q.v.).

## Epigonatium[[@Headword:Epigonatium]]

             (ἐπιγονάτιον), a portion of the sacerdotal habit, used in both the Greek and Roman. churches, consisting of an appendage somewhat resembling a  small maniple, on the right side hanging from, the girdle. In the Roman Church it is worn only by the pope. In the Greek Church it is borne by all bishops, and consists of brocade, velvet, or some stiff material, a foot in dimensions, with a cross wrought upon it, and tassels hanging from the three lower corners. It is not used in the English Church, SEE VESTMENTS.

## Epigonus[[@Headword:Epigonus]]

             a heresiarch, was a disciple of Noetus, and came to Rome about A.D. 200, and there propagated his master's opinions. SEE NOETIANS.

## Epilenaea[[@Headword:Epilenaea]]

             sacred games celebrated among the ancient Greeks in the time of vintage, before the invention. of the wine-press. They contended with one another in treading the grapes, who should soonest press out the must, in the meantime singing the praises of Dioinvsus,and begging that the must might be sweet and good.

## Epimanicia[[@Headword:Epimanicia]]

             the maniples or hand-pieces of the priests of the Greek Church. They are provided with epimanicia for both arms, while the maniple (q.v.) of the Romish priesthood is worn on the left hand alone.

## Epimenides[[@Headword:Epimenides]]

             a Greek poet, born in Crete, and highly revered as a prophet and natural sage at Athens, where he came by invitation B.C. cir. 596, and spent a long life. Our chief account of him is given by Diogenes Laeitius (1:10). He is said to have written prose works on sacrifices and the political constitution of Crete, together with two letters to Solon, which have all perished, as the extant copies of the last are spurious. Diogenes also attributes to him poetical works entitled the "Genesis and Theogony" of the Curetes and Corybantes (in 5000 verses), an epic on Jason and the Argonauts (in 6500 verses), and an epic on Minos and Rhadamanthys (in 4000 verses); but it is doubtful whether he ever wrote them. He may have been the author of poems called "Useful" and "Pure" (Χρησιμοί and Καθαρμοί), which are ascribed to him by other ancient authorities (Suidas, s.v. Ε᾿πιμενίδης ; Strabo, 10, page 479; Pausan. 1:14, 4). But all these have equally perished. He is probably referred to by the apostle Paul in the words (Tit 1:12; see Alford, Gr. Test. in loc.), "One of themselves [the Cretans], even a prophet of their own, said, 'The Cretans are always liars,'" etc., apparently quoting from certain old-fashioned poems written upon skins, and popularly attributed to Epimenides. — Smith, Dict. of Class. Biogr. s.v.; Heinrich, Epimenides aus Creta (Lpz. 1801); also the monographs De Epimenide of Gottschalck (Altorf, 1714), and Schuremann (Hafn. 1733).

## Epinicion[[@Headword:Epinicion]]

             a triumphal hymn used in the communion service of the early Church. It consisted of the words, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts!" It has sometimes been confounded with the Trisagion (q.v.).

## Epiphanes[[@Headword:Epiphanes]]

             (Ε᾿πιφανής, manifest, hence famous), an epithet given to the gods when appearing to men, The Syrian king Antiochus, brother of Seleucus, coming fortunately into Syria a little after the death of his brother, was regarded as some propitious deity, and was hence called Epiphanes — the splendid (1Ma 1:10; 1Ma 10:1; 2Ma 4:17; 2Ma 10:9). SEE ANTIOCHUS 3.

## Epiphanes, or Epiphanius[[@Headword:Epiphanes, or Epiphanius]]

             son of Carpocrates, heretic and gnostic, like his father. He supposed an infinite eternal principle, and united with this fundamental principle the system of Valentinus. According to him, as according to some modern reformers, it is ignorance and passion which, in disturbing the equality and the community of goods, have introduced evil into the world; and the idea of property forms no part of the divine plan, but is of human invention. He concluded, therefore, that all laws should be suppressed, and equality re- established. He concluded, also, that the community of wives, as well as of the fruits of the earth, is necessary to the re-establishment of order. He died at the early age of seventeen years. A temple was consecrated to him in Cephalonia. Neander, Ch. Hist. 1:449; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. book 1, chapter 2, part 2, chapter 5, § 14, n. 17; Hoefer, Nozuv. Biog. Gener. 16:159.

## Epiphania[[@Headword:Epiphania]]

             SEE HAMATH.

## Epiphanians[[@Headword:Epiphanians]]

             a branch of the CARPOCRATIANS SEE CARPOCRATIANS (q.v.).

## Epiphanias, Bishop Of Armenia[[@Headword:Epiphanias, Bishop Of Armenia]]

             lived in the latter part of the 7th century. After having been one of the most distinguished scholars of the patriarchal school, he retired into a desert near Tevin, whence he was taken to discharge the functions of abbot of the monastery of Sourp. Garabed (St. John the Baptist), in the province of Daron, to which: dignity was joined the title of bishop of the Mamigonians,  borne by Epiphanias for twenty years. In A.D. 629 he assisted at the Council of Garin (Erzernm), and wrote, The History of the Monastery of Soup Garabed: — The History of the Council at Ephesus: —Commentary on the Psalms of David and on the Book of Proverbs: —Sermons. See. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Epiphanius[[@Headword:Epiphanius]]

             (Επιφάυιος), bishop of Constantia, one of the Church fathers, was born in Palestine, near Eleutheropolis, in the early part of the 4th century (between 310 and 320). His parents are said to have been Jews, but in his sixteenth year he embraced Christianity; the only case of the kind among the fathers, for the rest of them were either converts from heathenism, or born of Christian parents. He went to Egypt, and there gave himself to ascetic life among the monks; one record also says that he imbibed Gnostic errors, from which he was reclaimed by the monkish discipline. He became an earnest patron and friend of monasticism, and founded a monastery near his native village, of which he became abbot. In 367 he was elected bishop of Constantia (Salamis), the metropolis of Cyprus. Here he remained thirty- six years, busy with the duties of his episcopate, and especially busy with his pen. He devoted himself to the vindication of orthodoxy with unquestioned learning, but with intemperate zeal and violence. He cherished a special hatred for Origen and his doctrines, and wrote, preached, and traveled in order to destroy their influence in the Church. This hatred led him into a quarrel with John, bishop of Jerusalem. "A report that Origen's opinions were spreading in Palestine, and sanctioned even by John, bishop of Jerusalem, excited Epiphanius to such a pitch that he left Cyprus (A.D. 394) to investigate the matter on the spot. At  Jerusalem he preached so violent a sermon against any abettors of Origen's errors, and made such evident allusions to the bishop, that John sent his archdeacon to beg him to stop. Afterwards, when John preached against anthropomorphism (of a tendency to which Epiphanius had been suspected), he was followed up to the pulpit by his undaunted antagonist, who announced that he agreed in John's censure of anthropomorphites, but that it was equally necessary to condemn Origenists. Having excited sufficient commotion at Jerusalem, Epiphanius repaired to Bethlehem, where he was all-powerful with the monks; and there he was so successful in his denunciation of heresy, that he persuaded some to renounce their connection with the bishop of Jerusalem" (Smith, Dict. of Biog. s.v.). He also interfered with the diocesan jurisdiction of John, by ordaining one Paulinianius in Palestine. The quarrel became very bitter, and was for many years a source of great trouble and injury to the Church.

Epiphanius formed an alliance with the violent and unscrupulous Theophilus of Alexandria (q.v.), who had been an Origenist, but, for his own purposes, changed his professed opinions on the subject, and ordered the Nitrian monks to give up all Origen's writings. They refused, and he called a council at Alexandria, A.D. 399, which condemned Origen, his writings, and his followers. Soldiers were sent to drive the monks from Nitria. Some of them went to Constantinople, where Chrysostom (q.v.) gave them his protection. Theophilus persuaded Epiphanius (now over 80 years old) to call a council of Cyprian bishops (A.D. 401). Here Origen was again condemned. Epiphanius wrote to Chrysostom to join in this condemnation. As Chrysostom did not reply, Epiphanius took it for granted that he favored Origenism, and determined to go in person to Constantinople to "crush Amalek," to use his own words (in a letter to Jerome). Sozomen (Eccl. Hist. 8:14) gives a pretty full account of this visit, saying that, on the arrival of Epiphanius, Chrysostom went out with all his clergy to meet the visitor and do him honor; "but Epiphanius declared that he would neither reside with John, nor pray with him, unless he would denounce the works of Origen, and expel Dioscorus and his companions from the city. Not considering it just to act in the manner proposed until judgment had been passed on the case, John tried to postpone the adoption of further measures to some future time. In the mean time his enemies met together, and arranged that on the day when the people would be assembled in the Church of the Apostles, Epiphanius should publicly pronounce condemnation on the works of Origen, and on Dioscorus and his companions as the partisans of this writer; and also denounce the bishop of  the city as the abettor of Dioscorus. By this means it was hoped that the affections of the people would be alienated from their bishop. The following day, when Epiphanius was about entering the Church, in order to carry his design into execution, he was stopped by Serapion, at the command of John, who had received intimation of the plot. Serapion proved to Epiphanius that while the project he had devised was unjust in itself, it could be of no personal advantage to him, for that, if it should excite a popular insurrection, he would be regarded as responsible for the outrages that might follow. By these arguments Epiphanius was induced to relinquish his designs." About this time the empress Eudoxia sent for Epiphanius to pray for her son Theodosius, who was ill; Epiphanius replied that her son would recover provided she would not patronize the defenders of Origen. To this message the empress answered that Epiphanius had failed to save that of his own archdeacon, who had recently died. Finally, some of the Origenists had a conversation with Epiphanius, in which they seem to have convinced him that he had acted rashly. Soon after (Sozomen, 1.c.), he embarked for Cyprus, either because he recognised the futility of his journey to Constantinople, or because, as there is reason to believe, God had revealed to him his approaching death, for he died while on his voyage back to Cyprus. It is reported that he said to the bishops who had accompanied him to the place of embarkation, "I leave you the city, the palace, and the stage, for I shall shortly depart." He died at sea, on his return to Cyprus, A.D. 403. He is commemorated as a saint in the Church of Rome on May 12.

Epiphanius was "a man of earnest monastic piety, and of sincere but illiberal zeal for orthodoxy. His good nature. allowed him to be easily used as an instrument for the passions of others, and his zeal was not according to knowledge. He is the patriarch of heresy-hunters. He identified Christianity with monastic piety and ecclesiastical orthodoxy, and considered it the great mission of his life to pursue the hydra of heresy into all its hiding-places. His learning was extensive, but ill digested. He understood five languages — Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and a little Latin. Jerome, who knew but three languages, though he knew these far better than Epiphanius, calls him πεντάγλωσσος, the five-tongued; and Rufinus reproach. fully says of him that he considered it his sacred duty to slander the great Origen in all languages and nations. He was lacking in knowledge of the world and of men, in sound judgment, and in critical discernment. He was possessed of a boundless credulity, now almost  proverbial, causing innumerable errors and contradictions in his writings. His style is entirely destitute of beauty or elegance; still, his works are of considerable value as a storehouse of the history of ancient heresies and of patristic polemics" (Schaff, History of the Christian Church, 3, § 169). Scaliger calls Epiphanius an ignorant man, who committed the greatest blunders, told the greatest falsehoods, and knew next to nothing about either Hebrew or Greek.

Hook (Ecclesiastes Biography, 4:583) cites Epiphanius as one of the writers to whom we can refer for proof of the errors of modern Romanism, and for justification of the Reformation. For example, against invocation of saints, "Neither Elias (he says), nor John, nor Thecla, nor any of the saints is to be worshipped. For that ancient error shall not prevail with us, that we should forsake the living God and worship the things that are made by him. For they worshipped and served the creature above the Creator, and became fools. For if he will not permit angels to be worshipped, how much more would he not have her who was born of Anna? Let Mary, therefore, be had in honor, but let the Lord be worshipped." Again he observes "that the creature cannot be worshipped without injuring the true faith, and falling back to the errors of the ancient pagans, who forsook the worship of the true God to adore the creature; or without incurring the malediction spoken of by St. Paul — they worshipped, and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever; therefore God gave them up to vile affections." "Sed neque Helias, neque Joannes-neque quisquam sanctorm adoratur," etc. (Haer. 79 and 62). As decisive is his testimony against the doctrine of a purgatorial state. " In the age to come (he says) there is no advantage of fasting, no call to repentance, no display of charity; none are admitted after their departure hence, nor can we then correct what was before amiss. There Lazarus goeth not to Dives, nor Dives to Lazarus; the garners are sealed, the combat finished, the crowns distributed. Those who have not yet encountered have no more opportunity, and those who have conquered are not cast out. All is finished after we have departed hence" (Hoer. 59).

The extant writings of Epiphanius are the following, in the order in which they are given in the edition of his works by Petavius (Paris, 1622; Leipzig, 1682; and in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, volumes 41, 42, 43):

1. Παναριον, Panarium (medicine-chest), a treatise against heresies. It was written at the request of two monks, named Paul and Acacius,  belonging to a monastery near Berea, in Lower Syria. Prefixed to the work is a letter to these monks, which serves as a preface. The whole work is divided into three books, which are subdivided into seven tomes or sections. The first book contains three of these subdivisions, and each of the others two. The whole includes an account of eighty heresies, twenty of which were before Christ:

1, the Barbarians, from Adam to Noah;

2, the Scythians, from Nimrod to Terah;

3, the Hellenists, including all who paid divine honors to the creature, including idolatry proper, and also the philosophical arts of Stoics, Platonists, Pythagoreans, Epicureans;

4, the Samaritanism, arising from a mixture of Hellenism and Judaism, and including four sects;

5, the Judaeans (Judaism), including the seven sects of Sadducees, Scribes, Pharisees, Hemerobaptists, Nazarenes, Essenes, and Herodians. Of Christian heresies he names the Simonians (followers of Simon Magus), the Basilidians, and other Gnostic sects. With the sixty- fourth heresy he begins his account of the heresies of his own age, Origenism, Arianism. A critical work of great ability on the information given by Epiphanius has been published by Lipsius, Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius. It limits itself to heresies 13 to 57, which are mostly Gnostic systems. Lipsius shows that Epiphanius, Philaster, and Pseudo- Tertullian made use of the same source, and that this source was the work of Hippolytus against 52 heresies called συνταγμα, which was still known to Photius.

2. Α᾿γκυρωτός, Ancoratus (anchored), i.e., anchor or defense of the faith, especially of the doctrine of the Trinity; so called "because," says Epiphanius, "I have collected, according to my slender abilities, all those passages of Scripture which are calculated to establish our faith; that this book may, like the anchor of a ship, establish believers in the orthodox faith, in the midst of the agitations and tempests of heresy."

3. Anacephalaeosis (Migne, 42:833), which is a summary or abridgment of the Panarium, the order of topics being somewhat varied.  4. Περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν, De Mensuris et Ponderibus (of measures and weights), in which he gives an account of the weights and measures used in Scripture, a book still useful for Biblical archaeology.

5. Περὶ τῶν δώδεκα λίθων, de xii gemmis quse erant in veste Aaronis (on the 12 gems which were in Aaron's breast-plate).

A Commentary on the Song of Songs, under the name of Epiphanius, was published by Foggini, in a Latin version (Rome, 1750, 4to; and the same was published [in Greek and Latin], Rome, 1772, 4to), by Giacomellus, who attributes it to Philo Carpasius. SEE PHILO.

The complete editions of Epiphanius (by Petavius and Migne) have been named above. There is a new edition by Dindorf (Leips. 5 volumes, 8vo, 1859-1863). The Panarion is given in volumes 2, 3, of Oehler, Corpus Haeresiologicum (Berlin, 1859-1862, 5 volumes, 8vo). There is a German translation of portions of Epiphanius, with notes, by Rosler (1778, 8vo). His account of the Arian and Meletian heresies was translated into English by Whiston, in his Collection of Ancient Monuments on the Trinity (Lond. 1713, 8vo). A separate life of Epiphanius was published by Gervaise (Paris, 1738, 4to).

See Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 6:32; 8:15; Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 6:10, 12, 14; Dupin, Ecclesiastes Writers, 2:234; the account of the Bollandists, in Migne, Patrol. Graec. 41; Oudin, De Script. Ecclesiastes 1:527; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacres (Paris, 1860), volume 6, chapter 15; Cave, Hist. Litt. (Genev. 1720), 1:147; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Grceca, ed. Harles, 8:255 sq.; Lardner, Works, 4:185 sq.; Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature, 1:324; Neander, Church History (Torrey's), 2:680, 697; Schaff, Ch. History, volume 3, § 169; Hoffmann, Bibliog. Lexikon, 2:25 sq.

## Epiphanius (2)[[@Headword:Epiphanius (2)]]

             fourteenth bishop and fifth patriarcha OF CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 520-535, seems to have been a quiet and prudent person, well fitted for that violent age, when the great popular sedition occurred in that city (A.D. 531), and when the emperors prescribed the policy of the Church. His letters to pope Hormisdas are extant, also the sentence of the court which he held against Severus and Peter (Migne, Patrol. Graec. 36:783 sq.).

## Epiphanius Of Jerusalem[[@Headword:Epiphanius Of Jerusalem]]

             a Greek hagiographer, lived probably in the 12th century. Allatius (De Symeonum Scriptis, page 106) and Fabricius (Codex Apogryph. n. 2) have given an extract from the Life of the Virgin by this author; the entire work has been published since in the Anecdota Literaria of Amodutius. Epiphanius is also the author of a History of St. Andrew, the apostle (Allatius, De Symeonum Scriptis, page 90), and of a Description of Jerusalenm (published by Ferdinand Morelli in his Expositio Thematum, Paris, 1620, and by Allatius, Σύμμιχτα). A MS. in the Bodleian Library contains a treatise entitled Epiphanii Monachi et Presbyteri, Character B. Virginis et Domini Nostri, which differs from the Life of the Virgin cited above, but seems to be by the same author. The same is also true of the MS. entitled De Dissidio quatuor Evangelistarum, Circa Resurrectionem Christi, which is found in the same library. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Epiphanius The Younger[[@Headword:Epiphanius The Younger]]

             bishop of Constantia, dived about the end of the 7th century. He was represented at the third General Council of Constantinople, in A.D. 680, by the bishop of Trimithus. Several of his discourses attributed to St. Epiphanius belong, probably to this Epiphanius or to a bishop of Constantia, also called Epiphanius. This latter is the author of a letter of congratulation, which was addressed to the patriarch John, who was  restored to the see of Constantinople in 867. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Epiphanius, Scholasticus[[@Headword:Epiphanius, Scholasticus]]

             an ecclesiastical writer of the Latin Church, lived at the beginning of the 6th century, and is supposed to have been an Italian by birth. At the request of his friend Cassiodorus (q.v.) he translated from Greek into Latin the works of the Church historians Socrates, Sozonmen, and Theodoret. Cassiodorus revised the translation, and made out of the three works one, which, under the name of Historia Tripartita, remained throughout the Middle Ages one of the standard historical works. Likewise, at the request of Cassiodorus, Epiphanius translated several other works, as the Codex Encyclicus (a collection of synodal epistles to the emperor Leo I in defense of the Council of Chalcedon); a Commentary of bishop Epiphanius of Cyprus on the Song of Songs; a Commentary of Didymus on the Proverbs and the catholic epistles. — Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev. 1720), 1:320; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 16:162; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:100.

## Epiphanius, St[[@Headword:Epiphanius, St]]

             bishop of Pavia, was born in that city, of a noble family, in 439 (according to others 438). He received an education for the priesthood under the special superintendence of St. Crispin, bishop of Pavia. He was consecrated subdeacon in 456, deacon in 458, and on the death of Crispin in 466, he was unanimously chosen bishop by the clergy and people. He had long been noted for his rigid asceticism, and after his election his rigor greatly increased. He took only one meal a day, abstained altogether from wine and meat, never used a bath, and was present at divine service with  feet locked together. At that time the West Roman empire was falling to pieces, and a prey to the incursions of northern tribes. During these disturbances, bishop Epiphanius seems to have gained to a high degree the esteem and the confidence of all the rulers. He mediated a peace between emperor Anthemus and his son-in-law Ricimer. In 474 he was sent by the emperor Nepos as envoy to Enrich, king of the Visigoths. In 476 king Odoacer conquered Pavia, and gave the city up to plundering, on which occasion the cathedral was destroyed. Epiphanius rebuilt the cathedral, and prevailed upon the king to exempt the city for five years from all taxes. During the war between Odoacer and Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, he gained the confidence of both parties. Theodoric, who in 493 became the master of Italy, granted, upon the intercession of Epiphanius, an amnesty to all who had borne arms against him. Theodoric then (494) sent Epiphanius on a mission to Gundobald, king of the Burgundians, to treat with him for the release of the Ligurian prisoners, who were to repeople the desolated districts of Italy. The mission was successful, and Theodoric subsequently remitted to the Ligurians two thirds of the taxes. Epiphanius died in Pavia, January 21, 497. In 962 the emperor Otho had his relics transported to Hildesheim, in Germany. The Church of Rome commemorates him as a saint on January 21. — Butler, Lives of Saints, 1:191; Acta Sanctorum, January 21 (biography by his successor Ennodius); Neander, Light in Dark Places (New York, 1853), page 97; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 16:161; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:100. (A.J.S.)

## Epiphany[[@Headword:Epiphany]]

             (ἐπιφάνεια, τὰ ἐπιφάνια, the "manifestation" of Christ), one of the oldest festivals of the Christian Church, and mentioned as such by Clement of Alexandria (Stromat. 1:1). Until the time of Chrysostom, it opened in the Eastern Church the cycle of festivals. It denoted at first the baptism of Christ, which, as Chrysostom himself remarks, was, in a higher sense than his birth, his real manifestation to men. A special festival of the birth of Christ arose later than the festival of Epiphany, and up to that time the commemoration of the birth of Christ was included in that of Epiphany. According to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, it was at first celebrated at Alexandria by the Basilidians, but soon it was introduced into the orthodox Church also. Neander thinks that it did not originate with the Basilidians, but that they derived it from Jewish Christians in Syria and Palestine. The first trace of the festival in the Latin Church is found in 360, when, as Ammianus Marcellinus (21:2) mentions, the emperor Julian took part in a celebration of the festival at Vienne. In the Western Church it came early to denote the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, with especial reference to his appearance to the wise men of the East, who came to adore him and bring him presents (Mat 2:1-12). Gradually the commemoration of other events in the life of Christ was connected with the celebration of Epiphany, as the working of the first miracle at the wedding at Cana (hence it was called "bethphania," manifestation in a house), and the feeding of five thousand persons (hence the name "phagiphania").

Prominent,.however, in the Latin Church remained the celebration of Epiphany as the manifestation of Christ to the wise men. The tradition of the Church venerated the wise men as the "Three Holy Kings," and the festival itself was commonly called in the Church the festival of the Three Kings (festum trium regum, festum Magorum, festum stellae). Like other high festivals, Epiphany was celebrated by a vigil, by the preaching of homilies, by the reception of the Lord's Supper, and by granting liberty to slaves. During the Middle Ages a dramatic representation of the oblation of the wise men was incorporated into divine worship, and in some countries these performances have maintained themselves until the present century. Peculiar popular amusements also connected themselves with the celebration of the day in Roman Catholic countries, and partly exist even at the present day. In the city of Rome there is on the festival of Epiphany a great exhibition in the College of the Propaganda, young men from all countries making addresses in their native languages, in order thus to  represent the appearance of Christ to all nations. In some Western churches, especially in Africa, Epiphany was used as a day of baptism (dies luminum); but Pope Leo I was a decided opponent of this custom, calling it irrationabilem novitatem (an unreasonable novelty). Among the Franks the custom was also known, and Charlemagne mentions it in an epistle to the bishop Garibald, but without approving it. Previously Gregory II, in 726, had forbidden to baptize except on Easter and Pentecost. In the Greek Church it was customary to consecrate the water on this day, and the custom still prevails in Russia. Bingham, Orig. Eccl. book 20, chapter 4; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 4:94; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:283; Augusti, Handbuch d. christl. Arch.ologie, 1:528; 2:476; Binterim, Denkwiurdigkeiten der christl.-kath. K. volume 5. SEE THEOPHANY. (A.J.S.)

## Epiphi[[@Headword:Epiphi]]

             (Ε᾿πιφί, 3Ma 6:38), the name of the eleventh month of the Egyptian Vague year, and the Alexandrian or Egyptian Julian year: Copt. epep; Arab. apib. Its beginning corresponds with the 25th of June in the Julian calendar (Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol. 1:98, 144). In ancient Egyptian it is called "the third month [of] the season of the waters." SEE EGYPT. The name Epiphi is derived from that of the goddess of the month, Apap-t (Lepsius, Chron. d. Eg. 1:141). The supposed derivation of the Hebrew month-name Abib from Epiphi is discussed in other articles. SEE MONTH.

## Episcopa[[@Headword:Episcopa]]

             a name sometimes given in the early Church to the wife of a bishop. The word is used in this sense in the second Council of Tours, where it is said that if a bishop have not a wife there shall no train of women follow him.

## Episcopacy[[@Headword:Episcopacy]]

             (ἐπίσκοπος, bishop; ἐπισκοπεῖν, to superintend), the government of bishops in the Church, whether as an order superior to presbyters or not. For the classes, duties, insignia, elections, and jurisdiction of bishops, SEE BISHOP. For the controversy as to the exclusive validity of Episcopal orders, SEE SUCCESSION, APOSTOLICAL. We give, in this article, a brief statement of the origin of Episcopacy, and of the theories of Episcopacy maintained in the prominent Episcopal churches of Christendom.

I. Origin of Episcopacy. — The high Episcopal writers, both of the Church of Rome and the Church of England, maintain that the order of bishops takes the place of the apostles in the Christian Church by direct divine appointment. Their view has been stated as follows: "While our Lord remained upon earth he acted as the immediate governor of his  Church. Having himself called the apostles, he kept them constantly about his person, except at one time, when he sent them forth upon a short progress through the cities of Judea, and gave them particular directions how they should conduct themselves. The seventy disciples whom he sent forth at another time are never mentioned again in the New Testament. But the apostles received from him many intimations that their office was to continue after his departure; and as one great object of his ministry was to qualify them for the execution of this office, so, in the interval between his resurrection and his ascension, he explained to them the duties of it, and he invested them with the authority which the discharge of those duties implied (Mat 28:19-20; Joh 20:21-22). Soon after the ascension of Jesus, his apostles received those extraordinary gifts of which his promise had given them assurance, and immediately they began to execute their commission as the rulers of that society which was gathered by their preaching. In Acts vi we find the apostles ordering the Christians at Jerusalem to 'look out seven men of honest report,' who might take charge of the daily ministrations to the poor, and to bring the men so chosen to them, that 'we,' said the apostles, ' may appoint them over this business.' The men accordingly were 'set before the apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them.' Here are the apostles ordaining deacons. Afterward we find St. Paul, in his progress through Asia Minor, ordaining in every church elders, πρεσβυτἑρους (Act 14:23).

The men thus ordained by St. Paul appear, from the Acts and the Epistles, to have been teachers, pastors, overseers, of the flock of Christ; and to Timothy, who was a minister of the Word, the apostle speaks of 'the gift which is in thee by the putting on of my hands' (2Ti 1:6). Over the persons to whom he thus conveyed the office of teaching he exercised jurisdiction, for he sent to Ephesus to the elders of the church to meet him at Miletus; and there, in a long discourse, gave them a solemn charge (Act 20:17-35), and to Timothy and Titus he writes epistles in the style of a superior. He not only directs Timothy, whom he had besought to abide at Ephesus, how to behave himself in the house of God as a minister, but he sets him over other ministers. He empowers him to ordain men to the work of the ministry (2Ti 2:2). He gives him directions about the ordination of bishops and deacons; he places both these kinds of office-bearers in Ephesus under his inspection, instructing him in what manner to receive an accusation against an elder who labored in word and doctrine; and he commands him to charge some that they teach no other doctrine but the form of sound words. In like manner he  describes to Titus the qualifications of a bishop or elder, making him the judge how far any person in Crete was possessed of these qualifications; he gives him authority over all orders of Christians there; and he empowers him to reject heretics. Here, then, is that apostle with whose actions we are best acquainted seemingly aware that there would be continual occasion in the Christian Church for the exercise of that authority over pastors and teachers which the apostles had derived from the Lord Jesus; and by these two examples of a delegation, given during his lifetime, preparing the world for beholding that authority exercised by the successors of the apostles in all ages. Accordingly, the earliest Christian writers tell us that the apostles, to prevent contention, appointed bishops and deacons; giving orders, too, that upon their death other approved men should succeed in their ministry. We are told that the other apostles constituted their first- fruits, that is, their first disciples, after they had proved them by the Spirit, bishops and deacons of those who were to believe; and that the apostle John, who survived the rest, after returning from Patmos, the place of his banishment, went about the neighboring nations, ordaining bishops, establishing whole churches, and setting apart particular persons for the ministry, as they were pointed out to him by the Spirit" (Watson, s.v.). In substance, the high Episcopalians claim that "after the ascension of our Lord, and before the death of the inspired apostles, there were in the Church three orders in the ministry — apostles, presbyters, and deacons; sand these three orders have continued ever since. The name apostle, out of respect to the memory of the inspired apostles, was changed to bishop, while the office remained the same."

The view above given, however satisfactory it may be to high Episcopalians, is not adopted by the more moderate writers on that side, nor by other denominations of Christians. The following brief account, from Neander's Introduction to Coleman's Apostolical and Primitive Church, is both lucid and impartial. "The earliest constitution of the Church was modeled, for the most part, after that religious community with which it stood in closest connection, and to which it was most assimilated the Jewish synagogue. This, however, was so modified as to conform to the nature of the Christian community, and to the new and peculiar spirit with which it was animated. Like the synagogue, the Church was governed by an associated body of men appointed for this purpose. The name of presbyters, which was appropriated to this body, was derived from the Jewish synagogue. But in the Gentile churches formed by the  apostle Paul they took the name of ἐπίσκοποι, bishops, a term more significant of their office in the language generally spoken by the members of these churches. The name presbyter denoted the dignity of their office, while bishop, on the other hand, was expressive rather of the nature of their office, ἐπισκοπεῖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, to take the oversight of the Church.

Most certainly no other distinction originally existed between them. But, in process of time, some one, in the ordinary course of events, would gradually obtain the pre-eminence over his colleagues, and, by reason of that peculiar oversight which he exercised over the whole community, might come to be designated by the name ἐπίσκοπος, bishop, which was originally applied to them all indiscriminately. The constant tumults, from within and from without, which agitated the Church in the time of the apostles, may have given to such a one opportunity to exercise his influence the more efficiently; so that, at such a time, the controlling influence of one in this capacity may have been very salutary to the Church. This change in the relation of the presbyters to each other was not the same in all the churches, but varied according to their different circumstances. It may have been as early as the latter part of the life of John, when he was sole survivor of the other apostles, that one, as president of this body of presbyters, was distinguished by the name of ἐπίσκοπος, bishop. There is, however, no evidence that the apostle himself introduced this change, much less that he authorized it as a perpetual ordinance for the future. Such an ordinance is in direct opposition to the spirit of that apostle. This change in the mode of administering the government of the Church, resulting from peculiar circumstances, may have been introduced as a salutary expedient, without implying any departure from the purity of the Christian spirit.

When, however, the doctrine is, as it gradually gained currency in the third century — that the bishops are by divine right the head of the Church, and invested with the government of the same; that they are the successors of the apostles, and by this succession inherit apostolical authority; that they are the medium through which, in consequence of that ordination which they have received merely in an outward manner, the Holy Ghost, in all time to come, must be transmitted to the Church when this becomes the doctrine of the Church, we certainly must perceive in these assumptions a great corruption of the Christian system. It is a carnal perversion of the true idea of the Christian Church. It is a falling back into the spirit of the Jewish religion. Instead of the Christian idea of a church, based on inward principles of communion, and extending itself by means of these, it presents us with the image of one like  that under the Old Testament, resting in outward ordinances, and seeking to promote the propagation of the kingdom of God by external rites. This entire perversion of the original view of the Christian Church was itself the origin of the whole system of the Roman Catholic religion, the germ from which sprung the popery of the Dark Ages. We hold, indeed, no controversy with that class of Episcopalians who adhere to the Episcopal system as well adapted, in their opinion, to the exigencies of their Church. But the doctrine of the absolute necessity of the Episcopal as the only valid form of government, and of the Episcopal succession of bishops above mentioned in order to a participation in the gifts of the Spirit, we must regard as something foreign to the true idea of the Christian Church. It is in direct conflict with the spirit of Protestantism, and is the origin, not of the true catholicism of the apostle, but of that of the Romish Church. When, therefore, Episcopalians disown, as essentially deficient in their ecclesiastical organization, other Protestant churches which evidently have the spirit of Christ, it only remains for us to protest, in the strongest terms, against their setting up such a standard for the Christian Church. Far be it from us, who began with Luther in the Spirit, that we should now desire to be made perfect by the flesh (Gal 3:3)."

Bunsen gives the following view of the original character of the Episcopacy: "The episcopate was originally the independent position of a city clergyman, presiding over the congregation, with the neighboring villages, having a body of elders attached to him. Where such a council can be formed there is a complete Church — a bishopric. The elders are teachers and administrators. If an individual happen to be engaged in either of these offices mose exclusively than the other, it makes no real alteration in his position, for the presbyters of the ancient Church filled both situations. Their office was literally an Office, not a rank. The country clergymen were most probably members of the ecclesiastical council of the city church, as the bishops of the country towns certainly were members of the metropolitan presbytery" (Hippolytus and his Age, 3:246).

Professor R.D. Hitchcock (American Presbyterian Review, January 1867) gives a luminous sketch of the origin and growth of Episcopacy. Admitting that the Episcopal system was in full force in the Church before the end of the third century, he shows clearly, nevertheless, that it was not of apostolical origin, but a later growth of ecclesiastical development, as follows: (1.) The best Episcopal writers now admit that the Episcopal system is not to be found in the N.T. (2.) The earliest witness, outside of  the N.T., is Clement of Rome (about A.D. 100), in whose Epistle to the Corinthians the words bishop and presbyter are used interchangeably. Dr. Hitchcock analyzes the letters of Ignatius (t 115?) both in the Syriac version of his Epistles and in the shorter Greek version, giving every passage in which Episcopacy occurs. His conclusions are that, (1.) Admitting the substantial integrity of the texts, the strong infusion of Episcopacy in them "is best explained by supposing it to be a new thing, which Ignatius was doing, always and everywhere, his utmost to recommend. As special pleading for a novelty, the Episcopal tone of the Ignatian epistles is easily understood. (2.) The Ignatian Episcopacy is not diocesan, but Congregational. Each of the churches addressed had its own bishop, presbyters, and deacons. (3.) The apostolic succession (in Ignatius) is not Episcopal, but Presbyterian. The bishop is the representative of Christ, as Christ is of the Father; the presbyters are representatives of the apostles, and the deacons of the precept or commandment of Christ. In short, the Ignatian Episcopacy, instead of having the appearance of a settled polity, handed down from the apostles, has the appearance of being a new and growing institution, unlike what went before as well as what was coming after" (Amer. Presb. Review, January1867, page 145). — The next witness is Irenaeus (t 202), who, according to Dr. Hitchcock, commonly uses the words "bishop," "episcopal," "episcopate" in the Ignatian Congregational sense; while in certain cited passages he uses "bishop" and " presbyter" interchangeably, as Clement does. This "wavering terminology is indicative, not of apostolic tradition, but of later genesis and growth, and that growth not yet completed." — Tertullian (t 240?) draws the line distinctly between clergy and laity, and discriminates clearly between bishops, priests, and deacons. In Cyprian (248-258), as has been remarked above, Episcopacy is fully matured. ( SEE CHURCH, 2:328.)

II. Episcopacy of the Roman Catholic Church. —

(1.) 'The theory of the Episcopacy according to Roman writers springs from the Romish doctrine of a visible Church. "An invisible Church" (Mohler, Symbolism, § 43) "needs only an inward, purely spiritual sacrifice, and a general priesthood;" but the visible Church, in its very idea, according to the Romish view, requires an external sacrifice, and the consecration of especial priests to perform it. The priest is supposed to receive the internal consecration from God through the external consecration of the Church — that is to say, he receives the Holy Ghost  through the imposition of hands of the bishops. The stability of the visible Church is supposed to require, therefore, an ecclesiastical ordination, originating with Christ, and perpetuated in uninterrupted succession; so that, as the apostles were sent forth by Christ, they, in their turn, instituted bishops, and these have appointed their successors down to our days. But, if these bishops are to form a perpetual corporation, they need a center and head connecting them firmly together, and exercising jurisdiction over them, and this head is found in the pope. The Episcopacy, with the pope at its head, is revered in the Church of Rome as a divine institution.

(2.) We say "with the pope at its head,'" for this point is essential to the Romish idea of an Episcopacy jure divino. The Roman Church has been divided on this question for ages. It formed one of the chief controversies in the Council of Trent, where many of the bishops earnestly endeavored to have their office pronounced to be of divine right apart from the pope, while the papal legates strenuously, but adroitly, resisted this claim, and managed to prevent its authorization by the council. The declarations of Trent on the subject are as follows (sess. 23, De Reformatione; chapter 4): "The sacred and holy synod declares that, besides the other ecclesiastical degrees, bishops, who have succeeded unto the place of the apostles, principally belong to the (this) hierarchical order; that they are placed, as the apostle says, by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God (Act 20:28); that they are superior to priests; confer the sacrament of ordination; ordain the ministers of the Church, etc." Further (same session, Son 6:1-13): "If any one shall say that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy instituted by divine ordination, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers, let him be anathema." And also (Son 7:1-13), "If any one shall say that bishops are not superior to priests, or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining, etc., let him be anathema." Nothing is said here of the divine right of the Episcopal order. But, in fact, it is not even called an order at all. In chapter 2 of the same: session (Touching the seven orders) we have priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, but not a word about bishops; So far as order is concerned, the bishops are simply priests. The Catechism of the Council of Trent declares that the order of priesthood, though essentially one, has different degrees of dignity and power — 1, simple priests; 2, bishops; 3, archbishops; 4, patriarchs; and, 5, superior to all, the sovereign pontiff. The history of the stormy 22d session of the council throws great light upon these decrees. A canon was proposed concerning "the institution of  bishops," and the Spanish prelates demanded an addition to it, declaring the Episcopate to be of divine right. This question arose, in fact, in 1546, and was before the council, in some shape or other, until 1562 (sess. 22), when it took the precise form, "Are bishops superior to priests by divine right, or only by ecclesiastical and papal right?" The pope knew that if it should be decided that the bishops held their power directly from God, there was no ground for the doctrine that they existed only through the pope, and feared that they would ultimately assert their entire independence. The dispute ended in dropping altogether the canon on the "institution of bishops," and substituting the vague decree and canon above cited.

(3.) Two theories, then, of the Episcopate exist in the Roman Church:

1, the so-called Papal system, according to which the pope is the sole bishop by divine right, and all other bishops exist only through him, and derive their superiority to presbyters solely from him;

2, the Episcopal system, which asserts an independent divine right on the part of each bishop. The former is the ultramontane view, and it is now prevalent throughout almost all the Roman world. The latter is the moderate or Gallic view. It holds that the bishops are the rightful governors of the Church, superior to presbyters by the direct appointment of God; and maintains that the pope is, with regard to other bishops, primus inter pares, appointed for the sake of keeping up the unity of the Church as a corporate body. The question, in fact, turns upon that of the primacy of the see of Rome. SEE PRIMACY. The Episcopal theory was adopted by the Gallican clergy SEE GALLICANISM, by the Jansenists (q.v.), and by Hontheim (q.v.). The present tendency of the entire Romish Church, however, is to the ultramontane theory.

The Romish Episcopacy, as a whole, is diocesan. SEE DIOCESE. The clergy of the diocese are subject to the bishop, but his authority does not extend beyond the diocese. There are, besides the diocesan bishops, bishops vacantes, bishops in partibus, bishops suffragan, etc., for which distinctions, SEE BISHOPS. "The division of the Church into dioceses may be viewed as a natural consequence of the institution of the office of bishops. The authority to exercise jurisdiction, whein committed to several hands, requires that some boundaries be defined within which each party may employ his powers, otherwise disorder and confusion would ensue, and the Church, instead of being benefited by the appointment of  governors, might be exposed to the double calamity of an overplus of them in one district, .and a total deficiency of them in another. Hence we find, so early as the New-Testament history, some plain indications of the rise of the diocesan system in the cases respectively of James, bishop of Jerusalem; Timothy, bishop of Ephesus; Titus, of Crete, to whom may be added the angels or bishops of the seven churches in Asia. These were placed in cities, and had jurisdiction over the churches and inferior clergy in those cities, and probably in the country adjacent. The first dioceses were formed by planting a bishop in a city or considerable village, where he officiated statedly, and took the spiritual charge, not only of the city itself, but the suburbs, or region lying round about it, within the verge of its [civil] jurisdiction, which seems to be the plain reason of that great and visible difference which we find in the extent of dioceses, some being very large, others very small, according as the civil government of each city happened to have a larger or lesser jurisdiction" (Hook). See Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. ix, ch. 2. The bishops are named from the principal city of the diocese, as Rome, Lyons, etc. There were bishops, not diocesan, in Ireland, until the 12th century (see Christian Remembrancer, January 1855, page 215). While the Romish bishops are independent of each other, they are all subordinate to the pope, and must make regular returns to him of the state of their dioceses. SEE BISHOPS.

III. (1.) The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States hold that there are three orders of ministers in the Church, bishops, priests, and deacons, and that bishops are the successors of the apostles, and superior to priests and deacons. The High-Church theory maintains the divine right of Episcopacy, and its absolute necessity to the existence of the Church; the Low-Church party deny that there is any positive command upon the subject in Scripture, or that there is anything in the standards of the Church of England which makes episcopacy to be of the essence of a church. The High-Churchmen maintain, and the Low-Churchmen reject the theory of the "exclusive validity of episcopal orders." SEE SUCCESSION. In the preface to the ordinal of the Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, it is declared as "evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." The doctrine of those churches in general is, "That there is in the Church a superior order of office-bearers, the successors of  the apostles, who possess in their own persons the right of ordination and jurisdiction, and who are called ἐπίσκοποι, as being the overseers not only of the people, but also of the clergy; and an inferior order of ministers, called presbyters, the literal translation of the word πρεσβύτεροι, which is rendered in our English Bibles elders, persons who receive from the ordination of the bishop power to preach and to administer the sacraments, who are set over the people, but are themselves under the government of the bishop, and have no right to convey to others the sacred office which he gives them authority to exercise under him." According to a phrase used by Charles I, who was by no means an unlearned defender of that form of government to which he was a martyr, the presbyters are episcopigregis [bishops of the flock], but the bishops are episcopi gregis et pastorum [bishops of the flock and of the pastors.] "The liberal writers, however, in the Church of England do not contend that this form of government is made so binding in the Church as not to be departed from and varied according to circumstances. It cannot be proved, says Dr. Paley, that any form of church government was laid down in the Christian as it had been in the Jewish Scriptures, with a view of fixing a constitution for succeeding ages.

The truth seems to have been, that such offices were at first erected in the Christian Church as the good order, the instruction, and the exigencies of the society at that time required, without any intention, at least without any declared design of regulating the appointment, authority, or the distinction of Christian ministers under future circumstances." To the same effect, also, Bishop Tomline says, "It is not contended that the bishops, priests, and deacons of England are at present precisely the same that bishops, presbyters, and deacons were in Asia Minor seventeen hundred years ago. We only maintain that there have always been bishops, priests, and deacons in the Christian Church since the days of the apostles, with different powers and functions, it is allowed, in different countries and at different periods; but the general principles and duties which have respectively characterized these clerical orders have been essentially the same at all times and in all places, and the variations which they have undergone have only been such as have ever belonged to all persons in public situations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and which are, indeed, indispensable from every thing in which mankind are concerned in this transitory and fleeting world. I have thought it right to take this general view of the ministerial office, and to make these observations upon the clerical orders subsisting in this kingdom, for the purpose of pointing out the foundation and principles of Church authority, and of showing that our  ecclesiastical establishment is as nearly conformable as change of circumstances will permit to the practice of the primitive Church.

But, though I flatter myself that I have proved episcopacy to be an apostolical institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops. No church can exist without some government; but, though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the offices of public worship, though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers, and though a subordination among them is expedient in the highest degree, yet it does not follow that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country; they may vary with the other varying circumstances of human society, with the extent of a country, the manners of its inhabitants, the nature of its civil government, and many other peculiarities which might be specified. As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. But he has, in the most explicit terms, enjoined obedience to all governors, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and whatever may be their denomination, as essential to the character of a true Christian. Thus the Gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents." Bishop Tomline, however, and the High-Episcopalians of the Church of England, contend for an original distinction in the office and order of bishops and presbyters; which notion is contradicted by the founder of the Church of England, Archbishop Cranmer, who says, "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things;' but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion" (Watson). On the inconsistency of the position of that portion of the so-called evangelical Episcopalians which holds that bishops are really successors of the apostles, see an admirable article in the Princeton Review, January 1856 (art. 1).

(2.) The episcopacy of the Church of England is diocesan, like that of the Church of Rome, and the bishops are named from the chief city of the diocese (London, York, etc.). In the Protestant Episcopal churches the dioceses are generally coterminous with the States of the Union, and the bishops are named accordingly (Delaware, Connecticut, etc.). The larger states are in some instances subdivided. "In the American Church the bishops are all of equal authority each ruling his own diocese independently  of the control of an ecclesiastical superior. No bishop is amenable to any central authority." There are no archbishops; but assistant and missionary bishops are authorized. SEE BISHOPS, AND PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

IV. Methodist Episcopal Church. —

(1.) The episcopacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church is believed to be nearer to the apostolic model than that of the churches which maintain the apostolical succession. Its simple idea, is, that certain elders are chosen from the body of the presbyters to superintend the Church, and are called bishops or superintendents, both terms being used in the Methodist ritual. The bishops, in virtue of their functions, naturally stand above their brethren. With regard to the ordinary functions of the ministry, they do not differ from other ministers; but extraordinary functions, such as ordaining, presiding in assemblies, and the like, are devolved upon them by their brethren, and exercised by them exclusively and of right — right not divine, but ecclesiastical and human, founded upon the will of the body of pastors. The primitive principle that bishops and presbyters are of equal rank in the N.T. is fully recognized; nor are bishops regarded as the successors of the apostles. "As soon as a church has more than one pastor, it is natural and necessary that one should preside over the rest," and that "certain functions should be reserved to him" (Buigener, Council of Trent, book 5, chapter 2). It is not contrary to the essence of the ministry, but rather in harmony with its missionary and pastoral aims, that the presidency thus arising should last for life, and that he who exercises it should govern the body of pastors according to laws adopted and approved by them, should appoint the ministers to their work, and should exercise all the functions necessary to an effective and vigorous superintendency; and if the superintendent or bishop is appointed for life, it is quite in accordance with scriptural usage that he should be set apart for his work by "the laying on of hands." Accordingly, the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church are elected by the General Conference (q.v.) for life, and are ordained according to a special form, modified from the ordinal of the Church of England (Discipline, pt. ii, chap. in). The limits of their authority are clearly set forth in the Book of Discipline (part 1, chapter 4). A bishop is amenable, not to the bench of bishops, but to the General Conference, which may even " expel him for improper conduct if they deem it necessary" (Discipline, part 1, chapter 9). "In the American branch of the Methodist Church, episcopacy exists not only in the form in which it does in every English  circuit — which is the old parochial episcopacy — but by formally committing general oversight into the hands of bishops, who have no other charge. These claim no superiority in order over their brethren, but exercise well-defined powers, simply as an arrangement of the Church for its own welfare — an arrangement which has worked admirably; and it may be questioned whether any form of church government in the world has more of the elements of power and permanence than this, which expresses Wesley's own idea of a fully organized church" (Lond. Quarterly Review, July 1856, page 530).

It has been objected to the Methodist episcopacy that, while the theory of the Church admits but two orders in the ministry, the separate ordination of bishops really implies three. But the objection is groundless. (See above, II, 2.) In fact, the number of "orders" has always been an open question, even in the Roman Church; the Council of Trent did not settle it (compare Canons of Trent, sess. 13, Son 2:1-17). The "balance of authority, even from the earliest ages, certainly inclines to consider the episcopate, as an order, to be identical with the priesthood, not the completion of it" (Maskell, Monumenta Ritualia, 3:81. So also Palmer: "If we understand the word order in, the sense of degree, we may say that there are three orders of the Christian ministry; but if we distribute it according to its nature, there are hut two, viz. bishops (or presbyters) and deacons" (On the Church, part 6, § 1).

Some Methodist writers have maintained that three orders, bishops, priests, and deacons, belong to the constitution of the Church as laid down in Scripture, and therefore that the episcopal office is not simply an ecclesiastical one. See especially Grayson, The Church and the Ministry (Louisville, 1853, 8vo).

(2.) The Methodist episcopacy is not diocesan, like that of the churches of Rome and England, but general and itinerant. Instead of being confined to a city or district, the bishop is, required to "travel at large;" and if "he cease from traveling without the consent of the General Conference, he cannot thereafter exercise the episcopal office." SEE CONFERENCES, AND METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

While, under the Methodist system, the bishops do not claim to be "successors of the apostles," or to be endowed, either as individuals or collectively, with superior authority to teach or to govern, apart from power given them by the body of presbyters as represented in the General Conference, it yet appears to be clear that, as  to their functions and jurisdiction, they approach nearer to the apostolical idea than bishops under the diocesan system. Dollinger (perhaps the ablest of living Romanist writers), in maintaining that "bishops are the successors of the apostles, and have received their authority," is yet forced to admit that, under the Roman episcopal system, the authority of bishops is strictly limited to a particular diocese, while the jurisdiction of the apostles " extended to every part of the earth, wheresoever their universal vocation to convert the nations and to found churches conducted them" (Church History, 1:226, Lond. 1840). Under the Methodist system, a bishop may preside in a Conference and ordain presbyters in March in New York, in May in Illinois, in July in California, in October in China, and in December in Germany.

(3.) The Methodist episcopacy was instituted by Wesley. During the Revolutionary War in America, most of the clergy of the Church of England left the country. Before the war, the American preachers, like those in England, had been forbidden to administer the sacraments: the people were sent to the clergy of the Church of England for baptism and the Lord's Supper. After the war the societies were without the ordinances, and were likely to be disbanded in consequence. After duly considering the exigency, Mr. Wesley (who had previously in vain urged the bishop of London to ordain preachers for America) determined to organize the American Methodists into an independent Episcopal Church, and ordained the Reverend Thomas Coke, LL.D., as superintendent, and Richard, Whatcoat and Thomas Vasev as elders. In 1784 the Rev. Francis Asbury was ordained by Dr. Coke, and. the Methodist Episcopal Church was duly organized the first American Episcopal Church. SEE METHODISM. Mr. Wesley did not pretend to ordain bishops in any other sense than according to his view of primitive episcopacy, in which, as he maintained, bishops and presbyters are the same order. The grounds of his procedure in the case are stated in his “Letter to Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury," prefixed to "Sunday Service of the Methodists" (1784); given also in Watson's Life of Wesley (page 244). An excellent sketch of the rise of the Methodist episcopacy is given by Stevens, History of Methodism, volume 2.

V. The Moravian Church (Unitas Fratrum) holds to episcopacy. Their bishops, however, are not diocesan. The history of the preservation of the episcopate is given in De Schweinitz, The Moravian Episcopate: (Bethlehem 1865). SEE MORAVIANS.  See Canones et Decreta Concil. Trident., sess. xxiii; Catechism of the Council of Trent, part 2, Sacrament of Orders; Bungener, History of the Council of Trent, book 5, chapter 2; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, book 2, chapter 15; Mohler, Symbolism, § 43; Rothe, Anfänge d. christlichen Kirche, vol. i; Baur, Ursprung des Episcopats (Tabingen, 1838, 8vo); Neander, Church History, 1:190; Mosheim, Ch. History, volume 1; Killen, Ancient Church, section 3, chapters 6, 7; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, chapter 8; Coleman, Apostolical and Primitive Church, chapter 6; Lord King, Primitive Church (12mo); Bangs, Original Church of Christ (N.Y. 12mo); Schaff, History of the Christian Church, volume 1, § 107, 108; Emory, On Episcopacy; Emory, Defence of our Fathers (N.York, 8vo); Wesley, Works, 7:312; Stillingfleet, Irenicum, 8vo; Stevens, History of Methodism, volume 2, chapters 6, 7; Watson, Life of Wesley, chapter 13; Burnet, History of English Reformation, 1:400, 586; 4:176; Porter, Compendium of Methodism; Princeton Review, January 1856; Lightfoot, On Philippians (1868), Appendix; The Rise of the Episcopate (New Englander, July, 1867); Palmer, On the Church (High- Church view), 2:349 sq.; Hinds, Rise and Early Progress of Christianity (Encyclop. Metropol. London, 1850, 12mo); and the article SUCCESSION SEE SUCCESSION . The High-Episcopal view is well stated for modern readers in Vox Ecclesiae (Philadelphia, 1866, 12mo); the moderate, in.Litton, The Church of Christ (Lond. 1851, 8vo; Phila. 1853, 8vo).

## Episcopae[[@Headword:Episcopae]]

             a name given to the deaconesses (q.v.) of the ancient Christian Church.

## Episcopalians[[@Headword:Episcopalians]]

             members of those churches which adopt the Episcopal form of Church government. SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH; SEE MORAVIANS; SEE LUTHERAN CHURCH; SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

## Episcopate[[@Headword:Episcopate]]

             the office of a bishop (q.v.).

## Episcopi Senatus[[@Headword:Episcopi Senatus]]

             (bishops of the senate), a name given in the canon law to the chapter of a cathedral (q.v.).

## Episcopissae[[@Headword:Episcopissae]]

             a name sometimes given to the deaconesses of the early Church.

## Episcopius, Simon[[@Headword:Episcopius, Simon]]

             (Dutch, Bisschop), an eminent and learned Arminian theologian, was born in January 1583, at Amsterdam, where he received his school education. In 1600 he went to the University of Leyden, where he took his degree of M.A. in 1606. He thenceforward devoted himself to the study of theology. "Earnestly," says Curcellaeus (in his eulogy on Episcopius), "did he listen to the lectures of those very learned professors, Francis Gomarus, Luke Trelcatius, and James Arminius; and in the exercises of debates and  harangues, which they commonly called theses, he left many of his equals far in the distance, and was highly esteemed as one worthy of being called to the ministry of the divine word. But when, especially after the death of Trelcatius, that terrible discussion on predestination, which afterwards agitated all Holland, finally arose, and was not only secretly carried on between the two professors, but also broke forth into open violence, our Episcopius became favorably inclined towards the Arminian doctrines. For this reason he received little favor from the pastors on the opposite side of the controversy, so that when the very illustrious councils of the state of Amsterdam, to whom the singular learning and piety of Episcopius had become known, would have invited him to become their preacher, these pastors, by causing delays, entirely frustrated the plans of the councils. Episcopius, disheartened at this affair, determined to leave the academy at Leyden, and in the year 1609 (in 'which' year Arminius died) he betook himself to the Franeker Academy, belonging to the Frisii, incited especially by the fame of that most illustrious man and learned professor of the sacred language, John Drusius. But there he displayed, as youths of a bold mind are wont, such a zeal in the theological discussions, that he gave not a little offense to Sibrandus Lubbertus, a professor of that academy. Accordingly, a few months after, he departed and came into France, where in a brief space of time he obtained so fair a mastery of the French language that he not only understood it, but could speak it with considerable ease and purity. Finally, in the year 1610, he returned to his native land, only to receive the same tokens of ill will." In that year he was ordained pastor of Bleyswick, a village near Rotterdam. In 1611 a colloquy was held at the Hague, by order of the States General, with a view to ending the agitating controversy between the Gomarists and Arminians, between six Remonstrant pastors and six Contra-Remonstrants. Episcopius, as one of the six Remonstrants, displayed so much learning and skill that his fame spread through all the country. In 1612 he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Leyden, as successor of Gomarus. Here his pre-eminent talents had full scope, and his reputation grew rapidly. The Gomarist controversy, however, waxed hotter and hotter; the orthodoxy of Episcopius was called in question by his theological opponents; and the rage of the Calvinistic party among the populace even went so far as to threaten violence. In 1614 he went to Amsterdam to attend a baptism, and the minister, Heyden, having stigmatized him as a heretic, he was saved from stoning only by the zeal of his friends. A blacksmith once ran after him with a hot iron with the cry, "Stop the Arminian disturber of the  Church," and would probably have murdered him but for the interference of bystanders.

The Synod of Dort was held in 1618. SEE DORT. Episcopius was the chief spokesman of the Arminians. At the 23d session he delivered a discourse of great power, which is to be found in his Works, in Limborch's Vita Episcopii, and in Calder's Life of Episcopius (N.Y. 1837, chapter 10). The synod condemned the Arminians, and by the aid of the civil, government banished the Remonstrant ministers. Episcopius retired first to Antwerp, where he wrote his Responsio ad duas Petri Waddingii Jesuitae Epistolas (1621, on the Rule of Faith and on the Worship of Images); his celebrated Confessio Fidei Remonstrantium (Remonstrants' Confession of Faith, 1622; Opera, volume 3); Antidotum, sive genu. ina Declaratio sent. Synodi Dordracence (Opera, volume 2, Lond. 1678). When the war between Spain and the Netherlands was renewed, Episcopius took refuge in France, residing chiefly in Paris (1621-1626). Here he published Paraphrasis in cap. 8-11 Epist. ad Romanos (Paraphrase on Rom 8:1-39; Rom 9:1-33; Rom 10:1-21; Rom 11:1-36, Opera, volume 1); Bodecherus Ineptiens (Bodecherus the Simple; a defense of the Remonstrants against the charge of Socinianism; Examen thesium J. Capelli (on the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy in Belgium); Tractatus de Libero Arbitrio (Opera, volume 1); Correspondence with Job. Cameron on Grace and Free Will (Opera, volume 1). On the death of Prince Maurice (1625) the persecution of the Remonstrants slackened, and it became safe for Episcopius to return to his country in 1626, when he became minister to the Remonstrants of Rotterdam. Here he published Apologiapro Confessione, etc. (Apology for the Confession of the Remonstrants), and other controversial tracts (Opera, volume 3). In 1634 he was made rector of the newly-established college of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, where the rest of his life was spent in diligent and successful teaching, and in constant literary and pastoral activity. The fruits of his lectures appear in permanent form in his Institutiones Theologicae, lib. 4, which, however, was left unfinished, and published posthumously (Opera, volume 1); and also in Responsio ad Quaestiones Theologicas 54 (Answers to 64 questions in theology proposed by stu: dents). He died April 4, 1643.

Episcopius was acknowledged, even by his enemies, to be a man of very rare abilities, as well as of great learning. Heidanus (one of his opponents) says he was endowed with "great learning, penetration, eloquence, and skill." His friend Uitenbogaert declared that he had never met a theologian  "to be compared with Episcopius for his knowledge of the Scriptures and of divine subjects." Mabillon recommends his Institutes as of great value to students of divinity, except the parts in which he speaks against Romanist doctrines. Bull (in his Judgment of the Catholic Church) speaks of him as the "very learned Episcopius." His talent for controversy was of a very high order; but his Institutes shows that he also possessed the power of clear and luminous statement to a rare degree. The theology of Episcopius is, in substance, that of Arminius. He has been charged with Socinianism, but his writings, controversial and other, sufficiently refute that charge as brought not only against him, but against the early Remonstrants in general. The charge was in part due to the fact that he held the ethical side of Christianity to be the test of communion rather than the doctrinal; holding that Christianity is not so much a doctrine as a life, and that it has its doctrines only with a view to its life. The two great champions of the doctrine of the Trinity in England, Waterland and Bull, both wrote against Episcopius. Waterland (Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, Works, Oxford, 1853, 3:440 sq.) states that Episcopius holds "the doctrine of the Trinity, as to the main substance of it, to be certain and clear, but yet not necessary to be believed in order to salvation," and adds that the doctrine is "taught in full and strong terms in the 'Confession of the Remonstrants,' and in other places in the works of Episcopius." He then goes on, and successfully, to show the error and danger of the unguarded statement of Episcopius as to its importance. Bull's Judgment of the Catholic Church on the necessity of believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is very God (Works on the Trinity, Oxford, 1854, volume 3), was written expressly to refute the statement of Episcopius (Institutes, book 4, chapter 34, § 2), that "in the primitive churches, during at least three centuries, the belief and profession of the special divine sonship of Christ was not judged necessary to salvation." It is hardly necessary to say that Bull makes out his case. He does not, however, charge Episcopius with doctrinal error, but with too great and even dangerous liberality. He states also that, "although Episcopius was a man of unquestionably great ability, and in many respects possessed learning of no ordinary kind, yet he but little consulted or regarded, nay, he actually despised the writings of the ancient fathers and doctors." But on this see Limborch (cited by Calder, Life of Episcopius, N.Y. ed. page 433). After the death of Episcopius, Jurieu charged him with Socinianism, which gave rise to a sharp letter from Clericus (Le Clerc) refuting the charge (see Bayle, s.v. Episcopius).  The writings of Episcopius were collected by Curcellaeus, who published volume 1, Amst. 1650, with a sketch of the author's life; volume 2, edited by Poelenburg, appeared in 1665. A second edition was published under the title S. Episcopii opera omnia theologica, cum autographo collata, et a mendis aliquot gravioribus repurgata (Lond. 1678, 2 volumes, fol.). His life was also written by Philip Limborch, first in Dutch, and afterwards enlarged in Latin (Hist. Vitc S. Episcopii, etc., Amst. 1701). There is an English version of his Labyrinthus Pontificius under the title Popish Labyrinth, or a Treatise on Infallibility (Lond. 1763). See also Calder, Memoirs of Simon Episcopius (New York, 1837, 12mo); Heppe, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:100; a translation of Curcellseus's sketch, in the Methodist Quarterly Review, October 1863, page 612; Nichols, Calvinism and A rminianism compared (Lond. 1824. 2 volumes, 8vo); Morison, On the ninth of Romans, page 40 (Kilmarnock, 1849, 8vo); Schrdckh, Kirchengeschichte seit d. Reformation, 5:239-296; and the articles SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE DORT; SEE REMONSTRANTS.

## Episcopus Episcoporum[[@Headword:Episcopus Episcoporum]]

             bishop of bishops, a title assumed by the popes.

## Episcopus Judaeorum[[@Headword:Episcopus Judaeorum]]

             (bishop of the Jews). The Jews of England, under the first Norman kings, had over them an officer under this title, licensed by the crown, who judged and ruled them according to their own law.

## Episcopus Oecumenicus[[@Headword:Episcopus Oecumenicus]]

             Ecumenical bishop, a title of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

## Episcopus Regionarius[[@Headword:Episcopus Regionarius]]

             a bishop in the early church, whose labors were confined to no particular place, but who wandered about from one district to another.

## Episcopus in Partibus[[@Headword:Episcopus in Partibus]]

             bishop in partibus infidelium, SEE BISHOP, volume 1, page 821, Col 2:1-23.

## Episemon[[@Headword:Episemon]]

             (ἐπίσημον, i.e., distinguished), a cabalistic word much used in the Gnostic system of Marcus, and hinted at by several of the early Church fathers.

## Episozomene[[@Headword:Episozomene]]

             (ἐπισωζομένη), a name given by the Cappadocian Christians to Ascension day (q.v.), probably because on that day our salvation was perfected.

## Epistemonarch[[@Headword:Epistemonarch]]

             (Gr. ἐπίσταμαι, to know, ἄρχων, a ruler), an officer in the Greek Church, whose duty it is to guard the doctrines of the Church, and to examine all matters relating to faith.

## Epistle[[@Headword:Epistle]]

             (ἐπιστολή, something sent, as a "letter"). The use of written letters implies, of course, considerable progress in the development of civilized life. There must be a recognised system of notation, phonetic or symbolic; men must be taught to write, and have writing materials at hand. In the early nomadic stages of society accordingly, like those which mark the period of the patriarchs of the O.T., we find no traces of any but oral communications. In the Homeric poems, though messages are usual, yet a sort of hieroglyphical letters is not unknown (Il. 6:168). Messengers were sent instructed what to say from Jacob to Esau (Gen 32:3), from Balak to Balaam (Num 22:5; Num 22:7; Num 22:16), bringing back in like manner a verbal, not a written answer (Num 24:12). SEE MESSENGER. The  negotiations between Jephthah and the king of the Ammonites (Jdg 11:12-13) were conducted in the same way. It was still the received practice in the time of Saul (1Sa 11:7; 1Sa 11:9). The reign of David, bringing the Israelites, as it did, into contact with the higher civilization of the Phoenicians, witnessed a change in this respect also. SEE AMBASSADOR. The first recorded letter (סֵפֶר = "book;" comp. use of βιβλίον, Herod. 1:123) in the history of the O.T. was that which "David wrote to Joab, and sent by the hand of Uriah" (2Sa 11:14), and this must obviously, like the letters that came into another history of crime (in this case also in traceable connection with Phoenician influence, 1Ki 21:8-9), have been "sealed with the king's seal," as at once the guarantee of their authority, and a safeguard against their being read by any but the persons to whom they were addressed. The material used for the impression of the seal was probably the "clay" of Job 38:14. The act of sending such a letter is, however, pre-eminently, if not exclusively, a kingly act, where authority and secrecy were necessary. Hence they contained simply royal commands, and nothing is said of salutation or even address in connection with them. Joab, on the other hand, answers the letter which David had sent him after the old plan, and receives a verbal message in return. The demand of Benhadad and Ahab's answer to it are conveyed in the same way (1Ki 20:2; 1Ki 20:5). Jehu wrote letters, and sent them to Samaria to authorities, respecting Ahab's children, the form of which, or of the one transcribed, is the first instance in the Bible of anything like a formula. It begins, "Now as soon as this letter cometh to you," but ends without any like phrase. It was apparently replied to by a message, and Jehu wrote another letter, which, as given, has not the same peculiarity as the first. That Jehu, who, though perhaps well born, was a rough soldier, should have written and there is no ground for supposing that he used a scribe, but, from the extremely characteristic style, rather evidence against such an idea indicates that letter-writing was then common (2Ki 10:1-7). In this case secrecy may have been thought desirable, but the importance of the matter would have been a sufficient reason for writing. Written communications, however, become more frequent in the later history. The letter which the king of Syria, Benhadad, sent by Naaman to Jehoram, king of Israel, though to a sovereign with whom the writer was at peace, is in the same peremptory style, with no salutation (2Ki 5:5-6), from which we may conjecture that only the principal contents are given in this and like instances. The '"writing" (מַכְתָּב) to Jehoram, king of Judah, from Elijah (q.v.) must have been a written prophecy rather than a  letter (2Ch 21:12-15); though it must be observed that such prophecies when addressed to persons are of an epistolary character. Hezekiah, when he summoned the whole nation to keep the Passover, sent letters "from the king and his princes," as had been determined at a council held at Jerusalem by the king, the princes, and all the congregation.

The contents of these letters are given, or the substance. The form is that of an exhortation, without, however, address. The character is that of a religious proclamation (2Ch 30:1-9). Hezekiah, in fact, introduced a system of couriers like that afterwards so fully organized under the Persian kings (comp. Herod. 8:98, and Est 8:10; Est 8:14). The letter or letters of Sennacherib to Hezekiah seem to have been written instructions to his messengers, which were given to Hezekiah to show him that they had their master's authority. It is to be observed that the messengers were commanded, "Thus shall ye speak to Hezekiah," and that Hezekiah "received the letter" from them. What he received was probably a roll of papyrus, as that which Jehoiakim burnt seems to have been (Jer 36:23), for when he took it to the Temple he "spread it before the Lord" (2Ki 19:9-14; Isa 37:9-14; comp. 2Ch 32:17). It does not appear to have been usual for the prophets to write letters. Generally they seem, when they did not go themselves to those whom they would address, either to have sent a messenger, or to have publicly proclaimed what they were commissioned to say, knowing that the report of it would be carried to those whom it specially concerned. When Nebuchadnezzar had carried captive some of the people of Judah, we read how Jeremiah addressed them by a letter, which is a written exhortation and prophecy (29:1-23). It can scarcely be said that here we perceive a positive distinction between the later prophets and the earlier, for Elijah sent a letter or "writing" to Jehoram, king of Judah, as already noticed. The distance of Babylon from Jerusalem, and of Jerusalem from the kingdom which was the scene of Elijah's ministry, seems to afford the true explanation. That letters were not uncommon between the captives at Babylon and those who remained at Jerusalem before it was destroyed, appears probable from the mention of letters to Zephaniah the priest, and to others from a false prophet Shemaiah, at Babylon, in contradiction of Jeremiah's letter (24-29). Jeremiah was commanded to send to the captives a condemnation of this man (30-32), and it is therefore probable that at least three letters passed on this occasion. Though with the little evidence we have we cannot speak positively, it seems as if the custom of letter- writing had become more common by degrees, although there is no ground  for inferring any change in its character. Still we find nothing of an address or signature. The letter seems to be always a document, generally a message written for greater security or to have full authority, and was probably rolled, tied up, and sealed with the writer's seal. SEE LETTER.

Although no Hebrew letters are preserved of the time before David, it might be supposed that the form might have been derived from Egypt. We have papyri containing copies by Egyptian scribes of the kings of the Rameses family about the 13th century B.C., of letters of their own correspondence. These show a regular epistolary style, the conventionalism of which at once removes us from all ideas of Shemitic literature. There is an air of the monuments about it that strikes us in the descriptive character of certain of the formulas. Some letters, from a superior to an inferior, commence in the manner shown in the following example: "The chief librarian Amen-em-an, of the royal white house, says to the scribe Penta- ur, Whereas, this letter is brought to you, saying communication." A usual ending of such letters is, "Do thou consider this." Some begin with the word "Communication." The fuller form also seems to be an abbreviation. An inferior scribe, addressing his superior, thus begins: "The scribe Penta- ur salutes his lord, the chief librarian, Amen-em-an, of the royal white house. This comes to inform my lord. Again I salute my lord. Whereas I have executed all the commissions imposed upon me by my lord, well and truly, completely and thoroughly [?] I have done no wrong. Again I salute my lord." He ends, "Behold, this message is to inform my lord." A more easy style is seen in a letter of a son to his father, which begins, The scribe Amen-mesu salutes [his] father, captain of bowmen, Bek-en-ptah," and ends "Farewell." A military of, ficer writing to another, and a scribe writing to a military officer, appear to begin with a prayer for the king before the formula "Communication." A royal or government letter is a mere written decree, without any formal introduction, and ending with an injunction to obey it. The contents of these letters are ale ways addresses to the persons written to, the writer using the first person singular. The subject-matter is various, and perhaps gives us a better idea of the literary ability of the Egyptians, and their lively national character, than any other of their compositions (see Goodwin on the "Horatic Papyri," in the Cambridge Essays, 1855, page 226 sq.). Indeed in Egypt everything of importance was committed to writing (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:176, abridgm.), and the monuments constantly depict scribes taking an inventory or check of all sorts of operations. SEE EGYPT.  In the books of Scripture written after the return from Babylon, mention is made of letters of the enemies of the Jews to the kings of Persia, and of the kings to these persons, the Jews, or their officers, some of which are given. These are in an official style, with a greeting, and sometimes an address. The letter to Artaxerxes contains the form, "Be it known unto the king," "Be it known now unto the king" (Ezr 4:11-16); and his answer thus begins, "Peace [or "welfare"], and so forth" (Ezr 4:17-22), the expression "and so forth" occurring elsewhere in such a manner that it seems to be used by the transcriber for brevity's sake (Ezr 4:10-11; Ezr 7:12). It must, therefore, not be compared to the common modern Arabic formula of commencement, "After the [usual] salutations." The letter of the opponents of the' Jews to Darius (Hystaspis) thus begins: "Unto-Darius the king, all peace. Be it known unto the king (Ezr 5:6-17)." The letter of Artaxerxes (Longimanus) to Ezra is a written decree, and not an ordinary letter, save in form (Ezr 7:11; Ezr 7:26). Nehemiah asked for, and was granted, letters from the same king to the governors and the keeper of the king's forest (Neh 2:7; Neh 2:9). When he was rebuilding Jerusalem, Sanballat sent him "an open letter" by his servant, repeating an invented rumor of the Jews' intention to rebel (6:5, 7): no doubt it was left not sealed purposely, either in order that the rumor should be so spread as if by accident, or to show disrespect. At this time many letters passed between the nobles of Judah and Tobiah, and letter-writing seems to have been common (17; see also 19). In Esther we read of exactly the same custom as that spoken of in the case of Jezebel's letter, the authority of writings with the king's name and seal, even if not written by him. It is related that Ahasuerus "took his signet from his hand and gave it unto Haman," who caused letters to be written containing a mandate: "In the name of king Ahasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king's signet" (Est 3:10; Est 3:12-13). In like manner; the same authority was given to Esther and Mordecai, and it is remarked, "For the writing which is written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's signet, may not be reversed" (8:7, 8). The influence of Persian, and yet more, perhaps, that of Greek civilization, led to the more frequent use of letters as a means of intercourse. Whatever doubts may be entertained as to the genuineness of the epistles themselves, their occurrence in 1Ma 11:30; 1Ma 12:6; 1Ma 12:20; 1Ma 15:1; 1Ma 15:16; 2Ma 11:16; 2Ma 11:34, indicates that they were recognized as having altogether superseded the older plan of messages orally delivered. SEE LETTER.

The two stages of the history of the N.T. present in this respect a very striking contrast. The list of the canonical books shows how largely epistles were used in the expansion and organization of the Church. Those which have survived may be regarded as the representatives of many others that are lost. We are perhaps too much in the habit of forgetting that the absence of all mention of written letters from the Gospel history is just as noticeable. With the exception of the spurious letter to Abgarus (q.v.) of Edessa (Euseb. H.E. 1:13) there are no epistles of Jesus. The explanation of this is to be found partly in the circumstance of one who, known as the "carpenter's son," was training as his disciples those who, like himself, belonged to the class of laborers and peasants, partly in the fact that it was by personal rather than by written teaching that the work of the prophetic office, which he reproduced and perfected, had to be accomplished. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

In the Acts of the Apostles we have the short epistle addressed by the apostolic council held at Jerusalem to the Gentile converts in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia (Act 15:23-24). There is also a letter from Claudius Lysias to Felix, which may be supposed to preserve the official style of the provinces. Both these use the common Greek formulas, beginning, after the names of the writer and the person written to, with the salutation, and ending with the adieu. The epistles of the N.T. in their outward form are such as might be expected from men who were brought into contact with Greek and Roman customs, themselves belonging to a different race, and so reproducing the imported style with only partial accuracy. They begin (the Epistle to the Hebrews and 1 John excepted) with the names of the writer, and those to whom the epistle is addressed. Then follows the formula of salutation (analogous to the ε῏υ πράττειν of Greek, the S., S.D., or S.D.M., salutem, salutem dicit, salutem dicit multam, of Latin correspondence) — generally in Paul's Epistles in some combination of the words "grace, mercy, and peace" (χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη); in others, as in Act 15:23; Jam 1:1, with the closer equivalent of χαίρειν, "greeting," which last is never used by Paul. Then the letter itself commences in the first person, the singular and plural being used, as in the letters of Cicero, indiscriminately (comp. 1Co 2:1-16; 2Co 1:8; 2Co 1:15; 1Th 3:1-2; and passim). When the substance of the letter has been completed, questions answered, truths enforced, there come the individual messages, characteristic, in Paul's Epistles especially, of one who never allowed his personal affections to be swallowed up in the greatness of his work. The conclusion in this case was probably modified by the fact that the letters  were dictated to an amanuensis. When he had done his work, the apostle took up the pen o - reed, and added, in his own large characters (Gal 6:11), the authenticating autograph, sometimes with special stress on the fact that this was his writing (1Co 16:21; Gal 6:11; Col 4:18; 2Th 3:17), always with one of the closing formula of salutation, "Grace be with thee" — "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit." In one instance, Rom 16:22, the amanuensis in his own name adds his salutation. In the "farewell" (ἔῤῥωσο of Act 23:30, ἔῤῥωσθε of Act 15:29) we have the equivalents to the vale, valete, which formed the custonary conclusion of Roman letters. It need hardly be said that the fact that Paul's Epistles were dictated in this way accounts for many of their most striking peculiarities, the frequent digressions, the long parentheses, the vehemence and energy as of a man who is speaking strongly as his feelings prompt him rather than writing calmly. An allusion in 2Co 3:1 brings before us another class of letters which must have been in frequent use in the early ages of the Christian Church, the ἐπιστολαί συστατικαί, or letters of recommendation, by which travelers or teachers were commended by one church to the good offices of others. Other persons (there may be a reference to Apollos, Act 18:27) had come to the Church of Corinth relying on these. Paul appeals to his converts as Christ's epistle (ἐπιστολή Χριστοῦ, 2Co 3:3 ), written, "not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God." For other particulars as to the material and implements used for epistles, SEE WRITING.

## Epistle (2)[[@Headword:Epistle (2)]]

             the first lesson in the communion service of the Church of England, deriving its name from the circumstance that it is generally taken from the apostolic epistles; though sometimes from the Acts, and occasionally from the Old-Test. writings. The form was derived from that of the Greek and Latin churches, where it was usually denominated the "Apostle." It has been in use in the English Church since the time of Augustine of Canterbury, a period of twelve hundred years. See Hook, Church Dict. s.v.; Staunton, Eccles. Dict. s.v.

## Epistler[[@Headword:Epistler]]

             an ecclesiastical officer mentioned in the canons of: the Church of England, and in the injunctions of queen Elizabeth, whose duty it was to read the Epistle in collegiate churches. He was required to be dressed in a cope. The office is now obsolete.

## Epistles Of Barnabas[[@Headword:Epistles Of Barnabas]]

             SEE BARNABAS.

## Epistles Of Clement[[@Headword:Epistles Of Clement]]

             SEE CLEMENT.

## Epistles Of The Apostolical Fathers[[@Headword:Epistles Of The Apostolical Fathers]]

             SEE BARNABAS; SEE CLEMENT OF ROME; SEE IGNATIUS; SEE POLYCARP.

## Epistles, Apostolical[[@Headword:Epistles, Apostolical]]

             All the revelations of God to mankind rest upon history. Therefore in the Old, as well as in the New Testament, the history of the deeds of God stands first, as being the basis of holy writ; thereupon follow the books which exhibit the doctrines and internal life of the men of God — in the Old Testament the Psalms, the writings of Solomon, etc., and in the New Testament the epistles of the apostles; finally, there follow in the Old Testament the writings of the prophets, whose vision extends into the times of the New Testament; and at the conclusion of the New Testament stands its only prophetic book, the Revelation of John.

1. The PAULINE epistles are thirteen in number, or fourteen, if we add to them the epistle to the Hebrews. Three of these are distinctively styled the Pastoral Epistles, namely, those to Timothy and Titus, as being chiefly on  the duties of the pastorate. Up to our days the genuineness of the first thirteen epistles of Paul has almost unanimously been recognized in Germany, with the exception only of the pastoral epistles, and more especially the first letter to Timothy. Eichhorn and Bauer have attacked the genuineness of all the three pastoral epistles, and Schleiermacher that of the first epistle to Timothy. Indeed, the very peculiar character of the Pauline epistles is so striking to any one who is not ignorant of the want of ease and originality conspicuous in the counterfeit writings of early times, as to leave not the least doubt of their genuineness. Depth of thought, fire of speech, firmness of character — these manly features, joined withal to the indulgence of feelings of the most devoted love and affection, characterize these epistles. The amiable personal character of the apostle may be most beautifully traced in his epistle to the Philippians and in that to Philemon. (On many peculiarities of the Pauline epistles, see Laurent, Neutestam. Studien, Gotha, 1866.) SEE PAUL.

All Paul's epistles, except the one to the Romans were called forth by circumstances and particular occasions in the affairs of the communities to which they were addressed. It is believed that all the apostolical epistles of Paul have been preserved; for the inference from 1Co 5:9, that a letter to the Corinthians has been lost, is not warranted by the language and circumstances. SEE CORINTHIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO. From Col 4:16, it has also been concluded — though probably erroneously, since there perhaps the letter to the Ephesians is referred to — that another letter to the community of Laodicea has likewise been lost. SEE LAODICEANS, EPISTLES TO AND FROM.

Press of business usually compelled Paulas was, besides, not uncommon in those times — to use his companions as amanuenses. He mentions (Gal 6:11), as something peculiar, that he had written this letter with his own hand. This circumstance may greatly have favored the temptation to forge letters in his name, because, since the period of Alexandrine literature, it was not unusual to indite spurious books, as is evident from Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes page 23); and even Christian bishops made complaints about the falsification of their letters. Paul alludes to this (2Th 2:2), and therefore writes the greeting (2Th 3:17) with his own hand. Paul himself exhorted the communities mutually to impart to each other his letters to them, and read them aloud in their assemblies (Col 4:16). It is therefore probable that copies of these letters had been early made by the several communities, and deposited in the form  of collections. So long, therefore, as the various communities transmitted the manuscripts to each other, no other letters, it is obvious, could come into the collections than those to whose genuineness the communities to whom they were originally addressed bore witness. Even Peter (2Pe 3:16) seems to have had before him a number of Paul's letters, as, about forty years later, a number of letters of Ignatius were transmitted by Polycarp to Smyrna, while the church of Philippi forwarded to him those directed to them (Ep. Polic. sub. fin.; Euseb. Hist. Ecclesiastes 3:36). The Pauline collection, in contradistinction to the Gospels, passed by the name of ὁ ἀπόστολος, or "The Apostle."

The letters of Paul may be chronologically arranged as those written before his first Roman imprisonment, those written during it, and those written after it: thus,

(a), beginning with his first letter to the Thessalonians, and concluding with that to the Romans, embracing an interval of about six years (A.D. 49-55);

(b), from the letter to the Ephesians to that to the Hebrews, about two years (A.D. 57-8); and

(c), his letter to Titus and his second to Timothy, about two years (A.D. 63-4). SEE ACTS (OF THE APOSTLES).

In our Bibles, however, the letters are arranged according to the pre- eminent parts and stations of the communities to whom they were addressed, and conclude with the epistles to the two bishops and a private letter to Philemon. (See each in its proper place.)

That these epistles offered great difficulties was already felt in the earliest times (2Pe 3:16). In the Roman Church their true understanding was more particularly lost by the circumstance that it understood by THE LAW only the opus operatumn of the ceremonial law; consequently the Roman Church could not comprehend justification by faith, and taught instead justification by works. As soon, therefore, as the true understanding of the Pauline epistles dawned upon Luther, his breach with the Roman Church was decided. SEE JUSTIFICATION.

2. The CATHOLIC epistles. There is, in the first instance, a diversity of opinion respecting their name: some refer it to their writers (letters from all the other apostles who had entered the stage of authorship along with  Paul); some, again, to their contents (letters of no special, but general Christian tenor); others, again, to the recipients (letters addressed to no community in particular). None of these views, however, is free from difficulties. The first and the second views — and more especially the first — cannot be brought to harmonize with the idiomatic expressions in the extant pages of the ancient writers; the second is, besides, contradicted by the fact that the letter of James is of a special tenor, while, on the contrary, that to the Romans is of such a general character as to deserve the name "Catholic" (q.v.) in that sense. The third opinion is most decidedly justified by passages from the ancient writers (Euseb. Hist. Ecc 5:18; Clem. Alex. Strom. 4:15, ed. Potter, p. 606; Orig. c. Cels. 1:63). The Pauline epistles all had their particular directions, while the letters of Peter, James, 1 John, and Jude were circular epistles. The epistles 2 and 3 John were subsequently added, and included on account of their shortness, and to this collection was given the name Catholic Letters, in contradistinction to the Pauline, which were addressed to particular churches or individuals. The dates of nearly all of them are later than those of Paul, but their precise time is uncertain. See each in its order; also under SEE ACTS (OF THE APOSTLES).

3. Literature. — Besides the general Introductions (q.v.) to the N.T., or parts of it, and the Prolegomena in most modern commentaries on each epistle, there is a wide range of general discussion relating to them which cannot here be profitably reviewed: special treatises only can be enumerated, and even these not exhaustively. On the autograph letters there are monographs in Latin by Rathlef (Hannov. 1752) and Stosch (Guelf. 1751); on ecclesiastical letters in general, and their various descriptions, by Berg (Jen. 1666), Bencini (Taurin. 1730), Brondley (Hafn. 1711-1712), Friderici (Gotha, 1754), Kiessling (Lips. 1744), Miller (Stad.. 1682), Pezold (Lips. 1698), Schmid (Helmst. 1713), Spies (Altorf. 1745); also Dodwell (Dissert. Cyprian. Oxon. 1684, page 17 sq.), Cassabritius (Notit. Concil. Lugd. 1670, page 275 sq.); introductory in general, by Braun (Selecta Sancta, pages 1-162), Kleuker (German, Hamb. 1799), Kohler (Germ. Lpz. 1830); and of the catholic epistles specially, by Storr (Tub. 1789), Tiegler (Rost. 1807), Staudler (Gott. 1790).

Special COMMENTARIES on all the epistles of the N.T. are the following, of which the most important are denoted by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Cassiodorus, Complexiones (ed. Chandler, Lond. 1722, 12mo); Card. Cajetan, Enarratio (Ven. 1531, Par. 1532, 1537, 1546, Antw. 1611,  fol.; Paris, 1540, Lugd. 1556, 1558, Paris, Par. 1571, 8vo; also in Opp. 5); Titelmann, Elucidatio (Antw. 1532, 1543, 8vo; Par. 1553, Ant. 1540, Ven. 1547, Lugd. 1553, 12mo); Bullinger, Commentarii (Tigur. 1537, 1549, 1558, 1582, 1588, 1603, fol.); Pellican, Commentarii (Tigurini. 1539, fol.); Gagneus, Scholia (Par. 1543, 1547, 1550, 1563, 1629, 1633, 8vo); Politus (or Catharinus), Commentarius (Romans 1546,Ven. 1551, Par. 1566, fol.); \*Calvin, Commentarii (Geneva, 1551, fol.); Buonricci, Parafrsasi (Ven. 1565, 4to); Beza, Explicatio (Genev. 1565, 1570, 8vo); Hemming, Commentarius (Lips. 1572, Vitemb. 1576, Frcft. 1579, Argent. 1589, fol.); Arias Montanus, Elucidationes (Antw. 1588, 8vo); Gualther, Homiliae (Tigurini. 1599, fol.); Erythrophilus, Auslegung (Gosl. 1605, sq., 4 volumes, 4to); \*Lubin, Exercitationes [on nearly all the epistles] (Rost. 1610, 4to); \*Este, Commentarius (Duoci. 16146, Colon. 1631, Paris, 1633,1640, 1653, 1659, 1666, 1679, fol.); Vorstius, Commentary [on most of the epistles] (Amst. and Herder. 1631, 4to); Fabricius, Analysis (in Catena, Lips. 1634, 1639, fol.); Gomarus, Explicatio (in Opp. 1644, fol.); \*Dickson, Commentarius (Glasg. 1645, 4to; in English, Lond. 1659, fol.); Trapp, Commentary (Lond. 1647, 4to); Godeau, Paraphrases (Par. 1651, 6 volumes, Rouen, 1657, Lyons, 1685, 3 volumes, 12mo); Fromond, Commentarius (Lovan. 1653, Paris, 1674, fol.); Anon. Verklaring (Amst. 1679, 4to); \*Whitby, Commentary (London, 1700, fol., and since with others); Hunn, Commentarii (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Noel Alexander, Commentarius (Rothm. 1710, 2 vols. fol.); Pyle, Paraphrase (London, 1725, 8vo); \*Lang, Erklarung (Halle, 1729, fol.); Locke, Pierce, and Benson, Paraphrase (published separately, London, 1733-52, 3 volumes, 4to; upon the same plan, and together forming a commentary on all the epistles); Dale, Analysis (London, 1737, 2 volumes, 8vo); Weitenauer, Explicatio, etc. (Aug. Vind. 1769, 8vo); Hess, Schr. der Apostel (Ziir. 1775, 1820 sq., 3 volumes, 8vo); Leutwein, Erkldrung (Leipzig, 1782-9, 3 volumes, 8vo); Nisbit, Illustration (Lond. 1787, 1789; in Germ., Nurnb. 1790, 8vo); Bahrdt, Erklaruag (Berlin, 1787-9, 3 volumes, 8vo); Przipcovius, Cogitationes (in Opp. Amst. 1792, fol., 36); Jaspis, Annotationes (Lips. 1793-7, enlarged, 1821, 2 volumes, 8vo); Kuster, Anmerkungen (Chemn. 1794, Berl. 1803, 8vo); \*Macknight, Commentary (London, 1795, 4 volumes, 4to; 1806, 1816, 8 volumes, 8vo; without the Greek text, 1795, 3 volumes, 4to; 1809, 1816, 4 volumes, 8vo; 1832, 1 volume, 8vo); Roberts, Harmony (Cambr. 1800, 4to); Shuttleworth, Paraphrase (Oxf. 1829, 8vo); Slade, Annotations (4th ed. London, 1836, 8vo); Schotl and Winzer, Commentar (Lpz. 1834 sq., 2 volumes, 8vo);  Barlee, Version (London, 1837, 8vo); Peile, Annotations (Lond. 1848-52, 4 volumes, 8vo); \*Prichard, Commentary (Lond. 1864 sq., 3 volumes, 8vo have appeared). SEE NEW TESTAMENT.

On the whole of the Pauline epistles alone, the following: Origen, Fragmenta (in Opp. 4:690); Ambrosiaster, Commentarius (in Opp. 2:15); Chrysostom, Homiliae (in Opp.); Pelagius, Commentarii [on the first 13 epistles] (in Augustini Opp. Append.); Theodoret, Commentarius (London, 1636, fol.; also in Opp. III, 1; and Bibl. Patr. [Oxf. 8vo] 8); Avitus, Fragmenta (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 9, etc.); Primasius, Commentaria (ib. 10:142); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. 6:31); St. John Damascenus, Excerpta [from Chrysostom] (in Opp. 2:1); Claudius Taurinensis, Prologus (in Mlai, Script. et. VII, 1:274); Sedulius, In epp. P. (Basil, 1528; also in Bibl. Max. Patr. 6:458); (Ecumenius, In epp. P. (Gr. and Lat. Romans 1546:1532, Paris, 1631, 2 volumes, fol.; also in Opp.); Lanfranc, Commentarii (in Opp.; also in Bibl. Max. Patr. 18:621); Raban Maurus, Commentarii (in Opp.); Remigius Autiss. [Haimo] Explanationes (Colossians 1618, fol.; also in Bibl. Max. Patr. 8:883); Theophylact, Commentarius (Gr. and Latin, Lond. 1636, fol.; also in Opp. 2); Anselm, Commentaria (in Opp. ed. 1612); Hugo A St. Victor, Qucestiones (in Opp. 1:266); Aquinas, Expositio (Basil, 1475; Lugd. 1689, fol.; also in Opp. 6, 7); Bruno, Commentarius (Paris, 1509, fol.); Dionysius Carthus., Commentaria (Paris, 1531, 8vo); Peter the Lombard, Collectanea [from the fathers] (Paris, 1535, fol.; 1537, 1541, 1543, 1555, 8vo); Salmeron, Commentarii (in Opp. 13-15); Contarini, Scholia (Par. 1571; Ven. 1589, fol.; also in Opp.); Faber, Commentarius (Par. 1512, 1515, 1531, Basil. 1527, fol.; Colossians 1531, 4to; Antw. 1540, 8vo); Bugenhagen, Adnotationes [on most of these epistles] (Argent. 1524, Basil. 1525, 1527, 8vo); \*Calvin, Commentaria (Argent. 1539, Genev. 1548, 4to; Genev. 1551, 1556, 1600, 1617, fol.; also since, and in French and English); Guilliaud, Collationes (Lugd. 1542, 1543, 4to; Par. 1550, 8vo); Arboreus, Commentarius (Par. 1553, fol.); \*Musculus, Commentarii [on nearly all of these epistles] (in parts, Basil. 1555 sq., 4 volumes, fol.); Sasbout, Commentarius [on most of these epistles] (Antw. 1561, 8vo); Major, Enarrationes (in Opp. Vitemb. 1569, fol., 1); Hyperius, Commentarii (Tigurini. 1583, fol.); \*Selnecker, Commentarius (Lips. 1595, fol.); Hespus, Commentarius (Muhlh. 1604, Lips. 1605, fol.); Weinrich, Commentarii [on most of these epistles] (in separate volumes, Lips. 1608-18, together — 1620, 1670, 4to); \*Baldwin, Commentarius (in separate volumes, Vitemb. 1608-18;  together, Freft. 1644, 1664, 1680, 4to; 1691, 1700, 1710, Vitemb. 1655, fol.); Justinianus, Explanationes (Lugd. 1612, 1613, 2 vols. fol.); a Lapide, Commentaria (Antwerp, 1614, 1617, 1622, 1627, 1633, 1656, 1665, 1679; Paris, 1621, 1625, 1631, 1638; Lugd. 1644, 1683, fol.); Gorcom, Epitome [from Este and others] (Antw. 1619, Par. 1623, 8vo); Quistorp, Commentarius (partly in separate vols. Rost. 1636 sq.; complete, 1652, 4to); Laurence, Explicatio (Amst. 1642, 4to); Scultetus, Annotata [on Tim., Titus, and Philem.] (in the Critici Sacri, 7); Crell, Commentaria [on many passages of these epistles] (in Opp. 3:167); De Launay, Paraphrase (Car. 1650, 4to); Ambianas, Commentaria (Par. 1659-64, 3 vols. fol.); Crocius, Commentarius [on the smaller of these epistles] (Marp. 1663. Cas. 1670, 2 vols. fol.); Calixtus, Expositiones [on most of these epistles] (in parts, Helmst. 1664-6, 4to); Woodhead, Allestry, and Walker Eed. Fell], Paraphrase (Oxon. 1674,1702; Lond. 1707, 8vo); Schomer, Exegesis (voti, Rost. 1699, 1705; 2:1700, 1706, 4to); Heidegger, Exegetica (Tigur. 1700, 4to); A Picon, Expositio (Par. 1703, fol.); Schmid, Commentarii [on most of these epistles] (at first in separate parts; together, Hamb. 1704, 4to); Locke, Paraphrase [on several of these epistles] (in parts, London, 1705 sq.; together, 1709, 1733, 4to); Wells, Help [on many of these epistles] (Lond. 1715, 8vo); Lang, Commentatio (Hal. 1718, 4to); Van Til, Commentarius [on four of these epistles] (Amsterd. 1726, 4to); Pierce, Notes [on the smaller of these epistles] (in parts, London, 1729 sq.; together, 1733, 4to); G. Benson, Paraphrase (London, 1734 sq.; in several volumes separately, and together, 1752-6, 2 vols.; in Germ., Lips. 1761, 4 volumes, 4to); Remy, Commentarius (Aug.Vind. 1739, 4to); Van Alphen, Specimena [on five of these epistles] (Tr. ad Rh. 1742, 4to); \*Michaelis, Anmerkungen [on most of these epistles] (Gott. 1750, 1791, 4to); Baumgarten, Auslegung [on the smaller of these epistles] (Hal. 1767, 4to); Zacharia, Erkladrung [on the smaller of these epistles] (Gotting. 1771,. 1787, 8vo); Addington, Remarks (in his Life of Paul,; London, 1784, 8vo); Krause, Anmerk. [on Philemon and 1 Thessalonians] (Frkft. 1790, 8vo); Anonymous, Uebers., etc. (Hirsch. 1791, 8vo); Struve, Uebers., etc. (Alton. 1792, 8vo, part 1); Morus, Acroases [on Galatians and Ephes.] (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Rullmann, Observationes [on the Koemerian MS.] (Rint. 1795, 4to); Bp. Burgess, Introductio [excerpts from old writers on many of these epistles) (Lond. 1804, 12mo); Bevan, Notes (in his Life of Paul, London, 1807, 8vo); Weingert, Commentarius [on the smaller epistles, chiefly compiled] (Goth. 1816, 8vo) Belsham, Exposition (Lond. 1823, 4 volumes, 8vo); \*Flatt,  Commentar (Tibing. 1826-32, 5 volumes, 8vo); Stenerson, Commentarius (Christ. 1829-30, 2 volumes, 8vo); Hemcen, Schriften, etc. (in his Leben Paulus, Gott. 1830, 8vo), Schrader, Paulus (Leipzig, 1830-3, 5 volumes, 8vo); Paulus Erlaut. [on Romans and Gal.] (Heidelberg, 1831, 8vo); Eyre, Illustration (London, 1832, 2 volumes, 8vo); Steiger, Bearleitung [on the smaller of these epistles] (Erlang. 1835, 8vo); Latham, Atrangement (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Morehead, Explanation (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Whately, Essays (London, 1845, 6th ed. 1849, 8vo); Sumner, Exposition (London, 1845 sq., 3 volumes, 8vo); Lewin, Life and Epist. of Paul (Lond. 1851, 2 volumes, 8vo); \*Conybeare and Howson, Life and Ep. of Paul (Lond. 1852, 2 volumes, 4to; 1856, 1858, N.Y. 1855, 2 volumes, 8vo); Jowett, Notes [on Romans, Galatians, and Thessalonians] (Lond. 1855, 2 volumes, 8vo); \*Ewald, Erklarung (Gott. 1857, 8vo); Linton, Notes (Lond. 1858, 12mo); \*Ellicott, Commentary [on several of these epistles] (in separate vols. Lond. 1859 sq.; Andover, 1865, 8vo); Newland, Catena [on Ephesians and Philippians] (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Macevilly, Exposition (2d ed. Lond. 1860, 2 volumes, 8vo); Bisping, Bandb. (Miinst. 1864 sq. 8vo). SEE COMMENTARY.

On the three pastoral epistles alone (1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus), the following: Jerome, Commentarii (in Opp. Suppos. 11); Chrysostom, Homilice (tr. in Lib. of Fathers, Oxf. 1843, 8vo, 12); Calvin, Sermons (Genev. 1563, fol.; tr. Lond. 1579, 4to; different from his Commentary on these epistles, Edinb. 1856, 8vo, tr. from his Commentarii, in Opp.); Daille, Sermons (Geneva,: 1555-61, 5 volumes, 8vo); Magalianus, Commentarii (Lugd. 1609, 4to); Soto, Commentarius (Par. 1610, fol.); Scultetus, Observationes (Francf. 1624, Vitemb. 1630, 4to; also in the Crit. Sacri, 7); Habertus, Expositio (Par. 1656, 8vo); Heydenreich, Erlauter. (Hadamar. 1826-8, 2 volumes, 8vo); \*Flatt, Anmerk. (Tubing. 1831, 8vo); Anon. Μεταφρασιᾷ (Par. 1831, 8vo); Mack, Commentar (Tubing. 1831, 1841, 8vo); Malthies, Erklar. (Greifsw. 1840, 8vo); Moller, Commentar (Kopenh. 1842, 8vo); Paterson, Commentary (London, 1848, 8vo); \*Ellicott, Commentary (London, 1856, Andover, 1864, 8vo). SEE TIMOTHY; SEE TITUS (EPISTLES TO).

On all the Catholic epistles alone (Jam 1:1-27 and 2Pe 1:1-21; 2Pe 2:1-22, and 3 John, and Jude), the following: Theophylact, Commentarius (in Opp. 3); also Enarrationes (in Bibl. Patr. Gall. 6:286); OEcumenius, Expositio (Frcft. 1610, 4to; also in Opp. 2); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. 5:673; Works, 12:157; comp. Works, 1:215); Cramer, Commentarii [from the fathers] (in his  Catena, 8); Aquinas, Expositio (Paris, 1543, 1563; Lugdun. 1556, Antwerp, 1592, 8vo; etc.); Hus, Commentarii (in Monumenta, 2:105); Faber, Commentarius (Basil, 1527, fol.; Antw. 1540, 8vo); Imler, Commentarius (Freft. 1542, 2 volumes, 8vo); Horne, Expositio (Brunswick, 1554, 4to); Hemming, Commentarius (in separate volumes, Havn. 1563, and Vitemb. 1569, 8vo; together, in English, Lond. 1577, 4to); Ferus, Exegesis (Complut. 1570, fol.); Aretius, Commentarius (Morg. 1589, Berne, 1608, 8vo); Grynaeus, Explicatio (Basil, 1593, 8vo); Salmeron, Disputationes (in Opp. 16); Crell, Commentarius [on many passages of these epistles] (in Opp. 3:318); Cocceius, Commentarius (in Opp. 6); Various, Annotations (in the Critici Sacri, 8); Serarius, Commentarius (Moguntiac. 1612, fol.); Lorinus, Commentarius (Lugd. 1619, 2 volumes fol.); Justinianus, Explanationes (Lugd. 1621, fol.); Turnemann, Meditationes (Frcft. 1625, 4to); Alsted, Notationes (Herb. 1631,1640, 8vo); Lenseus, Commentarii (Holm. 1645, 4to); Benson, Paraphrase (London, 1706, 4to); Grarmlich, Anmerkungen (Stuttg. 1721, 8vo); Riclot, Paraphrase (Metz, 1727, 12mo); Collet, Paraphrase (Lond. 1734, 8vo); Boysen, Erklar. [on Peter and Jude] (Halle, 1775, 8vo); Zacharia, Erk/dr. (Gott. 1776, 8vo); Schirmer, Erklar. [on Peter, James, and Jude] (Breslau, 1778, 8vo); Schroder, Erklar. [on Peter and Jude] (Schwabach, 1781, 8vo); Schlengel, Anmerk. (Halle, 1783, 8vo); Seemiller, Annotationes [on James and Jude] (Norimburg, 1783, 8vo); Semler, Paraphrasis [on Peter and Jude] (Halle, 1784, 8vo); Pott, Annotationes (in parts, Gott. 1786-90, 8vo; also in the N.T. Koppian. 9); E. Bengel, Erkldrung (Tib. 1788, 8vo); Carpzov, Scholia (Hal. 1790, 8vo); Gopfert, Anmerk. (Zwickau and Lpz. 1791, 8vo); Morus, Prcelectiones (on Peter and James] (Lips. 1794, 8vo); Roos, Auslegung [on Pet. and Jude] (Tub. 1798, 8vo); Augusti, Erklar. (Lemgo, 1801-8, 3 volumes, 8vo); Hottinger, Commentarius [on 1 Peter and James] (Lips. 1815, 8vo); Grashof, Erkldr. (Essen. 1830, 8vo); Sumner, Exposition (Lond. 1840, 8vo); Diedrich, Erklar. (Lpz. 1861, 8vo). See each epistle in its place.

## Epistles, Spurious[[@Headword:Epistles, Spurious]]

             Of these many are lost; but there are several extant, of which the following are the principal (see Jones, A new Method of settling the Canon, volume 2). SEE CANON.

1. The Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans. — There was an "Epistle to the Laodiceans" extant in the beginning of the second century, which was received by Marcion, but whether this is the same with the one now extant in the Latin language is more than doubtful. "There are some," says Jerome, "who read the Epistle to the Laodiceans, but it is universally rejected." The original epistle was most probably a forgery founded on Col 4:16. "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the Epistlefrom Laodicea." The apparent ambiguity of these last words has induced some to understand Paul as speaking of an epistle written by him to the Laodiceans, which he advises the Colossians to procure from Laodicea and read to their Church. "Some," says Theodoret, "imagine Paul to have written an epistle to the Laodiceans, and accordingly produce a certain forged epistle; but the apostle does not say the epistle to, but the epistle from the Laodiceans." Bellarmine among the Roman Catholics, and among the Protestants Le Clerc and others, suppose that the passage in Colossians refers to an epistle of Paul, now lost, and the Vulgate translation — eam quae Laodicensium est — seems to favor this view. Grotius, however, conceives that the Epistle to the Ephesians is here meant, and he is followed by Hammond, Whitby, and Mill, and also by archbishop Wake (Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers). Theophylact, who is followed by Dr. Lightfoot, conceives that the epistle alluded to is 1 Timothy. Others hold it to be 1 John, Philemon, etc. Mr. Jones conjectures that the epistle now passing as that to the Laodiceans (which seems entirely compiled out of the Epistle to the Philippians) was the composition of some idle monk not long before the Reformation; but this opinion is scarcely compatible with the fact mentioned by Mr. Jones himself, that when Sixtus of Sienna published his Bibliotheca Sancta (A.D. 1560), there was a very old manuscript of this epistle in the library of the Sorbonne.  This epistle was first published by James le Fevre, of Estaples, in 1517. It may be found in Gr. and Lat. in Fabricius, Codex Apocr. 2:871; and translated in Hone's Apocryphal N.T. page 94. SEE LAODICEANS (EPISTLE TO).

2. The Third Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. — It was the opinion of Calvin, Louis Capell, and many others, that the apostle Paul wrote several epistles besides those now extant. One of the chief grounds of this opinion is the passage 1Co 5:9. There is still extant, in the Armenian language, an epistle from the Corinthians to St. Paul, together with the apostle's reply. This is considered by Mr. La Croze to be a forgery of the tenth or eleventh century, and he asserts that it was never cited by any one of the early Christian writers. In this, however, he is mistaken, for this epistle is expressly quoted as Paul's by St. Gregory the Illuminator in the third century, Theodore Chrethenor in the seventh, and St. Nierses in the twelfth. Neither of them, however, is quoted by any ancient Greek or Latin writer (Henderson, On Inspiration, page 497. The passages are cited at length in father Paschal Aucher's Armenian and English Grammar, Venice, 1819. Lord Byron's translation of them is given by Stanley in his Commentary on Corinthians, 2:303). SEE CORINTHIANS (FIRST EPISTLE TO).

3. The Epistle of Peter to James is a very ancient forgery. It was first published by Cotelerius, and is supposed to have been a preface to the Preaching of Peter, which was in great esteem among some of the early Christian writers, and is several times cited as a genuine work by Clement of Alexandria, Theodotus of Byzantium, and others. It was also made use of by the heretic Heracleon, in the second century. Origen observes of it that it is not to be reckoned among the ecclesiastical books, and that it is neither the writing of Peter nor of any other inspired person. Mr. Jones conceives it to be a forgery of some of the Ebionites in the beginning of the second century. It is given in Gr. and Latin by Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N.T. 2:907. SEE PETER.

4. The Epistles of Paul and Seneca consist of eight extended Latin letters from the philosopher Seneca to the apostle Paul, and six from the latter to Seneca. (See Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N.T. 2:872; and the translation in Hone's Apocryphal N.T. page 95 sq.) Their antiquity is undoubted. St. Jerome had such an idea of the value of these letters that he was induced to say, "I should not have ranked Seneca in my catalogue of saints, but that I  was determined to it by those epistles of Paul to Seneca and Seneca to Paul, which are read by many... . He was slain by Nero two years before Peter and Paul were honored with martyrdom." St. Augustine also observes (Epistle to Macedonius) that "Seneca wrote certain epistles to St. Paul which are now read." The epistles are also referred to in the spurious "Acts" of Linus, the first bishop of Rome after the apostles. But these Acts are a manifest forgery, and were first alluded to by a monk of the eleventh century. The letters do not appear to have been mentioned by any other ancient writer; but it seems certain that those now extant are the same which were known to Jerome and Augustine. The genuineness of these letters has been maintained by some learned men, but by far the greater number reject them as spurious. Mr. Jones conceives them to be a forgery of the fourth century, founded on Phillipians 4:22. Indeed, there are few persons mentioned in the New Testament as companions of the apostle who have not had some spurious piece or other fathered on them. SEE SENECA.

5. Among the apocryphal letters now universally rejected are the well- known Epistle of Lentulus to the Roman senate, giving a description of the person of Christ (Orthodoxographia, page 2, Basil. 1555; Fabricii Cod. Epig. 1719), and some pretended epistles of the Virgin Mary. One of these is said to be written in Hebrew, and addressed to the Christians of Messina in Sicily, of which a Latin translation has been published, and its genuineness gravely vindicated (Veritas Vindicata, 1692, fol.). It is dated from Jerusalem, in the 42d year "of our Son." nones of July, Luna 17, Feria quinta. The metropolitan church of our Lady of the Letter, at Messina, takes its name from the possession of this celebrated epistle, of which some have pretended that even the autograph still exists. An epistle of the Virgin to the Florentines has been also celebrated, and there is extant a pretended letter from the same to St. Ignatius, together with his reply. (For three of these spurious letters, see Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. N.T. 2:842.) SEE JESUS CHRIST.

For other spurious epistles, SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Epistolae[[@Headword:Epistolae]]

             When the ancient Christians were about to travel into a foreign country, they took with them letters of credence from their own bishop, in order that they might communicate with another church. These letters were of three kinds: epistole commendatoriae, given to persons of quality, or  persons whose reputation had been called in question, or to the clergy who had occasion to travel into foreign countries; epistola communicatoriae, given to such as were in peace and communion with the Church; epistolae dimissoriae, such as were given by the bishops to the clergy when removing from one diocese to another. All these were called epistolae formatae, because they were written in a peculiar form, with certain marks, which served to distinguish them from counterfeits. Farrar, Ecclesiastes ,Dictionary, s.v.; Bingham, Orig. Eccl. book 2, chapter 4.

## Epistolae Obscunorum Virorum[[@Headword:Epistolae Obscunorum Virorum]]

             (Epistles of obscure Men), a celebrated collection of letters by anonymous authors, in which the opponents of Humanism, and the Church of Rome in general, were castigated with pungent satire. The special occasion for the publication of these epistles was a bitter controversy between the learned Reuchlin (q.v.) on the one hand, and a converted Jew named Pfefferkorn, and the Dominicans of Cologne (headed by Hochstraten [q.v.], the inquisitor, and by Prior Ortuinus Gratius) on the other. The latter advocated the expulsion of all Jews from Germany, the burning of their books, and the forcible education of their children in the Christian religion. Reeuchlin, being asked for his opinion, advised that only the writings of the Jews against Christianity should be burned. The bishop of Spires declared in favor of Reuchlin. Pope Leo X, who personally cared more about the friendship of the Humanists than about the Church, but who, as pope, dared not to offend the monks, delayed his decision. The Humanists now organized themselves everywhere into a league, and flooded Germany with books against the fanatical monks. Among these books, the Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum are the most celebrated. They successfully imitate the barbaric Latin of the monks. The types, which were of very poor quality, and abounding in abbreviations, were a studious imitation of those used by Quentil of Cologne, the publisher of Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans. The name of Aldus Manutius was used as publisher, and Venice as the place of printing, and a pretended papal privilege guaranteed it for ten years against counterfeited editions. They were addressed to Ortuinus Gratius, a leading man among the band of literary fanatics at Cologne, who was regarded as the real author of the writings of Pfefferkorn against Reuchlin. They give a vivid picture of the opinions, the talk, and the writings of the monks and their friends, and expose their ignorance, hypocrisy, arrogance, and licentiousness. The satire was so skillful, and the imitation of the monkish language and spirit so successful,  that, according to the testimony of Erasmus, the Franciscans and Dominicans of England at first received the epistles with great applause, and a Dominican prior circulated a number of copies among members of his order, believing them to be written in its honor. When the real character was discovered, the rage of the monks was great, and the pope was prevailed upon to issue against the epistles a brief of condemnation. Pfefferkorn wrote a book against the epistles in 1516 (Defensio Joa. Pepericorni contra famosas et criminales obscurorum virorum epistolas), and the monks, in 1518, published against it a work called Lamentationes obscurorum virorum; but all these books were so poor and insipid that they increased rather than weakened the effect of the epistles. The Lamentationes in particular, as a defense of the monks, are so ineffective that some Roman Catholic writers, though without good reason, ascribe the authorship to the Humanists themselves. The epistles consist of three parts. The first was printed in 1515 at Hagenau by the learned printer Wolfgang Angst, a friend of Reuchlin, under the title Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum ad venerabilem virum Mag. Ortuinum Gratium, Daventriensem ("a native of Deventer") Coloniae Agrippinae bonas litteras docentem, variis et locis et temporibus missae ac demum in volumen coactae. The second part was printed at Basel in 1517 by Froben; the third, which is much inferior to the two former, appeared much later. Sir William Hamilton (Edinburgh Review, 53:193) remarks that "the Epistolae are at once the most cruel and the most natural of satires, and, as such, they were the most effective. They converted the tragedy of Reuchlin's persecution into a farce; annihilated, in public consideration, the enemies of intellectual improvement; and even the friends of Luther, in Luther's lifetime, acknowledged that no other writing had contributed so powerfully to the downfall of the papal domination."

As to the authorship of the Epistolae, there has been much dispute. It appears certain that neither Erasmus nor Reuchlin had any part in the compilation. The recent German critics generally incline to think that the first part was chiefly compiled by Wolfgang Angst and Crotus Rubianus, and the second by Crotus Rubianus, Hutten, and Pirkheimer; but Hamilton, in the article above cited, shows almost decisively that Hutten, Crotus, and Buschius were the joint authors. A late writer, Chauffour-Kestner (Ulrich von Hutten, translated by A. Young), attributes the work exclusively to Hutten (see British and For. Evang. Review, October 1867, page 775). The Epistolae have frequently been printed; among the earlier editions,  those of Frankfort (1643), London (1710), and another London edition (without date), with nine pictures, are the best. There are modern editions by Dr. Munch (Lpz. 1827), by Rotermund (Hanov. 1827), and by Boecking (Lpz. 1858). The London edition of 1710 is the most elegant in form. It was edited by the learned Maittaire, who really believed it to be the genuine work of the monks, as did Steele, to whom Mattaire's edition was dedicated, and who noticed it, as if genuine, in The Tatler. This edition was reproduced by Clements, London, 1742. The literary history of the Epistolae is very fully given in Sir W. Hamilton's article above referred to, which criticizes Munch's edition with some severity. Very full information on the Epistolk is given in the three last-named editions. See, besides the authors already cited, Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:111; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:633.

## Epistolae Praestantium Virorum[[@Headword:Epistolae Praestantium Virorum]]

             a valuable collection of letters illustrating the history of the Arminians and Remonstrants. Its full title is Praestantium ac Eruditorum irorum Epistolae Ecclesiasticae et Theologiae varii argumenti, inter quas eminent ece, quae a Jac. Arminio, Conr. Vorstio, Sim. Episcopio, Hug, Grotio, Casp. Barlaeo, conscripts sunt. (Amst. 1660, 8vo; 2d ed. Amst. 1684, fol.).

## Epistolae Synodicae[[@Headword:Epistolae Synodicae]]

             a name sometimes given to enthronistic letters (q.v.), but more generally used to indicate the circular letters by which a primate summoned a council of the Church in ancient times.

## Epistolare[[@Headword:Epistolare]]

             (plur. -aria), a term used in Biblical criticism (q.v.) to distinguish those MS. Lectionaries (q.v.) or selections from the Greek Test. anciently employed in Church service that contained selections from the epistles only. SEE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE.

## Epistolarium[[@Headword:Epistolarium]]

             The office of the Holy Communion was in the early ages of the Church contained in four volumes, viz. the Antiphoner, the Lectionary, the Books of the Gospels, and the Sacramentary. The second of these, the Lectionary, was the book of the epistles read at mass (Du Cange, Glossarium, s.v. Lectionarius), generally called the Epistolarium, also Comes and Apostolus. — Procter, On the Book of Common Prayer, page 9.

## Epitaphia[[@Headword:Epitaphia]]

             (ἐπιτάφια), funeral orations. It was usual in the early Church to make funeral orations (λόγοι ἐπικήδειοι) in praise of those who had been  distinguished during life by their virtues and merits. Several of these are extant, as that of Eusebius at the funeral of Constantine; those of Ambrose on the deaths of Theodosius and Valentinian, and of his own brother Satyrus; those of Gregory of Nazianzus upon his father, his brother Csesarius, and his sister Gorgonia; and that of Gregory of Nyssa upon the death of Melitus, bishop of Antioch. — Riddle, Christ. Antiq. book 7, chapter 3.

## Epitrachelion[[@Headword:Epitrachelion]]

             (Gr. ἐπί, upon, and τράχηλος, the neck), a vestment of the Greek ecclesiastics, which, instead of being put round the neck like a scarf, is joined at the centre, and has an orifice left at its upper end that it may be passed over the head. SEE STOLE.

## Epoch[[@Headword:Epoch]]

             1. The point of time, usually marked by some important event, from which a series of year's, termed an era, is computed or dated; although "epoch" and "aera" are often used synonymously for either a chronological period or date in general (see Penny Cyclopedia, s.v. AEra). An aera properly so called the ancient Hebrews did not possess. Signal events seem to have been made use of as points from which to date. Moses, like Herodotus, reckoned by generations. The Exodus, as may be seen in Exo 19:1, and Num 33:38, probably, also, the building of the first Temple (1Ki 9:10; 2Ch 3:2), were employed as starting-points to aid in assigning events their position in historical succession. Also the destruction of the first Temple, or the beginning of the Babylonish captivity (in the summer of the year B.C. 586), and the liberation of the Jews from the Syrian yoke by the valor of the Maccabees (in the autumn of the year B.C. 143), were used as epochs from which time was reckoned. After the manner of other nations, the Hebrews computed time by the succession of their princes, as may be seen throughout the books of Kings and Chronicles. At a later period, and in the first book of the Maccabees, what is termed the Greek sera, or that of the Seleucidae, began to be employed. This aera, which is also called the aera of the Syro-Macedonians, commences from the year of Rome 442, twelve years after the death of Alexander, and 311 years and four months before the birth of our Savior, the epoch of the first conquest of Seleucus Nicator in that part of the West which afterwards composed the immense empire of Syria (see Noris, Annus et epocha Syro-Macedonum, Lips. 1696). The Julian year, formed of the Roman months, to which Syrian names were given, was used. The aera prevailed not only in the dominions of Seleucus, but among almost all the people of the Levant, where it still exists. The Jews did not abandon the use of this sera until within the last 400 years. At present they date from the Creation, which they hold to have taken place 3760 years and three months before the commencement of the Christian aera. In order to fix  their new moons and years; as well as their feasts and festivals, they were obliged to make use of astronomical calculations and cycles. The first cycle they used for this purpose was one of 84 years, but this being discovered to be faulty, they had recourse to: the Metonic cycle of 19 years, which was established by the authority of rabbi Hillel, prince of the Sanhedrim, about the year 360 of the Christian aera. This they still use, and say it is to be observed till the coming of the Messiah. Indeed, some contend that their present practice of dating from the Creation of the world is of great antiquity. Their year is luni-solar, consisting either of 12 or 13 months each, and each month of 29 or 30 days; for in the compass of the Metonic cycle there are 12 common years, consisting of 12 months, and seven intercalary years, consisting of 13 months, which are the third, sixth, eighth, eleventh, fourteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth of the cycle. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

The birth of the Savior of the world probably took place somewhat earlier than the date which is usually assigned to it. Usage, however, has long fixed the aera to which it gave rise, namely, the Christian aera, or the sera of the Incarnation, to begin on the 10th day of January, in the middle of the fourth year of the 194th Olympiad, the 753d year of the building of Rome, and in the 4714th of the Julian period. The use of the Christian aera was introduced in the sixth century; in France it was first employed in the seventh. About the eighth it was generally adopted; but considerable difference has existed not only in various countries, but even in the same place in the same country and at the same period, respecting the commencement of the year. Nor did the use of the sera become universal in Christendom till the fifteenth century. The Christian year consists of 365 days for three successive years, and of 366 in the fourth, which is termed leap-year. This computation subsisted for 1000 years without alteration, and is still used by the Greek Church. The simplicity of this form has brought it into very general use, and it is customary for astronomers and chronologists, in treating of ancient times, to date back in the same order from its commencement. There is, unfortunately, a little ambiguity on this head, some persons reckoning the year immediately before the birth of Christ as 1 B.C., and others noting it with 0, and the second year before Christ with 1, thus producing one year less than those who use the former notation. The first, however, is the usual mode. The Christian year, arranged as has been shown, was 11' 11" too long, an error which amounted to a day in nearly 129 years. Towards the end of the sixteenth  century the time of celebrating the Church festivals had advanced ten days beyond the periods fixed by the Council of Nice in 325. It was, in consequence, ordered by a bull of Gregory XIII that the year 1582 should consist of only 355 days, which was brought about by omitting ten days in the month of October, namely, from the 5th to the 14th. And to prevent the recurrence of a like irregularity, it was also ordered that in three centuries out of four the last year should be a common instead of a leap-year, as it would have been by the Julian Calendar. The year 1600 remained a leap- year, but 1700, 1800, and 1900 were to be common years. This amended mode of computing was called "The New Style." It was immediately adopted in all Catholic countries, but Protestants came to use it only gradually. In England the reformed calendar was adopted in the year 1752 by omitting eleven days, to which the difference between the styles then amounted. The alteration was effected in the month of September, the day which would have been the third being called the fourteenth. SEE VULGAR AERA.

The following summary shows the correspondence of the principal epochs, aeras, and periods with that of the birth of Christ, or Christian aera. (A valuable treatise on AEras of ancient and modern Times may be found in the Companion to the Almanac, 1830.) SEE AERA.

2. The term epoch is used by modern writers to denote "critical junctures in the development of history, the signals of a new creation; hence termed ἐποχαί, pauses or resting-places for contemplation. What exists at the epoch in the germ is developed to a more advanced stage, and thus afterwards becomes the Period. The former denotes the fountain-head, the latter the stream; their limits are where a new form of culture again appears in an epoch. The epochs are either critical and destructive, or creative and organizing." — Neander, Hist. of Dogmas, 1:20.

## Eponamon[[@Headword:Eponamon]]

             a name given by the natives of Chili, in South America, to the devil, as being strong and powerful.

## Epulones[[@Headword:Epulones]]

             a special order of priests among the ancient Romans. They were first appointed B.C. 198, to preside at the Epulum Jovis (q.v.) and similar feasts, and were usually three in number, although they were at one time seven and at another ten.

## Epulum Jovis[[@Headword:Epulum Jovis]]

             (the feast of Jupiter), a festival of the ancient Romans, held in honor of the father of the gods. At these the gods themselves were supposed to be present; for their statues were brought on rich beds, with their pulvinaria or pillows, and placed at the most honorable part of the table as the principal guests. The care of this apparatus belonged to the epulones (q.v.).

## Equiria[[@Headword:Equiria]]

             (Lat. equus, "a horse"), two festivals celebrated by the ancient Romans, the one in February, the other in March, in honor of Mars, the god of war, at which horse-racing was the principal amusement.

## Equitius[[@Headword:Equitius]]

             a lay abbot of many monasteries, both male and female, in the province of Valeria, who liv.ed in the 6th century. The year both of his birth and death are unknown. He had not taken orders, but was nevertheless very active in preaching. He was therefore denounced at Rome, and the pope summoned him before his tribunal, but the great and general reputation of Equitius induced the pope to dismiss the case. Equitius led a very ascetic life, and is  said to have always, during his many travels, carried the Bible with him. According to Baronius, pope Gregory I was a monk according to the rule of St. Equitius, but this is denied by other writers. — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 4:113; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 3:638. (A.J.S.)

## Equitius (2)[[@Headword:Equitius (2)]]

             bishop of Hippo Diarrhytus, notorion for his turbulence, against whom the Council of Carthage, A.D. 401, took steps towards a deposition.

## Equity[[@Headword:Equity]]

             "is that exact rule of righteousness or justice which is to be observed between man and man. Our Lord beautifully and comprehensively expresses it in these words: 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets' (Mat 7:12). This golden rule, says Dr. Watts, has many excellent properties in it.

1. It is a rule that is easy to be understood, and easy to be applied by the meanest and weakest understanding (Isa 35:8).

2. It is a very short rule, and easy to be remembered: the weakest memory can retain it; and the meanest of mankind may carry this about with them, and have it ready upon all occasions.

3. This excellent precept carries greater evidence to the conscience, and a stronger degree of conviction in it, than any other rule of moral virtue.

4. It is particularly fitted for practice, because it includes in it a powerful motive to stir us up to do what it enjoins.

5. It is such a rule as, if well applied, will almost always secure our neighbor from injury, and secure us from guilt if we should chance to hurt him.

6. It is a rule as much fitted to awaken us to sincere repentance upon the transgression of it as it is to direct us to our present duty.

7. It is a most extensive rule, with regard to all the stations, ranks, and characters of mankind, for it is perfectly suited to them all.

8. It is a most comprehensive rule with regard to all the actions and duties that concern our neighbors. It teaches us to regulate our temper and behavior, and promote tenderness, benevolence, gentleness, etc.

9. It is also a rule of the highest prudence with regard to ourselves, and promotes our own interest in the best manner.

10. This rule is fitted to make the whole world as happy as the present state of things will admit. See Watts, Sermons, serm. 33, volume 1; Evans, Sermons, serm. 28. SEE ETHICS.

## Equivocation[[@Headword:Equivocation]]

             "(aquae, voco, to use one word in different senses). 'How absolute the knave is! We must speak by the card, or equivocation will undo us' (Humlet, Act 5:1-42, scene 1). In morals, to equivocate is to offend against the truth by using language of double meaning, in one sense, with the intention of its being understood in another or in either sense according to circumstances. The ancient oracles gave responses of ambiguous meaning. Aio, te, AEacide, Romanos vincere posse may mean either, 'I say that thou, O descendant of Jacus, canst conquer the Romans,' or 'I say that the Romans can conquer thee, O descendant of AEacus.' Latronem Petrum occidisse may mean 'a robber slew Peter,' or 'Peter slew a robber.' Edwardum occidere nolite timere borum est. The message penned by Adam Orleton, bishop of Hereford, and sent by queen Isabella to the jailers of her husband, Edward II. Being written without punctuation, the words might be written two ways: with a comma after timere, they would mean, 'Edward, to kill fear not, the deed is good;' but with it after nolite, the meaning would be, 'Edward kill not, to fear the deed is good.' Henry Garnet, who was tried for his participation in the Gunpowder Plot, thus expressed himself in a paper dated March 20, 1605-6, 'Concerning equivocation, this is my opinion: in moral affairs, and in the common intercourse of life, when the truth is asked among friends, it is not lawful to use equivocation, for that would cause great mischief in society wherefore, in such cases, there is no place for equivocation. But in cases where it becomes necessary to an individual for his defense, or for avoiding any injustice or loss, for obtaining any important advantage, without danger or mischief to any other person then equivocation is lawful' (Jardine, Gunpowder Plot, page 233). Dr. Johnson would not allow his servant to say he was not at home when he really was. 'A servant's strict regard for truth,' said he, 'must be weakened by such a practice. A philosopher may know that it is merely a form of denial, but few servants are such nice distinguishers. If I accustom a servant to tell a lie for me, have I not reason to apprehend that he will tell many lies for himself?' (Boswell, Letters, page 32.) There may be equivocation in sound as well as in sense. It is told that the queen of George III asked one of the dignitaries of the Church if ladies might knot on Sunday. His reply was, Ladies may not; which, in so  far as sound goes, is equivocal." — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.

## Er[[@Headword:Er]]

             (Hebrews id. עֵר, watchful; Sept. and N.T. "Hp, Vulg. Her.), the name of three men. SEE ERI.

1. The oldest son of the patriarch Judah by BathShuah (daughter of Shuah), a Canaanitess. His wife was Tamar, but he had no issue, and his widow eventually became the mother of Pharez and Zarah by Judah. Er "was wicked [רע, a paronomasia of ער] in the sight of the Lord; and the Lord slew him" (Gen 38:3-7; Num 26:19). B.C. cir. 1896. It does not appear what the nature of his sin was; but, from his Canaanitish birth on the mother's side, it was probably connected with the abominable idolatries of Canaan.

2. A "son" of Shelah (Judah's son), and "father" of Lecah (1Ch 4:21). B.C. prob. ante 1618.

3. Son of Jose and father of Elmodan, in Christ's genealogy, of David's private line prior to Salathiel (Luk 3:28). B.C. cir. 725.

## Era[[@Headword:Era]]

             SEE AERA.

## Eraclius[[@Headword:Eraclius]]

             SEE HERACLIUS.

## Erakim[[@Headword:Erakim]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Eran[[@Headword:Eran]]

             (Hebrews Eran', עֵרָן, watchful; Sept. Ε᾿δέν, appar. reading עדן, with the Samar. and Syr.; Vulg. Heran), son of Shuthelah (eldest son of Ephraim), and progenitor of the family of the Eranites (Num 26:36). B.C. post 1856. The name does not occur in the genealogies of Ephraim in 1Ch 7:20-29, though a name, ELADAH (1Ch 7:20) or ELEAD (1Ch 7:21), is found which may be a corruption of it.

## Eranite[[@Headword:Eranite]]

             (Hebrews with the art. ha-Erani', הָעֵרָנַי, Sept. οΕ῾᾿δενί [like the Samar. and Syr. reading ד for ר ], Vulg. Heranitz, A.V. "the Eranites"), a patronymic designation of the descendants of the Ephraimite ERAN (Num 26:36).

## Erard (Eberhard)[[@Headword:Erard (Eberhard)]]

             a Bavarian bishop, lived about 679. He was the brother of St. Hidulphus, archbishop of Treves, and assisted him in the administration of his see. He was consecrated originally bishop of Ardagh, in Ireland, but finally of Ratisbon, yet without a stationary location. He is often given the title of the Blessed, and is commemorated Jan. 8 (also January 6, February 9, April  14, and October 8). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v;

## Erasmus, Desiderius[[@Headword:Erasmus, Desiderius]]

             was born at Rotterdam, October 28, 1467 (1465). His father's name was Gerhard, his mother's Margaretha; they were never married. The boy was called Gerhardus Gerhardi, which he changed into the name Desiderius Erasmus (properly Erasmius), having the same meaning in Latin and Greek (amiable). The father went to Rome. Being informed there that Margaretha was dead, he entered into orders; but, finding her alive on his return, he and she devoted themselves to the training of their son. At six he was a chorister in the cathedral at Utrecht. At nine he was sent to school at Deventer, where he had for school-fellow a youth who afterwards became pope Adrian VI. He displayed so great talent at Deventer that it was even then predicted that he would one day be the most learned man in Germany. After the death of his parents, when he was under fourteen, his guardians determined to make a monk of him, in order, it is said, that they might secure his patrimony for themselves. He refused to enter the monastic life; but his guardians placed him in the seminary at Herzogenbusch, where, as he says, he spent three useless and unhappy years. He was then put at the monastic house of Zion, near Delft, and finally he entered the Augustinian monastery of Emaius, or Stein, near Gouda. Here, after sturdy resistance, he entered on his novitiate in 1486. His life at Stein was unhappy, except so far as it was relieved by study, to which he devoted all the time possible. His hatred of monkery increased with each year of his stay in the monastery. In 1491, the bishop of Cambray, desiring a capable Latinist as his secretary for a projected journey to Rome, obtained permission for Erasmus to leave the convent. The journey did not come off, and Erasamus (who was ordained priest in 1492) remained some years under the bishop of Cambray, who authorized him to proceed to Paris to continue his studies, instead of returning to the monastic life. At Paris, Erasmus barely supported himself, by taking pupils, and he suffered greatly from sickness and poverty. He afterwards  attributed his weakness of constitution to his wretched food and unwholesome lodgings in Paris. After a short visit to Cambray and to Holland for his health, he returned to Paris, where his pension from the bishop failed, and he taught for his bread. Among his pupils was lord William Mountjoy, who ever after remained his friend and patron. For him he wrote the treatise De Ratione conscribendi epistolas. Mountjoy offered him a pension to accompany him to England. Erasmus passed a year there (1498-9), chiefly at London, Oxford, and Cambridge, and became acquainted with many Englishmen distinguished for piety and learning. At Oxford he studied in St. Mary's College, and formed many connections which were afterwards of use to him. Among his special friends were Colet, Grocyn, Latimer, and the celebrated chancellor Thomas More. From England Erasmus returned to Paris, where he again supported himself by pupils.

In 1499 he returned to the Continent, and spent his time chiefly in studying Greek, and in translating Greek authors into Latin. He had no fixed abode; now he was in Paris, and again in the provinces of France or in Holland. The Adagia and the Enchiridion Militis Christiani were published between 1500 and 1504. He began his Biblical studies also about this time, publishing in 1505 a new edition of the Remarks of Laurentius Valla on the N.T. In 1505 he spent a short time in England, where he made the acquaintance of archbishop Warham, to whom he dedicated his translation of the Hecuba. In 1506 he accomplished his long-cherished desire of visiting Italy, where he succeeded in obtaining from pope Julius II a dispensation from his monastic vows. At Turin he was made D.D. (1506), and his time was divided between Bologna, Rome, Florence, and Padua, where he improved his knowledge of Greek under the instruction of the best Greek and Italian scholars. In 1507 he superintended, at Venice, a new edition of his Adagia, printed by the celebrated Aldus Manutius. "At Rome he met with a flattering reception, and promises of high advancement; but, having engaged to return to England, he did so in 1510, in the expectation that the recent accession of Henry VIII, with whom he had for some time maintained a correspondence, would insure to him an honorable provision." On the journey he wrote the work which gave him his greatest celebrity for the time, the Encomium Moriae (Panegyric on Folly), which he dedicated to Thomas More. He lived "for some time at Cambridge, where he was appointed Lady Margaret professor (in divinity), and also lectured on Greek. His lodging was in Queen's College, in the grounds of which Erasmus's Walk is still shown. In 1509, at the request of Colet, he published Copia Verborum ac rerum, long in use as a school-  book. He accepted an invitation from the archduke, afterwards Charles V, and went to Brabant in 1514, with the office of councillor, and a salary of 200 florins. After this we find him resident sometimes in the Netherlands, sometimes at Basel, where the great work in which he had been many years engaged, the first edition of the New Testament in Greek, was published in 1516, accompanied by a new Latin translation. Some amusing specimens of the objections made to this undertaking by the ignorant clergy will be found in his 'Letters' (6:2)" (Engl. Cyclop.). It was dedicated to pope Leo X. His fame had by this time spread all over Europe; he and Reuchlin were called the Eyes of Germany. From this period onward he resided chiefly at Basel, though his wandering habits were never entirely shaken off. The second edition of his N.T. appeared in 1519, and prefixed to it was his Ratio sen Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram Theologiam (also published separately, 1522). In 1521 he published his Colloquia, "composed ostensibly to supply young persons with an easy school-book in the Latin language, and at the same time to teach them religion and morals. For the purpose of teaching the Latin language this little book seems peculiarly well adapted: it was long used for this purpose in England. In these 'Colloquies,' which are generally very amusing, Erasmus has made some of his smartest attacks on various superstitions of the Roman Catholic Church. On this account the book was prohibited" (Eng. Cyclop.). His Annotations in N.T. appeared at Basel (1516-22, many editions), and his Paraphrases in N.T. (1524, fol.; Berlin, 1777-80, 3 volumes, fol.) The Paraphrases were so much esteemed in England that it was made the duty of every parish church, by an order in council (1547), to possess a copy of the English translation (Lond. 1548, 2 vols. fol., by Udall, Coverdale, and others; 2d edit. 1551).

As Erasmus had decided to remain in the Church of Rome, his residence at Basel became an uneasy one when the Reformation got possession of that city. In 1529 he removed to Freiburg, in Breisgau, where he built a house with a view to permanent residence, but never liked it. His later years were embittered by literary and religious quarrels. His pecuniary affairs, however, which had always been embarrassed in his early years, were now easy. In 1535 he returned to Basel, intending, however, only a short stay before returning to his native land to die. He was soon taken ill, but recovered sufficiently to continue his literary labors, especially on his edition of Origen. He suffered from gravel; an attack of dysentery  supervened, and carried him off on the night of July 11-12 (O.S.), 1536. He left his property to the poor.

The literary industry of Erasmus during his whole life was prodigious. He early imbibed a love for the ancient classics, and contributed largely to increase the taste for ancient culture by his writings in praise of them, by his editions of classic authors, and by his attacks on the scholastic theology and on the ignorance of the monks. "He worked incessantly in various branches, and completed his works with great rapidity; he had not the patience to revise and polish them, and accordingly most of them were printed exactly as he threw them out; but this very circumstance rendered them universally acceptable; their great charm was that they communicated the trains of thought which passed through a rich, acute, witty, intrepid, and cultivated mind, just as they arose, and without any reservations. Who remarked the many errors which escaped him? His manner of narrating, which still rivets the attention, then carried every one away" (Ranke, Reformation, by Austin, book 2, chapter 1). His Ciceronianus is "an elegant and stinging satire on the folly of those pedants who, with a blind devotion, refused to use in their compositions any words or phrases not to be found in Cicero. Erasmus's own Latin style is clear and elegant; not always strictly classical, but like that of one who spoke and wrote Latin as readily as his mother tongue. His 'Letters,' comprising those of many learned men to himself, form a most valuable and amusing collection to those who are interested in the manners and literary histories of the age in which they were written; and several of them in particular are highly valuable to Englishmen as containing a picture of the manners of the English of that day" (Eng. Cyclop.). But, of all his writings, the only ones that are likely to retain a lasting place in literature are the Colloquies, and the Panegyric on Folly — writings of his comparative youth, and regarded by him rather as pastime. "For neither as a wit nor as a theologian, nor perhaps even as a critic, does Erasmus rank among master intellects; and in the other departments of literature no one has ventured to claim for him a very elevated station. His real glory is to have opened at once new channels of popular and of abstruse knowledge — to have guided the few, while he instructed the many — to have lived and written for noble ends — to have been surpassed by none in the compass of his learning, or the collective value of his works — and to have prepared the way for a mighty revolution, which it required moral qualities far loftier than his to accomplish.

For the soul of this great man did not partake of the energy of  his intellectual faculties. He repeatedly confesses that he had none of the spirit of a martyr, and the acknowledgment is made in the tone of sarcasm rather than in that of regret. He belonged to that class of actors on the scene of life who have always appeared as the harbingers of great social changes — men gifted with the power to discern and the hardihood to proclaim truths of which they want the courage to encounter the infallible results; who outrun their generation in thought, but lag behind it in action; players at the sport of reform so long as reform itself appears at an indefinite distance; more ostentatious of their mental superiority than anxious for the well-being of mankind; dreaming that the dark page of history may hereafter become a fairy tale, in which enchantment will bring to pass a glorious catastrophe, unbought by intervening strife, and agony, and suffering; and therefore overwhelmed with alarm when the edifice begins to totter, of which their own hands have sapped the foundation. He was a reformer until the Reformation became a fearful reality; a jester at the bulwarks of the papacy until they began to give way; a propagator of the Scriptures until men betook themselves to the study and the application of them; depreciating the mere outward forms of religion until they had come to be estimated at their real value; in short, a learned, ingenious, benevolent, amiable, timid, irresolute man, who bearing the responsibility, resigned to others the glory, of rescuing the human mind from the bondage of a thousand years. The distance between his career and that of Luther was therefore continually enlarging, until they at length moved in opposite directions, and met each other with mutual animosity" (Edinburgh Review, 68:302).

The relations of Erasmus to the Reformation have been summarily stated in the paragraph just cited. He was the literary precursor of the Reformation. His exegetical writings prepared the way for later expositors, opened a new era in Biblical criticism, and also aided in giving the Bible its Protestant position as the rule of faith. His satires upon the monks, upon the scholastic theology, and upon Church abuses generally, contributed largely to prepare the minds of literarymen throughout Europe for a rupture with Rome. He taught, in anticipation of Protestantism, that Christian knowledge should be drawn from the original sources, viz. the Scriptures, which he said should be translated into all tongues. In his Encomium Morice, Folly is introduced as an interlocutor who "turns into ridicule the labyrinth of dialectic in which theologians have lost themselves, the syllogisms with which they labor to sustain the Church as Atlas does the  heavens, the intolerant zeal with which they persecute every difference of opinion. She then comes to the ignorance, the dirt, the strange and ludicrous pursuits of the monks, their barbarous and objurgatory style of preaching; she attacks the bishops, who are more solicitous for gold than for the safety of souls; who think they do enough if they dress themselves in theatrical costume, and under the name of the most reverend, most holy, and most blessed fathers in God, pronounce a blessing or a curse; and, lastly, she boldly assails the court of Rome and the pope himself, who, she says, takes only the pleasures of his station, and leaves its duties to St. Peter and St. Paul. Among the curious wood-cuts, after the marginal drawings of Hans Holbein, with which the book was adorned, the pope appears with his triple crown. It produced an indescribable effect: twenty- seven editions appeared even during the lifetime of Erasmus; it was translated into all languages, and greatly contributed to confirm the age in its anticlerical dispositions" (Ranke, 1.c.). But the personal character of Erasmus was not fitted for such storms as those of the Reformation. Intellectually, he was too many-sided and too undecided; morally, he was of too flaccid a fibre, too timid, and too fond of ease, to devote himself to a certain strife with very uncertain issues. Moreover, he never had profound religious convictions or experience. The monks, nevertheless, were right to a certain extent in their saying that "Erasmus laid the egg; Luther hatched it." At first Erasmus regarded Luther with favor as a coadjutor in his attacks upon the ignorance of the monks, and in his plans for the reformation of literature. But Luther saw the weakness and spiritual poverty of Erasmus, and expressed his fears in letters to Spalatin and Lange as early as 1517; while Erasmus, in letters to Zwingle, deprecated the haste and vehemence of Luther. In 1519 (March 28) Luther wrote a friendly letter to Erasmus, who says in reply (April 30): "I hold myself aloof from the controversies of the times to devote my whole strength to literature. After all, more is to be gained by moderation than by passion; so Christ conquered the world. It is better to write against those who have abused the authority of the papacy than against individual popes." In 1520, Frederick, elector of Saxony, meeting Erasmus at Cologne, asked his opinion of Luther; his reply was, Lutherus peccavit in ducous, nempe quod tetigit coronam pontificis et ventres monachorum: "Luther has committed two blunders; he has ventured to touch the crown of the pope and the bellies of the monks ... but his language is too violent," etc. He expressed similar cautions in a letter to Justus Jonas at the time of the Diet of Worms (1521). The earnest Ulrich von Hutten sought to draw Erasmus openly to  the Protestant side, but in vain. In 1522 Hutten published an Expostulatio cum Erasmo, abounding in bitter invective, to which Erasmus replied in Spongia adversus Hutteni aspergines (Basel, 1523) (see Gieseler, Church History, ed. by Smith, 4, § 3). Luther is said to have condemned both these pamphlets as disgraceful. Luther wrote (1524) to Erasmus an earnest letter, urging him, if he would not join the Reformers, at least to refrain from open opposition. "You might, indeed, have aided us much by your wit and your eloquence; but, since you have not the disposition and the courage for this, we would have you serve God in your own way. Only we feared, lest our adversaries should entice you to write against us, and that necessity should compel us to oppose you to your face. If you cannot, dear Erasmus, assert our opinions, be persuaded to let them alone, and treat of subjects more suited to your taste" (Biblioth. Sacra, 1862, page 129). "From this time Erasmus complains incessantly of the hostility of the Evangelicals. The haughty style in which Luther offered him peace (in the letter above cited) could only have the effect upon that ambitious man of giving additional weight to the request which reached him at the same time from England, that he would take revenge upon Luther for his attack upon the royal author (Henry VIII). And so, to assail the formidable Luther in the weakest part of his theological system, Erasmus wrote his treatise De Libero Arbitrio (Sept. 1524). 'Luther replied with his usual bitterness in his De Servo Arbitrio (December 1525). Erasmus replied. in like coin in his Hyperaspistes (1526). Thus the renowned Erasmus now passed over into the ranks of the enemies of the Reformation, though he did not cease to recommend conciliatory measures towards it'" (Gieseler, 1.c.).

The writings of Erasmus were collected and published in 1540-41 (9, volumes, fol.), and also by Clericus (Leclerc), under the title Des. Erasmi Opera Omlia, emendatoria et auctiora, etc. (L. Bat. 1703-6, 10 volumes in 11, fol). He edited many of the fathers, viz. Origen, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom, Lactalitius, and translations of selections from them are given in his Opera. The separate editions of his more popular works (the Encomium, Adagia, Colloquia, etc.) are very numerous. There are English versions of the following: Panegyric upon Folly (two translations: one by Chaloner, the other by Kennet; often printed); Colloquies (1671, and often, especially in selections); Enchiridion Militis, by W. de Worde (1533, 16mo, and often); Christian's Manual (from the Enchiridion Militis, London, 1816, 8vo); Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher (chiefly from Erasmus, London, 1797, small 8vo); De Contemptu Mundi  (Lond. 1533, 16mo); De Immensa Dei Misericordia (1533, and often). Many of Erasmus's smaller tracts were also translated. There are several biographies of Erasmus (none very good), viz. Beatus Rhenanus, in Erasmi Opera, tom. i (1540); Leclerc's, in volume 1 of Erasmi Opera (1703); Merula, Vita Erasmi (Leyden, 1607, 4to); Knight, Life of Erasmus (London, 1726, 12mo); Burigny, Vie d'Erasme (Par. 1757, 2 volumes, 12mo); Jortin, Life of Erasmus (Lond. 1758, best ed. 1808, 3 volumes, 8vo; abridged by Laycey, London, 1805, 8vo); Hess, Leben des Erasmus (Zurich, 1790); Butler, Life of Erasmus (London, 1825, 8vo); Nisard, in Etudes sur la Renaissance (Par. 1855); Miiller, Leben des Erasmus (Hamb. 1828, 8vo; reviewed by Ulllnmnn, Studien u. Krit. 1829, page 1); Glasius, On Erasnmus as Church Reformer (a crowned prize-essay in the Dutch. language, The Hague, 1850). See also Bayle, Dictionary (s.v. Erasnuis); Dupin, Auteurs Ecclesiastes tom. 13; Waddington, History of the Reformation (London, 1841), chapter 23; Merle d'Aubigne, History of the Reformation, volume 1; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 16:207; Hallam, History of Literature (Harper's ed.), 1:134 sq.; Mackintosh, Miscellaneous Works (London, 1851), 1:190 sq.; Christ. Examiner, 49:80; Christian. Review, April, 1858; Quart. Review, 1859, art. 1; Theol. Quartalschrift, 1859, page 533; Bibliotheca Sacra. 19:106; Brit. and For. Ev. Review, July, 1867, page 517; H. Rogers, in Good Words, February 1868.

## Erasmus, Johannes[[@Headword:Erasmus, Johannes]]

             a Dutch theologian, lived in 1593. He was very learned, even according to the testimony of his adversaries. He knew Hebrew well. and had corrected Tremellius and Junius's version of the prophets. Having been appointed rector at Antwerp, he confessed the doctrine of the Unitarians, but William, prince of Orange, prevented his making proselytes, and obliged him to leave Holland. Erasmus first retired to Poland, and then into Transylvania, where the Unitarians made him minister at Claudiopolis, on the condition, however, that he would not teach that the Son of God vas created before all other things. Erasmus had a great conference on this subject with Faustus Socinus. He went from Claudiopolis to Cracow,. and asked permission of the Unitarians to explain his reasons for not believing "that Jesus Christ was not at all the Son of God before his birth by his mother." Socinus was appointed to answer him. The disputation lasted two days, but ended in the satisfaction of neither party. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Erasmus, Saint[[@Headword:Erasmus, Saint]]

             (commonly called Elmo, also Ermo), was bishop of some see near Antioch, and is said to have returned to Firmiae, in Campania, and then to have suffered martyrdom under Diocletian. The acts of this saint, given by the Romanists, are entirely apocryphal. It is pretended that the body of Erasmus was preserved at Gaeta, with the exception of some parts which were given to the monastery of Mt. Coelius at Rome, and some to those of St. Orestes. St. Erasmus is invoked by the sailors on the Mediterranean against tempest and other danger, and for this reason they have given his name to an electric phenomenon which often appears on top of the masts of vessels during a storm. He is also the patron saint against the stomach- ache, on the tradition that he suffered martyrdom by evisceration. He is commemorated June 2 (or 3). See Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art, page 699.

## Erastianism[[@Headword:Erastianism]]

             the title generally given to "that system ‘which would rest the government of the Church spiritual as well as civil altogether in the Christian magistrate.' This, however, 'was far from being an invention of Erastus, since in every kingdom of Europe the Roman claims had been resisted on thee like principles for centuries before he was born; the peculiarity of Erastus's teaching lay rather in his refusing the right of excommunication to the Christian Church' (see Oxf. Hooker, Ed. Pref. page 58)" (Eden, Churchman's Dictionary, s.v.). Hardwick propeses; "Byzantinism" as the proper title for the theory named instead of "Erastianism" (History of the Reformation, chapter 8, page 356). See also Nichols, Anecdotes of Bowyer (London, 1782, 4to), page 71; Pretyman, The Church of England and Erastianisna (Lond. 1854);: Hagenbach, History of Doctrines (Smith's ed.), 2:299; Cunningham, Historical Theology, 2:569; Orme, Life and Times of Baxter, 1:71; Christian Review, 8:579; and the articles SEE  CHURCH; SEE DISCIPLINE; SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY; SEE ERASTUS, THOMAS.

## Erastus[[@Headword:Erastus]]

             (῎Εραστος, beloved, an old Grecian name, Diog. Laert. 3:31), a Corinthian, and one of Pull's disciples, whose salutations he sends from Corinth to the Church at Rome as those of "the chamberlain (q.v.) of the city" of Corinth (Rom 16:23). The word so rendered (οἰκονόμος, Vulg. arcarius) denotes the city treasurer or steward (Suicer, Thesaur. 2:464; see Flessa, De arcariis, Baruth. 1725-6, 2, § 11; also Elszner, Obs. 2:68), an officer of great dignity in ancient times (comp. Josephus, Ant. 7:8, 2); so that the conversion of such a man to the faith of the Gospel was a proof of the wonderful success of the apostle's labors in that city. We find Erastus with Paul at Ephesus as one of his attendants or deacons (οἱ διακονοῦντες αὐτῷ), whence he was sent, along with Timothy, into Macedonia, while the apostle himself remained in Asia (Act 19:22), A.D. 51. They were both with the apostle at Corinth when he wrote, as above,-from that city to the Romans, A.D. 55; and at a subsequent period (A.D. 64) Erastus was still at Corinth (2Ti 4:20), which would seem to have been the usual place of his abode (ἔμεινε). According to the traditions of the Greek Church (Menol. Graecum, 1:179), he was first aeconomus to the Church at Jerusalem, and afterwards bishop of Paneas, and died a natural death. Many critrics, however (Grotius, Kype, Kuinol, De Wette, Winer, etc.), regard the Corinthian Erastus as a different person from Paul's companion, on the ground that the official duties of the former would not allow such an absence from the city (Neander, Planting and Training, 1:392, note), or that, if he was with Paul at Ephesus, we should be compelled to assume that he is mentioned in the epistle to the Romans by the title of an office which he had once held and afterwards resigned (Meyer, Kommentar. in loc.).

## Erastus, Thomas[[@Headword:Erastus, Thomas]]

             (properly LIEBER or LIEBLER, which he put into the Greek form, Erastus), was born at Baden, in Switzerland (according to another account, at Auggen, in Baden-Durlach), September 7, 1524. He studied divinity and philosophy at Basel, and afterward at Pavia and Bologna, where he graduated M.D. In 1558 he became physician to the prince of Henneberg. The elector palatine, Frederick III, also appointed him first  physician and professor of medicine in the University of Heidelberg. In 1560 and 1564 he attended the conferences of Lutheran and Reformed divines at Heidelberg and Maulbronn on the Lord's Supper, and vigorously maintained the Zuinglian view. He maintained the same doctrine in a treatise .De Caena Domini (1565; transl. by Shute, Lend. 1578, 16mo). He was charged with Socinianism, but without just ground. But his name is chiefly preserved for his views on Church authority and excommunication. "A sort of fanaticism in favor of the use of ecclesiastical censures and punishments had been introduced by Olevianus, a refugee from Treves, and by several fugitives from the cruelties of the duke of Alva in the Low Countries, and had spread among the Protestants of the Palatinate. Erastus termed it 'febris excommunicatoria,' and thought it an unwise policy for the Protestants, surrounded by their enemies, to be zealous in cutting off members from their own communion. He examined the principles and Biblical authority of ecclesiastical censures, and carried on a controversy in which he was violently opposed by Dathenus, and more mildly by his friend Beza. This controversy would have probably died as a local dispute had it not been revived by Castelvetro, who had married the widow of Erastus, publishing from his papers the theses called Explicatio Quaestionis gravissimnce de Excommunicatione, which bears to have been written in 1568, and was first published in 1589. The general principle adopted by Erastus is, that ecclesiastical censures and other inflictions are not the proper method of punishing crimes, but that the administration of the penal law, and of the law for compelling performances of civil obligations, should rest with the temporal magistrate. He held that the proper ground on which a person could be prohibited from receiving the ordinances of a church — such as the sacrament or communion of the Lord's Supper was not vice or immorality, but a difference in theological opinion with the church from which he sought the privilege. The church was to decide who were its members, and thereby entitled to partake in its privileges, but was not entitled to take upon itself the punishment of offenses by withholding these privileges, or by inflicting any other punishments on the ground of moral misconduct. Few authors so often referred to have been so little read as Erastus. The original theses are very rare. An English translation was published in 1669, and was re-edited by the Reverend Robert Lee in 1845. By some inscrutable exaggeration, it had become the popular view of the doctrines of Erastus that his leading principle was to maintain the authority of the civil magistrate over the conscience, and to subject all ecclesiastical bodies to his direction and control, both in their doctrine and their  discipline. In the discussions in the Church of Scotland, of which the result was the secession of a large body of the clergy and people because it was found that the Church could not make a law to 'nullify the operation of lay patronage, those who maintained within the Church the principle that it had no such power were called Erastians as a term of reproach. As in all cases where such words as Socinian, Arian, Antinomian, etc., are used in polemical debates, the party rejected with disdain the name thus applied to it. But it is singular that in the course of this dispute no one seems to have thought of explaining that the controversy in which Erastus was engaged was about a totally different matter, and that only a few general and very vague remarks in his writings have given occasion for the supposition that he must have held the principle that all ecclesiastical authorities are subordinate to the civil. Erastus died at Basel on the 31st December- January 1, 1583." — English Cyclopaedia; Wordsworth, Ecclesiastes Biography; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 31:174; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:121.

## Erath, Augustin[[@Headword:Erath, Augustin]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born January 28, 1648, near Augsburg. In 1679 he was appointed professor of theology at Dillingen,  and died Sept. 5,1719. He is the author of many writings, enumerated in Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.).

## Erato[[@Headword:Erato]]

             in Greek mythology, was one of the nine muses; her songs were so touching and charming that they moved even the most callous hearts to love; hence also her name (from ἔρος, love). She is said to have been the first to compose elegies or plaintive verse. She is generally represented with the lyre on her arm and a plectrunm in her hand.

## Erbkram, Heinrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Erbkram, Heinrich Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born July 8, 1810, at Glogau. For his academical career he prepared himself at the Wittenberg Seminary, and commenced his theological lectures at Berlin in 1838. In 1855 he accepted a call to Konigsberg, and died there. January 9, 1884. He is best known as the author of Geschichte der protestantischen Sekten im Zeitalter der Reformation (Hamburg and Gotha, 1848). (B.P.)

## Erchembert (or Erchempert)[[@Headword:Erchembert (or Erchempert)]]

             an Italian historian, was descended from the dukes of Benevento. The castle of Pilau, where he resided with his father, Adelgair, was taken in August 881, by Pandonulf, count of Capua, and Erchembert was carried away a prisoner, but escaped and took the habit of a monk at the-convent of the Benedictines of Monte Cassino. At the age of twenty-five he was elected abbot of a convent near by; but was driven from it by Arnulf, and returned for the rest of his days to his cell. He wrote a Chronicle, or an extended history of the Lombards, which is believed to be lost, although an abridged edition, from 774 to 888, as a continuation of the work of.Paul Diacre, was published by Antonio Caracioli (Naples, 1626); by Camillo Peregrini, in his Historia Principum Longobardorum, etc. (ibid. 1643). There is also attributed to Erchembert, De Destructione et Renovatione  Cassiensis Cocnobii: — De Israelitarum Incursione: — Vida Landulfi I, Episcopi Capuae, extending from 851 to 879, in verse: — Acta Translationis Corporis St. Matthaei, Apost. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ercnat[[@Headword:Ercnat]]

             (or Herenat), an Irish saint, commemorated January 8 and October 30, was a virgin of Duneane, A.D. 460, who died, it is said, of love for St. Benigius, but revived, and spent her days in preparing and embroidering sacred vestments.

## Erdaviraph[[@Headword:Erdaviraph]]

             an impostor who flourished in Persia in the 3d century, and was considered the real restorer of the doctrines of the Magi. He professed to have fallen into a deep sleep, during which his soul made the journey to paradise, being seven days on the way.

## Erdt, Paulinus[[@Headword:Erdt, Paulinus]]

             a German Franciscan monk, professor of theology at the University of Freiburg, was born at Vertoch in 1737. He displayed much zeal in opposing infidelity, both by his translations from English and French as well as his own works. The most important of his works is Historiae litterariae theologiae rudimenta octodecim libris conprehensa, seu via ad historiam litterariums theologiae revelatae, adnotationibus litterariis instructa (Augsburg, 1785, 4 volumes, 8vo). Erdt died Dec. 16,1800.

## Ere[[@Headword:Ere]]

             (Lat. Hercus) is the name of several Irish saints, the chief. of whom was bishop of Slane; of royal descent. who died A.D. 512, aged about ninety years, and is commemorated on November 2.

## Erebinthi,Village Of[[@Headword:Erebinthi,Village Of]]

             (Ε᾿ρεβίνθων οϊvκος, house of chick-peas), a place on the line of Titus's wall of circumvallation around Jerusalem during the final siege (Josephus, War, 5:12, 2); apparently on the brow of the hill opposite Mount Zion, on the west. SEE JERUSALEM. Eusebius speaks of a village Erezmintha (Ε᾿ρεμίνθα, Onomast. s.v.), situated, however, in the south of Judaea, which Reland thinks (Palest. page 766) is the same as the Betherebin (Βιθθέρεβιν) mentioned by Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. 9:27).

## Erebus[[@Headword:Erebus]]

             (ἔρεβος, darkness), in Greek mythology, is the infernal region, the subterranean, chaotic night; being represented as.son of Chaos and Caligo. Erebus does not seem to be identical with Tartarus. His descendants are the following, by Night: Age, Death, Fate, Abstinence, Dreams, Epiphron, Clotho, Lachesis, Atropos, the three Parcse, Dispute, Evil, Malice, Nemesis, Euphrosyne, Friendship, Sympathy, Styx, and Sleep.

## Erech[[@Headword:Erech]]

             (Hebrews E'reok, אֶרֶךְ, length; Sept. Ο᾿ρέχ,Vulg. Arach), one of the cities which formed the beginning of Nimrod's kingdom in the plain of Shinar  (Gen 10:10). It is not said that he built these cities, but that he established his power over them; from which we may conclude that they previously existed. It was probably also the city of the ARCHEVITES, who were among those who were transplanted to Samaria by Asnapper (Ezr 4:9). Until recently, the received opinion, following the authority of St. Ephrem, Jerome, and the Targumists, identified Erech with Edessa or Callirhoe (now Urfah), a town in the northwest of Mesopotamia. This opinion is supported by Von Bohlen (Introd. to Genesis page 233), who connects the name Callirhoe with the Biblical Erech through the Syrian form Eurhok, suggesting the Greek word ἐ῏υῤῥοος. This identification is, however, untenable: Edessa was probably built by Seleucus, and could not, therefore, have been in existence in Ezra's time (Ezr 4:9), and the extent thus given to the land of Shinar presents a great objection. Erech must be sought in the neighborhood of Babylon. Gesenius (Thesaur. page 151), following Bochart (Phaleg, 4:16), rather seeks the name in the ῎Αρακκα or Aracha of the old geographers, which was on the Tigris, upon the borders of Babylonia and Susiana (Ptolemy, 6:3; Ammian. Marcell. 33:6, 26). This was probably the same city which Herodotus (1:185; 6:119) calls Ardericca (῎Αρδέρικκα), i.e. Great Erech. Rosenmüller happily conjectures (Alterth. 1, 2:25) that Erech probably lay nearer to Babylon than Aracca; and this has lately been confirmed by Colossians Taylor, the British resident at Bagdad, who is disposed to find the site of the ancient Erech in the great mounds of primitive ruins, indifferently called Irak, Irka, Werka, and Senkerah, by the nomade Arabs and sometimes El-Asayiah, "the place of pebbles" (Bonomi, Nineveh, page 40). These mounds, which are now surrounded by the almost perpetual marshes and inundations of the lower Euphrates, lie some miles east of that stream, about midway between the site of Babylon and its junction with the Tigris. This is doubtless the same as Orchoa (Ο᾿ρχόη) 82 miles south, and 42 east of Babylon (Ptolemy, 6:20, 7), the modern designations of the site bearing a considerable affinity to both the original names. It is likewise probable that the Orcheni (Ο᾿ρχηνοί) described by Strabo as an astronomical sect of the Chaldaeans dwelling near Babylon (21, page 739); in Ptolemy as a people of Arabia living near the Persian Gulf (5:19, 2); and in Pliny as an agricultural population, who banked up the waters of the Euphrates, and compelled them to flow into the Tigris (6:27, 31), were really inhabitants of Orchoe and of the district surrounding it. This place appears to have been the necropolis of the Assyrian kings, the whole neighborhood being covered with mounds, and strewed with the remains of  bricks and coffins. Some of the bricks bear a monogram of "the moon," and Colossians Rawlinson surmises that the name Erech may be nothing more than a form of יָרֵחִ, the Hebrews name for that luminary (Athenceum, 1854, No. 1377); but the orthography does not sustain this conjecture. Some have thought that the name of Erech may be preserved in that of Irak (Irak-Arabi), which is given to the region enclosed by the two rivers in the lower part of their course. (See Chesney, Euphrates Expedition, 1:116, 117; Ainsworth, Researches, page 178; Loftus, Chaldcea, page 160 sq., where a full description is given.) For another Erech, probably in Palestine, SEE ARCHI.

## Erembert, Saint[[@Headword:Erembert, Saint]]

             eleventh bishop of Toulouse, was born at Villiolicorte, near Poissy. He became a monk in 648 at the abbey of Fontenelle, which then was directed by Wandregisilus. Being appointed by Clothaire III to the see of Toulouse, about 656, he governed it twelve years with prudence, and then resigned, and dwelt for some time at his native home, but finally retired to the monastery of Fontenelle, where he died in 671 or 678. He is commemorated May 14. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Eremite[[@Headword:Eremite]]

             (ἔρημος, desert), one who lives in a wilderness, or other solitude, for purposes of religious contemplation. The name was given in the ancient Church to those Christians who fled from the persecutors of Christianity into the wilderness, and there, isolated from all other men, gave themselves up to a life of rigid asceticism. Paul of Thebes is called the first eremite, and he soon found numerous followers. From the association of eremites the coenobites arose, who, in turn, form the transition to the monastic orders, which became in the Church of Rome and in the Eastern Church the most common form of organized asceticism. The name eremite remained, however, in use both for those who, in opposition to monastic association, preferred the eremitic life, and for a number of orders or branches of orders (orders of eremites), which either retained some customs in the life of the original eremites, or which made special provisions that their members could live in entire isolation from each other meeting only for the celebration of divine service. Thus the proper name of the Augustinians (q.v.) was the Eremites of St. Augustine, although they became, in fact, a regular order. There were also eremites belonging to the orders of Franciscans (q.v.), Camaldulenses (q.v.), Coelestines (q.v.), Hieronymites (q.v.), and Servites (q.v.). Among the other orders of the eremites were the Eremites of St. John the Baptist, SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST, EREMITES OF, and the Eremitesof St. Paul. — Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:501. SEE PAUL, ST., EREMITES OF.

## Erendiganus, Rufi[[@Headword:Erendiganus, Rufi]]

             a Swiss theologian, lived in the second part of the 17th century. He was a Capuchin, .and definitor and provincial of his order. He wrote, Manuductio Sacerdotis (Lucerne, 1674): — Calendariumn Spirituale (ibid. 1698): — Revelationes S. Brigittae (ibid. 1699): — Speculum Animarum Thomae de Kempis (ibid. eod.). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Erevantsi, Melkhiseth[[@Headword:Erevantsi, Melkhiseth]]

             (i.e., Melchisedech of Erivan), an Armenian doctor, was born in 1559 at Vejan. He early devoted himself to monastical life, and after studying under the famous doctor Nerses Peghlow about fifteen years, left his monastery, which was situated in the isle of Lim, in the centre of the lake of Van, in order to visit Armenia. He planted a great number of institutions of education, and returned to his monastery. The patriarch, Moses III, sent him out again as director of the patriarchal school of Echmiadzin. He died at Erivan in 1631, leaving several MSS. on grammatical, rhetorical, and philosophical subjects. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Erez[[@Headword:Erez]]

             SEE CEDAR.

## Erfurt[[@Headword:Erfurt]]

             a city in the Prussian province of Saxony, with, in 1885, 58,386 inhabitants. In 741, Erfurt became the seat of a bishop, but St. Adalar was the last as well as the first bishop, the see being united with that of Mentz. In 1378 the city received permission from the pope residing at Avignon (Clement VII) to establish a university, and the permission was in 1389 confirmed by the Roman pope Urban VI. In 1392 the university was opened, being the fifth university of Germany. At the beginning of the 16th. century, Luther was for some time one of its professors. Subsequently its reputation dwindled down, and; it was abolished in 1816. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 3:661.

## Ergas, Joseph ben-Immanuel[[@Headword:Ergas, Joseph ben-Immanuel]]

             a Jewish rabbi, who flourished at Leghorn in the 18th century, is the author of ס8 שומר אמונים, a Philosophy of Religion and Cabala, written in the form of a dialogue (Amsterdam, 1736): — ס8 מבוא פתחים, Introduction to the Science of the True Cabala (ibid.): — a collection of decisions, שו8 8ת דברי יוסŠ(Leghorn, 1742). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:247; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Erhard, Bishop[[@Headword:Erhard, Bishop]]

             SEE HILDULF.

## Erhard, Thomas Aquinas[[@Headword:Erhard, Thomas Aquinas]]

             a German theologian of the order of the Benedictines, who lived in the first part of the 18th century, wrote, Gloria S. Benedicti (Augsburg, 1720): — Opus Rhetoricum: — Die Bibel Lateinisch und Deutsch (ibid. 1726): — Manuale Biblicum (1724): — Polycrates Gersensis, etc. (1729): — Commentarius in Universa Biblia (Augsburg, 1735): — De Imitatione Christi (about 1739): — Concordantiae Bibliorum Wessofontanae (Augsburg, 1751). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Eri[[@Headword:Eri]]

             (Hebrews Eri', עֵרַי, watchful), the fifth son of the patriarch Gad (Gen 46:16; Sept. Α᾿ηδείς, Vulg. Haeri), and progenitor (Num 26:16; Sept. Α᾿δδί, Vulg. Her) of the ERITES SEE ERITES (q.v.). B.C. 1856.

## Eribert[[@Headword:Eribert]]

             archbishop of Milan, A.D. 1015, took a prominent part in the intrigues that then divided Italy. He was a noted warrior, and established a military order of the Huniliati. which subsisted till 1570. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Eric IX[[@Headword:Eric IX]]

             (according to some historians VIII), surnamed the Saint, a king of Sweden. He was the son of Jedward, a "good and rich yeoman," as he is called in an old Swedish chronicle, and of Cecilia, the sister of king Eric Arsal. Having become king of Sweden, his chief endeavor was the Christianization of Sweden. He conquered southern Finland, and compelled the inhabitants to adopt the Christian religion. He also united Norway with Sweden. In the war against the Danish prince Magnus, he fell in a battle near the town of Upsala, May 18, 1160. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 16:243.

## Eric Of Brandenburg[[@Headword:Eric Of Brandenburg]]

             twenty-sixth archbishop of Magdeburg, was son of John I, elector of Brandenburg, and was elected in 1278. He had a stormy administration, and died in 1295. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Erigena[[@Headword:Erigena]]

             SEE SCOTUS ERIGENA.

## Eris[[@Headword:Eris]]

             (ἔρις, strife), in Greek mythology, was the personification of Discord, the daughter, of Night. When the deities were merrily assembled at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, Eris threw an apple among them, bearing the inscription "To the most beautiful." Juno, Venus, and Minerva claimed it. Had Jupiter decided in favor of one he would have incurred the bitter enmity of the others, and hence he refused to announce his opinion; therefore Paris was authorized to decide. Power and greatness, wisdom and fame, offered by the earnest goddesses, had no influence with him; for Venus promised him the most beautiful woman of Greece as a possession. That goddess therefore received the prize of beauty; Paris carried off Helena, the Trojan war was the result, and all the deities took a part in it: Juno and Minerva as enemies of the Trojans; Venus, Apollo, and Mars on the side of those against whom war was made.

## Erite[[@Headword:Erite]]

             (Hebrews collect. with the art. ha-Eri', הָעֵרַי, Sept. [appar. everywhere in this name reading דfor ר] οΑ῾᾿δδί, Vulg. Heritae, A.V. "the Erites"), a patronymic designation (Num 26:16) of the descendants of the Gadite ERI SEE ERI (q.v.).

## Erizatsy[[@Headword:Erizatsy]]

             (SARGIS or SERGIUS), a learned Armenian bishop, born towards the middle of the 13th century, at Eriza or Arzendjan, a city of Armenia. In, 1286, James I, patriarch of Sis, called him to his court, and made him his secretary. In 1291 he was consecrated bishop of Arzendjan, and, a short time after, the king of the Armenians of Cilicia (Hayton or Hathoum II) made him almoner of his palace. In 1306 he was present at the national council which was held at Sis, capital of Cilicia, and died a short time after. He wrote a treatise on The Hierarchy, and several other Works, which remain in MS. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 16:258.

## Erkenwald[[@Headword:Erkenwald]]

             the fourth bishop of the East Saxons, whose episcopal see was London, was brother of St. Ethelburga, and is said to have been born at Stallington, in Lindsey, of a noble family. From Bede we learn that he was already noted for sanctity when raised to the episcopate in 676. He died in 690, and is commemorated April 30 as the founder of St. Paul's (where his remains were interred), and also of one or two monasteries.

## Erkiglit[[@Headword:Erkiglit]]

             in Greenland mythology, are the spirits of war, living on the east side of the country, cruel, and enemies of man. They are represented as large men  with animal heads. Probably this superstition came from an ancient tradition, which gives to the northern coast of Greenland very warlike inhabitants, who sometimes pressed to all parts of the island in plundering and devastating expeditions, and destroyed all living beings.

## Erlangen[[@Headword:Erlangen]]

             a city in Bavaria, with a population of 15,828 inhabitants, mostly Protestant. It is the seat of one of three universities of Bavaria, with a Lutheran theological faculty. The University was, founded: in 1742 by the margrave Friedrich of Brandenburg. Baireuth for his residence, but in 1743 transferred to Erlangen. The University has in modern times been a chief seat of the Confessional party in the Lutheran Church. (A.J.S.)

## Erlkonig[[@Headword:Erlkonig]]

             in Norse mythology, is probably akin to Elfkonig, the ruler of the ethereal beings which are called elves (q.v.). He is not dangerous to grown persons, but often abducts children of Christians before they are baptized, not from any evil motive, but because he takes a great joy in them, and because the elves generally glory in coming into contact with human beings. He is represented as an unusually large, bearded man, with a shining crown and a wide, trailing mantle.

## Erloersortok[[@Headword:Erloersortok]]

             in Greenland mythology, is the ruler of the air, the evil principle. He is cruel and cunning; waylaying those who are on the way to heaven and lives on their vitals, which he tears from them.

## Ermelendis (or Hermelinda), Saint[[@Headword:Ermelendis (or Hermelinda), Saint]]

             was born at Odenca, near Louvain, about 550. She was of a rich family of Brabant, and was but twelve years old when she resolved to consecrate herself to God. Some time later her parents tried to induce her to marry, but she cut off her own hair in their presence and hid herself in the solitudes of the vicinity. She only left her cell, with bare feet, when she assisted at the divine services. Two young men, brothers, and lords of the place, having designs upon her chastity, Ermelinde retired to a more secluded place called Meldric (now Meldaert), near Hugard (Brabant), and subsisted there on fruits and herbs till her death, about A.D. 595. Forty- eight years afterwards her obscure tomb was discovered, and a chapel was erected over it, which has since perished. She is commemorated on October 29. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Diet. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Ermenaire[[@Headword:Ermenaire]]

             (Hermenarius), twenty-sixth bishop of Autun, A.D. 678, piously buried the mutilated remains of his predecessor, St. Ldger.

## Ermenfrid[[@Headword:Ermenfrid]]

             abbot of Cuisance, in Franche-Comte, entered monastic life, about 627, at Luxeuil; and coming into possession, by inheritance, of the monastery at Cuisance, restored it, and died there in old age. He is commemorated on September 25. See Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Ernan[[@Headword:Ernan]]

             (also Mernoc), the naihe of several Irish saints, one of whom was uncle, and two others iephews of St. Columba.

## Ernest Of Saxony[[@Headword:Ernest Of Saxony]]

             forty-first archbishop of Magdeburg, was elected to that see January 19, 1476; but the pope declined at first to consecrate him, and he had a long contest with Adolphus of Anhalt and the citizens of Magdeburg before he secured quiet possession of the see. He died August 3, 1513. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generule, s.v.

## Ernesti, Gunther Gottlieb[[@Headword:Ernesti, Gunther Gottlieb]]

             an Evangelical preacher of Germany, was born June 25, 1759, at Coburg. He studied at Jena, was for some time employed by the minister for ecclesiastical affairs at Hildburghausen, and died. there, June 28, 1797, being court-preacher at the time. Most of his publications were sermons. See Doring, Die Gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ernesti, Heinrich Priedrich Theodor Ludwig[[@Headword:Ernesti, Heinrich Priedrich Theodor Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 27, 1814, at Brunswick. He studied at Gottingen; was in 1838 deacon at his native place, in 1842 pastor at Wolfenbuttel, in 1843 superintendent, in 1850 member of consistory, and in 1858 general superintendent, and died at Wolfenblittel, August 17, 1880. He published Expositions on Luther's Smaller Catechism (1861), which is used in many places as the official manual for religious instruction. He also wrote, Ursprung der Siinde nach Paulinischen.Lehrbegriff(Gbttingen, 1862, 2 volumes): — Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus (3d ed. ibid. 1880). His earliest work was De Pkceclara Christi in Apostolis Instituendis Sapientia atque Prudentia (ibid. 1834). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:332 sq. (B.P.)

## Ernesti, Jakob Daniel[[@Headword:Ernesti, Jakob Daniel]]

             a German Protestant theologian, was born at Rochlitz, December 3, 1640. He studied till the age of fifteen under his father, Daniel, and then at Leipsic and Altenburg, and became, in 1663, minister of the gospel at Eybitsch, rector at the gymnasium of Altenburg in 1678, deacon in 1683, archdeacon in 1685, and finally consistorial assessor in 1705. He died December 15, 1707. His principal works are, Prodromus Apanthismatum (Altenburg, 1672): — Selecta Historica Rariorum Casuum (ibid. 1680). See Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ernesti, Johann August[[@Headword:Ernesti, Johann August]]

             an eminent critic and scholar, was born August 4, 1707, at Tennstadt, in Thuringia. He completed his academical studies at Wittenberg and Leipsic. In 1712 he became professor of ancient literature at Leipsic, and in 1758 doctor and professor of theology there. He held the two last-named professorships together till 1770, when he gave up the former to his nephew, August Wilhelm. He died September 11, 1781. He distinguished himself greatly by his philological and classical publications, and also by the new light which his theory of interpretation threw upon the sacred Scriptures. He adopted from Wetstein the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, and gave it general currency. Among the most important of his critical and philological writings are Opuscula philologico-critica  (Amster. 1762, 8vo): Opuscula oratoria, oratioes, prolusiones et elogia (Leyd. 1762 and 1767, 8vo): — Archaeologia litteraria (Leips. 1768 and 1790; 8vo): — Initia doctrine solidioris (Leips. 1736, 7th ed. 1783, 8vo). The style of this work gave to Ernesti the name of the Cicero of Germany. His most important work in the field of theology is his Institutio interpretis Novi Testamenti (Leips. 1761, 8vo; 5th ed. 1809). This work first clearly set forth what is called the grammatico-historical method of interpretation. It was translated by lerrot, and published in the Biblical Cabinet (Edinb. 1843, 2 volumes, 16mo); there is also an edition, with notes and appendix, by Moses Stuart (Andover, 1827, 12mo). Some valuable essays may be found in his Opuscula theologica (1792, 8vo). He rendered great service to theological literature by the publication of the Neue theologische Bibliothek (17601779, 14 volumes). His Lectiones Academicae in Epistolam ad Hebraeos was published by G.J. Dindorf in 1815 (Lips. 8vo). Ernesti's reputation as a classical scholar rests chiefly upon his excellent editions of Homer (Leips. 1759, 8vo), of Callimachus (Leyd. 1761, 2 volumes, 8vo), of Polybius (Leips. 1763-64, 3 vols. 8vo), of Xen-ophon, Aristotlej and of Cicero (ib. 1776, 3d ed. 7 volumes), of Tacitus (ib. 1772, 2 volumes, 8vo); also of Suetonius, Aristophanes, etc. His Eulogy, by Augustus William Ernesti, was published at Leipsic (1781, 8vo). See Hagenbach, German Rationalism, transl. by Gage, page 76; Teller, Ernesti's Verdienste um Theologie und Religion (Leips. 1783); Van Voorst, Oratio de J.A. Ermnestio (Leyd. 1804); Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 16:296; Kahnis, German Protestantism, page 119.

## Ernesti, Johann Christian[[@Headword:Ernesti, Johann Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 13, 1695. He studied at Wittenberg and Leipsic, and died superintendent in Langensalza, in 1770. A list of his writings is given in Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ernesti, Johann Christoph[[@Headword:Ernesti, Johann Christoph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 11, 1662. He studied at Wittenberg, and died there doctor of theology, August 11, 1722, leaving Disputationes de Bibliis Polyglottis: — De Antiquo Excommunicandi Ritu: — De Dialogis Doctorum Veteris Ecclesia: — De Absoluto Reprobationis Decreto. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:247. (B.P.)

## Ernesti, Johann Heinrich Martin[[@Headword:Ernesti, Johann Heinrich Martin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 26, 1755, at Mittwitz, near Cronach, and died at Coburg, May 10, 1836. He wrote, Irene. (Sulzbach, 1828): — Ueber Censur- und Bucherverbote, etc. (Leipsic, 1829): — Der Kirchen-Staat (Nuremberg, 1830). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:333; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:610; 2:321, 322. (B.P.)

## Eroge[[@Headword:Eroge]]

             (Ε᾿ρωγή), a place "before the city" (πρὸ τῆς πόλεως) Jerusalem, according to Josephus (Ant. 9:10, 4), where the mountain (Matthew of Olives) split asunder for a space of half a mile, filling the king's gardens with the detritus of the avalanche: an account which is evidently an embellishment of the prophetical commentary (Zec 14:5) upon the earthquake (Amo 1:1) on the occasion of Uzziah's usurpation of the sacerdotal functions (2Ch 26:16-21). Schwarz ingeniously explains (Palest. page 263 note) the name Eroge as a Graecized transposition for Zechariah's expression gorge of my mountains (גֵּיאאּהָרִי, gey-haray', Sept. φάραγξ ὀρέων, Vulg. vallis mnontium eorum, A.V. "valley of the mountain"). For another identification, SEE EN-ROGEL.

## Eromangan Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Eromangan Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This language is spoken in the island of Eromanga, one of the New Hebrides group. The version of Luke's gospel, which was published: in 1864, was begun by the Reverend G.N. Gordon, who was cruelly massacred by the natives in 1860. The work was completed by his brother,  the Reverend James I. The latter has since translated the book of Genesis, which was printed at Sydney in 1868, and was followed by Matthew's gospel in 1869, at London. In 1878 the Acts of the Apostles, which were translated by the Reverend H.A. Robertson, were published at the request of the New Hebrides mission at Sydney. These are at present the only parts of the Scripture translated into this language. (B.P.)

## Erovaz[[@Headword:Erovaz]]

             grand priest to the gods of Armenia. He was the brother of Erovant II, who intrusted him with the direction of the supreme national cultus, and also placed in his care the fortress of Pacaran, the ecclesiastical capital of Armenia. Sempad the Pacratide, who had taken possession of that place after the death of Erovant, drowned Erovaz in the river Akhourian, A.D. 88, and took away his treasures and his five hundred slaves. See Hoefer, Naouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Erpen, Thomas Van[[@Headword:Erpen, Thomas Van]]

             (Latin form ERPENIUS), a celebrated Orientalist, was born at Gorkum, Holland, September 7, 1584. He studied theology at Leyden, where, under the guidance of J.J. Scaliger, he also devoted himself particularly to the study of Oriental languages. He traveled in England, France, Italy, and Germany, everywhere enlarging his knowledge of Oriental literature; and in 1613 became professor of Oriental languages at Leyden. A second Hebrew chair in the university was founded expressly for him in 1619. "Soon after this he was appointed Oriental interpreter to the government, in which capacity he read and wrote replies to all official documents coming from the East. Such was the elegance and purity of his Arabic, as written at this time, that it is said to have excited the admiration of the emperor of Morocco. 'Towards the close of his life tempting offers of honors and distinction came pouring in upon him from all parts of Europe; but he was never prevailed upon to leave his native country, where, in the midst of an eminent career, he died November 13,1624. Although the present standard of Oriental knowledge in Europe is much in advance of that of Erpen's day, there is no doubt that it was through him principally that Eastern, especially Arabic, studies have become what they are. With hardly any better material than a few awkwardly printed Arabic alphabets, he contrived to write his famous grammar (Grammatica Arabica, quinque libris methodiae explicata, Leyden, 1613; recent edition by Michaelis, Gött. 1771), which for 200 years, till the time of Silvestre de Sacy, enjoyed, an undisputed supremacy; and there are many who think his Rudimenta unsurpassed, even at the present day, as a work for beginners. Among his other important works the best known is his Proverbiorum Arabicorum Centurice Duce (Leyden, 1614)" (Chambers, s.v.); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale. 16:308; Herzog. Real-Encyklop. 19:487.

## Error[[@Headword:Error]]

             "Knowledge being to be had only of visible certain truth, error is not a fault of our knowledge, but a mistake of our judgment, giving assent to that which is true (Locke, Essay on Human Underst. book 4, chapter 20). 'The true,' said Bossuet, after Augustine, 'is that which is, the false is that which is not.' To err is to fail of attaining to the true, which we do when we think that to be which is not, or think that not to be which is. Error is not in things themselves, but in the mind of him who errs, or judges not according to the truth. Our faculties, when employed within their proper sphere, are  fitted to give us the knowledge of truth. We err by a wrong use of them. The causes of error are partly in objects of knowledge and partly in ourselves. As it is only the true and real which exists, it is only the true and real which can reveal itself. But it may not reveal itself fully, and man, mistaking a part for the whole, or partial evidence for complete evidence, falls into error. Hence it is that in all error there is some truth. To discover the relation which this partial truth bears on the whole truth is to discover the origin of the error. The causes in ourselves which lead to error arise from wrong views of our faculties and of the conditions under which they operate. Indolence, precipitation, passion, custom, authority, and education may also contribute to lead us into error (Bacon, Noevum Organum, lib. 1; Malebranche, Recherche de la Verite; Descartes, On Method; Locke, On Human Understand. book 6, c. 20)." — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, pages 166-167.

## Erskine (or Areskine), Henry[[@Headword:Erskine (or Areskine), Henry]]

             a Scotch divine, one of the youngest of the thirty-three children of Ralph Erskine of Shielfield, was born at Dryburgh in 1624, where he received his early education. He took his master's degree at the University of Edinburgh in 1645, was ordained to the ministry by the Presbyterians in England, to the living at Cornhill, in Durham, but was soon ejected by the act of uniformity, in 1662, and returned to his own country. But the persecutions carried on then in Scotland required him to take refuge in Holland. In 1687, when king James's toleration was proclaimed, Mr. Erskine embraced it; and on the re-establishment of the presbytery in 1690, he was appointed minister of Chirnside, in Berwickshire. He died August 10, 1696. He never  published any of his works. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict, s.v.; Fasti Eccles. Scoticanae, 1:427, 451.

## Erskine (or Erskyn), John[[@Headword:Erskine (or Erskyn), John]]

             a Scotch clergyman, of Dun, knight, son of John Erskyne, of Dun, was born about 1508; studied first at the University of Aberdeen, then on the Continent. Having imbibed the doctrines of the Reformation, he taught them to the son of Alexander Straton, a neighbor who paid the forfeit of his life for his opinions, at Edinburgh, in August 1534. He led many other persons to embrace the new principles, and secured for themsafety and protection. When the English invaded Montrose, in 1548, Erskine, supported by his townsmen, repulsed them with a loss of eight hundred of the invaders. He lived a retired life till John Knox appeared, in 1555, when he joined him at Edinburgh, took part with his followers in their public services, and was coadjutor with Knox till a secession took place. He was one of the eight appointed by parliament, in 1557, to witness the marriage of the queen with the dauphin of France. On his return, in 1558, he assisted informing a Church of the Reformation, became an exhorter, drew up an address to the queen-dowager against the Romanists, with whose dissimulations, in 1559, the people at Perth became so enraged that they attacked the monasteries, and cast down the images, sparing only the places of worship through the influence of Erskine and Knox. He was nominated by the lords and barons, in July 1560, the first minister at Montrose under the Reformation, sat in the first General Assembly, 1560, and was appointed superintendent of Angus and Mearns, in 1561. Of the first fifty-six General Assemblies, he attended forty-four, and was the moderator over five of them, three times in succession. He was a member of the convention at Leith in 1571;. had to summon principals, and three regents of the university, and try them for teaching popery, in 1567 and 1569, and on their refusal to accept the new faith they were deprived by the privy council. He several times offered his resignation, which was always declined, and he died March 12, 1589, having been second only to Knox in accomplishing and securing the work of the Reformation. He governed his portion of the Church with singular wisdom and authority, disallowing all innovations. He was a man of courage, zeal, learning, prudence, generosity, and liberality. He compiled and published part of the Second Book of Discipline. See Fasti Eccles. Scoticanae, 3:887.

## Erskine, Charles[[@Headword:Erskine, Charles]]

             a cardinal of Scotch descent, was born at Rome, February 13, 1753. After entering the profession of a lawyer when still quite young, he attained a rare knowledge of Latin and philosophy, and was honored by Pius VI, who himself had been a lawyer. During the French revolution, Erskine was sent on an embassy to London. by that pontiff, remained there for eight years, and when he came back to Italy under Pius VII received the cardinal's hat. When afterwards he went to Paris he was welcomed by the consular government. Erskine died March 19, 1811. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Erskine, Ebenezer[[@Headword:Erskine, Ebenezer]]

             an eminent and pious Scotch divine, founder of the "Secession Church." He was born in the prison of the Bass Rock, June 22, 1680, and educated at the University of Edinburgh. He acted for some time as tutor and chaplain in the family of the earl of Rothes, and became a licentiate in divinity in 1702. In 1703 he was chosen minister of Portmoak, in the shire of Kinross, and became a very popular preacher. He accepted a charge in Stirling in 1731. "Mr. Erskine's first difference with his colleagues of the Church of Scotland was in his support of the principles of 'the Marrow of Modern Divinity,' a subject of great contention during the early part of the 18th century. He was one of several clergymen who, in connection with this subject, were 'rebuked and admonished' by the General Assembly. The 'secession of the body, headed by Mr. Erskine, was occasioned by the operation of the act of queen Anne's reign restoring lay patronage in the Church of Scotland, and, though not in all respects technically the same, it was virtually on the same ground as the late secession of 'The Free Church.' The presbytery of Kinross, led by Erskine's brother Ralph, had refused to induct a presentee forced on an objecting congregation by the law of patronage. In 1732, the General Assembly enjoined the presbytery to receive the presentee. At the same time they passed an act of Assembly regulating inductions, which, as it tended to enforce the law of patronage, was offensive to Mr. Erskine, and he preached against it. After some discussion, the General Assembly decided that he should be 'rebuked and admonished,' confirming a decision of the inferior ecclesiastical courts.  Against this decision Mr. Erskine entered a 'protest,' in which he was joined by several of his brethren. He was afterwards suspended from his functions. The Assembly subsequently endeavored to smooth the way for his restoration, but he declined to take advantage of it, and he and his friends, including his brother Ralph, formally seceded in 1736. When the Secession was divided into the two sects of Burghers and anti-Burghers, Mr. Erskine and his brother were of the Burgher party. He died on the 2d of June, 1756. The Secession Church, reunited by the junction of the Burghers and antiBurghers in 1820, remained a distinct body till 1847, when a union being effected with the Relief Synod (a body which arose from Mr. Gillespie's secession from the Established Church of Scotland in 1752), the aggregate body assumed the name of the United Presbyterian Church" (English Cyclopedia). Erskine bore a very high reputation as a scholar. His writings are collected in The whole Works of Ebenezer Erskine, consisting of sermons and discourses on the most important and interesting subjects (Lond. 1799, 3 volumes, 8vo). See Hetherington, Church of Scotland, 2:297 sq. SEE SECEDERS; SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

## Erskine, John, D.D[[@Headword:Erskine, John, D.D]]

             an eminent Scotch divine, was born in Edinburgh, June 2, 1721, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. His father (author of the Institutes of the Laws of Scotland) wished him to devote himself to law, but finally yielded to his son's desire that he should study theology. At twenty he published an essay on The Law of Nature sufficiently propagated to the Heathen World, aiming to show that the ignorance and unbelief of the heathen is not due to want of evidence (Rom 1:29). In 1743 he was licensed to preach by the presbytery of Dunblane, and in 1744 he became minister of Kirkintillock. In 1748, Mr. Erskine, and other evangelical clergymen of the Established Church, invited Whitefield into their pulpits. An animated discussion took place, in which Mr. Erskine triumphantly defended himself. Such a course required courage at a time when the character and doctrines of Whitefield, as well as his open-air preaching, were looked upon by many with suspicion or dislike. In the following year Mr. Erskine published An Essay intended to promote the more frequent dispensation of the Lord's Supper. In 1753 he was translated to Culross, and in 1758 to New Greyfriars' church, Edinburgh. Here he prepared his Theological Dissertations (Lond. 1765, 12mo), including the two essays above mentioned: one on the Covenant of Sinai, one on Saving Faith, and  one on the Apostolic Churches. He also edited a new edition of Hervey's Theron and Aspasio, with a preface against John Wesley, written with some bitterness, which gave rise to some letters between Erskine and Wesley, in which the latter appears to decided advantage (Wesley, Works, N. York ed. 6:125 sq., 744). In 1769 he published anonymously a pamphlet under the title ''Shall I go to war with my American brethren?" to expose the impolicy of such a contest. On the outbreak of hostilities he republished it with his name, following it up with another, entitled Reflections .on the Rise, Progress, and probable Consequences of the present Contentions with the Colonies, in which he urged the duty of the mother country resorting to conciliatory measures. In 1776 he issued a third pamphlet, under the title The Equity and Wisdom of the Government in the Measures that have occasioned the American Revolt tried by the sacred Oracles. On this subject Erskine was one of the few clear-sighted men of the time in Great Britain. When nearly sixty he studied Dutch and German in order to read the Continental divines; the fruit of these studies appeared in Sketches and Hints of Church History and theological Controcersy, translated or abridged from foreign Writers (Edinburgh; 1790-97, 2 volumes, 12mo). He died January 19, 1803. After his death appeared his Discourses (Edinburgh, 1818, 2 vols. 12mo). — Jamieson, Religious Biography, page 139; Jones, Christian Biography, page 191; Wellwood, Life of Erskine.

## Erskine, Ralph[[@Headword:Erskine, Ralph]]

             brother of Ebenezer, was born at Monilaws, Northumberland. March 18, 1685, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1711 he became minister at Dunfermline. In 1734 he joined his brother and others in their secession from the Church. SEE SECEDERS. He died November 6, 1752. He was a preacher of great popular abilities, devotional and zealous. His writings are collected under the title Sermons and other practical Works, consisting of above 150 sermons, besides his poetical pieces, to which is prefixed an account of the author's life and writings (Falkirk, 10 volumes, 8vo, 1794-96). — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 1:1063.

## Erskine, Thomas[[@Headword:Erskine, Thomas]]

             of Linlathen, Scotland, a writer on theology and religion, was born October 13, 1788. After being educated at the high-school of Edinburgh and at Durham, he attended the literary and law classes of the University of Edinburgh, and in 1810 became a member of the Edinburgh faculty of advocates. On the death of his elder brother, in 1816, he succeeded to the family estate of Linlathen, near Dundee, and retired from the bar, spending the remainder of his life in the discussion — either by conversation, by letters, or by literary publications — of the most important religious questions. He died at Edinburgh, March 20, 1870. His principal works are, Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth of Revealed Religion (1820): — an Essay on Faith (1822): — and the Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel (1828). These have all passed through several editions, and have also been translated into French. He also wrote, The Brazen Serpent (1831): — The Doctrine of Election (1839): — a posthumous work entitled Spiritual Order and Other Papers (1871), and various essays. Two volumes of his Letters, edited by William Hanna, D.D., with reminiscences by dean Stanley and principal Shairp, appeared in 1877. See Encyclop. Brit. 9th ed. s.v.

## Erskine, William[[@Headword:Erskine, William]]

             a Scotch nominal prelate, was minister of Campsey and commendator of Paisley. He was a titular bishop of Glasgow in 1585, but was never consecrated. He held the office but two years. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 262.

## Erthal, Franz Ludwig Von[[@Headword:Erthal, Franz Ludwig Von]]

             a German prelate, was born at Lohr-on-the-Main, September 16, 1730. He studied law at Wuirzburg, and when thirty-three years of age became a member of the chapter there. The emperor Joseph II appointed him to several high positions, and in 1779 he was made prince-bishop of Bamberg and Wiirzburg. His government was in every respect an excellent one. He died February 16, 1795, leaving, Zeit und Pflicht der Christen (Wurzburg, 1793): — Reden an das Landvolk (Bamberg, 1797). See Schmid, in Herzog-Plitt's Real-Encyclop. s.v.; Geschichte der Katholikirche Deutschlands (Munich, 1872); Bernhard, Franz Ludwig von Erthal (Tubingen, 1852). (B.P.)

## Erubim[[@Headword:Erubim]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Erwin, Alexander. R., D.D[[@Headword:Erwin, Alexander. R., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Louisiana, January 12, 1820, of pious Baptist parents. He joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1839; was licensed to preach in 1840, and in 1842 entered the Tennessee Conference. In 1848 he was appointed president of Clarksville Female Academy; in 1854 re-entered the regular work; in 1859 was appointed president of Huntsville Female College, and died January 10, 1860. Dr. Erwin was manly and dignified in appearance, humble and cheerful in spirit, extensive in knowledge, and energetic in labor. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1860, page 212.

## Erythraeus, Joachim (1)[[@Headword:Erythraeus, Joachim (1)]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born December 13, 1637, at Bela, in Upper Hungary. He studied at Wittenberg, and was for some time archdeacon in his native country. When the evangelical preachers had to leave Hungary, he went to Pomerania, and was appointed pastor at Stettin, where he died, March 21, 1699. He wrote, Dissert. de Attribut.is Dei: — Synopsis Biblica Stilo Ligato Scripta: — Breviarium Biblicum: — Apoderica Sacra: — Expositio Confessionis Augustanae. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Erythraeus, Joachim (2)[[@Headword:Erythraeus, Joachim (2)]]

             son of the foregoing, was born January 28, 1663. With his father he went to Pomerania, was in 1688 deacon, and in 1700 succeeded his father. He died April 28, 1703. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Erythrian Sibyl[[@Headword:Erythrian Sibyl]]

             SEE SIBYL.

## Erythropel[[@Headword:Erythropel]]

             a name common to several Lutheran ministers of Germany:

1. DAVID RUPERT, was born March 30, 1653, at Hanover, and studied at Jena. In 1679 he was court-preacher at his native place, in 1685 member of consistory, in 1698 superintendent, in 1706 first court-preacher, and died December 22, 1732. He wrote, De Montibus Pietdtis: — De Ministris Ecclesiarum Augustanae Confessionis. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

2. DAVID WILHELM, son of the above, was born at Hanover, June 20, 1687. He studied at different universities, and after his return commenced his ministry inl his native city in 1710. He was intrusted with the highest ecclesiastical positions, and died in February, 1758. He wrote, De Fatis Calicis Eucharistici (Helmstadt, 1708).

3. GEORGE, was born at Hanover in 1607, studied at Rinteln and Jena, and died in his native city in 1669.

4. MARTIN, was born at Hanover in 1610. He studied at Helmstadt and Marburg, was in 1634 pastor at Darmstadt, in 1648 court-preacher and general superintendent, and died June 1, 1655. He wrote, Pathologica. Christi Prophetica (Marburg, 1640): — Thesaurus Connubialis, or Geistlicher Eheschatz in Predigten (ibid. 1641).

5. RUPERT, father of Martin, was born in 1556, studied at Leipsic and Wittenberg, and was in 1584 conrector at Hanover. In 1585 he was made pastor of the Church of the Holy Cross, in 1596 of St. George's, and died Oct. 7, 1626. He wrote, Analysis Logica in Epistol. et Evangel. Dominic. Pericopas: — Postilla Methodica in Epistol. et Evangelia: — Theologia Apostolica et Methodica, or exposition on the epistles of Paul, Peter, James, Jude, John, and the epistle to the Hebrews: — Harmonia Historica IV Evangelistarum: — Catena Aurea in Harmon. Evangel. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Esaias[[@Headword:Esaias]]

             (Rec. Text ᾿Ησαϊvας, Lachm. with Codex B ᾿Ησαϊvας; Vulg. Isaias, Cod. Amiat. Esaias), the Graecized form, constantly used in the N.T. (Mat 3:3; Mat 4:14; Mat 8:17; Mat 12:17; Mat 13:14; Mat 15:7; Mar 7:6; Luk 3:4; Luk 4:17; Joh 1:23; Joh 12:38-39; Joh 12:41; Act 8:28; Act 8:30; Act 28:25; Rom 9:27; Rom 9:29; Rom 10:16; Rom 10:20; Rom 15:12) for ISAIAH SEE ISAIAH (q.v.). SEE ESAY.

## Esaias Of Egypt[[@Headword:Esaias Of Egypt]]

             who lived about the end of the 4th century, was abbot of some monastery in that country, and left a large number of MSS., nearly all in Greek. Assemani cites some in Arabic and Syriac, but these are probably translations from the Greek. Several have been published, viz., Chapters on the Ascetic and Quiet Life (Κεφάλαια περὶ ἀσκήσεως καὶ ἡσυχίας), in Greek and Latin, in the Thesaurus Asceticus of Peter Possin (Paris, 1684): — Praecepta seu Concilia Posita Tironibus (Augsburg, 1759): — Orationes, a Latin translation of twenty-nine discourses, or rather apothegms, published by Franc. Zini, with other ascetical writings by St. Nilus and other theologians (Venice, 1574): — Dubitationes in Visionem Ezechielis, in MS. in the royal library of the Escurial in Spain, has been described by Montfaucon, but it has not been printed. It is doubtful if all these works are by the same author, as there may have been several writers  of this name in Egypt. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Esar-haddon[[@Headword:Esar-haddon]]

             (Hebrews Esar'-Haddon', אֵסִראּהדֹּן, perhaps akin with Pers. Athrodana, gift of fire; Sept. Α᾿σορδάν [in Ezra Α᾿σαραδδών] v.r. Α᾿σαραδάν, in Tob 1:21, Σαρχηδονός; Josephus, Ant. 10:1, 5, Α᾿σσαραχόδδας), the son and successor of Sennacherib (2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38). The date apparently assigned by these passages is B.C. 712, but, as he seems to be the Asaradinus (Α᾿σαρίδανος) of Ptolemy's Canon, whose reign bears date from B. C. 680, we may either suppose that the death of Sennacherib occurred some years after his defeat before Jerusalem, or that an interregnum occurred before the accession of Eskrhaddon. It has generally been thought that he was Sennacherib's eldest son, and this seems to have been the view of Polyhistor, who made Sennacherib place a son, Asordanes, on the throne of Babylon during his own lifetime (ap. Euseb. Chron. Son 1:5). The contrary, however, appears by the inscriptions, which show the Babylonian viceroy-called Asordanes by Polyhistor, but Aparanadius (Assaranadius?) by Ptolemy to have been a distinct person from Esar-haddon, who is called in cuneiform (q.v.) Asshur-akh-iddina (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1:386 sq.). Thus nothing is really known of Esar- haddon until his succession (B.C. cir. 680; see Colossians Rawlinson in the Lond. Athenceum, August 22, 1865), which seems to have followed quietly and without difficulty on the murder of his father and the flight of his guilty brothers (2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38). It may, perhaps, be concluded from this that he was at the death of his father the eldest son, Assaranadius, the Babylonian viceroy, having died previously. It is impossible to fix the length of Esarhaddon's reign, or the order of the events which occurred in it. Little is known to us of his history but from his own records, and they haye not come down to us in the shape of annals, but only in the form of a general summary (see them translated by H.F. Talbot, in the Jour. of Sac. Lit. April 1859, pages 68-79). That he reigned thirteen years at Babylon is certain from the Canon of Ptolemy, and he  cannot have reigned a shorter time in Assyria. He may, however, have reigned longer, for it is not improbable that after a while he felt sufficiently secure of the affections of the Babylonians to re-establish the old system of viceregal government in their country. Saosduchinus may have been set up as ruler of Babylon by his authority in B.C. 667, and he may have withdrawn to Nineveh, and continued to reign there for some time longer. His many expeditions and his great works seem to indicate, if not even to require, a reign of some considerable duration. It has been conjectured that he died about B.C. 660, after occupying the throne for twenty years. He appears to have been succeeded by his son Asshur-bani-pal, or Sardanapalus II, the prince for whom he had built a palace in his own lifetime. No farther mention is made of this monarch in Scripture but that he settled certain colonists in Samaria (Ezr 4:2). SEE ASNAPPER.

Esar-haddon appears by his monuments to have been one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful of all the Assyrian monarchs. He carried his arms over all Asia between the Persian Gulf, the Armenian mountains, and the Mediterranean. Towards the east he engaged in wars with Median tribes "of which his fathers had never heard the name;" towards the west he extended his influence over Cilicia and Cyprus; towards the south he claimed authority over Egypt and Ethiopia. In consequence of the disaffection of Babylon, and its frequent revolts from former Assyrian kings, Esar-haddon, having subdued the sons of Merodach-Baladan who headed the national party, introduced the new policy of substituting for the former government by viceroys a direct dependence upon the Assyrian crown. He did not reduce Babylonia to a province, or attempt its actual absorption into the empire, but united it to his kingdom in the way that Hungary was, until 1848, united to Austria, by holding both crowns himself, and residing now at one and now at the other capital. He is the only Assyrian monarch whom we find to have actually reigned at Babylon, where he built himself a palace, bricks from which have been recently recovered bearing his name. His Babylonian reign lasted thirteen years, from B.C. 680 to B.C. 667, and it was undoubtedly within this space of time that Manasseh, king of Judah, having been seized by his captains at Jerusalem on a charge of rebellion, was brought before the Assyrian monarch at Babylon (2Ch 33:11), and detained for a time as prisoner there. This must therefore have been Esar-haddon, who, persuaded of his innocence, or excusing his guilt, eventually restored him to his throne (comp. 2Ch 33:13), thus giving a proof of clemency not very  usual in an Oriental monarch. It seems to have been in a similar spirit that Esar-haddon, according to the inscriptions, gave a territory upon the Persian Gulf to a son of Merodach-Baladan, who submitted to his authority and became a refugee at his court. As a builder of great works Esar- haddon is particularly distinguished. Besides his palace at Babylon, which has already been mentioned, he built at least three others in different parts of his dominions, either for himself or his son, while in a single inscription he mentions the erection by his hands of no fewer than thirty temples in Assyria and Mesopotamia. His works appear to have possessed a peculiar magnificence. He describes his temples as "shining with silver and gold," and boasts of his Nineveh palace that it was "a building such as the kings his fathers who went before him had never made." The south-west palace at Nimrud is the best preserved of his constructions. This building, which was excavated by Mr. Layard, is remarkable for the peculiarity of its plan as well as for the scale on which it is constructed. It corresponds in its general design almost exactly with the palace of Solomon (1Ki 7:1-12), but is of larger dimensions, the great hall being 220 feet long by 100 broad (Layard's Nin. and Bab. page 558, Harpers' edit.), and the porch or antechamber 160 feet by 60. It had the usual adornment of winged bulls, colossal sphinxes, and sculptured slabs, but has furnished less to our collections than many inferior buildings, from the circumstance that it had originally been destroyed by fire, by which the stones and alabaster were split and calcined. This is the more to be regretted as there is reason to believe that Phoenician and Greek artists took part in the ornamentation. See Bridge, Hist. of Esarhaddon (Lond. 1881). SEE ASSYRIA.

## Esau[[@Headword:Esau]]

             (Hebrews Esav', עֵשָׂו, hairy [see Gen 25:25; his surname EDOM was given him from the red pottage, Gen 25:30]; Sept. and N.T. ᾿Ησαῦ), the eldest son of "Isaac, Abraham's son" (Gen 25:19) by Rebekah, "the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, of Padanaram, the sister to Laban the Syrian." The marriage remaining for some time (about 19 years; comp. Gen 25:20; Gen 25:26) unproductive, Isaac entreated Jehovah, and Rebekah became pregnant. Led by peculiar feelings "to inquire of Jehovah," she was informed that she should give birth to twins, whose fate would be as diverse as their character, and, what in those days was stranger still, that the elder should serve the younger. On occasion of her delivery, the child that was born first was "red, all over like a hairy  garment; and they called his name Esau." Immediately afterwards Jacob was born. B.C. 2004. This was not the only remarkable circumstance connected with the birth of the infant. Even in the womb the twin brothers struggled together (Gen 25:22). Esau was the firstborn; but, as he was issuing into life, Jacob's hand grasped his heel. The bitter enmity of two brothers, and the increasing strife of two great nations, were thus foreshadowed (Gen 25:23; Gen 25:26). From the special attention drawn to his hairy appearance, one would suppose that the name Esau (עֵשִׂו), or Esav, was intended to give expression to that quality. So have many learned men in recent as well as former times held, though they are obliged to resort to the Arabic for the etymological explanation; a word very similar in Arabic, signifying hairy. The older Hebrew commentators, however, derived it from the verb עָשָׂח, asuh', to make, and explained the word as signifying "made," "complete," "full-grown" — viewing the hair as an indication of premature manly vigor. But the Jews of the present day seem more disposed to fall in with the other derivation (for example, Raphall in loco). The unusual covering of hair, which not only distinguished Esau as a child, but kept pace with his growth, and in mature life gave his skin a kind of goat-like appearance (Gen 27:16), was undoubtedly meant to be indicative of the man; it was a natural sign, coeval with his very birth, by which his parents might descry the future man-as one in whom the animal should greatly preponderate over the moral and spiritual qualities of nature-a character of rough, self-willed, and untamed energy. From the word designating his hairy aspect, sear (שֵׂעִר), it is not improbable that the mountain-range which became the possession of his descendants was called Mount Seir, though it is also possible that the rough, wooded appearance of the mountain itself may have been the occasion of the name. SEE SEIR.

In process of time the different natural endowments of the two boys began to display their effects in dissimilar aptitudes and pursuits. While Jacob was led by his less robust make and quiet disposition to fulfill the duties of a shepherd's life, and pass his days in and around his tent, Esau was impelled, by the ardor and lofty spirit which agitated his bosom, to seek in the toils, adventures, and perils of the chase his occupation and sustenance; and, as is generally the case in natures like his, he gained high repute by his skill and daring, which allied him to the martial exercises of the Canaanites (Gen 25:27). He was, in fact, a thorough Bedawy, a "son of the desert" (so we may translate אַישׁ שָׂדֶה, man of the field), who delighted to  roam free as the wind of heaven, and who was impatient of the restraints of civilized or settled life. His old father, by a caprice of affection not uncommon, loved his willful, vagrant boy; and his keen relish for savory food being gratified by Esau's venison, he liked him all the better for his skill in hunting (Gen 25:28). A hunter's life is of necessity one of uncertainty as well as hardship; days pass in which the greatest vigilance and the most strenuous exertions may fail even to find, much less capture game (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2:399). The hunting tribes of North America often find themselves, after severe and long-continued labor and watching, unprovided with food, and necessitated to a length of abstinence which would be fatal to persons bred in towns or living by the ordinary pursuits of the field. Esau had on one occasion experienced such a disappointment, and, wearied with his unproductive efforts, exhausted for want of sustenance, and despairing of capturing any prey, he was fain to turn his steps to his father's house for succor in his extremity. On reaching home he found his brother enjoying a darefully prepared dish of pottage: attracted by the odor of which, he besought Jacob to allow him to share in the meal. His brother saw the exigency in which Esau was, and determined not to let it pass unimproved. Accordingly, he put a price on the required food. Esau was the elder, and had, in consequence, immunities and privileges which were of high value. The surrender of these to himself Jacob made the condition of his complying with Esau's petition. Urged by the cravings of hunger, alarmed even by the fear of starvation, Esau sold his birthright to his younger bother, confirming the contract by the sanction of an oath. Jacob, having thus got his price, supplied the famishing Esau with needful refreshments. Jacob took advantage of his brother's distress to rob him of that which was dear as life itself to an Eastern patriarch. The birthright not only gave him the headship of the tribe, both spiritual and temporal, and the possession of the great bulk of the family property, but it carried with it the covenant blessing (Gen 27:28-29; Gen 27:36; Heb 12:16-17). Yet, though Esau, under the pressure of temporary suffering, despised his birthright by selling it for a mess of pottage (Gen 25:34), he afterwards attempted to secure that which he had deliberately sold (Gen 27:4; Gen 27:34; Gen 27:38; Heb 12:17). It is evident the whole transaction was public, for it resulted in a new name being given to Esau. He said to Jacob, "Feed me with that same red (הָאָרֹם); therefore was his name called Edom" (אדֵוֹם; Gen 25:30). It is worthy of note, however, that this name is seldom applied to Esau himself, though almost universally given to the country he settled in, and to  his posterity. SEE EDOM. The name "Children of Esau" is in a few cases applied to the Edomites (Deu 2:4; Jer 49:8; Oba 1:18), but it is rather a poetical expression.

Arrived now at forty years of age, Esau married two wives in close succession. B.C. cir. 1963. Some unhappy feelings appear to have previously existed in the family; for while Esau was a favorite with his father, in consequence, it appears, of the presents of venison which the youth gave him, Jacob was regarded with special affection by the mother. These partialities, and their natural consequences in unamiaible feelings, were increased and exaggerated by Esau's marriage. His wives were both Canaanites, and, on .account of their origin, were unacceptable to Isaac and Rebekah. The latter was especially grieved. "I am weary," she said (Gen 27:46), "of my life, because of the daughters of Heth." Esau thus became alienated from the parental home. Even his father's preference for him may have been injuriously affected. The way was in some measure smoothed for the transference of the coveted birthright to the younger son.

There is much apparent confusion in the accounts of Esau's wives and their relatives and posterity, as given in Gen 26:34; Gen 28:9; Gen 36:2-5; Gen 36:10-30; Gen 36:40-43; 1Ch 1:35-42; 1Ch 1:51-54, which may be adjusted by the following combination:

(1.) His first wife was Adah, the daughter of Elon the Hittite (Gen 36:2), or an aboriginal Canaanite. SEE HITTITE. In Gen 26:34, she is incorrectly called Bashemath, apparently by confusion with the name of his third wife, although her parentage is correctly given. Her only child was Eliphaz, who was therefore Esau's first-born (Gen 36:10; Gen 36:15; 1Ch 1:35).

(2.) Esau's second wife was Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, as all the accounts agree except that in Gen 26:34, where, by some error or variation of names, she is called Judith, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite. This Anah, in Gen 36:2; Gen 36:14, is called the daughter of Zibeol, but from Gen 36:20; Gen 36:24-25, and 1Ch 1:38, it is evident that he was the son of Zibeon, his brother being Ajah, and his only children a son Dishon and this daughter Aholibamah. We may also remark that this Anah and this Dishon had each an uncle of the same name respectively (Gen 36:20-21), and the name Aholibamah belonged subsequently to a chieftain of an Edomitish-tribe (Gen 36:41). Zibeon was a son of Seir, the original settler of the mountain which went by his name. His  descendants were properly called Horites (Gen 36:20; Gen 36:29), but in Gen 36:20 he is called a Hivite, a term frequently interchangeable for heathenish tribes, as Hittite, in Gen 26:34, is twice used for the same purpose. This connection of Esau with the original inhabitants of Idumaea will explain his subsequent removal to that region, and the eventual supremacy of his descendants there. His children by Aholibamah were Jeush, Jaalam, and Korah.

(3.) Esau's third wife, taken, not like the former, from foreign families, but from kindred stock, was Bashemath (otherwise called Mahalath), sister of Nebajoth and daughter of Ishmael, who bore him Reuel (Gen 36:3-4; Gen 28:9). This elucidation substantially agrees with that proposed by Prof. Turner (Companion to Genesis, page 323), after Hengstenberg. These sons of Esau rose to the importance of sheiks ("dukes") in their respective families (those by Ahoe libamah being especially so styled, Gen 36:18) and this was naturally more emphatically the case with his grandsons (Gen 36:15-16, where the name Korah is an interpolation, and Amalek is reckoned along with the legitimate children of Eliphaz; comp. the parallel account in 1Ch 1:36, where the name Timna is in like manner interpolated), who were probably cotemporaneous with the native sheiks mentioned in 1Ch 1:29-30, or but little later-the gradual superiority of the Esauites over the Horites appearing from the fact that the heirs of the latter (1Ch 1:22-28) are not named with this distinction (comp. 1Ch 1:20-21). This double line of chieftains of the respective tribes appears to have continued for a long time; for in the subsequent list of native kings (1Ch 1:31-39) and heads of the Edomitish part of the inhabitants (1Ch 1:40; 1Ch 1:43), coming down in parallel lines to about the time of the Exode (but from what point dated is uncertain), each appears to have regularly succeeded his predecessor, not by hereditary right indeed, but by that species of common consent, founded upon acknowledged pre-eminence, which is to this day recognized in the election of Arab emirs. SEE EDOMITE.

The time for the fulfillment of the compact between the brothers has at length arrived. Isaac is "sick unto death." His appetite, as well as his health, having failed, is only to be gratified by provocatives. He desires some savory venison, and gives the requisite instructions to Esau, who accordingly proceeds in quest of it. On this Rebekah begins to feel that the critical time has come. If the hated Hittites are not to enter with her less favored son into possession of the family property, the sale of the birthright  (the original idea of which she may have suggested to the "plain man," her son Jacob) must now in some way be confirmed and consummated. One essential particular remained — the father's blessing. If this should be given to Esau, all hope was gone; for this, like our modern wills, would hand the inheritance and the accompanying headship of the tribe to Esau and his wives. Isaac, however, had lost his sight — indeed, all his senses were, dull and feeble. It was therefore not very difficult to pass off Jacob upon him as Esau. Rebekah takes her measures, and, notwithstanding Jacob's fears, succeeds. Isaac, indeed, is not without suspicion, but a falsehood comes to aid Jacob in his otherwise discreditable personation of Esau. The blessing is pronounced, and thus the coveted property and ascendency are secured. The affectionate endearments which pass between the deceiver and the abused old blind father stand in painful contrast with the base trickery by which the mother and the son accomplished their end.

This episode in the history of Esau and Jacob is still more painful than the former, as it fully brings out those bitter family rivalries and divisions which were all but universal in ancient times, and which are still a disgrace to Eastern society. Esau, however, returns from the field, approaches his decrepid and sightless father, declaring who he is. "And Isaac trembled very exceedingly, and said, Who? where is he that hath taken venison and brought it me, and I have eaten of all before thou camest, and have blessed him? yea, and he shall be blessed." On this Esau becomes agitated, and entreats a blessing for himself — "Bless me, even me also, O my father." Urging this entreaty again and again, even with tears, Isaac at length said to him, "Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; and by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck" (Gen 27:1-46). Thus, deprived forever of his birthright, in virtue of the irrevocable blessing, Esau but too naturally conceived and entertained a hatred of Jacob, and he vowed vengeance. But, fearing his aged father's patriarchal authority, he secretly congratulated himself: "The days of mourning for my father are at hand, then will I slay my brother Jacob" (Gen 27:1-46). Thus he imagined that by one bloody deed he would regain all that had been taken from him by artifice. But he knew not a mother's watchful care. Not a sinister glance of his eyes, not a hasty expression of his tongue, escaped Rebekah. Words to the above effect which Esau let drop were repeated to his mother, who thereupon felt that the life of her darling son, whose gentle nature and domestic habits had won her heart's affections. was now in imminent peril;  and she prevailed on her younger son to flee to his uncle Laban, who lived in Haran, there to remain until time, with its usual effect, should have mitigated Esau's wrath. B.C. 1927. The sins of both mother and child were visited upon them by a long and painful separation, and all the attendant anxieties and dangers. By a characteristic piece of domestic policy, Rebekah succeeded both in exciting Isaac's anger against Esau, and obtaining his consent to Jacob's departure — "And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth; if Jacob take a wife such as these, what good shall my life do me?" Her object was attained at once. The blessing was renewed to Jacob, and he received his father's commands to go to Padan-aram (Gen 27:46; Gen 28:1-5.)

When Esau heard that his father had commanded Jacob to take a wife of the daughters of his kinsman Laban, he also resolved to try whether by a new alliance he could propitiate his parents. He accordingly married his cousin Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael (Gen 28:8-9). This marriage appears to have brought him into connection with the Ishmaelitish tribes beyond the valley of Arabah. He soon afterwards established himself in Mount Seir; still retaining, however, some interest in his father's property in Southern Palestine. It is probable that his own habits, and the idolatrous practices of his wives and rising family, continued to excite and even increase the anger of his parents; and that he, consequently, considered it more prudent to remove his household to a distance. He was residing in Mount Seir when Jacob returned from Padan-aram, and had then become so rich and powerful that the impressions of his brother's early offences seem to have been almost completely effaced. Jacob, however, feared lest his elder brother might intercept him on his way, to take revenge for former injuries.

He accordingly sent messengers to Esau, in order, if possible, to disarm his wrath. Esau appears to have announced in reply that he would proceed to meet his returning brother. When, therefore, Jacob was informed that Esau was on his way for this purpose with a band of four hundred men, he was greatly distressed, in fear of that hostility which his conscience told him he had done something to deserve. What, then, must have been his surprise when he saw Esau running with extended arms to greet and embrace him? and Esau "fell on his neck, and kissed him, and they wept." Jacob had prepared a present for Esau, hoping thus to conciliate his favor; but, with the generous ardor which characterizes, and somewhat of the disinterestedness which adorns, natures like his, Esau at first courteously refused the gift: "I have enough, my  brother; keep that thou hast unto thyself" (Gen 33:1-20). But doubts and fears still lurked in the mind of Jacob, and betrayed him into something of his old duplicity; for, while he promises to go to Seir, he carefully declines his brother's escort, and immediately after his departure turns westward across the Jordan (Gen 32:7-8; Gen 32:11; Gen 33:4; Gen 33:12; Gen 33:17). B.C, 1907. The whole of this rencounter serves to show that, if Jacob had acquired riches, Esau had gained power and influence as well as property; and the homage which is paid to him indirectly and by implication on the part of Jacob, and directly, and in the most marked and respectful manner, by the females and children of Jacob's family, leads to the supposition that he had made himself supreme in the surrounding country of Idumaea. SEE EDOM.

It does not appear that the brothers again met until the death of their father, about twenty years afterwards. Mutual interests and mutual fear seem to have constrained them to act honestly, and even generously towards each other at this solemn interview. They united in laying Isaac's body in the cave of Machpelah. B.C. 1883. (See Rost, Pietas Esavi inparentes, Bautzen, 1788.) Then "Esau took all his cattle, and all his substance, which he had got in the land of Canaan" — such, doubtless, as his father, with Jacob's consent, had assigned to him — "and went into the country from the face of his brother Jacob" (Gen 35:29; Gen 36:6). He now saw clearly that the covenant blessing was Jacob's, that God had inalienably allotted the land of Canaan to Jacob's posterity, and that it would be folly to strive against the divine will: He knew also that as Canaan was given to Jacob; Mount Seir was given to himself (comp. Gen 27:39; Gen 32:3; and Deu 2:5), and he was therefore desirous, with his increased wealth and power, to enter into full possession of his country, and drive out its old inhabitants (Deu 2:12). Another circumstance may have influenced him in leaving Canaan. He "lived by his sword" (Gen 27:40), and he felt that the rocky fastnesses of Edom would be a safer and more suitable abode for such as by their habits provoked the hostilities of neighboring tribes than the open plains of Southern Palestine. Esau is once more presented to us (Gen 36:1-43) in a genealogical table, in which a long line of illustrious descendants is referred to "Esau, the father of the Edomites" (Gen 36:43).

The country to which Esau, with his immense family and flocks, retired, was the tract of Mount Seir, from which they gradually dispossessed the thinly scattered population that preceded them in its occupancy, and which they continued to hold for many generations. It was a region entirely suited to  the nomadic and roving character of the race. But in regard to the relationship between them and the seed of Israel, the remote descendants of Esau proved less pliant or generous than their progenitor; for from the time that Israel left the land of Egypt, when the two families again came into contact, the posterity of Esau seemed to remember only the old quarrel between the respective heads of the races, and to forget the brotherly reconciliation. A spirit of keenest rivalry and spite characterized their procedure towards Israel; through many a bloody conflict they strove to regain the ascendency which the decree of heaven had destined in the other direction; and in the times of Israel's backsliding and weakness they showed themselves ever ready, according to the prophetic word of Isaac, "to break his yoke from off their neck," and to drive the evil to the uttermost. But it was a fruitless struggle; the purpose of Heaven stood fast; the dominion remained with the house of Jacob; and in the course of the Maccabbean wars the children of Esau finally lost their independent existence, and became substantially merged in the house of Israel. The decree of Heaven, as we have said, had so fixed it; but that decree did not realize itself arbitrarily; the preference for Israel and his seed was no senseless favoritism; from the first the qualities were there which inevitably carried along with them the superiority in might and blessing; while, on the other hand, in Esau's carnalism, sensuality, godlessness, the destiny of his race was already indicated. SEE IDUMAEA.

If the historical outline now given is supported by the scriptural narrative, the character of Esau has not ordinarily received justice at the hands of theologians. The injurious impression against him may be traced back to a very ancient period. The Targum of Jonathan (at Gen 25:34) sanctioned and spread, if it did not originate, the misjudgment by unwarrantable additions to the account given in Genesis. The reason, it states, why Esau did not at once slay his brother was lest, as happened in the case of Cain and Abel, another man-child might be born, and thus he should still be deprived of his inheritance; he therefore resolved to wait till the death of Isaac, when the murder of Jacob would leave him in safe and undisputed possession. Representations made in the Talmud are of a similar tendency (Otho, Lex. Rabb. Page 207; Wetstein, N.T. 2:437; comp. Philo, Opp. 1:551; 2:441, 675). The Arabians likewise commemorate him (Hottinger, Hist. Orient. page 53 sq.). Cedrenius gives (Hist. Eccl. page 34) the story of his having been killed by an arrow discharged byJacob. The fathers of the Church, particularly Augustine, regard Esau as the  representative of the damned, while they admire Jacob as that of the elect (see Stempel, De salute Esavi, Jena, 1678), basing these views upon an erroneous interpretation of such passages as Rom 12:16; Rom 9:13. (Shuckford's Connections, 2:174; Clarke's Comment. on Gen 27:1-46; Gen 35:1-29; Kitto's Daily Illustr. in loc.; Niemeyer, Charakt. 2:153 sq.; Baumgarten, Allg. Welthist. 2:50 sq.; Bauer, Hebr. Gesch. 1:147; Hochheimer, Im Orient. 1841, No. 35; Sherlock, Works, 5; Dupin, Nouv. Bibl. 4; Evans, Script. Biog. 1; Roberts, Sermons, page 134; Puckle, Sermons, 1:96; Simeon, Works, 1:211; Alcock, Apology for Esau, Plymouth, 1791; Townsend, Sermons [1849], page 253; Goodwin, Parish Sermons, 2:1.) SEE JACOB.

## Esau (2)[[@Headword:Esau (2)]]

             ( ῾Ησαύ, Vulg. Sel), given (1Es 5:29) as the name of the head of one of the families of "Temple servants" or Nethinim that returned from the captivity; in place of the ZIHA SEE ZIHA (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 2:43).

## Esay[[@Headword:Esay]]

             ( ῾Ησαϊvας,Vulg. Is'aia, Isaias), the form in which the name of the prophet ISAIAH SEE ISAIAH (q.v.) constantly appears in the A.V. of the Apocrypha (Sir 48:20; Sir 48:22; 2Es 2:18). SEE ESAIAS.

## Escalante, Juan Antonio[[@Headword:Escalante, Juan Antonio]]

             a reputable Spanish historical painter, was born at Cordova in 1630, and studied under Francisco Rizi. There are a number of his works in the churches of Madrid, which are highly praised, among which is a fine picture of St. Catharine, in San Miguel; and an altar-piece representing The Dead Christ, with other figures, in the Church of Espiritu Santo. He died at Madrid in 1670. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Eschatology[[@Headword:Eschatology]]

             (a discussion of the last things, ἔσχατα), a branch of theology which treats of the doctrines concerning death, the condition of man after death, the end of this world period, resurrection, final judgment, and the final destiny of the good and the wicked. We treat it here,

I. In its Biblical aspects, especially as to the doctrine of the Bible concerning the end of the world, denoted by the use of the phrase "last days," which is applied in the O.T. to the consummation of the Jewish economy by the introduction of the Messianic (Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; comp. Act 3:1; Heb 1:2), and in the N.T. is extended to the still expected developments of the divine purposes respecting the Church (2Ti 3:1; 2Pe 3:3). SEE LAST DAY.

1. The Maccabcean Age. — In the O.T. prophets the return from Babylon is often made a type of the incoming of the more glorious dispensation of the Gospel. This is the first, more obvious, and most literal eschatological symbol, and much of the language (especially of Isaiah) bearing upon it has therefore a double sense (q.v.) or twofold application. SEE RESTORATION (OF THE JEWS).

2. The Chiliastic Period. — This is the Christian, as the preceding was the Jewish view of the consummation of the existing divine economy, so far as relates to the administration of this world. It will be treated under MILLENNIUM SEE MILLENNIUM .

3. The final Denouement of all terrestrial Affairs. This whole branch of the subject is particularly exhibited in our Lord's discourse to his disciples upon the Mount of Olives (Mat 24:1-51; Mat 25:1-46), in which the two scenes of the retribution impending over Jerusalem, and the final judgment, are intimately associated together, in accordance with that almost constant practice in the Hebrew prophets by which one event is made the type and illustration of another much farther in the future. SEE HYPONOIA.

This is emphatically exemplified in the vaticinations of ISAIAH SEE ISAIAH  (q.v.), who perpetually refers to the coming glory of Christ under the figure of the nearer deliverance from Babylon, both these denouements being projected upon the same plane of prophecy, without any note of the interval of time between; likewise in the visions of John in the Revelation (q.v.), where the dramatis personae are generic representations of certain principles constantly reappearing in the history of the Church rather than confined to particular characters at one time only. Such often repeated developments of divine providence are the "coming of the Son of Man" and its attendant phenomena, in the sketches or rather glimpses afforded us by the Scriptures into the future. SEE SIGN (OF THE SON OF MAN).

As to the passage in Matthew, which forms the leading proof-text of eschatological treatises, the following expository hints will serve to clear up much of the obscurity and ambiguity which has been thrown around the text by the confused manner in which many interpreters have treated its predictions (see Strong's Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels,:§123; Stier, Words of Jesus, in loc.; Whedon, Commentary, in loc.; Nast, Commentary, in loc.).

(1.) The question of the apostles (Mat 24:3) relates to two distinct subjects, namely, the "coming of the 'Son of man' to do these things," and the "end, of the world;" these two topics; therefore, are discussed by Christ in his reply. (More strictly, there are two questions concerning the first event, namely, "when," and "the sign." Mark and Luke evidently mean to confine their reports of this discourse to this former catastrophe, and therefore they do not mention the second inquiry as to the "end of the world" at all.) Yet, as the questioners apparently supposed that these two events would be simultaneous, or at least intimately connected (as the constant tenor of all former prophecies had naturally made them think), the answer also uses very similar language in treating them both, a style which their analogous nature peculiarly required. Still, the Great Teacher could not fail to give them true criteria by which to separate these two catastrophes, and for these we are to look in his language. That all the events predicted in Matthew's account as far as Mat 24:34 are connected with the former of these themes, namely, the demolition of Jerusalem and abolition of the Jewish polity, is certain from the declaration at that verse, that they should ALL occur within the then living generation; and the following verses are so intimately connected with these, both by continuity of idea and notes of simultaneousness, that a disruption anywhere before chapter Mat 25:31 would be very harsh and arbitrary. At this point, however,  we discover clear intimations of a transition (easy indeed, as the typical correspondence of the two catastrophes would lead us to expect, yet a real and marked one) to the second subject, the general judgment. The change is introduced by the notes of time, "But unwarrantably omitted in our translation] when .... then," and by the loftier tone of the style, besides the distinctive mention of " all nations" as the subjects of that adjudication (Mat 25:32). In the latter portion of Christ's discourse alone is employed the briefer and more general mode of prediction usual with the prophets in prefiguring far-distant events, and here only is the language all exclusively applicable to the final judgment. The expressions deemed by some to point out such a transition at other points than those assumed above (Mat 24:35, and especially Mat 25:31) will be noticed presently; — it is sufficient here to say in general that, as the passages embraced within the medial portion (Mat 24:27, Mat 25:30) are designed to be a link of connection between two judicial events so correlative in character, they naturally assume a style that might be applied to either, borrowing some expressions in describing the former which otherwise would belong exclusively to the latter. See a similarly blended style in describing the former of these two events in 2Th 1:7-9; comp. with 2Th 2:2; and comp. Mat 16:27-28.

Many place at the end of Mat 24:28 the transition to the final judgment; but it is difficult to extend 'the intimations of consecutiveness that follow ("[But] immediately after," "But in those days") over such a chasm. It is true, the description ensuing in Mat 24:29-31 is unusually allegorical for a prose discourse, but this is explained by the fact that it is evidently borrowed almost wholly from familiar poetic predictions of similar events. Many of these particulars, moreover, may refer, partially at least, in a literal sense, to the concurrent natural phenomena intimated in Luk 21:11; and in their utmost stretch of meaning they also hint at the collapse of nature in the general judgment. The objection of anachronism in this application of the "tribulation" of Luk 21:29 as a subsequent event, is obviated by considering that this term here 'refers to the incipient stages of the "tribulation" of Luk 21:21, where the previous context shows that the distress of the first siege and preliminary campaign are "specially intended; Luke (Luk 21:24) there gives the personal incidents of the catastrophe itself as succeeding, with an allusion to the long desolation of the land that should follow; so that Christ here resumes the thread of prophetic history (which had been somewhat interrupted by the caution against the impostors who were so rife in the brief interim of the suspension of actual  hostilities) by returning to the national consequences of the second and decisive onset of the Romans. The assignment of these events contained in the ensuing verses, as to take place "after the tribulation" (presumed to be that of the acme of the Jewish struggle), is the strongest argument of those who apply this whole following passage to the final judgment. But they overlook the equally explicit limit "immediately after," and, moreover, fail to discriminate the precise date indicated by "that tribulation." This latter is made (in Mat 24:21) simultaneous with the flight of the Christians, which could not have been practicable in the extremity of the siege, but is directed (in Mat 24:15) to be made on the approach of the besiegers. The consummation intimated here, therefore, refers to the close of the siege (i.e., the sack itself), and the preceding rigors are those of its progress. It ought, moreover, to be considered that the fall of the capital was but the precursor of the extinction of the Jewish nationality (here typified by celestial prodigies); the utter subjugation of the country at large of course following that event. Another interpretation is, that the following passage refers to a second overthrow (the final extermination of the Jewish metropolis under the emperor Adrian in a subsequent war), as distinguished from the first under Titus; this is ingenious, but would hardly justify the strong language here employed, and would, moreover, require the limit ''immediately" to be extended half a century farther, when the living "generation" must have entirely passed away. Nor at this later event could the "redemption" of the Christians properly be said to "draw nigh" (Luk 21:28), the Jews having then long ceased to have any considerable power to persecute; compare the deliverance prophetically celebrated in Rev 11:1-19, especially Rev 11:8; Rev 11:13.

(2.) In the highly-wrought description of Mat 24:29; Luk 21:25-26 (which constitutes the transition point or intermediate part of our Savior's discourse), the political convulsions during the acme of the Jewish struggle with the Romans are compared with a contest among the elements, in which the sun, moon, stars, earth, and waves join in one horrible war to aggravate human misery and desperation (comp. Jdg 5:20); the individual terms are therefore to be understood as merely heightening the general idea. To those who suppose the final judgment referred to in the expressions of this and the following verses, it may here be remarked that these symbolical phenomena of nature are all said to take place "immediately after [Mark, 'in'] ... those days," while the subsequent "coming" is made simultaneous by the word "then" used by all the  evangelists; and all these events are specially noted as signals of a "deliverance" (Luk 21:28), evidently the same with that of the Christians from Jerusalem's ruin and power to oppress be. fore alluded to; the whole being limited by all the evangelists in distinct terms to the present generation. In order to understand many of the phrases of this representation (as especially those of Luk 21:30-31), the induction (so to speak) of a style of language usually appropriated to the second catastrophe (as intimated at the close of paragraph 1 above), must be borne in mind.

The first element of this "tribulation" (that affecting the celestial luminaries, a statement common to all the evangelists here) is cited from Isa 13:10, a passage spoken with reference to the fall of Babylon; comp. Joe 3:15, and many similar passages, in which the prophets represent great national disasters by celestial phenomena of an astounding character. All the following quotations, as they appear in the evangelists, are cited by our Savior with considerable latitude and irregularity of order, as his object was merely to afford' brief specimens of this style; but the general resemblance to the original pictures is too strong to be mistaken. See Isa 34:4; Isa 13:13; Eze 32:7, and especially Joe 2:30, a prediction expressly quoted by the apostle Peter (Act 2:19) as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem.

In illustration of the angels spoken of in connection with these incidents (Mat 24:31; Mar 13:27), it should be borne in mind that the Jew naturally associated a retinue of angelic servants with the advent of the Messiah in his triumphant career, and this idea Christ here accommodates, in order to assimilate this first with his final judicial appearance, and thus impress it more deeply upon his volatile disciples' mind (comp. Dan 7:10). The "angels" in this case are the providential means (including particularly the Roman invaders), by which the Christians' rescue from siege, sack, and especially persecution, was effected; and the "trumpet sound" refers to the warning intimations which the belligerent preparations afforded them, thus giving them at once an assurance and a signal of deliverance. In the similar language of Mat 13:41; Mat 13:49, the primary reference is to the general judgment. But in the passage before us it is to be specially noted that the "trumpet" is to "gather together his elect" only, in distinction from the "all nations" of Mat 25:32.  At Mat 24:44 (comp. Luk 12:41), the discourse, which previously had been slightly tinged with allusions to the second judicial coming of Christ (Luk 12:29-31), now begins to verge more distinctly to that final stage, as the reply to Peter that follows indicates. Still, there is no mark that the transition to the last judgment is effected till Mat 25:31.

In the conclusion of the first topic of Christ's discourse (Mat 25:1-13; comp. Luk 12:35-38 : the parable in Mat 25:14-30 is parallel with an earlier one of our Lord, Luk 19:11 sq.), the near anticipation of the second topic produces almost a double sense in this (and to a degree, in the preceding) parable, which is not so much the effect of direct design as the natural moulding of the 'language while on a kindred subject, by the vivid presence to the mind of a sublime one which is soon to be introduced; and, indeed, scarcely any phraseology (especially in the far- reaching style of allegory) could have been' consistently adopted which would not have been almost equally applicable to both events ... Still, a comparison of Luk 19:13 with Mat 24:36; Mat 24:42 shows that the same occurrences (Jerusalem's siege and fall) are here chiefly referred to.

(3.) The imaginative style of the representation of the judgment day (Mat 25:31-36), which is especially betrayed in the comparison with the shepherd, shows that many of its descriptive particulars are designed only for poetic "drapery," needed to portray the actualness of that scene of the invisible world; the body of reality couched under it consists in the fact of a universal discrimination of mankind at a future set timely Christ in the capacity of judge, according to their religious character, followed by the assignment of a corresponding destiny of happiness or misery Comp. Rom 14:10; Rom 14:12; 2Co 5:10; 1Th 4:16.

See Cremer, Eschatologische Rede Christi (Stuttg. 1860); Dorner, De oratione Chisti eschatologica (Stuttg. 1844); Lippold, De Christo venturo oracula (Dresd. 1776); also the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1836, 2:269; 1846, 4:965; 1861-3; Jour. Sac. Lit. January 1857; Stowe, in Bibliotheca Sacra, 7:452. There are special exegetical treatises on Mat 24:1-51; Mat 25:1-46, in Latin, by Jachmann (Lips. 1749), Brandes (Abose, 1792), Rintsch (Neost. ad Oril. 1827), Kenon (Abo, 1798), Schmid (Jen. 1777), Masch (Nov. Bibl. Lubec. 2:69), Anon. (Lips. 1809); in German, by Crome (Brem. u. Verd. Bibl. 2:349), Ammon (N. theol. Journ. 1:365), Jahn (in Bengel's Archiv.  2:79), Anon. (in Eichhorn's Biblioth. 3:669; Beitriage z. Beford. 11:118; Tollner's Kurze verm. Aufsitze, II, 1:221-50): on Christ's coming (rapovaia, SEE ADVENT ), in Latin, by Tychsen (Gott. 1785), Schott (Jen. 1819); in German, by Baumeister (in Klaiber's Stud. I, 2:219-41; 3:1- 59; II, 1:1-104; 2:3-48), Schulthess (Neueste theol. Nachtr. 1829, p. 1848): on the phrase ουδε ο υιος, in Latin, by Osiander (Tub. 1754): on the parallel passage of Luke, in German, by Goze (Sendschr. Hamb. 1783, 1784), Moldenhauer (ib. 1784, bis). See Kahle, Biblische Eschatologie (Gotha, 1870).

II. Theological Eschatology is a subdivision of systematic, and more particularly of dogmatic theology. It generally constitutes the concluding part of dogmatic theology, as it treats of what constitutes both for the individual Christian and for the Christian Church, as a whole, the completion of their destiny. As eschatology presupposes a belief in the immortality of the soul, some writers on dogmatic theology (as Hase) treat of it in connection with the doctrine of man, and before they treat of the Church. Others connect the doctrine of death with the doctrine of sin. On some points of eschatology, different views were held at an early period of the Church. Origen understood a passage in the Epistle to the Romans on the Apocatastasis (q.v.) as meaning a final reconciliation and salvation of the wicked, and this view has found some adherents at all times. SEE RESTORATIONISTS. In modern times, some go so far as to deny all punishment after the present life, and asserting the immediate salvation of all men, SEE UNIVERSALISTS; while others teach that immortality will be the lot of only the good, and that the wicked, after their death, will be annihilated. SEE ANNIHILATIONISTS. See also the articles SEE DEATH, SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE, SEE JUDGMENT, SEE HEAVEN, SEE HELL, SEE RESURRECTION, SEE IMMORTALITY. The Church of Rome developed the theory of a future state, different from heaven and hell, for which see the article PURGATORY SEE PURGATORY.

No point connected with eschatology has from the earliest period of the Church been more productive of excited controversy than the doctrine of the second advent of Christ and of the Millennium. For the history of this doctrine; see the article MILLENNIUM SEE MILLENNIUM . In German there are separate treatises on eschatology, e.g. Richter, die Lehre von den letzten Dinzgen (Bresl. 1833, 8vo); Lau, Paulus Lehre v. d. letzt. Dingen (Brandenbl. 1837, 8vo); Valenti, Eschatologie (Basel, 1840, 8vo); Karsten, Lehre von d. letzten Dingen (Rostock, 3d ed. 1861); Schultz,  Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit (Gettingen, 1861); Wilmarshof, Das Jenseits (Leipz. 3 parts, 1863-1866); Noldechen, Grade der Seligkeit (Berlin, 1863); Splittgerber, Tod, Fortleben u. Aferstehung (Halle, 1863); Rink, Vom Zustande nach dem Tode (Ludwigsburg, 2d ed. 1865); Oswald, Eschatologie (Paderborn, 1868). — Hagenbach, Encycl. § 89; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 4:155.

## Eschenbach, Andreas Christian[[@Headword:Eschenbach, Andreas Christian]]

             a German divine and philologist, was born at Nuremberg, March 24, 1663, and was educated at Altdorf, where, in 1684, he received the poetic crown. He went to Jena and taught the classics with considerable reputation. He travelled through Germany and Holland, and on his return assisted his father in the Church of Wehrd, in Nuremberg. In 1691 he was appointed inspector of the schools of Altdorf, and in 1695 was recalled to Nuremberg as deacon of the Church of St. Mary, and professor of eloquence, poetry, history, and the Greek language in St. Giles's College, to which office, in 1705 was added that of pastor of St. Clare. He died September 24, 1722. Someof his philological dissertations were printed in 1700, in, the Syntagma Secundum Dissertationum Philologicarum (Rotterdam, 8vo). His Epigenes sive Commentarius in Fragmenta Orphica, was published at Nuremberg (1702, 4to). He translated into German, Allix on The Truth of the Christian Religion, and on The Coming of the Messiah. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

## Eschenburg, Bernhard[[@Headword:Eschenburg, Bernhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Lubeck, September 30, 1832, is the author of, Versuch einer Geschichte der offentlichen Religionsvortrage (Jena, 1785). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:628; 2:57. (B.P.)

## Eschenburg, Johann Joachim[[@Headword:Eschenburg, Johann Joachim]]

             a Lutheran hymn-writer of Germany, was born December 7, 1743, at Hamburg, and died at Brunswick, February 29, 1820. He is the author of  twelve hymns. See Jordens, Lexicon deutscher Dichter und Prosaisten, 6:768-798; Schroder, Lexicon der Hamburgischen Schriftsteller, volume 2; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 6:237 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:290. (B.P.)

## Eschius[[@Headword:Eschius]]

             SEE VAN ESCHE.

## Eschrakites[[@Headword:Eschrakites]]

             (enlightened), a Mohammedan sect; who give themselves to contemplation. Their meditations pertain chiefly to God, whom they, unlike the other Mohammedans, believe to be a trinity of persons. Wherever the Koran conflicts with their doctrines they consider it abrogated. They hold in. utter contempt the gross notions of Mohammed concerning the sensual pleasures of paradise, and consider man's supreme happiness to consist in the contemplation of divinity. This is one of the most respectable of the Mohammedan sects, resembling more nearly than any other, both in faith and practice, ordinary Christians.

## Escobar (del Carro), Juan[[@Headword:Escobar (del Carro), Juan]]

             a Spanish theologian, was born at Puente de Cantos (Andalusia); taught law with success at the College of Santa Maria and at the University of Seville; became afterwards inquisitor at Murcia and at Cordova, and died at Madrid after 1642, leaving, De Puritate Sancti Officii Inquisitionis, etc. (Lyons, 1637): — De Utroqse Foro (Cordova, 1642): — De Confessariis, etc. (ibid. eod.): — De Horis Canonicis (ibid. eod.): — Antilogia, etc. (ibid. eod.). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Escobar y, Mendoza Antonio[[@Headword:Escobar y, Mendoza Antonio]]

             a Spanish Jesuit and noted casuist, was born at Valladolid in 1589, and took the vows of the order of Jesuits in 1604. He became very eminent as a preacher, and is said to have preached daily (sometimes twice a day) for fifty years. He was also a prolific writer, leaving more than forty folio volumes of ascetic divinity, sermons, casuistry, etc. His Liber Theologiae Moralis (Lyon, 1646, 7 volumes, 8vo) passed through many (39 in Spain) editions, and was long the favorite text-book of the Jesuits. He also wrote Universae Theologiae Moralis problemata (Lyon, 1652, 2 volumes, fol.): — Universae Theol. Moral. receptiores sententiae, etc. (Lyon, 7 volumes, fol.). Escobar became the butt of Pascal's wit in the Provincial Letters, a fact which will carry his name to the latest posterity. His "liberality" in morals was so excessive that even Rome was compelled to disavow some of his doctrines. His complete works fill 42 volumes. He died July 4, 1669. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 16:375; Alegambe, Biblioth. Scriptorum Soc. Jesu (Louvain, 1854).

## Escobar, Bartolomeo de[[@Headword:Escobar, Bartolomeo de]]

             a Spanish missionary, who spent his life and fortune in pious labors, was born at Seville in 1562. He became a Jesuit in the West Indies, where he lived seventeen years, and afterwardsspent three years at Lima, dying there in 1624, and leaving, Conciones in Quinquagesima (Lyons, 1617): — Conciones de Festis Domini (Paris, 1624): — Conciones super Omnes Beatce Virginis Festivitates (ibid. eod.): — Sermones de la Concepcion (Oviedo, 1622). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Escobar, Marina de[[@Headword:Escobar, Marina de]]

             a Spanish foundress of religious orders, was born at Valladolid, February 8, 1554. Although the daughter of rich parents, she refused marriage. She had visions very frequently, in which Sts. Gertrude, Brigitta, and Mathilda appeared to her. In 1582 a number of women desired to share her mode of living, and retired under her guidance to a monastery, to which she gave the name of Recollection of St. Bridget. She died June 9, 1633. Her Life, begun by P. Del Puente, was finished by P. Cachupin, the provincial of the Jesuits of Castile (Madrid, 1665). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Escobar, Pedro Suarez de[[@Headword:Escobar, Pedro Suarez de]]

             a Spanish theologian, was born at Medina; belonged to the order of the Hermits of St. Augustine, and went into Spanish America, preaching the Catholic faith in Mexico. He became successively first theologian of the cathedral of that city, praefect of the province, and bishop of Guadalaxara. He died at Tlaicapan in 1591, leaving, Escata del Paraiso Celestial: — Silva de la Perfeccion Evangelica: — Relox de Principes: — Sermones de los Evangelios de Todo et Ano (Madrid, 1601). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Escuara[[@Headword:Escuara]]

             SEE BASQUE SPANISH.

## Escurial, or Escorial[[@Headword:Escurial, or Escorial]]

             a city of Spain, twenty-four miles N.W. of Madrid, containing a celebrated convent palace generally called Escurial. The convent, built for 160 monks of the order of Jerome, was erected 1653-84, by Philip II, in fulfillment of a vow made at the battle of St. Quentin, fought on the anniversary of St. Lawrence. It is built in the form of a gridiron, in commemoration of the martyrdom of the saint, and the king's palace forms the handle. The buildings are 740 feet long, inclosing 20 courts, in which are 63 fountains; there are 17 cross paths, 890 doors, 1000 columns, 5000 windows, 9 towers surmounted by cupolas, a magnificent church with 48 altars in side chapels. The main altar is adorned by a statue of St. Lawrence in solid silver, weighing 450 pounds. Underneath is the costly burying vault of the king, of marble and jasper, The library of the convent contains some 4600 MSS., 1905 Arabic, and is the principal collection of Oriental history and  literature. Many of the MS. and other treasures were lost when the place was sacked by the French in 1808. Besides these, there are some 32,143 vols. of ancient authors, principally on history. The picture-gallery contains some 465 original paintings. A park surrounds the king's palace, or Casa del Principe. — Penny Cyclopedia; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:157.

## Esdaile, James, D.D[[@Headword:Esdaile, James, D.D]]

             a Scotch clergyman, became a tutor in the family of Mr. Christie, of Durie; was licensed to preach in June 1803; presented by the town council to the second charge at Montrose in June, and ordained August 14, 1805; promoted to the East Church, Perth, October 18, 1810; resigned his charge, which was accepted June 15, 1844, after securing a bond from the magistrates for an annuity of £200, having discharged the duties of his office with great ability and a high degree of acceptance and usefulness. He died January 8, 1854, aged eighty years. He published, Christian Theology (Edinb. 1823): — Apocraphy, for the Perthshire Bible Society (1826): —A Letter to the Reverend W.A. Thomson (Perth, eod.): — Lectures on the Shorter Catechism (ibid. 1829): — Civil and Religious Institutions Necessarily and Inseparably Connected (ibid. 1833): — The Voluntary Church Scheme without Foundation in Scripture, Reason, or Common- sense (ibid. 1834): 'The Spirit, Principles, and Reasoning of the Voluntaries Exposed (ibid. eod.), with various articles in the Edinburgh Encyclopaedia. See Fasti Eccles. Scoticanae, 2:619; 3:848.

## Esdraela[[@Headword:Esdraela]]

             SEE JEZREEL.

## Esdraelom[[@Headword:Esdraelom]]

             SEE ESDRAELON.

## Esdraelon[[@Headword:Esdraelon]]

             [from v.r. Ε᾿σδραηλών] (or rather Esdrelon, Ε᾿σδρηλών, Jdt 3:9; Jdt 4:6; but "Esdreloam," Ε᾿σδρηλών, Jdt 1:8; "Esdraelom," 7:3, where it is called "the great plain," as simply in Josephus everywhere, τὸ πεδίον μέγα), the name of a valley or large bottom, a Graecized form derived from the old royal city of Jezreel, which occupied a commanding site, near the eastern extremity of the plateau, on a spur of Mount Gilboa. "The great plain of Esdraelon" extends across central Palestine from the Mediterranean to the Jordan, separating the mountain ranges of Carmel and Samaria from those of Galilee. The western section of it is properly the plain of Accho or Acre ('Akka). The main body of the plain is a triangle. Its base on the east extends from Jenin (the ancient Engannim) to the foot of the hills below Nazareth, and is about 15 miles long; the north side, formed by the hills of Galilee, is about 12 miles long; and the south side, formed by the Samaria range, is about 18 miles. The apex on the west is a narrow pass opening into the plain of 'Akka. This vast expanse has a gently undulating surface — in spring all green with corn where cultivated, and rank weeds and grass where neglected — dotted with several low gray tells, and near the sides with a few olive groves. This is that valley of Megiddo (בַּקְעִת מְגַדּוֹ, so called from the city of Megiddo [q.v.], which stood on its southern border), where Barak triumphed, and where king Josiah was defeated and received his death-wound (Jdg 5:1-31; 2Ch 25:1-28). Probably, too, it was before the mind of the apostle John when he figuratively described the final conflict between the hosts of good and evil who were gathered to a place called Ar-mageddon (Α᾿ρμαγεδδών, from the Hebrews עָר מְגַדּוֹ, that is, the city ofMegiddo; Rev 16:16). The river  Kishon — "that ancient river" so fatal to the army of Sisera (Jdg 5:21) — drains the plain, and flows off through the pass westward to the Mediterranean.

From the base of this triangular plain three branch plains stretch out eastward, like fingers from a hand, divided by two bleak gray ridges — one bearing the familiar name of Mount Gilboa; the other called by Franks Little Hermon, but by natives Jebel ed-Duhy. The northern branch has Tabor on the one side, and Little Hermon on the other; into it the troops of Barak defiled from the heights of Tabor (Jdg 4:6); and on its opposite side are the sites of Nain and Endor. The southern branch lies between Jenin and Gilboa, terminating in a point among the hills to the eastward; it was across it that Ahaziah fled from Jehu (2Ki 9:27). The central branch is the richest as well as the most celebrated; it descends in green, fertile slopes to the banks of the Jordan, having Jezreel and Shunem on opposite sides at the western end, and Bethshean in its midst towards the east. This is the " valley of Jezreel" proper — the battle-field on which Gideon triumphed; and Saul and Jonathan were overthrown (Jdg 7:1 sq.; 1Sa 29:1-11; 1Sa 31:1-13). Indeed, a large part of the most sanguinary battles fought in Palestine in every age have been waged upon this eventful plain.

Two things are worthy of special notice in the plain of Esdraelon: 1. Its wonderful richness. — Its unbroken expanse of verdure contrasts strangely with the gray, bleak crowns of Gilboa, and the rugged ranges on the north and south. The gigantic thistles, the luxuriant grass, and the exuberance of the crops on the few cultivated spots, show the fertility of the soil. It was the frontier of Zebulon — "Rejoice, Zebulon, in thy going out" (Deu 33:18). But it was the special portion of Issachar — "And he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute" (Gen 49:15). 2. Its desolation. — If we except the eastern branches, there is not a single inhabited village on its whole surface, and not more than one sixth of its soil is cultivated. It is the home of the wild, wandering Bedouin, who scour its smooth turf on their fleet horses in search of plunder; and when hard pressed can speedily remove their tents and flocks beyond the Jordan, and beyond the reach of a weak government. It has always been insecure since history began. The old Canaanitish tribes drove victoriously through it in their iron chariots (Jdg 4:3; Jdg 4:7); the nomad Midianites and Amalekites —those "children of the East," who were "as  grasshoppers for multitude," Whose "camels were without number" — devoured its rich pastures (Jdg 6:1-6; Jdg 7:1); the Philistines long held it, establishing a stronghold at Bethshean (1Sa 29:1; 1Sa 31:10); and the Syrians frequently swept over it with their armies (1Ki 20:26; 2Ki 13:17). In its condition, thus exposed to every hasty incursion and to every shock of war, we read the fortunes of that tribe which for the sake of its richness consented to sink into a half-nomadic state — "Rejoice, O Issachar, in thy tents... . Issachar is a strong ass, crouching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant, and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute" (Gen 49:14-15; Deu 33:18). Once only did this tribe shake off the yoke-when under the heavy pressure of Sisera, "the chiefs of Issachar were with Deborah" (Jdg 5:15). Their exposed position and valuable possessions in this open plain made them anxious for the succession of David to the throne, as one under whose powerful protection they would enjoy that peace and rest which they loved; and they joined with their neighbors of Zebulun and Naphtali in sending to David presents of the richest productions of their rich country (1Ch 12:32; 1Ch 12:40). SEE ISSACHAR.

The whole borders of the plain of Esdraelon are dotted with places of high historic and sacred interest. Here we group them together, while referring the reader for details to the separate articles. On the east we have Endor, Nain, and Shunem, ranged round the base of the "hill of Moreh;" then Bethshean in the center of the plain where the "valley of Jezreel" opens towards ,the Jordan; then Gilboa, with the "well of Harod," and the ruins of Jezreel at its western base. On the south are Engannim, Taanach, and Megiddo. At the western apex, on the overhanging brow of Carmel, is the scene of Elijah's sacrifice; and close by the foot of the mountain below runs the Kishon, on whose banks the false prophets of Baal were slain. On the north, among places of less note, are Nazareth and Tabor. The modern Syrians have forgotten the ancient name as they have forgotten the ancient history of Esdraelon, and it is now known among them only as Merj ibn- 'Amer, "the Plain of the Son of Amer." A graphic sketch of Esdraelon is given in Stanley's Syr. and Pales. page 327 sq.; see also Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palestine, p. 851 sq.; Jowett, Christian Researches, page 146, 222; Robinson, Researches, new edition, 2:315-30, 366; 3:113 sq.; Thomson; L(rd and Book. 2:216 sq.; Walther, De Μεγαλωπεδιῳ Paulestinca (Lips. 1792). SEE JEZREEL.

## Esdras[[@Headword:Esdras]]

             (Εσδρας; Vulg. Esdras), the Graecized form, used throughout the Apocrypha (1Es 8:1; 1Es 8:3; 1Es 8:7-9; 1Es 8:19; 1Es 8:23; 1Es 8:25; 1Es 8:91-92; 1Es 8:96; 1Es 9:1; 1Es 9:7; 1Es 9:16; 1Es 9:39-40; 1Es 9:42; 1Es 9:45-46; 1Es 9:49; 2Es 1:1; 2Es 2:10; 2Es 2:33; 2Es 2:42; 2Es 6:10; 2Es 7:2; 2Es 7:25; 2Es 8:2; 2Es 8:19; 2Es 14:1; 2Es 14:38), of the name of the scribe EZRA SEE EZRA (q.v.). In several manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, as well as in all the printed editions anterior to the decree of the Council of Trent, and in many since that period, there will be found four books following each other, entitled the 1Jam 2:1-26 d, 3d, and 4th books of Ezra. The first two are the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the 3d and 4th form the subject of the articles below. They are the same which are called 1Jam 2:1-26 d Esdras in the English Authorized Version. For their use and relation to the canonical books see Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, 1710), page 47 sq.; Trendelenburg, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. 1:180 sq.; Eichhorn, Einleit. in d. Apocr. page 335 sq.; Herzfeld, Gesct. d. Israel, page 320 sq.; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 4:131 sq.; Keil, Einleit. in d. A. T. (ed. 1859), page 677 sq.; Davidson, Text of O.T. page 937 sq. SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Esdras (2)[[@Headword:Esdras (2)]]

             (Armen. Ezr or Ezras), catholicos or universal patriarch of Armenia, was born at Parhajlaguerd (in the province of Ararat). He was educated ῥfrom his childhood in the patriarchal palace, and after having filled the office of doorkeeper to St. Gregory the Illuminator, was elected to succeed the patriarch Christopher III, who died A.D. 628. A short time after that the emperor Heraclius, on his return from his expedition against Chosroes II, king of Persia, stopped at Garin, formerly called Theodosiopolis and now Erzerim, and undertook to unite the Armenian Church with the Greek. To this end he tried to conciliate the affections of the Armenians who had submitted to his rule. He gave them as governor-general a very popular man, the prince Mjej Cnouni; he treated the patriarch with distinction, and gave him a part of the city of Goghp.

At the order of the emperor, Esdras called together a council (A.D. 629) in the city of Garin, where a great number of bishops, doctors (vertabeds), and Armenian princes, likewise several Greek doctors, came together. During the conference of one month, the reunion of the two churches was decreed. The Council of  Chalcedon was recognized as the fourth, General Council, and it was concluded that the feast of the nativity of Jesus Christ is to be celebrated separately from that of his baptism. Most of the Perso-Armenian bishops adhered to the decisions of the council. Many of the theologians who had- attached themselves to the anathematized doctrines received Esdras very coldly when he came back to Tevin, the seat of his administration, and loudly disapproved his last acts. The chief of this party, John Mairagometsi, was ill-treated by order of the patriarch and sent into exile as a heretic. Esdras died in 689, of sorrow, it is said. He has been differently judged by his compatriots; the historians John VI Catholicos and Michael Asori (or the Syrian) call him ignorant, while the Armenians unitedly reverence him as a saint. During his time Armenia was ravaged by the Arabs, who massacred thirty thousand people in the city of Tevin. Nerses III, bishop of Daik, succeeded Esdras. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Esdras, First Book Of[[@Headword:Esdras, First Book Of]]

             This is the first of the apocryphal books in the English translations of the Bible (viz., Coverdale, Matthews, Taverner, the Geneva Bible, Cranmer's Bible, the Bishops' Bible, the A.V.), which follow Luther and the translators of the Zurich version, who were the first that separated the apocryphal from the canonical books. It must, however, be observed that Luther himself never translated the apocryphal portions of Ezra, because he regarded them as unworthy of a place among the apocrypha (see below, sec. 5).

I. Title and Position. — This book has different titles.. In some editions of the Sept. it is called ὁ ῾Ιερεύς, the Priest (Cod. Alex.), which is equivalent to Ezra, who, by way of eminence, was styled "the priest" or "the scribe,” in others it is designated ῎Εσδρας, Ezra, while in the Vatican and many modern editions of the Sept., as well as in the old Latin and the Syriac, it is called "the first book of Ezra," and accordingly is placed before the canonical Ezra, which is called "the second book of Ezra," because the history it gives is in part anterior to that given in the canonical Ezra. In the Vulg., again, where Ezra and Nehemiah are respectively styled the first and second book of Ezra, this apocryphal book, which comes immediately after  them, is called "the third book of Ezra." Others, again, call it "the second book of Ezra" (Isidore, Origg. 6:2), because Ezra and Nehemiah, which it follows, were together styled "the first book of Ezra,"' according to a very ancient practice among the Jews, who, by putting the two canonical books together, obtained the same number of books in the Scriptures as the letters in the Hebrew alphabet; and others call it Pseudo-Ezra, in contradistinction to the canonical Ezra. The name first Esdras given to it in the A.V. is taken from the Geneva Bible; the older English translations (viz. Coverdale's Bible, Matthew's Bible, the Bishops' Bible), as well as the sixth article of the Church of England (1571), following Luther and the Zurich Bible, call it the third Esdra, according to the Vulg. Since the Council of Trent (1546), this book has been removed from its old position to the end of the volume in the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Vulg. In the list of revisers or translators of the Bishops' Bible, sent by Archbishop Parker to Sir William Cecil, with the portion revised by each, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the apocryphal books of Esdras seem to to all comprised under the one title of ESDRAS. Barlow, bishop of Chichester, was the translator, as also of the books of Judith, Tobias, and Sapientia (Corresp. of Archbp. Parker, Park. Soc. page 335).

II. Design and Contents. — The object of this book, as far as its original portion is concerned (3:50-5:6), is to excite the heathen rulers of Judaea to liberality and kindness towards the Jews, by depicting the good example of Darius, from whom Zerubbabel obtained permission, by the aid of wisdom, to return with his brethren to Palestine, and to rebuild the city and the Temple. This design is worked out in the following attractive story. Darius, having given a sumptuous feast to all his subjects in the second year of his reign, retired to rest (3:1-3); when asleep, his three bodyguards, Zerubbabel being one of them, proposed each to write a maxim stating what he thought was the most powerful thing, in the hope that the king would reward the wisest writer (verses 4-9). Accordingly, they all wrote: one said "Wine is the most powerful;" the other, "A king is the most powerful;" while Zerubbabel wrote, "Women are very powerful, but truth conquers all." The slips containing these maxims were put under the king's pillow, and were given to him when he awoke (verses 10-12). When he had read them he immediately sent for all his magnates, and, having read these maxims before them (verses 13-15), called upon the three youths to explain their sayings (verses 16-17). The first spoke elaborately about the great power which wine manifests in different ways (verses 18-24); the second  descanted upon the unlimited power of royalty, illustrating it by various examples (verses 1-12); while Zerubbabel discoursed upon the mighty influence of women, frequently contravening the power of wine and monarchs, and then burst forth in praise of truth so eloquently, that all present exclaimed, "Great is truth, and mightiest above all things" (verses 13-26). Darius then offered to Zerubbabel anything he should ask (verse 42), whereupon he reminded the king of his vow to rebuild Jerusalem and return the sacred vessels when he ascended the throne (verses 43-47). The king stood up, kissed Zerubbabel, wrote to all officials to convey him and all his brethren to Palestine, and to supply all the necessary materials for the rebuilding of the Temple (verses 48-63).

This is preceded and followed by descriptions of events which present the whole as one continuous narrative, relating in historical order the restoration of the Temple-service first under Josiah, then under Zerubbabel, and finally under Ezra, and which are compiled from the records contained in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and 'Nehemiah', as follows:

1. Chapter 1 corresponds to 2Ch 35:1-27; 2Ch 36:1-23, giving an account of Josiah's magnificent celebration of the. Passover-feast is the eighteenth month of his reign, and continuing the history till the Babylonien captivity.

2. Chapter 2:1-15, corresponds to Ezr 1:1-11, recording the return of the Jews from Babylon under the guidance of Sana bassarin the reign of Cyrus.

3. Chapter 2:16-30, corresponds to Ezr 4:7-24. giving an account of Artaxerxes' prohibition to build the Temple till the second year of Darius.

4. Chapter 3:50-5:6, contains the original piece.

5. Chapter 5:7-73, corresponds to Ezr 2:1-70; Ezr 3:1-13; Ezr 4:1-5, giving a list of the persons who returned with Zerubbabel, describing the commencement of the building of the Temple and the obstacles whereby it was interrupted "for the space of two years" until the reign of Darius.

6. Chapter 6:50-7:15, corresponds to Ezra 5:50-6:22, giving an account of the building of the Temple by Zerubbabel under Darius, of its. completion in the sixth year of this monarch's reign, and of the commencement of the Temple service.

7. Chapter 8:1-9:36, corresponds to Ezr 7:1-28; Ezr 8:1-36; Ezr 9:1-15; Ezr 10:1-44, describing the return of Ezra with his colony, and the putting away of the strange wives. Chapter 9:37-55 corresponds to Neh 7:23-73; Neh 8:1-12, giving an account of Ezra's public reading of the law. The original piece around which all this clusters has evidently been the cause of this transposition and remodeling of the narrative contained in the canonical books. Having assumed that Zerubbabel returned to Jerusalem with a portion of his brethren in the second year of Darius, the compiler naturally placed Ezr 2:1-70; Ezr 3:1-13; Ezr 4:1-5, which gives the list of those that returned, after the original piece, for it belongs to Zerubbabel's time, according to 2:2, and the original piece he placed after Ezr 4:7-24, because Ezra (Ezr 4:24) led him to suppose that Artaxerxes reigned before Darius. Hence a twofold design in the compiler is discernible. One was to introduce and give scriptural sanction to the legend about Zerubbabel, which may or may not have a historical base, and may have existed as a separate work; the other was to explain the great obscurities of the book of Ezra, and to present the narrative, as the author understood it, in historical order, in which. however, he has signally failed. For, not to advert t innamerable other contradictions, the introducing of the opposition of the heathen, as offered to Zerubbabel after he had been sent to Jerusalem in such triumph by Darius, and the describing of that opposition as lasting "until the reign of Darius" (5:73), and as put down by an appeal to the decree of Cyrus, is such a palpable inconsistency as is alone sufficient quite to discredit the authority of the book. It even induces the suspicion that it is a farrago made up of scraps by several different hands. At all events, attempts to reconcile the different portions with each other, or with Scripture, is lost labor.

III. Unity and Original Language. — The above analysis of its contents shows that the book gives us a consecutive history de templi restitutione, as the old Latin tersely expresses it. It is, however, not complete in its present state, as is evident from the abrupt manner in which it concludes with Neh 8:12. We may therefore legitimately presume that the compiler intended to add Neh 8:13-18, and perhaps also chapter 9. Josephus, who follows the history given in this book, continues to speak of the death of Ezra (Ant. 11:5, 5), from which it may be concluded that it originally formed part of this narrative. More venturous are the opinions of Zunz, that Neh 1:1-11; Neh 2:1-20; Neh 3:1-32; Neh 4:1-23; Neh 5:1-19; Neh 6:1-19; Neh 7:1-73 originally belonged to this book (Die  Gottesdienstl. Vortriige, page 29), and of Eichhorn, that 2Ch 34:1-33 followed the abrupt breaking off (Einleitung in d. Apokr. page 345 sq.).

As to its original language, this compilation is undoubtedly made directly from the Hebrew, and not from other parts of the present Sept. This is evident from the rendering of לַבְטֵי הָעָםby ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ λαοῦ, reading לַפְטֵי (compare 1:11 with 2Ch 34:12), and of וְכֹל כְּלֵי מִחֲמִדֶּיהָ by καὶ συνετέλεσαν πάντα τὰ ἔνδοξα αὐτῆς, reading וְכָלוּ כֹל (comp. 1:53 with 2Ch 36:19; see also 2:7-9 with Ezr 1:4; Ezr 1:6; Ezr 2:17 with Ezr 4:9; Ezr 2:16 with Ezr 4:7; Ezr 2:24 with Ezr 4:16; Ezr 9:10 with Ezr 10:4), since these can only be accounted for on the supposition that the book was compiled and translated from the Hebrew. The translator, however, did not aim so much to be literal as to produce a version compatible with the Greek idiom. Hence he sometimes abbreviated the Hebrew (comp. 1:10 with 2Ch 35:10-12; 2Ch 2:15-16 with Ezr 4:7-11; Ezr 5:7 with Ezr 5:6-7; Ezr 6:4 with Ezr 5:3-4; Ezr 8:6 with Ezr 7:6; Ezr 8:14 with Ezr 7:17; Ezr 8:20 with Ezr 7:22), and sometimes tried to make it more intelligible by adding some words (comp. 1:56 with 2Ch 26:20; 2Ch 2:5 with Ezr 1:3; Ezr 2:9 with Ezr 1:4; Ezr 2:16 with Ezr 4:6; Ezr 2:18 with Ezra 4:12; 5:40 with Ezra 2:63; 5:47 with Ezra 3:1; 5:52 with Ezra 3:5; 5:66 with Ezra 4:1; 6:41 with Ezr 2:64; Ezr 6:8 with Ezr 4:14; Ezr 6:9 with Ezr 5:8; Ezr 7:9 with Ezr 6:18). The original portion, too, is a Palestinian production, embellished to suit the Alexandrian taste. The Hebrew forms of it may be seen in Josephus (Ant. 11:3, 1) and Josippon ben-Gorion (1, c. 6, page 47 sq., ed. Breithaupt).

IV. Author and Date. — As regards the time and place when the compilation was made, the original portion is that which alone affords much clew. This seems to indicate that the writer was thoroughly conversant with Hebrew, even if he did not write the book in that language. He was well acquainted, too, with the books of Esther and Daniel (1Es 3:1-2 sq.), and other books of Scripture (ib. 20, 21, 39, 41, etc., and 45 compared with Psa 137:7). But that he did not live under the Persian kings, and was not contemporary with the events narrated, appears from the undiscriminating way in which he uses promiscuously the phrase Medes and Persians, or Persians and Medes, according as he happened to be imitating the language of Daniel or of the book of Esther. The allusion in 4:23 to "sailing upon the sea and upon the rivers," for the  purpose of "robbing and stealing," seems to indicate a residence in Egypt, and an acquaintance with the lawlessness of Greek pirates there acquired. The phraseology of 5:73 savors also strongly of Greek rather than Hebrew. If, however, as seems very probable, the legend of Zerubbabel appeared first as a separate piece, and was afterwards incorporated into the narrative made up from the book of Ezra, this Greek sentence from ch. v would not prove anything as to the language in which the original legend was written. The expressions in 4:40, "She is the strength, kingdom, power, and majesty of all ages," is very like the doxology found in some copies of the Lord's Prayer, and retained by us, "Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory forever." But Lightfoot says that the Jews in the Temple service, instead of saying Amen, used this antiphon, Blessed be the Name of the Glory of His Kingdom forever and ever (Works, 6:427). Thus the resemblance may be accounted for by their being both taken from a common source.

Whoever the author was, he seems to have lived in Palestine (comp. 5:47), and certainly was a master of Greek, as is evident from his superior style; which resembles that of Symmachus, and from his successfully turning the Hebraisms into good Greek (comp. 8:5 with Ezr 8:17; Ezr 9:13 with Ezr 10:14). The compiler must have lived at least a century before Christ, since Josephus follows his narrative of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ant. 11:5; 11:45). The book must therefore have existed for some time, and have acquired great reputation and authority, to make the Jewish historian prefer its description of those days to that of the canonical books.

V. Canonicity and Importance. — This book was never included in the Hebrew canon, nor is it to be found in the catalogues of the Hebrew Scriptures given by the early fathers, e.g. Melito, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, the Council of Laodicea, and many others; and St. Jerome emphatically warns us "not to take pleasure in the dreams of the 3d and 4th apocryphal books of Ezra" (Pref. in Esdr. et Nechum.). The councils of Florence (1438) and Trent (1546) decided against its canonicity. The reason of this last exclusion seems to be that the Tridentine fathers were not aware that it existed in Greek; for it is not in the Complutensian edition (1515), nor in the Biblia Regia. Vatablus (1540) had never seen a Greek copy, and, in the preface to the apocryphal books, speaks of it as only existing in some MSS. and printed Latin Bibles. Baduel also, a French Protestant divine  (Bibl. Crit.) (about 1550), says that he knew of no one who had ever seen a Greek copy. For this reason it seems it was excluded from the Canon, though it has certainly quite as good a title to be admitted as Tobit, Judith, etc. It has indeed been stated (Bp. Marsh, Compar. View. ap. Soames, Hist. of Ref. 2:608) that the Council of Trent, in, excluding the two books of Esdras, followed Augustine's Canon; but this is not so. Augustine (de Doctr. Christ. lib. 2:13) distinctly mentions among the libri canonici Esdrce duo; and that one of these was our 1st Esdras is manifest from the quotation from it given in his De Civit. Del. Hence it isalso sure that it was included among those pronounced as canonical by the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397 or 419, where the same title is given, Esdrce lib i duo: here it is to be noticed by the way that Augustine and the Council of Carthage use the term canonical in a much broader sense than we do; and that the manifest ground of considering them canonical in any sense is their being found in the Greek copies of the Sept. in use at that time. Luther would not even translate it, "because there is nothing in it which is not better said by Esop in his Fables, or even in much more trivial books" (Vorrede auf den Baruch); the version given in the later editions of Luther's Bible is the work of Daniel Cramer, and the Protestant Church generally has treated it with great contempt, because it contradicts the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah. On the other hand, Josephus, as we have seen, regards it as a great authority, and it was treated with great reverence by the Greek and Latin fathers. St. Augustine mentions it among the canonical books (De Doctr. Christ. lib. 2:13), and quotes the famous passage, "Truth is the strongest" (chapter 3:12), as Ezra's prophecy respecting Christ (De Civitat. Dei, 18:16); the same sentence is quoted as Scripture by Cyprian (Epist. 74; comp. also Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 1; Athanasius, Orat. 3, cont. Arianos; Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph.). Modern criticism has justly taken the middle course between treating it with contempt and regarding it as canonical, and has recognized in it an important auxiliary to the settling of the text, and to the adjusting of the facts recorded in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, since this book has evidently been made from a different recension of the Hebrew, and has some readings and divisions preferable to those contained in the canonical books (comp. 5:9 with Ezr 2:12; Ezr 9:12 with Ezra 10:6; 9:16 with Ezr 10:16). Both Bertheau in his commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah (Exeget. Handb. part 18), and Fritzsche in his commentary on the apocryphal Ezra (Exeget. Handb. z. d. Apoir. part 1), have shown the  important services which the canonical and uncanonical records may render to each other.

VI. There are no separate commentaries on the first book of Esdras, and the literature pertaining to it is given under foregoing heads.

## Esdras, Second Book Of[[@Headword:Esdras, Second Book Of]]

             i.e., the second in the order of the apocryphal books as given in the English translations of the Bible, which follow the Zurich Bible.

I. Title and Position. — The original designation of this book, by which it is appropriately called in the Greek Church, is Α᾿ποκάλυψις Ε᾿σδρᾶ or προφητεία Ε᾿σδρᾶ, the Revelation or prophecy of Ezra (comp. Nicephorus, apud Fabric. Cod. Pseud. V.T. 2:176; Cod. Apocr. N.T. 1:951 sq.; Montfaucon, Biblioth. Coislin. page 194). The designation "1 Ezra," which it has in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, arises from the fact that it was placed before the canonical Ezra because it begins a little earlier (i.e., B.C. 558) than the Hebrew Ezra. It is called "2 Ezra" in the Latin version because it follows the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah, which were together styled the first Ezra, and it is still more generally denominated "4 Ezra," a name given to it by St. Jerome (comp. Praef. in Esdr. et Nechen.), because it is in most of the Latin MSS. the fourth of the books which go by the name of Ezra, and which are placed in the following order: 1 Ezra, i.e. the canonical Ezr 2:1-70 Ezra, i.e., Neh 3:1-32 Ezra, i.e., 1 apocryphal Ezr 4:1-24 Ezra, i.e., this book. The name "4 Ezra" is retained by Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, Matthew's Bible, Cranmer's Bible, the Bishops' Bible, and in the 6th article of the Church of England (1571). The name "2 Esdras," given to it in the A.V., is taken from the Geneva Bible, and is the title given to it by the author himself (2Es 1:1). This book, like the former one, is placed at the end of the Vulgate in the Sixtine and Clementine editions, because it has been excluded from the Canon by the Council of Trent.

II. Design and Plan. — The object of this book was to comfort the chosen people of God who were suffering under the grinding oppression of the heathen, by assuring them that the Lord has appointed a time of deliverance when the oppressors shall be judged, and the ten tribes of Israel, in union with their brethren, shall return to the Holy Land to enjoy a glorious kingdom which shall be established in the days of the Messiah.  This is gradually developed in an introduction, and Seven angelic revelations, or visions, in which Ezra is instructed in the mysteries of the moral world, as follows:

1. Introduction (3:1-36, A.V.; or 1:1-36, Ethiopic Vers.). — When on his couch in Babylon, in the 30th year after the destruction of Jerusalem (B.C. 558), mourning over the deplorable fate of his brethren (2Es 1:1-3), and recounting the dealings of God with mankind generally (2Es 1:4-12), and with his chosen people in particular, in consequence of their sinful nature inherited from Adam (2Es 1:13-22), for which the Temple was destroyed and the city delivered into the hands of Gentiles (2Es 1:23-27), Ezra asked God why the heathen sinners of Babylon are spared, whilst the people of his covenant are so unsparingly punished (2Es 1:28-36)?

2. First Revelation (4:50-5:15, A.V.; 2:1-3:23, Eth.). — In answer to this, the angel Uriel is sent, who, after censuring the presumptuousness of a short-sighted man in trying to fathom the unsearchable dealings of the Most High, when he cannot understand the things below (2Es 1:1-21), and after Ezra's earnest reiteration of the question (2Es 1:22-25), says that sin has not yet reached its climax (2Es 1:26-31), enumerates the signs whereby the fullness of that time will be distinguished, and promises to reveal to him still greater things if he will continue to pray and fast seven days (2Es 1:32-40; 2Es 2:1-48; 2Es 3:1-36; 2Es 4:1-52; 2Es 5:1-15).

3. Second Revelation (5:16-6:34, A.V.; 3:24-4:37, Eth.). — Having fasted seven days according to the command of the angel, and against the advice of the prince of the Jews (2Es 1:16-21), Ezra again appeals to God, asking why he does not punish his sinful people himself rather than give them over to the heathen (2Es 1:22-30)? Uriel, who appears a second time, after referring again to the inscrutable judgments of God (2Es 1:31-40), reveals to Ezra, according to promise, more distinctly what shall be the signs of the latter days, saying that with Esau [the Idumaeans] the present world will terminate, and the world to come will begin with Jacob (6:1-10), whereupon the day of judgment will follow, and be announced by the blast of a trumpet (2Es 1:11-25); Enoch and Elias, the forerunners of the Messiah, shall appear (2Es 1:26), and sin and corruption will be destroyed (2Es 1:27-28); tells him to be comforted, patient, and resigned, and that he shall hear something more if he will fast again seven days (2Es 1:29-34).

4. Third Revelation (6:35-9:25, A.V.; 4:38-9:27, Eth.). — The fasting being over, Ezra again appeals to God, to know how it is that his chosen people for whom this wonderful world was created, are deprived of their inheritance (2Es 1:35-40)? Whereupon Uriel appears a third time, tells him that it is because of their sin (7:1-25), describes the death of the Messiah, the resurrection, the judgment, and the things which will-come to pass, concluding with an admonition to Ezra to fast and pray again (2Es 1:26-40; 2Es 2:1-48; 2Es 3:1-36; 2Es 4:1-52; 2Es 5:1-56; 2Es 6:1-59; 2Es 7:1-70; 2Es 8:1-63; 2Es 9:1-25).

5. First Vision (9:26-10:59, A.V.; 9:28-10:74, Eth.). — After appealing again to God in behalf of his brethren (2Es 1:26-37), Ezra suddenly saw a woman in the deepest mourning for her only son, who had been born to her after being married thirty years, and who died on the day of his nuptials (verses 38-10:l), and she would not be comforted (2Es 1:2-4). He rebuked her for being so disconsolate about the loss of one son, when Sion was bereaved of all her children (2Es 1:2-14), and recommended her to submit to the dealings of God (2Es 1:15-24); her face speedily shone very brightly, and she disappeared (2Es 1:25-27); whereupon Uriel appeared to Ezra, and told him that the woman is Sion, the thirty years of her barrenness are "the thirty years wherein no sacrifice was offered in her," her first-born is the Temple built by Solomon, his death on the day of his marriage is the destruction of Jerusalem, and the extraordinary brightness of the mother's face is the future glory of Sion (2Es 1:28-40).

6. Second Vision (11:50-12:51, A.V.; 11:50-12:58, Eth.). — Ezra in a dream had a revelation of the latter days under the figure of an eagle coming up from the sea with three heads and twelve wings, which afterwards produced eight smaller wings spread over all things, and reigning over all the world (2Es 1:1-7). These wings, beginning from the right side, according to a voice which proceeded from the body of the eagle, reigned successively over all the earth, and perished, so that there remained six small wings (2Es 1:8-23), which, however, in attempting to rule, also perished, and the three heads only were left on the eagle's body (2Es 1:24-31). These now reigned, one after the other, and perished, so that a single head remained (2Es 1:32-35). A lion (the Messiah) declared to the eagle that all his wings and heads were destroyed because he ruled the earth wickedly (2Es 1:36-40); then the body and whatever was left of the eagle were bumnt in fire (12:1, 2). Ezra awoke, and having prayed for the interpretation of this vision (2Es 1:3-9), was told by the angel that the  eagle was the fourth monarchy which Daniel saw, and was admonished again to fast and pray (2Es 1:10-40).

7. Third Vision (13:1-58, A.V.; 13:1-64, Eth.). — Ezra then had another dream, in which he saw a mighty spirit (πνεῦμα) arise from the sea resembling a man, who destroyed all his enemies with the blast of his mouth, and gathered around him large multitudes (2Es 1:1-13). On awaking, Ezra was told by the angel that it was the Messiah, who shall gather together the ten tribes, lead them to their holy land, and give them Sion "prepared and builded for them" (2Es 1:14-40).

8. Conclusion (14:1-48, A.V.; 14:1-52, Eth.).Three days later, the voice which spoke to Moses in the bush tells Ezra that the latter days are at hand (2Es 1:1-12), bids him set his house in order, reprove those that are living (2Es 1:13-18), and write down, for the benefit of those who are not yet born, ninety-four books, i.e., the twenty-four inspired books of the O.T. which have been burnt, and seventy books of divine mysteries, which he duly did with the help of scribes (2Es 1:19-40), the recovered Scriptures to be communicated to all, and the Cabbalistic books only to the sages (verses 45-48).

The chief characteristics of the "three-headed eagle," which refer apparently to historic details, are 'twelve feathered wings" (duodecim aloe pennarum), "eight counter-feathers"(contrarie pennae),and "three heads;" but, though the writer expressly interprets these of kings (12:14, 20) and "kingdoms" (12:23), he is, perhaps intentionally, so obscure in his allusions that the interpretation only increases the difficulties of the vision itself. One point only may be considered certain — the eagle can typify no other empire than Rome. Notwithstanding the identification of the eagle with the fourth empire of Daniel (comp. Barnabas, Epist. page 4), it is impossible to suppose that it represents the Greek kingdom (Hilgenfeld; compare Volkmar, Dias vierte Buch Esra, page 36 sq.). The power of the Ptolemies could scarcely have been described in language which may be rightly applied to Rome (11:2, 6, 40); and the succession of kings quoted by Hilgenfeld to represent "the twelve wings," preserves only a faint resemblance to the imagery of the vision. But when it is established that the interpretation of the vision is to be sought in the history of Rome, the chief difficulties of the problem begin. The second wing (i.e., king) rules twice as long as the other (11:17). This fact seems to point to Octavianus and the line of the Caesars; but thus the line of " twelve" leads to no plausible  conclusion. If it is supposed to close with Trajan (Licke, 1st ed.), the "three heads" receive no satisfactory explanation. If, again, the "three heads" represent the three Flavii, then "the twelve" must be composed of the nine Caesars (Jul. Caesar-Vitellius) and the three pretenders, Piso, Vindex, and Nymphidius (Gfrorer), who could scarcely have been brought within the range of a Jewish Apocalypse. Volkmar proposes a new interpretation, by which two wings are to represent one king, and argues that this symbol was chosen in order to conceal better from strange eyes the revelation of the seer. The twelve wings thus represent the six Caesars (Caesar — Nero); the eight "counter-feathers," the usurping emperors Galba, Otho,Vitellus, and Nerva; and the three heads the three Flavii. This hypothesis offers many striking coincidences with the text, but at the same time it is directly opposed to the form of interpretation given by Ezra (12:14, regnabunt ... duodecim reges; 5:18, octo reges), and Volkmar's hypothesis that the twelve and eight were marked in the original MS. in some way so as to suggest the notion of division, is extremely improbable. Van der Vlis and Liicke, in his later edition, regard the twelve kings as only generally symbolic of the Roman power; and while they identify the three heads! with the triumvirs, they seek no explanation of the other details. All is evidently as yet vague and uncertain, and will probably remain so till some clearer light can be thrown upon Jewish thought and history during the critical period B.C. 100-A.D. 100.

In tone and character, the Apocalypse of Ezra offers a striking contrast to that of Enoch (q.v.). Triumphant anticipations are overshadowed by gloomy forebodings of the destiny of the world. 'The idea of victory is lost in that of revenge. Future blessedness is reserved only for "a very few" (7:70; 8:1, 3, 5255; 7:1-13). The great question is, "not how the ungodly shall be punished, but how the righteous shall be saved, for whom the world is created" (9:13). The "woes of Messiah" are described with a terrible minuteness which approaches the despairing traditions of the Talmud (5; 14:10 sq.; 9:3 sq.); and after a reign of 400 years (7:28-35; the clause is wanting in Eth., 5:29), "Christ," it is said, "my Son, shall die (Arab. omits), and all men that have breath; and the world shall be turned into the old silence seven days, like as in the first beginning, and no man shall remain" (7:29). Then shall follow the resurrection and the judgment, "the end of this time and the beginning of immortality" (7:43). In other points the doctrine of the book offers curious approximations to that of Paul, as the imagery does to that of the Apocalypse (e.g. 2Es 13:43; 2Es 5:4). The relation of "the first Adam" to his sinful posterity, and the operation of the law (3:20 sq.; 7:48; 9:36); the transitoriness of the world (4:26); the eternal counsels of God (vi, sq.); his providence (7:11) and longsuffering (7:64); his sanctification of his people "from the beginning" (9:8), and their peculiar and lasting privileges (6:59), are plainly stated; and, on the other hand, the efficacy of good works (8:33), in conjunction with faith (9:7), is no less clearly affirmed.

III. Unity and Original Language. — For along time this book of Ezra was known only by an old Latin version, which is preserved in some MSS. of the Vulgate. This version was used by Ambrose, and, like the other parts of the Vetus Latina, is probably older than the time of Tertullian. It is published in Walton's Polyglot, volume 4. An Arabic text was discovered by Mr. Gregory, about the middle of the 17th century, in two Bodleian MSS., and an English version made from this by Simon Ockley was inserted by Whiston in the last volume of his Primitive Christianity (London, 1711). Fabricius added the various readings of the Arabic text to his edition of the Latin in 1723 (Cod. Pseudep. V.T. 2:174 sq.). An Ethiopic text was published by [archbishop] Laurence, with English and Latin translations (Primi Esrae libri, versio Ethiopica ... Latine Angliceque reddita, Oxon. 1820); likewise from a Bodleian MS. which had remained wholly disregarded, though quoted by Ludolf in his dictionary. The Latin translation has been reprinted by Gfrörer, with the various readings of the Latin and Arabic (Pref. Pseudep. Stuttg. 1840, page 66 sq.); but the original Arabic text has not yet been published.

The three versions were all made directly from a Greek text. This is evidently the case with regard to the Latin (Lücke, Versuch einer vollst. Einitung, 1:149) and the Ethiopic (Van der Vlis, Disputatio; critica de Ezrae lib. apocr. page 75 sq.), and apparently so with regard to the Arabic. A clear trace of a Greek text occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas (c. 12 =2 Ezr 5:5), but the other supposed references in the apostolic fathers are very uncertain (e.g. Clem. 1:20; Herm. Past. 1:1, 3, etc.). The next witness to the Greek text is Clement of Alexandria, who expressly quotes the book as the work of "the prophet Ezra" (Strom. 3, 16, § 100). A question, however, has been raised whether the Greek text was not itself a translation from the Hebrew (Bretschneider, in Henke's Mus. 3:478 sq., ap. Lucke 1.c.); but the arguments from language, by which the hypothesis of a Hebrew (Aramaic) original is supported, are wholly unsatisfactory; and, in default of direct evidence to the contrary, it must be supposed that the  book was composed in Greek. This conclusion is farther strengthened by its internal character, which points to Egypt as the place of its composition. The idea of a Hebrew original has now been pretty generally given up by scholars, despite the positive assertion of Galatinus (De Arcanis Catholice Veritatis) that a copy of it was reported to exist among the Jews at Constantinople in his day, and it is commonly believed that it was written in Greek. Although the Greek is lost, yet there can be no doubt that the Old Latin version, through which alone this book has been known to us till lately, was a translation from that language. This is evident from the fact that it imitates the Greek idiom in making the adjective in the comparative degree govern a genitive case, and not, as in Latin, an ablative, and introduces other Gracisms, which are barbarous, in the version (comp. 2:24; 5:13, 26, 39; 6:25, 31, 46, 57; 7:5; 8:7, 8, 38, 44; 9:14; 11:42). This is, moreover, corroborated by the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, as well as the quotation from this book in the fathers (see below, sect. 5), which prove the very early existence of it in Greek. It is, however, equally certain that many of the things contained in this book are of Palestinian origin, and are still to be found in Hebrew or Aramaic dispersed through the Talmud and Midrashim.

The common Latin text, which is followed in the English version, contains two important interpolations (chapter 1, 2; 15, 16) which are not found in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, and are separated from the genuine Apocalypse in the best Latin MSS. Both of these passages are evidently of Christian origin: they contain traces of the use of the Christian Scriptures (e.g. 1:30, 33, 37; 2:13, 26, 45 sq.; 15:8, 35; 16:54), and: still more they are pervaded by an anti-Jewish spirit. Thus, in the opening chapter, Ezra is commanded to reprove the people of Israel for their continual rebellions (1:1-23), in consequence of which God threatens to cast them off (1:24- 32), and to "give their houses to a people that shall come." But, in spite of their desertion, God offers once more to receive them (2:1-32). The offer is rejected (2:33), and the heathen are called. Then Ezra sees "the Son of God" standing in the midst of a great multitude "wearing crowns and bearing palms in their hands" in token of their victorious confession of the truth. The last two chapters (15, 16) are different in character. They contain a stern prophecy of the woes which shall come upon Egypt, Babylon, Aria, and Syria, and upon the whole earth, with an exhortation to the chosen to guard their faith in the midst of all the trials with which they shall be visited (? the Decian persecution; comp. Lucke, page 186 sq.).  Another smaller interpolation occurs in the Latin version in 7:28, where filius meus Jesus answers to "My Messiah" in the Ethiopic, and to "My Son Messiah" in the Arabic (comp. Lucke, page 170, n., sq.). On the other hand, a long passage occurs in the Ethiopic and Arabic versions after 7:35 which is not found in the Latin (Ethiop. c. 6), though it bears all the marks of genuineness, and was known to Ambrose (De bono mort. 10, 11). In this case the omission was probably due to dogmatic causes. The chapter contains a strange description of the intermediate state of souls, and ends with a peremptory denial of the efficacy of human intercession after death. Vigilantius appealed to the passage in support of his views, and called down upon himself by this the severe reproof of Jerome (Lib. c. Vigil. c. 7). This circumstance, combined with the Jewish complexion of the narrative, may have led to its rejection in later times (comp. Lücke, page 155 sq.).

Despite the arbitrary division into chapters in our English version which sometimes interrupts a vision in the middle of a sentence, few readers will fail to see the intimate connection and the beautiful adjustment of these angelic revelations, and how every one of them forms an essential part in leading us farther and farther till we reach the climax of the apocalypse. It is owing to this remarkable unity which the whole work displays that the numerous interpolations made for dogmatic purposes have so easily been detected.

IV. Author and Date. — The greatest divergency of opinion prevails on this subject. The author has successively been described as a true prophet who lived B.C. 336; an impostor who flourished A.D. 160; a Jew, a Christian, a converted Jew, and as a Montanist. The whole complexion of the book, however, incontestably shows that the author of it was a Jew. His personating Ezra, the contempt and vengeance which he breathes against the Gentiles (6:50, 57), the intense love he manifests for the Jews, who alone know the Lord and keep his precepts (3:30-36), declaring that for them alone was this world created (4:63, 66; 6:55, 59; 7:10, 11), and reserving all the blessings of salvation for them (7:1-13); his view of righteousness, which consists in doing the works of the law, and that the righteous are justified and rewarded for their good works (8:33, 36); the purport of his questions, referring exclusively to the interests of this people (4:35; 6:59); the Hagadic legends about the Behemoth and Leviathan which are reserved for the great Messianic feast (6:49-52); the ten tribes (13:39-47); the restoration of the Scriptures and the writing of cabbalistic  books for the sages or rabbins of Israel (14:20-22, 31-47) — all this proves beyond doubt that the writer was a thorough Hebrew. Chapters 1, 2, 15, and 16, which contain allusions to the N.T. (compare 1:30 with Matthew 33:37-39; 2:11 with Luk 16:9; Luk 2:12 with Rev 22:2; Rev 15:8 with Revelation 6:10; 16:29 with Matthew 34:10; 16:42-44 with 1Co 7:29), and especially the anti-Jewish spirit by which they are pervaded, as well as the name of Jesus in chapter 8:28, which have been the cause why some have maintained that this book is the production of a Christian, are now generally acknowledged to be later interpolations made by some Christian. (See above, sect. 3.)

As to the date of the book, the limits within which opinions vary are, narrower than in the case of the book of Enoch. Licke (Versuch einervollst. Einl. etc., ed. 2, 1:209) places it in the time of Caesar; Van der Vlis (Disput. crit. 1..) shortly after the death of Caesar. Laurence (1.c.) brings it down somewhat lower, to B.C. 28-25, and Hilgenfeld (Jud. Apokr. page 221) agrees with this conclusion, though he arrives at it by very different reasoning. On the other hand, Gfrorer (Jahrh. d. Heils, 1:69 sq.) assigns the book to the time of Domitian, and in this he is followed by Wieseler and by Bauer (Lucke, page 189 sq.), while Lücke, in his first edition, had regarded it as the work of a Hellenist of the time of Trajan. The interpretation of the details of the vision of the eagle, which furnishes the chief data for determining the time of its composition, is extremely uncertain, from the difficulty of regarding the history of the period from the point of view of the author; and this difficulty is increased by the allusion to the desolation of Jerusalem, which may be merely suggested by the circumstances of Ezra, the imaginary author; or, on the contrary, the last destruction of Jerusalem may have suggested Ezra as the medium of the new revelation. (Comp. Fabricius, Cod. Pseudep. 2, page 189 sq., and Lucke, page 187, n., sq., for a summary of the earlier opinions on the composition of the book.) But no two expositors agree in their explanation of the vision in chapter 11 and 12, and every one finds in the "three heads," the "twelve feathered wings," and the "eight counter-feathers" such emperors, kings, and demagogues as will square with his preconceived notions as to what they shall describe. So, for instance, the learned Whiston makes the three heads to mean the kingdom of France since Francis the Great, A.D. 1515; of Spain since Ferdinand, the author of the Inquisition, A.D. 1468; and the house of Austria since the emperor Albert, A.D. 1438 — all of whom persecuted the Protestants (Authen. Records,  1:81). The safest and most satisfactory data for determining its age are — 1. The quotations from it in the epistle of St. Barnabas (chapter 12 with 2 Ezr 5:3) and in Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. 3:16), showing beyond doubt that the book was well known at the commencement of the Christian sera, and must therefore have been written some time before to have obtained such general currency and acceptance; and, 2. The minute description which the writer gives of the pre-existence and death of the Messiah (7:29; 14:7), such as no Jew would have given at the very outset of Christianity, to which we have traced the book, when these very points were the stumbling-block to the ancient people, and formed the points of contest between Judaism and Christianity, thus showing that it must have been written before Christ. We may therefore safely assign it to about B.C. 50.

But, while the date of the book must be left undetermined, there can be no doubt that it is a genuine product of Jewish thought. Weisse (Evangelienfrage, page 222) alone dissents on this point from the unanimous judgment of recent scholars (Hilgenfeld, page 190 sq.); and the contrast between the tone and style of the Christian interpolations and the remainder of the book is in itself sufficient to prove the fact. The Apocalypse was probably written in Egypt; the opening and closing chapters certainly were.

V. Canonicity and Importance. — By many of the fathers this book was undoubtedly regarded as canonical. The quotation from it in the epistle of Barnabas is described as the saying of a prophet (chapter 12); the quotation by Clemens Alexandrinus is introduced in the same manner (῎Εσδρας ὁ προφήτης λέγει, Strom. 3:16); and Ambrose speaks of it as containing divine revelations (De Bono Mortis, 10, 11). The famous story about Ezra being inspired to write again the law, which was burned (14:20- 48), has been quoted by Irenaeus (adv. Haer. 3:21, 2); Tertullian (De Cult. afem. 1:3); Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromat. 1:22); Chrysostom (Homil. 8 in Heb.), and many others. The Ethiopian Church regards it as canonical, which may be seen from the manner in which it is alluded to in the Book of Devotions called "The Organon of the blessed Virgin Mary" (written in A.D. 1240), "Open my mouth to praise the virginity of the mother of God, as thou didst. open the mouth of Ezra? who rested not for forty days until he had finished writing the words of the law and the prophets, which Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, had burnt" (Prayer for Monday; see also Prayer for Tuesday). St. Jerome was the first who denounced it. In  reply to Vigilantius, who, regarding this book as inspired, appealed to 12:36-45, to prove that "none would venture to intercede for others in the day of judgment," this father, playing upon the name Vigilantius, remarked, "Tu vigilans dormis, et dormiens scribis, et propinas mihi libruim apocryphum, qui sub nomine Esdrae a te et similibus tui legitir, ubi scriptum est, quod post mortem nullus pro aliis gaudeat deprecari, quem ego librum nunquan legi, quid enim necesse est in manus sumere, quod Ecclesia non recepit. Nisi forte Balsamum et Barbelum, et thesaurum Manichaei, et ridiculum nomen Leusiborae proferas; et quia radices Pyrenaei habitus, vicinusque es Hiberiae, Basilidis, antiquissimi haeretici, et imperitae scientiae incredibilia portenta prosequeris, et proponis, quoad totius orbis auctoritate damnatur" (Ep. 53 ad Vigilant.). This is a most important passage, inasmuch as it shows that those of the primitive Church who, from their knowledge of Hebrew, had the best means of ascertaining what were the canonical Scriptures of the ancient synagogue, repudiated this book as uncanonical. In the Council of Trent, the second Ezra, like the first, was excluded from the canon, and Luther denounced it as worse than AEsop's Fables. SEE ESDRAS, FIRST BOOK OF. But this is going too far. Historico-critical expositors of the Bible, and those who are engaged in Christological works, while regarding 2 Esdras as not belonging to the Canon, yet see in it a most important record of Jewish opinion on some vital points. It shows that the Jews, before the rise of Christianity, most distinctly believed in the immortality of the soul, that the Messiah was denominated the Son of God, that he existed in heaven previous to his appearance upon earth (14:7), and that he was to die (7:29).

One tradition which the book contains obtained a wide reception in early times, and served as a pendant to the legend of the origin of the Septuagint. Ezra, it is said, in answer to his prayer that he might be inspired to write again all the law which was burnt, received a command to take with him tablets and five men, and retire for forty days. In this retirement a cup was given him to drink, and forthwith his understanding was quickened and his memory strengthened; and for forty days and forty nights he dictated to his scribes, who wrote ninety-four books (Latin, 204), of which twenty-four were delivered to the people in place of the books which were lost (14:20-48). This strange story was repeated in various forms by Irenaeus (adv. Haer. 3:21, 2), Tertullian (De cult. fam. 1:3, "Omne instrumentum Judaicae literaturae per Esdram constat restauratum"), Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 1:22, page 410, P.; compare page 392),  Jerome (adv. Helv. 7; comp. Pseudo-Augustine, De Mirab. S. Scr. 2:32), and many others; and probably owed its origin to the tradition which regarded Ezra as the representative of the men of "the Great Synagogue" (q.v.), to whom the final revision of the canonical books was universally assigned in early times. SEE CANON.

Although Esdras is included in the 6th article of the Church of England, among the other books read for edification, etc. SEE DEUTERO- CANONICAL, it will be observed that no lessons are taken from it in the offices of the Church of England. References are, however, made from it in the Authorized Version to parallel passages in the Old and New Testament. Grabe and others have conceived that this was the book cited as the " Wisdom of God" (Luk 11:9; comp. with 4 Esdras 1:32).

VI. Literature. — Lee, Dissertation upon the second Book of Esdras (Lond. 1722); Whiston, Authentic Records (Lond. 1727), 1:44 sq.; Van der Vlis, Disputatio Critica de Ezrae Libro Apocrypho (Amst. 1839); Gfrorer, Das Jahrhundert des Heils (Stuttgart, 1838), 1:69 sq., and Prophets veteres Pseudepigraphi (Stuttgart, 1840), page 66 sq.; Lucke, Einleitung in d. Offenbarung Johannis, 2d ed., page 138 sq.; Davidson, The Old Testament Text Considered (Lond. 1856), page 990 sq.; Hilgenfeld, Die judische Apokalyptik (Jena, 1857), page 187 sq.; Volkmar, Das vierte Buch Ezra (Zurich, 1858); Keil, Einleitung in d. Alte Testament (1859,1863), page 734 sq.; Tresenreuter, De libro quarto Esdrae (Cobl. 1742); Vogel, De quarto libro Esdrae (in his Progr. de Conjecturae usu em crisi N.T. page 48 sq.); Ewald, Das vierte Ezrabuch (Gott. 1864); Calinet, Sur le quatrieme livre d'Esdras (in his Commentaire, 3:253 sq.); Greswell, Second Book of Esdras in his Parables, V, 2:280 sq. ). See especially Hilgenfeld in the Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1858-67; Benslev, The Missing Fragments qfthe Fourth Book of Ezra (Lond. 1878, 4to).

## Esebon, They Of[[@Headword:Esebon, They Of]]

             (οιΕ῾᾿σεβωνίται v. r. οἰ Ε᾿σεβών, Vulg. Hesebon), a Graecized form of the name of certain Canaanites beyond Jordan referred to in the Apocrypha (Jude 5:15) as having been destroyed by the Israelites; evidently the inhabitants of HESHBON SEE HESHBON (q.v.) of the O.T. (Num 21:26).

## Esebrias[[@Headword:Esebrias]]

             (Ε᾿σερεβίας, Vulg. Sedebias), the first named of the ten priests separated with ten others by Ezra to transport the silver and gold from Babylon to Jerusalem (1Es 8:54); evidently the SHEREBIAH SEE SHEREBIAH (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 8:24).

## Esek[[@Headword:Esek]]

             (Hebrew id. עֵשֶׂק, quarrel; Sept. and Vulg. translate Α᾿δικία, calumnia, as if reading עשֶׁק), a well (בְּאֵר) containing a spring of water, which the herdsmen of Isaac dug in the valley of Gerar, and which received its name because the herdmen of Gerar quarreled הַתְעִשְׁקוּ, wrangled, Sept. ἠδίκησαν, Vulg. evasively, A.V. "strove;" but different from the וִיָּרַיבוּ of the preceding clause, ἐμαχήσαντο, jurgiun fuit, "strove") with him for the possession of it (Gen 26:20). Isaac seems to have therefore relinquished it. It appears not to have been one of those which Abraham had previously dug (Gen 26:18; the contest there was a question of title, here of possession). There are still several wells in this vicinity. SEE GERAR.

## Esger, Hans[[@Headword:Esger, Hans]]

             a Dutch theologian and hebraist, was born at Amsterdam, January 2, 1696. He was preacher at Ost- and Wester-Blocker, at Naarden, Middelburg, and finally at Amsterdam. In 1755 he was called as professor of Hebrew antiquities at Leyden, where he had been teaching theology before, and died there, May 28 of same year, leaving, Mosis Maimonidis Constitutio de Siglis (Leyden, 1727): — Oratio de Supremo Ecclesiae; Doctore (ibid. 1740): — De Regimine Ecclesiae (ibid. 1741): — De Fontibus Theologiae (ibid. 1751). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Eshbaal[[@Headword:Eshbaal]]

             [some Esh-ba'al] (Hebrew Esba'al, אֶשְׁבִּעִל, in pause אֶשְׁבָּעִל, man of Baal; Sept. Α᾿σαβάλ v.r. Ι᾿εβάλ and Βαάλ, Vulg. Esbaal), the appropriate name of the fourth son of king Saul, according to the genealogy of 1Ch 8:33; 1Ch 9:39. He is doubtless the same person (see 1Sa 31:2, compared with 2Sa 2:8) as ISH-BOSHETH SEE ISH-BOSHETH (q..v.), since it was the practice to change the obnoxious name of Baal into Bosheth or Besheth, as in the case of Jerub-besheth for Jerub-baal, and (in this very genealogy) of Merib-baal for Mephi-bosheth: compare also Hos 9:10, where Bosheth (A.V. "shame") appears to be used as a synonym for Baal. SEE BAAL.

## Eshban[[@Headword:Eshban]]

             (Hebrew Eshban', אֶשְׁבָּן, man of consideration; Sept. Α᾿σεβάν and Ε᾿σεβάν v. r. Α᾿σεβών, Vulg. Eseban), the second named of the four sons of Dishan (Gen 36:26, A.V. "Dishon") or Dishon (1Ch 1:41), the son of Seir the Horite. B.C. post 1963.

## Eshbili, Yom-Tob ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Eshbili, Yom-Tob ben-Abraham]]

             a famous Talmudist of the 13th century, is known for his novellas onl almost all the treatises of the Talmud. These novellas, or חדושים, are highly appreciated by Talmudic scholars, and are therefore often reprinted. A complete list of them is given by Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:248-250. (B.P.)

## Eshcol[[@Headword:Eshcol]]

             (Hebrew Eshkol', אֶשְׁכֹּל[twice plenu אֶשְׁכּוֹל, Num 13:24; Num 33:9], a bunch of grapes), the name of a man and also of a place.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿σχώλ, Josephus Ε᾿σχώλης, Vulg. Eschol.) A young Amoritish chieftain, who, with his brothers Mamre and Aner, being in alliance with Abraham, when the latter resided near Hebron, joined him in the recovery of Lot from the hands of Chedorlaomer and his confederates (Gen 14:13; Gen 14:24; comp. 13:18). B.C. cir. 2085. According to Josephus (Ant. 1:10, 2) he was the foremost of the three brothers, but the Bible narrative leaves this quite uncertain (comp. Gen 14:13 with 24). Some have thought that the name of Eshcol remained attached to one of the fruitful valleys in that district till the arrival of the Israelites (Num 13:24), who then interpreted the appellation as significant of the gigantic "cluster" (in Hebr. eshcol) which they obtained there; but this does not accord with the independent origin of the latter name as assigned in the narrative (see below).

2. A wady (נִחִל, winter-torrent; Sept. and Vulg. [translating likewise the name itself] φάραξ βότρυος, vallis botri, or [Num 13:24] Nehelescol; A.V. "brook" and "valley") in which the Hebrew spies obtained the fine cluster of grapes which they took back with them, borne " on a staff between two," as a specimen of the fruits of the Promised Land (Num 13:24). The cluster was doubtless large; but the fact that it was carried in this manner does not, as usually understood, imply that the bunch was as much as two men could carry, seeing that it was probably so carried to prevent its being bruised in the journey. SEE GRAPE.

From the fact that the name had existed in this neighborhood centuries before, when Abraham lived there with the chiefs Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, not Hebrews, but Amorites (see Gen 14:13), many have supposed that the appellation in this instance ("because of the cluster, הָאֶשְׁכּוֹל, Sept. βότρυς, Vulg. torrens botri) was merely the Hebrew way of appropriating the ancient name derived from that hero into the language of the conquerors, consistently with the paronomastic turns so much in favor at that time, and with a practice traces of which are deemed to appear elsewhere; but it is more probable that the same reason which led the Israelites to apply to the valley such a designation, had operated also among the original possessors of the soil. In that case the Amoritish  chieftain may have been so called (that dialect being doubtless akin to the Heb.) from his fertile region. From the terms of two of the notices of this transaction (Num 32:9; Deu 1:24), it might be inferred that Eshcol was the farthest point to which the spies penetrated; but this would contradict the express statement of Num 13:21, that they went as far northward, as Rehob. They must, therefore, either have carried the bunch of grapes this whole distance and back, or, as is more likely, they cut it on their return. From the context (Num 13:22), the valley in question seems to have been in the vicinity of Hebron. Accordingly, the valley through which lies the commencement of the road from Hebron to Jerusalem is traditionally indicated as that of Eshcol. This valley is now full of vine. yards and olive-yards, the former chiefly in the valley itself, the latter.up the sides of the inclosing hills. "These vineyards are still very fine, and produce the finest and largest grapes in all the country" (Robinson, Researches, 1:317). Eusebius, however (Onomast. s.v. φάραγξ βότρυος), places it, with some hesitation, at Gophna, 15 miles north of Jerusalem, on the Neapolis road. By Jerome it is given as north of Hebron, on the road to Bethsur (Epitaph. Paulae). The Jewish traveler Ha-Parchi speaks of it as north of the mountain on which the (ancient) city of Hebron stood (Benjamin of Tudela, ed. Asher, 2:437); and here the name has apparently been observed still attached to a spring of remarkably fine water called 'Ain-Eskali, in a valley which crosses the vale of Hebron north-east and southwest, and about two miles north of the town (Van de Velde, Narrative, 2:64). Dr. Rosen, however, still more recently, writes the name as Ain el-Rashkala (Zeitschr. d. morpenl. Gesellsch. 1858, page 481).

## Eshean[[@Headword:Eshean]]

             [some E'sheän] (Hebrews Eshan', אֶשׁעְן, a prop; Sept. Ε᾿σάν v.r. Σομά, Vulg. Esaan), a city in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Dumah and Janum (Jos 15:52), situated in the group west by south of Hebron (Keil, Comment. in loc.). Vai de Velde thinks (Memoir, pages 310, 311) the place may be the same as Ashan (q.v.); but this is inadmissible, partly because of the difference in the name (עַשַׁן), and partly because the only Ashan mentioned in Scripture lay in the low country (Jos 15:42; comp. Jos 15:33), while Eshean is expressly placed in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:48; Jos 15:52). To escape this last and fatal objection, Van de Velde follows Von Raumer (Palist. page 173) in supposing two Ashans, one in the mountains of Judah, and the other in the  southern plain of Palestine, belonging to Simeon; but that the Ashen of Judah and that of Simeon were one and the same, is evident from comparing Jos 15:42; Jos 19:9, where Ether appears as in the vicinity of both, and Jos 19:7 with 1Ch 4:32, where the same is the case with Ain-Rimilon. Still, although Eshean cannot thus be identified with the Chor-ashan of 1Sa 30:30, we may perhaps adopt Van de Velde's location of the former at the ruins of Khursa (Robinson's Researches, in, Append. page 116), not far south-west of Hebron (Stewart, Tent, page 224).

## Eshean (2)[[@Headword:Eshean (2)]]

             For this Biblical site Lieut. Conder suggests (Memoirs to the Ordinance Survey, 3:313). the. present ruined village es-Simia, lying three and a half miles southwest of Juttah.

## Eshek[[@Headword:Eshek]]

             (Hebrews id. עֵשֶׁק, oppression; Sept. Ε᾿σελέκ v. r. Α᾿σήλ, Vulg. Esec): brother of Azel (q.v.), a Benjamite, one of the late descendants of king Saul; he was the father of several sons, among them Ulam, the founder of a large and noted family of archers, lit. "treaders of the bow" (1Ch 8:39). B.C. ante 588. They are omitted in the parallel list of 1Ch 9:35-44.

## Eshel[[@Headword:Eshel]]

             SEE TAMARISK.

## Eshkalonite[[@Headword:Eshkalonite]]

             (Hebrews collect. with the art. ha-Eshkeloni', הָאֶשְׁקְלוֹנַי, Sept. οΑ῾᾿σκαλωνίτης, Vulg. Ascalonite, A.V. "the Eshkalonites"), the patrial designation (Jos 13:3) of the inhabitants of ASHKELON SEE ASHKELON (q.v.).

## Eshtaol[[@Headword:Eshtaol]]

             (Hebrews Eshtaol', אְֵשׁתָּאוֹל [but defectively אֶשְׁתָּאֹל in Jdg 13:25; Jdg 18:2; Jdg 18:8; Jdg 18:11], according to Fürst, narrow pass, but Gesenius suggests perhaps petition; Sept. Α᾿σθαώλ v.r. [in Jdg 13:5] Ε᾿σδαόλ, Vulg. Esthaol or [in Jos 15:33] Estaob), a town in the low country of Judah, the Shephelah or plain of Philistia. It is the first of the first group of cities in that district (Jos 15:33) enumerated with Zoreah (Hebrews Zareah), or Zorah, in company with which it is commonly mentioned. Zorah and Eshtaol were two of the towns allotted to the tribe of Dan out of Judah (Jos 19:41). Between them, and behind Kirjath-jearim, was  situated Mahaneh-Dan, the camp or stronghold which formed the head- quarters of that little community during their constant encounters with the Philistines. Eshtaol was one of the great strongholds of the Danites, and its inhabitants, with these of Zorah, were noted for their daring. SEE DAN. The 600 men who captured and colonized Laish were natives of these two towns (Jdg 18:1-31). Here, among the old warriors of the tribe, Samson spent his boyhood, and experienced the first impulses of the Spirit of Jehovah; and hither, after his last exploit, his mangled body was brought, up the long slopes of the western hills to its last rest in the burying-place of Manoah his father (Jdg 13:25; Jdg 16:31; Jdg 18:2; Jdg 18:8; Jdg 18:11-12). In the genealogical records of 1 Chronicles the relationship between Eshtaol, Zareah, and Kirjathjearim is still maintained (1Ch 2:53). In the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome (s.v. Α᾿σθαώλ and Ε᾿σθαώλ), Eshtaol is twice mentioned —

(1) as Astaol of Judah, described as then existing between Azotus and Ascalon under the name of Astho (Α᾿σθώ);

(2) as Esthaul of Dan, ten miles north of Eleutheropolis. The latter position is quite in accordance with the indications of the Bible. It is connected with Zorah, Zanoah, and Bethshemesh (Jos 15:33; Jos 19:41); and as these three places have been identified, we may conclude that Eshtaol was situated close to the foot of the mountains of Judah, and in or near wady Surar. Schwarz (Palest. page 102) mentions a village named Stual, west of Zorah, but, apart from the fact that this is corroborated by no other traveler and by no map, the situation is too far west to be "behind Kirjath-jearim" if the latter be Kuryet el-Enab. The village marked on the maps of Robinson and Van de Velde, as Yeshua, and alluded to by the former (Researches, new ed., 3:154, who states that the name is pronounced Eshwa), is nearer the requisite position. Yeshua lies at the eastern extremity of the broad valley which runs up among the hills between Zorah and Bethshemesh. The mountains rise steep and rugged immediately behind it, but the village is encompassed by fruitful fields and orchards. Zorah occupies the top of a conical hill scarcely two niles westward, and a lower ridge connects the hill with the mountains at Yeshua. Upon that ridge the permanent camp, or gathering-place of Dan (Jdg 13:25) was probably fixed (Robinson, Later Res. page 153 sq.). SEE MAHANEH-DAN.

## Eshtaulite[[@Headword:Eshtaulite]]

             [many Esh'taulite] (Hebrews collect. with the art. ha-Eshtaili', הָאֶשְׁתָּאֻלַי, Sept. οιΕ῾᾿αθαωλαῖοι v.r. ὑἱοὶ Ε᾿σθαάμ,Vulg. Esthaolitae, A.V. "the Eshtaulites"), the designation of the inhabitants of ESHTAOL SEE ESHTAOL (q.v.), who, with the Zareathites, were at a later period among the families of Kirjath-jearim (1Ch 2:53).

## Eshtemnoa[[@Headword:Eshtemnoa]]

             [many Eshtem'oa] (Hebrews Eshtemo'd, אֶשְׁתְּמוֹעִ[but defectively אֶשְׁתְּמֹעin 1 Chronicles], obedience Sept. in Jos 21:14 Ε᾿σθεμώ, in 1 Samuel Εσθιέ, in 1Ch 4:17; 1Ch 4:19 Ε᾿σθαιμών v.r. Ε᾿σθεμών and Ε᾿σθημωνή, in 1Ch 6:57 [42] Ε᾿σθαμώ v.r. Ε᾿σταμώ; Vulg 'Esthamo, but Estemo in Josh., and Esthemo in 1 Chronicles vi) or Esh'temoh (Hebrews Eshtemoh', אֶשְׁתְּמֹה, by an interchange of final gutturals, Jos 15:50; Sept. Ε᾿σθεμώ, Vulg. Istemo), a town of Judah, in the mountains; mentioned between Jattir and Holon (Jos 21:14; 1Ch 6:57), and Letween Anab and Anim (Jos 15:50). With its "suburbs" Eshtemoa was allotted to the priests (Jos 21:14; 1Ch 6:57). It was one of the places frequented by David and his followers during the long period of their wanderings; and to his friends there he sent presents of the spoil of the Amalekites (1Sa 30:28; comp. 1Sa 30:31). In the lists — half genealogical, half topographical — of the descendants of Judah, Eshtemoa occurs as having been founded or rebuilt by an Ezrahite called Ishbah (1Ch 4:17) (q.v.), perhaps the same with Naham of 1Ch 4:19 SEE MERED, where the place has the dubious epithet of "Maachathite" (q.v.). Others, however, regard the Eshtemoa there named as a person from Maachah Eusebius and Jerome simply mention the place as "a very large village" in the Daroma, in the province of Eleutheropolis (Onomast. s.v. Ε᾿σθεμά, Esthemo). There is little doubt that it has been discovered thy Dr. Robinson at Semu'a, a village seven or eight miles south of Hebron, on the great road from el- Milh, containing considerable ancient remains, and in the neighborhood of other villages still bearing the names of its companions in the list of Jos 15:1-63 : Debir, Socoh, Jattir, etc., and itself the last inhabited place toward the desert (Researches, 2:194; comp. Schwarz, Palest. page 105). It is a considerable village, situated on a low hill, with broad valleys round about; not susceptible of much tillage, but full of flocks and herds all in fine order.  In several places there are remains of walls built of very large stones, bevelled, but left rough in the middle, several of them more than ten feet in length. There are the ruins of a castle at this place, with one tower tolerably perfect, but it is probably of Saracenic origin (Robinson, Researches, 2:627; Wilson, Lands of Bible, 1:355). A city Shema is also mentioned in the south of Judah (Jos 15:26); too far south, however, to correspond to Semua.

## Eshton[[@Headword:Eshton]]

             (Heb., Eshton', אֶשְׁתּוֹן, according to Gesenius uxorious, according to Furst careless; Sept. Α᾿σσαθών, Vulg. Esthon), a son of Mehir, and grandson of Chelub, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:11). B.C. ante 1618. Among his four sons and one grandson enumerated (1Ch 4:12) as "the men of Recah," two (Beth-rapha and Ir-nahash) seem, however, to be rather names of places.

## Eskild[[@Headword:Eskild]]

             a Swedish prelate, succeeded to the see of Lund, although his election was forbidden by king Eric Ermund, against whom he took arms while only bishop. of Roskilde. He finally retired to the monastery of Clairvaux, in France, where he died, September 6, 1181. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Eskilli, Nicolaus[[@Headword:Eskilli, Nicolaus]]

             a Swedish theologian, was born July 4, 1588. He studied at different universities of Germany, and was in 1611 rector at Calmar. The war: between Sweden and Denmark put a sudden stop to his activity, but he resumed it in 1623. He died Feb. 17,1650, leaving, Disp. Synodalis de Scriptura Sacrct (Colmar, 1629): — De Jehovah Elohim (ibid. 1632): — De Persona et Officio Christi (ibid. 1633): — De Creatione et Providentia (ibid. 1635): — Disputationes Octa Synodales (ibid.). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eskridge, Vernon[[@Headword:Eskridge, Vernon]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church (South), was born in Westmoreland County, Virginia, October 26, 1803. His early education was neglected, and on this account he hesitated to enter the ministry, to which he felt strong leanings; but on the death of his young wife and child he hesitated no longer, and in 1827 he began to preach as an itinerant minister. In this service he labored faithfully until 1837, when ill health compelled him to retire from the itineracy, though he still preached diligently as his health would allow. In 1851 he was appointed chaplain in the U.S. Navy, and during his service in the Cumberland in 1852 some twenty were converted, including captain Upshur. On his return to Portsmouth, Va., the yellow fever was raging there. He devoted himself night and day to the service of the sick, and on Sept. 4,1855, he was taken with the disease, and died September 11. — Sprague, Annals, 7:735.

## Eskuche, Balthasar Ludwig[[@Headword:Eskuche, Balthasar Ludwig]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born at Cassel, March 12, 1710; studied at Marburg; was in 1734 preacher and professor at Rinteln, and died March 16, 1755, leaving, De Naufragio Paulino (Bremen, 1730): — De Requie Pauli in Melita (Magdeburg, 1731): — De Festo Judaeorum Purim (Marburg and Rinteln, 1734): — In Orationem Paulinam in Areopago (Rinteln, 1735-40): — De Festo ξυλοφορίων (ibid. 1738): — Disp. ad Oraculum Jer 31:22 (ibid. 1739): — De Muliere Bethaniensi (ibid.): — Erlauterung der heiligen Schriftaus morgenlandischen Reisebeschreibungen (ibid. 1745, 2 volumes): — Obervationes Philolog. Crit. in Nov. Test. (ibid. 1748-54). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:134; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:250. (B.P.)

## Esli[[@Headword:Esli]]

             (Ε᾿σλί v.r. Ε᾿σλεί), son of Naggai and father of Naum, of the maternal ancestors of Christ after the exile (Luk 3:25); apparently identical with ELIOENAI, the son of Meariah and father of Johanan (1Ch 3:23-24). SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).

## Esne, Esna, or Esneh[[@Headword:Esne, Esna, or Esneh]]

             "the hieroglyphic Sen, and the Greek Latopolis or Lattpolis — the city of the latus fish or Latus nobilis, from the fish there worshipped — is a small and badly-built town of Upper Egypt, and is situated on the left bank of the Nile, in lat. 250 15' N. The central portion of Esne has edifices of colored brick. It contains about 4000 inhabitants, of whom 1500 are Copts, and has some manufactories of blue cotton and pottery. There are famous ruins at Esne, which consist of a sandstone temple, with a portico of four rows of six columns, which appears to have been founded by Thothmes III, whose name is seen on the jambs of a door. The temple, however, seems to have been restored or principally constructed by Ptolemy Euergetes (B.C. 246- 222), and the pronaos was erected in the reign of the emperor Claudius (A.D. 41-54), and completed in that of Vespasian. The interior is of the date of Trajan, the Antonines, and Geta, whose name, erased or replaced by that of Caracalla, is there found. The great temple was dedicated to Chnumis, Satis and Har-Hek. It has a zodiac like that of Denderah. formerly thought to be of the most remote antiquity, but now known to be no older than the Romans. A smaller temple with a zodiac, erected in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes, formerly stood at E'Deyr, 21 miles north of Esne, but it has been destroyed. At Esne is also a stone quay, bearing the names of M. Aurelius. This city was the capital of a nome, and the coins struck in it in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 127-128) represent the fish latus. See Champollion, Not. Descrip. p. 283; Wilkinson, Modern Egypt. 2:268; Tochon d'Annecy, Midailles."

## Esnig[[@Headword:Esnig]]

             (or ESNAG, EZNIG, EZNAG), one of the most prominent men of the Armenian Church. He was born in 397, at Gochp or Golp, a place near Mount Ararat, and was one of the pupils of the patriarch Isaak and of Saint Mesrop. As he was acquainted with the Syrian language, he was sent in 425, together with Joseph of Palin, to Edessa, in order to translate the writings of the Syrian Church fathers into Armenian. After finishing this work they went to Constantinople, learned the Greek language, and began the translation of Greek works. On returning home in 431 they took with them many writings of Greek fathers, the acts of the synods of Nice and Ephesus, and a correct copy of the Alexandrine version. From the latter the Armenian version of the Bible, in which Esnig cooperated, was made. Many other theological works were translated by him, and he is one of the  six learned Armenians to whom the honorary title "Targmanitschk" (translators) was given. In 449 Esnig was present at the national synod of Artachad, which replied to the Persian king's demand upon the Armenians to embrace the doctrine of Zoroaster. He died about 478, as bishop of Bagrewand. Besides the numerous translations of foreign works, Esnig wrote an original work against heresies. It is divided into four books, of which the first is directed against the pagans, the second against the Parsees, the third against the Greek philosophers, and the fourth against the Marcionites and Manichaeans. This work contains some valuable information on the Parsees and on. the system of Marcion which is not known, from any other source. It has been published at Smyrna (1762): and at Venice (1826), and a French translation has appeared by Le Vaillant de Florival (Refutation des different Sectes des paiens, Paris, 1853. Parts of it have been translated into German by Neumann (in Hermes, volume 33, and in Zeitschriftfar histor. Theolog. 1834) and by Dr. Windischmann (Bayrische Annalen, 1834), and into Latin by Dr. Petermann (in his grammat. ling. Armen. pages 44-48). A Latin translation of the whole work was promised by the distinguished Orientalist, Dr. Windischmann, but it has never appeared. An appendix to the Venice edition contains a "collection of sentences drawn from the Greek fathers, and in particular from St. Nilus." In point of style, Esnig is counted among the classics of Armenian literature.Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:163; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 16:886; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:711; Neumann, Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Lit. (Tub. 1841). (A.J.S.)

## Esohenmayer, Adam Carl August[[@Headword:Esohenmayer, Adam Carl August]]

             a German philosophical writer, was born July 4, 1768, at Neuenburg. In 1811 he was made professor of philosophy at Tubingen, but retired in 1836 from his academical position to Kirchheim, and died there, November 17, 1852. He wrote, Die Philosophie in ihrem Uebergange zur Nichtphilosophie (Erlangen, 1803): — System der Moral philosophie (Stuttgart, 1818): — Religionsphilosophie (Tubingen, 1818-24, 3 volumes): — Die Hegelsche Religionsphilosophie verglichen mit dem christlichen Prinzip (ibid. 1834), written against Hegel: — Der Ischariotismus unserer Tage (ibid. 1835), written against the Life of Jesus, by Strauss: — Charakteristik des Unglaubens, Halbglaubens und Vollglaubens (ibid. 1838): — Grundriss der Naturphilosophie (ibid. 1832): — Grundzuge der christlichen Philosophie (Basle, 1840): — Organon des Christenthums (Stuttgart, 1843): — Sechs Perioden der christlichen Kirche (Heilbronn, 1851). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:286, 288, 429, 551, 594; 2:10; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:336. (B.P.)

## Esora[[@Headword:Esora]]

             (properly LESSRA, Αἰσωρά, Vulg. omits), a place fortified by the Jews on the approach of the Assyrian army under Holofernes (Jdt 4:4). The name may be the representative of the Hebrew word HAZOR or ZORAH (Simonis, Onom. N.T. page 19). The Syriac reading (Bethchorn) suggests BETHI-HORON, which is not impossible.

## Esora (2)[[@Headword:Esora (2)]]

             (Jdt 4:4) is thought by Lieut. Conder (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336; comp. Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," January 1881, page 52) to be the present "village Asireh, north of Shechem," meaning, doubtless, what is laid down on the Ordnance Map as Asiret el-Hatob, three miles north of Nablus, but not noticed in the Memoirs accompanying the Survey.

## Esoteric[[@Headword:Esoteric]]

             (Greek ἐσωτερικός), scientific as opposed to popular; applied, especially with regard to the ancient mysteries, to doctrines taught only to the initiated, as distinguished from exoteric. (ἔξω, without) doctrines, which could be taught to the vulgar and uninitiated. "The philosophy of the Pythagoreans, like that of the other sects, was divided into the cxoteric and  the esoteric; the open, taught to all; and the secret, taught to a select number" (Warburton, Div. Leg. book 2, note B B). "According to Origen, Aulus Gellius, Porphyry, and Jamblichus, the distinction of esoteric and exoteric among the Pythagoreans was applied to the disciples, according to the de.ree of initiation to which they had attained, being fully admitted into the society, or being merely postulants (Ritter, Hist. Plilos., French transl., 1:248). Plato is said to have had doctrines which he taught publicly to all, and other doctrines which he taught only to a few, in secret. There is no allusion to such a distinction of doctrines in the writings of Plato. Aristotle (Physica, 4:2) speaks of opinions of Plato which were not written. But it does not follow that these were secret. Aristotle himself frequently speaks of some of his writings as exoteric, and others as acroamatic or esoteric. The former treat of the same subjects as the latter, but in a popular and elementary way, while the esoteric are more scientific in their form and matter (Ravaisson, Essai sur la Metaph. d'Aristote, t. 1, c. 1; Tucker, Light of Nature, volume 2, chapter 2)." — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.

## Espagne, Jean D[[@Headword:Espagne, Jean D]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born in Dauphiny in 1591; became pastor at Orange in 1620, but soon left France, and was successively minister in Holland and at London, where he died, April 25, 1659, leaving English translations of some small treatises, especially Les Erreurs Populaires en Points de la Religion, etc. (La Haye, 1639): — La Manducation du Corps de Christ (ibid. 1640): — L'Usage de l'Oraison Dominicale (Lond. 1646). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Espen Zeger Bernhard Van[[@Headword:Espen Zeger Bernhard Van]]

             one of the most celebrated writers on the ecclesiastical law in the 18th century, was born at Louvain July 9,1646. He studied theology and philosophy at the university of his native city, and after having been ordained priest in 1673, lie was two years later made Doctor Juris (doctor of law), and appointed professor of canonical law at the Collegium Adrianum at the University. He lived very retired, devoting his whole time to study, but such became soon his reputation that he was consulted by a number of princes, bishops, tribunals and learned corporations. Many of his opinions, however, particularly on the Congregation of the Index. on dispensations, immunities, exemptions, the royal placet; and the appeal from the ecclesiastical to civil power, were note favorable to the pretensions of the popes, and in 1704 and 1734 all his works were put on the Index. His defense of the consecration of a Jansenist archbishop at Utrecht caused in 1728 his suspension from all priestly functions, as well as from his chair at the University. All demands made upon him by the archbishop of Malines to revoke his opinions he firmly refused. He fled to Amersfort, a common refuge of Jansenist exiles, where he died October 2, 1728, at the advanced age of 82 years. Van Espen is universally classed among the ablest writers on ecclesiastical law, and even pope Benedict did not withhold a recognition of his ability. The best edition of his works is  the one published by Baren (Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum, 5 volumes, Louvain, 1753-65; also Cologne, 1777, 5 volumes; Mentz, 1791, 3 volumes). An abstract of this work was published by Oberhauser (Augsburg, 1782; Cilli. 1791). — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch.-Lex. 3:711; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 16:410; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 4:164; G. du Pac de Bellegarde, Vie de Van Espen (Louvain, 1767). (A.J.S.)

## Espence (Lat. Espencaeus), Charles D[[@Headword:Espence (Lat. Espencaeus), Charles D]]

             a French theologian, was born of noble parents at Chalons-sur-Marne, in 1511, and became a doctor of the Sorbonne and rector of the University of Paris. Cardinal de Lorraine employed him in various important cases. He distinguished himself in the assembly of Orleans in 1560, and at the Conference of Poissy in 1561. He died October 5, 1571, leaving, Institution d'un Prince Chretien (Lyons, 1548): — Traite des Ouvrages Clandestins: — Des Commentaires sur les Epitres de Saint Paul a Timothee et a Tite, full of long discussions on hierarchy and eclesiastical discipline; also several controversial treatises, some in French and others in Latin. All these were collected at Paris in 1619. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Espinac, Pierre D[[@Headword:Espinac, Pierre D]]

             a French prelate, born early in the 16th century, was the son of Pierre d'Espinac, lieutenant of the king in Burgundy. He became canon count, then dean of the Church of Lyons, and finally archbishop there, after the death of his uncle, Antoine d'Albon, in 1574. The clergy chose him as their orator in the assembly of Blois, and he became chief of the deputation of the Catholics at the celebrated deputation of Suresne. He died January 9, 1599, leaving, besides addresses on the above occasions, Exhortation au Peuple de Lyon (1583): — Un Breviaire: — Des Poesies Francaises (not printed). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Espinay, Andre d[[@Headword:Espinay, Andre d]]

             a French prelate, was successively archbishop of Aries and. of Bordeaux, cardinalarchbishop and count of Lyons, and aided Charles VIII in his war  in Brittany. He died at Paris, November 10, 1500. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Espinay, Charles d[[@Headword:Espinay, Charles d]]

             a French bishop, born of an ancient family of Brittany about 1530, became commendatory abbot of Tronchet, of St. Gildas du Bois, and prior of Gahard and of Becherel, was appointed in 1558 bishop of Dol, but before being consecrated assisted at the Council of Trent. He was active in the ecclesiastical troubles of his time, and died in September 1591. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Espinay, Jacques d[[@Headword:Espinay, Jacques d]]

             a French prelate, was apostolical prothonotary of the holy see, and succeeded by his intrigues in being appointed bishop of St. Malo, January 9, 1450. Nicholas V transferred him, March 18 following, to the see of Rennes, but the due of Brittany, Pierre II, violently opposed these changes. In the end, Espinay was deprived even of his patrimony, and although suffering from the gout was confined in a prison, where he died, January 9, 1482. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gneirale, s.v.

## Espinel, Vicente[[@Headword:Espinel, Vicente]]

             a Spanish writer and ecclesiastic, was born at Ronda, in the province of Granada, about 1551. He was educated at Salamanca, and served as a soldier in Flanders. His ecclesiastical position seems to have been that of chaplain at Ronda, but he resided chiefly. at Madrid. He died about 1634. He is now chiefly noted for his romance of Marcos de Oregon, a work delineating Spanish mariners. He was also a poet of some reputation. There is a good English translation of his Maarcos de Olregon, by Algernon Langton (Lond. 1816, 2 volumes). See Encyclop. Brit. 9th ed. s.v.

## Espinosa, Diego De[[@Headword:Espinosa, Diego De]]

             a Spanish prelate and statesman, was born at Martininos de las Posadas (old Castile), in 1502. He studied civil and canonical law, which he taught when very young at Cuenca; then became auditor at Seville, and director of the royal council of Navarre. "Philip II appointed him some time afterwards grand inquisitor of Spain, superintendent of the negotiations and affairs of Italy, and finally bishop of Siguenza. In 1568 Espinosa received the cardinal's hat. In the exercise of his high functions he was remarkable for  his equal severity against iniquitous judges and heretics. He died September 5, 1572. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Espousals[[@Headword:Espousals]]

             1. Among the Jews this was the ceremony of betrothing, or coming under obligation for the purpose of marriage, and was a mutual agreement between the parties which usually preceded the marriage some time. The espousals frequently took place years before the parties were married. SEE BETROTHAL; SEE MARRIAGE.

2. In the early Christian Church espousals differed from marriage. The two terms are in early writers sponsalia and ntuptiae. Certain preliminaries were necessary before persons could complete a marriage: they consisted in a mutual contract or agreement between the parties concerning their marriage to be performed within a certain limited time, which contract was confirmed by certain gifts or donations, called arrhae or arrhabones, the earnest of marriage; as also by a ring, a kiss, a dowry, a writing or instrument of dowry, with a sufficient number of witnesses to attest it. The free consent of parties contracting marriage was declared necessary by the old Roman law, which was confirmed by Diocletian, and inserted by Justinian in his code. When the contract was made, it was usual for the man to bestow presents on the woman: these were sometimes called sponsalia, espousals, and sometimes sponsalitiae donationes, espousal- gifts, or arrhae and pignora, pledges of future marriage, because the giving and receiving them was a confirmation of the contract. These donations were publicly recorded. The ring was then presented to the woman as a further confirmation of the contract, and does not appear to have been given in the actual solemnization of marriage. Bingham, in proof of this, quotes the words of pope Nicholas I, and also refers to Ambrose and Tertullian. The origin of the marriage-ring has been traced to the tenth century, and is supposed to have been introduced in imitation of the ring worn by bishops. Isidorus Hispalensis refers to the marriage-ring in this language: Quod autem in nuptiis annulus a sponso sponsae datur, id fit vel propter mutuae dilectionis signum, vel propter id magis, ut hoc pignore corda eorum jungantur; unde et quarto digito annulus inseritur, ideo  quod vena quaedam (ut fertur) sanguinis ad cor usque perveniat: "The reason why a ring is given by the bridegroom to the bride is either as a mark of mutual love, or rather a pledge of the union of their hearts; mnd the reason for its being placed on the fourth finger is because a certain vein (as it is said) reaches thence to the heart." The kiss was solemnly given, with the joining together of the hands of the betrothed. The dowry settled upon the woman was by a stipulation made in writing, or by public instruments under hand and seal. Chosen witnesses were present, the friends of each party, and their number was generally ten. Occasionally a ministerial benediction was used in espousals as well as in marriage. SEE MARRIAGE. — Farrar, Ecclesiastes Dict. s.v.; Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 22, chapter 3; Procter, On Common Prayer, page 401.

## Espouse[[@Headword:Espouse]]

             (properly (אָרִשׂ, aras', 2Sa 3:14, to betroth, as elsewhere rendered; μνῃστεύομαι, Mat 1:18; Luk 1:27; Luk 2:5; less correctly for חֲתֻנָּה, chat thunnah', Son 3:11, nuptials; בְּלוּלוֹת, keluloth', Jer 2:2, the bridal state, i.e., condition of a bride before marriage; ἁρμόζομαι. 2Co 11:2, to cause to be married, i.e., negotiate the match). Espousal was a ceremolny of betrothing, or coming under obligation for the purpose of marriage, and was a mutual agreement between the two parties which usually preceded the marriage some considerable time. SEE MARRIAGE. The reader will do well carefully to attend to the distinction between espousals and marriage, as espousals in the East are frequently contracted years before the parties are married, and sometimes in very early youth. This custom is alluded to figuratively, as between God and his people (Jer 2:2), to whom he was a husband (21:32), and the apostle says he acted as a kind of assistant (pronuba) on such an occasion: "I have espoused you to Christ" (2Co 11:2); have drawn up the writings, settled the agreements, given pledges, etc., of your union (compare Isa 54:5; Mat 25:6; Rev 19:1-21). SEE BETROTH.

## Espy, T. B., D.D[[@Headword:Espy, T. B., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Cass County, Georgia, in 1837. He was educated at Howard College, Ala., served three years as chaplain in the Confederate army, two years as pastor at Athens, Georgia, two at Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1873 became editor of the Western Baptist, in 1879 of the Baptist Reflector, and later of the American Baptist Flag, St. Louis, Mo. He died at Little Rock, February 7, 1881. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Esquimaux Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Esquimaux Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Esquimaux are a people dispersed over the northern coast of North America, inhabiting the shores of all the seas, bays, gulfs, and islands of the Arctic Ocean, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They are also found on the Atlantic side of the continent, along the coast of Labrador, as far south as the fiftieth degree of latitude; and are likewise to be met with on the opposite coast of America, along the shores of the Pacific, from Behring Strait to Mount St. Elias, in the sixtieth degree of latitude. Moravian missionaries were the first who proclaimed the glad tidings of the Gospel in these inclement regions. The first part of the New Test. which was published in that language was the gospel of John, and three years later, in 1813, the British and Foreign Bible Society published the other three gospels. Other parts soon followed, till in 1826 the entire New Test. was given to that benighted people. Of the Old Test. different parts were published from time to time, till in 1871 the entire Bible was printed for the Esquimaux. The language has been treated in modern times by Kleinschmidt, in Grammatik der gromlandischen Spriache (Berlin, 1871). SEE GREENLANDISH VERSION. (B.P.)

## Esril[[@Headword:Esril]]

             (Ε᾿σρίλ v.r. Ε᾿ζρίλ, Vulg. omits), one of the Israelites, "sons of Ozora," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1Es 9:34); corresponding in position with the SHARAI SEE SHARAI (q.v.) of the Hebrew text  (Ezr 10:40), although the form is confused with that of Azaelus =Azareel following it.

## Esrom[[@Headword:Esrom]]

             (Ε᾿σρώμ v.r. Ε᾿σρών), a Graecized form (Mat 1:3; Luk 3:35) of the name of HEznoc (q.v.), the grandson of Judah (1Ch 2:5).

## Ess, Karl van[[@Headword:Ess, Karl van]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Warburg, in Westphalia, September 25, 1770. He entered the Benedictine order in 1788, and in 1801 became prior of the Abbey of Huysburg, near Halberstadt. Together with his cousin, Leander van Ess (q.v.), he published a German translation of the Bible (Brunswick, 1807, and a great many editions since), which had an immense circulation until it was forbidden by the pope. Being appointed in 1811, by the bishop of Paderborn, episcopal commissary, he abandoned his liberal views. He wrote a brief history of religion (Entweurf einer kurzen Geschichte der Religion, Halberstadt, 1817), which called forth several replies. He died October 22, 1824. — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 19:488.

## Ess, Leander van[[@Headword:Ess, Leander van]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, and cousin of the preceding one, was born a Warburg, in Westphalia, February 15, 1772. At an early age he entered the Benedictine abbey of Marienmünster, in the diocese of Paderborn. In 1813 he was appointed pastor at Marburg, and extraordinary professor at the university of that city; and later he also became assistant director of the normal school. No priest in the Roman Catholic Church of the 19th century showed so, great a zeal for the circulation of the Bible as Leander van Ess. Aided byhis cousin Karl (q.v.), he prepared a German translation of tihe New Testament, and enlisted the British and Foreign Bible Societe in its circulation. A translation of the Old Testament he published in 1819 (Nuremberg). He also published an edition of the Vulgate (1822), and an edition of the Greek New Testament cut from the Vatican manuscript (1824). The pope was highly indignant at his undertaking, and on this occasion issued one of the notorious papal bulls against Bible societies. Karl van Ess timidly receded from his liberal position, but Leander bravely maintained it. He resigned his offices at  Marburg, and devoted his time chiefly to a literary defense of his efforts in circulating the Bible. He compiled, to encourage Roman Catholic readers of the Bible, "a selection from the works of Church fathers and other great Catholic writers concerning the necessary and useful reading of the Bible" (Auszuge aus den heil. Vateri, etc., Leips. 1808); a Latin treatise on the authority of the original text of the Bible as compared with the Vulgate (Pragmatica doctorum Catholicorum Tridentini circa Vulgatum decreti sensum testantium historia, Salzburg, 1816; in German, Tub. 1824); and several other works, urging a frequent reading of the Bible by the people (Was war die Bible der ersten Christen? 1816; Gedanken uber Bibel u. Bibellesen, 1816; Die Bible nicht ein Buch war für Priester, 1818). He also wrote a book in defense of marriages between Protestants and Roman Catholics (Rechtfertigung der gemischt. Ehen, 1821). He died October 13, 1847. His very valuable library, rich in manuscripts and incunables, was purchased by the Union Theological Seminary in New York. — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 19:489.

## Essence[[@Headword:Essence]]

             (essentia, from essens, the old participle of esse, to be), a term in philosophy corresponding to ούσία in Greek, and sometimes to nature, sometimes to being or substance in English. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, 12:11) derives it as follows: "Sicut ab eo quod est sopere, vocatur sapientia; sic ab eo quod est esse, vocatur essentia." Chauvin (Lex. Phil.) gives the definition, "Totum illudper quod res est, et est id quod est." Locke (Essay, book 3, chapter 3, § 15) says: "Essence may be taken for the very being of anything, whereby it is what it is." Locke distinguishes the real and the nominal essence. "The nominal essence depends upon the real essence; thus the nomiinal essence of gold is that complex idea which the word 'gold' represents, viz. 'a body yellow, heavy, malleable, fusible, and fixed;' but its real essence is the constitution of its insensible parts, on which these qualities and all its other properties depend, which is wholly unknown to us. The essence of things is made up of that common nature wherein it is founded, and of that distinctive nature by which it is formed. This latter is commonly understood when we speak of the formality, or formalis ratio (the formal consideration) of things; and it is looked upon as being more peculiarly the essence of things, though it is certain that a triangle is as truly made up in part of figure, its common nature, as of the three lines and angles which are distinctive and peculiar to it" (Fleming, Vocab. of Philosophy, s.v.).  With regard to the Trinity, the Greek writers (Athanasius and others) distinguish οὐσία (essentia, substantia), which denotes what is common to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, from ὑπόστασις (persona), which denotes what is individual, distinctive, and peculiar to the three in one. Shedd (History of Doctrine, 2:363) distinguishes the various scholastic terms carefully, and says of ocaia, or essence, that it "denotes that which is common to Father, Son, and Spirit. It denominates the substance, or constitutional being of the Deity, which is possessed alike and equally by each of the personal distinctions. The essence is in its own nature one and indivisible, and hence the statement in the creed respecting it affirms simple unity, and warns against separation and division. The terms 'generation' and 'procession' do not apply to it." McCosh discusses the term and its uses in his Intuitions of the Mind (1866, 8vo, page 152).

Essenes (Ε᾿σσηνοί, Josephus generally; Esseni, Pliny) or ESSÆANS (Ε᾿σσαῖοι, Josephus, War, 1:3, 5, etc.; Philo), a Jewish sect of mystico- ascetics, which combined foreign elements, especially Oriental and Greek, with Jewish doctrines, and with certain peculiar views and practices of their own. They rejected most of the Jewish sacrifices, and made their fellowship an exclusive one.

I. Signification of the Name. — This has been very variously explained, as follows:

1. Philo (Quod omnis prob. lib. § 12) derives it from the Greek ὅσιος, holy.

2. Josephus, according to Jost (Geschichte d. Judenthums, 1:207), seems either to derive it from the Chaldee חָשָׁא, to be quiet, to be mysterious, because he renders חשֶׁן, the high-priest's breastplate, for which the Sept. has λογεῖον, by ἐσσῆν, or directly from חשֶׁן, in the sense of λογεῖον or λόγιον, endowed with the gift of prophecy.

3. Epiphanius (Hær. xix) takes it to be the Hebrew חֲסַין=στιβαρὸν γἐνος, the stout race.

4. Suidas (s.v.) and Hilgenfeld (Die jud. Apokal. page 278) make it out to be the Aramaic form חֹזַין=θεωρητικοί, seers, and the latter maintains that this name was give en to the sect because they pretended to see visions and to prophesy.

5. Josippon ben-Gorion (lib. 4, § 6, 7, page 274 and 278, ed. Breithaupt) takes it for the Hebrews חָסַיד, the pious, the puritans.

6. De Rossi (Meor Exaim, c. 3), Gfrorer (Philo, 2:341), Dahne (Ersch und Gruber's Encyklop. s.v.), Nork (Real-Worterbuch, s.v.), Herzfeld (Gesch'chte de V. Israel, 2:395), and others, insist that it is the Aramaic אִסְיָא= θεραπευτής, physician, and that this name was given to them because of the spiritual or physical cures they performed.

7. Aboth R. Nathan (c. 36), and a writer in Jost's Annalen (1:145), derive it from עָשָׂה, to do, to perform; the latter says that it is the Aramaic from עֲשַׂינָא, and that they were so called because of their endeavors to perform the law.

8. Rappaport (Erech Millin, page 41) says that it is the Greek ισος, an associate, a fellow of the fraternity.

9. Frankel (Zeitschrift, 1846, page 449 sq.) and others think that it is the Hebrew expression צְנוּעַים, the retired.

10. Ewald (Geschichte d. V. Israel, 4:420) is sure that it is the Rabbinic חִזָן, servant (of God), and that the name was given to them because it was their only desire to be θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ.

11. Gratz (Geschichte d. Juden. in, 525) will have it that it is from the Aramaic סְחָא, to bathe, with Aleph prosthetic, and that it is the shorter form for צִפְרָא סָחֵי=טוֹבְלֵי שִׁחֲרַית, ἡμεροβαπτισταί, hemerobaptists, a name given to this sect because they baptized themselves early in the morning.

12. Dr. Low (Ben Chaanaja, 1:352) never doubts but that they were called Essenes after their founder, whose name he tells us was יַשִׁי, or Jesse, the disciple of Joshua b. Perachja.

13. Others, again, say that it alludes to Jesse, the father of David.

14. Others, again, submit that it is derived from the town Essa, or the place Vadi Ossis (compare Ewald, Geschichte d. V. I. 4:420).

15. Dr. Adler (Volkslehrer, 6:50), again, derives it from the Hebrew אָסִר, to bind together, to associate, and says that they were called אֲסֻרַים, because they united together to keep the law.

16. Dr. Cohn suggests the Chaldee root עֲשִׁן, to be strong, and that they were called עֲשַּׁינַי because of their strengtl of mind to endure sufferings and to subdue their passions (Frankel's Monatsch. 7:272).

17. Oppenheim thinks that it may be the form עוֹשַׂין, and stands for עוֹשַׂין טָהְרִת הִקּדֶשׁ or חֲטִאֹת עוֹשַׂין טָהְרִת, observers of the laws of purify and holiness (ib.).

18. Jeilinek (Ben Chananja, 4:374), again, derives it from the Hebrew חֹצֶן, sinus, περίζωμα, alluding to the כִּנְפַיםmentioned in the Talmud (Bechoroth, 30, a), i.e. the apron which the Essenes wore.

19. Others, again, derive it from a supposed form הֲסָיֵא, in the sense of pious, because it connects the Essenes with the Chasidin, from which they are thought to have originated. SEE ASSIDAEANS.

II. Tenets and Practices. — The cardinal doctrine of this sect was the sacredness of the inspired law of God. To this they adhered with such tenacity that they were led thereby to pay the greatest homage to Moses the lawgiver, and to consider blasphemy of his name a capital offense. They believed that to obey diligently the commandments of the Lord, to lead a pure and holy life, to mortify the flesh and the lusts thereof, and to be meek and lowly in spirit, would bring them in closer communion with their Creator, and make them the temples of the Holy Ghost, when they would be able to prophesy and perform miracles, and, like Elias, be ultimately the forerunners of the Messiah. This last stage of perfection, however, could only be attained by gradual growth in holiness, and by advancement from one degree to another. Thus, when one was admitted a member of this order, and had obtained the זָרַיז = περίζωμα, apron, which, from its being used to dry one's self with after the baptisms, was the symbol of purity, he attained,

1. To the state of outward or bodily purity by baptisms (לידי נקיות זריזות מביאה). From bodily purity he progressed to that stage which  imposed abstinence from concubial intercourse (נקיות מביאה לידי פרישות).

3. From this stage, again, he attained to that of inward or spiritual purity (פרישות מביאה לידי טחרה).

4. From this stage, again, he advanced to that which required the banishinr of all anger and malice, and the cultivation of a meek and lowly spirit (ענוה טהרה מביאה לידי).

5. Thence he advanced to the stage of holiness (ענוה מביאה לידי חסירות).

6. Thence, again, he advanced to that wherein he was fit to be the temple of the Holy Spirit, and to prophesy (מביאה לידי רה8ק חסידות).

7. Thence, again, he advanced to that state when he could perform miraculous cures and raise the dead (רות הקדשׁ לידי תחה8מ); and,

8. Attained finally to the position of Elias, the forerunner of the Messiah (תחח8מ לידי אליהו). Comp. Jerusalem Talmud, Sabbath, c. 1; Shekalim, c. 3; Bably, Aboda Zara, 20:6; Midrash Rabba, Shir Hashirins init.; and Ben Chenanja, 4:374.

As contact with any one who did not practice their self-imposed Levitical laws of purity, or with anything belonging to such a one, rendered them impure, the Essenes were, in the course of time, obliged to withdraw altogether from general society, to form a separate community, and live apart from the world. Their manner of life and practices were most simple and self-denying. They chiefly occupied themselves with tilling the ground, tending flocks, rearing bees, and making the articles of fool and dress required by the community (as it was contrary to their laws of Levitical purity to get anything from one who did not belong to the society), as well as with healing the sick, and studying the mysteries of nature and revelation. Whatever they possessed was deposited in the general treasury, of which there were appointed by the whole fraternity several managers, who supplied therefrom the wants of every one, so that they had all things in common; hence there were no distinctions amongst them of rich and poor, or of masters and servants. They reprobated slavery and war, and would not even manufacture martial instruments. They rose before the sun,  and did not talk about any worldly matters till they had all assembled together and offered up their national prayer for the renewal of the light of the day (המאיר לארוֹ), whereupon they dispersed to their respective engagements, according to the directions of the overseers, till the fifth hour, or eleven o'clock when the labor of the forenoon terminated, and all reassembled, had a baptism in cold water, after which they put on their white garments, entered their refectory with as much religious solemnity as if it were the holy Temple, sat down together in mysterious silence to a common meal, which had the character of a sacrament — and may be the reason why they did not offer sacrifices in the Temple — the baker placed before each one a little loaf of bread, and the cook a dish of the most simple food, the priest invoked God's blessing upon the repast, and concluded with thanks to the Bountiful Supplier of all our wants. This was the signal of their dismissal when all withdrew, put off their sacred garments; and resumed their several employments till the evening, when they again partook of a common meal. Such was their manner of life during the week. On the Sabbath, which they observed with the utmost rigor, and on which they were more especially instructed in their distinctive ordinances, Philo tells us, "They frequent the sacred places which are called synagogues, and there they sit, according to their age, in classes, the younger sitting below the elder in becoming attire, and listening with eager attention. Then one takes up the holy volume and reads it, whilst another of the most experienced ones expounds, omitting that which is not generally known; for they philosophize on most things in symbols, according to the ancient zeal" (Quod oensis prob. lib. sec. 12). The study of logic and metaphysics they regarded as injurious to a devotional life. They were governed by a president, who was chosen by the whole body, and who also acted as judge. In cases of trial, however, the majority of the community, or at least a hundred members of it, were required to constitute the tribunal, and the brother who walked disorderly was excommunicated, yet he was not regarded as an enemy, but was admonished as a brother, and received back after due repentance.

As has already been remarked, the Essenes generally were celibates; their ranks had therefore to be recruited from the children of the Jewish community at large, whom they carefully trained for this holy and ascetic order. Previous to his final admission, the candidate for the order had to pass through a novitiate of two stages. Upon entering the first stage, which lasted twelve months, the novice (νεοσύστατος) had to cast in all his possessions into the common treasury, and received a spade (σκαλίς, ἀξινάριον=יָתֵד) to bury the excrement (compare Deu 23:12-15), an aproa (περίζωμα=זָרַיז), used at the baptisms, and a white robe to put on at meals, which were the symbols of purity, and, though still an outsider, he had to observe some of the ascetic rules of the society. If, at the close of this stage, the community found that he had properly acquitted himself during the probationary year, the novice was then admitted into the second stage, which lasted two years. During this period he was admitted to a closer fellowship with the brotherhood, and shared in their lustral rites, but was still excluded from the common meals. Having passed satisfactorily through the second stage of probation, the novice was then fully received into the community (εἰς τὸν ὅμιλον), when he bound himself by awful oaths (the only occasion on which they allowed swearing) "that, in the first place, he will exercise piety towards God; and then that he will observe justice towards all men; and that he will do no harm to any one, either of his own accord or by the command of others; that he will always hate the wicked, and help the righteous; that he will ever be faithful to all men, especially his rulers, for without God no one comes to be ruler, and that if he should be ruler himself he will never be overbearing, nor endeavor to outshine those he rules either in his garments or in finery; that he will always love truth, and convince and reprove those that lie; that he will keep his hand from stealing, and his soul clear from any unjust gain; that he will not conceal anything from the members of his society, nor communicate to any one their mysteries, not even if he should be forced to it at the hazard of his life; and, finally, that he will never deliver the doctrines of the Essenes to any one in any other manner than he received them himself; that he will abstain from all species of robbery, and carefully preserve the books belonging to their sect and the names of the angels" (War, 2:8, 7). This last expression refers to the secrets connected with the Tetragranmaton (המפורש שם), and the other names of God and the angels comprised in the theosophy (מעשה מרכבה), and to the mysteries connected with the cosmogony (בראשית מעשה) which played so important a part both among the Essenes and the Cabbalists.

III. Origin and Relationship to Judaism and Christianity. — The origin of this sect has been greatly mystified by Philo and Josephus, who, being anxious to represent their co-religionists to cultivated Greeks in a Hellenistic garb, made the Essenes resemble as much as possible the  Ascetic, Pythagorean, Platonic, and other philosophers. It has been still more mystified by the account of Pliny, who tells us that this community has prolonged its existence for thousands of Ages ("per seculorum millia — incredibile dictu — gens sterna est in qua nemo nascitur," Hist. Nat. 5:15). Most modern writers have shaped their description of this community according to these accounts, supposing that the Essenes are neither mentioned in the N.T. nor in the ancient Jewish writings, and hence concluding that the sect originated in Egypt or Greece, or in the philosophic systems of both countries. Hilgenfeld (Zeits. fur wiss. Theol., 1867, 1, art. 6) undertakes to show the historical connection of Essenism with Parsism and Buddhism. Frankel seeks, from a number of passages in the Talmud and Midrashim, to show that Essenism is simply an order of Pharisaism, that both are sections of the Chasidim or Assidseans SEE CHASIDIM, and that all these three orders are frequently spoken of under the same name. That the Essenes are an order of Pharisees is distinctly stated in Aboth R. Nathan, c. 37, where. we are told that there are eight distinctions or orders among the Pharisees, and that those Pharisees who live in celibacy are the Essenes (פרוש מחופתו עשאני—פרושים הם ח8). This will, moreover, be seen from a comparison of the following practices, which Josephus describes as peculiar characteristics of the Essenes, with the practices of the Pharisees, as given in the Talmud and Midrashim:

1. The Essenes had four classes of Levitical purity, which were so marked that a member of the upper class had to bathe himself when he touched anything belonging to the lower class, or when he came in contact with a stranger; so also the Pharisees (comp. Josephus, War, 2:8, 10, with Chagiga, 2:7).

2. The Essenes regarded ten persons as constituting a complete number for divine worship, and held the assembly of such n, number as sacred; so the Pharisees (comp. War, 2, 8, 9, with Aboth, 3:6; Berachoth, 54, a).

3. The Essenes would not spit out in the presence of an assembly, or to the right hand; so the Pharisees (comp. War, 2:8, 9, with Jerusalem, Berachoth, 3:5).

4. The Essenes regarded their social meal as a sacrament; so the Pharisees (compare War, 2:8, 5, with Berachoth, 55, a).  5. The Essenes bathed before meals; so the Pharisees (comp. War, 2:8, 5, with Chagiga, 18, b).

6. The Essenes put on an apron on the lower part of the body when bathing; the Pharisees covered themselves with the talith (comp. War, 2:8, 5, with Berachoth, 24, b).

7. The Essenes bathed after performing the duties of nature; so the priests (comp. War, 2:8, 9, with Yoma, 28, a).

8. The Essenes abstained from taking oaths; so the Pharisees (compare War, 2:8, 6, with Shebuoth, 39, b; Gittin, 35, a; Bemidbar Rabba, 22).

9. The Essenes would not even remove a vessel on the Sabbath; so the Pharisees (compare War, 2:8, 9, with Tosiphta Succa, 3).

10. The Essenes had a steward in every place where they resided to supply the needy strangers of this order with articles of clothing and food; so the Pharisees (comp. War, 2:8, 4, with Peah, 8:7; Baba Bathra, 8, a; Sabbath, 118).

11. The Essenes believed that all authority comes from God; so the Pharisees (comp. War, 2:8, 7, with Berachoth, 58, a).

12. An applicant for admission to the order of the Essenes had to pass through a novitiate of twelve months; so the חֲבֵרamong the Pharisees (compare War, 2:8, 7, with Bechoroth, 30, b).

13. The novice among the Essenes received an apron (περίζωμα) the first year of his probation; so the Chaber among the Pharisees (compare War, 2:8, 7, with Tosiphta Demay, c. 2; Jerusalem, Demay, 2:3, b; Bechoroth, 30, b).

14. The Essenes delivered the theosophical books, and the sacred names, to the members of their society; similarly the Pharisees (comp. War, 2:8, 7, with Chagiga, 2:1; Kiddushim, 1, a).

The real differences between the Essenes and the Pharisees developed themselves in the course of time, when the extreme rigor with wich the former sought to perform the laws of Levitical purity made them withdraw from intercourse with their fellow-men, and led them,

1. To form an isolated order;  2. To keep from marriage, because of the perpetual pollutions to which women are subject in menstruation and childbirth, and because of its being a hindrance to a purely devotional state of mind;

3. To abstain from frequenting the Temple and offering sacrifices (compare Josephus Ant. 18:1, 5); and,

4. Though they firmly believed in the immortality of the soul, yet they did not believe in the resurrection of the body (War, 2:8, 11).

To the Pharisees they stood nearly in the same relation as that in which the Pharisees themselves stood with regard to the mass of the people. The difference lay mainly in rigor of practice, and not in articles of belief. SEE PHARISEE.

But the best among the Jews felt the peril of Essenism as a system, and combined to discourage it. They shrank with an instinctive dread from the danger of connecting asceticism with spiritual power, and cherished the great truth which lay in the saying, "Doctrine is not in heaven." The miraculous energy which was attributed to mystics was regarded by them rather as a source of suspicion than of respect, and theosophic speculations were condemned with emphatic distinctness (Frankel, Monatsschrift, 1853, page 62 sq., 68, 71).

As to their connection with Christianity, there can be no difficulty in admitting that Christ and the apostles recognised those principles and practices of the Essenes which were true and useful. Though our Savior does not mention them by the name Essenes, which Philo and Josephus coined for the benefit of the Greeks, yet there can be no doubt he refers to them in Mat 19:12, when he speaks of those "who abstain from marriage for the kingdom of heaven's sake," since they were the only section of Jews who voluntarily imposed upon themselves a state of celibacy in order that they might devote themselves more closely to the service of God. Also 1 Corinthians vii can hardly be understood without bearing in mind the notions about marriage entertained by this God-fearing and self-denying order. As to other coincidences, Mat 5:34, etc., ed Jam 5:12, urge the abstinence from using oaths which was especially taught by the Essenes. The manner in which Christ commanded his disciples to depart on their journey (Mar 6:8-10), is the same which these pious men adopted when they started on a mission of mercy. The primitive Christians, like the Essenes, sold their land and houses, and  brought the prices of the things to the apostles, and they had all things in common (Act 4:32-34). John the Baptist was a parallel to this holy order, as is evident from his ascetic life (Luk 11:22); and when Christ pronounced him to be Elias (Mat 11:14), he may almost be said to have declared that the Baptist had really attained to that spirit and power which the Essenes strove to obtain in their highest stage of purity. From the nature of the case, however, Essenism, in its extreme form, could exercise very little direct influence on Christianity. In all its practical bearings it was diametrically opposed to the apostolic teaching. The dangers which it involved were far more clear to the eye of the Christian than they were to the Jewish doctors. The only real similarity between Essenism and Christianity lay in the common element of true Judaism; and there is little excuse for modern writers who follow the error of Eusebius, and confound the society of the Therapeutne with Christian brotherhoods. Nationally, however, the Essenes occupy the same position as that to which John the Baptist was personally called. They mark the close of the old, the longing for the new, but without political aspirations. In place of the message of the coming "kingdom" they could proclaim only individual purity and isolation. At a later time traces of Essenism appear in the Clementines, and the strange account which Epiphanius gives of the Osseni (᾿Θσσενοί) appears to point to some combination of Essene and pseudo- Christian doctrines (Her. 19). After the Jewish war the Essenes disappear from history. The character of Judaism was changed, and ascetic Pharisaism became almost impossible.

IV. Date, Settlements, and Number of this Order. — The fact that the Essenes developed themselves gradually, and at first imperceptibly, through intensifying the prevalent religious notions, renders it impossible to say with exactness at what degree of intensity they are to be considered as detached from the general body. The Savior and the ancient Jewish writers do not speak of them as a separate body. Josephus, however, speaks of them as existing in the days of Jonathan the Maccaboean, B.C. 143 (Ant. 13:5, 9); he then mentions Judas, an Essene, who delivered a prophecy in the reign of Aristobulus I, B.C. 106 (War, 1:3, 5; Ant. 13:11, 2). The third mention of their existence occurs in connection with Herod (Ant. 15:10, 5). These accounts distinctly show that the Essenes at first lived among the people, and did not refrain from frequenting the court, as Menachem the Essene was a friend of Herod, who was kindly disposed towards this order (ib.). This is, moreover, evident from the fact that there was a gate at  Jerusalem which was named after them (Ε᾿σσηνῶν πύλη, War, 5:4, 2). When they ultimately withdrew themselves from the rest of the Jewish nation, the majority of them settled on the north-west shore of the Dead Sea (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 5:17; Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 2:17), and the rest lived in scattered communities throughout Palestine and other places. Their number is estimated both by Philo and Josephus at 40930.

The obscurity of the Essenes as a distinct body arises from the fact that they represented originally a tendency rather than an organization. The communities which were formed out of them were a result of their practice, and not a necessary part of it. As a sect they were distinguished by an aspiration after ideal purity rather than by any special code of doctrines; and, like the Chasidimi of earlier times, they were confounded in the popular estimation with the great body of the zealous observers of the law (Pharisees). The growth of Essenism was a natural result of the religious feeling which was called out by the circumstances of the Greek dominion, and it is easy to trace the process by which it was matured. From the Maccaboaan age there was a continuous effort among the stricter Jews to attain an absolute standard of holiness. Each class of devotees was looked upon as practically impure by their successors, who carried the laws of purity still further; and the Essenes stand at the extreme limit of the mystic asceticism which was thus gradually reduced to shape. The associations of the "Scribes and Pharisees" (חברים "the companions, the wise") gave place to others bound by a more rigid rule; and the rule of the Essenes was made gradually stricter. Those whom Josephus speaks of as allowing marriage may be supposed to have belonged to such bodies as had not yet withdrawn from intercourse with their fellow-men. But the practice of the extreme section was afterwards regarded as characteristic of the whole class, and the isolated communities of Essenes furnished the type which is preserved in the popular descriptions.

The character of Essenism limited its spread. Out of Palestine, Levitical purity was impossible, for the very land was impure; and thus there is no trace of the sect in Babylonia. The case was different in Egypt, where Judaism assumed a new shape from its intimate connection with Greece. Here the original form in which it was molded was represented, not by direct copies, but by analogous forms, and the tendency which gave birth to the Essenes found a fresh development in the pure speculation of the Therapeuta (q.v.). These Alexandrine mystics abjured the practical labors which rightly belonged to the Essenes, and gave themselves up to the study  of the inner meaning of the Scriptures. The impossibility of fulfilling the law naturally led them to substitute a spiritual for a literal interpretation; and it was their object to ascertain its meaning by intense labor, and then to satisfy its requirements by absolute devotion. The "whole day, from sunrise to sunset, was spent in mental discipline." Bodily wants were often forgotten in the absorbing pursuit of wisdom, and "meat and drink" were at all times held to be unworthy of the light (Philo, De vit. contempl. § 4).

According to Credner, Ueber Essener und Ebioniten (in Winer's Zeitschr. I, 2-3, 217 sq.), the Ebionites descended from the Essenes. Grisse says (ib. page 653) that the Therapeutae, who lived in Egypt (Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 2:138 sq., 725), were a class of the Essenes (see Bald, Diss. Essmos Pgythagorissantes delineatura, Upsal. 1746); and he presumes that they existed as early as the time of Alexander the Great, and, spreading from Egypt to Palestine, there became acquainted with the Pythagorean or Oriental philosophy (comp. Josephus, Ant. 15:13). Dr. Wise thinks that the founder of the Essenes must have been an Egyptian Jew who was acquainted with the Pythagorean order, and came to Palestine about B.C. 200; and says farther that the Therapeuts (founded about B.C. 170) of Egypt and elsewhere were in name and essence an imitation of the Essenes. He asserts also that no positive traces of their messianic views are left either by Josephus or Philo, or even by the Talmud, but that, in consideration of their numerous similarities to the Egyptian Jews, they may be supposed to have entertained messianic hopes similar to the Egyptians (The Israelite, November 1, 1867).

V. Literature. — The oldest accounts we have of the Essenes are those given by Josephus, War, 2:8, 2-15; Ant. 12:5, 9; 15:10, 4 sq.; 18:1, 2 sq.; Philo, Quod omnis probus liber, § 12 sq.; Pliny, Hist. Nater. 5, c. 16, 17; Solinus, Polyhist. c. 35; Porphyry, De Abstinentia, page 381; Epiphanius, ad. firer. lib. 1; Eusebius, Histor. Ecc 2:1-26, c. 17. Of modern productions we have Bellermann, Geschichtliche Nachrichten cus dem Alterthume fiber Essier und Therapeuten (Berlin, 1821), who has studiously collected all the descriptions of this order; Gfrörer, Philo und die judischh alexandrinische Theosophe (Stuttgart, 1835), page 299 sq. Prideaux, Connection of the O. and N.T., part 2, book 5:5; Dähne, Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch alexandrinischen Religions Philosophie, 1:467 sq.; and by the same author, the article Essier, in Ersch und Gruber's Encyklopädie; Neander, History of the Church, ed. Bohn, volume 1. The Essays of Frankel, in his Zeitschrift fer die religiosen  Interessen d. Judenthmums (Lpz. 1848), page 441 sq.; and Monatsschrift fcir Geschichte u. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums, 2:30 sq., 61 sq., are most important, and may be considered as having created a new epoch in the treatment of the history of this order, Adopting the results of Frankel, and pursuing the same course still further, Gratz has given a masterly treatise upon the Essenes in his Geschichte der Juden (Leipzig , 1856), 3:96 sq., 518 sq.; treatises of great value ale also given by Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner-Secten (Leipzig, 1857), page 207 sq.; and Herzfeld, Geschichte, d. V. Israel (Nordhausen, 1857), 2:368, 388 sq. The accounts given by Ewald, Geschichte d. Volkes Israel (Gdttingen, 1852), 4:420 sq., and Hilgenfeld, Die jddische Apokalyptik (Jena, 1857), page 245 sq., though based upon Philo and Josephus, are important contributions to the literature of the Essenes; that of the latter is interesting and ingenious, but essentially onesided and subservient to the writer's theory (compare Volkmar, Das vierte B. Fzra, page 60). To these must be added the very interesting and important relics of the Essenes, published by Jellinek, with instructive notices by the learned editor, in Beth la Midrash, volume 2 (Leipzig, 1853), page 18 sq.; volume 3 (Leipzig, 1855), page 20 sq.

See also Ginsburg, History and Doctrines of the Essenes (Lond. 1864); Hermes, De Essais (Hal. 1720); Lund, De Pimar. Sadd. et Ess is (Abose, 1689); Sauer, De Essenis et Therapeutis (Vratisl. 1829); Willemer, Deu 1:1-46 Essenis (Viteb. 1680); Zeller, Ueb. d. Zusammenh. d. Essaismus mit Griechenthum (in the Tub. theol. Jahrb. 1856, pages 401-433); Roth, De Essenis (Jen. 1669); Willemer, id. (Viteb. 1680); Lange, id. (Hal. 1721); Tresenreuter, De Essceorum nomine (Alt. 1743); Van der Hude, Num discipli Joh. Bapt. fuerunt. Esscei (Helmst. 1754); Carpzov, Dank-cpfer an Gott. page 282 sq.; Ernesti, Ueb. "Porphyrius de Abstinentia" (in his Theol. Jibl. 9:63 sq.); Grave, De Pythagor. et Fssenor. discipline (Gott. 1808); Bielcke, De Essusis et Therapeutis (Starg. 1755); Bittner, De Essmis (Jen. 1670); Credner, Ueb. Essder and Ebioniten (in Winer's Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 2:211-264); Grossmann, De ascetis Judceorumn (Altenb. 1833); Zinck, De, Therapeutis (Lips. 1724). On the supposed relations of Essenism to Christianity, there are special treatises in Latin by Zorn, (in his Opusc. Sacr. 2:62 sq.), Kaiser (in his Quaestion. Synodal. [Curise, 1801], page 25 sq.), Dorfmiiller (Wunsiedel, 1803), Tinga (Groning. 1805); in German by Litderwald (in Henke's Magaz; 4:371 sq.), Bengel (in Flatt's Magaez. 7:126 sq.). See likewise the Stud. u. Krit. 1845, 3:549; Jour. Sac. Lit. October 1852, pages 176-186.; April,  1853, page 170 sq.; Blackwood's Magazine, 1840, pages 105, 463, 639; Amer. Bibl: Repos. January 1849, page 162 sq.; Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr.fuzr wissensch. Theologie, 1867, 1, art. 6; Illgen's Zeitschr. fur hist. Theol. 1841, 2:3 sq.; the Strasb. Revue de theol. 1867, page 221 sq.; Zeller's Theol. Jahrb. 1855, page 315 sq.; 1850, page 401 sq.; Meth. Quart. Rev. July, 1867, page 450; North British Rev. December 1867, page 151; Pressense, Religions before Christ, pages 231-234; Schaff, Apostolic Church, pages 175, 657 sq.; Holzmann, Gesch. d. Vodes Israel, 1:206 sq.; Lucius, Der Essenismus (Strasb. 1881). SEE SECTS, JEWISH.

## Essenius, Andrew[[@Headword:Essenius, Andrew]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Bommel in February, 1618, and was educated at Utrecht, where he became pastor in 1651. In 1653 he was made professor of theology in the University of Utrecht. He died May 18, 1677. Among his writings are Triumphus Crucis (Amst. 1649): — De Moralitate (Sabbati 1658): — Systema Theologicumn (1659): — Compendium Theol. Dogmas. (1669). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 16:441.

## Essentia[[@Headword:Essentia]]

             SEE ESSENCE.

## Establishment[[@Headword:Establishment]]

             This term is applied to the position of that religious denomination in any country which solely or peculiarly enjoys the patronage of the state, and the clergy of which have, in consequence, their several endowments and incomes especially settled and maintained by the Legislature or government. The general tendency of opinion in all countries is now against established churches, and in favor of the voluntary principle for the support of churches. The subject is discussed at length, historically and otherwise, in the article SEE CHURCH AND STATE (2:329). We present here a summary of the arguments on both sides.

I. The partisans for religious establishments observe

1. that they have prevailed universally in every age and nation. The office of prophet, priest and king were united in the same patriarch (Gen 18:19; Gen 17:1-27; Gen 21:1-34; Gen 14:18). The Jews enjoyed a religious establishment dictated and ordained by God. In turning our attention to the heathen  nations, we shall find the same incorporation of religious with civil government. (Gen 47:22; 2Ki 17:27; 2Ki 17:29). Every one who is at all acquainted with the history of Greece and Rome knows that religion was altogether blended with the policy of the state. The Koran may be considered as the religious creed and civil code of all the Mohammedan tribes. Among the Celts, or the original inhabitants of Europe, the Druids were both their priests and their judges, and their judgment was final. Among the Hindoos the priests and sovereigns are of different tribes or castes, but the priests are superior in rank; and in China the emperor is sovereign pontiff, and presides in all public acts of religion.

2. Again: it is said that. although there is no form of Church government absolutely prescribed in the New Testament, yet from the associating law, on which the Gospel lays so much stress, by the respect for civil government it so earnestly enjoins, and by the practice which followed and finally prevailed, Christians cannot be said to disapprove, but to favor religious establishments.

3. Religious establishments also, it is observed, are founded on the nature of man, and interwoven with all the constituent principles of human society: the knowledge and profession of Christianity cannot be upheld without a clergy; a clergy cannot be supported without a legal provision; and a legal provision for the clergy cannot be constituted without the preference of one sect of Christians to the rest. An established church is most likely to maintain clerical respectability and usefulness by holding out a suitable encouragement to young men to devote themselves early to the service of the Church, and likewise enables them to obtain such knowledge as shall quilify them for the important work.

II. They who reason on the contrary side observe

1. that the patriarchs sustaining civil as well as religious offices is no proof at all that religion was incorporated with the civil government in the sense above referred to, nor is there the least hint of it in the sacred Scriptures. That the case of the Jews can never be considered in point, as they were under a theocracy and a ceremonial dispensation that was to pass away, and consequently not designed to be a model for Christian nations. That, whatever was the practice of heathens in this respect, this forms no argument in favor of that system which is the very opposite to paganism.  2. The Church of Christ is of a spiritual nature, and ought not, yea, cannot in fact be incorporated with the state without sustaining material injury. In the three first and purest ages of Christianity the Church was a stranger to any alliance with temporal powers; and, so far from needing their aid, religion never flourished so much as while they were combined to suppress it.

3. As to the support which Christianity, when united to civil government, yields to the peace and good order of society, it is observed that this benefit will he derived from it in at least as great a degree without an establishment as with it. Religion, if it have any power, operates on the conscience of men; and, resting solely on the belief of invisible realities, it can derive no weight or solemnity from human sanctions. Human establishments, it is said, have been, and are, productive of the greatest evils, for in this case it is requisite to give the preference to some particular system; and as the magistrate is no better judge of religion than others, the chances are as great of his lending his sanction to the false as the true. The thousands that have been persecuted and suffered in consequence of establishments will always form an argument against them. Under establishments also, it is said, corruption cannot be avoided. Emolument must be attached to the national church, which may be a strong inducement to its ministers to defend it, be it ever so remote from the truth. Thus, also, error becomes permanent; and that set of opinions which happens to prevail when the establishment is formed, continues, in spite of superior light and improvement, to be handed down, without alteration, from age to age. Hence the disagreement between the public creed of the Church and the private sentiments of its ministers.

4. Finally, though all Christians should pay respect to civil magistrates as such, and all magistrates ought to encourage the Church, yet no civil magistrates have any power to establish any particular form of religion binding upon the consciences of the subject; nor are magistrates ever represented in Scripture as officers or rulers of the Church. As Mr. Coleridge observes, the Christian Church is not a kingdom, realm, or state of the world, nor is it an estate of any such kingdom, realm, or state; but it is the appointed opposite to them all collectively — the sustaining, correcting, befriending opposite of the world — the compensating counterforce to the inherent and inevitable evils and defects of the state as a state, and without reference to its better or worse construction as a particular state; while, whatever is beneficent and humanizing in the aims,  tendencies, and proper objects of the state, it collects in itself as in a focus, to radiate them back in a higher quality; or, to change the metaphor, it completes and strengthens the edifice of the state, without interference or commixture, in the mere act of laying and securing its own foundations. And for these services the Church of Christ asks of the state neither wages nor dignities; she asks only protection, and to be let alone. These, indeed, she demands; but even these only on the ground that there is nothing in her constitution nor in her discipline inconsistent with the interests of the state; nothing resistant or impedimental to the state in the exercise of its rightful powers, in the fulfillment of its appropriate duties, or in the effectuation of its legitimate objects.

5. As to the provision made for the clergy, this may be done without an establishment, as matter of fact shows in hundreds of instances in the Dissenting and Methodist churches in England, and universally by all churches in America. Indeed, the question of the value of the voluntary principle may be considered as finally settled by the experience :of the English and American churches. In England, in 1855, the Established Church had church accommodation for 5,300,000, and all other denominations could seat 4,900,000, making in all church-room for 10,200,000 of the population. in the United States there were church accommodation in 1850 for 14,00,00000, and it is computed by Dr. Baird (Religion in America) that there must be altogether far more than one minister for each 900 inhabitants. In England they have an establishment of untold wealth. For centuries they have been accumulating edifices for worship the most costly and durable that the world knows, and yet the United States, without any aid from the government, seats a larger proportion of the inhabitants in houses of worship, and raises $25,000,000 annually for religious benevolence. That which has been the cause of this superior success in America is the more perfect action of the voluntary principle. Even in England this principle has worked in the same manner. Fifty years ago the population of that country was less than half what it now is. Then the Church of England could seat 4,000,000, now 5,300,000. But at that time the Dissenters could seat only one fifth of the numbers they can at present. In America the population has doubled itself five or six times since the Revolution, and yet then there was but about one minister to every 2000 inhabitants, now there is one to every 1000. See Warburton, Alliance between Church and State; Christie, Essay on Establishments; Paley, Mor. Philippians 5:2, c. 10; Bp. Law, Theory of Religion; Watts,  Civil Power in Things Sacred, third volume of his Works; Hall, Liberty of the Press, section 5:; Conder, Protestant Nonconformity; Baird, Religion in America (N.Y. 1856, 8vo); and art. SEE CHURCH AND STATE.

## Estaing, Francois[[@Headword:Estaing, Francois]]

             a learned and charitable French prelate, was born January 6, 1462. He was bishop of Rhodez, and constructed the tower of the cathedral at his own expense. He died November 1, 1529. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Estaing, Joachim[[@Headword:Estaing, Joachim]]

             bishop of Clermont, died in 1650, and had as his successor in his diocese his brother Louis, who was almoner to Anne of Austria. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Estampes[[@Headword:Estampes]]

             SEE ETAMPES.

## Este, Ippolito d[[@Headword:Este, Ippolito d]]

             an Italian prelate, son of duke Ercole I, was born in 1479. He was appointed cardinal at the age of fifteen years by pope Alexander VI. He is accused of having given orders for putting out the eyes of his natural brother, Giulio d'Este, through jealousy. He was the political counsellor and lieutenant of his brother Alfonso, who had become duke of Ferrara in 1505. He contributed to the destruction of the Venetian fleet, December 22, 1509. Cardinal d'Este had received a very careful education, and possessed extensive knowledge, particularly of mathematics. He died in 1520. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Este, Juan Baptista d[[@Headword:Este, Juan Baptista d]]

             a convert from Judaism, who flourished in the beginning of the 17th century in Portugal, is the author of Consolacon Christiana (Lisbon, 1616): — Dialogo entre Discipulo e Mestre Catechizante, in one hundred chapters (ibid. 1621). See Fuirst, Bibl. Jud. 1:258; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1 and 3:810; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Estella, Diego D[[@Headword:Estella, Diego D]]

             a Spanish ascetic writer, was born at Estella in 1524. After studying at the universities of Toulouse and. Salamanca, he entered the monastic life, and gained the confidence of Philip II, who called him his consulting theologian. He died August 1, 1578, leaving De la Vida del Evangelista San Juan (Lisbon, 1554): — De la Vanidad del Mundo (Salamanca, 1574): — In Evangelism Lucae (Alcala de Henares, 1578). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, S.V.

## Estes, Daniel Gordon, D.D[[@Headword:Estes, Daniel Gordon, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, graduated from the General Theological Seminary; officiated in St. Louis, Mo., in 1853, and in the following year became rector. In 1857 he resided in Amesbury, Massachusetts; subsequently became rector of St. James's Church in that place, and continued to serve that parish until 1872. He died August 9, 1873, aged fiftythree years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1874, page 138.

## Esther[[@Headword:Esther]]

             [vulgarly pronounced Es'ter], a beautiful Jewish maiden, the heroine of the Biblical book that bears her name.

1. Name. — Her proper Hebrew name was Eadassah (q.v.), but on her introduction into the royal harem she received, in accordance with Oriental usage (comp. Dan 1:7), the new and probably Persian name of Esther (אֶסְתֵּר, Ester'; Sept. Ε᾿σθήρ, and so Josephus [Genesis ῆρος, Ant. 11:6, 2, etc.; Vulg. Esther), which thenceforth became her usual and better-known designation, as appears from the formula הַיא אֶסְתֵּר, "that is, Esther" (Est 2:7), exactly analogous to the usual addition of the modern names of towns to explain the use of the old obsolete ones (Gen 35:19; Gen 35:27; Jos 15:10, etc.). As to its signification, Gesenius (Thes. Hebrews page 134, a) cites from that diffuse Targum on this book, which is known as the second Targum on Esther, the following words: "She was called Esther from the name of the star Venus, which in Greek is Aster" (i.e., ἀστἡρ, Lat. aster, Engl. star; see Lassen, Ind. Biblioth. 3:8, 18). Gesenius then points to the Persian word satarah, star, as that of which Esther is the Syro-Arabian modification; and brings it, as to signification, into connection with the planet Venus, as a star of good fortune, and with the name of the Syrian goddess Ashtreth (q.v.). In this etymology Fürst acquiesces (Hebrews Handwb. s.v.).

2. History. — She was the daughter of Abihail (who was probably the son of Shimei), a Benjamite, and uncle of Mordecai (q.v.). Her ancestor Kish had been among the captives led away from Jerusalem (part of which was in the tribe of Benjamin) by Nebuchadnezzar when Jehoiachin was taken captive. The family did not avail itself of the permission to return to Palestine under the edict of Cyrus. Her parents being dead, Esther was brought up as a daughter by her cousin Mordecai, who had an office in the court or household of the Persian monarch "at Shushan, in the palace." The reigning king of Persia, Ahasuerus, having divorced his queen, Vashti, on account of the becoming spirit with which she refused to submit to the  indignity which a compliance with his drunken commands involved, search was made throughout the empire for the most beautiful maiden to be her successor. Those whom the officers of the harem deemed the most beautiful were removed thither, the eventual choice among them remaining with the king himself. That choice fell on Esther, who found favor in the eyes of Ahasuerus, and was advanced to a station enviaile only by comparison with that of the less favored inmates of the royal harem. B.C. 479. The king was not aware, however, of her race and parentage; and so, with the careless profusion of a sensual despot, on the representation of Haman the Agagite, his prime minister, that the Jews scattered through his empire were a pernicious race, he gave him full power and authority to kill them all, young and old, women and children, and take possession of all their property. The circumstance that Esther herself, though queen, seemed to be included in this doom of extirpation, enabled her to turn the royal indignation upon Haman, whose resentment against Mordecai had led him to obtain from the king this monstrous edict. The laws of the empire would not allow the king to recall a decree once uttered; but the Jews were authorized to stand on their defense; and this, with the known change in the intentions of the court, averted the worst consequences of the decree. The Jews established a yearly feast in memory of this deliverance, which is observed among them to this day. See PURIM. Such is the substance of the history of Esther, as related in the book which bears her name. (See below.) The details, as given in that book, afford a most curious picture of the usages of the ancient Persian court, the accuracy of which is vouched for not only by the historical authority of the book itself, but by its agreement with the intimations afforded by the ancient writers, as well as by the fact that the same usages are in substance preserved in the Persian court at the present day. SEE HAREM.

Sir John Malcolm tells us that the sepulcher of Esther and Mordecai stands near the center of the city of Hamadan. It is a square building, terminated by a dome, with an inscription in Hebrew upon it, translated and sent to him by Sir Gore Ouseley, ambassador to the court of Persia, as follows: "Thursday, fifteenth of the month Adar, in the year 4474 from the creation of the world, was finished the building of this temple over the graves of Esther and Mordecai, by the hands of the good-hearted brothers Elias and Samuel, the sons of the deceased Ishmael of Kashan." According to the vulgar Jewish sera, this would have been not more than eleven centuries ago; but' the date may be after the computation of the Eastern Jews, which  would make it about A.D. 250. Local tradition says that it was thoroughly repaired about 175 years since by a Jewish rabbi named Ismael (Kitto, Pict. Bible, at Est 10:1). SEE ACHMETHA.

3. Proposed Identifications with Personages in Profane History. — The question as to the identity of the Persian king referred to in connection with Esther is discussed under AHASUERUS SEE AHASUERUS , and the reasons there given lead to the conclusion that he was Xerxes, the son of Darins Hystaspis. (See, however, a contrary view in the Jour. of Sac. Lit. July, 1860, page 406 sq.)

A second inquiry remains, Who, then, was Esther? Artissona, Atossa, and others are indeed excluded by the above decision; but are we to conclude, with Scalirer, that because Ahasuerus is Xerxes, therefore Esther is Amestris? Surely not. None of the historical particulars related by Herodotus concerning Amestris (Herod 9:108; comp. Ctesias, ap. Photius, Cod. 72, page 57) make it possible to identify her with Esther. Amestris was the daughter of Otanes (Onophas in Ctesias), one of Xerxes's generals, and brother to his father Darius (Herod. 7:61, 82). Esther's father and mother had been Jews. Amestris was wife to Xerxes before the Greek expedition (Herod. 7:61), and her sons accompanied Xerxes to Greece (Herod. 7:39), and had all three come to man's estate at the death of Xerxes in the 20th year of his reign. Darius, the eldest, had married immediately after the return from Greece. Esther did not enter the king's palace till his 7th year, just the time of Darius's marriage. These objections are conclusive, without adding the difference of character of the two queens. The truth is that history is wholly silent both about Vashti and Esther. Herodotus only happens to mention one of Xerxes's wives; Scripture only mentions two, if indeed either of them were wives at all. But since we know that it was the custom of the Persian kings before Xerxes to have several wives, besides their concubines; that Cyrus had several (Herod. 3:3); that Cambyses had four whose names are mentioned, and others besides (3:31, 32, 68); that Smerdis had several (ib. 68, 69); and that Darius had six wives, whose names are mentioned (ib. passim), it is most improbable that Xerxes should have been content with one wife. Another strong objection to the idea of Esther being his one legitimate wife, and perhaps to her being strictly his wife at all, is that the Persian kings selected their wives not from the harem, but, if not foreign princesses, from the noblest Persian families, either their own nearest relatives, or from one of the seven great Persian houses. It seems therefore  natural to conclude that Esther, a captive, and one of the harem, was not of the highest rank of wives, but that a special honor, with the name of queen, may have been given to her, as to Vashti before her, as the favorite concubine or inferior wife, whose offspring, however, if she had any, would not have succeeded to the Persian throne. This view, which seems to be strictly in accordance with what we know of the manners of the Persian court, removes all difficulty in reconciling the history of Esther with the scanty accounts left us by profane authors of the reign of Xerxes.

It may be convenient to add that the Od year of Xerxes, in which the banquet that was the occasion of Vashti's divorce was held, was B.C. 488, his 7th, B.C. 479, and his 12th, B.C. 474 (Clinton, F.B.), and that the simultaneous battles of Plataea and Mycale, which frightened Xerxes from Sardis (Diod. Sic. 11:36) to Susa, happened, according to Prideaux anl Clinton, in September of his 7th year. For a fuller discussion of the identity of Esther, and different views of the subject, see Prideaux's Connexion, 1:236, 243, 297 sq., and Petav. De doctr. temp. 12:27, 28, who make Esther wife of Artaxerxes Longim., following Joseph. Ant. 11:6, as he followed the Sept. and the apocryphal Esther; J. Scalig. (De emend. temp. 6:591; Animadv. Euseb. page 100) making Ahasuerus, Xerxes; Usher (Annal. Vet. Test.) making him Darius Hystaspis; Loftus, Chaldaea, etc. Eusebius (Cenon. Chron. £38, ed. Mediol.) rejects the hypothesis of Artaxerxes Longim. en the score of the silence of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and adopts that of Artaxerxes Mnemon, following the Jews, who make Darius Codcmannus to beathe same as Darius Hystaspis, and the son of Artaxerxes by Esther! It is most observable that all Petavius's and Prideaux's arguments against Scaliger's view apply solely to the statement that Esther is Amestris. SEE XERXES.

4. The character of Esther, as she appears in the Bible, is that of a woman of deep piety, faith, courage, patriotism, and caution, combined with resolution; a dutiful daughter to her adoptive father, docile and obedient to his counsels, and anxious to share the king's favor with him for the good of the Jewish people. That she was a virtuous woman, and, as far as her situation made it possible, a good wife to the king, her continued influence over him for so long a time warrants us to infer. There must have been a singular grace and charm in her aspect and manners, since she "obtained favor in the sight of all that looked upon her" (Est 2:15). That she was raised up as an instrument in the hands of God to avert the destruction of the Jewish people, and to afford them protection, and forward their  wealth and peace in their captivity, is also manifest from the Scripture account. But to impute to her the sentiments put in her mouth by the apocryphal author of chapter 14, or to accuse her of cruelty because of the death of Haman and his sons, and the second day's slaughter of the Jews' enemies at Shushan, is utterly to ignore the manners and feelings of her age and nation, and to judge her by the standard of Christian morality in our own age and country instead. In fact, the simplicity and truth to nature of the scriptural narrative afford a striking contrast both with the forced and florid amplifications of the apocryphal additions, and with the sentiments of some later commentators. See Debaeza, Historia Esther (in his Comment. Ahegor. vi); Anon. De Assuero (in the Crit. Sac. Thes. Nov. 1:761); Robinson, Script. Char. 2; Hughes, Esther and her People (London, 1846); Justi, Ueb. d. Ahasuerus in Esther (in Eichhorn's Repertor. 15:1 sq.); Tyrwhitt, Esther and Ahasuerus (London, 1868, 2 volumes, 8vo).

## Esther, Apocryphal Additions To The Book Of[[@Headword:Esther, Apocryphal Additions To The Book Of]]

             Besides the many minor deviations from the Hebrew, there are six important additions in the Septuagint and the other ancient versions of the book of Esther.

I. Title and Position. — In the Sept. and the Old Latin these additions are dispersed through the canonical book, forming therewith a well-adjusted whole, and have therefore no separate title. St. Jerome, however, separated them in his translation, and removed them to the end of the book, because they are not found in the Hebrew. They are, therefore, in this position in the MSS. and the printed editions of the Vulgate, and form, according to cardinal Hugo's division, the last seven chapters of the canonical Esther. Luther, who was the first that separated the apocryphal from the canonical books, entirely detached these additions, and placed them among the Apocrypha under the title "Stucke in Esther.” In the Zurich Bible, where the apocryphal and canonical books are also separated, the canonical volume is called 1 Esther, and these additions are denominated 2 Esther. Our English versions, though following Luther's arrangements, are not uniform in their designation of these additions. Thus Coverdale calls them "The chapters of the book of Hester, which are not found in the text of the Hebrew, but in the Greek and Latin." In Matthews and the Bishops' Bible, which are followed by the A.V., they are entitled, "The rest of the chapters of the book of Esther, which are found neither in the Hebrew nor in the Chaldee," whilst the Geneva version adopts Luther's title.

The reason of their present confused arrangement seems to be this: When Jerome translated the book of Esther, he first gave the version of the Hebrew only as being alone authentic. He then added at the end a version in Latin of those several passages which he found in the Sept., and which were not in the Hebrew, stating where each passage came in, and marking them all with an obelus. The first passage so given is that which forms the continuation of chapter 10 (which of course immediately precedes it),  ending with the entry about Dositheus. Having annexed this conclusion, he then gives the Prooemium, which he says forms the beginning of the Greek Vulgate, beginning with what is now Est 10:2 of chapter 11; and so proceeds with the other passages. But in subsequent editions all Jerome's explanatory matter has been swept away, and the disjointed portions have been printed as chapter 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, as if they formed a narrative in continuance of the canonical book. The extreme absurdity of this arrangement is nowhere more apparent than in chapter 11, where the verse (1) which closes the whole book in the Greek copies, and in St. Jerome's Latin translation, is actually made immediately to precede that (Est 10:2) which is the very first verse of the Prooemium. As regards the place assigned to Esther in the printed Sept., in the Vatican edition (not MS.), and most others, it comes between Judith and Job. Its place before Job is a remnant of the Hebrew order, Esther there closing the historical, and Job beginning the metrical Megilloth. Tobit and Judith have been placed between it and Nehemiah, doubtless for chronological reasons. But in the ancient MSS. the position is different. SEE BIBLE.

II. Design and Contents. — The object of these additions is to give a more decidedly religious tone to the record contained in the book of Esther, and to show more plainly how wonderfully the God of Israel interposed to save his people and confound their enemies. This the writer has effected by elaborating upon the events narrated in the canonical volume as follows:

1. Est 1:1 of the canonical volume is preceded in the Sept. by a piece which tells us that Mordecai, who was in the service of Artaxerxes, dreamt of the dangers which threatened his people, and of their deliverance (Est 1:1-12). He afterwards discovered a conspiracy against the king, which he discloses to him, and is greatly rewarded for it (Est 1:13-18). This is, in the Vulgate and Eng. version, chapter 11:2-12:6.

2. Between Est 1:13-14 of chapter 3 in the canonical book, the Septuagint gives a copy of the king's edict addressed to all the satraps, to destroy without compassion that foreign and rebellious people, the Jews, for the good of the Persian nation, in the fourteenth day of the twelfth month of the coming year. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, chapter 13:1-7.  3. At the end of Est 4:17 of the canonical book, the Sept. has two prayers of Mordecai and Esther, that God may avert the impending destruction of his people. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, chapter 13:8-14:19.

4. Between Est 4:1-2 of chapter 5 in the canonical book, the Sept. inserts a detailed account of Esther's visit to the king. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, chapter 15:1-16.

5. Between Est 4:13-14 of chapter 8 in the canonical hooks, the Sept. gives a copy of the edict, which the king sent to all his satraps, in accordance with the request of Mordecai and Esther, to abolish his former decree against the Jews. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, chapter 16:1-24.

6. At the close of the canonical book, chapter 10:3, the Sept. has a piece in which we are told that Mordecai had now recalled to his mind his extraordinary dream, and seen how literally it had been fulfilled in all its particulars. It also gives us an account of the proclamation of the Purim festival in Egypt.

The whole book is closed with the following entry: "In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemaeus and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said lie was a priest and Levite, and Ptolemy his son, brought this epistle of Phurim, which they said was the same, and that Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy, that was in Jerusalem, had interpreted it." This entry was apparently intended to give authority to this Greek version of ESTHER by pretending that it was a certified translation from the Hebrew original. Ptolemy Philometor, who is here meant, began to reign B.C. 181. He is the same as is frequently mentioned in 1 Mace. (e.g. 10:57; 11:12; comp. Joseph. Ant. 13:4, 1 and 5, and Clinton, F.H. 3:393). Dositheus seems to be a Greek version of Mattithiah; Ptolemy was also a common name for Jews at that time.

III. Origin, historical Character, and Unity. — The patriotic spirit with which the Jewish nation so fondly expatiated upon the remarkable events and characters of by-gone days, and which gave rise to those beautiful legends preserved in their copious literature, scarcely ever had a better opportunity afforded to it for employing its richly inventive powers to magnify the great Jehovah, embalm the memory of the heroes, and brand the names of the enemies of Israel, than in the canonical book of Esther. Nothing could be more natural for a nation who "have a zeal of God" than  to supply the name of God, and to point out more distinctly his interposition in their behalf in an inspired book, which, though recording their marvelous escape from destruction, had for some reasons omitted avowedly to acknowledge the Lord of Israel. Besides, the book implies and suggests far more than it records, and it cannot be doubted that there are many other things connected with the history it contains which were well known at the time, and were transmitted to the nation. This is evident from the fact that Josephus (Ant. 11:6, 6 sq.) gives the edict for the destruction of the Jews in the Persian empire, the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, and the second edict authorizing the Jews to destroy their enemies, also mentioning the name of the eunuch's servant, a Jew, who betrayed the conspiracy to Mordecai, and citing other passages from the Persian chronicles read to Ahasuerus, besides that relating to Mordecai, and amplifications of the king's speech to Haman, etc.; and that the second Targum, the Chaldee, published by De Rossi, and Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, page 74 sq.), give the dream of Mordecai, as well as his prayer and that of Esther.

The first addition which heads the canonical book, and in which Mordecai foresees in a dream both the dangers and the salvation of his people, is in accordance with the desire to give the whole a more religious tone. The second addition originated from the fact that Est 3:13 of the canonical book speaks of the royal edict, hence this piece pretends to give a copy of the said document; the same is the case with the third addition, which follows Est 4:17, and gives the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, for the said passage in the canonical volume relates that Esther ordered prayers to be offered. The fourth addition after Est 5:1, giving a detailed account of Esther's interview with the king, originated from a desire to give more information upon the fact, which is simply alluded to in the canonical passage. The fifth addition, after Est 8:13, originated in the same manner as the second, viz. in a desire to supply a copy of the royal edict, while the sixth addition, after Est 10:3, beautifully concludes with an interpretation of the dream with which the first addition commences the canonical volume. From this analysis it will be seen that these supplementary and embellishing additions are systematically dispersed through the book, and form a well-adjusted and continuous history. In the Vulgate, however, which is followed by the versions of the Reformers on the Continent and our English translations, where these  additions are torn out of the proper connection and removed to a separate place, they are most incomprehensible.

IV. Author, Date, and original Language. — From what has been remarked in the foregoing section, it will at once be apparent that these apocryphal additions were neither manufactured by the translator of the canonical Esther into Greek, nor are they the production of the Alexandrian nor of any other school or individual, but embody some of the numerous national stories connected with this marvelous deliverance of God's ancient people, the authorship of which is lost in the nation. Many of them date as far back as the nucleus of the event itself, around which they cluster, and all of them grew up at first in the vernacular language of the people (i.e., in Hebrew or Aramaic), but afterwards assumed the complexion and language of the countries in which the Jews happened to settle down. Besides the references given in the preceding section which lead us to these conclusions, we also refer to the two Midrashim published by Jellinek in his Beth Ha-Midrash, (Lpz. 1853), 1 sq. In chapter 3 the pretended copy of Artaxerxes's decree for the destruction of the Jews is written in thorough Greek style; the prayer of Esther excuses her for being wife to the uncircumcised king, and denies her having eaten anything or drunk wine at the table of Haman; the pretended copy of Artaxerxes's letter for reversing the previous decree is also of manifestly Greek origin in chapter 8, in which Haman is called a Macedonian, and is accused of having plotted to transfer the empire from the Persians to the Macedonians, a palpable proof of this portion having been composed after the overthrow of the Persian empire by the Greeks.

V. Canonicity of these Additions. — It is of this Sept. version that Athanasius (Hist. Epist. page 39, Oxf. translation) spoke when he ascribed the book of Esther to the non-canonical books; and this, also, is perhaps the reason why, in some of the lists of the canonical books, Esther is not named, as, e.g. in those of Melito of Sardis and Gregory Nazianzen (see Whitaker, Disput. on H. Scr. Park. Soc. pages 57, 58; Cosin on the Canon of Scr. pages 49, 50), unless in these it is included under some other book, as Ruth or Esdras ("this book of Esther, or sixth of Esdras, as it is placed in some of the most ancient copies of the Vulgate," Lee's Dissert. on 2d Esdas, page 25). The fathers, who regarded the Septuagint as containing the sacred scriptures of the O.T., believed in the canonicity of these additions. Even Origen, though admitting that they are not in the Hebrew,  defended their canonicity (Ep. ad African. ed. West, page 225), and the Council of Trent pronounced the whole book of Esther, with all its parts, to be canonical. These additions, however, were never included in the Hebrew canon, and the fact that Josephus quotes them only shows that he believed them to be historically true, but not inspired. St. Jerome, who knew better than any other father what the ancient Jews included in their canon, most emphatically declares them to be spurious ("Librum Esther variis translatoribus constat esse vitiatum; quem ego de archivis Hebraeorum relevans, verbum e verbo expressius transtuli. Quem librum editio vulgata laciniosis hinc inde verborum sinibus [al. funibus] trahit, addens ea quae ex tempore dici poterant et audiri; sicut solitum est scholaribus disciplinis sumto themate excogitare, quibus verbis uti potuit, qui injuriam passus est, vel qui injuriam fecit," Praef. in 1 Esth.). Sixtus Senensis, in spite of the decision of the council, speaks of these additions after the example of Jerome (as "la cinias hinc inde quorumdam scriptorum temeritate insertas"), and thinks that they are chiefly derived from Josephus; but this last opinion is without probability. The manner and the order in which Josephus cites them (Ant. 11, 6) show that they had already, in his days, obtained currency among the Hellenistic Jews as portions of the book of Esther, as we know from the way in which he cites 6ther apocryphal books that they were current likewise, with others which are now lost; for it was probably from such that Josephus derived his stories about Moses, about Sanballat, and the temple on Mount Gerizim, and the meeting of the high-priest and Alexander the Great.

VI. Literature. — Josephus, Ant. 11:6,6 sq.; the Midrash Esther; Targum Sheni on Esther, in Walton's Polyglot, volume 4; Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, 1710), page 72 sq.; Whitaker, Disputation on Scripture (Park. Soc., ed. 1849), page 71, etc.; Usher, Syntagma de Graeca LXX interpretum vessione (London, 1655); De Rossi, Specimen Variarum Lectionum sacsri Textus et Chaldaica Estheris Additanmenta (Romns, 1782); Eichhorn, Einleitung in d. Apokr. Schriften d. A.T. (Leip. 1795), ). 483 sq.; Fritzsche, Ε᾿σθήρ, Duplicem libritextum ad optinsos cdd. emend. et cum selecta lectionis varietate (ed. Torici. 1848); and by the same author, Exegetisches Handbuch z. d. Apokr. d. A.T. 1:69 sq.; Davidson, The Text of the O.T. Considered (London, 1856), page 1010 sq.; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes. Israel, vol. (Nordhausen, 1857), page 365 sq.; Keil, Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleituqng, etc. (ed. 1859), page 705 sq.; Wolf's Bibl. febr. pages 11, 88 sq.; Hotting. 'Thesaur. page 494;  Walton, Proleg. 9, § 13; Nickes, De Estherae libro (Romans 1857, 1858); Baumgarten, De Fide Lib. Esther (Hal. 1839); Schnurrer (ed.), Var. Lect. Estheris (2d ed. Tubing. 1783). SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Esther, Book Of[[@Headword:Esther, Book Of]]

             the last of the historical books of the O.T., according to the arrangement in the Auth. Engl. Version. (See Davidson, in Horne's Introd., new ed., 2:697 sq.)

I. Contents, Name, and Place in the Canon. — In this book we have an account of certain events in the history of the Jews under the rule of the Persian king Ahasuerus (Achashverosh), doubtless the Xerxes of the Greek historians. SEE AHASUERUS 3. The writer informs us of a severe persecution with which they were threatened at the instigation of Haman, a favorite of the king, that sought in this way to gratify his jealousy and hatred of a Jew, Mordecai, who, though in the service of the king, refused to render to Haman the homage which the king had enjoined, and which his other servants rendered; he describes in detail the means by which this was averted through the influence of a Jewish maiden called "Hadassab, that is, Esther," the cousin of Mordecai, who had been raised to be the wife of the king, along with the destruction of Haman and the advancement of Mordecai; he tells us how the Jews, under the sanction of the king, and with the aid of his officers, rose up against their enemies, and slew them to the number of 75,000; and he concludes by informing us that the festival of Purirn was instituted among the Jews in commemoration of this remarkable passage in their history. From the important part played by Esther in this history, the book bears her name. It is placed among the hagiographa (q.v.) or Kethubiln' (כְּתוּבַים) by the Jews, and in that first portion of them  which they call the five Megilloth (מְגַלּוֹת, rolls), or books read in the synagogue on special festivals; the season appropriate to it being the feast of Purim, held on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar, of the origin of which it contains the account. Hence it stands in the Hebrew Canon after Koheleth or Ecclesiastes, according to the order of time in which the Megilloth are read. By the Jews it is called the Megillab, by way of eminence, either from the importance they attach to its contents, or from the circumstance that from a very early period it came to be written on a special roll (מְגַלָּה) for use in the synagogue (Hottinger, Thes. Philippians page 494). In the Sept. it appears with numerous additions, prefixed, interspersed, and appended; many of which betray a later origin, but which are so inwrought with the original story as to make with it a continuous and, on the whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christians it has been variously placed; the Vulgate places it between Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocryphal additions [see next article]; the Protestant versions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end of the historical books.

II. Canonicist. — Among the Jews this book has always been held in the highest esteem. There is some ground for believing that the feast of Purim was by some of the more ancient Jews opposed as an unlicensed novelty (Talm. Hieros. Megilloth, fol. 70; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebrews ad Job 10:22); but there is no trace of any doubt being thrown by them on the canonicity of the book. By the more modern Jews it has been elevated to a place beside the law, and above the other hagiographa, and even the prophets (Pfeiffer, Thes. Hermen. page 597 sq.; Carpzov, Introd. page 366 sq.). Indeed, it is a saying of Maimonides that in the days of the Messiah the prophetic and hagiographical books will pass away, except the book of Esther, which will remain with the Pentateuch. This book is read through by the Jews in their synagogues at the feast of Purim, when it was, and is still in some synagogues, the custom at the mention of Haman's name to hiss, and stamp, and clench the fist, and cry, Let his name be blotted out; may the name of the wicked rot. It is said, also, that the names of Haman's ten sons are read in one breath, to signify that they all expired at the same instant of time. Even in writing the names of Haman's sons in the 7th, 8th, and 9th verses of Est 9:1-32, the Jewish scribes have contrived to express their abhorrence of the race of Haman; for these ten names are written in three perpendicular columns of 3, 3, 4, as if they were hanging upon three parallel cords, three upon each cord, one above another, to represent the  hanging of Raman's sons (Stehelin's Rabbinical Literature, 2:349). The Targum of Est 9:1-32, in Walton's Polyglot, inserts a very minute account of the exact position occupied by Haman and his sons on the gallows, the height from the ground, and the interval between each; according to which they all hung in one line, Haman at the top, and his ten sons at intervals of half a cubit under him. It is added that Zeresh and Haman's seventy surviving sons fled, and begged their bread from door to door, in evident allusion to Psa 109:9-10. Some of the ancient Jewish teachers were, somewhat staggered at the peculiarity of this book, that the name of God does not once occur in it; but others accounted for it by saying that it was a transcript, under divine inspiration, from the Chronicles of the Medes and Persians, and that, being meant to be read by heathen, the sacred name was wisely omitted. Baxter (Saint's Rest, part 4, chapter 3) speaks of the Jews using to cast to the ground the book of Esther because the name of God was not in it. (See Pareau's Principles of Interpretation, and Hottinver's Thes. Philippians page 488.) But Wolf (Bibl. Hebr. Part 2, page 90) denies this, and says that if any such custom prevailed among the Oriental Jews, to whom it is ascribed by Sandys, it must have been rather to express their hatred of Haman. Certain it is that this book was always reckoned in the Jewish canon, and is named or implied in almost every enumeration of the books composing it, from Josephus downwards.

It has been questioned whether Josephus considered the book of Esther as written before or after the close of the canon. Du Pin maintains that, as Josephus asserts SEE DEUTERO-CANONICAL that the sacred books were all written between the time of Moses and the reign (ἀρχή) of Artaxerxes, and (Ant. 11) places the history of Esther in that reign, he consequently includes it among those books which he says were of inferior authority, as written under and since the reign of that prince (Complete Hist. of the Canon, page 6). Eichhorn, on the other hand, favors the opinion that Josephus meant to include the reign of that prince within the prophetical period, and concludes that this historian considered the book of Esther as the latest of the canonical writings.

In the Christian Church the book of Esther has not been so generally received. Jerome mentions it by name in the Prolog. Gal., in his Epistle to Paulinus, and in the preface to Esther; as does Augustine, De Civit. Dei, and De Doctr. Christ., and Origen, as cited by Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 6:25), and many others. Whilst apparently accepted without question by the churches of the West in the early centuries, the  testimony of the Eastern Church concerning it is more fluctuating. It is omitted in the catalogue of Melito, an omission which is shared with Nehemiab, and which some would account of, by supposing that both these books were included by him under Ezra, a supposition that may be admitted in reference to Nehemiah, but is less probable in reference to Esther. Origen inserts it, though not among the historical books, but after Job, which is supposed to indicate some doubt regarding it on his part. In the catalogues of the Council of Laodicea, of the apostolical canons, of Cyrill of Jerusalem, and of Epiphanius, it stands among the canonical books; by Gregory of Nazianzus it is omitted; in the Synopsis Scrip. Sac. it is mentioned as said by some of the ancients to be accepted by the Hebrews as canonical; and by Athanasius it is ranked among the ἀναγινωσκόμενα, not among the canonical books. These differences undoubtedly indicate that this book did not occupy the same unquestioned place in general confidence as the other canonical books of the O.T.; but the force of this, as evidence, is greatly weakened by the fact that it was not on historical or critical grounds, but rather on grounds of a dogmatical nature, and of subjective feeling, that it was thus treated. On the same grounds, at a later period, it was subjected to doubt, even in the Latin Church (Junilius, De partibus Leg. Div. c. 3). At the time of the ReformationI, Luther, on the same grounds, pronounced the book more worthy to be placed "extra canonem" than "in canone" (De servo arbitrio; comp. his Tischreden, 4:403, Berlin ed. 1848), but in this he stood alone in the Protestant churches of his day; nor was it till a comparatively recent period that his opinion found any advocates. The first who set himself systematically to impugn the claims of the book was Semler, and him Oeder, Corrodi, Augusti, Bertholdt, De Wette, and Bleek have followed. Eichhorn with some qualifications, Jahn and Havernick unreservedly, have defended its claims.

The objections urged against the canonicity of the book resolve themselves principally into these three —

1. That it breathes a spirit of narrow, selfish, national pride and vindictiveness, very much akin to that displayed by the later Jews, but wholly alien from the spirit which pervades the acknowledged books of the O.T.;  2. That its untheocratic character is manifested in the total omission in it of the name of God, and of any reference to the divine providence and care of Israel; and,

3. That many parts of it are so incredible as to give it the appearance rather of a fiction or romance than the character of a true history (Bertholdt, De Wette, etc.). In regard to the first of these; whilst it must be admitted that the spirit and conduct of the Jews, of whom the author of this book writes, are not those which the religion of the O.T. sanctions, it remains to be asked whether, in what he narrates of them, he has not simply followed the requirements of historical fidelity; and it remains to be proved that he has in any way indicated that his own sympathies and convictions went along with theirs. There can be little doubt that among the Jews of whom he writes a very different state of religious and moral feeling prevailed from what belonged to their nation in the better days of the theocracy. The mere fact that they preferred remaining in the land of the heathen to going up with their brethren who availed themselves of the permission of Cyrus to return to Judaea, shows how little of the true spirit of their nation remained with them. This being the case, the historian could do nothing else than place before us such a picture as that which this book presents; had he done otherwise he would not have narrated the truth. It does not follow from this, however, that he himself sympathized with those of whom he wrote, in their motives, feelings, and conduct, or that the spirit dominant in them is the spirit of his writing. It is true, occasions may frequently present themselves in the course of his narrative when he might have indulged in reflections of an ethical or didactic character on what he has narrated, but to do this may not have been in the plan and conception of his work, and he may therefore have intentionally avoided it.

Observations to the same effect may be made on the second objection. If the purpose of the author was to relate faithfully and without comment the actions and words of persons who were living without any vital recognition of God, the omission of all reference to God in the narrative will be sufficiently accounted for by this circumstance. If it be said, But a pious mat would have spontaneously introduced some such reference, even though those of whom he wrote gave him no occasion to do so by their own modes of speech or acting, it may suffice to reply that, as we are ignorant of the reasons which moved the author to abstain from all remarks of his own on what he narrates, it is not competent for us to conclude from the omission in question that he was not himself a pious man. If again it be  said, How can a book which simply narrates the conduct of Jews who had to a great extent forgotten, if they had not renounced the worship of Jehovah, without teaching any moral lessons in connection with this, be supposed to have proceeded from a man under God's direction in what he wrote, it may be replied that a book may have a most excellent moral tendency, and be full of important moral lessons, even though these are not formally announced in it. That it is so with the book of Esther may be seen from such a work as M'Crie's Lectures on this book, where the great lessons of the book are expounded with the skill of one whose mind had been long and deeply versed in historical research. As the third objection above noticed rests on the alleged unhistorical character of the book, its force will be best estimated after we have considered the next head.

III. Credibility. — In relation to this point three opinions have been advanced:

1. That the book is wholly unhistorical, a mere legend or romance;

2. That it has a historical basis, and contains some true statements, but that with these much of a fabulous kind is intermixed;

3. That the narrative is throughout true history. Of these opinions the first has not found many supporters: it is obviously incompatible with the reception of the book into the Jewish canon; for, however late be the date assigned to the closing of the canon, it is incredible that what must have been known to be a mere fable, if it is one, could have found a place there; it is incompatible with the early observance by the Jews of the feast of Purim, instituted to commemorate the events recorded here (comp. 2Ma 15:36); and it is rendered improbable by the minuteness of some of the details, such as the names of the seven eunuchs (Est 1:10), the seven officers of the king (Est 1:14), the ten sons of Haman (Est 9:7-10), and the general accurate acquaintance with the manners, habits, and contemporary history of the Persian court which to author exhibits. (See the ample details on this head collected by Eichhorn and Havernick, Einleit. II, 1:338-357). The reception of the book into the canan. places a serious difficulty in the way of the second opinion; for if those who determined this would not have inserted a book wholly fabulous, they would as little have inserted one in which fable and truth were indiscriminately mixed. It may be proper, however to notice the parts which are alleged to be fabulous, for only thus can the objection be  satisfactorily refuted. First, then, it is asked, How can it be believed that if the king had issued a decree that all the Jews should be put to death, he would have published this twelve months before it was to take effect (Est 3:12-13)? But, if this seem incredible to us, it must, if untrue, have appeared no less incredible to those for whom the book was written; and nothing can be more improbable than that a writer of any intelligence should by mistake have made a statement of this kind; indeed, a fiction of this sort is exactly what a fabulist would have been most certain to have avoided; for, knowing it not to be in accordance with fact and usage, he must have been sure that its falsehood would be at once detected. Secondly, It is said to be incredible that the king, when he repented of having issued such an edict, should, as it could not be recalled, have granted permission to the Jews to defend themselves by the slaughter of their enemies, and that they should have been permitted to do this to such an extent as to destroy 75,000 of his own subjects.

To our habits of thinking this certainly appears strange; but we must not measure the conduct of a monarch like Xerxes by such a standard: the caprices of Oriental despots are proverbially startling, their indifference to human life appalling; and Xerxes, as we know from other sources, was apt even to exceed the limits of ordinary Oriental despotism in these respects (comp. Herod. 1:183; 7:35, 39, 238; 9:108-113; Justin, 2:10, 11). Now if it be true, as Diodorus Siculus relates, that Xerxes put the Medians foremost at Thermopylse on purpose that they might all be killed, because he thought they were not thoroughly reconciled to the loss of their national supremacy, it is surely not incredible that he should have given permission to Haman to destroy a few thousand strange people like the Jews, who were represented to be injurious to his empire, and disobedient to his laws. Nor, again, when we remember what Herodotus relates of Xerxes in respect to promises made at banquets, can we deem it incredible that he should perform his promise to Esther to reverse the decree in the only way that seemed practicable. It is likely, too, that the secret friends and adherents of Haman would be the persons to attack the Jews, which would be a reason why Ahasuerus would rather rejoice at their destruction. Thirdly, it is asked how can we believe that the king would issue an edict to all his subjects that every man should bear rule in his own house (1:22)? We reply that, as the edicts of Oriental despots are not all models of wisdom and dignity, here seems to us nothing improbable in the statement that such an edict was, under the circumstances, issued by Ahasuerus. Fourthly, Is it credible, it is asked, that Esther should have been so long a  time in the palace of the king without her descent being known to the king or to Haman, as appears to have been the case? We reply that it does not appear certain that her Jewish descent was unknown; and, if it were, we are too little acquainted with the usages of the Persian royal harem to be able to judge whether this was an unlikely thing to occur or not: we may suggest, however, that the writer of the history was somewhat more likely to know the truth on such points than German professors in the 19th century.

The casual way in which the author of 2Ma 15:36 alludes to the feast of Purim, under the name of "Mardochaeus's day," as kept by the Jews in the time of Nicanor, is another strong testimony in its favor, and tends to justify the strong expression of Dr. Lee (quoted in Whiston's Josephus, xi, chapter 6), that "the truth of this history is demonstrated by the feast of Purim, kept up from that time to this very day."

The style of writing is remarkably chaste and simple, and the narrative of the struggle in Esther's mind between fear and the desire to save her people, and of the final resolve made in the strength of that help which was to be sought in prayer and fasting, is very touching and beautiful, and without any exaggeration. Even De Wette observes that the book is simple in its style, free from declamation, and thus advantageously distinguished from the similar stories in the Apocrypha (Introduction, Parker's translation, Boston, 1843).

IV. Authorship and Date. — Augustine (De Civitate Dei) ascribes the book to Ezra. Eusebius (Chronic. 47, d. 4), who observes that the facts of the history are posterior to the time of Ezra, ascribes it to some later but unknown author. Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromata, lib. 1, page 329) assigns it and the book of Maccabees to Mordecai. The pseudo-Philo (Chronographia) and Rabbi Azarias maintain that it was written at the desire of Mordecai by Jehoiakim, son of Joshua; who was high-priest in the 12th year of the reign of Artaxerxes. The subscription to the Alexandrian version states that the epistle regarding the feast of Purim was brought by Dositheus into Egypt, under Ptolemy and Cleopatra (B.C. cir. 160); but it is well known that these subscriptions are of little authority. The authors of the Talmud say that it was written by the members of the Great Synagogue (q.v.), who also wrote Ezekiel and the twelve Prophets. But the whole account of the Great Synagogue, said to have been instituted by Ezra, and concluded by Simon the Just, who is said to have closed the canon, and  whose death took place B.C. 292, is by some looked upon as a rabbinical romance. Of all these suppositions, the ascription to Mordecai seems the most probable. The minute details given of the great banquet, of the names of the chamberlains and eunuchs, and Haman's wife and sons, and of the customs and regulations of the palace, betoken that the author lived at Shushan, and probably at court, while his no less intimate acquaintance with the private affairs both of Esther and Mordecai well suits the hypothesis of the latter being himself the writer. It is also in itself probable that as Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who held high offices under the Persian kings, wrote an account of the affairs of the nation, in which they took a leading part, so Mordecai should have recorded the transactions of the book of Esther likewise. The termination of the book with the mention of Mordecai's elevation and government agrees also with this view, which has the further sanction of many great names, as Aben Ezra, and most of the Jews, Vatablus, Carpzov, and many others. Those who ascribe it to Ezra, or the men of the Great Synagogue, may have merely meant that Ezra edited and added it to the canon of Scripture, which lee prob. ably did, bringing it, and perhaps the book of Daniel, with him from Babylon to Jerusalem. SEE MORDECAI.

That the book was written after the downfall of the Persian monarchy in the time of the Maccabees is the conclusion of Bertholdt, De Wette, and Bleek. The reasons, however, which they assign for this are very feeble, and have been thoroughly nullified by Havernick. The latter supposes it to have been written at a much earlier date, and the reasons he urges for this are —

1. The statement in Est 9:32, compared with Est 10:2, where the author places what he himself has written on a par in point of authenticity with what is recorded in the Persian annals, as if contemporary productions;

2. The vividness, accuracy, and minuteness of his details respecting the Persian court;

3. The language of the book, as presenting, with some Persianisms, and some words of Chaldaic affinity, which do not occur in older Hebrew (such as מִאֲמִר, מִזָּיוֹן, פִּתְשֶׁגֶן, שִׁרְבּיט), those idioms which characterize the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles; and,  4. The fact that the closing of the canon cannot be placed later than the reign of Artaxerxes, so that an earlier date must be assigned to this book, which is included in it. SEE EZRA. Whether the book was written in Palestine or in Persia is uncertain, but probability inclines to the latter supposition.

VI. Commentaries. — The following are separate exegetical works on the canonical potion of the book of Esther, in addition to the formal Introductions to that portion of Scripture, and exclusive of the purely rabbinical treatises on the Jewish usages referred to in the book; the most important have an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Raban Maurus, Commentarii (in Opp.); Arama, פֵּרוּשׁ(Constantinople, 1518, 4to); Bafiolas, פֵּרוּשׁ(Riva di Trento, 1560, 4to); Strigel, Scholia (Lips. 1571, 1572, 8vo); Brentius, C(ommentarii (Tubing. 1575, 4to; in Engl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1584, 8vo); Askenz, יוֹסַŠ לֶקִח(Cremona, 1576, 4to, etc.); Feuardent, Commentaria (Par. 1585, 8vo, etc.); Melammed, מִאֲמִר מָרְדְּכִי(Constantpl. 1585, 4to); \*Drusius, Annotationes (Leyd. 1586, 8vo); \*Senarius, Commentarii (Mogunt.1590, fol., etc.); Zahalon, יִִֵשׁ ָאלֵהַים(Ven. 1594, 4to); Alsheich, מִשְׂאִת משֶׁה(Ven. 1601, 4to); Cooper, Notes (London, 1609, 4to); D'Aquine, Raschii Scholia (Par. 1622, 4to); Wolder, Dispositiones (Dantz. 1625, 4to); \*Sanctius, Commentarii (Leyd. 1628, fol.); Conzio, Commento (Chieri. 1628, 4to); Duran, סֵפֶר מְגַלִּת(Ven. 1632, 4to); Crommius, Theses (Lovan. 1632, 4to); Merkel, מַירָא דָכְיָא (Lublin, 1637, 4to); \*Bonart, Commentarius (Colossians Agr. 1647, fol.); Montanus, Commentarius (Madr. 1648,. fol.); Trapp, Commentary (London, 1656, fol.); De Celada, Commentarii (Lugd. 1658, fol.); Jackson, Explanation (London, 1658, 4to); Barnes, Paraphrasis poetica (Lond. 1679, 8vo); Adam, Observationes (Groningen, 1710, 4to); Rambach, Notce (in his Adnot. V.T. 2:1043); Heumann, Estherae auctoritas (Gotting. 1736, 4to); Meir, מַשְׁתֵּה יִיַן(Fürth, 1737, 8vo); Nestorides, Annotazioni (Ven. 1746, 4to); Aucher. De auctoritate Estherae (Havn. 1772, 4to); Crusins, Nktzl. Gebrauch der B. Esther (from the Latin, Lpz. 1773, 4to); \*Vos, Oratio (Ultr. 1775, 4to); Zinck, Commentarius (Augsb. 1780, 4to); De Rossi, Var. Lect. (Rome, 1782, 8vo); Pereles, גֻּלּת הִכֹּתֶרֶת(Prague, 1784, 4to); Tolfssohn, אֶסְתֵּר(Benl. 1788, 87vo); Lamson, Discourses (Edinb. 1804, 12mo); Lowe, אוֹר הָרָשׁ(Nouydwor, 1804, 4to); \*Schirmer, Observationes (Vratislav. 1820, 8vo); \*Kele, Vindiciae  (Freib. 1820, 4to); \*Calmberg, Commentarius (Hamb. 1837, 4to) \*M'Crie Lectures (Works, 1838, 8vo); \*Baumgarten, De fide Esthere (Hal. 1839, 8vo); Morgan, Esther typical (London, 1855, 8vo); Crosthwaite, Lectures (London, 1858, 12mo); Davidson, Lectures (Edinb. 1859, 8vo); \*Bertheau (in the Kurzgef. exeg. fandb. Lpz. 1862, 8vo); Oppert, Commentaire d'apris les inscriptions Perses (Par. 1864, 8vo). SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

## Esther, Fast Of[[@Headword:Esther, Fast Of]]

             (תִּעֲנַית אֶסְתֵּר) so called from the fact that it was ordered by Esther to avert the impending destruction which at that time threatened the whole Jewish population of the Persian dominions (comp. Est 4:16-17). The Jews to this day keep this fast on the 13th of Adar, the day which was appointed for their extirpation, and which precedes the feast of Purim, because it was ordained both by Esther and Mordecai, that it should continue a national fast, to be observed annually in commemoration of that eventful day (comp. Est 9:31). During the Maccabaean period, and for some time afterwards, this fast was temporarily superseded by a festival which was instituted to celebrate the anniversary of the victory obtained by Judas Maccabaeus over Nicanor on the 13th of Adar (comp. 1Ma 7:49; Josephus, Ant. 12:10, 5; Megillath Taranith, c. 12; Josippon ben-Gorion, 3:22, page 244, ed. Breithaupt). But this festival has long since ceased to be celebrated, and as early as the ninth century of the Christian aera we find that the fast of Esther was again duly observed (comp. Sheelthoth of R. Achai, Purim 4), and it has continued ever since to be one of the fasts in the Jewish calendar. The Jews entirely abstain from eating and drinking on this day, and introduce into the daily service penitential psalms, and offer prayers which have been composed especially for this occasion. If the 13th of Adar happens to be on a Sabbath, this fast is kept on the Friday, because fasting is not allowed on the Sabbath day. Some Jews go so far as to fast three days, according to the example of Esther (Est 4:6). SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.

## Esthonian Version[[@Headword:Esthonian Version]]

             SEE REVAL ESTHONIAN VERSION; SEE RUSSIA

(VERSIONS OF).

## Estienne[[@Headword:Estienne]]

             SEE STEPHENS.

## Estius, Gulielmus[[@Headword:Estius, Gulielmus]]

             (William Hessels van Est), an eminent Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Gorcum, Holland, 1542, and studied at Utrecht and Louvain. He was for ten years professor at Louvain; in 1580 he became professor of divinity at Douai, and in 1603 chancellor of the University. Estius obtained great repute for learning and piety. Benedict XIV named him doctor  fundatissimus. He died at Douai September 20, 1613. His principal writings are Commentarii in Epistolas Aposfolicas (Douai. 1614-16; Colossians 1631, 3 volumes, fol. 3:1; Paris, 1679, fol.; Rouen, 1709, 2 volumes, fol.): — In quat. libros sententiarnsm commentarii (Par. 1638, fol.; Naples, 1720): — Annot. In preacipua difficiliora S.S. (Antw. 1621, fol.). His Commentary on the Epistles is extolled alike by Romanists and Protestants. There is a new edition, edited by Sausen (Ma ence, 1841, 8vo). — Horne, Introd. Bib. Appendix, page 134; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Ginerale, 24:588.

## Estori Hap-Parchi ben-Moses[[@Headword:Estori Hap-Parchi ben-Moses]]

             SEE PARCHI ESTORI.

## Estouteville, Guillaume[[@Headword:Estouteville, Guillaume]]

             a French prelate, was born before 1403. He studied at the University of Paris, entered early the Benedictine order, and was raised to the highest dignity, being successively bishop of Maurienne, Digne, Beziers, Ostia, Velletri, and Port-Sainte-Rufin, and also archbishop of Rouen. He had, among other abbeys, those of St. Ouen de Rouen, of Jumieges, of Montebourg, and of Mont St. Michel, together with the priories of St. Martin-des Champs, at Paris, Grand Pre, and Beaumont en Auge (Normandy). In 1437 he was made cardinal-priest by Eugenius IV, with the title of Silvestre et Martinz des Monts. He was legate in France under Nicholas V, and took part in the election of four pontiffs. In 1477 Sixtus IV appointed him chamberlain of the Church of Rome. D'Estouteville died dean of the sacred college, December 22, 1483. He bestowed his immense wealth on several ecclesiastical and literary institutions. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Estrangelo[[@Headword:Estrangelo]]

             SEE SYRIAC LANGUAGE.

## Estrees, Cesar d[[@Headword:Estrees, Cesar d]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris, February 5, 1628. When quite young he was appointed bishop of Laon. Louis XIV charged him several times with negotiations, in which he showed a profound knowledge of the affairs of the Church and of those of the State. D'Estrees obtained the cardinal's hat in 1674. In 1680 he resigned the bishopric of Laon in favor of his nephew, and went to Rome on public affairs. He was eventually made abbot of St. Germain-des-Pres, and died dean of the French Academy, December 18, 1714. See Hoefer, Noev. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Estrees, Jean d[[@Headword:Estrees, Jean d]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1666, and became abbot of St. Claude. Louis XIV sent him on an embassy to Portugal in 1692, and finally to Spamn in 1703. In January, 1716, he was appointed archbishop of Cambray, and died March 3, 1718, without being consecrated. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Etam[[@Headword:Etam]]

             (Hebrew Eytam', עֵיטָם, eyrie, i.e., place of ravenous birds; Sept. Ητάμ in Judges, Αἰτάμ in 1Ch 4:3, elsewhere Αἰτάν; Josephus Αἰτάν in Ant. 5:8, 8, ᾿Ηταμέ in Ant. 8:10, 1, ῎Ηθαμ in Ant. 8:7 7, 3; Vulg. Etam), the name apparently of two places in Palestine.

1. A village (הָצֵר) of the tribe of Simeon, specified only in the list in 1Ch 4:32 (comp. Jos 19:7); but that it is intentionally introduced appears from the fact that the number of places is summed as five, though in the parallel list as four. Near this place (hence its name, q.d. eagle's nest) was probably situated a "rock" (סֶלִע, πέτρα, silex) or clif, into a cleft or chasm (סְעַיŠ, A.V. "top") of which Samson retired after his slaughter of the Philistines, in revenge for their burning the Timnite woman who was to have been his wife (Jdg 15:8; Jdg 15:11). This natural stronghold (πέτρα δ᾿ ἐστὶν ὀχυρά, Josephus, Ant. 5:8, 8) was in the territory usually assigned to the tribe of Judab yet not far from the Philistine border; and near it, probably at its foot, was Lehi or Ramath-lehi, and Enhak-kore (15:9, 14, 17, 19). As Van de Velde has, with great probability, identified Lehi with Lekiyeh, on the edge of the Philistine plain S.E. of Gaza (Narrative, 2:141), he is probably also right in locating this Etam at tell Khewefeh, a little north of it (Memoir, page 311), in the immediate vicinity of tell Hua or En-hakkore (q.v.). Schwarz's location of Etam at Khudna (he says Gutna, i.e., Utma, Palest. page 124) is without support.

2. A city in the tribe of Judah, fortified and garrisoned by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:6). From its position in this list we may conclude that it was near Bethlehem and Tekoah; and in accordance with this is the mention of the name among the ten cities which the Sept. insert in the text of Jos 15:60, "Thecoe and Ephratha, which is Bethleem, Phagor and Etan (Αἰτάν)," etc. Here, according to the statements of the Talmudists, were the sources of the water from in which Solomon's gardens and pleasure-grounds were fed, and Bethlehem and the Temple supplied. (See Lightfoot, on Joh 5:1-47) Hence we may perhaps infer that the site was identical with that of Solomon's Pools at El-Buruk, near Bethlehem (see Schwarz, Palaest. page 268). SEE JERUSALEM; SEE WATER. Josephus (Ant. 8:7, 3) places it at fifty stadia (in some copies sixty) from Jerusalem (southward), and alleges that Solomon was in the habit of taking a morning drive to this favored spot in his chariot. It is thus probable that this weas the site of one of Solomon's houses of pleasure, where he made him gardens and orchards, and pools of water (Ecc 2:5-6). The same name occurs in the lists of Judah's descendants (1Ch 4:3), but probably referring to the same place, Bethlehem being mentioned in the following verse. SEE JEZREEL

3. Dr. Robinson (Researches, 1:515; 2:168) inclines to find Etam at a place about a mile and a half south of Bethlehem, where there is a ruined village called Urtas, at the bottom of a pleasant valley of the same name. Here there are traces of ancient ruins, and also a fountain, sending forth a copious supply of fine water, which forms a beautiful purling rill along the bottom of the valley. This location is in accordance with all the foregoing notices, and is adjacent to Solomon's Pools (Thomson, Land and Book, 2:431). Williams (Holy City, 2:500) fully accredits the above Rabbinical account, and also states that the old name is perpetuated in a wady Etam, which is on the way to Hebron from Jerusalem, and that there are still connected with it the largest and most luxuriant gardens to be met with in the hilly region of Judaea.

Eternal is in general the rendering in the A.V. of the Hebrews עוֹלָםolam', and the Greek αἰών or αἰώνιος (both frequently "everlasting," "ever," etc.), besides occasionally of קֶדֶם, ke'demn (strictly early, of yore, referring to the past, Deu 33:27, elsewhere "ancient," ''of old," etc.), and ἀϊvδιος (Rom 1:20; "everlasting," Jud 1:6), which is kindred in etymology and import with αἰώνιος. Both עוֹלָםand αἰών are properly represented by "eternal," inasmuch as they usually refer to indefinite time past as well as fetusre. The former is from the root עָלִם, to  hide, and thus strictly designates the occult time of the past, q.d. "time out of mind," or time immemorial (Psalm 129:24; Jer 6:16; Jer 18:15; Job 22:15; Amo 9:11; Deu 32:7; Pro 22:28; Psa 24:7; Psa 143:3; Eze 26:20), but not necessarily remote antiquity (Psa 139:24; Job 22:15; Jer 6:16; Jer 18:15; Dan 9:24; and especially. Isa 58:12; Isa 61:4). Prospsetively it denotes an indefinite time to come, forever, i.e., relatively, e.g. to an individual life (Deu 15:17, Exo 21:6; 1Sa 27:12, etc.), that of a race (1Sa 2:20; 1Sa 13:12; 2Sa 7:16; 1Ch 17:12, etc.), or of the present constitution of the universe (Ecc 1:4; Psa 104:5; Psa 78:69, etc.); or absolutely (Gen 17:7-8; Exo 12:14; Jer 51:39; Ecc 12:5, etc.). Yet that the nature of the subject is to apply the only limitation is shown by the fact that while the term is used of God in the widest sense, both of the past and future (Gen 21:33; Isa 40:28; Dan 12:7), it is also employed hyperbolically or poetically of a "good long period" (Isa 30:14-15), especially in salutations and invocations (1Ki 1:31; Neh 2:3). In all these significations and applications it is often used in the plural (עוֹלָמַים), whether past (Isa 51:9; Dan 9:24; Ecc 1:10) or future (Psa 61:5; Psa 77:6, etc.), and this sometimes in a reduplicated form, like "ages of ages" (αἰῶνες). Peculiar is the Rabbinical usage (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 1620) for the world (so Greek αἰών), but only in Ecc 3:11. — Gesenius's and Fürst's Hebrews Lex. s.v.; Hommel, De vi vocis עוֹלָם (Wittemb. 1795).

The Greek term αἰών remarkably corresponds to the Hebrew עוֹלָםin nearly all these senses, and is its usual rendering in the Sept. It is derived from ἄω, ἀϊvω, to breathe, or directly from the adverb αέί (originally αἰεί), always (itself an old dative from an obsolete noun αί῝ός or αἴον =Lat. aevum, probably derived from ἄω, and the same in root with the English ever, and also, perhaps, aye), with the locative termination ών appended to the root. The adjective αἰώνιος, with which we are here more directly concerned, follows most of the shades of meaning and appropriations of the primitive. Its general import is enduring, perpetual. In the N.T. it is spoken of the past in a restricted manner, in the sense of ancient or primeval (Rom 16:25; 2Ti 1:9; Tit 1:2); or of the past and future absolutely (Rom 16:26; Heb 9:14); elsewhere of the future, in an unlimited sense, endless (2Co 4:18; 2Co 5:1; Luk 16:9; Heb 13:20; Heb 9:12; Rev 14:6; 1Ti 6:16; Phm 1:15), as of the prospect of Christ's kingdom (2Pe 1:11), but especially of the happy future of the saints in heaven (particularly in the phrase "life everlasting," Mat 19:16; Mat 19:29; Mat 25:46, and often), or the miserable fate of the wicked in hell (e.g. as punishment, Mat 25:46; condemnation, Mar 3:29; judgment, Heb 6:2; destruction, 2Th 1:9, or fire, Mat 18:8; Mat 25:41; Jud 1:7). — Robinson, Lex. of the N.T. s.v.; Leavitt, in the Christian Month. Spect. 9:617; Goodwin, in the Chris. Examiner, 9:20; 10:34, 166; 12:97, 169; Stuart, in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, 2:405; Cremer, Worterbuch d. N.T. Gracitat, page 46.

## Etam (2)[[@Headword:Etam (2)]]

             The rock thus designated in the account of Samson's exploits (Judges 15) is regarded by Lieut. Conder (Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," January 1875, page 12) as the remarkable chasm or cave near the present Beit-Aftb, eight miles west by north from Bethlehem, and described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordinance Survey (3:23) as a cavern some two hundred and fifty feet long, with an average height of five to eight feet and a width of about eighteen feet; entered at the east end by a vertical shaft called "the well," six by five feet wide and twenty feet deep. The village is a small one, standing on a bare knoll of rock some sixty to one hundred feet above the surrounding ridge, with cisterns to the houses, and a few traces of antiquity. The place is in the vicinity of Samson's adventures, and the identification is accepted by Tristram (Bible Places, page 48).

## Etam Of Judah[[@Headword:Etam Of Judah]]

             (2Ch 11:6), as still different, has been confirmed at Wady Urtas by the recovery of the name in Ain-Atan, a spring on the hillside, south- east of the pools of Solomon (el-Burak), one of the four that feed the reservoirs (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:90).

## Etam Of Simeon[[@Headword:Etam Of Simeon]]

             (1Ch 4:32) will in that case be a different place, for which Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work in Palest. 2:336) the present ruin Aiteun, laid down on the Ordnance Map at eight miles south by east from Beit-Jibim, and described in the accompanying Memoirs (3:278) as "a mound with foundations; a square cell is cut in the rock opposite the ruin on the south."

## Etampes-Valencay, Achille d[[@Headword:Etampes-Valencay, Achille d]]

             a French prelate and general, was born at Tours in 1589. He was for a long time a valiant captain of the Knights of Malta. At the siege of Montauban he attracted the attention of Louis XIII, who assigned him a company of cavalry in his regiment. After the capture of La Rochelle, where he commanded as vice-admiral, he became major-general. Immediately after the restoration of peace he returned to Malta. Pope Urban VIII charged him with the command of the pontifical troops against the duke of Parma, and as a reward gave him the cardinal's hat. The new prelate showed as  much vigor in the council as he had at the head of the army. He was involved in a contest between Mazarin and the court of Rome. He died in that city in 1646. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Etampes-Valencay, Leonor d[[@Headword:Etampes-Valencay, Leonor d]]

             a French prelate and theologian, brother of the preceding, was born about 1585. He entered the ministry, and obtained, while quite young, the abbey of Bourgueil-en-Vallee, which he represented as deputy to the Estates- general of 1614. In 1620 he succeeded his cousin Philippe Hurault in the see of Chartres, and in 1647 was transferred to the archbishopric of Rheims. He signalized himself in the assembly of the clergy of 1636 by maintaining the royal authority. He died at Paris in 1651, leaving a poem in Latin, in honor of the Virgin (Paris, 1605): — a Ritual, for the diocese of Chartres (ibid. 1627). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Etchen[[@Headword:Etchen]]

             (Echeus, or Etlan), commemorated February 11 in the Irish and Scotch calendars, was bishop of Cluain-foda, in Meath, of royal descent, originally a physician. He seems to have been born cir. A.D. 490, to have lived on the borders of Ossory, and died A.D. 578.

## Eternal Life[[@Headword:Eternal Life]]

             (ζωὴ αἰώνιος).

I. Biblical Usage of the Terms. —

1. In the O.T. we find this expression occurring only in Dan 12:2 : Some shall awaken עוֹלָם לְהִיֵּוSept. εἰς ζωὴν αἰὠνιον, the others

לְדַרְאוֹן עוֹלָם. For the first indication on this point, Lev 18:5 Eze 20:11; Eze 18:21; Habakuk 2:4 (comp. Gal 3:11-12); Psa 34:13 (comp. 1Pe 3:10) are to be referred to.

2. In the N.T. it is of frequent occurrence. In the first three evangelists, we find ζωὴ αἰώνιος (eternal life), or sometimes only ζωή (life), represented as the object and destiny of man, e.g. Mat 7:14; Mat 18:8-9; Luk 10:28; comp. Luk 10:25; Luk 18:18. The resurrection of the dead precedes it (Luk 14:14). It therefore comprises the whole future of the disciple of Christ, his full reward; and the idea is thus connected with that of felicity (μισθὸς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, reward in heaven, Mat 5:12; reception into the αἰώνιαι σχηναί, everlasting habitations, Luk 16:9). In Mat 19:29; Mat 25:46, we find it opposed to κόλασις αἰώνιος (eternal punishment). Paul considers the ζωὴ αἰώνιος as the supreme reward of well-doing (Rom 2:7; 1Ti 6:12; 1Ti 6:19), the result of continually walking in the holiness secured to us by Christ; the τέλος (Rom 6:22), the reward (Gal 6:8), as also the object of our faith (1Ti 1:16), and of saving grace (Rom 5:21), and consequently also the object of our hopes (Tit 1:2; Tit 3:7; comp. Jud 1:21). It appears synonymous with the ἐπαγγελία ζωῆς τῆς  μελλούσης (promise of the life to come) (1Ti 4:8), the receiving of the incorruptible crown of righteousness (1Co 9:25; 2Ti 4:8), the preservation unto the heavenly kingdom (2Ti 4:18). By Peter it is described as the κληρονομία which consists in the σωτηρία ψυχῆς, revealed as δόξα, and retained in heaven (1Pe 1:4; 1Pe 1:9; 1Pe 5:1; 1Pe 5:10). James considers it as the promised crown of life and inheritance of the kingdom (Jam 1:12; Jam 2:5). In the epistle to the Hebrews it is described as the Sabbath of the people of God (Heb 4:9; compare Heb 12:22 sq., etc.). While, however, life everlasting thus belongs to the future, we must not forget that, according to Paul's exposition, it appears in its essence indissolubly connected with our present life. As our relation to God, as altered by sin, can but lead to death, so in the restoration of the original relation there must necessarily, and, indeed, as an ethical religious principle, be ζωή (life) presented in the δικαιοσύνη, righteousness (Rom 5:21; Rom 8:10; Gal 3:21); so that δικαιοσύνη in its connection with ζωη (Rom 5:18, δικαίωσις ζωῆς, justification of life), constitutes the very essence of the σωτηρία (salvation) imputed to the subject, even though in the Judaic epistles of the apostle the ζωή itself is dwelt upon more than the fundamental idea of the δικαιοσύνη. Christ is ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν (our life); though yet concealed (Col 3:3-4; Php 1:21; Gal 2:20; Eph 3:17; 1Co 15:45), he is found in us (Gal 4:19); we have put him on, and become parts of his body (Eph 5:30; Gal 3:27; Col 1:18, etc.). From this it results that his life of glory must also become ours, which idea is presented to us in various ways (Rom 6:8; 2Ti 2:11-12; Rom 5:17; Rom 5:21; Rom 8:30; Eph 2:5-6). The Spirit gives also the πνεῦμα ζωῆς (Spirit of life), as the element of new life (Rom 8:2; comp. 2Co 3:17), the foundation of that life which overcomes that which is mortal (2Co 5:4-5; Eph 1:14); our mortal body is by it made alive (Rom 8:11); its results arepeace and life (Rom 8:6; Rom 8:10; Rom 8:13). In this respect eternal life is the "gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom 6:23). As λόγος ζωῆς (the word of life) (Php 2:16), Christ has destroyed death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel (2Ti 1:10).

Aside from this evident connection between eternal life and the newness of life of the Christ was derived from Christ (Rom 6:4), the ζωὴ αἰώνιος (eternal life) is still always considered in Paul's writings as  posterior to the casting off if the mortal body, and the exchange of the corruptible for the incorruptible. The consequences of these premises in their full development are first presented to us, however, in the epistles of John. Here we find' the most important principle for the subjective aspect .of Christianity: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αίώνιον (he that believeth on the Son hath eternal life) (Joh 3:36; Joh 3:15-16; Joh 5:24; Joh 6:47; Joh 6:53-58; Joh 10:28; Joh 17:2-3; Joh 20:31; 1Jn 5:12-13). Having passed from death unto life, death has no longer dominion over him (Joh 5:24), and he is free from the law and from the anger of God; he becomes partaker of the fullness of salvation. On the contrary, those who do not hearken to the Son have not life, neither shall they see it, but the anger of God abides with them. Thus, while Paul distinguishes between the actual state of grace, with its accompanying hope on the one hand, and the future attainment of the object of our hope, John unites these in his conception of eternal life, and thus uses the expressions ζωὴ αἰώνοις (eternal life) and ζωή (life), which stand in the relation of form and contents, indifferently with or without the article (John in, 36; v. 24; 1Jn 3:14-15; 1Jn 5:11-13, etc.). The life of the faithful on this earth is inseparably connected with their eternal life, from the fact of their absolute deliverance fromn the sentence of death resulting from a state of estrangement from God (Joh 6:53). It is a result of the birth of the Spirit (Joh 3:1-36; comp. 5:21; 1Jn 1:5; Joh 3:36). See also Joh 4:14; Joh 5:28; Joh 6:40; Joh 17:24; 1Jn 3:2.

This eternal life, with its divine course and its victorious power, finds its ground in the communion of life with Christ which is the result of faith. For while God as the absolute being is He whose life is "of himself" (Joh 6:57), and is Himself "eternal life" (1Jn 5:20), the source of all life, yet the communication of life to the world, i.e., to mankind, has from the beginning, even before time began, (Joh 8:56), been irrevocably vested in the Son. He is the λόγος (word) as well in his relation to God as in his relation to the world. He has received the fullness of divine life from the Father in such a manner that it belongs to him as thoroughly his (Joh 5:26; 1Jn 5:11). Now, inasmuch as the Logos became flesh, the eternal life, which was of God, became manifested in him. It is, in the next place, the revealed light of life. Christ, in his relation to the world, is therefore as well ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς as ἡ ζωή (1Jn 1:1-2; Joh 1:3-4; Joh 6:53; Joh 14:6); in one word, the really sole source of life, the universal priiciple of life in the world, both spiritual and material (Joh 5:21-29; Joh 10:9; Joh 10:28; Joh 11:25; Joh 14:19; Joh 6:27; Joh 6:35; Joh 6:39; Joh 6:63; Joh 7:38-39). From this it is easilyseen how eternal life is designated in the N.T. as the command of the Father, the knowledge of God and of Christ, or also as the commandment of Christ (Joh 12:50; comp. Joh 8:51; Joh 17:3; 1Jn 2:25; 1Jn 3:14-15; comp. Joh 12:25).

Confirmations of this view, by which the ζωή comes to occupy the first place in the plan of salvation in Christ, are to be found in numerous passages of the N.T. Christ is represented as the ever-living (Rev 1:18), the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς (Act 3:15), the λίθος ζῶν, by virtue of whom those who follow him become λίθοι ζῶντες, living stones (1Pe 2:4-5). In 1Pe 3:7 (comp. 4:6) we read of a κληρονομία χάριτος ζωῆς, and in the apocalyptic description of the heavenly Jerusalem we still read of a ποταμὸς ὕδατος ζωῆς (river of the water of life) which flows from the throne of God and of the Lamb, as also of a ξύλον ζωῆς (tree of life) by the shores of the stream (Rev 22:1-2; Rev 22:14; Rev 22:19; Rev 2:7). See the different interpretations given to John's ζωὴ αἰώνιος in Kaeuffer, De bibl. ζ. ἀ. notione, page 22.

II. History of the Doctrine. —

1. The Talmudists speak only of the עוֹלָם הִבָּא, in which all Israelites have part, but nowhere of an eternal life; while the Targumists make use of the expression, for instance, in Lev 18:5.

2. It was long before even the Christian Church, was able to understand the full scope of the idea. In early times the ζωὴ αἰώνιος (eternal life) was represented only as future happiness, to be fully accomplished only after the resurrection and the judgment of the world. Irenaeus (adv. Haer. 1, c. 10) states what the per universum orbem usque ad fines terree seminata ecclesia (the Church dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth) believes on this point, the rediturum — ut justis et sanctis — incorruptibilem statum largiatur et vitam seternam tribuat (coming of Christ to confer eternal life upon the righteous and holy). So also Tertullian (De prcescr. Hceret. C. 13). Augustine (De Sp. et Lit. c. 24): "Cum venerit, quod perfectum est, tune erit vita seterna; it is totum prsemiumn, cujus promissione gaudemus" (that is, the complete reward, in the promise of which we joy) (Pe snorib. eccl. oath. page 25; De Trin. 1:13; Enchir. § 29, etc. Basil (Essarr. Psa 45:1-17) connects it with the eternal membership of heaven. The Apostles' Creed and the Athanasian  Creed end the enumeration of their articles of faith with the dogma concerning eternal life as emanating from God, the absolute cause, and represent it as the final object of all ordained development (Const. Apost. 7:41). John of Damascus, at the end of his Orthod. fid., where he treats of the resurrection, says expressly, αἰώνιος ζωὴ τὸ ἀτελεύτατον τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος δηλοῖ· οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἡμέραις καί νυξὶν ὁ χρόνος ἀριθμηθήσεται· ἔστι δὲ μᾶλλον μία ἡμέρα ἀνέσπερος, τοῦ ήλίον τῆς δικαιοσύνης τοῖς δικαίοις φαιδρῶς ἐπιλάμποντος. Even when the fathers speak of Christ as the ζωή they refer almost exclusively to the imparting of future blessedness: Cyril of Alexandria and Anamonius (Catena on Joh 14:6), Gregory Nazianzenus (Orat. 10, c. Eunom.). At all events, they call the assurance of life resting on communion with Christ merely ζωή, ἡ κυρίου ζωή, but not ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

Yet occasionally they touch upon nearly all the questions connected with that point, without, however, arriving at any definite system of doctrine. In their description of the state of the blessed they mention as the most important points its endless duration, freedom from evil, and absolute satisfaction. The latter was sometimes defined as complete knowiedge, perfect moral liberty inner and outer peace, or immediate intercourse with God and the saints, together with personal reunion with those who have preceded us; or, again, as the contemplation of God, as the fulfillment of all human desire, or as several of these different points together. The finis desidesiorumn nostrorum is God himself, qui sinefine videbitur, sinefostidio anabiter, sirvefatigatione laudabitur (Justin, Apol. 1:8; Origen, Deprinc. 3:318, 321; Cyprian, De mortal. [1726], page 166; Greg. Naz. Osat. 16:9; 8:23; Greg. Nyss. Orat. fun. de Placilla et Orat. de Mortuis; Basil, Hom. 6 in Hexaom. et Hom. in Psa 114:1-8; August. De civ. Dei, 22:29, 30; Chrysost. Hose. 14 in Ep. ad Rona; Ambros. in Gal 6:1-18; Cassiodor. De anima, c. 12). The idea of different degrees of felicity in future life, as differences of reward, was widely prevalent, without however, making it lose its character as gratia pro gratia (grace for grace) (August. Tract. 13 in John; Theodoret on Rom 6:23, and in Canticum 1). According to the ἀξία (desert) of every one, there are πολλαὶ ἀξιωμάτων διαφοραί, βαθμοὶ πολλοί and μέτρα (Orig. 1:1, 2, 11; Greg. Naz. Orat. 27:8; 14:5; 19:7; 32:33; Basil in Eunom. 1:3; August. De Carv. Dei, 22:30, 2; Hieron. ad. Jov. 2). The fathers say also very positively that the joys of heaven cannot be described in words, and human imagination can only form an approximative idea of them. So Greg. Nyss. (Orat. Catecls. c. 40). "Bona  vitae aeternae tam multa sunt ut numerum, tam magna ut mnensuram, tam pretiosa ut aestimationem omnem excedant" (August. De triapl. habit. c. 1, Conf. Orth.).

3. The divines of the Middle Ages brought to light no new truths on this point, but assembled those already recognized into a system. They also established a doctrinal distinction between vita aeterna (eternal life) and beatitudo (happiness), defining them both. Anselm (De simil. c. 47) counts fourteen partes beatitudinis, seven of which relate to the glorifying of the body, and seven to the soul. The occupations of the saints are generally connected also with the number seven. Yet it was more customary to divide the different aspects of that state-of course subject to all kinds of occasional modifications into twelve parts (Bonaventura, Dieta salut. 10, c. 4; Peter d'Ailly, Spec. consid. 3, c. 11; Johan. de Turre crem. Tract. 36 in reg.): "Duodecim considerationes vitae asternae:

1. Illa sola est vita vera;

2. Possidetur sanitas sine quacunque infirmitate, molestia aut passione;

3. Pulchritudo sine quacunque deformitate;

4. Copia omnium bonorum;

5. Satietas et adimpletio omnium desideriorum sine quocunque defectu;

6. Securitas et pacis tranquillitas sine timore quocunque;

7. Visio beata clarissima et jucundissima divinitatis;

8. Delectatio summa;

9. Sapientia et plenissima cognitio absque ignorantia (an especially gratifying prospect for the scholastics; so that, for instance, Duns Scotus wonders whether the saints knew the real essence of things);

10. In illa viventes sumnmo ibi honore et gloria sublimantur;

11. Est in ea jucunditas ineffabilis;

12. Laus interminabilis." (The twelve points are: 1. Eternal life is the only true life; 2. It has health without infirmity or passion; 3. Beauty without disfigurement; 4. All blessings in abundance; 5. Satisfaction of all desires; 6. Peace and tranquillity without fears; 7. Beatific vision of the Divinity;  8. Supreme delight; 9. Wisdom and perception without ignorance; 10. The highest honor and glory; 11. Ineffable sweetness; 12. Endless praise.)

Thomas Aquinas recognized, besides, the general and common beatitud, especial dotes, gifts. Thus, aside from the corona aurea, he reserves a special aureola to the martyrs and saints, and also to monks and nuns, as a sort of superadded reward. According to him, the organ of transmission of the blessings of future life is knowledge ; according to Scotus, the will. After the times of Anselm, and among the scholastics and mystics, we find very attractive descriptions of the blessed state, full of elevated ideas. "Praemium est," says Bernard (De meditat. c. 4), "videre Deum, vivere cum Deo, esse cum Deo, esse in Deo, qui erit omnia in omnibus; habere Deum, qui est summum bonum; et ubi est summum bonum, ibi summa felicitas." (The reward is, to see God, to dwell with God, to exist with God and in God, who shall be All in All; to possess God, who is the highest Good; and where the highest Good is, there is perfect bliss.)

4. The Roman Catholic Church has simply gathered the teachings of the scholastics into a whole on this point, and has established them in a more fixed and dogmatic manner, as is shown in the exposition given in the Roman Catechism. According to it, the vita aeterna (eternal life), by which believers are, after their resurrection, to attain the perfection after which they aim, is non magis perpetuitas vitae, quam in perpetuitate beatitudo, quae beatorunm desiderium expleat (not only perpetuity of life, but also bliss in that perpetuity, satisfying all the desires of the blessed). It is evident, moreover, that the nature of the blessedness of the saints cannot be appreciated by our minds in any but an empirical, not an absolute manner. According to the scholastics, the eternal blessings can be divided into,

1. Essential; the contemplation of God in his nature and substance, and the consequent participation in his essence, which is identical with his possession.

2. Accessory; glory, honor, perfect peace, etc. They are expressly represented as incentives to lead a virtuous life. On their connection with good works in the Romanist system, see Council of Trent (Sess. 6, c. 26).

5. With the exception of the part relating to purgatory, the doctrine of the elder Protestantism on this subject does not essentially differ from that of the Romish Church. The symbolical books of the evangelical Church afford us but little information on this point. In general, the vita aeterna continued to be considered as salutis nostrce complementum, spei meta, finis fidei (the goal of hope, the end of faith). By it was understood the position of the just, partly after this life in general, and partly after the resurrection. (Comp. Augsburg Conf: art. 17; Apol. 4:212; Cat. Min. 2:3; Formula Concordiae, 633, 723; Coif. Belg. art. 67; Luther, Works, 1:360, 887, 997; 11:1487; Melancthon, loci. 1553, 75; Calvin, Institutes, 3:9, 1.) Still the effects of a deeper study of Scripture (a result of the Reformation) became manifest in various ways, and especially in the idea of a beginning of eternal life in the heart of the believer, which was recognised as connected with regeneration (Apol. Confessionis, 4:140, 148, 99, 187, 209, 210, 285, mostly in the German text; Buddeus, 445, 503; Zwingli, Exp. cld. 12; P. Martyr, Loci. 442; Cat. Pal. 58; Alting, Expl. Catech. 280; Alsted, 759; Perkins, Cat. 778; Confessio Bohem. Niem. 846). Compare also Jansenius, Comm. Cone. Ev. c. 136, 976. Yet this truly evangelical view was not steadily persisted in, but, on the contrary, it was soon asserted again that the expression "eternal life" occurred only in Scripture to designate the reward of Christian fidelity. Nevertheless, the fundamental points of the idea of eternal life remained in the doctrine of a mystical union with Christ, and in the doctrine concerning the Eucharist. Many draw a distinction between the vita spiritualis (spiritual life), of which Christ is the alimentum (food), and the vita aeterna (eternal life). The former was also designated as vita gratie (the life of grace), and the latter as vita glorie (the life of glory). There were three degrees of eternal life recognized: 1. initialis, in this world; 2. partialis, after the death of the individual; 3. perfectionalis, after the last judgment. (So Pearson, On the Creed, Oxford, 1820, 1:598.) Gerhard's definition (Cotta, 20, 533) is an excellent exposition of the Protestant scholastic views on this subject: "Vita aeterna est felicissimus ac beatissimus ille siatus, quo Deus ex immensa misericordia (causa efficiens principalis) propter Christum mediatorem (causa efficiens meritoria) perseverante fide (causa instrumentalis) adprehensum pios post hanc vitam beabit, ut primum quidem animae eorum a corporibus separatse, postmodum vero eaedem in die resurrectionis glorificatis corporibus reunita, ab omnibus miseriis, doloribus et malls liberatae, cum Christo, angelis sanctis et omnibus electis in sempiterna lmetitia, gloria et felicitate vivant, perfecta Dei cognitione,  perfecta sanctitate et justitia ornatae Deum a facie ad faciem sine fine videant, sine fastidio ament ac sine defatigatione glorificent." The early Protestant theologians speak of the felicity of the future life as incomprehensible and ineffable (Conf. Belg. 37; Bohem. in Niem. 846; Calvin, 3, 15, 10; Gerhard, 20, 340). Its blessings are partly privative, partly positive: the meeting again and recognition of Christians was considered one of them (Zwingli In exp. fid. 12); this is called a positive blessing. That individual blessedness will not be disturbed by the, knowledge of the damnation of others is called a privative blessing. In opposition to Rome, the influence of personal merit on the future state was denied by these theologians; but some of them, while admitting that blessedness is essentially the same for all, hold to several degrees of blessedness. A number of other questions as to the language of the blessed, the manner of the contemplation of God, if he shall be praised in word, etc., are generally treated by the ancient theologians after the example of Calvin, Inst. 3, 25, 6, as irrelevant, and of no religious importance. In later times they have been discussed anew.

VII. Later Views. — The evangelical Protestant churches probably would all agree that eternal life commences in Christian experience in this world. So Wesley (Sermons, 2:181): "This is the testimony, that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life [the eternal life here spoken of]; and he that hath not the Son hath not life." As if he had said, This is the sum of the testimony which God hath testified of his Son, that God hath given us not, only a title to, but the real beginning of eternal life; and this life is purchased by, and treasured up in his Son, who has all the springs and the fullness of it in himself, to communicate to his body, the Church. This eternal life, then, commences when it pleases the Father to reveal his Son in our hearts; when we first know Christ, being enabled to "call him Lord by the Holy Ghost;" when we can testify, our conscience bearing us witness in the Holy Ghost, "The life which I now live I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." And then it is that happiness begins — happiness real, solid, substantial. Then it is that heaven is opened in the soul, that the proper heavenly state commences, while the love of God, as loving us, is shed abroad in the heart, instantly producing love to all mankind; general pure benevolence, together with its genuine fruits, lowliness, meekness, patience, contentedness in every state; an entire, clear, full acquiescence in the whole  will of God, enabling us to "rejoice evermore, and in everything to give thanks."

As to the nature of the blessedness of the future life, "the sum of what we are taught by reason and Scripture on this point may be comprehended under the three following particulars:

(a) We shall hereafter be entirely freed from the sufferings of this life;

(b) Our future blessedness will be a continuation of the happiness of this life;

(c) But it will also be increased by the addition of many new joys, which stand in no natural or necessary connection with our preceding condition in this life.

But, for want of accurate knowledge of the state of things in the future world, we can say nothing definite and certain as to the nature of these positive rewards. In the doctrine of the New Testament, however, positive rewards are considered most obviously as belonging to our future felicity, and as constituting a principal part of it. For it always represents the joys heaven as resulting strictly from the favor of God, and as being undeserved by those to whom they are given. Hence there must be something more added to the natural good consequences of our actions, something which cannot be considered as the necessary and natural consequences of the good actions we may have before performed. Some theologians have supposed that the saints in heaven may be taught by immediate divine revelations (lumen glories); especially those who may enter the abodes of the blessed without knowledge, or with only a small measure of it; e.g. children, and others who have died in ignorance for which they themselves were not to blame. On this subject nothing is definitely taught in the Scriptures; but both Scripture and reason warrant us in believing that provision will be made, for all such persons in the future world. A principal part of our future happiness will consist, according to the Christian doctrine, in the enlargement and correcting of our knowledge respecting God, his nature, attributes, and works, and in the salutary application of this knowledge to our own moral benefit, to the increase of our faith, love, and obedience. There has been some controversy among theologians with regard to the vision of God (visio Dei intuitiva, or sensitiva, or beatifica, or comprehensiva); but Christ is always represented as one who will be personally visible by us, and whose personal, familiar intercourse and guidance we shall enjoy. And herein Christ himself places a chief part of  the joy of the saints (Joh 14:1-31; Joh 17:1-26, etc.). And so the apostles often describe the blessedness of the pious by the phrase being with Christ. To his guidance has God entrusted the human race in heaven and on earth. And Paul says (2Co 4:6) we see ‘the brightness of the divine glory in the face of Christ;' he is 'the visible representative of the invisible God' (Col 1:15). Paul says expressly (1Th 4:17) that we shall be with Christ, in company with our friends who died before us (ἀμα σὺν αὐτοῖς); and this presupposes that we shall recognize them, and have intercourse with them, as with Christ himself. Paul advises that Christians should comfort themselves under the loss of their friends by considering that they are at home with the Loa d, and that they shall be again united together" (Knap Christ. Theology, sec. 140, pages 490-494). See also Cotta, fist. Dorm. de Vita aeterna; Cotta, Theses Theol. de Vita caterna (Tttbing. 1758); Storr, Opuscula Academica, 2:75; Wesley, Sermons, 2:180 sq.; Baxter, Saints' Rest; Isaac Taylor, Physical Theory of another Life; Naville Vie Eternelle (1865); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:254 (from which this article is in part a translation); Maartensen, Christian Dogmnatics, § 283-290. SEE IMMORTALITY; SEE RESURRECTION; SEE HEAVEN.

## Eternales[[@Headword:Eternales]]

             a Christian sect, supposed to have arisen about A.D. 260, deriving their name from their belief in the eternity of the world. They maintained that the earth will continue in its present state, even after the resurrection of the dead.

## Eternity of God[[@Headword:Eternity of God]]

             SEE GOD.

## Eternity of the World[[@Headword:Eternity of the World]]

             SEE COSMOGONY.

## Etham[[@Headword:Etham]]

             (Hebrews Etham', אֵתָם, supposed by Jablonsky [Opusc. ed. to Water. 2:157] to be i.q., Coptic atiom, i.e., "boundary of the sea;" Sept. Ο᾿θώμ, but omits in Num 33:8; Vulg. Etham), the third station of the Israelites when they left Egypt; a place described as lying "in the edge of the wilderness," where they encamped after the journey from Succoth (Exo 13:20; Num 33:6). This description, and the route pursued by them, seem to fix upon some spot on the east of Egypt, north of the Red Sea, near the desert tract stretching thence along the whole eastern shore as far as Marah, to which the same name, "desert of Etham," is therefore naturally applied in the text (Num 33:8). The precise locality of Etham has been a matter of dispute, according to the various theories of the passage across the sea. No spot more likely has been indicated than a point in the valley of the bitter lakes opposite the foot of wady AbuZeid, in the direct route around the point of the sea, but from  which there is a passage sharply deflecting, up wady Ena-shesh, around Jebel Attaha, which the Israelites were at this point commanded to take. SEE EXODE; SEE DESERT.

The sense of the passage Num 33:6-8, is evidently this: At the end of the second day they had already arrived at the bolders of the Arabian desert, at Etham, from which the tract of country lying next to Egypt receives the name, desert of Etham; but, instead of advancing directly into the desert, they turned down again farther into Egypt, to the Arabian Gulf. Afterwards, instead of going round the sea, they proceeded through it into the desert of Etham. SEE SHUR. Schwarz says (Palaest. page 211) that the part of the desert north of the Red Sea, near Suez, is still called Ethia, but this lacks confirmation.

## Ethan[[@Headword:Ethan]]

             (Hebrews Eythan', אֵיתָן, perpetuity, as often), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Αἰθάν, v.r. Γαιθάν and Αἰθαιμ.) One of four persons ("Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mabol") who were so renowned for their sagacity that it is mentioned to the honor of Solomon that his wisdom excelled theirs (1Ki 4:31 [Heb 5:11]), Ethan being distinguished as "the Ezrahite" from the others, who are called "sons of Mahol;" unless, indeed, this word Alahol (q.v.) be taken, not as a proper name, but appellatively for "sons of music, dancing," etc., in which case it would apply to Ethan as well as to the others. This interpretation is strengthened by our finding the other names associated with that of Ethan in 1Ch 2:6, as "sons of Zerab," i.e., of Ezra, the same as Ezrahites, or descendants of the son of Judah. SEE EZRAHITTE. With this agrees the Jewish chronology, which counts them as prophets during the sojourn in Egypt (Seder Olam Rabba, page 52), although the Jews have also a tradition confounding Ethan with Abraham, Heman with Moses, and Chalcol with Joseph (Jerome, Comment. on Kings, in loc.). In 1Ch 2:8, Ethan's "sons" are mentioned, but only one name is given, that of Azariah. B.C. post 1856. In the title to the 89th Psalm an "Ethan the Ezrahite" is named as the author; but there seems to be some confusion here in the latter epithet. See No. 3 below.

2. (Sept. Αἰθάμ v.r. Οὐρί.) Son of Zimmah and father of Adaiah, in the ancestry of the Levite Asaph (1Ch 6:42 [27]). B.C. cir. 1585. In 1Ch 6:21 he seems to be called JOAH, the father of Iddo.  3. (Sept. Αἰθάν v.r. Αἰθάμ.) A Levite, son of Kushi or Kushaiah, of the family of Merari; appointed one of the leaders of the Temple music by David (as singer, 1Ch 6:44 [29], or player on cymbals, 15:17, 19). B.C. 1014. In the latter passages he is associated with Heman and Asaph, the heads of two other families of Levites; and inasmuch as in other passages of these books (1Ch 25:1; 1Ch 25:6) the names are given as Asaph, Heman, and JEDUTHUN, it has been conjectured that this last 'and Ethan were identical. There is at least great probability that Ethan the singer was the same person as Ethan the Ezrathite (comp. No. 1 above), whose name stands at the head of Psa 89:1-52, for it is a very unlikely coincidence that there should be two persons named Heman and Ethan so closely connected in two different tribes and walks of life. The difficulty is even greater in the case of Heman (q.v.), who, in the title to Psa 88:1-18, is likewise expressly called an Ezrahite, and yet identified in its authorship with the sons of Korah. Hengstenberg supposes (Comment. on Psalms, Clark's ed. 3:89) that both Heman and Ethan, although descendants of Judah, were adopted into the ranks of the Levites; but this will not meet the above genealogy of this Ethan, who is moreover classed with the Merarites, and not with the Korahites. SEE HEMAN, and SEE EZRAHITE.

## Ethanim[[@Headword:Ethanim]]

             (Hebrews Eythanim', אֵיתָנַים, perennial streams; Sept. Α᾿θανίν), another name for the month TISRI SEE TISRI (q.v.); so called from the fullness of the brooks at that time of the year, being swelled with the autumnal rains (1Ki 8:2). SEE CALENDAR.

## Ethbaal[[@Headword:Ethbaal]]

             (Hebrews Ethba'al, אֶתְבִּעִל, with Baal, i.e., enjoying his favor and help; Sept. Ε᾿θβάαλ), a king of Sidon, father of the infamous Jezebel, the wife of Ahab (1Ki 16:31). According to Josephus (Ant. 8:13, 1 and 2; Apion, 1:18), Ethbaal is called Ithobalus (Ι᾿θόβαλος or Εἰθώβαλος, i.e., אַתּוֹבִעִל=Baal with him) by Menander, who also says that he was a priest of Astarte, and, having put the king Pheles to death, assumed the scepter of Tyre and Sidon, lived sixty-eight years, and reigned thirty-two (comp. Theophil. Autol. 3, page 132). As fifty years elapsed between the deaths of Hiram and Pheles, the date of Ethbaal's reign may be given as about B.C. 940-908. The worship of Baal was no doubt closely allied to that of  Astarte, and it is even possible that a priest of Astarte might have been dedicated also to the service of Baal, and borne his name. We here see the reason why Jezebel, the daughter of a priest of Astarte, was so zealous a promoter of idolatry, the taint of which, with its attendant tyranny, eventually extended to the throne of Judah in the person of Athaliah; and as, twenty-one years after the death of Ethbaal, his granddaughter Dido built Carthage, and founded that celebrated commonwealth (Josephus, as above), we may judge what sort of a spirit animated the females of this royal family. SEE AHAB. Another Phoenician king of the same name (Ι᾿θόβαλος or Εἰθώβαλος) appears as a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar (Josephus, Ant. 10:11, 1; Apion, 1:21; Eusebius, Chron. Armen. 1:74). SEE PHOENICIA.

## Ethelbert[[@Headword:Ethelbert]]

             king of Kent, was born A.D. 546 or 552, and succeeded to the throne about A.D. 560 (?). About A.D. 590 he was acknowledged as Braetwalda (president of the Heptarchy). In 570 he married Bertha, a Christian, and daughter of Charibert, a Frankish king. It had been agreed before her marriage that she should be allowed to enjoy her own religion. The most important event of his reign was the introduction of Christianity into his kingdom by Augustine, who landed in Kent in 596. SEE AUGUSTINE (volume 1, page 544). In 597 the king himself was baptized. He founded the bishopric of Rochester, and, with his nephew Sebert, king of Essex, erected the church of St. Paul's in London. Ethelbert died in 616. — Maclear, Christian Missions during the Middle Ages (1863), chapter 5; Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, 1:156 sq.

## Ethelbert (2)[[@Headword:Ethelbert (2)]]

             (1) Saint, king of the East-Angles, beheaded in 792 (rather 794) by order of Offa, king of Mercia, and venerated May 20 as the patron of Hereford.

(2) Saint, martyred with his brother, St. Ethelred, at the court of their cousin Egbert, king of Kent, in the 7th century, and commemorated on October 17.

(3) Archbishop of York (called also Adalbert, and usually Albert), a kinsman and pupil of archbishop Egbert, and the teacher of Alcuin, was consecrated to the see April 24, 767, and in 773 pope Adrian sent him the pallium. He made an excellent archbishop, continuing his frugal habits, and devoting himself to the interests of the Church. In 780 he appointed Eanbald his coadjutor, and died at York, November 8, 781 or 782.

(4) Bishop of Withem, in Galloway, consecrated June 10, 777; died October 16, 797.

## Ethelburga[[@Headword:Ethelburga]]

             is the name of several early English abbesses, one of whom is especially entitled saint. She was sister to Erkenwald, bishop of London; was by him appointed first abbess of the nunnery at Barking, Essex, which he built and endowed. Here she led a very austere life, and died in 676. She is commemorated on October 11.

## Ethelgar[[@Headword:Ethelgar]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was educated at Glastonbury, where he was a favorite pupil. In 964 he was appointed abbot of Newminster at Winchester, and on May 2, 980, he was consecrated to the see of Selsey. For more than eight years Ethelgar was bishop of Selsey. In 988 he was translated to the see of Canterbury. All hopes and expectations seem to have been disappointed by his death, December 3, 989. See Hook, Lives of the Abps. of Canterbury, 1:428 sq.

## Ethelhard[[@Headword:Ethelhard]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, does not seem to have figured in history until his consecration to that see, July 21, 793. His first public act was to assist in nominating representatives to attend the council which the emperor Charlemagne had called to assemble at Frankfort, one of the most important councils ever held in the West. His administration was one of success and satisfaction to his people. He was especially instrumental in securing, in 802, the pope's recognition of the sovereign rights of the see. He died May 12, 805. See Hook, Lives of the Abps. of Canterbury, 1:255 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Ethelnoth[[@Headword:Ethelnoth]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was the son of Egelmaer, the earl, and was a Glastonbury man. He obtained the grant of additional privileges for the monastery from Canute, and is reported to have written its history. He was first a monk of Glastonbury, then dean of Canterbury, and chaplain to Canute, the king. Other preferment he declined until a vacancy occurred in the see of Canterbury. In 1020 the see was vacant, and Ethelnoth was nominated by the king as primate of England. Having settled his affairs in Canterbury, he made provision for a temporary absence, and proceeded to Rome in 1022, where he was received with distinction by Benedict VIII. From Rome he went to Pavia to visit the tomb of St. Augustine of Hippo. Ethelnoth seems to have been a church restorer. He repaired substantially the cathedral, which his predecessors had only patched over. He displayed both firmness and discretion during his administration. He died in October 1038. See Hook, Lives of the Abps. of Canterbury, 1:478 sq.

## Ethelred[[@Headword:Ethelred]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, is said to have been bishop in Wiltshire before his appointment to Canterbury in 870. He was educated at the monastery of St. Augustine. After his appointment to the see, he went immediately to Rome for the pallium, as was required in those days. During Ethelred's administration it is said that Cameliac came to Canterbury to be consecrated by him to the see of Llandaff. This plainly shows that the spiritual supremacy of the English Church already extended, at least, over the south-eastern part of Wales. In the episcopate of Ethelred, the same Church gave proof of its revived energy, by opening a communication with the Christians of the far East, especially with those then existing in India. These things occurred towards the close of Ethelred's life. He was cordial in his cooperation with the king, and took many steps towards the reformation of the Church. To him also is due, at least, the merit of carrying into effect the will of the sovereign. He died in 889. See Hook, Lives of the Abps. of Canterbury, 1:298 sq.

## Ethelred (2)[[@Headword:Ethelred (2)]]

             SEE AILRED.

## Ethelreda, Saint[[@Headword:Ethelreda, Saint]]

             SEE AUDRY, ST.

## Ethelwold[[@Headword:Ethelwold]]

             the principal reformer of monastic orders in England, was born in Winchester about 925. From early youth he distinguished himself by his learning, and obtained the favor of king Athelstah. He was ordained priest simultaneously with Dunstan, and when the latter became abbot of Glastonbury, about 947, Ethelwold, entered his monastery and became a companion of his studies. He distinguished himself as a poet, grammarian, and theologian. He is also reported to have been familiar with the mechanical arts, and to have constructed two bells. When he declared his intention to go to France, in order to perfect himself in his studies, king Edred, who wished to retain him in England, refused to him permission to  travel, and appointed him abbot of Abingdon. This monastery was then in ruins, and was rebuilt by Ethelwold. In 963 king Edgar appointed him bishop of Winchester, The great task of his life henceforth was the reorganization of the Anglo-Saxon monasteries, which were at that time administered by secular priests (clerici, canonic, presbyteri). The discipline in the monastery was anything but severe, and many of the priests were married. Ethelwold substituted for the secular priests regular monks, and displayed great activity in rebuilding the monasteries that had been destroyed by the Danes, and in repeopling those that had been abandoned. The monastery of Winchester, under his direction, became a celebrated school, from which proceeded several distinguished abbots and bishops. He died August 1, 984, at Winchester. The chief work of Ethelwold is an Anglo-Saxon translation of the Latin rule of St. Benedict. It has never been printed. He also wrote a mathematical treatise, still extant in manuscript. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 16:598; Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. 435 sq. (A.J.S.)

## Ethelwold (Lat. AEdilualdus)[[@Headword:Ethelwold (Lat. AEdilualdus)]]

             bishop of Lindisfarne, cir. 724-740, was originally a servant under St. Cuthbert, and afterwards abbot of Melrose, and lived. through many vicissitudes in those days of peril. He is commemorated on February 12.

## Ether[[@Headword:Ether]]

             (Hebrews id. עֵתֶר, abundance), one of the cities in the plain (Shephelah) of Judah (mentioned between Libnah and Ashan, Jos 15:42, Sept. ῎Αθερ v.r. Ι᾿θάκ), eventually assigned to Simeon (mentioned between Remmon and Ashan, Jos 19:7, Sept. ῎Αθερ v.r. Ι᾿εθέρ). In the parallel list of the towns of Simeon in 1Ch 4:32, TOCHEN is substituted for Ether. In the Onomasticon Eusebius and Jerome mention it twice (s.v. Ε᾿θέρ, Ether; Ι᾿εθέρ, Jether — in the latter case confounding it with JATTIR, a city of priests, which contained friends of David during his troubles under Saul), and state that it was then a considerable place (κώμη μεγίστη), retaining the name of Jethira (Ι᾿εθειρά, Ι᾿εθαρά), very near Malatha, in the interior of the district of Daroma, that is, in the desert country below Hebron and to the east of Beersheba. At Beit-Jibrin Van de Velde heard of a tell Athar in this neighborhood, but could not learn its distance or direction (Memoir, page 311). For the present, we may conjecturally place it at Beit-Auwa, in the vicinity of the associated localities, S. of Beit-Jibrin and W. of Hebron; a ruined village, covering low hills on both sides of the path, and exhibiting foundations of hewn stones, leading to the inference that it was once an extensive town (Robinson, Researches, 3:10).

## Ether (2)[[@Headword:Ether (2)]]

             is identified by lieutenant Conder (Tent Work in Palestine, 2:336). with a ruined site, el-Atr, one mile north-west of Beit-Jibrin; but it is doubtful if the territory of Simeon extended so far north. Van de Velde's Tell Athan, "a little to the northeast of Beersheba," which is adopted by Tristram (Bible Places, page 42), does not appear on the Ordinance Map.

## Etheridge, John Wesley[[@Headword:Etheridge, John Wesley]]

             Ph.D., a Methodist minister and eminent scholar, was born at Grangewoods, Isle of Wight, February 24, 1804, and died at Camborne May 24,1866. His parents were Methodists, and he was brought up with religious care. In 1827 he entered the ministry of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and was appointed to the Hull Circuit. In 1838 his health failed, and he became "supernumerary." In 1846 he was able to return to the itinerant ministry, in which service he remained until his death. "He was an eminently holy man. Whether in the pulpit or in the social circle, he appeared clothed with humility, and radiant with Christian benevolence; Constrained by the love of Christ, he lived only to promote the interests of the Church. He was 'a burning and shining light,' and consumed himself in the service of his Lord and Savior" (Minutes, 1867).

Dr. Etheridge's devotion to letters, amid the engrossing labors of the Methodist ministry, was very remarkable. Early in life he showed extraordinary aptitude for languages, and by continued study he learned to read and write Hebrew and Syriac with facility. In the literature of these two languages he became pre-eminent before his death. His published writings include The Syrian Churches, their early History, Liturgies, and Literature (London, 1846, 12mo: this work contains a translation, also, of the four Gospels from the Peschito): — The Apostolical Acts and Epistles from the Peschito, with the remaining Epistles and the Revelation, after a later Syrian Text (London, 1849, 12mo) for a Aramaicae (London, 1843, 12mo: a useful series of Essays on the. Shemitic, Aramaic, and Syriac languages and literature): — Jerusalem and Tiberias, a Survey of the religious and scholastic Learning of the Jews, designed as an Introduction to Hebrew Literature (London, 1856, 12mo): — The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uzziel, etc. (London, 1862, 12mo). Besides these he published Misericordia, or Contemplations on the Mercy of God (Lond. 1842): — The Life of Dr. Adam Clarke (London, 1858; N.Y. 1860): — The Life of Dr. Thomas Coke (Lond. 1860): — The Life of the Reverend John Fletcher. — Minutes of Conferences (English) for 1867; Christian Examiner, 64:346.

## Ethics[[@Headword:Ethics]]

             from ῏ηθος, originally the Ionic form of ἔθος, in Germ. Sittenlehre, in English moral philosophy, though this last phrase sometimes covers the  whole science of mind. Ethics are related to law and duty, and to virtue and vice. "Aristotle says that ῏ηθος, which signifies moral virtue, is derived from ἔθος, custom, since it is by repeated acts that virtue, which is a moral habit, is formed" (see Fleming's Vocab. Philippians page 171). "Ethics, taken in its widest sense, as including the moral sciences or natural jurisprudence, may be divided into,

1. Moral philosophy, or the science of the relations, rights, and duties by which men are under obligations towards God, themselves, and their fellow-creatures.

2. The law of nations, or the science of those laws by which all nations, as constituting the society of the human race, are bound in their mutual relations to one another.

3. Public or political law, or the science of the relations between the different ranks in society.

4. Civil law, or the science of those laws, rights, and duties by which individuals in civil society are bound — as commercial, criminal, judicial, Roman, or modern.

5. History, profane, civil, and political" (Peemans, Introd. ad Philosoph. page 96). Ethics, then, covers the science of all that is moral, whether it relates to law or action, to God or the creature, to the individual or the state. It goes wherever the ideas of right and wrong can enter.

I. Ethical science may be divided into philosophical ethics, theological ethics, and Christian ethics.

(a.) Philosophical Ethics. — The science, in this aspect, must find its root and its life, its forms and its authority, in the depths of the human constitution This leads necessarily to the idea of God. We do not affirm that ethics cannot be discussed at all without bringing in the notion of a supreme being. On the contrary, it is undeniable that we find in man a moral nature; whatever may be the character of his morality, the very doubts about that imply the fact of morality. He manifestly has relations to virtue and vice, to right and wrong, to blame and praise, to guilt and innocence. True, if he does not accept the idea of God, morals seem to lose their foundation. Why should a man obey the dictates of his nature, even when obedience seems to be right and useful, unless his nature is a product  of wisdom, and reveals the law and the nature of an infinite intelligence? But truth is stubborn, and even a fragment of it, swinging in the air without a foundation, will live. Pulled up out of the soil of the doctrine of God, the moral ideas, however shorn of their strength and withered, still assert their authority and insist on obedience, from motives of utility, or fitness, or happiness. A genuine philosophical ethics, however, will find a Creator from the study of the creature, and will raise from the nature of man a law which will ground itself in the idea of God.

(b.) Theological Ethics. — This is grounded upon acme religion or theology. But in this aspect the science is broad enough to cover every religion. The ethics might be theological, and at the same time Buddhistic, or Mohammedan, or Brahminical. Theological ethics, therefore, might be a system on which the fundamental principle of morals had been perverted by the admixture of cruel and impure superstitions, just as a so-called philosophical ethics might be atheistic or pantheistic.

(c.) Christian Ethics. — Christian ethics is theological ethics limited by Christianity. As thus stated, it might appear to be narrower than either philosophical or theological ethics, but in reality it is far otherwise. Philosophical ethics is Christian so far as it is true and just, and, from the very nature of Christianity, as containing a complete account of human duty, it must even be broader and deeper than all human philosophies which relate to it. As to the relation of Christian ethics to any other supposed theological ethics, or to all other theologies in their moral aspects taken together, its position must be that of judge among them all; it must measure them all, eliminating whatever is false, restoring what is lacking, or rather supplanting them one and all as the only standard of moral truth and duty.

Besides, Christian ethics, considered as a science, and hence as a field for speculation, covers the whole ground. Philosophy and theology, in their ethical relations, are entirely within its scope. It must judge them both wherever it touches them. It has made ethics, and indeed all speculation, a different thing from what it was before it entered into human thought, and it aims to master all human thinking within its sphere. It is, to be sure, amenable to philosophical thought, and cannot repel the tests of right reason; it readily enters into the struggle with every adverse intellectual tendency, carrying with it a divine confidence that alone contains the infallible and indestructible norm of humanity regarded as moral.  Christian ethics, indeed, considered as speculative, is not infallible. God has given the ethical norm, but man is obliged to speculate for himself Evidently the complete form of Christian ethics, considered as philosophical, has not yet been reached. Its condition is yet militant, both in relation to false systems and to its own development. The genuine Christian ethics, in the scientific sense, lies scattered in various human treatises, in part is yet to be born, and remains to be evolved in the coming ages, and to be wrought into a system of beneficence and beauty which shall settle down on the whole human race, at once an atmosphere )f divine and filial love, and an antidote to discord, injustice, and all impurity.

"As between theological and philosophical speculation, so between theological and philosophical ethics, in so far as they are speculative, we must make a strong distinction. The latter pair differ precisely as the former do. But, much as philosophical and theological ethics differ, they are not opposites. Within the Christian world, Christian ethics, like philosophy in general, must always be' essentially Christian. It has always been so, as the result of an inviolable historical necessity, but in different degrees at different periods of time, and in the several stages of its progress. There may, indeed, arise a relative hostility between philosophical ethics and the contemporaneous Christian teaching, or even a hostility between ethical writers and Christianity in general; or, rather, such a hostility is unavoidable precisely in the degree in which humanity fails to be penetrated by Christianity. But, so long as this continues to be the case, it must be a proof of imperfection, not in philosophy only, but also in Christian piety. For even if Christian piety, looking at the doctrine in itself, should be convinced that it possessed the true results, yet she possesses her treasure without the scientific ability to understand it, or; to vindicate it to the understanding of others. It is, therefore, as science, still imperfect. A result of this will be that theological ethics will share in the imperfection. So long as the moral consciousness of the Christian, which is specifically determined by the church of which he is a member, does not clearly recognize itself in the forms of morality prevailing in his circle, a Christian ethical philosophy must remain a want — a desideratum. This, however, is only to say that this want will last while the general moral sentiment and that of the Church remain apart. The more nearly each approaches perfection in its own sphere, the nearer they come to being one. If we conceive of each as perfect, they remain two only in form, i.e., not different  in their method, but only in the order according to which, under the same method, they scientifically arrange themselves.

"What has now been said of the relation between philosophical and theological ethics, holds of the latter only so far as it is conceived of as speculative. In other modes of treating theological ethics, especially in the traditional, it is easy to conceive that the relation would be different... . It must be distinctly affirmed that a Christian character belongs to philosophical ethics throughout the Christian world. We do not mean that it ought to be so, but that it really is so; not, indeed, always in the highest and fullest sense, and as it ought to be, but still, in such a sense, whatever men may be conscious of, that without Christianity it never could have been what it is. In the Christian world there is no element of the moral or intellectual life which is not associated with some result of Christianity, itself undeniably the ground-principle of the historical development of our whole, Christian times. It can never be sufficiently remembered, especially in our own times, that what is actually Christian, and, indeed, what is essentially and specifically Christian, reaches, in all the relations of life, far beyond the sphere to which usage gives the name of Christian, or of which the present generation is at all conscious as Christian. The Christian element inheres in the very blood of that portion of humanity which passes under the name of Christendom. This is not the less true because certain individuals belonging to the Christian community may not feel its regenerating power. Besides, that would be a poor ethical system, considered as philosophy, which should ignore the great facts through which morality becomes Christian, and which should refuse to those facts the controlling position which actually belongs to them in making the moral world what. in point of science, it has become. These great facts, let men close their eyes as they will, are the breaking out of sin and the development of its destructive power in the world on the one hand, and the entrance of Jesus, the God-man, and the historical redeeming power proceeding from him on the other. Even philosophical morality, if it would not degenerate into mere unphilosophical abstractions, must make the moral life, considered as historical and concrete, scientifically comprehensible; the concrete historical form of the moral world, however, is, for us at least, before everything else, Christian, just as general history since the time of Christ is itself Christian.

"But, so long as we follow Schleiermacher, and, in explaining the relation between philosophical and theological ethics, make the religious  consciousness the opposite of speculation, we shall never escape confusion. The religious consciousness finds its antithesis not in speculation, but in the not religious, and speculation finds its opposite not in piety, but in empirical reflection: empirical reflection and speculation stand in very similar relations to piety. The larger number of theological writers are still of the opinion that the distinction between philosophical and theological ethics lies in the former being the universal, the abstract, the ethics of humanity, and the latter the concrete and specifically Christian, because it rests on history. Thus Schmid and Wuttke. These writers hold that the great facts which form the angles of the Christian theory of the world, namely, sin and redemption by Christ, are, according to their nature, inadequate as the basis of any purely a priori or speculative theory. They lay great stress on this. But why reason thus? At bottom, because they start with the presupposition that there is no other necessity but the necessity of nature. But, in spite of all the confident assertions of the contrary, we cannot doubt that from the specifically Christian consciousness of God, which is the subject treated here, sin and redemption should be deduced as a logical necessity" (Rothe, Theologische Ethik, 1:57).

II. Position of Ethics in Theology. — "Ethics is a part of systematic theology, which also includes dogmatics. As systematic science, it is to be distinguished from exegetical and historical theology. Its office is not merely to show what is the original, and thus normative Christian ethics, nor what has been accepted as such, but rather to teach that Christian ethics is the genuine ethical truth." ... . "On the other hand, ethics must be separated from the various branches of practical theology among which it has often been placed. The two sciences are different both in scope and aim. Ethics embraces the whole Christian idea of good, and not merely the Church, in which it finds only its culmination, and points away from itself to practical theology, the aim of which is, of course, practical" (Herzog's Real-Encyklop. art. Ethik).

Place in Systematic Theology. — "In ancient times, and down to the Reformation, it was not independent, but held a subordinate place in the science of dogmatics. From the 17th century the two have been separated, and, following P. Ramus, most writers have distinguished between them as between theory and practice. In point of fact, dogmatics has practical importance, and ethics, as the science of the good, has a theory" (Herzog's Real-Encyklop. art. Ethik). "Dogmatics and ethics are as certainly  independent disciplinae as God and man are separate beings. Only a point of view like that of Spinoza, in his Ethics, which denies the existence of a real creation and a moral world separate from God, can controvert the independent position of ethics by the side of dogmatics" (idem).

These views are substantially correct. "Christian ethics has a right to an independent position in the sphere of systematic theology, and it and dogmatics are as certainly distinct as are God and man." Still it is none the less true that, God and man conceived to be such as they are, ethics cannot be practically separated from religion. Ethics finds its highest sanctions in religion, as religion must consist largely in prescribing ethics. God and man being presented to the mind, ethics must cover the character of each, and also the relation between them.

III. The Ethical Faculty — Conscience. — There has been a great waste of controversy on the question whether or not conscience is a distinct and separate faculty of the soul, or only an application of the reason or judgment to moral subjects. The truth is that, the mind being a unit, all its faculties are only so many powers of applying itself differently according to demand. A faculty is a power of doing or acting, and a separate faculty is the power of acting in a particular, direction, as distinguished from other directions. The mind is as certainly and distinctly moral as it is intellectual, on imaginative, or volitional. Each of these expresses a distinct power of the one mind.

This faculty of forming moral judgments we call conscience and, if the views now expressed be correct, there is little propriety in discussions respecting the origin of conscience. It has no origin but that of its possessor; it is born with him, though from its nature it is only developed farther on in life, just as reason and imagination are. It has been asked, in reply to this view, whether conscience is not made what it is in any given case by the circumstances about it — In teaching, by the man's own acts — in short, by all the influences brought to bear upon him. We answer it is as to its form but there was first conscience, a moral faculty in the man to be shaped. We concede that neither moral ideas nor ideas of any sort, are innate; lent the capacity, nay, the constitutional necessity for moral ideas is innate.

IV. The Ethical Standard is, of course, according to Christianity, to be found in the Scriptures, but there is still in the sphere of science a wide  diversity as to their meaning. But when the standard is supposed to be understood on a given question, and the conscience submits to it, there must follow a perfect self-abnegation; degradation miust result fronc disolbedience. In the case of a conflict between the conscience and the law of the state, for example, in which case the conscience of the lawgiving majority collides with the individual conscience, who shall yield? The answer, from the very nature of the case, is neither. They must fight it out. The state, from its nature, is supreme, and cannot yield; but for the man the conscience is also supreme. The man can only die, or make some other atonement, and thus maintain allegiance to the highest tribunal.

V. History of Ethics. —

(a.) The sources of knowledge here are Christ, his person and teaching; also the writings of flee apostles, as shown in the New Testament. In the Old Testament the whole contents are authoritative, except as modified or repealed by the New Testament. By the side of these objective sources we have a subjective source in the New Covenant; it is the influence of the Holy Spirit in the faithful. To this Barnabas, Justin, and Clement of Alexandria bear witness. This life of the Spirit in the Church was by-and-by supplanted by the supposed efficacy of ordination, by which the Spirit was bound to the priesthood exclusively. There came now an outward law of the Church to modify the New Testament, and it controlled the ethical consciousness of Christendom until the Reformation.

(b.) Abundance of ethical material is found in the apostolical fathers, who base ethics on individual personality, on marriage, the family, etc. The most effective of the earlier writers was Tertullian (220). His ethical writings were very numerous, such as concerning spectacles, concerning the veiling of virgins, monogamy, penitence, patience, etc. His idea of Christianity was that it was a vast and defiant war power, separated from all the heathen customs of the Old World, and resolved to bring upon that world the judgment of Heaven. Cyprian, with his high claims for the episcopate, exercised great influence on the ethical sphere of the Church. He concentrated the truth of the Church in the episcopacy, in which he saw the vehicle of the Holy Ghost, and the instrument by which unity and the Holy Spirit should be assured to the Church forever. He, carried this idea of the dignity of the episcopate, and the sanctity and sanctifying power of orders, to a ridiculous extent. His doctrine of the efficacy of orders and the dignity of bishops was set over against certain sects — Novatians,  Montanists, Donatists — who held that the holiness and unity of the Church demanded that none but holy persons should be members. Augustine fell heir to this controversy. As the Church grew into an earthly kingdom, her ethics took more and more the direction of a so-called higher virtue, whose chief forms were celibacy, poverty, conventual life, and self- imposed torture.

Asceticism not only formed a part of the Church life, it became also the center from which the Christian life was forced to receive rule and law. It determined what was sin, and what was right and good: it dictated to councils; and, getting control of the state, it dispensed at will its spiritual and temporal awards; penitential books in great numbers were compiled, and, bad as the system was, in itself, it became a powerful instrument in bringing to order the various heathen peoples. For the books and writers on these subjects, see Herzog's Real-Encyclop. 4:194, where the relation of asceticism to mysticism is well presented, and it is shown that all these terrible struggles had their root in the consciousness of the infinite demerit of sin, and found their happy solution in Luther's doctrine of faith.

The Reformation not only conquered the prevailing errors b) leading men back to the holy Scriptures, but it established positively the real principle of Christian ethics. It did this through justifying faith which, working by love, creates the possibility of Christian ethics. Love, springing from faith, is the fulfilling of the law. It is ethics in the soul, ready to take shape in noble action. This, working in time community inwardly, proceeds to mold all relations, private and public-marriage, family, church, state, science, art, and culture. The great reformers did not write complete ethical treatises, though they discussed many ethical subjects, such as prayer, oaths, marriage, etc.; but they especially discussed ethics in their explanations of the Decalogue in the Catechism. Indeed, the original form of Christian ethics is the Catechism. See Paul of Eitzen, Ethicae doctrinae, lib. 4 (1751), with later additions; also David Chytrdus, 1600, Virtutum descriptiones in praepta Decalogi distributae (1555); Lambert Daneau (t 1596), Ethices Christianae, lib. 3 (Geneva, 1577); Thomas Venatorius, De Virtuto Christiana, lib. 3; comp. Schwarz, Thomas Venatorius, and the beginnings of Protestant ethics, in connection with the doctrine of justification, Stud. u. Krit. (1850), heft. 1. See also Melancthon, in his Philosophia Moralis (1539), his Enarratio aliquot librorum Aristotelis (1545), and his Phiysica. Add to these Keckerncaun, Systema ethicae tribus liris adornatum (Geneva, 1614); Weigel, Johann Arndt, Valentin  Andrea, Spener, Nitzsch, Henry Muller, Scriver, and others, all mystics. The Reformed have also done something in this line, especially G. Voetius, C. Vitringa, H. Witsius, Amesius, Amyraldus (Morale Chretienne, 6 volumes, 1652-1660).

Three men, according to J.A. Dorner (in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 4:199), form the transition stage to the emancipation of philosophy — Hugo Grotius (De jure pacis et belli), Puffendorf; with his school, and Christian Thomasius. Then come Wolf, Mosheim (in his Moral, 9 volumes), Steinhart, Bahrdt, Buddeus, Chr. Aug. Crusius and J.F. Reuss (Elementa theolegia Moralis, 1767). Even the Roman Catholic Church of the last two centuries has felt the influemlce of the modern philosophy; the following Romanist writers are Wolfians: Luby, Schwarzhuber, Schanza, and Stadler; and the following are Kantians: Wanker, Mutschelle, Hermes, with his disciples Braun, Elvenica, and Vogelsang. Weiller is a Schellingian; independent. and, at the same time, mild and evangelical, pious and rich in thought, are Michael Sailer and Hirscher. Geishuttner is a Fichtian.

Kant's "practical reason," the metaphysics of ethics, occupies in the philosophy of morals a most important place, and, notwithstanding certain defects, it has the immortal honor to have discovered that the most certain of all things is the conscience in its relation to the practical reason, and to have made an end of the eudaemonism of ethics by means of the majesty of the moral law, which he compares with the glory of the starry heavens. To his "categorical imperative" certain rationalistic Kantians adhere; for example, J.W. Schmid, Karl Christian Schmid, and Krug. Some of the supernaturalists,: as Staudlin and Tieftrunk, Ammon and Vogel, incline to Jacobi's philosophy, See also Fichet, System of Ethics (1797). To the Jacobi-Friesian school belong De Wette (Christliche Sittenlehre, 4 bde. 1819-23), Kahler, and Baumgarten-Crusius. To the school of Hegel belong Michelet (System der Philosoph. Moral, Berlin, 1828), L.V. Henning (Princip. der Ethik in historischer Entwicklung, 1824), Vatke, Von der menschl. Freiheit im Verhaltniss zu Suinde und Gnade, 1843); Marheineke (Christliche Moral, 1847), Daub (Christliche Moral, 1840). Of this school, yet more under the influence of Schleiermacher, are Martensen (Syst. Moral Philos. 1841), Wirth (Sys. specul. Ethik, 1841), H. Merz (Syst. Christl. Sittenlehre, nach den Grundsatzen des Protestantismus, etc., 1841).  The activity of Schleiermacher in Christian ethics, as in other departments of theology, was immense. From 1819 he published his treatises on "the idea of virtue," "the idea of duty," and on "the relation between the moral law and the law of nature;" also on the idea of what may be "allowed" and the "chief good." His system was not further published by himself, but after his death A. Schweizer edited his Philos. Ethik in 1835, and Jonas his Christl. Sitte in 1843. See also Sartorius, Heil. Liebe; Harless, Christliche Ethik; and especially Rothe, Theolog. Ethik (2d edit. 1867). Rothe (translated by Morrison, Clark's Library, Edinlurgh, 1888, 8vo) seeks to combine Hegel's standpoint of objective knowledge with Schleiermacher's fine moral tact and organizing power, and to excel them both in his highly original method. See also Ritenick's Christl. Stenlehrle (1845); Gelzer, De Religion im Leben, etc. (1854); Schwarz, Evan. Chr. Ethik (1836, 3d ed.); Wendt, Kirchliche Ethik v. Standpunkte d. christl. Fr iheit (2 volumes, 8vo, Leipz. 1864-65); Culman, D. christliche Ethik (Stuttgardt, 1864-66, 2 volumes, 8vo). This sketch of the history of ethics is chiefly condensed from Dorner's article (Ethik) in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:165 sq. (B.H.N.)

Appendix. — It is proper to add to the above a brief account of the history of ethics, or moral philosophy, in England. A survey of this field will be found in Mackintosh, General View of the Progress of Ethical Philosophy (Encyc. Britannica, Prelim. Diss.), separately printed in his Miscellaneous Works (Lond. 1851, 12mo), and in a separate volume (Phila. 1832, 8vo); also in Whewell, Lectures on the Hist. of Moral Philosophy in England (Lond. 1852, 8vo); there is also a summary sketch of the history in Brando, Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art, 1:821 sq. (Lond. 1865, 3 volumes, 8vo). From these, and other sources we condense the following sketch:

The modern English theories may be classed as selfish or disinterested, according as they found virtue on a selfish or a benevolent principle. The Selfish theory is advocated by Hobbes (1679), who makes self-love the exclusive passion, and considers pleasure the only motive to action (see his Human Nature, his Leviathan, and our article SEE HOBBES ). The same theory is adopted in substance by Jeremy Bentham (t 1832), who assumes Hobbes's principle as self-evident, that every object is indifferent, except for its fitness to produce pleasure or pain, which he declares are the sole motives to action. "Bentham is the most distinguished propounder of the principle of utility as the basis of morals, a principle explained by him as in contrast, first, to asceticism, and next to 'sympathy and antipathy,' by which  he meant to describe all those systems, such as the moral-sense theory, that are grounded in internal feeling, instead of a regard to outward consequences. In opposing utility to asceticism, he intended to imply that there was no merit attaching to self-denial as such, and that the infliction of pain or the surrender of pleasure could only be justified by being the means of procuring a greater amount of happiness than was lost" (Chambers, s.v.). See Bentham, Treatise on Morals and Legislation; and our article SEE BENTHAM, JEREMY.

Locke (t 1704) denied the existence of a separate faculty for perceiving moral distinctions. In his Essay on the Human Understanding (book 1, chapter 3), he maintains that virtue is approved of, not because it is innate, but because it is profitable. Paley (t 1805) also rejected the doctrine of a moral sense, and held, in substance, the utilitarian theory, maintaining that "virtue is the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness" (Moral and Political Philosophy). The utilitarian theory is taught by all the recent English writers of the materialistic school: see James Mill, Analysis of the Human Mind (Lond. 1829; SEE MILL, JAMES ) ; Austin, Province of Jurisprudence determined (2d ed. London, 1861); John Stuart Mill, Dissertations and Discussions (1859); and his Utilitarianism, reprinted from Fraser's Magazine (1862; 2d ed. 1864); Bain, The Emotions and the Will (Lond. 1859); The Senses and the Intelect (Lond. 1855); also his Mental and Moral Science (Lond. 1868, 8vo), where he teaches that conscience is solely the product of education. See also in reply to these writers, The North British Review, September, 1867, art. 1; The British Quarterly January, 1868, art. 6.

Opposed to the utilitarian theory there are two theories, which may be called the instinctive and the rational. The former refers the moral principle to the sensitive or emotive part of man's nature; the latter, to the perception of moral good and evil by the intellect. To the first class belongs Adam Smith (t 1790), whose Theory of the Moral Sentiments (Glasgow, 1759; London, 1790, and often) refers the moral sense to sympathy. His view is thus stated by Mackintosh (Ethical Philosophy, Philadelphia, 1832, page 149): "That mankind are so constituted as to sympathize with each other's feelings, and to feel pleasure in the accordance of these feelings, are the only facts required by Dr. Smith, and they certainly must be granted to him. To adopt the feelings of another is to approve them. When the sentiments of another are such as would be excited in us by the same objects, we approve them as morally prosper. To obtain this accord, it  becomes necessary for him who enjoys or suffers to lower his expression of feeling to the point to which the bystander can raise his fellow-feelings, on which are founded all the high virtues of self-denial and self-command; and it is equally necessary for the bystander to raise his sympathy as near as he can to the level of the original feeling. In all unsocial passions, such as anger, we have a divided sympathy between him who feels them and those who are the objects of them. Hence the propriety of extremely moderating them. Pure malice is always to be concealed or disguised, because all sympathy is arrayed against it. In the private passions, where there is only a simple sympathy — that with the original passion — the expression has more liberty. The benevolent affections, where there is a double sympathy — with those who feel them and those who are their objects — are the most agreeable, and may be indulged with the least apprehension of finding no echo in other breasts. Sympathy with the gratitude of those who are benefited by good actions prompts us to consider them as deserving of reward, and forms the sense of merit; as fellow-feeling with the resentment of those who are injured, by crimes leads us to look on them as worthy of punishment, and constitutes the sense of demerit. These sentiments require not only beneficial actions, but benevolent motives for them; being compounded, in the case of merit, of a direct sympathy with the good disposition of the benefactor, and an indirect sympathy with the person benefited; in the opposite case with the precisely opposite sympathies. He who does an act of wrong to another to gratify his own passions must not expect that the spectators, who have none of his undue partiality to his own interest, will enter into his feelings. In such a case he knows that they will pity the person wronged, and be full of indignation against him. When, he is cooled, he adopts the sentiments of others on his own crime, feels shame at the impropriety of his former passion, pity for those who have suffered by him, and a dread of punishment from general and just resentmment. Such are the constituent parts of remorse. Our moral sentiments respecting ourselves arise from those which others feel concerning us. We feel a self-approbation whenever we believe that the general feeling of mankind coincides with that state of mind in which we ourselves were at a given time.

'We suppose ourselves the spectators of our own behavior, and endeavor to imagine what effect it would in this light produce in us.' We must view our own conduct with the eyes of others before we can judge it. The sense of duty arises from putting ourselves in the place of others, and adopting  their sentiments respecting our own conduct. In utter solitude there could have been no self-approbation. The rules of morality are a summary of those sentiments, and often beneficially stand in their stead when the self delusion of passion would otherwise hide from us the nonconformity of our state of mind with that which, in the circumstances, can be entered into and approved by impartial bystanders. It is hence that we learn to raise our mind above local or temporary clamor, and to fix our eyes on the surest indications of the general and lasting sentiments of human nature. 'When we approve of any character or action, our sentiments are derived from four sources: first, we sympathize with the motives of the agent; secondly, we enter into the gratitude of those who have been benefited by his actions; thirdly, we observe that his conduct has been agreeable to the general rules by which these two sympathies generally act; and, last of all, when we consider such actions as forming part of a system of behavior which tends to promote the happiness either of the individual or of society, they appear to derive a beauty from this utility not unlike that which we ascribe to any well-contrived machine"' (Theory, 2:304, Edinb. 1801).

Lord Shaftesbury (t 1713) published in 1699 his Inquiry concerning Virtue (also London, 1709, and in his Characteristics), which, according to Mackintosh, "is unquestionably entitled to a place in the first rank of English tracts on moral philosophy, and contains more intimations of an original and important nature on the theory of Ethics than perhaps any preceding work of modern times." This praise rests on the fact that Shaftesbury developed the doctrine of a moral sense. The "most original, as well as important of his suggestions is, that there are certain affections of the mind which, being contemplated by the mind itself through what lie calls a reflex sense, become the objects of love, or the contrary, according to their nature. So approved and loved, they constitute virtue or merit as distinguished from mere goodness, of which there are traces in animals who do not appear to reflect on the state of their own minds, and who seem, therefore, destitute of what he elsewhere calls a moral sense. These statements are, it is true, far too short and vague. He nowhere inquires into the origin of the reflex sense. What is a much more material defect, he makes no attempt to ascertain in what state of mind it consists. We discover only by implication, and by the use of the term sense, that he searches for the fountain of moral sentiments, not in mere reason, where Cudworth and Clarke had vainly sought for it, but in the heart, whence the main branch of them assuredly flows. It should never be forgotten that we  owe to these hints the reception into ethical theory of a moral sense, which, whatever may be thought of its origin, or in whatever words it may be described, must always retain its place in such theory as a main principle of our moral nature. His demonstration of the utility of virtue to the individual far surpasses all attempts of the same nature, being founded, not on a calculation of outward advantages or inconveniences, alike uncertain, precarious, and degrading, but on the unshaken foundation of the delight, which is of the very essence of social affection and virtuous sentiment; on the dreadful agony inflicted by all malevolent passions upon every soul that harbors the hellish inmates; on the all-important truth that to love is to be happy, and to hate is to be miserable; that affection is its own reward, and ill-will its own punishment; or, as it has been more simply and more affectingly, as well as with more sacred authority, taught, that to give is more blessed than to receive, and that to love one another is the sum of all human virtue" (Mackintosh, History of Ethical Philosophy, page 95).

Bishop Butler (t 1752) sets forth his moral doctrine in his Sermons (often reprinted), which have been recently published as a text-book by the Reverend J.C. Passmore, under the title Bishop Butler's Ethical Discourses (Philadelphia, 1855, 12mo). He is undoubtedly the greatest of modern English writers on the true nature of ethics. "Mankind,” he says, "have various principles of action, some leading directly to the private good, some immediately to the good of the community But the private desires are not self-love, or any form of it; for self-love is the desire of a man's own happiness, whereas the object of an appetite or passion is some outward thing. Self-love seeks things as means of happiness; the private appetites seek things, not as means, but as ends. A man eats from hunger, and drinks from thirst; and though he knows that these acts are necessary to life, that knowledge is not the motive of his conduct. No gratification can imideed lie imagined without a previous desire. If all the particular desires did not exist independently, self-love would have no object to employ itself about, for there would be no happiness, which, by the very supposition of the opponents, is made up of the gratification of various desires. No pursuit could be selfish or interested if there were not satisfactions first gained by appetites which seek their own outward objects without regard to self, which satisfactions compose them mass which is called a man's interest. In contending, therefore, that the benevolent affections are disinterested, no more is claimed for them than must be granted to mere animal appetites and to malevolent passions. Each of these principles alike seeks its own  object for the sake simply of obtaining it. Pleasure is the result of the attainment, but no separate part of the aim of the agent. The desire that another person may be gratified seeks that outward object alone, according to the general course of human desire. Resentment is as disinterested as gratitude or pity, but not more so.

Hunger or thirst may lee, as much as the purest benevolence, at variance with self-love. A regard to our own general happiness is not a vice, but in itself an excellent quality. It were well if it prevailed more generally over craying and short-sighted appetites. The weakness of the social affections and the strength of the private desires properly constitute selfishness, a vice utterly at variance with the happiness of him who harbors it, and, as such, condemned by self-love. There are as few who attain the greatest satisfaction to themselves as who do the greatest good to others. It is absurd to say with some that the pleasure of benevolence is selfish because it is felt by self. Understanding and reasoning are acts of self, for no man can think by proxy; but no one ever called them selfish. Why? Evidently because they do not regard self. Precisely the same rule applies to benevolence. Such an argument is a gross confusion of self, as it is a subject of feeling or thought, with self considered as the object of either. It is no more just to refer the private appetites to self-love because they commonly promote happiness, than it would be to refer them to self-hatred in those frequent cases where their gratification obstructs it. But, besides the private or public desires, and besides the calm regard to our own general welfare, there is a principle in man, in its nature supreme over all others. This natural supremacy belongs to the faculty which surveys, approves, or disapproves the several affections of our minds and actions of our lives. As self-love is superior to the private passions, so conscience is superior to the whole of man.

Passion implies nothing but an inclination to follow it, and in that respect passion differs only in force. But no notion can be formed of the principle of reflection or conscience which does not comprehend judgment, direction, superintendency. Authority over all other principles of action is a constituent part of the idea of conscience, and cannot be separated from it. Had it strength as it has right, it would govern the world. The passions would have their power but according to their nature, which is to be subject to conscience. Hence we may understand the purpose at which the ancients, perhaps confusedly, aimed when they laid it down that virtue consisted in following nature. It is neither easy, nor, for the main object of the moralist, important to render the doctrines of the ancients of modern language. If Butler returns to this phrase too often, it was rather from the  remains of undistinguishing reverence for antiquity than because he could deem its employment important to his own opinions. The tie which holds together religion and morality is, in the system of Butler, somewhat different from the common representations, but not less close. Conscience, or the faculty of approving or disapproving, necessarily constitutes the bond of union. Setting out from the belief of theism, and combining it, as he had entitled himself to do, with the reality of conscience, he could not avoid discovering that the being who possessed the highest moral qualities is the object of the highest moral affections. He contemplates the Deity through the moral nature of man. In the case of a being who is to be perfectly loved, 'goodness must be the simple actuating principle within him, this being the moral quality which is the immediate object of love.' 'The highest, the adequate object of this affection, is perfect goodness, which, therefore, we are to love with all our heart with all our soul, and with all our strength.' 'We should refer ourselves implicitly to him, and cast ourselves entirely upon him. The whole attention of life should be to obey his commands' (Sermon 13, On the Love of God). Moral distinctions are thus presupposed before a step can be made towards religion: virtue leads to piety; God is to be loved, because goodness is the object of love; and it is only after the mind rises through human morality to divine perfection that all the virtues and duties are seen to hang from the throne of God" (Mackintosh, History of Ethical Philosophy, 116 sq.).

To the same school belong Hutcheson (t 1747), who taught that moral good is simply what the word itself expresses, which is not explicable by any other phrase. From this he argues that moral good must be perceived by a sense, because the senses alone are percipient of simple qualities (see his Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, Glasgow, 1725, and often). Hume (Inquiry concerning the Principles of Moral,) asserts, indeed, that general utility constitutes a uniform ground of moral distinctions, and that reason judges of the utility of actions. But he asserts also that we approve of good and disapprove of evil in virtue of a primary sentiment of our nature (distinct from self-love), which he calls benevolence or humanity, but which is identical with conscience, or the moral sense. As to the idea of moral obligation, he makes it simply a judgment of the understanding that happiness flows from obedience to the moral faculty rather than from obedience to self-love. For the doctrines of Mackintosh, we must refer our readers to his admirable sketch (so often cited in this article) of the History of Ethical Philosophy.  Of the so-called Rational school, the distinctive characteristic is "that it considers the idea of good to be an a priori conception of reason, in which the idea of obligation is necessarily and essentially implied. As to the nature of the idea itself, two opinions have been held, viz. 1, that it is simple and immediate; 2, that it derives its explanation and authority from some higher notion of the intellect. The most distinguished representatives of the latter opinion are Clarke and Wollaston, while the former has found able advocates in Cudworth, Price, and Stewart" (Brande, 1.c.).

Dr. M'Cosh (American Presbyt. Review, January 1868, art. 1) classes the modern views on ethics in Great Britain into the two schools of Sensational and Rational (or priori), "corresponding to the two schools of philosophy which have divided Europe since Descartes and Locke." Under the latter he classes Cudcworth, Clarke, Coleridge, Reid, Stewart, and Sir W. Hamilton; "none of them, however, except Coleridge, taking up so high a priori grounds as Descartes and Cousin in 'France, or Kant and Hegel in Germany." The Protestants of England, in the main, at this time, according to the same writer, do not agree with those Roman Catholic writers who deny an independent morality apart from the authority of the Church; while, on the other hand, they do not agree with the philosophers who assert not only the independence, but the sufficiency of ethnic or natural morality. (See the article cited for a view of the relations Of the modern sensational doctrine to theology and religion.)

Among American writers, Jonathan Edwards (t 1758) is first to be named in this field. In his Dissertation concerning the End of true Virtue, and that On the End for which. God created the World (both contained in his Works, N.Y. ed. volume 2), he sets forth an ethical theory marked by the subtlety and originality which characterize all his speculations. Mackintosh sums it up as follows: "True virtue, according to him, consists in benevolence, or love to being 'in general,' which he afterwards limits to ‘intelligent being,' though sentient would have involved a more reasonable limitation. This good will is felt towards a particular being, first, in proportion to his degree of existence (for, says he 'that which is great has more existence, and is farther from nothing, than that which is little'); and, secondly, in proportion to the degree in which that particular being feels benevolence to others. Thus God, having infinitely more existence and benevolence than man, ought to be infinitely more loved; and for the same reason, God must love himself infinitely more than he does all other beings. He can act only from regard to himself, and his end in creation can only be  to manifest his whole nature, which is called acting for his own glory." See also, on his ethical theory, the article SEE EDWARDS in Appleton's Cyclopedia, 7:18; and the Bibliotheca Sacra, April 1853, page 402 sq. There are many excellent manuals, prepared for text-books, by American writers, such as those of Adams, Wayland, Alexander, Haven, Alden, Hopkins, etc., for farther mention of which we have not space. Hickok (System of Moral Science, 1853, 8vo) treats the subject froan the a priori point of view, and also in its relations to Christian theology, in a very masterly manner.

He makes duty an end in and of itself. The voice of conscience is imperative. "There is an awful sanctuary in every immortal spirit, and man needs nothing more than to exclude all else, and stand alone before himself, to be made conscious of an authority he can neither dethrone nor delude. From its approbation comes self-respect; from its disapprobation comes self-contempt. A stern behest is ever upon him that he do nothing to degrade the real dignity of his spiritual being. He is a law to himself, and has both the judge and executioner within himself, and inseparable from him." "We may call this the imperative of the reason, the constraint of conscience, or the voice of God within him; but, by whatever terms expressed, the real meaning will be that every man has consciously the bond upon him to do that, and that only, which is due to his spiritual excellency." "To be thus worthy of spiritual approbation is the end of all ends; and as worthy of happiness, this many now righteously be given and righteously taken, but not righteously paid as price or claimed as wages. The good is to be worthy, not that he is to get something for it. The highest good — the summum bonum — is worthiness of spiritual approbation" (Moral Science pages 45-49).

Christian ethics, as distinguished from moral philosophby in general, has not received the same attention from English and American writers as from German. The earlier Looks on Casuistry (q.v.) and Cases of Conscience, however, belong under this head. Most of the standard English and American writers commingle philosophical morals with Christian ethics. Butler brings out with clearness the relations of ethics to the Christian religion. Wardlaw's Christian Ethics (Od ed. Lond. 1837, Boston; 5th  ed. Lond. 1852) asserts that "the science of morals has no province at all independently of theology, and that it cannot be philosophically discussed except upon theological principles (Boston ed. page 367, note). Watson (Theolog. Instzt. part. 3) treats of Christian ethics under the title "The Morals of Christianity," and denies the is priori method (see Cocker, in  Meth. Quart. January 1864). Spalding (Philippians of Christian Morals, Lond. 1843, 8vo) has "recourse both to science as derived from an examination of mcan's moral nature, and to revelation as derived from an examination of the Scriptures."

In France, the orthodox Romaim Catholic writers have generally confirmed themselves to the so-called Moral Theology (q.v.). The Cartesian school SEE DES CARTES, cultivated Ethics in the new philosophical spirit; its best representative is Malebranchme. Virtue he defines to be the love of universal order, as it eternally existed in the divine reason, where every created reason contemplates it. Particular duties are but the applications of this love. He abandoned the ancient classification of four cardinal virtues, and for it substituted the modern distinction of duties toward God, men, and ourselves. The French school of Sensualismi, of which Condillac was the head SEE CONDILLAC, regarded all intellectual operations, even judgment and volition, as transformed sensations; and Helvetius, applying the theory to morals, held that self-love or interest is the exclusive motor of man, denied disinterested motives, made pleasure the only good, and referred to legislative rewards and punishments as illustrating the whole system of individual action. La Mettrie maintained an atheistic Epicunanism, and Condorcet wished to substitute an empirical education for the ideas and sanctions of religion and morality. The most complete and logical elaboration of the materialism, atheism, and fatalism of the period, which had pleasure for its single aim and law, was given in D'Holbach's Systeme de la nature. Of the later French writers, Jouffroy is perhaps the most important. He gave a peculiar explanation of good and evil. Every thing is good in proportion as it aids in the fulfillment of our destiny. The problem of human destiny, therefore, lies at the foundation of morality. There can be no a prior judgment as to the moral quality of actions, since that is relative to the agent, depending on the influence they may have on the destiny for which he was created. Good, in the case of any particular being, is the fulfillment of its own specific destiny; good, in itself, is the fulfillment of the destiny of all beings; and an interruption in the accomplishment of destiny constitutes evil. His system of Ethics is chiefly laid down in his Cours dam Droit naturel (2 volumes, Par. 1835; a third volume was edited after his death by Damriron, 1842), his most eloquent work, which, besides ethics, treats of psychology and theodicy. Some points are more fully developed in a series of essays, which first appeared  in periodicals, and of which subsequently two collections (Melanges philosophiques and Nouveaux melanges philosophiques) were published.

See, besides the authors named in the course of this article, A Sketch of the History of Moral Philosophy, in the introduction to St. Hilaire's translation of Aristotle's Politics (Politique d'Aristote, Paris); Meiners, Allgem. Krit. Geschichte d. alteren u. neueren Ethik (Gottingen, 1801, 2 volumes); Hagrenbach, Encyclop. u. Methodologie, § 92; Cousin, OEuvr. Philosophiques (Paris, 1846-52); Bautain, Morale (Paris, 1842, 2 volumes); Damiron, Cours de Philosophie, volumes 3 and 4 (Paris, 1842); Jouffroy, Introd. to Ethics, transl. by Channing (Boston, 1840, 2 volumes, 8vo); Janet, Hist. des ides morales et politiques (Paris, 1856); Neander, Vorlesungen ui. d. Geschichte d. christl. Ethik (Berl. 1865, 8vo); Neander, Relations of Grecian to Christian Ethics; Christ. Exam. 29:153; 30:145; Bibl. Sac. 1853, 476 sq.; article Ethics in Chambers' Encyclopcedia, and in the Penney Cyclopaedia, both in the interest of the sensational philosophy; North British Review, December 1867, arts. 4; Wuttke, Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre (2 volumes, 8vo, 1861-62; 2d edit. 1866); Maurice, Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy; Maurice, The Conscience: Lectures on Casuistry (London, 1868). On the nature of evil, SEE EVIL; SEE SIN. On liberty and necessity, SEE WILL. For the Roman Catholic way of treating ethics, SEE MORAL THEOLOGY.

## Ethiopia[[@Headword:Ethiopia]]

             (1Es 3:2; Est. 13:1; 16:1; Jdt 1:10; Act 8:27; the Hebrew כּוּשׁ, Kush, i.e., CUSH, as it is generally rendered, Gen 2:13; 2Ki 19:9; Est 1:1; Job 28:19; Psa 68:31; Psa 87:4; Isa 18:1; Isa 20:3; Isa 20:5; Isa 27:9; Isa 45:14; Eze 30:4-5; Eze 38:5; Nah 3:9), a country which, as thus designated by the ancients, lay to the south of Egypt, and embraced, in its most extended sense, the modern Nubia, Sennaar, Kordofan, and northern Abyssinia, and in its more definite sense the kingdom of Meroe, from the junction of the Blue and White branches of the Nile to the border of Egypt. In one passage in the description of the garden of Eden, an Asiatic Cush or Ethiopia must be intended (Gen 2:13), and the distribution of the descendants of Cush, with later Biblical historical indications, should be compared with the classical mentions of eastern and western Ethiopians, and other indications of profane history. In  all other passages, the words Ethiopia and the Ethiopians, with one possible exception, "the Arabians, that [were] near the Ethiopians" (2Ch 21:16), which may refer to Arabians opposite to Ethiopia, may be safely considered to mean an African country and people or peoples. In the Bible, as in classical geography, but one limit of Ethiopia is laid down, its northern frontier, just beyond Syene, the most southern town of Egypt. Egypt is spoken of as to be desolate "from Midol to Syene, even unto the border of Ethiopia" (Eze 29:10), or "from Midol to Syene" (30:6), showing that then, as now, the southern boundary of Egypt was at the First Cataract. In other directions the boundaries can only be generally described as the Red Sea on the E., the Libyan desert on the W., and the Abyssinian highlands on the S. The extent assigned to Ethiopia in ancient times may have been very great, as it was the land of the negroes, and therefore represented all that was known of inner Africa, besides that part of the continent south is of Egypt which is washed by the Red Sea. The references in the Bible are, however, generally, if not always, to the territory which was at times under Egyptian rule, a tract watered by the Upper Nile, and extending from Egypt probably as far as a little above the confluence of the White and Blue Rivers.

The Hebrews do not appear to have had much practical acquaintance with' Ethiopia itself, though the Ethiopians were well known to them through their intercourse with Egypt. They were, however, perfectly aware of its position (Eze 29:10), and they describe it as a well-watered country lying "from the side of" (A.V. "beyond") the waters of Cush (Isa 18:1; Zep 3:10), being traversed by the two branches of the Nile, and by the Astaboras or Tacazze. 'The Nile descends with a rapid stream in this part of its course, forming a series of cataracts: its violence seen is to be referred to in the words of Isa 18:2, "whose land the rivers have spoiled." The Hebrews seem also to have been aware of its tropical characteristics, the words translated in the A.V. "the land shadowing with wings" (Isa 18:1), admitting the sense of "the land of the shadow of both sides," the shadows falling towards the north and south at different periods of the year, a feature which is noticed by many early writers (compare the expression in Strabo, 2, page 133, αμφισκιοι; Virgil, Ecl. 10:68; Pliny, 2:75). The papyrus boats ("vessels of bulrushes," Isa 18:2), which were peculiarly adapted to the navigation of the Upper Nile, admitting of being carried on men's backs when necessary, were regarded as a characteristic feature of the country. The Hebrews carried on  commercial intercourse with Ethiopia, its "merchandise" (Isa 45:14) consisting of ebony, ivory, frankincense, and gold (Herod. 3:97, 114), and precious stones (Job 28:19; Josephus, Ant. 8:6, 5).

The following close translation of Isaiah's splendid summons (chapter 18) to the Ethiopians, as auxiliaries to the Egyptians in the struggle against Sennacherib, is inserted here as graphic of many salient features of that warlike state:

Ho! land of whirring wings, That art across the rivers of Cushi; That sendest on the sea ambassadors, Even in vessels of papyrus upon the face of the waters.

Go ye light messengers, To a nation drafted and drilled, To a people fearful henceforth and onward, A nation most valiant and dominant, Whose land rivers have split: All ye inhabitants of the world, And dwellers of the land, At the lifting of the standard of the mountains you shall see, And at the clanging of the trumpet you shall hear.

For thus has Jehovah said to me:I will calmly look in my place — Like serene heat above sunlight, Like the cloud of dew in the heat of harvest; Yet before the harvest, when the blossom has grown perfect,

Or a plump green grape can the flower become, Then has one cut the shoots with the pruning-knives, And the twigs has he removed, lopped. And they shall be left together for the buzzard of the mountains, And for the beast of the earth; And upon him shall the buzzard summer,

And every beast of the earth shall winter upon him. In that time shall a present be led to Jehovah of armies, Of a people drafted and drilled, Even from a people fearful henceforth and onward, A nation most valiant and dominant, Whose land rivers have split, To the place of the name of Jehovah of armies, Mount Zion.  The inhabitants of Ethiopia were a Hamitic race (Gen 10:6), and are described in the Bible as a dark-complexioned (Jer 13:23) and stalwart race (Isa 45:14, "men of stature;" 18:2, for "scattered," some substitute "tall"). Their stature is noticed by Herodotus (3:20, 114) as well as their handsomeness. Not improbably the latter quality is intended by the term in Isa 18:2, which in the A.V. is rendered "peeled," but which may mean "fine-looking." Their appearance led to their being selected as attendants in royal households (Jer 38:7). The Ethiopians are on one occasion coupled with the Arabians, as occupying the opposite shores of the Red Sea (2Ch 21:16); but elsewhere they are connected with African nations, particularly Egypt (Psa 68:31; Isa 20:3-4; Isa 43:3; Isa 45:14), Phut (Jer 46:9), Lub and Lud (Eze 30:5), and the Sukkiim (2Ch 12:3). They were divided into various tribes, of which the Sabaeans were the most powerful. SEE SEBA; SEE SUKKIIM.

The name Cush is found in the Egyptian KISH, which is evidently applied to the same territory, though we have the same difficulty in determining its limits, save on the north. The classical Ethiopia (Αἰθιοπια) may have the same origin, through the Coptic ethos, of which, unless it be derived from thos, "a boundary," the Sahidic form esos may be the purest, and connect the classical with the ancient Egyptian name. The Greeks themselves regarded it as expressive of a dark complexion (from αἴθω, "to burn," and ὤψ, "a countenance"). In the Bible there is no certain notice of any Ethiopian race but Cushites.

According to Dr. Brugsch, the first country above Egypt was TA-MERU- PET, or TA-HENS, corresponding to Nubia, and extending, under the Pharaohs, at least as far south as Napata. Dr. Brugsch supposes that TA- HENS was, in the earlier times, the whole tract south of Syene under Egyptian rule [therefore governed by the prince of KISH, and corresponding to or included in that country], and, in the later times, little more than the Dodecasotcenus of the Ptolemies and Romans, the remains of the older territory (Geographische Inschriften, 1:100). As a nome, Nubia, before the formation of the Ombite Nome, included Ombos, Silsilis being probably the first city of the Egyptian Apollinopolite Nome. Although it is not impossible that at Silsilis was anciently the great natural barrier of Egypt on the south, we think that this extension of Nubia was simply for purposes of government, as Dr. Brugsch seems to admit (Geogr. Inschr. 1:100). South of the Nubia of the Pharaohs he places a region of  which the name perhaps reads PENT-HEN-NUFRE, which, however, was probably a district of the former country. Still further, and near Merob, he puts the land of KISH, and in and, about Meroe the land of the NEHSI or negroes. Others, however, think that KISH commenced immediately above Egypt, lerobably always at the First Cataract, and included all the known country south of Egypt, TA-MERU-PET or TAKENS, save as a nome, being a part of it, the modern Nubia. Names of conquered negro nations, tribes, or countries occur on the monuments of the empire: of these, the most suggestive are the BARBARTA and TAKRERR (see Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. 1:100 -107, 150164; 2:4-13, 20; 3:3, 4, and indices s.v. Athiopien, Kes, etc.).

Ethiopia comprises two very different tracts. North of the region of tropical rains, it is generally an extremely narrow strip of cultivated land, sometimes but a few Cards wide, on both sides, or occasionally on one side only, of the Nile. Anciently the watered tract was much broader, but the giving way of a barrier at Silsilis (Jebel es-Silsileh) or Syene (Aswatn) has lowered the level of the river for some distance above the First Cataract; exactly how far cannot be accurately determined, but certainly for the whole space below the Third Cataract. The cultivable soil which was anciently productive is now far above the highest level of the stream. The valley is, however, never broad, the mountains seldom leaving a space of more than a mile within the greater part of the region north of the limit of tropical rains. The aspect of the country is little varied. On either side of the river, here narrower than in its undivided course in Upper Egypt, rise sterile sandstone and limestone mountains, the former sometimes covered by yellow sand-drifts. At the First Cataract, at Kalab'sheh, and at the Second Cataract, the river is obstructed, though at the second place not enough to form a rapid, by red granite and other primary rocks. The groves of date-palms, here especially fine, are the most beautiful objects in the scene, but its general want of variety is often relieved by the splendid remains of Egyptian and Ethiopian civilization, and the clearness of the air throws a peculiar beauty over everything that the traveler beholds. As he ascends the river, the scenery, after a time, becomes more varied, until on the east he reaches the Abyssinian highlands, on the west the long meadows, the pasture-lands of herds of elephants, through which flows the broad and sluggish White Nile. In this upper region the climate is far less healthy than below, save in Abyssinia, which, from its height, is drained, and enjoys an air which is rare and free from exhalations. The country is  thus for the most part mountainous, the ranges gradually increasing in altitude towards the S., until they attain an elevation of about 8000 feet in Abyssinia.

The Nile is the great fertilizer of the northern regions of Ethiopia, which depend wholly upon its yearly inundation. It is only towards the junction of the two great streams that the rains take an increasingly important share in the watering of the cultivable land. In about N. lat. 170 40', the great river receives its first tributary, the Astabloras, now called the Atbarah. In about N. lat. 150 40' is the confluence of the Blue and White Niles. The Blue Nile, which has its source in Abyssinia, is a narrow, rapid stream, with high, steep mild-banks, like the Nile in Egypt; it is strongly charged with alluvial soil, to which it owes the dark color which has given it its distinctive name. From this stream the country below derives the annual alluvial deposits. The White Nile is a colorless river, very broad and shallow, creeping slowly through meadows and wide in marsh-lands. Of the cultivation and natural products of Ethiopia little need be said, as they do not illustrate the few notices of it in Scripture. It has always been, excepting the northern part, productive, and rich in animal life. Its wild animals have gradually been reduced, yet still the hippopotamus, the crocodile, and the ostrich abound, though the second alone is found throughout its extent. The elephant and lion are only known in its southernmost part.

In the Bible a Cushite appears undoubtedly to be equivalent to a negro, from this passage, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his stripes?” (Jer 13:23); and it is to be observed, that whenever the race of KISH is represented on the Egyptian monuments by a single individual, the type is that of the true negro (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1:404, abridgm.), It is therefore probable that the negro race anciently extended further to the north than at present, the whole country watered by the Nile, as far as it is known, being now peopled by a race intermediate between the negro race and the Caucasian. There is no certain mention in the Bible of this intermediate race in Ethiopia, but the Egyptian and Ethiopian monuments afford us indications of its ancient existence in its modern territory, though probably it did not then extend as far south as now. At the present day, Ethiopia is inhabited by a great variety of tribes of this race: the Kunuz, said to be of Arab origin, nearest to Egypt, are very dark; the Nubeh, the next nation, much lighter; beyond them are some fair Arabs, the Caucasian Abyssinians, with scarcely any trace of negro influence save in  their dark color, and tribes as black as the true negro, or nearly so, though not of the pure negro type. The languages of Ethiopia are as various as the tribes, and appear to hold the same intermediate place between the Shemitic group and the Nigritian, if we except the Ethiopic, which belongs to the former family. SEE ETHIOPIC LANGUAGE.

In all that relates to the civilization of ancient Ethiopia we see the same connection with Egypt that is constantly indicated in the Bible. So far as the Egyptian sway extended, which was probably, under the empire, as far as somewhat above the junction of the two Niles the religion of Egypt was probably practiced. While the tract was under Egyptian rule this was certainly the case, as the remains of the temples sufficiently show. We find it as the religion of Tirhakah in his Ethiopian as well as his Egyptian sculptures, and this is also the case with the later kings of Ethiopia who held no sway in Egypt. There were evidently local differences, but apparently nothing more. Respecting the laws and forms of government the same may be supposed. We have very little evidence as to the military matters of the Ethiopians, yet, from their importance to Egypt, there can be little doubt that they were skillful soldiers. Their armies were probably drawn from the Ethiopian or intermediate race, not from the negro. Of the domestic life of this people we have but slight hints. Probably they were more civilized than are their modern successors. Their art, as seen in the sculptures of their kings in Ethiopian temples from Tirhakah downwards, is merely a copy of that of Egypt, showing, after the first, an inferiority in style to the contemporary works of the original art. Their character can scarcely be determined from scanty statements, applying, it may be, to extremely different tribes. In one particular all accounts agree: they were warlike, as, for instance, we equally see in the defiance the Ethiopian king sent to Cambyses (Herod. 3:21), and in the characteristic inscription at Kalab'sheh of Silco, "king (βασιλίσκος) of the Nubadse and all the Ethiopians" (Modern Egypt and Thebes, 2:81, 312), who is to be regarded as a very late Ethiopian king or chief in the time of the Roman empire. The ancients, from Homer downwards, describe them as a happy and pious race. In the Bible they are spoken of as "secure" or "carelessly (Eze 30:9), but this may merely refer to their state when danger was impending. Probably the modern inhabitants of Ethiopia

give us a far better picture of their predecessors than we can gather from the few notices to which we have alluded. If we compare the Nubians with the representations of the ancient Egyptians on the monuments, we are  struck by a similarity of type, the same manner of wearing the hair, and a like scantiness of clothing. There can be no question that the Nubians are mainly descended from an Egyptianized Ethiopian people of two thousand years ago, who were very nearly related to the Egyptians. The same may be said of many tribes further to the south, although sometimes we find the Arab type and Arab manners and dress. The Ethiopian monuments show us a people like the ancient Egyptians and the modern Nubians. The northern Nubians are a simple people, with some of the vices, but most of the virtues of savages. The chastity of their women is celebrated, and they are noted for their fidelity as servants. But they are inhospitable and cruel, and lack the generous qualities of the Arabs. Further south manners are corrupt, and the national character is that of Egypt without its humanity, and untouched by any but the rudest civilization.

In speaking of the history of the country, we may include what is known of its chronology, since this is no more than the order in which kings reigned. Until the time of the 12th dynasty of Egypt we have neither chronology nor history of Ethiopia. We can only speculate upon the earlier conditions of the country with the aid of some indications in the Bible. The first spread of the descendants of Cush seems to be indicated by the order in which the Cushite tribes, families, or heads are enumerated in Gen 10:1-32. All the names, excepting Nimrod, might be thought to indicate a colonization of Southern and Eastern Arabia, were there not good reason to suppose that Seba, though elsewhere mentioned with Sheba (Psa 72:10), is connected with Ethiopia, and is probably the Hebrew name of the chief Ethiopian kingdom from the time of Solomon downwards. (Josephus calls Meroh Saba, Ant. 2:10, 2, and Seba of Cush he calls Sabas, ib. 1:6, 2.) If this be the case, it would be remarkable that Nimrod is mentioned at the end of the list and Seba at the beginning, while the intervening names, mostly if not all, are Arabian. This distribution may account for the strongly-Caucasian type of the Abyssinians, and the greater indication of Nigritian influence in all the other Ethiopian races; for a curve drawn from Nimrod's first kingdom there can, we think, be little doubt that the meaning in Genesis is, that he went northward and founded Nineveh — and extending along the South Arabian — coast, if carried into Africa, would first touch Abyssinia. The connection of Southern Arabia and Abyssinia has been so strong for about two thousand years that we must admit the reasonableness of this theory of their ancient colonization by kindred tribes. The curious question of the direction from which Egyptian civilization  came cannot here be discussed. It is possible that it may have descended the Nile, as was, until lately, supposed by many critics, in accordance with statements of the Greek writers. The idea or tradition of which these writers probably build may be due to the Nigritian origin of the low nature- worship of the old Egyptian religion, and perhaps, as far as it is picture- writing, of the hieroglyphic system, of which the characters are sometimes called Ethiopic letters by ancient writers.

The history of Ethiopia is closely interwoven with that of Egypt. The two countries were not unfrequently united under the rule of the same sovereign. The first Egyptian king who governed Ethiopia was one of the 12th dynasty, named Osirtasen I, the Sesostris of Herod. 2:110. During the occupation of Egypt by the Hyksos, the 13th dynasty retired to the Ethiopian capital, Napata; and again we find the kings of the 18th and 19th dynasties exercising a supremacy over Ethiopia, and erecting numerous temples, the ruins of which still exist at Semneh, Amada, Soleb, Abusimbel, and Jebel Berkel. The tradition of the successful expedition of Moses against the Ethiopians, recorded by Josephus (Ant. 2:10), was doubtless founded on the general superiority of the Egyptians at that period of their history.

Under the 12th dynasty we find the first materials for a history of Ethiopia. In these days Nubia seems to have been thoroughly Egyptianized as far as beyond the Second Cataract, but we have no indication of the existence at that time in Ethiopia of any race but the Egyptian. We find an allusion to the negroes in the time between the 12th dynasty and the 18th, in the name of a king of that period, which reads RA?-NEHSI, or "the Sun? of the Negroes," rather than "the Negro Sun?" (Turin Papyrus of Kings, ap. Lepsius Konigsbuch, pl. 18:197; 19:278). The word NEESI is the constant designation of the negro race in hieroglyphics.

Before passing to the beginning of the 18th dynasty, when the Egyptian empire definitely commenced, SEE EGYPT, we may notice two possible references to the Ethiopians in connection with the Exodus, an event which probably occurred at an early period of that empire. In Isa 43:1-28, which though relating to the future, also speaks of the past, and especially mentions or alludes to the passage of the Red Sea (see particularly Isa 43:16-17), Ethiopia is thus apparently Connected with the Exodus: "I gave Egypt [for] thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee" (Isa 43:3). It can scarcely be supposed that this is an emphatic relation of future events, and  it is difficult to connect it with any other known past event, as the conquest of Egypt by Sennacherib, which may have already occurred. If this passage refer to the Exodus, it would seem to favor the idea that the Israelites went out during the empire, for then Ethiopia was ruled by Egypt, and would have been injured by the calamities that befell that country. In Amos there is a passage that may possibly connect the Ethiopians with the Exodus: "[Are] ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the LORD. Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" (9:7). But the meaning may be that the Israelites were no better than the idolatrous people of Cush.

At the beginning of the 18th dynasty we find the Egyptians making expeditions into Ethiopia, no doubt into its farther regions, and bringing back slaves. At this time the Egyptians seem to have intermarried with people of Ethiopia, probably of the intermediate race, darker than the Egyptians, but not of the negro race. One of the wives of Adhhmes, or Amosis, the first king of the. 18th dynasty, is represented as black, though not with negro features. A later sovereign of the same dynasty, Amenoph III, is seen by his statues to have been partly Ethiopian, and this may have been one cause of his identification by the Greeks with Memnon. Daring this and the dynasty which succeeded it, the 19th, we have no proof that the regularly-governed Egyptian dominions extended beyond Napata, but it is probable that they reached a little beyond the junction of the White and Blue Niles. There can be no doubt that Ethiopia remained subject to Egypt as late as the reign of Rameses VI, soon after whom the proper Egyptian empire may be said to have closed, having lasted three centuries from the beginning of the 18th dynasty. Under that empire, Ethiopia, or at least the civilized portion, was ruled by a governor, who bore the title SUTEN-SA- EN-KISH, "Prince," literally "Royal son," "of Cush," etc. The office does not seem to have been hereditary at any time, nor is it known to have been held by a son of the reigning king, or any member of the royal family.

After the reign of Rameses VI, the feebleness of the later Theban kings may have led to the loss of Ethiopia, and we know that in Solomon's time there was a kingdom of Sehna. Shishak, the first king of the 22d dynasty, probably made Ethiopia tributary. When this king, the Sheeshonk I of the monuments, invaded the kingdom of Judah, he had in his army "the Lubim, the Sukkiim, and the Cushiim" (2Ch 12:13). The Lubinm are a people of Northern Africa, near Egypt and the Sukkiimi are of doubtful  place. The indications are of an extensive dominion in Africa; for, though the Lubim and Sukkiim may have been mercenaries, it is unlikely that the Cushim were also. There can be no doubt that Shishak was a powerful king, especially as he was strong enough to invade Judah, and it is therefore probable that he restored the influence of the Egyptians in Ethiopia. SEE SHISHAK.

Zerah the Ethiopian, on account of his army being of Cushim and Lubim, and thus, as well as in consisting of chariots, horsemen, and foot, of like composition with that of Shishak (2Ch 16:8; 2Ch 14:9; 2Ch 14:12-13; 2Ch 12:2-3), seems certainly to have been either a king of this dynasty, or else a general of such a king. In the former case he would probably correspond to Osorkon II. The names Osorkon and Zerah seem very remote, but it must be remembered that Egyptian words transcribed in Hebrew are often much changed, and that in this case it is probable that both Egyptian and Hebrew forms, if they be two orthographical representations of one word, come from a third source. The style "Zerah the Cushite" is unlike that applied to kings of Egypt who were foreigners, or of foreign extraction, as in the cases of "So, king of Egypt," and "Shishak, king of Egypt." On this account, and especially from the omission of the word king, or any royal appellation, though we cannot infer positively from the few instances in Scripture, Zerah may be rather supposed to have been a general, but the army that he commanded must, from the resemblance of its composition to that of Shishak's, have been that of a king of the same line. Mr. Kenrick rather too hastily remarks as to the term Cushite, that "no king of the Bubastite [22d] dynasty could have been so designated," and is at some pains to explain what he considers to be a mistake (Ancient Egypt, 2:297 sq.). It is recorded that Asa had an army of 580,000, and that Zerah the Ethiopian came against him with 1,000,000, and 300 chariots. These high numbers have been objected to; but the history of our times shows that war upon this large scale is not alone possible to great kingdoms, but also to states of no very large population which put forth their whole strength. It is to be noticed that Asa was evidently struck by the greatness of the hostile army, to which the prophet Hanani alludes, reproving him at a later time (2Ch 16:8). SEE NUMBER. Asa encountered Zerah "in the valley of Zephathah at Mareshah, and, praying for God's aid against this huge army, it was put to the rout, and he pursued it to Gerar, and smote all the cities round Gerar, which seem to have been in alliance with the invaders, and took much spoil from the cities, and also smote the tents of cattle, from which he took many sheep and camels (14:8-15). This great overthrow may have  been a main cause of the decline of the power of the 22d dynasty, which probably owed its importance to the successes of Shishak. SEE ZERAH.

During the later period of this dynasty, it is probable that Ethiopia became wholly independent. The 23d dynasty appears to have been an Egyptian line of little power. The 24th, according to Manetho, of but one king, Bocchoris the Saite, was probably contemporary with it. In the time of Bocchoris, Egypt was conquered by Sabaco the Ethiopian, who founded the 25th dynasty of Ethiopian kings. The chronology and history of this line is obscure. We take Manetho's list for the chronology, with a few necessary corrections in the length of the reigns, in the following table SEE EGYPT:

The duration here given to the first and second reigns can only be considered to be conjectural. Herodotus assigns 50 years as the duration of the Ethiopian dominion in Egypt (2:137, 139), and as he lived at no great distance from the time, and is to be depended upon for the chronology of the next dynasty, we should lay some stress upon his evidence did he not speak of but one Ethiopian king, Sabacos. Perhaps he includes in this single reign that of Tirhakah, and omits that of the first Sabacos. There are two Hebrew synchronisms and one Egyptian point of evidence which aid us in endeavoring to fix the chronology of this dynasty. Either the first or second king of the dynasty is supposed to be the So of the Bible, with whom Hoshea, who began to reign B.C. 729-8, made a treaty at least three years before the taking of Samaria: the latter eyent is fixed at B.C. 720; therefore one of these two Ethiopians was probably reigning in B.C. 723, or somewhat, perhaps seven. years, earlier. See So. Nor is it supposable that the treaty may have been made before the conquest of Egypt; for So is expressly called "king of Egypt" (2Ki 17:4), whereas Zerah and Tirhakah are distinctively styled Cushites (2Ch 14:9; 2Ki 19:9). Tirhakah was contemporary with Hezekiah and Sennacherib at the time of the destruction of the Assyrian army. The chronology of Hezekiah's reign is, with respect to these synchronisms, difficult; but we are disposed to think that the common reckoning, varying not more than three years, is correct, and that the preferable date of the accession of Hezekiah is B.C. 726. Some chronologers follow Dr. Oppert in supposing that the date of Sennacherib's invasion should be Hezekiah's 24th year instead of the 14th year (Chronologie des Assyriens et des Babyloniens, pages 14, 15), but we rather infer a long interval between two wars. SEE HEZEKIAH.

The last year of Hezekiah is thus B.C. 697, unless we  suppose that his reign was longer than is stated in the Masoretic text, and that it was for the latter part contemporary with Manasseh's. Tirhakah's reign is nearly determined by the record in a tablet of the tombs of the Butls Apis, that one of them was born in his twenty-sixth year, and died at the end of the 20th of Psammetichus I. The length of its life is unfortunately not stated, but it exceeded twenty years, and the longest age recorded is twenty-six. Supposing it to have lived twenty-one years, the first year of Tirhakah's reign would fall in B.C. 690 (see Rawlinson's Herod. 2:319, where the successor of Psammetichus is proved to date from B.C. 664), which would correspond to the 8th year of Manasseh. The contemporaneousness of Tirhakah and Hezekiah can be explained by one of two suppositions, either that Hezekiah's reign exceeded twenty-nine years, or that Tirhakah ruled in Ethiopia before coming to the throne of Egypt. It must be remembered that it cannot be proved that the reigns of Manetho's 25th dynasty form a series without any break, and also that the date of the taking of Samaria is considered fixed by the Assyrian scholars. At present, therefore, we cannot venture on any changes. SEE CHRONOLOGY;

We do not know the cause of the rise of the 25th dynasty. Probably the first king already had an Ethiopian sovereignty when he invaded Egypt. That he and his successors were natives of Ethiopia is probable from their being kings of Ethiopia and having non-Egyptian names. Though Sabaco conquered Bocchoris and put him to death, he does not seem to have overthrown his line or the 23d dynasty: both probably continued in a tributary or titular position, as the Sethos of Herodotus, an Egyptian king of the time of Tirhakab, appears to be the same as Zet, who, in the version of Manetho by Africanus, is the last king of the 23d dynasty, and as kings connected with Psammetichus I of the Salte 26th dynasty are shown by the monuments to have preceded him in the time of the Ethiopians, and probably to have continued the line of the Salte Bacehoris. We think it probable that Sabaco is the "So, king of Egypt," who was the cause of the downfall of Hoshea, the last king of Israel. The Hebrew name סוא, if we omit the Masoretic points, is not very remote from the Egyptian SHEBEK. It was at this time that Egypt began strongly to influence the politics of the Hebrew kingdoms, and the prophecies of Hosea, denouncing an Egyptian alliance, probably refer to the reign of So or his successor; those of Isaiah, of similar purport, if his book be in chronological order, relate to the reign of Tirhakah. Tirhakah is far more fully commemorated by monuments than  his predecessors.

At Thebes he has left sculptures, and at Jebel-Berkel, Napata, one temple and part of another. There seems to be no doubt that Sethos (Zet?) was at least titular king of part of Egypt, or the whole country, under Tirhakah, on the following evidence: In the Bible; Tirhakab, when mentioned by name, is called "king of Cush (Ethiopia)," and a Pharaoh is spoken of at the same period (Isa 30:2-3; Isa 36:6; 2Ki 18:21); in the Assyrian inscriptions a Pharaoh is mentioned as contemporary with Sennacherib; and the Egyptian monuments indicate that two or three royal lines centered in that of the 26th dynasty. The only event of Tirhakah's reign certainly known to us is his advance against Sennacherib, apparently in fulfillment of a treaty made by Hezekiah with the Pharaoh whom we suppose to be Sethos. This expedition was rendered needless by the miraculous destruction of the Assyrian army, but it is probable that Tirhakah seized the occasion to recover some of the cities of Palestine which had before belonged to Egypt. Herodotus gives a traditional account of Sennacherib's overthrow, relating that when Egypt was ruled by Sethos, a priest-king, the country was invaded by Sennacherib, against whom Sethos, who had offended the military class, marched with an army of artificers and the like, and encamped near Pelusium, where in the night a multitude of field-mice gnawed the bow- strings and shield-straps of the Assyrians, who, being thus unable to defend themselves, took to flight (2:141). It has been well observed that it is said by Horapollo that a mouse denoted "disappearance" in hieroglyphics (Herog. 1:50). Here we have evidently a confused tradition of the great overthrow of the Assyrians. Strabo, on the authority of Megasthenes, tells us that Tirhakab, in his extensive expeditions, rivaled Sesostris, and went as far as the Pillars of Hercules (15:686).

The beginning of the 26th dynasty was a time of disaster to Egypt. Tirhakah was either dead or had retired to Ethiopia, and Egypt fell into the hands of several petty princes, probably the dodecarchs of Herodotus, whose rule precedes, and perhaps overlaps, that of Psammetichus I, who is said to have been at first a dodecarch. In this time Esarhaddon twice invaded and conquered the country; but, after his second invasion, Psammetichus seems to have entirely thrown off the Assyrian yoke, and restored Egypt to somewhat of its ancient power. There are several passages in Scripture which probably refer to these invasions, and certainly show the relation of Ethiopia to Egypt at this time. The prophet Nahum, warning Nineveh, describes the fall of Thebes, "Art thou better than No  Amon, that was situate among the rivers, [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea, [and] her wall from the sea? Cush and Mizraim [were her] strength, and [it was] infinite; Put and Lubim were in thy help" (Nah 3:8-9). The sack and captivity of the city are then related. The exact period of Nahum is not known, but there is much probability that he lived about the time of the invasion of Judaea by Sennacherib (Nah 1:11-12). SEE NAHUM.

He therefore appears, to refer to one of the conquests of Egypt by Sennacherib, Sargon, or Shalmaneser. See No. The close alliance of Cush and Mizraim seen as to point to the period of the Ethiopian rule, when the states would have united against a common enemy. Three chapters of Isaiah relate to the future of Ethiopia and Egypt, and it is probably that they contain what is virtually one connected subject, although divided into a prophecy against Ethiopia, the burden of Egypt, and the record of an event shown to prefigure the fall of both countries, these divisions having been followed by those who separated the hook into chapters. The prophecy against Ethiopia is extremely obscure. (See the version above.) It appears to foretell the calamity of Ethiopia to its farthest people, to whom messengers should be sent in vessels of papyrus, by the sea, here the Nile, as in the description of Thebes by the prophet Nahum (1.c.), bearing, probably, that news which is related in the next chapter. In the end the Ethiopians would send a present to the Lord at Zion (chap. xviii). Then follows " the burden of Egypt," apparently foretelling the discord and strife of the dodecarchy, the delivering of the people into the hand of a cruel lord, probably the Assyrian conqueror, the failure of the waters of Egypt and of its chief sources of revenue, and the partial conversion of the Egyptians, and, as it seems, their ultimate admission to the Church (chapter 19).

We then read how a Tartan, or general; of Sargon, the king of Assyria, took Ashdod, no doubt with a garrison from the Egyptian army. At this time Isaiah was commanded to walk "naked and barefoot," probably without an outer garment, three years, as a sign to show how the Egyptians and Ethiopians, as no doubt had been the case with the garrison of Aehdod, probably of both nations, should be led captive by the king of Assyria. This captivity was to be' witnessed by the Jews who trusted in Ethiopia and Egypt to be delivered from the king of Assyria, and the invasions of Egypt by Esarhaddon are therefore probably foretold (chapter 20). In the books of later prophets Ethiopia does not take this prominent place: no longer a great power, it only appears as furnishing part of the Egyptian forces or sharing the calamities of Egypt, as in the history of Egypt we find Ethiopia occupying  a position of little or no political importance, the successors of Tirhakah in that country being perhaps tributaries of the kings of the 26th dynasty. In the description by Jeremiah of Phaiaob-Necho's army, the Ethiopians (Cush) are first spoken of among the foreign warriors mentioned as serving in it (Eze 46:9). Ezekiel prophecies the fear of Ethiopia at the overthrow of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar (Eze 30:4-9), and though the helpers of Egypt were to fall, it does not seem that the invasion of their lands is necessarily to be understood. One passage illustrates the difficult 18th chapter of Isaiah: "In that day shall messengers go forth from me in ships to make ["secure" or] careless Ethiopia afraid, and. great pain shall come upon them as in the day of Egypt" (Eze 30:9). Zephaniah, somewhat earlier, mentions the Ethiopians alone, predicting their overthrow (Zep 2:12). It is probable that the defeat of the Egyptian army at Carchemish by Nebuchadnezzar is referred to, or else the same king's invasion of Egypt.

The kings of Egypt do not appear to have regained the absolute rule of Ethiopia, or to have displaced the native kings, though it is probable that they made them tributary. Under Psammetichus, a revolt occurred in the Egyptian army, and a large body of rebels fled to Ethiopia, and there established themselves. A Greek inscription on one of the colossi of the great temple of Abu-Simbil, not far; below the Second Cataract, records the passage of Greek mercenaries on their return from an expedition up the river, "king Psamatichus" having, as it seems, not gone beyond Elephantine. This expedition was probably that which Herodotus mentions Psammetichus as having made in order to bring back the rebels (2:30), and, in any case, the inscription is valuable as the only record of the 26th dynasty which has been found above the First Cataract. It does not prove, more especially as the king remained at Elephantine, that he governed any part of Ehiopia. The next event of Ethiopian history is the disastrous expedition of Cambyses, defeated by the desert-march, and not by any valor of the invaded nation. From this time the country seems to have enjoyed tranquillity, until the earlier Ptolemies acquired part of Lower Nubia that was again lost to them in the decline of their dynasty. When Egypt became a Roman province, Syene was its frontier town to the south; but when, under Augustus, the garrison of that town had been overwhelmed by the Ethiopians, the prefect Petronius invaded Ethiopia, and took Napata, said to have been the capital of queen Candace. The extensive territory subdued was not held, and though the names of some of  the Caesars are found in the temples of Lower Nubia, in Strabo's time Syene marked the frontier. This part of Ethiopia must have been so unproductive, even before the falling of the level of the Nile, which Sir Gardner Wilkinson supposes to have happened between the early part of the 13th dynasty and the beginning of the 18th, that it may well have been regarded as a kind of neutral ground.

The chronology of the kings of Ethiopia after Tirhakah cannot yet be attempted. Professor Lepsius arranges all the Ethiopians under four periods: 1st. The 25th dynasty, first and 2Ki 2:1-25 d. Kings of Napata, beginning with Tirhakah, who, in his opinion, retired from Egypt, and made this his capital: of these kings, one, named NASTES-SES, or NASTES-NEN, has left a tablet at Dongolah, recording the taking in his wars of enormous booty in cattle and gold (Lepsius, Denkminler, 5:16; Brugsch, Geogr. Istschr. 1:163, 164). 3d. Older kings of Meroe, among whom is a queen KENTAHI, in whom a Candace is immediately recognized, and also MI-AMEN ASRU and ARKAMEN, the latter Ergamenes, the contemporary of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who had, according to Diodorus Siculus, received a Greek training, and changed the customs of Ethiopia (3:6). Some of these princes had an extensive dominion. The name of Ergamenes is found from Lower Nubia to Meroe. 4th. Later kings of Meroe, some, at least, of whom ruled both Meroe and Napata, though the former seems to have been the favorite capital in the later period (Konigsbuch, pl. 71, 72, 73). The importance of queens is remarkably characteristic of an African people. SEE MEROE.

The spread of Christianity in Ethiopia is a remarkable event in the history of the country, and one in which the truth of "the sure word of prophecy" has been especially evident. In this case, as in others, the Law may have been the predecessor of the Gospel. The pious eunuch, "Ebed-melech the Ethiopian," who befriended Jeremiah (Jer 38:7-13; Jer 39:15-18), may have been one of many converts from paganism, but it is scarcely likely that any of these returned to their native land. The Abyssinian Jews, being probably a colony of those of Arabia, were perhaps of later origin than the time of the introduction of Christianity. But in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, who had charge of all the treasure of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, and who, on his return from worshipping at Jerusalem, was baptized by Philip the deacon, we see evidence of the spread of the old dispensation in Ethiopia, and of the reception there of the new (Act 8:27-39). In Psa 68:1-35 (31), in Isaiah (Isa 45:14), and probably in  Zephaniah (Zep 3:10), the calling of Ethiopia to God's service is foretold. Whether conversion to the Law or to Christianity, or indeed to both, is in. tended, it is remarkable that, though-long deprived of its actual geographical contact with the Coptic Church. of which it is a branch, by the falling away of Nubia, the Abyssinian Church yet remains, and the empire and the kingdom of Shoa are the only Christian sovereignties in the whole of Africa. SEE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

The ancient monuments of Ethiopia may be separated into two great classes, the Egyptian and the Egypto-Ethiopian. In Lower Nubia the Egyptian are almost universal; at Napata we find Egypto-Ethiopian, as well as higher up in the island of Meroe. In the monuments north of Napata, of which the chief lie between the first and second cataracts, we perceive no difference from those of Egypt save in the occurrence of the names of two Ethiopian kings-ARKAMEN, or Ergamenes, and ATSHERAMEN. The remains attest the wealth of the kings of Egypt rather than that of the country in which they are found; their abundance is partly owing to the scanty modern population's not having required the ancient masonry for building materials. The nearness of the mountains on either side to the river, and the value of the little tracts of alluvial soil, have rendered wholly or partly rock-hewn temples numerous here. Tombs are few and unimportant. Above the second cataract there are some similar remains, until the traveler reaches Jebel Berkel, the sacred mountain beneath which stood Napata, where, besides the remains of temples, he is struck with the sight of many pyramids. Other pyramids are seen in the neighborhood. They are peculiar in construction, the proportion of the height to the base being much greater than in the pyramids of Egypt. The temples are of Egyptian character, and one of them is wholly, and another partly, of the reign of Tirhakah. The pyramids are later, and are thoroughly Ethiopian. Yet higher up the river are the monuments of Meroe and neighboring places. They are pyramids, like those of Napata, and temples, with other buildings, of a more Ethiopian style than the temples of the other capital. The size and importance of these monuments prove that the sovereigns who ruled at Meroe must have been very rich, if not warlike. The farthest vestiges of ancient civilization that have been found are remains of an Egyptian character at Sobah, on the Blue Nile, not far south of the junction of the two rivers.

The name suggests the Biblical Seba, which, as a kingdom, may correspond to that of Meroe; but such resemblances are dangerous. The tendency of Ethiopian art was to imitate the earliest  Egyptian forms of building, and even subjects of sculpture. This is plain in the adoption of pyramids. The same feeling is strongly evident in Egypt under the 26th dynasty, when there was a renaissance of the style of the pyramid period, though no pyramids seem to have been built. This renaissance appears to have begun under, or immediately after, the later part of the 25th dynasty, and is seen in the subjects of sculpture and the use of titles. The monuments of Ethiopian princes, at first as good as those of Egypt at the same time, become rapidly inferior, and at last are extremely barbarous, more so than any of Egypt. The use of hieroglyphics continues to the last for royal names, but the language seems, after the earlier period, to have been little understood. An Ethiopian demotic character has been found of the per iod, which succeeded the hieroglyphic for common use, and even for some inscriptions. We do not offer any opinion on the language of this character. The subject requires full investigation. The early Abyssinian remains, as the obelisk at Axum, do not seem to have any connection with those of more northern Ethiopia: they are of later times, and probably are of Arab oririn. Throughout Ethiopia we find no traces of an original art or civilization, all the ancient monuments save those of Abyssinia, which can scarcely be called ancient, showing that the country was thoroughly Egyptianized. Lepsius has published the Ethiopian monuments in his Denkmdler (part 5; pl. 1-75), as well as the inscriptions in Ethiopian demotic (part 6; pl. 1-11; see also 12, 13).

For the Christian history and relations of Ethiopia, see Titelmann, De fide, religione et moribus AEthiopum (Antwerp, 15034); De Goes, id. (Par. 1541, and since); Dresser, De statu eccles. Ethiopicae (Lips. 1584); De Vereta, Historia de Etiopia (Valentia, 1590); Predicadores en la Etopia (ib. 1611); Godiger, De rebus Abassinorum (Lugd. 1615); Machalt, De rebus in AEthiopia (Paris, 1624-6) ; Da Viega, Christ. religio in Ethiopia (Laus. 1628); Dannhauer, Ecclesia Ethiopica (Argent. 1664); Ludolf, Historia Ethiopica (Fr. ad M. 1681; with the supplemental Specimen, Ib. 1687; Commentarius, ib. 1691; and Adpendix, ib. 1693; the original work in English, Lond. 1684; abridged in French, Par. 1684); Cavatus, Descriptio Congo, Matambe et Angola (Bonn, 1687); Geddes, Hist. of Ethiopia (Lond. 1696); Windham, Einleitung in d. ithiop. Theologie (Helmst. 1719); Lobo, Iter hist. in Abyssiniam (publ. only in a transl. Relation historique d'Abyssinie, Par. 1727, Amst. 1728) La Croze, Christianisme dEthiopie (Hague, 1739, in Germ. 1740); Oertel, Theologia  AEthiopum (Wittemb. 1746); Kocker, Fasti Habissinorumn (Berne, 1760); Bruce, Travels in Abyssinia (Edinb. 1790). SEE ABYSSINIA.

## Ethiopian[[@Headword:Ethiopian]]

             (Αἰθίοψ, Act 8:27; כּוּשׁי, Kushi', Num 12:1; 2Ch 12:3; 2Ch 14:9; 2Ch 14:12-13; 2Ch 16:8; 2Ch 21:16; Jer 13:23; Jer 38:7; Jer 38:10; Jer 38:12; Jer 39:16; Dan 11:43; Amo 9:7; Zep 2:12; i.e., Cushite; elsewhere as a rendering of the simple כּוּשׁ, Kush), an inhabitant of the land of ETHIOPIA SEE ETHIOPIA (q.v.) or CUSH SEE CUSH properly "Cushite" (Jer 13:23); used of Zerah (2Ch 14:9 [8]) and Ebedmelech (Jer 38:7; Jer 38:10; Jer 38:12; Jer 39:16). SEE CUSHI.

## Ethiopian Church[[@Headword:Ethiopian Church]]

             SEE ABYSSNIAN CHURCH.

## Ethiopian Eunuch[[@Headword:Ethiopian Eunuch]]

             (ἀνὴρ Αἰθίοψ, εὐνοῦχος), a person described (Act 8:27) as a chief officer (vizier) of the Ethiopian queen Candacs (δυνάστης Κανδάκης τῆς βασιλίσσης Αἰθιόπων), who was converted to Christianity through the instrumentality of the evangelist Philip (q.v.). Ethiopic tradition calls him Indich (see Bzovii Annal. ad 1524, page 542; but comp. Ludolf, Hist. AEth. 3:2), and Irenaseus (Act 3:12) and Eusebius (Hist. Ecc 2:1) make him thie founder of Christianity in Arabia Felix and Ethiopia, but according to Sophronius he preached in the island of Ceylon, and suffered martyrdom there. His official title does not necessarily indicate an emasculated person SEE EUNUCH, but probably here denotes a prime minister of state rather than a simple cubicularius or chamberlain (q.v.). Kuindl (ad loc.) thinks he was a Jew of the Diaspora; and certainly he was at least a proselyte (q.v.). As to the place of his power, it is not quite certain that the passage in Pliny (Hist. Nat. 6:5) refers to Meroa as the seat of government of the female sovereigns (comp. βασιλέας, Strabo, 17:2, 3); but possibly rather to Napata (Τανάπη, Dion Cass. 54:5), the capital of a different part of Ethiopia (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 2:35), or perhaps an uncertain locality (Ritter, Erdk. 1:592). On the historical elements of the question, see Laurent, Neutestamen. Studien (Gotha, 1866), page 140 sq.; Bibliotheca Sacra, July 1866, page 515; on the religious teachings of the narrative, SEE SAM. Smith, Sermon on the Eth. Eunuch's Conversion (Lond. 1632). SEE CANDACE.

## Ethiopian Monks[[@Headword:Ethiopian Monks]]

             Monasticism spread rapidly up the Nile into Ethiopia, and gained as strong a hold there as in Egypt or Syria, if not a stronger. All the monasteries in Ethiopia professed to obey the so-called "Rule of Antony," but with different observances. An attempt at reformation, such as invariably recurs in the life of a monastic order, was made in the 7th century; Tecla- Haimanot being the second founder or Benedict of Ethiopian monasticism. He endeavored to consolidate the system under a superior-general, second in ecclesiastical rank only to the patriarch of Ethiopia, who was to visit and inspect the monasteries personally or by proxy. Several of them, however, preferred to retain their independence, like Congregationalists. Monks swarmed in Ethiopia long after the first fervor of asceticism; and the constitution of the Ethiopian Church was monastic. The story of a military order of monks, like the knightstemplar, originating in the 4th century, is purely fabulous. See Helyot, Diet. des Ordres Religieux, 2:222 sq.

## Ethiopian Woman[[@Headword:Ethiopian Woman]]

             (Hebrews Kshith', כֻּשַׁית, fem. of Cushite; Sept. Αἰθιοπίσσα, Vulg. AEthiopissa). Zipporah, the wife of Moses, is so described in Num 12:1. She is elsewhere said to have been the daughter of a Midianite (Exo 2:21, compared with 16), and, in consequence of this, Ewald and others have suppiosed that the allusion is to another wife whom Moses married after the death of Zipporah; but the Arabian Ethiopia is probably referred to in this case. SEE ZIPPORAH.

## Ethiopic Language[[@Headword:Ethiopic Language]]

             As it is maintained by competent judges that the Amharic and the Tigre are really dialects of the ancient Ethiopic or Geez (which is doubted by Adelung and Vater in the Mithridates), it may be expected, from the recent progress of comparative grammar, that future scholars will apply them to elucidate the structure of the other Syro-Arabian languages. At present, however, as even the Amharic is not yet able to boast of adequate and accessible means for its study, and as neither possesses any ancient version of any part of the Bible, the Geez is the only one which claims a particular notice here. SEE AMHARIC LANGUAGE.

The ancient Ethiopic or Geez, which is the only one of the three dialects that either has been or is now generally used in written documents of a sacred or civil kind, is to be classed as an ancient branch of the Arabic. This affinity is evident from the entire grammatical structure of the language; it is confirmed by the relation of its written character to that of the Himyarite alphabet; and either supports, or is supported by, the assumption that Habesh or Abyssinia was actually peopled by a colony from Southern Arabia. The grammatical structure of the Geez shows a largely predominant identity with that of Arabic; but it also possesses some traits which are in closer accordance with the other Syro-Arabian idioms, and some which are peculiar to itself alone. The main features of its  structure are as follows: The verb possesses the first ten conjugations of the Arabic verb, with the exception of the eighth and ninth; besides these it has two other conjugations which are unknown to the Arabic. There is a special conjunctive mood; the double infinitive is often used as a noun, irrespective of the absolute or construct form; the participle is wanting. The formation of nouns' resembles most that of Hebrew; but nouns often have superfluous end-vowels, which are modified in particular cases, and are analogous to the Arabic nunnation. As for the flexion of nouns, the masculine and feminine plurals are either formed by affixed syllables (an, at) on the principle common to the whole Syro-Arabian family, or by changes within the compass of the radical letters, after the manner of the so-called broken plurals of the Arabic grammar. The "construct state," and that relation of the noun which is equivalent to our objective case, are denoted by changes in the final vowels, or by employing the relative pronoun; the dative is indicated by prepositions. The comparative and superlative are expressed by means of particles. There is no form for the dual number either in the verb or the noun. With regard to the vocabulary of the language, one third of the roots are to be found in the same state in Arabic. By making allowance for commutations and transpositions, many other roots may be identified with their Arabic correspondents: some of its roots, however, do not exist in our present Arabic, but are to be found in Aramaic and Hebrew. Besides this, it has native roots peculiar to itself; it has adopted several Greek words, but shows no traces of the influence of Coptic.

The alphabet possesses twenty-six consonants, arranged in a peculiar order, twenty-four of which may, however, be regarded as essentially equivalent (although with different sounds in many instances) to the letters in the Arabic alphabet. The remaining two are letters adopted to express the Greek Φ and Ψ.

The vowel-sounds, which are seven, are not expressed by separable signs, as in the Hebrew and Arabic punctuation, but are denoted by modifications in the original form of the consonants, after the manner of the Devanagari alphabet. The mode of writing is from left to right. The position of the accent depends upon many complicated rules. As for the written characters, Gesenius has traced the relation between some of them and their equivalents in the Phoenician alphabet. There is, however, the most striking resemblance between the Geez letters generally and those in the Himyarite inscriptions, a circumstance which accords well with the  supposed connection of Southern Arabia and Habesh. Moreover, Lepsius, in an interesting essay, Ueber die Anordnung und Verwandschaft des Semitischen, Indischen, AEthiopischen, etc. Alphabets (in his Zwei sprachvergleichende Abhandlungen, Berlin, 1836, 8vo, pages 74-80), has adduced some striking arguments to prove that the Devanagari alphabet must have had some influence on the development of the Geez.

The literature of the Geez language is very scanty indeed, and that little is almost exclusively of a Biblical or ecclesiastical character. Dr. Laurence has lately added considerably to this by the publication of the Book of Enoch (q.v.), the Ascension of Isaiah (q.v.), and the first Book of Esdras (q.v.), in the Ethiopic version. There also exist in Ethiopic the Christian Book of Adam (in Germ. by Dillmann, Gott. 1853), and several other apocryphal works relating the miracles of Christ, Mary, etc. It possesses nothing, not even an imitation of the national poetry, nor of the lexicographical and grammatical works of the Arabs. Some few historical works in the shape of chronicles, and a few medical treatises, constitute the main body of their profane literature. The Geez has ceased, ever since the beginning of the 14th century, to be the vernacular language of; any part of the country, having been supplanted at the court of the sovereign by the Amharic. It still continues, however. to, be the language used in religious rites, in domestic affairs of state, and in private, correspondence. See Ludolf, Grammatica AEthiopica (2d edit. Freft. 1702, fol.), and his Lexicon AEthiopico-Latinum (2d edit. ib. 1699, fol., originally Lond. 1661, 4to); Hasse, Prakt. Hdb. d. arab. u. athiop. Sprache (Jen. 1793, 8vo); Hupfeld, Exercitt. AEthiopiae (Lips. 1826, 4to); Gesenius, in Ersch und Gruber's Allgemeine Encyclopadie, s.v. Aethiopische Sprache; Dillmann, Lexicon Ling. AEthiopicae (Lpz. 1862 sq., 4to); Chrestomathia Ethiopica (Lpz. 1865, 8vo); Castell, Lexicon Heptaglottum (Lond. 1669, fol.); Schrader, De Linguae AEthiop. indole (Vien. 1860 sq., 4to). SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

## Ethiopic Version[[@Headword:Ethiopic Version]]

             The libraries of Europe contain some, although very rarely complete, manuscript copies of a translation of the Bible into the Geez dialect (see Ludolf, Historia AEthiopica, Lond. 1684; also Platt's Catalogue of AEth. MSS., London, 1823). This version of the Old Testament was made from  the Greek of the Septuagint, according to the Alexandrian recension, as is evinced, among other things, by the arrangement of the Biblical books, and by the admission of the Apocrypha without distinction. Tradition assigns it to Frumentius as the author, but it probably proceeded from various Christian hands. Dorn supposes (De Psalterio AEthiopico, Lips. 1825) that the translator consulted the Hebrews original, but this is disputed by Gesenius and Rodiger (Aligem. Litt. Zeit. 1832). It is divided into four parts: The Law, or the Octateuch, containing the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth; The Kings, in thirteen books, consisting of two books of Samuel, two of Kings, two of Chronicles, two of Ezra (Ezra and Nehemiah), Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, the Psalms; Solomon, in five books, consisting of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, and Sirach; Prophets, in eighteen books, consisting of Isaiah, Jeremiah's prophecy and Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve minor prophets; lastly, they have also two books of the Maccabees. Besides this, they possess an apocryphal book of Enoch, which they place next to that of Job. The critical uses of this version are almost exclusively confined to the evidence it gives as to the text of the Septuagint. The version of the New Testament was made directly from the Greek original (see Bode, N.T. AEth. cum Graeco collatum, Brunswick, 1753). It follows the verbal arrangement of the Greek very closely, and has mistakes that are only to be explained by the confusion of words which resemble each other in that language. It is difficult to determine what recension it follows, but it frequently agrees with the Peshito and the Itala. It is impossible to ascertain the date of the execution of either of these translations, but they may both be ascribed with much probability to the beginning of the fourth century. — Kitto, s.v. Although there are several MSS. in Europe containing the Ethiopic version entire, only parts have yet been printed: the Psalter, first by Potken, along with Canticles (Romans 1513, 4to); also by the Bible Soc. (Lond. 1815), with notes by Ludolf (Frcft. 1701, 4to); the Canticles alone. by Nissel (Lugd. 1660, 4to); Jonah, in Lat. by Petraeus (ib. eod. 4to); Ruth, by Nissel (ib. eod. 4to); Malachi, in Lat. by Petraeus (ib. 1661, 4to); Joel, by the same (lb. eod. 4to); first 4 chapters of Genesis, by Biircklin (Freft. 1696, 4to); Jonah, with a glossary, etc., by Staudacher (ib. 1706, 8vo); various fragments, by Bode (Helmst. 1755, 4to). Dillmann is publishing for the first time the O.T. entire (Biblia V.T. AEth., Lips. 1860 sq., 4to). The whole New Testament has, however, appeared. It was first published by three Abyssinians (Rome, 1548-9, 3 vols. 4to), reprinted in Walton's Polyglot (London, 1857, fol.; volume 5, with a Latin version, also  1698). Platt has edited the entire O.T. in Amharic (Lond. 1840, 4to). The Gospels were edited anew from MSS. by Platt (Lond. 1826, 4to), and the whole N.T. by the same in 1830. Bode published translations and critical editions of several portions: Ep. to Hebrews (Rome, 1548, 4to), Matthew's Gaosp. (Hal. 1749, 4to). See Rosenmuller, Handb.f. d. Lit. d. bibl. Krit. 3:65 sq.; Davidson, Biblical Criticism, 2:202 sq.; Dillmann, in Herzog's Encyklopadie, s.v. SEE VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

## Ethma[[@Headword:Ethma]]

             (Ε᾿θμά v.r. Νοομά,Vulg. Nobei), given (1Es 9:35) as the name of the head of one of the families of Israelites, several of whose "sons" divorced their Gentile wives after the exile; apparently a corruption of NEBO SEE NEBO (q.v.) in the Hebrews list (Ezr 10:43).

## Ethnan[[@Headword:Ethnan]]

             (Hebrews Ethnan', אֶתְנָן, a gift; Sept. Ε᾿σθανάμ v. r. Ε᾿νθαδί Vulg. Ethnan), a descendant of Judah; one of the sons of Helah, the wife of Ashur, "the father of Tekoa" (1Ch 4:7). B.C. post 1618.

## Ethnarch[[@Headword:Ethnarch]]

             (ἐθνάρχης), properly ruler of a nation; hence generally a praefect of a district or city (Lucian, Macrob. 17), e.g. Simon Maccabaeus, as head of the Jewish crommonwealth (1Ma 14:47, "governor;" 15:1, 2, "prince ;" Josephus, Ant. 13:6, 6); Archelaus, appointed lay his father's will and the emperor's ratification, his viceroy in Judaea (Josephus, War, 2:6, 3), of the national head (modern "patriach") of time Jews in Egypt (Josephus, Ant. 14:7, 2; conp. Strabo, 16:798). Spoken of the "governor" or mayor of the city of Damascus (2Co 11:02), under the Arabian king Aretas (q.v.). (See Walch, Disert. in Acta Aposit. 2:85.)

## Ethnology[[@Headword:Ethnology]]

             may be defined as that branch of modern science which treats of the various nations of the earth with respect to their races, i.e., their relative origin, and their linguistic and social affinities; and it is thus distinguished from political geography, which discusses their association under their several civil governments. In the Bible, this subject, like all other scientific questions, is rather touched upon incidentally as connected with the history of mankind than in any formal and exact manner; yet the information thus afforded is of inestimable value, being, in fact, the only trustworthy clew to guide the investigator through the labyrinth in which later complications, and especially recent speculations, have involved the whole matter. Infidelity has striven hard to impugn the statements of Scripture on this ground especially; and it is therefore satisfactory to know that the most candid and general researches strongly tend to corroborate the positions of Holy Writ relative to all the main points involved in the discussion. These, so far as the Bible is directly concerned, all center in one cardinal topic, the unity of the human race; and they bear upon this chiefly in two lines of argument, namely, 1st, the analogous and common elements of various languages, showing an origin from one source; and, 2dly, the manner in which men are distributed, or, rather, grouped, over the surface of the earth, as illustrating the ethnological chart laid down in the tenth chapter of Genesis, This last only, or "the Dispersion of Nations," we propose to discuss in the present article, referring the other two to the article SEE ADAM, and, especially, the article SEE MAN, and articles there referred to; SEE TONGUES (CONFUSION OF), and other articles there referred to. For the physiological part of the argument we refer to the researches of Blumenbach, Dr. Prichard in his elaborate volumes on this subject, the notes in J. Pye Smith's Scripture and Geology, and a dissertation by Samuel Forrey, M.D., entitled The Mosaic Account of the Unity of the Human Race confirmed by the Natural History of the American Aborigines, in the American Biblical Repository, July, 1843. For a complete synoptical view of the present races of men, see Prichard's Ethnological Maps (Londoma, 1843, fol.). The following account embraces the principal points.

I. Fact of an early Dissemination of the Race. Many obvious reasons incline us to suppose that the small number of mankind which divine mercy  spared from the extirpation of the Deluge, eight persons, forming at the utmost five families, would continue to dwell near each other as long as the utmost stretch of convenience would permit them. The undutiful conduct of Ham and his fourth son cannot well be assigned to a point of time earlier than twenty or thirty years after the Flood. So long, at least, family affection and mutual interests would urge the children of Noah not to break up their society. The dread of dangers, known and unknown, and every day's experience of the benefit derived from mutual aid, would strengthen other motives. It is evident from Gen 11:10-16, that about 100 years, according to the Hebrew text, were spent in this state of family propinquity, yet with a considerable degree of proximate diffusion, which necessity would urge; but the dates of the Septuagint, without including the generation of the post-diluvian Caanan (q.v.), give 400. The Hebrew period, much more the others, will afford a sufficient time for such an increase of mankind as would render an extensive outspread highly expedient. A crowded population would be likely to furnish means and incentives to turbulence on the one hand, and to some form of tyranny on the other. Many of the unoccupied districts would become dangerously unwholesome by stagnating waters and the accumulation of vegetable and animal putrescence. The products of cultivation and of other arts would have been acquired so slowly as to have retarded human improvement and comfort. Tardy expansion would have failed to reach distant regions till many hundreds or thousands of years had run out. The noxious animals would have multiplied immoderately. The religious obedience associated, by the divine command, with the possession and use of the earth, would have been checked and perverted to a greater degree than the world's bitter experience proves that it actually has been. Thus it may appear with pretty strong evidence that a dispersion of mankind was highly desirable to be in a more prompt and active style than would have been effected by the impulses of mere convenience and vague inclination. SEE GEOGRAPHY.

That this dictate of reasonable conjecture was realized in fact, is determined by the Mosaic writings. Of the elder son of Eber, the narrative says his "name was Peleg (פֶּלֶג, division), because in his days the earth was divided" (Gen 10:25); and this is repeated, evidently as a literal transcript, in 1Ch 1:19. If we might coin a word to imitate the Hebrew, we might show the paronomasia by saying "the earth was pelegged" (נַפְלְגָה). Some are of opinion that the event took place about the time of his birth, and that his birth-name was given to him as a  memorial of the transaction. But it was the practice of probably all nations in the early times that persons assumed to themselves, or imposed upon their children and other connections, new names at different epochs of their lives, derived from coincident events in all the variety of associated ideas. Of that practice many 'examples occur in the Scriptures. The conjecture is more prob. able that, in this instance, the name was applied in the individual's maturer age, and on account of some personal concern which he had in the commencement or progress of the separation. But the signification usually given is by no means a matter of indubitable certainty. The verb occurs only in the two passages mentioned (strictly but one), and in Psa 55:9, "divide their tongues," and Job 38:25, "who bath divided a channel for the torrent" (produced by a heavy thunder-shower)? Respectable philologists have disputed whether it refers at all to a separation of mankind, and think that the event which singularly marked Peleg's life was an occurrence in physical geography, an earthquake which produced a vast chasm, separating two considerable parts of the earth in or near the district inhabited by men. That earthquakes and dislocations of land have taken place in and around that region at various times before the historical period, the present very different levels, and other results of volcanic agency, afford ample proofs. The possibility, therefore, of some geological convulsion cannot be denied; or that it might have been upon a t great scale, and followed by imperfect effects upon the condition of mankind. The transpiration of some comparatively local interest, however, would seem a more appropriate occasion for the name of an individual than so world-wide an occurrence as the general distribution of mankind. But if the race was as yet confined to a narrow circle and a single community, the breaking up of that society would be a very signal event to celebrate in his name. SEE PELEG.

But neither the affirming nor the rejecting of this interpretation of "the earth's being divided" can affect the question upon the primeval separation and migratory distributions of men. The reasons which we have mentioned render it certain that some such event, and successive events, have taken place; and, without urging the passage of disputed interpretation, it is evident that Gen 10:1-32; Gen 11:1-32 assume the fact, and may be considered as rather a summary recognition of it than as a detailed account. Thus (9:19), "These are the three sons of Noah, and from these all the earth was scattered over" (נ פְעָה). Again (10:32), "These are the families of the sons of Noah, [according] to their generations, in their nations; and from  these the nations were dispersed (נַפְרְרוּ) in the earth after the Flood." Here another verb is used, often occurring in the Old Testament, and the meaning of which admits of no doubt. We find it also at Gen 11:5, "From these the isles of the nations were dispersed (נַפְרְדוּ) in their lands, each [according] to its language, [according] to their families in their nations." The Biblical date thus assigned to the dispersion is not inconsistent with the most careful estimate of the antiquity of nations, such as Egypt and Assyria. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

In the latest composition of Moses is another passage, which, in this inquiry, must not be neglected (Deu 32:8-9): "In the Most High's assigning abodes to the nations, in his dispersing the sons of Adam, he fixed boundaries to the peoples according to the number (מַסְפָּר, numeration) of the sons of Israel: for the assigned portion of Jehovah is his people; Jacob, the lot of his inheritance." Of this 8th verse the Septuagint translation is remarkable, and it thus became the source of extraordinary interpretations: "When the Most High apportioned nations, when he scattered abroad the, sons of Adam he fixed boundaries of nations according to the number of the angels of God." There might be a reading (El or Elohim instead of Israel) which would yield that meaning from comparison with Job 1:6; Job 2:1; Job 38:7. Also the Alexandrine translators might welcone a colorable reasoning for the rendering, that it might haply serve as a protection from the danger of the Macedonico-Egyptian government, taking up the idea that the Jews claimed a divine right of supremacy over all other nations. This reading, however, save occasion to the Greek fathers (Justin Martyr, Origen, Eusebius, etc.) to maintain the doctrine of a later Jewish origin, that the grandsons of Noah being seventy, each was the ancestor of a nation, each nation having its own language derived from the confusion of Babel, and each also its guardian angel set over it by the Creator, excepting the nation of Israel, of which Jehovah himself was the tutelary deity. The only real difficulty of this passage lies in its seeming to assert that the nascent population was distributed into groups with the express design of effecting a numerical correspondence with the Israelitish family eight hundred years after. The names assigned to the third degree, that is, the sons (rather tribes or nations) of Noah's three sons, are, Japhet fourteen, Ham thirty-one, Shenm twenty-five, making seventy; and the whole family of Jacob, when it came to be domiciliated in Egypt, was seventy (Gen 46:26; Exo 1:5; Deu 10:22). Some have also fancied a parallel in the seventy elders (Exo 24:1; Exo 24:9; Num 11:16; Num 11:24-25; see also Kitto, Pictorial Palestine, Civil History, Index, "Elders"). These puerilities might have been prevented had men considered that מַסְפָּרdoes not signify merely an arithmetical amount, but is used to denote an exact narration (Jdg 7:15). The passage is in the highly poetical style of the magnificent ode in which it occurs, and, reduced to plain terms, simply declares that the Almighty Sovereign, in whose hands of necessity lies the disposal of human birth- places, had so arranged these, in mapping out the world, as best to subserve the future occupancy of Canaan by his chosen people.

But the main passage of Scripture usually relied upon to prove the fact of a sudden and violent disruption of primeval society into the germs of the early nations, as well as to explain its circumstances and cause, is the account of the building of the tower of Babel (Gen 11:1-9), in which the dispersion of those engaged in that enterprise has been regarded as a part of the disseverance commemorated in the name of Peleg. There are, however, some objections to this view of the narrative. In the first place, these two events are not thus connected in the account itself. The sporadic varieties of language, which is the grand distinction between the different tribes that have founded the ancient monarchies and cities, had not yet appeared; nor could they be accounted for in this manner if the original community had already begun to separate into the more modern states. The only supposition that would make the two occurrences compatible, if connected, is that the whole body of the Noachites, while in process of migration westward (בְּנָסְעָם מַקֶּדֶם), with a view to settling in different localities, were arrested by the inviting character of the plain of Shinar, until their purpose of diffusion (פּוּוֹ, the same word in Gen 11:4; Gen 11:8) was renewed by the divine interference. In the second place, it is not certain that either of the incidents thus associated is of so cosmopolitan a character as this theory assumes. By simply rendering אֶרֶוֹ, land or region, instead of "earth," the whole affair is reduced to a petty dispute or misunderstanding among the workmen engaged upon a public edifice, and a consequent dissolution of that particular cluster of inhabitants. Certain it is that all the dialects of this polyglot globe cannot be referred to a single incident or occasion like this. Such, at least, are in substance the arguments that have been offered against interpreting the sacred narrative here as having a general application to the whole race, nor can it be denied that they possess a certain degree of plausibility (see Bryant, Ancient Mythology, 3d ed. 4:23-44, 92 pq.). On the other hand, if, as everything in the context seems  to require, we conceive the descendants of Noah to have been at this time (say about the birth of Peleg, i.e., one hundred years after the Flood) quite limited in numbers and extent (as the longevity of the patriarchs and their pastoral habits both indicate), we shall find no particular difficulty in taking the entire statement in its broadest and most literal sense, as the opening wedge of that universal split, which has since widened more and more, in language and abode, among the sons of men. This narrative, then, of the Dispersion begins with the remarkable statement: "Now the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from [or "in"] the East, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there" (Gen 11:1-2). The expressions " language" (lip) and "speech" (words) are too precise to be understood (as Vitringa, Obs. Sacrae, chapter 9, page 109) as indicating merely an agreement in purpose. The journeying together shows that the time spoken of was before the Noachians had ceased to be a single nation, and perhaps when they formed but a great tribe, and were journeying (נָסִע, to pull up stakes, as a tent or encampment) after the manner of time Arabs across the plains watered by the Tigris and Euphrates. It cannot be doubted that Shinar was Babylonia. The name, indeed, is perhaps traceable in Mesopotamia in the modern Sinjhi, and it is noticeable that the ancient Egyptian transcription of Shinar (שַׁנְעָר) is SANSART (this k corresponding to the Hebrew ג, as though the had been pronounced like the Arabic Gain). But there is no evidence that the Hebrews called any country except Babylonia "the land of Shinar." The direction of the journey, if it be indicated as "from the East," probably would only mark the previous halting-place of the Noachians, not the place at which they first began to repeople the earth. The narrative then relates the attempt to build a city and a tower in order to prevent the scattering of mankind, and the punishment of the builders by the confusion (if their language and their being scattered abroad from the unfinished city Babel, or Confusion. Leaving the subject of the Confusion of Tongues for later discussion, we must observe the general agreement of profane historians as to the antiquity of Babylon, and the reminiscence of the Tower in the towers of the Babylonian temples. The Pyramids of Egypt and those of Mexico should be compared with these towers; and, in the case of the former, on account of their extreme antiquity, the comparison is very impertant. The exact character of the scattering is difficult to infer. The cause, according to the ordinary explanation of the narrative, was the Confusion of Tongues,  but some have supposed the latter to have been the consequence of the Dispersion. From Gen 11:4 compared with Gen 11:9, it would appear to have been but a resumption of the original plan of immigration, now that their holding together had become impossible, for the want of a common medium of vocal communication. Whatever difficulties we may discover in this and the preceding chapter of Genesis, "it is no longer probable only, but it is absolutely certain, that the whole race of man proceeded from Irann [the proper and native name of Persia and some connected regions] as from a center, whence they migrated first in three great colonies; and that those three branches grew from a common stock, which bad been miraculously preserved in a general convulsion and inundation of this globe" (Sir William Jones, On the Origin and Families of Nations, Works, ed. by Lord Teignmouth, 8vo, 3:196). There is, perhaps, no distinct reference to the building of the Tower and the Dispersion in the traditions of any heathen nation. The Greek story of the giants who piled mountains one upon another to reach Olympus is perhaps the most probable trace. Unlike the case of the Flood, there is no clear evidence that the Dispersion made a strong impression upon the minds of those who witnessed and shared in it. This would indicate that it was unaccompanied by any great outward manifestation of God's anger, and was the immediate consequence of such difficulties as would arise from the sudden division of mankind into tribes speaking different languages or dialects. SEE BABEL (TOWER OF).

II. Preliminary Considerations in examining the List of Genesis 50–70. The enumeration comprises only nations existing in the age of Moses, and probably of them only the most conspicuous, as more or less connected with the history of the Israelites. Many nations have been formed in subsequent times, and, indeed, are still forming, by separation and by combination; these can be considered only as included on the ground of long subsequent derivation. Such are the populations of Eastern Asia, Medial and South Africa, America, and Australasia.

2. It cannot be affirmed with certainty that we are here presented with a complete Table of Nations, even as existing in the time of Moses. Of each of the sons of Noah it gives the sons; but of their sons (Noah's great- grandsons) it is manifest that all are not mentioned, and we have no possible means of ascertaining how many are omitted. Thus, of the sons of Japheth, the line is pursued only of Gomer and Javan; Magog, Madai, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras are dropped without any mention of their issue; yet we have evidence that nations of great importance in the history of  mankind have descended from them. Ham had four sons: of three of them the sons, or rather clannish or national descendants, are specified; but to Phut, the fourth, no posterity is assigned. Shem had five sons, but the descendants of only two of them are recorded. It cannot be supposed that those whose sequence is thus cut off died without children; for as we shall presently see, nations of great historical interest may be traced up to them.

3. Mere similarity, or even identity of name, is not a sure guide. So remarkable a name as Hazarmaveth can scarcely be mistaken when we find it in Hadramaut. Such a name would not be repeated, and the Hadramaut which we discover in Arabia cannot be doubted to indicate the settlement of Joktan's son Hazarmaveth; but this is an exceptional case. When the similarity of Dodanim to Dodona is considered to be a sufficient proof of identity, all criticism is set at defiance. For the investigation before us we have an aid, invaluable both for its ample comprehension and its divine authority, in the account of the traffic of Tyre (Eze 27:1-36).

4. The list is, in one aspect, a kind of geographical table: many names in its descents are found in later places of Scripture as geographical terms designating nations, or at least important tribes. Therefore

(1.) We must not look for a name in that of a town. There is an exceptions probably not the only one, in the case of Sidon, the city of the Sidonians, who were doubtless a Canaanitish tribe, but to trace names in general in those of towns is very hazardous.

(2.) The tracing of a nation or tribe to a name in the list is of little value, unless neighboring or kindred nations, or nations otherwise markedly connected with it, can also be traced to the same part of the list.

5. Preference must always be given to the oldest documents in seeking for identifications. Next to the O.T., the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian monuments must be cited. In each set of documents, the notices nearest in point of time are always likely to be the best commentators; for it must be remembered that migrations and deportations are less likely to affect evidence the earlier it is.

6. Although the list is geographical, its form is genealogical; and it does sometimes, and may frequently, state or convey the name of the founder of  a nation or tribe-thus, all those terminating in the plural ins, and those specified by the Gentilitian adjective, the Jebusite, the Hivite, etc. Yet

(1.) We must not attempt to identify a founder's name in the traditions of nations, except when it is distinctly mentioned there as such.

(2.) As before, we must not be satisfied unless the identification is' supported by the geographical position of the founder's nation, or its ethnological character, or else by some marked characteristics connecting it: with other names identified in the same part of the list.

III. The Immediate Sons of Noah. — Shem is always mentioned first of the three sons of Noah when their names occur together, the order being Shem, Ham, and Japheth. In Gen 10:21 he is called "the elder brother of Japheth," which the A.V. incorrectly translates "the brother of Japheth the elder," where a comma after "Japheth" gives the correct sense. In the list of that chapter, notwithstanding the occurrence of the usual order in Gen 10:1, the sons of Japheth are first mentioned, then those of Ham, and lastly those of Shem, the order being inverted. It has been supposed that Shem was put at the close of the list in order that the insertion of the other descendants of Noah might not form a digression in the history of the Shemites and their Hebrew branch. The Japhethites may have been put at the head of the list as the most widely spread, and so the most distant; and, for a like reason, the Hamites may have preceded the Shemites, the order being that of the extent of colonization. Or, again, the order may be geographical, from west to east, in accordance with the western, central, and eastern positions of the three great stocks. We shall see that the details favor the last view.

Shem (שֵׁם) signifies "name, good name, fame;" Ham (חָם), "hot, warm;" Japheth (יֶפֶת), "spread," from פָּתָה. The names are probably prophetical of the future renown of the Shemites, of the hot land of the Hamites, and the spread of the Japhethites. The prophecy of Noah (Gen 9:25-27) indicates the appropriateness of Japheth's name to his future; and a prophetical sense of the names of his brethren may therefore be conjectured. But there is no distinct allusion to any such sense in their cases. It might be thought that the appropriateness of Shem's name as illustrious could be traced in the prediction that his should be the believing stock, but there is no indication whatever of any moral significance in the name of Ham.  1. Shem. — There is no trace of any single nation or country named after Shem, probably because the Shemites, by an instinct afterwards remarkable in their descendants, early separated into distinct tribes, though not migrating very far. This was the case with the Israelites; and with the Arabs the same process is still in constant operation. SEE SHEM.

2. Ham. — The name of Ham has been connected with an appellation of Egypt in Hebrew, only occurring in three. passages in the poetical books- "the land of Ham" (Psa 78:51; Psa 105:23; Psa 106:22), and with the most usual Egyptian name of the country, KEM, the black (land)." The former term we cannot doubt contained the patriarch's name. Is the latter identical with it? The significations of Ham and KEM are sufficiently near. Ham may reasonably be derived from חָמִם, "he or it was warm," and compared with חוּם, "he or it was black," and the Arabic cham, of the same signification as the last, and chama, "black fetid mud" (Kdmsues), or "black mud" (Sihah MS.). KEli cannot be taken for an Egyptian transcription of Ham, but it may be a word of cognate origin (comp. KAR, "a circle," הוּל, חַיל, "he or it turned, turned round;" KARR, "a furnace," חָרָה, "it burned;" ENA, "to bend," חָנָה, "he or it bowed down, inclined"). There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that the Egyptian name of the country is identical with the Hebrew name of the patriarch. Are they of separate origin? We must either suppose this, or that "the land of Ham" became changed to "Ham-land," or "black land." The genius of the Egyptian language would account for such a change, which seems not improbable. That Ham should have given his name to a country might be accounted for by the supposition that, except the Canaanites, the Hamites penetrated into Africa, and at first established themselves in Egypt. SEE HAM.

3. Japheth. — It is impossible not to see the name of Japheth in the Greek Japetus the Titan, son of Uranus and Ge, and the supposed ancestor of the human race; for, as we shall see, the Greeks, or at least those of the Hellenic stock, are classed among the Japhethites in the list of Genesis. SEE JAPHETH.

IV. The Descendants of Japheth.— The following is the table of the Japhethites:

Japheth.    1. Gomer.   a. Ashikenaz.

                        b. Riphath.

                        c. Togarmah.

            2. Magog.

            3. Madai.

            4. Javan.   a. Elishah.

                        b. Tarshish.

                        c. Kittim.

                        d. Dodanim.

            5. Tubal.

            6. Meshech.

            7. Tiras.

1. Gomer. — This name occurs in but one later place in connection with geography, as that of a nation of tribe allied with Magog, and it is there mentioned immediately before Togarmah, distinguished as northern (Eze 38:6). It has therefore been supposed to point to a remote northern nation, Scythic, or perhaps European. Two great gentile names have been compared, the Cimmerians of the Tauric Chersonese, who invaded the west of Asia Minor early in the 7th century B.C., and the Cimbri and Cymry, whose ethnic and nominal identity cannot be doubted. Considering the migratory character of the Cimmerians and Cimbri, it is reasonable to suppose that they had the same origin. In the cuneiform inscriptions of Darius Bystaspes, Gimiri occurs as the Shemitic equivalent of the Arian name Saka (Σακαι). (Sir H. Rawlinson, in Rawlinson's Herodotus, 3:150, note 1.) SEE GOMER.

a. Ashkenaz. — In a single later mention Ashkeumaz occurs, in a confederacy against Babylon, with Ararat, Minni, and Middai (Jer 51:27-28). It was therefore a nation in the direction of Armenia.

b. Riphath, written in 1Ch 1:6, Diphath, does not occur elsewhere in Scripture. It has been compared with the Riphasan Mountains of Greek geography; but the statement of Josephus, commenting on this list, that the Paphlagonians were anciently called Riphathmeams, is worthy of notice (Ant. 1:6, 1).

c. Togarmah is mentioned in Ezekiel among the traders with Tyre, after Tarshish, Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, all Japhethites, and before Dedan, here probably the country of which the inhabitants, called Dodanina, are classed among the sons of the Japhethite Javan (Eze 27:12-15); and, in a later place, "the house of Togarmah, of the north quarters," follows Gomer in the list of the army of Gog,  prince of Magog (Eze 38:6). These particulars point to a northern people not remote from Greece. Togarmah traded with Tyre "with horses and horsemen, and mules" (Eze 27:14), whence we may suppose these traffickers came by land. All the indications agree very well with the opinion that Togarmah may be connected with the Armenians.

2. Magog is elsewhere mentioned by Ezekiel only, first among the countries ruled by Gog, and especially associated with Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal (Eze 38:2-3), and apparently spoken of as dwelling "in the isles" (Eze 39:6). The term "isles" certainly must not be taken necessarily to indicate islands, but it is apparently limited to maritime, transmarinei, and very remote regions. It has generally been held that Magog, used for a nation, is applied to the Scythians of the Greeks, though perhaps in a restricted sense. Certainly, in the time of Ezekiel, the Scythians who invaded Western Asia were the most powerful nation of the country to which the confederacy mentioned by the prophet may reasonably be assigned; and the agreement of Josephus (Ant. 1:6, 1) and Jerome (Quaest. in Gen 10:2) in the identification is not to be overlooked. SEE MAGOG.

3. Madai, always later applied to the country Media, very appropriately follows Magog, if the latter, when used geographically, indicates the Scythiian neighbors of the Medes. Madai, like other names afterwards employed for a country rather than a people, may originally have been a man's name (comp. Mizraim, infra). SEE MADAI.

4. Javan. — Except where applied to an Arabian place or tribe (Eze 27:19; and perhaps Joe 3:6), this is, in all later places, the name of the Greeks, or at least of the Hellenic Greeks. The Persians, like the Hebrews, called all the Greeks Ionians. SEE JAVAN.

a. Elishahi at the head of the descendants of Javan, is to be looked for in Hellenic geography. It is mentioned in Ezekiel as trading with Tyre, "Blue and purple, from the isles of Elishah, was that which covered thee" (Eze 27:7). The name has been compared with Elis, Hellas, and the AEolians. Etymologically the first and third are equally probable, but other circumstances seem almost decisive in favor of the latter. The coast of the AEolian settlements in Asia Minor produced purple, and the name of so important a division of the Hellenic nation  would suit better than that of a city which never was rich and powerful enough to be classed with Sidon, Tyre, or Carthage.

b. Tarshish is in later Biblical history the name of a great mart, or, as some hold, of two. The famous Tarshish, supposing there were two, was one of the most important commercial cities of the period of the kings; second only, if second, to Tyre. It was accessible from the coast of Palestine, but its trade was carried on in large ships, "ships of Tarshish," which implies a distant voyage from Palestine. It brought to Tyre "silver, iron, tin, and lead" (Eze 27:12). These products, seem to point incontestably to a Spanish emporium, and the majority of modern commentators agree in fixing on the celebrated Tartessus, said to have been founded by the Phoenicians, and with which the Phoenicians traded. In some places Tarshish seems to be evidently a country.

c. Kittim.— This Gentile noun, usually written Chittim in the A.V., is generally connected with Citium of Cyprus. Other indications of Scripture seem not unfavorable to this identification, which would make the Kittim or Chittim a seafaring population of Cyprus.

d. Dodanim, closely connected in the table by construction as well as in form with Kittim — "Elishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim" (Gen 10:4) — was a maritime or insular people. Ezekiel says of Tyre, "The men of Dedan [were] thy merchants; many isles [were] the merchandise of thine hand': they brought thee [for] a present horns of ivory and ebony" (Gen 27:15). The reading in the list as given in 1Ch 1:7 is Rodanim, a form which is probably the true one, as supported by the Sept. and Saniaritan versions. The Sept. identifies this people with the Rhodians in all instances, including that in Ezekiel. In the prophet's time Rhodes was a great seat of Phoenician commerce, and at the site of Camirus, one of its three important cities before the city Rhodes was founded, many objects of Phoenician style have been discovered. It may be added that ivory is one of the materials of its antiquities. The identification, considering the probable place of the Kittim, is very likely.

5. Tubal, and,

6. Meshech, are in later places mentioned together (Eze 27:13; Eze 38:2-3; Eze 39:1), and were evidently northern nations (Eze 39:2). They have  been traced in the Moschi and Tibareni mentioned together by Herodotus (3:94; 7:78), and as Muskai and Tuplai, in the Assyrian inscriptions (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:530), which inhabited the northern coast of Asia Minor towards the Caucasus.

7. Tiras, last in the list of the sons of Japheth, has not been satisfactorily identified. The best comparison is perhaps with the Tyrrhenians or Tyrsenians, as then all the chief territories of Japhethite civilization would seem to have been indicated — Armenia, Asia Minor, Thrace, the Asiatic Islands, European Greece, Italy, and Spain.

V. Descendants of Ham, or Hamites:

Ham.  1. Cash.    a. Seba.

                  b. Havilah.

                  c. Seabtah.

                  d. Raamah.

                        a. Sheba.

                        b. Dedan.

                  e. Sabtechah.

                  f. Nimrod.

      2. Mizraim. a. Ludim.

                  b. Anamim.

                  c. Lehabim.

                  d. Naphtuhim.

                  e. Pathrusim.

                  f. Casluhim.      a. Philistim.

                  g. Caphtorim

      3. Phut.

      4. Canaan.  a. Sidon.

                  b. Heth.

                  c. Jebusite.

                  d. Amorite.

                  e. Girgasite.

                  f. Hivite.

                  g. Arkite.

                  h. Sinite.

                  i. Arvadite.

                  j. Zemarite.

                  k. Hamathite.

1. Cush is immediately recognised in KISH, the ancient Egyptian name of Ethiopia above Egypt, With this identification all geographical mentions in Scripture, except that in the account of Paradise (Gen 2:13), agree. The latter may refer to a primaeval Cush, but an Asiatic settlement is positively indicated in the history of Nimrod, and we shall see that the settlements of the Cushites extended from African Ethiopia to Babylon, through Arabia. SEE CUSH.

a. Seba is connected by Isaiah with Egypt and Cush (Isa 43:3; Isa 45:14), and the statement of Josephus that the island and city of Meroe bore this name is therefore to be noticed. In the ancient Egyptian geographical lists, SAHABA and SABARA occur among names of tribes or places belonging to Ethiopia (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. 2, page 9, pl. 12, k. 1.).

b. Havilah. — The identification of Havilah is difficult, as the name recurs in the list of the sons of Joktan; and in Biblical geography, except only in the description of Edent it is found in Arabia alone. If the two stocks intermixed, and thus bore a common name, a single localization would be sufficient.

c. Sabtah can only be doubtfully traced in Arabian geography.

d. Raamah, in the Sept. ῾Ρεγμά, is well traced in the ῾Ρέγμα of Ptol. (6:7), and ῾Ρῆγμα of Steph. Byz. (s.v.), a city of Arabia on the Persian Gulf.

a. Sheba, and, b. Dedan, bear the same names as two descendants of Keturah (Gen 25:3), from which it has reasonably been supposed that we have here an indication of a mixture of Cushite and Abrahamite Arabs, like that of Cushite and Joktanite Arals inferred in the case of the two Havilahs. It is to be remarked that the name of Dedan has been conjecturally traced in the modern name of the island of Dadan, on the east coast of Arabia, and that of Sheba in, the ruins of an ancient, city called Seba, in the neighboring island of Awal.

e. Sabtechah is not identified.

f. Nimrod is generally thought to have been a remoter descendant of Cush than son, and this the usage of Hebrew genealogies may be held to sanction. He is the first and only known instance in the list of the leader of a dynasty rather than the parent of a nation or tribe. His name is followed by a parenthetical passage relating to his power and the  establishment and extension of his kingdom. It is probable that this narrative is introduced to mark the commencement of the first Noachian monarchy. It may be compared with the notices of inventions in the account of Cain's descendants (Gen 4:20-22). The name of Nimrod is probably Shemitic, from מָרִר, " he was rebellious." It occurs in ancient Egyptian, in the form NAMURET, in the family of the 22d dynasty, which was certainly, at least in part, of foreign origin, The like names SHESHENK, USARKEN, TEKERUT, appear to be Shemitic.

2. Mizraim, literally "the two Mazors," is the common name of Egypt in the Bible; the singular, Mazor, being rarely used. It has been thought to be a purely geographical name, from its having a dual form, but it has been discovered in ancient Egyptian as the name of a Hittite or kindred chief, B.C. cir. 1300, contemporary with Rameses II, written in hieroglyphics MATRIMA, where the MA is known to express the Hebrew dual, as in MAHANMA for Mahanaim. That it should be used at so early a time as a proper name of a man suggests that the fact that Egypt was so called may be due to a Noachian's name having had a dual form, not to the division of the country into two regions. If, however, we suppose that in Gen 10:1-32 Mizraim indicates the country, then we might infer that Ham's son was probably called Mazor. It is remarkable that Mazor appears to be equivalent to Ham: as we have seen, the meaning of the latter is evidently "hot" or "black," perhaps both, and a cognate word is used in Arabic for "black mud;" among the meanings of misr, the Arabic equivalent of Mazor, the Kaaitls gives "red earth or mud." Thus Ham and Mazor or Mizraim would especially apply to darkness of skin or earth; and, since both were used geographically to designate the "black land," as cultivated Egypt always was from the blackness of its alluvial soil, it is not surprising that the idea of earth came to be included in one of the significations of each. If Mizraim were purely geographical in the list, then we might perhaps suppose that it was derived from Mazor as a Shemitic equivalent of Ham. It is certainly remarkable that all the descendants of Mizraim are mentioned as tribes in the plurals of gentile nouns. SEE MIZRAIM.

a. Ludim, perhaps mentioned in passages of the prophets as Lud or Ludim (Isa 66:19; Jer 46:9; Eze 27:10; Eze 38:5; Eze 30:4-5), where, however, the Shemitic Lud may be intended. There would be no doubt that in at least one of these passages (Eze 30:4-5), where Egypt, and, as far as they are identified, African nations  or countries are spoken of, the Ludim are those of the Mizraite stock, were it not possible that under the term Ludim or Lydian the Ionian and Carian mercenaries of the Pharaohs may be indicated.

b. Anamim, a nation as yet not identified. c. Lehabim, no doubt the same as the Lubim or Libyans mentioned in later places of Scripture as allies or mercenaries contributing to the armies of the Pharaohs, and supporting or dependent on Egypt as a race in very close relations. They correspond to the REBU or LEBU of the Egyptian inscriptions, western neighbors of Egypt, conquered by the kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties.

d. Naphtuhim strikingly resembles the Coptic name of the westernmost part of Lower Egypt, the territory of the city Marea, probably the older Mareotic nome Niphaiat or Niphaiad, a plural form commencing with the definite article ni.

e. Pathrusim, a tribe of which the territory, "the country of Pathros," is mentioned in later places. The latter has been compared with the Egyptian Pathyrite or Phaturite Nome; in Coptic papitoures, papithoures; in ancient Egyptian PA-HAT-HER; the chief objection to which identification is, that the geographical importance of the name seems scarcely sufficient.

f. Casluhim, not as yet identified.

g. Caphtorim, and the land of Caphtor, have given rise to much discussion. Poole has proposed as the equivalent of Caphtor the ancient Egyptian name of Coptos, KEBTU, KEBTA, KEBHER, probably pronounced Kuht, Kabt, Kebthor, the Coptic Keft, Kepto, Kepto, Kebto, Gr. Κόπτος, Arab. Kuft, and ventured to compare Αἴγυπτος with אַי כִפַתּוֹר. SEE CAPHTOR. It must be rememtered that the city Coptos, or its nome, has given its name to the whole nation of Egyptians, who were known as Copts by the Arabs at the time of the conquest. But good reasons have been urged in favor of Cyprus, especially the circumstance of the Philistine migration.

h. Philistim. — The Philistines are here said to have come forth from the Casluhim; elsewhere they are called Caphtorim, and said to have come out of Caphtor. It is not allowable to read that the Philistim and Caphtorim came from the Casluhitn. Perhaps there is a transposition in  the text. The origin of the Philistines from a Mizraite stock is a very important fact for the explanation of the list.

3. Phut. — In later places, Put or Phut occurs as the name of an African country or nation, closely connected with Egypt, like the Lubim. It may be compared with those geographical names in the ancient Egyptian inscriptions in which the element PET, "the bow," occurs. Nubia was called the "bow-land," TU-PET, where it is usual to read TU-KENS, but the bow has not the sound KENS elsewhere; and it is probable that a part of Nubia was called Kens, and that the bow was written as a determinative symbol to show that Kens was included in "the bow-land;" but the question is full of difficulties. SEE PHUT.

4. Canaan, in Gen 9:1-29 (18, 22, 25, 26, 27), is distinctly mentioned as the son of Ham. It has been thought that his name means the "degraded," "the subdued" man, "the lowlander," for both senses are possible. SEE CANAAN.

a. Sidon, "the first-born" of Canaan, like Heth, immediately following, is a proper name, whereas all the remaining names are gentile nouns in the singular. Sidon is thought to signify "the fishing-place," so that the name of the place would seem here to be put for that of the founder, "the fisherman," Αλιεύς of Sanchoniathon or Philo of Byblus. But it must be noticed that the next name, Heth, is treated in later places as that of a man. The position of the Sidonians, like that of most of the Canaanitish tribes, need not here be described.

b. Heth, ancestor of the "Children of Heth," or Hittites, a very important nation of Palestine and Syria. 'There are indications in Scripture of Hittites out of Palestine, and the ancient Egyptians warred with the KHETA in the valley of the Orontes, whose names show that they spoke a Shemitic language. The Egyptian monumental representations show that their armies were composed of men of two races, the one apparently Shemite in type, the other beardless, and resembling the Tatar type. SEE HITTITE.

c. The Jebusite,

d. Amorite,

e. Girgasite (properly Girgashite),  f. Hivite, all inhabitants of Palestine; but the Amorite, like the Hittite nation, seems to have had a wider extension, for the territory in which stood KETESH, the great stronghold of the KHETA on the Orontes, is called in Egyptian "the land of AMAR" (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. 2, page 21, 22, pl. 18:44, 47).

g. The Arkite, compared with the Phoenician town of Area.

h. The Sinite, not satisfactorily identified. Perhaps one of their settlements may be traced in Sin or Pelu-slum.

i. The Arvadite, no doubt the people of Aradus. The derivation from רוּד, with the sense " wandering," "place of fugitives," is in accordance with the tradition referred to by Strabo, who says that Aradus was built by Sidonian fugitives (16:2, 13, 14). Aradus was a Phoenician city.

j. The Zemarite, conjecturally traced in the town Simyra, which has nothing to recommend it but its neighborhood to Arka and Aradus.

k. The Hamathite, well known to have been seated in Upper Syria, where Hamath, on the Orontes, was long a capital of an important kingdom.

VI. Descendants of Shem, or Shemites: Shem.

      I. Elam.

      II. Asshur.

      III.  Arphaxad.

            a. Salah.   a. Eber.          (a.) Peleg.

                                   (b.) Joktan.

                                         (a.) Almodad.

                                         (b.) Sheleph.

                                               (c.) Hazarmaveth.

                                               (d.) Jerah.

                                               (e.) Hadoram.

                                               (f.) Uzal.

                                               (g.) Diklah.

                                               (h.) Obal.

                                               (i.) Abimael.

                                               (j.) Sheba.

                                               (k.) Ophir.

                                               (l.) Havilah.

                                               (m.) Jobab.

      IV.   Lud.

            5. Arian.

                  a. Uz.

                  b. Hul.

                  c. Gether.

                  d. Mash.

1. Elam, when used geographically, held to correspond to Susiana, not to Persia Proper.

2. Asshur, afterwards the Assyrian nation. In the cuneiform inscriptions Asshur is the chief object of worship of the kings. SEE ASSHUR.

3. Arphaxad, probably well traced, in the province Arrapachitis.

a. Salah seems to be only a genealogical link. In the Shemitic family the list is clearly something more than ethnological and geo graphical; it is of the nature of a pedigree, at least as far as it deals with the ancestry of Abraham.

b. Eber. — It is impossible here to discuss the difficult question whether to this patriarch the name of the Hebrews owed its origin. The argument based on the mention in this list that Shem was " the father of all the children of Eber" (Heb 10:21) seems to us almost unanswerable on the affirmative side. SEE EBER.

(a.) Peleg seems, like Salah, to be but a genealogical link.

(b.) Joktan is perhaps only a similar link: his descendants form an important series.

(a.) Almodad, supposed to b e traceable in Arabian names.

(b.) Sheleph, traced in El-Yemen.

(c.) Hazarmaveth, identical in name with the great region of Hadramaut, in Southern Arabia.

(d.) Jerah, not certainly identified, and

(e.) Hadoram, not traced.

(f.) Uzal, the same name as Awzal, the ancient name of San'a, capital of El-Yemen.

(g.) Diklah,

(h.) Obal,

(i.) Abimael, not traced.

(j.) Sheba is the same name as the Arabic Sebh, the old kingdomn of El-Yemen. The mentions in the Bible of the kingdom of Sheba point towards Arabia, amid the Arabic indication thus fixes the position of Joktanite Sheba in the south.

(k.) Ophir, perhaps traced in Southern Arabia.

(l.) Havilab, as already remarked under the head of the Cushite Havilab, may indicate a mixture of Cushite and Joktanite settlers in Arabia.

(m.) Jobab, not certainly identified.

4. Lud has been compared to Lydus, the traditional ancestor of the Lydians. The Shemitic character of the Lydian civilization is confirmatory of this view. The Egyptian monuments of the empire mention a powerful Asiatic people of Shemitic type, apparently living not far from Mesopotamia, called RUTEN or LUDEN. It is possible that the Lydians may have migrated into Asia Minor after the time of the Egyptian empire, or that there may have been two Lydian settlements. It is not clear whether the Lud or Ludini of later places of Scripture were of this stock, or the same as the Alizraite Ludim, as already remarked.

5. Aram is, in later places, the geographical designation of Syria, though the term is not of the same extent as our Syria. We read of Aram- namharaimm, "Aram of the two rivers," either Mesopotamacia, according to the general opinion, or the country of the Orontes and Leontes, of Padan-Aram, perhaps a part of the same tract, or another name for it; and also of Arama-Zobah, Aram-Bath-rehob, Aram-Maachah, and Aram- Dammesek, or Syria of Damascus, all kingdoms in the country Aram (q.v.).

a. Uz. Mention is made of "the land of Uz"-in the book of Job, where other indications seem to point to the north of Arabia.  b. Hul, and,

c. Gether, are not identified;

d. Mash is but conjecturally traced in Mesene, in Lower Babylonia, or Mons Masius, at the north of Mesopotauinia.

VII. Results. — These are twofold:

RACES.                  LANGUAGES.

I. Caucasian.                I. Shemitic (as Hebrew).

      1. White (as Greek).    II. Iranian (Greek).

      2. Tawny (Arab).  III. Barbaric.

      3. Brown (Abyssinian).       1. Egyptian.

                             2. Nigritian.

                             3. Tatar.

II. Lower Nilotic (Egyptian).

III. Nigritian (Negro).

IV. Tatar (Chinese).

In the table which follows, the first column gives those names from Gen 10:1-32 for which there are highly probable geographical identifications; the second column states these identifications; the third contains ethnological evidence from Egyptian (Eg.), Assyrian (As.), or other. sources; the fourth exhibits the like philological evidence.

From this evidence we may draw the followimeg inferences on several important points:

1. Order of Names. — The Japhethites seem to be placed first, as the most distant nations. In the list of the Hamites, the southern, and, therefore, most distamnt Cushites, are arranged from west to east, Seba (Meroe) being followed by Raamah (in Arabia), and the series closing with Nimrod, who ruled in Babylonia and Assyria. North of Cush is Mizrain, in the enumeration of whose tribes the western Lehabinin (Libyans) are followed after an interval by the easternmost Philistim, apparently the only Mizraites of Palestine. The list of the Canaanites begins with Sidon, the Phoenicians of the sea-coast north of the Philistines; then mentions under Heth the Hittites, perhaps on account of their southern settlement, and, going northwards, enumerates tribes near Lebanon, closing with the Syrian Hamathites. The Shemitic tribes begin in the east, extending regularly from  Susiana to Arabia, and then ascending to Syria. Lud may be an exception, but, as we have seen, the Lydians may primeavally have been settled near Syria, otherwise Lud may be mentioned between the Arabs and Aram as, an outlying Shenaitic tribe, to be spoken of before the enumeration of those nearest Palestine.

2. Race. — All the names identified with a high degree of probability are, with six exceptions, of Caucasian nations. The exceptions are: three certainly of the Lower Nilotic race, which is intermediate between the Caucasian and Nigritian races, showing strong traits of both, a fourth probably of the same race, and two others which require more particular investigation. Cush, in ancient Egyptian, applies to Nigritians, for the race of KISH is represented on the Egyptian monuments as of the most marked Nigritian type: the kings and other royal personages of Merohi, and the Ethiopians of rank under them, are, however, represented on their monuments as similar to the Lower Nilotic race. This suggests that Cush may indicate a country mainly peopled by Nigritians, yet with a governing mixed race. The remaining exception is the case of the Hittites, who are represented on the Egyptian monuments as of two types — the one Caucasian. the other apparently Tatar. This may show that two different races were ruled by those Hittite kings with whom the Pharaohs warred, as Og, the king of Bashan, was a Rephaite, not an Amorite.

3. Language. — The languages are all Iranian or Shemitic, with three exceptions. Egyptian, occurring twice in our table, has a monosyllabic barbaric vocabulary, with an amalgamate Shemitic grammar. Here, therefore, as in race, there is a departure from the unmixed type. To Cush we have conjecturally assigned a barbaric Niriitian language, because the names of Ethiopian tribes conquered by the Egyptians, and of Ethiopian sovereigns of later times, are not readily traceable to either an Egyptian or a Shemitic source; but we cannot say certainly that a Shemitic element is wholly wanting in the languages to which these words belong.

The order indicates that the intention of the list is partly geographical. In the detail of each division the settlements of races are probably indicated rather in the order of position than of ancestral relationship;, though the principle of relationship is never departed from, as far as we can see.

4. Date. — The list of Gen 10:1-32 contains certain statements which may now be examined, in order to infer the date to which the document refers. It is said, "Afterward were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad"  (Gen 10:18); which may indicate the formation of the great Hittite settlement in the valley of the Orontes, or other like extensions. In any case it points to an event, or series of events almost certainly prior to the establishment of the Israelites in Palestine. So, too, the definition of the otherwise unknown Resen, as "the great city" (Gen 10:12), indicates a period anterior to that of the kings who ruled at Asshur (Kal'ah Sherghat) and Calah (Nimrud), the earliest of whom is placed about B.C. 1270. At the time of the Egyptian empire the capital appears to have been Nineveh, "and the date of the list would therefore be anterior to that time, or at least to the reign of Thothmes III, to whom it was tributary about 1450 B.C. It would appear, therefore, that the list was either written or put into its present form not long after, or at the time of Moses if not earlier, and that it refers to a yet earlier period — that of the first spread of the Noachians.

VIII. Omissions. — The nations omitted in the list must now be noticed, as far as they seem to be of a like hi oh antiquity. In Deu 2:1-37 there is mention of several tribes or nations which had been destroyed by other tribes or nations who reached Palestine or its neighborhood before the Israelitish occupation. Certain of these are called Rephaim, others not. The particulars are as follows, as far as they relate to our present subject:

1. Emim Rephaim, succeeded by Moabites (Deu 2:9-11).

2. Horim, succeeded by Edomites (Deu 2:12; Deu 2:22).

3. Zamzummim, elsewhere called Zuzi in (Gen 14:5), Rephaim, succeeded byAmmonites (Deu 2:19-21).

4. Avim, succeeded by Caphtorim, that is, Philistines (Deu 2:23).

5. Anakim, here mentioned as Rephaim (Deu 2:10; Deu 2:21) still occupying the south of Palestine at the time when the Israelites entered it.

The Avim were probably also a Rephaite nation, for as late as David's time giants were found among the Philistines. Elsewhere in Palestine the Israelites seem to have found, besides "the three sons of Anak," or the Anaekim of Hebron, Og, the king of Bashan, who "remained of the remnant of Rephaim" (2:11), a man of gigantic stature. The position of these Rephaim is that of a few powerful chiefs among the Canaanites and Philistines, representing tribes destroyed by Hebrews, the only exceptional case being that of the Philistines, if, as we suppose, the Avim were Rephaim, for in that case the former must have first attacked , but  ultimately changing their policy, abstained from annihilating the older population.

At an earlier time we find a very different condition of the country. The powerful confederacy of which (Chedorlaomaer as chief, attacked and conquered, besides the kings of the cities of the plain, the Rephaim, Zuzim, Emim, Horim, Amalekites, and Amorites. Here the Canaanites occupy a very inferior position in the south and east of Palestine, but one Canaanitish nation being mentioned, and besides undoubted Rephaites, the Horim probably of the same stock, and the ancient and pedigreeless nation of Amalek.

We thus find an indication of an old population of Palestine distinct from both Canaanites and Hebrews, and especially remarkable for their great height. That they were in race still more remote from their successors than has usually been held, has been argued from the Anakim's being spoken of as "of the Nephilim" (Num 14:33), the term applied to the giants before the Flood, where it is said "the Nephilim were in the earth in those days" (Gen 6:4). On this subject, compare Poole, The Genesis of the Earth and of Man 1:2 d ed. pages 80-82, 284, 285, where it is maintained that the Nephilim were a pre-Adamite race.

IX. Literature. — Bochart, Phaleg et Canaan, sive Geographia Sacra (Cadomi. 1646); Michaelis, Spicilegiuna Geographiae exterae Hebrmorena (Gotting. 1769, 1780); Forster, Epistolae ad J.D. Michaelem (Gotting. 1772); Volney, Recherches nouvelles (Paris, 1814), chapter 18; Feldhoff, Volkestafel der Genesis (Elberf. 1837); Hohlenberg, Comnaent. de cap. 10 Geneseos (Hafn. 1828); Eichhorn, De Cuscheis verisinailia (Amst. 1774); Krebs, De divisione Phalegria (Lips. 1750); Nagel, Commentatio exeget. in Act 17:26 (Altd. 1740); Zacharih, Dissent. philol. in loc. und. (Hal. 1754); Schulthess, Das Paradies (Zier. 1816); Krucke, Erklar. d. Volkestatfeln in erst B. Moses (Bonn, 1837); Rosenmuller, Bibl. Alterthumsk. 1, 1:221 sq.; Knobel, Die Volkestafel der Genesis (Giess. 1850); Milhenhoff, in the Gotting. Anzeigen, 1851, page 17 sq.; Joseph 5: Gorres, Die Japhidem und ihr Auszug aus Armenien (Regensb. 1845); Beke, Origines Biblicae (Lond. 1884); Forster, Hist. Geography of Arabia (Lond. 1844); Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses (in Clarke's Library); Brace, Races of the Old World (N.Y. 1863). SEE DISPERSION OF MANKIND; SEE DIVISION OF THE EARTH; SEE MAN.

## Ethnophrones[[@Headword:Ethnophrones]]

             (from ἔθνος, a nation, and φρονέω, to think), a name sometimes applied to the heretics of the 7th century, who sought to combine pagan customs and ceremonies with Christianity.

## Etini[[@Headword:Etini]]

             (Hebrews Ethni' אֶתְנַי, munificent, Sept. Α᾿θανί v.r. Α᾿θανεί), son of Zerah and father of Adaiab, of the Levitical family of Gershom (1Ch 6:41 [26]). B.C. cir. 1420. In 1Ch 6:21, the same person appears to be designated hsy the name of JEATARAI. SEE ASAPH.

## Ets-Aboth[[@Headword:Ets-Aboth]]

             SEE THICK-TREE.

## Ets-Gopher[[@Headword:Ets-Gopher]]

             SEE GOPHER-WOOD.

## Ets-Hadar[[@Headword:Ets-Hadar]]

             SEE GOODLY-TREE.

## Ets-Shemen[[@Headword:Ets-Shemen]]

             SEE OIL-TREE.

## Etsbega[[@Headword:Etsbega]]

             a dignitary of the Abyssinian Church, next in authority to the Abuna (q.v.).

## Etshmiadzin[[@Headword:Etshmiadzin]]

             a remarkable Armenian convent in Erivan, a Transcaucasian province of Russia, and about 16 miles west of the town of Erivan. "It is of great extent, is surrounded by a wall 30 feet in height, and 1I miles in circuit. This wall encloses several distinct churches, each of which is presided over by a bishop; is cruciform in shape, and is surmounted by a kind of cupola crowned by a low spire. For many centuries this has been the seat of the Catholics (the head or patriarch of the Armenian Church). This patriarch presides at the synodical meetings, but cannot pass a decree without its having the approval of the. moderator, an official appointed by the Russian emperor, in whose hands the control of the convent virtually rests. In the convent library there are 635 manuscripts 462 of which are in the Armenian language."

## Ettwein, John[[@Headword:Ettwein, John]]

             a distinguished divine of the Moravian Church, was born June 29, 1721, at Freudenstadt, Wurtemberg. In 1754 he came to America, where for nearly half a century he labored as an evangelist, as a member of the executive board, and finally as a bishop, to which latter office he was appointed in 1784. He traveled thousands of miles, often afoot, and preached the Gospel in eleven of the original thirteen colonies, as also in what is now the State of Ohio, to white people, negroes, and Indians. In 1772 he was the leader of the Christian Indians on their exodus from the Susquehanna country in Pennsylvania to the Tuscarawas in Ohio, exposing himself to great hardships and dangers. During the Revolutionary War he was in  frequent intercourse and correspondence with Washington and several members of Congress; and when the general hospital of the American army was transferred to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, he devoted himself with singular disinterestedness to the spiritual wants of the sick, in spite of his many other duties. To him, too, must be ascribed the honor of originating, in 1787, "the Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen," which still exists, and now has a large funded capital, and to which Congress made a grant of several townships on the Tuscarawas, in trust for the Christian Indians. He died January 2, 1802. (E. de S.)

## Etu[[@Headword:Etu]]

             an object of worship in the islands of the Pacific, consisting of some bird, fish, or reptile, in which the natives believed a spirit resided. For an account of this worship see Williams, Missionary Researches.

## Etun[[@Headword:Etun]]

             SEE LINEN.

## Eubulus[[@Headword:Eubulus]]

             (Εὔβουλος, good in counsel), a Christian at Rome whose greeting Paul sent to Timothy during his last imprisonment (2Ti 4:21), A.D. 64.

## Eucadires[[@Headword:Eucadires]]

             priests of the ancient Carthaginian deities, also called Abadires (q.v.).

## Eucharist[[@Headword:Eucharist]]

             one of the names of the Lord's Supper, from εὐχαριστία, giving of thanks. SEE LORD'S SUPPER.

## Euchel Isaac Ben Abraham[[@Headword:Euchel Isaac Ben Abraham]]

             a Jewish scholar, born in 1756, was a distinguished member of the Society for the Promotion of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, which was formed in the days of Mendelssohn (q.v.). He is the author of a very learned treatise on the ancient mode of burial among the Jews, Ist nach judischen Gesetzen das Uebernachten der Todten wirklich verboten? (Breslau, 1797.) He published also a translation of the Jewish Prayers, מוֹרֶה נֵבוֹכַים םָ פֵּרוּשַׁים, or Mose Maimuni's Mose Nebuchim, with the Commentary of Mose Narboni, called הִנִּרְבּוֹנַי, and others (Sulzbach, 1828, 3 volumes, 4to); a history of the life of Moses Mendelssohn (Berlin, 1798, 8vo; Vienna, 1812); eand as a part of the great Bible work started by Mendelssohn, Die Spruche Salomo's im Original ins Deutsche ubersetzt und hebraiisch commentirt (8vo, Berlin, 1789, 1790, and often). — Furst,  Bibliotheca Judaica, pages 259, 260; Kitto, Cyclop. of Biblical Literature, s.v.

## Euchelaion[[@Headword:Euchelaion]]

             the oil of prayer, a ceremony in the Greek Church answering to extreme unction in the Latin. To such penitents as are conscious of the guilt of any "mortal sin," as adultery, fornication, or pride, this sacrament is administered by the bishop or archbishop, assisted by seven priests, who commences with this prayer: "Lord, who with the oil of thy mercies hast healed the wounds of our souls, do thou sanctify this oil, that they who are anointed therewith may be freed from their infirmities, and from all corporeal and spiritual evils." The oil of prayer is pure and unmixed, having in it no other ingredient. A quantity sufficient to serve for the whole year is consecrated on Wednesday in the Holy Week by the archbishop or bishop. In the administration, the priest dips some cotton at the end of a stick, and thereby anoints the penitent in the form of a cross on the forehead, on the chin, on each cheek, and on the backs and palms of the hands; after which he repeats this prayer: "Holy Father, physician of souls and bodies, who hast sent thine only Son Jesus Christ, healing infirmities and sins, to free us from death, heal this thy servant of corporeal and spiritual infirmities, and give him salvation and the grace of thy Christ, through the prayers of our more than holy lady, the mother of God, the eternal virgin, through the assistance of the glorious, celestial, and incorporeal persons, through the virtue of thy life-giving and holy cross, of the holy and glorious prophet, the forerunner, John the Baptist, and the holy and glorious apostles." — Farrar, Ecclesiastes Dictionary, s.v.; Pinkerton, Present State of the Greek Church, 193.

## Eucherius[[@Headword:Eucherius]]

             bishop of Lyons in the 5th century, was born of a noble family at Lyons. He was a senator, happily married, and the father of two sons, Veranius and Salonius, who at an early age were sent to the monastery of Lerins (now St. Honorat) for education. In 422 Eucherius entered the same convent as a monk, having obtained the consent of his wife Galla, who likewise devoted herself to monastic life. Soon after, Eucherius retired into solitude on the island of Lero (St. Marguerite). In 434 he was, in consequenca of the reputation of his great piety, elected bishop of Lyons, and, as such, was present at the two synods of Orange (441 and 442). He  died in 454 (according to others, in 450 or 449). He is commemorated as a saint on the 16th of November. He was followed on the see of Lyons by his son Veranius, while the second, Salonius, became bishop of Geneva. Eucherius wrote, about the year 427, Epistola paraenetica de contemtu mundi et secularis philosophie (edit. by Rosweid, Antwerp, 1621); in 428, Epistola de laude eremi seu vita solitaria (edit. by Rhenanus, Basel, 1516, and by Erasmus, Basel, 1520): — Liber formularum spiritalis intelligentice: — Institutionum libri II: — Exhortatio ad Monachos; and several homilies. Several other works are wrongly attributed to him. It seems that he sympathized with the Semiiarians. A collection of all his works was published by Brassicanus (Basel, 1531), in the Biblioth. Patr. Max. Lugd. tom. 6 and 27; and in Migne, Patrol. Lat. tom. 1. SEE HERZOG, Real-Encyklop. 19:490.

## Eucherius (2)[[@Headword:Eucherius (2)]]

             the thirty-second bishop of Orleans, was born there, of noble parents, towards the close of the 7th century; devoted himself early to a monastic life at Jumieges; was elected to the see on the death of his uncle, in 717; administered it with remarkable success, but was banished to Cologne, in 732, by Charles Martel, apparently for resisting a confiscation of the Church revenues; and died at a place near Liege in 738 (or 742). He is commemorated February 20.

## Euchites[[@Headword:Euchites]]

             SEE MESSALIANS.

## Euchologion[[@Headword:Euchologion]]

             (εὐχή λόγος), the common name of the liturgical books of the Greek Church, containing the services for the sacraments, conferring of orders, and other religious offices. There is an edition by Goar, entitled Euchologion, sive Rituale Graecormm, complectens ritus et ordines divince Liturgice, officiorum, sacramertorum, etc., juxta usum Orientalis ecclesiae (Par. 1647). See Covel, Some Account of the Greek Church (Lond. 1722, fol.), chapters 2, 3; Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church, part 1 (Lond. 1850), 1:317.

## Euchomrni[[@Headword:Euchomrni]]

             (from εὔχομαι, to pray), a name sometimes applied to those of the catechumens (q.v.) who remained to receive the minister's prayers and benedictions. SEE GENUFLECTENTES.

## Eudaemon John Andrew[[@Headword:Eudaemon John Andrew]]

             a Greek Jesuit, was born at Canea, in Candia, about 1560. He derived his descent from the imperial family of the Paleologi; went to Italy when very young, and in 1581 entered the Society of Jesus. After having taught philosophy at Rome and theology at Padua, he was appointed rector of the Greek College, which pope Urban VIII had just established at Rome. He accompanied, as theologian, the papal legate, cardinal Barberini, to France, and died at Rome in 1625. He wrote a large number of controversial works against Casaubon, Brightman, John Barclay, Robert Abbot, and many others. Pamphlets against Henry IV and Louis XIII were also ascribed to him. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gener. 16:663.

## Eudaemonism[[@Headword:Eudaemonism]]

             (Gr. εὐδαιμονία, happiness), a principle in philosophical ethics according to which the attainment of happiness is represented as the true aim of life. Those who hold this view are called EUDEMONISTS. Opposed to eudsemonism are all those systems of ethics which regard not the pleasure of the individual, but the recognition of some universal law as the higher principle. Eudeemonism lay at the basis of the Cyrenaic school founded by Aristippus, and of the Epicurean philosophy (q.v.). It was developed to its utmost consequences by Hegesias, who taught that if no enjoyments are to be expected by men, death is preferable to life. Essentially different from this class of Eudaemonists is the system of Aristotle, who regarded virtue as a spiritual enjoyment, and in this sense represented ethics as the doctrine of seeking and finding a happy life. This view has found adherents among Christian writers on ethics, who define and treat ethics as the doctrine of a happy life. Others have combined with eudaemonism common usefulness, moral sentiment, and perfection, and thus have purified and ennobled it. Belonging properly to the schools of Aristippus and Epicurus are in modern times the different systems of sensualism (q.v.) and materialism (q.v.). In an ennobled form, Eudsemonism reappears in some representatives of the Scotch school, who, in opposition to the self-love of Hobbes, develop the longing for universal happiness as the supreme ethical principle. In direct and keen opposition to every form of eudaemonism, Kant established the principle of the categorical superlative, according to which the good must be done for its own sake, and the moral law, with the duties emanating from it, can alone be made the central principle of ethics. SEE KANT. Schleiermacher assigned to the idea of the highest good the highest position in ethics, and likewise rejected Eudaemonism as a principle. This is now, in general, the attitude of writers on Christian ethics; the thirst of man for happiness is not absolutely rejected, but it is found unsuited for a fundamental principle, which must be sought in a universaldivine law, not in the natural longings of the individual. SEE ETHICS. Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:207.

## Eudes De Rougemont[[@Headword:Eudes De Rougemont]]

             sixty-eighth bishop of Besanton, belonged to one of the oldest families of Burgundy, and succeeded, February 9, 1269, Guillaume de La Tour. He fell into a quarrel with his people, in 1279, concerning the expenses of the see, which resulted in his discomfiture. He died June 23, 1301. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Eudes, Jean[[@Headword:Eudes, Jean]]

             founder of the congregation called the Eudists, was born at Rye, Normandy, November 14, 1601, and died at Caen, August 19, 1680. At 14  he commenced his studies under the Jesuits at Caen, entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1623, and was ordained priest in 1625. From 1627 to 1632 he was engaged in missionary labors among the plague-stricken people of Normandy, and in 1642 he became superior of the Congregation of the Oratory at Caen. Much of his time was spent in missions throughout France to reform the clergy. In 1643 he organized a new society, which took the name "Eudists," or the "Congregation of Jesus and Mary," and soon had numerous branches in France. Its members were devoted to the education of young candidates for the priesthood, and to "missions" (in the Roman Catholic sense) among the clergy. Eudes wrote a number of books of devotion. The Eudists were scattered at the Revolution, but were revived by the abbe Blanchard in 1826. They have a college, called St. Gabriel's, in the State of Indiana.

## Eudists[[@Headword:Eudists]]

             SEE EUDES.

## Eudo de Stella[[@Headword:Eudo de Stella]]

             SEE EON DE STELLA.

## Eudocia[[@Headword:Eudocia]]

             wife of the emperor Theodosius II, was the daughter of Leontius, an Athenian sophist. She was called Athenais, and was carefully instructed by her father in Greek letters. She was also noted for personal beauty. On the death of her father, the jealousy and avarice of her brothers compelled her to go to Constantinople, where she appealed to Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II, who was so fascinated by her beauty and talent that she induced Theodosius to marry her, A.D. 421. She was baptized under the name of Eudocia, and long retained great influence with the emperor. In A.D. 438 she made a splendid pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Soon after she was charged with aspiring to the government of the Eastern empire; and later, with an intrigue with one Paulinus, a courtier. About A.D. 449, "the emperor, through jealousy, dismissed all her court, and had her exiled to Palestine, where she continued to reside after his death. She there embraced the opinions of Eutyches, and supported by her liberality and influence the monk Theodosius, who forced himself into the see of Jerusalem, after driving away Juvenal, the orthodox bishop, and kept it until he was himself driven away by order of the emperor Marcianus.  Euthlymius, called the Saint, by his reasonings brought back Eudocia to the orthodox faith, after which she spent the remainder of her days at Jerusalem, where she died in 460, protesting her innocence of the crime with which her husband had charged her." Eudocia wrote several works: (1) Photius quotes a translation in verse of the first eight books of the Old Testament. (2) There is also attributed to her a Life of Christ, composed of lines taken from Homer, translated into Latin by Eachard, and published under the title of Homerocentra, or Homerici Centones (Gr. and Lat. Frlncof. 1541,1554; Par. 1578, 12mo; Lips. 1793, 8vo); an account of the martyrdom of St. Cyprian, Greek and Latin, ed. by Bandini, in his Graecae Ecclesiastes vet. Monumenta, 1:130-189. — Hoffmann, Bibliogr. Lex. 2:63; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chapter 32.

## Eudoxia[[@Headword:Eudoxia]]

             wife of the emperor Arcadius, was born in the year 375, and was married to Arcadius in 395. She was the mother of Theodosius II, or the younger. Her name is mentioned here on account of her difficulties with Chrysostom. She used her influence for the banishment of Clilysostom, against whom her hatred was incited by the unsparing attacks which he made against all evil-doers, and especially, it is said, by his declaration that she was “a new Herodias thirsting after the blood of John." She died in 404. — Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 3:736: Hoefer, Nouvelle Biog. Generale, 13:687; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (Harper's ed.), 3:343 et sq.

## Eudoxians[[@Headword:Eudoxians]]

             SEE EUDOXIUS.

## Eudoxius[[@Headword:Eudoxius]]

             an Arian, and bishop of Constantinople, was born at Arabissus, in Armenia, first mentioned as bishop of Germanicia (near Mount Taurus). About 356 he obtained by artifice the patriarchate of Antioch, where he soon came forward as a patron of the Aetians (Theodoret, H.E. book 2, chapters 25, 26). Sozomen says that "when Eudoxius found himself in possession of the Church of Antioch he ventured to uphold the Aetian heresy openly. He assembled in Antioch all those who held the same opinions as himself, among whom were Acacius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, and Uranius, bishop of Tyre, and rejected the terms of 'like substance' and 'con-  substantial,' under the pretext that they had been denounced by the Western bishops" (H.E. book 2, chapter 12). Although he was deposed at the synod of Seleucia, yet he does not appear to have ever vacated his see; and on Macedonius being ejected from the see of Constantinople, says Socrates, Eudoxius, who now despised that of Antioch, was promoted to the vacant bishopric (H.E. book 2, c. 43). He obtained the see of Constantinople in 359, and retained it until his death in 370. Some fragments remain of a treatise of his De Incarnatione Dei Verbi. — Hook, Eccl. Biog. 5:7; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:403-11; Cave, Hist.Lit. (Geneva, 1720), 1:138.

## Euergetes[[@Headword:Euergetes]]

             (Εὐεργέτης, a benefactor; see Josephus, War, 3:9, 8; Diod. Sic. 11:26; Xenoph. Anab. 7:6, 38; sometimes Anglicized EVERGETES), a common surname and title of honor (comp. Plato, Gorg. page 506 C, and Stallb. ad loc.) in Greek states, conferred at Athens by a public vote (Demosth. Page 475), and so notorious as to pass into a proverb (Luk 22:25). It was bestowed by states upon those who had conferred benefits upon them, and was taken by several kings. SEE PTOLEMY; SEE ANTIOCHUS.

A king is mentioned by this title in the 2d prologue to Ecclesiasticus, wherein the translator states that, having gone into Egypt in the 38th year of king Euergetes, and been there some time, he found this book by his grandfather, (Ε᾿ν γὰρ τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως παραγενηθεὶς εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ συγχρονίσας, ε῏υρον οὐ μικρᾶς παιδείας ἀφόμοιον). There can be no question that a king of Egypt is here meant; for, though a king of Syria could be intended by this title, Alexander I, Antiochus VII, and Demetrius III being shown by their coins tohave been styled Euergetes, no one of them reigned more than a few years. It is more probable, on prima facie grounds, that an Egyptian Euergetes is here spoken of, if the same discrepancy should not be found. Two of the Ptolemies bore this title: Ptolemy III, always known as Euerzetes, who reigned twenty-five years, B.C. 247-222, and Ptolemy VII (or IX), Euergetes II, more commonly called Physcon, who began to reign jointly with his brother Ptolemy VI (or VI I), Philometor, B.C. 170, and became sole king in B.C. 146, dying in his fifty-fourth year, reckoned from the former date, and the twenty-ninth year of his sole reign, B.C. 117 (Fynes Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, 3:382, 383, 386, 399; Lepsius, Konigsbuch, Synoptische Tafeln, page 9). A great  difficulty has arisen in the attempt to decide which of these kings is intended. Everything hinges upon the manner in which the reigns were reckoned.

There is no satisfactory evidence for supposing that Euergetes I counted his regnal years from a time before his accession; the evidence of the inscription at Adule, that Fynes Clinton adduces in favor of as high a date as the 27th year, is wholly inconclusive (pages 382, 386); besides, the 27th year is far short of the 38th. To ascertain the official reckoning of the years of Euergetes II, during the latter part of his rule, and thus to determine from what date he then counted his regnal years, we have only to examine the demotic papyai of his reign. From these Dr. Young collected a list of dates which appeared thirty years ago in his posthumous Rudiments of an Egyptian Dictionary. These dates are year 29, 84, 45,46,47 or 43, 52, 53 (pages 27-31). It. is thus proved incontestably that Physcon counted his years from the commencement of his joint reign with Philometor, without any separate reckoning from his accession as sole king of Egypt. The hieroglyphic inscriptions, as we would expect, follow the same reckoning. Thus one of the Apis tablets gives the dates of the 28th, 31st, 51st, and 52d years of this king (Lepsius, The 22d Egyptian Royal Dynasty, transl. by Dr. Bell, page 41). We must not pass by the idea of Jahn (Einleiteng, 2:930 sq.), that the 38th year refers to the translator's age instead of a king's reign. It would be better to suppose an asra. Three seem possible, the man of the Seleucidae, that of Simon the Maccabee, used in Palestine, and the aera of Dionysius used in Egypt. The aera of the Seleucidas began B.C. 312, and its 38th year is therefore too early for the reign of Euergetes I; the aera of Simon the Maccabee began B.C. 143, or a little later, and its 38th year is too late for, the reign of Euergetes II. The aera of Dionysitus commenced B.C. 285 (Lepsius, Kanigsbuch, 1.c.), and its 38th year was therefore the last of Ptolemy II, Euergetes I coming to the throne in the next year. The construction that does not allow the year of the reign of Euergetes to be intejaded, and thus necessitates some such explanation, is certainly the more correct; but as Dr. Davidson, who has laboriously collected upon this question much criticism which We have shown to be needless, observes, we need not here look for correct grammar (Horne's Introd. 1856, 2:1026-1028). With this admission the usual reading cannot be doubted, and the date mentioned would be B.C. 133. Other evidence for the time of the composition of Ecelesiasticus, which, of course, can be approximately inferred from that of the translation, is rather in favor of the second than the first Euergetes. — SEE ECCLESIASTICUS; SEE JESUS, SON OF SIRACH.

## Eufronius[[@Headword:Eufronius]]

             SEE EUPHRONIUS

.

## Eugenicus[[@Headword:Eugenicus]]

             a Greek theologian, lived in the first half of the 15th century. He began public life as an instructor in rhetoric, but his learning and eloquence soon procured him the first positions in the Church, and towards 1436 he was made archbishop of Ephesus. Two years later he accompanied the emperor (John Palaeologus) to the Council of Florence. Here he not only represented his own diocese, but acted also for the patriarchs of Antioch and of Jerusalem. A zealous defender of the Greek Church and adversary of the Roman, Eugenicus was the only one who, at the close of the council, refused to recognize the pretensions of the pope and to sign the acts of the council. On his return to Constantinople the people received him with great enthusiasm. Even upon his death-bed in 1447, he solemnly adjured George the Scholastic to continue the strife against the Latins. The numerous writings of Eugenicus are of a polemical nature, directed against the Latin Church and those prelates of the Greek Church who were favorable to the former. Many have never been published; but they are recorded by Fabricius. We make mention here only of his printed works: Letter to the Emperor Palaeologus, in which he advises the Greeks against the Council of Florence, and exposes the intrigues of the Latinists. This letter has been translated into Latin, with a reply by Joseph of Methone, in Labbe, Concilia, 13:677. An encyclical letter upon the same subject in Labbe, Concilia, 13:714; A Treatise on Liturgicaul Topics; A Profession of Faith, a fragment of which is given by Allatius, De Consensu, 3:3. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 16:706; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, 11:670; Oudin, Script. Ecclesiastes 3:2343.

## Eugenios Bulgaris[[@Headword:Eugenios Bulgaris]]

             SEE BULGARIS.

## Eugenius[[@Headword:Eugenius]]

             a Catholic bishop OF CARTHAGE, was elected to that see in 480 or 481. In 483 he was banished by the Arian party to Tripoli, where he remained until 484, when he returned to his diocese. But the next king,banished him to Gaul, where he remained the rest of his life. He died at Vienne, September 6, 505. He left Expositio Fidei Catholici (printed in Migne, Patrol L. t. 3). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Eugenius I, Pope[[@Headword:Eugenius I, Pope]]

             a son of the Roman Rufinianus, was elected by the Romans September 8, 654, as successor to Martin I, who had been sent into banishment to the Thracian Chersonesus by order of the emperor Constans II, who favored the schism of the Monothelites. Martin dying in the following year, Eugenius continued in dispute with the court of Constantinople till he died, June 1, 657, and was succeeded by Vitalianus. In order to reestablish peace with the Greeks, his legates made an arrangement with Peter, the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, that instead of one or two wills in  Christ three should be assumed — one substantial, the two others natural. — Bower, History of the Popes, 3:70.

II. Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded Paschal I February 14, 824, in the midst of great disorder, which occurred at Rome, owing to the corrupt state of society and mal-administration of that city. To reform these, the emperor Louis the Good sent his son Lotharius to Rome, who corrected many abuses, which, by the account of Eginhardt and other chroniclers, had grown to an enormous extent. He confirmed the right of electing the pope to the clergy and people of Rome; and the Council, of Rome, which he convoked on November 1, 826, issued many beneficent decrees for the restoration of Church discipline, for the establishment of schools, and against the worldly occupations of clergymen. He died August 827. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 4:214; Bower, History of the Popes, 4:205.

III. Pope. He was a monk of Citeaux, disciple and friend of St. Bernard, and afterwards abbot of St. Anastasius. He was elected to the pontifical chair of Rome February 27, 1145. He appears to have been a year sincere disciple of Bernard, and anxious, like him, to reform the manners of the clergy and consolidate the papal power. Through the greater part of his pontificate, owing to the turbulence of the Roman people SEE ARNOLD OF BRESCIA, he was unable to reside in the city. This circumstance, however, did not hinder his being acknowledged as pope, or his exercising the functions of his office. During his reign the second crusade, under the preaching of St. Bernard, was undertaken. SEE CRUSADERS. Shortly after its mortifying failure the pontiff died at Tivoli, July 8, 1153. See Neander, Bernard und s. Zeit. 190-296; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:214.

IV, Pope, Gabriele Condolmiere, a native of Venice, succeeded Martin V as pope March 3, 1431. At the early age of twenty-four he was made by pope Gregory XII, with whom he was related, bishop of Siena, and soon after (1408) cardinal. "His was a most stormy pontificate. He drove away the powerful family of Colonna, including the nephews of the late pope, from Rome, charging them with having enriched themselves at the expense of the papal treasury. He afterwards made war against the various lords of Romagna, who were supported by the Visconti of Milan. But the greatest annoyance to Eugenius proceeded from in the Council of Basle, which had been convoked by his predecessor, and which protracted its sittings year after year, broaching doctrines very unfavorable to the papal supremacy. SEE BASLE, COUNCIL OF Eugenius, who had been obliged to escape  from Rome in disguise on account of a popular revolt, and had taken up his residence at Bologna in 1437, issued a bull dissolving the council, recalling his nuncio who presided at it, and convoking another council at Ferrara. SEE FERRARA.

Most of the fathers assembled at Basle refused to submit, and summoned the pope himself to appear before them, to answer the charge of simony schism, and others, and after a time proceeded against him as contumacious, and deposed him. Eugenius meanwhile had opened in person his new council at Ferrara in February, 1438, in which, after annulling all the obnoxious decrees of the Council of Basle, he launched a bull of excommunication against the bishops who remained in that assembly, which he characterized as a 'satanic conclave, which was spreading the abomination of desolation into the bosom of the Church.' The Catholic world was divided between the two councils; that of Basle proceeded to elect a new pope in the person of Amadeus VIII of Savoy, who assumed the name of Felix V, and was solemnly crowned at Basle. Eugenius encouraged the Hungarians and Poles to break the peace they had solemnly sworn with the Turks, under pretense that their oaths were not valid without the sanction of the pope; he even sent cardinal Julian as his nuncio to attend the Christian army. The result was the battle of Varna, 1444, in which the Christians were completely defeated, and king Ladislaus of Poland and cardinal Julian lost their lives. Eugenius died at Rome Feb. 23, 1447. He left the Church in a state of schism between him and his competitor Felix, his own states a prey to war, and all Christendom alarmed at the progress of the Turkish arms" (English Cyclopaedia). SEE BOWER, History of the Popes, 7:238.

## Eugenius, Bishop Of Toledo[[@Headword:Eugenius, Bishop Of Toledo]]

             the second of that name, was first a clerk of the Church there, and on being chosen bishop, retired to Saragossa in a monastery but being discovered, was brought back to Toledo, and ordained in 646. He presided at the councils held at Toledo in the years 653, 655, and 656, and died in 657. He was the author of several works, particularly a treatise on the Trinity, two books of miscellanies, and one in prose and verse, which were published by father Sirmond at Paris (1619, 8vo; also in 1696; Venice, 1728, in the Bibliotheca Max. Patrum; Lyons, 1677, 12:345). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Eugippius, or Eugyppius[[@Headword:Eugippius, or Eugyppius]]

             a learned monk, who lived at the close of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century. He seems to have been the descendant of an Italian family, and was at first monk in the monastery of St. Severin (q.v.) at Fariana, in Noricum (near the present Pchlarn, in Austria), subsequently in the monastery of Castrum Lucullanum (now Castello del Novo, belonging to the city of Naples). He is sometimaes called "abbot," but it is doubtful whether he was, in the later years of his life, abbot of Lucullanum, or whether the name was only given him as an honorary title. He is the author of a life of his teacher, St: Severinus (Vita St. Severini, publ. by Canisius, Antiq. Lect. t. 6, in Acta Sanctorun, January 8; and by Welser, Augsb. 1594), which is a very important contribution to the Church history of Germany. He also compiled a collection of Thoughts and Sentences from  the works of St. Augustine (Thesaurus Augustinianeus (Basle, 1542; Venice, 1513), which was dedicated to the Roman virgin Proba. The author of the second work was formerly believed by some writers to be a different person from the author of the life of St. Severin, but this opinion has now been generally abandoned. Among the letters of Fulgentius (q.v.) of Ruspe, there is one addressed to Eugippius; a letter of Eugippius to Fulgentius is lost. Edgippius was also in literary connection with Dionysius Exiguus. There is a monastic rule which is ascribed to Eugippius, but it was early superseded by that of St. Benedict. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:217.

## Euhemerus[[@Headword:Euhemerus]]

             a Greek historian, philosopher, and traveler, lived about the year B.C. 300. It is not exactly known whether he was born at Messina (in Sicily), at Tegea (in the Peloponnesus), on the isle of Cos, or at Agarigentum. He belonged to the Cyrenaic school, well known for its skepticism in religious matters. As bold as the other philosophers of this school, and more systematic, Euhemerus proposed a general interpretation of the myths, which has been justly compared with modern German Rationalism. An exposition of his doctrine is given by Diodorus Siculus. "Euhemaerus," he says, "friend of Cassander (king of Macedonia B.C. 320-296), was entrusted by this prince with certain missions to some of the Southern countries. On his way he passed in the Indian Ocean a group of isles, of which the largest was called Panchaia. "The Panchaeans were distinguished for their piety, and honored the gods by sacrifice and offerings of gold and silver." They worshipped Jupiter, and such other gods as we meet with in Grecian mythology; but all these gods were really men distinguished for great actions, and deified on account of them. On his return from the voyage Euhemerus wrote a Sacred History ( ῾Ιερὰ ἀναγραφή), in about nine books,in which he showed, according to Lactantius and Arnohbius, that these gods were but men (Lactantius, De Falsa Religione, 1:11). A Latin translation was made by the poet Ennius. Of this translation only ninety-five lines now remain (Amsterdam, 1707). This work contains the history of the gods of the Panchasans, of the people and their manners, Euhemerus himself leaning in fact to the doctrines of the Panchasans. The form in which he presented his system was not entirely new, for Plato had adopted a similar course in his Republic; the germ of the system itself is to be found in some passages of Herodotus and Thucydides. The originality of Euhemerus consists in exaggerating, and in carrying out even to  absurdity, the idea that Mythology contains certain historical elements. In effect, he resolved all mythology into history, maintaining that the gods "were originally illustrious kings, deified after death either by the spontaneous reverence of the people or by the cunning of the rulers."

But mythology contains, aside from this, so much that bears on astronomy, the physical sciences, metaphysics, and, most of all, so much of fiction, that it is next to impossible to determine what in this confusion is truly historical. Some historians, like Diodorus Siculus, who have attempted to interpret mythology after the plan of Euhemerus, have succeeded only in substituting prosaic fiction for the imaginative popular legends. The pagame writers generally treat Euhemerus with severity. After the origin of Christianity, the views of Euhemerus, as containing the satires of a pagan on pagan religions, were made great use of in argument by the Church fathers against paganism, with some exaggerations, perhaps, of the doctrines of Euhemerums. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Lactantius, Chrysostom, in arguing against paganism, adopt the view of Euhbenerus, that the worship of great men was the original source of all idolatry, and gave birth to all the pagan divinities. In 1641, Vossius, following an idea of Tertullian, sought to show that the gods of paganism were the patriarchs of the O.T. Serapis was Joseph; Janus, Noah; Minerva, Naomi, etc. Huet, bishop of Avranches, discovered Moses in Osiris and Bacchus, as well as in manyotheu pagan divinities. Euhemereism, as a method of interpreting the ancient mythology, was supplanted by the symbolisma of Kreuzer, a system infinitely superior to the other two above mentioned, but still containing much that is illusory and erroneous. A Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 16:828; Donaldson, History of Christian Literature and Doctrine (see Index); Gerlach, Historische Studien (Hamb.1841, 8vo); Lecky, History of Rationalism, 1:327; Brucker, Hist. Crit. Philosophiae, 1:604 sq.; Clinton, Fasti Hellenici (Oxon. 1830), 2:481; Meiners, Hist. Doct. apud Graecos, 2:664 sq.; Fabricinis, Bibliotheca Graeca, in, 616; Hoffman, Bibliographisches Lexicon, 1:65; Milman, History of Christianity (New York, 1866), 1:49, note. SEE MYTHOLOGY.

## Eukteroi Oikoi[[@Headword:Eukteroi Oikoi]]

             (εὐκτήριον, an oratory, and οἴκος, a house), a name sometimes applied to ancient Christian churches.

## Eulalia[[@Headword:Eulalia]]

             a saint of the Church of Rome, was born at Merida, Spain, in 290. She was the descendant of a noble Christian family. When the general persecution of Christians began under Maximian, Eulalia, contrary to the directions given by the Church, voluntarily sought martyrdom by presenting herself to  the prefect of Lusitania, remonstrating with him against idolatry and the persecution of Christianity, and by personally insulting him (spitting in his face, etc.).

She was consequently burned alive December 10 (or 12), 303 (or 304). Her relics were preserved at Merida, and many miracles were ascribed to them at the time of the invasion of the Goths and Vandals. Barcelona also claims the possession of the relics of St. Eulalia, and the legend of this saint is so much like that of Eulalia of Merida that it is generally believed that the two are only one person, and that, as is common in the Church of Rome, the same relics are. claimed by two cities. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 16:708.

## Eulalius[[@Headword:Eulalius]]

             anti-Pope, lived in the first part of the fifth century. Created arch-cardinal by Innocent I, he was, after the death of pope Zosimus, near the close of the year 418, through the influence of Symmachts, elected pope in opposition to Boniface I, who had been elected by a legal majority. For several months he contended against Boniface, but finally the emperor Honorius decided in favor of Boniface, being persuaded that Eulalius had been illegally elected, and gave orders to Symmachus, the governor of the city of Rome, to drive Eulalius from the city, and to put Boniface in possession of the see. Eulalius thereupon left Rome, and became bishop of Nepi. After the death of Boniface, at the election of Celestine I, the friends of Eulalius offered, to contend again in his favor, but he promptly declined the papal dignity. — Bower, History of the Popes, 1:358 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 16:709; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:750; Jaffe, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum. (J.H.W.)

## Eulogia[[@Headword:Eulogia]]

             (εὐλογία).

(1.) A term used in reference to the consecrated bread of the Eucharist. In the early Church, at the end of mass, the loaves offered by the faithful (not consecrated) were blessed by the celebrant, and distributed as a sign of communion, as they now are in the Greek Church, to those who had not communed, and formerly to catechumens who were not admissible. They were called eulogies or antidora, compensations, by the Council of Antioch in 341.

(2.) Εὐλογία was one of the early titles of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and appears to have been taken from the language of Paul when he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless" — τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας. Down to the time of Cyril and Chrysostom, εὐλογία is used synonymously with εὐχαριστία, but after the fifth century the term was appropriated to the bread set apart from the oblations for the poor and the clergy. To this custom we may refer the origin of private masses, and of communion in one kind.

(3.) The practice of giving the eulogia also tends to explain the custom of non-communication which sprang up in the Church about the same time. The faithful who did not communicate retired from the assembly before the celebration of the Lord's Supper began, but not without receiving the benediction of the minister. The fideles were soon divided into two classes — communicantes and non-communicantes — of which the Church knew nothing in earlier ages. The Council of Nantes, about A.D. 890, ordered the presbyters to keep some portions of the oblations in a proper vessel, so that those persons who were not prepared to communicate might, on every festival and Lord's day, receive some of the euloqia, previously blessed with a proper benediction. — Bingham, Orig. Eccl. book 10, chapter 2, § 16; book 15, chapter 4, § 3; Riddle, Christ. Antiquities, pages 545, 578.

## Eulogium[[@Headword:Eulogium]]

             the consecrated bread of the Greek Church.

## Eulogius[[@Headword:Eulogius]]

             patriarch of Alexandria from 581 to 608. Pope Gregory I makes particular mention of him as a successful polemic against the Nestorians, Severians, Theodosians, Cainites, Acephalians, and Agnoetae. Photius preserves numerous fragments of his writings. He died in 608. — Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Ler. 3:753, 754; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, (ed. Harles), 10:753.

## Eulogius Of Cordova[[@Headword:Eulogius Of Cordova]]

             was in 859 elected archbishop of Toledo, but, by the opposition of the Moors, he, was not permitted to enter upon the duties of his office. He was a learned and brave defender of Christianity against Mohammedanism, and sealed his love for the cause by his own blood, being beheaded by the Moors, March 11, 859, for the assistance which he had rendered a young girl who had been converted and by him baptized in the Christian faith. His writings are: Memoriale Sanctorum sive libri in de Martyribus Cordubensibus, a work in which the glory of the Spanish martyrs of his times is recorded: — Exhortatio ad martyrium sire docunentum martyriale  ad Floras et Miariam virgines confessores: —Apologeticus pro martyribus adversus calumniatores, in which he denies the assertion that the Christians desired martyrdom. He also wrote letters to the bishop Wilifindus of Pampeluna, his friend Alvarus, and others. His remains are to be found in Schott, Hispania Illustrata, volume 4; in the Bibliotheca Patrum, 15:242; also in Migne, Patrol. Lat. tom. 115. A biography of Eulogius, written by his friend Alvarus, is also in Migne, t. 115. — Ceillier, Hist. des Aut. Sac. et Eccl. 19:64; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:754, 755; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 16:719; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:220; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, 4:257; Clarke, Sacred Literature, volume 2.

## Eulogy[[@Headword:Eulogy]]

             SEE FUNERAL.

## Eulysius[[@Headword:Eulysius]]

             bishop of Apamea, in Bithynia, one of Chrysostom's most loyal adherents, banished to Mizpah, beyond Bosrah, in Syria, A.D. 406.

## Eumenes[[@Headword:Eumenes]]

             (Εὐμένης, well-disposed) II, king of Pergamus, and son of Attalus I. His accession to the throne is fixed by the death of his predecessor to B.C. 197 (Clinton, F.H. 3:408). He inherited from his father the friendship and alliance of the Romans, and when peace was made in B.C. 196 with Philip V, king of Macedonia, he was presented with the towns of Oreus and Eretria in Eubcea (Livy, 33:34). In B.C. 191 Eumenes and the Romans engaged the fleet of Antiochus (Livy, 36:43-45), and, seeing more than ever the policy of adhering to the Romans, he, in the following year, rendered them valuable assistance at the battle of Magnesia, commanding  his own troops person (Livy, 37:39-44; Justin, 31:8; Appian, Syr. 34). As soon as peace was concluded, B.C. 188, Eumenes set out for Rome to ask some rewards for his services. The senate were pleased with the modesty of his behavior, and conferred upon him the Thracian Chersonese, Lysimachia, both Phrygias, Mysia, Lycaonia, Lydia, and Ionia, with some exceptions. One province only would have much enlarged his dominions, but by this large addition to his territory he found himself one of the most powerful of monarchs (Livy, 37:56; 38:39; Polyb. 22:27; Appian, Syr. 44). About the same time he married the daughter of Ariarathes IV, king of Cappadocia (Livy, 38:39). Eumenes continued in good favor with the Romans for several years, and repeatedly sent embassies to them. In B.C. 172 he again visited Rome, and in returning nearly lost his life through the treachery of Perseus, king of Macedonia (Livy, 42:1-16). In B.C. 169 Eumenes is said to have had secret correspondence with Perseus, by which act he lost the favor of the Romans (Polyb. Frag. Vat. 29, Didot ed. pages 39, 40), and two years after he was forbidden to enter Rome (Livy, Epit. 46). The latter part of his reign was disturbed by frequent wars with Prusias, king of Bithynia. The Romans favorably received his brother Attalus, apparently for the purpose of exciting him gaiinst Eumenes, who had sent him to Rome. Attains, however, was induced, through the entreaties of a physician named Stratius, to abandon any such ideas. Eumenes thus managed to keep on friendly terms with his brother and the Romans till his death (Livy, 45:19, 20; Polyb. 30:1-3; 31:9; 32:5). The exact date of his death is not mentioned by any writer, but it must have taken place in B.C. 159 (Clinton, F.H. 3:406). Eumenes II much improved the city of Perganeus by erecting magnificent temples and other public buildings. His greatest act was the foundation of a splendid library, which rose to be a rival in extent and value even to that of Alexandria (Strabo, 13:4, Diddt ed. page 533; Pliny, 22:11 (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.). SEE PERGAMUS.

The large accession of territory which was granted to Eumenes from the former dominions of Antiochus is mentioned 1Ma 8:8, but the present reading of the Greek and Latin texts offers insuperable difficulties. "The Romans gave him," it is said, "the country of India and Media, and Lydia, and parts of his (Antiochus's) fairest countries (ἀπὸ τῶν καλλ. χωρῶν αύ τ οῦ)." This is particularly out of the question, for neither India nor Media ever belonged to Antiochus or the Romans. Various conjectures have been proposed to remove these obvious errors; but, though it may  reasonably be allowed that Mysia may have stood originally for Media ( מסיfor מדי, Michaelis), it is not equally easy to explain the origin of χώραν τὴν Ι᾿νδικήν. Grotius, without any MS. authority, conjectured Ionia to be meant, which agrees with the account of Livy (37:55). It is possible that Ι᾿νδικήν may have been substituted for Ι᾿ωνικήν after Μηδίαν was already established in the text. Other explanations are given by Grimm, Exeg. Handb. ad loc.; Wernsdorf, Defide Libr. Macc. page 50 sq., but they have less plausibility. Josephus states the matter but summarily (Ant. 11:10, 6).

## Eumenides[[@Headword:Eumenides]]

             SEE FURIES.

## Eunatan[[@Headword:Eunatan]]

             (Ε᾿ννατάν v.r. Ε᾿λναθάν, Vulg. Ennagam), given (1Es 8:44, where it is perhaps but an original misprint for Ennatan) as the name of one of the principal men directed by Ezra to procure priests for the returning party of exiles; apparently a corruption for the second ELNATHAN SEE ELNATHAN (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 8:16).

## Eunice[[@Headword:Eunice]]

             (Εὐνίκη, good victory, originally the name of one of the Nereids), the mother of Timothy, and the wife of a Greek; spoken of (2Ti 1:5) as possessing unfeigned faith, and described in Act 16:1 as a believing Jewess (γυνὴ Ι᾿ουδαία πιστή). A.D. ante 47. SEE TIMOTHY.

## Eunomians[[@Headword:Eunomians]]

             a sect of Arians, so called after their founder, EUNOMIUS. SEE EUNOMIUS.

## Eunomius[[@Headword:Eunomius]]

             a bishop and founder of a sect of Arians. He was born in the village of Dacora, in Cappadocia, and is described by his admirer, Philostorgius, as ugly in appearance, and somewhat stammering. He was educated by his father until, under the advice of the Arian bishop Secundus, of Antioch, he went to Alexandria, where he became the disciple, associate, and notary of Aitius (q.v.), the head of the Anomacmans. On a journey which he undertook to visit the emperor, he was seized by the Semiarians and sent to Phrygia; but in 360, his friend Eudoxius, formerly bishop of Antioch, but who had recently been called to Constantinople, procured for him the see of Cyzicum. There he proclaimed his views, first cautiously and moderately, but soon openly and unreservedly. The people of Cyzicum loudly complained of him, and, though he defended himself at Constantinople with great eloquence, he was abandoned by Eudoxius, who prevailed upon him to resign, since he was unwilling to subscribe the formula of Ariminum, or approve the deposition of Aftius. After this time Eunomius acted as the acknowledged head of the party. Under Julian, who recalled all the exiled bishop's, Eunomius was with Aritius in Constantinople, disseminating their views, collecting adherents, and consecrating bishops, who settled in many regions of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. Being suspected of intimate relations with Procopius, a rebel against the authority of emperor Valens, he was twice exiled, but each time soon recalled. In 383 the emperor Theodosius demanded from all the prominent men of the several religious parties an explanation of their  theological views, rejected the profession of faith made by Ennomius, had him arrested at Chalcedon and exiled to Halmnyris, in Mcesia, and from there to Caesarea, in Cappadocia. From there, when his longer stay was not tolerated, he returned to his native place, where he died about 396.

Eunomius wrote a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, and a number of letters, which were known to Photius. Both the commentary and the letters are lost. His first defense (ἀπολογητικός), which was written either in 360 or (according to Rettberg) in 365, called forth a long reply from Basil. From several manuscripts of the latter, the text of this work of Eunomius has been restored. It is partly given by Cave (Hist. Liter. Genev. 1720, 1:139), and completely by Fabricius (Biblith. Graeca, 8), Canisius (Lect. Antiq. 1), and Thilo (Biblioth. dogmat. 2). A second defense (ὑπὲρ ἀπολογίας ἀπολογία, as Gregory calls it) elicited in reply the twelve orations of Gregory of Nyssa. The fragments of Eunomius contained in the work of Gregory have been collected by Rettberg (Marcelliana, page 125). His profession of faith (ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως), which Eunomrius in 383 presented to the emperor Theodosius, has been published by Valesius (notes to Socrates, 5:10), Fabricius (1.c.), Cave (1.c.), and Rettberg (Marcelliana, page 149).

Eunomius was one of the prominent leaders of the Arians. He was capable, keen, undaunted, and full of contempt for his opponents. He had a keener dialectic faculty than Arius, and anticipated Des Cartes in making clearness the test of truth. "An opponent of whatever was inconceivable and transcendental, he pursued knowledge in a one-sided direction, not deeply speculative, but proceeding from an empirical understanding to make everything clear, which was his principal aim. In short, he advocated an intelligent supranaturalism, in which a rationalistic tendency was concealed, similar to what we find in Socinus" (Neander, Hist. of Dogmas, ed. Ryland, 1:264). The following account of the confession of faith of the Eunomians is given biny Cave (volume 1, page 140), from a manuscript in archbishop Tennison's library: "There is one God, uncreated and without beginning, who has nothing existing before him, for nothing can exist before what is uncreate; nor with him, for what is uncreate must be one; nor in him, for God is a simple and uncompounded Being. This one simple and eternal Being is God, the Creator and Ordainer of all things. For God created, begot, and made the Son only, by his direct operation and power, before all things, and every other creature; not producing, however, any being like himself, or imparting any of his own proper substance to his Son; for God  is immortal, uniform, and indivisible, and therefore cannot communicate any part of his own proper substance to another. He alone is unbegotten, and it is impossible that any other being should be formed of an unbegotten substance. He did not use his own substance in begetting his Son, but his will only; nor did he beget him in the likeness of his substance, but according to his own good pleasure. He then created the Holy Spirit, the first and greatest of all spirits, by his own power and operation mediately, yet by the immediate power and operation of the Son. After the Holy Spirit, he created all other things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, corporeal and incorporeal, mediately by himself, by the power and operation of his Son." The adherents of Eunomnius, who were very numerous, were, together with those of Ahtius, condemned as heretics by the second (Ecumenical Council. After the death of Eunomius, the Eunomians fully separated from the communion of the predominant Church. Some factions called themselves after prominent teachers, as Eutychius, Theophronius. The Church gave them a number of nicknames, as ὀνοβόσται, spadones. They baptized, not upon the Trinity, but upon the death of Christ. They did not exist long as a sect, but soon died out, in consequence of internal dissensions and numerous secessions to the dominant Church. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:220; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. 1:248, 301, Tillemont; Dorner, Lehre Christi, 1:819 (Edinb. transl., div. 1, volume 2, page 243); Neander, Church Hist. 2:319-425; Clarke, Sacred Liter. 1:318; Schaff, Church History, 3, § 121. (A.J.S.)

## Eunuch[[@Headword:Eunuch]]

             (εὐνοῦχος) has, in its literal (Greek) sense, the harmless meaning of "bed- keeper," i.e., one who has the charge of beds and bed-chambers; but as only persons deprived of their virility have, from the most ancient times, been employed in Oriental harems, and as such persons are employed almost exclusively in this kind of service, the word "bed-keeper" became synonymous with "castratus." Castration, according to Josephus (Ant. 4:8, 40), was not practiced by the Jews upon either men or animals, SEE BEAST; yet the custom is frequently referred to in the Bible by the Hebrew term סָרַיס(saris', Sept. εὐνοῦχος; Vulg. spado; A.V. "eunuch," "officer," and "chamberlain," apparently as though the word intended a class of attendants who were not always mutilated), which (from the Arabic root saras, to be impotent ad Venerem) clearly implies the incapacity which mutilation involves (Isa 56:3; Sir 20:20 [21]),  and perhaps includes all the classes mentioned in Mat 19:12, not signifying, as the Greek εὐνοῦχος, an office merely. The law, Deu 23:1 (comp. Lev 22:24), is repugnant to thus treating any Israelite; and Samuel, when describing the arbitrary power of the future king (1Sa 8:15, marg.), mentions "his eunuchs," but does not say that he would make "their sons" such. This, if we compare 2Ki 20:18; Isa 39:7, possibly implies that these persons would be foreigners. It was a barbarous custom of the East thus to treat captives (Herod. 3:49; 6:32), not only of tender age (when a non- development of beard, and feminine mold of limbs and modulation of voice ensues), but, it would seem, when past puberty, which there occurs at an early age.

Physiological considerations lead to the supposition that in the latter case a remnant of animal feeling is left, which may explain Sir 20:4; Sir 25:20 (comp. Juv. 6:366, and Mart. 6:67; Philostr. Apoll. Tyan. 1:37; Ter. Eun. 4:3, 24), where a sexual function, though fruitless, is implied. Busbecq (Ep. 3:122, Oxf. 1660) seems to ascribe the absence or presence of this to the total or partial character of the mutilation; but modern surgery would rather assign the earlier or later period of the operation as the real explanation. (Comp. Juv. 12:35; Philo, Opp. 2:264; Mishna, Yebaimh, 8:2; Deu 23:2; see Gesenius, Thes. page 338; Paul. AEgin. 6:68; Fischer, Proluss. page 497; Pierer, Medic. Realw. I, 2:63.) It is total among modern Turks (Tournefort, 2:8, 9, 10, ed. Par. 1717, taille fleur de ventre); a precaution arising from mixed ignorance and jealousy. The "officer" Potiphar (Gen 37:36; Gen 39:1, marg. "eunuch") was an Egyptian, was married, and was the "captain of the guard." The Jewish tradition is that Joseph was made a eunuch on his first introduction to Egypt; and yet the accusation of Potiphar's wife, his marriage and the birth of his children, are related subsequently without any explanation. (See Targum Pseudojon. on Gen 39:1; Gen 41:50; and the details given at 39:13.) On the Assyrian monuments a eunuch often appears, sometimes armed and in a warlike capacity, or as a scribe, noting the number of heads and amount of spoil, as receiving the prisoners, and even as officiating in religious ceremonies (Layard, Nineveh, 2:324-6, 334.) A bloated beardless face and double chin is there their conventional type. SEE ATTIRE.

Chardin (Voyages en Perse, 2:283, ed. Amst. 1711) speaks of eunuchs having a harem of their own. If Potiphar had become such by operation for disease, by accident, or even by malice, such a marriage seems, therefore, according to. Eastern notions, supposable. (See Grotius on Deu 23:1; comp. Burckhardt, Tramv. in Arab. 1:290.) Nor is  it wholly repugnant to that barbarous social standard to think that the prospect of rank, honor, and royal confidence might even induce parents to thus treat their children at a later age, if they showed an aptness for such preferment. The characteristics as regards beard, voice, etc., might then perhaps be modified, or might gradually follow. The Potipherah of Gen 41:50, whose daughter Joseph married, was "'priest of On," and no doubt a different person. (See Delphini, Eunuchi conjugium, Hal. 1680.)

The origination of the practice is ascribed to Semiramis (Amm. Marcell. 14:6), and is no doubt as early, or nearly so, as Eastern despotism itself. Their incapacity, as in the case of mutes, is the ground of reliance upon them (Clarke's Travels, part 2, § 1, 13; Busbecq, Ep. 1:33). By reason of the mysterious distance at which the sovereign sought to keep his subjects (Herod. 1:99; comp. Est 4:11), and of the malignant jealousy fostered by the debased relation of the sexes, such wretches, detached from social interests and hopes of issue (especially when, as commonly, and as amongst the Jews, foreigners), the natural slaves of either sex (Est 4:5), and having no prospect in rebellion save the change of masters, were the fittest props of a government resting on a servile relation, the most complete organs of its despotism or its lust, the surest (but see Est 2:21) guardians (Xenoph. Cyrop. 7:5, § 15; Herod. 8:105) of the monarch's person, and the sole confidential witnesses of his unguarded or undignified moments. Hence they have in all ages frequently risen to high offices of trust. Thus the "chief" of the cup-bearers (q.v.) and of the cooks of Pharach were eunuchs, as being near his person, though their inferior agents need not have been so (Gen 40:1). (Wilkinson [Anc. Egypt, 2:61] denies the use of eunuchs in Egypt. Herodotus, indeed [2:92], confirms his statement as regards Egyptian monogamy; but if this as a rule applied to the kings, they seemed, at any rate, to have allowed themselves concubines [page 181].

From the general beardless character of Egyptian heads, it is not easy to pronounce whether any eunuchs appear in the sculptures or not.) The complete assimilation of the kingdom of Israel, and latterly of Judah, to the neighboring models of despotism, is traceable in the rank and prominence of eunuchs (2Ki 8:6; 2Ki 9:32; 2Ki 23:11; 2Ki 25:19; Isa 56:3-4; Jer 29:2; Jer 34:19; Jer 38:7; Jer 41:16; Jer 52:25). — They mostly appear in one of two relations — either military, as "set over the men of war," greater trustworthiness possibly counterbalancing inferior courage and military vigor, or associated, as we mostly recognize them,  with women and children. (2Ch 28:1 is remarkable as ascribing eunuchs to the period of David, nor can it be doubted that Solomon's polygamy made them a necessary consequence; but in the state they do not seem to have played an important part at this period.)

We find the Assyrian Rab-Saris, or chief eunuch (2Ki 18:17), employed, together with other high officials, as ambassador. Similarly, in the details of the travels of an embassy sent by the duke of Holstein (page 136), we find a eunuch mentioned as sent on occasion of a state-marriage to negotiate, and of another (page 273) who was the Meheter, or chamberlain of Shah Abbas, who was always near his person, and had his ear (comp. Chardin, 3:37), and of another, originally a Georgian prisoner, who officiated as supreme judge. Fryer (Travels in India and Persia, page 1698) and Chardin (2:283) describe them as being the base and ready tools of licentiousness, as tyrannical in humor, and pertinacious in the authority which they exercise; Clarke (Travels in Europe, etc., part 2, § 1, page 22), as eluded and ridiculed by those whom it is their office to guard. A great number of them accompany the shall and his ladies when hunting, and no one is allowed, on pain of death, to come within two leagues of the field, unless the king sends a eunuch for him. So eunuchs run before the closed arabahs of the sultanas when abroad, crying out to all to keep at a distance. This illustrates Est 1:10; Est 1:12; Est 1:15-16; Est 2:3; Est 2:8; Est 2:14. The moral tendency of this sad condition is well known to be the repression of courage, gentleness, shame, and remorse, the development of malice, and often of melancholy, and a disposition to suicide. The favorable description of them in Xenophon (1.c.) is overcharged, or, at least, is not confirmed by modern observation. They are not more liable to disease than others. unless of such as often follows the foul vices of which they are the tools. The operation itself, especially in infancy, is not more dangerous than an ordinary amputation. Chardin (2:285) says that only one in four survives; and Clot Bey, chief physician of the pasha, states that two thirds die. Burckhardt, therefore (fub. page 329), is mistaken when he says that the operation is only fatal in about two out of a hundred cases. SEE HAREM.

It is probable that Daniel and his companions were thus treated, in fulfillment of 2Ki 20:17-18; Isa 39:7; comp. Dan 1:3; Dan 1:7. The courf of Herod of course had its eunuchs (Josephus, Ant. 16:8, 1; 15:7, 4), as had also that of queen Candace (Act 8:27). Michaelis (2:180) regards them as the proper consequence of the gross polygamy of the East, although his further remark that they tend to balance the sexual  disparity which such monopoly of woman causes is is less just, since the countries despoiled of their women fur the one purpose are not commonly those which furnish male children for the other.

In the three classes mentioned in Mat 19:12, the first is to be ranked with other examples of defective organization; the last, if taken literally, as it is said to have been personally exemplified in Origen (Euseh. Eccl. Hist. 6:8; see Zorn, De eunachisomo Origenis, Giess. 1708), is an instance of human ways and means of ascetic devotion being valued by the Jews above revealed precept (see Schdttgen, Hor. Hebrews 1:159). Our Savior in that passage doubtless refers to the voluntary and ascetic celibacy of the Essenes (q.v.). But a figurative sense of εὐνοῦχος (comp. 1Co 7:32; 1Co 7:34) is also possible. SEE CELIBACY.

In the A.V. of Esther the word "chamberlain" (marg,. "eunuch") is the constant rendering of סָרַיס, saris, and as the word also occurs in Act 12:20, and Rom 16:23, where the original expressions are very different, some caution is required. In Act 12:20, τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος τοῦ βασιλέως may mean a "chamberlain" merely. Such were persons of public influence, as we learn from a Greek inscription preserved in Walpole's Turkey (2:559), in honor of P. Aelius Alcibiades, "chamberlain of the emperor" (ἐπὶ κοιτῶνος Σεβ.), the epithets in which exactly suggest the kind of patronage expressed. In Rom 16:23, the word ἐπίτροπος is the one commonly rendered " steward" (e.g. Mat 20:8; Luk 8:3), and means the one to whom the care of the city was committed. See generally Salden, Otia Theol. de Eunuchis, page 494 sq. SEE CHAMBERLAIN.

In Deu 23:1 (פְּצוּעִאּדִּכָּה, one mutilated by crushing, i.e., the testicles, Sept. technically θλαδίας), and also probably in Lev 21:20 (מְרוֹחִ אָשֶׁךְ, one crushed as to his testicles, Sept. partially μονόρχις), the allusion is to a peculiar kind of emasculation still practiced in the East, according to the Greek physicians (Paulus AEgineta, book 6), which consists in softening the testicles of very young boys in warm water, and then rubbing and pressing them till they disappear. As the heathen priests were often thus qualified for office, persons so mutilated were excluded from the Jewish Church. SEE ASHTORETH.

## Eunuchs[[@Headword:Eunuchs]]

             a sect of heretics in the third century, who were said to be mad enough to emasculate themselves under the assumption that they should thus eradicate their evil propensities, and qualify themselves for performing, into a more holy and acceptable manner, the duties of religion. Origen was the subject of this miserable delusion. The practice is prevalent at this day in Russia, among the sect of the Skoptzi (q.v.). In the Council of Nicaea persons of this class were condemned, and excluded from holy orders. SEE CELIBACY AND VALESIANS.

## Euodias[[@Headword:Euodias]]

             or, rather, EUODIA (Εὐοδία, a good journey; for, as found in Philippians 9:2, Εὐοδίαν is fem., since the following verse refers to that and the associated name by αὐταῖς and αἵτινες), a female member of the Church at Philippi, who seems to have been at variance with another female member named Syntyche. A.D. 57. Paul describes them as women who had "labored much with him in the Gospel," and implores their. to be of one mind (Php 4:2-3).

## Euodius[[@Headword:Euodius]]

             SEE EVODIUS.

## Euphemia, Saint[[@Headword:Euphemia, Saint]]

             of Chalcedon, suffered martyrdom in the time of Galerius, cir. A.D. 307. Her anniversary is September 16.

## Euphemites[[@Headword:Euphemites]]

             SEE MESSALIANS.

## Euphemius[[@Headword:Euphemius]]

             (by some Euthymius), third patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 489-496, was a learned historian and orthodox presbyter of that city, but became involved in the jealousies between the Greek and Roman ecclesiastics, and was finally deposed by the emperor Anastasius. He died in 515.

## Euphrasia (or Euphrosyna)[[@Headword:Euphrasia (or Euphrosyna)]]

             daughter of Paphnutius of Alexandria, early in the 5th century, fled from home to avoid marriage, and was received into a neighboring monastery, where, under the assumed name of Smaragdius, she concealed her sex for thirty-eight years. Her father meanwhile visited her, without recognizing her, and was converted to Christianity. On her death-bed she discovered herself to him, and he became a monk. She is commemorated by the Latins, February 11; by the Greeks, September 25.

## Euphrates[[@Headword:Euphrates]]

             bishop of Cologne, was the successor of bishop Maternus. He was present at the Synod of Sardica in 347, and was sent by the bishops of that synod with recommendatory letters from the emperor Constance to the emperor Constantius to obtain the recall of the exiled catholic bishops. The report that a synod held at Cologne in 346 deposed Euphrates for not believing in the divinity of Christ is now generally regarded as spurious. The acts of this pretended synod were probably compiled in the eighth century, and are from beginning to end a forgery. — Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexik. 12:241; Rettberg, Kirchen-Geschichte Deutschlands, volume 1. (A.J.S.)

## Euphrates [[@Headword:Euphrates ]]

             is the Greek form (Εὐφράτης) of the river designated in Hebrews by the name PHRATH or Perath' (פְּרָת, which Gesenius regards as i.q. "sweet water," referring to the present Arabic name Frah as having that signify; but Furst refers to an obsolete root indicating the impetuous character of the stream), and is probably a word of Arian origin, the initial element being ‘u, which is in Sanscrit su, in Zend ha, and in Greek ε῏υ; and the second element being fra, the particle of abundance. The Euphrates is thus "the good and abounding river." It is not improbable that in common parlance the name was soon shortened to its modern form of Frat, which is almost exactly what the Hebrew Uiteration expresses. But it is most frequently denoted in the Bible by the tearn הִנָּהָר, han-nahar', i.e., "the  river," the river of Asia, in grand contrast with the shortlived torrents of Palestine, being by far the most considerable stream in that part of the continent. Thus, in Exo 23:3, we read, "from the desert unto the river" (comp. Isa 8:7). In like manner, it is termed in Deu 1:7 "the great river." The Euphrates is named in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.).

1. It is first mentioned in Gen 2:14, where the Euphrates is stated to be the fourth of the riflers which flowed from a common stream in the garden of Eden. Its celebrity is there sufficiently indicated by the absence of any explanatory phrase, such as accompanies the names of the other streams. SEE EDEN.

We next hear of it in the covenant made with Abraham (Gen 15:18), where the whole country from "the great river, the river Euphrates," to the river of Egypt is promised to the chosen race. In Deuteronomy and Joshua we find that this promise was borne in mind at the time of the settlement in Canaan (Deu 1:7; Deu 11:24; Jos 1:4); and from an important passage in the first book of Chronicles it appears that the tribe of Reuben did actually extend itself to the Euphrates in the times anterior to Saul (1Ch 5:9). Here they came in contact with the Hagarites, who appear upon the Middle Euphrates in the Assyrian inscriptions of the later empire. It is David, however, who seems for the first time to have entered on the full enjoyment of the promise by the victories which he gained over Headadezer, king of Zobab, and his allies, the Syrians of Damascus (2Sa 8:3-8; 1Ch 18:3). The object of his expedition was "to recover his border," and "to stablish his dominion by the river Euphrateas;" and in this object he appears to have been altogether successful, in so much that Solomon, his son, who was not a man of war, but only inherited his father's dominions, is said to have "reigned over all kingdoms from the river (i.e., the Euphrates) unto the land of the Philistines and unto the border of Egypt" (1Ki 4:21; comp. 2Ch 9:26). Thus, during the reigns of David and Solomon, the dominion of Israel actually attained to the full extent both ways of the original promise, the Euphrates forming the boundary of their empire to the northeast, and the river of Egypt to the south-west. This wide-spread dominion was lost, upon the disruption of the empire under Rehoboam; and no more is heard in Scripture of the Euphrates until the expedition of Necho against the Babylonians in the reign of Josiah. The "Great River" had meanwhile served for some time as a boundary between Assyria and the country of the  Hittites, SEE ASSYRIA, but had repeatedly been crossed by the armies of the Ninevite kings, who gradually established their sway over the countries upon its right bank. The crossing of the river, was always difficult, and at the point where certain natural facilities fixed the ordinary passage the strong fort of Carchemish had been built, probably in very early times, to command the position. SEE CARCHEMISH.

Hence, when Necho determined to attempt the permanent conquest of Syria, his march was directed upon "Carchencish by Euphrates" (2Ch 35:20), which he captured and held, thus extending the dominion of Egypt to the Euphrates, and renewing the old glories of the Ramesside kings. His triumph, however, was short-lived. Three years afterwards the Babylonians — who had inherited the Assyrian dominion in these parts — made an expedition under Nebuchadnezzar against Necho, defeated his army, "which was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish" (Jer 46:2), and recovered all Syria and Palestine. Then "the king of Egypt came no mire out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt" (2Ki 24:7).

These are the chief events which Scripture distinctly connects with the "Great River." The prophets made use of the Euphrates as a figurative description of the Assyrian power, as the Nile with them represented the power of Egypt; thus, in Isa 8:7, "The Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria" (Jer 2:18; comp. Rev 9:14; Rev 16:12). It is probably included among the "rivers of Babylon," by the side of which the Jewish captives "remembered Zion" and "wept" (Psa 137:1); and no doubt is glanced at in the threats of Jeremiah against the Chaldaean "waters" and "springs," upon which there was to be a "drought" that should "dry them up" (Jeremiah 1:38; 513:26). The fulfillment of these prophecies has been noticed under the head of CHALDAEA. The river still brings down as much water as of old, but the precious element is wasted by the neglect of man; the various water-courses along which it was in former times conveyed are dry, the main channel has shrunk, and the Water stagnates in unwholesome marshes.

It is remarkable that Scripture contains no clear and distinct reference to that striking occasion when, according to profane historians (Herod. 1:191; Xenoph. Caqrop. 7:5), the Euphrates was turned against its mistress, and used to effect the ruin of Babylon. The brevity of Daniel (5:30, 31) is  perhaps sufficient to account for his silence on the point; but it might have been expected from the fullness of Jeremiah (chapter 1 and 51) that so remarkable a feature of the siege would not have escaped mention. We must, however, remember, in the first place, that a clear prophecy may have been purposely withheld, in order that the Babylonians might not be put upon their guard. And, secondly, we may notice that there does seem to be at least one reference to the circumstance, though it is covert, as it was necessary that it should be. In immediate conjunction with the passage which most clearly declares the taking of the city by a surprise is found an expression which reads very obscurely in our version — "the passages are stopped" (Jer 51:32). Here the Hebrew term used (מִעְבָּרוֹת) applies most properly to "fords or ferries over rivers" (comp. Jdg 3:28); and the whole passage may best be translated, "the ferries are seized" or "occupied;" which agrees very well with the entrance of the Persians by the rivers and with the ordinary mode of transit in the place, where there was but one bridge (Herod. 1:186). The fords were at Thapsacus (Xenoph. Asab. 1:4, 11).

2. The Euphrates is the largest, the longest, and by far the most important of the rivers of Western Asia. It rises from two chief sources in the Armenian mountains, one of them at Domli. 25 miles N.E. of Erzeroum, and little more than a degree from the Black Sea; the other on the northern slope of the mountain range called Ala-Tagh, near the village of Diyadin, and not far from Mount Ararat. The former, or Northern Euphrates, has the name Frat from the first, but is known also as the Kara-Su (Black River); the latter, or Southern Euphrates, is not called the Frat, but the Murad Chai, yet it is in reality the main river. Both branches flow at the first towards the west or south-west, passing through the wildest mountain districts of Armenia; they meet at Kebban-Maden, nearly in long. 390 E. from Greenwich, having run respectively 400 and 270 miles. Here the stream formed by their combined waters is 120 yards wide, rapid, and very deep; it now flows nearly southward, but in a tortuous course, forcing a way through the ranges of Taurus and and-Taurus, and still seeming as if it would empty itself in the Mediterranean, but prevented from so doing by the longitudinal ranges of Amanus and Lebanon, which here run parallel to the Syrian coast, and at no great distance from it; the river at last desists from its endeavor, and in about lat. 360 turns towards the south-east, and proceeds in this direction for above 1000 miles to its embouchure in the Persian Gulf (Herod. 1:180; Strabo, 2:521; Ptolem. 5:13; Pliny, Hist. Nat.  5:20; Q. Curt. 1:13; Orbis Terrarum, C.. Kaercher Auct.). In conjunction with the Tigris, it forms the rich alluvial lands of Mesopotamia (q.v.), over which it flows or is carried by canals, and thus diffuses abroad fertility and beauty. At Bagdad and Hillah (Babylon), the Euphrates and Tigris approach comparatively near to each other, but separate again, forming a kind of ample basin, till they finally become one at Koorma. Under the Caesars the Euphrates was the eastern boundary of the Roman empire, as under David it was the natural limit of the Hebrew monarchy. SEE TIGRIS.

The last part of its course, from Hit downwards, is through a low, flat, and alluvial plain, over which it has a tendency to spread and stagnate; above Hit, and from thence to Sumeisat (Samosata), the country along its banks is for the most part open, but hilly; north of Sumeisat the stream runs in a narrow valley among high mountains, and is interrupted by numerous rapids. The entire course is calculated at 1780 miles, nearly 650 more than that of the Tigris, and only 200 short of that of the Indus; and of this distance more than two thirds (1200 miles) is navigable for boats, and even, as the expedition of colonel Chesney proved for small steamers. The width of the river is greatest at the distance of 700 or 800 miles from its mouth — that is to say, from its junction with the Khabour to the village of Werai. It there averages 400 yards, awhile lower down, from Werai to Lamlun, it continually decreases, until at the last-named place its width is not more than 120 yards, its depth having at the same time diminished from an average of 18 to one of 12 feet. The causes of this singular phenomenon are the entire lack of tributaries below the Khabour, and the employment of the water in irrigation. The river has also in this part of its course the tendency already noted, to run off and waste itself in vast marshes, which every year more and more cover the alluvial tract west and south of the stream. From this cause its lower course is continually varying, and it is doubted whether at present, except in the season of the inundation, any portion of the Euphrates water is poured into the Shat-el-Arab.

In point of current it is for the most part a sluggish stream; for, except in the height of the flooded season, when it approaches 5 miles an hour, it varies from 24 to 3½, with a much larger portion of its course ,under 3 than above. Its general description for some distance below Erzingan is that of a river of the first order, struggling through high hills, or rather low mountains, making an exceedingly tortuous course as it forces its way over a pebbly or rocky bed from one natural barrier to another. As it winds  round its numerous barriers, it carries occasionally towards each of the cardinal points a considerable body of water, and is shallow enough in some places for loaded camels to pass in autumn, the water rising to their bellies, or about 4½ feet. The upper portion of the river is enclosed between two parallel ranges of hills, covered for the most part with high brushwood and timber of moderate size, having a succession of long, narrow islands, on several of which are moderate-sized towns; the borders of this ancient stream being still well inhabited, not only by Bedouins, but by permanent residents. The following towns may be named: Sumeisat, Haorum, Romkala, Bir, Giaber, Deir, Rava, Anna, Hadisa, El-Us, Jibba, Hit, Hillah, Lemlun, Korna, and Bussora. The scenery above Hit, in itself very picturesque, is greatly heightened by the frequent re-currence of ancient irrigating aqueducts, beautiful specimens of art, which are attributed by the Arabs to the Persians when fire-worshippers: they literally cover both banks, and prove that the borders of the Euphrates were once thickly inhabited by a highly-civilized people. They are of stone.

Ten miles below Hit is. the last of these. The country now becomes flatter, with few hills; the river winds less; and the banks are covered with Arab villages of mats or tents, with beautiful mares, cattle, and numerous flocks of goats and sheep. From Hit to Babylon the black tent of the Bedouin is almost the only kind of habitation to be seen. This distance is cultivated only in part; the rest is desert, with the date-tree showing in occasional clusters. In descending, the irrigating cuts and canals become more frequent. Babylon is encircled by two streams, one above, the other below the principal ruin, beyond which they unite and produce abundance. For about thirty miles below Hillah both banks, have numerous mud villages, imbedded in date- trees: to these succeed huts formed of bundles of reeds. The country lower down towards Lemlun is level, and little elevated above the river; irrigation is therefore easy: in consequence, both banks are covered with productive cultivation, and fringed with a double and nearly continuous belt of luxuriant date-trees, extending down to the Persian Gulf. At one mile and a half above the town of Dewania is the first considerable deviation from this hitherto majestic river; another takes place 22 miles lower; and nine miles farther — at Lemlun — it again separates into two branches, forming a delta not unlike that of Damietta, and, when the river is swollen, inundating the country for a space of about 60 miles in width with a shallow sheet of water, forming the Lemlun marshes, nearly the whole of which is covered with rice and other grain the moment the river recedes (in June). Here mud villages are swept away by the water every year. Below Lemlun the Tigris  sends a branch to the Euphrates, which is thus increased in its volume, and, turning to the east, receives the chief branch of the Tigris, thence running in one united stream, under the name of the Shat-el-Arab, as far as the sea (the Persian Gulf). In this last reach the river has a depth of from 3 to 5 fathoms, varies in breadth from 500 to 900 yards, and presents banks covered with villages and cultivation, having an appearance at once imposing and majestic. The length of that part of the river, reckoning from Bir to Bussora, navigable for large vessels at all times of the year, is 143 miles. It is very abundant in fish. The water is somewhat turbid, but, -when purified, is pleasant and salubrious. The Arabians set a high value on it, and name it Morad-Su that is, Water of desire, or longing.

The annual inundation of the Euphrates occurs in the month of May. The river begins to rise in March, and continues rising till the latter end of May. The consequent increase of its volume and rapidity is attributable to the early rains, which, falling in the Armenian mountains, swell its mountain tributaries; and also, in the main, to the melting of the winter snows in these lofty regions. About the middle of November the Euphrates has reached its lowest ebb, and, ceasing to decrease, becomes tranquil and sluggish. The greatest rise of the Tigris is earlier, since it drains the southern flank of the great Armenian chain. The Tigris scarcely ever overflows, SEE HIDDEKEL, but the Euphrates inundates large tracts on both sides of its course from Hit downwards. The great hydraulic works ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar (Abyden. Fr. 8) had for their great object to control the inundation by turning the waters through sluices into canals prepared for them, and distributing them in channels over a wide extent of country. "When the Euphrates,” says Rich, "reaches its greatest elevation, it overflows the surrounding country, fills up, without the necessity of any human labor, the canals which are dug for the reception of its waters, and thus amazingly facilitates the operations of husbandry. The ruins of Babylon are then inundated, so as to render many parts inaccessible, the intermediate hollows being converted into marshes" (Babylon and Persepolis, page 54). Rauwolf observes, "The water of the Euphrates, being always troubled, and consequently unfit for drinking, is placed in earthen jars or pitchers for an hour or two, until the sand and other impurities sink to the bottom, where they are soon found lying to the thickness of a man's finger" (comp. Jer 2:18; Jer 13:4-7). Mr. Ainsworth says, "The period at which the waters of the Euphrates are most loaded with mud, are in the first floods of January; the gradual melting of  the snows in early summer, which preserves the high level of the waters, does not at the same time contribute much sedimentary matter. From numerous experiments made at Bir in December and January, 1836, I found the maximum of sediment mechanically suspended in the waters to be equal to one eightieth part of the bulk of fluid, or every cubic inch of water contained one eightieth part of its bulk of suspended matters; and from similar experiments, instituted in the month of October of the same year, at the issue of the waters from the Lemlum marshes, I only obtained a maximum of one two hundredth part of a cubic inch of water (mean temp. 740). The sediments of the river Euphrates, which are not deposited in the upper part of the river's course, are finally deposited in the Lemlum marshes. In navigating the river in May, 1836, the water flowing into the marshes was colored deeply by mud, but left the marshes in a state of comparative purity" (Researches, pages 110, 111).

The Euphrates has at all times been of some importance as furnishing a line of traffic between the East and the West. Herodotus speaks of persons, probably merchants, using it regularly on their passage from the Mediterranean to Babylon (Her. 1:185). He also describes the boats which were in use upon the stream (1:194), and mentions that their principal freight was wine, which he seems to have thought was furnished by Armenia. It was, however, more probably Syrian, as Armenia is too cold for the vine. Boats such as he describes, of wicker-work, and coated with bitumen, or sometimes covered with skins, still abound on the river (Chesney, Euphrates, 2:639-651). Men wishing to swim across or along the stream simply throw themselves upon an inflated skin and thus float, precisely in the manner described by ancient writers, and depicted of the Assyrian sculptures (Botta, Nineveh, page 238 sq.). Alexander appears to have brought to Babylon by the Euphrates route vessels of some considerable size, which he had had made in Cyprus and Phoenicia. They were so constructed that they could be taken to pieces, and were thus carried piecemeal to Thapsacus, where they were put together and launched (Aristobul. ap. Strab. 16:1, 11). The disadvantage of the route was the difficulty of conveying return cargoes against the current. According to Herodotus, the boats which descended the river were broken to pieces and sold at Babylon, and the owners returned on foot to Armenia, taking with them only the skins (1:194). Aristobulus, however, related (ap. Strab. 16:3, 3) that the Gerrhaeans ascended the river in their rafts not only to Babylon, but to Thapsacus, whence they carried their wares on foot in  all directions. The spices and other products of Arabia formed their principal merchandise. On the whole, there are sufficient grounds for believing that throughout the Babylonian and Persian periods this route was made use of by the merchants of various nations, and that by it the east and west continually interchanged their most important products (see Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, pages 456, 457). Caravans were employed above Thapsacus (Haeren, Asiatic Nations, 1:429, 430). The emperor Trajan constructed a fleet in the mountains of Nisibis, and floated it down the Euphrates. The emperor Julian also came down the river from the same mountains with a fleet of not fewer than 1100 vessels. A great deal of navigation is still carried on from Bagdad to Hillah, the ancient Babylon, but the disturbed state of the country prevents any above the latter place. In the time of queen Elizabeth merchants from England went by this river; which was then the high road to India. There were anciently many canals which connected the Tigris with the Euphrates; many of them are still in being. The Euphrates steamer passed from the Euphrates to the Tigris by the Iva canal, which leaves the former a few miles above Felugo, and enters the latter a short way below Bagdad. The steam navigation of the Euphrates must be a question of considerable importance, and colonel Chesney has proved that it may be navigated as high as Bir by steamers drawing four feet of water; yet it can hardly be expected that it can ever be made available as an ordinary channel between Europe and India. Its navigation would undoubtedly confer the greatest advantages on the inhabitants of the vast and fertile countries through which it flows, should they once more be emancipated from the barbarism under which they have so long been oppressed.

3. See, for a general account of the Euphrates, colonel Chesney's Euphrates Expedition, volume 1; and, for the lower course of the stream, compare Loftus's Chaldma and Susiana. See also Rawlinson's Herodofus, volume 1, Essay 9; and Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, chapters 21 and 22; Wahl's Asien, page 700; Ritter's Erdk. 2:120; Traite Element. G ographique (Bruxelles, 1832), volume 2; Mannert's Geogr. 2:142; Reichard's Kl. Geogr. Schrif. page 210; Parliam. Rep. of Steans Navigation to India (1834); M'Culloch's Geograph. Dict. s.v.; Ainsworth's Travels in Asia Minor, etc. (1842); Ker Porter, Travels, 2:403; Forbiger, Alte Geographie, 2:69 sq.; Rosenmuller, Alterth. 1, 1:188 sq. SEE BABYLON.

## Euphrates (2)[[@Headword:Euphrates (2)]]

             a heretic of the 2d century, was the founder of the sect of Ophites or Serpentarians, one of whose dogmas was, that the serpent by which our first parents were deceived was either Christ himself or Sophia (wisdom) concealed under that form, for which reason they paid a kind of divine honor to certain serpents kept for that purpose. In most points he adhered to the Oriental or Gnostic philosophy, of two opposite principles, with the aeons and other dreams of those sects. Origen did not consider the disciples of Euphrates as Christians, but as calumniators of Jesus Christ.

## Euphronius (or Eufronius)[[@Headword:Euphronius (or Eufronius)]]

             (1) Bishop of Antioch, intruded by the Arian party, A.D. 332-334.

(2) Bishop of Colonia, in Armenia; afterwards metropolitan of Nicopolis, A.D. 375.

(3) Ninth bishop of Autun, not long before A.D. 452; commemorated August 3.

(4) The eighteenth bishop of Tours, A.D. 555-572, who resisted the violent encroachments of the civil power, died in his seventieth year, and is commemorated August 4.

## Eupolemus[[@Headword:Eupolemus]]

             (Εὐπόλεμος, good us war, a frequent Greek name), the "son of John, the son of Accos (q.v.), one of the envoys sent to Rome by Judas Maccabaeus, B.C. cir. 161, to negotiate an alliance with then Romans (1Ma 8:17; Josephus, Ant. 12:10, 6). He has been identified (Euseb. Praep. Eu. 9:17 sq.) with the historian of the same name (Josephus, Apion, 1:23), who wrote several works on the affairs of the Jews (Kuhlusey, Eupolemi fragmenta, Berlin, 1840, 8vo); but it is by no means clear that the historian was of Jewish descent (yet comp. Jerome, de Vir. Illustr. 38). His father, John (q.v.), is spoken of as having procured special privileges for the Jews from the Syrian kings (2Ma 4:11).

## Euroclydon[[@Headword:Euroclydon]]

             (Εὐροκλύδων, q.d. south-east billow), the name given (Act 27:14) to the gale of wind in, the Adriatic Gulf, which off the south coast of Crete seized the ship in which Paul was ultimately wrecked on the coast of Malta. SEE SHIPWRECK OF PAUL. The circumstances of this gale are described with much particularity, and they admit abundant illustration from the experience of modern seamen in the Levant. In the first place it came down from the island (κατ᾿ αύτῆς), and therefore must have blown more or less from the northward, since the ship was sailing along the south coast, not far from Mount Ida, and on the wary from Fair-Havens towards Phoenice. So Captain Spratt, after leaving Fair-Havens with a light southerly wind, fell in with "a strong northerly breeze blowing direct from Mount Ida" (Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, 1856, pages 97, 245). Next, the wind is described as being like a typhoon (mod. tuffone, i.e., "striker") or whirlwind (τυφωνικός, A.V. "tempestuous;" comp.  τυφών, Aristot. Meteor. 1; De Mundo, 4:18); and the same authority speaks of such gales in the Levant as being generally "accompanied by terrific gusts and squalls from those high mountains" (Conybeare, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1856, 2:401). It is also observable that the change of wind in the voyage before us (27:13, 14) is exactly what' might have been expected; for Captain J. Stewart observes, in his remarks on the Archipelago, that "it is always safe to anchor under the lee of an island with a northerly wind, as it dies away gradually, but it would be extremely dangerous with southerly winds, as they almost invariably shift to a violent northerly wind" (Purdy's Sailing Directory, part 2, page 61).

The long duratian of the gale ("the fourteenth night," Act 27:27), the overclouded state of the sky ("neither sun nor stars appearing," Act 27:20), and even the heavy rain which concluded the storm (τὸν ὑετόν, 28:2), could easily be matched with parallel instances in modern times (see Smith. Voyage and Shipwreck, page 144; Conybeare, Life and Epp. 2:412). We have seen that the wind has more or less northerly. The context gives us full materials for determining its direction with great exactitude. The vessel was driven from the coast of Crete to Clauda (27:16), and apprehension was felt that she would be driven into the African Syrtis (Act 27:17). Combining these two circumstances with the fact that she was less than half way from Fair- Havens to Phoenice when the storm began (Act 27:14), we come to the conclusion that it came from the N.E. or E.N.E., and hence might fitly be termred a north-easter. This is quite in harmony with the natural sense of Εὐρακύλων (Vulg. Euro-aquilo, i.e. north-east wind, the modern Gregalia of those seas), which is regarded as the true reading by Bentley, and is found in some of the best MSS.; but we are disposed to adhere to the received text, more especially as it is the more difficult reading, and the phrase used by Luke (ὁ καλούμενος Εὐροκλύδων) seems to point to some peculiar word in use among the sailors. Alford thinks that the true name of the wind was εὐρακύλων, but that the Greek sailors, not understanding the Latin termination, corrupted the word into εὐροκλύδων, aid that so Luke wrote it (Comment. in loc.). Such winds are known to modern mariners in the Mediterranean bythe name of Levanters. They are not confined to any single point, but blow in all directions from the northeast round by the north to the south-east. The "great wind" or mighty tempest experienced by the prophet Jonah on his way from Joppa to Tarshish (1, 4; comp. the destructive "east wind" of Psa 48:7) appears to have been one of these gales (comp. Josephus,  War, 3:8, 3, who calls it the "black north wind," μελαμβόρειον). SEE WIND.

## Europa[[@Headword:Europa]]

             in Greek mythology, was the famous beloved of Jupiter, for whose sake he transformed himself into a bull, and took her on his back to Crete, where she gave birth by him to Minos, Rhadamanthus, and Sarpedon. According to Homer, she was a daughter of Phoenix and Perimede; but later writers make her the daughter of the Phoenician king Agenor and Telephassa. Agenor, on learning of her abduction, sent out all his sons in search of her, with the command not to return without her. As they did not discover her, the sons settled in strange countries, and thus the father lost all his children. Europa married Asterion, the king of Crete, who brought up her children as wise, just men, so that they became the judges of the infernal regions. She was worshipped on Crete. The myth doubtless represents the passage of colonists across the Hellespont from Asia to Europe.

## Europe[[@Headword:Europe]]

             the smallest, but also the most highly civilized and most populous of the three great divisions of the old continent.

I. It is separated from America on the west and north-west by the Atlantic; from Africa on the south by the Mediterranean; and from Asia by the Archipelago, Sea of Marmora, Black Sea, Caucasian ridge, Caspian Sea, Ural River and Mountains, and the Kara River. It is in the form of a huge peninsula, projecting from the north-west of Asia. Its extent from Cape St. Vincent on the south-west to the mouth of the Kara River on the north- east is 3400 miles; and from Cape Nordkun, the most northerly point of the Scandinavian main land, to Cape Matapan, the southmost point of Greece, 2400 miles. The continent of Europe, irrespective of islands, lies within lat. 360 1'-71° 6' N., and long. 9° 30' W. — 68° 30' E. Its area is estimated at nearly 3,800,000 square miles; and its coastline, more extensive in proportion to its size than that of any other great natural division of the globe, is estimated at 19,500 miles, giving a proportion of 1 linear mile of coast for every 190 square miles of surface. It had in 1888 a population of 330,000,000, which 'gives an average of about 87 for every square mile.

II. Church History. — Europe early received the seed of Christianity from the apostles themselves. The territory embraced in what is now Turkey, Greece, and Italy was for many years the scene of the apostolic labors of Paul, who founded a number of churches, and wrote epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Thessalonians. Whether he visited Spain, England, and other countries of Europe, as has been asserted by some writers, is doubtful. Peter is claimed by the Roman Catholic Church to have been for twenty-five years bishop of Rome. The fact of his having been in Rome, and having presided for several years over the Church there, is generally recognized by most of the historians. The share of the other apostles in the Christianization of Europe is doubtful, and the accounts of their missionary labors rest more on legends than historic documents (see the articles on each of the apostles, and each of the European countries); but it is a well-established fact that, even before the close of the first century, numerous churches were established in Turkey, Greece, Malta, Italy, France, Spain, and Southern and Western Germany. The growing  authority of the bishops of Rome, SEE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH soon made Europe the center of the Christian world. When Constantine became a Christian, the Christianization of all that portion of Europe which belonged to the Roman empire made rapid progress, and was soon completed. In the fifth and sixth centuries, Spain, France, Scotland, England, and several German tribes became Christian. Christianity steadily advanced in all directions, but it was not until the sixteenth century that every pagan people of Europe had adopted the Christian doctrine. In the mean while, however, part of the Christian territory in Southern Europe had been conquered by the Mohammedans, who at one time even hoped for the conquest of all Europe. They lost, however, in the course of the following centuries, most of their conquests, retaining only the control of one empire in Eastern Europe. Thus Europe has been for many centuries a predominantly Christian division of the world, while of both Asia and Africa only small sections became Christian. The schism between the Greek and the Latin churches became complete in the ninth century, and the ecclesiastical connection between Eastern and Western Europe has been interrupted ever since. Still greater became the alienation between the countries which adhered to the Reformation of the sixteenth century and those over which the Church of Rome retained, control, and more than one destructive war grew out of this division. SEE REFORMATION; SEE PROTESTANTISM.

III. Ecclesiastical Statistics. — The following tabular statement of the statistics of the Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Eastern churches, prepared by Prof. A.J. Schem, is taken from the American Year-book for 1869.

It will be seen from the above table that the Eastern churches (or, more particularly, the Greek Church) prevail in Russia, Turkey, and Greece. In Turkey the government is Mohammedan, but the majority of the population belong to the Greek Church. The Roman Catholic Church prevails in Portugal, Spain, France, the South German States, Austria, Italy (inclusive of the Papal States, San Marino and Monaco), and Belgium, while Protestantism is the prevailing religion in the North German Confederation, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. (A.J.S.)

## European Universities[[@Headword:European Universities]]

             SEE UNIVERSITIES.

## Eurus[[@Headword:Eurus]]

             in Greek mythology, is the east, or, rather, south-east, wind, bringing to the Greeks close, damp weather, and heavy storms. Therefore he is represented on the tower of the winds with flowing hair, tangled beard, and of surly aspect. SEE EAST WIND.

## Eusebia, Saint[[@Headword:Eusebia, Saint]]

             abbess of Hamay or Hamaige, daughter of Adalbrand, a Frankish lord, and of St. Rictrude, was born in 637. She was educated by her grandmother, St. Gertrude, abbess of Hamay (Hamaticum), and was elected to succeed her in 649; but as she was only twelve years old, Rictrude, who at that time was abbess of Marchiennes, let her come into her convent with her whole community, by order of the king, Clovis II. Eusebia, who could not forget her monastery of Hamaige, therefore rose secretly in the 'night with one of her friends, and went there to chant the service, and came back the following morning to Marchiennes. Her mother found this out, however, gave her a severe chastisement, and engaged many bishops and abbots to  remonstrate with her, but they found her inflexible, and advised Rictrude to leave her at liberty. When only thirteen years old, Eusebia returned to Hamaige as abbess, and governed her community with humility, mildness, and prudence. She died in 660, and is commemorated March 16. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Eusebians[[@Headword:Eusebians]]

             a name given to the Arians from Eusebius of Nicomedia. SEE EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA.

## Eusebius[[@Headword:Eusebius]]

             the only pope of this name, and, according to a tradition, the son of a physician, became bishop of Rome in 310, after the death of Marcellus. The time of his pontificate is variously stated at from four months to six years. No events of importance are recorded of his pontificate. According to an epitaph published by Baronius (but which Baronius himself refers, not to the pope, but to some priest of the same name), the lapsi (q.v.) in Rome demanded immediate absolution, which Eusebius refused. Tumult arose, in consequence of which Eusebius was exiled by the usurper Maxentius to Sicily. He is commemorated as a saint on the 26th of September. Several decrees circulating under his name, as well as three letters to the bishops of Gaul, to the Egyptians, and to the bishops of Tuscia and Campania, are spurious. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 4:246; Acta Sanct. ad 26 Septbr.; Pagi, Breviarum pontific. Roman. (1, page 65); Bower, Hist. of the Popes; Ersch u. Gruber, Allgem. Encyklop. (section 1, volume 40, page 445).

## Eusebius (2)[[@Headword:Eusebius (2)]]

             with the surname BRUNO, after 1047 bishop of Angers. Little is known of his early life. Soon after becoming bishop he was suspended with a number of other bishops, being suspected, it is thought, of simony. But he seems to have fully justified himself, for in 1049 he was present at the reformatory council of Rheims, and was chosen a member of the committee to welcome pope Leo IX in the name of the council. In a letter written from Rome (1049), he complained of the measures taken by the pope against Berengar, who, in his opinion, was free from any heresy. Berengar himself counted Eusebius among his patrons, and it was the advice of Eusebius which induced him to take, at the Synod of Tours in 1054, the oath which the synod demanded from him. One of the foremost opponents of Berengar, bishop Theotwin of Liege, calls Eusebius one of the chief renewers of the heresy which finds in the Lord's Supper nothing but a shadow and an image of the body of Christ. But when count Geoffroi of Anjou, the powerful protector of the French heretics, died (1060), the courage of Eusebius was at an end. At the Episcopal Convention of Angers in 1062 he showed an inclination to accept the doctrine of the Church, though he still made a profession of personal friendship for Berengar. The same indecision shows itself in the celebrated letter, written between 1063 and 1066, in which  Eusebius de. chines to act as arbiter at a theological disputation which Berengar desired to told with the priest Gaufrid Martini, and defines his dogmatical position. The letter (which is regarded by Lessing as the ablest theological essay of the 11th century) deprecates new dogmatic explanations concerning the Eucharist, and declares that we ought not to appeal to the fathers, but to adhere to Scripture, and abide by the simple words that the bread and wine are the true body and blood of Christ as a duty of pious faith. The letter may be found in Menardus (Augustini c. Juliani operis imperfecti 1.2 priores), with arbitrary alterations in De Roye (Vita, haeres. et poenit. Berengar.), and Boulay (Hist. Univers. Paris). Two other letters of Eusebius are given by Sudendorf (Bereng. Turon.,185,0). Eusebius died at Angers Aug. 27, 1081. — Herzog, Real- Encykl. 4:228; Lessing, Werke (edit. Lachmann), volume 8; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 16:778; Neander, Church History (Torrey), 3:576; Neander, Hist. of Dogmas (Ryland), 2:462. (A.J.S.)

## Eusebius (3)[[@Headword:Eusebius (3)]]

             bishop of Emesa, fourth century. Socrates (Hist. Ecc 2:9) gives the following account of him: "Who this person was, George, bishop of Laodicea, who was present on this occasion, informs us; for he says, in the book which he has composed on his life, that he was descended from a noble family of Edessa, in Mesopotamia, and that from a child he had studied the Holy Scriptures; that he was afterwards instructed in Greek literature by a master resident at Edessa; and finally, that the sacred books were ex pounded to him by Patrophilus and Eusebius, the latter of whom presided over the church at Caesarea, and the former over that at Scythopolis. Having afterwards gone to Antioch, about the time that Eustathius was deposed on the accusation of Cyrus of Bercea for holding the tenets of Sabellius, he lived on terms of familiar intercourse with  Euphronius, that prelate's successor. When, however, a bishopric was offered him, he retired to Alexandria to avoid the intended honor, and there devoted himself to the study of philosophy. On his return to Antioch he formed an intimate acquaintance with Placitus or Flaccillus, the successor of Euphronius. At length he was ordained bishop of Alexandria by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, but did not go thither in consequence of the attachment of the people of that city to Athanasius. He was therefore sent to Emesa, where the inhabitants excited a sedition on account of his appointment, for they reproached him with the study and practice of judicial astrology; whereupon he fled to Laodicea and abode with George, who has given so many historical details of him. George, having taken him to Antioch, procured his being again brought back to Emesa by Flacciillus and Narcissus; but he was afterwards charged with holding the Sabellian heresy. His ordination is elaborately described by the same writer, who adds at the close that the emperor (Constantius) took him with him in his expedition against the barbarians, and that miracles were wrought by his hand" (see also Sozomen, Hist. Sir 3:6). During the latter years of his life he lived at Antioch, devoted to study. He died at Antioch about A.D. 360. Among the numerous works of Eusebius, Jerome mentions treatises against the Jews, the Pagans, and Novatians; a Commentary, in 10 books, to the Epistle to the Galatians, and Homilies on the Gospels. Theodoret mentions works of Eusebius against the Marcionites and Manichaeans; Ebedjesu. Questions on the Old Testament; and Xenajas (Asseman. Bibl. 2, page 28) a work on faith, and other addresses. Of all these works only fragments are extant. Two homilies (against Marcellus) undoubtedly belonging to him were falsely ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea. Some homilies are of a more recent date. SEE EUSEBIUS OF ALEXANDRIA. A biography of Eusebius, by bishop George, of Laodicea, is lost. A work on Eusebius and his writings has been written by Augusti (Euseb. Emes. opuscula quae supersunt graeca, Elberfeld, 1829); and some of the statements in this work have been refuted by Thilo (Ueber d. Schriften des Euseb. v. Alex. u. des Euseb. von Emisa (Halle, 1832). Some of the homilies ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea are attributed to Eusebius of Emesa.

## Eusebius (4)[[@Headword:Eusebius (4)]]

             a Nitrian monk (beginning of 5th century), one of the "four tall brothers" condemned by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, for defending the opinions of Origen. The three others were Dioscurus, Ammonius, and  Euthymius. They retired first to Jerusalem and Scythopolis, and then to Constantinople, where Chrysostom received them kindly, but did not admit them to communion. They were "pious men, though not wholly exempt from a certain fanatical ascetic tendency." — Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:691; Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 8:12-13; Socrates, Hist. Ecc 6:7.

Eusebius Of Laodicea,

a native of Alexandria, and therefore sometimes called Eusebius of Alexandria. As deacon in Alexandria, he accompanied his bishop, Dionysius, in the Valerian persecution of Christians before the proconsul AEmilianus (257), and by nursing the imprisoned Christians and burying the martyrs gave a shining testimony of his undaunted faith. When (from 260 to 263) a terrible epidemic and civil war devastated Alexandria, Eusebius again distinguished himself by his zeal in nursing the sick, ‘both pagan and Christian, and, in union with his friend Anatolius, procured relief to thousands of inhabitants who were threatened with starvation.' In 264 he attended, as the representative of bishop Dionysius, whom old age and sickness retained in Alexandria, the Synod of Antioch, which was to take action on the heresy of Paul of Samosata. Subsequently he became bishop of Laodicea in Syria, where he died in 270. He was succeeded by his friend Anatolius. Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:240; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 7:32. (A.J.S.)

## Eusebius (5)[[@Headword:Eusebius (5)]]

             bishop of Thessalonica, A.D. 601, wrote against the Aphthartodocetae, especially in reply to a, monk Andreas, "who taught that Christ's body became incorruptible when joined to his divinity; that Adam's body was not created liable to corruption; and that the world, in its original form, was incorruptiblealso." These and other errors Eusebius wished him to retract; but, instead of prevailing, Andreas attempted to fortify his posts by farther defenses, which induced Eusebius to write ten books against the positions he had before attacked, showing that Andreas had misunderstood Scripture and willfully misquoted the fathers. Of these works there are no remains except what are preserved by Photius in his Biblioth Cod. 162. — Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev. 1720), 1:373; Clarke, Succ. Sac. Lit. 2:376.

## Eusebius (6)[[@Headword:Eusebius (6)]]

             the name of a very great number of early Christian ecclesiastics, of whom we mention a few of the most noted.

(1) Fifth bishop of Antibes, cir. A.D. 549-554.

(2) Bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, A.D. 362-370, a friend of Gregory Nazianzen.

(3) The twenty-second bishop of Milan, A.D. 449-465.

(4) Bishop of Pelusium, cir. A.D. 431-457.

(5) Bishop of Tarragona, cir. A.D. 610-632.

(6) Bishop of Valentinianopolis, in proconsular Asia, deposed for scandalous acts, A.D. 400.

(7) Presbyter of Rome, A.D. 538, commemorated as a confessor Aug. 14.

(8) Presbyter of Cremona, a friend of St. Jerome.

## Eusebius Of Alexandria[[@Headword:Eusebius Of Alexandria]]

             I. In the Eastern churches, a number of homilies, ascribed to one Eusebius of Alexandria, enjoyed a great reputation, especially during the 6th and 7th centuries. They are either dramatic representations of the chief events in the life of Christ, or discussions of moral and practical questions. Their author is variously designated as monk, bishop, archbishop, or papa; most frequently bishop or archbishop of Alexandria. An ancient biography, published by cardinal Mai (Spicileg. Romans 9, page 103), represents him as a sainted monk living near Alexandria, and endowed with the faculty of working ciracles, who became successor of Cyril in the see of Alexandria, transferred his episcopal functions, after seven years (another reading says twenty years), to a noble Alexandrine named Alexander, and died in the retirement of a monastery. That this account is false we know from the list of bishops of Alexandria, which nowhere leaves room for a bishop Eusabius. According to Thilo (Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandrien und des Eusebius von Emesa, Halle, 1832), the author was either one of the four monks known in the Origenistic controversies under the name of the four "tall brothers," and distinguished among the monks of the Nitrian desert for piety and theological learning, or a presbyter at the court of Justinian I, who, honored with the title Papa, took an active part in the dogmatic controversies of the 6th century. Semisch (in Herzog's Real-  Encyklop. s.v.) thinks that neither of these two men has all the qualifications which one would expect from the author of the Homilies. The only thing certain, in his opinion, is that the homilies were compiled in the 5th or 6th century. The number of homilies that are at present known is twenty-one. Some of them were published at Paris, 1575, and Antwerp, 1602. Augusti (Euseb. Emes qua supersunt opuscula, Elberfeld, 1829) wrongly attributed three of the homilies (of the dramatic class) to Eusebius of Emesa. Thilo, in the work already mentioned, combated the views of Augusti, and in an appendix published a revised text of four of the homilies, to which, in 1834, he added an edition of a new homily on astrology. His views were confirmed by cardinal Mai (Spicil. Roman. 9), who, from a Vatican manuscript, published a number of homilies for the first time. A homily on alms, which has never been printed is to be found in the Vienna Imperial Library. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:226; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. (ed. Harles), 7:409. (A.J.S.)

II. Eusebius, bishop of Laodicea, being a native of Alexandria, is sometimes called Eusebius of Alexandria.

## Eusebius Of Caesarea[[@Headword:Eusebius Of Caesarea]]

             the "father of Church history," was born about 270. The place of his birth is not certainly known, but it is supposed to have been Caesarea in Palestine. Coming to Antioch towards the end of the 3d century, he there studied the Scriptures under Dorotheus (Eusebius, H.E. 7:32). On his return to Caesarea he was ordained by Agapius then bishop of that place. Here he became intimate with Pamphilus, a learned presbyter, who was head of a divinity school at Caesarea and who had gathered many books illustrative of Scripture and theology, especially the writings of Origen. This friendship was lifelong, and from it Eusebius took the name Εὐσέβιος (ὁίλος) τοῦ Παμφίλου, Eusebius Pamphili. It was probably under Pamphilus that Eusebius imbibed his fondness for the writings of Origen. During the persecution by Dioclesian, Pamphilus was imprisoned, and finally died a martyr (A.D. 309). Eusebius taught in the school of Pamphilus for years, but during the persecution he went to Tyre and to Egypt, where he himself was imprisoned as a confessor, and where he witnessed the sufferings of the faithful described in his Church History (book 8, c. 7, 9). Epiphanius (Her. 58:7) tells. us that Eusebius was charged at the Synod of Tyre (A.D. 335, where he sided against Athanasius), by Potamon, bishop of Heraclea, with having shown cowardice during the persecution in Egypt, and even with having offered incense to idols. But the charge doubtless arose from party feeling, as it is not likely that he could, with such a character, have been made bishop in  that age. In 313 or 315 he was chosen bishop of Caesarea, which see he administered with eminent success for twenty-five years.

The part taken by Eusebius in the Arian controversy has been the subject of much dispute. When Arius was deposed by Alexander, he enlisted numerous bishops in his behalf, especially Eusebius of Nicomedia, namesake and friend of Eusebius of Caesarea; and the latter wrote to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (two letters, of which fragments are extant), aiming, not to settle the doctrinal dispute, but rather to show that the views of Arius were misrepresented. He sought to reconcile the contending parties, and this conciliatory, if not compromising temper, characterized Eusebius through life. SEE ARIUS; SEE ATHANASIUS.

The part taken by Eusebius in the Council of Niceas (Nice, A.D. 325) is described by Valesius (Introd. to his edit. of Eusebius) as follows: "In this greatest and most celebrated council, Eusebius was far from an unimportant person; for he both had the first seat on the right hand, and in the name of the whole synod addressed the emperor Constantine, who sat on a golden chair, between the two rows of the opposite parties. This is affirmed by Eusebius himself (Life of Constantine), and by Sozomen (Ecclesiastes Hist.). Afterwards, when there was a considerable contest amongst the bishops relative to a creed or form of faith, Eusebius proposed a formula at once simple and orthodox, which received the general commendation both of the bishops and of the emperor himself. Something, notwithstanding, seeming to be wanting in the creed, to confute the impiety of the new opinion, the fathers of the Nicene Council determined that these words, 'VERY GOD OF VERY GOD; BEGOTTEN, NOT MADE; 'BEING OF ONE SUBSTANCE WITH THE FATHER,' should be added. They also annexed anathemas against those who should assert that the Son of God was made of things not existing, and that there was a time when he was not. At first, indeed, Eusebius refused to admit the term ὁμοούσιος, but when the import of that word was explained to him by the other bishops he consented, and, as he himself relates in his letter to his diocese at Caesarea, subscribed to the creed (Socrates, H.E. i. 8). Some affirm that it was the necessity of circumstances, or the fear of the emperor, and not the conviction of his own mind, that induced Eusebius to subscribe to the Nicene Council. Of some present at the synod this might be believed, but we cannot think it of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea. After the Nicene Council, too, Eusebius always condemned those who asserted that the Son of God was made of things not existing. Athanasins likewise affirms the  same concerning him, and, though he frequently mentions that Eusebius subscribed to the Nicene Council, nowhere intimates that he did it insincerely. Had Eusebius subscribed to that council, not according to his own mind, but fraudulently and in pretense, why did he afterwards send the letter we have mentioned to his diocese at Caesarea, and therein ingenuously profess that he had embraced the faith which had been published in the Nicene Council?" (For details, see Socrates, Hist. Ecc 1:8-9.)

After the deposition of Eustathius (q.v.), A.D. 351, the see of Antioch was offered to Eusebius, but he declined the honor, probably in fear of tumult, and even bloodshed, from the excited state of the popular mind in Antioch. The conduct of Eusebius in this case greatly gratified the emperor Constantine, who wrote him a letter praising his prudence, and saying that he was worthy of being bishop, "not of the city merely, but of almost the whole world" (Socrates, H.E, 1:24). In the later course of the Arian dispute, Eusebius, though theoretically orthodox, substantially acted with the Arians to a great extent. Even in his Church History he avoids even mentioning the controversy, ending his book with A.D. 324. He presided at the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335 (Epiphanius, Haer. 58:7), summoned for the trial of Athanasius, and joined in the condemnation of that great man (see art. ATHANASIUS, volume 1, page 505). The prelates assembled at Jerusalem, and deputed Eusebius to the emperor Constantine, to obtain his approval of their decision, and he seems to have used his influence with the emperor to secure both the recall of Arius and the exile of Athanasius.

In his last years Eusebius lived in close intimacy with the emperor Constantine, who cherished the warmest esteem and affection for him. In A.D. 336 Eusebius wrote his Panegyric on Constantine. The emperor had assigned him the task of superintending the transcription of fifty copies of the Scriptures on parchment, for the use of the churches of Constantinople. This was the last literary labor in which be was engaged (Vita Constant. 4:35) before his death, which took place A.D. 340.

From the general tenor of his life as sketched above, it is not to be wondered that Eusebius has been charged with a leaning towards Arianism. "So thought, among the ancients, Hilary, Jerome (who otherwise speaks favorably of Eusebius), Theodoret, and the second Council of Nicaea (A.D. 787), which unjustly condemned him, even expressly, as an Arian heretic; and so have thought, among moderns, Baronius, Petavius,  Clericus, Tillemont, Gieseler; while the Church historian Socrates, the Roman bishops Gelasius and Pelagius II, Valesius, G. Bull, Cave (who enters into a full vindication, volume 1, page 111), and Samuel Lee (and most Anglicans), have defended the orthodoxy of Eusebius, or at least mention him with very high respect. The Gallican Church has even placed him in the catalogue of saints. Athanasius never expressly charges him with apostasy from the Nicene faith to Arianism, or to semi-Arianism, but frequently says that before 325 he held with Arius, and changed his opinion at Nicaea. This is the view of Mohler also (Athanasius d. Grosse, page 333 sq.), whom Dorner (Christology, 1:792) inaccurately reckons among the opponents of the orthodoxy of Eusebius. The testimonies of the ancients for and against Eusebius are collected in Migne's edition of his works, tom. 1, pages 68-98. Among recent writers, Dr. Samuel Lee has most fully investigated the orthodoxy of Eusebius in the preliminary dissertation to his translation of the Theophania from the Syriac, pages 24-49. He arrives at the conclusion (page 48) that Eusebius was no Arian, and that the same reasoning must prove that he was no semi-Arian; that he did in no degree partake of the error of Origen, ascribed to him so positively and so groundlessly by Photius. But this is merely a negative result." — Schaff Hist. of the Christian Church, 2:874. Compare also Dupin, Ast. Eccl. (Paris, 1683), 2:1-15.

It is in the field of Church-history that the merits and services of Eusebius stand pre-eminent among early writers. He had large acquaintance with both Christian and pagan learning, and used it, if not with critical or philosophical skill, yet with patient industry and with literary integrity. He was the first to collect the scattered annals of the first three centuries of the Church in his Ecclesiastical History, the most important of all his writings, which traces the history of Christianity from the advent of the Messiah to the defeat of Licinius, A.D. 324. In this work he rejects, with greater care than is usually attributed to him, the doubtful facts and the fabulous narratives. And this is not his only merit. A living sympathy with the fortunes of Christianity, and earnest admiration for the heroism of its martyrs and confessors, inspires him throughout. "Others," he says in the beginning of the fifth book, "that compose historical narratives, would record nothing but victories in battle, the trophies of enemies, the warlike achievements of generals, the bravery of soldiers, sullied with blood and innumerable murders, for the sake of children, and country, and property. But our narrative embraces that conversation and conduct which is  acceptable to God the wars and conflicts of a most pacific character, whose ultimate tendency is to establish the peace of the soul." In Dr. Schaff's opinion (Ch. Hist. 3:877), the Church History of Eusebius "gives a colorless, defective, incoherent, fragmentary, yet interesting picture of the heroic youth of the Church, and ewes its incalculable value not to the historic art of the authors but almost entirely to his copious and mostly literal extracts from foreign, and, in some cases, now extinct sources."

In the 8th book of the Ecclesiastical History (c. 2) Eusebius states that it is no part of his plan to relate all the wickedness and dissensions of the Christians before the persecution, or to name those who were untrue to the faith; adding, "we shall only, upon the whole, introduce those events into our history that may be profitable first to us of the present day, and hereafter to posterity." In the Martyr. Palestin. (chapter 12) he states as a historical principle that the "events most suitable to be recorded in a history of the martyrs are those which redound to their honor." Gibbon (Decline and Fall, chapter 16) remarks that "such an acknowledgment will naturally excite a suspicion that a writer who has so openly violated one of the fundamental laws of history has not paid a very strict regard to the observance of the other." Certainly it was an error of judgment in Eusebius to hold back anything in his accounts. The Scripture might have taught him better; it does not omit the faults of patriarchs or saints. If nothing, moreover, is to be told of martyrs but "what redounds to their honor," one's admiration of these honorable facts must be lessened by the fear that what is kept back might counterbalance what is told. The principle of Eusebius is here historically bad. But Gibbon attacks Eusebius still more strongly in his Vindication of Chapters 15 and 16 of his history. Eusebius gives as the title of chapter 31, book 12, of the Praeparat. Evang., the question "How far it may be lawful to use falsehood as a medicine for the benefit of those who need such a procedure?" He begins the chapter with a citation from Plato (De Legibus, 2), as follows: "A legislator of any value, even if the fact were not such as our discourse has just established it, if in any case he might make bold to deceive young persons for their advantage; could he possibly inculcate any falsehood more profitable than this, or more potent to lead all without force or compulsion to the practice of all justice? 'Truth, my friend, is honorable and permanent; but not, it would seem, very easy of persuasion.'

To this passage of Plato, Eusebius adds: "You may find a thousand such instances in the Scriptures, where God is described as jealous, or sleeping, or angry, or liable to other human  affections, so expressed for the advantage of those who require such a method (ἐπ᾿ ὠφελείᾷ τῶν δεομένων τοῦ τοιούτου τρόπου).'" This is all that is said on the subject, and it may be interpreted to mean nothing more than that one's statements must be adapted to the understanding of his hearers or readers. But the use of the word "falsehood" in the heading of the chapter shows that, in the mind of Eusebius, either there was no just appreciation of the difference between "falsehood" and "accommodation," or else that his moral sense as to veracity had been vitiated by the ecclesiastical casuistry which even in his time had begun to show itself. It is easily to be seen, however, that Gibbon really misleads his readers by his statement of the case: "In this chapter," says he, "Eusebius alleges a passage of Plato which approves the occasional practice of pious and salutary frauds; nor is he ashamed to justify the sentiments of the Athenian philosopher by the example of the sacred writers of the Old Testament." This is not warranted by the passage, which is fully cited above. We adopt, nevertheless, the remark of Waddington (History of the Church, chapter 6, ad fin.): "It was disgraceful to the less enlightened fathers of the second and third centuries that, even in the midst of trial and tribulation, they borrowed a momentary succor from the profession of falsehood; but the same expedient was still more shameful to Eusebius, who flourished during the prosperity of the Church, whose age and more extensive learning left him no excuse in ignorance or inexperience, and whose great name and unquestionable piety gave sanction and authority to all his opinions. There can be no doubt, then, that the publication of that detestable principle in any one of his writings, however modified and limited by his explanation, must to a certain extent disturb our confidence in the rest; the mind which does not profess to be constantly guided by truth possesses no claim to our implicit submission. Nevertheless, the works of Eusebius must at last be judged by the character which severally pervades them, not by any single principle which the author has once only laid down, to which he has not intended (as it would seem) to give general application, and which he has manifestly proposed rather as a philosophical speculation than as a rule for his own composition. At least we feel convinced that whoever shall calmly peruse his Ecclesiastical History will not discover in it, any deliberate intention to deceive; in the relation of miraculous stories he is more sparing than most of the Church historians who succeeded him, and seemingly even than those whom he has copied; and, upon the whole, we shall not do him more than justice if we consider him as an avowed but honest advocate,  many of whose statements must be examined with suspicion, while the greater part bear direct and incontestable marks of truth."

Of his Chronicon it has also been justly asserted, "'that for centuries it was the source of all synchronistical knowledge of history in the Greek, Latin, Oriental, and Christian world, everywhere translated, continued, excerpted, and made the basis of the different works on this subject." His panegyrical writings on Constantine, however, afford, with much that is commendable and historically useful, abundant proofs of the weakness of his moral fibre, and of his sycophancy in dealing with the emperor. But it is to his credit that he never used his influence at court for merely personal ends. When Constantine on one occasion at Caesarea asked Eusebius to demand a favor for his Church, he declared "his Church was not in need of any favors. The only boon he asked was permission to use the public archives to enable him to write a history of the martyrs; which favor was readily granted him" (Jerome, Ep. ad Chromatium et Heliodorum; comp. Hefele in the Freib. Kirchen-Lex. 6:135 et sq.). Less important than the historical works of Eusebius, but nevertheless very meritorious, are his Apologetical writings, the most extensive in ancient apologetics. His notices of the oldest mythologies in the Praeparatio Evangelica are a valuable storehouse for theologians and philologists. In the field of doctrinal theology (contra Marcellum) the writings of Eusebius appear to less advantage than in any other. They touch upon the great question of his time, the Person of Christ. In these writings, as in his practical life, he appears to waver between orthodoxy and subordinationism.

The writings of Eusebius are here classified as A. Historical; B. Apologetic; C. Dogmatic; D. Exegetical.

A. Historical. —

1. The ἱστορία ἐκκλησιαστική, Ecclesiastical History, in ten books, beginning with the incarnation of Christ, relates the history of the Church, including accounts of writers, martyrs, persecutions, etc., up to A.C. 324. It was probably composed before the Nicene Council (325), as, near its close, Crispus, the eldest son of Constantine, is very favorably mentioned, which could hardly have happened after the execution of Crispus (325). The best editions of the History, with the Greek text, are Valesius, with life of Eusebius prefixed (Par. 1659-1673, 3 volumes, fol., often reprinted); Reading's edition of Valesius's Eusebius (Gr. and Lat.), with the fragments of Theodoret, Evagrius, and Philostorgius (Camb. 1720 and 1746, 3  volumes, fol.); Zimmermann, Hist. Ecclesiastes (Francfort, 1822, Gr. and Lat., 2 volumes, 8vo); Heinichen, Hist. Eccles., Reading's edition of Valesius, with Stroth's notes, and additional notes and indices by the editor (Leips. 1827-8, 3 volumes, 8vo; also see below); Burton, Hist. Ecclesiastes (Gr.) (Oxon, 1838, 1845, 1856, 8vo), also Annotationes Variorum, 2 volumes, 8vo (Oxon, 1842, 2 vols& 8vo); cheap edition by Schwegler (Tibing. 1852, 8vo) Laemmer, Hist. Eccles., cum tabulis specimina cod. vii cont. (Schaffhausen, 1862, large 8vo, page 836, with tables in fol.).

English Translations. — Hanmer, Ch. History of Eusebins, Socrates, and Evagrius, with the Life and Panegyric of Constantine (Cambridge, 1577, and often, fol.); the same, with Saltonstall's translation of The Life of Constantine (1650, fol.; 1663, fol.); Wells (based on the preceding, 1709, fol.); Parker's abridred (Lond. 1729, 4to); best translation, Cruse's (with Bovle's Council of Nice, Philadelphia, 1846; 10th ed. N.Y. 1856, 8vo; also in Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library, Lond, 12mo; and in Bagster's Greek Eccl. Historians, Lond. 1843. 8vo).

German Trasnslations. — Hedion (Strasb. 154, fol.); Stroth (Quedlinburg, 1777, 3 volumes, 8vo); Closs (in two editions, one for Romanists, the other for Protestants, Stuttgart, 1839, 8vo). French translation by Cousin (Paris, 1675, and often). On the Moscow MS. of the Eccl. Hist., see Zeits. Hist. Theol. 1861, page 311, and Theolog. Stud. u. Krit. 1858, heft 3.

2. The χρονικῶν κανόνων παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία, generally callel Chronicon, hibb. 2, is an abridgment of the history of the world from its creation up to A.D. 325, with chronological tables, in which the chronography of Julius Africanus is largely made use of. For the arbitrary changes made by Busebius in the text of Africanus, see Brunet de Presle, Dynasties Egyptiennes (Paris, 1850, 8vo). Of this chronicle there remain fragments in Greek and two translations: one in Latin by Jerome, and one in Armenian. The latter was first edited by Zohraab (Milan, 1818), Latin, by A. Mai; better ed. by Aucher (Lat. version from the Arrmenian, with the Greek fragments, Venet. 1818, 4to; reprinted in Migne, Patrol. Graec. tom. 19); new edithon by Schone (the Armenian translated by Peter.mann and Rodiger, Berlin, 1866).

3. The Life of Constantine, εἰς τὸν βίον Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως λόγοι 4; de vita Constantini, lib. 4; generally printed with the Ecclesiastical Hist. (see above); also separately, ed. by Heinichen, with  Reading's and Stroth's notes, etc. (Leipsic, 1829, 8vo); English translation in Bohn's Ecclesiastes Library (London, 12mo).

4. Panegyric on Constantine, εἰς Κωνσταντῖνον τριακόντα ετηρικός, an oration in praise of Constantine on .the thirtieth anniversary of his accession; generally printed with the Church History; also in Heinichen's Life of Constantine (see above, 3).

5. Σύγγραμμα περὶ τῶν κατ᾿ αὐτὸν μαρτυρισάντων, de martyribus Palestinw; really, de martyribus suis tcmparis; containing reports of numerous martyrs of the Diocletian persecution (A.D. 303-310), printed as an appendix to the eighth books of the Ecclesiastes History; specially interesting is Cureton's History of the Martyrs of Palestine, by Eusebius,— discovered in a very ancient Syrian MS., and transl. into English (Lond. 1860, 8vo); given also in Migne, Patrol. Graec. tom. 20.

6. The Acta St. Pamphili et sociorum (on the Martyrdom of his teacher Pamphilus) is only a fragment of a work on the life of Pamphilus, in three books which seems to have been lost.

B. Apologetic. —

1. The Preparation of the Gospel History, προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελική, praparatia evangelica, in fifteen books. In the first six books Eusebius vindicates Christianity by extracts from Grecian and Roman writers, and by criticisms on them and on the Phoenician and Egyptian mythologies and worship. In books 7-15 he treats of Judaism, its religion, history and institutions, showing its superiority to heathenism. The work pictures the condition of the world previous to the advent of Christ. Ed. by Rob. Stephens (Gr. 1544), and with Latin version by Viger (Paris, 1628, Cologne, 1688); ed. by Heinichen (Lips. 1842-3, 2 volumes, 8vo); ad. by Gaisford (Oxf. 1843, 4 volumes, 8vo); also in Migne, Patrol. Graec. t. 21. Cumberland translated Sanchoniathon's Phoenician History from book 1 of the Praep. Evang. (Lond. 1720, 8vo).

2. The Evangelical Demonstration, ἀπόδειξις εὐαγγελική, demonstratio evangelica, in twenty books, of which only ten remain. Eusebius wrote in order to prove that the Christian religion is demonstrably true fronc its internal character, and from the fulfillment of the Jewish prophecies. He points out the true relations between Judaism and Christianity, and the provisional character of the latter; and in books 3-  10 he comments on the Messianic prophecies. This work is intended to be the complement of the Praepar. Evang. (see above). Translated into Latin by Donatus of Verona, and published either at Rome or Venice in 1498; and at Cologne in 1542. The Greek text appeared, with that of the Praeparatio, at Paris in the editions both of Robt. Stephens and Viger (see above, 1); also separately by Stephens (Paris, 1545, fol.), edited by Gaisford (Gr. and Latin, Oxford, 1852, 2 volumes, 8vo); abridged German version in Rdssler, Bibl. der Kirchemviter (1778, 8vo), 5:203 sq.

3. Of a similar character are

(a) the ἐκλογαὶ προφητικαί, Ecloga Propheticae, of which four books only are preserved. They give mostly allegorical interpretations of Old- Test. Messianic passages (edited by Gaisford, Oxon. 1842, 8vo; also in Migne, Patrologisa Grac.).

(b) The five books of The Theophany, θεοφανεία, preserved in a Syriac translation, long lost, but discovered by Tattam. in 1839 in a Nitrian monastery, and published under the title Eusebius on the Theophania. or divine Manifestation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, translated from an ancient Syriac Version of the Greek Original now lost, with Notes, and a Vindication of the Orthodoxy and prophetical Views of the Author, by Prof. S. Lee (Camb. 1843, 8vo). Dr. Lee assigns the MSS. (now in the British Museum) to the year A.D. 411. The Greek fragments, with Lat. version, compared also with Lee's edition, are given in Migne, Patrol. Graec. 24:607 sq. See a full treatment of this subject in Ceillier, Ant. Sacr. (Par. 1865, 8va), page 258 sq.

4. The small work, Against Hierocles, πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Φιλοστράτου εἰς Απολλώνιον τὸν Τυανέα διὰ τὴν ῾Ιεροκλεῖ παραληφθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ το καὶ Χριστοῦ σύγκρισιν, generally cited Adversus Hieroclem, shows very ably that the magician amid philosopher Apollonius of Tyana cannot bear comparison with Christ. It is to be found in Morell's Philostratus; (Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1608); edited, with new transl. and notes, by Olearius (Leips. 1709); eand, with the libri contra Marcellum, ead. by Gaisford (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); also in Migne, Patrol. Graec. 22:795 sq.

C. Dogmatical and Polemical. —

1. Two books, κατὰ Μαρκέλλου, contra Marcellum, written by desire of the Council of Constantinople (held A.D. 336) to vindicate the  condemnation of Marcellus for Sabellianism by that council (see Hefelea Conciliengeschichte, volume 1, § 51). It is given in Viger's ed. of the Praep. Evang. (1628 and 1688); also in Gaisford's edition of the Liber cont. Hieroclem, (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); and in Migne, Patrol. Gicec. 24:707.

2. The three books, Of the Ecclesiastical Theology, περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς θεολογίας, De ecclesiastica theologia, are likewise intended against Marcellus, as θεολογία here means sermo de Filio Dei ejusque natura divina, with a biblico-dogmatical proof of the hypostatical existence of the Son. It is given (Greek and Latin) by Rettberg (Gottingen, 1794); in Covst. Hieroclem, ed. by Gaisford (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); and in Migne, Patrol. Graec. 24, 826 sq.

3. The short treatise, περὶ τῆς τοὺ πάσχα ἑορτῆς, De solemnitate paschali, treats of the typical character of the Jewish Passover, and of its consummation in the new covenant. It is in Migne, Patrologia Graec. 24:694 sq.

4. Fourteen smaller treatises. among which the most important are, Dejide adv. Sabelliums, De resurrectione, De incorporali animna; quod Deus Pater incorporalis sit, which remain only in Latin, and are all contained in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, tom. 24.

D. Exegetical. — These are partly introductory; partly commentaries, written upon the allegorical method of Origen, and without any knowledge of Hebrew.

1 The Onomasticon, or περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν τῇ θείᾷ γραφῇ, De locis Hebraicis, a topographical and alphabetical index of the names of places occurring in the Bible. It was translated into Latin by Jearome, and edited in Greek by Bonfrerius (Paris, 1631, and 1659, fol.); Gr. and Lat. in Hieron. Opera, t. 2 (Paris, 1699); by (Clericus (Amst. 1707, fol.); by Lard sow and Parthey (Berlin, 1862, 8vo).

2. Evangelici canones, a kind of Gospel-harmony, to be found in the editions of the N.T. by Erasmus, Stephens, and Mill; also in Migne, Patrolog. Graec. 22:1273 sq.

3. Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις, Quaestiones evangelicae, in three books, containing solutions of seeming contradictions of the evangelists; edited by Mai in his Coll. Script. Vet. (1825, 4to), 1:101 sq.  4. Commentaries on the Psalms and On Isaiah, which are preserved to a great extent, and given in Migne, Patrol. Graeca, tom. 24 and 25. Of his commentary on Solomon's Song, Proverbs, Daniel, and Luke, only fragments are left us, which are given in Migne, Patrol. Graec. tom. 24, who prints also Mai's newly-discovered fragments from his Nov. Patr. Bibliotheca, volume 4.

There is no absolutely complete edition of the works of Eusebius. The. nearest to such are Eusebii Pamphili Opera Omnia, Lat. (Basil. 1542, 4 volumes, fol.; 1559, 2 volumes, fol.; Paris, 1581, fol.); most complete of all (following Valesius, Montfaucon, Mai, and Gaisford), Migne, Patrol. Grcec. volumes 19-24. A new edition of the Scripta Historica, by Heinichen, was begun in 1867 (volume 1, 8vo, the Hist. Eccles.); and of the Opera Omnia by Dindorf (Leipsic, 1865-67, volumes 1-3, 8vo).

See Cave, Hist. Lit. 1:111; Dupin, Auteurs Ecc 2:1-15; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, ed. Harles, 7:335 sq.; Oudin, Script. Ecclesiastes 1:312 sq.; Lardner, Works, 4:69 sq.; Hoffmann, Bibliog. Lexikon, 1:98 sq.; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacres (Paris, 1865), 3:168 sq.; Neander, Ch. History, Torrey's transl., 2:367, 383; Jortin, Remarks on Ecclesiastes Hist. (London, 1767), 2:252; Waddington, Church History (in 1 volume), chapter 6; Schaff, History of the Christian Church, volume 3, § 161; Alzog, Patrologie, § 44; Lardner, Works, 4:69; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 1:233 et al.; Dowling, On the Study of Ecclesiastes Hist. page 13 sq.; Kestner, De Fide Eusebii (Gottingen, 1817); Baur, Comp. Euseb. cum Herodoto (Tubing. 1834,12mo); Hilnnell, De Eusebio Relig. Christ. Defensore (Getting. 1843); Lamson, Church of the First Three Centuries, 233 sq.; Dorner, Person of Christ (Edinb. transl.), div. 1, volume 2:218 sq.; Waterland, Works, 2:475 sq.

Eusebius Of Dorylaeum,

born at the end of the fifth century, began his public life as a lawyer, and obtained the place of imperial commissioner (agens in rebus). Evagrius (Hist. Ecc 1:9) says of him that, "while still practising as a rhetorician, he was the first to expose the blasphemy of Nestorius." It seems to have been he who interrupted Nestorius in a sermon about A. D. 430 (when he denied to Mary the title θεοτόκος), by crying aloud, "No, the eternal Logos himself subjected himself to a second birth." This, at least, is the conclusion of Neander (Church History, Torrey's transl.,  2:504). He also thinks it probable that Eusebius was the author of the formal complaint publicly posted against Nestorius in the church of Constantinople, comparing him to Paul of Samosata (Neander, 1.c.). It is possible that it was as a reward for this zeal that he was made bishop.

At all events, he entered into orders, and became bishop of Dorylaeum, in Phrygia. In the year 448, at the Home Council (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα), held at Constantinople, he entered complaint against Eutyches (whom he had previously warned privately), as holding false and blasphemous doctrines, contrary to the fathers, as to the person of Christ (Mansi, Concil. 6:495, 650). SEE EUTYCHES. At this synod Eutyches was condemned, but in the next year, at the Robber-Council, SEE EPHESUS, ROBBER-COUNCIL OF, Eutyches was restored, and Eusebius condemned and deprived of his see. When he attempted at this council to explain the doctrine of two natures in Christ, voices exclaimed, "Burn Eusebius! As he has cut Christ asunder, so let him be cut asunder." He fled to Rome. The tide was turned by the death of Theodosius, A.D. 450. Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, prevailed upon Marcian, the successor of Theodosius, to convene another general council, which met at Chalcedon A.D. 451, and Eusebius was restored to his see. A few polemical writings of Eusebius are still extant, as Consertatio adversus Nestorium (in the works of Marius Mercator, 2, page 18): — Libellus adversus Eutycheten (in; Labbe, volume 4, page 151): — Libellus adversus Dioscurum (ib. volume 4, page 380): — Epistola ad Marcianum imperatorem (ib. page 95). — Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:505-513; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 16:777.

## Eusebius Of Nicomedia[[@Headword:Eusebius Of Nicomedia]]

             who may be called the leader, if not the organizer, of the Arian party in the fourth century, was a distant relative of the emperor Julian, and was born about A.D. 324 (Ammianus Marcellinus, Hist. 12:9). He was first bishop of Berytus, in Phoenicia, but got himself translated to Nicomedia — Theodoret says (1:19) in violation of the canones — by the influence of Constantia, sister of the emperor Constantine, whose confidence he had completely won. After the excommunication of Arius by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 321), Eusebius took Arius (who had written him a letter asking his aid) under his protection, offered him an asylum in his own house, and wrote urgently, though at the present time respectfully, in his favor, to Alexander, the patriarch of Alexandria (for details, SEE ARIANISM, volume 1, page 389). As Eusebius had been a disciple of Lucian, he probably held the opinions of Arius at the time. Socrates says that "Eusebius of Nicomedia and his partisans, with such as embraced the  sentiments of Arius, demanded by letter that the sentence of excommunication which had been pronounced against him should be rescinded, and that those who had been excluded should be readmitted into the Church, as they held no unsound doctrine" (Hist. Ecc 1:6; see also Sozoman.

At the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), Eusebius and his friends used all possible efforts first to carry their own opinions through, and then to hinder a definitive sentence. Their opposition was finally concentrated against the application of the term ὁμοούσιος (consubstantial) to the Son. All opposition failed, and the orthodox doctrine was established by the council. SEE ARIANISM, SEE NICAEA, COUNCIL OF. Eusebius, finding himself standing nearly alone, affixed his signature at last Philostorgius (1:9) asserts that instead of the term ὁμοούσιος (of the same essence), Eusebius and his friends secretly introduced the semi-Arian term ὁμοιούσιος (of like essence); but the statements of Philostorgius are not to be implicitly believed. The decree of the council contained not only time Nicene Creed, but also an anathema of certain propositions of Arius. This last Eusebius refused to sign, declaring to the council that he "submitted to their determinations concerning the faith, and consented to subscribe to it, even admitting the word consubstantial, according to the genuine signification of it, and consequently that he held no erroneous opinion; but that as for the condemnation of Arius, he could not subscribe to it; not that he had a mind to reject the points of faith which they had decided, but because he did not think that he, whom they accused, was in the error that they laid to his charge: that, on the contrary, he was entirely persuaded, by the letters which he received from him, and by the conferences which he had had with him, that he was a man whose sentiments were entirely different from those for which he was condemned." Theognis of Nice, Theonas of Marmorica, and Secundus of Ptolemais, agreed with him in this. The council condemned them as heretics, and Constantine condemned them to banishment. But Arius, Theonas, and Secundus having submitted, Eusebius and Theognis finally signed, and were forgiven by the emperor.

Soon after the close of the council "Eusebius showed a desire to revive the controversy, for which he was deprived of his see and banished into Gaul. On this occasion Constantine addressed a letter to the people of Nicomedia, censuring their exiled bishop in the strongest manner as disaffected to his government, as the principal supporter of heresy, and a man wholly regardless of truth (Theodoret, Bed. Hist. 1:20). But he did  not long remain under the imperial displeasure; indeed, he subsequently so completely regained Constantine's favor as to be selected to baptize him, not long before his death (A.D. 337). His Arian feelings, however, broke out again. He procured the deprivation of Eustathius (q.v.), bishop of Antioch, and, if we may believe Theodoret (1:21), by suborning a woman to bring against him a false accusation of the most infamous kind. He was, perhaps, the most bitter opponent of Athanasius SEE ATHANASIUS, and exerted himself to procure the restoration of Arius to the full privileges of churchmanship, menacing Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, with deposition unless he at once admitted him to the holy communion, in which he would have succeeded but for the sudden death of Arius. In 339 Eusebius managed to procure his election. to the see of Constantinople, in defiance of a canon against translations agreed to at Nicae. He died about A.D. 342. Though Eusebius lies under the disadvantage of having his character handed down to posterity almost entirely by the description of theological enemies, yet it is difficult to imagine that he was in any way deserving of esteem. His signature to the Nicene Creed was a gross evasion; nor can he be considered to have signed it merely as an article of peace, since he was ever afterwards a zealous opponent of its principles. It can scarcely be doubted that he was worldly and ambitious. Athanasius considers him as the teacher rather than the disciple of Arius; and afterwards, when the Arians were divided among themselves into parties, those who maintained the perfect likeness which the substance of the Son bore to that of the father (Homoiousians) against the Consubstantialists on the one hand, and the pure Arians or Anomoians on the other, pleaded the authority of this Eusebius. The tenets of this party were sanctioned by the Council of Seleucia, A.D. 359" (Smith, Dict. of Biography, s.v.). See, besides the works already cited, Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev.) 1, 118; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:367 sq.; Newman, History of the Arians; Lardner, Works, 3:594; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:242; Waterland, Works (Oxf. 1843), 2:369 sq.

## Eusebius Of Vercelli[[@Headword:Eusebius Of Vercelli]]

             was born in Sardinia;, was baptized in Rome by pope Eusebius; and became lector, or ecclesiastical reader at Rome. He was ordained bishop of Vercelli, in Piedmont, A.D. 340, with the unanimous consent of clergy and people. He was the first in the West who united the monastic life with the clerical (Ambrose, cited by Ceillier, 5:500). Pope Liberius requested him to go with Lucifer of Cagliari, and other legate's,: on an embassy to  Constantius, by whom the persecution of Athanasius had been sanctioned. They visited the emperor (at Arles or Valende), and prevailed on him to summon the Council De Milan, which met A.D. 355. The Eusebians (Arians) at this council urged the condemnation of Athanasius, and the emperor sided with them. Eusebius of Vercelli having received the emperor's order to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, refused, but expressed his willingness to subscribe the Nicene Creed. Lucifer of Cagliari and Dionysius of Milan refused also. The third session was held in the palace, the Arian party fearing the violence of the people. The emperor himself then sent for the three above-mentioned bishops, and commanded them either to sign the document or to prepare for banishment; they, on their part, earnestly entreated him to remember the account he would be called upon to give in the day of judgment, and besought him not to introduce the heresy of Arius into the Church; but all was of no avail, and Eusebius, Dionysius, and Lucifer were sentenced to banishment. At Scythopolis, in Palestine, his place of exile, he was warmly welcomed, and also encouraged by an embassy from his people at Vercelli. But at last he was brutally outraged, dragged naked through the streets, and imprisoned in a dungeon. He was then transferred to Cappadocia, and thence to the Thebald (Theodoret, Hist. Ecc 3:4; Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 5:12). After the death of Constantius, his successor, Julian, issued an edict recalling the exiled bishops. Eusebius went first to Alexandria, where he stood by Athanasius in the council of A.D. 362 in taking measures to heal the Antiochian schism. SEE EUSTATHIANS. The council sent him to Antioch to end the strife there, but the ordination of Paulinus (q.v.) by Lucifer of Cagliari had made matters worse than ever. After travelling through the East he returned to Italy, where he was welcomed with enthusiasm, particularly in his own diocese. He showed himself, in the latter years of his life, a great admirer of monasticism, and introduced among the clergy of his diocese the common life. Having learned that the bishop Auxentius, of Milan, with the support of the emperor Valentinian, was very actively laboring for the triumph of Arianism, Eusebius, in 364, suddenly appeared in Milan to attack Arianism in its stronghold, but the emperor soon ordered him back to his diocese. He died in 371. An inscription on his tomb calls him a martyr, and, according to a later legend, he was killed by the Arians; but the writers that are best informed about him (Ambrose, Gregory of Tours, etc.) know nothing of his martyrdom. The Church of Rome formerly commemorated him as a martyr on the 1st of August, and now on the 16th of December. We possess three Epistolae of Eusebius:  1. Ad Constantium Augustum: —

2. Ad presbyteros et plebes Italiae, written on the occasion of his banishment, to which is attached Libellus facti, a sort of protest against the violent conduct of the Arian bishop Patrophilus, who was in some sort his jailor during his residence at Scythopolis: —

3. Ad Gregorium Episc. Hisp., found among the fragments of Hilary (11, § 5). He executed, also, a translation of the Commentary of his namesake, Eusebius of Caesarea, on the Psalms; and an edition of the Evangelists, from a copy said to be transcribed by his own hand, preserved at Vercelli, was published at Milan (1748, 4to) by J.A. Irico; and again by Blanchini, at Rome, 1748. This edition is given also in Migne, Patrol. Lat. volume 12. The Epistole will be found in Bibl. Patr. Galland. volume 5; part of them in Bib. Max. Pair. volume 5; and all in Migne, Patrol. Lat. volume 12. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 4:245 Mohler, Athanasius der Grosse; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacres (Paris, 1865), 4:271 sq.

## Eusebius St., Of Samosata[[@Headword:Eusebius St., Of Samosata]]

             one of the pillars of the orthodox Church of the fourth century in its conflicts with Arianism. Nothing is known of his early life. He was appointed bishop of Samosata in 361, and in the same year was present at the Synod of Antioch, at which both Arians and Catholics elected Meletius patriarch of Antioch. The document of election, signed by both parties, was deposited with Eusebius. When Meletius, in his very first sermon, declared himself strongly in favor of the doctrine of theCouncil of Nice, the Arians induced the emperor to demand from Eusebius the surrender of the certificate of election. On his refusal he was threatened with, having his right hand cut off; but he resolutely held out both hands, declaring his readiness to lose both his hands rather than "resign a document containing so manifest a demonstration of the impiety of the Arians" (Theodoret, Hist. Ecclesiastes 2:32). During: the persecution of the orthodox by Valens, he traveled, disguised as a soldier, through Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, everywhere consecrating orthodox. priests, and confirming the people in the Nicene faith. At the disputed election of a bishop for Caesarea, in Cappadocia (370), he aided in securing the success of the orthodox Basil (q.v.). He ever after remained an intimate friend of Basil, and with him, in 372 and 373, took a leading part in the effort to secure, with, the support of the Western churches, the success of the Nicene party also in the East.  He was, therefore, a special object of hatred to the Arians, whom 373 prevailed upon the emperor to exile him to Thracia. After the death of Valens (378) Eusebius was allowed to return to his diocese. He at once began to display an extraordinary activity in appointing Nicene in the place of Arian bishops. While entering the town of Dolica for this purpose in 379 (or 380), he was killed by a stone thrown by the hand of some Arian woman (Theodoret, Hist. Ecc 5:4). The Church of Rome venerates him as a saint on July 21, and the Greek Church on July 22.-Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 4:499; Ceiliier, Auteurs Sacres (Paris, 1865), 5:1 sq. (A.J.S.)

## Eustachius[[@Headword:Eustachius]]

             (or Eustathius, said to have been named Placidius before his conversion), a noted saint, is commemorated by the Latins November 2, and by the Greeks September 20, as a military. martyr, along with his wife Theopista, and his two sons, Agapius and Theopistus, at Rome, under Hadrian, A.D. 118. His Acts are evidently spurious, but his martyrdom is undoubted. Many churches are dedicated to him, especially one in Rome, and one in Paris. Baronius thinks he may have been the Placidus who was a general under Titus (Josephus, War, 3:4; 4:187), but that would make him very aged. See Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art, page 792.

## Eustachius, Giov. Paul[[@Headword:Eustachius, Giov. Paul]]

             SEE NOLA PAUL.

## Eustathians[[@Headword:Eustathians]]

             1. Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, was deposed at the Arian Council of A.D. 331. SEE EUSTATHIUS. The orthodox people of Antioch refused to receive an Arian bishop as his successor, and. kept aloof, thereby gaining the name "Eustathians.” In A.D. 360, Meletius (q.v.) was transferred by the Arians from the see of Sebaste to Antioch; but, though he adhered to the Nicene Creed, the "Eustathians" would not recognize him, as they refused to regard an Arian ordination. A moderate party, however, of the orthodox in Antioch did recognize him, and so arose. the opposition of the "Meletians" to the "Eustathians." The schism was made worse by the appointment of Paulinus (A.D. 362) as bishop of the Eustathians. The Western churches, with the Egyptian, recognized Paulinus, while the Orientals recognised Meletius. — Neander, Ch. Hist. Torrey's transl. 2:411; Guericke. Ch. Hist. Shedd's transl. § 85. SEE MELETIUS.

2. A sect in the fourth century, which taught that married people were excluded from salvation, prohibited their followers from praying in their houses, and' obliged them to quit all their possessions as incompatible with the hope of salvation. They wore a particular habit; appointed Sunday as a fast, and taught that the ordinary fasts of the Church are needless after people have attained to a certain degree of purity. The sect probably derived its name from Eustathius semi-Arian bishop of Sebaste (t 380), who was condemned in the Council of Gangra, in Paphlagonia, held between the years 326 and 341. But it has been strongly argued on the other hand that the Eustathius who founded the sect was a different person, an Armenian monk. Walch ([Hist. d. Ketzereien, in, 536) has treated the subject at large. — Murd. Mosheim, Ch. Hist. book 2, c. 4, part 2, chapter 3, § 19, n. 39; Socrates, H.E. 2:43; Sozomen, H.E. 3:14; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:419; Dupin, Hist. Eccl. cent. 4; Bingham, Orig. Eccl. book 22, Ch. 1, § 8. SEE EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE.

## Eustathius[[@Headword:Eustathius]]

             semi-Arian bishop of Sebaste, in Armenia, in the fourth century, was a great advocate of monasticism, which he introduced into Armenia. The ascetic fanatics called Eustathians are supposed to have taken their name and their practices from him (but SEE EUSTATHIANS, 2). He also founded in Sebaste a hospital for the poor, over which he placed Aarius, then his devoted friend. But later Aarius charged him with avarice, and they quarreled. SEE LERIANS. Eustathius died about A.D. 380. — Socrates Hist. Eccl. 2:43; Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 3:14; Neander, Church Hist. Torrey's transl. 2:342; Hefele, Concliengaeschichtea 1:652 sq.

## Eustathius (2)[[@Headword:Eustathius (2)]]

             (1) Abbot of Luxeuil (Franche Comte), born in Burgundy about 560, succeeded St. Columbanus in 610, labored as a missionary among the Varasci in 616, and died in 625; commemorated March 29 (by others October 11).

(2) Bishop of Attalia, resigned in 431.

(3) Bishop of Berytus, in Syria, ejected for time-serving heresy, in 457.

(4) Patriarch of Alexandria, 801-805.

## Eustathius Of Antioch[[@Headword:Eustathius Of Antioch]]

             was born at Sida, in Pamphylia (Hieron. Catal. 85). He was for some time bishop of Berea, from whence he was translated to the see of Antioch in 325 by the unanimous suffrage of clergy and people (Theodoret, H.E. 1:7). At the Council of Nice, in 325, he earnestly opposed the Arians, who, at the (Arian) Synod of Antioch, A.D. 331, took their revenge upon him. Eusebius of Nicomedia (or Cyrus of Berea) charged him with Sabellianism (Socrates, H.E. 1:24); but, according to Sozomen (H.E. 2:19), the pretext resorted to for his deposition was that he "had defiled the priesthood byunholydeeds." The synod deposed him, and the people of Antioch was stirred by the act almost to the point of sedition. This angered Constantine, who, moreover, was now, under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, favorable to the Arians. Eustathius had also incurred the ill will of Eusebius of Caesarea, whom he charged with unfaithfulness to the Nicene Cread. He was banished to Thrace, where he died before A.D. 337 (Socrates, 1:24, 25; Sozomen, 1. c.). His innocence as to the charge of immorality was fully shown by the confession of the woman who had sworn against him. The orthodox people of Antioch refused to acknowledge any other bishop, and, so long as they remained in this separate condition (until the fifth century), they were called Eustathians (Neander, Ch. Hist. Torrey's, 2:411).

Eustathius was a thorough opponent of the school of Origen, and this constituted one of the points of antagonism between him and Eusebius of Caesarea. He was a copious writer, but only one work of his known to be  genuine is now extant, viz. ᾿Κατὰ ᾿Ωριγένους διαγνωστικὸς εἰς τὸ τῆς ἐγγαστρομύθου θεώρημα, against Origen, on the subject of the Pythoness consulted by Saul. Origen had asserted that the witch of Endor had really brought up the spirit of Samuel; Eustathius refutes him with great acuteness, but also not without an unworthy disdain in replying to so great a man. This treatise is to be found at the end of Leo Allatius's edition of the Heptcemeron (1629, 4to, improperly ascribed to Eustathius). It is also given in the Critica Sacra, 8:331 sq., and in Bibl. Max. Patr., 17. There are fragments of a treatise of his on The Soul, and of his Homilies; all of which, withethe treatise against Origeme above named, are given in Migne, Patrol. Grac. 18:614 sq. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. aed. Harles, 9:131 sq.; Oudin, Script. Eccl.1:317 sq.; Ceillier, Auteurs Sacre's, Paris, 1865, 3:168 sq.; Cave, Hist. Lit. Genev. 1720, 1:119; Lardner, Works, 4:149; Dorner, Person of Christ, Edinburgh transl., div. 1, volume 2, page 518 sq.

## Eustathius Of Thessalonica[[@Headword:Eustathius Of Thessalonica]]

             one of the most learned bishops of the Greek Church in the Middle Ages, was a native of Constantinople. He was at first a monk, subsequently a deacon of the church of St. Sophia, and a teacher of eloquence. He also held a position at the court, having charge of all petitions, and in this capacity presented to the emperor a petition of the city of Constantinople on the occasion of a great scarcity of water. In this period of his life Eustathius compiled his celebrated commentaries on Greek classics, which give proof of an immense amount of reading, and are the more valuable as they contain many extracts from works which are now lost. It is especially the commentary on Homer (Rome, 1542-50, 4 volumes; Basel, 1559-60, 3 volumes; with register by Devarius, edited by Stallbaum, Leips. 1825-30, 6 volumes), which is a storehouse of learning. Of his commentary an Pindar, only the proaemium is now extant (published by Schneidewin, Gotting. 1837). In 1174 (or 1175) he was elected bishop of Myra, in Lycia, but before he had assumed the administration of this diocese the emperor appointed him metropolitan of Thessalonica. In 1180 when the emperor Manuel desired a mitigation of the formula of abjuration which the converts from Mohammedanism had to pronounce, Eustathius, at the synod, firmly opposed the emperor, who was greatly displeased with this opposition, but nevertheless remained a patron of Eustathius. When, in 1185, Thessalonica was conquered and plundered by the Normans under William II of Sicily, Eustathius was indefatigable in his efforts in behalf of  the city. His theological writings were for the first time published by Dr. Tafel (Opusculae codd. Basil. Paris. Veneto, nune primum edidit Th. L.F. Tafel, Francof. 1832; and with an Appendix, in Tafel De Thessalonica, Berlin, 1839). They are noted for outspoken evangelical sentiments. Of special importance in this respect is the work Meditations on the Monastic State (ἐπίσκεψις βίου μοναχικοῦ; transl. into German Betrachtungen uber d. Monchsstand] by G.L.F. Tafel, Berlin, 1847). Saune of his works, e.g. a commentary on John of Damascus, are still extant in MS. Eustathius died in Tlcessalonica about 1194. — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 4:247; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirch.-Lex. 3:771; Neander, Karakteristik des Bustathius in seiner reformator. Richtung, in Neander, Tissenschaftliche Abhandl. (Berlin, 1851). (A.J.S.)

## Eustochium Julia[[@Headword:Eustochium Julia]]

             was born at Rome about A.D. 365. A daughter of Paula (q.v.), she imitated the ascetic piety of her mother. In 382 she took the vow of virginity, and put herself under the direction of Jerome, who gave her instructions relative to the life she had chosen. It was for her that he wrote (383) his treatise on Virginity. On his departure from Rome, Paula and Eustochium accompanied him, and settled near him in a monastery, near Bethlehem. After the death of Paula (404), Eustochium succeeded her as superior of the monastery. So greatly was she profited by Jerome's instructions that she gained a knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages. To her Jerome dedicated his Commentaries on Ezekiel and Isaiah. He translated also the rules of Pachomius into Latin for the use of the members of the monastery at Bethlehem. In 416 the Pelagians burned this monastery and outraged the inmates. She is celebrated as a saint in the Roman Church on  the 28th of September. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genirale, 16:792; Butler, Lives of the Saints, 9:775; Milman, Hist. of Christianity (N.Y. 1866), 3:234.

## Eustochius[[@Headword:Eustochius]]

             (1) Fifth archbishop of Tours, 443460, is commemorated as a saint, September 19.

(2) Patriarch of Jerusalem, 544-556.

## Eustorgius[[@Headword:Eustorgius]]

             bishop of Milan, 512-518.

## Eustrates[[@Headword:Eustrates]]

             one of a class of martyrs to whom a festival is dedicated in the Greek Church on December 13.

## Eustratius[[@Headword:Eustratius]]

             a Greek theologian, who lived in the 6th century, wrote a treatise on The Condition of the Soul of Man after Death, printed for the first time by Leo Allatius, in the De Occidentalium atque Orientalium. The author has been identified with Eustathius; the biographer of Eutychius, of the 6th century.

## Eustratius (2)[[@Headword:Eustratius (2)]]

             bishop of Nice, flourished in the beginning of the 12th century, and was noted for his polemic writings in divinity, and his philosophical works. His Greek commentaries on Aristotle's Analytica and on his Ethica, are still  extant; the former published at Venice in 1534, the latter at the same place in 1536, and at Paris in 1543.

## Euterpe[[@Headword:Euterpe]]

             in Greek mythology, one of the muses, who presided over lyric poetry. See cut below. Eutherius, bishop of Tyana, an earnest Nestorian, was an acknowledged leader of that party in the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), and for some time afterwards. He was ultimately banished to Scythopolis, and thence to Tyre, where he died. He wrote a treatise, usually published with the works of Athanasius.

## Euthalius[[@Headword:Euthalius]]

             bishop of Sulce, 5th century, is supposed to have been the first to divide the N.T. into verses. Some of the poetical parts of the O.T. had been arranged. in lines (στίχοι), and Euthalius (A.D. 438) divided Paul's epistles into verses. Afterwards he so arranged Acts and the Catholic Epistles. The division into chapters had been made by a previous writer (A.D. 396), and Euthalius adopted it. Erasmus, In his N.T., inserts the Arguments of Euthalius to the Acts and to Paul's epistles. His Prologue to St. Paul's Epistles, including a sketch of Paul's life, was published by J.H. Bocclerus at the end of his N.T. (Argentor. 1645, 1660). All the remains of Euthalius are given by Zaccagni, Call. Mton. Vat. Ecclesiastes Grac. (Rome, 1698, 4to). — Horne, Introduction, part 1, chapter 2, § 3; Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev. 1720), 1.

## Euthymius[[@Headword:Euthymius]]

             abbot of Pharan, in Judea, was born in Melitene (Armenia) in 377. He was. educated under bishop Otreius, who ordained him priest, and intrusted him with the direction of the monasteries of Melitene. In 406 he went to Palestine, and retired into a cell near Jerusalem. Soon after he was joined by a great number of recluses, who chose him as their superior. His authority extended over several monasteries. Euthymius converted to Christianity a large number of Arabians, and brought back to the orthodox Church several Nestorians and ManichMeans, Through his entreaty also the empress Eudoxia, the wife of Theodosius the younger, entered into the bosom of the Catholic Church. There was also attributed to Euthymius the power of performing miracles. He died in 473. After his death he was revered as a saint, first in the East, and then in the West. See Hoefer. Nouvelle Biographie Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dictionary of Christian Biography, s.v.

## Euthymius Zigabeinus[[@Headword:Euthymius Zigabeinus]]

             (or ZIGADENUS), a Greek monk and theologian of the 12th century. He lived in the time of the emperor Alexius Comnenus (about A.D. 1120), and was his intimate friend. Of his life little is known, except from the Alexias of Anna Comnena (lib. 15), who praises his talent and scholarship. The following writings of his have been pubished:,

1. Πανοπλία δογματική, Panoplia Dossatica, against all heresies, written by the order of Alexius Camnenus, and divided into two parts and 24 sections each treating of a heresy. It consists chiefly of digested extracts from preceding writers. A Latin translation of it was published by Zinus (Venice, 1555, fol.; reprinted at Lyons, 1556 and 1580, 8vo); also in Bibl. Patrum (Lyons), 19:This translation omits the 12th and 13th titles "against the Pope and the Italians." The Greek original was published at Tergovist, in Wallachia (1710, fol.), and is very rare. It omits the last title, which is contained in Sylburg's Saracenica, pages 1-54.

2. Victoria et triumphus de sepia Massalianorum secta, etc. (Victory and Triumph over the impious, manifold, and execrable sect of the Messalians, etc.), together with fourteen anathemas against them; edited, Gr., with  Latin version and notes, by Tollius, in his Insignia Itineris Italici (Traject. ad Rhen. 1696, 4to); also in Gahlandii Bibl. Patr. 14:293.

3. Commentarius in Psalmos (Commentary on all the Psalms of David); Latin version by Saulus (Verona, 1530, fol.; often reprinted); also (Gr. and Lat.) in Theophylacti Opera Omnia, volume 4 (Venet. 1763, fol.).

4. A Commentary on the four Gospels, his most important work compiled from St. Chrysostom and other fathers; Latin version by J. Hentenius (Louvain, 1544, fol.; Paris, 1547, 1560, and 1602, 8vo); best edit. by C.F. Mattheei, Gr. and Lat. (Lips. 1792, 4 volumes). The work is still considered one of great value. See Matthasei's preface for full notices of Euthymius, and for the judgments of the learned concerning his writings. Many of his writings yet remain in MS. All his published works are given in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, volumes 128-131, Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, ed. Harles, 8:328 sq.; Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev. 1720), 1:567; Oudin, Script. Eccl. 2:979; Lardner, Works, v. 164; Ullmann, in Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1833, page 647 sq.

## Eutropius[[@Headword:Eutropius]]

             bishop of Valencia, in Spain, towards the end of the 6th century, originally abbot of the monastery of Servitanum, was associated with the most influential Spanish ecclesiastics of his time.

## Eutuchites[[@Headword:Eutuchites]]

             (from εὐ, good, and τίχη, fortune), a heretical sect mentioned by Theodoret as belonging to the 3d century. They held that our souls were placed in our bodies only to honor the angels who created them, that we  ought to be afflicted at nothing, and to be equally pleased with vice and virtue. They also taught that Christ was the son of an unknown god.

## Eutyches[[@Headword:Eutyches]]

             the so-called founder of Eutychianism, though the opinions advocated by him existed before (see Selig, De Eutychianismo ante Eutychen). His name Eutychas means "the Fortunate, but his opponents said he should rather have been named Atyches, the Unfortunate. He must not be confounded with the deacon Eutyches, who attended Cyril to the Council of Ephesus. Leo the Great, in his renowned letter to Flavian, calls him very ignorant and unskilled, Multum imprudens et nimis imperitus, and justly attributes his error rather to imperitia than to versutia. So also Petavius and Hefele (2:300). His relation to the Alexandrian Christology is like that of Nestorius to the Ametiochian; that is, he drew it to a head, brought it to popular expression, and adhered obstinately to it; but he is considerably inferior to Nestorius in talent and learning. His connection with this controversy is in a great measure accidental" (Schaff, Hist. of Christ. Church, 3:736). He led, from his early age, an ascetic life; was for thirty years archimacandrite of a monastery near Constantinople, and had reached his 70th year without being known for anything except his illiterate fanaticism his intimate relations with the all powerful Chrysaphius, minister of Theodosius, and his influence with the monastic party which blindly followed the lead of Cyril of Alexandria. He used his influence in favor of  Cyril at the OEcumenical Council of Ephesus, a copy of the minutes of which was sent to him by Cyril. After the death of Cyril he was on intimate terms with Cyril's successor, Dioscurus (q.v.). In 448 Eutyches wrote a letter to the Roman bishop Leo to prejudice him against the school of Antioch (q.v.), which, he insinuated, was bent on reviving Nestorianism. To counteract his operations, patriarch Domnus, of Antioch, in 448 charged Eutkyches with renewing the heresy of Apollinaris. No notice seems to have been taken at the imperial court of this charge; but the charges brought against him before the Synod of Constantinople (448) by his former friend Eusebius, bishop of Dorylasum (q.v.), had more effect. Patriarch Flavian, of Constantinople (q.v.) wished to avoid taking any decisive action, but Eusebius prevailed upon the synod to summon Eutyches. The latter, after making several excuses, obeyed the third summons, and presented himself before the synod, attended by a large number of monks and imperial officers. He defended his views in a long speech, but the synod, largely consisting of adherents of the Antioch school, found him guilty of heresy, and, in spite of all the secular pressure brought to bear upon them in favor of Eutyches, deprived him of his position of archimandrite, and excommunicated him. Eutyches, with the aid of his friend Chrysaphius, obtained from the emperor a revision of the trial by a new general council to be convoked at Ephesus. Flavian and Leo of Rome strenuously opposed the holding of the council. Leo, who had been written to by both parties, was encouraged by this circumstance to claim a right to decide the controversy, and for this purpose wrote the celebrated epistle to Flavian (Mansi, 5:1366 sq.) See the article SEE CHALCEDON; and SEE LEO.

But, owing to the influence of Eutyches and Dioscurus of Alexandria, the council was held, under the presidency of Dioscurus, and, amidst scenes of unheard of violence, which have given to the council the name of the Robber Council, the bishops were compelled to restore Eutyches to the Church and his former position, and to condemn the prominent men of the Antioch school. SEE EPHESUS, ROBBER- COUNCIL OF. The emperor promptly sanctioned this decision, and thus Eutychianism was on the point of becoming the predominant doctrine of the Eastern Church, when the death of Theodosius (450) gave a new turn to the controversy. The empress Puleheria and her husband Marcian sympathized with the opponents of Eutyches, recalled the exiled bishops. and convened the OEcumenical Council of Chaleed (which condemned the views held by Eutyches, and declared that "in Christ two distinct natures are united in one person, and that without any change, mixture, or  confusion." SEE CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF. Even before the meeting of the council Eutyches had again been excommunicated by patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, and expelled from his monastery by Marcian. The council did not again condemn him by, name. Of the last years of Eutyches we only know that he died in exile. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:251; Baur, Lehre voss d. Dreieinagkeit, 1:800; Neander, Church History (Torrey's), 3:501-505; Dorner, Person of Christ, div. 2, volume 1 and 2; Waterland, Works (Oxford), 3:411, 481, (A.J.S.)

## Eutychianism[[@Headword:Eutychianism]]

             the name of a doctrinal system called after Eutyches, according to which there was in Christ only one nature, that of the incarnate Word, his human nature having been absorbed in a manner by his divine nature. Eutyches, like Cyril, laid chief stress on the divine in Christ, and denied that two natures could be spoken of after the incarnation. In our Lord, after his birth, he worshipped only one nature, the nature of God become flesh and man: μίαν φύσιν προσκυνεῖν, καὶ ταύτην Θεοῦ σαρκωθέντος καὶ ἐνανθρωπἠσαντος, or, as he declared before the synod at Constantinople, ῾Ομολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἑνήσεως· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ (Mansi, 6:744). In behalf of his view he appealed to the Scriptures, to Athanasius and Cyril, and to the Council of Ephesus in 431. The impersonal human nature is assimilated, and, as it were, deified by the personal Logos, so that his body is by no means of the same substance (ὁμοούσιον) with ours, but a divine body. All human attributes are transferred to the one subject, the humanized Logos. Hence it may and must be said, God is born, God suffered, God was crucified and died. He asserted, therefore, on the one hand, the capability of suffering and death in the Logos-personality, and, on the other hand, the deification of the human in Christ. The other side imputed to Eutychianism the doctrine of a heavenly body, or of an apparent body, or of the transformation of the Logos into flesh. So Theodoret (Fab. haer. 4:13). Eutyches said Christ had a σῶμα ἀνθρώπου, but not a σῶμα ἀνθρώπινον and he denied the consubstantiality of his acrop with ours. Yet he expressly guarded himself against Docetism, and against all speculation: Φυσιολογεῖν ἐμαυτῷ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω. He was really neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but only insisted on some theological opinions and points of doctrine with great tenacity and obstinacy" (Schaff, History of the Christian Church, 3:737 sq.).

Bishop Forbes cites Photius and Johannes Damascenus aptly on Eutychianism as follows, viz.: "If there be one nature in Christ, it is either the divine or the human nature; if it be only the divine nature, where is the human? and if there be only the human, you cannot escape from denying the divine. But if it be something different from these (for this is the only other alternative they have, and they seem to lean that way), how shall not in that case Christ be of a different nature, both from his Father and from us? Can anything be more impious or absurd to say that the Word of God, who is God, became man, to the corruption of his own deity, and to the annihilation of the humanity he assumed? For this absolutely follows with those who have dared to speak of Christ as of neither nature, but of one besides these" (Photius, Epist. 1, cont. Eutych. cit. Suicer). "The two natures were without conversion or alteration joined together, and the divine nature did not depart from its own simplicity, nor did the nature of man turn into the nature of God, nor was it deprived of existence, nor was one composite nature made out of two; for a composite nature cannot be consubstantial with either of those natures from whence it is compounded. If, therefore, according to the heretics, Christ exist in one compounded nature after the union, he is changed from a simple into a compounded nature, and is not consubstantial with his Father, who is of a simple nature, nor with his mother, for she is not made up of the Godhead and manhood. And he will be neither in the Godhead nor in the manhood, nor will he be called God or man, but Christ only; and Christ will be the name not of his person, but of his own nature, as they deem. But we do not hold Christ to be of a composite nature, as the body and soul make the man, but we believe and confess that he is of the Godhead and manhood; perfect God and perfect man from and in two natures. Were he of one nature, the same nature would be at once created and increate, simple and composite, mortal and immortal. And the union of two natures in Jesus Christ has taken place neither by disorder (φυομός) nor by mixture (syncrasis or anacrasis), as Eutyches, Dioscorus (of Alexandria), and Severus say; neither is it personal (προσωπικόν) nor relative, nor κατ' ἀξίαν, nor from identity of will, nor from equality of honor, nor from the same name, as Nestorius, Diodorus (of Tarsus), and Theodorus (of Mopsuestia) said; but by synthesis; or personally (καθ᾿ ὐπόστασιν), immutably, inconfusedly, unalterably, inherently, inseparably, in two perfect natures in one person. And we term this union essential (ούσιώδη), that is, true and not fantastic; essential, not in that one nature is made of the two, but that they are mutually united in truth into one composite person of the Son of  God. And their substantial differences are preserved, for that which is created remains created, and that which is increate remains increate; the mortal remains mortal, the immortal abides immortal.

The one shines forth in miracles, the other submits to injuries; and the Word appropriates to itself that which is of man, For its are the things that pertain to the Sacred Flesh, and it gives its own properties to the flesh, .according to the law of the communication of properties and the unity of person, for he is the same who performs both the God-like and the manlike actions in either form with the communion of the other. Wherefore the Lord of glory is said to be crucified, although the divine nature did not suffer, and the Son of man, even before his passion, is confessed to be in heaven, as the Lord himself said (John 3). For there is one and the same Lord of glory, who is naturally and in truth the Son of man, that is, made man. We acknowledge both his miracles and his sufferings, though the first were performed according to one nature, the latter endured according to the other. Thus we know that his one person and his two natures are preserved. By the difference of the natures he is, on the one hand, one with the Father and the Holy Ghost; on the other hand, he is one with his mother and with us. And these two natures are joined in one composite person, in which he differs as from the Father and the Holy Ghost, so from his mother and us also" (Joh. Damascenus, Fid. Orth. 3:3, abr.). Bishop Forbes adds: “Now we have all a great tendency to Eutychianism. It gets over a great difficulty in the reception of truth to believe the humanity of our Lord destroyed. For faith now requires of us to believe that the human body of Jesus Christ still is, and that to it the Word is hypostatically joined, and that beyond the spheres and systems of which we are cognizant, it, partaking of our nature, is at the right hand of God" (On the Nicene Creed, Oxford, 1852, page 201 sq.).

The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) adopted the doctrine stated by pope Leo in his letter to Flavianus, SEE LEO, viz. in substance, "that in Christ two distinct natures were united in one person, without any change, mixture, or confusion." The Creed of Chalcedon states that "the one Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with us according to the manhood — like to us in all things except sin; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, in two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without division, without separation — the difference of the natures not being taken away by reason of the unity, but the propriety of each being preserved and joined together to form one person." The creed of the  council was not by any means universally received in the East. But the name Eutychianism gave way to that of Monophysitism. The ecclesiastical organizations adhering to the heresy are commonly known by the names of Jacobites, Armenian Church, Copts, and Abyssinian Church (see the special articles on these churches). For a sketch of the fortunes of the theory known as Eutychianism, SEE MONOPHYSITES. SEE CHALCEDON; SEE CHRISTOLOGY; SEE EUTTYCHES; SEE DIOSCUROS; and consult Pearson, On the Creed (Oxford, 1820), 2:179 sq.; Schaff, Ch. History, 1.c.; Waterland, Works (Oxford), 3:115, 411; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 2:249 et al.; Baur, Dogmengeschichte, 1:2, 256 sq.; Cunningham, Historical Theology, chapter 10, § 1.

## Eutychianus[[@Headword:Eutychianus]]

             pope and martyr, succeeded Felix I, bishop of Rome, January 275; died as martyr or confessor December 8, 283. Some decretals are ascribed to him, which may be found in Migne's ed. of the remains of Sixti Pap,: et al. (Patrol. Latina, volume 5).

## Eutychianus (2)[[@Headword:Eutychianus (2)]]

             a celebrated monk in the mountains separating Phrygia and Bithynia, in the time of Constantine the Great.

## Eutychius[[@Headword:Eutychius]]

             patriarch of Alexandria, was born at Fostat (ancient Cairo) in 876. His Arabic name was Said-ibn-Batrik. He was originally a physician, applied himself to the study of theology towards the close of his life, and was elected Melchite (or orthodox) patriarch of Alexandria in 933, and died about A.D. 946. He wrote, in Arabic, a Chronicle or Annals from the creation of the world to A.D. 937, under the Arabic title Nathm-el- Gauhar, String of Pearls; translated and edited by E. Pococke under the title Contextio Gemmarum, sive Annales, Arab. et Lat. (Oxonii. 1658-59, some copies 1656-64, 2 volumes, 4to): — Fragmenta duo de Paschate, et de SS. Eucharistice institutione (in Mai, Script. Vet. 9:623). Selden published an extract under the title Ecclesie sure origines, ex Arabico cum vers. Lat. (Lond. 1642, 4to), to which Abraham Ecchelensis replied in Eutychius Vindicatus, sive Responsio ad J. Seldeni Origines (Romans 1661, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 16:810; Graesse, Tresor de Livres Rares, 1:530.

## Eutychius (2)[[@Headword:Eutychius (2)]]

             (1) Bishop of Eleutheropolis (Hebron), in Palestine, in the middle of the 4th century, was deposed for semi-Arianism.

(2) Sub-deacon of Alexandria, martyred by the Arians, A.D. 356.

(3) The last-known exarch of Ravenna, A.D. 727-751.

## Eutychius Of Constantinople[[@Headword:Eutychius Of Constantinople]]

             "was originally a monk of the town of Amaseia, whence he was sent by his fellow-citizens to Constantinople as proxy for their bishop. The great talent he displayed in some theological controversy gained him general admiration, and the emperor, in A.D. 553, raised him to the highest dignity in the Church at Constantinople. In the same year he accordingly presided at an oecumenical synod which was held in that city. In A.D. 564 he incurred the anger of the emperor Justinian by refusing to give his assent to a decree respecting the incorruptibility of the body of Christ previous to his resurrection, and was expelled from his see in consequence. He was at first confined in a monastery, then transported to an island, Princepo, and at last to his original convent, Amaseia. In 578 the emperor Tiberius restored him to his see, which he henceforth retained until his death in 585, at the age of 73. There is extant by him a letter addressed to pope Vigilius on the occasion of his elevation in A.D. 553. It is printed in Greek and Latin among the Acta Synodi quintce Concil. v. 425, etc. He also wrote some other treatises, which, however, are lost" (Smith, Dict. of Biography, s.v.). — Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. 4:38; Cave, Hist. Lit. (Genev. 1720) 1:341.

## Eutychus[[@Headword:Eutychus]]

             (Εὔτυχος, of good fortune, a frequent name; see Josephus, Ant. 18:6, 5; 19:4, 4), a young man of Troas, who sat in the open window of the third floor while Paul was preaching late in the night, and who, being overcome by sleep, fell out into the court below, May, A.D. 55. He was "taken up dead" (ἤρθη νεκρός); but the apostle, going down, extended himself upon the body and embraced it, like the prophets of old (1Ki 17:21; 2Ki 4:34); and when he felt the signs of returning life, restored him to his friends, with the assurance that "his life was in him." Before Paul departed in the morning the youth was brought to him alive and well (Act 20:5-12). All the intimations of the narrative forbid. us for a moment to entertain the view of those critics who suppose that animation was merely suspended (Bloomfield, Hackett, in loc.). SEE PAUL.

Mr. Jowett states that, during his residence at Haivali in May, 1818, the house in which he abode gave him a correct idea of the falling of Eutychus from the upper loft while Paul was preaching at Troas. "According to our idea of houses," he remarks, "the scene of Eutychus's falling from the upper loft is very far from intelligible; and besides this, the circumstance of preaching generally leaves on the mind of cursory readers the notion of a church. To describe this house, which is not many miles distant from the  Troad, and perhaps, from the unchanging character of Oriental customs, nearly resembles the houses then built, will fully illustrate the narrative. On entering my host's door, we find the ground floor entirely used as a store; it is filled with large barrels of oil, the produce of the rich country for many miles round; this space, so far from being habitable, is sometimes so dirty with the dripping of the oil that it is difficult to pick out a clean footing from the door to the first step of the staircase. On ascending, we find the first floor, consisting of a humble suite of rooms, not very high; these are occupied by the family for their daily use. It is on the next story that all their expense is lavished; here my courteous host has appointed my lodging; beautiful curtains, and mats, and cushions to the divan, display the respect with which they mean to receive their guest; here, likewise, their splendor, being at the top of the house, is enjoyed by the poor Greeks with more retirement and less chance of molestation from the intrusion of the Turks; here, when the professors of the college waited upon me to pay their respects, they were received in ceremony and sat at the window. The room is both higher and also larger than those below; it has two projecting windows; and the whole floor is so much extended in front beyond the lower part of the building, that the projecting windows considerably overhang the street. In such an upper room — secluded, spacious, commodious — Paul was invited to preach his parting discourse. The divan; or raised seat, with mats or cushions, encircles the interior of each projecting window; and I have remarked, that when the company is numerous, they sometimes place large cushions behind the company seated on the divan, so that a second tier of company, with their feet upon the seat of the divan, are sitting behind, higher than the front row. Eutychus, thus sitting, would be on a level with the open window, and, being overcome with sleep, he would easily fall out from the third loft of the house into the street, and be almost certain, from such a height, to lose his life. Thither Paul went down, and comforted the alarmed company by bringing up Eutychus alive. It is noted that there were many lights in the upper chamber. The very great plenty of oil in this neighborhood would enable them to afford many lamps; the heat of these and so much company would cause the drowsiness of Eutychus at that late hour, and be the occasion likewise of the windows being open." SEE HOUSE.

## Evagrius[[@Headword:Evagrius]]

             (1) Orthodox bishop of Constantinople for two months in 370.

(2) Bishop of Antioch, cir. A.D. 388-392.

## Evagrius Ponticus[[@Headword:Evagrius Ponticus]]

             (Εὐάγριος), monk and ascetic writer, was born at Iberis, on the Black Sea, about A.D. 345. He was made deacon by Gregory of Nyssa or  Gregory of Nazianzum, and received his theological culture to some extent under the latter, who took him to Constantinople in 379 or 380, and made him archdeacon. In the Origenistic controversies he took the side of Origen. After some experience of the dangers of personal beauty and vanity, he renounced the world, assumed the monastic garb, and departed for Egypt in 383 or 384, where he lived as an ascetic up to the day of his death in (probably) 399. Socrates speaks very highly (H.E. 4:23) of his character and writings, of which there remain, 1. Μοναχός (in Cotelerius, Mon. Groc. 3:68): — 2. Α᾿ντιῤῥητικός (in Pallad. Vita Chrysost. page 349): — 3. Rerum Monachalium rationes; and a few other tracts, collected in Galland. Bibl. Patrol. 7:553; also in Migne, Patrol. Graec. 40:1219 sq. See Tillemont, Memoires, 10:368; Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 3:7; 4:23; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. 6:30; Cave, Hist. Lit. Anno 380.

## Evagrius Scholasticus[[@Headword:Evagrius Scholasticus]]

             the Church historian, was probably born at Epiphaneia, on the Orontes, in or about A.D. 536, and had a good education. He lived in Antioch, where he was a lawyer (scholasticus), whence his surname. He rendered essential service to the patriarch Gregory, whom he defended (against charges of adultery and incest) at a synod in Constantinople, A.D. 589. He was made quaestorian, as a reward for his professional skill, by the emperor Tiberius. Evagrius wrote An Ecclesiastical History, in continuation, of Eusebius and Theodoret, which extends from the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, to the twelfth year of the reign of the emperor Maurice, A.D. 5934. He is credulous and superstitious, but orthodox. The best edition, Gr. and Lat., is that of Valesius (Henri de Valois), which includes Eusebius and the other early Greek ecclesiastical historians (Par. 1659-73, fol.; reprinted, with some additional "variorum" notes, under the title Eccl. Scriptores cun not/s Valesi et Reading, Cantab. 1720, 3 volumes); also in Migne, Patrol. Graca, volume 79; translated into English, A History of the Church, with an account of the Author and his Writings, trans. by Meredith Hanmer, in Bagster's Eccl. Historians (Lond. 6 volumes, 8vo); and in Bohn's Ecclesiastes Library (Lond. 1851, 12mo); into German by REssler, in his Bibl. d. K/rcheavdter, volume 7 (1775, 8vo). — Fabricius, Bibliotheca Grceca, ed. Harles, 9:284 sq.; Hoffmann, Bibliog. Lexikon, 2:37; Schaff, History of the Christian Church, 3:882.

## Evaldus[[@Headword:Evaldus]]

             a Scotch prelate, was appointed the first bishop of the see of Argyle in 1200, by bishop John. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 284.

## Evangel[[@Headword:Evangel]]

             (Gr. εὐαγγέλιον, good tidings), a name often applied to the gospel. Hence the term evangelical (q.v.).

## Evangeliarium[[@Headword:Evangeliarium]]

             SEE EVANGELISTARY.

## Evangelical[[@Headword:Evangelical]]

             appertaining to, or characteristic of, the Gospel.

(1.) The term "has been applied to a portion of the English Church who either profess, or are supposed to know and inculcate the Gospel in an especial manner, and to give peculiar prominence to the doctrine of salvation by faith in the atonement. It is probably true that among this portion of the Church of England many, but not all maintain the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism; and there may have been a time when (in the opinion of some) lower views of the sacraments and of Church authority prevailed among them than what are generally received among other members of that Church. Very many persons lament the use of this term, and consider that, like all party appellations, it tends to perpetuate division in the Church; accordingly, they desire that it should be disused as a party term, and carefully confined to its original meaning" (Eden).

(2.) In Prussia, the United Established Church (since 1817) has been called the "Evangelical Church." SEE PRUSSIA AND UNITED EVANGELICAL CHURCH.

(3.) In England and America the term "evangelical" is frequently used to distinguish those churches which believe in the divinity of Christ and the atonement from those that do not.

## Evangelical Adventists[[@Headword:Evangelical Adventists]]

             SEE ADVENTISTS, EVANGELICAL.

## Evangelical Alliance[[@Headword:Evangelical Alliance]]

             is the name of an association of Christians belonging to the denominations collectively called Evangelical, and having for its object to represent the unity of these churches in all the more important articles of faith, notwithstanding their separation by external organization. The Alliance originated in Great Britain, and the rupture in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland seems to have greatly contributed to its establishment. On August 5, 1845, a number of persons belonging to different denominations drew up a, proposal of closer union. The advantages promised by such a movement were at once appreciated in England, and an assembly was convoked at Liverpool October 1, 1845, which was in session three days, and at which were present 216 persons, representing 20 different religious  societies. The first General Assembly of the Evangelical Alliance was held in Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen Street, London, and lasted from August 19 to September 2, 1846; 921 Christians from all parts of the world took part in its 26 sessions; among them were 47 from the European continent, and 87 from America and other parts. Among them we find the names of Dr. Barth, of Calvin. Wiirtemberg Dr. Baird, of New York; Reverend Dr. Bonnet, of Frankfort on the Maine (editor of the letters of Calvin); Dr. Buchanan, of Glasgow; Dr. Cunningham, of Edinburgh; William Jones, president of the Tract Society; Dr. Marriott, of Basel; the missionary Mogling, of Mangalur; the missionary inspector (subsequently superintendent general), Dr. Hoffmann; Reverend Adolphe Tonod (then in Montauban); Reverend Dr. Oneken, of Hamburg; Reverend Dr. Panchaud of Brussels; Reverend Baptist Noel, of London; and Dr. Tholuck, of Halle. Some fifty different denominations were represented, some of which, however as the reformed churches of France and Geneva, and the Lutheran churches of North America and Witrtemberg, differed only on local points. Some colored preachers also took part in the proceedings. Sir Culling Eardley (q.v.) was chosen as chairman, and remained the head of the Alliance until his death.

The platform was clearly and unanimously defined: the Evangelical Alliance is not to be a union of the different denominations, neither is it its aim to bring about such as its result; its object is only to promote Christian feelings, loving, friendly intercourse between the different denominations, and an effective cooperation in the efforts to repulse the common enemies and dangers. As the means of effecting this purpose, it advocates, not a sort of official or semi-official representative assembly of the different denominations, but rather the union of individuals. It is to be a Christian union, not a Church union; one in which a number of earnest, faithful Christians of the different denominations may join. Being a union of Christians, not of churches, the doors of the Evangelical Alliance are open to all who admit the fundamental principles of Christianity, without inquiring into the minutiae of their particular confessions. It only asks its members to accept (whether because or in spite of their particular confession does not matter) the fundamental principles and doctrines of the Gospel. This naturally led to a definition of these fundamental principles, the admission of which should be considered the basis of the Alliance. On the motion being made by Dr. Edward Bickersteth, the following nine articles' were, after mature deliberation, received as the fundamental principles of the Evangelical Alliance:  "The parties composing the Alliance shall be such parties only as hold and maintain what are usually understood to be evangelical views in regard to the matter of doctrines understated, namely:

1. The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures.

2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

3. The unity of the Godhead, and the trinity of persons therein.

4. The utter depravity of human. nature in consequence of the Fall.

5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners and mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign.

6. The justification of the sinners by faith alone.

7. The work of the Holy Spirit. in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

These principles were embodied in a document entitled Societatis Evangelicae constitutionis et statutorum expositio brevis. The members bind themselves to pray zealously for the Holy Spirit to descend upon all believers, and to employ jointly the morning of the first weekday as a season of prayer, as also the first week of each year; as also to use Christian circumspection in their speech and writings when touching, on points of difference. The Alliance was organized on the 2d of September. They organized a series of seven branch associations: 1. Great Britain and Ireland; 2. United States of North America; 3. France, Belgium, and the French portion of Switzerland; 4. Northern Germany; 5. South Germany, and the German portion of Switzerland; 6. British North America; 7.West Indies. These branch associations Went into actual operation afterwards. The Alliance spread in France, Switzerland, and Belgium, without agreement with its definition of the evangelical treed being insisted on. It  met with much opposition in Germany from the Lutherans, who did not find the creed sufficiently explicit on certain points, and from the disciples of Scbleiermacher, who disapproved of some of the articles. A second assembly was held in Paris in 1855 on the occasion of the World's Exhibition. The third meeting was held in Berlin in 1857. The ("Confessional") Lutherans became more determined in their opposition, while the evangelical party of Germany, though approving of the general scope of the Alliance, deemed it inexpedient to insist on the acceptance of the nine principles as a condition of membership. This meeting was largely attended, delegates from Macao, Africa, and Australia being present, and brought the Alliance more prominently before the churches of Continental Europe. The fourth meeting was held at Geneva in 1860. It was successful, notwithstanding the declension of the Genevan National Church to sympathize with its objects. Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland; Dr. Baird, of the United States; Monod, Pressense, and Gasparin, of France; Krummacher and Dorner, of Germany; Groen van Prinsterer, of Holland; and Merle d'Aubigne, of Switzerland, were among the most prominent and active members. The fifth meeting was to have been held at Amsterdam in 1866, but was postponed on account of the prevalence of the cholera at, the appointed time till 1867.

The fifth General Conference actually took place at Amsterdam on August 18, 1867, and was largely attended. There were delegates from France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, the United States, the British American provinces, Italy, Spain, Sweden, and Eastern countries. Baron Van Wassenaar Catwijk presided. Among the more prominent delegates were Dr. Krummacher, Prof. Herzog, Dr. Tholuck, and Prof. Lange, of Germany; Pasteur Bersiea, Dr. de Pressense, and Prof. St. Hilaire, of France; Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland; John Pye Smith, archdeacon Philpot, and S. Gurney, M.P., of England; Merle d'Aubigne, of Switzerland; the Reverend Dr. Prime, of the United States, and many others. The opening sermon was preached by Prof. Van Oosterzee. Among the subjects discussed were the religious condition of the Church of England, the Scottish churches, the connection of missions with civilization, Christianity, and literature; and art and science; the methods of operating missions; the religious condition of Germany, France, Holland, Belgiuma, and Italy; evangelical nonconformity; Christianity and the nationalities; and various subjects of theology and philosophy. Interesting reports were received of the progress of religious liberty in Turkey, and of the thraldorn of opinion in Spain. The observance of the Sabbath received especial consideration, resulting in the adoption of a resolution calling  upon the members of the Alliance to use in their several places of abode and spheres of influence earnest endeavors to secure from states, municipalities, and masters of establishments, from every one, the weekly day of rest from labor, "in order that all may freely and fully participate in the temporal And spiritual benefits of the Lord's day." A letter of affection and sympathy was adopted to Christians scattered abroad, particularly to those who are laboring against the hostile influences of heathenism or of superstition, and whose rights. of public worship are restrained or abridged. A protest against war was adopted. Special meetings were held on Sunday-schools And systematic benevolence. A series of meetings for the poor were held in one of the mission-rooms of the city with wholesome effect, and two temperance meetings. The. assembly adjourned on Tuesday, August 27.

The Evangelical Alliance of the United States was organized in New York city on January 30, 1867. Eminent divines and laymen of the Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, German Reformed Reformed, and Baptist churches, and from various parts of the country, signified their approval of the movement either by attendance in person or by letter. A letter of cooperation was read from the secretary of the British branch of the Alliance. The Hon. William E Dodge was elected president of the American branch. At a meeting held in New York November 12,1868, it was resolved to convene a new General Conference of the. Evangelical Alliance in the city of New York in the autumn of 1869. The British branch only of the national branches has been in the practice of holding annual meetings.

"Among the results already attained by the Alliance as incidental and secondary to its great object may be mentioned, The supply of an obvious want, namely, the existence of an organized body with and. by whom correspondence and cooperation may be easily and effectually carried on between Christians in different parts of the world, and which may greatly aid in uniting Christians in this country separated by ecclesiastical differences and other causes; the holding of conferences of Christians from all parts of the world, for devotion and mutual consultation, in London, Paris, Berlin, and other cities; aiding in the revival of religion both at home and abroad; the convening of very many meetings for united prayer forthe outpouring of the Spirit, and in reference to passing events of importance; the communication of much information as to the religious condition of Christendom; the encouragement of Christians exposed to trials and  difficulties by the expression of sympathy, and in several instances by eliciting pecuniary aid; sucessful interference on behalf of Christians and others when persecuted in Roman Catholic and Mohammedan countries; the mitigation or removal of the persecution of Protestants by their fellow- Protestants in Germany and elsewhere; the presentation of memorials to the sovereigns of Europe, including the sultan himself; on behalf of liberty of conscience for Mussulmen;the encouragement and assistance of the friends of pure evangelical doctrine in all Protestant countries in their struggle with Rationalism or infidelity; the uniting of evangelical Christians in different countries for fraternal intercourse and for mutual protection; opposition, in common with other bodies, to the progress of popery; the resistance of projects which would: tend to the desecration of the Lord's- day; the origination and extensive circulation of prize essays on the Sabbath, and on Popery and infidelity; and the origination of societies established on the principle of united action among evangelical Christians, such as, the Turkish Missions Aid Society, the Continental Committee for Religious Liberty, Christian Vernacular Education Society for India, and German Aid Society. Although these practical results are thus referred to, yet it is to be understood that, even if no. such secondary objects had been accomplished or attempted, the great value of the Alliance would still! remain in its adaptation to promote and manifest union! among Christians. The preceding is from an authoritative statement made by the Alliance" (Eadie, Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia, s.v.). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, page 270; Schem, American Ecclesiastical Almanac for 1868; the full reports of the General Assemblies of the Alliance; Dr. Massie, The Evangelical AIliance, its Origin and Development (Lond. John Snow 1847); L. Bonnet, L'unite de l'esprit par le lieu de la paix; Lettres sur l'alliance evangelique (Paris, Delay, 1847); Ans. and For. Ch. Union, September 1856, page 269; December 1856, page 367; Princeton Rev. October 1846. (A.J.S.)

## Evangelical Association[[@Headword:Evangelical Association]]

             an ecclesiastical body which took its rise in the year 1800, in the eastern part of Pennsylvania, and resulted from an organization into classes and congregations of the disciples of Reverend Jacob Albright, a native of Eastern Pennsylvania, who, being impressed by the general decline of religious life, and the corruption of doctrines and morals that prevailed in the German churches in that portion of country, undertook, about 1790, to work a reform among them. The effect of his first labors encouraged him  to travel through a great part of the country at his own expense, preaching the Gospel as he had opportunity in churches, schools, private houses, on public roads, etc. Although he commenced his labors without any ulterior design of forming a distinct ecclesiastical organization, yet he son found it necessary to unite his converts, scattered over several counties, into small societies for mutual support and sympathy. At a meeting called for the purpose of consulting upon the best measures to be adopted for the furtherance of a cause in which they all felt a deep interest, the assembly, without regard to the teachings of High-Churchism respecting a valid ministry, unanimously elected and ordained Mr. Albright as their pastor or bishop, authorizing him to exercise all the functions of the ministerial office over them, and declared the Bible to be their rule of faith and practice. This organization, incomplete at first, was soon after considerably improved by the adoption of a creed and rules for Church government. In course of time, as laborers increased and the society spread, annual conferences were held; and in 1816, sixteen years after the first organization of the Church, a general conference was held, for the first time, in Union County, Pennsylvania, which consisted of all the elders in the ministry. Since 1843 a general conference, composed of delegates elected by the annual conferences from among their elders, has held quadrennial sessions. For the first thirty years of its existence the society struggled against violent opposition; but during its later years it has made rapid progress, so that it now (1888) comprises 14 annual conferences, and 1123 itinerant and 634 local preachers, whose field of labor extends over the Northern, Western, and Pacific states, and into Canada and Europe.. The membership approximates 139,000, all adults; the number of churches is 1836 and parsonages 2572, valued together at $4,872,500; Sunday-schools 2348, and scholars 162,837; catechetical classes, exclusive of those connected with Sunday-schools, 341, with 3559 catechumefins.

In the year 1838 a missionary society was formed, which has up to this time supported about 600 home missions, most of which are now self-supporting stations, circuits, or even conferences. At present this society supports 542 missions in America and Europe. For a number of years it has been gathering funds for heathen missions,, and has entered Japan with success. There is also a Sunday-school and tract society in operation, publishing Sunday-school books and religious tracts. A charitable society was founded in the year 1835, which has received funds amounting to a considerable sum, by bequests, the interest of which is annually applied to the support of the widows and orphans of poor itinerant preachers. There are also church-  building societies established in several conferences. The Northwestern College, a flourishing institution of learning located at Naperville, Illinois, has been founded, and is supported by the Western conferences of the Church, and an endowment is being collected which now amounts to $100,000. Several seminaries are also patronized by the Church. An orphan institution, favorably located at Flat Rock, Ohio, has been founded within a few years, and is in successful operation. A prosperous publishing-house at Cleveland, Ohio, issues four periodicals: one, its German organ, Der Christliche Botschafter, a large weekly, and the oldest German religious paper published in America; another, its English organ, The Evagelical Messenger, also a weekly; and the third and fourth, Der Christicche Kinderfreund, and the Sunday-school Messenger, are monthly juvenile papers, intended chiefly for Sunday-schools. The weekly papers have together a circulation of 25,000, and the juveniles 30,000. Perhaps no other religious denomination in America is better organized and disciplined for work than the Evangelical Association. In doctrine and theology this Church is Arminian; with regard to sanctification, Wesleyan; but generally holds the essential doctrines of the Gospel as they are held in common by the evangelical churches of the land, with all of whom it aims to cultivate a fraternal spirits The ministry is divided into two orders, deacons and elders; and, faithful to the principles and examples of their founder, they practice itinerancy. The highest permanent order is the eldership; for, although the society has its bishops (elected by General Conference) and presiding elders (elected by the individual conferences), yet these, to be continued, must be reelected every four years; and if not re-elected they hold no higher rank or privilege than an elder. The General Conference meets every four years, and constitutes the highest legislative and judicial authority recognized in the Church; then come the annual and quarterly conferences, whose transactions are mostly of an executive and practical nature for the promotion of the work. In its mode of worship and usages the Evangelical Association is Methodistic; and preaching, originally in German, is now largely in English (R.Y.)

The denomination is at present greatly divided. In October 1891, two rival general conferences were held, one in Indianapolis, the other in Philadelphia, each of which elected different bishops and other officers. This led to protracted litigation, which has not yet been fully settled.  The following statistics are gathered from the United States census of 1890, but do not include the conferences in Canada, Germany, Switzerland, and Japan.

## Evangelical Church Conference[[@Headword:Evangelical Church Conference]]

             the name of periodical meetings of delegates of the Protestant state churches of Germany. The object of these meetings is, to have a free exchange of opinion on important questions of ecclesiastical life, to furnish a bond of union for the several Protestant state churches of Germany, and: to advance their harmonious development. The impulse to meetings of this kind proceeded, in 1815, from king Wilhelm of Wirtemberg. Invitations to a conference were issued conjointly by Prussia and Wurtemberg to the governments of South Germany, and by Prussia. and Hanover to the governments of Northern Germany. At the first conference, which met at Berlin in 1846, the Church boards of all the German states except Austria, Bavaria, Oldenburg, and the FreeCities were represented. This meeting was secret, and the proceedings have never been officially published. It is known, however, that they concerned the periodical holding of conferences of this kind, confessions, liturgy, and Church constitution. The second meeting was to have been held at Stuttgardt in 1848, but did not take place, in consequence of the disturbances caused by the revolution. At the Church diets (q.v.) of Stuttgardt (1850) and Elberfeld (1851), ecclesiastical officers of several countries deliberated on the resumption of the official Church conferences, and suggested the establishment of a central organ, which was to contain the decrees of all the supreme Church boards of the German States. Accordingly, the conference met ,again at Eisenach in June 1852, and in the same year an official central organ of the German Church governments was established at Stuttgardt (Allgem. Kirchenblatt fur das evangel. Deutschland). Since then the conference has met always at Eisenach, in 1855, 1857, 1859, 1861, 1863, 1865, and 1868. One of the first results of the conferences was a compilation of 150 of the best German Protestant hymns (Kernlieder), which was recommended to the several states as a proper basis of, or appendix to, the hymn-books of the several churches. In 1855 some resolutions concerning the treatment of sects by the state churches were unanimously adopted. These resolutions declared against the principle of full religious liberty, but recommended that the members 'of sects be allowed to contract valid civil marriages. The same conference adopted resolutions in behalf of a better observance of Sunday; of giving to congregations the right of cooperation (votum  negativum) in the appointment of ecclesiastical officers, and of introducing special liturgical devotions during the week of Passion. The conference of 1857 held important discussions on the revival of Church discipline, on reforms in the legislation concerning divorces, and on Christian burial. Among the results of the later meetings of the conference were the following: The introduction of a prayer for the German fatherland, to be used every Sunday in every Protestant church; resolutions on Church patronage, on liturgical, matters, on the examinations of theological students, on catechization, on the revision of the Lutheran Bible, on the best' way of collecting the statistics of the German Lutheran Church, on the construction of evangelical churches, on the State-Church system, etc. An account of each meeting of the conference since 1855 is given in Matthes, Allgem. Kirchliche Chronik; see also Herzog, Real-Encykl. 4:273.

## Evangelical Counsels[[@Headword:Evangelical Counsels]]

             SEE CONSILIA EVANGELICA.

## Evangelical Union[[@Headword:Evangelical Union]]

             "the name assumed by a religious body constituted in Scotland in 1843 by the Reverend James Morison, of Kilmarnock, and other ministers, whose doctrinal views had been condemned in the United Secession Church, to which they previously belonged, and the congregations adhering to them. They were soon afterwards joined by a number of ministers and congregations of similar views previously connected with the Congregational Union or Independents of Scotland, and have, since extended themselves considerably in Scotland and the north of England. Their doctrinal views are those which, from the name of Mr. Morison, have now become known in Scotland as Morisonian. SEE MORISONIANISM. Their church government is Independent, but in some of the congregations originally Presbyterian the office of the eldership is retained. A notable practice of this denomination is the very frequent advertising of sermons and their subjects." In 1851 the Union had in Scotland 28 places of worship, with 10,319 sittings.

## Evangelist[[@Headword:Evangelist]]

             (εὐαγγελιστής), the name of an order or body of men included in the constitution of the Apostolical Church (q.v.). The term is applied in the New Testament to a certain class of Christian teachers who were not fixed  to any particular spot, but traveled either independently, or under the direction of one or other of the apostles, for the purpose of propagating the Gospel. The absence of any detailed account of the organization and practical working of the Church of the first century leaves us in some uncertainty as to their functions and position. The meaning of the name, "The publishers of glad tidings," seems common to the work of the Christian ministry generally, yet in Eph 4:11 the "evangelists" appear, on the one hand, after the "apostles" and "prophets;" on the other, before the "pastors" and "teachers" (thus: αὐτὸς ἔδωκε τοὺς μὲν αποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους). Assuming that the apostles here, whether limited to the twelve or not, are those who were looked upon as the special delegates and representatives of Christ, and therefore higher than all others in their authority, and that the prophets were men speaking under the immediate impulse of the Spirit words that were mighty in their effects on men's hearts and consciences, it would follow that the evangelists had a function subordinate to theirs, yet more conspicuous; and so far higher than that, of the pastors who watched over a church that had been founded, and of the teachers who carried on the work of systematic instruction. This passage, accordingly, would lead us to think of them as standing between the two other groups sent forth as missionary preachers of the Gospel by the first, and as such preparing the way for the labors of the second.

The same inference would seem to follow the occurrence of the word as applied to Philip in Act 21:18. He had been one of those who had gone everywhere "preaching" (εὐαγγελιζόμενοι) the word (Act 8:4), now in one city, now in another (Act 8:40); but he has not the power or authority of an apostle, does not speak as a prophet himself, though the gift of prophecy belongs to his four daughters (Act 21:9), and he exercises apparently no pastoral superintendence over any portion of the flock. The omission of evangelists in the list of 1 Corinthians 12 may be explained on the hypothesis that the nature of Paul's argument led him there to speak of the settled organization of a given local Church, which of course presupposed the work of the missionary preacher as already accomplished, while the train of thought in Eph 4:11 brought before his mind all who were in any way instrumental in building up the Church universal. It follows, from what has been said, that the calling of the evangelist is expressed by the word κηρύσσειν, "preach," rather than διδάσκειν, "teach," or παρακαλεῖν, "exhort;" it is the proclamation of the glad tidings to those who have not known them, rather  than the instruction and pastoral care of those who have believed and been baptized. This is also what we gather from 2Ti 4:2; 2Ti 4:5. Timotheus is "to preach the word;" in doing this he is to fulfill " the work of an evangelist." It follows, also, that the name denotes a work rather than an order. The evangelist might or might not be a bishop-elder or a deacon.

The apostles, so far as they evangelized (Act 8:25; Act 14:7; 1Co 1:17), might claim the title, though there were many evangelists who were not apostles. The brother "whose praise was in the Gospel", (2Co 8:18) may be looked upon as one of Paul's companions in this work, and probably known by the same name, in short, the itinerant and temporary character of their calling chiefly serves to distinguish them from the other classes of Christian laborers. In this, as in other points connected with the organization of the. Church in the apostolic age, but little information is to be gained from later writers. The name was no longer explained by the presence of those to whom it had been specially applied, and it came to be variously interpreted. Theodoret (on Eph 4:11) describes the evangelists (as they have been described above) as traveling missionaries. Chrysostom, as men who preached the Gospel; but without going everywhere (μὴ περιϊvοντες πανταχοῦ); by which he probably denotes a restricted sphere to their labors, in contrast with the world-wide commission of the apostles. The account given by Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 3:37), though somewhat rhetorical and vague, gives prominence to the idea of itinerant missionary preaching. Referring to the state of the Church in the time of Trajan, he says, "Many of the disciples of that time, whose souls the divine word had inspired with an ardent love of philosophy, first fulfilled our Savior's precept by distributing their substance among the poor. Then traveling abroad, they performed the work of evangelists (ἔργον ἐπετέλουν Εὐαγγελιστῶν), being ambitious to preach Christ, and deliver the Scripture of the divine Gospels. Having laid the foundations of the faith in foreign nations, they appointed other pastors (ποιμἑνας το καθιστάντες ἑτέρους), to whom they entrusted the cultivation of the parts they had recently occupied, while they proceeded to other countries and nations." One clause of this description indicates a change in the work, which before long affected the meaning of the name.

If the Gospel was a written book, and the office of the evangelists was to read .or distribute it, then the writers of such books were κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν The evangelists. It is thus, accordingly, that Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 3:39) speaks of them, though the old meaning of the word (as in Hist. Ecc 5:10, where he  applies it to Pantaenus) is not forgotten by him. Soon this meaning so overshadowed the old that OEcumenius (Estius on Eph 4:11) has no other notion of the evangelists than as those who have written a Gospel (compare Harless on Eph 4:11). Augustine, though commonly using the word in this sense, at times remembers its earlier signification (Sermoni 99 and 246). Ambrosianus (Estius, 1.c.) identifies them with deacons. In later liturgical language the work was applied to the reader of the Gospel for the day (comp. Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity, book 78:7, 9). In modern phraseology the term is almost exclusively applied to the writers of the canonical Gospels (q.v.). See Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, 1:148150; Neander's History of the Planting of the Christian Church, 1:173; Middelboc, De evangelistis ecclesice apostolica (Hafn. 1779); Schaff, Apostolical Church, § 131.

## Evangelista[[@Headword:Evangelista]]

             the name given in the Greek Church to the deacon who reads the gospels in the course of divine service.

## Evangelistarium[[@Headword:Evangelistarium]]

             (Book of the Gospels), the name given in the earlier ages to a volume containing the portions appointed to be read from the Gospels. If the four Gospels complete were contained in the book, it was called Evangelistarium Plenarium. — Procter, Common Prayer, page 9; Siegel, Alterthumer, 3:249. SEE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE.

## Evangelists[[@Headword:Evangelists]]

             In the British census of 1851 four congregations returned themselves as worshipping under this name, probably to avoid being identified with any sect.

## Evangelists, The Four, Representations of, in Christian Art[[@Headword:Evangelists, The Four, Representations of, in Christian Art]]

             The adoption of the four creatures of the apocalypse (Rev 4:6) as images of the evangelists does not seem to have taken place generally, or is not recorded on Christian monuments, before the 5th century. It involves, of course, a peculiarly impressive connection between the beginning of the visions of Ezekiel and the unveiling of heaven to the eyes of John. The application of each symbol to each writer may be referred as contemplating the Lord's divine nature. Ingenuity and devotion have done their utmost on this subject for centuries, with little result. The accompanying emblematical figures are found in the chapel of San Satiro, in Milan. See Martigny, Dict. des Arch. Chretienne, s.v.; Jameson, Sacred and Legendary Art, page 132 sq.

## Evangelium AEternum[[@Headword:Evangelium AEternum]]

             (Everlasting Gospel), the name given to a book published in the 13th century (A.D. 1254), which was properly entitled Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum, probably written by the Franciscan Gerhardus. The idea of a new "everlasting Gospel" was one of the peculiar notions of Joachim of Floris (t 1202), who attacked the corruptions of the Church, and predicted an approaching renovation. SEE JOACHIM OF FLORIS.

These predictions were appropriated by the Franciscans as really referring to the rise and character of their order, which was founded by Francis of Assisi six years after Joachim's death. An apocalyptic party arose among the Franciscans, which seems to have been led by Gerhardus, and by Johannes of Parma (q.v.). The Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum seems to have been chiefly made up from three of the writings of Joachim, viz. Concordia Veter, et Nov. Test.; Psalt. decem Chordareum; and Apocalypsis nova. It set forth Joachim's doctrine of the "dispensations" (status) of the Church, the last of which, the dispensation of the Spirit, was to be opened about A.D. 1200. The movement was a new form of  Montanism. "Many vague notions were entertained about the Eternal Gospel of the Franciscans, arising from superficial views, or a superficial understanding of Joachim's writings, and the offspring of mere rumor of the heresy-hunting spirit. Men spoke of the Eternal Gospel as of a book composed under this title, and circulated among the Franciscans. Occasionally, also, this Eternal Gospel was confounded perhaps with the above-mentioned Introductorius. In reality, there was no book existing under this title of the Eternal Gospel, but all that is said about it relates simply to the writings of Joachim. The opponents of the Franciscan order objected to the preachers of the Eternal Gospel, that, according to their teaching, Christianity was but a transient thing, and a new, more perfect religion, the absolute form, destined to endure forever, was to succeed it.

William of St. Amour (De periculis novissimorum temporum, page 38) says: 'For the past fifty-five years some have been striving to substitute in place of the Gospel of Christ another gospel, which is said to be a more perfect one, which they call the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, or the Everlasting Gospel;' whence it is manifest that the anti-Christian doctrine would even now be preached from the pulpits if there were not still something that withholdeth (2Th 2:6), namely, the power of the pope and the bishops. It is said in that accursed book, which they called the Everlasting Gospel, which had already been made known in the Church, that the Everlasting Gospel is as much superior to the Gospel of Christ as the sun is to the moon in brightness, the kernel to the shell in value. The kingdom of the Church, or the Gospel of Christ, was to last only till the year '1260.' In a sermon, St. Amour points out the following as doctrines of the Everlasting Gospel: that the sacrament of the Church is nothing; that a new law of life was to be given, and a new constitution of the Church introduced; and he labors to show that, on the contrary, the form of the hierarchy under which the Church then subsisted was one resting on the divine order, and altogether necessary and immutable" (Neander, Church Hist. 4:619). The Introductorius has not come down to us, but its contents are partly known from a writing of Hugo of Caro, preserved in Quetif and Echard, Script. Ord. Prcedic. 1:202 sq., and partly from extracts given by the inquisitor Nicolas Eymeric, in his Directorium Inquisitoriunm, part 2, qu. 9, No. 4. The theologians of Paris attacked the book upon its first appearance, and it was formally condemned by Alexander IV, A.D. 1255. — Neander, Church History (Torrey's transl.), 4:618; Engelhardt Kircheng. Abhandlungen (Erlangen, 1832); Engelhardt in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:275; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. per. 3, § 70.

## Evanison, Edward[[@Headword:Evanison, Edward]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was born at Warrington, Lancashire, in 1731, and was educated at Emanuel College, Cainbridge, where he passed M.A. in 1753. In 1768 he became, vicar of South Mimms; in 1770, rector of Tewkesbury. He soon began to manifest doubts about the Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. For a sermon preached in 1771 he was prosecuted. In 1778 he resigned his preferments in the Church, and retired to Mitcham, where he kept a school. He died September 25, 1805. Among his writings are, On the Observance of Sunday (Spawich, 1792)

The Dissonance of the four Evangelists, and their Authority (Gloucester, 1805, 8vo). In this work Evanson rejects all the Gospels but Mark, and also, Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, James, Peter, John, and Jude. It was refuted by Falconer, Bamptone Lectures, 1810.

## Evans, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Evans, Benjamin, D.D]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born at Bilston, Staffordshire, May 13, 1803. As a boy his thirst for knowledge was intense, and he excelled in drawings on Staffordshire pottery-ware. He was converted in his youth, joined the Baptists, and at twenty entered Horton College, Bradford, Yorkshire. In 1825 he accepted an invitation as pastor over a very small Church at the seaport of Scarborough, where, for forty years, he preached four sermons, held five prayer-meetings, and conducted three Bible-classes weekly. He formed a new Baptist Ministerial Association, which sent out a young man from Horton College to represent the Baptist cause in Germany. He also founded the first Baptist church in Brussels. He effectually resisted the levying of Church rates in Scarborough on Independents; took a leading part in the anti-Corn-Law League, and in the  anti-State-Church Associations, and was the founder and first secretary of the Mechanics' Institute in the town; the Archaeological Society and Museum owes much of its success to his efforts. He was the founder of the Society for the Education of Ministers' Sons, and its president; the founder of the Theological College at Bury, and professor of ecclesiastical history in it; and he also established and edited The Baptist Record, a quarterly journal. Among his published works are, The Enlarged History of Scarborough: — The History of Horton and Rawdon Colleges: — The History of the Early English Baptists (2 volumes): — Modern Popery: — Hints to Young Christians: — Life of Wickliffe: — History of the German Reformation: — Lectures on Ecclesiastical History: — The Religious State of Belgium, and about a score of pamphlets on popular topics. He was the father of the Freeman newspaper, and a contributor to half a dozen Baptist magazines. He died suddenly, April 6, 1871. See (Lond.) Baptist Handbook, 1872.

## Evans, C., D.D[[@Headword:Evans, C., D.D]]

             a Welsh Baptist minister, was born at Llannwchllyn, Merionethshire, June 22, 1781. He was baptized in early life, began to preach in 1809, was two years in the Abergavenny Academy, and then for seven years pastor of the small Church of Llannefyd and Llansannan. In 1823 he removed to Cefimawr, which was his residence for thirty-five years, during twenty-nine of which he was pastor of the Church in that place. Considering the imperfection of his early education, he became a more than ordinarily cultured scholar, and wrote, The Peculiar Tenets of the Baptists, and A History of the Baptists, Based on the Fundamental Principles of their System. He died March 28, 1864. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1865, page 121. (J.C.S.)

## Evans, Caleb[[@Headword:Evans, Caleb]]

             D.D., son of the Reverend Hugh Evans, was born at Bristol about the year 1737, and was educated at the Homerton Academy. In 1767 he became colleague to his father as pastor of the church, and tutor in the academy at Broadmead. In 1770 he originated "The Bristol Education Society," to supply the dissenting congregations, and especially the Baptist, with able and evangelical ministers, as well as missionaries for propagating the Gospel in the world. From this time to the period of his death, August 9, 1791, Dr. Evans continued to discharge the duties of president of the society. He published an Answer to Dr. Priestley's Appeal, and a small volume entitled Christ Crucified, or the Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement (Bristol, 1789, sm. 8vo), besides occasional sermons. On the breaking out of the American War he advocated the freedom of the colonies, and wrote A Letter to John Wesley, in reply to his Calm Address to the American Colonies (London, 1775, 12mo); also a Reply to Fletcher's Vindication of Wesley's Address (Bristol, 1776, 12mo). — Jones, Christian Biography, page 144; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.

## Evans, Christmas[[@Headword:Evans, Christmas]]

             an eloquent Welsh preacher, was born December 25, 1766, at Llandyssul, Cardiganshire. His father was poor, and he had no school education. At seventeen he was converted, and joined the Baptist Church. He then first learned to read the Welsh, Bible, and soon after began to exhort. His first settlement as a preacher was at Lleyn; two years after he went to Anglesea to labor as an evangelist at ten preaching places, on a salary at first of £17 a year. He died at Swansea, July 20, 1838. He early showed oratorical powers, but in Anglesea he began to be a wonder. For a series of years he made preaching tours through. South Wales, and the memory of his sermons remains to this day. The following sketch of one of these sermons is given by his biographer, the Reverend D. M. Evans: "In the midst of a general hum and restlessness the preacher had read for his text, 'And you that were some time alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblamable, and unreproachable in his sight.' His first movements were stiff, awkward, and wrestling, while his observations were perhaps crude and commonplace rather than striking or novel; but he had not proceeded far before, having thus prepared himself, he took one of his wildest flights, bursting forth at the same time into those unmelodious  but all-piercing shrieks under which his hearers often confessed his resistless power. Closer and closer draw in the scattered groups, the weary loungers, and the hitherto listless among the motley multitude.

The crowd becomes dense with eager listeners as they press on insensibly towards the preacher. He gradually gets into the thickening plot of his homely but dramatic representation, while, all forgetful of the spot on which they stood old men and women, accustomed to prosy thoughts and ways, look up with open mouth through smiles and tears. Big burly country folk, in whom it might have been thought that the faculty of imagination had long since, been extinguished became: engrossed with ideal scenes. Men ‘whose talk is of bullocks' are allured into converse with the most spiritual realities. The preachers present become dazzled with the brilliance of this new star on the horizon; they start on their feet round the strange young man, look hard at him in perfect amazement; loud and rapturous confirmations break forth from their lips: 'Amen,' 'Ben digedig,' 'Diolch byth,' fall tumultuously on the ear; the charm swells onwards from the platform to the extreme margin of the wondering crowd, and to the occasional loud laugh there has now succeeded the baptism of tears. The excitement is at its highest; the preacher concludes, but the weeping and rejoicing continue till worn out nature brings the scene to an end." His chief qualities as a preacher "include passion, or ardent excited feeling, a dramatic imagination, and grotesque humor. The published scraps of sermons which remain, and have been translated into English, illustrate these qualities, and almost only these." — (Christian Spectator (Lond.) September 1863, reprinted in The Theolog. Eclectic, 1:147; Evans Memoir of Christmas Evians (1862); Stephen, Life of Christians Evans (London, 1847); Sermons of C. Evans with Memoir by Jas. Cross (Phila. 1854, 8vo).

## Evans, Evan (1), D.D[[@Headword:Evans, Evan (1), D.D]]

             a minister of the Church of England, is supposed to have been a native of Wales. He was sent to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, by the bishop of London, in 1700. Five years before, a church had been built there, and of this he took charge. Through his instrumentality churches were formed at Chichester, Chester, Maidenhead, Concord, Evesham, Montgomery, Radnor, and Oxford, places all within a radius of forty miles. After four years of service at Philadelphia, he asked for and received an assistant. In 1707 he visited England, and urged that a bishop should be sent over to the  colonies. In 1709 he returned to his charge in Philadelphia, and in 1711 it was found necessary to enlarge the church edifice. Resigning, he again visited England in 1716, and on his return to America accepted an appointment to Oxford and Radnor, a part of his former field, and remained there until 1718, when he resigned his mission, removed to Maryland, to St. George's parish, then in Baltimore, now Harford, County, and on every alternate Sabbath officiated in the adjoining parish, over twenty miles distant. He died in October 1721. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:22.

## Evans, Evan (2)[[@Headword:Evans, Evan (2)]]

             a Welsh divine and poet, was born at Cynhawdren, in Cardiganshire, about 1730, and was educated at Jesus College, Oxford. After taking orders in college, he officiated as curate in several places, particularly Newick, in Kent, Llanvair Talhaiarn, in Denbighshire, and Towyn, in Merionethshire. He died at his birthplace in 1790. He published Dissertatio de Bardis (1764, 4to), and translated into Welsh two volumes of Tillotson's Sermons. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Evans, James[[@Headword:Evans, James]]

             the celebrated Canadian missionary among the Indians, brother of Reverend Ephraim Evans, D.D., entered upon the missionary work at St. Clair, Ontario, in 1834. He labored at Rice Lake, Credit, Ancaster, and other places. To his mental vigor and indomitable perseverance the Indians are indebted for many advantages. Not the least of these is a written and printed character of their language, invented by Evans. He left behind him many papers, both in print and manuscript — a private journal, translations, Indian vocabularies, letters, etc. He died suddenly, while on a visit to England, at Keelby, Lincolnshire, November 23, 1846. Evans was a warm friend, a man of genius, an enterprising explorer, a devoted missionary, and an humble Christian. See Minutes of the British Conference, 1847, page 462; Carroll, Case and his Contemporaries (see index, volume 5).

## Evans, James Harrington[[@Headword:Evans, James Harrington]]

             a Baptist minister of John Street Chapel, London, was born about 1785. He died about 1849. His works are, Dialogues on the Trinity (Lond. 1819,  8vo): — Sermons on the Spirit of Holiness (1839, 4th ed. 12mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Evans, John[[@Headword:Evans, John]]

             D.D., an eminent Nonconformist divine, was born in 1680, at Wrexham, in Denbighshire. His father was minister of Wrexham. The son was first placed under the care of Mr. Thomas Rowe, near London, and studied afterwards at the seminary of Mr. Timothy Joule. He was ordained and settled at Wrexham, August 18, 1702. "Dr. Daniel Williams, of London, hearing that Mr. Evans was invited to Dublin, to prevent his leaving England sent for him to the metropolis, where he first assisted the doctor, afterwards became co-pastor, and at length succeeded him at his death. In the Arian controversy he refused to subscribe to any articles, but maintained the orthodox sentiments.” In the public services of the  dissenters he was often called to preside, and was appointed to assist in completing Matthew Henry's Commentary, of which he supplied the notes on the Epistles to the Romans so well, that Dr. Doddridgea says, 'The exposition of the Romans, begun by Henry, and finished by Dr. Evans, is the best I ever saw.' He was for some years preparing to write a history of nonconformity from the Reformation to the civil wars, but, by his death, the work devolved on Mr. Neal. He died May 16, 1730." Besides a number of separate sermons, he published Discourses concerning the Christian Temper, 38 Sermons (4th ed. London, 1737, 2 volumes, 8vo), with Life by John Erskine (1825, 8vo), which are called by Dr. Watts "the most complete summary of those duties which make up the Christian life," and by Doddridge "the best practical pieces in our language." See Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters, 2:364; Jones, Christian Biography, page 143; Skeats, Free Churches of England (London, 1868, 8vo), page 249.

## Evans, John, LL.D[[@Headword:Evans, John, LL.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born about 1767, at Usk, Monmouthshire. He was pastor of a congregation of General Baptists, Worship Street, London from 1792 to 1827, and died in the latter year, leaving a number of theological sermons and other works, for a list of which see Watt, Bibl. Brit., and the Gentleman's Magazine, XCVII, 1:369. He published, in 1797, An Attempt to Account for the Infidelity of the Late Mr. Gibbon. His best-known work is a Brief Sketch of the Different Denominations into which the Christian World is Divided (1794). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Evans, Jonathan[[@Headword:Evans, Jonathan]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Coventry about 1748. He was converted in 1778 or 1779, and shortly after began to work with much earnestness for the salvation of his irreligious neighbors. In 1782 he turned his attention more particularly to the parish of Foleshill, near Coventry, and was so successful as to purchase, in 1784, a building for a place of worship, and eventually a chapel was built. In 1796 a church was formed, chiefly of those who were the fruits of his ministry, of which he was ordained pastor, April 4, 1797. He died August 31, 1809. Mr. Evans was a plain, earnest preacher, and very successful in winning souls. He was the author of three fine hymns, commencing, "Come, thou soul transforming spirit," "Hark! the voice of love and mercy," "Let saints on earth their anthems raise." See (Lond.) Evangelical Magazine, 1847, page 128.

## Evans, Llewellyn Joan, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Evans, Llewellyn Joan, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister and professor, was born at Trenddyn, near Mold, North Wales, June 27, 1833; graduated in the scientific and classical courses of the college at Racine, Wisconsin; next entered Lane Theological Seminary, graduating in 1860. He was made pastor of the Seminary Church the same year, and was successively the occupant of the chair of church history (1863), biblical literature and exegesis (1867), and New Testament Greek and exegesis (1875). In 1856-57 he served as a member of the Wisconsin Legislature. He died at Bala, Wales, July 25, 1892. He translated Zochler's Commentary on Job, in Schaff's edition of Lange; also publishing many sermons and pamphlets.

## Evans, Thomas Saunders, D.D[[@Headword:Evans, Thomas Saunders, D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, was born at Belper, Derbyshire, March 8, 1816. He graduated from St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1839, and immediately became assistant master of Rugby School. In 1862 he became canon residentiary of Durham, and professor of Greek and classical literature. in the University of Durham, occupying these positions until his death in May 1888. He was the author of the Commentary on First Corinthians, in the Speaker's Commentary: — The Nihilist in the Hay- field, a Latin poem (1882).

## Evaristus[[@Headword:Evaristus]]

             bishop of Rome, is said to have been born at Bethlehem, and to have succeeded Clement as bishop of Rome about A.D. 100. He is said to have first organized Rome into parishes, and to have fallen a martyr A.D. 109.

## Evarts Jeremiah[[@Headword:Evarts Jeremiah]]

             secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, was born in Sunderland, Vermont, February 3, 1781, and graduated at  Yale College in 1802. He studied law, and practiced it at New Haven up to 1810, when he removed to Charlestown in order to edit The Panoplist, which he continued up to 1820. In 1811 he entered the service of the American Board as treasurer. He continued in that work, first as treasurer, then as secretary (in 1821), during the rest of his life. In 1820 The Panoplist was discontinued, and the publication of The Missionary Herald was begun by the American Board, with Mr. Evearts as its editor. He died in Charleston, South Carolina (whither he, had gone for the benefit of his health), May 10, 1831. The Reports of the Board during his connection with it were generally from his pen, and that of 1830, the last which he wrote, is a document of great power. His essays, under the signature of William Penn, on the rights and claims of the Indians, were published in 1829. See Tracy, Memoirs of Jeremiah Evarts (Boston, 1845); Christian Review, 11:20; Spirit of Pilgrims, 4:599.

## Eve[[@Headword:Eve]]

             (Hebrews Chavvah', חִוָּה, life or living, so called as the progenitor of all the human family; Sept. accordingly translates Ζωή in Gen 3:20, elsewhere Εὔα, N. Test. Ε῏υα, Josephus Εὐέα, Ant. 1:1, 2, 4), the name given by Adam to the first woman, his wife (Gen 3:20; Gen 4:1). B.C. 4172. The account of her creation is found at Gen 2:21-22. It is supposed that she was created on the sixth day, after Adam had' reviewed the animals. Upon the failure of a companion suitable for Adam among the creatures which were brought to him to be named, the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon him, and took one of his ribs (according to the Targum of Jonathan, the thirteenth from the right side!), which he fashioned into a woman, and brought her to the man (comp. Plato, Sympos. pages 189, 191). The Almighty, by declaring that "it was not good for man to be alone," and by providing for him a suitable companion, gave the divine sanction to marriage and to monogamy. "This companion was taken from his side," remarks an old commentator, " to signify that he was to be dear unto him as his own flesh. Not from his head, lest she should rule over him; nor from his feet, lest he should tyrannize over her; but from his side, to denote that species of equality which is to subsist in the marriage state" (Matthew Henry, Comment. in loc.). Perhaps that which is chiefly adumbrated by it is the foundation upon which the union between man and wife is built, viz. identity of nature and oneness of origin. Through the subtlety of the serpent (q.v.), Eve was beguiled into a violation of the  one commandment which had been imposed upon her and Adam. She took of the fruit of the forbidden tree and gave it her husband (comp. 2Co 11:3; 1Ti 2:13). SEE ADAM. The apostle seems to intimate (1Ti 2:14-15) that she was less aware than her husband of the character of her sin; and that the pangs of maternity were to be in some sort an expiation of her offense. The different aspects under which Eve regarded her mission as a mother are seen in the names of her sons. At the birth of the first she said "I have gotten a man from the Lord," or, as some have rashly rendered it, “I have gotten a man; even the Lord," mistaking him for the Redeemer. When the second was born, finding her hopes frustrated, she named him Abel, or vanity. When his brother had slain him, and she again bare a son, she called his name Seth, and the joy of a mother seemed to outweigh the sense of the vanity of life: "For God," said she, "hath appointed ME another seed instead of Abel, for Cain slew him." SEE ABEL.

The Eastern people have paid honors to Adam and Eve as to saints, and have some curious traditions concerning them (see D'Herbelot, Bibliothieque Orientale, s.v. Havah; Fabricius, Pseudepigr. V. Test. 1:103 sq.). There is a remarkable tradition preserved among the Rabbis that Eve was not the first wife of Adam, but that previous to her creation one had been created in the same way, which, they sagaciously observe, accounts for the number of a man's ribs being equal on each side. Lilith, or Lilis, for this was the name of Adam's first consort, fell from her state of innocence without tempting, or, at all events, without successfully tempting her husband. She was immediately ranked among the fallen angels, and has ever since, according to the same tradition, exercised an inveterate hatred against all women and children. Up to a very late period she was held in great dread lest she should destroy male children previous to circumcision, after which her power over them ceased. When that rite was solemnized, those who were present were in the habit of pronouncing, with a loud voice, the names of Adam and Eve, and a command to Lilith to depart (see Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum, 2:421). She has been compared with the Pandora of classic fable (Bauer, Mythol. 1:96 sq.; Buttmann, Mythologus, 1:48 sq.; Hasse, Entdeckung. 1:232).

See Olnmsted, Our First Mother (N.Y. 1852); Reineccius, De Adamo androgyno (Weissenf. 1725); Thilo, Filius matris viventium in virum Jehovam (Erlangen, 1748); Kocher, Comment. philol. ad Gen 2:18-20 (Jen. 1779); Schulthess, Exeget. theolog. Forschungen, 1:421 sq.; Bastard, Doctrine of Geneva, 2:61; Hughes, Female Characters, page 1.

## Eveillon, Jacques[[@Headword:Eveillon, Jacques]]

             a French theologian, and grandvicar of Angers under Messrs. Fouquet, Miron, De Reuil, and Arnaud, was born at Angers in 1572, and obtained his preferments in consequence of his superior knowledge of ecclesiastical laws and customs. He died at Angers in 1651. He was the. author of an excellent treatise, Des Excommunications et des Monitoires (1672). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Eveleigh, John, D.D[[@Headword:Eveleigh, John, D.D]]

             provost of Oriel College, Oxford, and prebendary of Rochester (1781), was born in 1747. He died December 10, 1814, leaving The Trinity (1791): — Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford (1792): —Plurality of Persons in the Godhead Proved (1797). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amner. Authors, s.v.

## Evelyn John[[@Headword:Evelyn John]]

             was born October 31, 1620, at his father's seat of Wotton, in Surrey. He was educated at Baliol College, Oxford, served a short time as a volunteer in the Low Countries, and returned at the breaking out of the Civil War to rejoin the king's forces; but, on the king's defeat at Gloucester, he left England, and during the rest of the troubles he traveled in France and Italy. In 1652 he returned to England, and on the restoration he took an honorable part in public business. He died February 27, 1706. He was one of the original members of the Royal Society, and a frequent contributor to its transactions. His most valuable work was Sylva, or a Discourse on Forest Trees. His Diary (not published till 1818) is exceedingly useful for the knowledge it conveys of the times in which Evelyn lived. The Diary and Correspondence has lately been re-edited, with much new matter (Lond. 1850-52, 4 volumes, 8vo). His History of Religion, a rational. Account of the true Religion, was also first published from the MS. in 1850 by the Rev. N. M. Evanson (London, 2 volumes, 8vo); and in 1848 his Life of Mrs. Godolphin (from MSS.) was published by bishop Wilberforce. — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.

## Even-Song[[@Headword:Even-Song]]

             the form of divine service appointed to be "said or sung" in the evening of each day in the Church of England, the expression "sung" meaning not an intonation of the voice, where the service is otherwise professedly read, but the chanting of the service, as in cathedrals. — Eden, Churchman's Dictionary, s.v.

## Evening[[@Headword:Evening]]

             (עֶרֶב, e'reb, e dusk; ἑσπέρα, ὀψία), the period following sunset, with which the Jewish day (νυχθήμερον) began (Gen 1:5; Mar 13:35). SEE DAY. Some writers have argued that the first creative day (Gen 1:5) is reckoned from the morning, when light first appeared (Gen 1:3), as if "evening" then designated not a portion of time, but a termination of the first creative period or age; but this does violence to the whole order of the narrative, in which a period of night invariably precedes one of daylight, precisely in accordance with the conventional Hebrew usage of a νυχθήμερον or "evening-and-morning," and as the terms are expressly defined in the former clause of Gen 1:5. If "evening" in the phrase in question be distinguishable from the "night" as a terminus, it is certainly a terminus a quo, as dating the latter from the aboriginal "darkness," Gen 1:2, and not a terminus ad quem of the ensuing day. SEE NIGHT.

The Hebrews appear to have reckoned two evenings in each day; as in the phrase בֵּין עִרְבִּיַם, between the two evenings (Exo 16:12; Exo 30:8), by which they designated that part of the day in which the paschal lamb was to be killed (Exo 12:6; Lev 23:5; Num 9:3; Num 9:5; in the Hebrews and margin); and, at the same time, the evening sacrifice was offered, the lamps lighted, and the incense burned (Exo 29:39; Exo 29:41; Num 28:4). But the ancients themselves disagreed concerning this usage; for the Samaritans and Caraites (comp. Reland, De Samarit. § 22, in his Diss. Miscell volume 2; Trigland, De Karaeis, chap. iv) understood the time to be that between sunset and twilight, and so Aben Esra at Exo 12:6, who writes that it was about the third hour (9 o'clock P.M.); the Pharisees, on the other hand, as early as the time of Josephus (War, 6:9, 3), and the Rabbins (Pesach, 5:3), thought that "the first evening" was that period of the afternoon when the sun is verging towards setting (Gr. δείλη πρωϊvα), "the second evening" the precise moment of sunset itself (δείλη ὀψία), according to which opinion the paschal lamb would bed slaughtered from the ninth to the eleventh hour (3 to 5 o'clock P.M.). The former of these opinions seems preferable on account of the expression in Deu 16:6, "when the sun goeth down," בְּבוַֹא הִשֶּׁמֶשׁ; and also on account of the similar phraseology among the Arabs (Borhaneddin, Enchiridion Studiosi, 8:36, ed. Caspin, Lips. 1838; Kamus, page 1917; on the contrary, see Pococke, Ad Carmen Tograi, page 71; Talmud Hieros. Berach. chapter 1; Babyl. Sabb. 2:346, fol.; Bochart, Hieroz. 1:634, Lips.). SEE PASSOVER.

## Evening Sacrifice[[@Headword:Evening Sacrifice]]

             SEE DAILY OFFERING.

## Everett Joseph[[@Headword:Everett Joseph]]

             an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Queen Anne's Co., Maryland, June 17, 1732; was converted in the time of Whitefield, under the preaching of the Presbyterians (then called "New Lights"), in June, 1763, but soon lost his religion, and remained in sin until in 1778 or 1779 he was reclaimed through Asbury's preaching. In 1780 he entered the itinerant ministry, and labored as pastor and presiding elder with great unction and success until 1804, when he became superannuated, and died in Dorchester, Maryland, October 16, 1809, having preached Christ earnestly for thirty years, and been instrumental in the salvation of many souls. He was a preacher "mighty through God," and died in great triumph. See Minutes of Conferences, 1:179; also Autobiographical Sketch in the Arminian Magazine, volume 2; Sprague, Annals, 7:71; Stevens, Hist. M.E. Church. (G.L.T.)

## Everett, James[[@Headword:Everett, James]]

             a noted English Methodist preacher, was born at Alnwick, Northumberland, May 16, 1784. He was converted when about nineteen years of age, joined the Wesleyans, soon began to preach, in 1806 was called into the regular work at Sunderland, and afterwards occupied important appointments in the Conference until 1821, when he became a supernumerary; but in 1828 resumed an efficient relation for a few years, and then retired as a superannuate to the city of York. In 1847 the celebrated "Fly Sheets" appeared in the Wesleyan connection, strongly inveighing against its administration; and their authorship being charged upon Mr. Everett, and he not denying it, he was expelled in 1848 from the ministry, together with Reverends James Dunn and Walter Griffith, who united in forming what has since been known as the Methodist Free Church (q.v.). Mr. Everett died in Sunderland, May 10, 1872. He is the author of several publications, chiefly biographical.

## Everett, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Everett, Robert, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Gronant, North Wales, January 2, 1791. He studied under Reverend Thomas Jones, of Newmarket, also in the Denbigh Academy; began preaching in 1809, but two years later entered Wrexham Theological Seminary, and completed a four years' course. He was ordained pastor in Debigh in 1815; dismissed in 1823; came to America and began to minister to the Welsh Congregational Church,Utica, N.Y., in July of the same year. This charge he resigned in 1832, and in the following year became acting pastor at East Winfield, where he remained until 1835, when, for about three years, he served the Presbyterian Church at Westernville. In April 1838, he was installed pastor of the two Welsh congregations of Steuben, a position which he retained until the close of his life, although, during the last few years, he preached only occasionally. He died there, February 25, 1875. The Welsh people in the United States gave him eleven hundred dollars as a testimonial in 1871.  Stenographia is the title of a work which he published at Denbigh in 1816, in which shorthand writing was first adapted to the Welsh language. Sixty editions of his First Catechism were published in Wales, being first issued at Denbigh in 1822. This was republished in America, and passed through several editions. At Steuben he published a Larger Cutechism; also Arveinydd, an aid to reading Welsh, of which fifteen editions were printed prior to his death. In January 1840, he published the first number of Y Cenhadwr Americanaidd (The American Missionary), a Welsh Congregational monthly, which was edited, after his death, by his son. In 1843 he published Y Dyngarwr (The Philanthropist), devoted to emancipation and temperance; and from 1850 to 1852 he edited Y Detholydd (Eclectic). Two Welsh hymnbooks, published in 1839 and 1846, were in large part prepared by Dr. Everett. See Cong. Quarterly, 1876, page 425; 1877, page 314.

## Everlasting[[@Headword:Everlasting]]

             SEE ETERNAL.

## Everlasting Gospel[[@Headword:Everlasting Gospel]]

             SEE EVANGELIUM AETERNUM.

## Everton, Silvester De[[@Headword:Everton, Silvester De]]

             an English prelate of the 13th century, took his name from Everton, a village in Bedfordshire. He received the lord chancellorship of England in 1246, and was very skilful in customs of chancery. The next year he was consecrated bishop of Carlisle. With the rest of the English bishops he boldly requested of Henry III that all foreigners and insufficient persons might be put out of their bishoprics. The king retorted on the bishops, singling out Silvester as to the point of insufficiency. Everton lost his life by a fall from a horse, in 1254. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 1:168.

## Eves, or Vigils[[@Headword:Eves, or Vigils]]

             the nights or evenings before certain holy days of the Church. In the primitive times, it was the custom for Christians to pass great part of the nights that preceded certain holydays in religious exercises; these, from their being performed in the night-time, were called vigils or watchings. One of the most remarkable in the early Church was the Easter vigil. According to the testimony of Lactantius and Jerome, the early Christians expected the second coming of Christ on this night, and prepared themselves, by fasting, prayer, and other spiritual exercises, for that great event. The illuminations on these vigils were often splendid. The night- watchings, in all probability, owed their origin to the necessity under which the primitive Christians lay of meeeting by night when the occasion ceased, the custom still continued. These night-meetings came to be much abused. Vigilantius, in the 4th century, strongly inveighed against them on the ground of their being injurious to the morals of young persons. He was opposed in this view by Jerome. Complaints, however, continued to  increase, till at length the custom was abolished. The fasts, however, were retained, keeping the former name of vigils. The Church of England has assigned vigils to several of her festivals, but has prescribed no other observance of them than the reading. of the collect peculiar to the festival. The holydays which have vigils may be seen in the English Prayer-book, in the table of the vigils, fasts, and days of abstinence to be observed in the year. There are no vigils recognized in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the table of vigils being left out by the revisers. TheMethodist Episcopal Church observes one vigil in the year, the Watch-night, December 31, in which service is kept up until midnight. — Bingham, Orig. Eccl. book 8, chapter 10, § 1; 13:111, 4; Eden, Churchman's Dict. s.v.

## Evi[[@Headword:Evi]]

             (Hebrews Evi', אֵַוי, desire or dwelling; Sept. Εὐεί, Εὐίν), one of the five kings ("dukes") of the Midianites (near Sihon) slain by the Israelites in the war arising out of the idolatry of Baal-peor, induced by the suggestion of Balaam (Num 31:8), and whose lands were afterwards allotted to Reuben (Jos 13:21). SEE MIDIAN.

## Evidence[[@Headword:Evidence]]

             I. Evidence is the rendering in the A.V. of סֵפֶר, seapher, a book (as usually rendered), or writing (q.v.) generally, hence a document of title, i.e., deed or bill of sale (Jer 32:10); ἔλεγχος, proof (Heb 11:1; "reproof," 2Ti 3:16, i.e., conviction).

II. Evidence is defined by Blackstone "to signify that which demonstrates, makes clear, or ascertains the truth of the very fact or point in issue, either on the one side or the other" (Comm. 3:23). "Intuitive evidence comprehends all first truths, or principles of common sense, as 'every change implies the operation of a cause;' axioms in science, as 'things equal to the same thing are equal to one another;' and the evidence of consciousness, whether by sense, or memory, or thought, as when we touch, or remember, or know, or feel anything. Evidence of this kind arises directly from the presence or contemplation of the object, and gives knowledge without any effort upon our parts. Deductive evidence is distinguished as demonstrative and probable. Demonstrative evidence rests upon axioms, or first truths, from which, by ratiocination, we attain to other truths. It is scientific, and leads to certainty. It admits not of degrees;  and it is impossible to conceive the contrary of the truth which it establishes. Probable evidence has reference, not to necessary, but contingent truth. It admits of degrees, and is derived from various sources; e.g., experience, analogy, and testimony" (Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.).

The Scotch school of metaphysics presents the doctrine of evidence as follows: "The theory of evidence was not unknown to Aristotle and the ancient writers, but it is chiefly to the researches of modern logicians, from Bacon downwards, that we are indebted for a complete exposition of it. The grounds on which we believe a statement to be either true or false are termed the evidence. These grounds, it is obvious, may vary in kind as well as in degree. Some truths are capable of being established with undoubted certainty; others, again, admit of a proof more or less strong. It is of great importance, therefore, to know by what kind of evidence any fact or statement can be supported, and thus we may readily ascertain to what extent our belief in it may be carried. The two great classes into which all kinds of evidence are usually reduced are. intuitive and deductive, the former calling for immediate and irresistible belief, independently of any process of argumentation whatever; the latter requiring for its proof various consecutive steps of reasoning. Some writers are in the habit of dividing evidence into three classes: intuitive — deductive, and. demonstrative, and the evidence of testimony. Under intuitive evidence, which commands instant and irresistible belief, are generally included, besides those priori truths which are necessarily involved in an act of consciousness, the evidence of sense, of memory, and of axioms or general principles. 'It is well, however, to bear in mind that consciousness and intuitive evidence are convertible terms, and that is in no sense entitled to be considered as resting on intuitive evidence which is not involved in an act of consciousness. This view of the subject no doubt limits the number of intuitive, and therefore dogmatically certain truths; sufficient, however, remains to establish a sure foundation for all future reasonings of every kind. And this is all that ought to be desired. Those truths only are entitled tom be ranked as intuitions which we cannot deny without involving ourselves in an obvious contradiction.

What is essentially necessary to the operation of our intellectual and moral nature is intuitive. We cannot think, for example, without being subjected to the influence of the evidence of consciousness. To these, then, in so far as man is concerned, dogmatical certainty belongs. He cannot doubt their truth without disclaiming the  nature with which he has been endowed. The evidence of intuition, or consciousness, is certain in itself, but from its truths no other truths can be deduced. Hence the distinction drawn between this and all the other species of evidence, which are classed under one head, termed deductive. Deductive evidence, or that which is chiefly available in the evolution of unknown from known truths, is usually distinguished into two kinds, demonstrative and moral, or probable evidence, giving rise to a corresponding distinction in modes of reasoning. It is of great importance that the difference between demonstrative and probable evidence be kept constantly in view, that we may be prevented from confounding two species of truth so completely distinct from one another. The evidence of demonstration applies to necessary, moral or probable evidence to contingent truth. The great mass of objects upon which our judgment and reasonings are exercised rests upon probable evidence. Demonstrative evidence is very limited in the range of its application, extending no farther than to the relations of number and quantity, which are capable of being expressed in language so strictly definite as to admit of no misunderstanding or mistake. On the strict definition of terms rests the whole certainty of mathematical truth, which is not an absolute, therefore, but a hypothetical certainty; and to the great mass of phenomena, and events with which we are familiarly, conversant, such a mode of reasoning would be altogether inapplicable.

The language employed is too vague and ambiguous to admit of strict definition; and such is the imperfection of language that, however desirable it might be to have words used in, a fixed meaning, it is impracticable. The idea has, no doubt, been entertained of reducing words, expressive of our views on general subjects, to a fixed and certain signification; and even the illustrious names of Leibnitz and Locke are found in connection with such a plan, and yet we fear the experience of all past ages must pronounce it utopian. However advantageous, indeed, such a plan in some respects might be, it is very doubtful whether it might not so fetter and constrain the mind that no scope would be given for the exercise of those powers which the labor required in procuring probable evidence summons into action his very injurious to the mind to entertain too strong a partiality for one species of evidence rather than another. We thereby lose sight of the important fact that the same kind of evidence is not equally applicable in all cases, and that therefore we ought only to require such evidences as the particular circumstances of the case admit. Instead, therefore, of being dissatisfied with the kind of evidence adduced, it ought to be' our chief inquiry whether, in any given case, we have  obtained the strongest evidence of that kind which is applicable." On the distinction between probable and demonstrative evidence, see Butler, Analogy of Religion (Introduction). See also Gardner, Christian (Encyklopaedia page 352; Bergier, Dict. de Theologei, 2:534; Brown, On Cause and Effect, notes E, F; Abercrombie, On Intellectual Powers, part 2; Starkie, On Evidence, 1:471; Gambier, On Moral, Evidence (London, 1824, 8vo).; Locke, Essay, book 4, chapter 15. Evidences of Christianity, the title generally given by English writers to the proofs of the divine origin of the Christian revelation. This branch of theology does not include demonstrations of the being of God against the atheists, but is directed against all who deny the divine authority of Christianity and of the Scriptures on which it rests. The term Apologetics has been adopted in Germanv for the name of this science, and under that title and that of Apology we have given an account of the forms which the proofs and defences of Christianity have assumed in the various periods of Church history. In this article we give (I.) a summary of the evidences as they are commonly stated by English writers; (II.) a summary of the views held by different writers as to the relative value of the several branches of evidence.

I. Summary of Christian Evidences. — The evidences of Christianity are usually classed by English writers under three heads — External, Internal, and Collateral. The External evidences are those which demonstrate the authenticity, credibility and divine authority of the Scriptures, including the arguments from miracles and prophecy. The Internal evidence is drawn from the excellence and beneficial tendency of the doctrines and morals of Scripture, from the character of Christ, and froan the marks of integrity, consistency, and inspiration which are inherent in the record. The Collateral evidence is drawm from the history of Christianity itself, from its marvellous diffusion, its effects upon human nature, upon the progress of society, and upon what is generally called civilization. One of the best sketches of the evidences, according to: this classification of them, is that given by Watson (Institutes, volume 1). Preliminary to a consideration of these direct evidences, he gives an excellent sketch of the presumptive evidence, of which the following is a brief outline. Man is universally admitted, by all who admit the being of God, to be a moral and, responsible agent, under the dominion of the law of God. But deists assert that this law is given in nature sufficiently, and that. revelation is unnecessary. It can be shown, on the other hand, that human reason, unaided, has never afforded to man any clear standard of moral quality for actions, and that, even if it  could do so, its decisionslack authority to control the will; they are, at best, but opinions, which may be received or not, at pleasure. History shows that sober views of religion have been found nowhere since the times of the patriarchs, except in the writings of the O. and N.T., and in writings drawn from: them; and that whatever truth; has been found in the religious systems of the heathen can be traced to revelation. Their notions as to the very rudimentary doctrines of religion e.g. God, providence, immortality, etc., clearly show the necessity of revelation. Admitting, then, the presumption that a revelation should be given in some way, we, may show, a priori, that it must

(1) contain information on the subjects most important to man;

(2) that it must accord with the principles of former revelations;

(3) that it must have an external authentication; and

(4) that it must contain provisions for its own effectual promulgation. All these conditions are fulfilled by the revelation given in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and nowhere else.

1. The external evidences include miracles and prophecy. "We need not inquire whether external evidence of a revelation is in all cases requisite to him n who immediately and at first receives it; for the question is not, whether private revelations have ever been made by God to individuals, and what evidence is required to authenticate them, but what is the kind of evidence which we ought to require of one who professes to have received a revelation of the will of God with a command to communicate it to us, and to enjoins it upon our acceptance and submission as the rule of our opinions and manners. He may believe that a divine communication has been made to himself, but his belief has no authority to command ours. He may have actually received it, but we have not the means of knowing it without proof. That proof is not the high and excellent nature of the truths he teaches in other words, that which is called the internal evidence cannot be that proof. For we cannot tell whether the doctrines he teaches, though they should be capable of a higher degree of rational demonstration than any delivered to the world before, may not be the fruits of his own mental labor. He may be conscious that they are not, but we have no means of knowing that of which he is conscious except by his own testimony. To us, therefore, they would have no authority but as the opinions of a man whose intellectual attainments we might admire, but to wham we could not  submit as to an infallible guide, and the less so it any part of the doctrine taught by him were either mysterious or above our reason, or contrary to our interests, prejudices, and passions. If, therefore, any person should profess to have received a revelation of truth from God to teach to mankind, and that he was directed to command their obedience to it an pain of the divine displeasure, he would be asked for some external authentication of his mission; nor would the reasonableness and excellence of his doctrines be accepted in place of this. The latter might entitle him to attention, but nothing short of the former would be thought a ground sufficiently strong for yielding to him an absolute obedience. Without it he might reason and be heard with respect, but he could not command. On this very reasonable ground the Jews on the occasion asked our Lord, "By what authority doest thou these things?" and on another, "What sign showest thou unto us?" Agreeably to this, the authors both of 'the Jewish, and the Christian revelations profess to have authenticated their mission by the two great external proofs, MIRACLES and PROPHECY, and it remains to be considered whether this kind of authentication be reasonably sufficient to command our faith and obedience.

The question is not whether we may not conceive of external proofs of the mission of Moses, and of Christ and his apostles, differing from those which are assumed to have been given, and more convincing. In whatever way the authentication had been made, we might have conceived of modes of proof differing in kind, or more ample in circumstance; so that to ground an objection upon the absence of a particular Mind of proof, for which we have a preference, would "be trifling. But this is the question: Is a mission to teach the will of God to man, under his immediate authority, sufficiently authenticated when miracles are really performed, and prophecies actually and unequivocally accomplished? We have, then, first to show that miracles and prophecies are possible, that their credibility can be established by human testimony, and that, when thus authenticated, they afford the necessary evidence of revelation. These topics will be treated under the heads of MIRACLES and PROPHECY (q.v.). The records of both miracles and prophecy are found in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The antiquity of these writings is demonstrated by the very fact of the existence, on the one hand of the Jewish 'polity,' and, on the other, of the Christian religion, as well as by the concurrent testimony ,of ancient profane authors. These books can be shown, by testimony more accurate and minute than exists with regard to any other ancient records, to  be substantially the same now as when originally written, nay, that they have come down to our times without any material alteration whatsoever. The credibility of the testimony of the sacred writers themselves is fairly proved by the character of the men, by the circumstances under which they wrote, and by the entire absence of motive for falsification. Allowing, then, the New Testament to be genuine, it follows,

"1. That the writers knew whether the facts they state were true or false (Joh 1:3; Joh 19:27; Joh 19:35; Act 27:7; Act 27:9).

2. That the character of these writers, so far as we can judge by their works, seems to render them worthy of regard, and leaves no room to imagine they intended to deceive us. The manner in which they tell their story is most happily adapted to gain our belief. There is no air of declamation and harangue; nothing that looks like artifice and design: no apologies, no encomiums, no characters, no reflections, no digressions; but the facts are recounted with great simplicity, just as they seem to have happened, and those facts are left to speak for themselves. Their integrity, likewise, evidently appears in the freedom with which they. mention those circumstances which might have exposed their Master and themselves to the greatest contempt amongst prejudiced and inconsiderate men, such as they knew they must generally expect to meet with (Joh 1:45-46; Joh 7:52; Luk 2:4; Luk 2:7; Mar 6:3; Mat 8:20; Joh 7:48). It is certain that there are in their writings the most genuine traces not only of a plain and honest, but a most pious and devout, a most benevolent and generous disposition, as everyone must acknowledge who reads their writings.

3. The apostles were under no temptation to forge a story of this kind, or to publish it to the world knowing it to be false.

4. Had they done so, humanly speaking, they must quickly have perished in it and their foolish cause must have died with them, without ever gaining any credit in the world. Reflect more particularly on the nature of those grand facts, the death, resurrection and exaltation of Christ, which formed the great foundation of the Christian scheme, as first exhibited to the apostles. The resurrection of a dead man, and his ascension into an abode in the upper world, were such strange things that a thousand objections would immediately have been raised against them, and some extraordinary proof would have been justly required as a balance to them. Consider the manner in which the apostles will- evidently appear that, instead of confirming their scheme, it must have been sufficient utterly to have overthrown it, had it been itself the most probable. imposture that the wit of man could ever have contrived. See Acts 3, 9, 14, 19, etc. They did not merely assert that they had seen miracles wrought by Jesus, but that he had endowed them with a variety of miraculous powers; and these they undertook to display, not; in such idle and useless tricks as sleight of hand might perform, but in such solid and important works as appeared worthy of divine interposition, and entirely superior to human power. Nor were these: things undertaken in a corner, in a circle of friends or dependents; nor were they said to be wrought, as might be suspected, by any confederates in the fraud; but they were done often in the most public manner. Would impostors have made such pretensions as these? or, if they had, must they not immediately have been, exposed and ruined? Now, if the New Testament be genuine, then it is certain that the apostles pretend to have wrought miracles in the very presence of those to whom their writings were addressed; nay, more, they profess likewise to have conferred those miraculous gifts in some considerable degrees on, others, even on the very persons to whom they write, and they appeal to their consciences as to the truth of it. And could there possibly be room for delusion here?

5. It is likewise certain that the apostles did gain early credit, and succeeded in a most wonderful manner. This is abundantly proved by the vast, number of churches established in early ages at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Colosse, etc.

6. That, admitting the facts which they testified concerning Christ to be true, then it was reasonable for their contemporaries, and is reasonable for us, to receive the Gospel which they have transmitted to us as a divine revelation. The great thing they asserted was, that Jesus was the Christ, and that he was proved to be so by prophecies accomplished in him, and by miracles wrought by him, and by others in his name. If we attend to these we shall find them to be no contemptible arguments, but must be forced to acknowledge that the premises being established, the conclusion most easily and necessarily follows; and this conclusion, that Jesus is the Christ, taken in all its extent, is an abstract of the Gospel revelation, and therefore is sometimes put for the whole of it (Act 8:37; Acts 12-18)." the doctrines of Scripture, of their consistency with the character of God, and their tendency to promote the virtue and happiness of men. It takes note also of the morals of Christianity, and of their superiority to all other systems of ethics; and especially of the character of Christ, as a real life far transcending even the highest imaginations of merely human moralists. "Of its just and sublime conceptions and exhibitions of the divine character; of the truth of that view of the moral state of man upon which its disciplinary treatment is founded; of the correspondence that there is between its views of man a mixed relation to God as a sinful creature, and yet pitied and cared for, and that actual mixture of good and evil, penalty and forbearance, which the condition of the world presents; of the connection of its doctrine of atonement with hope; of the adaptation of its doctrine of divine influence to the moral condition of mankind when rightly understood, and the affecting benevolence and condescension which it implies; and of its noble and sanctifying revelations of the blessedness of a future life, much might be said — they are subjects, indeed, on which volumes have been written, and they can never be exhausted.

Nowhere except in the Scriptures have we a perfect system of morals; and the deficiencies of pagan morality only exalt the purity, the comprehensiveness, the practicability of ours. The character of the Being acknowledged as supreme must always impress itself upon moral feeling and practice, the obligation of which rests upon his will. The God of the Bible is 'holy,' without spot; 'just,' without partiality; 'good,' boundlessly benevolent and beneficent; and his law is the image of himself, 'holy, just, and good.' These great moral qualities are not made known to us merely in the abstract, so as to be comparatively feeble in their influence, but in the person of Christ, our God incarnate, they are seen exemplified in action, displaying themselves amidst human relations, and the actual circumstances of human life. With pagans the authority of moral rules was either the opinion of the wise, or the tradition of the ancient, confirmed, it is true, in some degree, by observation and experience; but to us they are given as commands immediately issuing from the supreme Governor, and ratified as his by the most solemn and explicit attestations. With them many great moral principles, being indistinctly apprehended, were matters of doubt and debate; to us, the explicit manner in which they are given excludes both: for it cannot be questioned whether we are commanded to love your neighbor as ourselves; to do to others as we would that they should do to us, a precept which comprehends almost all relative morality in one plain  principle; to forgive our enemies; to love all: mankind; to live righteously and soberly, as well as godly; that magistrates must be a terror only to evil- doers, and a praise to them that do well; that subjects are to render honor to whom honor, and tribute to whom tribute, is due; that masters are to be just and merciful, and servants faithful and obedient.

These, and many other familiar precepts, are too explicit to be mistaken, and too authoritative to be disputed; two of the most powerful means of rendering law effectual. Those who never enjoyed the benefit of revelation, never conceived justly and comprehensively of that moral state of the heart from which right and beneficent conduct alone can flow; and, therefore, when they speak of the same virtues as those enjoined by Christianity, they are to be understood as attaching to them a lower idea. In this the infinite superiority of Christianity displays itself. The principle of obedience is not only a sense of duty to God and the fear of his displeasure, but a tender love, excited by his infinite compassions to us in the gift of his Son, which shrinks from offending. To this influential motive as a reason of obedience is added another, drawn from its end: one not less influential, but which heathen moralists never knew the testimony that we please God, manifested in the acceptance of our prayers, and in spiritual and felicitous communion with him. By Christianity, impurity of thought and desire is restrained in an equal degree as are their overt acts in the lips and conduct. Humanity, meekness, gentleness, placability, disinterestedness, and charity are all as clearly and solemnly enjoined as the grosser vices are prohibited; and on the unruly tongue itself is impressed 'the law of kindness.' Nor are the injunctions feeble; they are strictly LAW, and not mere advice and recommendations: 'Without holiness no man shall see the Lord' and thus our entrance into heaven, and our escape from perdition, are made to depend upon this preparation of mind. To all this is added possibility, nay, certainty of attainment, if we use the appointed means. A pagan could draw, though not with lines so perfect, a beau ideal of virtue which. he never thought attainable; but the 'full assurance of hope' is given by the religion of Christ to all who are seeking the moral renovation of their nature, because 'it is God that worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure.' When such is the moral nature of Christianity, how obvious is it that its tendency, both as to individuals and to society, must be in the highest sense beneficial! From every passion which wastes, and burns, and frets, and enfeebles the spirit, the individual is set free, and his inward peace renders his obedience cheerful and voluntary; and we might appeal to infidels themselves whether, if the moral principles of the Gospel were  wrought into the hearts and embodied in the conduct of all men, the world. would not be happy; whether if governments ruled, and subjects obeyed, by the laws of Christ; whether if the rules of strict justice which are enjoined upon us regulated all the transactions of men, and all that mercy to the distressed which we are taught to feel. and to practice came into operation; and whether, if the precepts which delineate and enforce the duties of husbands, wives, masters, servants, parents, children, did, in fact, fully and generally govern all these relations — whether a better age than that called golden by the poets would not then be realized, and Virgil's

Jams redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,

[Now Astraea returns, and tihe Saturnian reign,]

be far too weak to express the mighty change? [It was in the reign of Saturn that the heathen poets fixed the Golden Age. At that period, according to them, Astraea (the goddess of justice), and many other deities, lived on earth, but, being offended with the wickedness of men, they successively fled to heaven. Astraea staid longest, but at last retired to her natives seat, and was translated into the sign Virgo; next to Libra, who holds her balance.] Such is the tendency of Christianity. On immense numbers of individuals it has superinduced these moral changes; all nations where it has been fully and faithfully exhibited, bear, amidst their remaining vices, the impress of its hallowing and benevolent influence: it is now in active exertion in many of the darkest and worst parts of the earth, to convey the same blessings; and he who would arrest its progress, were he able, would quench the only hope which remains to our world, and prove himself an enemy not only to himself, but to all mankind.

What, then, we ask, does all this prove, but that theScriptures are worthy of God, and propose the veryends which rendered a revelation necessary? Of the whole system of practical religion which it contains we may say, as of that which is embodied in our Lord's sermon on the mount, in the words of one who, in a. course of sermons on that divine composition, has entered most deeply into its spirit, and presented a most. instructive delineation of the character which it was intended to form, Behold Christianity in its native form, as delivered by its great author. See a picture of God, as far as he is imitable by man, drawn by God's own hand. What beauty appears in the whole! How just a symmetry! What exact proportion in every part! How desirable is the happiness here described! How venerable, how lovely is the holiness!' 'If,' says Jeremy Taylor, 'wisdom, and mercy, and justice, and simplicity, and holiness, and purity, and meekness, and contentedness, and  charity be images of God and rays of divinity, then that doctrine, in which all these shine so gloriously, and in which nothing else is ingredient, must needs be from God. If the holy Jesus had come into the world with less splendor of power and mighty demonstrations, yet the excellency of what he taught makes him alone fit to bet he master of the world;' and agreeable to all this has been its actual influence upon mankind.

Although, says Bishop Perteus, Christianity has not always been so well understood or so honestly practiced as it ought to have been; although its spirit has been often mistaken and its precepts misapplied, yet under all these disadvantages it has gradually produced a visible change in those points which most materially concern the peace and quiet of the world. Its beneficent spirit has spread itself through all the different relations and modifications of life, and communicated its kindly influence to almost every public and private concern of mankind. It has insensibly worked itself into the inmost frame and constitution of civil states. It has given a tinge to the complexion of their governments, to the temper and administration of their laws. It has restrained the spirit of the prince and the madness of the people. It has softened the rigors of despotism and tamed the insolence of conquest. It has, in some degree, taken away the edge of the sword, and thrown even over the horrors of war a veil of mercy. It has descended into families; has diminished the pressure of private tyranny; improved every domestic endearment; given tenderness to the parent, humanity to the master, respect to superiors, to inferiors ease; so that mankind are, upon the whole, even in a temporal view, under infinite obligations to the mild and pacific temper of the Gospel, and have reaped from it more substantial worldly benefits than from any other institution upon earth. As one proof of this among many others, consider only the shocking carnage made in the human species by the exposure of infants, the gladiatorial shows, which sometimes cost Rome twenty or thirty lives in a month; and the exceedingly cruel usage of slaves allowed and practiced by the ancient pagans. These were not the accidental and temporary excesses of a sudden fury, but were legal, and established, and constant methods of murdering and tormenting mankind. Had Christianity done nothing more than brought into disuse, as it confessedly has done, the two former of these inhuman customs entirely, and the latter to a very great degree, it has justly merited the title of the benevolent religion. But this is far from being all. Throughout the more enlightened parts of Christendom there prevails a gentleness of manners widely different from the ferocity of the most civilized nations of antiquity; and that liberality with which every species of  distress is relieved is a virtue peculiar to the Christian name.

But we may ask farther, What success has it had on the mind of man as it respects his eternal welfare? How many thousands have felt its power, rejoiced in its benign influence, and under its dictates been constrained to devote themselves to the glory and praise of God! Burdened with guilt, incapable of finding relief from hunman resources, the mind has here found peace unspeakable in beholding that sacrifice which alone could atone for transgression. Here the hard and impenitent heart has been softened, the impetuous passions restrained, the ferocious temper subdued, powerful prejudices conquered, ignorance dispelled, and the obstacles to real happiness removed. Here the Christian, looking round on the glories and blandishments of this world, has been enabled, with a noble contempt, to, despise all. Here death itself, the king of terrors, has lost all his sting; and the soul, with a holy magnanimity, has borne up in the agonies of a dying hour, and sweetly sung itself away. to everlasting bliss. In respect to its future spread, we have reason to believe that all nations shall feel its happy effects. The prophecies are pregnant with matter as to this belief. It seems that not only a nation or a country, but the whole habitable globe, shall become the kingdom of our God and of his Christ" (Watson, Dictionary, s.v. Christianity).

3. The Collateral evidence treats of the marvelous diffusion of the Gospel, and of its actual effects upon mankind and upon the history of civilization, as proofs of its divine origin. "Of its early triumphs, the history of the Acts of the Apostles is a splendid record; and in process of time it made a wonderful progress through Europe, Asia, and Africa. In the third century there were Christians in the camp, in the senate, and in the palace; in short, everywhere, as we are informed, except in the temples and the theaters: they filled the towns, the country, and the islands. Men and women of all ages and ranks, and even those of the first dignity, embraced the Christian faith, insomuch that the pagans complained that the revenues of their temples were ruined. They were in such great numbers in the empire, that, as Tertullian expresses it, if they had retired into another country, they would have left the Roman territory only a frightful solitude. For the illustration of this argument, we may observe that the Christian religion was introduced everywhere in opposition to the sword of the magistrate, the craft and interest of the priests, the pride of the philosophers, the passions and prejudices of the people, all closely combined in support of the national worship, and to crush the Christian faith, which aimed at the  subversion of heathenism and idolatry. Moreover, this religion was not propagated in the dark by persons who tacitly endeavored to deceive the credulous, nor delivered out by little and little, so that one doctrine might prepare the way for the reception of another; but it was fully and without disguise laid before men all at once, that they might judge of the whole under one view. Consequently mankind were not deluded into the belief of it, but received it upon proper examination and conviction. Besides, the Gospel was first preached and first believed by multitudes in Judaea, where Jesus exercised his ministry, and where every individual had the means of knowing whether the things that were told him were matters of fact; and in this country, the scene of the principal transactions on which its credibility depended, the history of Christ could never have been received unless it had been true, and known to all as truth.

Again: the doctrine and history of Jesus were preached and believed in the most noted countries and cities of the world, in the very age when he is said to have lived. On the fiftieth day after our Lord's crucifixion, three thousand persons were converted in Jerusalem by a single sermon of the apostles; and a few weeks after this, five thousand who believed were present at another sermon preached also in Jerusalem (Act 2:41; Act 4:4; Act 6:7; Act 8:1; Act 9:1; Act 9:20). About eight or ten years after our Lord's death, the disciples were become so numerous at Jerusalem and in the adjacent country that they were objects of jealousy and alarm to Herod himself (Act 12:1). In the twenty-second year after the crucifixion, the disciples in Judaea are said to have been many myriads (Act 21:20). The age in which Christianity was introduced and received was famous for men whose faculties were improved by the most perfect state of social life, but who were good judges of the evidence offered in support of the facts recorded in the Gospel history; for it should be recollected that the success of the Gospel was not restricted to Judaea, but it was preached in all the different provinces of the Roman empire.

The first triumphs of Christianity were in the heart of Greece itself, the nursery of learning and the polite arts, for churches were planted at a very early period at Corinth, Ephesus, Beroea, Thessalonica, and Philippi. Even Rome herself, the seat of wealth and empire, was not able to resist the force of truth at a time when the facts related were recent, and when they might, if they had been false, have easily been disproved. From Greece and Rome, at a period of cultivation and refinement, of general peace and extensive intercourse, when one great empire united different nations and distant people, the confutation of these facts would very soon have passed from one country to another, to the utter confusion of the persons who  endeavored to propagate the belief of them. Nor ought it to be forgotten that the religion to which such numbers were proselyted was an exclusive one. It denied, without reserve, the truth of every article of heathen mythology, and the existences of every object of their worship. It accepted no compromise; it admitted of no comprehension. If it prevailed at all, it must prevail by the overthrow of every statue, altar, and temple in the world. It pronounced all other gods to be false, and all other worship vain. These are considerations which must have strengthened the opposition to it, augmented the hostility which it must encounter, and enhanced the difficulty of gaining proselytes; and more. especially when we recollect that, among the converts to Christianity in the earliest age, a number of persons remarkable for their station, office, genius, education, and fortune,, and who were personally interested by their emoluments and honors in either Judaism or heathenism, appeared among the Christian proselytes. Its evidences approved themselves not only to the multitude, but to men of the most refined sense and most distinguished abilities, and it dissolved the attachments which all powerful interest and authority created and upheld" (Watson, 1.c.).

Paleay's View of the Evidences of Christianity for a long time held the first place as a textbook on evidences in England. Paley even goes so far as to say we can conceive of no way in which a revelation could be made except by miracles. "In whatever degree it is probable, or not very improbable, that a revelation should be communicated to mankind at all, in the same degree it is probable, — or not very improbable, that miracles should be wrought. Therefore, when miracles are related to have been wrought in the promulgation of a revelation manifestly wanted, and, if true, of inestimable value, the improbability which arises from the miraculous nature of the things related is not greater than the original improbability that such a revelation should be imparted by God." The book is divided into two parts: I. The direct historical evidence of Christianity, and wherein it is distinguished from the evidence alleged for other miracles; II. The 'auxiliary evidences of Christianity'. The first part is then divided into two propositions:

(I.) "That there is satisfactory evidence that many, professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles, passed their lives in labors, dangers, and sufferings, voluntarily undergone in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of: their  belief in those accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motives, to new rules of conduct."

(II.) "That there is not satisfactory evidence that persons pretending to be original witnesses of any other similar miracles have acted in the same manner in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief in the truth of those accounts." The argument rests on the credibility of testimony, and aims to show that the testimony in this case is indubitable. The second part treats briefly the argument from prophecy, from the morality of the Gospel, and the internal evidences afforded both by the sacred writings, and by the doctrines and histories which they contain.

Coleridge, who disparaged the comparative value of evidence from miracles and prophecy, dictated to a friend the following scheme of evidences:

"I. Miracles, as precluding the contrary evidence of no miracles.

II. The material of Christianity, its existence and history.

III. The doctrines of Christianity, and the correspondence of human nature to these doctrines, illustrated,

1st, historically, as the actual production ,of the new world, and the dependence of the fate of the planet upon it;

2d, individually, from its appeal for its truth to an asserted fact, which, whether it be real or not, every man possessing reason has an equal power of ascertaining within himself, namely, a will which has more or less lost its freedom, though mot the consciousness that it ought to be and may become free; the conviction that this cannot be achieved without the operation of a principle connatural with itself; the evident rationality of an entire confidence in that principle, being the condition end means of its operation; the experience in his own nature of the truth of the process described by Scripture as far as he can place himself within the process, aided by the confident assurances of others as to the effects experienced by them, and which he is striving to arrive at.

All these form a practical Christian. Add, however, a gradual opening out of the intellect to more and more clear perceptions of the strict coincidence  of the doctrines of Christianity, with the truths evolved by the mind from inflexions on its own nature. To such a man one main test of the objectivity, the entity, the objective truth of his faith, is its accompaniment by an increase of insight into the moral beauty and necessity of the process which it comprises, and the dependence of that proof on the causes asserted. Believe, and, if thy belief be right, that insight which gradually transmutes faith into knowledge will be the reward of that belief. The Christian, to whom, after a long profession of Christianity, the mysteries remain as much mysteries as before, is in the same state as a school-boy with regard to his arithmetic, to whom the facit at the end of the examples in his ciphering-book is the whole ground for his assuming that such and such figures amount to so and Song of Solomon 3 d. In the above I include the increasing discoveries in the correspondence of the history, the doctrines, and the promises of Christianity with the past, present, and probable future of human nature; and in this state a fair comparison of the religion as a divine philosophy with all other religions which have pretended to revelations and all other systems of philosophy, both with regard to the totality of its truth and its identification with the manifest march of affairs.

I should conclude that, if we suppose a man to have convinced himself that not only the doctrines of Christianity, which may be conceived independently of history or time, as the Trinity, spiritual influences, etc., are coincident with the truths which his reason, thus strengthened, has evolved from its own sources, but that the historical dogmas, namely, of the incarnation of the creative Logos, and his becoming a personal agent, are themselves founded in philosophical necessity then it seems irrational that such a man should reject the belief of the actual appearance of a religion strictly correspondent therewith, at a given time recorded, even as much as that he should reject Caesar's account of his wars in Gaul, after he had convinced himself a priori of their possibility. As the result of these convictions, he will not scruple to receive the particular miracles recorded,. inasmuch as it would be miraculous that an incarnate God should not work what must to mere man appear as miracles, inasmuch as it is strictly accordant with the ends and benevolent nature of such a being to commence the elevation of man above his mere senses by attracting and enforcing attention, first, through an appeal to those senses. But with equal reason will he expect that no other or greater force should be laid on those miracles as such; that they should not be spoken of as good in themselves much less as the adequate and ultimate proof of that religion; and, likewise, he will receive additional satisfaction should he find these miracles so wrought, and on such  occasions, as to give them a personal value as symbols of important truths when their miraculousness was no longer needful or efficacious" (Coleridge, Works, N.Y., 5:555).

On the argument of Butler's Analogy, SEE BUTLER.

II. As to the comparative value of the different classes of the Christian evidences there has been much dispute. Coleridge admitted the value of the testimony from miracles for the Jews at the beginning of Christianity, but considered that argument as much less valuable now than the internal evidence. "It was only to overthrow the usurpation exercised in and through the senses that the senses were miraculously appealed to. Reason and religion are their own evidence. The natural sun is in this respect a symbol of the spiritual. Ere he is fully risen, and while his glories are still under veil, he calls up the breeze to chase away the usurping vapors of the night season, and thus converts the air itself into the minister of its own purification: not surely a proof or elucidation of the light from heaven, but to prevent its interception. Wherever, therefore, similar circumstances coexist with the same moral causes, the principles revealed and the examples recorded in the inspired writings render miracles superfluous; and if we neglect to apply truths in expectation of wonders, or under pretext of the cessation of the latter, we tempt God, and merit the same reply which our Lord gave to the Pharisees on a like occasion. I shall merely state here what my belief is concerning the true evidences of Christianity.

1. Its consistency with right reason I consider as the outer court of the temple, the common area within which it stands.

2. The miracles, with and through, which the religion was first revealed and attested, I regard as the steps, the vestibule, and the portal of the temple.

3. The sense, the inward feeling in the soul of each believer of its exceeding desirableness, the, experience that he needs something, joined with the strong foretokening that the redemption and the graces propounded to us in Christ are what he needs — this I hold to be the true foundation of the spiritual edifice. With the strong a priori probability that flows in from 1 and 3 on the correspondent historical evidence of 2, no man can refuse or neglect to make the experiment without guilt. But,

4, it is the experience derived from a practical conformity to the conditions of the Gospel; it is the opening eye, the dawning light, the terrors and the  promises of spiritual growth, the blessedness of loving God as God, the nascent sense of sin hated as sin, and of the incapability of attaining to either without Christ; it is the sorrow that still rises up from beneath, and the consolation that meets it from above; the bosom treacheries of the principal in the warfare, and the exceeding faithfulness and long-suffering of the uninterested ally; in a word, it is the actual trial of the faith in Christ, with. its accompaniments and results that must form the arched roof, and faith itself is the completing KEY-STONE. In order to an efficient belief in Christianity a man must have been a Christian, and this is the seeming argumentumn in circulo incident to all spiritual truths, to every subject not presentable under the forms of time and space, as long as we attempt to master by the reflex acts of the understanding what we can only know by the act of becoming. 'Do, the will of my father, and ye shall know whether I am of God.' These four evidences I believe to have been, and still to be, for the world, for the whole Church, all necessary, all equally necessary; but that at present, and for the majority of Christians born in Christian countries, I believe the third and the fourth evidence to be the most operative; not as superseding, but as involving a glad, undoubting faith in the two former" (Coleridge, Biographia Literaria, chapter 24).

Ullmann (Sinlessness of Jesus, § 1) remarks "that the nature of the case, and the necessities of their contemporaries, justified the apostles in proving the divine mission of Christ by the argument from miracles and prophecy. But the necessity of the times and of individuals may in this respect vary; and although the Gospel in its essence remains the same, and contains eternal, unchangeable truth, yet in a different age a different method of proof may lead more immediately to the acknowledgment of this truth. In our own time it seems proper to fix our eyes especially upon the spiritual character of Jesus in order to obtain satisfactory proof of the divinity of his mission and instructions, not because the apostolical mode of proof has become untenable, but because the other mode has a more vital efficacy on account of the style of education prevalent at the present day. We do not finf ourselves in immediate, conscious connection with the spirit and prophecies of the Old Testament, as thee Jews were in the time of the apostles; we live among contemporaries to whom miracles are more a ground of doubt than of faith; we should not forget that the, proof from miracles exerts its full power, properly speaking, on none but the eye- witnesses of them and, conducts us to the desired conclusion only by a circuitous path. On the other hand, a vivid apprehension of the inward  character of Jesus brings us nearest to the operative center of Christianity, and at the; same time makes us feel the influence of the moral power which goes forth from that center. Here faith in Jesus rests immediately on himself; it is free, spiritual confidence in his person. As with his contemporaries everything depended on the yielding confidence with which they received the favors which he brought them, so likewise with us this confidence may be the element of a full belief in Christianity, and is, at all: events, a condition of receiving benefit from our Redeemer."

The tendency of German theology has gone against the external: evidences of Christianity, but this very tendency opened the door to rationalism and infidelity, above which German orthodoxy has only recently begun to emerge. On this point, see the Nasa York Review, 2:141 sq. See also bishop Butler's admirable discussion of the "particular" evidence for Christianity in his Analogy of Religion, part 2, chapter 7. See also Mansell, in Aids to Faith, Essay 1 (London, 1861, 8vo). The tendency of the best modern apologists is not to thrust the argument from miracles. into the background, but to vindicate it afresh. So Auberlen, Gottliche Offenbarung (1864); Mozley, On Miracles; Fisher, Essays on the supernatural Origins of Christianity, page 12 sq., 503 sq. The rejection of miracles generally leads to a rejection of the doctrine of the personality of God. See, for a fuller treatment of this branch of the subject, the article MIRACLES SEE MIRACLES . The chief task of the apologist for Christianity in the present age (apart from the metaphysical conflict with Pantheism and Positivism, for which see articles, under those heads) is to vindicate the authenticity and the early date of the books of the N.T. against the assaults not merely of avowed skeptics, but also of theologians within the Christian Church, such as those of the: Tubingen school (q.v.). This task resolves itself, again, into that of vindicating the historical reality of the scriptural miracles. "The recent criticism of the N.T. canon, embracing the attempt to impeach the genuineness of various books, is only a part of the great, discussion of the historical truth of the N.T.; for it is difficult to attack the credibility of the Gospel historians without first disproving their genuineness." (Fisher, Essays, page 14). In the noted Essays and Reviews (Boston ad. 1865, 12mo), Prof. Baden Powell has an article on "The Study of the Evidences of Christianity," in which he undertakes to state the present condition of the discussion, and to indicate the true line: of Christian evidences. He disparages the "professed advocates of an external revelation and historical evidence" by innuendo as  well as by direct attack, and assumes the inconceivability and impossibility of miracles. See Goodwin's article in the American Theological Review, July 1861, which closes as follows: "It is one thing to urge other evidences of Christianity as stronger and more satisfactory than that from miracles; it is another thing to reject all miracles as incredible and absurd. He who takes the former course may show an eminently Christian spirit, and for ourselves we cordially sympathize with his position; but he who takes the latter course, if not an infidel himself; is certainly playing into the hands of infidels and atheists."

One of the chief forms taken by recent Christian apologetics is the argument drawn from the actual phenomena of Christianity, the existing facts which nobody can deny. The first of these is the character of Christ, which has been so described by rationalistic and infidel writers (e.g. Strauss, Renan, Schenkel) as to bring the argument down almost, if not quite, to the point whether Jesus were an impostor or no. The replies to these attacks within the last twenty years have brought with greater force than ever the eternal light of evidence which the person and life of the Redeemer contain in favor of the whole system of Christianity. See the works on this subject of Neander, Lange, Schaff, Pressense, Ellicott, Young, Plumptre, and others. Dr. Schaff sums up the result of a study of Christ in one strong passage: "Jesus of Nazareth is the one absolute and unaccountable exception to the universal experience of mankind. He is the great central miracle of the whole Gospel history; and all his miracles are but the natural and necessary manifestations of his miraculous person, performed with the same ease with which we perform our ordinary daily works." The second of these phenomena is found in the books of the New Testament themselves, as affording abundant internal evidence of reality and truthfulness. The third is the specific Christian doctrine, which can be traced up (through the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians, the genuineness and early date of which are admitted even by the Tubingen school) to within thirty years after the death of Christ. (See an excellent article on the Unexhausted Resources of Christian Evidence, by Prof. Lorimer, in B. and F. Ev. Review, January 1865, reprinted in The Theolog. Eclectic, New Haven, in, 30 ;sq.) Dr. H. Schmidt, of Meiningen, taking the Tubingen critics at their word, undertakes to find in the four unquestioned epistles (Galatians , 1 James , 2 d Corinthians, and Romans) a full vindication of the truth and divine origin of Christianity. See his Der Paulinische Christus (Weimar, 1867, 8vo).  The comparison of Christianity with heathen religions 'is opening a new and rich mine of Christian evidences. The science of "Comparative Religion," so called, is yet in its infancy, but all contributions to it only tend to bring out the argument for the divine origin of Christianity into clearer relief. See Maurice, Religions of the World (1846, 12mo); Pressense, Religions before Christ (1866, 8vo); Muller, Chips from a German Workshop (1867, 2 volumes, 12o); Hardwick, Christ and ether Masters (Lond. 2d ed., 1863, 2 volumes, 12mo); and an article by Caldwell, Bapt. Quart. Rev. October 1868.

The question of the origin and dates of the several gospels is treated under the separate articles Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The Tubingen school, and the modern critics who follow them, put the dates forward into the second century. SEE TUBINGEN SCHOOL. On the questions involved, see Fisher, Essays, already cited; Westcott, On the Canon of the N.T. (Cambridge, 1855); Tischendorf, Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst (Leipsig, 1865; transl. by W.L. Gage, under the title Origin of the four Gospels, Lond. 1868; Amer. Tract Society, 1868).

Literature. — For a pretty copious account of the literature of the subject, SEE APOLOGETICS; SEE APOLOGY. We add here the following: Translation of Luthardt's Apol. Vortrage (noticed in volume 1, page 305), entitled Apologetic Lectures on the fundamental Truths of Christianity (1867, crown 8vo); and Auberlen's Offenbarung (see our volume 1, page 301), entitled The Divine Revelation (Edinburgh, 1867); Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels, abridged edit. (Boston, 167, 12mo); Barneo, Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity in the Nineteenth Century (New York, 1868, 12mo); M'Cosh, The Supernatural in its Relations to the Natural; Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels (Boston, 1867), chapter 3; Schaff, Person of Christ (Am. Tract Society); Plumptre, Christ and Chris.tesnom (Lond. 1867, 8vo); Gratry. Les Sophistes et la Critique (Paris, 1864, 8vo); Princeton Review, April, 1852, art. 6; Bartlett on “Christianity and prominent Forms of Assault," in Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1868; Brit. and For. Evang. Review. July 1868, art. 6. SEE APOLOGETICS; SEE APOLOGY, INSPIRATION; SEE JESUS;SEE MIRACLES.

## Evigilitor[[@Headword:Evigilitor]]

             an officer in Greek monasteries, whose duty it was to waken the monks for nocturnal and matutinal services. Another officer of the kind was the excitator, who had to waken a monk asleep in church.

## Evil[[@Headword:Evil]]

             is discord or disturbance in the order of the universe. Leibnitz divides it into metaphysical evil, i.e., imperfection; physical evil, i.e., suffering; moral  evil, i.e., sin. Origen defined evil to be the negation of good; and in this he has been followed by many Christian thinkers. The distinction into natural and moral evil is the only one now generally recognized.

1. "Natural evil is whatever destroys or any way disturbs the perfection of natural beings, such as blindness, diseases, death, etc. But as all that we call natural evil is not the penalty of sin, nor, as some have supposed, only the penalty of it, such disturbance is not necessarily an evil, inasmuch as it may be counterpoised, in the whole, with an equal if rot greater good, as in the afflictions and sufferings of good men. When such disturbance occurs as the penalty of transgression, it is the necessary consequence of moral evil." The tendency of modern thought is towards the doctrine that the (apparent) disturbances of the physical world are likely to be reconciled with universal law as science advances.

2. "Moral evil is the disagreement between the actions of a moral agent and the rule of those actions, whatever it be. Applied to choice, or acting contrary to the revealed law of God, it is termed wickedness or sin. Applied to an act contrary to a mere rule of fitness, it is called a fault" (Bucky s.v.). On the origin of evil, and its relations to the government of God, SEE SIN; SEE THEODICY.

## Evil-merodach[[@Headword:Evil-merodach]]

             (Hebrews Evil' Merodak', מְרֹדִךְ אְֵויל; Sept. Εὐιαλμαρωδέκ, Οὐλαιμαδάχαρ), son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who, on his accession to the throne (B.C. 561), released the captive king of Judah, Jehoiachin, from prison, after 37 years of incarceration, treated him with kindness and distinction, and set his throne above the other conquered kings who were detained at Babylon (2Ki 25:27; Jer 52:31-34). SEE CHALDAEAN. A Jewish tradition (noticed by Jerome on Isa 14:29) ascribes this kindness to a personal friendship which Evil- merodach had contracted with the Jewish king when he was himself consigned to prison by Nebuchadnezzar, who, on recovering from his seven years' monomania, took offense at some part of the conduct of his son, by whom the government had in the mean time been administered. This story was probably invented to account for the fact. His name is variously written by other ancient authors (Εὐειλμαράδουκος by Berosus, in Josephus, Apion 1:20; Εὐιλμαλουροῦχος by Megasthenes and Abydenus, in Euseb. Chron. Armen. page 128; Α᾿βιλμαρώδαχος by  Josephus, Ant. 10:11, 2). Hales identifies him with the king of Babylon who formed a powerful confederacy against the Medes, which was broken up, and the king slain by Cyrus, then acting for his uncle Cyaxares. But this rests on the authority of Xenophon's Cyropaedia, the historical value of which he estimates far too highly. SEE CYRUS. He is doubtless the same as the Ilvoradam of Ptolemy's "Canon," who reigned but a short time, having ascended the throne on the death of Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 561, and being himself succeeded by Neriglissar in B.C. 559. SEE BABYLON.

He thus appears to have reigned but two years, which is the time assigns ed to him by Abydenus (Fr. 9) and Berosus (Fr. 14). At the end of this brief space Evil-merodach was murdered by Neriglissar SEE NERGAL- SHAREZER, a Babylonian noble married to his sister, who then seized the crown. The other ancient authorities assign him different lengths of reign. According to Berosus, Evil-merodach provoked his fate by lawless government and intemperance. Perhaps the departure from the policy of his father, and the substitution of mild for severe measures, may have been viewed in this light.

The latter half of the name Evil-merodach is that of a Babylonian god MERODACH SEE MERODACH (q.v.). Two modes of explaining the former part of it have been attempted. Since evil, as a Hebrew word, means "foolish," Sinconis proposes to consider it the derivative of אול, in the Arabic signification of "to be first," affording the sense of "prince of Merodach." This rests on the assumption that the Babylonian language was of Syro-Arabian origin. Gesemmius, on the other hand, who does not admit that origin, believes that some Indo-Germanic word, of similar sound, but reputable sense, is concealed under evil, and that the Hebrews made some slight perversion in its form to produce a word of contemptuous signification in Hebrew, just as is assumed in the case of Beelzebul.

## Evil-speaking[[@Headword:Evil-speaking]]

             "the using language either reproachful or untrue respecting others, and thereby injuring them. It is an express command of Scripture to speak evil of no man (Tit 3:2; Jam 4:11); by which, however, we are not to understand that there are no occasions on which we are at liberty to speak of others that which may be considered as evil.

1. Persons in the administration of justice may speak words which in private intercourse would be reproachful.

2. God's ministers may inveigh against vice with sharpness and severity, both privately and publicly (Isa 58:1; Tit 1:13).

3. Private persons may reprove others when they commit sin (Lev 19:17).

4. Some vehemence of speech may be used in defense of truth and impugning errors of bad consequence (Jud 1:3).

5. It may be necessary, upon some important occasions, with some heat of language, to express disapprobation of notorious wickedness (Act 8:23). Yet in all these the greatest equity, moderation, and candor should be used; and we should take care,

1. Never to speak in severe terms without reasonable warrant or apparent just cause.

2. Nor beyond measure.

3. Nor out of bad principles or wrong ends; from ill will, contempt, revenge, envy, to compass our own ends; from wantonness or negligence, but from pure charity for the good of those to whom or of whom we speak.

This is an evil,however, which greatly abounds, and which is not sufficiently watched against; for it is not when we openly speak evil of others only that we are guilty, but even in speaking what is true we are in danger of speaking evil of others. There is sometimes a malignant pleasure manifested; a studious recollection of everything that can be brought forward; a delight in hearing anything spoken against others; a secret rejoicing in knowing that another's fall will be an occasion of our rise. All this is base to an extreme. The impropriety and sinfulness of evil-speaking will appear if we consider,

1. That it is entirely opposite to the whole tenor of the Christian religion.

2. Expressly condemned and prohibited as evil (Psa 64:3; Jam 4:11).

3. No practice hath more severe punishments denounced against it (1Co 5:11 to 1Co 6:10).

4. It is an evidence of a weak and distempered mind.

5. It is even indicative of ill breeding and bad manners.

6. It is the abhorrence of all wise and good men (Psa 15:3).

7. It is exceedingly injurious to society, and inconsistent with the relation we bear to each other as Christians (Jam 3:6).

8. It is branded with the epithet of folly (Pro 18:6-7).

9. It is perverting the design of speech. 10. It is opposite to the example of Christ, whom we profess to follow. SEE SLANDER." (Barrow, Works, volume 1, serm. 16; Tillotson, Sermons serm. 42; Jack, Sermons on Evil Speaking; Seed, Sermons, 1:339; Campbell, Dissertations, diss. 3, § 22.)

## Evocatio[[@Headword:Evocatio]]

             a religious ceremony observed by the ancient Romans when besieging a town, in which they solemnly called upon the deities of the place to forsake it and come over to their assistance. They usually attempted to bribe the gods by promising them temples and festivals.

## Evodius[[@Headword:Evodius]]

             a Latin theologian, was born about the middle of the fourth century, at Tagaste, in Africa. He was a countryman of St. Augustine, and was united with him in an intimate and lifelong friendship. After following in his youth a secular profession, he became, in 396 or 397 bishop of Uzalis. Augustine asserts that while there he performed several miracles by means of the relics of St. Stephen, which Orosius in 416, had brought from Palestine. Evodius took an active part in the controversy against the Donatists and Pelagians, and in 427 wrote on this subject a letter to the monks of Adrumetum. He died about 430. We have from him four letters to St. Augustine (160, 161, 163, and 177 in the edition of the Benedictines); a letter addressed by him, conjointly with four other bishops, to bishop Innocent I, of Rome (published in volume 6 of the Benedictine edit. of the' works of Augustine); fragments of a letter to the monks of Adrumetum (joined to the letter 216 of St. Augustine). His treatise on the miracles performed by the relics of St. Stephen is lost; for the Libri duo de Miraculis S. Stephani, appended to Augustine's De Civitate Dei (in volume 7 of his works), cannot be attributed to him. A treatise De Fide, or De Unitate Trinitatis contra Manichceos, is by some likewise ascribed to Evodius. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 16:842.

## Evodius (2)[[@Headword:Evodius (2)]]

             according to tradition, the first bishop of Antioch, after A.D. 42.

## Evolution[[@Headword:Evolution]]

             The important relations which the scientific subject has assumed to religious literature justifies, us. in a more copious and particular treatment than was appropriate under the general head of DEVELOPMENT SEE DEVELOPMENT (q.v.).\*

\*We present, unmodified, the facts and positions of our esteemed correspondent on this subject, who views it in it scientific aspect, although we dissent from some of his conclusions. — ED. SEE SCEPTICISM, in this volume.

I. Definition. — Evolution in its widest sense, and viewed from the scientific standpoint, is the continuous transformation and differentiation of an identical substance. More specifically, it is the continuous unfolding of a material existence according to such method that constituent parts which were germinal or potential become actual and functional, and according to such an order that the primitive existence is successively more differentiated, with parts progressively more and more specialized in structure and function. It is the passage from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous. It implies continuity and unity of existence. It also implies persistence of the fundamental conception embodied in the primitive substance, so that, however diversified, all its parts still conform to a changeless type.

It is a mode which reveals itself transcendentally as. the necessary product of mind; it reveals thought as all-pervading and all-enduring throughout the material realm in which the law of evolution finds its exemplification.

Whether the phenomena of the natural world come into existence under a method conformable to the above definition of evolution is a question of fact, to be decided by investigation of the phenomena.\*\* This question of fact falls, therefore, strictly within the domain of natural science. Whatever verdict may be prouounced at this tribunal can never be invalidated by any a priori considerations, nor by any delineation of supposed consequences or implications of the verdict. Nor can it be set aside as proceeding from incompetent authority, since no authority in a question of fact can be conceived more competent than that of a body of witnesses who have  surpassed all others in the study of that about which they testify. For our present purpose we must ascertain, therefore, what are the determinations of natural science in reference to the nature of the successions of phenomena in the natural world. Does science find a material continuity running through these successions; or does it find them marked by interruptions, discontinuity, and new beginnings?

\*\* Not speculatively viewed, however, but in the light of all the evidence, both natural and revealed. — ED.

II. History of Opinion. — In searching for the best judgment of mankind in reference to the question of material continuity in the natural world we ought to cite first the opinions of thinkers antedating the epoch when scientific research had supplied material for a proper demonstration of the doctrine. As all philosophizing on the laws of nature must, of necessity, be grounded on an observation of nature more or less extensive and more or less exact, so the opinions of the ancient philosophers, however slender the basis of their inductions, must be regarded as essentially scientific. Science had not yet been distinguished from philosophy. Theories as to the origin of the world and of organic existence were in vogue some centuries before the Christian aera. The hylozoism of the Ionian physicists conceived a primordial matter endowed with generative or transmutative powers through which cosmic forms, successively differentiated, came into being. Trhe speculation presents analogies with the modern one of Buffon. Heraclitus, about 500 B.C., taught the doctrine of a perpetual flux of things, involving ceaseless conflicts between opposites, in the midst of which individual things survive, by superior fitness, the processes of destruction aid renovation. A developmental mode of cosmic origins was taught by Anaxagoras of Clazomenae (Aristotle, Physica, 8:1) about 500 B.C. He supposed the primitive condition of things to be a heterogeneous commixture of substances without order or motion. This continued an indefinite period, when the mind began to act upon it by instituting a revolving motion at a single point. This propagated itself into the surrounding realm, and led to the separation of the elementary contraries, fire and air, water and earth. The process was repeated in the resulting masses, and thus, by continuous differentiation of likes and unlikes, the actual constitution of the world resulted (Ueberweg, Hist of Philos. 1:66). The views of Leucippus and Democritus, about 430 B.C., contemplated.a gradual evolution of things. They held that immensity was eternally filled with atoms actuated by an eternal motion. These, in disposing themselves  according to size, produced collisions which originated vortical motions. These, extending farther and farther, led to the formation of worlds. Such views were extended by Epicurus and the Roman Lucretius; and long afterwards, similar theories, but with more theistic leanings, were entertained by Torricelli. Galileo, and Gassendi. The Greek atomists attributed the lateral motions of the atoms to choice — a conception of the animated nature of atoms which was revived in the monads of Gassendi, Leibnitz, Rosmini, Campanela, Bruno, and Maupertuis; and reproduced in the conscious atoms and molecules of Hackel, Elsberg, and other moderns. The evolution of the cosmic system through the intervention of viortices was undertaken in the well-known theory of Descartes (Principia Philosophiae, 1644); and Kepler made use, also, of a.vortical movement in the matter of a primitive chaos, but invoked the Empedoclean conception of attractions and repulsions for the initiation of the primitive motions. The speculations of Swedenborg (Principia Rerum Naturalium, 1733-34) also posited vortical atomic motions, which expanded to cosmical movements and led to the differentiation of worlds. These various speculations (more fully set forth in Winchell's World Life, or Conmparative Geology, part 4), opened the way for the better defined and better-defended nebular cosmogonies of Kant and his successors. The evolution of the earth's physical features by means. of fire and water was first undertaken by Leibnitz (Protogea, etc., 1749, first, in abstract, in Acta Eruditorum, Leipzig, 1683). These eminent thinkers, whom, in this connection, we can only mention, all conceive the earth and the solar system to have originated through the progressive differentiations of a primitive chaotic matter. This is the conception of modern evolution.

Meantime the notion of a material continuity in the successions of the organic world was repeatedly shadowed forth. Empedocles taught the progressive origination of organic forms. Aristotle maintained that immanent divine mind determines in nature a tendencye towards improvement and perfection. Lucretius held that the races of men, however diverse, are derived from a common origin, and this through the continual survival of those best fitted for the environment. In later times, Sir Mathew Hale (Primitive Origination of Mankind, 1677, page 211), enumerates distinctly the results of the struggle for existence in the animal. De Maillet (Telliamed, Amsterdam, 1748), attempted to explain how animal forms undergo transmutation through the influence of changed environment; and Lamarck (Philosophic Zoologique, new ed. 1873) to this influence added  the principle of use and disuse, and admitted also an underlying inherent conatus towards beneficial change. These very concise references to the history of opinion. may be supplemented by a perusal of the article on "Evolution" in the Encyclopcedia Britannica, and by a study of the later works to be mentioned in the progress of this article. Within our restricted limits it will be more profitable to proceed to an outline of the evidences of evolution as at present understood.

III. The Scientific Evidences. —

1. Inorganic Evolution. The processes of change in the topographical and hydrographical features of the earth's surface are so familiar that we almost fail to note the fact that these re cent transformations are but the last terms of a series of changes which have moulded the globe and imparted to it the features that complete its fitness for the reception of organic populations. But, in fact, the filling and drainage of a pond or lakelet in a human lifetime is the same kind of work as that which spread the deposits of the prairies of the Mississippi, the tchornosjom of southern Russia, the pampas of Buenos Ayres, and the steppes of southern Siberia. The alluvial sediment left by a Mississippi overflow of this year is only one of the succession of contributions which, in ages past, have formed the entire delta of the great river. The delta grows; ocean sediments accumulate; the hillsides waste; the mountains wear out; whole shore-lines rise or sink; and the integration of these minute annual changes between vast limits of time shows that all the grander features of our planet have grown into existence by progressive transformations of the original matter. All this is obvious.

So it is obvious that the observed and admitted tenor of events implies an ancient course of change, in times so remote that the conditions had not yet approximated to those revealed in the human period. The pages of geological science enumerate those changes. It is not necessary to assume that all or any of the conclusions of science are exact in reference to the particular events of the geological past; it cannot be doubted, however, that research has successfully shown that the present is the outcome of the past, and that the rocks and waters and gases which we observe are only a transformed portion of the material of the primeval world. The actual earth has passed, by material continuity, from a primitive state, in which all its physical conditions were extremely different from the present. Its mountains, rivers, islands, and seas have progressively come into existence. Its different portions have become more and more differentiated. It was  once more homogeneous. It has undergone a real evolution. But the geognostic data which pass before our observation disclose the primitive world in a process of emergence from a molten state. The world's history has been a history of cooling; and there are numerous indications that the actual records of geology note only the last stages of the world's cooling history. We have not the space at command, nor is it necessary, to enter into an enumeration of the grounds on which science has traced terrestrial evolution backward to a nebular state, and even to a remoter one, in which the matter of the whole solar system is disclosed in a process of common evolution, under the action of the same forces as enter into the transformations of the earth's surface in these times, before human eyes. That our planetary system has had a nebular history is almost unanimously admitted by the science of the present. The chief divergences of opinion concern only some details of that history. This conclusion implies a material continuity through the totality of the changes. Rocks and ocean and atmosphere have grown out of fire-mist and nebula. World-life is a grand spectacle of evolution, and it illustrates continuity and unity of method on a scale of vastness which is deeply impressive. The details of the evolution must be sought in special works (see Winchell, World Life, 1883). The conception of modern nebular theory is itself an evolution. It was first shadowed forth by the Greek and mediaeval thinkers already quoted. It began to assume a consistent and modern aspect at the hands of Immanuel Kant (Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels, 1755, and a prize essay, read in 1754 before the Berlin Academy of Science). Sir William Herschel's nebular researches disclosed the apparent existence of enormous patches of chaotic world-stuff, which seemed to undergo a process of differentiation into stars and planets (see sundry memoirs, read before the Royal Society of London between 1783 and 1818, but especially in 1784, 1785, 1791, 1795, 1811, and 1814; also Sir John Herschel, Observations of Nebulce and Clusters of Stars at Slough, 1825-33; Phil. Trans. November 21, 1833). Laplace, in apparent ignorance of Kant's remarkable speculation, brought the conception of nebular cosmogony to a rigorously scientific statement (Exposition du Systeme du Monde, 1796); and the general form of his theory enters into the most recent cosmological speculations, though the progress of discovery and of thought has necessitated slight modifications, and has greatly extended the scope of the grand generalization. That which for years was known as "the nebular hypothesis"\* has strengthened into a nebular theory, accepted now with almost the same confidence as the Newtonian theory of universal  gravitation. This is the verdict of science on a question in its own appropriate field. No dissent from the outside is deserving of consideration: though, of course, exceptions taken by a scientific minority must be honestly examined. For a discussion of alleged difficulties of nebular cosmogony, see Winchell's World Life, pages 153-198.

\* The "nebular theory" here referred to is based upon the supposition that the universe originally existed in the form of gaseous vapor diffused by intense heat throughout space, and that all the heavenly bodies have resulted from this by rotation and gradual condensation through cooling off. Most or all the phenomena which they exhibit, such as sphericity, orbital and axial revolution, together with earthquakes and volcanoes (as showing the still liquid central mass), are thought to be best explained on this hypothesis, and the fact that nebulse are yet discovered in the starry spaces is held as confirmatory of it. On the other hand, some of these nehule have already been resolved by powerful telescopes into a mass of separate stars, and the presumption is therefore strong that such is the composition of all of them. Comets are too little known to be of much weight in the argument. Many astronomical facts, however, are decidedly antagonistic to the "nebular" view, such as the wait of ascertainable ratio between the magnitudes, distances from the sun and periods of revolution of our own planets and the obliquity of their orbits, some celestial bodies actually moving in the opposite direction. Experiments with the spectrum show that they are not all composed of the same elements. Moreover it is impossible to see, if space were at first filled with incandescent gas, where the excessive heat could have radiated to. For these and other reasons some of the ablest astronomers, Proctor for example, wholly discard the theory as insufficient and disproved. The question is a purely scientific one, of no especial interest to the theologian, so long as the origination of matter, motion, and life, with their laws and properties, be attributed to the divine flat. But the attempt to identify the processes of the nebular theory of cosnmoollny with any part of the narrative in the first chapter of Genesis is exegetically preposterous. Whatever therefore may become of that theory, Moses is not responsible for it, and revelation has nothing to do with it. — ED.

According to this conclusion, the cosmic realm is the grandest conceivable exemplification of the method of evolution pursued in nature. This evolution guides and determines all the ulterior details of inorganic history. The total inorganic universe, as we know it, is the final outcome of the method of efficient activity revealed in nature, and it has been exerted upon identical portions of matter from the dawn of cosmical history to the  present. The question of fact, so far as concerns inorganic nature, can no longer be agitated.

2. Organic Evolution. — This is a greater and more serious question. Does a material continuity run through the succession of organic types which have appeared and disappeared in the history of the world? Are the higher species of the modern world descended from the lower species of the ancient world? Are the diversified types derived from a common ancestry? Is man's bodily organism the outcome of genealogical descent? That these queries must be answered affirmatively seems to be the inevitable conclusion from an enormous amount of modern research. The proofs are numerous and diverse; but we may range them along five lines of argumentation, converging towards the conclusion.

(1.) Ontogeny. — By this we mean the history of the individual. This, beyond all controversy, is an evolution. The succession of changes from the beginning of conscious life to maturity is great, but they are wrought in the same identical being. Still greater ontogenetic transformations may be traced back through embryonic life to the earliest changes wrought in the fertilized ovum. The unfertilized ovum is itself only a transformed epithelial cell, and consists of yolk, germinative vesicle, and germinative dot. The successive transformations of these elements bring into view, first, the faint outlines of the most fundamental structures, as vertebrae, spinal marrow and brain, heart and digestive structures, then the complete details, and finally the accessory structures belonging to the perfected form. The particulars of the history are too technical to be enumerated in this place. This succession of embryonic transformations in a higher vertebrate reveals a wonderful case of characteristic evolution, beginning in a cell and ending in a complicated animal structure. But the most impressive significance of the history will be mentioned in another connection. For details, see Balfour, A Treatise on Comparative Emnbryology (1880, volume 1); Ktolliker, Entwickelungsgeschichte des Menschen und der hoheren Thiere (1876); Foster and Balfour, Elements of Embryology (1874, volume 1, on the chick); Hackel, Anthropogenie (1874); Packard, Life Histories (1876); and, further, the important-works of Huckel, Owen, Bischoff, Parker, Remak, Agassiz, Clark, Reichert, von Baer, etc.

(2.) Morphology. — The forms of animals and plants are said to be similar in proportion to their affinities; but the implications of the statement are seldom appreciated. Among men, family resemblances are understood to  signify blood relationship more or less remote. All men of the same race possess so many points of resemblance that every one admits their common descent from the same original parent. All mankind, according to the doctrine of evolution, however diverse in feature or endowment, must have descended from a common primitive human ancestry. But when we speak of two so-called species of the cat family, say the leopard of Africa and the panther of Asia, the popular opinion is that they are primordially distinct; though their resemblances are vastly closer than those of the Bushman and his neighbor, the Cape Englishman, the denial of whose kinship we resent. In fact, these two cats are so closely similar that some zoologists unite them in one species. If pronounced one species, popular opinion would assign them a common descent; if two species, it would hold them primordially distinct. Yet the animals, with all their characteristics, remain the same, whatever view may be taken of the systematic value of their slight distinctions. Now the question of consanguinity is one of fact, not depending on the opinion which may be entertained respecting differences.\* Whatever that opinion may be, it continues manifest that we have a better reason for ascribing these cats to a common ancestry than for doing this with a Congo African and a blonde Scandinavian. But suppose we compare the leopard and the tiger — two distinct species by all admissions. The nature of their resemblances is precisely the same as in the other case, and only a little less in degree. To admit the common descent of the leopard and panther is to compel, at the risk of inconsistency, the admission of the common descent of the leopard and the tiger. When we assent to the consanguineous relation of two recognised species the whole proposition, in all' its breadth, is conceded, that not only all cats, but all mammals, are derived from some primitive stock; and the divergences existing have been acquired during the progress of the generations. But since mammals present so many graduations towards birds, in egg-laying ornithorhynchus and echidna, towards reptiles in the chelonians, and fishes in the cetaceans, we cannot refuse a common descent to mammals and all other vertebrates. This admission brings the whole animal kingdom with it, for some tunicates and cephalopods would be admitted close kinll to some of the lowest vertebrates. Indeed, if we compare any two representatives of the animal kingdom, however divergent, we shall find that they resemble each other in more points than the number of their differences; and the argument for their common descent is of the same nature as in the case of the negro and Scandinavian. This, then, is an indication of the nature of the argument from morphology — and we can only present the indication (for  further details, see works on zoology and botany). Some striking animal portraits may be found in Johnson, Natural History (2 volumes, 8vo); Cassell, Natural History (1883, 6 volumes, 8vo); Knight, Animated Nature (2 volumes, 4to) ; Brehm, Thierleben (9 volumes, 8vo). Details of structure in Owen, Comparative Anatomy (3 volumes, 8vo); Hackel, Generelle Morphologie der Organismen (volume 1); Gegenbaur, Grundriss der vergleichenden Anatomie (8vo); Huxley, Manual of the Anatomy of Vertebrated Animals (8vo), etc.

\* But on this question we have, in the book of Genesis, historical proof which cannot safely be neglected; and it is more definite than the scientific. — ED.

(3.) Palaeontology. — The doctrine of the descent of all living species from a common remote ancestry implies that in former times the divergences of organic types were less than at present. Such a retral convergence of genealogical lines is precisely what palaeontology shows. Within historic times this convergence is almost imperceptible; but as soon as we enter the aeons of geology no fact is more conspicuous. To take an example which has been much bruited, the domestic horse, now so widely differentiated from five-toed quadrupeds, we find that in the age immediately preceding the present true horses lived, in which the rudimentary second and fourth digits, or splint bones, of the modern horse were more developed. Further back were horses with the same bones terminated by dangling hooflets. Still further back were horses having these hooflets more developed, and reaching the ground. But these horses had other splint bones, the rudimentary condition of a first digit, and in remoter times these rudiments are found terminated by dangling hooflets, and in still remoter, by functional hoofs. So we trace the succession of equine types back to a four-toed quadruped which, when we consider the corresponding divergences in the teeth, tibiae, and other structures, we should hesitate to group with modern horses, if they were not connected by a gradation so gentle that we find no place to draw the dividing line.\* The ancient four-toed horses are connected with a type of five-toed predecessors by a similar kind of relationship. The equine succession leads back, therefore, to a five-toed quadruped. If we take the modern ox or sheep or pig or camel or rhinoceros, we shall be able to trace back similarly a succession which leads towards a primitive fivetoed quadruped; and in every case such quadruped approximates the form which stands at the beginning of the equine succession. The details of facts establishing such a  -generalization are accessible to all readers in the writings of Leidy, Cope, Marsh, Gaudry, Owen, Huxley, and other palaeontologists. See Cope's memoirs in reports of surveys under Hayden and Wheeler, and briefer papers in American Naturalist; Marsh, in American Journal of Science (sermon 3); Leidy, U.S. Geol. Survey of the Territories (volume 1); Ancient Fauna of Nebraska (1853); "Extinct Mammalia of Dakota and Nebraska," in the Jour. Acad. Nat. Science (Phila. 1869, volume 7). In a manner precisely similar the two types of modern birds — “flying " and "running" — may be traced back along two successional lines, to Mesozoic Samirian reptiles. So, progress has been made in tracing lines of succession among invertebrate animals and plants. The facts show what the doctrine of descent requires, a gradual convergence backward of all the lines of organic succession.

\*But there does not seem to be a particle of proof that these latter races were genetically or actually derived from the former ones. On the contrary, these very differences all the evidence we possess on the subject- go to show that they are not their offspring. — ED.

But, if these successions are genealogical,\*\* there must have been uninterrupted continuity along each line.

\*\* This genealogy is, in our view, a pure assumption. — ED.

The chain connecting the past and the present exhibited no missing links. It is the attempt of palaeontology to discover traces of all the links; but obviously the attempt is more difficult than to find all the fragments of a meteorite which exploded in the sky before the Christian era. The work of paleontology is necessarily incomplete; the relics of many types which once contributed to the continuity of the successions worked out remain undiscovered. There are, indeed, many missing links in our knowledge; but the tenor of discovery is such as to imply that no missing links interrupted .the continuity of the actual successions. Every year's acquisition of new facts narrows the great gaps, and closes up some of the smaller ones. Some successions are already reconstructed with marvellous completeness; beyond question much more is destined to be accomplished; and we may logically forecast the future state of the evidence and anticipate the conclusion. So we reason from palaeontology, and it seems entirely logical to conclude that in the actual life-history of our planet the successions of specific forms were nicely graduated from the rude and generalized types of the remote past to the large-brained and highly specialized types of the  present. But this admission does not establish any genetic connections running through the several series. Each species may still have resulted from a special origination. Only the presumptions to be, drawn from embryology and morphology suggest genetic descent in palaeontology. The facts of palaeontology might be as they are, with every species a primordial and persistent form; butt the establishment of these graduated successions establishes what must have been the fact on the theory of common descent, and constitutes a link in the chain of argument.

(4.) Variability. — Is it within the economy of nature that organic types shall undergo indefinite secular variation, or maintain essential permanence? Within the historic period few undomesticated species are known to have varied to any marked extent; but all those domesticated have become differentiated, and sometimes to a striking extent. The different breeds of horses, cattle, dogs, fowls, and pigeons differ to such an extent that many of them, but for our knowledge of their common origin, would be set down by any naturalist as distinct species. They are distinct species in the same sense as the jaguar and the ounce and the panther are distinct. The elder Agassiz, though no evolutionist, used to proclaim the different races of men as widely distinct as the different families of monkeys. The suggestion that these divergences have not arisen in a state of nature seems to possess no relevancy, for it is still shown that the aptitude to vary is possessed by nature's organisms. Moreover, the influences brought to bear on these animals through man's treatment are the same in kind as those which sometimes arise from natural operations; they only differ in intensity, and thus accelerate changes for which nature fitted, and perhaps destined, the being. Finally, the changed forms result from the same kind of action of the same physiological forces as are in play in animals uninfluenced by domestication. Only powers like those of digestion, respiration, growth, and adaptation have been employed in the development of these varieties, and these are the functional activities of all animals. It would seem, therefore, that the results of domestication may be fairly appealed to as tests of the permanence of species. (See Darwin, Animals and Plants under Domestication.)

But it appears that great variations sometimes occur among animals and plants in a state of nature. Conflicts between individuals and conflicts with physical conditions are influences continually making their impressions on the organism. These are not causes, but only conditions, of organic change. By the law of adaptation the forces of the organism effect such changes as  changed environment demands. The same species of birds, mammals, and molluscs, in their wide range across a continent from east to west, and from north to south, are found to vary according to the latitude, longitude, altitude, and other circumstances. A thorough knowledge of such variations in North America has led to the merging of large numbers of once accepted species (Allen, Proc. Bos. Soc. Nat. Hist. 15:156; 16:276; Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. 2, No. 4, page 345, August 1876; Amer. Naturalist, October 1876, page 625; Baird, Mem. National Acad. January 1863; Amer. Jour. Sci. II, 41, January, March, and May 1863; Ridgeway, Amer. Jour. Sci. III, 4:454, 5:415). Similar extreme variability is observed in many invertebrate species, both recent and extinct. Hackel, in a remarkable work on calcareous sponges, has reached the conclusion that all the forms belong to one species, so gradual are the transitions between the several nominal species (Die Kalkschwamme, 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo). Many forms of fossil shells formerly regarded as distinct species have more recently been united, simply because series of intermediate forms became known. Hilgendorf has traced minutely the secular variations of a species of Planorbis (Ueber Planorbis multiformis in Steinheimner Susswasserkalk), and Hyatt has extended these studies (Proc. Amner. Assoc. 1880, and "Anniversary Mem." in Bost. Soc. Nat. Hist. 1880). Similar work has been done among Paleozoic brachiopods.

The influence of changed environment is sometimes accelerated by human intervention. The axolotl, permanently gill-bearing in its native elevated home, loses its gills when kept near the sea-level, and becomes a land salamander. In Japan certain leeches and planarians have become adapted to land life, and a fish, even (Periophthalmnus), frequents the land and seems in a transition state. Certain brine shrimps are reported by Schmaukevitch as undergoing important structural changes in the course of a few generations, when the brine is gradually freshened; and return to the original state as the salinity is again restored (Zeitsch. wiss. Zodlogie, 25: Suppl. 1, 1875, page 103, pl. 6; Annals and Mag. Nat. Hist. March 1876; ib. 29:429-494, 1877. See, also, Contributions on Knowledge of the Influence of External Conditions of Lfe upon the Organization of, Animals, transl. in Hayden's twelfth Ann. Rep. part 1, 473-514. But compare Verrill, Proc. Amer. Assoc. 1869, 230; Amer. Jour. Sci. II, 48, 244, 430; Packard, Amer. Jour. Sci. III, 2:108). The domestic cat on the Pribilov Islands becomes thickened, short, losing the tail, and undergoing  great change of voice. Certain domestic pigs in Texas are well known to have become solid-hoofed.

Through hybridity, also, probably, result forms divergent from recognized species. Among cultivated plants hybrids are not uncommon. In the wild state the number of reputed hybrid forms may be judged from a glance through any manual of botany. (See also, Hooker, Flora of New Zealand; Candolle, "Etude sur l'Espece," in the Bibliothequle Univ. de Geneve, November 1862; Hooker and Thomson, Flora Indica, volume 1," Introductory Essay," London, 1855; Gray, Amer. Jour. Sci. II, 21:134; Naudin: Hybridity in the Vegetable Kingdom). Among animals, fertile hybridity, as well as infertile, is pretty well established.\* From the hare and the rabbit has arisen a self-sustaining hybrid now extensively employed in Europe for food. Fertile hybrids of the common and Chinese geese are extensively reared in India, as also in England; while several generations of the hybrid from the mallard and muscovy ducks are reported living in Mt. Auburn cemetery (Brewer, Proc. Bos. Soc. Nat. Hist. 21 January 1874). Carl Vogt reports fertile hybrids of the wolf and dog, as also of the goat and sheep, and the latter is confirmed by Hackeli Von Tschudi and Vogt both report the same of the goat and steinbock, and of the fox and dog. The same is alleged of the buffalo and bison. Without relying on the intervention of hybridity, enough has been observed of the power of organic forms to adapt themselves permanently to the permanent changes of the environment to fully establish the conclusion that it is the economy of nature to permit structural variations without limits.\* If a full survey of the facts to which we have too briefly alluded justifies the conclusion, as we think it does, then no bar exists to the conclusion that the successions of Palseontological types have arisen through the continued variation of primitive forms; and that the latter, also, may have arisen through variation and descent from one primordial, life-endowed being. This extreme conclusion, however, is not at all necessary to the proof of a method of evolution in the world, since the genealogical lines may have proceeded from any such number of beginnings as the state of the observed relationships may allow.

\* But we believe this is true only to a very limited extent, and the fertility very rarely extends to successive generations. — ED.

(5.) Comprative Embryology. — A careful study of the aspects of the developing embryo of a higher vertebrate, as indicated above, under  "Ontogeny," shows that it reaches, in ascending order, a succession of stages which may be enumerated and defined. Now the facts to which we wish to direct attention particularly, constitute a series of significant parallelisms.

(a) Ontogenetic parallelism. Research shows that every higher vertebrate passes through the same embryonic stages, and no divergences revealing the characteristics of class, genus, and. species make their appearance until the development is well advanced. To a certain stage the human embryo cannot be distinguished from that of a fish; at later stages, it diverges successively from the embryo of reptiles, birds, quadrupeds, and quadrumana. The embryo chick is absolutely undistinguishable from the embryo of man until about the sixth day of incubation. Even invertebrates pursue a course of development closely parallel with that of the earlier stages of the mammalian embryo. (Hackel, Naturliche Schopfungsgeschichte, 11 Vortrag; Anthropogenie, 13-19 Vortrage; Balfour, British Assoc. Address, 1880, Nature, 22:418).

(b) Taxonomic parallelism. The succession of aspects presented by the mammalian embryo is identical with that shown in the gradations of living animals. The disappearance of the nucleus of the egg results in a simple cytode, which is paralleled in the living world by Protamaeba, the lowest known animal. The new-formed nucleus gives the ovum the character of Amoeba. The "morula" mass resulting from the divisions of the yolk is paralleled by Labyrinthula. The spheroid formed of a single layer of cells corresponds to the larves of Planula. The invagination of this, forming a two-walled spheroid or urn ("gastrula") is paralleled by the larves of Protascus. The four-layered, elongated form answers to the worm Turbellarid. The fibrous, semi-tubular cranium and gelatinous spine are found adult in the lancelet. The gill-arches of the embryo are permanent in the dog-fish and other sharks. The tailed condition represents the maturity of the reptile. So, without further particulars, it may be broadly asserted that the gradations of living animals are pictured in the successive stages of the mammalian embryo. (See especially Hickel and Balfour, as cited; Baer, Nachrichten uber Leben und Schrifien 1865.) The principle has, indeed, found useful application in some cases, in determining the relative rank of animals.

(c) Palaeontological parallelism. It was amply shown by the elder Agassiz that the geological succession of organic types presents an order identical  with that of the classificatory arrangement of animals. (See especially, Essay on Classification.) This has been more fully illustrated by Hackel (see citations above). Owing, however to the recognised imperfection of our knowledge of extinct life, this parallelism is less detailed than the others. We know specifically, however, that the primitive form, Eozoon, must have been akin to Amoeba and Labyrinthula; that the turbellarian grade was reached in Scolithus, of the Potsdam sandstone; that the shark type was attained in the Upper Silurian and Devonian; the transition from aquatic to terrestrial creatures, in the Amphibia of the Coal Measures, with some advance in the Trias; that reptiles succeeded in the Mesozoic, and birds appeared on their decline; that the lowest mammalian types existed in the Jurassic and higher types followed through. the Tertiary; that the lowest four-handed animals were of Lower Eocene age, and that tailed monkeys, anthropoid apes, and men followed in due order.

\*We submit that these very limited variations do not prove a capacity for unlimited variation. — ED.

The established facts of comparative embryology show a prolonged and detailed succession of organic conceptions literally three times repeated. The doctrine of chances demonstrates that this must result from some mutual dependence and connection among them. The palaeontological succession must result from the order of succession under a law of development as primitively exemplified in the evolution of the individual. In the latter, each successive stage arises demonstrably by continuity with the preceding. The palaeontological series consists of the final terms of many genetically related embryonic series successive in the extinct world. The taxonomic series consists of the final terms of many genetically related embryonic series simultaneous in the actual world. All the terms in each series are therefore materially connected through the embryonic series of which they are several parts.\*

\*The force of this argument, however, seems to us to be wholly invalidated by two facts: 1. No instance of the propagation of one species of animal by parents of another, has been historically found; 2. The embryo in every instance stops at the precise point prescribed by its specific character; and becomes either an abortion or a monster if it fails to reach it. — ED.

IV. Evolution Theories. — While most evolutionists believe that the intellectual and moral elements of man are, equally with the material  organism. the outcome of a long process of improvement, Mr. A.R. Wallace holds that both body and mind of man may have arisen in a different manner. (Wallace, Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection, Am. ed. 1871; Address at Glasgow Meeting. Brit. Assoc. 1871, Amer. Jour. Sci. III, 13:377), while St. George Mivart limits the exception to man's psychic nature (Genesis of Species, 1871; Lessons from Nature, 1876). The majority of evolutionists maintain that man's body is so intimately identified in structure with that of lower animals that it is incredible that it has not participated in the common history. As to his psychic nature, it is held to be identical in many of its manifestations with the natures of brutes, and a strong presumption hence arises that even man's highest powers exist germinally in the lower animals.

The speculations of theorists concern chiefly the causes, conditions, and instrumentalities on which organic evolution depends. De Maillet, in a work whose title (Telliamed, 1748) was an anagram of the author's name, represents that organic beings possess an aptitude for structural changes, and that changes arise when, under changed conditions, the animal puts forth efforts to exercise changed functions. Lamarck (Philosophie Zoologique, 1809; new ed. by Martins, Paris, 1873) maintained that primitive rudiments of the great divisions of the organic kingdoms arose by spontaneous generation; that these were endowed with an inherent tendency to improvement, which becomes effective especially through use and disuse of organs, while the influence of external conditions determines use and disuse. The author of the Vestiges of Creation, 1844, suggested that life first appeared on our planet "in simple germinal vesicles," "produced by some chemico-electrical operation," and that successive steps of advance were effected "through the agency of the ordinary process of generation." The conditions under which this process resulted in an improved being were presented, he thought, in abnormally prolonged gestation. Next, the principle of natural selection was suggested simultaneously by Charles R. Darwin and A.R. Wallace (Jour. Linnaean Soc. London, August 1858; preceded by Wallace's paper in Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist. September 1855), and this was most industriously and ably elaborated and illustrated by Darwin in a subsequent series of publications which have constituted an epoch in the history of scientific thought (Origin of Species, 1859; Variations of Animals and Plants, 1868; The Descent of Man, 1871; Expression of the Emotions, 1872; Insectivorous Plants, 1875; Effects of Cross- and Self-Fertilization, 1876, and; numerous other works  and memoirs bearing more or less directly on the question of natural selection). This theory is not to be identified with the broad doctrine of evolution, as is commonly done. It assumes that a method of evolution exists in nature, and undertakes to explain by what means and agencies it is carried on. Recognising the fact that a perpetual struggle exists among individuals for existence, and for most favorable conditions of existence, and that the strongest always succeed the best, while the feeblest tend to perish, the obvious and necessary inference is drawn that the species is perpetuated by its best representatives, and thus undergoes continual improvement, precisely as when man intervenes to improve the breeds of domestic animals. Darwin inclined at first to consider this tendency a full explanation of organic progress, but later he admitted other influences, including, like Lamarck, an inherent nisus towards improvement, and the effects of use and disuse of organs. For an ampler exposition of the doctrine, see the article "Darwinism " in the Encyclopaedia Americana. That a process of natural selection goes on, and that its tendency is what Darwin claims, all must admit. But there is a growing belief that organic advances and relapses require an appeal also, to other conditions, instrumentalities, and causes. For instance, professor Parsons, of Harvard, inclined to regard specific variation as the result of extraordinary births (Amer. Jour. Science, July 1860, II, 30:1), and soon afterwards Richard Owen advanced an almost identical idea (Anat. of Vertebrates, chapter 40; Amer. Jour. Science, II, 47:33). Galton's theory seems to be the same (Hereditary Genius, 1869, pages 363-383). Killiker varied this conception by suggesting heterogeneous generation through agamic and parthenogenic reproduction-a profound misapprehension of proper generation (Ueber die Darwin'sche Schopfungsgeschichte, 1864). Huxley, while accepting Darwinism for what it is worth, has indicated some qualifications and additions (Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews, 1862; On the Origin of Species, 1863; Critiques and Addresses, 1869, etc.). He holds particularly that nature sometimes makes considerable jumps; that the process of natural selection goes on among the molecules of the organism, and that there exists an inherent tendency of organization to vary. The latter point he emphasizes. Alpheus Hyatt, in 1868, pointed out that degradational metamorphoses in the old age of the individual, or the type, could not rationally be referred to natural selection, which acts in the contrary direction. An internal law fixes the duration of the species as of the individual. Specific advance he attributes to habitual acceleration of embryonic development. In the advanced age of species the reverse takes  place, and thus the decline of a species reproduces, in inverted order, the succession of types which appeared during the rise of the species (Mem. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist. 1867, 1, part 2; Amer. Naturlalist, June 1870, 4:230; Fossil Cephalopods, Museum Comparatur Zool. Cambridge, 1872). Professor E.D. Cope varied this conception by attributing the recession of organic types to the influence of retarded development (Synopsis of Cyprinidae of.Penn. 1866; "Origin of Genera," in the Proc. Acad. Nat. Science, Phila. October 1868; "The Hypothesis of Evolution," in Lipp. Mag. 1870, and University Series, New Haven, 1873; "The Method of Creation of Organic Types," in the Proc. Acad. Nat. Science, Phila. 1871, and other papers). Probably the suggestions based on rate and duration of embryonic changes are all available. At the same time it is quite conceivable that the principle of natural selection obtains in embryonic life, both in conditions immediately present with the embryo and those external conditions which produce them — the circumstances surrounding the female parent, or even the male. This becomes intelligible on the basis of some such theory as Spencer's "Physiological Units," Darwin's "Pangenesis," Elsberg's "Plastidule Hypothesis" (Proc. Amer. Assoc. 1874, 1876), Hackel's "Perigenesis" (Die Perigenesis, 1876; Die heutige Entwickelungslehre, etc., 1879; Nature, October 4, 1877, and Pop. Scien. Monthly Suppl.) or Brooks' "Law of Heredity " (New York, 1883). Still, it must be admitted that in some cases widely variant forms, as in the Ancon breed of sheep, arise suddenly where, to all appearance, some other condition not yet known determines the divergence. We think also it must be finally admitted that the organism is affected by an implanted destination or law, which bends it constantly towards conformity to the environment, and employs the several agencies mentioned for the accomplishment of this result. In the history of the world the environment has undergone a progressive differentiation and improvement. Organization has advanced correspondingly. When the environment remains persistent, or deteriorates, organic forms persist or even deteriorate to a corresponding extent. If, however, no existing theory of organic evolution proves final, the fact of organic evolution remains highly probable.

V. Limitations of the Doctrine. — We have stated, preliminarily, that the question of evolution is simply one of fact. In ascertaining whether a method of evolution is a fact in the natural world, we are not concerned in anything outside of this simple inquiry. It is of no import whether the result is effectuated by necessity or free-will, by inherent forces, by implanted  forces or external forces, by material forces or spiritual forces, by mediate action or immediate action. We are not even concerned in determining what conditions are favorable, what instrumentalities are employed, whether the action is prenatal or postnatal, whether through embryonic development, prolonged, accelerated, or retarded. All these questions are interesting — some of them may be important. The human mind cannot be restrained from investigating them. But it is important to understand clearly that a verdict on any one of these questions does not bear on the antecedent question of fact. If the fact exists, different persons may explain and interpret it differently. The explanation falls within the domain of science; the interpretation touches philosophy and theism. Scientific explanations are already various — each probably partial. Interpretations may be materialistic or spiritualistic — that will depend on the antecedent philosophy of the thinker. They may be theistic or atheistic — that depends on the predisposition of the interpreter. Philosophic and theological opinions must rest on other grounds. The fact of a method of evolution in the world is not responsible for them.

More categorically, we may state:

(1) The fact of evolution implies nothing in respect to causation. It throws no light on secondary cause or first cause. It does not imply the evolution of life from inorganic matter. It knows nothing of beginnings; it discovers only a method of continuance; the beginning may have been a creation by fiat. It knows nothing of the cause or causes of continuance; it may be by immanent divine agency.

(2) There is no assumption of inherent forces or necessary activities, or eternal matter. It is allowable to deny inherent forces and necessary actions, and hold to the creation of matter and force, and even to the identification of natural force with the divine volition.

(3) There is no implication concerning the nature or origin of mind. It may arise with each distinct organism; it may arise only in the human organism.

(4) Nothing is implied concerning the interpretation of the activities going forward in the organism. We are at liberty to affirm that they imply choice selection, intelligence. We are at full liberty to trace intelligence in the methods of the inorganic world, or to affirm that the all-embracing method of evolution is itself the highest possible manifestation of intelligence and unity.

(5) We may also, if we please, maintain that the method of the world and the collocations of the world imply determination and motive. Thus, in brief, the limitations of the essential doctrine of evolution are such that, in spite of the speculative views of some evolutionists, the full acceptance of the doctrine does not conflict with any fundamental conception of Christian theology.

VI. Literature. — Many of the most important original works have been cited in the progress of this article. Some other titles may be added: Spencer, First Principles of Philosophy; Principles of Biology; Gray, Darwiniana (1878); Romanes, The Scientific Evidences of Organic Evolution (1882), Chapman, The Evolution of Life (1873); Semper, Animal Life as Affected by the Natural Conditions of Existence; Die Verwandt schaftsbezie hungen der gegliederten Thiere (1875); Lankester, Degeneration, a Chapter in Darwinism (1880); Lindsay, Mind in the Lower Animals (1879); Seidlitz, Beitrage zur Descendenz-Theorie (1876); Fritz Muller, Fur Darwin (eod.); Zacharias, Zur Entwickelungstheorie (eod.); Jacoby, Etudes sur la Selection dans ses Rapports avec l'Heredite chez l'Homme; Canestrini, Teoria di Darwin Criticamente Exposta (Milan, 1880); Du Prel, Der Kampf ums Dasein am Himmel; Faivre, La Variabilite des Especes (1868); Weismann, Studien zur Descendenz- Theorie (1876); Ribot, Heredity; O. Schmidt, Descent and Darwinism (1875); H. Muller, Die Befruchtung der Blumen durch Insecten (1873; an Engl. translation, 1883); Alpenblumen und ihre Befruchtung durch Insecten (1881); Fechner, Einige Ideen zur Schopfungs- und Entwickelungsgeschichte der Organismen; Mivart, Man and Apes (1874); Bastian, Evolution and the Origin of Life; Roux, Der Kampnf der Theile im Organismus (1881); Gazelles, Outline of the Evolution Philosophy (1875). On the interpretation of evolution: Dreher, Der Darwinismus und seine Stellung in der Philosophie (1877); von Gizycki, Philosophische Consequenzen der Lamarck-Darwin'schen Entwickelungstheorie (1876); R. Schmidt, Die Darwin'schen Theorien und ihre Stellung zur Philosophie, Religion, und Moral (eod.; id. Engl. translation); Henslow, The Theory of the Evolution of Living Things, and the Application of the Principles of Evolution to Religion (1873); Leconte, Religion and Science; Simcox, Natural Law (1877); Wright, Philosophical Discussions, especially pages 97-266; Weismann, Ueber die letzten Ursachen der Transmutationen (1876); Spiller, Die Unrkraft des Weltalls nach ihrem Wesen und Wirken (eod.); Schneider, Der thierische Wille (1880);  Romanes, Animal Intelligence (1883); Mental Evolution in Animals (eod.); Savage, The Religion of Evolution (1877); Beale, Life Theories, their Influence upon Religious Thought (1871); Winchell, The Speculative Consequences of Evolution (1881); Sparks from a Geologist's Hammer, pages 301-385 (eod.), pages 301-385; Beckett, On the Origin of the Laws of Nature. Critical and adverse writings: von Hartmann, Wahrheit und Irrthum im Darwinismus (1875); Wigand, Der Darwinismus u. die Naturforschung Newtons u. Cuviers (1874-77, 3 volumes); Virchow, Die Freiheit der Wissenschaft im modernen Staat (1877; Engl. translation); Semper, Hackelismus in der Zoologie (1876); Michaelis, Anti- Darwinistische Beobachtungen (1877); Mivart, Lessons fron Nature, as Manifested in Mind and Matter (1876); Contemporary Evolution (eod.); Agassiz, Contributions to the Natural History of the U.S. volume 1, Introduction; Amer. Jour. Science, July 1860; Dawson, The Story of the Earth and Man (1873); Hodge, What is Darwinism?; Barrande,Trilobites (1871); Cephalopodes (1877); Brachiopodes (1879). A monthly journal of highest ability, devoted to evolution, is Kosmos, Stuttgart. (A.W.)

## Evovae[[@Headword:Evovae]]

             is an artificial word made out of the vowels in the words "saeculorum Amen;" which occur at the end of the Gloria Patri. Its object was to serve as a kind of memoria technica to enable singers to render the several Gregorian chants properly; each letter in evovae standing for the syllable from which it is extracted. It must be borne in mind that psalms, etc., were sung under antiphons, and that the music of the antiphon, being constructed in a particular "mode" or "scale," such as Dorian, Phrygian, and the like, the chant or "tone" ("tune") to the psalm, being not intended to represent a fill stop or close, might (and usually did) not end on the final belonging to the mode, leaving that for the concluding antiphon: thus different forms of the same mode or tone would arise, and these were called evovae, and sometimes by other names. This only applies to the latter half (cadence) of the chant, as in the "mediation" (at the middle of the verse of a psalm) scarcely any variety was admitted, except such as arose from local use. Thus, in the various works on the subject, and in service books, varieties of endings are to be found of greater or less antiquity. See Smith, Dict. of Christ. Antiq. s.v.

## Evremond (Lat. Ebremundus), Saint[[@Headword:Evremond (Lat. Ebremundus), Saint]]

             was born at Bayeux of a noble family; married a high-born lady, but suddenly devoted himself to a monastic life in Fontenay; afterwards became abbot of Mont Maire, in the diocese of Seez, and died about A.D. 720 (others say before 584). He is commemorated June 10. See Smith, Dict. of Christ. Antiq. s.v.; Guerin, Les Petits Bollandistes, 6:553.

## Evroul (Lat. Ebrulfus)[[@Headword:Evroul (Lat. Ebrulfus)]]

             (1) Saint, was brought up at the court of Childebert I and his successor, was noted for his learning and wealth, but renounced all for a monk's life, and founded the monastery of St. Evroul d'Ouche (Uticus), in the diocese of Lisieux (Neustria), where he died in 596. He is commemorated December 29.

(2) The eighteenth bishop of Noyon and Tournay, died A.D. 621 (according to others, before 575).

(3) Saint, is said to have been abbot of the monastery of St. Fuscien-aux- Bois, near Amiens, probably near the close of the 6th century. He is commemorated July 26.

## Ewald Johann Ludwig[[@Headword:Ewald Johann Ludwig]]

             theologian, was born at Dreieichenhain, Hesse, September 16, 1747. He studied at the University of Marburg. After serving two years as tutor to  the children of the prince of Hesse-Philippsthal, he became pastor at Offenbach, 1768. He began preaching as a Rationalist, but in a few years he found reason alone inadequate for his personal guidance and for his public teaching. In 1778 he announced publicly this change of conviction. In 1781. he became general superintendent and court preacher at Detmold; but his pungent preaching soon got him into trouble. He founded at Detmold a seminary for teachers. In 1796 he accepted a pastoral charge at Bremen; and here, also, he greatly promoted the. schools, visiting the establishments of Pestalozzi and Fellenberg, in Switzerland, to inform himself on their systems. In 1805 he was called to Heidelberg as professor of ethics, and in 1807 became church councillor at Carlsruhe, where he died, March 19, 1822. He was a voluminous author. Doering gives a list of eighty-nine different publications of his. The chief are, Predigerbeschaftigung (Lemgo, 1783-94, 9 parts): — Christenthum und Kosmopolitismus (Lemgo, 1788-89, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Salomo; Versuch einer psychologisch-biographischeen Darstellung (Gera, 1800, 8vo): — Die Gottlichkeit d. Christenthums (Brem. 1800, 8vo): — Briefe fiber die alte Mystik u. d. neuen Mysticismus (Leipsig, 1822, 8vo); besides numerous sermons and books on practical religion and education. — Doering, Die deutschen Kanzel-Redner, 1:46.

## Ewald, Christian Ferdinand[[@Headword:Ewald, Christian Ferdinand]]

             an Episcopal minister and famous missionary among the Jews, was born of Jewish parentage, September 14, 1802, at Maroldsweisach, near Bamberg. At the age of twenty he joined the Christian Church, studied at Basle, and was in 1826 licensed to preach the gospel. In 1829 he was called to London, and having duly prepared for missionary work, he connected himself in 1832 with the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews. In 1836 he was ordained by the bishop of London, having been previously in Lutheran orders. There are but few of the society's missionaries whose sphere of labor has been so lengthened in duration or so wide in extent. For nearly ten years he labored with great devotedness in one of the most trying portions of the Jewish mission field-the north coast of Africa-at Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli, and other large towns. In 1839 he left Tunis for a time and proceeded to Leghorn, and in 1841 finally left Tunis to accompany the first Anglican bishop, Dr. Alexander, to Jerusalem as his chaplain, and for some ten years was earnestly engaged in the Holy City. An account of the work is given in his Missionary Labors in the City of  Jerusalem. In 1851 ill-health compelled him to leave the East, and, being appointed principal of the home mission, he took up his abode in London. In 1872 a general debility of constitution rendered it necessary for him- to resign his position. He died August 9, 1874. The University of Erlangen, of which Ewald was a graduate, on the publication of his German translation of the Talmudic treatise Aboda Sarah, in 1856, conferred upon him de religione Christiana inter barbaras gentes propaganda optime merito, linguarum orientalium gnarrissimo, the diploma of a doctor in philosophy, and the archbishop of Canterbury conferred upon him, in 1872, the degree of bachelor of divinity, as stated in the diploma, in consideration "of his uprightness of life, sound doctrine, and purity of morals; of his proficiency in the study of divinity, of Hebrew and Oriental languages and literature; and also of his missionary labors and eminent services in the promotion of Christianity among the Jews." (B.P.)

## Ewald, Georg Heinrich August[[@Headword:Ewald, Georg Heinrich August]]

             one of the most learned Orientalists of our century, was born at Gottingen, November 16, 1803. In 1820 he entered the university of his native city, and three years later received the degree of doctor of philosophy. After teaching for some time at the Wolfenbiittel gymnasium, he returned in 1824 to Gottingen, became repetent at the university, and in 1827 was made professor. In 1837 he was expelled from his position for having signed, with six other professors, a protest against the revocation of the liberal constitution of 1833, which Ernest Augustus, king of Hanover, effected. In 1829 and 1836 he had visited France and Italy, and now (in 1838) he visited England. In the same year he was appointed professor at Tubingen, where he remained for ten years. The bitter feuds with his colleagues made his stay there very unpleasant, and it was a relief when, in 1848, he was recalled to Gottingen. In 1867 he refused to take the oath of allegiance to the king of Prussia, and this refusal was punished by his exclusion from the faculty of philosophy, although he was still allowed his salary and the privilege of lecturing. This latter privilege was withdrawn in 1868, on account of utterances against the king. He died of heart disease, May 4, 1875. Ewald's writings have found about as many admirers abroad as at home. The value of much of his learning is seriously impaired by his dogmatic spirit. His independence often degenerates into self-conceit. His violent rationalism is conspicuous. His literary activity began in 1823, with the Composition der Genesis Kritisch untersucht, and only closed with an autobiography written during the last months of his life, which has not been  published.

Of his many writings we mention, De Metris Carminum Arabicorum (Brunswick, 1825): — Das Hohelied Salomo's ubersetzt und erklart (1826; 3d ed. 1866): — Libri Wakedii de Mesopotamiae Expugnatae Historia pars (1827): — Kritische Grammatik der Hebr. Sprache (eod.), subsequently enlarged, and Ausfuhrliches Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache des Alten Testaments (1844; 8th ed. 1870; Engl. transl. by Nicholson, Lond. 1836; of the syntax alone, from 8th ed. by Kennedy, Edinb. 1879): — Hebrdische Sprachlehre fur Anfinger (1842; Engl. transl. from 3d ed. by Smith, Lond. 1870): — Abhandlungen zur orientalischen und biblischen Literatur (1832): — Grammatica Critica Ling. Arab. (1831-33, 2 volumes): — Die poetischen Bucher des Alten Bundes (1835- 39; 3d ed. 1868; Engl. transl. Lond. 1880 sq.): — Propheten des Alten Bundes (1840, 1841; 2d ed. 1867, 1867, 3 volumes; Engl. transl. Lond. 1876-81, 5 vols.): — Geschichte des Volkes Israel (1843-59, 7 volumes; 3d ed. 1868; Engl. transl. corresponding to volumes 1-4): — History of Israel (Lond. 1867-74, 5 volumes): — Die Alterthumer des Volkes Israel (1848; Engl. transl. Antiquities of Israel, Lond. 1876): — Die drei ersten Evangelien ubersetzt und erklart (1850): — Das ethiopische Buch Henokh (1854): — Das vierte Buch Ezra (1860): — Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus ubersetzt und erklart (1857): — Die Johanneischen Schriften (1861, 1862): — Die Bucher des Neuen Testaments (1870, 1871): — Die Theologie des Alten und Neuen Bundes (1870-75, 4 volumes): — Jahrbucher der biblischen Wissenschaft, 1-11, 1848-61, containing a number of essays which are still very valuable. In connection with L. Dukes he published, Beitrage zur Geschichte der liltesten Auslegung des Spracherklarung des Alten Test. (1844, 3 volumes). See Herzog-Plitt, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclopedie des Sciences Religieuses, s.v., Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:341-344; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:261; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ewe[[@Headword:Ewe]]

             stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative of the following Hebrews words: רָחֵל (rachel', fem.), a "ewe" (Gen 31:38; Gen 32:14) or "sheep" generally (Son 6:6; Isa 53:7); שֶׂה (sek, masc. Exo 12:5; fem. Jeremiah 1, 17; Eze 34:20), a sheep or goat from a flock generally, variously rendered ("cattle," "sheep," "goat," "ewe"); כִּבְשָׂה (kibsah') or כִּבְשָׂה (kabsah', fem., so called from being fit for coupling), a "ewe-lamb," i.e., from one to three years old (Gen 21:28-30; Lev 14:10; Num 6:14; 2Sa 12:3-4; 2Sa 12:6); עָלוֹת (aloth', milk-giving fem. plur.), milch ("[ewes] with young," Psa 78:71; Isa 40:11). SEE SHEEP, etc.

## Ewe Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Ewe Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Ewe or Ewegbe (also called Eipe, Aijigbe, Krepe, Dahomey) language is spoken on the west coast of Africa, at and beyond the river Volta. The Rev. B. Schlegel, of the Bremen Missionary Society, began to translate the Holy Scriptures into this language in the year 1858, and the Bremen Bible Society undertook the printing of the same. In 1861 the four gospels were published. In 1874 the British and Foreign Bible Society published, at the request of the Bremen mission, St. Paul's epistles, which were translated by the Reverend Mr. Ulerz, and in 1878 the entire New Test. was issued from  the press. Several books of the Old Test. have also been published, as Exodus, Joshua to Ruth, and Samuel. Up to March 31, 1884, there were distributed 4500 portions of the Old Test. and 3000 portions of the New Test. For the study of the language, see Schlegel, Schlussel zur Ewe Sprache (Stuttgart, 1857). (B.P.)

## Ewer[[@Headword:Ewer]]

             or pitcher (q.v.) accompanying a wash-hand basin (q.v.). It is stated as a description of Elisha (2Ki 3:11) that he "poured water on the hands  of Elijah." This was the act of an attendant or disciple; and it was so much his established duty, that the mere mention of it sufficed to indicate the relation in which Elisha had stood to Elijah. It is also an indication that the Hebrews were accustomed to wash their hands in the manner which is now universal in the East, and which, whatever may be thought of its convenience, is unquestionably more refreshing and cleanly than washing in the water as it stands in a basin, which is a process regarded by the Orientals with great dislike. The hands are Therefore held over a basin, the use of which is only to receive the water which has been poured upon the hands, sometimes of several persons successively, from the jug or ewer held above them (Lane, Modern Egyptians, 1:212). A servant or some other person approaches with the ewer in his right hand and the basin in his left; and when the hands have been placed in proper position over the basin, which he continues to hold, lets fall a stream of water upon them from the ewer, suspending it occasionally to allow the hands to be soaped or rubbed together. No towel is offered, as every one dries his hands in his handkerchief, or however else he pleases. The water is usually tepid, and always so after a meal, in order to clear the grease contracted by eating with the hands. In the East, the basin, which, as well as the ewer, is usually of tinned copper, has commonly a sort of cover, rising in the middle and sunk into the basin at the margin, which, being pierced with holes, allows the water to pass through, thus concealing it after it has been defiled by use. The ewer has a long spout, and a long, narrow neck, with a cover, and is altogether not unlike our coffee-pots in general appearance: it is the same which the Orientals use in all their ablutions. It is evident that a person cannot conveniently thus wash his own hands without assistance. If he does, he is obliged to fix the basin, and to take up and lay down the ewer several times, changing it from one hand to the other. Therefore a person never does so except when alone. If he has no servant, he asks some bystander to pour the water upon his hands, and offers a return of the obligation, if it seems to be required (Kitto, Pict. Bible, note ad loc.). SEE WASHING OF HANDS.

## Ewer, Ferdinand Cartwright, D.D[[@Headword:Ewer, Ferdinand Cartwright, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Nantucket, Massachusetts, May 22, 1826. He graduated from Harvard College in 1846, became rector of Grace Church, San Francisco, California, in 1857, in 1858 assistant minister of St. Ann's, New York city, in 1860 of Christ Church in the same city, later of the parish of St. Ignatius, and died in Montreal, October 10, 1883.

## Ewh, Georg[[@Headword:Ewh, Georg]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in 1828, at Kirchberg, in Rhenish Prussia. He studied theology at Bonn and Berlin, came to America in 1866, and was appointed pastor of the Lutheran Church (St. Matthew's) at Jersey City, N.J., where he died, April 7,1881. (B.P.)

## Ewing, Alexander, D.C.L[[@Headword:Ewing, Alexander, D.C.L]]

             a Scotch bishop, was born in Aberdeen, March 25, 1814. He was educated at a private school in Chelsea and at the University of Edinburgh, but, owing to his delicate health and ample inheritance, he did not adopt a profession on leaving school. He began preparation for the ministry in 1836, and entered into priest's orders in 1841, when he took charge of the Episcopal congregation at Forres. He remained in this position until 1846, when he was elected first bishop of the newly restored diocese of Argyll and the Isles, the duties of which office he discharged till his death, May 22, 1873. His theological views were communicated to the world in the form of letters to the newspapers, pamphlets, special sermons, essays contributed to the series of Present Day Papers, of which he was the editor, and a volume of sermons entitled Revelation considered as Light. He also published the Cathedral or Abbey Church of Iona (1865). See Memoir, by Ross (1877); Encyclop. Brit. (9th ed.), s.v.

## Ewing, Finis[[@Headword:Ewing, Finis]]

             one of the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, was born July 10, 1773, in Bedford County, Virginia. His father was of ScotchIrish descent, and both his parents were eminent for their piety, the father for many years being an elder in the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Ewing had but little early education. He spent some time in college, but where is not  known. His biographer says, "Like Franklin, he seems very early to have acquired a fondness for books. His varied and extensive reading made him emphatically a learned man, though not systematically educated, and the brilliancy of his success as a minister of the Gospel evinced intellectual endowments of a high order." His parents having died in Virginia, the surviving family moved to what was called the "Cumberland Country," and settled in Davidson County, Tennessee, near Nashville. On January 15, 1793, he married the daughter of general William Davidson, of North Carolina. The county was named from him (Davidson), in honor of his many valuable services during the war of the Revolution.

Here Mr. Ewing and his wife united with Reverend Dr. Craighead's church, and lived in its communion some years before either of them knew anything about experimental religion. After the birth of their first child (but at what time is not known) Mr. Ewing removed to Kentucky, and settled in what was afterwards Logan County, near Red River Church, of which Reverend James M'Gready was pastor. In the great revival of 1800, which swept over all the Western States, and out of which originated the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Mr. Ewing heard for the first time in his life the doctrines of regeneration and personal holiness insisted upon from the pulpit. He became satisfied that he had not a saving knowledge of the truth, and communicated his feelings to his wife, whom he found in a similar state of mind. After many prayers and tears, while engaged in family worship, he "became filled with joy and peace in believing." Some time after this (the precise period is not known)' he told his impressions to preach the Gospel to Transylvania Presbytery, which body, at the advice of Reverend David Rice, D.D., one of the oldest ministers: in the presbytery, licensed Mr. Ewing and three others to exhort. His success was wonderful; scores of sinners were converted wherever he went. His talents, piety, commanding language, and zeal carried. everything before them. He was soon licensed to preach as a probationer, but the prevailing party in the presbytery opposed his licensure. He went on preaching very successfully, however, revival attending his labors wherever he traveled. His labor was so much called for, and so marked with success, that at the urgent call of several congregations he was ordained, in November 1803, to the work of the ministry. The revival went on with unabated power for several years; in the mean time Kentucky Synod had pretended to dissolve Cumberland Presbytery, which had ordained him, because of alleged irregularities.

The presbytery remained for four years not attempting to exercise its functions as a presbytery; after which, failing to secure a redress of their grievances  from the General Assembly, they determined to organize again, even contrary to the wishes of a majority of Kentucky Synod. On February 4, 1810, Mr. Ewing and two other ordained ministers united and formed the first presbytery of the new Cumberland Presbyterian Church, giving it the name of the presbytery Kentucky Synod had dissolved, viz. Cumberland Presbytery; hence the name "Cumberland Presbyterians." Mr. Ewing removed after some years to Todd County, Kentucky, and became pastor of Lebanon congregation, near Ewingsville. Here under his eye was sustained for many years a flourishing classical seminary of learning. In 1820, at the urgent call of many. friends and brethren, he removed to the State of Missouri, and settled in what is now Cooper County. It was not long until he built up a large congregation at New Lebanon, which still flourishes. Here he prepared and published his Lectures on Divinity, which have been extensively circulated and read, and which contain the germ of the peculiarities of Cumberland Presbyterians. He labored here with great acceptance and success until 1836, when he removed to the town of Lexington, Lafayette County, Mo. Here he soon gathered a congregation, built a church, and, with others, was the means of extending the work of grace all over the vast incoming territories of the West. Mr. Ewing died here July 4, 1841, in his 68th year. He was tall, portly in appearance, had a keen, penetrating eye, always bore a dignified look, was a man of extraordinary pulpit talents, and of great success among all classes in winning souls to the Redeemer. In our troubles with Great Britain in 1812 he did not hesitate to give all the weight of his great influence in favor of his country. He was no politician, yet at one time, being an intimate friend and acquaintance of general Jackson, he was by him appointed register of the land office at Lexington, Mo. He died lamented by a large and growing denomination, and by many others, as a great and good man. His remains rest in the cemetery at Lexington, Moa (J.B.L.)

## Ewing, Greville, D.D[[@Headword:Ewing, Greville, D.D]]

             a Scotch clergyman, was born in Edinburgh in 1767; educated at the highschool; apprenticed to an engraver, but when of age studied theology at Edinburgh University; became tutor to the family of Mr. Lockhart, of Castle Hill; was licensed to preach September 5, 1792, and his talents made him popular from the first. He was nominated by the trustees as minister of lady Glenorchy's chapel, Edinburgh, in June 1792, and ordained colleague in October 1793. Aided by Robert Haldane, Esq., he proposed to organize a select company for propagating the gospel in Bengal, but the East India Company was hostile to the movement. He established the Missionary  Magazine for Scotland, the first religious periodical in that country. He resigned his charge, December 26, 1798; became minister to a large congregation at the Tabernacle, Glasgow, in May 1799, under the auspices of Mr. Haldane, and presided over a seminary for training pious young men for the ministry for two and a half years with considerable success. Differences having arisen with Mr. Haldane, he resigned, and in 1811 became senior tutor to a new theological seminary belonging to the Congregational Union, and continued to discharge the duties with praiseworthy fidelity till obliged by debility to resign. He died August 2, 1841. He published five single Sermons; several controversial works; A Greek Grammar, and Greek and English Scripture Lexicon (Edinb. 1802, 1812): — Facts and Documents respecting the Connections between Robert Haldane and Greville Ewing (1809): — An Essay on Baptism (1823): — Memoir of Barbara Ewing (1829), with many smaller works. See Fasti Eccles. Scoticanae, 1:80, 81.

## Ewing, John[[@Headword:Ewing, John]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, and provost of the University of Pennsylvania, was born in Nottingham, Cecil County, Maryland, June 22, 1732, and graduated in 1754 in New Jersey College, of which he remained tutor for two years. Having completed his theological course, he was ordained, became instructor; in the College of Philadelphia, and was installed pastor of the first Presbyterian church, Philadelphia, in 1759. He visited England and Scotland in 1773 in behalf of the academy in Newark, Del., and returned in 1775 to the duties of his ministry. In 1779 he was  appointed provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and professor of natural philosophy, in which science he delivered annually a course of learned lectures. In this station united with that of pastor, he continued to the end of life. He was also one of the vice-presidents of the American Philosophical Society. He died September 8, 1802. He published Lectures on Natural Philosophy (2 volumes, 8vo), and Sermons (8vo) — Sprague, Annals, 3:216.

## Exactions[[@Headword:Exactions]]

             (Let. exactiones, taliae), the name given in ecclasiastical law to taxes of an extraordinary kind, which either were not in use before, or the rate of, which hash been increased. As a general rule, taxes of this kind are forbidden. Thus the third Council of Toledo prohibited the bishops from "imposing exactions upon the diocese," and Leo IV designates as unlawful exactions any "gifts beyond the statutes of the fathers" that bishops may impose upon clergymen or laymen. The prohibition was renewed at the Council of Lateran in 1179 by Alexander III, who "prohibited bishops or abbots, or any other prelates, from imposing new takes upon the churches, or from increasing the old ones, or from appropriating for their private uses any portion of the revenue." 'The imposition of exactions requires a reasonable cause, and limitation to what is necessary. State churches cannot impose an exaction without previously obtaining the permission ofthe state government. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:280.

## Exactor[[@Headword:Exactor]]

             the rendering (Isa 60:17) of נֹגֵשׁ, noges', driver (task-master, Exo 3:7; Job 3:18; Isa 9:3; or simply driver of animals, Job 39:7); hence exactor of a debt (or tribute, Dan 11:20; Zec 9:8); hence (in accordance with Oriental ideas and customs) a ruler, king, tyrant (Isa 3:12; Isa 24:2; Zec 10:4): as the parallel term "prince" in the above passage of Isaiah shows to be, there the meaning.

## Exaltation of Christ[[@Headword:Exaltation of Christ]]

             (status exaltationas), a theological phrase, including in its scope the resurrection of Christ, his ascension into heaven, his sitting at the right hand of God the Father, and his coming to judge the world at the last day.  See articles on these heads; also CHRISTOLOGY SEE CHRISTOLOGY; and Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, Smith's ed., 2:352.

## Exaltation of the Cross[[@Headword:Exaltation of the Cross]]

             SEE CROSS, EXALTATION OF THE,

## Example[[@Headword:Example]]

             (δεῖγμα, Jud 1:7), especially CHRIST'S (ὑπόγραμμα, 1Pe 2:21) for the imitation of his followers (ὑπόδειγμα, Joh 13:15; elsewhere in other relations, Heb 4:11; Heb 8:5; Heb 9:23; Jam 5:10; 2Pe 2:6), and subordinately pastors for their flack (τὐπος, Php 3:17; 2Th 3:9; 1Ti 4:12; 1Pe 5:3, etc.). See Flatt, Das Beispiel Jesu (in the Magaz. fur chr. Doymat. 1:179 sq.); Keil, De Exemplo Christi (Lips. 1792; Opusc. 1:100- 135); Oeder, De Christi imitatione (in his Obss. sacr. 1:33-56); Schmid, De perverso Christi imitatione (Lips. 1710);, Stober, De exemplorum imitatione (Argent. 1771-6); Wolf, De exemplis caute adhibendis (Lips. 1785-6); Kempis, Imitaio of Christ (often published).

## Example (2)[[@Headword:Example (2)]]

             "a copy or pattern, in a moral sense, is either taken for a type, instance, or precedent for our admonition, that we may be cautioned against the faults or crimes which others have committed, by the bad consequences which have ensued from them; or example is taken for a pattern for our imitation, or a nmodel for us to copy after. That good examples have a peculiar power above naked precepts to dispose us to the practice of virtue and holiness may appear by considering, 1. That they most clearly express to us the nature of our duties in their subjects and sensible effects. General precepts form abstract ideas of virtue, but in examples, virtues are most visible in all their circumstances. 2. Precepts instruct us in what things are our duty, but examples assure us that they are possible. 3. Examples, by secret and lively incentive, urge us to imitation. We are touched in another manner by the visible practice of good men, which reproaches our defects, and obliges us to the same zeal which laws, though wise and good, will not effect. The life of Jesus Christ forms the most beautiful example the Christian can imitate. Unlike all others, it was absolutely perfect asmd uniform, and every way accommodated to our present state. In him we “behold all light without a shade," all beauty without a spot, all the purity  of the law and the excellency of the Gospel. Here we see piety without superstition, and moraliter without ostentation; hunaility without mean and fortitude without temerity; patience without apathy, and compassion without weakness; zeal without rashness, and beneficence without prodigality. The obligation we are under to imitate this example arises from ditty, relationship, engagement, interest, and gratitude. SEE JESUS CHRIST. Those who set bad examples should consider,

1. That they are the ministers of the devil's designs to destroy souls.

2. That they are acting in direct opposition to Christ, he who came to save and not to destroy.

3. That they are adding to the misery and calamities which are already in the world.

4. That the effects of their example may be incalculable on society to the end of time, and perhaps in eternity; for who can tell what may be the consequence of one sin on a family, a nation, or posterity?

5. They are acting contrary to the divine command, and thus exposing themselves to final ruin" (Tillotson, Sermons, ser. 189, 190; Barrow, Works, volume 3, ser. 2 and 3; Flavel, Works, 1:29, 30; Dwight, Theology, ser. 54; Christ our Example, by Caroline Fry).

## Exarch[[@Headword:Exarch]]

             (ἔξαρχος),

(1.) the title given, under the Byzantine emperors, to their viceroys in Italy and Africa, after Justinian's reconquest of those provinces.

(2.) The title was adopted in the early Church for the highest orders of the hierarchy. Primates or metropolitamas were styled ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας, and the patriarchs were called ἔξαρχοι τῆς διοικήσεως. In the 6th canonm of Sardiea (A.D. 344) the former title (exarch of the eparchy) is given to primates; the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, forbade its use (Riddle, Antiquities, book 3, chapter 3). The exarch, as primate, was "inferior to the patriarch, and superior to the metropolitan. In the third century there were three exarchs, viz. Ephesus, with the diocese of Asia, 12 provinces and 300 sees; Heraclea, with the diocese of Thrace, and, 6 provinces, Caesarea, 13 provinces and 104 sees. The privileges of  these exarchates were transferred by the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) to the patriarch of Constantinople."

(3.) The exarch in the Greek Church at the present day is the patriarch's deputy, whose duty it is to visit the provinces under, his inspection, to inform himself as to the lives and morals of the clergy; to take cognizance of eclesiastical causes — the manner of celebrating divine ordinances, the sacraments, particularly confession, the observance of the canons, monastic discipline, affairs of marriages, divorces, etc.; but, above all, to take account of the revenues which the patriarch receives from the several churches. — Bingham, Orig. Eccles. Bohn's ed. 1:61, 67.

## Excellents[[@Headword:Excellents]]

             SEE GAONS.

## Exchanger[[@Headword:Exchanger]]

             (τραπεζίτης, so called from the table used for holding; the coin SEE CHANGER OF MONEY ), a broker or banker (i.e., bench-man) SEE BANK, one who exchanged money, and also received money on deposit at interest, in order to loan it out to others at a higher rate (Mat 25:27). (See Smith's Dict. of Class. Ant. s.v. Mensarii.) SEE MONEY- CHANGER; SEE LOAN.

## Excision[[@Headword:Excision]]

             an ecclesiastical sentence among the Jews, whereby a person was separated or cut off from his people. SEE BAN; SEE EXCOMMUNICATION.

## Exclusiva[[@Headword:Exclusiva]]

             in ecclesiastical law, means the right, claimed by Austria, France, and Spain, to exclude each one candidate at a papal election. This right has never been formally acknowledged by the curia, but the claim has always, since the 15th century, been complied with by the conclave, although the Jesuits, shortly before the death of Pius IX, asserted that this rightn should no more be granted, since these states were no longer Catholic, in the old sense of the word, but tolerant rather. See Haberlin, Romisches Conclave (Halle, 1769), page 152 sq.; Ueber die Rechte der Regierungen beim Conclave (Munich, 1872); Bonghi, Pio IX e il Papa Futuro (Milan, 1877), pages 47-58; Mejerj in Herzog-Plitt, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of' Christ. Antiq. s.v. (B.P.)

## Excommunication[[@Headword:Excommunication]]

             the judicial exclusion of offenders from the religious rites and privileges of the particular comemunlity to which they belong. It is a power founded upon a right inherent in all, religious societies, and is analogous to the powers of capital punishment, banishment, and exclusion from membership which are exercised by political and municipal bodies. If Christianity is merely a philosophical idea thrown into the world to do battle with other theories, and to be valued according as it maintains its ground or not in the conflict of opinions, excommunication, and ecclesiastical punishments and discipline are unreasonable. If a society has been instituted for maintaining any body of doctrine and any code of morals, they are necessary to the existence of that society. That the Christian Church is an organized polity, a spiritual "kingdom of God" on earth, is the declaration of the Bible; and that the Jewish Church was at once a spiritual and a temporal organization is clear. Among the Jews, however, excommunication was not only an ecclesiastical, but also a civil punishment, because in their theocracy there was no distinction between the divine and the statutory right (Exo 31:14; Ezr 10:3; Ezr 10:11; Neh 13:28). But among Christians excommunication was strictly confined to ecclesiastical relations, as the  situation and constitution of the Church during the first three centuries admitted of no intermingling or confounding of civil and religious privileges or penalties. Excommunication, in the Christian Church, consisted at first simply in exclusion from the communion of the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts: "with such a one, no, not to eat" (1Co 5:11). It might also include a total separation from the body of the faithful; and such a. person was, with regard to the Church, "as a heathen man and a publican." But this excision did not exempt him from my duties to which he was liable in civil life, neither did it withhold from him any natural obligations, such as are founded on nature, humanity, and the law of nations (Mat 18:17; 1Co 5:5; 1Co 5:11; 1Co 10:16-18; 2Th 3:6; 2Th 3:14; 2Jn 1:10-11). SEE CHURCH.

I. Jewish. — The Jewish system of excommunication was threefold. For a first offense a delinquent was subjected to the penalty of נִדּוּי (niddui). Rambaam (quoted by Lightfoot, Horae Hebraicae, on 1Co 5:5), Moriunus (De Panitentia, 4:27), and Buxtorf (Lexicon Tahn. col. page 303 sq.) enumerate the twenty-four offenses for which it was inflicted. They are various, and range in heinousness from the offense of keeping a fierce dog to that of taking God's name in vain. Elsewhere (Talm. Bab. Moed Katon, fol. 16, 1) the causes of its infliction are reduced to two, termed money and epicurism, by which is meant debt and wanton insolence. The offender was first cited to appear in court, and if he refused to appearer to make amends, his sentence was pronounced "Let NI. or N. be under excommunication." The excommunicated person was prohibited the use of the bath, or of the razor, or of the convivial table; and all who had to do with him were commanded to keep him at four cubits' distance. He was allowed to go to the Temple, but not to make the circuit in the ordinary manner. The term of this punishment was thirty days, and it was extended to a second and to a third thirty days when necessary. If at the end of that time the offender was still contumacious, he was subjected to the second excommunication termed הֶרֶם(cherem), a word meaning something devoted to God (Lev 27:21; Lev 27:28; Exo 22:20 [19]; Num 18:14). Severer penalties were now attached. The offender was not allowed to teach or to be taught in company with others, to hire or to be hired, nor to perform any commercial transactions beyoand purchasing the necessaries of life. The sentence was delivered by a court of ten, and was accompanied by a solemn malediction, for which authority was supposed to be found in the "Curse ye Meroz" of Jdg 5:23.  Lastly followed שִׁמָּתָא(shamma-tha), which was an entire cutting off from the congregation. It has been supposed by some that these two latter forms of excoanmunication were undistinguishable from each other. See BAN.

The punishment of excommunication is not appointed by the law of Moses. It is founded on the natural right of self-protection which all societies enjoy. The case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. (Numbers 16), the curse denounced on Meroz (Jdg 5:23), the commission and proclamation of Ezra (Ezr 7:26; Ezr 10:8), and the reformation of Nehemiah (13:25), are appealed to by the Talmudists as precedents by which their proceedings are regulated. In respect to the principle involved, the "cutting off from the people" commanded for certain sins (Exo 30:33; Exo 30:38; Exo 31:14; Lev 17:4), and the exclusion from the camp denounced on the leprous (Leveticus 13:46; Num 12:14), are more apposite.

In the New Testament, Jewish excommunication is brought prominently before us in the case of the man that was born blind and restored to sight (John 9). "The Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. Therefore said his parents, He is of age, ask him" (Joh 9:22-23). "And they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out" (Joh 9:34-35). The expressions here used, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται—ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω, refer, no doubt, to the first form of excommunication, or niddui. Our Lord warns his disciples that they will have to suffer excommunication at the hands of their countrymen (Joh 16:2), and the fear of it is described as sufficienmt to prevent persons in a respectable position from acknowledging their belief in Christ (Joh 12:42). In Luk 6:22, it has been thought that our Lord referred specifically to the three forms of Jewish excommunication, "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company [ἀφορίσωσιν], and shall reproach you [ὀνειδίσωσιν], and cast out your name as evil [ἐκβάλωσιν], for the Son of man's sake." The three words very accurately express the simple separation, the additional malediction, and the final exclusion of niddui, cherem, and shammathal. This verse makes it probable that the three stages were already formally distinguished from each other, though, no doubt, the words appropriate to each are occasionally used inaccurately. See the monographs in Latin on Jewish excommunication by Musculus (Lips. 1703), Opitz (Kilon. 1680).  II. In the New Testament. — Excommunication in the New Testament is not merely founded on the natural right possessed by all societies, nor merely on the example of the Jewish Church and nation. It was instituted by our Lord (Mat 18:15; Mat 18:18), and it was practiced by and commanded by Paul (1Ti 1:20; 1Co 5:11; Tit 3:10).

1. Its Institution. — The passage in Matthew has led to much controversy, into which we do not enter. It runs as follows: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained the brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear themn, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be. bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Our Lord here recognizes and appoints a way in which a member of his Church is to become to his brethren as a heathen man and a publican, i.e., be reduced to a state analogous to that of the Jew suffering the penalty of the third form of excommunication. It is to follow on his contempt of the censure of the Church passed on him for a trespass which he has committed. The final excision is to be preceded, as in the case of the Jew, by two warnings.

2. Apostolic Example. — In the Epistles we find Paul frequently claiming the right to exercise discipline over his converts (comp. 2Co 1:23; 2Co 13:10). In two cases we find him exercising this authority to the extent of cutting off offenders from the Church. One of these is the case of the incestuous Corinthian "Ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1Co 5:2-5). The other case is that of Hymenmeus and Alexander: "Holding faith and a good conscience, which some, having put away concerning faith, have made shipwreck; of whom is Hymeneeus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (1Ti 1:19-20). It seems certain that  these persons were excommunicated, the first for immorality, the others for heresy. What is the full meaning of the expression "deliver unto Satan" is doubtful. All agree that excommunication is contained in it, but whether it implies any further punishment, inflicted by the extraordinary powers committed specially to the apostles, has been questioned. The strongest argument for the phrase meaning no more than excommunication may be drawn from a comparison of Col 1:13.

Addressing himself to the "saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse," Paul exhorts them to "give thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." The conception of the apostle here is of men lying in the realm of darkness, and transported from thence into the kingdom of the Son of God, which is the inheritance of the saints in light, by admission into the Church. What he means by the power of darkness is abundantly clear from many other passages in his writings, of which it will be sufficient to quote Eph 6:12 : "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil; for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Introduction into the Church is therefore, in Paul's mind, a translation from the kingdom and power of Satan to the kingdom and government of Christ. This being so, he could hardly more naturally describe the effect of excluding a man from the Church than by the words "deliver him unto Satan," the idea being that the man ceasing to be a subject of Christ's kingdom of light, was at once transported back to the kingdom of darkness, and delivered therefore into the power of its ruler, Satan. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the terms in which Paul describes the commission which he received from the Lord Jesus Christ when he was sent to the Gentiles: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (Act 26:18). Here again the act of being placed in Christ's kingdom, the Church, is pronounced to be a translation from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God. Conversely, to be cast out of the Church would be to be removed from light to darkness, to be withdrawn from God's government, and delivered into the power of Satan (so Balsamon and Zonaras, in Basil. Song of Solomon 7; Estius, in 1 Corinthians 5; Beveridge, in Can. Apost. 10). If, however, the expression means more than excommunication, it would imply the additional exercise of a special apostolical power, similar to that exerted on Ananias and Sapphira (Act 5:1), Simon Magus (8:20), and Elymas (13:10). (So Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Hammond, Grotius, Lightfoot.)

3. Apostolic Precept. — In addition to the claim to exercise discipline, and its actual exercise in the form of excommunication by the apostles, we find apostolic precepts directing that discipline should be exercised by the rulers of the Church, and that in some cases excommunication should be resorted to: "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," writes Paul to the Thessalonians (2Th 3:14). To the Romans: "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have heard, and avoid them" (Rom 16:17). To the Galatians: "I would they were even cut off that. trouble you" (Gal 5:12). To Timothy: "If any man teach otherwise, ... from such withdraw thyself" (1Ti 6:3). To Titus he uses a still stronger expression: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject" (Tit 3:10). John instructs the lady to whom he addresses his second epistle not to receive into her house, nor bid God speed to any who did not believe in Christ (2Jn 1:10); and we read that in the case of Cerinthus he acted himself on the precept that he had given (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 3:28). In his third epistle he describes Diotrephes, apparently a Judaizing presbyter, "who loved to have the pre- eminence," as "casting out of the Church," i.e., refusing Church communion to the stranger brethren who were traveling about preaching to the Gentiles (3Jn 1:10). In the addresses to the Seven Churches the, angels or rulers of the church of Pergamos and of Thyatira are rebuked for "suffering" the Nicolaitans and Balaamites "to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things, sacrificed unto idols" (Rev 2:20). There are two passages still more important to our subject. In the epistle to the Galatians, Paul denounces, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed [ἀνάθεμα ἔστω]. As I said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, Gal 1:8-9). And in the second epistle to the Corinthians: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha" (1  Corinthians 16:22). It has been supposed that these two expressions, "let him be Anathema," "let him be Anathema Maranatha," refer respectively to the two later stages of Jewish excommunication — the cherem and the shammahi. This requires consideration.

The words ἀνάθεμα and ἀνάθημα have evidently the same derivation, and originally they bore the same meaning. They express a person or thing set apart, laid up, or devoted. But whereas a thing may be set apart by way of honor or for destruction, the words, like the Latin "sacer" and the English "devoted," came to have opposite senses—τὸ ἀπηλλοτριωμένον Θεοῦ, and τὸ ἀφωρισμένον Θεῷ. The Sept. and several ecclesiastical writers use the two words almost indiscriminately, but in general the form ἀνάθημα is applied to the votive offering (see 2Ma 9:16; Luk 21:5; and Chrysost. Hom. 16 in Ep. cad Rom.), and the form ἀνάθεμα to that which is devoted to evil (see Deu 7:26; Jos 6:17; Jos 7:13). Thus Paul declares that he could wish himself an ἀνάθεμα from Christ if he could thereby save the Jews (Rom 9:3). His meaning is that he would be willing to be set apart as a vile thing, to be cast aside and destroyed, if only it could bring about the salvation of his brethren. Hence we see the force of ἀνάθεμα ἔστω in Gal 1:8. "Have nothing to do with him," would be the apostle's injunction, "but let him be set apart as an evil thing, for God to deal with him as he thinks fit." Hammond (in loc.) paraphrases it as follows: "You are to disclaim and renounce all communion with him, to look on him as on an excommunicated person, under the second degree of excommunication, that none is to have any commerce with in sacred things." Hence it is that ἀνάθεμα ἔστω came to be the common expression employed by councils at the termination of each canon which they enacted, meaning that whoever was disobedient to the canon was to be separated from the communion of the Church and its privileges, and from the favor of God, until he repented (see Bingham, Ant. 16:2,16). SEE ANATHEMA.

The expression Α᾿νάθεμα μαραναθά as it stands by itself without explanation in 1Co 16:22, is so peculiar, that it has tempted a number of ingenious expositions. Parkhurst hesitatingly derives it from

אִתָּה מָחַרָם, "Cursed be thou." But this derivation is not tenable. Buxtorf, Morinus, Hammond, Bingham, and others identify, it with the Jewish shammatha. They do so by translating shammatha, "The Lord comes." But shammatha cannot be made to mean "The Lord comes" (see Lightfoot, in  loc.). Several fanciful derivations are given by rabbinical writers, as " There is death," "There is desolation;" but there is no mention by them of such a signification as "The Lord comes." Lightfoot derives it from שִׁמֵּת, and it probably means a thing excluded or shut out. Maranatha, however peculiar its use in the text may seem to us, is a Syro-Chaldaic expression, signifying "The Lord is come" (Chrysostom, Jerome, Estius, Lightfoot), or "The Lord cometh." If we take the former meaning, we may regard it as giving the reason why the offender was to be anathematized; if the latter, it would either imply that the separation was to be in perpetuity, "donee Dominus redeat" (Augustine), or, more properly, it would be a form of solemn appeal to the day on which the judgment should be ratified by the Lord (comp. Jud 1:14). In any case it is a strengthened form of the simple ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. And thus it may be regarded as holding towards it a similar relation to that which existed between the shanmaftha and the cherem, but not on any supposed ground of etymological identity between the two words shammatha and maranatha. Perhaps we ought to interpunctuate more strongly between ἀνάθεμα, and μαραναθά and read ἤτω ἀνάθεμα· μαραναθά, i.e., "Let him be anathema. The Lord will come." The anathema and the cherem answer very exactly to each other (see Lev 27:28; Num 21:3; Isa 43:28). SEE MARANATHA.

4. Restoration to Communion. — Two cases of excommunication are related in Holy Scripture, and in one of them the restitution of the offender is specially recounted. The incestuous Corinthian had been excommunicated by the authority of Paul, who had issued his sentence from a distance without any consultation with the Corinthians. He had required them publicly to promulgate it and act upon it. They had done so. The offender had been brought to repentance, and was overwhelmed with grief. Hereupon Paul, still absent as before, forbids the further infliction of the punishment, pronounces the forgiveness of the penitent, and exhorts the Corinthians to receive him back to communion, and to confirm their love towards him.

5. The Nature of Excommunication is made more evident by these acts of Paul than by any investigation of Jewish practice or of the etymology of words. We thus find

(1) that it is a spiritual penalty, involving no temporal punishment except accidentally;

(2) that it consists in separation from the communion of the Church;

(3) that its object is the good of the sufferer (1Co 5:5), and the protection of the sound members of the Church (2Ti 3:17);

(4) that its subjects are those who are guilty of heresy (1Ti 1:20) or gross immorality (1Co 5:1);

(5) that it is inflicted by the authority of the Church at large (Mat 18:18) wielded by the highest ecclesiastical officer (1Co 5:3; Tit 3:10);

(6) that this officer's sentence is promulgated by the congregation to which the offender belongs (1Co 5:4), in deference to his superior judgment and command (2Co 2:9), and in spite of any opposition on the part of a minority (ib. 6);

(7) that the exclusion may be of indefinite duration or for a period;

(8) that its duration may be abridged at the discretion and by the indulgence of the person who has imposed the penalty (ib. 8);

(9) that penitence is the condition on which restoration to communion is granted (ib. 7);

(10) that the sentence is to be publicly reversed as it was publicly promulgated (ib. 10).

III. In the Post-Apostolic Christian Church.—

(I.) In general. — Such a power is necessarily inherent in every community; and although "the only sense in which the apostles, or, of course, any of their successors in the Christian ministry, can be empowered to 'forgive sins' as against God is by pronouncing and proclaiming his forgiveness of all those who, coming to him through Christ, repent and forsake their sins," yet since offenses as against a community may "be visited with penalties by the regular appointed officers of that community, they may enforce or remit such penalties. On these principles is founded the right which the Church claims both to punish ecclesiastical offenses, and to pronounce an absolute and complete pardon of a particular offender on his making the requisite submission and reparation."  (II.) In the early Christian Church. —

1. In the discipline of the primitive Church, according to the apostolic injunction, recourse was not had to excommunication until "after the first and second admonition" (προθέσμια). If the offender proved refractory after the time granted for repentance (Siegel, Alterthumer, 2:131), he was liable to excommunication, which at first consisted simply in the removal of the offender from the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts: hence the word excommunication, separation from communion. The practice was founded on the words ,f the apostle (1Co 5:11), "with such an one, no, not to eat;" which do not refer to ordinary meals and the common intercourse of life, but to the agapae and other solemnities. The chief difference between Jewish and Christian excommunication consisted in this: the former extended in its consequences to the affairs of civil life, whereas the latter was strictly confined to ecclesiastical relations. It was impossible, in the constitution and situation of the Church during the three first centuries, that there should have been any confounding or intermingling of civil and religious privileges or penalties. But, though instituted at first for the purpose of preserving the purity of the Church, excommunication was afterwards by degrees converted by ambitious ecclesiastics into an engine for promoting their own power, and was often inflicted on the most frivolous occasions (Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 15, chapter 2). The primitive Church was very cautious in exercising its power of excommunication. No man could be condemned to it in his absence, or without being allowed liberty to answer for himself. Legal conviction was always required, i.e., by his own confession, by credible evidence, or by open notoriety. Minors were subjected to corporal discipline rather than to this censure (Bingham, Orig. Eccl. book 16, chapter 2; Cave, Prim. Christianity, 3:5).

2. There were two excommunications, the greater (major) and lesser (minor). The excommunicatio minor (ἀφορισμός) excluded from participation in the Eucharist and prayers of the faithful, but did not expel from the Church; for the person under its sentence might stay to hear the psalmody, reading of the Scripture, sermons and prayers of the catechumens and penitents, and then depart as soon as the first service, called the service of catechumens, was ended (Theod. Ep. 77; ad Eelul. 3:797). This punishment was commonly inflicted upon lesser crimes, or if upon greater, upon such sinners only as showed a willingness to repent- upon those who had lapsed rather through infirmity than maliciousness.  The excommunicatio major, greater excommunication (παντελὴς ἀφορισμός), was a total expulsion from the Church, and separation from communion in all holy offices with it (Encyclop. Metropolitana). When attended with execratioans, excommunication was called anathema (see article, volume 1, page 219). The several churches mutually informed each other of their own separate excommunications in order that a person excommunicated by one church might be held so by all; and any church which received him was held deserving of similar punishment. He who was guilty of any intercourse with an excommunicated person, himself incurred a like sentence, which deprived him of Christian burial and insertion in the diptychs or catalogues of the faithful. No gifts or oblations were received from the excommunicated. No intermarriages might take place with them. Their books might not be read, but were to be burned (Bingham, Oruq. Eccl. book 15). For the restoration of excommunicated persons, penances (q.v.) and public professions of repentance were required; and in Africa and Spain the absolution of lapsed persons (i.e., those who, in time of persecution, had yielded to the force of temptation, and fallen away from their Christian profession by the crime of actual sacrifice to idols) was forbidden, except at the hour of death, or in cases where martyrs interceded for them. SEE LAPSI.

(III.) The Roman Church. — As the pretensions of the hierarchy increased, excommunication became more and more an instrument of ecclesiastical power, as well as a means of enlarging it. When the Church had full control of the state, its sentences were attended with the gravest civil as well as ecclesiastical consequences. There are three degrees of excommunication, the minor, the major, and the anathema.

1. The minor is incurred by holding communion with an excommunicated person: oratione, locutione, bibendo, comedendo — praying, speaking, drinking, eating; and absolution may be given by any priest on confession. Priests who have incurred the minor ban may administer the Eucharist, but cannot partake of it.

2. The major excommussicatio falls upon those who disobey the commands of the pope, or who, having been found guilty of any offense, civil or criminal, refuse to submit to certain points of discipline; in consequence of which they are excommunicated from the Church triumphant, and delivered over to the devil and his angels. It requires a written sentence from a bishop after three admonitions. It deprives the condemned person of all the  blessings of the Church in any shape, except that he is not debarred from hearing the Word. So long as the State obeyed the Church, civil disabilities followed the sentence of excommunication; no obedience was due to the excommunicated; the laws could give them no redress for injuries; and none could hold intercourse with them under penalty of excommunication. On this last point, however, a distinction has been made since the 15th century between those who are called tolerati (tolerated) and those who are designated as vitandi (persons to be shunned). Only in the case of the latter (a case extremely rare, and confined to heresiarchs, and other signal offenders against the faith or public order of the Church) are the ancient rules for prohibition of intercourse enforced. With the 'tolerated,' since the celebrated decree of Pope Martin V in the Council of Constance, the faithful are permitted to maintain the ordinary intercourse. By the 12th century the word ban (bannus, bannum), which in ancient jurisprudence denoted a declaration of outlawry, had come into ecclesiastical use to denote the official act of excommunication. SEE BAN.

The professed aim of excommunication was the reform of the offender as well as the purification of the Church. Absolution can be granted, in case of the major ban, only by the authority which laid the bans or its successor. Before absolution the authorities must be satisfied of penitence. The "penitent must first swear to obey the commands of the Church, and to make all necessary atonement for his special offense; he must then be reconciled by kneeling, bareheaded and stripped to his shirt, before the bishop sitting at the church gates. Here he again repeats his oath, and the bishop, reciting the psalm Deus misereatar, strikes him with a rod during each verse. Then, after certain prayers, he absolves him and leads him into the church."

3. The anathema is attended with special ceremonies. "The bishop must be attended by twelve priests, each of whom, as well as himself, bears a lighted candle. He then sits before the high altar, or any other public place which he prefers, and delivers his sentence, which adjudges the offender to be anathemizatsum et damnatum cum diabolo et angelis ejus et omnibus reprobis in wternum igem — cursed and damned with the devil and his angels and all the reprobate to eternal fire. The candles are then dashed down. The ceremonials of absolution from this sentence are not very different from the last, although the form of prayer is varied" (Encyclop. Metrop. s.v.). The effects of the anathema were summed up in the monkish lines

Si pro delicto anathema quis efficiatur,

Os, orare, vale, comnamunio, mensa negatur.

SEE ANATHEMA; SEE BELL, BOOK, AND CANDLE

"In the Roman Catholic Church the power or excommunicating is held t6 reside, not in the congregation, but in the bishop; and this is believed to be in exact accordance with the remarkable proceeding commemorated in the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (1Co 5:3; 1Co 5:5), and with all the earliest recorded examples of its exercise. Like all the powers of the episcopate, it is held to belong, in an especial and eminent degree, to the Roman bishop, as primate of the Church; but it is by no means believed to be. long to him exclusively, nor has such exclusive right ever been claimed by the bishops of Rome. On the contrary, bishops within their sees, archbishops while exercising visitatorial jurisdiction, heads of religious orders within their own communities, all possess the power to issue excommunication, not only by the ancient law of the Church, but also by the most modern discipline" (Chambers, s.v.). But Aquinas held that excommunication, as not belonging to the keys of order, not to those of jurisdiction, and as not referring to grace directly, but only accidentally, might be exercised by persons not in holy orders, but yet having jurisdiction in ecclesiastical courts (Summa, Suppl. 3, qu. 22). See Marshall, Penitential Discipline, Oxf. 1844, page 139. The Council of Trent declares (sess. 25, chapter 3, de Reform.) that, "Although the sword of excommunication is the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline, and very salutary for keeping the people in their duty, yet it is to be used with sobriety and great circumspection; seeing that experience teaches that if it be rashly or for slight causes wielded, it is more despised than feared, and produces destruction rather than safety. It shall be a crime for any secular magistrate to prohibit an ecclesiastical judge from excommunicating any one, or to command that he revoke an excommunication issued, under pretext that the things contained in the present decree have not been observed; whereas the cognizance hereof does not pertain to seculars but to ecelesiastics. And every excommunicated person soever who, after the lawful monitions, does not change his mind, shall not only not be received to the sacraments and to communion and intercourse with the faithful, but if, being bound with censures, he shall, with obdurate heart, remain for a year in the defilement thereof, he may even be proceeded against as suspected of heresy." The popes have exercised the power of excommunication against entire communities at once. The Capitularies of  Pepin the Less, in the 8th century, ordained that the greater excommunication should be followed by banishment from the countmy. On the claim of the popes to excommunicate and depose monarchs, and to free subjects from their allegiance, see M'Clintock, Temporal Power of the Pope (N.Y. 1855, 12mo). "The latest examples of papal excommunication of monarchs were Napoleon I in 1809, and Victor Emmanuel, king of Italy, in 1860; neither of whom, however, was excommunicated by name, the pope having confined himself to a solemn and reiterated publication of the penalties decreed by his predecessors against those who unjustly invaded the territories of the Holy See, usurped or violated its rights, or violently impeded their free exercise. The excommunication of a sovereign was regarded as freeing subjects from their allegiance; and, in the year 1102, this sentence was pronounced against the emperor Henry IV, an example which subsequent popes likewise ventured to follow. But the fearful weapons with which the popes armed themselves in this power of excommunication were rendered much less effective through their incautious employment, the evident worldly motives by which it was sometimes governed and the excommunications which rival popes hurled against each other during the time of the great papal schism" (Chambers, s.v.).

(IV.) The Greek Church. — In the Greek Church excommunication cuts off the offender from all communion with the 318 fathers of the first Council of Nicena, consigns him to the devil and his angels, and condemns his body to remain after death as hard as a piece of flint, unless lie humbles himself and makes atonement for his sins by a sincere repentance. "The form abounds with dreadful imprecations; and the Greeks assert that, if a person dies excommunicated, the devil enters into the lifeless corpse; and, therefore, in order to prevent it, the relations of the deceased cut his body in pieces and boil them in wine. Every year, and a fixed Sunday, the ‘greater ban' is pronounced against the pope and the Church of Rome, on which occasion, together with a great deal of idle ceremony, he drives a nail into the ground with a hammer as a mark of malediction" (Buck, s.v.). Sir Paul Rycaut (Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches, Lond. 1679, 8vo), who wrote his observations on the state of that communion in 1678, has gives? in the original Greek, the form of an excommunication issued against an unknown thief whom the authorities were seeking to discover. It runs as follows: "If they restore not to him that which is his own, and possess him peaceably of it, but suffer him to remain  injured and damnifyed, let him be separated from the Lord God Creator, and be accursed, and unpardoned, and undissolvable after death in this world, and in the other which is to come. Let wood, stones, and iron be dissolved, but not they: may they inherit the leprosy of Gehazi and the confusion of Judas may the earth be divided, and devour them like Dathn and Abiram; may they sigh and tremble an earth like Cain, and the wrath of God be upon their heads and countenances; may they see nothing of that for which they labor, and beg their bread all the days of their lives; may their works, possessions, labors, and services be accursed; always without effect or success, and blown away like dust; may they have the curses of the holy and righteous patriarchs Abram, Isaac, and Jacob; of the 318 saints who were the divine fathers of the Synod of Nice, and of all other holy synods; and being without the Church of Christ, let no human administer unto them the things of the Church, or bless them, or offer sacrifice for them or give them the ἀντίδωρον, or the blessed bread, or eat, or drink, or work with them, or converse with them; and after death let no man bury them, in penalty of being under the same state of excommunication; for so let them remain until they have performed what is here written."

(V.) In Protestant Churches. — New relations between Church and State followed hard upon the Reformation, and new limits were soon assigned to the exercise of discipline. According to the view of the Wittemberg reformers, the ban could have no civil effect unless ratified by the State. The necessity of the power of excommunication in the Church was asserted by all the Reformers. They maintained that excommunication is the affair of the whole Church, clergy and laity (Calvin, Institut. volume 4, chapter 11; Melancthon, Corpus Ref. ed. Bretschneider, 3:965). SEE ERASTIANISM. They disclaimed the right of using the excommunicatio major. In general, the "Reformers retained only that power of excommunication which appeared to them to be inherent in the constitution of the Christian society, and to be sanctioned by the Word of God; nor have any civil consequences been generally connected with it in Protestant countries. To connect such consequences with excommcunication in any measure whatever is certainly inconsistent with the principles of the Reformation" (Chambers, s.v.).

The causes of excommunication in the established Church of England are, contempt of the bishops' court, heresy, neglect of public worship and the sacraments, incontinency, adultery, sinony, etc. If the judge of any spiritual court excommunicates a man for a cause of which he has not the legal  cognizance, the party may have an action against him at common law, and he is also liable to be indicted at the suit of the king (Can. 65, 68; see also the Homily On the Right Uses of the Church). The 33d Article of Religion is as follows: "That person which, by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and publican until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto." "By old English law an excommunicated person was disabled from doing any act required to be done by one that is probes et legalis honzo. He could not serve on juries, nor be witness in any court, nor bring an action real or personal to recover lands or money due to him. By stat. 5 and 6 Edward VI, cap. 4, striking, or drawing a weapon to strike, in a church or churchyard, incurred ipso facto excommunication; ipso facto excommunication, or latae sententivs, meaning some act so clear or manifest that no sentence is requisite, in contradistinction from sententiae ferendae, i.e., when sentence must be passed before the offender be considered excoamumunicated. The offenses which, in the reign of Edward III, 1373, were punished by ipsofacto excommunication, are enumerated in some articai issued when Wittlesey was archbishop of Canterbury; most of them are such as might be injurious to the persons or properties of the clergyi The document may be found in Conc. Magn. Britt. 3:95. By 3 James I, cap. 5, every popish recusant convict stands to all intents and purposes disabled, as a person lawfully excommunicated.

The ecclesiastical law denies Christian burial to those excommunicated majori excommunicatione, and an injunction to the ministers to that effect will be found in the sixty-eighth canon, and in the rubric of the burial service. The law acknowledged two excommunications: the lesser excluded the offender from the communion of the Church only; the greater from that communion, and also from the company of the faithful, etc. The sixty fifth canon enjoins ministers solemnly to denounce those who stand lawfully excommunicated every six months, as well in the parish church as in the cathedral church of the diocese in which they remain, 'openly in time of divine service, upon some Sunday,' 'that others may be thereby both admonished to refrain their company and society, and excited the rather to procure out a writ de exconmunicato copiendo, thereby to bring and reduce them into due order and obedience.' By statute 52 George III, cap. 127, excommunications, and the proceedings following thereupon, are discontinued, except in certain cases specified in the act; which may receive definitive sentences as spiritual censures for offenses of  ecclesiastical cognizance; and instead of sentence of excommunication, which used to be pronounced by the ecclesiastical courts in cases of contumacy, the offenders are to be declared contumacious, and to be referred to the court of chancery, by which a writ de contumae capiendo is issued instead of the old writ de excommunicato capiendo. Formerly this writ de excommunicato capiendo was issued by the court of chancery upon it being signified by the bishop's certificate that forty days have elapsed since sentence of excommunication has been published in the church without submission of the offender. The sheriff then received the writ, called also a significavit, and lodged the culprit in the county jail till the bishop certified his reconciliation. A similar method of proceeding to that now adopted was recommended by a report of a committee of both houses of Parliament as far back as March 7, 1710, and again on April 30, 1714. No person excommunicated for such offenses as are still liable to the punishment can now be imprisoned for a longer term than six months (Burns, Eccl. Law, by Tyrwhit, adv.). In Scotland, when the lesser excommunication, or exclusion from the sacraments has failed, the minister pronounces a form by which the impenitent offender is declared 'excommunicated, shut out from the communion of the faithful, debarred from their privileges, and delivered unto Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' The people are then warned to avoid all unnecessary intercourse with him. Anciently, in Scotland, an excommunicated person was incapable of holding feudal rights, but at present the sentence is unaccompanied by any civil penalty or disqualification" (Encyclopaedia Metropolitana, s.v.).

The law of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, as expressed by the 42d canon of 1832, is as follows: Sec. 1. If any persons within this Church offend their brethren by any wickedness of life, such persons shall be repelled from the holy communion, agreeably to the rubric. Sec. 2. On information being laid before the bishop that any one has been repelled from communion, it shall not be his duty to institute an inquiry unless there be a complaint made to him in writing by the repelled party. But on receiving complaint, it shall be the duty of the bishop, unless he think fit to restore him from the insufficiency of the cause assigned by the minister, to institute an inquiry, as may be directed by the canons of the diocese in which the event has taken place. Sec. 3. In the case of a great heinousness of offense on the part of members of this Church, they may be proceeded against to the depriving them of all privileges of church membership,  according to such rules or process as may be provided by the General Convention, and, until such rules and process shall be provided, by such as may be provided by the different State Conventions. See also the 33d Article of Religion.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church the power of excommunication lies with the minister after trial before a jury of the peers of the accused party. The grounds and forms of trial are given in the Discipline, part in, chap. i It is provided in the Constitution that no law shall ever be made doing away the privilege of accused ministers or members to have trial and right of appeal (Discipline, part 2, chapter 1, § 1).

"Among the Independents, Congregationalists, and Baptists, the persons who are or should be excommunicated are such as are quarrelsome and litigious (Gal 5:12); such as desert their privileges, withdraw themselves from the ordinances of God, and forsake his people (Jud 1:19); such as are irregular and immoral in their lives, railers, drunkards, extortioners, fornicators, and covetous (Eph 5:5; 1Co 5:11). In the United States these simple principles of Church discipline are very generally followed by all evangelical denominations" (Buck, s.v.). See particularly the Form, of Government of the Presbyterian Church, book 2 of Discipline; Dexter, On Congregationalism (Boston, 1865), pages 191-2; Ripley, On Church Polity (Bost. 1867), page 81 sq.; Edwards, Nature and Use of Excommunication (Works, N.Y. 1848), 4:6:8.

Literature. — See, besides the works already cited, Ferraris, Promta Bibliotheca, ed. Migne, 3:846 sq.; Siegel, Christl.-kirchl. Alterthumer, 2:131 sq.; Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 16, chapter 2, 3; Van Espen, De Censuris Ecclesiasticis (Opera, Paris, 1753, 4 volumes); Scheele, Die Kirchenzucht (Halle, 1852, 8vo); Hooker, Eccl. Polity, 8:1, 6; Calvin, Institutes, book 4, chapter 12; Thorndike, Works (Oxford, 1856), 6:21; Waterland, Works (Oxford, 1853), 3:456; Winer, Comp. Darstellung, § 20; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, ed. Smith, § 255; Herzog, Real- Encyklopaldie, s.v. Bann; Palmer, On the Church, 1:96; 2:277, 304; Watson, Theological Institutes, 2:574; Burnet, On the Articles, Browne, On the Articles, Forbes, On the Articles (each on Article XXXIII); Wheatly, On Common Prayer, Bohn's ed., page 442 sq.; Scott, Synod of Dort (Philadelphia Presb. Board), page 249; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chapter 15, part 5. SEE ANATHEMA;SEE BAN; SEE DISCIPLINE.

## Exdcatacceli[[@Headword:Exdcatacceli]]

             a name given to several officers of the Church at Constantinople, high in authority, and in public assemblies taking precedence of the bishops. Originally they were priests, but afterwards only deacons. The college of the exocatacaeli corresponded to the college of cardinals (q.v.) at Rome.

## Exeat[[@Headword:Exeat]]

             a Latin term, signifying either the permission given by a bishop to a clergyman of his diocese that he may for a time go out of his diocese, or the same permission given by an abbot to one of the "religious" of his monastery, or by the authorities of a college (in England) to a student.

## Execration[[@Headword:Execration]]

             (אָלָה, alah', Jer 42:18; Jer 44:12; a "curse" or "oath," abstractly, as elsewhere) is properly the representative of the Greek word κατάρα, which occurs (in the verb καταράομαι) in the Sept. at Num 23:8; Num 24:9; Jos 6:26; 1Sa 17:43, etc., as a rendering of various Hebrews terms (אָרִר, זָעִם, קִלֵּל, etc.), and also in the N.T. ("curse," Mat 5:44; Mar 2:21, etc.). It is used also in profane authors to denote the imprecations which it was customary among ancient nations to pronounce upon their enemies for the purpose of calling down the divine wrath, branding them with infamy, and exciting against them the passions of the multitude. By this means they also devoted their enemies to the ruin they considered them to deserve. These imprecations were chiefly pronounced by priests, enchanters, or prophets. SEE BALAAM.

The Athenians made use of them against Philip of Macedon. They convened an assembly, in which it was decreed that all statues, inscriptions, or festivals among them, in any way relating to him or his ancestors, should be destroyed, and every other possible reminiscence of him profaned; and that the priests, as often as they prayed for the success of the Athenian affairs, should pray for the ruin of Philip. It was also customary, both among the Greeks and Romans, after having destroyed cities in war, the revival of whose strength they dreaded, to pronounce execrations upon those who should rebuild them. Strabo observes that Agamemnon pronounced execrations on those who should rebuild Troy, as Croesus did against those who should rebuild Sidena; and this mode of execrating cities Strabo calls an ancient custom (κατὰ παλαιὸν ἔθος, 13, page 898, edit. 1707). The Romans published a decree full of execrations against those who should rebuild Carthage (Zonaras, Annal.). An incident somewhat analogous is related (Jos 6:26) after the taking of Jericho. From the words “and Joshua adjured them at that time," it is likely that he acted under a divine intimation that Jericho should continue in ruins, as a monument of the divine displeasure and a warning to posterity. The words "cursed be the  man (the individual) before the Lord that riseth up and buildeth this city Jericho," although transformed into an execration by the word supplied by the translators, amount to no more than a prediction that "he shall lay the foundation thereof in his first-born, and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it," that is, he shall meet with so many impediments to his undertaking that he shall outlive all his children, dying in the course of nature before he shall complete it. SEE JERICHO. Execrations were also pronounced upon cities and their inhabitants before undertaking a' siege (Macrobius has preserved two of the ancient forms used in reference to the destruction of Carthage, Saturnal. 3:9), and before engaging with enemies in war. Tacitus relates that the priestesses of ancient Britain devoted their Roman invaders to destruction with imprecations, ceremonies, and attitudes, which for a time overwhelmed the soldiers with terror (Anal. 14:29). The execrations in the 83d Psalm, probably written on the occasion of the confederacy against Jehoshaphat, and other instances of a like nature, partake of the execrations of the heathen in nothing but form, being the inspired predictions or denunciations of divine vengeance against the avowed enemies of the God of Israel, notwithstanding the proofs they had witnessed of his supremacy; and the object of these imprecations, as in many other instances, is charitable, namely, their conversion to the true religion (Jos 6:18; see also Psa 59:12). SEE ANATHEMA; SEE IMPRECATION.

## Execution[[@Headword:Execution]]

             or capital punishment, among the Jews, when lawful and regular, was of one of the following kinds.

1. Death by the sword (לְפִי חֶרֶב, or הִכָּה בְחֶרְב, also sinply הִכָּה; 2Sa 1:15; 2Ki 10:25; Jer 26:23), by which, however, we are not to understand beheading (in 2Ki 10:7, the bodies were probably decapitated after death), as the Rabbins will have it (Mishna, Sanhedr. 7:3), a penalty that early occurs in Egypt (Gen 40:1)), and later in the Roman period among the Jews, as the introduction of foreign princes (Mat 14:10 sq.), and as is probably meant in Act 12:2 (comp. Josephus, Ant. 15:1, 2); but the offender was stabbed or cut to death, as the case might be.

2. Stoning (q.v.); since the shooting with a dart, mentioned in Exo 19:13, was only selected in place of this when an individual was to be put  to death at a distance. These punishments were intensified by indignities to the corpse; namely,

(a.) Burning (שָּׂרִŠ בָּאֶשׁ, Levo 20:14; 21:9; compare Jos 7:15; Jos 7:25; Gen 38:24; 1Ma 3:5; [see Michaelis in loc.]). That we are here not to think of a burning alive, we may gather from Jos 7:25; and it is the more probable from the procedure detailed in the Mishna (Sanhedr. 7:2), which directs that the delinquent's mouth should be forced open by a cloth drawn around the neck, and melted lead then be poured in!

(b.) Hanging (תָּלָה) on a tree or post (Deu 21:22; Num 25:4; comp. Jos 10:26; 2Sa 4:12; 1Sa 31:8; 1Sa 31:10), with which mutilation of the dead body was often connected (2Sa 4:12). The person hung was regarded as execrated (Deu 21:23; comp. Gal 3:13), and was not allowed to remain suspended over night (Deu 21:23; comp. Jos 8:29; Jos 10:26 sq.), through fear of tainting the atmosphere, since putrescence soon began. The opposite treatment was deemed an extraordinary severity (2Sa 21:6; 2Sa 21:9 sq.). The hanging of a living person (Ezr 6:11) is a Persian punishment. Under the Herods this custom was likewise introduced among the Jews (Josephus, Ant. 16:11, 6), as in the Roman period in Egypt (Philo, 2:529).

(c.) Finally, a heap of stones (גִּל אֲבָנַים גָּדול) was thrown over the body, i.e., the grave (Jos 7:25 sq.; Jos 8:29; 2Sa 18:17), This dishonor is still common in the East (Panlus, Neu. Repert. 2:53; Jahn, Archaol II, 2:353). One of these kinds of punishment is constantly referred to by the legislative precept, "That soul shall be cut off from the people" (יְנִכְרְתָה הִנֶּפֶשׁ הִהיא מִקֶּרבֵ עִמּו, or מֵעִמֶּיהָ), as especially appears from Exo 31:14; Lev 17:4; Lev 20:17 (see Michaelis, Mos. Rech', 5:37 sq.; the cases are specified in the Mishna, Cherithuth, 1:1); but the Rabbins are not altogether agreed; comp. Abarbanel on Num 15:30; also in Ugolini Thesaur. 30); not, as most will have it, a mere interdict from political or religious privileges. SEE EXCOMMUNICATION. All penal inflictions were usually speedy (Jos 7:24 sq.; 1Sa 22:16), and originally inflicted directly by the populace, but under the kings by their body-guard, or one of their attendants. SEE CHERETHITE.

Foreign punishments, unknown to the Jewish law, were the following:

1. Sawing in pieces (2Sa 12:31). SEE SAW.

2. Dichotomy, i.e., cutting asunder (διχοτομεῖν or μελίζειν=" quartering") or dismemberment (שִׁסֵּŠ, 1Sa 15:33; μελιστὶ διαιρεῖν, Josephus, Ant. 15:8, 4; a barbarous instance is given in Josephus, Ant. 13:12, 6; and an inhuman murder in Jdg 19:29; but 1Ki 3:25, does not belong here) of the living being (see Krumbholz, Depznaper τὸ διχοτομεῖν signeiicata, in the Bibl. Brem. 7:234 sq.), which was universal among the Babylonians (Dan 2:5; Dan 3:29 : in 2Sa 4:12; 2Ma 1:16, mangling after death is indicated by way of infamy; compare Livy, 8:28; in Eze 16:40; Eze 20:47, dichotomy is not to be understood), as well as Egyptians (Herod. 2:139; 3:13) and Persians (Herod. 7:39; Died. Sic. 17:83; comp. Horace, Sat. 1:1, 99 sq.; 2Ma 7:8; Mat 24:51; Luk 12:46; Koran, 20:74; 26:49; Assemani, Martyrol. Or. 1:241 sq.). 3. Precipitation ( שְׁמִיטָה2Ch 25:12; comp. Psalm cxli. 6 κατακρημνισμός, Luk 4:29; comp. 2Ma 6:10) from a rock ("dejicere de saxo Tarpeio" or "ex aggere," Suetonius, Calig. 27) is well known as a Roman mode of execution (for the Athenians, see Wachsmuth, Hellen. Alterth. 2:20). 4. Tympanisn (τυμπανισμός), or beating to death (Heb 11:35; A.V. "torture;" comp. Aristot. Rhet. 2:5; Lucian, Jup. Trag. 19, etc.), of which the instrument was a cudgel (τύμπανον, 2Ma 6:19; 2Ma 6:28, A.V. "torment;" Aristophanes, Plut. 476); but it is uncertain whether we are thereby to understand simply a club with which the unfortunates were dispatched, or a wooden hoop upon which they were stretched in the manner of a rack (comp. Joseph us, De Maccab. 8:5 and 9). SEE TYMPANUM.

Besides the above, the following methods of execution are. named in the Bible as practiced by nations in the neighborhood of Palestine: 1. Burning alive in a furnace (Dan 3:6; Dan 3:11; Dan 3:15; Dan 3:19 sq.), which occurs in modern Persia (Chardin, Voyage, 6:218), is of very early date (if we may trust the traditions concerning Abraham [q.v.], Targ. on 2Ch 28:3); likewise roasting or boiling convicts over a slow fire. (Jer 29:22 [see Hebenstreit, De Achali et Zelekie cupplicio, Lips. 1736]; 2Ma 6:5). SEE JOHN (THE APOSTLE). An example of burning alive does not occur (2 Samuel 21:31, marg. מלבן; see Thenius. in loc.) until the time of Herod (Josephus, War, 1:33, 4); but in Egypt the vindictive Roman magistrates took pleasure in burning Jews (Philo, 2:542, 527). No instances of burying alive (Ctesias, Pers. 41:53; Livy, 8:15, etc.) are found  in the Scriptures (Num 16:30 sq., is not in point). 2. Casting into the lions' den (Daniel 6). SEE LION; DEN.

3. Sufocation in hot ashes (2Ma 13:5 sq.; comp. Valer. Max. 9:2, 6, "He filled with ashes a place inclosed by high evalls, with a beam projecting within, upon which he placed the doomed, so that, when overcome with drowsiness, they fell into the insidious ash-heap below;" see Ctesias, Pers. 47 and 52). SEE ASHES.

4. Dashing in pieces children (sucklings) an the corneas of walls, which occurred on the sack of cities (Isa 13:16; Isa 13:18; Hos 14:1; Nah 3:10; comp. Psa 137:9), like the ripping open of pregnant women (2Ki 8:12; 2Ki 15:16; Hos 14:1; Amo 1:13), is, with the exception of 2Ki 14:16, only a heathenish barbarity. On crucifixion, SEE CRUCIFY.

5. Finally, drowning (καταποντισμός, Mat 18:6), and fighting with wild beasts (θηριομαχία, 1Co 15:32), are but casually alluded to in the N.T. Drowning, as a mode of inflicting death, is old (comp. Exo 1:22). Among the Romans, those guilty of parricide were sewed in sacks (culei) and then drowned (Cicero, Rose. Am. 25; ad Herean. 1, 13; Seneca, Clem. 1:15; Juvenal, 8:214); but this in the time of the emperors came to be deemed an inhuman mode of execution (comp. Josephus, A at. 14:15, 10; War, 1:22, 2; Lactantius, Mort. persec. 15:3); and thus remaining under the water (Jer 51:63) was thought a peculiarly severe fate (Josephus, Apiosm, 1:04; comp. Mat 18:6; see Gitz, De pistrinis vett. page 131 sq.; Grdfe, De καταποντισμῷ, num fuerit supplic. Judaeorums, Lips. 1662.; Welleius, De supplicio submers. Havn. 1701; Scherer, De καταποντ ap. antiq. Argent. 17:4). Such cruel punishments sometimes followved the mutilations of martyrdom (2Ma 7:4; 2Ma 7:7; 2Ma 7:10). On tlmairomachy, SEE GAMES; and on the passage 3 Maccabees 5, comp. Porphyry, Abstin. 2:57. See generally Carpzov, Appar. page 581 sq.; Alichaelis, De judiciis poenisque capitatibus in S.S. (Hal. 1749; also in Ugolini Thesaur. 26, and Pott's Sylloge, 4:177 sq.); Jahn, Archdol. II, 2:347 sq.; Alichaelis, Mosaisches Racht, 5:11 sq. SEE PUNISHMENT.

## Executioner[[@Headword:Executioner]]

             (σπεκουλἀτωρ, for Lat. speculator, originally a scouet, afterwards a life- guardsman under the emperor), a member of the royal bodyguard adopted by Herod in imitation of the Romans (see Tacitus, Hist. 2:11; Suetonius,  Claud. 35), and in accordance with Oriental despotisni, and enplooyed to execute his sanguinary orders (Mar 6:27). (See Smith's Dict. of Class. Antia. s.v. Spaculatores; Schwarz, De Speculatoribus vett. Romanorum, Altd. 1726.) SEE CHERETRITE.

In ancient times persons of the highest rank and station were employed to execute the sentence of the law. The office of Potiphar, in the Egyptian court, mentioned in Gen 37:36, is thought to have been “chief of the executioners," as in the margiuc of our version. SEE GUARD. This is still a high office in the East as a court office. Such executioners have nothing to do with carrying into effect the awards of the law in its ordinary course, but only with those of the king. It is there an office of great responsibility; and to insure its due and strict fulfillment, it is entrusted to an officer of the court, who has necessarily under his command a body of men whose duty it is to preserve the order and peace of the palace and its precincts, and to attend and guard the royal person on public occasions; and, under the direction of their chief, to inflict such punishment as the king awards upon those who incur his displeasure. Potiphar, therefore, in this sense might be called captain of the guard. He had his official residence at the public jail (Gen 40:3). Nebuzaradan (2Ki 25:8; Jer 39:9) and Arioch (Dan 2:14) held the same office. That the "captain of the guard" himself occasionally performed the duty of an executioner appears from 1Ki 2:25; 1Ki 2:34. Nevertheless the post was one of high dignity, and something beyond the present position of the zabit of modern Egypt (comp. Lane, 1:163), with which Wilkinson (2:45) compares it. It is stillnot unusual for officers of high rank to inflict corporal punishment with their own hands (Wilkinson, 2:43). It does not appear that the Jews had public executioners, but the prince or general laid his commands on any of his attendants. Gideon commanded Jether, his eldest son, to execute his sentence on the kings of Midian; Saul ordered the footmen who stood around him, and were probably a chosen body of soldiers for the defense of his person, to put to death the priests of the Lord, and when they refused, Doeg, an Edomite, one of his principal officers executed, the command (1Sa 22:18).

Long after the days of Saul, the reigning monarch commanded Benaiah, the chief captain of his armies, to perform the duty of putting Joab to death. Sometimes the chief magistrate executed the sentence of the law with his own hands; for when Jether shrank from the duty which his father required, Gideon, at that time the supreme magistrate in Israel, did not hesitate to do it himself. Thus also in Homer (Odyss. 21,  fin.; 22, imit.) we read that the exasperated Ulysses commanded his son Telarnsachus to put to death the suitors of Penelope, which was immediately done. In condemnations under the Mosaic law, the congregation or assembly of people executed the criminal, but the witnesses commenced the work of death (Lev 24:16; Deu 17:7; Joh 8:7; Act 7:57-60). Executions in the East are often very prompt and arbitrary. In many cases, among the Turks and Persians, the suspicion is no sooner entertained, or the cause of offense given, than the fatal order is issued, the messenger of death hurries to the unsuspecting victim, shows his warrant, and executes his order that instant in silence and solitude (2Ki 6:32; Pro 16:14; Mar 6:27). SEE PUNISHMENT.

## Exedra[[@Headword:Exedra]]

             a name sometimes given by St. Augustine to the ambo (q.v.). It is often used in ancient writers as synonymous with the apsis (q.v.).

## Exedrae[[@Headword:Exedrae]]

             buildings contiguous to the church. SEE CHURCH EDIFICES.

## Exegesis[[@Headword:Exegesis]]

             SEE EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

## Exegetical Collections[[@Headword:Exegetical Collections]]

             SEE CATENA; SEE COMMENTARIES.

## Exegetical Theology[[@Headword:Exegetical Theology]]

             that branch of theology which treats of the exposition and interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. SEE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THSEOLOGY. Exegesis (ἐξήγησις) is statement, explanatioa, from ἐξηγέομαι, I lead, describe, explain; and froan this, an exegete, ἐξηγητής, guide, interpreter. The word exegetical, then, includes all that belongs to explassat/on, and Exegetical Theology includes all that belongs to the explanation and interpretation of the holy Scriptures.

I. Matter of Exegetical Theology. — The Bible, including both the O. and N.T., is the material on which the science of exegetical theology is employed. Some writers therefore designate it as Biblical theology; but the real work of exegesis is to gather from the word the material of Biblical theology, leaving the arrangement and coordination of this material to fall into a separate branch of the science. SEE BIBICAL THEOLOGY; SEE THEOLOGY. In fact, the results of exegetical study may fall, according to  their nature, into historical, doctrinal, or practical theology. SEE BIBLE. As the Bible comes to us as the record of a revelation from God, its claims in this respect form the subject of a separate branch, entitled INSPIRATION SEE INSPIRATION (q.v.). The study of inspiration leads to the general question of the possibility and nature of REVELATION SEE REVELATION (q.v).

II. Method of Exegetical Theology. —

1. Philology. As the Bible comes to us in ancient languages (Hebrew, Chaldee, Hellenistic Greek), the first requisite of exegesis is the knowledge of these languages, both as to their grammatical structure and their vocabulary. This branch is called Sacred Linguistics, or Sacred Philology. The knowledge of classical Greek is of course presupposed, while Syriac, Samaritan, and Arabic are cognate and auxiliary. For details, see the separate articles in this work on the various topics named.

2. Archceology. — Not only does the Bible come to us in ancient languages, but it was also written at various times, in various countries, and under various conditions of life (social, political, religious, etc.). Thus arise the various branches of Bible history (belonging partly to exegetical and partly to historical theology), Biblical geography, chronology, ethnography, natural history of the Bible, laws, usages, domestic economy, agriculture, sacred rites, and worship. All these branches are summed up under the general title Antiquities, or Archaoeoloy. See both these heads in this Cyclopaedia, and also the other topics named, for the details and the literature.

3. Canon. — As these books come to us claiming to be authoritative, we must be able to answer the question, What books belong to the Bible as a sacred book? The answer to this question gives rise to that branch called the science of the Canon of Scripture. It is divided into canon of the O.T. and canon of the N.T. SEE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

4. Criticism. — Granting that we have certain books admitted to be canonical, the farther question arises, Have we these writings in their original and correct forms? The answer to this question gives rise to Criticism, which is divided into the lower or text-criticism, which seeks to ascertain the true and original reading of the text as accurately as possible, and the higher criticism, which examines into the integrity, genuineness, and authenticity of the books. The higher criticism seeks to distinguish the  true from the false, and forms, to a certain degree, the basis of Apologetics (q.v.); the text-criticism distinguishes the original from the altered or corrupted. SEE CRITICISM.

5. Interpretation. — All the studies heretofore named are preparatory to the work of getting at the meaning of the sacred Scriptures, which is the function of Interpretation, or Hermeneutics (ἑρμηνεύω). The general principles on which any other writings would be interpreted are of course applicable here (General Hermeneutics); but the special character of these writings as sacred gives rise to an enlargement of those general principles of interpretation (Sacred Hermeneautics). When the sense of Scripture is sought simply by the use of linguistics or criticism, the interpretation is called Grammatical. When not only linguistics and criticism, but also all the knowledges embraced above under archaeology are employed, the interpretation is called Grammatico-Historical. When, in addition, the traditional sense of the Church as to the substantial facts and doctrines of revelation is brought to bear upon the Word, the interpretation is called Doctrissal, or Dogmatical. Finally, when a farther sense than that conveyed in the words of the writer is sought, the interpretation is called Allegorical. For the nature, history and value of these, SEE HERMENEUTICS; SEE INTERPRETATION.

III. Results or Products of Exegetical Theology. — The application of the laws of hermeneutics, and of the preparatory or propaeudeutic sciences mentioned above, in practical work, is Exegesis. The fruit of this labor may appear, within the sphere of exegetical theology itself, in translations of the Bible, or of any of its parts SEE VERSIONS; or in commentaries on the Bible, or on separate books of the Bible, or on separate passages in any of the books. SEE COMMENTARIES. The principles and rules of exegesis are also to be used by the preacher in the preparation of his discourses for the congregation. SEE HOMILETICS; SEE SERMON.

Most of the topics of exegetical theology are embraced in what is called Introduction to the Scriptures, a vague title, formerly much in use, but now giving way to more scientific and distinctive terms, such as Literary History of the Bible, for a general name, and the several titles mentioned above for special branches. The books on Introduction, are often rather useful collections of propaedeutic knowledge than scientific treatises. SEE INTRODUCTION. There are no books in English treating exegetical theology as a separate branch in scientific form; but English literature  abounds in excellent works on the several branches, which will be found indicated under the several titles in this Cyclopedia. The most. important general works are the so-called books of "Introduction," such as Horne, Introduction (new ed., London, 1860, 4 volumes, 8vo); Davidson, Introduction to N.T. (Lond. 1848-51 [Dr. Davidson's later writings are not so trustworthy as his earlier]); Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels (reprinted, Bost. 1867, 12mo). On the literature, see farther under the head INTRODUCTION. On the scope of exegetical theology, and its relations to the other branches of the science, see Hagenbach, Encyklopadie and Methodologie (Leipsig, 1864, 7th edit, § 34-56); Marsh, Lectures on the Arrangement of the several Branches of Divinity (Cambridge, 1809, 8vo); Pelt, Theologische Encyklopadie als System (Hamburg, 1843, 8vo), § 10-28; Clarisse, Encyklopaedite Theologicae Epitome (Lugd. Bat. 1835, 8vo), sect. 1, 2, and our articles SEE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THEOLOGY; SEE THEOLOGY.

Exemption designates, in ecclesiastical law, the release of persons or institutions from the jurisdiction of the regular superior, and their subordination to a higher or special superior.

1. Roman Catholic Church. — The first example of formal exemption is the release of monasteries from the episcopal jurisdiction. Many wealthy convents induced the popes, emperors, and kings to allow them a free election of their superiors, and a free administration of their property. Subsequently many of the monastic orders were altogether exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, the members being subordinate only to their monastic superiors and the pope. The bishops incessantly labored for a restoration of their full jurisdiction, and the Council of Constance favored them, but most of the popes sided with the monks rather than with the bishops. The Council of Trent granted most of the demands of the bishops, but the difficulties between bishops and monastic orders have never wholly ceased. Bishops sometimes are exempt from the usual subordination to an archbishop, being subordinate directly to the pope. Sometimes (as in Austria) the army was exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and placed under the jurisdiction of a special army-bishop.

2. Protestant Churches. — The Protestant state churches retained, with other parts of the ecclesiastical law, the idea of exemption. The princes claimed for themselves exemption from the usual ecclesiastical jurisdiction; later, the same exemption was claimed for civil and military officers. In  some countries the nobility also were exempt. In Prussia, a circular of the government in 1817 abolished all exemptions, but it was not executed. Churches which are based on the voluntary principle know of no exemption, because they compel none of their members to belong to any particular congregation.

In many districts in Germany, Roman-Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed pastors had jurisdiction even over members of the two other churches; and the exemption of Protestants from Roman Catholic jurisdiction, and vice versa, is not yet fully carried through. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:286; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 3:841. (A.J.S.)

## Exercise, Bodily[[@Headword:Exercise, Bodily]]

             (σωματικὴ γυμνασία, i.e., physical training, i.q., gymnastics, 1Ti 4:8). What the apostle seems to disparage under this term is not the athletic discipline which it classically imports (Arrian, Epict. 1:27, 6; Polyb. 4:7, 6), and which his frequent allusions to the Grecian games (q.v.) might imply, but rather that ascetic mortification of the fleshly appetites, and even innocent affections (comp. 1Ti 4:3; Col 2:23), which characterized some of the Jewish fanatics (Col 2:7), especially the Essenes (q.v.). — Fleischmann, Interpretatio, in loc.; Seelen, De Gymnasiis ad quae Peulus (in hoc loc.) alludit (Lubec, 1758). SEE TIMOTHY.

## Exercises, Spiritual[[@Headword:Exercises, Spiritual]]

             (exercitia spiritualia), a title given by Romanists to certain exercises held under the leadership generally of a confessor (magister exercitiorum), for spiritual edification. They consist, generally, in alternate meditations and prayers at regularly appointed hours, with seclusion, mortification, etc. These exercises are practiced both by clergy and laity, especially before communion, and as preparatory to the great Church festivals. Especially before ordination to the priesthood, such exercises are not only commended, but required of candidates. The most elaborate form of the exercises is that of Ignatius Loyola. His method received the approbation of the pope, and Alexander VII granted, in a brief dated October 12, 1657, full absolution to all, whether priests or laymen, who should submit to them for eight days in the houses of the Company of Jesus. These exercises consist in alternate meditations, readings, oral prayers, and self-scrutiny, as special preparation for the reception of the sacraments of penitence and communion. In case of there being several persons exercising together,  silence is recommended as a duty. The new missions established by the Jesuits and Redemptorists make use of these exercises, transforming the work of sanctification into a dead mechanical action. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 3:289; Aschbach, Allg. Kirchen-Lex. 2:707; Ferraris, Promta Bibliotheca, 3:916 sq. See Bellecius, Medulla asaeseos seu exercitia Sancti Patris Ignatii (new ed. by Westhoff); and the articles SEE JESUITS, and SEE LOYOLA.

## Exhortation[[@Headword:Exhortation]]

             (παράκλησις, strictly a calling near, invitation, and so "entreaty," 2Co 8:4; hence admonition, special hortatory instruction in public, Luke in, 18; Act 13:15; 1Ti 4:13; also "consolation" or comfort, Rom 15:4, etc.) seems to have been recognized in the Apostolic Church as a distinct supernatural or prophetic office or function (χάρισμα, "gift") bestowed by the Holy Spirit (Rom 12:8). As such, it was doubtless a subordinate exercise of the general faculty of teaching (1Co 14:31). Olshausen (Conmment. in loc.) thinks that Paul does not distinguish it as a special charism, but rather regards it as coordinate with eldership. SEE GIFT (SPIRITUAL).

2. It is defined as "the act of laying such motives before a person as may excite him to the performance of any duty. It differs only from suasion in that the latter principally endeavors to convince the understanding, and the former to work on the affections. It is considered as a great branch of preaching, though not confined to that, as a man may exhort, though he do not preach; though a man can hardly be said to preach if lie do not exhort. SEE EXHORTERS. The Scriptures enjoin ministers to exhort men, that is, to rouse them to duty by proposing suitable motives (Isa 58:1; 1Ti 6:2; Heb 3:13; Rom 12:8); it was likewise the constant practice of prophets, apostles, and Christ himself (Isa 1:17; Jer 4:14; Ezekiel 37; Luk 3:18; Luk 12:3; Act 11:23)" (Buck, Theological Dictionary, s.v.). "The above, and numerous other passages of Scripture, indicate several important particulars: 1. That it was not beneath the dignity, or foreign to the office of the inspired apostles, frequently to exhort. 2. That they enjoined a similar practice and the duty of exhortation upon young ministers of their day. 3. That exhortation, as separate from preaching, was the special office of a certain class of religious teachers in the New-Testament Church. 4. That mutual exhortation for their own  profit and edification was enjoined by the apostles upon Christians generally" (Kidder, Homiletics, page 105). SEE EXHORTERS.

3. In the book of Common Prayer, the short addresses of the minister to the people in the daily service, in the communion office, and in the office for the visitation of the sick, are called Exhortations. The first of these, beginning "Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us," etc., was introduced into the English formulary at the Reformation. Palmer (Orig. Liturg. 1:211) compares it to a passage in a sermon of Avitus of Vienne, fifth century. Procter (Common Prayer, page 206) remarks that "it was constructed partly from the preceding sentences, and partly by adaptations from previously existing forms." But, in fact, this exhortation, with the other opening portions of morning prayer, is chiefly due to a ritual drawn up by Calvin, for the church at Strasburg, entitled La Forme des Prieres et Chantes ecclesiasiques (Strasburg, 1545). See Baird, Eutaxia (N. York, 1855, page 191). The exhortations to the communion were also introduced at the Reformation. "The ancient Church, indeed, had no such exhortations, for their daily, or at least weekly communions made it known that there was then no solemn assembly of Christians without it, and every one (not under censure) was expected to communicate. But now, when the time is somewhat uncertain, and our long omissions have made some of us ignorant, and others forgetful of this duty; most of us unwilling, and all of us more or less indisposed for it, it was thought both prudent and necessary to provide these exhortations, to be read when the minister gives warning of the communion, which he is always to do upon the Sunday or some holy day immediately preceding" (Wheatly, On Common Prayer, page 284). The second exhortation was compiled apparently by Peter Martyr at the instance of Bucer (Procter, On Common Prayer, page 344).

Exhorters, a class of lay persons licensed in the Methodist Episcopal Church to exhort, not to preach. The leaders meeting (q.v.), or class (q.v.), recommend such persons, and the preacher issues the license. The duties of an exhorter are "to hold meetings for prayer and exhortation wherever opportunity is afforded, subject to the direction of the preacher in charge; to attend all the sessions of the Quarterly Conference; be subject to an annual examination of character in the Quarterly Conference, and renewal of license annually by the presiding elder, or preacher having the charge, if approved by the Quarterly Conference." This office has been found very useful, both in the edification of the Church, and in developing the talent of  persons likely to be called to the ministry. Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1868, pages 113, 114.

## Exile[[@Headword:Exile]]

             (only occurs of an expatriated person, צעֶה, tsoeh', bent, "captive exile," Isa 51:14; גֹלֶה, goleh', a transported captive, as elsewhere often SEE BANISH), ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN, of the Israelitish nation (comp. Cellarii Dissertatt. page 178 sq.). SEE CAPTIVITY.

1. Of the kingdom of Israel, as early as the time of Pekah (q.v.), B.C. cir. 741. Tiglath Pileser (q.v.), in accordance with a cardinal maxim of Oriental despots (compare Haeren, Ideen, I, 1:405 sq.; Gesenius, Jesa. 1:949), transported to Assyria (2Ki 15:29; comp. Isaiah 8:23) a part of the inhabitants of Galilee and the trans-Jordanic provinces (Gilead). A still earlier deportation (1Ch 5:26) seems to have been made by Pul (q.v.). After the destruction of Samaria (q.v.) and the entire northern state (B.C. 720) by Shalmaneser (q.v.), the same fate overtook all the distinguished and serviceable Israelites (2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:9 sq.; 1Ch 5:26). They were assigned a residence on the Chaboras, in Mesopotamia SEE HABOR, and in Media (comp. Josephus, Ant. 9:14, 1), and there established the worship of Jehovah after their corrupt fashion (2Ki 17:27 sq.). See Witsius, Δεκάφυλον, site de decem tribubus Isr. (in his ,Egyptiaca, page 318 sq.), Michaelis, De exilio decem tribuum (in his Comment. Soc. Gott. Brem. 1774, page 31 sq.). SEE ISRAEL (KINGDOM OF).

2. Respecting the carrying away of the Jews in several colonies, there are various accounts in the Hebrew historical books, which modern writers have not carefully distinguished (see Bauer, Hebrews Gesch. 2:370 sq.; Jahn, Archdol. 11, 1:190 sq.; Bertholdt, Zeittafel zum Daniel, page 503 sq.).

(a.) The books of Kings mention only two deportations: the first occurred after the surrender of Jerusalem to Nebuchadnezzar, in the time of Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:14 sq.; comp. Jer 27:20 sq.; in this way involved Mordecai (Est 2:6), and it befell (besides the king himself) the affluent and useful citizens, 10,000 and upwards in number (Josephus says 10,832, Ant. 10:7, 1); the second was the result of a formal capture of Jerusalem by assault of the Chaldaeans in the time of Zedekisah, and was effected by Nebuchadnezzar's general (in that prince's 19th year)  Nebuzaradan (2Ki 25:11). Only the common people, devoted to agriculture, remained (2Ki 25:12; 2Ki 25:22).

(b.) The books of Chronicles expressly record only the carrying away under Zedekiah (2Ch 26:20), while (2Ch 26:10), in mentioning the transportation of king Jehoiachin, they say nothing of a deportation of the people at that time.

(c.) Jer 52:28 sq., specifies three distinct carryings away, and assigns to each not only the number of those deported, but also a date namely, the first deportation in the 7th year (of Nebuchadnezzar, comp. Jer 52:29-30), which consisted of 3023 Jews; the second in the 18th of Nebuch., of 832 chiefs of Jerusalem; then third in the 23d of Neb., of 745 individuals. Finally

(d.), according to Dan 1:1; Dan 1:3 sq., as early as the 3d yeas of Jehoiakim's reign, some Jewish youths of noble families among them Daniel himself) must have been carried to Babylon. These difficulties (see Hengstenberg, Genuineness of Daniel [Clarke's ed.], page 43 sq., against De Wette, in the Hall. Encyclop. 23:7 sq.; Lengerke, Daniel, page 13 sq.) are readily adjusted by observing, 1st, that the years of Nebuchadnezzar in this passage of Jeremiah bear date from his full accession to the throne of Babylon (the beginning of B.C. 604), while those in Kings are reckoned from the epoch of his viceroyship, a little over one year earlier SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR; and, 2dly, that the apparent discrepancy in the number of citizens transported naturally arises from the different manner in which they are enumerated and classified in the several narratives. Thus viewed, the transactions will appear concisely as follows:

1. (Early in B.C. 6516.) Nebuuchadnezzar's invasion, in the 3d year of Jehoiakimn (Dan 1:1).

2. (Sumumer of B.C. 606.) Subjugation by Nebuchadnezzar in his first associate year, and the 4th of Jehoiakiam (Jer 25:1); when, besides some of the sacred vessels (2Ch 36:7), a few royal youths were taken away as hostages, including Daniel and his companions (Dan 1:2 sq.).

3. (Spring of B.C. 598) First general deportation, in the 7th year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (Jer 52:28), or the 8th of his viceroyship (2Ki 24:12), and the beginning of Jehoiachin's reign (2 Kings xxiv,  8), when 3028 eminent Jews (Jer 52:28), including the king (2Ch 36:10), his family, and officers (2Ki 24:12), with such men as Mordecai (Est 2:6), also some 7000 warriors (2Ki 21:16), were carried away, making about 10,000 individuals of note (2Ki 24:14), besides about 1000 artisans (2Ki 24:16, and leaving only the poorer classes of the city and its neighborhood (2Ki 14:14).

4. (Late in B. C. 588.) Second general deportation, in Nebuchadnezzar's 18th year of reign (Jer 52:29), or the 19th of his viceroyship (2Ki 25:8), when, besides the rest of the sacred vessels (2Ch 36:18), 832 more of the principal men who had by that time rallied to Jerusalem were taken away (Jer 52:29), iucluding especially the refugees (2Ki 25:1), and leaving but the commonest agricultural laborers (2Ki 25:14).

5. (Early in BS.C. 582.) Final deportation, in Nebuchadnezzer's 28d year (Jer 52:30), when the last 745 private persons (Jer 52:30) who had not fled to Egypt (Jer 43:5-7), nor been destroyed in the pa vioum massacres (2Ch 36:20), ware taken away making 4600 definitely enumerated (Jer 52:10), but in all somue 12,600 male heads of families, with their wives, children, and dependents, from Jerusalem and its vicinity alone, and a proportionate number from the residue of the country of Judaea.

The Babylonian exile thus began with the Jews partially in B.C. 598, but generally in B.C. 588. It ended in the first year of the reign of Cyrus (over Babylon), i.e., B.C. 536, and therefore lasted strictly 51-52 years. The reckoning of Jeremiah, however (Jer 25:11 sq.; Jer 29:10; compare 2Ch 36:21; Zec 1:12; Zec 7:5; Josephus, War, 5:9, 4), which assigns it a length of 70 years, is to be understood as computed from Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Western Asia in B.C. 606, when, as appears from Dan 1:1; Daniel cf.1 some of the members of the royal family of Judah were carried into captivity, in fulfillment of Isa 39:6-7. (See Offerhaus, Spicilegium, page 181 sq.; Schroder, Rege. Babyl. page 286 sq.). This was the more natural epoch to the Jews, inasmuch as from that time Nebuchadnezzar became to all intents and purposes the liege lord of the Jewish kings, and in the above table we see the years of his reign are dated accordingly. It is a remarkable coincidence that from thee date of the destruction of the Temple, B.C. 588 (2Ki 25:8), to the time of its  complete restoration, B.C. 517 (Ezr 6:15), is precisely the commensurate (and sacred) term of 70 years; and this period is sometimes employed as an aera by the sacred writers (Eze 40:1). Other very strained conjectures as to this time are those of Behin (in Iken and Hase's Thesaur. theol. philol. 1:954 sq.), Bengel (Ordo temporum, page 196 sq.), etc. Ideler deems the desolation of the Temple to be exclusively referred to (Flandbuch d. Chronol. 1:530). Gramberg (Religionsid. 2:388 sq.) and Hitzig (Jerem. page 230) think the 70 years merely a round number. SEE SEVENTY YEARS' CAPTIVITY.

The condition of the Hebrews in the exile was certainly, as a general thing, not so severe (Jahn, Archaologie, II, 1:209; comp. Leydecker, De var. reip. Hebr. statu, page 299 sq., especially page 310 sq.; Verbrugge, De statu ad condit. Judaeurum teampore exil. Babyl., in his work De nomin. Hebr. plur. num. [Groning. 1730], page 71 sq.) as is usually held. Most of them became settled (Jer 29:5 sq.), and acquired property, even to affluence (Tob. 1:22, 25; 2:1; 6:13; 8:21; 9:3; 10:11; 14:15, etc.), and the possession of slaves (Tob 8:14 sq.; Tob 11:10). Several were taken to court (Dan 1:3 sq., Dan 1:19), and even promoted to high station (Daniel 2:48 sq.; 6:2; compare Est 10:3), or were honored with important trusts (Tob 1:16); indeed, in one instance a Jewess actually reached queenly dignities (Est 2:17). They also appear to have kept up in some sort their national constitution (Eze 14:1; Eze 20:1; Susan. 5:28), and to have maintained among themselves an observance of the Mosaic law (Tob 7:14; Susan. 5:62). According to the Talmud (R. Gedaliah in Shalshel. Flakkab. folio 13; Gemara, Makkoth, 1:1; Sanhedr. 1:12 and 21), they were under the general direction of an aichmalotarch (q.v.), or "chief of the exiles" (ראֹשׁ הִגְּלוּת), one of their own nation (Buddaei Hist. Vet. T. 2:863). Religious discipline was exercised among them; but, as they could not lawfully offer sacrifice outside Jerusalem, their worship necessarily consisted of prayer (and public reading, out of which naturally grew expounding) in stated assemblies (comp. Psalms 137). SEE SYNAGOGUE. They did not lack strong comfort and exhortation: Ezekiel (q.v.) lifted in their midst his prophetic voice, and Jeremiah (q.v.) sent them from afar a monitory epistle (chapter 29). Probably many surrendered themselves to levity and vice (Eze 33:31), and yielded an ear to false prophets (Jer 29:21; but comp, Tob 2:14).

Of the permission to return to Palestine, which Cyrus granted to the entire people (Ezr 1:5; Ezr 7:13), Jews alone, in the first instance at least, availed  themselves (Ezra 2; Nehemiah 7; comp. Josephus, Ant. 11:5, 2: "But the whole people of the Israelites remained in the mine country ... The ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates to this day, unknown and innumerable myriads"); for the return mentioned in Ezr 2:1, is only of such exiles as had been carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, and in the list there following there are (besides priests and Levites) only recited Judahites and Benjamites; nor can "Israel" (Ezr 2:59; compare Neh 7:61) be there referred to the former kingdom so called. The indications of Jer 1:4; Jeremiah cf., 17, 19; Eze 37:11 sq., had, moreover, not at that time been fulfilled (the date in 1Ch 5:26 is uncertain; Keil, On Kings, page 497, n.). (See Witsius, Δεκάφυλον, page 344 sq.; Ritter, Erdk. 10:250.) Yet it cannot well be doubted that many of the exiles from the northern kingdom, who were likewise embraced in the decree of Cyrus, and at the time included in his dominions, did eventually join their Jewish brethren, if not in some of the homeward expeditions named in Scripture as having taken place under Ezra, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, yet in some smaller, later, or less distinguished companies. This supposition is not only justified by the, nature of the case, but fortified by the numerous intimations in the prophets (e.g. Jeremiah 1:4, 5, 17-20, 33-35) coupling the return of both the kingdoms (see Meth. Quart. Review, July, 1855, page 419 sq.), and is well-nigh established by the Palestinian occurrence in a late age of individuals from the northern tribes (e.g. Luk 2:36; comp. Act 26:7). What proportion thus returned we have no means of determining; it was doubtless small, as was indeed that of the exiles from the southern tribes compared with the great mass who still remained in the land of their captivity, now become their home. Community of lot must have drawn both branches of the common stock of Israel nearer together during the captivity under the same heathen government, and it is altogether likely that in a few centuries those who permanently remained lost all trace of the sectarian distinction that had once estranged "Judah and Ephraim." SEE RESTORATION (OF THE JEWS).

The descendants of those who did not return either centred at certain points, especially Babylon (q.v.), where they afterwards became celebrated for their Jewish schools of Rabbinical literature; or, as was chiefly the case, it may be presumed, with the more distant and earlier removed ten tribes, wandered still farther in numerous Jewish colonies into the Medo- Babylonian provinces (Lightfoot, Append. to Hor. Hebr. in Acts, page 264  sq.), remnants of which have survived to a late day (Benj. of Tudela, quoted in Ritter, Erdk. 10:241 sq.). It is possible even that the Samaritans may have owed their mongrel origin to some such source (Gesenius, De Pentat. Samar. page 4), as they were transplanted to Palestine before the deportation of the Jews, and yet sufficiently late to have allowed a partial amalgamation with the heathen whence they came to have taken place, and especially as they had only the Pentateuch (Paulus, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. 1:931). From the provinces of the Persian empire the Jewish colonists may readily have spread into Arabia, India, and even China. Wild attempts at their discovery have been abundantly made, such as those of Adair (tlistory of the American Indians, Lond. 1775), Noah (The Amer. Indians the Descendants of the ten Lost Tribes of Israel, N.Y, 1835), and Grant (Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes, N.Y. 1841). SEE DISPERSED JEWS.

## Exinanition[[@Headword:Exinanition]]

             SEE CHRISTOLOGY.

## Existence of God[[@Headword:Existence of God]]

             SEE GOD.

## Exiteria[[@Headword:Exiteria]]

             sacrifices offered by the ancient Greek generals before setting out on ally warlike expedition. They were of the nature of divination, to ascertain whether the enterprise was to be successful or disastrous.

## Exocionites[[@Headword:Exocionites]]

             (Ε᾿ξωκιονίται), a name applied to the Arians (q.v.) of the 4th century, who, when expelled from Constantinople by Theodosius the Great, retired to a place outside the city. The name occurs in the records of Justinian, and frequently in the chronicle of Alexandria.

## Exocontians[[@Headword:Exocontians]]

             (or EXOUCONTIANS, Ε᾿ξουκόντιοι), a name given to the strict Arians, because they maintained that Christ was created ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, before the beginning of things. They were also called Anomoeans, Altians. See these titles, and also SEE ARIANS.

## Exode[[@Headword:Exode]]

             OF THE ISRAELITES FROM EGYPT TO CANAAN (usually referred to in Hebrews by the phrase הוֹצִיא יְהוָֹה אֶתאּבְּנֵי יִשִׂרָאֵל מֵאֶיֶוֹ מִצִרִיִם, “The Lord did bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt," Exo 12:51; to which is often emphatically added, וּבִזְרעִ נְטוּיָה בְּיָר חֲזָקָה, "with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm," Deu 26:8, to express the miraculous interventions of Providence in the series of events), the great national epoch of the Hebrew people, in fact their "independence day," and as such constantly referred to  in all their subsequent history and vaticinations. Several of the Psalms are but a poetical rehearsal of its scenes (e.g. Psalms 114, 136); it is the burden of Habakkuk's lofty ode (Habakkuk 3); and besides the recapitulation of many of its incidents by Moses in Deuteronomy, it constitutes the main topic of one of the books of Scripture. The following account, including especially the date of the event, and the identifications of the place of crossing the Red Sea and of the stations in the desert, is a resume of nearly all the important matters not treated by us under other heads. SEE EXODUS.

I. Date. — The particular Egyptian monarch under whom this great event, the first definite link of the Hebrew with other ancient history, occurred, is so differently identified with those of early profane chronicles, and of the monuments by various Egyptologers, that but little reliance, unfortunately, can be placed upon any of them, based as they almost entirely are upon conjectural adaptations or arbitrary premises. The only one of these hypotheses that seems to afford any independent evidence of agreement is that lately propounded by Osburn (in the Journ. of Sac. Lit. for July, 1860), who conceives that the Egyptian king in question was Sethos II, the grandson of the great Sesostris, but of so odious a character and so inglorious a reign that his sarcophagus was demolished and his cartouche effaced by the early Egyptians themselves. SEE PHARAOH. This king, however, began to reign about B.C. 1240, a date entirely too late for the event under consideration. The historical questions connected with this point are noticed under EGYPT SEE EGYPT.

Hales places the Exode in B.C. 1648, Usher in B.C. 1491, Bunsen in B.C. 1320, and Poole in B.C. 1652. A careful collation of the Biblical elements of the calculation, the only definite and trustworthy data, point to the spring of B.C. 1658 as the most probable date of the beginning of the series of exodic transactions. SEE CHRONOLOGY. As to the account of the Exode given by Manetho, it was confessedly a mere popular story, for he admitted it was not a part of the Egyptian records, but a tale of uncertain authorship (Josephus, c. Apion. 1:16). A critical examination shows that it cannot claim to be a veritable tradition of the Exode: it is, indeed, if based on any such tradition, so distorted that it is impossible to be sure that it relates to the king to whose reign it is assigned. Yet, upon the supposition that the king is really Menptah, son of Rameses II, the advocates of the Rabbinical date entirely base their adjustment of Hebrew with Egyptian history at this period. SEE MANETHIO.  II. The Outset. — The Exode is a great turningpoint in Biblical history. With it the patriarchal dispensation ends and the law begins, and with it the Israelites cease to be a family and become a nation. It is therefore important to observe how the previous history led to this event. The advancement of Joseph, and the placing of his kinsmen in what was, to a pastoral people at least, "the best of the land," yet, as far as possible, apart from Egyptian influence, favored the multiplying of the Israelites and the preservation of their nationality. The subsequent persecution bound them more firmly together, and at the same time loosened the hold that Egypt had gained upon them. It was thus that the Israelites were ready, when Moses declared his mission, to go forth as one man from the land of their bondage. SEE JOSEPH.

The intention of Jehovah to deliver the Israelites from Egyptian bondage was made known to Moses from the burning bush at Mount Horeb, while he kept the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law. Under the divine direction, Moses, in conjunction with Aaron, assembled the elders of the nation, and acquainted them with the gracious design of Heaven. After this they had an interview with Pharaoh, and requested permission for the people to go, in order to hold a feast unto God in the wilderness. The result was not only refusal, but the doubling of all the burdens which the Israelites had previously had to bear. Moses hereupon, suffering reproach from his people, consults Jehovah, who assures him that he would compel Pharaoh "to drive them out of his land." "I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm and with great judgments" (Exo 3:1 to Exo 6:6). Then ensue a series of miracles (Exodus 6-12), commonly called the PLAGUES OF EGYPT SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT (q.v.). At last, overcome by the calamities sent upon him, Pharaoh yielded all that was demanded, saying, "Rise up, and get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel; and go serve the Lord as ye have said; also take your flocks and your herds, and be gone." Thus driven out, the Israelites, to the number of about 600,000 adults, besides children, left the land, attended by a mixed multitude, with their flocks and herds, even very much cattle (Exo 12:31 sq.). Being "thrust out" of the country, they had not time to prepare for themselves suitable provisions, and therefore they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt. SEE MOSES.

On the night of the self-same day that terminated a period of 430 years, during which they had been in Egypt, were they led forth from Rameses or  Goshen. They are not said to have crossed the River Nile, whence we may infer that Goshen lay on the eastern side of the river. Their first station was at Succoth (Exo 12:37). SEE SUCCOTH. The nearest way into the Land of Promise was through the land of the Philistines. This route would have required them to keep on in a north-east direction. It pleased their divine conductor, however, not to take this path, lest, being opposed by the Philistines, the Israelites should turn back at the sight of war into Egypt. If; then, Philistia was to be avoided, the course would lie nearly direct east, or south-east. Pursuing this route, "the armies" come to Etham, their next station, "in the edge of the wilderness" (Exo 13:17 sq.). Here they encamped. Dispatch, however, was desirable. They journey day and night, not without divine guidance, for "the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and night." This special guidance could not well have been meant merely to show the way through the desert, for it can hardly be supposed that in so great a multitude no persons knew the road over a country lying near to that in which they and their ancestors had dwelt, and which did not exceed more than some forty miles across. The divine guides were doubtless intended to conduct the Israelites in that way and to that spot where the hand of God would be most signally displayed in their rescue and in the destruction of Pharaoh. SEE PILLAR.

The Land of Goshen may be concluded, from the Biblical narrative, to have been part of Egypt, but not of what was then held to be Egypt proper. It must therefore have been an outer eastern province of Lower Egypt. It is enough here to say that it was on the eastern side of the Nile, probably in the province of Esh-Shurkiyeh. Rasmeses was the place of rendezvous. But it is evident, from the frequent communications of Moses with the Egyptian court on the one hand, and with the Israelites on the other, that the latter must have been, at the time of starting, congregated at a point not far from the capital. They could only, therefore, have gone by the valley now called the wady et-Tumeylht, for every other cultivated or cultivable tract is too far from the Red Sea. In the Roman time, the route to Gaza from Memphis and Heliopolis passed the western end of the wady et- Tumeylat, as may be seen by the Itinerary of Antoninus (Parthey, Zur Erdk. d. Alt. AEgyptens, map 6), and the chief modern route from Cairo to Syria passes along the wady et-Tumeylut and leads to Gaza (Wilkinson, Handbook, new ed. page 209). Rameses, as we shall see, must have lain in this valley, which thus corresponded in part at least to Goshen. That it  wholly corresponded to that region is evident from its being markedly a single valley, and from the insufficiency of any smaller territory to support the Israelites. SEE GOSHEN.

It is not difficult to fix very nearly the length of each day's march of the Israelites. As they had with them women, children, and cattle, it cannot be supposed that they averaged more than fifteen miles daily; at the same time, it is unlikely that they fell far short of this. The three journeys would therefore give a distance of about forty-five miles. There seems, however, as we shall see, to have been a deflexion froum a direct course, so that we cannot consider the whole distance from the starting-point, Rameses, to the shore of the Red Sea, as much more than about forty miles in a direct line. Measuring from the western shore (of the Arabian Gulf south-east of the wady et-Tumeylat, a distance of forty miles in a direct line places the site of Rameses near the ruins called in the present day Abu Kesheib, not far from the middle of the valley. This is in accordance with the location of Robinson and Lepsius. That the Israelites started from a place in this position is farther evident from the account of the two routes that lay before them: "And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not [by] the way of the land of the Philistines, although that [was] near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt, but God let the people turn to the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Exo 13:17-18). The expression used, וִיִּסֵּב, does not necessarily imply a change in the direction of the journey, but may mean that God did not lead the Israelites into Palestine by the nearest route, but took them about by the way of the wilderness. Were the meaning that the people turned, we should have to suppose. Ranceses to have been beyond the valley to the west, and this would probably make the distance to the Red Sea too great for the time occupied in traversing it, besides overthrowing the reasonable identification of the land of Goshen. Rameses is evidently the Rameses of Exo 1:11. It seems to have been the chief town of the land of Goshen, for that region, or possibly a part of it, is called the land of Rameses in Gen 47:11; comp. 4, 6. SEE RAMESES.

1. The direct route thence to the Red Sea was along the valley of the ancient canal. If, however, they rendezvoused near the metropolis, their route would be different. From the vicinity of Cairo there runs a range of hills eastward to the Red Sea, the western extremity of which, not far from Cairo, is named Jebel-Mokattem; the eastern extremity is termed Jebel-  Ataka, which, with its promontory Ras Ataka, runs into the Red Sea. Between the two extremes, some. where about the middle of the range, is an opening which affords a road for caravans. Two routes offered themselves here. Supposing that the actual starting-point lay nearer Cairo, the Israelites might strike in from the north of the range of hills at the opening just mentioned, and pursue the ordinary caravan road which leads from Cairo to Suez; or they might go southward from Mokattem, through the wady et-Tih, that is, the Valley of Wandering, through which also a road, though less used, runs to Suez. According to Niebuhr, they took the first; according to ancient tradition, Father Sicard (Ueber der Weg der Israel/ten), Paulus (Samml. 5:211 sq.), and others, they took the iast. Sicard found traces of the Israelites in the valley. He held Rameses to be the starting-point, and Rameses he placed about six miles from ancient Cairo, where Bezatin is now found. Here is a capacious sandy plain, on which Sicard thinks the Israelites assembled on the morning when they began their journey. In this vicinity a plain is still found, which the Arabs call the Jews' Cemetery, and where, from an indefinite period, the Jews have buried their dead. In the Mokattem chain is a hill, a part of which is called Mejanat Musa, "Moses's Station." On another hill in the vicinity ruins are found, which the Arabs name Meravad Musa, "Moses's Delight." Thus several things seem to carry the mind back to the time of the Hebrew legislator. Through the valley which leads from Bezatin (the Valley of Wandering) to the Red Sea, Sicard traveled in three days. He reckons the length to be twenty-six hours, which if we give two miles to each hour (Robinson), would make the distance fifty-two miles. This length is also assigned by Girard (Descrip. Topograp. de la Valise Deuteronomy 1'Egarement).

The valley, running pretty much in a plain surface, would afford a convenient passage to the mixed bands of Israelites. About eighteen miles from Bezatin you meet with Gendelhy, a plain with a fountain. The name signifies a military station, and in this Sicard finds the Succoth (tents) of Exodus, the first station of Moses. The haste with which they left (were driven out) would enable them to reach this place at nightfall of their first day's march. Sicard places their second station, Etham, in the plain Ranaliyeh, eighteen miles from Gendelhy, and sixteen from the sea. From this plain is a pass four miles in length, so narrow that not more than twenty men can go abreast. To avoid this, which would have caused dangerous delay, the order was given them to turn (Exo 14:2). Etham is said (Exo 13:20) to be on the edge of the wilderness. Jablonski says the word means "terminus maris," the termination or  boundary of the sea. Now, in the plain where Sicard fixes Etham (not to be confounded with the Eastern Etham, through which afterwards the Israelites traveled three days, Num 33:8), is the spot where the waters divide which run to the Nile and to the Gulf of Suez, and Etham is therefore truly terminus maris.

On the other hand, if, as the position of Rameses, and the nature of the ground between that point and the head of the gulf seems to indicate, they pursued the direct route thence down the valley of the bitter lakes, we may locate Succoth not far from the ruins of Serapeum, and Etham at a point about half way between. that spot and the head of the gulf; for we may suppose that the encumbered multitude made but little progress the first day, whereas on the third their march may have been quickened by apprehensions of the approaching Egyptians in pursuit. SEE ETHAM.

2. At the end of the second day's march, for each camping-place seems to mark the close of a day's journey, the route appears to have been altered from the natural thoroughfare around the head of the gulf. The first passage relating to the journey, after the mention of the encamping at Etham, is this, stating a command given to Moses: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they turn [or 'return'] and encamp [or 'that they encamp again,' וְיָשֻׁבוּ וְיִהֲניּ] before Pihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon" (Exo 14:2). This explanation is added: "And Pharaoh will say of the children of Israel, They [are] entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in" (Exo 14:3). The rendering of the A.V., "That they turn and encamp," seems to us the most probable of those we have given: "return" is the closer translation, but appears to be difficult to reconcile with the narrative of the route; for the more likely inference is that the direction was changed, not that the people returned: the third rendering does not appear probable, as it does not explain the entanglement. It is most likely that they at once turned, although they may have done so later in the march. The direction cannot be doubted, for thee would have been entangled (Exo 14:5) only by turning southward. not northward. They encamped for the night by the sea, probably after a full day's journey. Pi-hahiroth (the mouth of the hiding- places) Sicard identifies with Tuarek (small caves), which is the name still given to three or four salt springs of the plain Baideah, on the south side of Mount Attaka, which last Sicard identifies with Baal-zephon, and which is the northern boundary of the plain Baideah, while Kulalah (Migdol) is its southern limit. But we would prefer to transpose these names, assigning  Migdol to Jebel Attaka, and Baal-zephoen to Jebel Deraj or Klulaih, while Wady Tuwarik will remain for Pi-hahiroth. (See each in its order.) The pass which leads to Suez, between Attaka and the sea, is very narrow, and could easily be stopped by the Egyptians. In this plain of Baideah Pharaoh had the Israelites hemmed in on all sides. This, then, according to all appearance, is the spot where the passage through the sea was effected. Such is the judgment of Sicard and of Raumer (Dea Zug der Israeliten, Leipzig, 1837; for a description of the Valley of Wandering, see also Ritter, Erdkunde, 1:858). It cannot be denied that this route satisfies all the conditions of the case. Equally does the spot correspond with the miraculous narrative furnished by holy writ. A different route is laid down by Niebuhr (Arab. page 407). Other writers, who, like him, endeavor to explain the facts without the aid of miracle, imitate his example. (See below.)

It is no small corroboration of the view now given from Sicard and Ranmer that in substance it has the support of Josephus, of whose account we shall, from its importance, give an abridgment. The Hebrews, he says, took their journey by Latopolis where Babylon was built afterwards when Cambyses Lid Egypt waste. As they went in haste, on the third day they came to a place called Baal-zephon, on the Red Sea. Moses led them this way in order that the Egyptians might be punished should they venture in pursuit, and also because the Hebrews had a quarrel with the Philistines. When the Egyptians had overtaken the Hebrews they prepared to fight them, and by their multitude drove them into a narrow place; for the number that went in pursuit was 600 chariots, 50,000 horsemen, and 200,000 infantry, all armed. They also seized the passages, shutting the Hebrews up between inaccessible precipices and the sea; for there was on each side a ridge of mountains that terminated at the sea, which were impassable, and obstructed their flight. Moses, however, prayed to God, and smote the sea with his rod, when the waters parted, and gave the Israelites free passage. The Egyptians at first supposed them distracted; but when they saw the Israelites proceed in safety, they followed. As soon as the entire Egyptian army was in the channel, the sea closed, and the pursuers perished amid torrents of rain and the most terrific thunder and lightning (Ant. 2:15).

III. Passage of the Red Sea. — This was the crisis of the Exode. It was the miracle by which the Israelites left Egypt and were delivered from the oppressor, All the particulars relating to this event, and especially those which show its miraculous character, require careful examination.

1. It is usual to suppose that the most northern place at which the Red Sea could have been crossed is the present head of the Gulf of Suez. This supposition depends upon the idea that in the time of Moses the gulf did not extend farther to the northward than at present. An examination of the country north of Suez has convinced some geographers, however, that the sea has receded many miles, and that this change has taken place within the historical period, possibly in fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah (Isa 11:15; Isa 19:5; comp, Zec 10:11). The old bed is thought by them to be indicated by the Birket et-Timsah, or "Lake of the Crocodile," and the more southern bitter lakes, the northernmost part of the former corresponding to the ancient head of the gulf. In previous centuries it is not supposed that the gulf extended farther north, but that it was deeper in its northernmost part. We are inclined to believe, however, that such a change, if it ever took place, cannot materially affect the question of the place of the Israelites' passage.

From Pi-hahiroth the Israelites crossed the sea. The only points bearing on geography in the account of this event are that the sea was divided by an east wind, whence we may reasonably infer that it was crossed from west to east, and that the whole Egyptian army perished, which shows that it must have been some miles broad. Pharaoh took at least six hundred chariots, which, three abreast, would have occupied about half a mile, and the rest of the army cannot be supposed to have taken up less than several times that space. Even if in a broad formation some miles would have been required. It is more difficult to calculate the space taken up by the Israelitish multitude, but probably it was even greater. On the whole, we may reasonsably suppose about twelve miles as the smallest breadth of the sea.

2. A careful examination of the narrative of the passage of the Red Sea is necessary to a right understanding of the event. When the Israelites had departed, Pharaoh repented that he had let them go. News is carried to the monarch which leads him to see that the reason assigned (namely, a sacrifice in the wilderness) is but a pretext; that the Israelites had really fled from his yoke; and also that, through some (to him) unaccountable error, they had gone towards the south-east, had reached the sea, and were hemmed in on all sides. He summons his troops and sets out in pursuit — "all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, and his horsemen and his army;" and he overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, before Baal-zephon" (Exo 14:9). It might be conjectured, from one part of  the narrative (Exo 14:1-4), that he determined to pursue them when he knew that they had encamped before Pi-hahiroth, did not what follows this imply that he set out soon after they had gone, and also indicate that the place in question refers to the pursuit through the sea, not to that from the city whence he started (Exo 14:5-10). This city was most probably Zoan, and could scarcely have been much nearer to Pi-hahiroth, and the distance is therefore too great to have been twice traversed, first by those who told Pharaoh, then by Pharaoh's army, within a few hours. The strength of Pharaoh's army is not farther specified than by the statement that "he took six hundred chosen chariots, and [or 'even'] all the chariots of Egypt, and captains over every one of them" (Exo 14:7). The war-chariots of the Egyptians held each but two men, an archer and a charioteer. The former must be intended by the word שָׁלִשִׁם, rendered in the A.V. "captains."

Throughout the narrative the chariots and horsemen of Pharaoh are mentioned, and "the horse and his rider" (Exo 15:21) are spoken of in Miriam's song, but we can scarcely infer hence that there was in Pharaoh's army a body of horsemen as well as of men in chariots, as in ancient Egyptian the chariot-force is always called HTAR or HETRA, "the horse," and these expressions may therefore be respectively pleonastic and poetical. There is no evidence in the records of the ancient Egyptians that they used cavalry, and, therefore, had the Biblical narrative expressly mentioned a force of this kind, it might have been thought conclusive of the theory that the Pharaoh of the Exode was a shepherd-king. With this army, which, even if a small one, was mighty in comparison with the Israelitish multitude, encumbered with women, children, and cattle, Pharaoh overtook the people " encamping by the sea" (Exo 15:9). When the Israelites saw the oppressor's army they were terrified, and murmured against Moses. "Because [there were] no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?" (Exo 15:11.) Along the bare mountains that skirt the valley of Upper Egypt are abundant sepulchral grottoes, of which the entrances are conspicuously seen from the river and the fields it waters: in the sandy slopes at the foot of the mountains are pits without number and many built tombs, all of ancient times, No doubt the plain of Lower Egypt, to which Memphis, with part of its far-extending necropolis, belonged politically, though not geographically, was throughout as well provided with places of sepulture. The Israelites recalled these cities of the dead, and looked with Egyptian horror at the prospect that their carcasses should be left on the face of the wilderness. Better, they said, to have continued to serve the Egyptians than thus to perish (Exo 15:12). Then  Moses encouraged them, bidding them see how God would save them, and telling them that they should behold their enemies no more.

There are few cases in the Bible in which those for whom a miracle is wrought are commanded merely to stand by and see it. Generally the divine support is promised to those who use their utmost exertions. It seems from the narrative that Moses did not know at this time how the people would be saved, and spoke only from a heart full of faith, for we read, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward; but lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it; and the children of Israel shall go on dry [ground] through the midst of the sea" (Exo 15:15-16). That night the two armies, the fugitives and the pursuers, were encamped near together. Here a very extraordinary event takes place: "The angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face and stood behind them; and it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these; so that the one came not near the other all the night" (Exo 15:19-20). The monuments of Egypt portray an encampment of an army of Rameses II during a campaign in Syria; it is well-planned and carefully guarded: the rude modern Arab encampments bring before us that of Israel on this memorable night. Perhaps in the camp of Israel the sounds of the hostile camp might be heard on the one hand, and on the other the roaring of the sea. But the pillar was a barrier and a sign of deliverance. The time had now come for the great decisive miracle of the Exode. "And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea: and the Lord caused the sea to go [back] by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry [land], and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went through the midst of the sea upon the dry [ground]; and the waters [were] a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left" (Exo 15:21-22; comp. 29).

The narrative distinctly states that a path was made through the sea, and that the waters were a wall on either hand. The term "wall" does not appear to oblige us to suppose, as many have done, that the sea stood up like a cliff on either side, but should rather be considered to mean a barrier; as the former idea implies a seemingly needless addition to the miracle, while the latter seems to be not discordant with the language of the narrative. It was during the night that the Israelites crossed, and the Egyptians followed. In the morning watch, the last third or fourth of the night, or the period before sunrise, Pharaoh's army was in full pursuit in the divided sea (Exo 15:23-25). Delays are now occasioned to the Egyptians; their chariot-wheels are supernaturally taken off, so that "in the morning-watch they drave them heavily." The Egyptians are troubled, they urge each other to fly from the face of Israel. Then was Moses commanded again to stretch out his hand, and the sea returned to its strength and overwhelmed the Egyptians, of whom not one remained alive (Exo 15:26-27). The statement is so explicit that there could be no reasonable doubt that Pharaoh himself, the great offender, was at last made an example, and perished with his army, did it not seem to be distinctly stated in Psalms 36 that he was included in the same destruction (Psalms 36:15). The sea cast up the dead Egyptians, whose bodies the Israelites saw upon the shore. From the song of triumph which Moses sang upon this occasion we learn some other particulars, as that "the depths covered Pharaoh's host, they sank to the bottom as a stone;" language which, whatever deduction may be made for its poetic character, implies that the miracle took place in deep water (Exodus 15; comp. Psa 106:9 sq.). In a later passage some particulars are mentioned which are not distinctly stated in the narrative in Exodus. The place is indeed a poetical one, but its meaning is clear, and we learn from it that at the time of the passage of the sea there was a storm of rain, with thunder and lightning, perhaps accompanied by an earthquake (Psa 77:15-20). To this Paul may allude where he says that the fathers "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1Co 10:2); for the idea of baptism seems to involve either immersion or sprinkling, and the latter could have here occurred: the reference is evidently to the pillar of the cloud: it would, however, be impious to attempt an explanation of what is manifestly miraculous. These additional particulars may illustrate the troubling of the Egyptians, for their chariots may have been thus overthrown.

Here, at the end of their long oppression, delivered finally from the Egyptians, the Israelites glorified God. In what words they sang his praise we know from the Song of Moses, which, in its vigorous brevity, represents the events of that memorable night, scarcely of less moment than the night of the Passover (Exo 15:1-18; Exo 15:19 is probably a kind of comment, not part of the song). Moses seems to have sung this song with the men, Miriam with the women also singing and dancing, or perhaps there were two choruses (Exo 15:20-21). Such a picture does not recur in the history of the nation. Neither the triumphal song of Deborah, nor the rejoicing when the Temple was recovered from the Syrians,  celebrated so great a deliverance, or was joined in by the whole people. In leaving Goshen, Israel became a nation; after crossing the sea, it was free. There is evidently great significance, as we have suggested, in Paul's use of this miracle as a type of baptism; for, to make the analogy complete, it must have been the beginning of a new period of the life of the Israelites.

3. The importance of this event in Biblical history is shown by the manner in which it is spoken of in the books of the O.T. written in later times. In them it is the chief fact of Jewish history. Not the call of Abraham, not the rule of Joseph, not the first Passover, not the conquest of Canaan, are referred to in such a manner as this great deliverance. In the Psalms it is related as foremost among the deeds that God had wrought for his people. The prophet Isaiah recalls it as the great manifestation of God's interference for Israel, and an encouragement for the descendants of those who witnessed that great sight. There are events so striking that they are remembered in the life of a nation, and that, like great heights, increasing distance only gives them more majesty. So no doubt was this remembered long after those were dead who saw the sea return to its strength and the warriors of Pharaoh dead upon the shore.

It may be inquired how it is that there seems to have been no record or tradition of this miracle among the Egyptians. This question involves that of the time in Egyptian history to which this event should be assigned. The date of the Exode, according to different chronologers, varies more than three hundred years; the dates of the Egyptian dynasties ruling during this period of three hundred years vary fully one hundred. The period to which the Exode may be assigned therefore virtually corresponds to four hundred years of Egyptian history. If the lowest date of the beginning of the 18th dynasty be taken, and the highest date of the Exode, both which we consider the most probable of those that have been conjectured in the two cases, the Israelites must have left Egypt in a period of which monuments or other records are almost wholly wanting. Of the 18th and subsequent dynasties we have as yet no continuous history, and rarely records of events which occurred in a succession of years. We know much of many reigns, and of some we can be almost sure that they could not correspond to that of the Pharaoh of the Exode. We can in no case expect a distinct Egyptian monumental record of so great a calamity, for the monuments only record success; but it might be related in a papyrus. There would doubtless have long remained a popular tradition of the Exode; but if the king who perished was one of the shepherd strangers, this tradition would  probably have been local, and perhaps indistinct. Josephus, indeed, gives us some extracts from the last work of Manetho, who appears, if we may trust the criticisms of the Jewish historian (contra Apionem, § 14, 26), to have greatly garbled the account in favor of the Egyptians. SEE HYKSOS.

Endeavors have been made to explain away the miraculous character of the passage of the Red Sea. It has been argued that Moses might have carried the Israelites over by a ford, and that an unusual tide might have overwhelmed the Egyptians. But no real diminution of the wonder is thus effected. How was it that the sea admitted the passing of the Israelites, and drowned Pharaoh and his army? How was it that it was shallow at the right time, and deep at the right time? Some writers (Wolfenb. Fragm. page 64 sq.) have at once declared the whole fabulous, a course which appears to have been taken as early as the time of Josephus (Ant. 2:16, 5).

Others, who do not deny miracles as such, yet with no small inconsistency seek to reduce this particular miracle to the smallest dimensions. Writers who see in the deliverance of the Hebrews the hand of God and the fulfillment of the divine purposes, follow the account in Scripture implicitly, placing the passage at Ras Attaka, at the termination of the Valley of Wandering; others, who go on rationalistic principles, find the sea here too wide and deep for their purpose, and endeavor to fix the passage a little to the south or the north of Suez. The most recent advocate of the passage at or near Suez is the learned Dr. Robinson (Biblical Researches in Palestine). The route taken by Moses was, according to Robinson, from Rameses to the head of the Arabian Gulf, through Succoth to Etham. The last place he fixes on the edge of the desert, on the eastern side of the line of the gulf. Instead of passing down the eastern side, at the top of which they were, the Israelites thence marched down the western side of the arm of the gulf, stopping in the vicinity of Suez, where the passage was effected. This view of the miracle, however, entirely fails to satisfy the Scripture account, and has been amply refuted by Dr. Olin (Travels in the East, N.Y. 1843) and others. (See the account of Mr. Blumhardt's visit, October 1836, in the Church Missionary Record, January 1836; Kitto's Scripture Lands, page 58; Daily Bible Illustrat. 2:95.)

Some have supposed the Red Sea anciently extended farther north, and have sought to identify the localities of the passage on that theory (see Sharpe in Bartlett's Forty Days in the Desert, page 23 sq.); but this is quite improbable and without evidence. Another explanation (Dr. Durbin, Observations in the Fast, 1:254) makes the Israelites to have turned from the vicinity of the bitter lakes to the western  side of the head of Suez, and so to have followed the shore to the plain of Baideah let the mouth of wady Tuwarik, and there crossed; but if (as some travelers affirm) there is room for such a passage along the shore by Ras Attaka, the Israelites inight have escaped by the same route by simply retreating, or, if that had been prevented by the Egyptians following along the same path behind them, they uuuight still have fled up the wady Tih, and thence around Jebel Attaka and the head of the sea. A still later view (Captain Moresby, in Aiton's Lands of the Messiah, page 107) places the scene of the passage still farther south, at the mouth of the next valley opening on the Red Sea near Ras Abu Deraj; but it would be difficult to show how the Israelites could have reached this spot from their former position in the edge of the wilderness, and it would also bring them out too far south on the other side of the Red Sea. Indeed, the mountains approach so steeply the shore all along at these points, that they could only have arrived at the valley or plain of Baideash, where we have supposed the passage to have been made, by turning sharply at Ethamm around the western base of Mount Attaka, and so partly back into the wady et-Tih, through which they were immediately pursued by the Egyptiames. The latter thus hemmed them in completely, and drove them forward to the extreme edge of the shore projecting in front of Mount Attaka, around which they were unable to escape. Here it was that Providence opened to them a miraculous path through the deep waters to the opposite point (at the mouth of wady Beyanah), near which are situated the wells of Moses, which doubtless derived their name from the first encampment of the Hebrews after their rescue. SEE RED SEA.

IV. The Route from the Red Sea to Sinai. — When safe on the eastern shore, the Israelites, had they taken the shortest route into Palestine, would have struck at once across the desert in a south-easterly direction to el- Arish or Gaza. But this route would have brought them into direct collision with the Philistines, with whom they were as yet quite unable to cope. Oar they might have traversed the desert of Paran, following the pilgrim road of the present day to Elath, and, turning to the north, have made for Palestine. In order to accomplish this, however, hostile hordes and nations would have to be encountered, whose superior skill and experience in war might have proved fatal to the newly-liberated tribes of Israel. Wisely, therefore, did their leader take a course which necessitated the lapse of time, and gave promise of affording intellectual and moral discipline of the highest value. He resolved to lead his flock to Sinai, in order that they might see  the wonders there to be exhibited, and hear the lessons there to be given. At Sinai, and on the journey thither, might the great leader hope that the moral brand which slavery had imprinted on his people would be effaced, and that they would acquire that self-respect, that regard to God's will, that capacity of self-guidance which alone could make liberty a blessing to the nation, and enable Moses to realize on their behalf the great and benign intentions which Godhadled him to form. There were, however, two ways by which he might reach Sinai. By following a south-easterly direction, and proceeding across the desert et-Tih, he would have reached at once the heart of the Sinaitic, region. This was the shorter and the more expeditious road. The other route lay along the shore of the Red Sea, which must be pursued till an opening gave thee means of turning suddenly to the east, and ascending at once into the lofty district. The latter was preferable for the reason before assigned, namely, the additional opportunities which it offered for the education of the undisciplined tribes of recently emancipated slaves.

Moses did not begin his arduous journey till, with a piety and a warmth of gratitude which well befitted the signal deliverance that his people had just been favored with, he celebrated the power, majesty, and goodness of God in a triumphal ode, full of the most appropriate, striking, and splendid images; in which commemorative festivity he was assisted by "Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron," and her associated female band, with poetry music, and dancing. The nature of these festivities gives us full reason to conclude that, if the people at large were still slaves in intellect and morals, there were not wanting individuals in the camp who were eminently skilled in the best refinements of the age. The spot where these rejoicings were held could not have been far from that which still bears the nanme of Ayuen Meisa, "the fountains of Moses," the situation of which is even now marked bv a few palm-trees. This was a suitable place for the encampment, because well supplied with water. Here Robinson counted seven fountains, near which he saw a patch of barley and a few cabbage- plants.

1. In tracing the track pursued by the host, we should bear in mind the limitation that a variety of converging or parallel routes naust often have been required to allow of the passage of so great a number (Robinson, Researches, 1:106). Assuming the passage of the Red Sea to have been effected at the spot indicated above, they eould march froma their point of landing, a little to the E. of S. Here they were in the wilderness of Shur,  and in it "they went three days and found no water." The Israelites seem to have proceeded along the coast, probably following the route usually pursued by modern travelers, being at a short distance from the shore and parallel with it. The district is hilly and sandy, with a few water-courses running into the Red Sea, which, failing rain, are dry. "These wadys," says Robinson, "are mere depressions in the desert, weith only a few scattered herbs and shruebs, now withered and parched with drought." SEE SHUR.

At the end of three days the Israelites reached the fountain Marah, but the waters were bitter, and could not be drunk. The stock which they had brought with them being now exhausted, they began to utter murmurings on finding themselves disappointed at Marah. Moses appealed to God, who directed him to a tree, which, being thrown into the waters, sweetens ed them. The people were satisfied and admonished. The present 'Ain el- Hawara has been thought icy most travelers since Burckhardt's time to be Marah. The basin is six or eight feet in diameter, and the water Robinson found about two feet deep. Its taste is unpleasant, saltish, and somewhat bitter. The Arabs pronounce it bitter, and consider it as the worst water in all these regions. Near the spring are numerous bushes of the shrub ghurkud — a low, bushy, thorny shrub, producing a small fruit, which ripens in June, not unlike the blackberry, very juicy, and slightly acidulous. It delights in a saline soil, and is found growing near the brackish fountains in and around Palestine, affording a grateful refreshment to travelers. By means of the berries, or, if they were met ripe, the leaves of this plant, the bitterness may have been removed from the waters of Marah. Not improbably the miracle in the case lae in this, that Jehoasah directed Moses to use the tree (bush) itself, instead of what was usual, the berries, as from the time of year, shortly after Easter, they could hardly have been ripe. Between Ain Howarah and Ayuin Musa the plain is alternately — gravelly, stony, and sandy, while under the range of Jebel Wardan (a branch of et- Tih) chalk and flints are found.

There is no water on the direct line of route (Robinson, 1:127-144). Hawara stands in the lime and gypsum region which lines the eastern shore of the Gulf of Suez at its northern extremity. Seetzen (Reisen, 3:117) describes the water as salt, with purgative qualities; but adds that his Bedouins and their camels drank of it. He argues, from its inconsiderable size, that it could not be the Marah of Moses. This, however, seems an inconclusive reason. It would not be too near the point of landing assumed, as above, as Dr. Stewart argues (page 55), when we consider the encumbrances which would delay the host, and,  especially while they were new to the desert, prevent rapid marches. But the whole region appears to abound in brackish or bitter springs (Seetzen, ib. 3:117, etc.; Anmerk. page 430). For instance, about one and three- fourths hours nearer Suez than the wady Ghurundel (which Lepsius took for Marah, but which Niebuhr and Robinson regard as more probably Elim), Seetzen (ib. 3:113, 114) found a wady Tal, with a salt spring and a salt crust on the surface of its bed, the same, he thinks, as the spot where Niebuhr speaks of finding rock-salt. This corresponds in general proximity with Marah. The neighboring region is described as a low plain girt with limestone hills, or more rarely chalk. On this first section of their desert march, Dr. Stanley (Sinai and Palst. page 37) remarks, "There can be no dispute as to the general track of the Israelites after the passage (of the Red Sea). If they were to enter the mountains at all, they must continue in the route of all travelers, between the sea and the table-land of the Tih, till they entered the low hills of Ghurufndel." He adds in a note, "Dr. Graul, however, was told ... of a spring near Tih el-Amara, right (i.e., south) of Hawara, so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink of it. From hence the road goes straight to wady Ghurundel." Seetzen also inclines to view favorably the identification of el Amara with Marah. He gives it the title of a "wady," and precisely on this ground rejects the pretensions of ei- Hawara as being no "wady," but only a brook; whereas, from the statement "they encamped" at Marah, Marah must, he argues, have been a wady. SEE MARAH.

2. The next station mentioned in Scripture is Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees. As is customary with travelers in these regions, "they encamped there by the waters" (Exo 16:1). The indications given in the Bible are not numerous nor very distinct. Neither time nor distance is accurately laid down. Hence we can expect only general accuracy in our maps, and but partial success in fixing localities. Elim, however, is generally admitted to be wady Ghurundel, lying about half a day's journey south-east from Marah. The way from Egypt to Sinai lies through this valley, and, on account of its water and verdure, it is a chief caravan station at the present day. It seems certain, at all events, that wady Ghuirundel — whether it be Marah, as Lepsius and (although doubtfully) Seetzen thought, or Elim, as Niebuhr, Robinson, and Kruse — must have been on the line of march, and almost equally certain that it furnished a camping station. In this wady Seetzen found more trees, shrubs, and bushes than he anywhere else saw in his journey from Sinai to  Suez. He particularizes several date-palms and many tamarisks, and notes that the largest quantity of the vegetable manna, now to be found anywhere in the Peninsula, is gathered here (3:116) from the leaves of the last-named tree, which here grows "with gnarled boughs and hoary head; the wild acacia, tangled by its desert growth into a thicket, also shoots out its gray foliage and white blossoms over the desert" (Stanley, Sinai and Palest. page 68).

The "scenery" in this region becomes "a succession of water- courses" (ib.); and the wady Taiyibeh, connected with Ghurundel by Useit, is so named from the goodly water and vegetation which it contains. These three wadys encompass on three sides the Jebel Hummam; the sea, which it precipitously overhangs, being on the fourth. They are the principal ones of those which the Israelites, going from north-west to south-east along the coast, would come upon in the following order-wady Ghfurundel, wady Useit, wady Thal, and wady Shubeikeh, the last being in its lower part called also wady Taiyibeh, or having a junction with one of that name. Between Useit and Taiyibeh, the coast-range of these hills rises into the Jebel Hummam, "lofty and precip. itous, extending in several peaks along the shore, apparently of chalky limestone, mostly covered with flints . . its precipices ... cut off all passage alongshore from the hot springs (lying a little west of south from the mouth of wady Useit, along the coast) to the mouth of wady Taiyibeh" (Robinson, 1:150; compare Stanley, Sin. and Palest. page 35). Hence, between the courses of these wadys the track of the Israelites must have been inland. Stanley says "Elim must be Ghurindel, Useit, or Taiyibeh (page 37); elsewhere (page 68) that "one of two valleys, or perhaps both, must be Elim;" these appear from the sequel to be Ghurufndel and Useit, "fringed with trees and shrubs, the first vegetation he had met with in the desert;" among these are "wild palms," not stately trees, but dwarf or savage, "tanmarisks," and the "'wild acacia." To judge from the configuration as given in the maps, there seems to be no reason why all three should not have combined to form Elim. or, at any rate, as Stanley suggests, two of them. Only, from Num 33:9-10, as Elim appears not to have been on the sea, we must suppose that the encampment, if it extended into three wadys, stopped short of their seaward extremities. The Israelitish host would scarcely find in all three more than adequate ground for their encampment. Beyond (i.e., to the south-east of Ghurundel), the ridges and spurs of limestone mountain push down to the sea, across the path along the plain (Robinson, 1:101, and Map). This portion of the question may be summed up by presenting, in a  tabular form, the views of some leading travelers or annotators on the site of Elim:

Wady        Wady  Some warm springs

Ghurundel.        Useit.      north of Tar, which

                  feed the rich date

Niebuhr,    One of      Laborde     plantations of the

Robinson,   both, "possibly." convent there,

Kruse.      Stanley.    Seetzen.

[By Lepsius identified with Marah.]

Dr. Kruse (Anmerk. page 418) singularly takes the words of Exo 15:27, “they encamped there (in Elim) by the waters," as meaning "by the sea;" whereas, from Num 33:9-10, it appears they did not reach the sea till a stage farther, although their distance from it previously had been but small. SEE ELIM.

3. From Elim the Israelites marched, encamping on the shore of the Red Sea, for which purpose they must have kept the high ground for some time, since the precipices of Jebel Hummam — a lofty and precipitous mountain of chalky limestone — run down to the brink of the sea. They therefore went on the land side of this mountain to the head of wady Taiyibeh, which passes down south-west through the mountains to the shore. On the plain of Ras Zetima, at the mouth of this valley, was probably (Stanley, page 37) the encampment "by the Red Sea" (Num 33:10).

4. According to Num 32:11, the Israelites removed from the Red Sea, and encamped next in the wilderness of Sin; an appellation no doubt representing some natural feature, and none more probably than the alluvial plain, which, lying at the edge of the sea, about the spot we now regard them as having reached, begins to assume a significant appearance. The modern name for this is el-Kaa, identified by Seetzen with this wilderness (3, part 3:412). Stanley calls el-Kaa, at its initial point, "the plain of Murkhah," and thinks it is probably this wilderness (page 37). Robinson likewise identifies it with "the great plain, which, beginning near el- Murkhah, extends with greater or less breadth almost to the extremity of the peninsula. In its broadest part it is called el-Kaa" (1:106). Thus they kept along the shore, and did not yet ascend any of the fruitful valleys which run up towards the center of the district. The account in Exodus 16 knows nothing of the foregoing encampment by the sea, but brings the host at once into "the wilderness of Sin;" but we must bear in mind the general  purpose there of recording not the people's history so much as God's dealings with them, and the former rather as illustrative of the latter, and subordinate to it. The evident design, however, in Numbers 33 belong to place on record their itinerary, this latter is to be esteemed as the locus classicus on any topographical questions as compared with others having a less special relation to thettrack. Indeed, we may regard the encampment by the Red Sea as bed essentially in the wilderness of Shur itself. SEE SIN (DESERT OF).

The Israelites arrived in the wilderness of Sin on the fifteenth day of the second month after their dep.Arture out of the land of Egypt (Exo 21:1), and being now wearied of their journey and tired of their scanty fare, they began again to murmur. Indeed, it is not easy to see how the most ordinary and niggardly food could have been supplied to them, constituting as they did nearly two millions of persons, in such a country as that into which they had come. It is true that some provision might have been made by individuals ere the march from Suez began. It is also probable that the accounts of encampments which we have are to be regarded as chiefly those of Moses and his principal men, with a chosen body of troops, while the multitude were allowed to traverse the open country and forage in the valleys. Still the region was unfavorable for the purpose, and some have hence concluded that here we have one of those numerical difficulties which are not uncommon in the Old Testament Scripture, and which make many suspect some radical error in our conceptions of the Hebrew system of numbers. The contrast between the scanty supply of the desert and the abundance of Egypt furnished the immediate occasion of the outbreak of dissatisfaction. Bread and flesh were the chief demand; bread and flesh were miraculously supplied; the former by manna, the latter by quails (Exo 16:13). Manna grows in some of the neighboring valleys; but the Israelites were in the wilderness, so that the supply could not have proceeded from natural resources, even had such existed to a sufficient extent for the purpose. The modern confection sold under that name is the exudation collected from the leaves of the tamarisk-tree (tamarix Orientales, Linn.; Arab. tarfa, Hebrews אֵשֶׁל) only in the Sinaitic valleys, and in no great abundance. If it results from the punctures made in the leaf by an insect (the coccus manniparus, Ehrenberg) in the course of June, July, and August, this will not precisely suit the time of the people's entering the region, which was about May. It is said to keep as a hardened sirup for years (Laborde, Comment. Geogr. on Exo 16:13-14), and  thus does not answer to the more striking characteristics described in Exo 16:14-26. Seetzen thought that the gum Arabic, an exudation of the acacia, was the real manna of the Israelites; i.e., he regards the statement of " bread from heaven" as a fiction (Reisen, 3:75-79). A caravan of a thousand persons is said by Hasselquist (Voyages, etc., Materia Medica, page 298, transl. ed. 1766) to have subsisted solely on this substance for two months. SEE MANNA.

5. The next station mentioned in Exodus is Rephidim; but in Numbers Dophkah and Alush are added. The two latter were reached after the people had taken "their Journey out of the wilderness of Sin." Exact precision and minute agreement are not to be expected. The circumstances of the case forbid us to look for them. In a desert, mountainous, and rarely frequented country, the names of places are not lasting. There was the less reason for permanence in the case before us, because the Israelites had not taken the shorter and more frequented road over the mountains to Sinai, but keptsalong the shore of the Red Sea. It still deserves notice, that in Exo 17:1 there is something like an intimation given of other stations besides Rephidim ihu the words "after their journeys." Dophlkah is probably to be found near the spot where wady Feiran runs into the Gulf of Suez. SEE DOPHKAH. Alush may have lain on the shore near Ras Jehan. SEE ALUSH. From this point a range of calcareous rocks, termed Jebal Hemam, stretches along the shore, near the southern end of which the Hebrews took a sudden turn to the northeast, and, going up wady Hibran, reached the central Sinaitic district. On the opposite side, the eastern, the Sinaitic mountains come to a sudden stop, breaking off, and presenting like a wall nearly perpendicular granite cliffs. These cliffs are cut by wady Hibran, and at the point of intersection with the plain which runs between the two ranges probably lay Rephidim. The tabernacle vas not yet set mup, nor the order of march organized, as subsequently (Num 10:13, etc.); hence the words "track" or "route," as indicating a line, can only be taken in the most wide and general sense. SEE REPHIDIM.

This was the last station before Sinai itself was reached. Naturally enough is it recorded that "there was no water for the people to drink." The road was an and gravelly plain; on either side were barren rocks. A natural supply was impossible. A miracle was wrought, and water was given. The Scripture makes it clear that it was from the Sinaitic group that the water was produced (Exo 17:6). The plain received two descriptive names: Massah, "Temptation," and Meribah, "Strife." It appears that the  congregation was not allowed to pursue their way to Sinai unmolested. The Arabs thought the Israelites suitable for plunder, and fell upon them. These hordes are termed Amalek. The Amalekites may have been out on a predatory expedition, or they may have followed the Israelites from the north, and only overtaken them at Rephidim; any way, no conclusion can be gathered from this fact as to the ordinary abode of these nomads. It appears, however, that the conflict was a severe and doubtful one, which by some extraordimeary aid ended in favor of the children of Israel. This aggression on the part of Amalek gave occasion to a permanent national hatred, which ended only in the extermination of the tribe (Num 24:20; Exo 17:4-16). In commemoration of this victory, Moses was commanded to write an account of it in a book: he also erected there an altar to Jehovah, and called the name of it “Jehovah, my banner." There is no occasion to inquire whether or not there was space for a battle in the spot where Moses was. It was a nomad horde that made the attack and mot a modern army. The fight was not a pitched battle. SEE AMALEK.

The word Horeb, applied by Moses to the place whence the water was gained, suggests the idea that Horeb was the general, and Sinai the specific name; Horeb standing for the entire district, and Sinai for one particular mountain. Many passages sanction this distinction; but in the New Testament Sinai only is read, having then apparently become a general name, as it is at the present day (Act 7:30-38; Gal 4:24). It is a monkish usage which gives the name Sinai to Jebel Musa, and Horeb to the northern part of the same ridge. SEE HOREB.

6. The route from Rephidim to Horeb is usually supposed to have been by way of wady Feiran, but we can see no good reason for so circuitous a course, supposing that we have correctly located Rephidim. The Israelites may more probably have ascended wady Hibiahn as far as its junction with wady Bughabigh, and through this first south-easterly, and then north- easterly between Jebel Madsus and Jebel es-Sik; thence, in a northerly direction, along the western base of Jebel Katherin, through wady Um- Kuraf, across wady Tulah. Here they may have followed the path be. tween Jebel Humr and Jebel el-Ghubsheh, which comes out at the modern gardens in the recess of the hills. We thus place them before Mount Horeb, in fite capacious plain Rahah, which, having its widest part in the immediate front of that immense mass of rock, extends as if with two arms, one towards the northwest, the other towards the northeast. The review of the plain by so competent a person as Robinson is of great consequence for  the interests of scientific geography, and the yet more important interests of religious truth; the rather because a belief prevailed, even among the best informed, that there was no spot in the Sinaitic district which answered' to the demands of the scriptural narrative. Even the accurate Winer (Real-Wort. in art. "Sinai," not "Horeb," as referred to by Robinson, 1:17; 2:550) says, "Whichever mountain may be considered as the place for the promulgation of the law, the common representation still remains false — that at the foot of the hill there spreads out a great plain, on which the people of Israel might assemble" (comp. Rosenmimiler, Alterth. 3:129).

We shall therefore transcribe Robinson's words in extenso: "We came to Sinai with some incredulity, wishing to investigate the point whether there was any probable ground, beyond monkish tradition, for fixing upon the present supposed site. We were led to the conviction that the plain er- Rahah is the probable spot where the congregation of Israel were assembled; and that the mountain impending over it, the present Horeb, was the scene of the awful phenomena in which the law was given. We were surprised as well as gratified to find here, in the inmost recesses of these dark granite cliffs, this fine plain spread out before the mountain, and I know not where I have felt a thrill of stronger emotion than when, in first crossing the plain, the dark precipices of Horeb rising in solemn grandeur before us, we became aware of the entire adaptedness of the scene to the purposes for which it was chosen by the great Hebrew legislator. Moses doubtless, during the forty years in which he kept the flocks of Jethro, had often. wandered over these moanntains, and was well acquainted with their valleys and deep recesses, like the Arabs of the present day. At any rate, he knew and had visited the spot to which he was to conduct his people — this adytum in the midst of the great circular granite region; a secret holy place, shut out from the world amid lone asnd desolate mountains" (1:175 sq.). We subjoin what Robinson reports of the climate: "The weather, during our residence at the convent (of Sinai), as, indeed, during all our journey through the peninsula (March and April), was very fine. At the convent the thermometer ranged only between 470 and 670 F. But the winter nights are said here to be cold; water freezes as late as February, and snow often falls upon the mountains. But the air is exceedingly pure, and the climate healthy, as is testified by the great asge and vigor of many of the monks; and if in general few of the Arabs attain to so great an age, the cause is doubtless to be sought in the scantiness of their fare, and their exposure to privations, and not to any injurious influence of the climate" (page 175). Other travelers, however, have since contended for the plain of  wady es-Sebaiyeh, at the south-eastern base of Sinai, as the scene of the giving of the law (Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. 2:123). This appears a less favorable position for that purpose, but Ait might easily have been reached by the Israelites by keeping along the shore of the Red Sea, and ascending by the next valley opposite Jebel Um-Shaumer. SEE SINAI.

V. From Sinai to Kadesh. — The sojourn of a year in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai was an eventful one. The statements of the scriptural narrative which relate to the receiving of the two tables, the golden calf; Moses's vision of God, and the visit of Jethro, are too well known to need special mention here; but, besides these, it is certain, from Num 3:4, that before they quitted the wilderness of Sinai the Israelites were throwemn into mourning bythe untimely death of Aaron's two sons, Nadab and Abihu. This event is probably connected with the setting up of the tabernacle and the enkindling of that holy fire, the sanctity of which their death avenged. That it has a determinate chronological relation with the proanulgations which from time to time were made in that wilderness, is proved by an edict in Leviticus 16, being fixed as subsequent to it (Leviticus 10; comp. 16:1). The only other fact of history contained in Leviticus is the punishment of the son of mixed parentage for blasphemy (Lev 24:10-14). Of course the consecration of Aaron and his son is mentioned early in the book in connection with the laws relating to their office (Lev 8:9). In the same wilderness region the people were numbered, and the exchange of the Levites against the first-born was effected; these last, since their delivery when God smote those of Egypt, having incurred the obligation of sanctity to him. The offerings of the princes of Israel were here also received. The last incident mentioned before the wilderness of Sinai was quitted for that of Paran is the intended departure of Hobab the Kenite, emhich it seems he abandoned at Moses's urgency. SEE HOBAB.

1. After having been thus about a year in the midst of this mountains region, the Israelites broke up their encampment and began their journey in the order of their tribes, Judah leading the way with the ark of the covenant, under the guidance of the directing cloud (Num 9:15 sq.; Num 10:11 sq.). They doubtless proceeded down wady Sheik, having the wilderness of Paran (Debbet er-Ramleh) before them, in a northerly direction; but having come to a gorge in the mountains not far from Sinai, they appear to have struck in a north-easterly direction across some long swells into wady Sal, where the subsequent route obliges us to place the  station Taberah. It took the army three days to reach this station. Whatever name the place bore before, it now received that of Taberah (fire), from a superuatural fire with which murmurers, in the extreme parts of the canip, were de, stroyed as a punishment for their guilt. Here, too, the mixed multitude that was among the Israelites not only fell a-lusting themselves, but also excited the Hebrews to remember Egyptian fish and vegetables with strong desire, and to complain of the divinely supplied manna. The discontent was intense and widely spread. Moses became aware of it, and forthwith felt his spirit misgive him. He brings the matter before Jehovah, and receives divine aid by the appointment of seventy elders to assist him in the important and perilous office of governing the gross, sensuous, and self-willed mayriads whom he had to lead to Canaan. Moreover, an abundance of flesh-meat was given in a most profuse supply of quails. It appears that there were now 600,000 footmen in the congregation. SEE TABERAM.

2. Thee next station was Kibroth-hattaavah (probably at the intersection of their north-easterly course with wady Murrah), near which there are fine springs and excellent pasturage. This spot, the name of which signifies "graves of lust," emas so denominated from a plague inflicted an the people in punishment of their rebellious disposition (Num 11:33; 1Co 10:6). Raumer (Beitrage z. bib. Geog. page 6, also Palast. 1850, page 442) infers from Deu 1:3, that Dizahab (now Dahab) lay on the route of the Israelites, and therefore identifies it with Kibroth-hattavah; but this is improbable, and requires a large detour. SEE KIBROTH-HATTAAVAH.

3. Thence they journeyed to Hazeroth, which Robinson, after Burckhardt, finds in el-Hudherah, where is a fountain, together with palm-trees. "The determination of this point," says Robinson, "is perhaps of more importance in Biblical history than would at first appear; for, if this position be adopted for Hazeroth, it settles at once the question as to the whole route of the Israelites between Sinai and Ksadesh. It shows that they must have followed the route upon which we now were to the sea, and so along the coast to Akabah (at the head of the eastern arm of the Red Sea), and thence, probably, through the great wady el-'Arabah to Kadesh. Indeed, such is the nature of the country, that, having once arrived at this fountain, they could not well have varied their course so as to keep aloof from the sea, and continue along the high plateau of the western desert" (1:223). A glance at Kiepert's, or any map showing the region in detail, will show that  a choice of two main routes exists, in order to cross the intervening space between Sinai and Canaan, which they certainly approached in the first instance on the southern, and not on the eastern side. Here the higher plateau surmounting the Tih region would almost certainly, assuming the main features of the wilderness to have been then as they are now, have compelled them to turn its western side nearly by the route by which Seetzen came in the opposite direction from Hebron to Sinai, or to turn it on the east by going up the 'Arabah, or between the 'Arabah and the higher plateau. Over its southern face there is no pass, and hence the roads from Sinai, and those from Petra towards Gaza and Hebron, all converge into one of two trunk-lines of route (Robinson, 1:147, 151, 2; 2:186). One reason for thinking that they did not strike northwards across the Tih range from Sinai is Moses' question when they murmur, "Shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them, to suffice them?" which is natural enough if they were rapidlynearing the Gulf of 'Akabah, but strange if they were posting towards the inland heart of the desert. Again, the quails are brought by "a wind from the sea" (Num 11:22; Num 11:31); and various travelers (Burckhardt, Schubert. Stanley) testify to the occurrence of vast flights of birds in this precise region between Sinai and 'Akabah. Again, Hazeroth, the next station after these, is coupled with Dizahab, which last seems undoubtedly the Dahab on the shore of that gulf (Deu 1:1, and Robinson, 2:600, note). This makes a seaward position likely for Hazeroth.

Now as Taberah, previously reached, was three days' journey or more from the wilderness of Sinai, they had probably advanced that distance towards the northeast and 'Akabah; and the distance required for this will bring us so near el-Hudherath (the spot which Robinson thought represented Hazeroth in fact, as it seems to do in name), that it may be accepted as a highly probable site. Thus they were now not far from the coast of the Gulf of 'Akabah. A spot which seems almost certain to attract their course was the wady el-'Ain, being the water, the spring of that region of the desert, which would have drawn around it such "nomadic settlements as are implied in the name of Hazeroth, and such as that of Israel must have been" (Stanley, page 82). Stanley nevertheless thinks this identification of Hazeroth a "faint probability," and the more uncertain as regards identity, "as the name Hazeroth is one of the least likely to be attached to any permanent or natural feature of the desert," meaning "simply the inclosures, such as may still be seen in the Bedouin villages, hardly less transitory than tents" (Sinai and Palestine, pages 81, 82). We rely, however, as much on the combination of the various circumstances  mentioned above as on the name. The wady Hfiderah and wady el-'Ain appear to run nearly parallel with each other, from southwest to northeast, nearly from the eastern extremity of the wady es-Sheikh, and their northeast extremity comes nearly to the coast, marking about a midway distance between the Jebel,Musa and 'Akabah. After reaching the sea, however, at Ain el-Waseit, the Israelites may have made a detour by way of wady Wetir nearly to its head, and thence passed through the watercourse running directly northward into the Derb es-Sanna, thence around the northern face of Jebel Herte, down wady Hessi and wady Kureiyeh to the sea again; thus avoiding the narrow shore and the difficult pass across the hill between wady el-Huweimiraty and wady el Huweimirat. (See Stanley's Sinai and Palestine, page 84). SEE HAZEROTH.

At Hazeroth, where the people seem to have remained a short time, there arose a family dissension to increase the difficulties of Moses. Aaron, apparently led on by his sister Miriam, who may have been actuated by some feminine pique or jealousy, complained of Moses on the ground that he had married a Cushite, that is, an Arab wife, and the malcontents went so far as to set up their own claims to authority as not less valid than those of Moses. An appeal is made to Jehovah, who vindicates Moses, rebukes Aaron, and punishes Miriam (Numbers 12). SEE MIRIAM.

The two preceding stations seem from Num 10:11-13; Num 10:33-36, to have lain in the wilderness of Paran; but possibly the passage in Num 10:11-13 should come after that of Num 10:33-36, and the "three days' journey" of Num 10:33 lie still in the wilderness of Sinai; and even Taberah and Hazeroth, reached in 11, 12, also there. Thus the Israelites would reach Paran only in Num 12:16; and Num 10:12 would be either misplaced, or mentioned by anticipation only. SEE PARAN (WILDERNESS OF).

4. The next permanent encampment brought them into the wilderness of Paran, and here the local commentator's greatest difficulty begins. "And afterwards the people removed from Hazeroth, and pitched in the wilderness of Paran," at Kadesh (Num 12:16; Num 13:26). In Deu 1:19-21, we read, "And when we departed from Horeb we went through all that great and terrible wilderness which ye saw by the way of the mountain of the Amorites, as the Lord our God commanded us; and we came to Kadesh-barnea. And I said unto you, Ye are come unto the mountain of the Amorites, which the Lord our God doth give unto us.  Behold, the Lord thy God hath set the land before thee: go up and possess it; fear not, neither be dis. couraged." Accordingly, here it was that twelve men (spies) were sent into Canaan to survey the country, who went up from the wilderness of Zin (Num 13:21) to Hebron, and returning after foity days, brought back a very alarming account of what they had seen. Let it, however, be remarked that the Scriptures here supply several local data to this effect: Kadesh- barnea lay not far from Canaan, near the mountain of the Amorites, in the wilderness of Zin, in the wilderness of Paran. It is evident that there is here a great lacuna, which some have attempt. ed to fill up by turning the route a little to the west to Rithmah (q.v.), on the borders of Idumaea, and then conducting it with a sudden bend to the west and the south, into what is considered the wilderness of Paran (Relievo Map of Arabia Petrasa, published by Dobbs, London). In this view, however, we cannot concur. Both Robinson and Raumer are of a different opinion. At the same time it must be admitted that so great a gap in the itinerary is extraordinary. If, however, we find ourselves in in egard to the journey from Horeb to Kadesh possessed of fewer and less definite materials of information, we have also the satisfaction of feeling that no great scriptural fact or doctrine is concerned. It is certain that the narrative in the early part of Numbers goes at once from Hazeroth to Kadesh; and although the second account (in Numbers 33) supplies other places, these seem to belong properly to a second route and a second visit to Kadesh.

The history in the book of Numbers is not, indeed, a consecutive narrative; for after the defeat of the Israelites in their foolish attempt to force a.n entrance into Canaan contrary to the will of God (Num 14:45), it breaks suddenly off, and, leaving the journeyings and the doings of the camp, proceeds to recite certain laws. Yet it offers, as we think, a clear intimation of a second visit to the wilderness of Zin and to Kadesh. Without having said a word as to the removal of the Israelites southward, and therefore leaving them in the wilder ness of Zin, at Kadesh; it records in the twentieth chapter (Num 14:1), "Then came the children of Israel, the whole congregation, into the desert of Zin, in the first month, and the people abode in Kadesh." And this view appears confirmed by the fact that the writer immediately proceeds to narrate the passage of the Israelites hence on by Mount Hor southwards to Gilgal and Canaan. Robinson's remarks (2:611) on this point have much force: "I have thus far assumed that the Israelites were twice at Kadesh, and this appears from a comparison of the various accounts. They broke up from Sinai on the the twentieth day of the second month in the second year of their departure out  of Egypt, corresponding to the early part of May; they came into the desert of Paran, whence spies were sent up the mountain into Palestine, 'in the time of the first ripe grapes;' and these returned after forty days to the camp at Kadesh. As grapes begin to ripen on the mountains of Judah in July, the return of the spies is to be placed in Atigust or September. The people now murmured at the report of the spies, and received the sentence from Jehovah that their carcasses should fall in the wilderness, and their children wander in the desert forty years. They were ordered to turn back into the desert 'by the way of the Red Sea,' although it appears that they abode 'many' days in Kadesh. The next notice of the Israelites is, that in the first month they came into the desert of Zin and abode again at Kadesh; here Miriam dies; Moses and Aaron bring water from the rock; a passage is demanded through the land of Edom, and refiused; and they then journeyed from Kadesh to Mount Hor, where Aaron dies in the fortieth year of the- departure from Egypt, in the first day of the fifth month, corresponding to a part of August and September. Here, then, between August of the second year and August of the fortieth year, we have an interval of thirty-eight years of wandering in the desert. With this coincides another account. From Mount Hor they proceeded to Elath on the Red Sea, and so around the land of Edom to the brook Zered, on the border of Moab; and from the time of their departure from Kadesh (meaning, of course, their first departure) until they thus came to the brook Zered, there is said to have been an interval of thirty-eight years."

In this way the scriptural account of the journeyings of the Israelites become perfectly harmonious and intelligible. The eighteen stations mentioned only in the general list in the book of Numbers as preceding the arrival at Kadesh are then apparently to be referred to this eight-and-thirty years of wandering, during which the people atlast approached Eziongeber, and afterwards returned northwards a second time to Kadesh, in the hope of passing directly through the land of Edom. Their wanderings extended, doubtless, over the western desert, although the stations named are probably only those head-quarters where the tabernacle was pitched, and where Moses, and the elders, and priests encamped, while the main body of the people was scattered in various directions.

Where, then, was Kadesh? Clearly on the borders of Palestine. We agree with Robinson and Rauiner in placing it nearly at the top of the wady 'Arabah, where, indeed, it is fixed by Scripture, for in Num 12:16 we read, "Kadesh, a city in the uttermost of thy (Edom's) border." The  precise spot it may be difficult to ascertain; but here, in the wilderness of Zin, which lay in the more comprehensive district of Paran, is Kadesh to be placed. Raumer, however, has attempted to fix the locality, and in his views Robinson and Schubert generally concur. Raumer places it south from the Dead Sea, in the low lands between the mountain of the Edomites and that of the Amorites. The country gradually descends from the mountains of Judah southward, and where the descent terminates Raumer sets Kadesh. With this view the words of Moses entirely correspond, when, at Kadesh, he said to the spies, "Get you up southward (rather on the south, בִּנֶּגֶב), and go up into the mountain" (Num 13:17). The ascent may have been made up the pass es-Sufah; up this the self-willed Hebrews went, and were driven back by the Canaanites as far as to Hormah, then called Zephath (Numbers 12:17; 14:40-45; Jdg 1:17). The spot where Kadesh lay Robinson finds in the present Ain el- Weibeh. But Raumer prefers a spot to the north of this place — that where the road mounts by wady el-Khurar to the pass Sufah. It ought, he thinks, to be fixed on a spot where the Israelites would be near the pass, and where the pass would lie before their eyes. This is not the case, according to Schubert, at Ain el-Weibeh. Raunier, therefore. inclines to fix on Ain Hasb, which lies near Ain el-Khurar. This is probably Kadesh. The distance from the pass Sufah to Ain Hasb is little more than half the length of that from the same pass to Ain el-Weibeh. According to the Arabs, there is at Ain Hasb a copious fountain of sweet water, surrounded by verdure and traces of ruins, which must be of considerable magnitude, as they were seen by Robinson at a distance of some miles. These may be the ruins of Kadesh; but at Ain el-Weibeh there are no ruins (see Raumer, Palast. 1850, page 445). SEE KADESH.

By what route, then, did the Israelites come from Hazeroth to Kadesh? We are here supplied with scarcely any information. The entire distance, which is considerable, is passed by the historian in silence. Nothing more remains than the direction of the two places, the general features of the country, and one or two allusions. The option seems to lie between two routes. From Hazeroth, pursuing a direction to the northeast, they would coine upon the seacoast, along which they might go till they c.me to the top of the Bahr Akabah, and thence up wady Arabah to Kadesh, nearly at its extremity. Or they might have taken a northwestern course and crossed the mountain Jebel et-Tih. If so, they must still have avoided the western side of Mount Araif, otherwise they would have been carried to Beer-sheba,  which lay far to the west of Kadesh. Robinson prefers the first route, Raumer the second. "I," says the latter, "am of opinion that Israel went through the desert et-Tih, then down Jebel Araif, but not along wady 'Arabah." This view is thought to be supported by the words found in Deu 1:19, "When we departed from Horeb we went through all that great and terrible wilderness which ye saw by the way of the mountain of the Amorites [as if Jebel Araif], and we came to Kadesh- barnea." This journey from Horeb to Kadesh-lbarnea took the Hebrews eleven days (Deu 1:2). But in this last passage the route is expressly said to be "by the way of Mouni Seir" (which must therefore be the "mount of the Amorites" above referred to), and in Deu 1:1 the "wilderness is said to be in the 'Arabah ("plain"), with several places designated as extreme boundary points. SEE ARABAH.

VI. The Wanderings in the Desert. — At the direct command of Jehovah the Hebrews, left Kadesh, came down to the wady 'Arabah, and entered the wilderness by the way of the Red Sea (Num 14:25). In this wilderness they wandered eight-and-thirty years, but little can be set forth respecting the course of their march. It may in general be observed that their route would not resemble that of a regular modern army. They were a disciplined horde of nomads, and would follow nomadic customs. It is also clear that their stations, as well as their course, would necessarily be determined by the nature of the country, and its natural supplies of the necessaries of life. Hence regularity of movement is not to be expected. A common error is that of supposing that from station to station (in Numbers 33) always represents a day's march merely, whereas it is plain, from a comparison of two passages in Exodus (Exo 15:22) and Numbers (Num 10:23), that on two occasions three days formed the period of transition between station and station, and therefore that not day's marches, but intervals of an indefinite number of days between permanent encaneppments are intended by that itinerary; and as it is equally clear from Num 9:22 that the ground mecay have been occupied for "two days, or a month, or a year," we may suppose that the occupations of a longer period only may be marked in the itinerary; and thus the difficulty of apparent chasms in, its enumeration, for instance the greatest, between Ezion-Geber and Kadeash (33:35-37), altogether vanishes. How, except by a constant miracle, two million people were supported for forty years in the peninsula of Sinai, has been thought, under the actual circumstances of the case, to be inexplicable; nor will such scmnty supplies as an occasional well  or a chance oasis do much to relieve the subject. Much of the difficulty experienced by commentators on this head however, arises from a misconception of the nature of the so-called "desert" (מַרְבָּרּ, which is rather an open uninhabited country thame a desolate wilderness in the strict sense. Indeed, Jotbalh (q.v.), one of the stations named in this part of the route, is explicitly called " a land of rivers of waters" (Deu 10:8). Modern travelers through the region in question speak of miany parts of it as well watem-sad, and actually sustaining a numerous nomadic population (coanp. Math. Quart. Rev. April, 1863, page 301 sq.). SEE WILDERNESS.

1. In the absence of detailed information, any attempt to lay down the path pursued by the Israelites after their emerging from the 'Arabah can be little better than conjectural. Some authorities carry themna quite over to the eastern bank of the Red Sea; but the expression “by the way of the Red Sea" denotes nothing more than the western wilderness, or the wilderness in the direction of the Red Sea. The stations over which the Israelites passed are set down in Num 33:18 sq. (comp. Deu 10:6-7), and little beyond the bare record can be given. Only it seems extraordinary, and is much to be regretted, that for so long a period as eight-and-thirty years our information should be so exceedingly small. Raumer, indeed, makes a feeble effort (Beitrdge zur biblische Geographie, Leips. 1843) to fix the direction in which some of the stations'lay to each other, but he locates them all in the valley of the 'Arabah, without being able to identify one of the names with a modern locality (see his Palestina, 1850, page 446; also map). Were the interior of the peninsula thoroughly explored, we doubt not many of the ancient names might be found still subsisting which would serve as landmarks to determine the route. As it is, we do not altogether despair of finding some clew to the subject. [See below.] It miIay be of service to subjoin the following table of the places through which the Israelites passed (not all of them exactly stations) from the time of their leaving Egypt to their arrival in Canaan, which we take (with some alterations) from Dr. Robinson's paper in the Biblical Repos. for 1832, page 794-797.

(1.) FROM EGYPT TO SINAI.

(Exodus 12-19.)   (Numbers 33.)

[1.] From Rameses (Exo 12:37).     From Rameses (Num 33:3).

[2.] Succoth (Exo 12:37).    Succoth (Num 33:5).

[3.] Etham (Exo 13:20). Etham (Num 33:6).

[4.] Pi-hahirotle (Exo 14:2). Pi-hahiroth (Num 33:7).

[5.] Passage through the Red Sea (Exo 14:22).  Passage through the Red Sea Red Sea (Num 33:8).

[6.] Three days' march into  Three days' march in the des the desert of Shurdesert of Etham (Num 33:5). (Num 15:22).

[7.] Marah (Exo 15:23). Marah (Num 33:8).

[8.] Eline (Exo 15:27).      Elim (Num 33:9).

[9.]        Encampment by the Red Sea (Num 33:10).

[10.] Desert of Sin (Exo 16:1).          Desert of Sin (Num 33:11).

[11.]       Dophkah (Num 33:12).

[12.] Alush (Num 33:13).

[13] Rephidim (Exo 17:1).    Repiuidim (Num 33:14).

[14.] Desert of Sinai (Exo 19:1).  Desert of Sinai (Num 33:15).

(2.) FROM SINAI TO KADESH THE SECOND TIME.

(Numbers 10-20).  (Numbers 33.)

From the desert of Sinai (Num 10:12).    From the desert of Sinai (Num 33:16).

[15.] Taberah (Num 11:3; [Deu 9:2-2].

[16.] Kibroth-hattaavah (Num 11:34), desert of Paran Num 10:12).       Kibroth-hattaavah (Num 33:16)

[17.] Hazeroth (Num 11:35).        Hazeloth (Num 33:17).

[18.] The desert of 'Arabah by the way of Mount Seir [Deu 1:1-2] Dreadful desert by the way of mount of the Amorites [Deu 1:19]

[19.] Rithmah (Num 33:18).

[20.] Kadesh, in the desert of Paran (Num 12:16; Num 13:26); [Deu 1:2; Deu 1:19].

Hence they turn back and wander for 38 years (Num 14:25 sq.) through the desert (Deu 2:1)].

[21.] Rimmon-parez (Num 33:19)

[22.] Libnah (Num 33:20).

[23.] Rissah (Num 33:21) .

[24.]       Kehelathah (Num 33:22).

[25.]       Mount Shapner (Num 33:23).

[26.] [Haradah (Num 33:24).

[27.] Makheloth (Num 33:25).

[28.] Tahath (Num 33:26).

[29.] Tarah (Num 33:27).

[30.] Mithcah (Num 33:28)

[31.] Hashmonah (Num 33:29).

[32.] Moseroth (Num 33:30).

[33.] Ben-jaakun (Num 33:31).

[34.] Hor-hagidgad (Num 33:32).

[35.] Jotbathah (Num 33:33).

[36.] Ebronah (Num 33:34).

[37.] Ezion-geber (Num 33:35, by the way of the Red Sea [Deu 2:1].

[38] Return to Kadash, in Kadesh, in the desert of Zin the desert of Zin (verse 37). (Num 20:1), by the way of Matthew Seir (Num 2:1).

(3.) FROM KADESH TO THE JORDAN.

(Numbers 31; Deuteronomy 1, 2, 10).      (Numbers 31.)

From Kadesh (Numbers 20, 22). From Kadeash (Num 31:37).

[39.] Beeroth Bene-jaakan (Deu 10:6).

[40.] Mount Her (Numbers 20, 22), or Moses (Deu 10:6) where Aaron died.

[41.] Gudgodah (Deu 10:7)

[42.] Jotbaith (Deu 10:7)

[43.] Way of the Red Sea (Num 21:4), by Ezion-geber (Deu 2:5)

[44.] Elath (Deu 2:8)

[45.] Zalmonah (verse 41)

[46.] Punon (verse 42)

[47.] Oboth (Num 21:10). Oboth (verse 43)

[48.] Ije-abarim (Numbers 21, 44,45)     Ije-abarim, or him (Num 21:11)

[49.] The brook Zered (Num 21:12; Deu 2:13-14)

[50.] The brook Arnon (Num 21:13; Deu 2:24).

[51.]       Dibon-gad (verse 45).

[52.]       Almon-diblathmaim (v. 46).

[53.] Beer (well), in the desert (Num 21:16)

[54.] Mattanah (Num 21:18).

[55.] Nahaliel (Num 21:19).

[56.] Bamoth (Num 32:19).

[57.] Pisgah, put for the Mountains of Abarim, neat range of Abarim, of Nebo (verse 47). which Pisgah was part (Num 21:20).

[58.] By the way of Bashan  to the plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (Num 21:33; Num 22:1).  Plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (verse 48).

The points indicated in the above route as far as Kadesh have already been identified with considerable precision. It remains to consider how far the residue are capable of identification. For this purpose we have a few coincidences with modern or well-known localities, and several repetitions of the same or similar names, indicating a passage through the same spot from different directions. The rest must be supplied by conjecture, assisted by such suggestions as the nature of the region furnishes. It is a question whether the station Rithmah (Num 33:18) was one reached by the Israelites before or after their first arrival at Kadesh; but as it is mentioned in immediate connection with Hazeroth, we may infer that it was either another name for Ksadesh itself, or a locality so near it as to permit the omission of Kadesh in the summary where it occurs. After their repulse by the Canaanites at the pass called Nukb es-Sufah, the Israelites may be supposed to heave retreated along the westerly shore of the 'Arabah till they reached the wady el-Kafafiyeb, or that of Abu Jeradeh, which would afford them an ascent to the mountainous region occupying the northern interior of the desert, somewhere near the summit of which we may place their next encampment, called Rimmon-parez. Libnah, where they next encamped, may not improbably be the same with Laban, given (Deu 1:1) as one of the extreme points of their region of wandering, and may have been situated on the western declivity of the mountains, in thee neighborhood of the wady el-Ain, running down from  'Ain el-Kudeirat. Thence they may have proceeded down wady el-Ain to its junction with the large wady el-Arish, where we may place the next station, Rissah, in the vicinity of el-Kusasby, opposite Jebel el-Helal. Pursuing this last valley southward, they next halted at Kehelathah, perhaps at its junction with eady el-Hasana, opposite Jebel Achmar, and thence eastward up wady el-Mayein, around the northern base of the Arait en-Nakahm, which we may identify with Mount Shapher, to the summit just beyond Ain el-Mamein, where we may locate their next station, Hartidali. Makheloth and Tabath may be located at suitable intervals along the northern base of the ridge el-Mukrah, and Tara at the intersection of the route southeasterly thence with the wady el-Jerafeh, which they would be likely to pursue (stopping at Mitheah on the way) to its intersection with the wady el-Jeib, in the 'Arabah, where we may locate Hashmonah. Thence is an easy stage to the next station, Loseroth, which is doubtless the same with Mosera, afterwards visited (Deu 10:6), and there identified with the vicinity of Mount Hor, where Aaron died. Here we have a fixed point, whatever may be thought of the preceding conjectural circuit, which doubtless occupied several years. We notice that Schwarz, although unable to fix these stations at this portion of the itinerary of the Israelites, believes that they must have been in this high, rocky plateau, now occupied by the tribe Azazumeh (Palestine, page 215).

From Mount Hor the next station indicated is Beneja.akan (q.v.), evidently identical with the wells (Beeroth) of the same name, mentioned subsequently in the reverse order between Kadesh and Mosera (Deu 10:6), and probably a general term for the well-watered region including the fountains el-Hufeiry, el-Buweirideh, el-Webeh, and el- Ghamr. At this last-named spot; having crossed the 'Arabah in a north- easterly direction, the Israelites may have pursued their route up wady el- Ghamr, avoiding their late track in that vicinity (for the same names do not reappear), and thus by a south-westerly, and then southerly course, have fallen again into wady el-Jerafeh, and followed it up to where it forks into wady el-Ghudhagidh. This last name is probably a relic of that of their next station, Hor-hagidgad, essentially the same with the Gudgodah (q.v.) afterwards visited by them (Deu 10:7) in retracing their steps through this region; for although the letters of the Arabic and Hebrews names are not identical (as given in Robinson's lists, Researches, 3, Appendix. 210, where the orthography was probably taken only by ear), yet they are equivalent in sound, and in both cases contain the same  peculiar reduplication. Thence making a southerly circuit across the heads of several wadys running easterly from the little Jebel et-Tih, their next encampment was Jotbathah, coincident with the Jotbath of Deu 10:7, and there described as "a land of rivers and streams," which we may naturally locate at the intersection of the route thus indicated with the upper wady Jerafeh, where is a confluence of several branch wadys. Following up the chief of these, wady Mukutta et- Tawarik, in a south-easterly direction, they would fall in (at the station Ebronah) with the modern Haj route from Cairo, and follow it through the pass of 'Akabah to Eziongeber on the Red Sea. Thence they appear to have taken their first path through the 'Arabah to Kadesh again. The following is a table of a few of the most definite of these results:

Num 33:30-35.     Deu 10:6-7. CONJECTURAL SITE.

(1) Moseroth.     (2.) Mosera.      Ain et-Taiyibeh.

            near the foot of

            Mount Hor.

(2.) Bene-jaakan. (1) Beeroth of the      'Ain el- 'ebeh.

      children of Ja akan.

(3.) Hor-hagidgad.      (3.) Gudgodah.    Wady el-Ghudhagidh.

(4.) Jotbathah.   (4.) Jotbath.     Confluence of wady

            el-Aalibeh with

            el — Jerafeh.

2. The only events recorded during this period (and these are interspersed with sundry promulgations of the ceremonial law), are the execution of the offender who gathered sticks on the Sabbath (Num 15:32-36), the rebellion of Korah (chapter 16), and, closely connected with it, the adjudgment of the pre-eminence to Aaron's house with their kindred tribe, solemnly conmirmed by the judicial miracle of the rod that blossomed. This seems to have been followed by a more rigid separation between Levi and the other tribes as regards the approach to the tabernacle than had been practically recognized before (Num 16:27; Num 18:22; Num 16:40).

We are not told how the Israelites came into possession of the city Kadesh- Barnea, as seems implied in the narrative of their second arrival there, nor who wvere its previous occupants. The probability is that these last were a remnant of the Horites, who, after their expulsion by Edom from Mount Seir SEE EDOM, may have here retained their last hold on the ter itory between Edom and the Canaanitish Amorites of "the south." Probably  Israel took it by force of arms, which may have induced the attack of "Arad the Canaanite," who would then feel his border immediately threatened (Num 33:40; Num 21:1). This warlike exploit of Israel may perhaps be alluded to in Judges Num 21:4 as the occasion when Jehovah "went out of Seir" and "marched out of the field of Edom" to give his people victory. The attack of Arad, however, though with some slight success at first, only brought defeat upon himself and destruction upon his cities (21:3). We learn from 33:36 only that Israel marched without permanent halt from Eziongeber upon Kadesh. This sudden activity, after their long period of desultory and purposeless wandering, may have alarmed king Arad. The itinerary takes here another stride from Kadesh to Mount Hor. There their being occupied with the burial of Aaron may have given Arad his fancied opportunity of assaulting the rear of their march, he descending from the north whilst they also were facing southwards. In direct connection with these events we come upon a single passage in Deuteronomyr (10:6, 7), which is a scrap of narrative imbedded in Moses's recital of events at Horeb long previous. This contains a short list of names of localities, on comparing which with the itinerary we get some clew to the line of march from the region Kadesh to Ezion-geber southwards. SEE KADESH.

VII. From Kadesh to Canaan.

1. This third division of the Israelites' route is more susceptible of identification than either of the others, after having fixed by the foregoing process some important points, and in its latter portion is quite unmistakable. The Israelites evidently retraced their steps down the 'Arabah, perhaps keeping along its western side, at the farthest distance from the borders of Edom, till they arrived once more at the well-watered tract of the descendants of Jaakan, about half way between Kadesh and Mount Hor, or Mosera, to which they next crossed over, and where Aaron died (Deu 10:6), From this point, again avoiding the territory of the Edomites, they passed over by a considerable deflection, in a south- westerly direction, through wady el-Jerafeh to wady el-Ghudhagidh (which we have before identified with Gudgodah, or Hor-hagidgad), on their former track, around through Jotbath (Deu 10:7), and back again to the Red Sea at Ezion-geber and Elath (Deu 2:8, where, however, the two latter names occur in the reverse order). From this last point, having crossed the plain of the 'Arabah, they doubled the southern extremity of Mount Seir, through wady el-Ithm, and pitched at  Zalmonah, probably in the edge of the eastern desert plain, near the junction of wady el-Amran. Pursuing thence their route northeasterly along the present road that skirts the base of Mount Seir, they next arrived at Punon, which we may locate near the intersection of their route with the Haj road from Damascus. Keeping still along the base of the Mount-Seir range, they next halted at Oboth, situated probably in the region of wady el-Ghuweit, where the first stream takes its rise, emptying into the. Dead Sea from the south.

Pursuing the same road northwards that travelers at this day take along this route, they doubtless passed near Tufileh (Tophel, one of the points in their wanderings, Deu 1:1), and halted at Ije-abarim, probably near the wady el-Ahsy, which runs into wady el- Kurahy, the southern border of Moab. Their next stations are easily identified: the brook Zered can be no other than wady el-Deraah, the two forks of which inclose Kerak; the brook Arnon is conceded to be wady Mojeb; and Dihon-gad is evidently the modern Dhiban. From this last point they appear to have diverged considerably (apparently with a view to meet the hostile Sihon at Jahaz) to the east of the modern road, into the desert, where they passed through several unknown localities (in short stages, while waiting for the return of messengers asking leave of passage), Almon-Diblathaim, Beer, Mattanah, and Nahaliel [see each in its alphabetical place], and then returned by a slight north-westerly circuit to Bamoth (perhaps Jebel-Humeh), apparently some point opposite Pisgah, a peak (specially corresponding probably to Jebel Attarus) of the mountains inclosing the valley of the Jordan on the east. About this time the expedition was sent out against Sihon, Og, and the inhabitants of Bashan; upon the successful return of which they passed northward around the heights of Nebo (probably west of Heshbon), and so across the general range of Abarim by one of the valleys running south-westerly into the Jordan (probably wady Heshban). In this last vicinity they encamped in the plains of Moab, preparatory to crossing the Jordan opposite Jericho. (See each of the stations above-named in its alphabetical place.)

2. When we begin to take up the thread of the story at the second visit to Kadesh, we find that time had, in the interval, been busy at its destructive work, and we thus gain confirmation of the view which has been taken of such second visit. No sooner has the sacred historian told us of the return of the Israelites to Kadesh, than he records the death and burial of Miriam, and has, at no great distance of time, to narrate that of Aaron and Moses. While still at Kadesh a rising against these leaders takes place, on the  alleged ground of a want of water. Water is produced from the rock at a spot called hence Meribah (strife). But Moses and Aaron displeased God in this proceeding, probably because they distrusted God's providence and applied for extraordinary i esources. On account of this displeasure, it was announced to them that they should not enter Canaan. A similar transaction has been already spoken of as taking place in Rephidim (Exo 17:1). The same name, Meribah, was occasioned in that as in this matter. Hence it has been thought that we have here two versions of the same story. But there is nothing surprising, under the circumstances, in the outbreak of discontent for want of water, which may well have happened even more than twice. The places are different, very wide apart; the time is different; and there is also the great variation arising out of the conduct and punishment of Moses and Aaron. On the whole, therefore, we judge the two records to speak of different transactions.

Relying on the ties of blood (Gen 32:8), Moses sent to ask of the Edomites a passage through their territory into Canaan. The answer was a refusal, accompanied by a display of force. We suggest as an explanation of this unnatural churlishness that perhaps the request chanced to be preferred to the native Horite "king" (probably the very Hadad last mentioned in the list in Gen 36:39) rather than to the phylarch of the Esauites contemporary with him (Gen 36:43). SEE ESAU.

The Israelites, therefore, were compelled to turn their face southlward, and, making a turn around the end of the Elanitic gulf, reached Mount Hor, near Petra, on the top of which Aaron died. Finding the country bad for travelling, and their food unpleasant, Israel again broke out into rebellious discontent, and was punished by fiery serpents which bit the people, and many died, when a remedy was provided in a serpent of brass set on the flag-staff (Num 21:4 sq.). There is near Elath a promontory known as the Ras Um Haye, "the mother of serpents," which seem to abound in the region adjacent; and, if we may suppose this the scene of that judgment, the event would thus be connected with the line of march, rounding the southern border of Mount Seir, laid down in Deu 2:8 as being "through the way of the plain (i.e. the 'Arabah) from Elath and from Ezion- geber," whence "turning northward," having "compassed that mountain (Mount Seir) long enough," they "passed by the way of the wilderness of Moab" (Deu 5:3; Deu 5:8). Still going northward, and probably pursuing the caravan route from Damascus, they at length reached the valley of Zered (the brook), which may be the present wady Kerek, that  runs from the east into the Dead Sea. Hence they "removed and pitched on the other side of Arnon, which is in the border of Moab. between Moab and the Amoritest; (Num 21:13). Beer (the well) was the next station, where, finding a plentiful supply of water, and being rejoiced at the prospect of the speedy termination of their journey, the people indulged in music and song, singing "the song of the well" (Num 21:17-18).

The Amorites being requested, refused to give Israel a passage through their borders, and so the nation was again compelled to proceed still in a northerly course. At length, having beaten the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan, they reached the Jordan, and pitched their tents at a spot which lay opposite Jericho. Here Balak, king of the Moabites, alarmed at their numbers and their successful prowess, invited Balaam to curse Israel, in the hope of being thus aided to overcome them and drive them out. The intended curse proved a blessing in the prophet's mouth. While here the people gave way to the idolatrous practices of the Moabites, when a terrible punishment was inflicted, partly by a plague which took off 24,000, and partly by the avenging sword. Moses, being commanded to take the sum of the children of Israel, from twenty years upwards, found they amounted to 600,730, among whom there was not a man of those whom Moses and Aaron numbered in the wilderness of Sinai (Num 26:47; Num 26:64). Moses is now directed to ascend Alarim, to Mount Nebo, in the land of Moab, over against Jericho, in order that he might survey the land which he was not to enter on account of his having rebelled against God's commandment in the desert of Zin (Num 27:12; Deu 32:49). Conformably with the divine command, Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountains of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, and there he died, at the age of 120 years: "His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated" (Deuteronomy 34). Under his successor, Joshua, the Hebrews were forthwith led across the Jordan, and established in the Land of Promise.

Thus a journey, which they might have performed in a few months, they spent forty years in accomplishing, bringing on themselves unspeakable toil and trouble, and, in the end, death, as a punishment for their gross and sensual appetites, and their unbending indocility to the divine will (Num 14:23; Num 26:65). Joshua, however, gained thereby a great advantage, inasmuch as it was with an entirely new generation that he laid the foundations of the civil and religious institutions of the Mosaic polity in  Palestine. This advantage may be assigned as the reason why so long a period of years was spent in the wilderness.

VIII. Literature. — Besides the incidental treatment of this subject in general works on sacred geography, the writings of travelers through the region in ques; tion, and comnentaries on the parts of Scripture relating to it, the following special treatises exist: — Laborde, Commentaire Geographique sur l' Exode et les Nombres (Paris and Leipz. 1841, fol.); Hase, Tabula Synoptica statonum Israelitarum, etc. (Norimb. 1739, fol.); Bertholdt, De rebus a Mose in AEgypto testis (Erl. 1795, 8vo); Plitt, Die 40 jahrige Reisen d. Israeliten durch d. Wuste (Cassel, 1775, 8vo); Calmet, De tranfretatione Erythkraei (in volume 1, page 214 sq. of his Dissertatiors in V.T., Wirceb. 1789, 8vo); Benzel, De transitu Israel per Mare Rubrum (in his Syntagma Dissertt. 2:137 sq.); Michaelis (ed.), Essai sur l'heure du passage des Hebreux de la Mer Rouge (Gottingen, 1758, 8vo); Zeibich, Durchgang d. Israeliten, etc. (in his Verm. Beitr. 1:42 sq.); also De dissidio in enarrando itinere Isr. per Mare (Viteb. 1752, 4to); Reimarus, Durchg. d. Israel. durchs rothe Meer (in Lessing's Beitrage, fragm. 3); Richter, Meer durch welches d. Israel. gegangen. etc. (Lpz. 1778, 8vo); Kleuker, Wanderung d. Israel. durchs rothe Meer (Frankf. 1778, 8vo); Moldenhauer, Prufung d. dritten Fragments (Hamb. 1779, 8vo); Luderwald, Durchg. d. Isr. durchs rothe Meer (Helmst. 1779, 8vo); Doderlein, Fragmente u. Antifragmente, 1:35-112; Ritter, Ueberg. d. Isr. durch d. roths Meer (in Henke's Magaz. 4:291 sq.); treatises, De transitu populi Israel. etc., in the Critici Sacr, Thes. Nov. 1:274, 292, 300; Auspitz, הִלּוּחוֹת בִּאֵר (s. 1. 1818, 8vo); Dietz, Vestimenta Israel. in deasrto (Wittenb. 1676, 4to); Dorsh, De educt. Israel ex AEgypto (Strasb. 1652, 4to); Holste, Iter Isr. ex AEg. ad Canaan (Rost. 1707, 4to); Klein, Israel's Wanderungen (Bamberg, 1839, 8vo); Raumer, Zug der Isr. zus AEgypto nach Canaan (Leipzig 1837, 8vo); Thierbach, id. (ib. eod. 8vo); also Durchg. d. Isr. durch einem Theil d s mittell. Meeres (Erfurt, 1830, 8vo); Unruh, Zug der Isr. aus AEg. nach Canaan (Langensl. 1860, 8vo); Zinck, De transitu Maris Erythraei (Augsb. 1778, 4to); Banadius, Itinerarium filiorum Israel (Antw. 1621, fol.); Lightfoot, Itinera Israelitarum (Works, 2:415); Anon. Journeys of the Children of Israel (Lond. 1832, 18mo); Seaton; (Church in the Wilderness (London, 1821, 2 vols. 12mo); Alexander, De exitu ex AEgypto (Hist. Ecclesiastes 2:1117); Bp. Lloyd, Origins of Jewish Church (in Whiston's Sacred History, 1:46); Berton, L'itineraire des Israelites (Par. 1860, 4to);  Tischendorf; De Isr. per Mare Rubrum transita (Lips. 1847, 8vo); Miss Corbaux, Exodus Papyri (London, 1855, 8vo); Krummacher, Israel's Waunderings in the Wilderness (London, 1837-8, 2 volumes, 12mo); Bram, Israel's Wanderung von Gosen bis zum Sinai (Elbeuf, 1859, 8vo); Forster, Israel in the Wilderness (Lond. 1865, 8vo); see the Stud. u. Krit. 1839, 2:397 sq.; Jour. Sac. Lit. April, 1859; April, 1860. The best map of the region where the passage of the Red Sea, was effected is Linant's, in the Atlas of the official surveys for the Suez Canal, entitled "Percement de l'lsthme de Suez" (Paris, 1855 sq.). SEE WILDERNESS.

## Exodus[[@Headword:Exodus]]

             (Gr. ῎Εξοδος, an exit; in the Hebrew canon וְאֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת, ve-l'leh shemoth', its initial words, or simply שְׁמוֹת; in the Masora to Gen 24:8 called נזיקין see Buxt. Lex. Talm. col. 1325; Vulig. Exodus), the second book of the law or Pentateuch, so called from the principal event recorded in it, namely, the departure of the Israelites from Egpyt. SEE EXODE. With this book begins the proper history of that people, continuing it until their arrival at Sinai, and the erection of the sanctuary there.

I. Contents. —

1. Preparation for the Deliverance of Israel from their Bondage in Eyypt. — This first section (Exodus 1:50-12:36) contains an account of the following particulars: The great increase of Jacob's posterity in the land of Egypt, and their oppression under a new dynasty which occupied the throne after the death of Joseph (chapter 1); the birth, education, and flight of Moses (chapter 2); his solemn call to be the deliverer of his people (Exo 3:1 to Exo 4:17), and his return to Egypt in consequence (Exo 4:18-31); his first ineffectual attempt to prevail upon Pharaoh, to let the Israelites go, which only resulted in an increase of their burdens (Exo 5:1-21); a farther preparation of Moses and Aaron for their office, together ewith the account of their genealogies (Exo 5:22 to Exo 7:7); the successive signs and wonders, by means of which the deliverance of Israel from the land of hondage is at length accomplished, and the institution of the Passover (Exo 7:8 to Exo 12:36).

2. Narrative of Events from the Departure out of Egypt to the Arrival of the Israelites at Mount Sinai.We have in this section

(a.) the departure and (mentioned in connection with it) the injunctions then given respecting the Passover and the sanctification of the first- born (Exo 12:37 to Exo 13:16); the march to the Red Sea, the passage through it, and the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the midst of the sea, together with Moses's song of triumph upon the occasion (Exo 13:17 to Exo 15:21);

(b.) the principal events on the journey from the Red Sea to Sinai, the bitter waters at Marah, the giving of quails and of the manna, the observance of the Sabbath, the miraculous supply of water from the rock at Rephidim, and the battle there with the Amalekites (Exo 15:22 to Exo 17:16); the arrival of Jethro in the Israelitish camp, and his advice as to the civil government of the people (18).

3. The Solemn Establishment of the Theocracy on Mount Sinai. — The people are set apart to God as "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exo 19:6); the ten commandments are given, and the laws which are to regulate the social life of the people are enacted (Exo 21:1 to Exo 23:19); an angel is promised as their guide to the Promised Land, and the covenant between God and Moses, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy elders, as the representatives of the people, is most solemnly ratified (Exo 23:20 to Exo 24:18); instructions are given respecting the tabernacle, the ark, the mercy-seat, the altar of burnt-offering, the separation of Aaron and his sons for the priest's office, the vestments which they are to wear, the ceremonies to be observed at their consecration, the altar of incense, the laver, the holy oil, the selection of Bezaleel and Ahmoliab for the work of the tabernacle, the observance of the Sabbath and the delivery of the two tables of the law into the hands of Moses (Exo 25:1 to Exo 31:18); the sin of the people in the matter of the golden calf, their rejection in consequence, and their restoration to God's favor at the intercession of Moses (Exo 32:1 to Exo 34:35); lastly, the construction of the tabernacle, and all pertaining to its service in accordance with the injunctions previously given (Exo 35:1 to Exo 40:38).

This book, in shout, gives a sketch of the early history of Israel as a nation: and the history has three clearly marked stages. First we see a nation enslaved; next a nation redeemed; lastly a nation set apart, asnd, through the blending of its religious and political life, consecrated to the service of God. The close literarv connection between the books of Genesis and Exodus is clearly marked by the Hebrew conjunctive particle ו(vay),  "and," with which the latter begins, and still more by the recapitulation of the name of Jacob's sons who accompanied him to Egypt, abridged from the fuller account in Gen 46:8-17. Still the book of Exodus is not a continuation in strict chronological sequence of the preceding history; for a very considerable interval is passed over in silence, saving only the remark, "And the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and eaxed exceedingly mighty; and the land was filled with them" (Exo 1:7). The pretermission of all that, concerned Israel during this period and their intercourse with the Egyptians, instead of being an indication, as Rationalists allege, of the fragmentary character of the Pentateuch, only shows the sacred purpose of the history, and that, in the plan of the writer, considerations of a merely political interest were entirely subordinate to the divine intentions already partially unfolded in Genesis, and to be still farther developed in the course of the present narrative regarding the national constitution of the seed of Abraham.

II. Unity. — According to Von Lengerke (Kenaan, 88, 90), the following portions of the book belong to the original or Elohistic document: Exo 1:1-14; Exo 2:23-25; Exo 6:2 to Exo 7:7; Exo 12:1-28; Exo 12:37-38; Exo 12:40-51 (Exo 13:1-2, perhaps); 16; Exo 19:1; Exodus 20; Exodus 25-31; Exodus 35-40. Stihelin (Krit. Unterss.) and De Wette (Einleitung) agree in the main with this division. Knobel, the most recent writer on the subject, in the introduction to his commentary on Exodus and Leviticus, has sifted these books still muore carefully and with regard to many passages has formed a different judgment. He assigns to the Elohist: Exo 1:1-7; Exo 1:13-14; Exo 2:23-25, front ויאנחו, Exo 6:2 to Exo 7:7; except Exo 6:8; Exo 7:8-13; Exo 7:19-22; Exo 8:1-3; Exo 8:11 from ולא, and Exo 8:12-15; Exo 9:8-12; Exo 9:35; Exo 11:9-10; Exo 12:1-23; Exo 12:28; Exo 12:37 a,  Exo 12:40-51; Exo 13:1-2; Exo 13:20; Exo 14:1-4; Exo 14:8-9; Exo 14:15-18 (except מה תצעק אלי in Exo 14:15, and מט ָונטה את in Exo 14:16), Exo 14:21-23, and Exo 14:26-29 (except Exo 14:27 from וישב); Exo 15:19; Exo 15:22-23; Exo 15:27; Exo 16:1-2; Exo 16:9-26; Exo 16:31-36; Exo 17:1; Exo 19:2 a; Exo 19:25 to Exo 31:1; Exo 31:12-17 in the main; Exo 35:50-40:38.

A mere comparison of the two lists of passages selected by these different writers as belongiuug to the original document is sufficient to show how very uncertain all such critical processes must be. The first, that of Lengerke, is open to many objections, which have been arged by Havernick (Einleit. in der Pent. § 117), Ranke, and others. Thus, for instance, 6:6, which all agree in regarding as Elohistic, speaks of great judgments ( מַשְׁפָּטַים גְּדֹלַים in the plural), wherewith God would redeem Israel, and  yet not a word is said of these in the so-called original document. Again, Exo 12:12; Exo 12:23; Exo 12:27 contains the announcement of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, but the fulfillment of the threat is to be found, according to the critics, only in the later Jehovistic additions. Hupfeld has tried to escape this difficulty by supposing that the original documents did contain an account of the slaying of the first-born, as the institution of the Passover in 12:12, etc., has clearly a reference to it: only he will not allow that the story as it now stands is that account. But even then the difficulty is only partially removed, for thus one judgment only is mentioned, not many (Exo 6:6). Knobel has done his best to obviate this glaring inconsistency. Feeling no doubt that the ground taken by his predecessors was not tenable, he retains as a part of the originual work much which they had rejected. It is especially worthy of notice that he considers sonue at least of the miraculous portions of the story to belong to the older document, and so accounts for the expression in 6:6. The changing of Aaron's rod into a serpent, of the waters of the Nile into blood, the plague of frogs, of musquitoes (A.V. lice), and of boils, and the destruction of the first-born, are, according to Knobel, Elohistic. He points out what he considers here links of connection, and a regular sequence in the narrative. He bids us observe that Jehovah always addresses Moses, and that Moses directs Aaron howe to act. The miracles, then, are arranged in order of importance: first there is the sign which serves to accredit the mission of Aaron; next follow three plagues, which, however, do not touch men, sand these are sent through the instrumentality of Aaron; the fourth plague is a plague upon man, and here Moses takes the most prominent part; the fifth and last is accomplished by Jehovah himself. Thus the miracles increase in intensity as they go on. The agents likewise rise in dignity. If Aaron with his rod of might begins the work, he gives way afterwards to his greater brother, whilst for the last act of redemption Jehovah employs he human agency, but himself with a mighty hand and outstretched arm effects the deliverance of his people. The passages thus selected have no doubt a sort of connection, but it is in the highest degree arbitrary to conclude that because portions of a work may be omnitted without seriously disturbing the sense, these portions do not belong to the original Work, but must be regarded as subsequent embellishments and additions.

Again, all agree in assigning chapters 3 and 4 to the Jehovist. The call of Moses, as there described, is said to be merely the Jehovistic parallel to Exo 6:2 to Exo 7:7. Yet it seems improbable that the Elohist should  introduce Moses with the bare words, "And God spake to Moses" (Exo 6:2), without a single word as to the previous history of so remarkable a man. So argues Havernick, and, as it appears to us, not without reason. It will be observed that none of these critics attempt to make the divine names a criterion whereby to distinguish the several documents. Thus, in the Jehovistic portion (Exo 1:15-22), De Wette is obliged to remark, with a sort of uneasy candor, "but Exo 1:17; Exo 1:20, Elohim (?)," and again (Exo 3:4; Exo 3:6; Exo 3:11-15), "here seven times Elohim." In other places there is the same difficulty as in Exo 19:17; Exo 19:19, which Stahelin, as well as Knobel, gives to the Jehovist. In the passages in chapters 7, 8, 9, which Knobel classes in the earlier record, the name Jehovah occurs throughout. It is obvious, then, that there must be other means of determining the relative antiquity of the different portions of the book, or the attempt to ascertain which are earlier and which are later must entirely fail.

Accordingly, certain peculiarities of style are supposed to be characteristic of the two documents. Thus, for instance, De Wette (Einl. § 151, S. 183) appeals to פרה ורבה, Exo 1:7; בעצμ הי הזה Exo 12:17; Exo 12:41; ברית הסים, Exo 6:4; the formula וירבר יי אל משה לאמר Exo 25:1; Exo 30:11, etc.; צבאות, Exo 6:26; Exo 7:4; Exo 12:17; Exo 12:41; Exo 12:51; בין הערבים, Exo 12:6; Exo 29:41; Exo 30:8, and other expressions, as decisive of the Elohist. Stahelin also proposes on very similar grounds to separate the first fr(om the second legislation. "Wherever," he says, "I find mention of a pillar of fire, or of a cloud (Exo 33:9-10), or an 'angel of Jehovah,' as Exodus 23, 24, or the phrase 'flowing with milk and honey,' as Exo 13:5; Exo 33:3 ... where nmention is made of a coming down of God, as Exo 34:5, or where the Canaanitish nations are numbered, or the tabernacle supposed to be without the camp (Exo 33:7), I feel tolerably certain that I am reading the words of the author of the second legislation (i.e., the Jehovist)." But these nice critical distinctions are very precarious, especially in a stereoty-ped language like the Hebrew.

Unfortunately, too, dogmatical prepossessions have been allowed some share in the controversy. De Wette and his school chose to set down everything which savored of a miracle as proof of later authorship. The love of the marvelous, which is all they see in the stories of miracles, according to them could not have existed in an earlier and simpler age. But  on their oen hypothesis this is a very extraordinary view; for the earlier traditions of a people are not generally the least wonderful, but the reverse; and one cannot thus acquit the second eriter of a design in embellishing his narrative. However, this is not the place to argue with those who deny the possibility of a miracle, or who make the narration of miracles proof sufficient of later authorship. Into this error Knobel, it is true, has not fallen. By admitting some of the plagues into his Elohistic catalogue, he shows that he is at least free from the dogmatic prejudices of critics like De Wette. But his own critical tests are not conclusime. And the way in which he cuts verses to pieces, as in Exo 8:11, and Exo 13:15-16, where it suits his purpose, is so completely arbitrary, and results so evidently from the stern constraint of a theory, that his labors in this direction are not more satisfactory than those of his predecessors.

On the whole, there seems mumch reason to doubt whether critical acumen will ever be able plausibly to distinguish between the original and the supplement in the book of Exodus. There is nothing indeed forced or improbable in the supposition either that Moses himself incorporated in his memoil a ancient tradition, whether oral or written, or that a writer later thant Moses made use of materials left by the great legislator in a somewhat fragmentary form. There is an occasional abruptness in the narrative, which suggests that this may possibly have been the case, as in the introduction of the genealogy, Exo 6:13-27. The remarke in Exo 11:3; Exo 16:35-36, lead to the same conclusion. The apparent confusion at 11:1-3 may be explained by regarding these verses as parenthetical. Inasmuch, lowever, as there exists no definite proof or knowledge of any later editor, except it he Joshua or Ezra, to whom isolated and unimportant additions may be attributed, we are not warranted in attributing the book to any other author than Moses. SEE PENTATEUCH.

III. Credibility. — Almost every historical fact mentioned in Exodus has at some time or other been called in question; but it is certain that all investigation has hitherto only tended to establish the veracity of the narrator. A comparison with other writers and an examination of the monuments confirm, or at least do not contradict, the most material statements of this book. Thus, for instance, Manetho's story of the Hyksos, questionable as much of it is, and differently as it has been interpreted by different writers, points at least to some early connection between the Israelites and the Egyptians, and is corroborative of the fact implied in the  Pentateuch that, at the time of the Israelitish sojourn, Egypt was ruled by a foreign dynasty. SEE EGYPT. Manetho speaks, too, of strangers from the East who occupied the eastern part of Lower Egypt; and his account shows that the Israelites had become a numerous and formidable people. According to Exo 12:37, the number of men, besides women and children, who left Egypt was 600,000. This would give for the whole nation about two millions and a half. There is no doubt some difficulty in accounting for this immense increase, if we suppose (as on many accounts seems probable) that the actual residence of the children of Israel was only 215 years. We must remember, indeed, that the number who went into Egypt with Jacob was considerably more than "threescore and ten souls" SEE CHRONOLOGY; we must also take into account the extraordinary fruitfulness of Egypt (concerning which all writers are agreed — Strabo, 15:478; Aristot. Hist. Anim. 7:4; Pliny, H. N. 7:3; Seneca, Qu. Nat. 3:25, quoted by Halvernick), and especially of that part of it in which the Israelites dwelt; and, finally, we must take into the account the "mixed multitude" that accompanied the Israelites (Exo 12:38).

According to De Wette, the story of Moses's birth is mythical, and arises from an attempt to account etymologically for his name. But the beautiful simplicity of the narrative places it far above the stories of Romulus, Cyrus, and Semiramis, with which it has been compared (Knobel, page 14). As regards the etymology of the name, there can be very little doubt that it is Egyptian (from the Copt. mo, "water," and si, "to take"), and if so, the author has merely played upon the name. But this does not prove that the whole story is nothing but a myth. Philology as a science is of very modern growth, and the truth of history does not stand or fail with the explanation of etymologies. The same remark applies to De Wette's objection to the etymology in 2:22.

Other objections are of a very arbitrary kind. Thus Knobel thinks the command to destroy the male children (1:15 sq.) extremely improbable, because the object of the king was not to destroy the people, but to make use of them as slaves. To require the midwives to act as the enemies of their own people, and to issue an injunction that every son born of Israelitish parents should be thrown into the Nile, was a piece of downright madness of which he thinks the king would not be guilty. But we do not know that the midwives were Hebrew; they may have been Egyptian; and kings, like other slave-owners, may act contrary to their interest in obedience to their fears or their passions; indeed, Knobel himself compares  the story of king Bocchoris, who commanded all the unclean in his land to be cast into the sea (Lysim. ap. Josephus, c. Apion. 1:34), and the destruction of the Spartan helots (Plutarch, Lycnrg. 28). He objects further that it is not easy to reconcile such a command with the number of the Israelites at their exode. But we suppose that in very many instances the command of the king would be evaded, and probably it did not long continue in force.

Again, De Wette objects to the call of Moses that he could not have thus formed the resolve to become the savior of his people, which, as Havernick justly remarks, is a dogmatical, not a critical decision.

It has been alleged that the place, according to the original narrative, where God first appeared to Mosi was Egypt, God making himself known as Jehovah, that being the first intimation of the name (Exo 6:2). Another account, it is further alleged, places the scene at Horeb (Exo 3:2), God appearing as the God of the patriarchs (Exo 3:6), and declaring his name Jehovah (Exo 3:14); while a third makes Midian the scene of the interview (Exo 4:19). These assumptions require no refutation. It need only be remarked that the name Jehovah in Exo 6:2 necessarily presupposes the explanation given of it in Exo 3:14. Further, Moses's abode in Midian, and connection with Jethro, were matters, Knobel affirms, quite unknown to the older writer, while his statement that Moses was eighty years old when he appeared before Pharaoh (Exo 7:7), is declared irreconcilable with the supplementary narrative which represents him as a young man at the time of his flight from Egypt (Exo 2:11), and a son by Zipporah, whom he married probably on his arrival in Midian, is still young when he returned to Egypt (Exo 4:20; Exo 4:25; Exo 18:2). There can be no question that from Moses' leaving Egypt till his return thither a considerable time elapsed. It is stated in Exo 2:23 as "many days," and by Stephen (Act 7:30) as forty years. But it is not necessary to suppose that his abode in Midian extended over the whole, of that period. The expression וִיֵּשֶׁב, "he sat down," or settled (Exo 2:15), may only point to Midian as the end of his wanderings; or if otherwise, his marriage need not have followed immediately on his arrival, or there may have been a considerable interval between the birth of his two sons. The silence, indeed, of this part of the narrative regarding the birth of the second son may possibly be referrible to this circumstance, more probably indicated, however, by the different feelings of the father as expressed in the names Gershom and Eliezer  (Exo 2:22; Exo 18:4). The order of these names is perplexing to expositors who conceive that the first thoughts of the fugitive would have been thankfulness for his safety, and that only afterwards would spring up the feelings of exile. But if the name Eliezer was bestowed in connection with the preparation to return to Egypt, and particularly with the intimation "all the men are dead which sought thy life" (Exo 4:19), the whole is strikingly consistent. Another instance of the alleged discrepancies is that, according to one account, Moses' reception from his brethren was very discouraging (Exo 6:9), whereas the other narrative describes it as quite the reverse (Exo 4:31). De Wette calls this a striking contradiction, but it is only such when the intermediate section (Exo 5:19-23), which shows the change that in the interval had occurred in the prospects of the Israelites, is violently ejected from the narrative — a process fitted to produce contradictions in any composition. SEE MOSES.

The only alleged anachronism of importance in this book is the remark relative to the continuance of the manna (Exo 16:35), which would seem to extend it beyond the time of Moses, particularly when compared with Jos 5:11-12, according to which the manna ceased not until after the passage of the Jordan. But, as remarked by Hengstenberg, it is not of the cessation of the manna that the historian here writes, but of its continuance. Besides, "forty years" must be taken as a round number, for the manna, strictly speaking, lasted about one month less (Exo 16:1). SEE MANNA.

The ten plagues are physically, many of them, what might be expected in Egypt, although in their intensity and in their rapid succession they are clearly supernatural. Even the order in which they occur is an order in which physical causes are allowed to operate. The corruption of the river is followed by the plague of frogs. From the dead frogs are bred the gnats and flies; from these came the murrain among the cattle land the bolls on men; and so on. Most of the plagues, indeed, though of course in a much less aggravated form, and without such succession, are actually experienced at this day in Egypt. Of the plague of locusts it is expressly remarked that "before them were no such locusts, neither after them shall be such." And all travelers in Egypt have observed swarms of locusts, brought generally by a southwest wind (Denon, however, mentions their coming with an east wind), end in the winter or spring of the year. This last fact agrees also with our narrative. Lepsius speaks of being in a "regular snow-drift of locusts," which came from the desert in hundreds of  thousands to the valley. "At the edge of the fruitful plain," he says, "they fell down in showers." This continued for six days, indeed in weaker flights much uonger. He also saw hail in Egypt. In January, 1843, he and his party were surprised by a storm. "Suddenly," he writes, "the storm grew to a tremendous hurricane, such as I have never seen in Europe, and hail fell upon us in such masses as almost to turn day into night." He notices, too, an extraordinary cattle murrain "which carried off 40,000 head of cattle" (Letters from AEgypt, Eng. transl. pages 49, 27, 14). SEE PLAGUES (OF EGYPT).

The institution of the Passover (chapter 12) has been subjected to severe criticism. This has also been called a mythic fiction. The alleged circumstances are not historical, it is said, but arise out of a later attempt to explain the origin of the cememony and to refer it to the time of Moses. The critics rest mainly on the difference between the directions given for the observance of this the first, and those given for subsequent passovers. But there is no reason why, considering the very remarkable circumstances under which it was instituted, the first Passover should not have had its own peculiar solemnities, or why instructions should not then have been given for a somewhat different observance for the future. SEE PASSOVER.

In minor details the writer shows a remarkable acquaintance with Egypt. Thus, for instance, Pharaoh's daughter goes to the river to bathe. At the present day, it is true that only women of the lower orders bathe in the river. But Herodotus (2:35) tells us (what we learn also from the monuments) that in ancient Egypt the women were under no restraint, but apparently lived more in public than the men. To this must be added that the Egyptians supposed a sovereign virtue to exist in the Nile waters. The writer spaks of chariots and "chosen chariots" (Exo 14:7) as constituting an important element in the Egyptian army, and of the king as leading in person. The monuments amply confirm this representation. The Pharaohs lead their armies to battle, and the armies consist entirely of infantry and chariots. SEE CHARIOT.

As the events of this history are laid in Egypt and Arabia, we have ample opportunity of testing the accuracv of the Mosaical accounts, and surely we find nowhere the least transgression against Egyptian institutions and customs; on the contrary, it is most evident that the author had a thorough knowledge of the Egyptian institutions and of the spirit that pervaded them. Exodus contains a mass of incidents and detailed descriptions which  have gained new force from the modern discoveries and researches in the field of Egyptian antiquities (comp. Hengstenberg, Die Bucher Mosis und AEgypten, Berlin, 1841). The description of the passage of the Israelites through the desert also evinces such a thorough familiarity with the localities as to excite the utmost respect of scrupulous and salentific travelers of our own time for the authenticity of the Pentateuch (comp. ex. gr. Raumer, Der Zug der Israeliten aus Egypten nach Canaan, Leipz. 1837).

The arrangements of the tabernacle, described in the second part of Exodus, likewise throw a favorable light on the historical authenticity of the preceding events; and the least tenable of all the objections against it are, that the architectural arrangements of the tabernacle were too artificial, and the materialas and richness too costly and precious for the condition and position of the Jews at that early period, etc. But the critics seem to have overlooked the fact that the Israelites of that period were a people who had come out from Egypt, a people possessing wealth, Egyptian culture and arts, which we admire even nmow, in the works which have descended to us from ancient Egypt; so that it cannot seem strange to see the Hebrews in possession of the materials or artistic knowledge requisite for the construction of the tabernacle. Moreover, the establishment of a tent as a sanctuary for the Hebrews can only be explained from their abode in the desert, being in perfect unison with their then roving and nomadic life; and it is therefore a decided mistake in those critics who give to the sacred tent a later date than the Mosaical; while other critics (such as De Wette, Von Bohlen, Vatke) proceed much more consistently with their views by considering the narrative of the construction of a sacred tabernacle to be a mere fiction in Exodus, introduced for the purpose of ascribing to the Temple of Solomon a higher antiquity and authority. However, independently of the circumstance that the Temple necessarily presupposes the existence of a far older analogous sanctuary, the whole process of such a forced hypothesis is but calculated to strike out a portion from the Jewish history on purely arbitrary grounds.

The extremely simple and sober style and views throughout the whole narrative afford a sure guarantee for its authenticity and originality. Not a vestige of a poetical hand can b e discovered in Exodus 18; not even the most sceptical critics can deny that we tread here on purely historical ground. The same may fairly be maintained of chapter 20-23. How is it then possible that one and the same book should contain so strange a  mixture of truth and fiction as its opponeemts assert to be found in it? The most striking proofs against such an assumption are, in particular, the accounts, such as in Exodus 32 sq., where the most vehement complaints are made against the Israelites, where the high-priest of the covenant- people participates most shamefully in the idolatry of his people. All these incidents are described in plaen and clear terms, without the least vestige of later embellishmemets and false extolling of former ages. The Pentatemmch, some critics assert, is written for the interest and in favor of the hierarchy ; but can there be more anti-hierarchical details than are founed in that book? The whole representation indicates the strictest impartiality and truth.

IV. The authorship and date of the book will be discussed under PENTATEUCH.

V. (Commentaries, etc. — The following is a list of exegetical helps on the whole book, the most important being designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, Commentarii (in Opp. 2:110); Selecta (ib. 2:121); also Homiliae (ib. 2:129); Ephraem Syrus, Explanatio (in his Opp. 4:194); Isidore, Commentaria (in his Opp.); Theodoret, Questiones (in his Opp. I, 1); Hugo a St. Victoire, Adnotationes (in his Opp. 1); Aben-Esra, Commentar. (Prague, 1840, 8vo); Bede, Explanatio (in his Opp. 4); Quastiones (ib. 8); Rupert, In Exodus (in his Opp. 1:150); Zuingle, Adnotationes (Tigurini, 1527); Brent, Commentatio (in his Opp. 1); Ziegler, Commentarii (Basil. 1540, fol.); Phrygio, Commentarius (Tub. 1543, 4to); Lippoman, Catena (Par. 1550; Leyd. 1657, fol.); Chytraeus, Enarrationes (Vitemb. 1556, 1563, 1579, 8vo); Galasius, Commentarias (Genev. 1560, fol.); Strigel, Commentarius (Lips. 1566, 1572; Brem. 1585, 8vo); Simler, Commentarius (Tigur. 1584, 1605, fol.); Ystella, Commentaria (Romans 1601, fol.); Pererius, Disputationes (Ingolst. 1601, 4to); \*Mechilthea, Commentarius (in Ugolini Thesaurus, 14); Willet, Commentarie (London, 1608, 1622, 2 vols. fol.); Rung, Praelectiones (Vitemb. 1614, 8vgo); Babington, Notes (in Works, page 165); Reuter, Commentarius (Francf. 1616, 4to); \*Rivetus, Commentarii (L.B. 1634, 4to); Jackson, Paraphrase (in Works, 9:384); De la Havy, Commentarii (Paris 1639, 1641, 2 volumes fol.); Lightfoot, Gleanings (Lond. 1643, 4to); Sylvius, Commentarius (Duac. 1644, 4to); Cartwright, Adnotationes (Lond. 1653, 8vo); Calixtus, Exposatio (Helmst. 1641, 1654, 4to); Cocceius, Observationes (in his Opp. 1:136); Hughes, Exposition (Lond.  1672, fol.); \*Patrick, Commentary (Lond. 1697, 4to); Hagemann, Betrachtungen (Brunsw. 1738, 4to); Torellis, Animadversiones (Lips. 1746, 4to); Haitsma, Commentarii (Franc. 1771, 4to); Hopkins, Notes (London, 1784, 4to); \*St. Cruce, Hermentia (Heidelb. 1787, 4to); \*Horsley, Notes (in Bib. Criticism, 1:47); Cockburn, Credibility, etc. (Lond. 1809,8vo); \*Rosenmuller, Scholia (Lips: 1822, 8vo); Newnham, Illustrations (Lond. n. d. 8vo); Vizard, Commentary (London, 1838, l2mo); Buddicom, Exodus (2d ed. Liverp. 1839, 2 volumes, 12mo); Trower, Sermone (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Kitto, Illustration (Daily Bible Illust. 2); \*Bush, Notes (N.Y. 1852, 2 volumes, 12mo); Cumming, Readings (Lond. 1853, 8vo); \*Kalisch, Commentary (London, 1855, 8vo); Osburn, Israel in Egypt (London, 1856, 12mo); \*Knobel, Erkurung (Lpz. 1857, 8vo); Howard, Notes (Cambr. 1857, 8vo); \*Keil and Delitzsch, Comment. (from their Bibelwerk, Edinb. 1861, 8vo); \*Lanae, Comment. (in his Bibelwerk, 2, Lpz. 1864, 8vo); \*Murphy, Comment. (Edinb. 1866, Andov. 1868, 8vo). SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

## Exomologesis[[@Headword:Exomologesis]]

             (ἐξομολόγησις, confession). The word was used in the ancient Church to denote not only confession in words, but also the various acts required of penitents to give expression to sorrow for sin, and resolution of amendment.

1. It is common with Romanist writers, when "they meet with the word exomologesis in any of the ancient writers, to interpret it as private or auricular confession, such as is now practiced in the communion of that Church, and imposed upon men as absolutely necessary to salvation. But they who, with greater judgment and ingenuity among themselves, have more narrowly considered the matter, make no scruple to confess that the exomologesis of the ancients signifies a quite different thing, viz. the whole exercise of public penance, of which public confession was a noted part. The learned Albaspinaeus very strenuously sets himself to refute this error in the writers of his own party. Cardinal Bellarmine, says he (Observatt. lib. 2, cap. 26), and Baronius, and Maldonat in his controversies, and Pamelius in his commentaries upon Tertullian and Cyprian, lay it down as a certain truth that the fathers generally take the word exonologesis for private and auricular confession; but, having long and accurately considered all the places where it is mentioned, I cannot come in to their opinion. The fathers, adds he, always use this word when they would describe the  external rites of penance, viz. weeping, and mourning, and self-accusation, and other the like things, which penitents usually practiced in the course of public penance" (Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 18, chapter 3).

2. So anxious was the primitive Church to preserve the voluntary character of penance, that it was deemed unlawful to exhort or invite any one to submit to this kind of discipline. It was required that the offenders should seek it as a favor, and should supplicate for admission among the penitents. The following are the duties or burdens imposed upon them. Penitents of the first three classes — the mourners (flentes), the hearers (audientes), the kneelers or prostrators (genuflectentes or substrati) — were never allowed to stand during public prayers, but were obliged to kneel. Open and public confession before the whole church was to be made with lamentations, tears, and other expressions of grief, and these were to be often repeated. All ornaments of dress were to be laid aside, and all expressions of joy or pleasure to be abandoned. Male penitents were required to cut their hair and shave their beard in token of sorrow, and females were to appear with their hair dishevelled, and wea. ing a veil. During the whole time of penance the candidates were required to abstain from bathing, feasting, and corporeal pleasures lawful at other times. They were forbidden to Imarry during this period of humiliation. In addition, they were obliged to be present at every religious ceremony, and to perform works of love and charity, particularly almsgiving. They were also expected to perform the office of the parabolani in visiting and relieving the sick and burying the dead (Riddle, Christian Antiquities, book 4, chapter 4).

3. The greater litanies are sometimes termed exomologeses, confessions; because fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and confession of sins was usually joined with supplication to avert God's wrath and reconcile him to a sinful people (Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes book 13, chapter 1, § 11).

## Exorcism, Exorcist[[@Headword:Exorcism, Exorcist]]

             (ἐξορκιστής, Act 19:13).

I. In General. — The belief in demoniacal possessions, which may be traced in almost every nation, has always been attended by the professed ability, on the part of some individuals, to release the unhappy victims from their calamity. In Greece, men of no less distinction than both Epicurus (Diog. Laertius, 10:4) and AEschines were sons of women who lived by this art, and both were bitterly reproached, the one by the Stoics, and the  other by his great rival orator Demosthenes (De Cor.), for having assisted their parents in these practices. In some instances this power was considered as a divine gift; in others it was thought to be acquired by investigations into the nature of demons and the qualities of natural productions, as herbs, stones, etc., and of drugs compounded of them, by the use of certain forms of adjurations, invocations, ceremonies, and other observances. Indeed, the various forms of exorcism, alluded to in authors of all nations, are innumerable, varying from the bloody human sacrifice down to the fumes of brimstone, etc. SEE SORCERY.

II. In the Old and New Testaments. — The verb ἐξορκίζω occurs once in the New Testament and once ir. the Sept. version of the Old Testament. In both cases it is used, not in the sense of exorcise, but as a synonym of the simple verb ὁρκίζω, to charge with an oath, to adjure. Compare Gen 24:3 הַשְׁבּיע —, A.V. "I will make thee swear") with 37, and Mat 26:63 with Mar 5:7; and see 1Th 5:27 (ἐνορκίζω, Lachmann, Tischendorf). The cognate noun, however, together with the simple verb, is found once (Act 19:13) with reference to the ejection of evil spirits from persons possessed by them (comp. ἐξόρκωσις, ὁρκόω, Josephus, Ant. 8:2, 5). The use of the term exorcists in that passage, as the designation of a well-known class of persons to which the individuals mentioned belonged, confirms what we know from other sources as to the common practice of exorcism amongst the Jews (see the Talm. Babyl. Yoma, fol. 57:1). That some, at least, of them not only pretended to, but possessed the power of exorcising, appears by our Lord's admission when he asks the Pharisees, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your disciples (υἱοί) cast them out?" (Mat 12:27).

What means were employed by real exorcists we are not informed. David, by playing skilfully on a harp, procured the temporary departure of the evil spirit which troubled Saul (1Sa 16:23). The power of expelling demons Josephus places among the endowments of Solomon, and relates that he left behind have the manner of using exorcisms by which they drive away daemons (for the pretended fragments of these books, see Fabricius, Cod. Pseud. Vet. Test. page 1054). He declares that he had seen a man, named Eleazar, releasing people that were demoniacal, in the presence of Vespasian, his sons, captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. He describes the manner of cure thus: "He put a ring that had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon to the nostrils of the duemoniac; after which he drew out the  demon through his nostrils, and when the man fell down he adjured him to return no more, making still mention of Solomon and reciting the incantations he composed." He further adds, that even Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a cup or basin full of water a little way off, and commanded the daemon as he went out of the man to overturn it and thereby to let the spectators know he had left the man (Ant. 8:2, 5). He also describes the mode of obtaining the root baaras, which, he says, "if it be only brought to sick persons, it quickly drives away the daemons," funder circumstances whih, for their strangeness, may vie with any prescription in the whole science of exorcism (War, 7:6, 3). Among all the references to exorcism, as practiced by the Jews, in the New Testament (Mat 12:27; Mar 9:38; Luk 9:49-50), we find only one instance which affords any clue to the means employed (Act 19:13); from which passage it appears that certain professed exorcists took upon them to call over a demoniac the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth."' Their proceeding seems to have been in conformity with the well-known opinions of the Jews in those days, that miracles might be wrought by invoking the names of the Deity, or angels, or patriarchs, etc., as we learn from Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen, etc., and Lucian (Frag. page 141). The epithet applied in the above text to these exorcists (περιερχόμενοι, Vulgate, circumeuntes Judaei) indicates that they were traveling mountebanks, who besides skill in medicine, pretended to the knowledge of magic. Justin Martyr has an interesting suggestion as to the possibility of a Jew successfully exorcising a devil, by employing the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Dial. cum Tryph. c. 85, page 311, C. See also Apol. II, c. 6, page 45, B, where he claims for Christianity Superior but not necessarily exclusive power in this respect. Compare the statements of Irenmus, adv. Heres. 2:5, and the authorities quoted by Grotius on Mat 12:27). But Justin goes on to say that the Jewish exorcists, as a class, had sunk down to the superstitious rites and usages of the heathen (comp. Pliny, 30:2). SEE DEMON.

The power of casting out devils was bestowed by Christ while on eartb upon the apostles (Mat 10:8), and the seventy disciples (Luk 10:17-19), and was, according to his promise (Mar 16:17), exercised by believers after his ascension (Act 16:18); but to the Christian miracle, whether as performed by our Lord himself or by his followers, the N.T. writers never apply the terms "exorcise" or "exorcist." Nor is the  office of the exorcist mentioned by Paul in his enumeration of the miraculous gifts (1Co 12:9). Mosheim says that the particular order of exorcists did not exist till the close of the third century, and he ascribes its introduction to the prevalent fancies of the Gnostics (cent. 3, 11, c. 4). We notice John's remark upon the silence of John himself in his gospel on the subject of possessions, although he introduces the Jews as speaking in the customary way respecting demons and demoniacal possessions, and although he often speaks of the sick who were healed by the Savior; coupled with the fact, that John wrote his gospel in Asia Minor, where medical science was very flourishing, and where it was generally known that the diseases attributed to demons were merely materal diseases (Jahn, Archaol.: I, 2:232, 477-480; see also Lomeirus, De Vet. Gent. Lustra.; Bekker, Le Alonde Enchante; Van Dale, De divinat. idol. c. 6, page 519 sq.; Amnell, Diss. aid loc. in Acts, Upsal. 1758).

III. In the early Church. —

1. As Christians were supposed to be in constant conflict with the devil, they used not only prayer, but also exorcism, which was held to be a power given to the Church. Thus Tertullian (A.D. 220), speaking of the warfare of the Christian soldier (De Corona Milit. c. 11) with demons, says exorcismis fugavit (he routs them with exorcisms). So in his Apologeticus (c. 23) he says that the "evil spirit will confess himself to be a demon when commanded to speak by any Christian" (jussus a quolibet Christiano). So also Origen, cont. Celsum, lib. 7, ἰδιῶται τὸ τοιοῦτον πράττουσιν (the common unlettered people do the same). "'Oh, could you but hear,' says Cyprian (En. 76), 'and see those demons when they are tortured by us, and afflicted with spiritual chastisement and ve bat anguish, and thus ejected from the bodies of the possessed (obsessorum), moaning and lamuenting,' with human voice, through the power divine, as they feel the rods and stripes they confess the judgment to come.' The exorcists rule with commanding right over the whole army of the insolent adversary. Oftentimes the devil promises to depart, but departs not; but when we come to baptism, then indeed we ought to be assured and confident, because the demon is then oppressed, and the man is consecrated to God and liberated.' The invocation of Christ, attended by the sign; of the cross, and pronounced by persons formally appointed to the office, was the method by which those stupendous effects were usually produced; and one among the many ears which proceeded from this absurd practice was an opinion, which gained some prevalence among the less enlightened  converts, that the object of Christ's mission was to emancipate mankind from thee yoke of their invisible enemy, and that the promised redemption was nothing more than a sensible, liberation from the manifest influence of evil spirits" (Waddington, Church History, chapter 13). The Apostolical Constitutions, 8:26, says: "An exorcist is not appointed, for the prize pertaineth to voluntary goodness and the grace of God, through Christ, by the influence of the Holy Spirit; for he who hath received the gift of healing is declared by revelation from God, the grace that is in him being manifest unto all. But if there be need of him for a bishop, or preslmyter, or deacon, he is appointed accordingly." Thus it appears

(1) that the power of casting out devils was held to exist in the Church;

(2) that as late as the third century it was not held to belong exclusively to the clergy, but to the whole Church, or at least to some among the laity. The use of exorcism seems to have been at first confined to thee case of persons "possessed with devils," ἐνεργούμενοι, who were given into the care of persons set apart for the purpose (Cyprian, Epist. 75, 76). SEE ENERGUMENS. But Cyprian also speaks here of baptismal exorcism (see below).

2. Exorcists. — A special order of exorcists arose as early as the third century. Before that time, although, as has been seen, the power of exorcising was held to be a spiritual gift common to all classes in the Church, it yet appears to have been chiefly exercised by the clergy. On the date of the rise of the order of exorcists, and of their ordination and office, Bingham (Onig. Ecclesiastes book 3, chapter 4) speaks as follows: "'I take Bona's opinion to be the truest, that it came in upon the withdrawing (Rerum Liturg. lib. 1, c. 25, note 17) of that extraordinary and miraculous poweer, which probably emas by degrees, and not at the same time in all places. Cornelius (ap. Euseb. Lib. 6, c. 43), who lived in the third century, reckons exorcists among the inferior orders of the Church of Rome; yet the author of the Constitutions, who lived after him, says it was no certain order (Constit. Apost. lib. 8, c. 26), but God bestowed the gift of exorcising as a free grace upon whom he pleased; and therefore, consonant tc that hypothesis, there is no rule among those Constitutions for giving any ordination to exorcists, as being appointed by God only, and not by the Church. But the credit of the Constitutions is not to be relied upon in this matter; for it is certain by this time exorcists were settled as an order in most parts of the Greek Church, as well as the Latin; which is evident from  th.. Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, in one of whose canons (Cone. Antioch. c. 10) leave is given to the chorepiscopi to promote subdeacons, readers, and exorcists, which argues that those were then all standing orders of the Church. After this exorcists are frequently mentioned among the inferior orders by the writers of the fourth certury, as in the Council of Laodicea (Cone. Laodic. c. 24 and 26), Epiphanius (Expos. Fid. note 21), Paulinus (Natal. 4, S. Felicis.), Sulpicius Severus ( Vit. S. Martin. c. 5), and the Rescripts of Theodosius (Cod. Theodos. lib. 12, Titus 1, De Decurione Leg. 121), and Gratian (id. ib. lib. 16, Titus 2, De Episc. Leg. 24) in the Thaodosian Code, where those emperors grant them the same immunities from civil offices as they do to the other orders of the clergy. Their ordination and office is thus described by the fourth Council of Carthage (Conc. Carth. 4, c. 7: Exorcista quum ordinatur, accipiat de manu episcopi libellum, in quo scripti sunt exorcismi, dicente sibi episcopo: Accipe et commenda memoriae, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super energmeumenum, sive baptizatum, sive catechumenumn): "When an exorcist is ordained, he shall receive at the hands of the bishop a book, wherein the forms of exorcising are written, the bishop saying, Receive thou these and commit them to memory, and have thou power to lay hands upon the energumens, whether they be baptized or only catechumens." These forms were certain prayers, together with adjurations in the name of Christ, commanding the unclean spirit to depart out of the possessed person, which may be collected from the words of Paulinus concerning the promotion of St. Felix to this office, where he says (Natal. 4, S. Felcis.: Primis lector servivit in annis, inde gradum cepit, cui munus voce fideli adjurare malos, et sacris pellere verbis), from a reader he arose to that degree whose office was to adjure evil spirits, and to drive them out by certain holy words. It does not appear that they were ordained to this office by any imposition of hands either in the Greek or Latin Church; but yet no one might pretend to exercise it either publicly or privately, in the church or in any house, without the appointment of the bishop, as the Council of Laodicea directs (Cone. Laod. c. 26); or at least the license of a chorepiscopus, who in that case was authorized (Concil. Antiochen. cap. 10) by the bishop's deputation."

3. Exorcism in Baptism. — In the third century (at least after the Council of Carthage, A.D. 256) we find exorcism used in the catechumenate in preparation for baptism, and also as part of the ordinary ceremony of baptism. Riddle (Christian Antiquities, book 4, chapter 2) gives the  following view of its origin: "Baptism, as the sacrament of the Holy Ghost, contributes to deliver men from the power of Satan and evil spirits; and hence it appears expedient and right at the reception of that rite to renounce the devil and his works. And when the pumeber of candidates for baptism was multiplied from among the heathen, who are spoken of in Scripture as in a peculiar sense sinners (Gal 2:15), and who were regarded as being especially under the power of the prince of darkness, it seemed more particularly needful that admission into the Gospel Church — the kingdom of heaven — should be preceded by a formal abjuration of all heathen and superstitious practices or worship; in one word, by a renunciation of Satan. Such appears to be the most natural and simple account of the origin of exorcism at baptism in the Christian Church. Justin Martyr, the first uninspired writer who describes Christian baptism, knew nothing of this practice, although he was not unacquainted with the custom of exorcising evil spirits in the case of persons possessed. Tertullian, however, treats expressly of this matter, and says that the practice of renouncing the devil on occasion of baptism is founded not on Scripture, but on tradition (De Corona Mil. c. 3). Cyprian also treats of baptismal exorcism (Ep. 76, ad Magy.). At first, indeed, this ceremony was confined to a renunciation of the devil and all his works on the part of the person about to be baptized; and it was not until the fourth century that a form of abjuration by the officiating minister, commanding the evil spirit to depart from the new servant of Christ, was brought into use. And hence it is that some writers, making a distinction between the renunciation (ἀποταγή, abrenuntiatio) and exorcism (ἐξορκισμός), contend that the practice of exorcism was altogether unknown until the fourth, or, as others say, the seventh century. The fact, however, appears to be, that these customs are substantially one and the same, differing only in form. And the true state of the case with respect to baptismal exorcism appears to be as follows:

1. In the first century we find no trace of a renunciation of the devil in baptism.

2. In the second and third centuries this practice was in use, as appears from the testimonies of Tertullian and Cyprian, as well as of later writers who appeal to tradition.

3. In the fourth century the fathers speak of exorcism as not being highly expedient, inasmuch as, without it, children would not be free from the influence of evil spirits (Optat. Milev. De Schism. Donut. lib. 4, c. 6; Basil.  M. De Spiritu Sancto, c. 27; Gregor. Naz. Orat. 40). We find mention of baptismal exorcism also in the canons of the Council of Carthage held in the year 256, and those of the first Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. The exorcists, who were concerned at first only with the energumens, or persons possessed, were afterwards called upon to assist at the baptism of all adults; but, as infant baptism gained ground, the duties of this office became superfluous, and they are very rarely mentioned in worls posterior tothe sixth century."

Cyril of Jerusalem (+ 386) gives a somewhat detailed account of the form of exorcism. The ceremonies used were:

1. Preliminary fasting, prayers, and genuflections. These, however, may be regarded as general preliminaries to baptism.

2. Imposition of hands upon the head of the candidate, who stood with his head bowed down in a submissive posture.

3. Putting off the shoes and clothing, with the exception of an under garment.

4. Facing the candidate to the west, which was the symbol of darkness, as the east was of light. In the Eastern Church he was required to thrust out his hand towards the west, as if in the act of pushing away an object in that direction. This was a token of his abhorrence of Satan and his works, and his determination to resist and repel them.

5. A renunciation of Satan and his works thus: 'I renounce Satan and his works, and his pomps and his services, and all things that are his.' This or a similar form was thrice repeated.

6. The exorcist then breathed upon the candidate either once or three times, and adjured the unclean spirit in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to come out of him. This form of adjuration seems not to have been in use until the fourth century; and these several formalities were apparently introduced gradually and at different times. The whole ceremony was at first confined to the reninciation of ‘the devil and his works' on the part of the person about to be baptized (Coleman, Christian Antziquties, chapter 14, § 9 ; Riddle, 1. c.).

IV. Roman Catholic Church. — In the Roman Catholic Church exorcists constitute one of the four minor orders of the clergy-acolytes, exorcists,  readers, porters (Council of Trent, session 23, chapter 2, of Orders). When initiating the exorcist the bishop gives him a book containing the exorcisms (or the Missal), and says, "Accipe et commend e memori, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super energumenum, sive baptizatum sive catechumenum" (Take this and commit it to memory, and have power to impose hands on persons possessed, be they baptized or catechumens). Every candidate for priests' orders in the Roman Church first receives the four lower orders, including that of exorcist. The process of exorcising water for baptism is given under BAPTISM SEE BAPTISM Children are regarded as belonging to the devil until baptized, and the priest or assisting exorcist blows out the evil spirit by the breath (exsufflation), and also breathes on the child again (insufflation), as a symbol of the gift of the Spirit. So the Rituale: "Sacerdos exsufflat ter in faciem catechumeaii, semel dicens: Exi ab eo (ea), spiritus immunde, et da locum Spiritui Sancto Paraclito.

Hic in modum crucis halet in faciems ipsius dicat; Accipe Spiritum bon im per istam insufflationem, et Dei benedictionem. +Pax tibi." In cases where the priest is to practice exorcism on a person supposed to be "possessed of the devil," he is to prepare himself specially by prayer, fasting, confession, and mass. The ceremony may be performed in the church, or, if the sufferer be ill, at his house; but there must always be witnesses present. "Here, arrayed in robe, cope, and a blue stole, he first sprinkles the subject with holy water, and, kneeling down, prays the All Saints' litany, the Lord's prayer, and Psalms 53, Deus in nomine tuo (in our version Psalms 54); then two prayers in which, making the sign of the cross over the patient, he commands the evil spirit to depart, by the mysteries of the incarnation, the suffering and death, the resurrection and ascension of Christ, the sending of the Spirit, and the coming again to judgment. Thereupon follows the lesson from John 1, In piancipio erat Verbum, with Mar 16:15-18, and Luk 10:17-19. Then he lays both hands upon the head of the energumen, saying, 'Ecce crucem Domini: Jugite pantes adversae: Vicit leo de triba Juda,' and the prayer follows, with the proper formula of exorcism (Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus, etc.): 'I exorcise thee, unclean spirit, in the name of Jesus Christ; tremble, O Satan! thou enemy of the faith, thou foe of mankind, who hast brought death into the world, who hast deprived men of life, and hast rebelled against justice; thou seducer of mankind, thou root of all evil, thou source of avarice, discord, and envy', the priest meanwhile making three crosses, in the name of the Trinity, on the brow and breast of the possessed person. If the evil spirit does not depart, all these ceremonies must be repeated. In regard to the exorcism of  things, the view of St. Paul, that every creature of God, used with thanksgiving, is good, stands true at all times. But in consequence of the curse, which the first sin brought upon all nature, the Church of Rome exorcises beforehand things designed for sacred use, such as the water and salt required for holy water. Beasts also, horses, fields, and fruits, are so treated, more frequently in the Greek Cheurch than in the Roman" (Herzog, Encyclopadia, Bombuarger's transl., 1:255). When a house is infested with evil spirits the priest is sent for, who, on his arrival, sprinkles the place plentifully with holy water, repeats some prayers, and then pronounces the form of exorcism, whereupon it is supposed, the devils depart. Should they again return the ceremony of exorcism is repeated, and again if necessary until at length the Church proves itself victorious over the powers of hell (Encycl. Metropolitana; see also Jeremy Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, § 9, for an account of the forms of exorcism; and the copious collection entitled Thesaurus exorcismorum atque conjurationem terribilim, potentissimorum, efficacissimorum cum practica, probatissima: quibus spiritus maligni, daemones maleficiage omni, de corporibus humanis obsessis, tanquam flagellis fustibusque fugantur, expellantur, doctrinis refertissimus atque uberrimus, Colonins, 1628, 8vo).

V. The Greek Church also continues the order of exorcists and the practice of exorcism. The exorcism of catechumens is designated ἀφορκισμός, and it is thrice admiuinistered in making a catechumen (see Euchologion, cap. εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον). Exorcism is also practiced upon the baptism of infants. The priest, having received the child at the church doer, marks him with the sign of the cross on the forehead, then carries him to the font, where, before his immersion, he is exorcised. The ancient forms are preserved with very little change in modern use. Three forms are employed, which may be found in Schmitt, Morgenland.-griech-russische Kirche (Mainz, 1826, page 141). In Assemanni, Codex Litarg. 2:318 eq., may be found twenty-one forms for exorcising the devil and all evil spirits. In Metrophuanis Critopuli Confessio (1661), cap. 7, de Ecclesia, is the statement that baptism must be performed with prayers and exorcisms (μετὰ εὐχῶν καὶ ἐξορκισμῶν); also (ἔχομεν δὲ ἐξορκισμοὺς παρὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων πατέρων θαυμασίως συντεθειμένους) "we have forms of exorcism admirably prepared by the ancient fathers;" and in cap. 11, de Sacerdotio, he states the duty of the exorcists to be "to exorcise the catechumens and  catechize them" (see Kimmel, Monum. Fid. Ecclesiastes Orient. (Jens, 1840, 8eo).

VI. In Protestant Churches. — Luther approved of exorcism. In his Taufbeichlein he preserved the spirit of the Roman Catholic form of renunciation of the devil. He did not consider it as essential, but as very useful to "remind the people earnestly of the power of sin and the devil." The immediate successors of Luther adopted his views, and they were generally diffused in Saxony, Wutemberg, and the other strongly Lutheran parts' of Germany (Siegel, Alterthiinzer, 2:64; Wiedenfeld, De Exorcismi Origine, etc., Marburg, 1824). In 1583 Heshusius wrote in favor of abolishing its use. Justus Menius, in a treatise Voai Exorcismo, 1590, advocated its retention. Calvin (Instit. 4:12, 19), speaking of the "wax taper" and "exorcism" as used by the Romanists in baptism, says, "I am not ignorant of the ancient origin of this adventitious medley, yet it is lawful for me, and for all the faithful, to reject everything that men have presumed to add to the institution of Christ." In the Swedish Church, when the Augsburg Confession was proclaimed anew at the Council of Upsala, 153, exorcism was retained, in its milder expressions, "as a free ceremony, on account of its utility as an admonition to the audience looking on at the baptism" (Ranke, History of the Papacy, 1:11, Austin's transl., Edinb. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo). Zuinglius agreed with Calvin in rejecting exorcism and from the beginning the Reformed Chirch was disinclined to it. The question became a sort of test between Lutherans and Calvinists. In the Crypto- Calvinistic struggles the question of exorcism played a part, and one of the accusations against Nicolas Crell (v.r.) was that he “sought to extirpate exorcism from the Church, to its great injury (see Boelemer, Jis. Eccl. Protest. 3:843). Among later Lutheran theologians, Gerhardt, Quenstedt, and Hollaz place it among things indifferent; Baur, Baumgarten, and Reinhard urge its abolition. From Reinhard's time it has gradually become obsolete in the Lutheran Church. Since 1822 the "High" Lutherans have attempted to revive its use.

In the Church of England. — In the first liturgy of Edward VI, a form of exorcism at baptism is given. The priest, looking upon the children, was to say, "I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants, whom our Lord Jesus Christ has vouchsafed to call to his holy-baptism, to be made members of his body and of his holy congregation. Therefore, thou accursed spirit, remember thy sentence, remember thy judgment,  remember the day to be at hand wherein thou shalt burn in fire everlasting, prepared for thee and thy angels; and presume not henceforth to exercise any tyranny towards these infants whom Christ hath bought with his precious blood, and by his holy baptism, calleth to be of his flock." SEE BAPTISM.

Bucer's remonstrance against the indiscriminate use of the form of exorcism, on the ground that it would be uncharitable to suppose that all were demoniacs who came to be baptized, was listened to by the Reformers; for in their revision of the Prayer-book in the 5th and 6th of Edward VI, they decided on omitting it altogether. The seventy-second canon of the Church of England forbids any minister attempting to expel a devil or devils, under pain of the imputation of imposture, and cosenage, and deposition from the ministry, except he first obtains the license of the bishop of his diocese, had under his hand and seal (Wheatly, On Common Prayer, chapter 7, § 2). In the form of baptism used in the Church of England, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the question is put to the candidate, "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works?" etc. This is a remnant of the old form of renunciation (connected with the exorcism at the baptism of catechumens), but of exorcism itself there is nothing in their formularies.

Literature. — See, besides the works already cited, Suicer, Thesaurus, 5. ἀφορκισμός, ἐξορκισμός; Stolle, De Origine Exorcismi in Baptismo; Augusti, Denkwurdigkeiten, 7:268 sq.; Bingham, Orig. Eccles., Bohn's ed., 1:435; 2:110 sq.; Augusti, Christ. Archaeologie, 2:427 sq.; 3:402; Ferraris, Promta Bibliotheca, 3:927 sq.; Kraft, Ausfuhrl. Hist. von Exorcismo (Hamburg, 1750, 8vo); Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, book 2, chapter 15; Procter, On Common Prayer, page 365.

## Exordium[[@Headword:Exordium]]

             SEE HOMILETICS; SEE SERMON.

## Exoteric[[@Headword:Exoteric]]

             SEE ESOTERIC.

## Exothoumneni[[@Headword:Exothoumneni]]

             (ἐξωθούμενοι), the first of the four classes of catechumens (q.v.) in the early Church. They were instructed privately outside the Church, and prevented from entering into the Church until they were more fully enlightened. Expectatives, a term employed in the 14th century, when the French pontiffs residing at Avignon assumed to themselves the power of conferring all sacred offices, by which means they raised immense sums of money, calling forth the bitterest complaints from all the nations of Europe. Expectatives were abolished by the Coticil of Constance, March 25, 1436. SEE EXPECTANCY.

## Expectancy[[@Headword:Expectancy]]

             (Lat. expectantia, expectiva, gratia expectiva), in canon law, the name of a prospective claim to an ecclesiastical benefice which has not yet become vacant. At first the German emperors granted expectancies for the first place in every chapter that became vacant after their accession to the throne (jus primae precis). Afaer the eleventh century the popes granted expectancies at first in the shape of a request, and subsequently in the  shape of an order. The expectancy was either for a definite benefice, or for any benefice of a certain class or chapter. The third Council of Lateran (1179), and later papal rescripts, forbade the expectancies, but the popes themselves continued to grant them. They were again restricted by the Council of Constance, and forbidden by the Council of Basel. The Council of Trent totally abolished them, except in cases of bishops and monastic superiors, to whom, in some specified cases, a coadjutor, with the right of succession, was given. In the Protestant state churches the princes have claimed the right to grant expectancies. — Allgem. Real-EncykI. 1:622; Herzog, Real-Encykll. 4:292. (A.J.S.)

## Expectation Week[[@Headword:Expectation Week]]

             the time between Ascension Day and Whitsunday, the period during which the apostles tarried at Jerusalem in expectation of the fulfillment of the Master's promise as to the outpouring of the Comforter. — Procter, On Common Prayer, page 289.

## Expediency[[@Headword:Expediency]]

             fitness of means to ends. On expediency as the ground of morals, see Dwight, Theology, sermon 99; Robert Hall, Complete Works, 1:96; 2:295; Lit. and Theol. Review, 4:388; Wayland, in Bibliotheca Sacra, 1843, page 301; and the article ETHICS SEE ETHICS .

## Experience[[@Headword:Experience]]

             (δοκιμή, Rom 5:4, "proof," as elsewhere rendered), approval of integrity as the result of trial. " The three stages of ὑπομονή, endurance, δοκιμή, approval, and ἐλπίς, hope, are considered by the apostle as proceeding from the sufferings; the first denoting the state of moral earnestness implied in patient and faithful endurance, the second that state of approval as genuine which thence results, and bears within it hope as its blossom" (Olshausen, Comment. in loc.).

## Experience (2)[[@Headword:Experience (2)]]

             Hume's argument from. SEE HUME; SEE MIRACLE.

## Experience (3)[[@Headword:Experience (3)]]

             I. In Philosophy. — “Experience, in its strict sense, applies to what has occurred within a person's own knowledge. Experience, in this sense, of course relates to the past alone. Thus it is that a man knows by experience what sufferings he has undergone in some disease, or what height the tide reached at a certain time and place. More frequently the word is used to  denote that judgment which is derived from experience in the primary sense, by reasoning fiom that in combination with other data. Thus a man may assert, on the ground of experience, that he was cured of a disorder by such a medicine that that medicine is generally beneficial in that disorder; that the tide may always be expected, under such circum. stances, to rise to such a height. Strictly speaking, none of these can be known by experience, but are con. clusionsfrom experience. It is in this sense only that experience can be applied to thefuture, or, which comes to the same thling, to any general fact; as, e.g. when it is said that we know by experience that water exposed to a certain temperature will freeze" (Whately, Logic, app. 1).

Locke (Essay on Human Understand. book 2, chapter 1) assigns experience as the only and universal source of human knowledge. "Whence hath the mind all the materials of reason and knowledge? To this I answer, in one word, from experience; in that all our knowledge is founded, and from that ultimately derives itself. Our observation, employed either about external sensible objects, or about the internal operations of our minds, perceived and reflected on by our. selves, is that which supplies our understanding with all the materials of thinking. These are the fountains of knowledge from whence all the ideas we have, or can naturally have, do spring — that is, sensation and reflection." In opposition to this view, according to which all human knowledge is a posteriori, or the result of experience, it is contended that man has knowledge a priori — knowledge which experience neither does nor can give, and knowledge without which there could be no experience, inasmuch as all the generalizations of experience proceed and rest upon it. "No accumulation of experiments whatever can bring a general law home to the mind of man, because, if we rest upon experiments, our conclusion can never logically pass beyond the bounds of our premises; we can never infer more than we have proved; and all the past, which we have not seen, and the future, which we cannot see, is still left open, in which new experiences may arise to overturn the present theory. And yet the child will believe at once upon a single experiment, as having been once burned by fire. Why? Because a hand divine has implanted in him the tendency to generalize thus rapidly. Because he does it by an instinct of which he can give no account, except that he is so formed by his Maker" (Sewell, Christian Mor. chapter 24). "We may have seen one circle and investigated its properties, but why,- when our individual experience is so circumscribed, do we assume the  same relations of all? Simply because the understanding has the conviction intuitively that similar objects will have similar properties; it does not acquire this idea by sensation or custom; the mind develops it by its own intrinsic force — it is a law of our faculties, ultimate and universal, from vwhich all reasoning proceeds" (Dr. Mill, Essays, page 337). — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.

II. In Religion. —

(1.) Knowledge gained by trial or practice. "A man unacquainted with those spiritual changes in the mind which are mentioned in the Scripture can form no notion of them. He may have some idea of the possibility of the changes called the new birth, sanctification, etc., but he does not understand their nature; they are foolishness to him. Nothing is more common with unregenerate persons than to ridicule as enthusiastic religious experience. But if the constitution of human nature is considered, it will be seen that man has emotions as well as intellect. His passions are original parts of his mental constitution, and must be exercised in religion. They cannot be destroyed. However beautiful religion may be as a theory, its excellency and energy can only be displayed as experienced. Hence the Bible employs the analogous terms tasting, feeling, to indicate the internal enjoyment of a Christian. He has peace through believing. He joys in God, through whom he has received the atonement. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart. He is conascious that he is a new creature" (Farrar, Bibl. Dict. s.v.). "That our experience is always ablolutely pure in time present state cannot be expected; but if it be genuine, it will not fail, through the exercise of Christian diligence, to become more and more pure. The main point, therefore, is to guard well against mistaking the illusions of the imagination for the operation of divince truth an the conscience and the heart (1Th 2:13). SEE AFFECTIONS.

(2.) The most valuable things are most apt to be counterfeited. But Christian experience may be considered as genuine,

1. When it accords with the revelation of God's mind and will, or what he has revealed in his Word. Anything contrary to this, however pleasing, cannot be sound, or produced by divine agency.

2. When its tendency is to promote humility in us: that experience by which we learn our own weakness, and to subdue pride, must be good.  3. When it teaches us to bear with others, and to do there good.

4. When it operates so as to excite us to be ardent in our devotion, and sincere in our regard to God. A powerful experience of the divine favor will lead us to acknowledge the same, and to manifest our gratitude both by constant praise and genuine piety.

(3.) Christian experience, however, may be abused. There are some good people who certainly have felt and enjoyed the power of religion, and yet have not always acted with prudence as to their experience.

1. Some boast of their experiences, or talk of them as if they were very extraordinary; whereas, were they acquainted with others, they would find it not so. That a man may make mention of his experience is no way improper, but often useful; but to hear persons always talking of themselves seems to indicate a spirit of pride, and that their experience cannot be very deep.

2. Another abuse of experience is dependence on it. We ought certainly to take encouragement from past circumstances if we can; but if we are so dependent on past experience as to preclude present exertions, or always expect to have exactly the same assistance in every state, trial, or ordinance, we shall be disappointed. God has wisely ordered it that, though he never will leave his people, yet he will suspend or bestow comfort in his own time; for this very reason, that we may rely on him, and not on the circumstance or ordinance.

3. It is an abuse of experience which introduced at improper times and before improper persons. It is true, we ought never to be ashamed of our profesion; but to be always talking to irreligious people respecting experience, which they know nothing of, is as our Savior says, casting pearls before swine." See Buck, Treatise of Experience; Gurnall, Christian Armor; Edwards, On the Affections; Doddridge, Rise and Progress; Wesley, Sermons.

## Experience Meetings[[@Headword:Experience Meetings]]

             are assemblies of religious persons, who meet for the purpose of relating their experience to each other." ''They are sometimes called covenant and conference meetings, and, in the Methodist Church, class-meetings (q.v.); It has been doubted by some whether these meetings are of any great utility and whether they do not, in some measure, force people to say more than is true, and put up those with pride who are able to communicate their ideas with facility; but to this it has been answered,

1. That the abuse of a thing is no proof of the evil of it.

2. That the most eminent saints of old did not neglect this practice (Psalm 56:16; Mal 3:16).

3. That by a wise and prudent relation of experience the Christian is led to see that others have participated of the same joys and sorrows with himself; he is excited to love and serve God; and animated to perseverance in duty by finding that others, of like passions with himself, are zealous, active, and diligent.

4. That the Scriptures seem to enjoin the frequent intercourse of Christians for the purpose of strengthening each other in religious services (Heb 10:24-25; Col 3:16; Mat 18:20)." SEE CLASS-MEETINGS.

## Expiation[[@Headword:Expiation]]

             "a religious act, by which satisfaction or atonement is made for the commission of some crime, the guilt done away, and the obligation to  punishment cancelled. The chief methods of expiation among the Jews were by sacrifices; and it is important always to recollect that the Levitical sacrifices were of an expiatory character; because as among the Jews sacrifices were unquestionably of divine original, and as the terms taken from them are found applied so frequently to Christ and to his sufferings in the New Testament, they serve to explain that peculiarity under which the apostles regarded the death of Christ, and afford additional proof that it was considered by them, as a sacrifice of expiation, as the grand universal sin-offering for the whole world. For our Lord is announced by John as ‘the Lamb of God;' and that not with reference to meekness or any other moral virtue, but with an accompanying phrase, which would communicate to a Jew the full sacrificial sense of the term employed, 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' He is called 'our Passover, sacrificed for us.' He is said to have given 'himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savor.' As a priest, it was necessary 'he should have somewhat to offer;' and he offered 'himself,' 'his own blood,' to which is ascribed the washing away of sin, and our eternal redemption. He is declared to have put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, to have 'himself purged our sins,' to have 'sanctified the people by his own blood,' to have 'offered to God one sacrifice for sins.'

Add to these, and to innumerable other similar expressions and allusions, the argument of the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, by proving at length that the sacrifice of Christ was superior in efficacy to the sacrifices of the law, he most unequivocally assumes that the death of Christ was a sacrifice and sin-offering; for without that it would no more have been capable of comparison with the sacrifices of the law, than the death of John the Baptist, St. Stephen, or St. James, all martyrs and sufferers for the truth, who had recently sealed their testimony with their blood. This very comparison, we may affirm, is utterly unaccountable and absurd on any hypothesis which denies the sacrifice of Christ; for what relation could his death have to the Levitical immolations and, offerings if it had no sacrificial character? Nothing could, in fact, be more misleading, and even absurd, then to apply those terms which, both among Jewis and Gentiles, were in imse to express the various processes and means of atonement and pecular propitiation, if the apostles and Christ himself did not intend to represent his death strictly as as expiation for sin — misleading, because such would be the natural and necessary inference from the terms themselves which had acquired this as their established meaning; and absurd, because if; as Socinians say they need them metaphorically, there was not even an ideal  resemblance between the figure and that which it was intended to illustrate. So totally irrelevant, indeed, will those terms appear to any notion entertained of the death of Christ which excludes its expiatory character, that to assume that our Lord and his apostles used them as metaphors is profanely to assume themn to be such writers as. would not in any other case be tolerated; writers wholly unacquainted wtih the commonest rules of language, and therefore wholly unfit to be teachers of others, and that not only in religion, but in things of inferior inmportance.

2. "The use of such terms, we have said, would not only be wholly absurd, but criminally misleading to the Gentiles, as well as to the Jews, who were first converted to Christianity. To them the notion of propitiatory offerings, offerings to avert the displeasure of the gods, and which expiated the crimes of offenders, was most familiar, and terms corresponding to it were in constant use. The bold denial of this by Dr. Priestly might well bring upon him the reproof of archbishop Magee, who, after establishing this point from the Greek and Latin writers, observes, 'So clearly does their language announce the notion of a propitiatory atonement, that if we would avoid an imputation on Dr. Priestly's fairness, we are driven, of necessity, to question the extent of his acquaintance with those writers.' The reader may consult the instances given by this writer in No. 5 of his 'Illustrations,' appended to his 'Discourses on the Atonement;' and also the tenth chapter of Grotius's De Satisfactione, whose learning has most amply illustrated and firmly settled this view of the heathen sacrifices. The use to be made of this in the argument is, that as the apostles found the very terms they used with reference to the nature and efficacy of the death of Christ fixed in an expiatory signification among the Greeks, they could not, in honesty, use theml ini a distant figurative sense, much less in a contrary one, without giving their readers due notice of their having invested them with a new import. From ἄγος, a pollution, an impurity, which was to be expiated by sacrifice, are derived ἁγνίζω and ἁγιάζω, which denote the act of expiation; καθαίρω, too, to purify, cleanse, is applied to the effect of expiation; and ἱλάσκομαι denotes the method of propitiating the gods by sacrifice. These, and other words of similar import, are used by the authors of the Septuagint, and by the evangelists and apostles; but they give no premonition of using them in any strange and altered sense; and when they apply them to the death of Christ, they must, therefore, be understood to use them in their received meaning. In like manner the Jews had their expiatory sacrifices, and the terms and phrases used in them are,  in like manner, employed by the apostles to characterize the death of their Lord; and they would have been as guilty of misleading their Jewish as their Gentile readers had they employed them in a new sense, and without warning, which, unquestionably, they never gave.

3. "As to the expiatory nature of the sacrifices of the law, it is not required by the argument to show that all the Levitical offerings were of this character. There were also offerings for persons and for things prescribed for purification, which were identical; but even they grew out of the leading notion of expiatory sacrifice, and that legal purification which resulted from the forgiveness of sins. It is enough to prove that the grand and eminent sacrifices of the Jews were strictly expiatory, and that by them the offerers were released from punishment and death, for which ends they were appointed by the lawgiver. When we speak, too, of vicarious sacrifice, we do not mean either, on the one hand, such a substitution as that the victim should bear the same quantum of pain and suffering as the offender limself; or, on the other hand, that it was put in the place of the offender as a mere symbolical act, by which he confessed his desert of punishment; but substitution made by divine appointment, by which the. victim was exposed to sufferings and death instead of the offender, in virtue of which the offender himself was released. With this view, one can scarcely conceive why so able a writer as archbishop. Magee should prefer to use the term 'vicarious import' rather than the simple and established term 'vicarious,' since the Antinomian notion of substitution may be otherwise sufficiently guarded against, and the phrase 'vicarious import' is certainly capable of being resolved into that figurative notion of mere symbolical action, which, however plausible, does in fact deprive the ancient sacrifices of their typical, and the oblation of Christ of its real efficacy. Vicarious acting is acting for another; vicarious suffering is suffering for another; but the nature and circumstances of that suffering in the case of Christ are to be determined by the doctrine of Scripture at large, and not wholly by the term itself, which is, however, useful for this purpose (and therefore to be preserved), that it indicates the sense in which those who use it understand the declaration of Scripture, 'Christ died for us,' so as that he died not merely for our benefit, but in our stead; in other words, that, but for his having died, those who believe in him would personally have suffered that death which is the penalty of every violation of the law of God.

4. "That sacrifices under the law were expiatory and vicarious admits of abundant proof. The chief objections made to this doctrine are,

(1.) That under the law, in all capital cases, the offender, upon legal proof or conviction, was doomed to die, and that no sacrifice could exempt him from the penalty.

(2.) That in all lower cases to which the law had not attached capital punishment, but pecuniary mulets, or personal labor or servitude upon their non-payment, this penalty was to be strictly executed, and none could plead any privilege for exemption on account of sacrifice; and that when sacrifices were ordained with a pecuniary mulct, they are to be regarded in the light of fine, one part of which was paid to the state, the other to the Church. This was the mode of argument adopted by the author of The Moral Philosopher, and noth ng of weight has been added to these objections since his day. Now much of this may be granted without any prejudice to the argument, and, indeed, is no more than the most orthodox writers on this subject have often remarked. The law under which the Jews were placed was at once, as to them, both a moral and a political law; and the lawgiver excepted certain offenses from the benefit of pardon, because that would have been exemption from temporal death, which was the state penalty. He therefore would accept no atonement for such transgressions. Blasphemy, idolatry, murder, and adultery were the 'presumptuous sins' which were thus exempted; and the reason will be seen in the political relation of the people to God; for, in refusing to exempt them from punishment in this world, respect was had to the order and benefit of society. Running parallel, however, with this political application of the law to the Jews as subjects of the theocracy, we see the authority of the moral law kept over them as men and creatures; and if these 'presumptuous sins' of blasphemy and idolatry, of murder and adultery, and a few others, were the only capital crimes considered politically, they were not the. only capital crimes considered morally; that is, there were other crimes which would have subjected the offender to death but for this provision of expiatory oblations.

The true question, then, is whether such sacrifices were appointed by God, and accepted instead of the personal punishment or life of the offender, which otherwise would have been forfeited, as in the other cases; and, if so, if the life of animal sacrifices was accepted instead of the life of man, then the notion that 'they were ere mulets and pecuniary penalties' falls to the ground, and the vicarious nature of most of the Levitical oblations is established. That other offenses besides those above  mentioned were capital, that is, exposed the offender to death, is clear from this, that all offenses against the law had this capital character. As death weas the sanction of the commandment given to Adam, so any one who transgressed any part of the law of Moses became guilty of death; every inman was ‘accursed,' that is, devoted to die, who 'continued not in all things written in the book of the law.' 'The man only that doeth these things shall live by them' was the rule; and it was, therefore, to redeem the offenders from this penalty that sacrifices were appointed. So, with reference to the great day of expiation, we read, 'For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be clean from all your sins; and this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year' (Lev 16:30-34).

5. "To prove that this was the intention and effect of the annual sacrifices of the Jews, we need do little more than refer to Lev 17:10-11 : 'I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.' Here the blood which is said to make an atonement for the soul is the blood of the victims; and to make an atonement for the soul is the same as to be a ransom for the soul, as will appear by referring to Exo 30:12-16; and to be a ransom for the soul is to avert death. 'They shall give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, that there be no plague among them,' by which their lives might be suddenly taken away. The 'soul' is also here used obviously for the life; the blood, or the life of the victims in all sacrifices, was substituted for the life of man, to preserve him from death, and the victims were therefore vicarious.

6. "The Hebrew word כפר, rendered atonement, signifying primarily to cover, to overspread, has been the subject of some evasive criticisms. It comnes, however, in the secondary sense, to signify atonement or propitiation, because the effect of that is to cover, or, in Scripture meaning, to remit offenses. The Septuagint also renders it by ἐξιλάσκομαι, to appease, to make propitious. It is used, indeed, where the means of atonement are not of the sacrificial kind; but these instances equally serve to evince the Scripture sense of the term, in cases of transgression, to be that of reconoiling the offended deity by averting his displeasure, so that when the atonetment for sin is said to be made by sacrifice, no doubt can  remain that the sacrifice was strictly a sacrifice of propitiation. Agreeably to this conclusion, we find it expressly declared, in the several cases of pecular oblations for transgression of the divine commands, that the sins for which atonement was made by those oblations should be forgiven.

7. "As the notion that the sacrifices of the law emere not vicarious, but mere mulets and fines, is overturned by the general appointment of the blood to be an atonement for the souls, the forfeited lives, of men, so also is it contradicted by particular instances. Let us refer to Lev 6:15-16 : 'If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance in the holy things of the Lord, he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing, and shall add a fifth part thereto, and shall give it to the priest.' Here, indeed, is the proper fine for the trespass; but it is added, 'He shall bring for his trespass unto the Lord a ram without blemish, and the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering, and it shall be forgiven him.' Thus then, so far from the sacrifice being the fine, the fine is distinguished from it, and with the ram only was the atonement made to the Lord for his trespass. Nor can the ceremonies with which the trespass and sin offerings were accompanied agree with any notion but that of their vicarious character. The worshipper, conscious of his trespass, brought an animal, his own property, to the door of the tabernacle. This was not a eucharistical act; not a memorial of mercies received, but of sins committed. He laid his hands upon the head of the animal, the symbolical act of transferring punishment, then slew it with his own hand, and delivered it to the priest, who burned the fat and part of the animal upon the altar; and, having sprinkled part tof the blood upon the altar, and in some cases upon the offerer himself; poured the rest at the bottom of the maltar. And thus, we are told, 'The priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.' So clearly is it made manifest by these actions, and by the description of their nature and end, that the animal bore the punishment of the offender, and that by this appointment he was reconciled to God, and obtained the forgiveness of his offenses.

8. "An equally strong proof that the life of the animal sacrifice was accepted in the place of the life of man is afforded by the fact that atonement was required by the law to be made, by sin offerings and burnt offerings, for even bodily distempers and disorders. It is not necessary to the argument to explain the distinctions between these various oblations, nor yet to inquire into the reason for requiring propitiation to be made for  corporal infirmities, which in many cases could not be avoided. They were, however, thus connected with sin as the cause of all these disorders; and God, who had placed his residence among the Israelites, insisted upon a perfect ceremonial purity, to impress upon them a sense of his moral purity, and the necessity of purification of mind. Whether these were the reasons, or some others not at all discoverable by us, as such unclean persons were liable to death, and were exempted from it only by animal sacrifices. 'This appears from the conclusion to all the Levitical directions concerning the ceremonial to be observed in all such cases: 'Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness; that they die not in,' or by, 'their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle which is among them' (Lev 15:31). So that, by virtue of the sin offerings, the children of Israel were saved from a death which otherwise they would have suffered from their uncleanness, and that by substituting the life of the animal for the life of the offerer. Nor can it be urged that death is in these instances threatened only as the punishment of not observing these laws of purification; for the reason given in the passage just quoted shows that the threatening of death was not hypothetical upon their not bringing the prescribed purification, but is grounded upon the fact of 'defiling the tabernacle of the Lord which was among them,' which is supposed to be done by all uncleanness, as such, in the first instance.

9. "As a further proof of the vicarious character of the principal sacrifices of the Mosaic economy we may instance those statedly offered for the whole congregation. Every day were offered two lambs, one in the morning and the other in the evening, 'for a continual burnt offering.' To these daily victims were to be added weekly two other lambs for the burnt offering of every Sabbath. None of these could be considered in the light of fines for offenses. since they were offered for no particular person, and must be considered therefore, unless resolved into an unmeaning ceremony, pecular and vicarious. To pass over, however, the monthly sacrifices, and those offered at the great feasts, it is sufficient to fix upon those, so often alluded to in the Epistle to the Hebrews, offered on the solemn anniversary of expiation. On that day, to other prescribed sacrifices, were to be added another ram for a burnt offering, and another goat, the most eminent of the sacrifices for a sin offering, whose blood was to be carried by the high-priest into the inner sanctuary, which emas not done by the blood of any other victim, except the bullock, which was offered time same day as a sin offering for the family of Aaron. The circumstances of  this ceremony, whereby atonement was to be made 'for all the sins' of thee whole Jewish people, are so strikingly significant that they deserve a particular detail. On the day appointed for this general expiation the priest is commanded to offer a bullock and a goat as sin offerings, the one for himself and the other for the people; and, having sprinkled the blood of these in due form before the mercy seat, to lead forth a second goat, denominated 'the scapegoat;' and, after laying both his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the people, to put them upon the head of the goats and to send the animal, thus bearing the sins of the people, away into the wilderness; in this manner expressing, by an action which cannot be misunderstood, that the atonement, which, it is affirmed, was to be effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering, consisted in removing from the people their iniquities by this translation of them to the animal. For it is to be remarked that the ceremony of the scape-goat is not a distinct one: it is a continuation of the process, and is evidently the concluding part and symbolical consummation of the sin offering; so that the transfer of the iniquities of the people upon the head of the scapegoat, and the bearing them away into the wilderness, manifestly imply that the atonement effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering consisted in the transfer and consequent removal of those iniquities.

10. "How, then, is this impressive and singular ceremonial to be explained? Shall we resort to the notion of mulcts and fines? If so, then this and other stated sacrifices must be considered in the light of penal enactments. But this cannot aggree with the appointment of such sacrifices annually in succeeding generations: 'This shall be a statute forever unto you.' The law appoints a certain day in the year for expiating the sins both of the high- priest himself and of the whole congregation, and that for all high-priests and all generations of the congregation. Now, could a law be enacted inflicting a certain penalty, at a certain time, upon a whole people, as well as upon their high-priest, thus presuming upon their actual transgression of it? The sacrifice was also for sins in general; and yet the penalty, if it were one, is not greater than individual persons were often obliged to undergo for single trespasses. Nothing, certainly, can be maore absurd than this hypothesis. Shall we account for it by saying that sacrifices were offered for thee benefit of the worshipper, but exclude the notion of expiation? But here we are obliged to confine the benefit to reconciliation and the taking away of sins, and that by the appointed means of the shedding of blood, and the presentation of blood in the holy place, accompanied by the  expressive ceremony of imposition of hands upon the head of the victim; the import of which act is fixed, beyond all controversy, by the priests confessingr over that victim the sins of all the people, and at the same time imprecating upon its head the vengeance due to them (Lev 16:21). Shall we content ourselves with merely saying that this was a symbol? But the question remains, Of what was it the symbol? To determine this, let the several parts of the symbolic action be enumerated. Here is confession of sin; confession before God at the door, of the tabernacle; the substitution of a victim; the figurative transfer of sins to that victim; the shedding of blood, which God appointed to make atonemument for the soul; the carrying the blood into the holiest place, the very permission of which clearly marked the divine acceptance; the bearing away of iniquity; and the actual reconciliation of the people to God. If, then, this is symbolical, it has nothing very correspondent with it; it never had or can have anything correspondent to it but the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, and the communication of the benefits of his passion in the forgiveness of sins to those that believe in him, and ir. their reconciliation emwith God.

Shall we, finally, say that those sacrifices had respect, not to God, to obtain pardon by expiation, but to the offerer, teaching him moral lessons, and calling forth moral dispositions? We answer that this hypothesis leaves many of the essential circumstances of the ceremonial wholly unaccounted for. The tabernacle and temple were erected for the residence of God by his own command. There it was his will to be approached, and to these sacred places the victims were required to be brought. Anywhere else they might as well have been offered, if they had had respect only to the offerer; but they were required to be brought to God, to be offered according to a prescribed ritual, and by an order of men appointed for that purpose. Now truly there is no reason why they should be offered in the sanctuary rather than in any other place, except that they were offered to the Inhabitant of the sanctuary; nor could they be offered in his presence without having respect to him. There were some victims whose blood, on the day of atonement, was to be carried into the inner sanctuary; but for what purpose can we suppose the blood to have been carried into the most secret place of the divine residence, except to obtain the favor of him in whose presence it was sprinkled? To this we may add that the reason given for these sacred services is not in any case a mere moral effect to be prcduced upon the minds of the worshippers: they were 'to make atonement,' that is, to avert God's displeasure, that the people might not 'die.'  11. "We may find, also, another more explicit illustration in the sacrifice of the passover. The sacrificial character of this offering is strongly marked; for it was an offering brought to the tabernacle; it was slain in the sanctuary, and the blood was sprinkled upon the altar by the priests. It derives its name from thee passing over and sparing of the houses of the Israelites, on the door-posts of which the blood of the immolated lamb was sprinkled, when the first-born in the houses of the Egyptians were slain; and thus we have another instance of life being spared by time instituted means of animal sacrifice., Nor need we confine ourselves to particular instances. 'Almost all things,' says an apostle, who surely knew his subject, 'are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission.' Thus, by their very law, and by constant usage, were the Jews familiarized to the notion of expiatory sacrifice, as well as by the history contained in their sacred books, especially in Genesis, which speaks of the vicarious sacrifices offered by the patriarchs; and in the book of Job, in which that patriarch is said to have offered sacrifices for the supposed sins of his sons; and where Eliphaz is commanded, by a divine oracle, to offer a burnt-offering for himself and his friends, 'lest God should deal with themafter their folly.'

12. "On the sentiments of the uninspired Jewish writers on this point, the substitution of the life of the animal for that of the offerer, and, consequently, the expiatory nature of their sacrifices, Outram has given many quotations from their writings, which the reader may consult in his work on sacrifices. Two or three only may be adduced by way of specimen. R. Levi ben-Gerson says, 'The imposition of the hands of the offerers was designed to indicate that their sins were removed from themselves and transferred to the animal.' Isaac ben-Arama: 'He transfers his sins from himself, and lays them upon the head of the victim.' R. Moses ben-Nachiacan says, with respect to a sinner offering a victim, 'It was just that his blood should be shed, and that his body should be burned; but the Creator, of his mercy, accepted the victim from him as his substitute and ransom, that the blood of the animal might be shed instead of his blood- that is, that the blood of the animal might be given for his life.'

13. "Full of these ideas of vicarious expiation, then, the apostles wrote and spoke, and the Jews of their time heard and read, the books of the New Testament. The Socinian pretense is, that the inspired penmen used the sacrificial terms which occur in their writings figuratively; but we not only reply, as before, that they could not do this honestly unless they had given  notice of this new application of the established terms of the Jewish theology; but, if this be assumed, it leaves us wholly at a loss to discover what that really was which they intended to teach by these sacrificial terms and allusions. They are themselves utterly silent as to this point; and the varying theories of those who reject the doctrine of atonement, in fact, confess that their writings afford no solution of the difficulty. If, therefore, it is blasphemous to suppose, on the one hand, that inspired men should write on purpose to mislead, so, on the other, it is utterly inconceivable that, had they only been ordinary writers, they should construct a figurative language out of terms which had a definite and established sense, without giving any intimation at all that they employed them otherwise than in their received meaning, or telling us why they adopted them at all, and more especially when they knew that they must be interpreted, both by Jews and Greeks, in a sense which, if the Socinians are right, was in direct opposition to that which they in tended to convey."

Some modern writers deny the expiatory character of the Jewish sacrifices. So Bushnell (Vicarious Sacrifice, page 425) asserts that no such thing as expiation is contained or supposed to be wrought out in the Scripture sacrifices. On this see British Quarterly, October 1866, reprinted in the Theol. Eclectic (New Haven), 4:397; and also an article on the Expiatory Nature of the Atonenzent (Brit. Quarterly, October 1867; also in the Theol. Eclectic, 5:201 sq.). SEE ATONEMENT; SEE REDEMPTION; SEE SACRIFICE.

## Expiation, Jewish Day Of Annual[[@Headword:Expiation, Jewish Day Of Annual]]

             (Lev 17:1-3 a, comp. 23:36, 39; Num 29:7-11), a solemn fast (Act 27:9; Philo Opp. 2:206, 296, 591; Josephus, Ant. 14:16, 4) and holy-day ( שִׁבִּת שִׁבָּתוֹןLev 16:31; Lev 23:32), held from the evening of the 9th till that of the 10th day of the 5th month, Tisri, five days before the feast of Tabernacles. The modern Mohammedan fast called 'Ramadan," held during an entire (lunar) month has sometimes been referred to as having its analogies; likewise the fast of Isis among the ancient Egyptians (Herod. 4:186; comp. 2:40), and the Hindu fast-day "Sandrajonon," etc. SEE FAST.

## Expilly, Louis Alexandre[[@Headword:Expilly, Louis Alexandre]]

             a French prelate, was born February 24, 1742, at Brest. He studied at Paris, and was made bachelor of divinity there; was nominated pastor of St. Martin of Morlaix; in 1789 became deputy of the states-general; was consecrated bishop of the department of Finistere, February 24, 1791, and shared the fate of twenty-five of his colleagues, who were beheaded, May 22, 1794, for having taken an appeal to the department of the West against the national convention. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Exposition[[@Headword:Exposition]]

             "the opening up and interpreting larger portions of Scripture in public discourses. In Scotland, where the practice has long obtained, and still extensively prevails, it is called lecturing. While the striking and insulated texts of Scripture, which furnish abundant matter for sermons, are calculated, when judiciously treated, to rouse and fix attention; and the discourses founded on them may be more useful to general hearers, especially the careless and unconverted, expository discourses furnish peculiar advantages as it regards the enlargement of the Christian's views of divine truth, and his consequent advancement in the ways of God. By judiciously expounding the Scriptures, a minister may hope to give a clearer exhibition of the great principles of religion in their mutual connections and diversified bearings than could otherwise be done. He will have a better opportunity of unfolding the true meaning of those parts of  the Bible which are difficult of bringing a vast variety of topics before his hearers, which may be of the utmost importance to them, but which he could not so conveniently have treated in preaching from detached texts of exhibiting the doctrines and duties of Christianity in their relative positions of successfully counteracting and arresting the progress of dangerous errors, and of storing the minds of his people with correct and influential views of divine things. (See Doddridge on Preaching.) Such a mode of public instruction cannot but prove of great use to a minister's own mind, by rousing his energies, habituating him to close and accurate research, and saving him much of that indecision in the choice of texts which is so much lamented" (Buck, Theolog. Dictionary, s.v.). Dr. James W. Alexander was very earnest in advising expository preaching. "It is the most obvious and natural way of conveying to the hearers the import of the sacred volume. It is the very work (to interpret the Scriptures) for which the ministry was instituted." He advises exposition of whole chapters or books in course, pleading for it not only the sanction of ancient usage, but also certain great advantages of the method both to the preacher and his hearers (Thoughts on Preaching, N.Y. 1867, 12mo, page 272 sq.). SEE HOMILETICS.

## Expositions of Scripture[[@Headword:Expositions of Scripture]]

             SEE COMMENTARY.

## Exsufflation[[@Headword:Exsufflation]]

             a part of the ceremony of baptism in the ancient Christian Church, in which the candidate stood with his hands stretched out towards the West, and struck them together; then he proceeded thrice to exsufflate or spit, in defiance of Satan. SEE BAPTISM.

## Exsuperius[[@Headword:Exsuperius]]

             bishop of Toulouse in the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, celebrated for the exercise of remarkable charity during a great famine. After having given away all his own property, he sold the sacred vessels of gold and silver to help the poor. Jerome compared him to the widow of Sarepta, and dedicated to him his Commentary on Zechariah. Pope Innocent addressed a decretal to him. He died about A.D. 417. See Acta Sanctorum, Sept. 28; Tillemont, Memoires, 10:617, 825; A. Butler, Lives of Saints, September 28.

## Extempore Preaching[[@Headword:Extempore Preaching]]

             SEE HOMILETICS.

## Extispices[[@Headword:Extispices]]

             (Lat. exta, entrails, and specio, to look), a name sometimes given to the ancient haruspices (q.v.), because it was their duty carefully to examine the entrails of the victims offered in sacrifice.

## Extravagants[[@Headword:Extravagants]]

             (Extravagantes), a name given to decretal epistles of the popes issued after Gratian's Decretum, and not contained in that work ( SEE CANON LAW, ).  They were therefore called extra decretunm vagantes, or, briefly, extravagantes; and this name was still given to them after their insertion in the body of the canon law. For an account of the different collections of extravagantes, SEE CANON, LAW.

## Extreme Unction[[@Headword:Extreme Unction]]

             one of the sacraments (the 5th) of the Roman Church, administered to sick persons in extremis, by anointing them with oil when death appears near. It dates from the 11th century, though the Roman Church, of course, seeks to trace it back to the apostolic age.

I. Origin of the Practice. — The Church of Rome appeals (see below) to Mar 6:13, and Jam 5:14-16, as Scripture authority for extreme unction. In Mark we are told that the apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." Clearly there is no trace of the "sacrament" here. The Council of Trent, in Citing this passage, shrewdly says that it is "intimated" only in Mark, because, according to Rome, the apostles were not "priests" until the Last Supper. If, then, the passage in Mark teaches the institution of the sacrament, it would follow that others beside priests could administer it. Cardinal Cajetan, as cited by Catharinus, rejects this text as inapplicable to this sacrament; and Suarez (in part 3, disp. 39, § I, n. 5) says that "when the apostles are said to anoint the sick and heal them (Mar 6:13), this was not said in reference to the sacrament of unction, because their cures had not of themselves an immediate respect to the soul." As to the passage in James, it speaks of an anointing for "healing" by all the elders of the Church, who might or might not be laymen; it was "the prayer of faith that was to save the sick" (see, for a thorough discussion of this passage, Elliott, Delinzeation of Romanism, book 2, chapter 14).

II. The Ancient Greek Church. — The ancient writers of the Greek Church use the passage of James only for exegetical, not for dogmatical purposes. Origen, in the second homily on Leviticus 4, quotes the words of James when he speaks of the different ways which are given to the Christian for the remission of their sins. As the seventh way he mentions severe penance, in which he finds a compliance with the words of James: "If any be sick, let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them lay their hands on him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord," etc. The connection shows that Origen applies the words to mental and physical sickness, and the laying on of hands, which he adds to the apostolic words,  points to a local use of anointment in Alexandria at the reconciliation of the lapsi. Chrysostom (On the Priesthood, 2:196) quotes the words of James only as an argument that the priests have the power of remitting sins. John of Damascus, in speaking of the mysteries of the church, treats only of baptism and the Lord's Supper. The first certain testimony for the use of the anointment of the sick in the Greek Church is given by a Western writer about 798, Theodulf of Orleans.

III. The Ancient Latin Church. — In the Western Church, Irenaeus (1, 21, 5) states that the Gnostics, and in particular the Heracleonites, poured upon dying members a mixture of water and oil, amidst an invocation of prayer, in order that their souls might become invisible and inaccessible to the hostile powers of the spiritual world. It is uncritical in the highest degree for Roman Catholic writers to infer from the existence of a Gnostic rite the existence of a similar rite in the orthodox Church. Tertullian and Cyprian, to whom we are indebted for so full information of the ecclesiastical usages of the Western Church, know nothing of extreme unction as a sacrament. This silence can not be explained by a reference to the disciplina arcani, as the latter exclusively embraced baptism and the Lord's Supper, and as even these topics, notwithstanding the disciplina arcani, are frequently and fully discussed by the ecclesiastical writers. Many of the latter mention the frequent use of oil as a peculiar charisma for miraculous cures. Thus it is related by Tertullian that the pagan Severus, father of the emperor Antoninus, was cured by the Christian Proclus by means of anointment. This certainly can have no reference to a sacrament for the use of Christians. (Many other examples of this use of oil may be found in Chemnitz, and in Binterim, Denkwurdigkeiten, volume 6, part 3, page 289.) Superstition developed this usage; and it occurred, according to the testimony of Chrysostom, that the lamps burning in the churches were plundered for the purpose of using the oil as a preservative against possible, and, as a miraculous remedy, against actual diseases. It is easy to comprehend how this medicinal and miraculous anointment could become the basis and the origin of a sacrament (see on this point Marheineke, Symbolik, 1:3, page 258). The transition is visible in an epistle from the Roman bishop Innocent I to bishop Decentius, of Eugubium, written in 416. Innocent calls 'the anointment of the sick a "kind of sacrament" (genus sacramenti); and while he reserves to the bishops the right of preparing the sacred oil, he states that both priests and laymen may apply the oil (quod ab episcopo confectum non solum sacerdotibus sed omnibus uti Christianis  licet in sua aut in suorum necessitate unguendum), which is entirely at variance with the present teaching of the Church of Rome, according to which the sacrament can be administered only by priests. From the beginning of the ninth century the anointment of the sick is frequently mentioned in the acts of the Councils. Theodulf of Orleans (798), and the first Council of Mentz (847), place it by the side of penance and the Eucharist, but preceding the two latter. The recovery of the sick is always regarded as the chief object. Its use appears to have been considered necessary only for sinners; for abbot Adelhard, of Corbie, was asked by the monks of the monastery whether he desired to be anointed with the sacred oil, as they were certain that he was free from sins. The conception of the anointment of the sick as an act of penance caused a discussion of the question whether it could be repeated. Ivo of Chartres, and Godfrey, abbot of Vendome (about 2100), denied that the rite could be administered more than once, comparing it with the public penance; and it was a popular belief that a person recovering from sickness after receiving the anointment must not touch the ground with bare feet, and abstain from marital intercourse and the eating of meat. It was in the course of the 12th century that the names sacramentum exeuntium and extrema unctio came first into use.

IV. Extreme Unction as a Sacrament in the Church of Rome. — A full dogmatical treatment of the anointment of the sick, according to the teaching gradually developed in the Church, was first given by Hugo of St. Victor (De Sacram.fidei lib. 2, page 15). Peter Lombardus assigned to it, in the series of the seven sacraments which he is the first to mention, the fifth place (Sentent. lib. iv, dict. 23). The scholastics, and, in particular, Thomas Aquinas, completed the scientific development of this doctrine, and the shape given to it by Thomas received the sanction of the Councils of Florence and of Trent.

The canons of Trent on this subject are:

"Canon 1. If any shall say that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and declared by the blessed apostle James, but only a rite received from the fathers, or a human invention, let him be accursed.

Song of Solomon 2. If any shall say that the holy anointing of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor relieve the sick, but that it has ceased, as if it were formerly only the grace of healing, let him be accursed.

Song of Solomon 3. If any shall say that the rite and usage of extreme unction, which the holy Roman Church observes, is contrary to the sentence of the blessed apostle James, and therefore should be changed, and may be despised by Christians without sin, let him be accursed.

Song of Solomon 4. If any shall say that the presbyters of the Church, whom St. James directs to be called for the anointing of the sick, are not priests ordained by the bishops, but elders in age in any community, and that therefore the priest is not the only proper minister of extreme unction, let him be accursed" (Concil. Trident. sess. 14, c. 1 sq.). The authority for this sacrament is stated by the Council (same session, c. 1) as follows: "This sacred unction of the sick was instituted as a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament by Christ Jesus our Lord, being first intimated by Mark (6:13), and afterwards recommended and published to the faithful by James the apostle, brother of our Lord. 'Is any man,' saith he, ‘sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him' (Jam 5:14-15). In which words, as the Church has learned by apostolical tradition, handed down from age to age, he teaches the matter, form, proper minister, and effect of this salutary sacrament. For the Church understands the matter of the sacrament to be the oil, blessed by the bishop; the unction most fitly representing the grace of the Holy Spirit, wherewith the soul of the sick man is invisibly anointed. The form is contained in the words of administration."

The ceremony must be performed by a priest. The oil must be olive oil consecrated by a bishop. "No other sort of oil can be the matter of this sacrament; and this its matter is most significant of its efficacy. Oil is very efficacious in soothing bodily pain, and this sacrament soothes and alleviates the pain and anguish of the soul. Oil also contributes to restore health and spirits, serves to give light, and refreshes fatigue; and these effects correspond with and are expressive of those produced, through the divine power, on the sick by the administration of this sacrament" (Catechism of Trent, Baltimore, 8vo, page 206). The form of the ceremony is as follows: The priest, having dipped the thumb of his right hand in the holy oil, proceeds to mark the organs of the five senses of the patient with the sign of the cross; and after each, application he wipes the part with a ball of cotton, for which purpose he brings with him seven balls already prepared. The order observed is this: the right eye is first anointed, then the  left eye, the ears, and after them the nostrils (not the tip of the nose) are attended to in the same order, then the lips; after which the palms of the hands and soles of the feet receive the touch of the consecrated unguent. Men are also anointed in the reins, but this is dispensed with in the case of women. At each application the priest says, "Per hanc sacram unctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam indulgeat tibi Deus quicquid peccasti, per visum," or "auditum," "olfactum," “gustum," "et tactum," as the case may be "May God, by this holy anointing, and by his most pious mercy, pardon you the sins that you have committed by the eyes," "ears," "nose," "taste," and "touch." "The anointing being ended, the priest rubs those of his fingers which have touched the oil with small pieces of bread, and then washes his hands. The crumbs of bread and the water are next thrown into the fire; and the pieces of cotton employed in the ceremony are carried into thes church and burned, the ashes of which must be thrown into the sacrarium." As to the parsons to whom extreme unction is to be administered, the Catechism (1.c.) limits it "to those whose malady is such as to excite apprehensions of approaching dissolution. It is, however, a very grievous sin to defer the holy unction until, all hope of recovery now lost, life begins to ebb, and the sick person is fast verging into insensibility." ... "Extreme unction, then, can be administered only to the sick, and not to persons in health, although engaged in anything however dangerous, such as a perilous voyage, or the fatal dangers of battle. It cannot be administered even to persons condemned to death, and already ordered for execution. Its participation is also denied to insane persons, and to children incapable of committing sin, who, therefore, do not require to be purified from its stains, and also to those who labor under the amful visitation of madness, unless they give indications in their lucid intervals of a disposition to piety, and express a desire to be anointed. To persons insane from their birth this sacrament is not to be administered; but if a sick person, while in the possession of his faculties, expressed a wish to receive extreme unction, and afterwards becomes delirious, he is to be anointed." ... "The pastor will follow the uniform practice of the Catholic Church, and not administer extreme unction until the penitent has confessed and received the Eucharist."

The effect of extrenme unction is stated by the Council of Trent (sess. 14, chapter 2) as follows: "The power and effect of this sacrament are explained in the words and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.  For this power is the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose unction cleanses away sins, if any remain to be expiated, even the last traces of sin and relieves and confirms the soul of the sick man, exciting in him strong confidence of the divine mercy; by which strengthened, he bears far better the inconveniences and pains of his disorder; resists more easily the temptations of the devil, who does, as it were, lie in wait at his heels; and sometimes obtains the restoration of his bodily health, if the same shall further the salvation of his soul."

V. The Greek Church. — The Greek Church uses anointing with oil SEE EUCHELAION as one of its "mysteries," but does not limit it to cases of supposed mortal illness. She counts it as the seventh of the sacraments, and regards it as instituted by Christ (Mar 6:13), and introduced into practice by the Church (Jam 5:14). The oil may be consecrated by common priests, and is consecrated for every particular case. The anointment is generally performed by seven priests, but it may validly be performed by one. Those who are well enough go to church for the purpose of being anointed, after previously receiving absolution and the Eucharist. On the Thursday of the Passion Week in particular, many sufferers go to church for that purpose. The aim of the rite is to aid the recovery of the sick person, as is seen from the form of prayer used in applying the oil: "O holy Father, the physician of our souls and bodies, who didst send thy only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, to heal all diseases, and to deliver us from death, heal this thy servant M. from the bodily infirmity under which he now labors, and raise him up by the grace of Christ" (Perceval, Roman Schism; King, Greek Church). In the Confession of Metrophanes Critopulos (ed. by Kimmel, Jena, 1850), page 152, it is farther stated that, as many bodily diseases depend on sin, it is proper (δῆλον) that prayer should be offered at the same time for the remission of the sin for which the disease is a penalty. He adds that this Euchelaion is not extreme unction (οὐκ ἐσχάτη χρίσις). It canm be administered whenever a person is ill, and hence to the same person many times. For a description of this ceremony as perfoamead in the Greek Church, see Schmidt, Darstellung dergriechisch-russischen Kirche (Mentz, 1826, page 220 sq.).

VI. Extreme Unction and Protestantism. — As the ancient Waldenses recognized the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, there is no doubt that they also accepted extreme unction. Wycliffe doubted many  points of the doctrine of the Church of Ronme concerning extreme unction, but was willing to regard it as a sacrament for the physical cure of the sick, provided the priests could obtain this effect by their prayer. Luther had no objection to the anointing of the sick if the priests prayed with them and exhorted them, but hue denied the anointment to be a sacrament. Like Luther, all the other Protestant Churches reject extreme unction altogether. The 25th article of the Church of England puts it among the five so-called sacraments of Rome which "are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel." Bishop Forbes (who represents the Romanizing tendency in the Church of England) calls "the unction of the sick the lost pleiad of the Anglican firmament," and recommends its restoration (On 39 Articles, Art. 25 ad fin.). Among the High Church Lutherans there are also some who urge the introduction of the anointing of the sick. On the general subject, see, besides the authors already cited, Siegel, christl.-kirchl. Alterthumer, 4:119 sq.; Cramp, Text-book of Popery, chapter 9; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, book 7, chapter 2; Burnet, On 39 Articles (Art. 25); Herzog, Real-Encycl. 10:551; and the article SEE SACRAMENTS.

## Exucontians[[@Headword:Exucontians]]

             (Ε᾿ξουκόντιοι), a name given to the class of Arians called Aetians (q.v.), because they affirmed that the Son of God might be called God and the Word of God, but only in a sense consistent with his having been brought forth from non-existence. SEE ARIANS; SEE SEMI-ARIANS.

## Eybenschitz, Jonathan[[@Headword:Eybenschitz, Jonathan]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born at Cracow in 1690. He was not only a very learned Talmudist, but especially a follower of the cabalistic system of the pseudo-Messiah Chayon, whom he had met at Prague in 1726. At the age of twenty-one Eybenschiitz was president of a rabbinical college at Cracow, which soon became very famous. From year to year the number of his pupils increased, and he was soon recognised as a great authority. His position shielded him from the ban which was to be pronounced upon the followers of Sabbathai Zewi (q.v.) and Chayon. To avoid all suspicion, Eybenschintz himself pronounced the ban upon all the followers of the pseudo-Messiah, and in 1728 the congregation of Prague appointed him  preacher. In 1740 he accepted a call to Metz, and in 1750 he went to Altona.

It seemed as if with him an evil spirit had entered that place, which divided the German and the Polish Jews. When Eybenschitz came there; the famous Jacob Emden (q.v.) lived there, and, like his father, who had proscribed Chayon and his followers, regarded himself as the keeper of orthodoxy. An opportunity was soon offered to Emden whereby his vanity and his desire for heresy-hunting should be satisfied. At the time when Evbenschiitz came to Altona there was an epidemic in that city. Since every rabbi was regarded as a sort of magician, the new-comer was expected to put a stop to the disease. Eybenschitz prepared amulets, which he distributed among the people. For curiosity's sake one was opened, and lo! in it was written: "O thou God of Israel, who dwellest in the beauty of thy power, send down salvation to this person through the merit of thy servant Sabbathai Zewi, in order that thy name, and the name of the Messiah Sabbathai Zewi, may be hallowed in the world." This amulet came into the hands of Emden. Eybenschutz denied all connection with the adherents of Sabbathai, and as he had already:gained a great influence, it was believed; at least, everybody kept quiet. But Emden was not quiet, and finally the Wan was pronounced against Eybenschutz. The matter was brought before the king, Frederic V of Denmark, who decided in favor of Emden. Eybenschutz lost his position as rabbi of the congregation. As his best friends left him, in his perplexity he finally went to a former pupil of his, Moses Gerson Kohen, who after his baptism had taken the name. of Karl Anton (q.v.). Anton Wrote an apology in behalf of his teacher, which he dedicated to the king of Denmark. This, and other influences, had at last such effect that the whole affair was dropped, and Eybenschutz was elected anew as rabbi of the congregation. The Jewish community, however, became divided, and this division lasted as long as both Eybenschutz and Emden were alive. Eybenschutz died in 1764, and was followed twelve years later by his opponent Emden. Both are buried in the Jewish cemetery of Altona. Eybenschutz wrote, ס8 אהבת יהונתן, sermons and comments (Hamburg, 1766): — אלון בכית, homiletical comments upon the Lamentations (ibid. 1765), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:261 sq.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico, page 96 (Germ. transl.); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:385 sq., note 7, page 54; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. u.s. Sekten, 3:250 sq., 309 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Eyck, Hubert Van[[@Headword:Eyck, Hubert Van]]

             SEE PAINTING.

## Eyck, Hubert and John Van[[@Headword:Eyck, Hubert and John Van]]

             two brothers, were Flemish painters, and natives of the small town of Maeseyck, on the river Maes. Hubert was probably born in 1366, and John in 1370. They established themselves at Bruges. They are said by some writers to have been the discoverers of oil painting. They generally painted in concert until the death of Hubert. Their most important work was an altar-piece with folding-doors, painted for Jodocus Vyts, who placedit in the Church of St. Bavon, at Ghent. The principal picture in this curious production represents the Adoration of the Lamb, as described by St. John in the Revelation. On one of the folding doors is represented. Adam and Eve, and on the other St. Caecilia. In.the sacristy of the cathedral at Bruges is preserved a pict ure painted by John in 1436, representing the Virgin and Infant, with St. George, St. Donatius, and other saints. Hubert died September 18, 1429, and John in July, 1440. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Eyckens, Peter[[@Headword:Eyckens, Peter]]

             an eminent Flemish historical painter, was born at Antwerp in 1599, and was chosen director of the academy at Antwerp. His principal works in that city are, The Last Supper, in the Church of St. Andrew; St. Catherine Disputing with the Pagans, in the cathedral; and St. John Preaching in the Wilderness, in the Church of the Convent called Bogaerde. At Mechlin, in the Church of the Jesuits, were two of his most admired works. He died in 1649. See Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Eye[[@Headword:Eye]]

             ( עִיַןa'yin, from the idea of flowing [see below]; ὀφθαλμός). In most languages this important organ is used by figurative application, as the symbol of a large number of objects and ideas. In the East such applications of the word "eye" have always been uncommonly numerous, and they were so among the Hebrews. It may be serviceable to distinguish the following uses of the word, few of which are common among us except so far as they have become so through the translation of the Bible. (See Gesenius, Hebrews Lex.; Wemyss's Symbol. Dict.)

(1.) A fountain. This use of the word has already been indicated. SEE AIN. It probably originated from the eye being regarded as the fountain of tears.

(2.) Color, as in the phrase "and the eye (color) of the manna was as the eve (color) of ladellium" (Num 11:7). This originated, pearhaps, in the eye being the part of the body which exhibits different colors in different persons.

(3.) The surface, as "the surface (eye) of the land" (Exo 10:5; Exo 10:15; Num 22:5; Num 22:11): the last is the passage which affords most sanction to the notion that עִיִןmeans in some places "face." This is the sense which our own and other versions give to "eye to eye" (Num 14:14, etc.), translated "face to face." The phrases are indeed equivalent in meaning; but we are not thence to conclude that the Hebrews meant "face" when they said "eye," but that they chose the opposition of the eyes, instead of that of the faces, to express the general meaning. Hence, therefore, we may object to the extension of the signification in such passages as 1Sa 16:12, where "beautiful eyes" (עֵינִיַם יְפֵה) is rendered "fair countenance."

(4.) It is also alleged that a between (or about) the eyes means the forehead, in Exo 13:9; Exo 13:16, and the forepart of the head, in Deu 6:8; but the passages are sufficiently intelligible if understood to denote what they literally express; and with reference to the last it may be remarked that there is hair about the eves as well as on the head, the removal of which might well be' interdicted as an act of lamentation.

(5.) In Son 4:9 “eye" seems to be used poetically for “look," as is usual in most languages: "thou hast stolen my heart with one of thy looks" (eyes).

(6.) In Pro 23:31, the term "eye" is applied to the beads or bubbles af wine, when poured out, but our version preserves the sense of "color."

(7.) To these some other phrases, requiring notice and explanation, may be added:

"Before the eyes" of any one, meaning in his presence, or, as we should say, "before his face" (Gen 23:11; Gen 23:18; Exo 4:30).

"In the eyes" of any one means what appears to be so or so in his individual judgment or opinion, and is equivalent to "seeming" or "appearing" (Gen 19:8; Gen 29:20; 1Sa 12:3).

"To set the eyes" upon any one is usually to regard him with favor (Gen 44:21; Job 24:23; Jer 39:12); but it occurs in a bad sense, as of looking with anger, in Amo 9:8. But angels more usually expressed by the contrary action of turning the eyes away.  As many of the passions, such as envy, pride, pity, desire, are expressed by the eye, so, in the scriptural style, they are often ascribed to that organ. Hence such phrases as "evil eye" (Mat 20:15), "bountiful eye" (Pro 22:9), "haughty eyes" (Pro 6:17), "wanton eyes" (Isa 3:16), "eyes full of adultery" (2Pe 2:14), "the lust of the eves" (1Jn 2:16). This last phrase is applied by some to lasciviousness, by others to covetousness; but it is best to take the expression in the most extensive sense, as denoting a craving for the gay vanities of this life (comp. Eze 24:25). In the same chapter of Ezekiel (Eze 24:16), "the desire of they eyes" is put not for the prophet's wife directly, as often understood, but for whatever is one's greatest solace and delight, which in this case was the prophet's wife, but which in another case might have been something else.

Whether the Hebrews attached the same ideas to the expression "evil eye" (Pro 23:6; Pro 28:22) as is done by the Orientals at the present day is not easy to ascertain. It has been obseraed by Mr. Lane, and also by Mrs. Poole, that "nothing distresses an Egyptian parent more than that which in other countries is considered to convey a compliment — admiration of the child. If any one is seen to stare at so as to envy the offspring, the mother hastily snatches it away, to perform some superstitious rite, as a charm against the supposed evil eye." And Mr. Roberts says, among the Hindoos, the kan-nuru, "evil eye," of some people is believed to have a most baneful effect upon whatsoever it shall be fixed. Those who are reputed to have such eyes are always avoided, and none but near relations will invite them to a feast.

In Zec 4:10, the angels of the Lord are called "his eyes," as being the executioners of his judgments, and watching and attending for his glory. From some such association of ideas, the favorite ministers of state in the Persian monarchy were called "the king's eyes." So, in Num 10:31, "to be instead of eyes" is equivalent to being a prince, to rule and guide the people. This occurs also in the Greek poets, as in Pindar (Olymp. 2:10), where "the eye of Sicilia" is given as a title to one of the chief men in Sicily, showing his power. In like manner, in the same poet, "the eye of the army" stands for a good commander (Olymp. 6:16).

To keep anything as the apple or pupil of the eye is to preserve it with particular care (Deu 32:10; Zec 2:8).  Eye-service is peculiar to slaves, who are governed by fear only, and is to be carefully guarded against by Christians, who ought to serve from a principle of duty and affection (Eph 6:6; Col 3:22).

The expression in Psa 123:2; "As the eyes of servants look unto the hand's of their masters," has suggested a number of curious illustrations from Oriental history and customs, tending to show that masters, especially when in the presence of others, are in the habit of communicating to their servants' orders and intimations by certain motions of their hands, which, although scarcely noticeable by other persons present, are clearly understood and promptly acted upon by the attendants. This custom keeps them with their attention bent upon the hand of their master watching its slightest motions. (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illustra. on Pro 6:13.)

The celebrated passage "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's aye, and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye" (Mat 7:3), has occasioned much waste of explanation. It seems mecuch better to understand it as a hyperbolical proverbial expression, than to contend that as δοκός cannot literally mean "a beam," it must here signify something else, a disease, a thorn, etc. (see Doddridge and Campbell, in loc.). As a proverbial plurase, parallels have been produced abundantly from the Rabbins, from the fathers, and from the classics. SEE BLIND.

## Eylert, Ruhlemann Friedrich[[@Headword:Eylert, Ruhlemann Friedrich]]

             was born at Hamm, in Prussian Westphalia, April 5, 1770. He studied theology at Halle, where he imbibed the moderate Rationalism of Niemeyer. In 1794 he became a preacher in his native city, in 1806 court preacher at Potsdam, and after the death of Sack in 1817 he became superintendent, being at the same time appointed minister of public instruction. In his later years his theology assumed a positively orthodox character. He died February 3, 1852. While at court he was the friend and counsellor of king Frederick William III, over whom he exerted a great influence, especially in the matter of the Union and the Liturgy. SEE PRUSSIA, CHURCH OF. He was a prolific writer. The most important of his works are, Betrachtungen u. d. trostvollen Wahrheiten des Christenthums, etc. (1804; 4th ed. 1834): — Homiliens u. d. Parabeln Jesu (1806; 2d ed. 1819): — Predigten u. Bedurfuisse unsers Herzens (1803): — Karakterzuge Friedrich Wilhelm's III (1846-47). See Neeuer Nekrolog d. Deutschen (1852). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4:295.

## Eymeric, Nicolas[[@Headword:Eymeric, Nicolas]]

             a Spanish inquisitor, was born about 1320 at Gerona. He entered the Dominican order in 1334, and was made inquisitor general of Aragon in 1336. His zeal was too great even for his superiors, and he was removed from his office for a time, but after some years he returned to it. He was umoted especially for his fierce pursuit of the partisans of Raymond Lull (q.v.). His Directoriun Inquisitorum has been often reprinted (Rome, 1578, 1589, 1597, fol.; Venice, 1591, 1607). He died January 4, 1399. — Quetif et Echard, Script. Ord. Praed. 1:716; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 16:867. SEE INQUISITION.

## Eyre, John[[@Headword:Eyre, John]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was born at Bodmin, Cornwall, January, 1754. He had a good elementary education, and at fifteen was bound apprentice to a clothier. Before the termination of his apprenticeship he embraced a religious life, and on returning to his father's house he commenced holding public religious meetings. His father was offended at this, and drove him from his house. He was soon after admitted into lady Huntingdon's College at Trevecca, and in 1778 he was appointed minister to her chapel at Mulberry Gardens, London. In the same year he entered Emmanuel College, Oxford, and in December, 1779, he was made curate  of Weston. In 1781 he became curate of St. Giles's, Reading, and in 1782 of St. Luke's, Chelsea. In 1785 he became pastor of the Episcopal chapel at Homerton, and opened a school there, which became very successful. He was very popular as a preacher, free from bigotry, and active in all schemes of benevolence. The Evangelical Magazine and the London Missionary were originated and for a time edited by him. From the profits of the Evangelical Magazine between twenty and thirty thousand pounds were paid out for the support of widows of ministers of various denominations. He eas also one of the founders of the London Missionary Society (q.v.), of the scheme of "Village Itinerancy," and of the Hackiney Seminary for theological training. After a life of earnest piety and usefulness, he died March 28, 1803. — Morison, Missionary Fathers, page 9.

## Eyre, William[[@Headword:Eyre, William]]

             an English Calvinistic divine, was born in Wiltshire about 1613, and entered the University of Oxford in 1629. In 1654 he was minister of St. Edmund's Church, Salisbury, and was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1670. He published, Epistola ad Vaserium de Textus Hebraici Variantibus Lectionibus (1652): — The True Justification of a Sinner Explained (1654); in Latin, under the title of Vindiciae Justificationis Gratuitce (eod.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Eyster, Michael[[@Headword:Eyster, Michael]]

             a minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in York County, Pennsylvania, May 16, 1814. He was principally educated at the institutions in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1838. He labored in the ministry successively at Williamsburg, Greencastle, and Greensburg with great acceptance and success. He died August 12, 1853. He, was a man of rare promise, and, although comparatively young, had gained a strong hold upon the affections of the Church. In the pulpit his power over an audience was very great. He usually made a deep and an abiding impression. There was an originality and a freshness in his discourses not always found at the present day. (AM.L.S.)

## Eytel, Friedrich Hermann[[@Headword:Eytel, Friedrich Hermann]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born February 11, 1819, at Esslingen. He studied at Tiibingen, was in 1856 pastor at Hofingen, in 1861 at Maichingen, where he died, April 21, 1869. He published Psalter in Modernem Gewande (Stuttgard, 1862; 2d ed. 1866). See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:306. (B.P.)

## Ez[[@Headword:Ez]]

             SEE GOAT.

## Ezan[[@Headword:Ezan]]

             a hymn used in Mohammedan countries by the Muezzin (q.v.), or public crier, who chants it from the minarets of the mosques in a loud, deep-toned voice, summoning the people to their devotions. The proclamation is as follows: God is great, four times repeated; I bear witness that there is no god but God, twice repeated; I bear witness that Mohammed is the prophet of God, twice repeated; Come to the temple of salvation, twice repeated; God is great, God is most great; there is no God but God, and Mohammed is his prophet. At the morning prayer the muezzin must add, Prayer is better than sleep, twice repeated.

## Ezar[[@Headword:Ezar]]

             a less correct mode of Anglicizing (1Ch 1:38) the name EZER (q.v.).

## Ezbai[[@Headword:Ezbai]]

             [many Ez'bai, some Ezba'i] (Hebrews Ezbay', אֶזְבִּיin pause אֶזְבָּי, signif. uncertain; Sept. Α᾿ζβί v. R. Α᾿ζοβαί,Vulg. Asbai), the father of Naarai, which later was one of David's thirty heroes. (1Ch 11:37). B.C. 1046. In the parallel list (2Sa 23:30) the names are given  "PAARAI the Arbite," which Kennicott decides to be a corruption of the reading in Chronicles (Dissertation, page 209).

## Ezbon[[@Headword:Ezbon]]

             (Hebrews Etsbon', אֶצְבֹּן, perhaps working), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. θασοβάν, Vuig. Esebon.) The fourth son of the patriarch Gad (Gen 46:16) ; called also (Num 26:16) OZNI SEE OZNI (q.v.). B.C. 1856.

2. ( אֵצְבּוֹןSept. Α᾿σεβών v.r. Εσεβών,Vulg. Esbon.) The first-named of the sons (? descendants) of Bela, the son of Benjamin, according to 1Ch 7:7. It is singular, however, that while Ezbon is nowhere else mentioned among the sons of Bela, or Benjamin, he appears here in company with עִירַיIri, which is, nevertheless, not a Benjamite family, according to the other lists, but is found in company with Ezbon among the Gadite families, both in Gen 46:16 (Eri, עֵרַי), and Num 26:16. Were these two Gadite families incorporated into Benjamin after the slaughter mentioned Judges 20? Possibly they were from Jabesh-Gilead (comp. 21:12-14).. SEE BECHER. 1Ch 7:2 seems to fix the date of the census as in king David's time. B.C. cir. 1020.

## Ezechias[[@Headword:Ezechias]]

             (Ε᾿ζεκίας), a mode of Anglicizing, in the Apocrypha, the name of two men.

1. The "son of Theocanus," and one of the two Israelitish leaders prominent in the reform under Ezra (1Es 9:14); evidently the JAHAZIAH SEE JAHAZIAH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 10:15).

2. One who is represented as having prayed for the chosen people in the time of Sennacherib (2Es 7:40), obviously referring to king HEZEKIAH SEE HEZEKIAH (q.v.)

## Ezecias[[@Headword:Ezecias]]

             (Ε᾿ζεκίας), one of those who supported Ezra on the right while expounding the law (1Es 9:43), corresponding to the HILKIAH SEE HILKIAH (q.v.) of the parallel passage (Neh 8:4).

## Ezekias[[@Headword:Ezekias]]

             (Ε᾿ζεκίας), a Grecized form (Sir 48:17; Sir 48:22; Sir 49:4; 2Ma 15:22; Mat 1:9-10) of the namne of king HEZEKIAH SEE HEZEKIAH (q.v.).

## Ezekiel[[@Headword:Ezekiel]]

             (Heb. Yechezkel', יְהֶזְקֵאל, either meaning Whom God will strengthen or God will prevail), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿ζεκήλ) The head of the twentieth "course" of priests under David (1Ch 24:16, where the name is Anglicized JEHEZEKEL SEE JEHEZEKEL [q.v.]).

2. (Ι᾿εζεκιήλ, Josephus Ι᾿εζεκίηλος, Ant. 10:5, 1.) One of the four greater prophets. SEE PROPHET.

1. There have been various fancies about his name: according to Abarbanel (Praef in Ezech.), it implies "one who narrates the might of God to be displayed in the future," and samne (as Villalpandus, Praef. in Ezech. page 10) see a play on the word in the expressions חֲזְקַים and חַזְקֵי (Eze 3:7-9), whence the groundless conjecture of Sanctius (Prolegon. in Ezech. page 2, n. 2) that the name was given him subsequently to the commencement of his career (Carpzov, Introduct. ad Libr. Bibl. Vet. Testam. 2, part 3, chapter 5).

2. He was the son of a priest named Buzi (Eze 1:3), respecting whom fresh conjectures have been recorded, although nothing is known about him (as archbishop Newcome observes) beyond the fact that he must have given his son a, careful and learned education. The Rabbis had a rule that every prophet in Scripture was also the son of a prophet, and hence (as B. David Kimehi in his Commentary) they absurdly identify Buzi with Jeremiah, who, they say, was so called because he was rejected and despised. Another tradition makes Ezekiel the servant of Jeremiah (Gregory Naz. Or. 47), and Jerome supposes that the prophets being contemporaries during a part of their mission interchanged their prophecies, sending them respectively to Jerusalem and Chaldaea for mutual confirmation and encouragement, that the Jews might hear, as it were, a strophe and  antistrophe of warning and promise; "velut ac si duo cantores alter ad alterius vocem sese componerent" (Calvin, Comment. ad' Ezech. 1:2). Although it was only towards the very close of Jeremiah's lengthened office that Ezekiel received his commission, yet these suppositions are easily accounted for by the internal harmony between the two prophets, in proof of which Havernick (Introduct. to Ezek.) quotes Ezekiel 13 as compared with Jer 23:9 sq., and Ezekiel 34 with Jeremiah 33 etc. This inner resemblance is the more striking from the otherwise wide difference of character which separates the two prophets; for the elegiac tenderness of Jeremiah is the reflex of his gentle, calm, and introspective spirit, while Ezekiel, in that age when true prophets were so rare (Eze 12:21; Lam 2:9), "comes forward with all abruptness and iron consistency. Has he to contend with a people of brazen front and unbending neck? He possesses on his own part an unbending nature, opposing the evil with an unflinching spirit of boldness, with words full of consuming fire" (Havernick, Introd., transl, by Reverend F.W. Gotch in Jour. of Sac. Lit. 1:23).

3. Unlike his predecessor in the prophetic office, who gives us the amplest details of his personal history, Ezekiel rarely alludes to the facts of his own life, and we have to complete the imperfect picture by the colors of late and dubious tradition. He was taken captive from a place called Sarera (ἐκ γῆς Σαρηρά, Isidor. De Vit. et Ob. Sanct. 39; Epiphan. De Vit. et Mort. Prophet. 9, ap. Carpzov) in the captivity (or transmigration, as Jerome more accurately prefers to render גָּלוּת, Eze 1:2) of Jehoiachin (not Jehoiakim, as Josephus [Ant. 10:6, 3] states, probably by a slip of memory) with other distinguished exiles (2Ki 24:15) eleven years before the destruction of Jerusalem. B.C. 598. Josephus (l.c.) says that this removal happened when he was a boy, and although we cannot consider the assertion to be refuted by Havernick's argument from the matured, vigorous, priestly character of his writings, and feel still less inclined to say that he had "undoubtedly" exercised for some considerable time the function of a priest, yet the statement is questionable, because it is improbable (as Havernick also points out) that Ezekiel long survived the twenty-seventh year of his exile (39:17), so that, if Josephus be correct, he must have died very young. He was a member of a community of Jewish exiles who settled on the banks of the Chebar, a "river" or stream of Babylonia, which is sometimes taken to be the Khabour, but which the latest investigators suppose to be the Nahr Malcha, or royal canal of Nebuchadnezzar. SEE  CHEBAR.

The actual name of the spot where he resided was Tel-Abib ( תֵּל אָבַיב, Vulg. "acervus novarum frugum," Sept. μετέωρος καὶ περιῆλθον (?). Syr. "the hill of grief"), a name which Jerome, as usual, allegorizes; it is thought by Michaelis to be the same as Thallaba in D'Anville's map (Rosenmuller, Bibl. Geog. 2:188). It was by this river "in the land of the Chaldeans" that God's message first reached him (Eze 1:3); the Chaldee version, however, interpolates the words "in the land [of Israel: and again a second time he spake to him in the land] of the Chaldeans," because the Jews had a notion that the Shechinah could not overshadow a prophet out of the Holy Land. Hence R. Jarchi thinks that chapter 17 was Ezekiel's first prophecy, and was uttered before the captivity, a view which he supports by the Hebrew idiom הָיֹה הָיָה(A.V. "came expressly") in 1:3. R. Kimchi, hovever, makes an exception to the rule in case the prophecy was inspired in some pure and quiet spot like a river's bank (comp. Psa 137:1). His call took place "in the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity," B.C. 594 (1:2), "in the thirtieth year, in the fourth month." The latter expression is very uncertain. Most commentators (see Poll Synopsis, in loc.) take it to mean the thirtieth year of his age (so Carpzov, Appar. Crit. page 201, and others), the recognized period for assuming full priestly functions (Num 4:23; Num 4:30). Origen, following this assumption, makes the prophet a type of Christ, to whom also "the heavens were opened" when he was baptized; in Jordan. But, as Pradlus argues, such. a computation would be unusual, and would not be sufficiently important or well known as a mark of genuineness, and would require some more definite addition. Moreover, the statute referred to required an age of at least thirty full years. The Chaldee paraphrase by Jonah ben-Uzziel has "thirty years after Hilkiah, the high-priest, had found the book of the law in the sanctuary, in the vestibule under the porch, at midnight, after the setting of the moon, in the days of Josiah, etc., in the month Tammuz, in the fifth day of the month" (comp. 2 Kings 22), i.e., the eighteenth of Josiah, or B.C. 623.

This view is adopted by Jerome, Usher, Haivernick, etc., and is, on the whole, the most probable, although it has been objected to its adoption that, had this been a recognized area, we should have found traces of it elsewhere, whereas even Ezekiel never refers to it again. But, whatever starting-point we adopt, this will still remain an isolated date in Ezekiel; and the example of Jeremiah, who computes the years of his prophetical ministrations from the reform in the days of Josiah (Jer 25:3; comp. 2Ch 24:3), warrants the supposition that his contemporary and parallel would note his own call from a similar  religious epoch, the renewal of the passover in the same reign (2Ki 23:23). There are similar and more forcible objections to its being the thirtieth year from the jubilee, as Hitzig supposes, following many of the early commentators. It has been proposed by Scaliger (De Emendatione Temporuair, Lugd. Bat. 1598, page 374) that it was the thirtieth year from the new sera of Nabopolassar, father of Nebuchadnezzar, who began to reign B.C. 625, an interpretation adopted by Eichhorn, Pradus, Rosenmiiller, Henderson, etc. The use of this Chaldee epoch is the more appropriate as the prophet wrote in Babylonia, and he gives a Jewish chronology in 2Ki 23:2. Compare the notes of time in Dan 2:1; Dan 7:1; Ezr 7:7; Neh 2:1; Neh 5:14. But this would make the date in question B.C. 596 instead of 594. Moreover, as Nabopolassar was long since dead, the reckoning would doubtless have been by the years of the reigning monarch, as in the other passages cited. The decision of the question is the less important, because in all other places Ezekiel dates from the year of Jehoiachin's captivity (Eze 29:17; Eze 30:20, et passim). It appears that the call of Ezekiel to the prophetic office was connected with the communication of Jeremiah's predictions to Babylon (Jer 51:59), which took place in the earlier part of the same year (Havernick, page 9). We learn from an incidental allusion (Eze 24:18) — the only reference which he makes to his personal history — that he was married, and had a house (Eze 8:1) in his place of exile, and lost his wife by a sudden and unforeseen stroke. He lived in the highest consideration among his companions in exile, and their elders consulted him on all occasions (Eze 8:1; Eze 11:25; Eze 14:1; Eze 20:1, etc.), because in his united office of priest and prophet he was a living witness to "them of the captivity" that God had not abandoned them (comp.Vitringa, Synag. Vet. page 332). There seems to be little ground for Theodoret's supposition that he was a Nazarite. The last date he mentions is the twenty-seventh year of the captivity (Eze 29:17), so that his mission extended over twenty-two years, during part of which period Daniel was probably living, and already famous (Eze 14:14; Eze 28:3).

Tradition ascribes various miracles to him, as, for instance, escaping from his enemies by walking dryshod across the Chebar; feeding the famished people with a miraculous draught of fishes, etc. He is said to have been murdered in Babylon by some Jewish prince (?ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λαοῦ, called in the Roman martyrology for 6 Id. Apr. "judex populi," Carpzov. Introd. 1.c.), whom he had conyicted of idolatry; and to have been buried  in a double tomb (σπηλαῖον διπλούν), the tomb of Shem and Arphaxad, on the banks of the Euphrates (Epiphan. De Vit. et Mort. Prophet.). The tomb, said to have been built by Jehoiachin, was shown a few days' journey from Bagdad (Menasse ben-Israel, De Resurrec. Mort. page 23), and was called "the abode of elegance" (habitaculum elegantiae). A lamp was kept there continually burning, and the autograph copy of the prophecies was said to be there preserved. This tomb is mentioned by Pietro de la Valle, and fully described in the Itinerary of R. Benjamin of Ttdela (Hottinger, Thes. Philippians II, 1:3; Cippi Hebraici, page 82). His tomb is still pointed out in the vicinity of Babylon (Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, page 427), at a place called Keffil; and Mr. Loftus is inclined to accept the tradition which assigns this as the resting-place of the prophet's remains (Chaldaea, page 35). The spire is the frustum of an elongated cone, tapering to a blunted top by a succession of steps, and peculiarly ornamented (ib.). A curious conjecture (discredited by Clemens Alexandrinus [Strom. 1], but considered not impossible by Selden [Syntagm. de Diis Syr. 2:120], Meyer, and others) identifies him with "Nazaratus the Assyrian," the teacher of Pythagoras. We need hardly mention the ridiculous suppositions that he is identical with Zoroaster, or with the Ε᾿ζεκίηλος ὁ τῶν Ιουδαϊκῶν τραγωδίων ποιητής (Clem. Alexand. Strom. 1; Euseb. Praep. Evang. 9:28, 29), who wrote a play on the Exodus, called Ε᾿ξαγωγή (Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 2:19). This Ezekiel lived B.C. 40 (Sixt. Sen. Bibl. Sanct. 4:235), or later.

4. But, as Havernick remarks, "by the side of the scattered data of his external life, those of his internal life appear so much the richer." We have already noticed his stern and inflexible energy of will and character; and we also observe a devoted adherence to the rites and ceremonies of his national religion. Ezekiel is no cosmopolite, but displays everywhere the peculiar tendencies of a Hebrew educated under Levitical training. The priestly bias is always visible, especially in chapters 8-11, 40-48, and in Eze 4:13 sq.; Eze 20:12 sq.; Eze 22:8, etc. It is strange of De Wette and Gesenius to attribute this to a "contracted spirituality," and of Ewald to see in it "a one- sided conception of antiquity which he obtained merely from books and traditions," and "a depression of spirit (!) enhanced by the long continuance of the banishment and bondage of the people" (Havernick's Introd.). It was surely this very intensity of patriotic loyalty to a system whose partial suspension he both predicted and survived, which cheered the exiles with the confidence of his hopes in the future, and tended to preserve their  decaying nationality. Mr. F. Newman is even more contemptuous than the German critics. "The writings of Ezekiel," he says (Hebr. Monarchy, page 330, 2d ed.), "painfully show the growth of what is merely visionary, and an increasing value of hard sacerdotalism;" and he speaks of the "heavy materialism" of Ezekiel's Temple, with its priests, sacrifices, etc., as "tedious and unedifying as Leviticus itself." His own remark that Ezekiel's predictions "so kept alive in the minds of the next generation a belief in certain return from captivity, as to have tended exceedingly towards the result," is a sufficient refutation of such criticisms.

We may also note in Ezekiel the absorbing recognition of his high calling which enabled him cheerfully to endure any deprivation or misery (except indeed ceremonial pollution, from which he shrinks with characteristic loathing, Eze 4:14), if thereby he may give any warning or lesson to his people (4; Eze 24:15-16, etc.), whom he so ardently loved (Eze 9:8; Eze 11:13). On one occasion, and on one only, the feelings of the man burst, in one single expression, through the self-devotion of the prophet; and while even then his obedience is unwavering, yet the inexpressible depth of submissive pathos in the brief words which tell how it one day "the desire of his eyes was taken from him" (Eze 24:15-18), shows what well- springs of the tenderest human emotion were concealed under his uncompromising opposition to every form of sin. See Friderici, Disputatio de Ezechiele (Lips; 1719); Verpoorten, De scriptis Ezechielis (in his Dissertt. page 107); Alexander, Tist. Ecclesias. 3:560; Kitto. Jour. Sac. Lit. 1; Williams, Characters of O.T. page 288.

## Ezekiel (2)[[@Headword:Ezekiel (2)]]

             a Jewish Greek writer, who lived a century before Christ, is the author of a dramatic poem after the manner of Euripides, on the Deliverance of Israel from Egypt, entitled ἐξαγωγή. Fragments of this poem are preserved in the Praeparatio Evangelica of Eusebius (9:28, 29), and in the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria (1:23, page 414). They are given by Delitzsch in his Zur Geschichte der judischen Poesie (Leipsic, 1836), pages 211-219. The best edition of them, with translation and notes, is by Philippson (Berlin, 1830), entitled Ε᾿ζεκιήλου τοῦ τῶν Ι᾿ουδαϊκῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιήτου ἐξαγωγή, etc. See Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, page 114; Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, page 563 sq.; Herzfeld, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, 2:491, 517-519, 579 (Leipsic, 1863); Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:264; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ezekiel, Book Of[[@Headword:Ezekiel, Book Of]]

             This, both in the Hebrew and Alexandrian canons, is placed next to the writings of Jeremiah.

I. Order of Contents. — The central point of Ezekiel's predictions is the destruction of Jerusalem. Previously to this catastrophe his chief object is to call to repentance those who were living in careless security; to warn them against indulging in blind confidence, that by the help of the Egyptians (Eze 17:15-17; comp. Jer 37:7) the Babylonian yoke would be shaken off; and to assure them that the destruction of their city and Temple was inevitable and fast approaching. After this event his principal care is to console the captives by promises of future deliverance and return to their own land, and to encourage them by assurances of  future blessings. His predictions against foreign nations stand between these two great divisions, and were for the most part uttered during the interval of suspense between the divine intimation that Nebuchadnezzar was besieging Jerusalem (Eze 24:2) and the arrival of the news that he had taken it (Eze 33:21). The predictions are evidently arranged on a plan corresponding with these the chief subjects of them, and the time of their utterance is so frequently noted that there is little difficulty in ascertaining their chronological order. This order is followed throughout, except in the middle portion relating to foreign nations, where it is in some instances departed from to secure greater unity of subject (e.g. Eze 29:17). The want of exact chronological order in this portion of the book has led to various hypotheses respecting the manner in which the collection of the separate predictions was originally made. Jaha (Introd. page 356) supposes that the predictions against foreign nations were placed in their present position by some transcriber in the order in which they happened to come into his hands, and that he through forgetfulness omitted chapters 35, 38, and 39. Eichhorn (Einleit. 3:193) thinks it probable that the predictions were written on several greater or smaller rolls, which were put together in their present form without sufficient regard to chronological accuracy. Bertholdt (Einleit. 4:1487, quoted by Havernick) supposes that the collector of the whole book found two smaller collections already in existence (chapters 25-32 and Eze 33:21-33), and that he arranged the other predictions chronologically. All such hypotheses belong, as Havernick remarks, to a former age of criticism.

The arranugement, by whomsoever made, is very evidently intentional, and it seems on many accounts most probable that it was made by Ezekiel himself. This is maintained by Hilvernick out the following grounds:

(1.) The arrangement proceeds throughout on a plan corresponding with the subjects of the predictions. In those against foreign nations chronological is united with material order, whilst in those which relate to Ismael the order of time is strictly followed.

(2.) The predictions stand in such connection with each other that every part has reference to what has preceded it.

(3.) Historical notices are occasionally appended to the predictions, which would scarcely be done by a transcriber; e.g. the notice respecting himself in chapters 11, 24, 25, and the close of chapter 19, which Havernick translates “this is a lamentation and was for a  lamentation." The whole book is divided by Havernick into nine sections, as follows:

1. Ezekiel's call to the prophetic office (Eze 2:1 to Eze 3:15).

2. The generual carrying out of the comnbmission in a series of symbolical representations and particular predictions foretelling the approaching destruction of Judah and Jerusalem (Eze 3:16-17).

3. The rejection of the people because of their idolatrous worship; a series of visions presented to the prophet a year and two months later than the former, in which he is shown the Temple polluted by the worship of Adonis, the consequent judgment on thee inhabitants of Jerusalem and on the priests, and closing with promises of happier times and a purer worship (Ezekiel 8-11).

4. The sins of the people rebuked in detail; a series of reproofs and warnings directed especially against the particular errors and prejudices then prevalent amongst his contemporaries (Ezekiel 12-19).

5. The nature of the judgment, and the guilt which caused it; another series of warnings delivered about a year later, announcing the ncoming judgments to be yet nearer (Ezekiel 20-23).

6. The meaning of the now commencing punishment; predictions uttered two years and five months later, when Jerusalem was besieged, announcing to the captives that very day as the commencement of the siege (comp. 2Ki 25:1), and assuring them of the complete overthrow of the city (chapter 24).

7. God's judgment denounced on seven heathen nations (Ammon, Eze 25:1-7; Moab, 8-11; Edom, 12-14; the Philistines, Ezekiel 15:17; Tyre, 26-28:19;, Sidon, 20-24; Egypt, 29-32).

8. After the destruction of Jerusalem a prophetic representation of the triumph of Israel and of the kingdom of God on earth (Ezekiel 33-39).

9. The glorious consummation; a symbolic representation of Messianic times, and of the establishnent and prosperity of the kingdom of God (Ezekiel 40-48). See § 3 below.

II. Genuineness and Completeness. — According to Jewish tradition, doubts were entertained as to the canonicity of the look on the ground of  its containing some apparent contradictions to the law, as well as because of the obscurity of many of its visions. These, however, were removed, it is said, by Rabbi Hananias, vheo wrote a commentary on the book, in which all these difficulties were satisfactorily solved (Mischna, ad. Surenhusius, Praef. ad Part. 4; Carpzov, Introd. part 3, page 215); but still, on account of their obscurity, the visions at the beginning and close of the book were forbidden to be read by those who were under thirty years of age (Carpzov, page 212). Some Continental critics of the last century have impugned the canonicity of the last nine chapters, and have attributed them to same Samaritan or Hebrew who had returned in later times to the land of Judnea (Oeder, Freye Untersuchung uber einige Bucher des A.T., Hal. Sax. 1771; Vogel, in his remarks on the above; and Corrodi, Beleuchtunb des Jildisch. und Christl. Bibelkanons, part 1, page 105, quoted by Rose mcther, Schol. in Ezech. ad c. 40). These objections have been fully answered by Eichhorn (Einleitang, 3:203), Juahb (Introd. in Lib. Sac. V.T. page 356), and others. Jahn has also taken notice of and answered some objections raised by an anonymnous writer in the Monthly Magazine (1798), to the canonicity of chapters 25-32, 35, 36, 38, 39. A translation of Jahn's arguments will be found in Horne's Introd. 4:222, old ed. These and similar objections have so little weight or probability that we shall content ourselves with quoting the general remark of Gesenius in reference to the ehoale of Ezekiel's writings: "This book belongs to that not very numerous class, which, from beginning to end, maintains, by means of favorite expressions and peculiar phrases, such a oneness of tone as by that circumstance alone to prevent any suspicion that separate portions of it are not genuine" (Geschichte der Hebrews Spr. page 35). The canonicity of the book of Ezekiel in general is satisfactorily established by Jewish and Christian authorities. There is, indeed, no explicit reference to it, or quotation from it, in the New Testament. Eichhorn (Einleitung, page 218) mentions the following passages as having apparently a reference to this book: Rom 2:24; comp. Eze 36:21 : Roman 10:5; Gal 3:12; comp. Eze 20:11 : 2Pe 3:4; comp. Eze 12:22; but none of these are quotations. The closing visions of Ezekiel are clearly referred to, though not quoted, in the last chapters of the Apocalypse. The prophet Ezekiel is distinctly referred to by the son of Sirech (Sir 49:8), and by Josephus (Ant. 10:5, 1; 6:3, 7:2, 8:2). The book of Ezekiel is also nentioned as foraming part of the canon in the catalogues of Melito (Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 4:26), Origen (apud  Euseb. 1.c. 6:25), Jerome (Prolegus Caleatus), and the Talmud (Eichhorn, 3:218; 1:126-137).

One of the passages of Josephus to which we have referred has occasioned much controversy and many conjectures, because he seems to affirne that Ezekiel had written two books of prophecies (Ant. 10:5, 1). According to the ordinary and, indeed, as it would seem, necessary interpretation of this passage, Ezekiel was the first who wrote two books respecting the Babylonian captivity. The question then arises, Has one of his books been lost, or are the two now joined into one? The former supposition has been maintained by some in order to account for certain professed quotations from the prophet Ezekiel of passages which are not found in his writings at present. Thus Clemens Romanus (1 Ep. ad Cor. c. 8) refers to such a passage, which is given more at length by Clemens Alexand. (Paedagog. 1:10). Thus, again, Tertullian (De carne Christi, c. 23, page 394, ed. Semlea) says, "Legimus apud Ezechielem de vacca illa qune peperit et non peperit." Other instances may be seen in Fabricius (Codex Pseudapigraphus V.T., 2d ed., page 1118), and quoted from hin by Carpzov (Introd. part 3, page 208). Both these critics, however, agree that the neost probable explanation of such references is that they were derived fmom Jewish tradition. The latter hypothesis, that our present book was originally two, the second containing the last nine chapters, has received the support of very miany critics (see Le Moyine, Varnia Sacra, 2:332; Carpzov, Introd. page 208). This view, however, is not without serious difficulties. There is no evidence that the book, as at present existing, was ever considered two; and the testimony of Josepheus himself, that only twenty-two books were received as sacred (Contr. Apion. 1:8), appears quite opposed to such a supposition, since in whatever way the division of the Old Testament into twenty-two books is made there cannot be two out of the number left for Ezekiel. Eichhorn (Einleitung, 3:146) maintains that it is Jeremiah of whom Josephus speaks, a position to which we should at once assent if we could with him consider the words ὅς πρῶτος equivalent to ὁ δέ πρῶτος. If this is what Josephus meant, we must suppose some corruption of his text. Becker omits the ὅς.

III. Interpretation. — The latter part of the book has always been regarded as very obscure. It will be seen, by the brief notices of the contents given above, that Havernick considers the whole to relate to Messianic times. The predictions respecting Gog (chapteres 38, 39) have been referred by some to Antiochus Epiphanes; by others to Cambyses, to  the Chaldoeans, the Scythians, the Turks, etc. Mr. Granville Penn has interpreted them of Napoleon and the French (The Prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gogue, etc., 1815). SEE GOG. The description of the Temple (chapters 40-43) has been thought by many to contain an account of what Solomon's Temple was; by others, of what the second Temple should be. (See Havernick's Commentar uber Erebhiel, Erlangen, 1843.) The best interpretation of these predictions is to be found in that of the similar ones of the Apocalypse. SEE TEMPLE.

We cannot now enter into the difficulties of these or other chapters (for which we must refer to some of the commentaries mentioned below); but we will enumerate, following Fairbairn, the four main lines of interpretation, viz.,

1. The Historico-literal, adopted by Villalpandus, Grotius, Lowth, etc., who make them a prosaic description intended to preserve the memory of Soiomon's Temple.

2. The Historico-ideal (of Eichhorn, Dathe, etc.), which reduces them "to a sort of vague and well-meaning announcement of future good."

3. The Jewish-carnal (of Lightfoot, Hoffunan, etc.), which maintains that their outline was actually adopted by the exiles.

4. The Christian-spiritual (or Messianic), followed by Luther, Calvin, Cocceius, and most modern commentators, which makes them "a grand complicated symbol of the good God had in reserve for his Church." Rosenmuller, who disapproves alike of the literalism of Grotius, and the arbitrary, ambiguous allegorizing of others, remarks (Schol. in 28:26) that it seems a useless task to attempt to refer these prophecies to distinct events, or to refer their poetical descriptions to naked fact. It is most safe to regard them, in accordance with the nature of allegorical representations and visions in general, as having a literal or material basis in the near past or future (i.e., recollections of Solomon's Temple, and provision of hostile powers), which is made the vehicle of a higher and spiritual import setting forth the distant grandeur, glory, and triumph of the kingdom of God. SEE DOUBLE SENSE (OF PROPHECY).

IV. Style. — The depth of Ezekiel's snatter, and the marvelous nature of his visions, make him occasionally obscure. Hence his prophecy was placed by the Jews among the גְּנָזַין(treasures), those portions of Scripture which  (like the early part of Genesis, and the Canticles) were not allowed to be read till the age of thirty (Jerome, Ep. ad Eustach.; Origen, Proem. hoiuuil. 4, in Cantic.; Hottinger, Thes. Php 2:1; Php 2:3). Hence Jerome compares the "inextricabilis error" of his writings to Virgil's labyrinth ("Oceanus Scripturarum, mysteriorumque Dei labyrinthus"), and also to the Catacombs. The Jews classed him in the very highest rank of prophets. Gregory Naz. (Or. 23) bestows the loftiest encomiums upon him. Isidore (De vit. et ob. Sanct. 99) makes him a type of Christ from the title "Son of Man," but that is equally applied to Daniel (8:17). Other similar testimonies asre quoted by Carpzov (Instod. 2:193 sq.). The Sanhedrim is said to have hesitated long whether his book should form part of the canon, from the occasional ohescurity, and from the supposed contradiction, of 18:20 to Exo 20:5; Exo 34:7; Jer 32:18. But, in point of fact, these apparent oppositions are the mere expression of truths complementary to each other, as Moses himself might have taught them (Deu 24:16). Although, generally speaking, comments on this book were forbidden, a certain R. Nananias undertook to reconcile the supposed differences. (Spinoza, Tract Theol. Polait. 2:27, partly from these considerations, infers that the present book is made up of mere ἀποσμασμάτια, but his argument from its commencing with a 1, and from the expression in 1:3 above alluded to, hardly needs refutation.)

That Ezekiel was a poet of no mean order is acknowledged by almost all critics (Lowth, De sacra Poesi Hebraeorum, ed. J.D. Michaelis, Gottingen, 1770, page 431). Michaelis and Dathe are the only critics of any eminence (as far as we know) who think slightingly of his poetical genius. The question is altogether one of taste, and has, we imagine, been decided by common consent against Michaelis. He remarks more truly that Ezekiel lived at a period when the Hebrew language was declining in purity, when the silver age was succeeding to the golden one. It is, indeed, to the matter ratheir than the language of Ezekiel that we are to look for evidence of poetic genius. His style is often sinmply didactic, and he abounds in peculiarities of expression, Aramaisms, and grammatical anomalies which, while they give individuality to his writings, plainly evince the decline of the language in which he wrote. An extended account of such peculiarities is given by Eichhorn (Einlestuaig in das A.T. 3:196) and Gesenius (Geschichte der Heb. Sprache u. Schift, page 35). Among the most splendid passages are chapter 1 (called by the Rabbis מֶרְכָּבָהthe prophecy against Tyrus (chapters 26-28), that against Assyria's "the noblest  monument of Eastern history" (chapter 31), and chapter 8, the account of what he saw in the Temple porch,

"When, by the vision led, H

is eye surveyed the dark idolatries Of alienated Judah."

— Milton, Par. Lost, 1.

V. Commentaries. — The following are special exegetical works on the entire book; the most important have an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, Commentarii, etc. (in Opera, 3:351 sq., 406); Ephraem Syrus, Explanatio (in Opera, 5:165); Gregory Nazianzen, Signaficatio (in Opera Spuria, 1:870); Jerome, Commentarii, etc. (in Opera, 5); Theodoret, Interpretatio (in Opera, II, 2; also Rome, 1662, fol.); Gregory the Great, Homiliae (in Opera, 1:1174); Raban, Commentarii (in Opera); Rupert, In Ezech. (in Opera, page 489); (Ecolampadius, Commentarius (Basil. 1534, 4to; 1543, 8vo; Argent. 1634, 4to); Strigel, Scholia (Lips. 1539, 1561, 1575, 1579, 8vo); Calvin, Prelectiones (Geneva, 1565, 8vo, and since in French, Genev. 1565, fol.; in English, Edinb. 1849-50, 2 volumes, 8vo); Junius, Comentaria (Genev. 1609, fol.; 1610, 8vo); Maldonatus, In Ezech. (in his Commentarii. page 542); Selneeker Auslegung (Lips. 1567, 4to); Pinto, Commentarius (Salam. 1568, fol., and later); Lavater, Commentaris (Geneva, 1571, fol.); Serrantus, Counmentarius (Ante. 1572,1607, fol.); Heilbrunner, Quaestiones (Laving. 1587, 8vo); Abraham ben-Moses, Ubersetzung (Prag. 1602, 4to); \*Pradus and Villalpandus, Explanationes (Rome, 1605, 3 cols. fo].); Polan, Commentaria (Geneva, 1609, fol, 1610, 8vo); a Lapide, In Ezech. (in his Commentaria) Sanctius, Commentarius (Lugd. 1612, 1619, fol.); Brandmuller, Commentarius (Basil, 1621, 4to); \*Greenhill, Exposition (London, 1645-67, 5 volumes, 4to; also 1827-1863, 8vo; in Dutch, Hague, 17392-6, 4 volumes, 4to); Cocceius, Commentarius (Leyd. 1668, 4to; Amst. 1700, fol.); Hennisch Clavis (Ratenburg, 1684; Lips. 1697, 4to); Petersen, Zeugniss (Freft. 1719, 4to); \*Lowth, Commentary (London, 1723, 4to); \*Starck, Commentarius (Freft. ad M. 1731, 4to); Vogel, Weisagungen (Hal. 1772, 8vo); Volborth, Anmerk. (Gott. 1787, 8vo); Newcome, Explanation (Dub. 1788, 8vo, and since); Venema, Lectionas (Leov. 1790, 4to); \*Horsley, Notes (in Bib. Crsiticisme, 2:65); Hanker, Consideration (in Works, 9:719); \*Rosenmuller, Scolia (Lpz. 8vo, 1808-10, 2 volumes; also 1826); Rhesa, Observationes (Regiom. 1819, 4to); Stern, יְהזְקֵאל, etc. (Vienna, 1842, 8vo); \*Havernick, Commentar (Erlangen, 1843, 8vo); \*Umbreit,  Commentar (Hamb. 1843, 8vo); Macfarlan, Version (London, 1845, 8vo); \*Hitzig, Erklarung (in the Kurtz. Exeget. Hdb., Lpz. 1847, 8vo); \*Fairbairn, Exposition (Edinb. 1851, 1855, 8vo); \*Henderson, Commentary (London, 1855, 8vo) Guthrie, Discourses (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Shrewsbury, Notes (Manch. 1863, 8vo); Kliefoth, Erklarung (Rost. 1864-5, 8vo); \*Hengstenberg, Erlauterung (Brl. 1867 sq., 2 volumes, 8vo; transl. Lond. 1869, 8vo); Cowles, Notes (New York, 1867, 12mo). SEE PROPHETS.

## Ezel[[@Headword:Ezel]]

             occurs only in the name EBEN-EZEL (Hebrews with the art. repeated, ha- E'ben ha-E'zel, חָאֶבֶן הָאֶזֶל[in pause אָזֶל, A'zel], the stone of the departure, perhaps i.e., mile-stone; Sept. τὸ ῾Εργὰβ v.r. ἔργον and ὁ λίθος] ἐκεῖνο; Vulg. lapis cui nomen est Ezel; A.V. "the stone Ezel"), an old testimonial-stone in the neighborhood of Saul's residence, the scene of the parting of David and Jonathan when the former finally fled from the court (1Sa 20:19). It seems to have derived its name from some early circumstance not recorded. At the second mention of the spot (1Sa 20:41) the Hebrews text ( מֵאֵצֶל הִנֶּגֶםA.V. "out of a place toward the south," literally "from the slope of the south;" Sept. ἀπὸ τοῦ Α᾿ργάβ,Vulg. de loco qui vergebat ad austrum) is, in the opinion of some critics, corrupt, as indicated by the Sept., which in both cases has Ergab or Argab (i.e. אִרְגֹּב, Argob', a heap of stones) in 1Sa 20:19 for the Hebrews Eben, "stone," and in 1Sa 20:41 for han-negeb, "the south." The sense in 1Sa 20:41 would then be as follows: "David arose from close to the stone heap" — close to which (the same preposition, אֵצֶל; A.V. "by") it had been arranged beforehand that he should remain (1Sa 20:19). Other interpreters, however, render simply "on the south side," a signification which sufficiently suits the circumstances. SEE BETH-EZEL.

## Ezem[[@Headword:Ezem]]

             (Hebrews E'tsem, אֶצֶם), a less incorrect mode (1Ch 4:29) of Angliciziag the name AZEM SEE AZEM (q.v.), as elsewhere (Jos 19:3).

## Ezen[[@Headword:Ezen]]

             SEE EZNITE.

## Ezengatsi, George (Armen. Keore)[[@Headword:Ezengatsi, George (Armen. Keore)]]

             an Armenian doctor, was born about 1338. He was a disciple of the celebrated John Orodnetsi, and a friend of Gregory Dathevatsi. He was one of the greatest theologians of his century, and professor in a monastery  near Ezenga. He wrote, Instructions how to Administer the Sacraments of Marriage and Baptism: — Explications of the Homilies of St. Gregory Nazianzen: — A Commentary on the Apocalypse: — fourteen Sermons. There is also attributed to him a Commentary on Isaiah. All these works remain in MS. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ezengatsi, John (Armen. Hovan), surnamed Bluz and[[@Headword:Ezengatsi, John (Armen. Hovan), surnamed Bluz and]]

## Ezer[[@Headword:Ezer]]

             (Hebrews E'tser, אֵצֶר,treasure; Sept. Α᾿σάρ, Vulg. Eser), one of the sons of Seir, and native princes of Mount Hor (Gen 36:21; Gen 36:27; Gen 36:30; 1Ch 1:42; 1Ch 1:38, in which last verse the name is Anglicized "Ezar"). B.C. cir. 1927.

Ezer

(Hebrews E'zer, עֶזֶר עֵזֶר[in pause, A'zer, עָזֶר], help), the name of five men. SEE ROMAMTIEZER; SEE EBEN-EZER.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿ζέρ v.r. Α᾿ζέρ,Vulg. Ezer.) A person named with Elead (q.v.) as a son (or descendant) of Ephraim, who was slain by the aboriginal inhabitants of Gath while engaged in a foray on their cattle (1Ch 7:21). Ewald (Gesch. Isr. 1:490) assigns this occurrence to the pre-Egyptian period. B.C. ante 1658.

2. (Sept. Ε᾿ζέρ v.r. Γαζὴρ,Vulg. Ezer.) The father of Hushah, one of the posterity of Hur, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:4). B.C. cir. 1658. In 1Ch 4:17 he appears to be called EZRA, but no such son occurs among the list of'those there attributed to him.

3. (Sept. Α᾿ζέρ v.r. Α᾿ζά, Vulg. Ezer.) The first-named of the Gittite champions who repaired to David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:9). B.C, 1054.

4. (Sept. Α᾿ζέρ v.r. Α᾿ζούρ,Vulg. Azer.) Son of Jeshua, and ruler of Mizpah, who repaired part of the city wall near the armory (Neh 3:19). B.C. 446.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿εζούρ,Vulg. Ezer.) One of the priests who made the circuit of the newly-finished walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12:42). B.C. 446.

## Ezerias[[@Headword:Ezerias]]

             (οΕ῾ζερίας v.r. Ζεχρίας,Vulg. Azarias), the son of Helchiah and father of Saraias, in the ancestry of Esdras (1Es 8:1); evidently the high priest AZARIAH SEE AZARIAH (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 7:1).

## Ezias[[@Headword:Ezias]]

             (οΕ῾᾿ζίας v.r. οΟ῾᾿ζίας,Vulg. Azahel), the son of Meremoth and father of Amarias in the same genealogy (1Es 8:2); evidently the corresponding AZARIAH SEE AZARIAH (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (Ezr 7:3). SEE AZIEI.

## Ezion-geber[[@Headword:Ezion-geber]]

             (Hebrews Etsyon'-Ge'ber, עֶצְיוֹןאּגֶּבֶר[in this form only at 1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:17], i.e. giant's back-bone; Sept. Γασιὼν [in Deuteronomy Γεσιὼν] Γάβερ [in Chronicles Γαβέρ], but in 1 Kings Α᾿σίων Γάβερ ; Vulg. Asiongaber) or EZION-GA'BER (being "in pause," Hebrews Etsyon'-Ga'ber, עֶצִין גּ בֶר[in 1 Kings 20:49; 2Ch 20:36, fully עֶצְיוֹן], so found also at Num 33:35-36; Deu 2:8; but Angli. cized "Ezion-geber" in 1Ki 22:48 [49]), a very ancient city near Elath (q.v.), on the eastern arm of the Red Sea. Jonathan's Targum; following a false etymology, defines the name as i.e., "castle of the cock" (see Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. col. 384; Beck, Chron. Chald. paraphr. 2:101). It is first mentioned in Num 33:35 as one of the stations where the Hebrews halted in their journeyings through the desert, being the last there named before they came to "the wilderness of Zin, which is Kadesh," and the point where they afterwards turned from the 'Arabah to Elath, towards "the wilderness of Moab" (Deu 2:8). SEE EXODE. From its harbor it was that Solomon (1Ki 9:26) sent the fleet which he had there built to the land of Ophir. SEE COMMERCE.

Here also Jehoshaphat (1Ki 22:47; 2Ch 20:35) built a fleet "to go to Ophir;" but because he had joined himself with Ahaziah, "king of Israel, who did wickedly," "the ships were broken that they were not able to go to Tarshish," being probably destroyed on the rocks which lie in "jagged ranges on each side" (Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, page 84). Busching (Erdbeschr. V, 1:620) erroneously locates it at Shurmn, a port at the southern end of the gulf (Geogr. Nub. 3:5). Wellsted (Travels, 2:153) would find it in the modern Dahob, but this is the ancient Dizahab (q.v.); Laborde (Commentaire Geogr. page 124) seeks it in the rocky island el-Kurdiyah, which is hardly adequate in extent or position; and Rtippel (Arab. page 252) locates it at the mouth of'wadv Emrag, i.e., el-Mlursk, which is liable to the same objection. Josephus (Ant. 8:6, 4) says that Ezion-geber (Α᾿σσιογγάβαρος) was also called  Berenice, and that it lay not far from JElath. It is probably the same with the once-populous city 'Asyun (Burckhardt, Syria, page 511). Robinson (Bibliccl Researches, 1:250) says, “No trace of Ezion-geber seems now to remain, unless it be in the name of a small wady with brackish water, el- Ghudyan, opening into el-'Arabah from the western mountain, some distance north of Akabah." It is doubtful, however, whether the sea ever extended so far up the 'Arabah as this. It was probably situated at the point where the Haj route strikes the 'Arabah at the north-west point of the gulf (Robinson, ib. 1:239). Yet the town may have given name to this the nearest spring, for Ghudyan in Arabic corresponds in all the essential letters to Ezion in Heb., which is identical with the later 'Asyun. By comparing 1Ki 9:26-27, with 2Ch 8:17-18, it is probable that timber was floated from Tyre to the nearest point on the Mediterranean coast, and then conveyed over land to the head of the Gulf of Akabah, where the ships seem to have been built; for there can hardly have been adequate forests in the neighborhood. Dr. Wilson noticed fragments of an old caravan route part way up the hill-side in this vicinity (Lands of the Bible, 1:284). SEE WILDERNESS OF THE WANDERING.

## Eznik (or Eznag), Goghpatsi[[@Headword:Eznik (or Eznag), Goghpatsi]]

             (i.e., native of Kolp), a theologian, and one of the best writers of Armenia, was born in 397. He was well versed in the Syriac and Greek languages, so that his masters, the patriarchs Isaac and Mesrob, gave him a mission to Edessa in 425, then to Constantiniople, to collect and translate into Armenian the works of the Church fathers. Eznik became still later bishop of the province of Parcrevant and of the country of the Arsharounikhi. In 449 he attended the national council of Ardachad, which refused to embrace the religion of Zoroaster. Eznik died about 478, leaving, besides some homilies and short treatises, a work entitled The Destruction of False Doctrines (first published in the original Armenian at Smyrna, in 1762; and in a better form in the Collection of Armenian Classics, Venice, 1826; translated into French by Vaillant de Percival, Paris, 1833). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Eznite[[@Headword:Eznite]]

             (Hebrews in marg. Etsni', עֶצְנַי, but in the text ׃עֶצְנוֹi.e., Etsno') is given in 2Sa 23:8, in the Auth.Vers., as an epithet of Adino, praefect of David's body-guard; and if considered as a gentile adj., must mean an inhabitant of Ezen, a place otherwise unknown. But of the words rendered "Adino the Eznite" (עֲדינוֹ הָעֶצְנוֹ, Sept. Α᾿δινὼν οΑ῾᾿σωναῖος; Vulg. quasi tenerrimus ligni vermiculus, as if understanding the latter term to be a form of עֵצwood), Gesenius (Hebrews Lex.) regards the former as a peculiar alliteration for יְעִדּנוֹ, in the sense of "he brandished," from the root עָדַיןto be plant; and the latter as a rare word, עֵצֶן, a spear (for which sense he finds analogy in the Arabic); and thus the whole phrase will be equivalent to that in the parallel passage (1Ch 11:11), which otherwise we must here interpolate (with our translators) in order to make sense. That these words do not contain the name of a person is clear from the fact that Jashobeam is given in the parallel passage, and is capable of identification SEE JASHOBEAEL, and also from the enumeration, in which the two meritorius grades of three each, with the 30 warriors specially enumerated, require just this one special officer to make up the number of 37 specified in the text as peculiarly distinguished. SEE DAVID. The  passage in 2 Samuel is conceded to be less trustworthy than that in 1 Chronicles, even by Davidson, who vainly contends (Sacred Hermeneutics, page 545) for Adino as a proper name. (See at length in Kennicott, Dissertation, 1:71-128; Gesenius, Thes. Hebrews page 994-5.) SEE ADINO.

## Ezob[[@Headword:Ezob]]

             SEE HYSSOP.

## Ezra[[@Headword:Ezra]]

             (Hebrews [except in] Ezra', עֶזְרָא, the help, a Chaldee emphatic for Ezer), the name of three or four men.

I. (1Ch 4:17.)

II. (Sept. ῎Εζοα v.r. Εσδρας) (Vulgate Esdras.) A leading priest among the to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (Nehemiah B.C. 536. His son Meshullam was chief of in the time of the high-priest Joiakim (Neh 3:12). In the somewhat parallel list of Neh 10:2-8, the name of the same person is written עֲזֲרְיָּה, AZARIAH, as it is probably in Ezr 7:1.

III. (Sept. ῎Εσδρας v.r. ῎Εζρα, Josephus ῎Εσδρας,Vulg. Esdras.) The celebrated Jewish scribe (סֹפֵר) and priest (כֹּהֵן), who, in the year B.C. 459, led the second expedition of Jews back from the Babylonian exile into Palestine, and the author of one of the canonical books of Scripture.

1. Parentage. — Ezra was a lineal descendant from Phinehas, the son of Aaron (Ezr 7:1-5). He is stated to be the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah; which Seraiah was slain at Riblah by order of Nebuchadnezzar, having been brought thither a captive by Nebuzaradan (2Ki 25:18-21). SEE SERAIAH. But, as 130 years elapsed between the death of Seraiah and the departure of Ezra from Babylon, and we read that a grandson of Seraiah was the high-priest who accompanied Zerubbabel on the first return to Jerusalem, seventy years before Ezra returned thither, we may suppose that by the term son here, as in some other places, the relationship of great-grandson, or of a still more remote direct descendant,  is intended. SEE FATHER. All that is really known of Ezra is contained in the last four chapters of the book of Ezra, and in Nehemiah 8 and Neh 12:26. In addition to the information there given, that he was a "scribe," a "ready scribe of the law of Moses," "a scribe of the words of the commandments of the Lord and of his statutes to Israel," “a scribe of the law of the God of heaven," and "a priest," we are told by Josephus that he was high-priest of the Jews who were left in Babylon; that he was particularly conversant with the laws of Moses, and was held in universal esteem on account of his righteousness and virtue (Ant. 11:5, 1).

2. Scriptural History. — The rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem, which had been decreed by Cyrus in the year B.C. 536, was, aftei much powerful and vex" atious opposition, completed in the reign and by the permission of Darius Hystaspis, in the year B.C. 517.

The origin of Ezra's influence with the Persian king Artaxerxes Longimanus does not appear, but in the seventh year of his reign, B.C. 459, in spite of the unfavorable report which had been sent by Rehum and Shimshai, he obtained leave to go to Jerusalem, and to take with him a company of Israelites, together with priests, Levites, singers, porters, and Nethinim. Of these a list, amounting to 1754, is given in Ezra 8; and these, also, doubtless form a part of the full list of the returned captives contained in Nehemiah 7, and in duplicate in Ezra 2. Ezra and his companions were allowed to take with them a large free-will offering of gold and silver, and silver vessels, contributed not only by the Babylonian Jews, but by the king himself and his counselors. These offerings were for the house of God, to beautify it, and for the purchase of bullocks, rams, and the other offerings required for the Templeservice. In addition to this, Ezra was empowered to draw upon the king's treasurers beyond the river for any further supplies he might require; and all priests, Levites, and other ministers of the Temple were exemnpted from taxation. Ezra had also authority given him to appoint magistrates and judges in Judaea, with power of life and death over all offenders. The reason of the interest for the worship of God at this time evinced by Artaxerxes appears to have been a fear of the divine displeasure, for we read in the conclusion of the decree to the treasurers beyond the river, "Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven; for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons?" We are also told (Ezr 7:6) that the king granted Ezra all his request; and Josephus informs us that Ezra, being desirous of going to Jerusalem, requested the  king to grant him recommendatory letters to the governor of Syria (Ant. 11:5, 1). We may therefore suppose that the dread which Artaxerxes entertained of the divine judgments was the consequence of the exposition to him by Ezra of the history of the Jewish people. Some writers suppose that this favor shown to the Jews was consequent upon the marriage of Esther with Ahasuerus; but this could not be, even if we should grant, what is unlikely, that the Artaxerxes of the book of Ezra and the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther were the same person, because Ezra set out for Jerusalem in the first month in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes, and Esther was not taken into the king's house until the tenth month in the seventh year of the reign of Ahasuerus, and did not declare her connection with the Jewish people, and obtain favor for them until after the plot of Haman, in the twelfth year of Ahasuerus. SEE AHASUIRUS.

Ezra assembled the Jews who accompanied him on the banks of the river Ahava, where they halted three days in tents. Here Ezra proclaimed a fast, as an act of humiliation before God, and a season of prayer for divine direction and safe conduct; for, on setting out, he "was ashamed to require a band of soldiers and horsemen to help them against the enemy by the way," because he had asserted to the king that the hand of his God is upon all them that seek him for good. Ezra next committed the care of the treasures which he carried with him to twelve of the chief priests, assisted by ten of their brethren, appointing these to take charge of the treasures by the way, and deliver them safely in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem. On the twelfth day from their first setting out Ezra and his companions left the river Ahava, ant arrived safely at Jerusalem in the fifth month, having been delivered from the hand of the enemy and of such as lay in wait by the way. Three days aftel their arrival the treasures were weighed and delivered hiato the custody of some Levites. The returning exiles offered burnt- offerings to the Lord. They delivered also the king's commissions to the viceroys and governors, and gave needful help to the people and the ministers of the Temple.

Ezra's ample commission had been granted him at his own request (Ezr 7:6), and it appears that his great design was to effect a religious reformation among the Palestinian Jews, and to bring them back to the obserrance of the law of Moses, from which they had grievously declined. His first care, accordingly, was to enforce a separation from theirwives of all who had iade heathen marriages, in which number were many priests and Levites, as well ass other Israelites. For this an. opportunity soon presented itself.  When he had discharged the various trusts comannitted to him, the parincesa of the Jews came to him and complained that the Jewish people generally who had returned from the captivity, and also the priests and Levites but especially the rulers and princes, had not kept themselves sepapate from the people of the land, but had done according to the abominations of the remhant of the nations whom their forefathers had driven out, and married their daughters and allowed their children to intermarry with them. On this report Ezra evinced his deep affliction, according to the Jewish custom, by rending his mantle and tearing the hair of his head and beard. There gathered round him all those who still feared God, and dreaded his wrath for the transgression of those whom he had brought back from captivity. Having waited till the time of time evening sacrifice, Ezra rose up, and, having again rent his hair and his garments, made public prayer and confession of sin. The assembled people wept bitterly, and Shechaniah, one of the sons of Elam, came forward to propose a general covenant to put away the foreign wives and their children. Ezra then arose and administered an oath to the people that they would do accordingly. Proclamation was also made that all those who had returned from the captivity should within three days gather themselves together to Jerusalem, under pain of excommunication and forfeiture of their goods. The people assembled at the time appointed, trembling on account of their sin and of the heavy rain that fell. Ezra addressed them, declaring to them their sin, and exhorting them to amend their lives by dissolving their illegal connections. The people acknowledged the justice of his rebukes, and promised obedience. They then requested that, as the rain fell heavily, and the number of transgressors was great, he would appoint times at which they might severally come to be examined respecting this matter, accompanied by the judges and elders of every city. A commission emas therefore formed, consisting of Ezra and some others, to investigate the extent of the evil. This investigation occupied three months. Josephus relates the affecting scene which occurred on the reading of the law by Ezra (Ant. 11:5, 5). The account given by Josephus agrees with that of Nehemiah in all leading particulars, except that Josephus places the date and occasion in the reign of Xerxes (Ant. 11:5, 1).

With the detailed account of this important transaction Ezra's autobiography ends abruptly, and we hear nothing more of him till, rheja- teen was afterwards, in the twentieth of Artaxerses, we find him again at Jerusalem with Nehemiah the "Tirshatha." B.C. 446. It is generally  assumed that Ezra had continued governor till Nehemiah superseded him; but as Ezra's comemission was only of a temporary nature, "to inquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem" (Ezr 7:14), and to carry thither "the silver; and gold which the king and his counselors had freely offered unto the God of Israel" (Ezr 7:15), and as there is no trace whatever of his presence at Jerusalem between the eighth and the twentieth of Artaxerses, it seems probable that after he had effected the above-named reformation, and had appointed competent judges and magistrates, with authority to maintain it, he himself returned to the king of Persia. This is in itself what one would expect, and what is borne out by the parallel case of Nehemiah, and it also accounts for the abrupt termination of Ezra's narrative, and for that relapse of the Jews into their former irregularities which is apparent in the book of Nehemiah. Such a relapse, and such a state of affairs at Jerusalem in general, could scarcely have occurred if Ezra had continued there. Whether he returned to Jerusalem with Nehemiah, or separately, does not appear certainly, but as he is not mentioned in Nehemiah's narrative till after the completion of the wall (Neh 8:1), it is perhaps probable that he followed the latter some months later, having, perhaps, been sent for to aid him in his work. The functions he executed under Nehemiah's government were purely of a priestly and ecclesiastical character, such as reading and interpreting the law of Moses to the people during the eight days of the feast of Tabernacles, praying in the congregation, and assisting at the dedication of the wall, and in promoting the religious reformation so happily effected by the Tirshatha. But in such he filled the first place, being repeatedly coupled with Nehemiah the Tiliathba (8:9; 12:26), while Eliashib the high-priest is not mentioned as taking any part in the reformation at all. In the sealing to the covenant described in Nehemiah 10, Ezra perhaps sealed under the patronymic Seraiah or Azariah (Neh 10:2). In Nehemiah we read that, on the occasion of the celebration of feast of the seventh month, subsequently to Nehemiah's numbering the people, Ezra was requested reading the book of the law of Moses; and that he was herein standing upon a pulpit of wood, which rose him above all the people. As Ezra is not mentioned after Nehemiah's departure for Babylon in the thirty-second, of Artaxerxes, and as everything fell into confusion during Nehemiah's absence (Nehemiah 13), it is not unlikely that Ezra may have again returned to Babylon before that year. SEE Nehemiah 3. Traditionary Acts. — Josephus, who should be our next best authority after Scripture, evidently knew nothing about the time or the place of his death. He vaguely says, "He died an old man, and, was buried in a magnificent manner at Jerusalem" (Ant. 11:5, 5), and places his death in the high-priesthood of Joacim, and before the government of Nehemiah! According to some Jewish chroniclers, he died in the year in which Alexander came to Jerusalem, on the tenth day of the month Tebeth (that is, the lunation in December), in the same yesear in which took place the death of the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and in which prophecy became extinct. According to other taditions, Ezra returned to Babylon and died there at the age of 120 years. 'The Talmudic statement is that he died at Zamzumu, a town on the Tigris, while on his road from Jerusalem to Susa, whither he was going to converse with Artaxerxes about the affairs of the Jews. Thus Benjamin of Tudela says of Nehar- Samorah (apparently Zamuza, otherwise'Zamzumu): "The sepulcher of Ezra the priest and scribe is in this place, where he died on his journey fromr Jerusalem to king Artaxerxes" (Travels, 1:116). A tomb said to be his is siuomin on the Tigris, near its junction with the Euphrates (Layard, Nin. and Bab. page 428, note). An interesting description of this tomb is given by Kitto (Pict. Bible, note at the end of Ezra).

As regards the traditional history of Ezra, it is extremely difficult to judge what portion of it has any historical foundation. The principal works ascribed to him by the Jews, and, on the strength of their testimony, by Christians also, are the following:

(1.) Some traditions assert that Ezra was, about A.M. 0113, the president of the כנסר הגדולה, Synagoga Magna, and the father of all Mishnic doctors. SEE SYNAGOGUE, GREAT. In piety and meekness he was hike Moses' (Yuchasin, page 13. See Zeusach David). When he went from Babylon to Jerusalem, he took with him all persons whose descent was either illegitiemate or unknown, so that the Jews left in Babylon should be נקי כסולתpure like flour (Kiddushin, c. 4, 1, Gem.). Ezmia is said to have introduced the present square Hebrew character, and, in conjunction emith some other elders, to heave made the Masora (q. .), the punctuation, and accentuation of the whole Bible (Abarbanel, Praefat. ad Nachalath Aboth Elias, Praef. 3 Masor.). Ezra is also said to have vigorously resisted the sect of the Sadducees, which sprang up in his days; and therefore to have put the words העולם עד עולם מןa seculo in seculam, at the head  of all prayers, as a symbol by which the orthodox could be distinguished (Blb. Berachoth, fol. 54). Since the people, during the Babylonian captivity or exile, had become accustomed to the Aramaic languages and scarcely understood Hebrew Ezra established the office of turgomtan, תירגמוdragoman, or interpreter, ewho stood near the public reader in the synagogue, and translated every verse after it weas read (Megillah, fol. 74). Hence he is usually regarded as the founder of the synagogue worship. SEE SYNAGOGUE. Ezra ordained that the year of jubilee should be reckoned from the seventh year after the rebuilding of the Temple (Alimnonides, Hal. Jobel. cap. 10).

(2.) Ezra is considered to be the author of the canon, and worthy to have been the lawgiver, if Moses had not preceded him (Bab. Sanhal. c. 2, f. 21 comp. the art. SEE CANON ). He is even said to have rewritten the whole of the Old Testament from memory, the copies of which had perished by neglect. To him is also ascribed the authorship of the hooks of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and, some add, Esther; and, many of the Jews say, also of the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve prophets; to which we may with more probability perhaps add the 119th Psalm. (See each book in its place.) Tischendorf has lately published (Apocalypses Apocrypha, Lips. 1861-3) an editio princeps of the Greek text of an "Apocalypsis Esdem." SEE REVELATIONS (SPURIOUS).

But we must abstain from recounting all the traditional amplifications of the doings of Ezra, since, if sin were to be received, it would be difficult to say what he did not do so strong has been the inclination to connect important facts with his person (comp. 2 Esdras 14; Irenaeus, adv. Heares. 3:25; Clem. Alexandr. Strom. 1, page 142, Augustin. De Mirabil. Script. 2:23; Jerome, ad Halrid. page 212; Buxtorf Tiberias, page 88 sq, Bertholdt, Einleit. 1:69 sq.; De Wvette, Einleit. 17 sq.; Sauer, Dissert. in canonem Vet. Test. etc., Altorf; 1792; Sanhedrin, fol. 21:1; Rau, De Synag. Magna, pages 31, 89; Hartmann, Verbindung des Altensund Neuen Testamentes, page 114 sq.). Of most of the above acts of Ezra a full account is given in Prideaux's Connexion, 1:308-348, and 355-376; also in Otho's Lex. Rabb. page 208 sq. A compendious account of the arguments by which most of these Jewish statements are proved to be fabulous is given in Stehelin's Rabbin. Literat. pages 5-8; of which the chief are drawn from the silence of the sacred writers themselveas, of the apocryphal books and of Josephus and it might be added, of Jerome and from the fact that they may be traced to the author of the chapter in the Mishna called Pirke  Aboth. Arabian fables about Ezra are mentioned in Hottinger's Thes. Philo. page 113, and in Herbelot, Bibl. Orientale, pages 697, etc.

## Ezra, Abraham ibn-[[@Headword:Ezra, Abraham ibn-]]

             SEE ABEN-EZRA.

## Ezra, Book Of[[@Headword:Ezra, Book Of]]

             This is manifestly a continuation of the books of Chronicles, as, indeed, it is called by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, Sermones dierum Esdrae (ap. Cosin's Canon of Script. page 51), and as was early conceded (Huetius, Dem. Evaen. 4:14, page 341). SEE CHRONICLES (BOOKS OF).

I. Contents. — The book of Ezra contains ἀπομνημονεὑματα, memorabilia, or records of events occurring about the termination of the Babylonian exile. It contains accounts of the favors bestowed upon the Jewms by the Persian kings; of the rebuilding of the Temple; of the mission of Ezra to Jerusalem, and in regulations and reforms. Such records forming the subject of the book of Ezra, we neust not be surprised that its parts are not so intimately connected with each other as we might have expected if the author had set forth his intention to furnish a complete history of his times (see Pebeble, Persian Monarchy, in his storks, Lond. 1635, page 345). The events narraated. in thee book of Ezra are spread over the reigns of

Cyrus.................................... Years.

7     Months.

0

Cambyses ..............................  7     5

Magums, or Pseudo-Sneerdis ...........   0     17

Darius Hystaspis ....................    36    0

Xerxes .............................     190   5

Artaban................................  0     7

Artaxerxes (in the eighth year of whose) 8

reign the records of Ezra tease).        0

Total ............................. 79    0

The arrangement of the facts in the book of Ezra is chronological. The book may be divided into twoportions. Thefirst consists of chapters 1-6, and contains the history of the returning exiles and of their rebuilding of the Temple, and comprises the period from the first year of Cyrus, B.C. 536, to the sixth year of Darius Hystaspis, B.C. 515. The second portion contains the personal history of the migration of Ezra to Palestine, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. This latter portion, embracing chapters 7-10, is  an autobiography of Ezra during about twelve or thirteen months, in the seventh and eighth years of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimantis.

II. Plan. — The course of events recorded in these ten chapters appears to be as follows: First, the decree of king Cyrus, putting an end to the Babylonish captivity, and instructing the returning Israelites to rea build the Temple and restore the worship of Jehovah (Ezra 1). Second, the consequent proceedings of the people (Ezra 2, 3). Third, the hinderances to which they were exposed by the jealousy of the Persian government, stimulated as this was by the hatred of the neighbors of the Jews, until Darius discovered the original decree of Cyrus, and confirmed and, extended it, so that the Temple was fully rebuilt, and the worship restored according to the law (Ezra 4 :l-6). Fourth; the mission of Ezra, who was both a priest and a scribe, and was empowered by king Artaxerxes not only to maintain the prescribed worship; but, greatly more than that, to restore the entire theocratic administration only reserving the temporal supremacy of the Persian monarchy (Ezr 7:7). Lastly, the reconstruction of this theocratic state, which Ezra effected so completely that he carried the people with him in remodelling the family relations by the law against intermarriage with certain races (Ezr 9:10).

III.Utility. — This is a complete narrative in itself; and there is no room for the hypothesis that chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, taken together, form one great historical work. The arguments for this hypothesis are of no weight in themselves for establishing the conclusion; but in so far as they are statement of fact, they are willingly put forward by us as circumstances worthy of consideration in themselves, and apart from the illogical purpose to which they have been applied.

1. The three books have a large number of words and phrases in common, which are parts of Scripture. This agrees well with their composition at a new epoch in the history of the Hebrew nation and its literature, by men who had been brought up together at the same Persian court, Ezra and Nehemiah being also most intimate friends and fellow workers. The opinion is also probable that the chronicles were a compied bu Ezra, as well as the book to which his own name has been given.

2. There is a redilection from genealogical details running through all these books. This seems to have been characteristic of the age; and it was probably necessary, considering the efforts to restore the old arrangements  as to the holding of property, the administration of governing, all of which objects were likely to force genealogical questions upon the notice of men.

3. There is a similar prominence given to details about the priests and Levites. This is unavailable in any treatment of the people of Israel, unless their character as the church of God is to be overlooked. Especially, in whatever proportion must the greater attentuion have been given to its ecclestiastical arrangements.

IV. Authgorship. — A late ingeniuos writer (Reverend and Lord Hervey, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v.) thus pronounces on this question: “Like the two books of Chronicles, it consists of the contemporary historical journals kept from time to time by the prophets, or other authorised persons, who were eye witnesses for the most part of what they record, and whose several narratives were afterward strung together, and either abridged or added to as the case required by a later hand. That later hand, in the book of Ezra, was doubtedly Ezra's as put together by him, yet strictly only the last four chapters are his original work. Nor will it be difficult to point out with tolerable certainty several of the writers of whose writings the first six chapters are composed. Accordingly, that writer, in limitation of any relationship proceeds to dissect the book for this purpose. He regards as a parenthetic addition made in the reign of Artaxerxes Ezra's own production. A still later critic (Dr. Davidson in the new edition of Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Bible Lit s.v.) is even bolder in distributing various portions to “the Chronist” as he designates the unkown interpolater after Ezra.

It is a sufficient refutation of all such attempts to note their extremely subjective character, depending chiefly upon the caprice or conjecture of the critic himself; for the peculiarities cited, when closely examined, are found to be too general and accidental to be relied uponas proofs of authorship, especially in view of the foregoing remarksrespecting the scheme of the book. Moreover, if all admit, Ezra did incorporateolder documents into his history (so even Mosesdoes in the Pentateuch), yet, as he moulded them into a homogenous narrative, this does not mitigate against his claim to be regarded as the proper author, and not simply as the editor of the book ythat bears his name. (See the Einleitungen of Havernick and Keil.)  V. Personality of the Writer. — In the first six chapters the use of the third person predominates in the narrative, except in passages where, by synecdoche, occurs אמרנא, Hebrews אמרנוwe said, or where the narrative contains abstracts from documents to which Ezra had access. In these abstracts the Aramiac or Chaldee language of the original documents has been preserved from Ezr 4:8 to Ezr 6:8 and Ezr 7:12-26. These portions exist in Kennicott's Cod page 240, in a collateral Hebrew translation, reprinted in Knnicott's edition of the Hebrew Bible, and separately in Chaldaicorum Danielis et Eraroe capitum interpretatio Hebraica (Ludovicus Schulze, Halae, 1782, 8vo). An argument has been raised against the opinion that Ezra wasd the author of the whole book that bears his name from the use of the first person pluralin the 4th verse of the 5th chapter, which would seem to imply that the narrative was present on the occasion described; but, setting aside other replies to this argument, it appears that the word we refers to Tatnai and his companions, and not at all to the Jews.Ezra speaks from Ezr 7:27, to Ezr 9:15, in the first person. “There is an essential difference between public events which a man recollects, though only as in a dream, to have heard of at the time when they occurred, and those which preceeded his birth. The former we think of with reference to ourselves, the latter are foreign to us. The epoch and duration of the former we measure by our own life; the latter belong to a period for which our imagination has no scale. Life and definiteness are imparted to all that we hear or read with respect to the events of our own life.” (Niebuhr, On the distincton between Annals and History). These remarks, which Niebuhr made in reference to Tacitus, are in a great measure applicable also to Ezra. Instances of similar change of person are so frequent in ancient authors that rhewtorians have introduced it among the rhetorical figures under the name of enallages personarum. The prophetical writings of the Old Testament furnish examples of such ἐναλλαγή. For instance, Eze 1:1-3; Zec 1:1; Zec 6:1; Zec 7:1; Zec 4:8; Jer 20:1 sq., comp. with  Jer 5:7 sq.; Jer 21:1; Jer 28:1-5; Jer 32:1-8; Hos 1:2-3; Hos 3:1. So also in Habakkuk, Daniel, etc. The frequency of this ἐναλλαγή especially in the prophetical parts of the Old Testament, arises from either the more objective or more subjective tendency of the style, which of course varies with the contents of the chapter. (See Fromman, Disq. Qua Orientis regibus plurium numero de se loque non inusitatum fuisse, probabiliter ostenditur, Cob. 1762). We express our opinion that even Havernick does not rightly set forth the truth of the matter when, in the Einleitung, he says that this ἐναλλαγή arose from Ezra's imitationof  the prophetic usage, and when he approvingly quotes Schirmer's Observationes exegeticoe et criticoe in librum Esdroem 2:8 (Vratisl. 1830). There was certainly as little imitation of the prophets if we change from the first to the third person in our own communications. Ε᾿ναλλαγή never arises from imitation but only from imitation, but only from the more subjective or more objective turn of our mind, and from that vivacity of style which renders it incumbent upon the reader rather than upon the writer to supply that וִיּאֹמֶר, which, as in Jon 2:3, forms the transition from the use of the third to the adoption of the first person.

VI. Date. — The reckless assertions of some writers that this composition as a whole must be referred to a period about a century later the Ezra, or more, need not be noticed, because they have not even a pretense of argument in their favor. One writer, Zunz (Die gottesdienstl. Vortrage der Juden, 1832), has indeed alleged that there is some exaggeration about the sacred vessels said to have been restored by Cyrus; but his fellow- unbelievers have refused to agree with him, and have defended the historical credibility of the book throughout. Another critic, Bertheau, sees an evidence of the composition of Ezr 6:22 under the Greek successors of Alexander, because the king of Persia is called the king of Assyria; an argument which might have been left to its own weakness, even though we had been unable to give the parallels 2Ki 23:29; Lam 5:6, as Keil has done.

On the contrary, critics who rely upon their internal arguments might have seen evidence in favor of its early composition in the fact that its chronology is clear and exact; while the accounts of Jewish affairs under the Persian monarchy, a given by Josephus from apocryphal writers and other sources unknown to us, present extreme confusion and some palpable mistakes. The book begins with the decree to rebuild the Temple, B.C. 536. It narrates the difficulties and hinderances before this was accomplished in the sixth year of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, about B.C. 516. It passes in silence over the rest of his reign, 31 years, and the whole of the reign of Xerxes, 21 years, proceeding directly to the work of Ezra, who received his commission in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C.459. If the whole of the events narrated in the closing chapter took place almost immediately, as is understood, we believe, by all commentators, then the extreme length of time embraced in the narrative is not above 80 years; and the order is strictly chronological, though it is not  continuous, but leaves a blank of almost sixty years. (See Hilgenfeld, Ezra und Daniel, und ihre neueste Bearbeitungen, Halle, 1863.)

VII. Language. — The book is written partly in Hebrew and partly in Chaldee. The Chaldee begins at Ezr 4:8, and continues to the end of Ezr 6:18. The letter or decree of Artaxerxes, Ezr 7:12-26, is also given in the original Chaldee.

VIII. Canonicity. — There has never been any doubt about Ezra being canonical, although there is no quotation form it in the New Testament. Augustine styles Ezra “rather a writer of transactions than a prophet” (De Cix. Dei, 18:36).

IX. Apocryphal Additions. — We have spoken thus far of the canonical book of Ezra; there are, however, four books that have received this name, viz, the book noticed above, the only one which was received into the Hebrew canon under that name, the book of Nehemiah, and the two apocryphal books of Esdras, concerning which last SEE ESDRAS.

X. Commentaries. — The following are special exegetical works on the entire book, the most important being denoted by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: \*Aben Ezra, פֵּרוּשׁ(in Buxtorfs Rabbinical Bible, Basle, 1618-19 fol.); Bede, Erposito (in Works, 8:360); \*Rashi, פֵּרוּשׁ(Naples, 1487, 4to; Venice, 1517, fol.; in Latin, with other books, Goltha, 1714, 4to); \*Kimchi, פֵּרוּשׁ(in Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible, Ven. 1549, fol.); Simeon, פֵּריּשׁ(in the Bible, Venice, 1518, fol.); Jachya, פֵּרוּשׁ(Bologna, 1538, fol.); Jaabez, חֶסֶד תּורָת(Belvedere, n.d. fol.); Trapp, Commentary (London, 1656, fol.); De Oliva, Commentarii (Leyden, 1564, 4to; 1679, 2 volumes, fol.); \*Strigel, Commentarius (Tigur. 1570, 1584, fol.); also Scholia (Lips.1571); Wolphius, Commentarii (Tigur. 1584, fol.); Sanctius, Commentarii (Leyd. 1628, fol.); Lombard, Commentarius (Par. 1643, fol.); Jackson, Explanation (London, 1658, 4to); Lee, Discourse (London, 1722, 8vo); \*Rambach, Notae (in Grotii et Clerici Adnot. in Hagiogri); \*Schirmer, Observationes (Vratislav. 1817, 8vo; 1820, 450); \*Keil, Apologet. Vers. etc. (Berl. 1833, 8vo); Kleinert, Enstehung, etc. (in the Dorpt. Beitr. 1:1-304; 2:1-232); Jeitteles, עֶזְרָא, etc. (Vienna, 1835, 8vo); \*Bertheau, Erklar. (in the Kurzgef. Exeg. Hdb. Lpz. 1862, 8vo).  4. (Sept. ῎Εζρα v.r. ῎Εσδρας, Vulg. Esdras.) One of the chief Israelites who formed the first division that made the circuit of the walls of Jerusalem when reconstructed (Neh 12:33). B.C. 446.

## Ezra, Moses ibn-, ben Jacob[[@Headword:Ezra, Moses ibn-, ben Jacob]]

             a Jewish writer, was born about 1070, and died about 1139. He is considered one of the most finished of Hebrew poets, but is equally  celebrated as a Talmudist and professor of Greek philosophy. Although, like his brother poets, he excelled in sacred song, he also tuned his lyre as an inhabitant of the West, and sang at times of love, but more often in praise of the beauties of nature, which in later times was even acknowledged by Alexander von Humboldt (Cosmos, 3, page 119), who praised his sublime description of natural scenery. His works are remarkable not only for the intrinsic excellence of the matter, but also for the purity, sweetness, and aesthetic grace of their style. His selichoth, or penitential hymns, are greatly esteemed by the Jews, who give to Ibn-Ezra the epithet of has-salach, or the "selichoth poet," par excellence. He wrote hymns for festival and other occasions, entitled זמירות ותחנונים, in the Sephardim ritual: — Diwan R.M. ben-Ezra, a collection of poems, lyrical, occasional, and devotional: — Sefer ha-tarshish, or Sefer Anak, Be ס8 התרשישor ס8 ענק; this poem is called Tarshish, from the number of its stanzas — 1210: Sefer Arugath Hab-bosem, ס8 ערגת הבשם, the "Garden of Spices," on the philosophy of religion, after the manner of Saadiah's Emunoth, in seven chapters, fragments of which have been published by Dukes, after a Hamburg MS. in Zion 2, page 117 (Frankfort- on-the-Main, 1842, 1843): — Tokacha, תוכחה, a penitential hymn, reprinted by Asker, in his Book of Life, with an English translation (Lond. 1849). See Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 1:257 sq.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 11; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 6:123 sq.; Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jud. Poesie, pages 45, 168; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. u.s. Sekten, 2:414; Sachs, Religiose Poesie der Juden, page 69 sq., 276 sq.; Zunz, Literaturgeschichte der synag. Poesie, pages 202, 412, 585, 614; Synagogale Poesie, pages 21, 133, 228 sq.; Kimchi, Liber Radicum (ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht), page 36 sq.; Kampf, Nichtandalusische Poesie andalusischer Dichter, pages 192-216; Dukes, Moses ben-Ezra (Altona, 1839); Rabbinische Blumenlese, page 58. (B.P.)

## Ezrach[[@Headword:Ezrach]]

             SEE BAY-TREE.

## Ezrah[[@Headword:Ezrah]]

             (Hebrews Ezrah, עֶזְרָה, help, another form of Ezer or Ezra; Sept. Ε᾿σρί, Vulg. Ezra, A.V. “Ezra”), a descendant of Judah (as if in the line of Caleb), and the father of several sons, although his own parentage is not given (1Ch 4:17), unless he be identical with the Ezer of 1Ch 4:4, whose son's name, however, does not correspond. B.C. ante 1618. SEE MERED. According to the author of the Quoesliones in Paral. Ezra is the same as Amram, and his sons Jether and Mered are Aaron and Moses; but this is cut of the question. SEE EZRAHITE.

## Ezrahite[[@Headword:Ezrahite]]

             (Hebrew, with the article ha-Ezrach הָאֶזְרָחִי, as if a patronymic from Ezrach; Sept. ὁ Ζαρίτης v.r. οΕ῾᾿ζραηλίτης, Vulg. Ezrohita), a title attached to two persons — Ethan (1Ki 4:31; Psalms 89, title) and Heman (Psalms 88, title). The word is naturally derivable from Ezrah, אֶזְרָח, or which is almost the same — Zerah, זֶרִח; and accordingly in 1Ch 2:6, Ehan and Heman are both given as sons of Zerah, the son of Judah. Another Ethan and another Heman are named as Levites and musicians in the lists of 1 Chronicles 6 and elsewhere. — Smith, s.v. In the passage first cited, “the Ezrabite,” or, rather, Ezrachite, appears as a designation applied to Ethan, a man famous for his wisdom (1Ki 5:11 [A. V. 4:31]). SEE ETHAN. In the inscription of Psalms 89, Ethan the Ezrahite is named as its author; and in the inscription of Isaiah 98 the same is said with respect to it of Heman the Ezrahite. This has led some to identify the Ethan and Heman, who were chief among the singers appointed by David (1Ch 15:19). But we have no reason to believe that, whatever skill these men had in music, they were famed for surpassing wisdom; and the inscription in Psalms is perhaps due to the mistake of some one in whose mind the passage in Kings had got mixed up with 1Ch 2:6, where Ethan and Heman appear among the sons  of Zerah of the tribe of Judah. As אזרהי is the same as זרהי with the prosthetic א, it is not improbable that in this last passage it is the Ethan of Kings that is referred to; but we cannot with certainty pronounce this, as there is a want of accordance between the statement of the chronicler and that is Kings respecting the parentage of the other persons mentioned. It is not impossible, however, that the names “Heman, Calcol, and Dara” have been interpolated in the text of Chronicles form the passage in Kings, especially as the writer goes on to state only the descendants of Carmi or Zimri and Ethan (1Ch 2:7-8). In this case Ethan, the son of Zerah, may be Ethan the Ezrahite; but there is no Heman the Ezrahite. — Kitte, S.V. A readier solution of the whole difficulty would be to suppose that "Ezrahite" in the title to Psalms 88 is merely an orthographical variety for IZHARITE (יַצְהָרַי, 1Ch 26:23), a Levitical family to which the musical Heman certainly belonged (1Ch 1:33-38); and that the epithet has crept into the title of Psalms 89 by assimilation of the names of Ethan and Heman so frequently associated together (these two Psalms being apparently closely related in authorship, and perhaps originally joined together; set Delitzsch, Commentar fib. den Psalter, 1:653 sq.). SEE ZARHITE.

## Ezri[[@Headword:Ezri]]

             (Hebrews Ezri', עֶזְרַי, helpful; Sept. Ε᾿σδρί v.r. Ε᾿ζραϊv, Vulg. Ezri), son of Chelub, superintendent for king David of those “who did the work of the field for tillage of the ground" (1Ch 27:26). B.C. 1014.