

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

A- Adder

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

A

A.

SEE ALPHA

Aadrak

SEE AAZRAK

A'alar

(**Ααλαρ**), a person who (or a place from which some of the Jews) returned after the captivity (1 Esdras 5:36); more correctly called in the parallel list (^{<1076>}Nehemiah 7:61) **IMMER** SEE **IMMER** (q.v.).

Aara

(**ara**), a factitious term used by the Rabbins (*Lex. Talm. Aruch*, s.v.) as an example of a word beginning with two X's, like **AAZRAK** SEE **AAZRAK** (q.v.). In the Talmud, according to Buxtorf (*Lex. Talm.* col. 2), it is written *Avera* (**arywa**), perhaps only a singular Chaldaic form of the plural **URIM** SEE **URIM** (q.v.), *light*.

A'aron

[vulgarly pronounced *Ar'on*] (Heb. *Aharon'*, **רֹאֵן**, derivation uncertain: Gesenius, *Thesaur. Hebrews* p. 33, thinks from the obsolete root **rtā**; to be *libidinous* [so the Heb. *Lex. Aruch*, from **tr22t**, referring (erroneously) to his *conception* during the Pharaonic edict]; but in his *Hebrews Lex.* s.v. compares with **wot**; *mountaineer*; Furst, *Hebrews Handwörterbuch*, s.v., makes it signify *enlightener*, from an obsolete root **rtā**;= **rwa**, *to shine*. Sept., N.T., and Josephus, **Ἀαρών**).

I. History. — Aaron was the eldest son of the Levite Amram by Jochebed, and the brother of Moses (^{<001>}Exodus 6:20; 7:7; ^{<005>}Numbers 26:59); born B.C. 1742. He is first mentioned in the account of Moses' vision of the burning bush (^{<004>}Exodus 4:14), where the latter was reminded by the Lord

that Aaron possessed a high degree of persuasive readiness of speech, and could therefore speak in His name in his behalf. During the absence of Moses in Midian (B.C. 1698-1658), Aaron had married a woman of the tribe of Judah, named Elisheba (or Elizabeth), who had borne to him four sons, Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar; and Eleazar had, before the return of Moses, become the father of Phinehas (⁽¹¹⁶³⁾Exodus 6:23-25). Pursuant to an intimation from God, Aaron went into the wilderness to meet his long-exiled brother, and conduct him back to Egypt. They met and embraced each other at the Mount of Horeb (⁽¹¹⁶⁷⁾Exodus 4:27), B.C. 1658. When they arrived in Goshen, Aaron, who appears to have been well known to the chiefs of Israel, introduced his brother to them, and aided him in opening and enforcing his great commission (⁽¹¹⁶⁹⁾Exodus 4:29-31). In the subsequent transactions, Aaron appears to have been almost always present with his more illustrious brother, assisting and supporting him; and no separate act of his own is recorded, although he seems to have been the actual instrument of effecting many of the miracles ⁽¹¹⁷⁰⁾(Exodus 7, 19 sq.). Aaron and Hur were present on the hill from which Moses surveyed the battle which Joshua fought with the Amalekites (⁽¹¹⁷¹⁾Exodus 17:10-12); and these two long sustained the weary hands upon whose uplifting (in order to extend the official rod, rather than in prayer, see ver. 9) the fate of the battle was found to depend. Afterward, when Moses ascended Mount Sinai to receive the tables of the law, Aaron, with his sons and seventy of the elders, accompanied him part of the way up, and were permitted to behold afar off the symbol of the Sacred Presence (⁽¹¹⁷⁴⁾Exodus 24:1, 2, 9-11). During the absence of Moses in the mountain the people seem to have looked upon Aaron as their head, and an occasion arose which fully vindicates the divine preference of Moses by showing that, notwithstanding the seniority and greater eloquence of Aaron, he wanted the high qualities which were essential in the leader of the Israelites (see Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 3, 238 sq.). The people at length concluded that Moses had perished in the fire that gleamed upon the mountain's top, and, gathering around Aaron, clamorously demanded that he should provide them with a visible symbolic image of their God, that they might worship him as other gods were worshipped ⁽¹¹⁸¹⁾(Exodus 32). Either through fear or ignorance, Aaron complied with their demand; and with the ornaments of gold which they freely offered, cast the figure of a calf (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.). *SEE CALF*. However, to fix the meaning of this image as a symbol of the true God, Aaron was careful to proclaim a feast to Jehovah for the ensuing day (see Moncaeius, *Aaron purgatus sive de vitulo aures*, Atreb.

1605, Franckf. 1675). At this juncture, Moses' reappearance confounded the multitude, who were severely punished for this sin. Aaron attempted to excuse himself by casting the whole blame upon the people, but was sternly rebuked by his brother, at whose earnest intercessions, however, he received the divine forgiveness (^{<BIBL>}Deuteronomy 9:20). During this and a second absence in the mountain, Moses had received instructions regarding the ecclesiastical establishment, the tabernacle, and the priesthood, which he soon afterward proceeded to execute. *SEE TABERNACLE; SEE WORSHIP*. Under the new institution Aaron was to be high-priest, and his sons and descendants priests; and the whole tribe to which he belonged, that of Levi, was set apart as the sacerdotal or learned caste. *SEE LEVITE*. Accordingly, after the tabernacle had been completed, and every preparation made for the commencement of actual service, Aaron and his sons were consecrated by Moses, who anointed them with the holy oil and invested them with the sacred garments ^{<BIBL>}(Leviticus 8, 9), B.C. 1657. The high-priest applied himself assiduously to the duties of his exalted office, and during the period of nearly forty years that it was filled by him his name seldom comes under our notice. But soon after his elevation his two eldest sons, Nadab and Abihu, were struck dead for daring, seemingly when in a state of partial inebriety, to conduct the service of God in an irregular manner, by offering incense with unlawful fire. On this occasion it was enjoined that the priests should manifest none of the ordinary signs of mourning for the loss of those who were so dear to them. To this heavy stroke Aaron bowed in silence (^{<BIBL>}Leviticus 10:1-11). Aaron joined in, or at least sanctioned, the invidious conduct of his sister Miriam, who, after the wife of Moses had been brought to the camp by Jethro, became apprehensive for her own position, and cast reflections upon Moses, much calculated to damage his influence, on account of his marriage with a foreigner — always an odious thing, among the Hebrews. For this Miriam was struck with temporary leprosy, which brought the high-priest to a sense of his sinful conduct, and he sought and obtained forgiveness ^{<BIBL>}(Numbers 12). *SEE MIRIAM*. Subsequently to this (apparently B.C. 1620), a formidable conspiracy was organized against Aaron and his sons, as well as against Moses, by chiefs of influence and station — Korah, of the tribe of Levi, and Dathan and Abiram, of the tribe of Reuben. *SEE KORAH*. But the divine appointment was attested and confirmed by the signal destruction of the conspirators; and the next day, when the people assembled tumultuously, and murmured loudly at the destruction which had overtaken their leaders and friends, a fierce pestilence broke out

among them, and they fell by thousands on the spot. When this was seen, Aaron, at the command of Moses, filled a censer with fire from the altar, and, rushing forward, arrested the plague between the living and the dead (Numbers 16). This was, in fact, another attestation of the divine appointment; and, for its further confirmation, as regarded Aaron and his family, the chiefs of the several tribes were required to deposit their staves, and with them was placed that of Aaron for the tribe of Levi. They were all laid up together over night in the tabernacle, and in the morning it was found that, while the other rods remained as they were, that of Aaron had budded, blossomed, and yielded the fruit of almonds. The rod was preserved in the tabernacle (comp. Hebrews 9:4) as an authentic evidence of the divine appointment of the Aaronic family to the priesthood — which, indeed, does not appear to have been ever afterward disputed (Numbers 17). Aaron was not allowed to enter the Promised Land, on account of the distrust which he, as well as his brother, manifested when the rock was stricken at Meribah (Numbers 20:8-13). When the host arrived at Mount Hor, in going down the Wady Arabah *SEE EXODE*, in order to *double* the mountainous territory of Edom, the divine mandate came that Aaron, accompanied by his brother Moses and by his son Eleazar, should ascend to the top of that mountain in the view of all the people; and that he should there transfer his pontifical robes to Eleazar, and then die (Numbers 20:23-29). He was 123 years old when his career thus strikingly terminated; and his son and his brother buried him in a cavern of the mountain, B.C. 1619. *SEE HOR*. The Israelites mourned for him thirty days; and on the first day of the month Ab the Jews yet hold a fast in commemoration of his death (Kitto, s.v.). The Arabs still show the traditionary site of his grave (Numbers 20:28; 33:38; Deuteronomy 32:50), which in the time of Eusebius was reputed to be situated in Petra, in the modern Wady Mousa (*Onomast.* s.v. Or; *Am. Bib. Repos.* 1838, p. 432, 640). He is mentioned in the Koran (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 85 sq.), and the Rabbins have many fabulous stories relating to him (Eisenmenger, *Ent. Judenth.* 1:342,855,864). For Talmudical references, see *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. For an attempted identification with Mercury, see the *Europ. Mag.* 1:16. *SEE MOSES*.

In Psalm 133:2, Aaron's name occurs as that of the first anointed priest. His descendants ("sons of Aaron," Joshua 21:4, 10, 13, etc.; poetically, "house of Aaron," Psalm 115:10, 12; Psalm 118:3, etc.) were the priesthood in general, his lineal descendants being the high-

priests. *SEE AARONITE*. Even in the time of David, these were a very numerous body (^{<13127>}1 Chronicles 12:27). The other branches of the tribe of Levi were assigned subordinate sacred duties. *SEE LEVITE*. For the list of the pontiffs, including those of the line of Ithamar (q.v.), to whom the office was for some reason transferred from the family of the senior Eleazar (see Josephus, *Ant.* v. 11, 5, 8:1, 3), but afterward restored (comp. ^{<1123>}1 Samuel 2:30), *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*.

II. Priesthood. — Aaron and his sons were invested by Moses with the *priestly* office, which was to remain in Aaron's line forever (^{<1231>}Exodus 29). This was altogether distinct from the semi-sacerdotal character with which his mere seniority in the family invested him according to patriarchal usage. The duty and right of sacrificing to God was thereafter reserved to that family exclusively. The high-priesthood was confined to the first-born in succession; and the rest of his posterity were priests, simply so called, or priests of the second order (Ernesti, *De Aarone*, Wittenb. 1688-9). *SEE SACERDOTAL ORDER*.

III. Typical Character. — Aaron was a type of Christ (see Hylander, *De Aarone summisque Judaeor. pontificibus, Messioe typis*, Lond. and Goth. 1827) — not, indeed, in his personal, but in his official, character:

1. As high-priest, offering sacrifice;
2. In entering into the holy place on the great day of atonement, and reconciling the people to God; in making intercession for them, and pronouncing upon them the blessing of Jehovah, at the termination of solemn services;
3. In being anointed with the holy oil by *effusion*, which was pre-figurative of the Holy Spirit with which our Lord was endowed;
4. In bearing the names of all the tribes of Israel upon his breast and upon his shoulders, thus presenting them always before God, and representing them to Him;
5. In being the medium of their inquiring of God by Urim and Thummim, and of the communication of His will to them. But, though the offices of Aaron were typical, the priesthood of Christ is of a far higher order. Aaron's priesthood was designed as "a shadow of heavenly things," to lead the Israelites to look forward to "better things to come," when "another priest" should arise, "after the order of Melchizedek" (^{<3161>}Hebrews 6:20),

and who should “be constituted, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.” (See Hunter, *Sacred Biog.* p. 282 sq.; Evans, *Scrip. Biog.* 3, 77; Williams, *Characters of O.T.* p. 97; Gordon, *Christ in the Ancient Church*, 1:271.) **SEE PRIEST.**

Aaron Acharon

(i.e. the *younger*), a rabbi born at Nicomedia in the beginning of the 14th century. He belonged to the sect of the Caraites. We have from him several Hebrew works on mystical theology (*The Tree of Life, The Garden of Faith, The Garden of Eden*), and a literal commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled *hr/T rts* (veil of the law). — Hofer, *Biographie Generale*, 1, 6.

Aaron Ha-Rishon

(i.e. the *elder*), a celebrated rabbi of the sect of the Caraites, practiced medicine at Constantinople toward the close of the 13th century. He had the reputation of being a great philosopher and an honest man. He is the author of an Essay on Hebrew Grammar (*yPæd yl kē* “perfect in beauty,” Constantinople, 1561), and of a Jewish prayer-book according to the rites of the Caraitic sect (*t/LPæjrpse* Venice, 1528-29, 2 vols. 4to). He also wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, the first prophets (Joshua, the Judges, Samuel, and the Kings), on Isaiah and the Psalms, and on Job, all of which are still inedited. — Hofer, *Biographie Generale*, 1, 6.

Aaron ben-Aser, or Aaron bar-Moses,

a celebrated Jewish rabbi, lived in the first half of the 14th century. He is the author of a Treatise on the Accents of the Hebrew Language, printed in 1517. Aaron collected the various readings of the Old Testament in the manuscripts of the libraries of the West, while his collaborator, Ben-Nephthali, searched for various readings in the Eastern libraries. These variations of the text, though purely grammatical, gave rise to two celebrated sects among the Jews — that of the Occidentals, who followed Ben-Aser; — and that of the Orientals, which only admitted the authority of Ben-Nephthali. Their editions give for the first time the vowel signs, the invention of which has therefore frequently been ascribed to them. The works of Aaron ben-Aser have been printed, together with those of Moses ben-David, at the end of the *Biblia Rabbinica* of Venice — Hofer, *Biographie Generale*, 1, 7.

Aaron ben-Chayim,

a celebrated rabbi, born at Fez in the middle of the 16th century. He was the head of the synagogues of Fez and Morocco. In order to superintend the printing of his works, he made, in 1609, a voyage to Venice, where he died soon after. His works are (in Hebrew), *The Heart of Aaron*, containing two commentaries on Joshua and the Judges (Venice, 1609, fol.); *The Offering of Aaron*, or remarks on the book Siphra, an ancient commentary on Leviticus (Venice, 1609, fol.); *The Measures of Aaron*, or an essay on the 13 hermeneutical rules of Rabbi Ismael. — Hoefler, *Biographie Generale*, 1, 7. First, *Bib. Jud.* 1, 159.

Aaron ben-Joseph Sason

(SCHASCON), a rabbi of Thessalonica, lived at the close of the 16th century. He is the author of several celebrated Jewish works, among which are **tm̄ trwTq** (the law of truth), a collection of 232 decisions on questions relating to sales, rents, etc. (Venice, 1616, fol.); and **tm̄ rpse** (the book of truth), explicatory of the Tosaphoth of the Gemara (Amsterd. 1706, 8vo). — Hoefler, *Biographie Generale*, 1, 7.

Aaron Zahala

a Spanish rabbi, died 1293. He is the author of a commentary published under the title *Sepher Hachinak, id est Liber Institutionis, recensio 613 legis Mosaicoe praeceptorum*, etc. (in Heb., Venice, 1523, fol.) — Hoefler, *Biographie Generale*, 1:7.

A'aronite

(Heb. same as *Aaron*, used collectively), a designation of the descendants of Aaron, and therefore priests, who, to the number of 3700 fighting men, with Jehoiada the father of Benaiah at their head, joined David at Hebron (^{<1317>}1 Chronicles 12:27). Later on in the history (^{<1327>}1 Chronicles 27:17) we find their chief was Zadok, who in the earlier narrative is distinguished as “a young man mighty of valor.” They must have been an important family in the reign of David to be reckoned among the tribes of Israel. — Smith, s.v. *SEE AARON*; *SEE PRIEST*.

Aazrak

(*rzaa*), a Cabalistic word found in the Talmudic Lexicon *Aruch*, and apparently invented by the Rabbins in order to correspond to a prohibition found in the Mishna (*Shabbate*, 12:3) that no person should write on the Sabbath two letters, this word beginning with the letter 3 repeated. In the Talmud, however, it is written *Aadrak* (*rdaa*). Buxtorf (*Lex. Talmud.* col. 2) thinks it is merely the Biblical word - *r[āa]aazzerka*, *I will gird thee* (Auth. Vers. "I girded thee"), found in ^{<23675>}Isaiah 45:5.

Ab

(*ba*; prob. i. q. "the season of fruit, *rmebbæ* to be fruitful, and apparently of Syriac origin, D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* s.v. comp. ABIB; Josephus, *Ἀββᾶ*, *Ant.* 4, 4, 7), the Chaldee name of the fifth ecclesiastical and eleventh civil month of the Jewish year (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 2); a name introduced after the Babylonian captivity, and not occurring in Scripture, in which this is designated simply as the *fifth* month (^{<0633>}Numbers 33:38; ^{<2406>}Jeremiah 1:3; ^{<3075>}Zechariah 7:3, etc.). It corresponded with the Macedonian month *Lous* (*Ἄλωος*), beginning with the new moon of August, and always containing thirty days. The 1st day is memorable for the death of Aaron (^{<0633>}Numbers 33:38); the 9th is the date (Moses Cozennis, in Wagenseil's *Sota*, p 736) of the exclusion from Canaan (^{<0440>}Numbers 14:30), and the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar (^{<3075>}Zechariah 7:5; 8:19; comp. Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* 4:10; but the 7th day, according to ^{<1238>}2 Kings 25:8, where the Syriac and Arabic read 9th; also the 10th, according to ^{<2612>}Jeremiah 52:12, probably referring to the close of the conflagration, Buxtorf, *Synog. Judenth.* 35), and also by Titus (Josephus, *War*, 6:4, 5); the 15th was the festival of the Xylophoria, or bringing of wood into the Temple (Bodenschatz, *Kirchlich, verfassung der Juden*, 2:106; comp. ^{<3075>}Nehemiah 10:34; 13:31; on nine successive days, according to Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 331; on the 14th, according to Josephus, *War*, 2:17); the 18th is a fast in memory of the extinction of the western lamp of the Temple during the impious reign of Ahaz (^{<1207>}2 Chronicles 29:7). — Kitto, s.v. *SEE MONTH*.

Ab-

(*ba*; *father*), occurs as the first member of several compound Hebrew proper names, e.g. *SEE ABNER*, *SEE ABSALOM*, etc. not as a patronymic

SEE BEN, or in its literal acceptance, but in a figurative sense, to designate some quality or circumstance of the person named; e.g. *possessor of* or *endowed with*; after the analogy of all the Shemitic languages (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 7; in Arabic generally *Abu-*, see D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* s.v.). *SEE FATHER*; *SEE PROPER NAME*. Hence it is equally applicable to females; e.g. *SEE ABIGAIL* (as among the Arabs; comp. Kosegarten, in Ewalds *'Zeitschrift fur die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 1:297-317). In all cases it is the following part of the name that is to be considered as the genitive, the prefix **ba** being "in the construct," and not the reverse. *SEE ABI-*.

Ab'acuc

(Lat. *Abacuc*, the Greek text being no longer extant), one of the minor prophets (2 Esdras [in the Vulg. 4 Esdras] 1:40), elsewhere HABAKKUK *SEE HABAKKUK* (q.v.).

Abad'don

(Ἀβὰδδών, for Heb. ^ⲰDbā) *destruction*, i.e. the destroyer, as it is immediately explained by Ἀπολλύων, APOLLYON *SEE APOLLYON*), the name ascribed to the ruling spirit of Tartarus, or the angel of death, described (^ⲠRevelation 9:11) as the king, and chief of the Apocalyptic locusts under the fifth trumpet, and as the angel of the abyss or "bottomless pit" (see *Critica Biblica*, 2, 445). In the Bible, the word *abaddon* means destruction (^ⲠJob 31:12), or the place of destruction, i.e. the subterranean world, Hades, the region of the dead (^ⲠJob 26:6; 28:22; ^ⲠProverbs 15:11). It is, in fact, the second of the seven names which the Rabbins apply to that region; and they deduce it particularly from ^ⲠPsalms 138:11, "Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in (*abaddon*) destruction?" *SEE HADES*. Hence they have made Abaddon the nethermost of the two regions into which they divided the under world. But that in ^ⲠRevelation 9:11 Abaddon is the angel, and not the abyss, is perfectly evident in the Greek. There is a general connection with the destroyer (q.v.) alluded to in ^Ⲡ1 Chronicles 21:15; but the explanation, quoted by Bengel, that the name is given in Hebrew and Greek, to show that the locusts would be destructive alike to Jew and Gentile, is far-fetched and unnecessary. The popular interpretation of the Apocalypse, which finds in the symbols of that prophecy the details of national history in later ages, has usually regarded Abaddon as a symbol of

Mohammed dealing destruction at the head of the Saracenic hordes (Elliott's *Horae Apocalypticæ*, 1:410). It may well be doubted, however, whether this symbol is any thing more than a new and vivid figure of the same moral convulsions elsewhere typified in various ways in the Revelation, namely, those that attended the breaking down of Judaism and paganism, and the general establishment of Christianity (see Stuart's *Comment.* in loc.). *SEE REVELATION, BOOK OF*. The etymology of Asmodaeus, the king of the daemons in Jewish mythology, seems to point to a connection with Apollyon in his character as "the destroyer," or the destroying angel. Compare Ecclus. 18:22, 25. *SEE ASMODAEUS*.

Abadi'as

(Ἀβαδίας), a son of Jazelus, and one of the descendants (or residents) of Joab, who returned with 212 males from the captivity with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:35); evidently the same with the OBADIAH *SEE OBADIAH* (q.v.) of the parallel list (¹⁸⁸⁹Ezra 8:9).

Abad y Queypeo, Manuel,

a Mexican bishop, born in the Asturias, Spain, about 1775. Having become priest, he went to Mexico, where he was at first judge of wills at Valladolid de Mechoacan, and, in 1809, appointed bishop of Mechoacan. Upon the outbreak of the war of independence, Abad favored the national party, and declared himself against the Inquisition. When the restoration of Ferdinand VII was proclaimed, Abad was sent to Spain and imprisoned at Madrid. He succeeded in winning the favor of the king, and was not only released, but appointed minister of justice. In the night following, however, he was again arrested by order of the Grand Inquisitor, and shut up in a convent. He was liberated in consequence of the events of 1820, and elected a member of the provisional junta of the government. Subsequently he was appointed Bishop of Tortosa. In 1823 he was again arrested by order of the Inquisition, and sentenced to six years imprisonment. He died before this time had expired. — Hoefler, *Biographie Generale*, 1, 17.

Abaelard

SEE ABELARD.

Abagarus

SEE ABGARUS.

Abag'tha

(Heb. *Abagtha'*, **atgḇā**) prob. Persian [*SEE BIGTHA* , *SEE BIGTHAN* , *SEE BIGTHANA* , *SEE BAGOAS*], and, according to Bohlen, from the Sanscrit *bagadata*, 'fortune-given'; Sept. **Ααταζά**), one of the seven chief eunuchs in the palace of Xerxes, who were commanded to bring in Vashti (^{<1700>}Esther 1:10), B.C. 483.

Aba'na

[many *Ab'ana*] (Heb. *Abanah'*, **hnba**) Sept. **Ἀβανά**; Vulg. *Abana*; or rather, as in the margin, AMANAH *SEE AMANAH* [q.v.]; Heb. *Amanah'*, **hnma**][comp. ^{<2316>}Isaiah 23:16], since the latter means *perennial*; Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 116), a stream mentioned by Naaman as being one of the rivers of Damascus; another being the Pharpar (^{<1162>}2 Kings 5:12). The main stream by which Damascus is now irrigated is called *Barada*, the Chrysorrhoeas, or "golden stream" of the ancient geographers (Strabo, p. 755), which, as soon as it issues from a cleft of the Anti-Lebanon mountains, is immediately divided into three smaller courses. The central or principal stream runs straight toward the city, and there supplies the different public cisterns, baths, and fountains; the other branches diverge to the right and left along the rising ground on either hand, and, having furnished the means of extensive irrigation, fall again into the main channel, after diffusing their fertilizing influences, and are at length lost in a marsh or lake, which is known as the *Bahr el-Merj*, or Lake of the Meadow. Dr. Richardson (*Travels*, 2:499) states that the "water of the Barada, like the water of the Jordan, is of a white, sulfurous hue, and an unpleasant taste." Some contend that the Barada is the Abana and are only at a loss for the Pharpar; others find both in the two subsidiary streams, and neglect the Barada; while still others seek the Abana in the small river *Fijih*, which Dr. Richardson describes as rising near a village of the same name in a pleasant valley fifteen or twenty miles to the north-west of Damascus. It issues from the limestone rock, in a deep, rapid stream, about thirty feet wide. It is pure and cold as iced water; and, after coursing down a stony and rugged channel for above a hundred yards, falls into the Barada, which comes from another valley, and at the point of junction is only half as wide as the Fijih. The Abana or Amana has been identified by some (especially Gesenius, *Neb. Lex.*) with the Barada, from the coincidence of the name Amana mentioned in ^{<2048>}Song of Solomon 4:8, as one of the tops of Anti-Libanus,

from which the Chyrsorrhoeas (or Barada) flows; and the ruins of Abila, now found on the banks of that stream, are thought to confirm this view. A better reason for this identification is, that Naaman would be more likely to refer to some prominent stream like the Barada, rather than to a small and comparatively remote fountain like the Fijih. *SEE PHARPAR*. The turbid character of the water of Barada is no objection to this view, since Naaman refers to Abana as important for its *medicinal* qualities rather than on account of its limpid coldness. The identification of the Abana with the Barada is confirmed by the probable coincidence of the Pharpar with the Arvaj; these being the only considerable streams in the vicinity of Damascus (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1849, p. 371; Robinson's *Researches*, new ed. 3, 447). This is the view taken by the latest traveler who has canvassed the question at length (J. L. Porter, in the *Jour. of Sacr. Literature*. July, 1853, p. 245 sq.). According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 54), the Jews of Damascus traditionally identify the Barada with the Amana (q.v.). The Arabic version of the passage in Kings has *Barda*. According to Lightfoot (*Cent. Chor.* 4) the river in question was also called *Kirmijon* (𐤎𐤓𐤌𐤍) a name applied in the Talmud to a river of Palestine (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 2138). *SEE DAMASCUS*.

Abarbanel.

SEE ABRABENEL.

Ab'arim

(Heb. *Abarim*', 𐤁𐤁𐤓𐤌 [𐤁] regions *beyond*, i.e. east of the Jordan; Sept. 'Αβαρίμ, but τὸ πέραν in ⁽⁰²⁷²⁾Numbers 27:12, Vulg. *Abarim*; in ⁽²⁰²¹⁾Jeremiah 22:20, Sept. τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, Vulg. *transeuntes*, Auth. Vers. "passages"), a mountain (𐤁𐤁𐤓𐤌 𐤁; ⁽⁰²⁷²⁾Numbers 27:12; ⁽⁶³⁴⁾Deuteronomy 32:49), or rather chain of hills (𐤁𐤁𐤓𐤌 𐤁 𐤁; ⁽⁰²⁷²⁾Numbers 33:47, 48), which form or belong to the mountainous district east of the Dead Sea and the lower Jordan, being situated in the land of Moab (⁽⁰²¹¹⁾Numbers 21:11), on the route to Palestine (⁽⁰²⁷²⁾Numbers 27:12). It was the last station but one of the Hebrews on their way from Egypt to Canaan (⁽⁰³⁴⁷⁾Numbers 33:47, 48). *SEE IJE-ABARIM*. The range presents many distinct masses and elevations, commanding extensive views of the country west of the river (Irby and Mangles, p. 459). From one of the highest of these, called Mount Nebo, Moses surveyed the Promised Land before he died (⁽⁶³⁴⁾Deuteronomy 32:49). From the manner in which the

names Abarim, Nebo, and Pisgah are connected (~~(1539)~~ Deuteronomy 32:49, and 34:1), it would seem that they were different names of the same general mountain chain. *SEE NEBO*. According to Josephus, who styles it *Abaris* (Αβαρς , *Ant.* 4:8, 48), it was “a very high mountain, situated opposite Jericho,” and Eusebius (*Onomast.* Ναβα) locates it six miles west of Heshbon. The name Abarim has been tortured by some disciples of the Faber and Bryant school of etymologists into a connection with the name of a district of Egypt called *Abaris* or *Avaris* (Josephus, *Apn.* 1:14), and so with the system of Egyptian idolatry, from the deity of the same name. Affinities between the names of two of the peaks of this range, Nebo and Peor, have also been traced with those of other Egyptian deities, Anubis and Horis. There is no good foundation for such speculations.

Abaris

SEE ABARIM; SEE AVARIS.

Abauzit, Firmin

a French Unitarian, was born at Uzes, in Languedoc, Nov. 11, 1679. Though his mother was a Protestant, he was forcibly placed in a Roman Catholic seminary, to be educated as a Papist. His mother succeeded in recovering him, and placed him at school in Geneva. At nineteen he traveled into Holland and England, and became the friend of Bayle and Newton. Returning to Geneva, he rendered important assistance to a society engaged in preparing a translation of the New Testament into French (published in 1726). In 1727 he was appointed public librarian in Geneva, and was presented with the freedom of the city. He died at Geneva, March 20, 1767. Though not a copious writer, he was a man of great reputation in his day, both in philosophy and theology. Newton declared him “a fit man to judge between Leibnitz and himself.” Rousseau describes him as the “wise and modest Abauzit,” and Voltaire pronounced him “a great man.” His knowledge was extensive in the whole circle of antiquities, in ancient history, geography, and chronology. His manuscripts were burned after his death by his relatives at Uzes, who had become Romanists; his printed works are collected, in part, in *OEuvres Diverses de Firmin Abauzit* (Amsterdam, 1773, 2 vols.). Many of his theological writings are contained in a volume entitled *Miscellanies on Historical, Theological, and Critical Subjects*, transl. by E. Harwood, D.D. (Lond.

1774, 8vo). A list of his works is given by Haag, *La France Protestante*, 1:3. See, also, Hoefler, *Biog. Generale*, 1:38.

Ab'ba

(**Ἀββᾶ, aBa**) is the Hebrew word **ba**; *father*, under a form (the “emphatic” or definite state — the father) peculiar to the Chaldee idiom (^{<4146>}Mark 14:36; ^{<4185>}Romans 8:15; ^{<4046>}Galatians 4:6).

1. As such, it was doubtless in common use to express the paternal relation, in the mixed Aramaean dialect of Palestine, during the New Testament age. Especially would it be naturally employed from infancy in addressing the male parent, like the modern *papa*; hence its occurrence in the New Testament only as a *vocative* (Winer, *Gram. of the New-Test. Diction*, § 29). Its reference to God (comp. ^{<2404>}Jeremiah 3:4; ^{<4081>}John 8:41) was common among the later Jews (Hamburger, *Real-Encyklop. s.v.*). To guard against the appearance of too great familiarity, however, the writers of the New Testament, instead of translating the title into its Greek equivalent, **πάπα**, have retained it in its foreign form — one of emphasis and dignity; but they have in all cases added its meaning, for the convenience of their merely Greek readers. Hence the phrase “*Abba, father*” in its two-fold form (*Critica Biblica*, 2:445).

2. Through faith in Christ all true Christians pass into the relation of sons; are permitted to address God with filial confidence in prayer; and to regard themselves as heirs of the heavenly inheritance. This adoption into the family of God inseparably follows our justification; and the power to call God our Father, in this special and appropriative sense, results from the inward testimony of our forgiveness given by the Holy Spirit. **SEE ADOPTION.**

3. The word *Abba* in after ages came to be used in the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic churches, in an improper sense, as a title given to their bishops (D’Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient. s.v.*), like *padre*, etc., in Roman Catholic countries.’ The bishops themselves bestow the title *Abba* more eminently upon the Bishop of Alexandria; which gave occasion for the people to call him *Baba*, or *Papa*, that is, grandfather — a title which he bore before the Bishop of Rome.

Abbadie, Jacques,

born about 1658, at Nay, in Bearn, studied at Saumur and Sedan. His proficiency was so early and so great, that at seventeen he received the title of D.D. from the Academy at Sedan. In 1676 he incepted an invitation from the Elector of Brandenburg, and was for some time pastor of the French Protestant church at Berlin. The French congregation at Berlin was at first but thin; but upon the revocation of the edict of Nantes great numbers of the exiled Protestants retired to Brandenburg, where they were received with the greatest humanity; so that Dr. Abbadie had in a little time a great charge, of which he took all possible care; and, by his interest at court, did many services to his distressed countrymen. The Elector dying in 1688, Abbadie accepted a proposal from Marshal Schomberg to go with him to Holland, and afterward to England with the Prince of Orange. In the autumn of 1689 he accompanied the Marshal to Ireland, where he continued till after the Battle of the Boyne, in 1690, in which his great patron was killed. He returned to London, was appointed minister of the French Church in Savoy; next was made dean of Killaloe, in Ireland, and died near London, Sept. 15 (other authorities say Oct. 2 or 6), 1727. His chief work is his *Traiti de la Verite de la Religion Chretienne* (Rotterd. 1692, 2 vols. 12mo), which has passed through several editions, and has been translated into several languages (in English, Lond. 1694-8, 2 vols. 8vo). Madame de Sevigne called it "the most charming of books;" and, though written by a Protestant, it found just favor among French Romanists, and even at the court of Louis XIV. His other principal writings are: *Reflexions sur la Presence du Corps de Jesus Christ dans l'Euchariste*; *Les Caracteres du Chretien et da Christianisme*; *Traite de la Divinite de Notre Seigneur Jesus Christ*; *L'Art de se connaitre* (Rotterd. 1692, translated into different languages); *La Verite de la Religion Reformee* (Rotterd. 1718, 2 vols. 8vo); *Le Triomp de la Providence et de la Religion*, an explanation of a portion of the Apocalypse (Amst. 1723, 4 vols. 12mo); *Accomplishment of Prophecy in Christ* (Lend. new ed. 1840, 12mo). A full list of his writings is given by Haag, *La France Protestante*, 1:7. — Hoefler, *Biog. Generale* 1:38.

Abbas.

Two different authors are frequently quoted by this title.

1. A celebrated canonist who flourished in 1250, and wrote a Commentary on the Five Books of Decretals, printed at Venice in 1588, folio. He is known as *Abbas antiquus*.
2. The celebrated Nicholas Tudeschi, the Panormitan, known as *Abbas Siculus* or *Abbas junior*. *SEE PANORMITAN*.

Abbe

the French name for abbot (q.v.). It is used in France not only to designate the superior of an abbey, but is also the general title of the secular clergy. Before the French Revolution it was even sometimes assumed by theological students (unordained) in the hope that the king would confer upon them a portion of the revenues of some abbey. There were at one time in France so many unordained abbes, poor and rich, men of quality and men of low birth, that they formed a particular class in society, and exerted an important influence over its character. They were seen everywhere; at court, in the halls of justice, in the theaters, the coffee-houses, etc. In almost every wealthy family was an abbe, occupying the post of familiar friend and spiritual adviser, and not seldom, that of the gallant of the lady. They corresponded, in a certain degree, to the philosophers who lived in the houses of the wealthy Romans in the time of the emperors.

Abbe commendataire.

SEE ABBOTT.

Abbess

Picture for Abess

(Lat. *abbatissa*), the superior or head of an abbey of nuns, bearing the same relation to them as the abbot to the monks. An abbess possesses in general the same dignity and authority as an abbot, except that she cannot exercise the spiritual functions appertaining to the priesthood (*Conc. Trident. Sess. 25, c. 7*). Generally the abbess must be chosen from the nuns of the same convent; she must be sprung from legitimate marriage, must be over forty years old, and must have observed the vows for eight years. In case of emergency, however, any nun of the order who is thirty years old, and has professed five years, may be elected. In Germany fifteen abbesses (of Essen, Elten, Quedlinburg, Herford, Gandersheim, etc.) had formerly

the right of sending a representative to the German Diet, and possessed a kind of episcopal jurisdiction, which they exercised through an *official*. After the Reformation the superiors of several German abbeys, which were changed into Protestant institutions of ladies living in common, retained the title “abbess.” *SEE ABBEY; SEE ABBOT* .

Abbey

(Lat. *abbatia*), a monastery of monks or nuns, ruled by an abbot or abbess [for the derivation of the name, *SEE ABBOT*]. The abbeys in England were enormously rich. All of them, 190 in number, were abolished in the time of Henry VIII. The abbey lands were afterward granted to the nobility, under which grants they are held to the present day. Cranmer begged earnestly of Henry VIII to save some of the abbeys for religious uses, but in vain.

In most abbeys, besides the Abbot, there were the following officers or *obedientarii*, removable at the abbot’s will:

1. Prior, who acted in the abbot’s absence as his *locum tenens*. In some great abbeys there were as many as *five* priors.
2. Eleemosynarius, or Almoner, who had the oversight of the daily distributions of alms to the poor at the gate.
3. Pitantarius, who had the care of the *pittances*, which were the allowances given on special occasions over and above the usual provisions.
4. Sacrista, or Sacristan (Sexton), who had the care of the vessels, vestments, books, etc.; he also provided for the sacrament, and took care of burials.
5. Camerarius, or Chamberlain, who looked after the dormitory.
6. Cellarius, or Cellarer, whose duty it was to procure provisions for strangers.
7. Thesaurarius, or Bursar, who received rents, etc.
8. Precentor, who presided over the choir.
9. Hospitularius, whose duty it was to attend to the wants of strangers.
10. Infirmarius, who attended to the hospital and sick monks.

11. Refectionarius, who looked after the hall, and provided every thing required there.

For the mode of electing abbots, right of visitation, etc., see *Conc. Trident.* Sess. 24. On the most important English abbeys, see Willis, *History of Mitred Abbeys*, vol. 1; A. Butler, *Lives of Saints*, 2:633. **SEE CONVENT;** **SEE MONASTERY;** **SEE PRIORY.**

Abbo

Abbot of Fleury, in France, born 958, slain in a tumult at Reole, in Gascony, Nov. 13, 1004. He presided two years (985-987) over a monastic school in England, and returned to Fleury, where he was made abbot. He was so celebrated for his wisdom and virtues that people, even in far-distant parts, had recourse to him for advice and assistance, especially in all questions relating to monastic discipline, his zeal for which caused the tumult in which he was slain. — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 404, 470; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* c. 10, pt. 2, ch. 1, § 5; *Aeta Sanctorum*, t. 8.

Abbot

Picture for Abbot

(Lat. *abbas*; from Chaldee **aBa**, *the father*), the head or superior of an abbey of monks.

1. The title was originally given to every monk, but after the sixth century was restricted to the heads of religious houses. At a later period the title was not confined to the superiors of monasteries, but was also given to the superiors of other institutions (as *abbas curie, palatii, scholarum*, etc.), while, on the other hand, several other terms, as provost, prior, guardian, major, rector, etc., were adopted to designate the superiors of the convents of the several orders. The Greek Church uses generally the term *archimandrite* (q.v.). The name *abbot* was especially retained by the order of the Benedictines, and its branches, the Cistercians, Bernhardines, Trappists, Grandmontanes, Praemonstratenses. But the congregation of Clugny (q.v.) reserved the title abbot to the superior of the principal monastery, calling those of the other monasteries *coabbates* and *proabbates*. The Abbot of Monte-Cassino assumed the title *abbas abbatum*. A number of religious orders are governed by an *abbot-general*, e.g. (according to the *Notizie per 'Anno 1859*, the Official Roman

Almanac), the regular canons of Lateran, the Camaldulenses, the Trappists, the Olivetans, the (Oriental) order of St. Antonius, and the Basilians. *Regular* abbots are those who wear the religious habit, and actually preside over an abbey, both in spiritual and temporal matters. *Secular* abbots are priests who enjoy the benefices, but employ a *vicar* (q.v.) to discharge its duties. *Lay* abbots are laymen to whom the revenues of abbeys are given by princes or patrons. *Field* abbots (*abbates castrensus*) are regular abbots appointed for army service. *Arch* abbot is the title of the abbot of St. Martini, in Hungary. The abbots are, in general, subject to the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop, but formerly some were exempt, and had even a kind of episcopal jurisdiction (*jurisdictio quasi episcopalis*), together with the right of wearing episcopal insignia (*mitred abbots*, *abbates mitrati*). Some, as the abbot of St. Maurice, in Switzerland, have even a small territory. Abbots with episcopal jurisdiction have the right of taking part in general councils, and the right of voting in provincial synods. The privileges and duties of abbots are determined by the rules of the order to which they belong, as well as by canonical regulations.

The *commendatory* abbots (*abbates commendatarii*; Fr. *abbes commendataires*), in France and England, were secular ecclesiastics, to whom abbeys were given *in commendam*, who enjoyed a portion of the revenues, together with certain honors, but without jurisdiction over the inmates of the abbeys. This became latterly so common that most abbeys were thus held perpetually *in commendam*. In England many abbots, among other privileges, had the right of sitting in the House of Lords. According to Fuller (*Ch. Hist.* b. 6, p. 292, ed. 1655), there were sixty-four abbots and thirty-six priors, besides the Master of the Temple summoned to Parliament, which he terms “a jolly number.” Edward III reduced them to twenty-six. In Germany, ten *prince-abbots* (of Fulda, Corvey, etc.) were members of the German Diet till 1803. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* b. 7, ch. 3; *Conc. Trident.* Sess. 25, and, for full details, Martene, *De Ant. Monach. Rit.* lib. 5. The forms for the *benediction* of abbots (i. q. inauguration) are given in Boissonnet, *Dict. des Ceremonies*, 1:22 sq.

2. The title of *Abbot* is still used in some Protestant countries. In Germany it is sometimes conferred upon divines, especially if they enjoy the revenues of former abbeys. Thus the late Professor Lucke of Gottingen was an abbot.

Abbot, Abiel

D.D., a Unitarian minister, born in Wilton, N. H., Dec. 14, 1765. He graduated at Harvard, 1787, was assistant in the Phillips Andover Academy from 1787 to 1789, and became pastor of Coventry, Conn., 1795. Having been brought up a Trinitarian Calvinist, Mr. Abbot became, 1792, a decided anti-Trinitarian, and, in 1811, was deposed by the Consociation of Tolland County from the ministry on account of heretical doctrines. From Sept. 1811 to 1819, he had charge of Dummer Academy, and from 1827 to 1839 he was pastor of Peterborough, N. H. He received the degree of D.D. from Harvard in 1838, and died Dec. 31, 1859. He published in 1811 a "*Statement of the Proceedings in his Church at Coventry which terminated in his Removal,*" and some occasional pamphlets. — Sprague, *Unitarian Pulpit*, p. 229 sq.

Abbot, Abiel

D.D., a Unitarian minister, born at Andover, Mass., Aug. 17, 1770. He graduated at Harvard, 1792, and was pastor at Haverhill from 1794 to 1803, and at Beverley from 1803 until 1826. His health failing, he spent the winter of 1827-8 in Charleston, S. C., and in Cuba, but died just as the ship reached quarantine at New York, June 7, 1828. He was a man of taste and culture, and an eloquent preacher. His *Letters from Cuba* were published after his death (Boston, 1829, 8vo); and also a volume of *Sermons, with a Memoir* by Everett (Boston, 1831, 12mo). — Sprague, *Unitarian Pulpit*, p. 309 sq.

Abbot, George

D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury, brother of Robert (*inf.*), one of the translators of the English Bible, and a man of great ability and learning, was born at Guildford, October 29, 1562, and entered at Baliol College, Oxford, in 1578; subsequently was made Master of University College, and, in 1599, Dean of Winchester. At the university he was first brought into contact with Abp. Laud, whose ecclesiastical schemes he opposed through life. In 1604, Dr. Abbot was the second of eight learned divines at Oxford, chosen by King James, to whom the care of translating all (but the Epistles of) the New Testament was committed. In 1608, he assisted in a design to unite the churches of England and Scotland; in which his prudence and moderation raised him high in the favor of the king, who bestowed upon him successively the bishoprics of Lichfield (1609) and of

London (1610). In 1611 his majesty elevated him to the See of Canterbury. As archbishop, he had the courage to displease the king by opposing the *Book of Sports*, the divorce of the Countess of Essex, and the Spanish match. In 1627, he ventured the displeasure of Charles 1, by refusing to license a sermon, which Dr. Sibthorpe had preached, to justify one of Charles's unconstitutional proceedings. For this act he was suspended from his functions, but was soon, though not willingly, restored to them. A cause of deep sorrow to him, in his latter days, was his having accidentally while aiming at a deer, shot one of Lord Zouch's keepers. He died Aug. 4, 1633. He was a Calvinist in theology, and, unfortunately, very intolerant toward Arminians and Arminianism. His *Life*, with that of his brother Thomas, was published at Guildford (1797d 8vo). His chief works are: *Six Lectures on Divinity* (Oxford, 1598, 4to); *Exposition of the Prophet Jonah* (1600, 4to, new ed. Lond. 1845, 2 vols. with *Life*); *A brief Description of the World* (Lond. 1617, 4to, et al.) *Treatise of the perpetual Visibility and Succession of the true Church* (1624, 4to); *Judgment of the Archbishop concerning Bowing at the Name of Jesus* (Hamburg, 1632, 8vo). — Middleton, *Evang. Biog.*; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. 2; Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, 1:556; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 409.

Abbot, Robert

D.D., Bishop of Salisbury, was born at Guildford, in Surrey, in 1560, took the degrees of M.A. in 1582, and that of D.D. in 1597. He won the good opinion of James I by a work in confutation of Bellarmine and Suarez, in defense of the royal authority, and was soon after made Master of Baliol College, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. As Vice-Chancellor of the University, he favored the Calvinistic theology, and opposed Laud to the utmost. In 1615 he was appointed by his brother (then Archbishop of Canterbury) to the bishopric of Salisbury, which, however, he enjoyed but a short time, and died on the 2d of March, 1617. His works are:

1. *Mirror of Popish Subtilties* (Lond. 1594, 4to);
2. *Antichristi Demonstratio, contra Fabulas Pontificias*, etc. (1603, 4to);
3. *Defence of the Reformed Catholic of W. Perkins against Dr. W. Bishop* (1606, 1609, 4to);
4. *The Old Way, a Sermon* (1610, 4to);
5. *The true Ancient Roman Catholic* (1611, 4to);

6. *Antilogia* (against the Apology of the Jesuit Endemon, for Henry Garnett, 1613, 4to);
7. *De Gratia et Perseverantia Sanctorum* (1618, 4to);
8. *De amissione et intercessione Justification; et Gratiae*, (1618, 4to);
9. *De Suprema Potestate Regia*: (1619, 4to). He left in MS. a Latin commentary on Romans which is now in the Bodleian Library. — Middleton, *Eccl. Biog.*

Abbott, Benjamin

one of the most laborious and useful of the pioneer Methodist preachers in America, was born in Pennsylvania in 1732, and died Aug. 14, 1796. He preached for twenty years with great zeal and success, chiefly in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. Though an illiterate man, he was earnest, eloquent, enthusiastic, and self-sacrificing, — and thousands were added to the Church through his labors. — Firth, *Life of B. Abbott* (N. Y., 12mo); *Minutes of Conferences*, 1:68; Stevens, *Hist. of M. E. Ch.* 1:382 sq.; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:41.

Abbreviation

or the use of one or two initials for the whole of a word. These first occur, in a Scriptural connection, on some of the Maccabaeian coins (Bayer, *De nummis Hebraeo-Samaritanis*), and in a few MSS. of the O.T. (especially 8y8y for h/hy). They have been frequently resorted to for the purpose of explaining supposed discrepancies or various reading, both in words (Eichhorn, *Einleit. ins A. T.* 1:323; Drusius, *Quaest. Ebraic.* 3, 6) and numbers (Vignoles, *Chronologie.* pass.; Capellus, *Critica Sacra*, 1:10; Scaliger, in Walton's *Prolegomena*, 7:14; Kennicott's *Dissertations*), on the theory that letters were employed for the latter as digits (Faber, *Litterae olim pro vocibus adhibitae*, Onold, 1775), after the analogy of other Oriental languages (Gesenius, *Gesch. d. heb. Sprache*, p. 173). In later times the practice became very common with the Rabbins (Selig's *Compendia vocum Hebraico - Rabbinicarum*; also *Collectio abbreviatarum Hebraicarum*, Lpz., 1781), and was abused for cabalistical purposes (Danz, *Rabbinismus Enuclaeatus*). An instance of its legitimate numerical use occurs in ^{ⲉϥⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛ}Revelation 13:18 (Eichhorn, *Einleit. ins N.T.* 4:199), and the theory has been successfully applied to the

solution of the discrepancy between ^{<115>}Mark 15:25, and ^{<394>}John 19:14 (where the Greek γ [gamma=3] has doubtless been mistaken for ς [sigma=6]).

Abbreviator

a clerk or secretary employed in the Papal Court to aid in preparing briefs, bulls, etc. They were first employed by Benedict XII in the 14th century. Many eminent men have filled the office. Pius II (Aeneas Sylvius) was an abbreviator for the Council of Basle.

Ab'da

(Heb. *Abda'*, **aDbf** [a Chaldaizing form], *the servant*, i.e. of God), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. **Ἀβδᾶ**.) The father of Adoniram, which latter was an officer under Solomon (^{<106>}1 Kings 4:6). B.C. ante 995.

2. (Sept. **Ἀβδίας**.) The son of Shammua and a Levite of the family of Jeduthun, resident in Jerusalem after the exile (^{<117>}Nehemiah 11:17); elsewhere called OBADIAH *SEE OBADIAH* (q.v.), the son of Shemaiah (^{<196>}1 Chronicles 9:16).

Abdas, a Persian bishop during the reign of Yezdegird (or Isdegerdes), King of Persia, under whom the Christians enjoyed the free exercise of their religion. Abdas, filled with ill-directed zeal, destroyed (A.D. 414) one of the temples of the fire-worshippers; and being ordered by the monarch to rebuild the temple, refused to do so, although warned that, if he persisted, the Christian temples would be destroyed. Yezdegird put the bishop to death, and ordered the total destruction of all the Christian churches in his dominions; upon which followed a bitter persecution of the Christians, which lasted thirty years, and was the occasion of war between Persia and the Roman empire. In the Romish and Greek Churches he is commemorated as a saint on May 16. See Socrat. *Ch. Hist.* 7:18; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:110; Theod. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 39; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, May 16.

Ab'deel

(Heb. *Abdeel'*, **l aDbf**, *servant of God*; Sept. **Ἀβδιήλ**), the father of Shelemaiah, which latter was one of those commanded to apprehend Jeremiah (^{<266>}Jeremiah 36:26). B.C. ante 605.

Ab'di

(Heb. *Abdi'*, **יְדַבֵּר**, *my servant*; or, according to Gesenius, for **יְדַבֵּר**, *servant of Jehovah*; but, according to Furst, properly **יְדַבֵּר**, *bondman*), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. **Ἀβδί** v. r. **Ἀβαί**.) A Levite. grandfather of one Ethan, which latter lived in the time of David (^{<1364>}1 Chronicles 6:44). B.C. considerably ante 1014.
2. (Sept. **Ἀβδί**.) A Levite, father of one Kish (different from Kishi, a son of the preceding), which latter assisted in the reformation under Hezekiah (^{<1492>}2 Chronicles 29:12). B.C. ante 726.
3. (Sept. **Ἀβδία**.) An Israelite of the “sons” of Elam, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (^{<1508>}Ezra 10:26), B.C. 459.

Ab'dias

the name of two men.

1. ABDI'AS (Lat. *Abdias*, the Greek text not being extant), one of the minor prophets (2 Esdras [Vulg. 4 Esdras], 1:39), elsewhere called OBADIAH *SEE OBADIAH* (q.v.).
2. AB'DIAS, of Babylon, is said to have flourished about the year 59, and to have been one of the seventy disciples; but his very existence is somewhat doubtful. The work attributed to him, viz. *Historia Certaminis Apostolici*, in ten books, was written in the 8th or 9th century. It may be found in Fabricii *Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Test.* 2, 988; and was published also by Lazius (Basle, 1551, and Paris, 1160). A German translation is given in Barbery, *Bibliothek d. N.-T. Apokryphen* (Stuttg. 1841), p. 391 sq. — Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 1:67; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 59; Baronius, *Annal.* ann. 44.

Ab'diel

(Heb. *Abdiel'*, **אֲבִיעֵל**, *servant of God*; Sept. **Ἀβδιήλ**), a son of Guni and father of Ahi, one of the chief Gadites resident in Gilead (^{<1365>}1 Chronicles 5:15), B.C. between 1003 and 782.

Ab'don

(Heb. *Abdon'*, אַבְדֹן and אַבְדֹן, *servile*; Sept. Ἀβδών), the name of four men and one city.

1. The son of Hillel, a Pirathonite, of the tribe of Ephraim, and the twelfth Judge of Israel for eight years, B.C. 1233-1225. His administration appears to have been peaceful (Ἀβδών, Josephus, *Ant.* 5, 7, 15); for nothing is recorded of him but that he had forty sons and thirty nephews, who rode on young asses — a mark of their consequence (^{<07213>}Judges 12:13-15). He is probably the BEDAN *SEE BEDAN* referred to in ^{<09211>}1 Samuel 12:11.
2. The first-born of Jehiel, of the tribe of Benjamin, apparently by his wife Maachab, and resident at Jerusalem (^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 8:30; 9:36), B.C. ante 1093.
3. The son of Micah, and one of the persons sent by King Josiah to ascertain of the prophetess Huldah the meaning of the recently-discovered look of the Law (^{<1891>}2 Chronicles 34:20), B.C. 628. In the parallel passage (^{<1222>}2 Kings 22:12) he is called ACHBOR *SEE ACHBOR*, the son of Michaiiah.
4. A “son” of Shashak, and chief Benjamite of Jerusalem (^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 8:23), B.C. ante 598.
5. A Levitical town of the Gershonites, in the tribe of Asher, mentioned between Mishal or Mashal and Helkath or Hukkuk (^{<07213>}Joshua 21:30; ^{<13574>}1 Chronicles 6:74). The same place, according to several MSS., is mentioned in ^{<0693>}Joshua 19:28, instead of HEBRON *SEE HEBRON* (Reland, *Palest.* p. 518). Under this latter form Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 192) identifies it with a village, *Ebra*, which he affirms lies in the valley of the Leontes, south of Kulat Shakif; perhaps the place by the name of *Abnon* marked in this region on Robinson’s map (new ed. of *Researches*). It is probably identical with the ruined site *Abdeh*, 8 or 9 miles N.E. of Accho (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 280).

Abecedarians

(*Abecedarii*), a branch of the sect of Anabaptists, founded by Stork, once a disciple of Luther, who taught that all knowledge served to hinder men from attending to God’s voice inwardly instructing them; and that the only means of preventing this was to learn nothing, not even the alphabet, for

the knowledge of letters served only to risk salvation. *SEE ANABAPTISTS.*

Abecedarian hymns or psalms

psalms, the verses of which commence with the consecutive letters of the alphabet. *SEE ACROSTIC.* In imitation of the 119th Psalm. it was customary in the early Church to compose psalms of this kind, each part having its proper letter at the head of it: the singing of the verses was commenced by the precentor, and the people joined him in the close. Occasionally they sang alternate verses.. This mode of conducting the psalmody was sometimes called singing acrostics and acroteleutics, and is the apparent origin of the *Gloria Patri* repeated at the end of each psalm in modern liturgical services. *SEE CHORUS.* Some of the psalms of David are abecedarian, and others so constructed as to be adapted to the alternate song of two divisions of precentors in the Temple. *SEE PSALMS.* The priests continued their services during the night, and were required occasionally to utter a cry to intimate that they were awake to duty. ^{<BDB>}Psalm 134 appears to be of this order. The first watch address the second, reminding them of duty. “Behold: bless ye the Lord, all ye servants of the Lord, which by night stand in the house of the Lord. Lift up your hands in the sanctuary, and bless the Lord.” The second respond, “The Lord that made heaven and earth bless thee out of Zion.” This custom was probably introduced into the Christian church from the Hebrew service, and was intended to aid the memory. Hymns, composed in this manner, embodying orthodox sentiments, were learned by the people, to guard them against the errors of the Donatists (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 14:1, 12). *SEE HYMN; SEE PSALTER.*

Abed’-nego

(Heb. *Abed’ Neg* ^{<BDB>}*wgn]dbē*) *servant of Nego*, i.e. of Nebo, or the Chaldaic Mercury, ^{<BDB>}Daniel 1:7, and Chald. id. ^{<BDB>}*ʾgn]dbē*; Sept. and Josephus ^{<BDB>}*Ἀβδεναγώ*), the Chaldee name imposed by the king of Babylon’s officer upon AZARIAH *SEE AZARIAH* (q.v.), one of the three companions of Daniel (^{<BDB>}Daniel 2:49; 3: 12-30). With his two friends, Shadrach and Meshach, he was miraculously delivered from the burning furnace, into which they were cast for refusing to worship the golden statue which Nebuchadnezzar had caused to be set up in the plain of Dura (^{<BDB>}Daniel 3). He has been supposed by some to be the same person as Ezra; but Ezra

was a priest of the tribe of Levi (^{<H706>}Ezra 7:5), while this Azariah was of the royal blood, and consequently of Judah (^{<Z00B>}Daniel 1:3, 6).

Abeel, David

D.D., an eminent missionary, was born at New Brunswick, N. J., June 12th, 1804, studied theology at the seminary in that place, and in 1826 was licensed to preach in the Dutch Reformed churches. In October, 1829, he sailed for Canton as a chaplain of the Seamen's Friend Society; but at the end of a year's labor placed himself under the direction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. He visited Java, Singapore, and Siam, studying Chinese, and laboring with much success, when his health failed him entirely, and he returned home in 1833 by way of England, visiting Holland, France, and Switzerland, and everywhere urging the claims of the heathen. In 1838 he again returned to Canton. The "opium war" preventing his usefulness there, he visited Malacca, Borneo, and other places, and settled at Kolongsoo. His health giving way once more, he returned in 1845, and died at Albany, Sept. 4, 1846. He published *Journal of Residence in China*, in 1829-1833 (N. Y. 8vo); *The Missionary Convention at Jerusalem* (N. Y. 1838, 12mo); *Claims of the World to the Gospel* (N. Y. 1838). See Williamson, *Memoirs of the Rev. D. Abeel* (N. Y. 1849, 18mo); *Amer. Missionary Memorial*, p. 338.

Abeel, John Nelson

D.D., a minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, who was born in 1769, graduated in 1787 at Princeton, and was licensed to preach in April, 1793. In 1795 he became one of the clergy of the Collegiate Dutch Church in New York, where he continued until his death, Jan. 20, 1812. He was an eloquent preacher, and a man of great and deserved influence.

A'bel

(Heb. *He'bel*, **l bh**, *a breath*, 1, q. *transitory*; as Gesenius [*Heb. Lex.*] thinks, from the shortness of his life or, as Kitto [*Daily Bible Illust.*] suggests, perhaps i. q. *vanity*, from the maternal cares experienced during the infancy of Cain; Sept. and N.T. "Αβελ; Josephus, "Αβελος), the second son of Adam and Eve, slain by his elder brother, Cain (^{<000E>}Genesis 4:1-16), B.C. cir. 4045. *SEE ADAM*.

I. History. — Cain and Abel, having been instructed, perhaps by their father, Adam, in the duty of worship to their Creator, each offered the first-fruits of his labors: Cain, as a husbandman, the fruits of the field; Abel, as a shepherd, fatlings of his flock (see Fritzsche, *De Sacrificiis Caini et Habelis*, Lips. 1751). God was pleased to accept the offering of Abel, in preference to that of his brother (^{<S104>}Hebrews 11:4), in consequence of which Cain, giving himself up to envy, formed the desire of killing Abel; which he at length effected, having invited him to go into the field (^{<0048>}Genesis 4:8, 9; comp. ^{<A182>}1 John 3:12). **SEE CAIN.** The Jews had a tradition that Abel was murdered in the plain of Damascus; and accordingly his tomb is still shown on a high hill near the village of Sinie or Seneiah, about twelve miles northwest of Damascus, on the road to Baalbek (Jerome, in ^{<S501>}Ezekiel 37). The summit of the hill is still called *Nebi Abel*; but circumstances lead to the probable supposition that this was the site, or in the vicinity of the site, of the ancient Abela or Abila (Pococke, *East*, 2:168 sq.: Schubert, *Reis.* 3, 286 sq.). **SEE ABILA.** The legend, therefore, was most likely suggested by the ancient name of the place (see Stanley, *Palest.* p. 405). **SEE ABEL**— (For literature, see Wolf, *Curoe in N.T.*, 4, 749.)

II. Traditional Views. — Ancient writers abound in observations on the mystical character of Abel; and he is spoken of as the representative of the pastoral tribes, while Cain is regarded as the author of the nomadic life and character. St. Chrysostom calls him the *Lamb of Christ*, since he suffered the most grievous injuries solely on account of his innocency (*Ad Stagir.* 2:5); and he directs particular attention to the mode in which Scripture speaks of his offerings, consisting of the best of his flock, “and of the fat thereof,” while it seems to intimate that Cain presented the fruit which might be most easily procured (*Hom. in* ^{<0185>}Genesis 18:5). St. Augustin, speaking of regeneration, alludes to Abel as representing the new or spiritual man in contradistinction to the natural or corrupt man, and says, “Cain founded a city on earth; but Abel, as a stranger and pilgrim, looked forward to the city of the saints which is in heaven” (*De Civitate Dei*, 15:1). Abel, he says in another place, was the first-fruits of the Church, and was sacrificed in testimony of the future Mediator. And on ^{<S118>}Psalm 118 (*Serm.* 30, § 9) he says. “This city” (that is, “the city of God”) “has its beginning from Abel, as the wicked city from Cain.” Irenaeus says that God, in the case of Abel, subjected the just to the unjust, that the righteousness of the former might be manifested by what he suffered

(*Contra Haeares*. 3, 23). Heretics existed in ancient times who represented Cain and Abel as embodying two spiritual powers, of which the mightier was that of Cain, and to which they accordingly rendered divine homage. In the early Church, Abel was considered the first of the martyrs, and many persons were accustomed to pronounce his name with a particular reverence. An obscure sect arose under the title of *Abelites* (q.v.), the professed object of which was to inculcate certain fanatical notions respecting marriage; but it was speedily lost amidst a host of more popular parties. For other mythological speculations respecting Abel, see Buttmann's *Mythologus*, 1:55 sq.; for Rabbinical traditions, see Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* 1:462 sq., 832 sq.; for other Oriental notices, see Koran, 5, 35 sq.; Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 24 sq.; comp. Fabric. *Pseudepigr.* 1:113; other Christian views may be seen in Irenaeus, 5, 67; Cedrenus, *Hist.* p. 8 (Kitto).

The general tenor of these Eastern traditionary fictions is that both Cain and Abel had twin sisters, and that Adam determined to give Cain's sister to Abel, and Abel's sister to Cain in marriage. This arrangement, however, did not please Cain, who desired his own sister as a wife, she being the more beautiful. Adam referred the matter to the divine arbitration, directing each brother to offer a sacrifice, and abide the result. Abel presented a choice animal from his flock, and Cain a few poor ears of grain from his field. Fire fell from heaven and consumed Abel's offering without smoke, while it left Cain's untouched. Still more incensed at this disappointment, Cain resolved to take his brother's life, who, perceiving his design, endeavored to dissuade him from so wicked an act. Cain, however, cherished his malice, but was at a loss how to execute it, until the devil gave him a hint by a vision of a man killing a bird with a stone. Accordingly, one night he crushed the head of his brother, while sleeping, with a large stone. He was now at a loss how to conceal his crime. He enclosed the corpse in a skin, and carried it about for forty days, till the stench became intolerable. Happening to see a crow, which had killed another crow, cover the carcass in a hole in the ground, he acted on the suggestion, and buried his brother's body in the earth. He passed the rest of his days in constant terror, having heard a voice inflicting this curse upon him for his fratricide. (See D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s.v. Cabil.)

III. *Character of his Offering.* — The superiority of Abel's sacrifice is ascribed by the Apostle Paul to faith (⁸¹⁰⁴Hebrews 11:4). Faith implies a

previous revelation: it comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. It is probable that there was some command of God, in reference to the rite of sacrifice, with which Abel complied, and which Cain disobeyed. The “more excellent sacrifice” was the firstlings of his flock; in the offering of which there was a confession that his own sins deserved death, and the expression of a desire to share in the benefits of the great atonement which, in the fullness of time, should be presented to God for the sins of man. By his faith he was accepted as “righteous,” that is, was *justified*. God testified, probably by some visible sign — the sending of fire from heaven to consume the victim (a token that justice had seized upon the sacrifice instead of the sinner) — that the gift was accepted. Cain had no faith: his offering was not indicative of this principle. Although it is doubtful whether we can render the clause in God’s expostulation with him — “sin lieth at the door” — by the words, “a sin-offering lieth or croucheth at the door,” that is, a sin-offering is easily procured, yet the sin of Cain is clearly pointed out, for though he was not a keeper of sheep, yet a victim whose blood could be shed as a typical propitiation could without difficulty have been procured and presented. The truths clearly taught in this important event are, confession of sin; acknowledgment that the penalty of sin is death; submission to an appointed mode of expiation; the *vicarious* offering of animal sacrifice, typical of the better sacrifice of the Seed of the woman; the efficacy of faith in Christ’s sacrifice to obtain pardon, and to admit the guilty into divine favor (Wesley, *Notes on* ^{<810>}*Hebrews* 11:4). The difference between the two offerings is clearly and well put by Dr. Magee (*On the Atonement*, 1:58-61): “Abel, in firm reliance on the promise of God, and in obedience to his command, offered that sacrifice which had been enjoined as the religious expression of his faith; while Cain, disregarding the gracious assurances which had been vouchsafed, or, at least, disdainful to adopt the prescribed method of manifesting his belief, possibly as not appearing *to his reason* to possess any efficacy or natural fitness, thought he had sufficiently acquitted himself of his duty in acknowledging the general superintendence of God, and expressing his gratitude to the supreme Benefactor, by presenting some of those good things which he thereby confessed to have been derived from His bounty. In short, Cain, the first-born of the fall, exhibits the first-fruits of his parents’ disobedience, in the arrogance and self-sufficiency of reason, rejecting the aids of revelation, because they fell not within his apprehension of right. He takes the first place in the annals of Deism, and displays, in his proud rejection of the ordinance of sacrifice, the same spirit

which, in later days, has actuated his *enlightened* followers in rejecting the sacrifice of Christ.” **SEE SACRIFICE**. There are several references to Abel in the New Testament. Our Savior designates him “righteous” (~~4235~~ Matthew 23:35; comp. 1 John, 3:12). He ranks among the illustrious elders mentioned in ~~8101~~ Hebrews 11. According to ~~8124~~ Hebrews 12:24, while the blood of sprinkling speaks for the remission of sins, the blood of Abel for vengeance: the blood of sprinkling speaks of mercy, the blood of Abel of the malice of the human heart. — Watson, *Institutes*, 2:174, 191; Whately, *Prototypes*, p. 29; Horne, *Life and Death of Abel*, Works, 1812, vol. 4; Hunter, *Sacred Biography*, p. 17 sq.; Robinson, *Script. Characters*, i; Williams, *Char. of O.T.* p. 12; Simeon, *Works*, 19:371; Close, *Genesis*, p. 46; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 2:37.

Abel, THOMAS

SEE ABLE.

A’bel-

(Heb. *Abel’-*, **Al ba**; a name of several villages in Palestine, with additions in the case of the more important, to distinguish them from one another (see each in its alphabetical order). From a comparison of the Arabic and Syriac, it appears to mean *fresh grass*; and the places so named may be conceived to have been in peculiarly verdant situations (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 14; see, however, other significations in Lengerke, *Kanaan*, 1:358; Hengstenberg, *Pentat.* 2, 261). **SEE ABILA**.

In ~~0958~~ 1 Samuel 6:18, it is used as an appellative, and probably signifies a *grassy plain*. In this passage, however, perhaps we should read (as in the margin) **ba**, *stone*, instead of **l ba**; *Abel*, or *meadow*, as the context (verses 14, 15) requires, and the Sept. and Syriac versions explain; the awkward insertion of our translators, “the great [stone of] Abel,” would thus be unnecessary.

In ~~4004~~ 2 Samuel 20:14, 18, ABEL **SEE ABEL** stands alone for ABELBETH-MAACHAH **SEE ABELBETH-MAACHAH** (q. V.).

Abela

See **ABEL-BETH-MAACHAH**.

Abelard, Pierre [or Abaelard, Abaillard, Abelhardus]

born at Le Pallet, or Palais, near Nantes, 1079, was a man of the most subtle genius, and the father of the so-called scholastic theology. In many respects he was far in advance of his age. After a very careful education, he spent part of his youth in the army, and then turned his attention to theological study, — and had for his tutor in logic, at thirteen years of age, the celebrated Roscelin, of Compiègne. He left Palais before he was twenty years of age, and went to Paris, where he became a pupil of William of Champeaux, a teacher of logic and philosophy of the highest reputation. At first the favorite disciple, by degrees Abelard became the rival, and finally the antagonist of Champeaux. To escape the persecution of his former master, Abelard, at the age of twenty-two, removed to Melun, and established himself there as a teacher, with great success. Thence he removed to Corbeil, where his labors seem to have injured his health; and he sought repose and restoration by retirement to Palais, where he remained a few years, and then returned to Paris. The controversy was then renewed, and continued till Champeaux's scholars deserted him, and he retired to a monastery. Abelard, having paid a visit to his mother at Palais, found on his return to Paris in 1113 that Champeaux had been made Bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne. He now commenced the study of divinity under Anselm at Laon. Here also the pupil became the rival of his master, and Anselm at length had him expelled from Laon, when he returned to Paris, and established a school of divinity, which was still more numerously attended than his former schools had been. Guizet says, "In this celebrated school were trained one pope (Celestine II), nineteen cardinals, more than fifty bishops and archbishops, French, English, and German; and a much larger number of those men with whom popes, bishops, and cardinals had often to contend, such men as Arnold of Brescia, and many others. The number of pupils who used at that time to assemble round Abelard has been estimated at upward of 5000."

Abelard was about thirty-five when he formed an acquaintance with Heloise, the niece of Fulbert, a canon in the Cathedral of Paris. She was probably under twenty. He contracted with her a secret and unlawful connection, the fruit of which was a son named Peter Astrolabus. Soon after Abelard married Heloise; but the marriage was kept secret, and, at the suggestion of Abelard, Heloise retired into the convent of Argenteuil, near Paris, where she had been, as a child, brought up. The relatives of Heloise, enraged at this, and believing that Abelard had deceived them, revenged

themselves by inflicting the severest personal injuries upon him. He then, being forty years old, took the monastic vows at S. Denys, and persuaded Heloise to do the same at Argenteuil. From this time he devoted himself to the study of theology, and before long published his work *Introductio ad Theologiam*, in which he spoke of the Trinity in so subtle a manner that he was openly taxed with heresy. Upon this he was cited to appear before a council held at Soissons, in 1121, by the pope's legate, where, although he was convicted of no error, nor was any examination made of the case, he was compelled to burn his book with his own hands. After a brief detention at the abbey of St. Medard, he returned to his monastery, where he quarreled with his abbot, Adamus, and the other monks (chiefly because he was too good a critic to admit that Dionysius, the patron saint of France, was identical with the Areopagite of the same name mentioned in the Acts), and retired to a solitude near Nogent-sur-Seine, in the diocese of Troyes, where, with the consent of the bishop, Hatto, he built an oratory in the name of the Most Holy Trinity, which he called *Paraclete*, and dwelt there with another clerk and his pupils, who soon gathered around him again. His hearers, at various periods, were numbered by thousands. Being called from his retreat (A.D. 1125) by the monks of St. Gildas, in Bretagne, who had elected him their abbot, he abode for some time with them, but was at length compelled to flee from the monastery (about 1134) to escape their wicked designs upon his life, and took up his abode near Paraclete, where Heloise and her nuns were at that time settled. About the year 1140, the old charge of heresy was renewed against him, and by no less an accuser than the celebrated Bernard of Clairvaux, who was his opponent in the council held at Sens in that year. Abelard, seeing that he could not expect his cause to receive a fair hearing, appealed to Rome, and at once set put upon his journey thither. Happening, however, on his route, to pass through Cluny, he was kindly received by the abbot, Peter the Venerable, by whose means he was reconciled to Bernard, and finally determined to pass the remainder of his days at Cluny. He died April 21, 1142, aged sixty-three years, at the monastery of S. Marcel, whither he had been sent for his health.

As Bernard was the representative of Church authority in that age, so Abelard was the type of the new school of free inquiry, and of the use of reason in theology. His philosophy was chiefly, if not wholly, dialectics. In the controversy between the Realists and the Nominalists he could be classed with neither; his position was the intermediate one denoted by the

modern term Conceptualism. In theology he professed to agree with the Church doctrines, and quoted Augustine, Jerome, and the fathers generally, as authorities; but held, at the same time, that it was the province of reason to develop and vindicate the doctrines themselves.

“At the request of his hearers he published his *Introductio ad Theologiam*; but in accordance with the standpoint of theological science in that age, the idea of *Theologia* was confined, and embraced only Dogmatics. The work was originally, and remained a mere fragment of the doctrines of religion. He agreed so far with Anselm’s principles as to assert that the *Intellectus* can only develop what is given in the *Fides*; but he differs in determining the manner in which Faith is brought into existence; nor does he recognize so readily the limits of speculation, and, in some points, he goes beyond the doctrinal belief of the Church; yet the tendency of the rational element lying at the basis, and his method of applying it, are different. The former was checked in its logical development by the limits set to it in the Creed of the Church; many things also are only put down on the spur of the moment. The work not only created a prodigious sensation, but also showed traces of a preceding hostility.”

He treated the doctrine of the Trinity (in his *Theologia Christianna*) very boldly, assuming “unity in the Divine Being, along with diversity in his relations (*relationum diversitas*), in which consist the Divine Persons. He also maintains a cognition of God (as the most perfect and absolutely independent Being), by means of the reason, which he ascribes to the heathen philosophers, without derogating from the incomprehensibility of God. He also attempted to explain (in his *Ethica*), on philosophical principles, the chief conceptions of theological morality, as, for instance, the notions of vice and virtue. He made *both* to consist in the mental resolution, or in the intention; and maintained, against the moral conviction of his age, that no natural pleasures or sensual desires are in themselves of the nature of sin. He discovered the evidence of the morality of actions in the frame of mind and maxims according to which those actions are undertaken.” A pretty clear view of Abelard’s theology is given by Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas*, 478 sq. (transl. by Ryland, Lond. 1858, 2 vols.). Abelard founded no school, in the proper sense of the word; the results of his labors were critical and destructive, rather than positive. The later scholastics, however, were greatly indebted to him, especially as to form and method. His writings are as follows: *Epistolae ad Heloisiam*, 4; *Epistolae alie al diversos*; *Historia Calamitatum suarum. Apologia*;

Expositio Oration's Dominicae; Expositio in Symbolum Apostolorum; Expositio in Symbolum Athannasii; Solutiones Problematum Heloisae; Adversus Haereses liber; Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Romanos, libri 5; Sermones 32; Ad Helo sam ejusque Virgines Paracletenses; Introductio ad Theologiam, libri 3; Epitome Theologies Christianae.

The philosophy and theology of Abelard have been recently brought into notice anew; in fact, the means of studying them fully have only of late been afforded by the following publications, viz.: Abaelardi *Epitome Theologiae Christianae*, nunc primum edidit F. H. Rheinwald (Berlin, 1835); Cousin's edition of his *Ouvrages ineditis* (Paris, 1836, 4to); by the excellent *Vie d' Abelard*, par C. Remusat (Paris, 1845. 2 vols.); and by P. Abaelardi *Sic et Non*, primum ed. Henke et Lindenkohl (Marburg. 1851, 8vo). The professedly complete edition of his works by *Amboeseus* (Paris, 1616, 4to) does not contain the *Sic et Non*. Migne's edition (*Patrolregioe*, tom. 178) is expurgated of certain anti-papal tendencies. An edition was begun in 1849 by MM. Cousin, Jourdain, and Despois, but only two vols., 4to, were published. See Berington, *History and Letters of Abelard and Heloise* (Lond. 1784, 4to); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4:373; *Meth. Quar. Review*, articles *Instauratio Nova*, July and Oct. 1853; Bohringer, *Kircheng. in Biog.* vol. 4; *Presb. Quarterly*, Philada. 1858 (two admirable articles, containing the best view of Abelard's life and philosophy anywhere to be found in small compass); *The English Cyclop.*; Wight, *Romance of Abelard and Heloise* (N. Y. 1853, 12mo); Guizot, *Essai sur Abelard et Heloise* (Paris, 1839); *Edinb. Rev.* 30:352; *Westm. Rev.* 32:146.

A'bel-beth-ma'ichah

(Heb. Abel' Beyth-Maikah', **hk[ʔAtyBd ba**; Abel of Beth-Maachah; Sept. 'Αβὲλ οἴκου Μαχά in ^{<1150>}1 Kings 15:20, 'Αβὲλ Βαίθμααχά v. r. Θαμααχά in ^{<1259>}2 Kings 15:29), a city in the north of Palestine, in the neighborhood of Dan, Kadesh, and Hazor. It seems to have been of considerable strength from its history, and of importance from its being called "a mother in Israel" (^{<1009>}2 Samuel 20:19), i.e., a metropolis; for the same place is doubtless there meant, although peculiarly expressed (ver. 14, **hl̄ b̄a;hk[ʔm̄tyb̄**, toward Abel and Beth-Maachah, Sept. εἰς' Αβὲλ καὶ εἰς Βαίθμααχά, Vulg. in *Abelam et BethMaache*, Auth. Vers. "unto Abel and to Beth-Maachah;" ver. 15, **hk[ʔMhi tyB̄hl̄ b̄aB̄]** in *Abelch of the house of Maachah*, Sept. ἐν Αβὲλ Βαίθμααχά, Vulg. in *Abela et in*

Beth-maacha, Auth. Vers. “in Abel of Beth-maachah”). **SEE BETH-MAACHAH**. The same place is likewise once denoted simply by ABEL **SEE ABEL** (^{<4108>}2 Samuel 20:18); and in the parallel passage (^{<4106>}2 Chronicles 16:4), ABEL-MAIM **SEE ABEL-MAIM**, which indicates the proximity of a fountain or of springs from which the meadow, doubtless, derived its verdure. **SEE ABEL-**. The addition of “Maachah” marks it as belonging to, or being near to, the region Maachah, which lay eastward of the Jordan under Mount Lebanon. **SEE MAACHAH**. It was besieged by Joab on account of its having sheltered Sheba, the son of Bichri, a Benjamite, who had rebelled against David; but was saved from an assault by the prudence of a “wise woman” of the place, who persuaded the men to put the traitor to death, and to throw his head over the wall; upon which the siege was immediately raised (^{<4114>}2 Samuel 20:14-22). At a later date it was taken and sacked by Benhadad, king of Syria; and 200 years subsequently by Tiglath-pileser, who sent away the inhabitants captives into Assyria (^{<4210>}2 Kings 20:29). The name *Belmen* (Βελμέν), mentioned in Judith (4:4), has been thought a corruption of Abel-maim; but the place there spoken of appears to have been much more. southward. Josephus (*Ant.* 7:11, 7) calls it *Abelmachea* (Ἀβελμαχέα), or (*Ant.* 8:12, 4) *Abellane* (Ἀβελλώνη); and Theodoret (*Quest.* 39 in 2 *Reg.*) says it was still named *Abela* (Ἀβελᾶ). Reland (*Palest.* p. 520) thinks it is the third of the cities called *Abela* mentioned by Eusebius (*Onomast.*) as a Phoenician city between Damascus and Paneas; but Gesenius (*Thest. Heb.* p. 15) objects that it need not be located in Galilee (Harenberg, in the *Nov. Miscel. Lips.* 4:470), and is, therefore, disposed to locate it farther north. **SEE ABILA**. Calmet thinks it, in like manner, the same with *Abila* of Lysanias. But this position is inconsistent with the proximity to Dan and other cities of Naphtali, implied in the Biblical accounts. It was suggested by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 3, Appendix, p. 137) that *Abil el-Karub*, in the region of the Upper Jordan, is the ancient Abel-Beth-Maachah; this conclusion has recently been confirmed almost to certainty by Mr. Thomson (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1846, p. 202). It is so productive in wheat as to be called likewise *Abel el-Kamch* (*ib.* p. 204). This place “is situated on the west side of the valley and stream that descends from Merj-Ayun toward the Huleh, and below the opening into the Merj. It lies on a very distinctly marked *tell*, consisting of a summit, with a large offset from it on the south” (Reverend E. Smith, *ib.* p. 214). It is now an inconsiderable village, occupying part of the long oval mound (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:324 sq.). This identification essentially agrees with that of Schwarz

(*Palest.* p. 65), although he seeks to find in this vicinity three towns of the name of Abel (*Palest.* p. 203), for the purpose of accommodating certain Rabbinical notices. (See Reineccius, *De urbe Abel*, Weissenfels, 1725.)

A'bel-cera'mim

(Heb. *Abel' Kerannim'*, [בַּעֲרָמִים] meadow of vineyards; Sept. Ἀβελ ἄμπελώνων; Vulg. *Abel quas est vineis consita*; Auth. Vers. “plain of the vineyards”), a village of the Ammonites whither the victorious Jephthah pursued their invading forces with great slaughter; situate, apparently, between Aroer and Minnith (^{<07113>}Judges 11:33). According to Eusebins (*Onomast.* Ἀβελ), it was still a place rich in vineyards, 6 (Jerome 7) Roman miles from Philadelphia or Rabbath-Ammon; probably in a south-westerly direction, and perhaps at the present ruins *Merj* (meadow) *Ekkeh*. The other “wine-bearing” village Abel mentioned by Eusebius, 12 R. miles E. of Gadara, is probably the modern *Abil* (Ritter, *Erdk.* 15:1058); but cannot be the place in question, as it lies north of Gilead, which Jephthah passed through on his way south from Manasseh by the way of the Upper Jordan. *SEE ABILA.*

Abelites, Abelians, or Abelonians

a sect of heretics who appeared in the diocese of Hippo, in Africa, about the year 370. They insisted upon marriage, but permitted no carnal conversation between man and wife, following, as they said, the example of Abel, and the prohibition in ^{<00217>}Genesis 2:17. When a man and woman entered their sect they were obliged to adopt a boy and girl, who succeeded to all their property, and were united together in marriage in a similar manner. Augustine says (*De Hoer.* cap. 87) that in his time they had become extinct. The whole sect was at last reduced to a single village, which returned to the Church. This strange sect is, to some extent, reproduced in the modern Shakers. — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* c. 2, pt. 2; ch. 5 § 18.

Abellane

SEE ABEL-BETH-MAACHAH.

Abelli, Louis

Bishop of Rodez (South France), was born at Vez, 1604. He was made bishop in 1664, but resigned in three years, to become a monk in the

convent of St. Lazare, at Paris. He was a violent opposer of the Jansenists, and author of a system of Dogmatic Theology, entitled *Medulla Theologica* (republished in Mayence, 1839), and also of *Vie de St. Vincent de Paul*, 4to. He was an ardent advocate of the worship of the Virgin Mary, and wrote, in its defense, *La Tradition de l'église touchant le culte de la Vierge*, 1652, 8vo. He died in his convent in 1691.

Abelinachea

SEE ABEL-BETH-MAACHAH.

A'bel-ma'im

(Heb. *Abel Ma'yim*, מַעַיִן בַּעַר *meadow of water*; Sept. Ἀβελμαΐν, Vulg. *Abelmam*), one of the cities of Naphtali captured by Bendahad (1460 2 Chronicles 16:4); elsewhere (1150 1 Kings 15:20) called ABEL-BETH-MAACHAH SEE ABEL-BETH-MAACHAH (q.v.).

Abelmea

SEE ABEL-MEHOLAH.

A'bel-meho'lah

(Heb. *Abel' Mecholah'*, בַּעַר הַחַלְמַיִם *meadow of dancing*; Sept. Ἀβελμεουλά and Ἀβελμαουλά, Vulg. *Abelmehula* and *Abelneuel*), a place not far from the Jordan, on the confines of Issachar and Manasseh, in the vicinity of Beth-shittah, Zeredah, and Tabbath, whither Gideon's three hundred picked men pursued the routed Midianites (1072 Judges 7:22). It was the birthplace or residence of Elisha the prophet (1196 1 Kings 19:16), and lay not far from Beth-shean (1042 1 Kings 4:12); according to Eusebius (*Onomast.* Βηθμαελά), in the plain of the Jordan, 16 (Jerome 10) Roman miles south, probably the same with the village *Abelmea* mentioned by Jerome (*ibid.* Eusebius less correctly Ἀβὲλ νεά) as situated between Scythopolis (Bethshean) and Neapolis (Shechem). It is also alluded to by Epiphanius (whose text has inaccurately Ἀβελμούδ v. r. Ἀμεμουήλ, and wrongly locates it in the tribe of Reuben), and (as Ἀβελμαούλ) in the *Pas(kal Chronicle* (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 522). It was probably situated not far from where the Wady el-Maleh (which seems to retain a trace of the name) emerges into the Aulon or valley of the Jordan; perhaps at the ruins now called *Khurbet esh-Skul'*, which are on an undulating plain

beside a stream (Van de Velde, *Narrative*. 2:340). This appears to agree with the conjectural location assigned by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 159), although the places he names do not occur on any map.

A'bel-miz'raim

(Heb. *Abel' Mitsra'yim*, **Ι βα; μ2α; ρι κηα**, meadow of 'Egypt; but which should probably be pointed **μυα κηα βαε** 'Abel Mistra'yim, mourning of the Egyptians, as in the former part of the same verse: and so appear to have read the Sept. **πένθος Αἰγύπτου**, and Vulg. *Ploenctus Egypti*), a place beyond (i.e. on the west bank of) the Jordan, occupied (perhaps subsequently) by the threshing-floor of Atad. where the Egyptians performed their seven days' mourning ceremonies over the embalmed body of Jacob prior to interment (Genesis 1, 11). **SEE ATAD**. Jerome (*Onomast.* Area Atad) places it between Jericho and the Jordan, at three Roman miles distance from the former and two from the latter, corresponding (Reland, *Paloese*. p. 522) to the later site of BETH-HOGLAH **SEE BETH-HOGLAH** (q.v.).

A'bel-shit'tim

(Heb. *Abel' hash-Shittim'*, **Ι βα; μυΒαα/η**, meadow of the acacias Sept. **Ἀβελσαττεῖν**, Vulg. *Abel-satim*), a town in the plains of Moab, on the east of the Jordan, between which and Beth-Jesimoth was the last encampment of the Israelites on that side the river (^{<039>}Numbers 33:49). **SEE EXODE**. The place is noted for the severe punishment which was there inflicted upon the Israelites when they were seduced into the worship of Baal-Peor, through their evil intercourse with the Moabites and Midianites. **SEE BAAL**. Eusebius (*Onomast.* **Σαττεῖν**) says it was situated near Mount Peor (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 520). In the time of Josephus it was a town embosomed in palms, still known as *Abila* or *Abile* (**Ἀβίλα** or **Ἀβίλη**), and stood sixty stadia from the Jordan (*Ant.* 4:8, 1; v. 1, 1). Rabbinical authorities assign it the same relative position (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 229). It is more frequently called SHITTIM **SEE SHITTIM** merely (^{<025>}Numbers 25:1; ^{<011>}Joshua 2:1; ^{<015>}Micah 6:5). From the above notices (which all refer to the sojourn of the Israelites there), it appears to have been situated nearly opposite Jericho, in the eastern plain of Jordan, about where Wady Seir opens into the Ghor. The acacia-groves on both sides of the Jordan still "mark with a line of verdure the upper terraces of the

valley” (Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 292), and doubtless gave name to this place (Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, 2:17).

Abendana

(i.e. *Son of Dana*), JACOB *SEE JACOB*, a Jewish rabbi, born in Spain about 1630, died in London in 1696. He was rabbi first in Amsterdam, and from 1685 till his death in London. He translated into Spanish the book of Cusari as well as the Mishna, with the commentaries of Maimonides and Bartenora. His *Spicilegium rerum praeteritarum et intermissarum* contains valuable philological and critical notes to the celebrated Michlal Jophi (Amsterdam, 1685). A selection from his works appeared after his death, under the title *Discourses of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Polity of the Jews* (Lond. 1706).

Aben-Ezra

(otherwise ABEN-ESDRA, or IBN-ESRA, properly, ABRAHAM BEN-MEIR), a celebrated Spanish rabbi, called by the Jews *the Sage, the Great*, etc., was born at Toledo in 1092. Little is known of the facts of his life; but he was a great traveler and student, and was at once philosopher, mathematician, and theologian. His fame for varied and accurate learning was very great in his own day, and has survived, worthily, to the present age. He died at Rome, Jan. 23, 1167. De Rossi, in his *Hist. Dict. of Hebrew Writers* (Parma, 1802), gives a catalogue of the writings attributed to him. Many of them still exist only in MS. A list of those that have been published, with the various editions and translations, is given by Farst in his *Bibliotheca Judaica* (Lpz. 1849, 1:251 sq.). A work on astronomy, entitled *hmkh; tyvärB* (*the Beginning of Wisdom*), partly translated from the Arabic and partly compiled by himself, greatly contributed to establishing his reputation (a Latin translation of it is given in Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, t. 3). He also wrote a “Commentary on the Talmud,” and another work on the importance of the Talmud, entitled *ar/m r/sw* (*the Basis of Instruction*), several times printed (in German, F. ad M. 1840). His most important work consists of “Commentaries on the Old Testament” (*l [i vWr22P*, in several parts), a work full of erudition. Bomberg Buxtorf, and Moses Frankfurter included it in their editions of Hebrew texts and annotations of the Bible (Venice, 1526; Basil, 1618-19; Amst. 1724-7). His “Commentary on the Pentateuch” (*hr/ThiVldP*) is very rare in its

original form (fol. Naples, 1488; Constantinople, 1514), but it has often been reprinted combined with other matter, overlaid by later annotations, or in fragmentary form. None of the other portions of his great commentary have been published separately from the Rabbinical Bibles, except in detached parts, and then usually with other matter and translated. Aben-Ezra usually wrote in the vulgar Hebrew or Jewish dialect; but that he was perfectly familiar with the original Hebrew is shown by some poems and other little pieces which are found in the preface to his commentaries. The works of Aben-Ezra are thoroughly philosophical, and show a great acquaintance with physical and natural science. He also wrote several works on Hebrew Grammar (especially *מורה נבוכים* Augsb. 1521, 8vo; *תורת משה* Ven. 1546, 8vo; *חכמת אבות*; Constpl. 1530, 8vo), most of which have been re-edited (by Lippmann, Heidenhein, etc.) with Hebrew annotations. Some of his arithmetical and astronomical works have been translated into Latin. — Hoefler, *Biographie Generale*.

Abercrombie, James

D.D., an Episcopal divine and accomplished scholar, was born in Philadelphia in 1758, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania, 1776. He then studied theology, but, on account of an injury to his eyes, he entered into mercantile pursuits in 1783. In 1793 he was ordained, and became associate pastor of Christ Church in 1794. From 1810 to 1819 he was principal of the "Philadelphia Academy." In 1883 he retired on a pension, and died at Philadelphia, June 26, 1841, the oldest preacher of that Church in the city. He was distinguished as well for eloquence and liberality as for learning. He wrote *Lectures on the Catechism* (1807), and published a number of occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, v. 394.

Abercrombie, John

D.D., author of *Enquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers*, published 1830, and the *Philosophy of the Moral Feelings*, published 1833, was born at Aberdeen, Nov. 11, 1781, and attained the highest rank as a practical and consulting physician at Edinburgh. He became Lord Rector of Marischal College, Aberdeen, 1835. Besides the works above named, he wrote *Essays and Tracts on Christian Subjects* (Edinb. 18mo); *Harmony of Christian Faith and Character* (reprint from preceding, N.Y. 1845, 18mo). He died Nov. 14, 1844. — *Quart. Rev.* 45:341.

Aberdeen

(*Aberdonia Devana*), the seat of a Scotch bishopric, formerly suffragan to the Archbishopric of St. Andrew. The bishopric was transferred to Aberdeen about the year 1130, by King David, from Murthilack, now Mortlick, which had been erected into an episcopal see by Malcolm II in the year 1010, Beancus, or Beyn, being the first bishop.

Aberdeen, Breviary of.

While Romanism prevailed in Scotland, the Church of Aberdeen had, like many others, its own rites. The missal, according to Palmer, has never been published; but an edition of the breviary was printed in 1509. — Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* 1:188, who cites Zaccaria, *Biblioth. Ritualis*, tom. 1; A. Butler, *Lives of Saints*, 1:113.

Abernethy, John

an eminent Presbyterian divine, educated at the University of Glasgow, and afterward at Edinburgh. Born at Coleraine, in Ireland, 1680; became minister at Antrim in 1708, and labored zealously for twenty years, especially in behalf of the Roman Catholics. The subscription controversy, which was raised in England by Hoadley, the famous Bishop of Bangor, and the agitation of which kindled the flames of party strife in Ireland also, having led to the rupture of the Presbytery of Antrim from the General Synod in 1726, Abernethy, who was a warm supporter of the liberal principals of Hoadley, lost a large number of his people; and these having formed a new congregation, he felt his usefulness so greatly contracted that, on his services being solicited by a church in Wood Street, Dublin, he determined to accept their invitation. Applying himself with redoubled energy to his ministerial work, he soon collected a numerous congregation. His constitution failed under his excessive labors, and he died suddenly in December, 1740. His discourses on the being and attributes of God have always been held in much esteem. His works are: 1. *Discourses on the Being and Perfections of God* (Lond. 1743, 2 vols. 8vo); 2. *Sermons on various Subjects* (Lond. 1748-'51, 4 vols. 8vo); 3. *Tracts and Sermons* (Lond. 1751, 8vo).

Abesar.

SEE ABEZ.

Abesta.

SEE AVESTA.

Abeyance

signifies *expectancy*, probably from the French *bayer*, to gape after. Lands, dwelling-houses, or goods, are said to be in abeyance when they are only in expectation, or the intendment of the law, and not actually possessed. In the Church of England, when a living has become vacant, between such time and the institution of the next incumbent, it is in abeyance. It belongs to no parson, but is *kept suspended*, as it were, in the purpose, as yet undeclared, of the patron.

A'bez

(Heb. *E'beths*, /b̄a, in pause /b̄a;A 'beths, lustre, and hence, perhaps, tin; Sept. 'Αεμέξ, Vulg. *Abes*), a town in the tribe of Issachar, apparently near the border, mentioned between Kishion and Remeth (⁽⁻⁰⁶⁸²⁾Joshua 19:20). It is probably the *Abesap* (Ἀβέσαρος) mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 6:13, 8) as the native city of the wife whom David had married prior to Abigail and after his deprivation of Michal; possibly referring to Ahinoam the Jezreelitess (⁽⁻⁰²⁵⁸⁾1 Samuel 25:43), as if she had been so called as having resided in some town of the valley of Esdraelon. According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 167), "it is probably the village of *Kunebiz*, called also *Karm en-Abiz*, which lies three English miles west-south-west from Iksal;" meaning the *Khuneifis* or *Ukhneifis* of Robinson (*Researches*, 3, 167, 218), which is in the general locality indicated by the associated names.

Abgarus

(ABAGARUS, AGBARUS; sometimes derived from the Arabic *Akbar*, "greater," but better from the Armenian *Avag*, "great," and *air*, "man;" see Ersch und Gruber, s.v. *Abgar*), the common name of the petty princes (or Toparchs) who ruled at Edessa in Mesopotamia, of one of whom there is an Eastern tradition, recorded by Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* 1:13), that he wrote a letter to Christ, who transmitted a reply. Eusebius gives copies of both letters, as follows:

"Abgarus, Prince of Edessa, to Jesus, the merciful Savior, who has appeared in the country of Jerusalem, greeting. I have been informed of the prodigies and cures wrought by you without the use of herbs or medicines,

and by the efficacy only of your words. I am told that you enable cripples to walk; that you force devils from the bodies possessed; that there is no disease, however incurable, which you do not heal, and that you restore the dead to life. These wonders persuade me that you are some god descended from heaven, or that you are the Son of God. For this reason I have taken the liberty of writing this letter to you, beseeching you to come and see me, and to cure me of the indisposition under which I have so long labored. I understand that the Jews persecute you, murmur at your miracles, and seek your destruction. I have here a beautiful and agreeable city which, though it be not very large, will be sufficient to supply you with every thing that is necessary.”

To this letter it is said Jesus Christ returned him an answer in the following terms: “You are happy, Abagarus, thus to have believed in me without having seen me; for it is written of me, that they who shall see me will not believe in me, and that they who have never seen me shall believe and be saved. As to the desire you express in receiving a visit from me, I must tell you that all things for which I am come must be fulfilled in the country where I am; when this is done, I must return to him who sent me. And when I am departed hence, I will send to you one of my disciples, who will cure you of the disease of which you complain, and give life to you and to those that are with you.” According to Moses of Chorene (died 470), the reply was written by the Apostle Thomas.

Eusebius further states that, after the ascension of Christ, the Apostle Thomas sent Thaddaeus, one of the seventy, to Abgar, who cured him of leprosy, and converted him, together with his subjects. The documents from which this narrative is drawn were found by Eusebius in the archives of Edessa. Moses of Chorene relates further that Abgarus, after his conversion, wrote letters in defense of Christianity to the Emperor Tiberius and to the king of Persia. He is also the first who mentions that Christ sent to Abgarus, together with a reply, a handkerchief impressed with his portrait. The letter of Christ to Abgarus was declared apocryphal by the Council of Rome, A.D. 494; but in the Greek Church many continued to believe in its authenticity, and the people of Edessa believed that their city was made unconquerable by the possession of this palladium. The original is said to have later been brought to Constantinople. In modern times, the correspondence of Abgarus, as well as the portrait of Christ, are generally regarded as forgeries; yet the authenticity of the letters is defended by Tillemont, *Memoires pour Servir a L' Hist. Eccles.* 1, p. 362, 615; by

Welte, *Tubing. Quartalschrift*, 1842, p. 335 et seq., and several others. Two churches, St. Sylvester's at Rome, and a church of Genoa, profess each to have the original of the portrait. A beautiful copy of the portrait in Rome is given in W. Grimm, *Die Sage vom Ursprung der Christusbilder* (Berlin, 1843). The authenticity of the portrait in Genoa is defended by the Mechitarist, M. Samuelian. Hefele puts its origin in the fifteenth century, but believes it to be the copy of an older portrait. See the treatises on this subject, in Latin, by Frauendorff (Lips. 1693), Albinus (Viteb. 1694), E. Dalhuse (Hafn. 1699), Schulze (Regiom. 1706); Semler (Hal. 1759), Heine (Hal. 1768); Zeller (Frnkf. ad O. 1798); in German, by Hartmann (Jena, 1796), Rink (in the *Mergenblatt*, 1819, No. 110, and in Ilgen's *Zeitschr.* 1843, 2:3-26); and comp. Bayer, *Hist. Edessana*, p. 104 sq., 358 sq. See, also, Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:80; Mosheim, *Comm.* 1:95; Lardner, *Works*, 6:596; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, 3; and the articles *SEE CHRIST*, *SEE IMAGES OF; JESUS*.

A'bi

(Heb. *Abi'*, *ybaʿ*) *my father*, or rather *father of* *SEE ABI-*; Sept. 'Αβί, Vulg. *Abi*), a shortened form (comp. ^{<4200>}2 Chronicles 29:1) of ABIJAH *SEE ABIJAH* (q.v.), the name of the mother of King Hezekiah (^{<1280>}2 Kings 18:2, where the full form is also read in some MSS.).

Abi-

(*Aybaʿ*) an old construct form of *ba*; *father*, as is evident from its use in Hebrew and all the cognate languages), forms the first part of several Hebrew proper names (*Bib. Repos.* 1846, p. 760); e.g. those following. See AB-.

Abi'a

(‘Αβιά), a Graecized form of the name ABIJAH *SEE ABIJAH* (^{<4100>}Matthew 1:7; ^{<4005>}Luke 1:5). It also occurs (1 Chronicles 3: 10) instead of ABIAH *SEE ABIAH* (q.v.).

Abi'ah

a less correct mode (^{<0002>}1 Samuel 8:2; ^{<1000>}1 Chronicles 2:4; 6:28; 7:8) of Anglicizing the name ABIJAH *SEE ABIJAH* (q.v.).

A'bi-al'bon

(Heb. *Abi'-Albon*, אָבִי אֵלְבֹן *[Aybæ]* *father of strength*, i.e. *valiant*; Sept. Ἀβὶ Ἀλβών v. r. Ἀβὶ Ἀρβών, Vulg. *Abialbon*), one of David's bodyguard (^{<1231>}2 Samuel 23:31); called in the parallel passage (^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 11:32) by the equivalent name *ABIEL* *SEE ABIEL* (q.v.).

Abi'asaph

(Heb. *Abiasaph*, אָבִי אֶסָפָה *[Asaybæ]* *father of gathering*, i.e. *gatherer*; Sept. Ἀβιάσαφ, Vulg. *Abiasaph*), the youngest of the three sons of Korah the Levite (^{<1024>}Exodus 6:24); B.C. post 1740. He is different from the Ebiasaph of ^{<1163>}1 Chronicles 6:23, 37; 9:19. *SEE SAMUEL*.

Abi'athar

(Heb. *Ebyathar*, אֶבְיָתָר *[Etybæ]*, *father of abundance*, i.e. *liberal*; Sept. Ἀβιάθαρ or Ἀβιαθάρ, N.T. Ἀβιάθαρ, Josephus Ἀβιάθαρος), the thirteenth high-priest of the Jews, being the son of Ahimelech, and the third in descent from Eli; B.C. 1060-1012. When his father was slain with the priests of Nob, for suspected partiality to David, Abiathar escaped; and bearing with him the most essential part of the priestly raiment [*SEE EPHOD*], repaired to the son of Jesse, who was then in the cave of Adullam (^{<1021>}1 Samuel 22:20-23; 23:6). He was well received by David, and became the priest of the party during its exile and wanderings, receiving for David responses from God (^{<1017>}1 Samuel 30:7; comp. ^{<1011>}2 Samuel 2:1; 5:19). The cause of this strong attachment on the part of the monarch was the feeling that he had been unintentionally the cause of the death of Abiathar's kindred. When David became king of Judah he appointed Abiathar high priest (see ^{<1311>}1 Chronicles 15:11; ^{<1026>}1 Kings 2:26), and a member of his cabinet (^{<1274>}1 Chronicles 27:34). Meanwhile Zadok had been made high-priest by Saul — an appointment not only unexceptionable in itself, but in accordance with the divine sentence of deposition which had been passed, through Samuel, upon the house of Eli (^{<1020>}1 Samuel 2:30-36). When, therefore, David acquired the kingdom of Israel, he had no just ground on which Zadok could be removed, and Abiathar set in his place; and the attempt would probably have been offensive to his new subjects, who had been accustomed to the ministration of Zadok, and whose good feeling he was anxious to cultivate. The king appears to have got over this difficulty by allowing both appointments to

stand; and until the end of David's reign Zadok and Abiathar were joint high priests (^{<1004>}1 Kings 4:4). As a high-priest, Abiathar was the least excusable, in some respects, of all those who were parties in the attempt to raise Adonijah to the throne (^{<1019>}1 Kings 1:19); and Solomon, in deposing him from the high-priesthood, plainly told him that only his sacerdotal character, and his former services to David, preserved him from capital punishment (I Kings 2:26, 27). This completed the doom upon the house of Eli, and restored the pontifical succession — Zadok, who remained the high-priest, being of the elder line of Aaron's sons. *SEE ELEAZAR.*

In ^{<4026>}Mark 2:26, a circumstance is described as occurring "in the days of Abiathar, the high-priest" (ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως — a phrase that is susceptible of the rendering, *in [the time] of Abiathar, [the son] of the high-priest*), which appears, from ^{<0201>}1 Samuel 21:1, to have really occurred when his father Ahimelech was the high-priest. The most probable solution of this difficulty (but see Alford's *Comment.* in loc.) is that which interprets the reference thus: "in the days of Abiathar, *who was afterward* the high-priest" (Middleton, *Greek Article*, p. 188-190). But this leaves open another difficulty, which arises from the precisely opposite reference (in ^{<1087>}2 Samuel 8:17; ^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 18:16; 24:3, 6, 51) to "Ahimelech [or Abimelech] the son of Abiathar," as the person who was high-priest along with Zadok, and who was deposed by Solomon; whereas the history describes that personage as Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech. Another explanation is, that both father and son bore the two names of Ahimelech and Abiathar, and might be, and were, called by either (J. C. Leuschner, *De Achimelecho binomini*, Hirschb. 1750). But although it was not unusual for the Jews to have two names, it was *not* usual for both father and son to have the same two names. Others suppose a second Abiathar, the father of Ahimelech, and some even a son of the same name; but none of these suppositions are warranted by the text, nor allowable in the list of high priests. *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.* The names have probably become transposed by copyists, for the Syriac and Arabic versions have "Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech." The mention of Abiathar in the above passage of Mark, rather than the acting priest Ahimelech, may have arisen from the greater prominence of the former in the history of David's reign, and he appears even at that time to have been with his father, and to have had some part in the pontifical duties. In additional explanation of the other difficulty above referred to, it may be suggested as not unlikely that Ahimelech may have been the name of one of Abiathar's sons likewise

associated with him, as well as that of his father, and that copyists have confounded these names together. *SEE AHIMLECH.*

A'bib

(Heb. *Abib'*, *bybæ* from an obsolete root = *bbā*; *to fructify*), properly, a head or ear of grain (^{<0124>}Leviticus 2:14, “green ears;” ^{<0138>}Exodus 13:31, “ear”); hence, the month of newly-ripe grain (^{<0134>}Exodus 13:4; 23:15; 34:18; ^{<0161>}Deuteronomy 16:1), the first of the Jewish ecclesiastical year, afterward (^{<0111>}Nehemiah 2:1) called NISAN *SEE NISAN* (q.v.). It began with the new moon of March, according to the Rabbins (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 3), or rather of April, according to Michaelis (*Comment. de Alensibus Hebraeor.*, comp. his *Commentat.* Brema, 1769, p. 16 sq.); at which time the first grain ripens in Palestine (Robinson's *Researches*, 2:99, 100). *SEE MONTH.* Hence it is hardly to be regarded as a strict name of a month, but rather as a designation of the season; as the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Saadias have well rendered, in ^{<0134>}Exodus 13:4, the month of the new grain;” less correctly the Syriac, “the month of flowers” (comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:557). Others (as A. Muller, *Gloss. Sacra*, p. 2) regard the name as derived from the eleventh Egyptian month, *Epep* (ἐπιπί, *Plut. de Iside*, p. 372); but this corresponds neither to March or April, but to July (Fabricii *Menologium*, p. 22-27; Jablonsky, *Opusc.* ed. Water, 1:65 sq.). *SEE TEL-ABIB.*

Abibas

a martyr of Edessa, burned in 322, under the Emperor Licinius. He is commemorated in the Greek Church, as a saint, on 15th November.

Ab'ida

[many *Abi'da*] (Heb. *Abida'*, [*dybæ*] *father of knowledge*, i.e. *knowing*; ^{<0133>}1 Chronicles 1:33, Sept. Ἀβιδά; ^{<0124>}Genesis 25:4, Ἀβειδά, Auth. Vers. “Abidah”>, the fourth of the five sons of Midian, the son of Abraham by Keturah (^{<0121>}Genesis 25:1; ^{<0113>}1 Chronicles 1:33), and apparently the head of a tribe in the peninsula of Arabia, B.C. post 2000. *SEE ARABIA.* Josephus (*Ant.* 1:15, 1) calls him *Ebidas* (Ἐβιδᾶς). For the city Abida, see ABILA.

Ab'idah

[many *Abi'dah*], a less correct mode of Anglicizing (^{<0250>}Genesis 25:4) the name ABIDA *SEE ABIDA* (q.v.).

Ab'idan

(Heb. *Abidan*’,) ^{<0111>}*dyba*) *father of judgment*, i.e. *judge*; Sept. ‘*Ἀβιδάων*), the son of Gideoni, and phylarch of the tribe of Benjamin at the exode (^{<0111>}Numbers 1:11; 2:22; 10:24). At the erection of the Tabernacle he made a contribution on the ninth day, similar to the other chiefs (^{<0111>}Numbers 7:60, 65), B.C. 1657.

A'biel

(Heb. *Abiel*’,) ^{<0111>}*ayba*) lit. *father* [i.e. *possessor*] of *God*, i.e. *pious*, or perhaps *father of strength*, i.e. *strong*; Sept. ‘*Ἀβιήλ*), the name of two men.

1. The son of Zeror, a Benjamite (^{<0111>}1 Samuel 9:1), and father of Ner (^{<0145>}1 Samuel 14:51), which last was the grandfather of Saul, the first king of Israel (^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 8:33; 9:39). B.C. 1093. In ^{<0111>}1 Samuel 9:1 he is called the “father” (q.v.) of Kish, meaning grandfather. *SEE NER*.

2. An Arbathite, one of David’s distinguished warriors (^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 11:32). B.C. 1053. In the parallel passage he is called ABI-ALBON *SEE ABI-ALBON* (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 23:31). *SEE DAVID*.

Abie'zer

(Heb. id.,) ^{<0111>}*ryba*) *father of help*, i.e. *helpful*; Sept. ‘*Ἀβιέζερ*), the name of two men.

1. The second of the three sons of Hammoleketh, sister of Gilead, grandson of Manasseh (^{<1373>}1 Chronicles 7:18). B.C. cir. 1618. He became the founder of a family that settled beyond the Jordan [*SEE OPHRAH*], from which Gideon sprang (^{<0111>}Joshua 7:2), and which bore this name as a patronymic (^{<0111>}Judges 6:34), a circumstance that is beautifully alluded to in Gideon’s delicate reply to the jealous Ephraimites (^{<0111>}Judges 8:2). *SEE ABIEZRITE*. He is elsewhere called JEEZER *SEE JEEZER* , and his descendants Jeezerites (^{<0111>}Numbers 26:30).

2. A native of Anathoth, one of David's thirty chief warriors (^{<1027>}2 Samuel 23:27; ^{<13128>}1 Chronicles 11:28), B.C. 1053. He was afterward appointed captain of the ninth contingent of troops from the Benjamites (^{<13712>}1 Chronicles 27:12), B.C. 1014. *SEE DAVID.*

Abiez' rite

(Heb. *A bi'ha-Ezri'*, *yrwēh;ybæ*, *father of the Ezrite*; Sept. *πατήρ τοῦ ΕΖΡΙ*, Vulg. *pater families Ezri*; but in ^{<1082>}Judges 8:32, 'Αβὶ 'Εζρί, *de familia Ezri*), a patronymic designation of the descendants of ABIEZER *SEE ABIEZER* (^{<1002>}Judges 6:2, 24; 8:32).

Ab'igail

(Heb. *Abiga'yil*, *l ygybæ*, *father* [i.e. *source*] *of joy*, or perh. i. q. *leader of the dance*, once contracted *Abigal'*, *l gjbæ*, ^{<10725>}2 Samuel 17:25; Sept. 'Αβιγάιλ v. r. 'Αβιγαία, Josephus 'Αβιγαία), the name of two women.

1. The daughter of Nahash (? Jesse), sister of David, and wife of Jether or Ithra (q.v.), an Ishmaelite, by whom she had Amasa (^{<13126>}1 Chronicles 2:16, 17; ^{<10725>}2 Samuel 17:25). B.C. 1068.

2. The wife of Nabal, a prosperous but churlish sheep-master in the district of Carmel, west of the Dead Sea (^{<10273>}1 Samuel 25:3). B.C. 1060. Her promptitude and discretion averted the wrath of David, which, as she justly apprehended, had been violently excited by the insulting treatment which his messengers had received from her husband (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 6:13, 6-8). See NABAL. She hastily prepared a liberal supply of provisions, of which David's troop stood in much need, and went forth to meet him, attended by only one servant, without the knowledge of her husband. When they met, he was marching to exterminate Nabal and all that belonged to him; and not only was his rage mollified by her prudent remonstrances and delicate management, but he became sensible that the vengeance which he had purposed was not warranted by the circumstances, and was thankful that he had been prevented from shedding innocent blood (^{<10254>}1 Samuel 25:14-35). The beauty and prudence of Abigail (see H. Hughes, *Female Characters*, 2:250 sq.) made such an impression upon David on this occasion, that when, not long after, he heard of Nabal's death, he sent for her, and she became his wife (^{<10273>}1 Samuel 25:39-42). She accompanied him in all his future fortunes (^{<10273>}1 Samuel 27:3; 30:5; ^{<1012>}2 Samuel 2:2). *SEE DAVID.* By her he had one son, Chileab (2 Samuel

3: 3), who is probably the same elsewhere called Daniel (^{<1301>}1 Chronicles 3:1).

Abiha'il

(Heb. *Abicha'yil*, **I yb̄yb̄æ**) *father of* [i.e. *endowed with*] *might*, or perhaps *leader of the song*), the name of three men and two women.

1. (Sept. 'Αβιχαΐλ.) The father of Zuriel, which latter was the chief of the Levitical family of Merari at the exode (Numbers 3: 35). B.C. ante 1657.
2. (Sept. 'Αβιγαΐα v. r. 'Αβιχαΐα.) The wife of Abishur (of the family of Jerahmeel), and mother of Ahban and Molid (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 2:29, where the name in some MSS. is *Abiha'yil*, **I yb̄yb̄æ**) apparently by error). B.C. considerably post 1612.
3. (Sept. 'Αβιχαΐα.) The son of Huri, and one of the family chiefs of the tribe of Gad, who settled in Bashan (^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 5:14), B.C. between 1093 and 782.
4. (Sept. 'Αβιαιάλ v. r. 'Αβιαιά and 'Αβιχαΐα.) The second wife of king Rehoboam, to whom she or the previous wife bore several sons (^{<1418>}2 Chronicles 11:18). B.C. 972. She is there called the “daughter” of Eliab, the son of Jesse, which must mean *descendant* [**SEE FATHER**], since David, the youngest of his father's sons, was thirty years old when he began to reign, eighty years before her marriage.
5. (Sept. 'Αμιναδάβ v. r. 'Αβιχαΐα.) The father of Esther, and uncle of Mordecai (^{<1705>}Esther 2:15; 9:29; comp. 2:7). B.C. ante 479.

Abi'hu

(Heb. *Abihu'*, **¶hyb̄æ**) lit. *father* [i.e. *worshipper*] *of Him*, sc. *God*; Sept. 'Αβιούδ, Josephus 'Αβιούς, Vulg. *Abiu*), the second of the sons of Aaron by Elisheba (^{<1003>}Exodus 6:23; Numbers 3: 2; 26:60; ^{<1303>}1 Chronicles 6:3; 24:1), who, with his brothers Nadab, Eleazar, and Ithamar, was set apart and consecrated for the priesthood (^{<1200>}Exodus 28:1). With his father and elder brother, he accompanied the seventy elders partly up the mount which Moses ascended to receive the divine communication (^{<1201>}Exodus 24:1, 9). When, at the first establishment of the ceremonial worship, the victims offered on the great brazen altar were consumed by fire from heaven, it was directed that this fire should always be kept up, and that the

daily incense should be burnt in censers filled with it from the great altar (see ^{<1818>}Leviticus 6:9 sq.). But one day Nadab and Abihu presumed to neglect this regulation, and offered incense in censers filled with “strange” or common fire, B.C. 1657. For this they were instantly struck dead by lightning, and were taken away and buried in their clothes without the camp (^{<1818>}Leviticus 10:1-11; comp. Numbers 3: 4; 26:61; ^{<1341>}1 Chronicles 24:2). **SEE AARON**. There can be no doubt that this severe example had the intended effect of enforcing becoming attention to the most minute observances of the ritual service. As immediately after the record of this transaction, and in apparent reference to it, comes a prohibition of wine or strong drink to the priests whose turn it might be to enter the tabernacle, it is not unfairly surmised that Nadab and Abihu were intoxicated when they committed this serious error in their ministrations. **SEE NADAB**.

Abi’hud

(Heb. *Abihud*’, ^{<1818>}*whYba*), *father* [i.e. *possessor*] of *renown*, q. d. ^{<1818>}*Πάτροκλος*; Sept. and N.T. ‘^{<1818>}Ἀβιοῦδ), the name of two men.

1. One of the sons of Bela, the son of Benjamin (^{<1818>}1 Chronicles 8:3); apparently the same elsewhere called **AHIHUD** **SEE AHIHUD** (ver. 7). B.C. post 1856. **SEE JACOB**.
2. The great-great-grandson of Zerubbabel, and father of Eliakim, among the paternal ancestry of Jesus (^{<4013>}Matthew 1:13, where the name is Anglicized “Aliud”); apparently the same with the **JUDA** **SEE JUDA**, son of Joanna and father of Joseph in the maternal line (Luke 3: 26); and also with **OBADIAH** **SEE OBADIAH**, son of Arnan and father of Shechaniah in the O.T. (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 3:21). B.C. ante 410. (See Strong’s *Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 16.) Comp. **SEE HODIAH**.

Abi’jah

(Heb. *Abiyah*’, ^{<1818>}*whYba*) *father* [i.e. *possessor or worshipper*] of *Jehovah*; also in the equivalent protracted form *Abiya’hu*, ^{<1818>}*whYba* ^{<4430>}2 Chronicles 13:20, 21; Sept. and N.T. ‘^{<1818>}Ἀβιά but ‘^{<1818>}Ἀβία in ^{<1140>}1 Kings 14:1; ^{<600>}Nehemiah 10:7; ‘^{<1818>}Ἀβίας in ^{<1340>}1 Chronicles 24:10; ^{<1624>}Nehemiah 12:4, 17; ‘^{<1818>}Ἀβιού v. r. ‘^{<1818>}Ἀβιοῦδ, in ^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 7:8; Josephus, ‘^{<1818>}Ἀβίας, *Ant.* 7:10, 3; Auth. Vers. “Abiah” in ^{<1002>}1 Samuel 8:2; ^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 2:24; 6:28; 7:8; “Abia” in ^{<1310>}1 Chronicles 3:10; ^{<1007>}Matthew 1:7; ^{<1005>}Luke 1:5), the name of six men and two women.

1. A son of Becher, one of the sons of Benjamin (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 7:8). B.C. post 1856.
2. The daughter of Machir, who bore to Hezron a posthumous son, Ashur (^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 2:24). B.C. cir. 1612.
3. The second son of Samuel (^{<982>}1 Samuel 8:2; ^{<1363>}1 Chronicles 6:28). Being appointed by his father a judge in Beersheba, in connection with his brother, their corrupt administration induced such popular discontent as to provoke the elders to demand a royal form of government for Israel, B.C. 1093. *SEE SAMUEL.*
4. One of the descendants of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, and chief of one of the twenty-four courses or orders into which the whole body of the priesthood was divided by David (^{<1340>}1 Chronicles 24:10), B.C. 1014. Of these the course of Abijah was the eighth. Only four of the courses returned from the captivity, of which that of Abijah was not one (^{<1326>}Ezra 2:36-39; ^{<1473>}Nehemiah 7:39-42; 12:1). But the four were divided into the original number of twenty-four, with the original names; and it hence happens that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, is described as belonging to the course of Abijah (^{<1005>}Luke 1:5). *SEE PRIEST.*
5. The second king of the separate kingdom of Judah, being the son of Rehoboam, and grandson of Solomon (^{<1330>}1 Chronicles 3:10). He is also called (^{<1143>}1 Kings 14:31; 15:1-8) ABIJAMI *SEE ABIJAMI* (q.v.). He began to reign B.C. 956, in the eighteenth year of Jeroboam, king of Israel, and he reigned three years (^{<1426>}2 Chronicles 12:16; 13:1, 2). At the commencement of his reign, looking on the well-founded separation of the ten tribes from the house of David as rebellion, Abijah made a vigorous attempt to bring them back to their allegiance (^{<1433>}2 Chronicles 13:3-19). In this he failed; although a signal victory over Jeroboam, who had double his force and much greater experience, enabled him to take several cities which had been held by Israel (see J. F. Bahrdt, *De bello Abice et Jerob.* Lips. 1760). The speech which Abijah addressed to the opposing army before the battle has been much admired (C. Simeon, *Works*, 4:96). It was well suited to its object, and exhibits correct notions of the theocratical institutions (Keil, *Apolog. d. Chron.* p. 336). His view of the political position of the ten tribes with respect to the house of David is, however, obviously erroneous, although such as a king of Judah was likely to take. The numbers reputed to have been present in this action are 800,000 on the side of Jeroboam, 400,000 on the side of Abijah, and 500,000 left dead on

the field. Hales and others regard these extraordinary numbers as corruptions, and propose to reduce them to 80,000, 40,000, and 50,000 respectively, as in the Latin Vulgate of Sixtus V, and many earlier editions, and in the old Latin translation of Josephus; and probably also in his original Greek text, as is collected by De Vignoles from Abarbanel's charge against the historian of having made Jeroboam's loss no more than 50,000 men, contrary to the Hebrew text (Kennicott's *Dissertations*, 1:533; 2:201 sq., 564). See NUMBER. The book of Chronicles mentions nothing concerning Abijah adverse to the impressions which we receive from his conduct on this occasion; but in Kings we are told that "he walked in all the sins of his father" (^{<115B>}1 Kings 15:3). He had fourteen wives, by whom he left twenty-two sons and sixteen daughters (^{<143D>}2 Chronicles 13:20-22). Asa succeeded him (^{<144D>}2 Chronicles 14:1; ^{<100D>}Matthew 1:7).
SEE JUDAH.

There is a difficulty connected with the maternity of Abijah. In ^{<115D>}1 Kings 15:2, we read, "His mother's name was Maachah, the daughter of Abishalom" (comp. ^{<141D>}2 Chronicles 11:20, 22); but in ^{<143D>}2 Chronicles 13:2, "His mother's name was Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah." Maachah and Michaiah are variations of the same name; and Abishalom is in all likelihood Absalom, the son of David. The word (**tB**) rendered "daughter" (q.v.), is applied in the Bible not only to a man's child, but to his niece, granddaughter, or great-granddaughter. It is therefore possible that Uriel of Gibeah married Tamar, the beautiful daughter of Absalom (^{<104D>}2 Samuel 14:27), and by her had Maachah, who was thus the daughter of Uriel and granddaughter of Absalom. **SEE MAACHAH.**

6. A son of Jeroboam 1, king of Israel. His severe and threatening illness induced Jeroboam to send his wife with a present [**SEE GIFT**] suited to the disguise in which she went, to consult the prophet Ahijah respecting his recovery. This prophet was the same who had, in the days of Solomon, foretold to Jeroboam his elevation to the throne of Israel. Though blind with age, he knew the disguised wife of Jeroboam, and was authorized, by the prophetic impulse that came upon him, to reveal to her that, because there was found in Abijah only, of all the house of Jeroboam, "some good thing toward the Lord," he only, of all that house, should come to his grave in peace, and be mourned in Israel (see S. C. Wilkes, *Family Sermons*, 12; C. Simeon, *Works*, 3, 385; T. Gataker, *Sermons*, pt. 2:291). Accordingly, when the mother returned home, the youth died as she crossed the

threshold of the door. “And they buried him, and all Israel mourned for him” (^{<1148>}1 Kings 14:1-18), B.C. cir. 782. *SEE JEROBOAM*.

7. The daughter of Zechariah, and mother of King Hezekiah (^{<1200>}2 Chronicles 29:1), and, consequently, the wife of Ahaz, whom she survived, and whom, if we may judge from the piety of her son, she excelled in moral character. She is elsewhere called by the shorter form of the name, ABI *SEE ABI* (^{<1280>}2 Kings 18:2). B.C. 726. Her father, may have been the same with the Zechariah, the son of Jeberechiah, whom Isaiah took as a witness of his marriage with “the prophetess” (^{<2380>}Isaiah 8:2; comp. ^{<1405>}2 Chronicles 26:5).

8. One of those (apparently priests) who affixed their signatures to the covenant made by Nehemiah (^{<1600>}Nehemiah 10:7), B.C. 410. He is probably the same (notwithstanding the great age this implies) who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (^{<1623>}Nehemiah 12:4), B.C. 536, and who had a son named Zichri (^{<1627>}Nehemiah 12:17).

Abi'jam

(Heb. *Abiyam'*, $\mu\gamma\beta\alpha\grave{\jmath}$ *father of the sea*, i. q. *seaman*; Sept. $\text{\AA}\beta\iota\alpha$ v. r. $\text{\AA}\beta\iota\omicron\acute{\upsilon}$, Vulg. *Abiamn*), the name always given in the book of Kings (^{<1148>}1 Kings 14:31; 15:1, 7, 8) to the king of Judah (^{<1140>}1 Kings 14:1, refers to another person), elsewhere (^{<1380>}1 Chronicles 3:10; ^{<1410>}2 Chronicles 13:1-22) called ABIJAH *SEE ABIJAH* (q.v.). Lightfoot (*Harm. O.T.* in loc.) thinks that the writer in Chronicles, not describing his reign as wicked, admits the sacred JAH into his name; but which the book of Kings, charging him with following the evil ways of his father, changes into JAM. This may be fanciful; but such changes of name were not unusual (comp. *SEE BETHAVEN*; *SEE SYCHAR*).

Abila

($\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\text{\AA}\beta\iota\lambda\alpha$ and $\eta\text{\AA}\beta\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta$, Polyb. v. 71, 2; Ptolmy v. 18), the name of at least two places.

Picture for Abila 1

1. The capital of the “Abilene” of Lysanias (^{<1800>}Luke 3:1), and distinguished (by Josephus, *Ant.* 19:5, 1) from other places of the same name as the “ABILA OF LYSANIAS” ($\text{\AA}\beta\iota\lambda\alpha$ η $\text{\Lambda}\upsilon\sigma\alpha\acute{\nu}\iota\omicron\upsilon$). The word is evidently of Hebrew origin, signifying a *grassy plain*. *SEE ABEL*-. This

place, however, is not to be confounded with any of the Biblical localities of the O.T. having this prefix, since it was situated beyond the bounds of Palestine in Coele-Syria (*Antonin. Itin.* p. 197, ed. Wessel), being the same with the “Abila of Lebanon” (*A bila ad Libanum*), between Damascus and Baalbek or Heliopolis (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 317, 458). Josephus (see Hudson’s ed. p. 864, note) and others also write the name *Abella* (“Ἀβελλα), *Abela* (Ἀβέλα), and even *Anbilla* (“Ἀνβίλλα), assigning it to Phoenicia (Reland, *ib.* p. 527-529). A medal is extant, bearing a bunch of grapes, with the inscription, “Abila Leucas,” which Belleve (in the *Transactions of the Acad. of Belles Lettres*) refers to this city; but it has been shown to have a later date (Eckhel, 3:337, 345); for there is another medal of the same place, which bears a half figure of the river-god, with the inscription “Chrysoroas Claudiaion,” a title which, although fixing the site to the river Chysorrhoeas, yet refers to the imperial name of Claudius. Perhaps *Leucas* and *Claudiopolis* were only later names of the same city; for we can hardly suppose that two cities of the size and importance which each of these evidently had, were located in the same vicinity and called by the same name. The existence of a large and well-built city in this region (Hogg’s *Damascus*, 1:301) is attested by numerous ruins still found there (Bankes, in the *Quart. Review*, vol. 26, p. 388), containing inscriptions (De Saulcy, *Narrative*, 2:453). Some of these inscriptions (first published by Lebronne, *Journal des Savans*, 1827, and afterward by Urelli. *Inscr. Lat.* 4997, 4998) have lately been deciphered (*Trans. Roy. Geog. Soc.* 1851; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1853, p. 248 sq.), and one has been found to contain a definite account of certain public works executed under the Emperor M. Aurelius, “at the expense of the Abilenians;” thus identifying the spot where this is found with the ancient city of Abila (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1848, p. 85 sq.). It is the modern village *Suk el-Barada*, not far from the south bank of the river Barada (the ancient Chysorrhoeas), near the mouth of the long gorge through which the stream flows from above, and directly under the cliff (800 feet high) on which stands the Wely of Nebi Abil, or traditionary tomb of Abel (*Bib. Sacra*, 1853, p. 144). This tradition is an ancient one (Quaresmius, *Eleucid. Terrae Sanctae*, 7:7, 1; Maundrel, May 4), but apparently based upon an incorrect derivation of the name of the son of Adam. **SEE ABEL**. This spot is on the road from Heliopolis (Baalbek) to Damascus, at a distance corresponding to ancient notices (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 527, 528). The name *Suk* (i.e. *market*, a frequent title of villages where produce is sold, and therefore indicating fertility) of Wady *Barada* first occurs in Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 2), who speaks of the

lively green of the neighborhood, which, no doubt, has suggested the name Abel in its Hebrew acceptance of *meadow* (see Robinson. *Researches*, new ed. 3:480 sq.). **SEE ABILENE.**

Picture for Abila 2

2. There are two or three other places mentioned in ancient authorities (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 523 sq.) by the general name of *Abel*, *Abela*, or *Abila* (once *Abida*, Ἀβίδα apparently by error, Reland, *ib.* p. 459), as follows:

(a.) ABELA OF PHOENICIA (Jerome, *Onomast.* s.v.), situated between Damascus and Paneas (Caesarea Philippi), and therefore different from the Abila of Lysanias, which was between Damascus and Heliopolis (Baalbek). It is probably the same as ABELBETH-MAACHAH **SEE ABELBETH-MAACHAH** (q.v.).

(b.) ABILA OF PERAEA, mentioned by Josephus (*War*, 2:13, 2) as being in the vicinity of Julias (Bethsaida) and Besimoth (Bethjeshimoth) (*ib.* 4:7, 6). It is probably the same as ABEL-SHITTIM **SEE ABEL-SHITTIM** (q.v.).

(c.) ABILA OF BATANAEA, mentioned by Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. *Astaroth Carnainz*) as situated north of Adara, and by Josephus (quoting Polybius) as being taken with Gadara by Antiochus (*Ant.* 12:3, 3). It is apparently the same with the “Abila of the Decapolis” (comp. Pliny, 5:18), named on certain Palmyrene inscriptions (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 525 sq.), and probably is the *Abel* (Ἀβελά) of Eusebius (*Onomast.* e. v.), situated 12 miles E. of Gadara, now *Abil.* **SEE ABEL-CERAMIM.**

Abile'ne

(Ἀβιληνή sc. χώρα, Luke, 3:1), the small district or territory in the region of Lebanon which took its name from the chief town, Abila (Polyb. v. 71, 2; Josephus, *War*, 2, 13, 2; 4:7, 5; Heb. *Abel'*, אַבֵּילָה; *a plain*), which was situated in Coele-Syria (Ptolem. v. 18), and (according to the *Antonine Itin.*) 18 miles N. of Damascus, and 38 S. of Heliopolis (lat. 68° 45', long. 33° 20'); but which must not be confounded with Abila of the Decapolis (Burckhardt, p. 269; Ritter, 15, 1059). **SEE AILA.** Northward it must have reached beyond the upper Barada, in order to include Abila; and it is probable that its southern border may have extended to Mount Hermon (Jebel es-Sheikh). It seems to have included the eastern declivities of Anti-

Libanus, and the fine valleys between its base and the hills which front the eastern plains. This is a very beautiful and fertile region, well wooded, and watered by numerous springs from Anti-Lebanon. It also affords fine pastures; and in most respects contrasts with the stern and barren western slopes of Anti-Lebanon.

This territory had been governed as a tetrarchate by Lysanias, son of Ptolemy and grandson of Mennneus (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:13, 3); but he was put to death, B.C. 33, through the intrigues of Cleopatra, who then took possession of the province (*Ant.* 15:4, 1). After her death it fell to Augustus, who rented it out to one Zenodorus; but as he did not keep it clear of robbers, it was taken from him, and given to Herod the Great (*Ant.* 15:10, 1; *War.* 1:20, 4). At his death a part (the southern, doubtless) of the territory was added to Trachonitis and Itursea to form a tetrarchy for his son Philip; but by far the larger portion, including the city of Abila, was then, or shortly afterward, bestowed on another Lysanias, mentioned by Luke (~~Ant.~~ Luke 3:1), who is supposed to have been a descendant of the former Lysanias, but who is nowhere mentioned by Josephus. *SEE LYSANIAS.* Indeed, nothing is said — by him or any other profane writer respecting this part of Abilene — until several years after the time referred to by Luke, when the Emperor Caligula gave it to Agrippa I as “the tetrarchy of Lysanias” (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:6, 10), to whom it was afterward confirmed by Claudius. At his death it was included in that part of his possessions which went to his son Agrippa II. (See Josephus, *Ant.* 13:16, 3; 14:12, 1; 3,2; 7,4; 15:10, 3; 17:11, 4; 19:5, 1; 10:7, 1; *War.* 1:13, 1; 2:6, 3; 11. 5; Dio Cass. 49:32; 54:9.) This explanation as to the division of Abilene between Lysanias and Philip removes the apparent discrepancy in Luke, who calls Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene at the very time that, according to Josephus (a part of) Abilene was in the possession of Philip (see Noldii *Hist. Idum.* p. 279 sq.; Krebs, *Observ. Flav.* p. 110 sq.; Susskind, *Symbol. ad Illustr. Quaedam Evang. Loca*, 1:21; 3:23 sq.; also in Pott, *Syllog.* 8:90 sq.; also in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, 2:431 sq.; Miunter, *De Rebus Ituraeor.* Hafn. 1824, p. 22 sq.; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopsis*, p. 174 sq.; Ebrard, *Wissenschaft. Kritik*, p. 181 sq.; Hug, *Gutachten ub. Strauss*, p. 119 sq.). In fact, as Herod never actually possessed Abilene (Josephus, *Ant.* 19:5, 1; *War.* 2:11, 5), and Zenodorus only had the farming of it, this region never could have descended to Herod’s heirs, and therefore properly did not belong to Philip’s tetrarchy. The same division of the territory in question is implied in the exclusion of Chalcis from the

government of the later Lysanias, although included in that of the older (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:7, 1). We find Abila mentioned among the places captured by Placidus, one of Vespasian's generals, in A.D. 69-70 (Josephus, *War*, 4:7, 5); and from that time it was permanently annexed to the province of Syria (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.). The metropolis Abila is mentioned in the lists of the Christian councils as the seat of an episcopal see down to A.D. 634 (Reland, *Palest.* p. 529).

Ability.

SEE INABILITY; SEE WILL.

Abim'ael

(Heb. *Abimael'*, אבִימָאֵל *father of Mael*; Sept. Ἀβιμαέλ, Ἀβιμιεήλ, Josephus Ἀβιμῶνλος), one of the sons of Joktan in Arabia (^{<0118>}Genesis 10:28; ^{<0122>}1 Chronicles 1:22). B.C. post 2414. *SEE ARABIA*. He was probably the father or founder of an Arabian tribe called *Maal* (אמ; of unknown origin), a trace of which Bochart (*Phaleg*, 2:24) discovers in Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* 9:4), where the name *Mali* (Μάλι) occurs as that of a spice-bearing region. Perhaps the same is indicated in Eratosthenes (ap. Strabo, 16:1112) and Eustathius (ad Dionys. Periegetes, p. 288, ed. Bernhardy) by the *Mincei* (Μειναῖοι). So Diodorus Siculus (3, 42); but Ptolemy (6:7) distinguishes the *Manitae* (Μανίται) from these, and at the same time refers to a village called *Manialia* (Μάμαλα κώμη) on the shore of the Red Sea. Hence Schneider proposes to read *Mamali* (Μαμάλι) in the above passage of Theophrastus; perhaps we should rather read *Mani* (Μάνι), a natural interchange of liquids; and then we may compare a place mentioned by Abulfeda (*Arabia*, ed. Gaguier, p. 3, 42), called *Mlinay*, 3 miles from Mecca (Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 2:179 sq.).

Abim'elech

(Heb. *Abime'lek*, אֲבִימֶלֶךְ *father* [i.e. *friend*] of the king, or perhaps i. q. *royal father*; Sept. Ἀβιμελεχ, but Ἀχιμέλεχ in ^{<0316>}1 Chronicles 18:16; Josephus Ἀβιμέλεχος), the name of four men. From the recurrence of this name among the kings of the Philistines, and from its interchange with the name "Achish" in the title to ^{<0341>}Psalms 34, it would appear to have been, in that application, not a proper name, but rather a general title, like *Pharaoh* among the Egyptians. Compare the title *Padishah*, i.e. "father of the king,"

given to the kings of Persia, supposed by Ludolf (*Lex. Aethiop.* p. 350) to have arisen from a salutation of respect like that among the Ethiopians, *abba nagasi*, equivalent to "God save the king" (Simonis *Onomast.* p. 460). Comp. **SEE AHASUERUS.**

1. The Philistine king of Gerar (q.v.) in the time of Abraham (^{<0110>}Genesis 20:1 sq.), B.C. 2086. Abraham removed into his territory perhaps on his return from Egypt; and, fearing that the extreme beauty of Sarah (q.v.) might bring him into difficulties, he declared her to be his sister (see S. Chandler, *Vind. of O. T.* p. 52). The conduct of Abimelech in taking Sarah into his harem shows that, even in those early times, kings claimed the right of taking to themselves the unmarried females not only of their natural subjects, but of those who sojourned in their dominions. The same usage still prevails in Oriental countries, especially in Persia (*Critical Review*, 3:332). **SEE WOMAN.** Another contemporary instance of this custom occurs in ^{<0125>}Genesis 12:15, and one of later date in ^{<0100>}Esther 2:3. But Abimelech, obedient to a divine warning communicated to him in a dream, accompanied by the information that Abraham was a sacred person who had intercourse with God, restored her to her husband (see J. Orton, *Works*, 1:251). As a mark of his respect he added valuable gifts, and offered the patriarch a settlement in any part of the country; but he nevertheless did not forbear to rebuke, with mingled delicacy and sarcasm (see C. Simeon, *Works*, 1:163), the deception which had been practiced upon him (Genesis 20). The present consisted in part of a thousand pieces of silver, as a "covering of the eyes" for Sarah; that is, according to some, as an atoning present, and to be a testimony of her innocence in the eyes of all (see J. C. Biedermann, *Meletem. Philol.* 3:3; J. C. Korner, *Exercitt. Theol.* 2; J. A. M. Nagel, *Exercitt. Philol.* Altd. 1759; J. G. F. Leun, *Philol. Exeg.* Giess. 1781). Others more happily (**SEE COVERING OF THE EYES**) think that the present was to procure a veil for Sarah to conceal her beauty, that she might not be coveted on account of her comeliness; and "thus was she reprov'd" for not having worn a veil, which, as a married woman, according to the custom of the country, she ought to have done (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.). The interposition of Providence to deliver Sarah twice from royal harems (q.v.) will not seem superfluous when it is considered how carefully women are there secluded, and how impossible it is to obtain access to them (^{<0105>}Esther 4:5) or get them back again (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in ^{<0120>}Genesis 12). In such cases it is not uncommon that the husband of a married woman is

murdered in order that his wife may be retained by the tyrant (Thomson's *Land and Book*, 2:353). Nothing further is recorded of King Abimelech, except that a few years after he repaired to the camp of Abraham, who had removed southward beyond his borders, accompanied by Phichol, "the chief captain of his host," to invite the patriarch to contract with him a league of peace and friendship. Abraham consented; and this first league on record [*SEE ALLIANCE*] was confirmed by a mutual oath, made at a well which had been dug by Abraham, but which the herdsmen of Abimelech had forcibly seized without his knowledge. It was restored to the rightful owner, on which Abraham named it Beersheba (*the Well of the Oath*), and consecrated the spot to the worship of Jehovah (⁽¹²²⁾Genesis 21:22-34). (See Origen, *Opera*, 2:76; Whately, *Prototypes*, p. 197). *SEE ABRAHAM*.

2. Another king of Gerar, in the time of Isaac (⁽¹²¹⁾Genesis 26:1-22), supposed to have been the son of the preceding. B.C. cir. 1985. Isaac sought refuge in his territory during a famine; and having the same fear respecting his fair Mesopotamian wife, Rebekah, as his father had entertained respecting Sarah (*supra*), he reported her to be his sister. This brought upon him, the rebuke of Abimelech when he accidentally discovered the truth. The country appears to have become more cultivated and populous than at the time of Abraham's visit, nearly a century before; and the inhabitants were more jealous of the presence of such powerful pastoral chieftains. In those times, as now, wells of water were of so much importance for agricultural as well as pastoral purposes, that they gave a proprietary right to the soil, not previously appropriated, in which they were dug. Abraham had dug wells during his sojourn in the country; and, to bar the claim which resulted from them, the Philistines had afterward filled them up; but they were now cleared out by Isaac, who proceeded to cultivate the ground to which they gave him a right. *SEE WELL*. The virgin soil yielded him a hundred-fold; and his other possessions, his flocks and herds, also received such prodigious increase that the jealousy of the Philistines could not be suppressed, and Abimelech desired him to seek more distant quarters. Isaac complied, and went out into the open country, and dug wells for his cattle. But the shepherds of the Philistines, out with their flocks, were not inclined to allow the claim to exclusive pasturage in these districts to be thus established; and their opposition induced the quiet patriarch to make successive removals, until he reached such a distance that his operations were no longer disputed. Afterward, when he was at Beersheba, he received a visit from Abimelech, who was attended by

Ahuzzath, his friend, and Phichol, the chief captain of his army. They were received with some reserve by Isaac; but when Abimelech explained that it was his wish to renew, with one so manifestly blessed of God, the covenant of peace and good-will which had been contracted between their fathers, they were more cheerfully entertained, and the desired covenant was, with due ceremony, contracted accordingly (^{<0123>}Genesis 26:26-31). From the facts recorded respecting the connection of the two Abimelechs with Abraham and Isaac, it is manifest that the Philistines, even at this early time, had a government more organized, and more in unison with that type which we now regard as Oriental, than appeared among the native Canaanites, one of whose nations had been expelled by these foreign settlers from the territory which they occupied. (See Origen, *Opera*, 2:94-97; Saurin, *Discours*, 1:368; *Dissert.* p. 207.) **SEE PHILISTINE.**

3. A son of Gideon by a concubine wife, a native of Shechem, where her family had considerable influence (^{<0700>}Judges 9). Through that influence Abimelech was proclaimed king after the death of his father, who had himself refused that honor when tendered to him, both for himself and his children (^{<0782>}Judges 8:22-24). In a short time, a considerable part of Israel seems to have recognised his rule (Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 2:444), which lasted three years (B.C. 1322-1319). One of the first acts of his reign was to destroy his brothers, seventy in number, being the first example of a system of barbarous state policy of which there have been frequent instances in the East, and which indeed has only within a recent period been discontinued. They were slain “on one stone” at Ophrah, the native city of the family. Only one, the youngest, named Jotham, escaped; and he had the boldness to make his appearance on Mount Gerizim, where the Shechemites were assembled for some public purpose (perhaps to inaugurate Abimelech), and rebuke them in his famous parable of the trees choosing a king (see Josephus, *Ant.* v. 7, 2); a fable that has been not unaptly compared with that of Menenius Agrippa (Livy, 2:32; comp. Herder, *Geist der Hebr. Poesie*, 2:262). **SEE JOTHAM; SEE PARABLE.** In the course of three years the Shechemites found ample cause to repent of what they had done; they eventually revolted in Abimelech’s absence, and caused an ambuscade to be laid in the mountains, with the design of destroying him on his return. But Zebul, his governor in Shechem, contrived to apprise him of these circumstances, so that he was enabled to avoid the snare laid for him; and, having hastily assembled some troops, appeared unexpectedly before Shechem. The people of that place had meanwhile secured the assistance of

one Gaal (q.v.) and his followers, who marched out to give Abimelech battle. He was defeated, and returned into the town; and his inefficiency and misconduct in the action had been so manifest that the people were induced by Zebul to expel him and his followers (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* v. 7, 4). But the people still went out to the labors of the field. This being told Abimelech, who was at Arumah, he laid an ambushade in four parties in the neighborhood; and when the men came forth in the morning, two of the ambushed bodies rose against them, while the other two seized the city gates to prevent their return. Afterward the whole force united against the city, which, being now deprived of its most efficient inhabitants, was easily taken. It was completely destroyed by the exasperated victor, and the ground strewn with salt (q.v.), symbolical of the desolation to which it was doomed. The fortress, however, still remained; but the occupants, deeming it untenable, withdrew to the temple of Baal-Berith, which stood in a more commanding situation. Abimelech employed his men in collecting and piling wood against this building, which was then set on fire and destroyed, with the thousand men who were in it. Afterward Abimelech went to reduce Thebez, which had also revolted. The town was taken with little difficulty, and the people withdrew into the citadel. Here Abimelech resorted to his favorite operation, and while heading a party to burn down the gate, he was struck on the head by a large stone cast down by a woman from the wall above. Perceiving that he had received a death-blow, he directed his armor-bearer to thrust him through with his sword, lest it should be said that he fell by a woman's hand (^{<1001>}Judges 9). Abimelech appears to have been a bold and able commander, but uncontrolled by religion, principle, or humanity in his ambitious enterprises (Niemeyer, *Charaki.* 3, 324). His fate resembled that of Pyrrhus II, king of Epirus (Justin. 25:5; Pausan. 1, 13; Val. Max. 5, 1, 4; comp. Ctesias, *Exc.* 42; Thucyd. 3:74); and the dread of the ignominy of its being said of a warrior that he died by a woman's hand was very general (Sophocl. *Trach.* 1064; Senec. *Here.* (*Et.* 1176). Vainly did Abimelech seek to avoid this disgrace (Saurin, *Disc. Hist.* 3, 400); for the fact of his death by the hand of a woman was long after associated with his memory (^{<1012>}2 Samuel 11:21).
SEE SHECHEM.

4. In the title of ^{<1341>}Psalms 34, the name of Abimelech is interchanged for that of ACHISH **SEE ACHISH** (q.v.), king of Gath, to whom David fled for refuge from Saul (^{<10210>}1 Samuel 21:10).

5. The son of Abiathar, and high-priest in the time of David, according to the Masoretic text of ^{<13816>}1 Chronicles 18:16 [see ABI-], where, however, we should probably read (with the Sept., Syr., Arab., Vulg., Targums, and many MSS.) AHLMELECH *SEE AHLMELECH* (as in the parallel passage, ^{<1087>}2 Samuel 8:17). *SEE ABIATHAR*.

Abin'adab

(Heb. *Abinadab'*, **bdnybæ**) *father of nobleness*, i.e. *noble*; Sept. everywhere **Ἀμινιάδᾰβ**, Vulg. *Abinadab*. Josephus **Ἀβινιάδαβος**, *Ant.* 8:2, 3), the name of four men.

1. A Levite of Kirjath-jearim, in whose house, which was on a hill [*SEE GIBEAH*], the ark of the covenant was deposited, after being brought back from the land of the Philistines (^{<9700>}1 Samuel 7:1), B.C. 1124. It was committed to the special charge of his son Eleazar; and remained there eighty years, until it was removed by David (^{<3068>}2 Samuel 6:3, 4; ^{<1337>}1 Chronicles 13:7). *SEE ARK*.

2. The second of the eight sons of Jesse, the father of David (^{<9168>}1 Samuel 16:8; ^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 2:13), and one of the three who followed Saul to the campaign against the Philistines in which Goliath defied the army (^{<9713>}1 Samuel 17:13), B.C. 1063,

3. The third named of the four sons of King Saul (^{<1383>}1 Chronicles 8:33; 9:39), and one of the three who perished with their father in the battle at Gilboa (^{<9302>}1 Samuel 31:2; ^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 10:2), B.C. 1053. His name appears to be omitted in the list in ^{<944>}1 Samuel 14:49.

4. The father of one of Solomon's purveyors (or rather BEN-ABINIDAB is to be regarded as the name of the purveyor himself), who presided over the district of Dor, and married Taphath, Solomon's daughter (^{<1041>}1 Kings 4:11), B.C. ante 1014.

Abin'oam

(Heb. *Abino'am*, **μ[nyba]**) *father of grace*, i.e. *gracious*; Sept. **Ἀβινώεμ**, the father of Barak the judge (^{<906>}Judges 4:6,12; 5:1, 12). B.C. ante 1409.

Abi'ram

(Heb. *Abiram'*, μρυβαῖ *father of height*, i.e. *proud*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἀβειρών, Vulg. *Abiron*, Josephus Ἀβίραμος, *Ant.* 4, 2, 2.) One of the sons of Eliab of the family-heads of Reuben, who, with his brother, Dathan, and with On of the same tribe, joined Korah the Levite in a conspiracy against Moses and Aaron, which resulted in their being swallowed up with all their families and possessions (except the children of Korah) by an earthquake (^{<0401>}Numbers 16:1-27; 26:9; ^{<0510>}Deuteronomy 11:6; ^{<0967>}Psalms 106:17), B.C. cir. 1620. *SEE KORAH*.

2. (Sept. Ἀβιρόν, Vulg. *Abiram*.) The eldest son of Hiel the Bethelite, who is remarkable as having died prematurely (for such is the evident import of the statement), for the presumption or ignorance of his father, in fulfillment of the doom pronounced upon his posterity who should undertake to rebuild Jericho (^{<1163>}1 Kings 16:34), B.C. post 905. *SEE HIEL*.

Abi'ron

(Ἀβειρόν), the Graecized form (Ecclus. 40:18) of the name of the rebellious ABIRAM *SEE ABIRAM* (q.v.).

Abis.

SEE CAPHAR-ABIS *SEE SEE CAPHAR-ABIS* .

Abis'ei

[many *Abise'i*] (*Lat.* *Ab'sei*, for the Greek text is not extant), an incorrect form (2 [Vulg. 4] Esdras 1:2) of the name of the priest ABISHUA *SEE ABISHUA* (q.v.).

Ab'ishag

(Heb. *Abishag'* גּוּבְיָבַעַ *father of* [i.e. *given to*] *error*, i. q. *inconsiderate*; Sept. Ἀβισάγ), a beautiful young woman of Shunem, in the tribe of Issachar, who was chosen by the servants of David to be introduced into the royal harem, for the special purpose of ministering to him and cherishing him in his old age, B.C. cir. 1015. She became his wife, but the

marriage was never consummated (^{<1008>}1 Kings 1:3-15). Some time after the death of David, Adonijah, his eldest son, persuaded Bathsheba, the mother of Solomon, to entreat the king that Abishag might be given to him in marriage, B.C. cir. 1013. But as rights and privileges peculiarly regal were associated with the control and possession of the harem (q.v.) of deceased kings (^{<1028>}2 Samuel 12:8), Solomon detected in this application a fresh aspiration to the throne, which he visited with death (^{<1027>}1 Kings 2:17-22; Josephus, **Ἀβησαῖκη**, *Ant.* 7:14, 3). *SEE ADONIJAH.*

Ab'ishai

[many *Abish' ai*] (*Heb.* *Abishay'*, **γνῖβαῖα**, *father* [i.e. *desirous*] *of a gift*; Sept. **Ἀβισαῖ**, but **Ἀβεσσά** in ^{<0216>}1 Samuel 26:6, 7, 8, 9; ^{<3911>}1 Chronicles 19:11, 15; **Ἀβισσά** in ^{<326>}1 Chronicles 2:16; **Ἀβεσσαί** in ^{<3123>}1 Chronicles 11:20; **Ἀβισά** in ^{<382>}1 Chronicles 18:12; and **Ἀμεσά** in ^{<0216>}2 Samuel 20:6; also contracted *Abshay'*, **γνβαι** in the text of ^{<1000>}2 Samuel 10:10; ^{<326>}1 Chronicles 2:16; 11:20; 18:12; 19:11, 15; Josephus **Ἀβισαῖος**), a nephew of David (by an unknown father, perhaps a foreigner) through his sister Zeruah, and brother of Joab and Asahel (^{<1028>}2 Samuel 2:18; ^{<326>}1 Chronicles 2:16). The three brothers devoted themselves zealously to the interests of their uncle during his wanderings. Though David had more reliance upon the talents of Joab, he appears to have given more of his private confidence to Abishai, who seems to have attached himself in a peculiar manner to his person, as we ever find him near, and ready for council or action, on critical occasions (^{<1024>}2 Samuel 2:24; ^{<3911>}1 Chronicles 19:11). Abishai, indeed, was rather a man of action than of council; and, although David must have been gratified by his devoted and uncompromising attachment, he had more generally occasion to check the impulses of his ardent temperament than to follow his advice (^{<1033>}2 Samuel 3:30). Abishai was one of the two persons whom David asked to accompany him to the camp of Saul, and he alone accepted the perilous distinction (^{<0216>}1 Samuel 26:5-9), B.C. 1055. The desire he then expressed to smite the sleeping king identifies him as the man who afterward burned to rush upon Shimei and slay him for his abuse of David (^{<1049>}2 Samuel 16:9, 11; 19:21). When the king fled beyond the Jordan from Absalom, Abishai was by his side; and he was intrusted with the command of one of the three divisions of the army which crushed that rebellion (^{<1082>}2 Samuel 18:2-12), B.C. cir. 1023. When the insurrection of Sheba occurred David sent him, in connection with Joab, to quicken the tardy preparations of

Amasa in gathering troops against the rebel (^{<1016>}2 Samuel 20:6-10), B.C. cir. 1022. During the last war with the Philistines David was in imminent peril of his life from a giant named Ishbi-benob, but was rescued by Abishai, who slew the giant (^{<1015>}2 Samuel 21:15-17), B.C. cir. 1018. He was also the chief of the second rank (^{<1039>}2 Samuel 23:19; ^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 11:20) of the three “mighties,” who, probably in some earlier war, performed the chivalrous exploit of breaking through the host of the Philistines to procure David a draught of water from the well of his native Bethlehem (^{<1034>}2 Samuel 23:14-17). Among the exploits of this hero it is mentioned (^{<1038>}2 Samuel 23:18) that he withstood 300 men, and slew them with his spear; but the occasion of this adventure, and the time and manner of his death, are equally unknown. In ^{<1083>}2 Samuel 8:13, the victory over the Edomites in the Valley of Salt (B.C. cir. 1037) is ascribed to David, but in ^{<1382>}1 Chronicles 18:12, to Abishai. It is hence probable that the victory was actually gained by Abishai, in connection with Joab (^{<1116>}1 Kings 11:16), but is ascribed to David as king and commander-in-chief (comp. ^{<1000>}2 Samuel 10:10, 14). *SEE DAVID*.

Abish'alom

a fuller form (^{<1152>}1 Kings 15:2, 10) of the name ABSALOM *SEE ABSALOM* (q.v.).

Abish'ua

(Heb. *Abishu'a*, [ʾIvybæ], *father of welfare*, i.e. *fortunate*; Sept. Ἀβισού or Ἀβισοῦ, but in ^{<1384>}1 Chronicles 8:4 [v. r. Ἀβεσσουέ] and ^{<1505>}Ezra 7:5, Ἀβισουέ), the name of two men.

1. A son of Bela, and grandson of Benjamin (^{<1384>}1 Chronicles 8:4); possibly the same as JERIMOTH *SEE JERIMOTH* (^{<1307>}1 Chronicles 7:7). B.C. post 1856. *SEE JACOB*.

2. The son of Phinehas (grandson of Aaron) and father of Bukki, being the fourth high-priest of the Hebrews (^{<1304>}1 Chronicles 6:4, 5, 50; ^{<1505>}Ezra 7:5). Josephus calls him *Abiezer* (Ἀβιεζέρης, *Ant.* 5. 11, 4), but elsewhere *Josephus* (Ἰώσηππος, *Ant.* 8:1, 3, ed. Havercamp). He appears from the *Chronicon of Alexandria* to have been nearly contemporary with Ehud, B.C. cir. 1523-1466. *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*.

Ab'ishur

(Heb. *Abishur'*, *r||vybæ*) *father of the wall*, i.e. perhaps *mason*; Sept. *Ἀβισούο*), the second named of the two sons of Shammai, of the tribe of Judah, who married Abihail, by whom he had two sons (^{<1028>}1 Chronicles 2:28, 29), B.C. considerably post 1612.

Ab'isum

(*Ἀβισαῖ* v. r. *Ἀβισουαί*), the son of Phinees and father of Boccas, in the genealogy of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2); evidently the high-priest ABISHUA *SEE ABISHUA* (q.v.).

Ab'ital

(Heb. *Abital'*, *l fybæ*) *father of dew*, i.e. *fresh*; Sept. *Ἀβιτάλ*), the fifth wife of David, by whom she had Shephatiah, during his reign in Hebron (^{<1084>}2 Samuel 3:4; ^{<1388>}1 Chronicles 3:3), B.C. 1052.

Ab'itub

(Heb. *Abitub'*, *b||fybæ*) *father of goodness*, i.e. *good*; Sept. *Ἀβιτώβ* v. r. *Ἀβιτούλ*), a Benjamite, first named of the two sons of Shaharaim by his second wife, Baara or Hodesh, in Moab (^{<1081>}1 Chronicles 8:11). B.C. cir. 1612. *SEE SHAHARAIM*.

Abi'ud,

a Graecized form (^{<1013>}Matthew 1:13) of the name ABIHUD (q.v.).

Abiyonah.

SEE CAPER.

Abjuration

I. in the Roman Church, a formal and solemn act by which heretics and those suspected of heresy denied and renounced it. In countries where the inquisition was established, three sorts of abjuration were practiced:

- 1.** *Abjuration deformali*, made by a notorious apostate or heretic;
- 2.** *Abjuration de vehementi*, made by a Roman Catholic strongly suspected of heresy;

3. *Abjuratio de levi*, made by a Roman Catholic only slightly suspected.

II. In England, the *oath of abjuration* is an oath by which an obligation was come under not to acknowledge any right in the Pretender to the throne of England. It is also used to signify an oath ordained by the 25th of Charles II, abjuring particular doctrines of the Church of Rome. (See S. G. Wald, *De Haeresi Abjuranda*, Regiom. 1821; *Vond. Abschwörung der Simonie*, in Henke's *Eusebia*, 1:184 sq.) **SEE HERETIC.**

Able (or Abel) Thomas,

chaplain to queen Catharine, wife of Henry VIII of England. He took the degree of M.A. at Oxford, in 1516, and subsequently that of D.D. He vehemently opposed the divorce of the king and queen, and wrote a treatise on the subject in 1530, entitled *De non dissolvendo Henrici et Catharine matrimonio*. He was also a strenuous opponent of the king's supremacy, for which he was hanged at Smithfield in 1540 (Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 1:45).

Ablution

Picture for Ablution

I. the ceremonial washing, whereby, as a symbol of purification from uncleanness, a person was considered

- (1.) to be cleansed from the taint of an inferior and less pure condition, and initiated into a higher and purer state;
- (2.) to be cleansed from the soil of common life, and fitted for special acts of religious service;
- (3.) to be cleansed from defilements contracted by particular acts or circumstances, and restored to the privileges of ordinary life;
- (4.) as absolving or purifying himself, or declaring himself absolved and purified, from the guilt of a particular act.

We do not meet with any such ablutions in patriarchal times; but under the Mosaical dispensation they are all indicated. **SEE LUSTRATION; SEE SPRINKLING.**

A marked example of the first kind of ablution occurs when Aaron and his sons, on their being set apart for the priesthood, were washed with water before they were invested with the priestly robes and anointed with the holy oil (^{<1886>}Leviticus 8:6). To this head we are inclined to refer the ablution of persons and raiment which was required of the whole of the Israelites, as a preparation to their receiving the law from Sinai (^{<1890>}Exodus 19:10-15). We also find examples of this kind of purification in connection with initiation into some higher state both among the Hebrews and in other nations. Thus those admitted into the mysteries of Eleusis were previously purified on the banks of the Ilissus by water being poured upon them by the Hydranos (Polyaen. 5:17; 3:11). *SEE CONSECRATION.*

The *second* kind of ablution was that which required the priests, on pain of death, to wash their hands and their feet before they approached the altar of God (^{<1887>}Exodus 30:17-21). For this purpose a large basin of water was provided both at the tabernacle and at the temple. *SEE LAVER.* To this the Psalmist alludes when he says, "I will wash my hands in innocency, and so will I compass thine altar" (^{<1886>}Psalms 26:6). Hence it became the custom in the early Christian Church for the ministers, in the view of the congregation, to wash their hands in a basin of water brought by the deacon, at the commencement of the communion (Jamieson, p. 126); and this practice, or something like it, is still retained in the Eastern churches, as well as in the Church of Rome, when mass is celebrated. *SEE HOLY WATER.* Similar ablutions by the priests before proceeding to perform the more sacred ceremonies were usual among the heathen (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Chernips). The Egyptian priests indeed carried the practice to a burdensome extent (Wilkinson, 1:324, abridgm.), from which the Jewish priests were, perhaps designedly, exonerated; and in their less torrid climate it was, for purposes of real cleanliness, less needful. Reservoirs of water were attached to the Egyptian temples; and Herodotus (2:37) informs us that the priests shaved the whole of their bodies every third day, that no insect or other filth might be upon them when they served the gods, and that they washed themselves in cold water twice every day and twice every night; Porphyry says thrice a day, with a nocturnal ablution occasionally. This kind of ablution, as preparatory to a religious act, answers to the simple *wadu* of the Moslems, which they are required to go through five times daily before their stated prayers (see Lane, *Mod. Eg.* 1:94 sq.), besides other private purifications of a more formal character (see Reland, *De Relig. Moh.* p. 80-83). This makes the ceremonies of

ablution much more conspicuous to a traveler in the Moslem East at the present day than they would appear among the ancient Jews, seeing that the law imposed this obligation on the priests only, not on the people. Connected as these Moslem ablutions are with various forms and imitative ceremonies, and recurring so frequently as they do, the avowedly heavy yoke of even the Mosaic law seems light in the comparison. *SEE BATHE.*

In the *third* class of ablutions washing is regarded as a purification from positive defilements. The Mosaic law recognises eleven species of uncleanness of this nature ^(~~1211~~)(Leviticus 12-15), the purification for which ceased at the end of a certain period, provided the unclean person then washed his body and his clothes; but in a few cases, such as leprosy and the defilement contracted by touching a dead body, he remained unclean seven days after the physical cause of pollution had ceased. This was all that the law required; but in later times, when the Jews began to refine upon it, these cases were considered generic instead of specific — as representing classes instead of individual cases of defilement — and the causes of pollution requiring purification by water thus came to be greatly increased. This kind of ablution for substantial uncleanness answers to the Moslem *ghusl* (Lane, *ib.* p. 99; Reland, *ib.* p. 66-77), in which the causes of defilement greatly exceed those of the Mosaic law, while they are perhaps equalled in number and minuteness by those which the later Jews devised. The uncleanness in this class arises chiefly from the natural secretions of human beings and of beasts (used for food, and from the ordure of animals not used for food; and, as among the Jews, the defilement may be communicated not only to persons, but to clothes, utensils, and dwelling — in all which cases the purification must be made by water, or by some representative act where water cannot be applied. Thus in drought or sickness the rinsing of the hands and face may be performed with dry sand or dust, a ceremony that is termed *tayemmum* (Lane, *ib.*). *SEE UNCLEANNESS.*

Of the *last* class of ablutions, by which persons declared themselves free from the guilt of a particular action, the most remarkable instance is that which occurs in the expiation for an unknown murder, when the elders of the nearest village washed their hands over the expiatory heifer, beheaded in the valley, saying, “Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it” (^(~~1211~~)Deuteronomy 21:1-9). It has been thought by some that the signal act of Pilate, when he washed his hands in water and declared himself innocent of the blood of Jesus (^(~~1274~~)Matthew 27:24), was a designed

adoption of the Jewish custom; but this supposition does not appear necessary, as the practice was also common among the Greeks and Romans (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antig.* s.v. *Lustratio*). *SEE MURDER.*

Other practices not indicated in the law appear to have existed at a very early period, or to have grown up in the course of time. From ^{<1915>}1 Samuel 16:5, compared with ^{<1910>}Exodus 19:10-14, we learn that it was usual for those who presented or provided a sacrifice to purify themselves by ablution; and as this was everywhere a general practice, it may be supposed to have existed in patriarchal times, and, being an established and approved custom, not to have required to be mentioned in the law. There is a passage in the apocryphal book of Judith (12:7-9) which has been thought to intimate that the Jews performed ablutions before prayer. But we cannot fairly deduce that meaning from it (comp. ^{<1888>}Ruth 3:3); since it is connected with the anointing (q.v.), which was a customary token of festivity (see Arnald, in loc.). It would indeed prove too much if so understood, as Judith bathed in the water, which is more than even the Moslems do before their prayers. Moreover, the authority, if clear, would not be conclusive. *SEE PURIFICATION.*

But after the rise of the sect of the Pharisees, the practice of ablution was carried to such excess, from the affectation of extraordinary purity, that it is repeatedly brought under our notice in the New Testament through the several animadversions of our Savior on the consummate hypocrisy involved in this fastidious attention to the external types of moral purity, while the heart was left unclean (e.g. ^{<1835>}Matthew 23:25). All the practices there exposed come under the head of purification from uncleanness; the acts involving which were made so numerous that persons of the stricter sect could scarcely move without contracting some involuntary pollution. For this reason they never entered their houses without ablution, from the strong probability that they had unknowingly contracted some defilement in the streets; and they were especially careful never to eat without washing the hands (^{<1870>}Mark 7:1-5), because they were peculiarly liable to be defiled; and as unclean hands were held to communicate uncleanness to all food (excepting fruit) which they touched, it was deemed that there was no security against eating unclean food but by always washing the hands ceremonially before touching any meat. We say "ceremonially," because this article refers only to ceremonial washing. The Israelites, who, like other Orientals, fed with their fingers, washed their hands before meals for the sake of cleanliness. *SEE EATING.* But these customary washings were

distinct from the ceremonial ablutions, as they are now among the Moslems. There were, indeed, distinct names for them. The former was called simply *hl yfæt* *netilah'*, or *washing*, in which water was *poured upon* the hands; the latter was called, *hl ybæt* *tebilah'*, *plunging*, because the hands were *immersed in water* (Lightfoot on ~~Mark~~ Mark 7:4). It was this last, namely, the ceremonial ablution, which the Pharisees judged to be so necessary. When, therefore, some of that sect remarked that our Lord's disciples ate "with unwashen hands" (~~Mark~~ Mark 7:2), it is not to be understood literally that they did not at all wash their hands, but that they did *not plunge* them ceremonially according to their own practice (*πυγμαῖ* not "oft," as in the Auth. Vers., but *with the fist*, q. d. "up to the elbow," as Theophylact interprets). And this was expected from them only as the disciples of a religious teacher; for these refinements were not practiced by the class of people from which the disciples were chiefly drawn. Their wonder was, that Jesus had not inculcated this observance on his followers, and not, as some have fancied, that he had enjoined them to neglect what had been their previous practice. (See Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s.v. Lotio.) **SEE WASH.**

In at least an equal degree the Pharisees multiplied the ceremonial pollutions which required the ablution of inanimate objects — "cups and pots, brazen vessels and tables" — the rules given in the law (~~Leviticus~~ Leviticus 6:28; 11:32-36; 15:23) being extended to these multiplied contaminations. Articles of earthenware which were of little value were to be broken, and those of metal and wood were to be scoured and rinsed with water. All these matters are fully described by Buxtorf, Lightfoot, Schottgen, Gill, and other writers of the same class, who present many striking illustrations of the passages of Scripture which refer to them. The Mohammedan usages of ablution, which offer very clear analogies, are fully detailed in the third book of the *Mishkat ul-Masabih* (or "*Collection of Musselman Traditions*," translated from the Arabic by A. N. Matthews, Calcutta, 1809, 2 vols. 4to), and also in D'Ohsson's *Tableau*, liv. 1, chap. 1. **SEE BAPTISM.**

II. In the Roman Church ablution is a liturgical term, denoting the use of wine and water by the priest, after communion, to cleanse the chalice and his fingers. Two ablutions are made in the mass.

1. Wine alone is poured into the chalice, in order to disengage the particles, of either kind, which may be left adhering to the vessel, and is afterward drunk by the priest.

2. Wine and water are poured upon the priest's fingers into the chalice (see Boissonnet, *Dict. des Rites*, 1, 65). **SEE MASS.**

III. In the Greek Church, ablution is a ceremony observed seven days after baptism, wherein the unction of the chrism is washed off from those who have been baptized (King, *Greek Church*). **SEE CHRISM.**

For the literature of the subject, in general, see T. Dassorius, *De lustratione Judaeorum* (Viteb. 1692); A. Froelund, *De χειροκαίποδονιψίᾳ sacerdotum Hebraeorum* (Hafn. 1695); O. Sperling, *De baptismo ethnicorum* (Hafn. 1700); J. Behm, *De lotione Judaeorum et Christianorum*: (Regiom. 1715); J. G. Leschner, *De lustrationibus vett. gentilium praecedaneis* (Viteb. 1709); J. Lomeier, *De vett. gentilium lustrationibus* (Ultraj. 1681, 1701); H. Lubert, *De antiquo lavandi ritu* (Lubec, 1670); J. J. Miller, *De igne lustrico* (Jen. 1660); T. Pfanner, *De lotionibus Christianorum*, in his *Observ. Eccles.* 1, 364-421. **SEE WATER.**

Abnaim

(rather OBNAIM). **SEE STOOL.**

Ab'ner

(Heb. *Abner'*, אֲבִנֵר, once in its full form *Abiner'*, אֲבִינֵר ^{<0140>}1 Samuel 14:50, *father of light*, i.e. *enlightening*; Sept. Αβενήρ, Josephus Αβήναρος, *Ant.* 6:4, 3, elsewhere Αβίνηρος), the son of Ner (q.v.) and uncle of Saul (being the brother of his father Kish), and the commander-in-chief of his army (^{<0140>}1 Samuel 14:50 sq.), in which character he appears several times during the early history of David (^{<0175>}1 Samuel 17:55; 20:25-; 26:5 sq.; ^{<1338>}1 Chronicles 26:28). It was through his instrumentality that David was first introduced to Saul's court after the victory over Goliath (^{<0175>}1 Samuel 17:57), B.C. 1063; and it was he whom David sarcastically addressed when accompanying his master in the pursuit of his life at Hachilah (^{<0214>}1 Samuel 26:14), B.C. 1055. After the death of Saul (B.C. 1053), the experience which he had acquired, and the character for ability and decision which he had established in Israel, enabled him to uphold the falling house of Saul for seven years; and he might probably have done so

longer if it had suited his views (^{<1016>}2 Samuel 2:6, 10; 5:5; comp. 6:1). It was generally known that David had been divinely nominated to succeed Saul on the throne: when, therefore, that monarch was slain in the battle of Gilboa, David was made king over his own tribe of Judah, and reigned in Hebron, the old capital. In the other tribes an influence adverse to Judah existed, and was controlled chiefly by the tribe of Ephraim. Abner, with great decision, availed himself of this state of feeling, and turned it to the advantage of the house to which he belonged: of which he was now the most important surviving member. He did not, however, venture to propose himself as king; but took Ishbosheth, a surviving son of Saul, whose known imbecility had excused his absence from the fatal fight in which his father and brothers perished, and made him king over the tribes, and ruled in his name (^{<1018>}2 Samuel 2:8). This event appears to have occurred five years after Saul's death (^{<1020>}2 Samuel 2:10; comp. 11), an interim that was probably occupied in plans for settling the succession, to which Ishbosheth may have been at first disinclined. *SEE ISHBOSHETH.*

Nor, perhaps, had the Israelites sooner than this recovered sufficiently from the oppression by the Philistines that would be sure to follow the disaster upon Mount Gilboa to reassert their independence, at least throughout Palestine proper. Accordingly Ishbosheth reigned in Mahanaim, beyond Jordan, and David in Hebron. A sort of desultory warfare continued for two years between them, in which the advantage appears to have been always on the side of David (^{<1011>}2 Samuel 2:1). The only one of the engagements of which we have a particular account is that which ensued when Joab, David's general, and Abner met and fought at Gibeon (^{<1012>}2 Samuel 2:12 sq.), B.C. 1048. Abner was beaten, and fled for his life; but was pursued by Asahel (the brother of Joab and Abishai), who was "swift of foot as a wild roe." Abner, dreading a blood-feud with Joab, for whom he seems to have entertained a sincere respect, entreated Asahel to desist from the pursuit; but finding that he was still followed, and that his life was in danger, he at length ran his pursuer through the body by a back thrust with the pointed heel of his spear (^{<10218>}2 Samuel 2:18-32). This put a strife of blood between the two foremost men in all Israel (after David); for the law of honor, which had from times before the law prevailed among the Hebrews, and which still prevails in Arabia, rendered it the conventional duty of Joab to avenge the blood of his brother upon the person by whom he had been slain. *SEE BLOOD-REVENGE.*

As time went on Abner had occasion to feel more strongly that he was himself not only the chief, but the only remaining prop of the house of Saul; and this conviction, acting upon a proud and arrogant spirit, led him to more presumptuous conduct than even the mildness of the feeble Ishbosheth could suffer to pass without question. *SEE ABSALOM; SEE ADONIJAH*. He took to his own harem a woman named Rizpah, who had been a concubine-wife of Saul (^{<1017>}2 Samuel 3:7 sq.). This act, from the ideas connected with the harem of a deceased king (comp. Josephus, *Apion*, 1:15; Herod. 3:68), was not only a great impropriety, but was open to the suspicion of a political design, which Abner may very possibly have entertained. *SEE HAREM*. A mild rebuke from the nominal king, however, enraged him greatly; and he plainly declared that he would henceforth abandon his cause and devote himself to the interests of David. To excuse this desertion to his own mind, he then and on other occasions avowed his knowledge that the son of Jesse had been appointed by the Lord to reign over all Israel; but he appears to have been unconscious that this avowal exposed his previous conduct to more censure than it offered excuse for his present. He, however, kept his word with Ishbosheth. After a tour, during which he explained his present views to the elders of the tribes which still adhered to the house of Saul, he repaired to Hebron with authority to make certain overtures to David on their behalf (^{<1018>}2 Samuel 3:12 sq.). He was received with great attention and respect; and David even thought it prudent to promise that he should still have the chief command of the armies when the desired union of the two kingdoms took place (*De Pacto Davidis et Abneri*, in the *Crit. Sac. Thes. Nov.* 1:651). The political expediency of this engagement is very clear, and to that expediency the interests and claims of Joab were sacrificed. That distinguished personage happened to be absent from Hebron on service at the time, but he returned just as Abner had left the city. He speedily understood what had passed; and his dread of the superior influence which such a man as Abner might establish with David (see Josephus, *Ant.* 7:1, 5) quickened his remembrance of the vengeance which his brother's blood required. His purpose was promptly formed. Unknown to the king, but apparently in his name, he sent a message after Abner to call him back; and as he returned, Joab met him at the gate, and, leading him aside as if to confer peaceably and privately with him, suddenly thrust his sword into his body. B.C. 1046. The lamentations of David, the public mourning which he ordered, and the funeral honors which were paid to the remains of Abner (^{<1019>}2 Samuel 4:12), the king himself following the bier as chief mourner,

exonerated him in public opinion from having been privy to this assassination (^{<1083>}2 Samuel 3:31-39; comp. ^{<1085>}1 Kings 2:5, 32). As for Joab, his privilege as a blood-avenger must to a great extent have justified his treacherous act in the opinion of the people; and that, together with his influence with the army, screened him from punishment. See JOAB.

David's short but emphatic lament over Abner (^{<1083>}2 Samuel 3:33, 34) may be rendered, with strict adherence to the *form* of the original (see Ewald, *Dichter des alten Bundes*, 1:99; comp. Lowth, *Heb. Poetry*, 22), as follows:

*As a villain dies, should Abner die?
Thy hands not bound,
And thy feet not brought into fetters;
As one falls before the sons of malice, fellest thou!*

As to the sense of the words, J. D. Michaelis (*Uebersetzung des alten Test.*) saw that the point of this indignant, more than sorrowful, lament, lies in the *mode* in which Abner was slain. Joab professed to kill him "for the blood of Asahel, his brother" (^{<1027>}2 Samuel 3:27). But if a man claimed his brother's blood at the hand of his murderer, the latter (even if he fled to the altar for refuge, ^{<0214>}Exodus 21:14) would have been delivered up (bound, hand and foot, it is *assumed*) to the avenger of blood, who would then possess a legal right to slay him. Now Joab not only had no title to claim the right of the *Goel*, as Asahel was killed under justifying circumstances (^{<1029>}2 Samuel 2:19); but, while pretending to exercise the avenger's right, he took a lawless and private mode of satisfaction, and committed a murder. Hence David charged him, in allusion to this conduct, with "shedding the blood of war in peace" (^{<1085>}1 Kings 2:5); and hence he expresses himself in this lament, as if indignant that the noble Abner, instead of being surrendered with the formalities of the law to meet an authorized penalty, was treacherously stabbed like a worthless fellow by the hands of an assassin. **SEE HOMICIDE.**

We find the name of a son of Abner, Jaasiel, subsequently appointed phylarch, under Solomon, of the tribe of Benjamin (^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 27:21). (On the character of Abner, see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.; Niemeyer, *Charakterist.* 4:343 sq. On his death, see C. Simeon, *Works*, 3, 327; H. Lindsay, *Lectures*, 2:30; R. Harris, *Works*, p. 231.) **SEE DAVID.**

Abnet

SEE GIRDLE.

Abo

a Lutheran archbishopric in Finland (q.v.). A bishopric was established in Abo in the thirteenth century, which, in 1817, was elevated by the Russian government to the rank of an archbishopric.

Abodah.

SEE TALMUD.

Abomination

Picture for Abomination

(I WGP *ḥippul*, filthy *stench*, ^{<0718>}Leviticus 7:18; “abominable,” ^{<0907>}Leviticus 19:7; ^{<2304>}Isaiah 65:4; ^{<2044>}Ezekiel 4:14; /WQV, *shikkuts*’, ^{<0907>}Deuteronomy 29:17; ^{<1105>}1 Kings 11:5, 7; ^{<1233>}2 Kings 23:13, 24; ^{<4458>}2 Chronicles 15:8; ^{<2304>}Isaiah 66:3; ^{<2001>}Jeremiah 4:1; 7:30; 13:27; 16:18; 32:34; ^{<4151>}Ezekiel 5:11; 7:20; 11:18, 21; 20:7, 8, 30; 37:23; ^{<2007>}Daniel 9:27; 11:31; 12:11; ^{<2800>}Hosea 10:10; ^{<3406>}Nahum 3:6; ^{<3807>}Zechariah 9:7; or /qV, *shekets, filth*, ^{<0721>}Leviticus 7:21; 11:10, 11, 12, 13, 20, 23, 41, 42; ^{<2304>}Isaiah 66:17; ^{<2001>}Ezekiel 8:10; elsewhere **hb[*ḥ*ṭ**, *toebah*’, *abhorrence*; Sept. βδέλυγμα, and so N.T., ^{<1244>}Matthew 24:14; ^{<1134>}Mark 13:14; ^{<2165>}Luke 16:15; ^{<6704>}Revelation 17:4, 5; 21:27), any object of detestation or disgust (^{<0822>}Leviticus 18:22; ^{<0725>}Deuteronomy 7:25); and applied to an impure or detestable action (^{<3211>}Ezekiel 22:11; 30:26; ^{<3021>}Malachi 2:11, etc.); to any thing causing a ceremonial pollution (^{<0432>}Genesis 43:32; 46:34; ^{<0543>}Deuteronomy 14:3); but more especially to idols (^{<0822>}Leviticus 18:22; 20:13; ^{<0725>}Deuteronomy 7:26; ^{<1105>}1 Kings 11:5, 7; ^{<1233>}2 Kings 23:13); and also to food offered to idols (^{<3807>}Zechariah 9:7); and to filth of every kind (^{<3406>}Nahum 3:6). There are several texts in which the word occurs, to which, on account of their peculiar interest or difficulty, especial attention has been drawn. SEE IDOLATRY.

The *first* is ^{<0432>}Genesis 43:32: “The Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews, for that is an *abomination* (**hb[*ḥ*ṭ**) unto the Egyptians.” This is best explained by the fact that the Egyptians considered themselves

ceremonially defiled if they ate with *any* strangers. The primary reason appears to have been that the cow was the most sacred animal among the Egyptians, and the eating of it was abhorrent to them; whereas it was both eaten and sacrificed by the Jews and most other nations, who, on that account, were abominable in their eyes. It was for this, as we learn from Herodotus (2. 41), that no Egyptian man or woman would kiss a Greek on the mouth, or would use the cleaver of a Greek, or his spit, or his dish, or would taste the flesh of even clean beef (that is, of oxen) that had been cut with a Grecian carving-knife. It is true that Wilkinson (*Anc. Egyptians*, 3, 358) ascribes this to the disgust of the fastidiously-clean Egyptians at the comparatively foul habits of their Asiatic and other neighbors; but it seems scarcely fair to take the *facts* of the father of history, and ascribe them to any other than the very satisfactory *reasons* which he assigns for them. We collect, then, that it was *as foreigners*, not pointedly as Hebrews, that it was an abomination for the Egyptians to eat with the brethren of Joseph. The Jews themselves subsequently exemplified the same practice; for in later times they held it unlawful to eat or drink with foreigners in their houses, or even to enter their dwellings (~~618B~~John 18:28; ~~410B~~Acts 10:28; 11:3); for not only were the houses of Gentiles unclean (Mishna, *Ohaloth*, 18:7), but they themselves rendered unclean those in whose house they lodged (Maimonides, *Mishcab a Morheb*. 12:12) which was carrying the matter farther than the Egyptians (see also *Mitsvoth Tora*, 148). We do not trace these instances, however, before the Captivity (see J. D. Winkler, *Animadvers. Philol.* 2:175 sq.). **SEE UNCLEANNESS.**

The *second* passage is ~~046A~~Genesis 46:34. Joseph is telling his brethren how to conduct themselves when introduced to the king of Egypt; and he instructs them that when asked concerning their occupation they should answer, "Thy servants' trade hath been about cattle from our youth even until now, *both we and also our fathers.*" This last clause has emphasis, as showing that they were hereditary nomade pastors; and the reason is added, "That ye may dwell in the land of Goshen, for *every shepherd is an abomination* (**hb[ēT]**) unto the Egyptians." In the former instance they were "an abomination" *as strangers*, with whom the Egyptians could not eat; here they are a further abomination as *nomade shepherds*, whom it was certain that the Egyptians, for that reason, would locate in the border land of Goshen, and not in the heart of the country. That it was nomade shepherds, or Bedouins, and not simply shepherds, who were abominable to the Egyptians, is evinced by the fact that the Egyptians themselves paid

great attention to the rearing of cattle. This is shown by their sculptures and paintings, as well as by the offer of this very king of Egypt to make such of Jacob's sons as were men of activity "overseers of his cattle" ^(47:6)(47:6). For this aversion to nomade pastors two reasons are given; 'and it is not necessary that we should choose between them, for both of them were, it is most likely, concurrently true. One is, that the inhabitants of Lower and Middle Egypt had previously been invaded by, and had remained for many years subject to, a tribe of nomade shepherds, who had only of late been expelled, and a native dynasty restored—the grievous oppression of the Egyptians by these pastoral invaders, and the insult with which their religion had been treated. *SEE HYKSOS*. The other reason, not necessarily superseding the former, but rather strengthening it, is that the Egyptians, as a settled and civilized people, detested the lawless and predatory habits of the wandering shepherd tribes, which then, as now, bounded the valley of the Nile and occupied the Arabias — a state of feeling which modern travelers describe as still existing between the Bedouin and fellahs of modern Egypt, and indeed between the same classes everywhere in Turkey, Persia, and the neighboring regions (see *Critici Sac. Thes. Nov.* 1, 220). *SEE SHEPHERD*.

The *third* marked use of this word again occurs in Egypt. The king tells the Israelites to offer to their god the sacrifices which they desired, without going to the desert for that purpose. To this Moses objects that they should have to sacrifice to the Lord "the abomination (^(hb[ÉT]) ' of the Egyptians," who would thereby be highly exasperated against them (^(48:26)Exodus 8:26). A reference back to the first explanation shows that this "abomination" was the cow, the only animal which *all* the Egyptians agreed in holding sacred; whereas, in the great sacrifice which the Hebrews proposed to hold, not only would heifers be offered, but the people would feast upon their flesh (see J. C. Dietric, *Antiquitates*, p. 136). *SEE APIS*.

A *fourth* expression of marked import is the ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION (^{(μμεσ]/ΥQvæ} Daniel 11:31; Sept. βδέλυγμα ἡφανισμένον, or ^{(μμεσ]/ΥQvæ} Daniel 12:11; Sept. τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, literally, *filthiness of the desolation*, or, rather, *desolating filthiness*), which, without doubt, means the idol or idolatrous apparatus which the desolator of Jerusalem should establish in the holy places (see Hitzig, in loc.). This appears to have been (in its first application) a prediction of the pollution of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, who

caused an idolatrous altar to be built on the altar of burnt offerings, whereon unclean things were offered to Jupiter Olympius, to whom the temple itself was dedicated (see Hoffman, in loc.). Josephus distinctly refers to this as the accomplishment of Daniel's prophecy; as does the author of the first book of Maccabees, in declaring that "they set up the abomination of desolation (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως) upon the altar" (1 Maccabees 1:59.; 6:7; 2 Maccabees 6:2-5; Joseph. *Ant.* 12:5, 4; 12:7, 6). The phrase is quoted by Jesus in the same form (⁴⁰⁴⁵Matthew 24:15), and is applied by him to what was to take place at the advance of the Romans against Jerusalem. They who saw "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place" were enjoined to "flee to the mountains." This may with probability be referred to the advance of the Roman army against the city with their image-crowned standards, to which idolatrous honors were paid, and which the Jews regarded as idols. The unexpected retreat and discomfiture of the Roman forces afforded such as were mindful of our Savior's prophecy an opportunity of obeying the injunction which it contained. That the Jews themselves regarded the Roman standards as *abominations* is shown by the fact that, in deference to their known aversion, the Roman soldiers quartered in Jerusalem forbore to introduce their standards into the city; and on one occasion, when Pilate gave orders that they should be carried in by night, so much stir was made in the matter by the principal inhabitants that, for the sake of peace, the governor was eventually induced to give up the point (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:3, 1). Those, however, who suppose that "the holy place" of the text must be the temple itself, may find the accomplishment of the prediction in the fact that, when the city had been taken by the Romans and the holy house destroyed, the soldiers brought their standards in due form to the temple, set them up over the eastern gate, and *offered sacrifice to them* (Joseph. *War*, 6:6, 1); for (as Havercamp notes from Tertullian, *Apol. c.* 16:162) "almost the entire religion of the Roman camp consisted in worshipping the ensigns, swearing by the ensigns, and in preferring the ensigns before all the other gods." Nor was this the last appearance of "the abomination of desolation in the holy place;" for not only did Hadrian, with studied insult to the Jews, set up the figure of a boar over the Bethlehem gate of the city (Ælia Capitolina) which rose upon the site and ruins of Jerusalem (Euseb. *Chron.* 1. 1, p. 45, ed. 1658), but he erected a temple to Jupiter upon the site of the Jewish temple (Dion Cass. 49. 12), and caused an image of himself to be set up in the part which answered to the most holy place (Nicephorus Callist. 3:24). This was a consummation of all the

this. The allusion cannot in any case be to a profanation of the sacred precincts by the Jews themselves, for the excesses of the Zealots (q.v.) during the final siege (Josephus, *War*, 4:3, 7) were never directed to the introduction of idolatry there; whereas the first act of heathen occupancy was the erection of the standards crowned with the bird of victory — a circumstance that may be hinted at in the peculiar term “wing” here employed (see F. Nolan, *Warburton Lect.* p. 183). **SEE BANNER.**

A still more important difference among commentators, as to the meaning of the expression in question, has respect to the point, whether the abomination, which somehow should carry along with it the curse of desolation, ought to be understood of the idolatrous and corrupt practices which should inevitably draw down desolating inflictions of vengeance, or of the heathen powers and weapons of war that should be the immediate instruments of executing them. The following are the reasons assigned for understanding the expression of the former:

- 1.** By far the most common use of the term *abomination* or *abominations*, when referring to spiritual things, and especially to things involving severe judgments and sweeping desolation, is in respect to idolatrous and other foul corruptions. It was the pollution of the first temple, or the worship connected with it by such things, which in a whole series of passages is described as the abominations that provoked God to lay it in ruins (^{<4210>}2 Kings 21:2-13; ^{<3470>}Jeremiah 7:10-14; ^{<3511>}Ezekiel 5:11; 7:8, 9, 20-23). And our Lord very distinctly intimated, by referring on another occasion to some of these passages, that as the same wickedness substantially was lifting itself up anew, the same retributions of evil might certainly be expected to chastise them (^{<4213>}Matthew 21:13).
- 2.** When reference is made to the prophecy in Daniel it is coupled with a word, “Whoso readeth let him understand,” which seems evidently to point to a profound spiritual meaning in the prophecy, such as thoughtful and serious minds alone could apprehend. But this could only be the case if abominations in the moral sense were meant; for the defiling and desolating effect of heathen armies planting themselves in the holy place was what a child might perceive. Such dreadful and unseemly intruders were but the outward signs of the real abominations, which cried for vengeance in the ear of heaven. The compassing of Jerusalem with armies, therefore, mentioned in ^{<4213>}Luke 21:20, ready to bring the desolation, is not to be

regarded as the same with the abomination of desolation; it indicated a farther stage of matters.

3. The abominations which were the cause of the desolations are ever spoken of as springing up from within, among the covenant people themselves, not as invasions from without. They are so represented in Daniel also (^{צור}Daniel 11:30, 32; 12:9, 10); and that the Jews themselves, the better sort of them at least, so understood the matter, is plain from 1 Maccabees 1:54-57, where, with reference to the two passages of Daniel just noticed, the heathen-inclined party in Israel are represented, in the time of Antiochus, as the real persons who “set up the abomination of desolation and built idol altars;” comp. also 2 Maccabees 4:15-17. (See Hengstenberg on the *Genuineness of Daniel*, ch. 3, § 3; and *Christology*, at ^{צור}Daniel 9:27, with the authorities there referred to.) These arguments, however, seem to be outweighed by the conclusive historical fact that the material ensigns of paganism were actually erected both by the Syrian and Roman conquerors in the place in question, and in so plainly physical a prediction, it is most natural to suppose that both Daniel and our Lord intended to refer to this palpable circumstance. *SEE DESOLATION.*

Aboth.

SEE MISHNA.

Abrabanel, Abrabanel, or Abravanal Isaac

(also called ABARBANEL, ABRAVENEL, BARBANELLA, RAVANELLA), ISAAC, a famous rabbi, born at Lisbon, 1437. He was descended from an ancient and distinguished Jewish family, which claimed to be able to trace their pedigree to king David. He was a favorite of Alphonso V of Portugal, but after that king's death he was charged with certain misdemeanors and compelled to quit Portugal. He took refuge in Castile, where he obtained (1484) employment under Ferdinand and Isabella; but, in 1492, with the rest of the Jews, he was driven out of the kingdom. He went at first (1493) to Naples, where he gained the confidence of king Ferdinand I. After the conquest of Naples by Charles VIII of France, he followed Alphonso II to Sicily. After the death of Alphonso he flew to Corfu, then (1496) to Monopoli, a town of Apulia, and ultimately (1503) to Venice, in which city he became very popular by terminating a conflict between the Venetians and the Portuguese. He finally died at Venice, 1508. His body was brought to Padua, and there buried with the greatest honors on the part of the

republic of Venice. Abrabanel was an indefatigable student and writer, and is placed by the Jews almost in the same rank with Maimonides. He wrote bitterly against Christianity, but his commentaries are nevertheless much esteemed, as he is very careful in illustrating the literal sense of the text. The most important of them are, *hr/ThivWlr22P*, a *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (fol. Venice, 1579, and later; best ed. by Van Bashuysen, fol. Hanau, 1710); *µyaybaµynna22a vWlrPea* *Commentary on the Early Prophets* [Joshua - Kings] (fol. Pesaro, 1522; Naples, 1543; best ed. by Pfeiffer and Christiani, Leipz. 1686); *yrēµµyn — j 22a µyayba8Pe rs[]* a *Commentary on the* [properly so called] *Prophets* (fol. Pesaro, 1520; best ed. Amst. 1641); *l aYed8Pea* *Commentary on Daniel* (4to, Naples, s. d.; Ferrara, 1651, and later; best ed. Venice, 1652). This commentary contains the strongest invectives against Christ and the Christians, though some of them are omitted in the second edition (see De Rossi, *Bibl. Jud. Antichr.* p. 7 sq.), and it therefore called forth a large number of refutations from Danz, C. l'Empereur, Seb. Schnell, Pfeiffer, Koppen, Brand, H. Gebhard, J. Fr. Weidler, and C. G. Mundinus. Latin translations were published of the Commentaries on Nahum and Habakkuk by J. Meyer (in his *Notes to Seder Olam*); of the commentary on Haggai by Scherzer (*Trifol. Or.* Lips. 1663 and 1672), and Abicht (*Select. Rabb. Phil.*); of the commentaries on Malachi by J. Meyer (Hamburg, 1685). A translation of the whole commentary was made, but not published, by a former Jew at Vienna. The preface to this work by Rabbi Baruch gives an essay on the life and the writings of Abrabanel, compiled from his works. He also wrote *h[Wvy][ymæhi* (*herald of salvation*), an explanation of the principal Messianic passages of the Old Testament, in which work a complete system of the views of the Jewish theology concerning the Messiah is given. This work, in which Abrabanel gives full scope to his animosity against the Christians, was prepared by him at Monopoli, and for the first time published (in 4to) without the name of place (probably at Salonichi) in 1526 (again, Amsterdam, 1644; Offenbach, 1767). A Latin translation, under the title *Proeco Salutis*, was published by H. May (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1712, 4to), who, in the room of a preface, gives a biography of Abrabanel. *hnma}var* (*head of security*), a treatise on the articles of the Jewish faith (first ed., Constantinople, 1505, fol.). *µynæ2z trf[]* (*crown of old men*), one of the first works of the author, in which he treats of the different kinds of prophecy (first printed at Sabionetta,

1537, 4to). **פְּחָזַל בַּא ה' / [פְּחָזַל]** (*works of God*), a philosophical treatise on the creation of the world, in which he argues against the assumption of an eternity of the world (Venice, 1592, 4to). Several works of Abrabanel have not been printed yet. The proposal of Bashuysen to issue a complete edition of all the works of Abrabanel has never been executed. All his works were in Hebrew, but many of his Dissertations have been translated into Latin by Buxtorf (4to, Basil, 1660) and others. Although he spent many years at royal courts, Abrabanel, in one of his works, expressed very decided republican opinions. He left two sons, one of whom distinguished himself as a physician and as the author of an Italian poem, *Dialogi d' Amore*; the other embraced the Christian religion. The son of the latter published at Venice, in 1552, a collection of Hebrew letters. — Winer, *Theol. Lit.* vol. 1; Furst, *Bib. Jud.* 1, 11 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, 3, 104; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraica*, 3, 544; Mai, *Dissertatio de origine, vita et scriptis Abrabanielis* (Altdorf. 1708); Hoefer, *Biographie Generale*, 1, 31; Ersch and Gruber, *Encycl.* s.v.

Abracadabra

a magical word of factitious origin, like most alliterative incantations. It is found on one of the amulets under which the Basilidian heretics were supposed to conceal the name of God. It was derived from the Syrian worship, and was recommended as a magical charm against ague and fever. It is described by Serenus Sammonicus (the elder), who is usually classed, apparently without reason, among the followers of Basilides (q.v.). The word was written in a kind of inverted cone, omitting the last letter every time it is repeated. The lines of Serenus (*De Medicina*) which describe it are as follows:

“Mortiferum magis est, quod Graecis hemitritaeum
 Vulgatur verbis, hoc nostra dicere lingua
 Non potuere ulli, nec voluere parentes.
 Inscris Chartae, quod dicitur Abracadabra,
 Saepius et subter repetis, sed detrahe summam,
 Et magis atque magis desint elementa figuris
 Singula, quae semper rapies, et caetera figes,
 Donec in angustum redigatur litera conum,
 His lino nexis collum redimere memento,” etc.

Thus,

A B R A C A D A B R A
 A B R A C A D A B R
 A B R A C A D A B
 A B R A C A D A
 A B R A C A D
 A B R A C A
 A B R A C
 A B R A
 A B R
 A B
 A

Different opinions have been advanced as to the origin and meaning of the word. Basnage ascribed it to an Egyptian, Beausobre a Greek, others a Hebrew origin, but Grotefend (in Ersch and Gruber, *Encycl.* s.v.) tries to prove that it is of Persian (or rather Pehlevi) origin. As Greek amulets are inscribed with ABPACADABPA, he considers it certain that the word ought to be pronounced *Abasadabra*. He derives it from the Persian *Abbrasax* (the name of the Supreme Being) and the Chaldee word *arWBDA* (*the utterance*), so that the meaning of it is “a divine oracle.” This explanation, Grotefend thinks, throws some light on other magical words which the Basilidians used in nearly the same manner as the Thibetans and Mongolians their *Homani Peme-Hum*; as the Palendrones *Ablanathanalba* and *Amoroma*. — Lardner, *Works*, 8, 683; C. F. Ducange, *Glossarium*, s.v. **SEE ABRAXAS**.

A'braham

(Heb. *Abraham*', *μῆρβᾱι* *father of a multitude*; Sept. and N.T. Ἀβραάμ, Josephus, Ἄβραμος), the founder of the Hebrew nation. Up to ^{<1170>}Genesis 17:4, 5 (also in ^{<1307>}1 Chronicles 1:27; ^{<1697>}Nehemiah 9:7), he is uniformly called ABRAM **SEE ABRAM** (Heb. *Abram*', *μῆρβᾱι* *father of elevation*, or *high father*; Sept. Ἄβραμ); but the extended form there, given to it is significant of the promise of a numerous posterity which was at the same time made to him. See *infra*.

History. — Abraham was a native of Chaldaeae, and descended, through Heber, in the ninth generation, from Shem the son of Noah (see F. Lee, *Dissertations*, 2, 78 sq.). His father was Terah, who had two other sons, Nahor and Haran. Haran died prematurely “before his father,” leaving a

son, Lot, and two daughters, Milcah and Iscah. Lot attached himself to his uncle Abraham; Milcah became the wife of her uncle Nahor; and Iscah, who was also called Sarai, became the wife of Abraham (^{<01125>}Genesis 11:26-29; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 1:6, 5). **SEE ISCAH.** Abraham was born A.M. 2009, B.C. 2164, in “Ur of the Chaldees” (^{<01128>}Genesis 11:28). The concise history in Genesis states nothing concerning the portion of his life prior to the age of about 70. There are indeed traditions, but they are too manifestly *built up* on the foundation of a few obscure intimations in Scripture to be entitled to any credit (see Weil’s *Biblical Legends*). Thus it is intimated in ^{<01242>}Joshua 24:2, that Terah and his family “served other gods” beyond the Euphrates; and on this has been found the romance that Terah was not only a worshipper, but a maker of idols; that the youthful Abraham, discovering the futility of such gods, destroyed all those his father had made, and justified the act in various conversations and arguments with Terah, which we find repeated at length. Again, “Ur of the Chaldees” was the name of the place where Abraham was born, and from which he went forth to go, he knew not whither, at the call of God. Now Ur (^{<01171>}r-^{<01171>}W) means *fire*; and we may therefore read that he came forth from *the fire of the Chaldees*, on which has been built the story that Abraham was, for his disbelief in the established idols, cast by king Nimrod into a burning furnace, from which he was by special miracle delivered. And to this the premature death of Haran has suggested the addition that he, by way of punishment for his disbelief of the truths for which Abraham suffered, was marvellously destroyed by the same fire from which his brother was still more marvellously preserved. Again, the fact that Chaldea was the region in which astronomy was reputed to have been first cultivated, suggested that Abraham brought astronomy westward, and that he even taught that science to the Egyptians (Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 8). It is just to Josephus to state that most of these stories are rejected by him, although the tone of some of his remarks is in agreement with them. Abraham is by way of eminence, named first, but it appears that he was not the oldest (nor probably the youngest, but rather the second) of Terah’s sons, born (perhaps by a second wife) when his father was 130 years old (see N. Alexander, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 287 sq.). Terah was seventy years old when the eldest son was born (^{<01132>}Genesis 11:32; 12:4; 20:12; comp. Hales, 2, 107); and that eldest son appears to have been Haran, from the fact that his brothers married his daughters, and that his daughter Sarai was only ten years younger than his brother Abraham (^{<01177>}Genesis 17:17). Abraham must have been about 70 years old when the family quitted their native city of Ur, and went and

abode in Charran (for he was 75 years old when he left Haran, and his stay there could not well have been longer than five years at most). The reason for this movement does not appear in the Old Testament. Josephus alleges that Terah could not bear to remain in the place where Haran had died (*Ant.* 1, 6, 5); while the apocryphal book of Judith, in conformity with the traditions still current among the Jews and Moslems, affirms that they were cast forth because they would no longer worship the gods of the land (Judith 5:6-8). The real cause transpires in ^{<400>}Acts 7:2-4: “The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham while he was (at Ur of the Chaldees) in Mesopotamia, *before he dwelt in Charran*, and said unto him, Depart from *thy land*, and from thy kindred, and come hither to *a land* which *I* will shew thee. — Then departing from the land of the Chaldees, he dwelt in Charran.” This first call is not recorded, but only implied in ^{<012>}Genesis 12; and it is distinguished by several pointed circumstances from the *second*, which alone is there mentioned. Accordingly Abraham departed, and his family, including his aged father, removed with him. They proceeded not at once to the land of Canaan, which, indeed, had not been yet indicated to Abraham as his destination,; but the came to Haran, and tarried at that convenient station for five current years, until Terah died, at the age of 205 years. Being free from his filial duties, Abraham, now 75 years of age, received a second and more pointed call to pursue his destination: “Depart from thy land and from thy kindred, and from *thy father’s house*, unto the land which I will shew thee” (^{<012>}Genesis 12:1). The difference of the two calls is obvious; in the former the *land* is indefinite, being designed only for a temporary residence; in the latter it is definite, intimating a permanent abode. A third condition was also annexed to the latter call, that he should separate from his father’s house, and leave his brother Nahor’s family behind him in Charran. He, however, took with him his nephew Lot, whom, having no children of his own, he appears to have regarded as his heir, and then went forth, “not knowing whither he went” (^{<810>}Hebrews 11:8), but trusting implicitly to the Divine guidance. (See Philo, *Opera*, 1, 436; 2, 43; Saurin, *Discours*, 1, 161; *Dissert.* p. 92; Simeon, *Works*, 1, 100; Roberts, *Sermons*, p. 52; Hunter, *Sac. Biog.* p. 55 sq.). See UR; HARAN.

Abraham probably took the same route as Jacob afterward, along the valley of the Jabbok, to the land of Canaan, which he found thinly occupied by the Canaanites, in a large number of small independent communities, who cultivated the districts around their several towns, leaving ample

pasture-grounds for wandering shepherds. In Mesopotamia the family had been pastoral, but dwelling in towns and houses, and sending out the flocks and herds under the care of shepherds. But the migratory life to which Abraham had now been called compelled him to take to the tent-dwelling as well as the pastoral life; and the usages which his subsequent history indicates are therefore found to present a condition of manners and habits analogous to that which still exists among the nomade pastoral or Bedouin tribes of south-western Asia. The rich pastures in that part of the country tempted Abraham to form his first encampment in the vale of Moreh, which lies between the mountains of Ebal and Gerizim. Here the stronger faith which had brought the childless man thus far from his home was rewarded by the grand promise: "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (^(GEN 12:2, 3)Genesis 12:2, 3). It was further promised that to his posterity should be given the rich heritage of that beautiful country into which he had come (^(GEN 12:7)Genesis 12:7). It will be seen that this important promise consisted of two parts — the one temporal, the other spiritual. The *temporal* was the promise of posterity, that he should be blessed himself, and be the founder of a great nation; the *spiritual*, that he should be the chosen ancestor of the Redeemer, who had been of old obscurely predicted (^(GEN 3:15)Genesis 3:15), and thereby become the means of blessing all the families of the earth. The implied condition on his part was that he should publicly profess the worship of the true God in this more tolerant land; and, accordingly, "he built there an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him." He soon after, perhaps in consequence of the jealousy of the Canaanites, removed to the strong mountain-district between Bethel and Ai, where he also built an altar to that "JEHOVAH" whom the world was then hastening to forget. His farther removals tended southward, until at length a famine in Palestine compelled him to withdraw into Egypt, where corn abounded. Here his apprehension that the beauty of his wife Sarai might bring him into danger with the dusky Egyptians overcame his faith and rectitude, and he gave out that she was his sister (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 8, 1). As he had feared, the beauty of the fair stranger excited the admiration of the Egyptians, and at length reached the ears of the king, who forthwith exercised his regal right of calling her to his harem, and to this Abraham, appearing as only her brother, was obliged to submit (comp. Josephus, *War*, v, 9, 4). As, however, the king had no intention to act harshly in the exercise of his privilege, he loaded Abraham

with valuable gifts, suited to his condition, being chiefly in slaves and cattle. These presents could not have been refused by him without an insult which, under all the circumstances, the king did not deserve. A grievous disease inflicted on Pharaoh and his household relieved Sarai from her danger by revealing to the king that she was a married woman; on which he sent for Abraham, and, after rebuking him for his conduct, restored his wife to him, and recommended him to withdraw from the country. The period of his stay in Egypt is not recorded, but it is from this time that his wealth and power appear to have begun (⁽⁻⁰¹²⁶⁾Genesis 12:16). If the dominion of the Hyksos in Memphis is to be referred to this epoch, as seems not improbable, *SEE EGYPT*, then, since they were akin to the Hebrews, it is not impossible that Abram may have taken part in their war of conquest, and so have had another recommendation to the favor of Pharaoh. He accordingly returned to the land of Canaan, much richer than when he left it “in cattle, in silver, and in gold” (⁽⁻⁰¹³²⁾Genesis 13:2). It was probably on his way back that his sojourn in the territories of Abimelech, king of Gerar, occurred. This period was one of growth in power and wealth, as the respect of Abimelech, and his alarm for the future, so natural in the chief of a race of conquering invaders, very clearly shows. Abram’s settlement at Beersheba, on the borders of the desert, near the Amalekite plunderers, shows both that he needed room, and was able to protect himself and his flocks. It is true, the order of the narrative seems to place this event some twenty-three years later, after the destruction of Sodom; but Sarah’s advanced age at that time precludes the possibility of her seizure by the Philistine king. By a most extraordinary infatuation, Abraham allowed himself to stoop to the same mean and foolish prevarication in denying his wife which had just occasioned him so much trouble in Egypt. The result was also similar *SEE ABIMELECH*, except that Abraham answered the rebuke of the Philistine by stating the fears by which he had been actuated, adding, “And yet indeed she is my sister; she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife.” This mends the matter very little, since, in calling her his sister, he designed to be understood as saying she was *not* his wife. As he elsewhere calls Lot his “brother,” this statement that Sarah was his “sister” does not interfere with the probability that she was his niece. The occurrence, however, broke up his encampment there, and expedited the return of the entire party northward. Lot also had much increased his possessions; and after their return to their previous station near Bethel, the disputes between their respective shepherds about water and pasturage

soon taught them that they had better separate. The recent promise of posterity to Abraham himself, although his wife had been accounted barren, probably tended also in some degree to weaken the tie by which the uncle and nephew had hitherto been united. The subject was broached by Abraham, who generously conceded to Lot the choice of pasture-grounds. Lot chose the well-watered plain in which Sodom and other towns were situated, and removed thither. *SEE LOT*. Thus was accomplished the dissolution of a connection which had been formed before the promise of children was given, and the disruption of which appears to have been necessary for that complete isolation of the coming race which the Divine purpose required. Immediately afterward the patriarch was cheered and encouraged by a more distinct and formal reiteration of the promises which had been previously made to him of the occupation of the land in which he lived by a posterity numerous as the dust (see M. Weber, *Proles et salus Abraham promissa*, Viteb. 1787). Not long after, he removed to the pleasant valley of Mamre, in the neighborhood of Hebron (then called Arba), situated in the direct line of communication with Egypt, and opening down to the wilderness and pasture-land of Beersheba, and pitched his tent under a terebinth-tree (⁽¹¹³⁾Genesis 13). This very position, so different from the mountain-fastness of Ai, marks the change in the numbers and powers of his clan.

It appears that fourteen years before this time the south and east of Palestine had been invaded by a king called Chedorlaomer, from beyond the Euphrates, who brought several of the small disunited states of those quarters under tribute (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 10, 1). Among them were the five cities of the plain of Sodom, to which Lot had withdrawn. This burden was borne impatiently by these states, and they at length withheld their tribute. This brought upon them a ravaging visitation from Chedorlaomer and four other (perhaps tributary) kings, who scoured the whole country east of the Jordan, and ended by defeating the kings of the plain, plundering their towns, and carrying the people away as slaves. Lot was among the sufferers. When this came to the ears of Abraham he immediately armed such of his slaves as were fit for war, in number 318, and being joined by the friendly Amoritish chiefs, Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, pursued the retiring invaders. They were overtaken near the springs of the Jordan; and their camp being attacked on opposite sides by night, they were thrown into disorder, and fled (see Thomson's *Land and Book*, 1, 320 sq.). Abraham and his men pursued them as far as the

neighborhood of Damascus, and then returned with all the men and goods which had been taken away (comp. Buckingham, *Mesop.* 1, 274). Although Abraham had no doubt been chiefly induced to undertake this exploit by his regard for Lot, it involved so large a benefit that, as the act of a sojourner, it must have tended greatly to enhance the character and power of the patriarch in the view of the inhabitants at large. When they had arrived as far as Salem on their return (see Thomson, 2, 211 sq.), the king of that place, Melchizedek, who was one of the few native princes, if not the only one, that retained the knowledge and worship of “the Most High God,” whom Abraham served, came forth to meet them with refreshments, in acknowledgment for which, and in recognition of his character, Abraham presented him with a tenth of the spoils. By strict right, founded on the war usages which still subsist in Arabia (Burckhardt’s *Notes*, p. 97), the recovered goods became the property of Abraham, and not of those to whom they originally belonged. This was acknowledged by the king of Sodom, who met the victors in the valley near Salem. He said, “Give me the persons, and keep the goods to thyself.” But with becoming pride, and with a disinterestedness which in that country would now be most unusual in similar circumstances, he answered, “I have lifted up mine hand [i.e. I have sworn] unto Jehovah, the most high God, that I will not take from a thread even to a sandal-thong, and that I will not take any thing that is thine, *lest thou shouldest say, I have made Abram rich*” (^{-014E}Genesis 14). The history of his attack on Chedorlaomer gives us a specimen of the view which would be taken of him by the external world. By the way in which it speaks of him as “Abram the Hebrew,” it would seem to be an older document, a fragment of Canaanitish history preserved and sanctioned by Moses. The invasion was clearly another northern immigration or foray, for the chiefs or kings were of Shinar (Babylonia), Ellasar (Assyria?), Elam (Persia), etc.; that it was not the first is evident from the vassalage of the kings of the cities of the plain; and it extended (see ^{-014E}Genesis 14:5-7) far to the south, over a wide tract of country. The patriarch appears here as the head of a small confederacy of chiefs, powerful enough to venture on a long pursuit to the head of the valley of the Jordan, to attack with success a large force, and not only to rescue Lot, but to roll back for a time the stream of northern immigration. His high position is seen in the gratitude of the people, and the dignity with which he refuses the character of a hireling. That it did not elate him above measure is evident from his reverence to Melchizedek, in whom he

recognised one whose call was equal and consecrated rank superior to his own. *SEE MELCHIZEDEK.*

Soon after his return to Mamre the faith of Abraham was rewarded and encouraged, not only by a more distinct and detailed repetition of the promises formerly made to him, but by the confirmation of a solemn covenant contracted, as nearly as might be, “after the manner of men,” between him and God. *SEE COVENANT.* It was now that he first understood that his promised posterity were to grow up into a nation under foreign bondage; and that, in 400 years after (or, strictly, 405 years, counting from the birth of Isaac to the exode), they should come forth from that bondage as a nation, to take possession of the land in which he sojourned (^(~~Q14E~~)Genesis 14). After ten years’ residence in Canaan (B.C. 2078), Sarai being then 75 years old, and having long been accounted barren, chose to put her own interpretation upon the promised blessing of a progeny to Abraham, and persuaded him to take her woman-slave Hagar, an Egyptian, as a secondary, or concubine-wife, with the view that whatever child might proceed from this union should be accounted her own. *SEE HAGAR.* The son who was born to Abraham by Hagar, and who received the name of Ishmael [*SEE ISHMAEL*], was accordingly brought up as the heir of his father and of the promises (^(~~Q16E~~)Genesis 16). Thirteen years after, when Abraham was 99 years old, he was favored with still more explicit declarations of the Divine purposes. He was reminded that the promise to him was that he should be the father of *many* nations; and to indicate this intention his name was now changed (see C. Iken, *De mutatione nominum Abrahami et Sarce*, in his *Dissert. Philol.* 1) from ABRAM to ABRAHAM (see Philo, *Opp.* 1, 588; comp. *Alian. Var. Hist.* 2, 32; Euseb. *Proep. Ev.* 11, 6; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 1, 373; Lengerke, *Ken.* 1, 227). See NAME. The Divine Being then solemnly renewed the covenant to be a God to him and to the race that should spring from him; and in token of that covenant directed that he and his should receive in their flesh the sign of circumcision. *SEE CIRCUMCISION.* Abundant blessings were promised to Ishmael; but it was then first announced, in distinct terms, that the heir of the special promises was not yet born, and that the barren Sarai, then 90 years old, should twelve months thence be his mother. Then also her name was changed from Sarai to Sarah (*princess*); and, to commemorate the laughter with which the prostrate patriarch received such strange tidings, it was directed that the name of Isaac (*laughter*) should be given to the future child. The very same day, in obedience to the

Divine ordinance, Abraham himself, his son Ishmael, and his house-born and purchased slaves, were all circumcised (⁽¹⁷⁰⁾Genesis 17), spring, B.C. 2064. Three months after this, as Abraham sat in his tent door during the heat of the day, he saw three travelers approaching, and hastened to meet them, and hospitably pressed upon them refreshment and rest (Dreist, *De tribus viris Abrahamo appar.* Rost. 1707). They assented, and under the shade of a terebinth, or rather an oak (q.v.) tree, partook of the abundant fare which the patriarch and his wife provided, while Abraham himself stood by in respectful attendance, in accordance with Oriental customs (see Shaw, *Trav.* 1, 207; comp. *Iliad*, 9, 205 sq.; 24, 621; *Odyss.* 8, 59; ⁽¹⁷¹⁾Judges 6:19). From the manner in which one of the strangers spoke, Abraham soon gathered that his visitants were no other than the Lord himself and two attendant angels in human form (see J. E. Kiesseling, *De divinis Abrahami hospitibus*, Lips. 1748). The promise of a son by Sarah was renewed; and when Sarah herself, who overheard this within the tent, laughed inwardly at the tidings, which, on account of her great age, she at first disbelieved, she incurred the striking rebuke, "Is any thing too hard for Jehovah?" The strangers then addressed themselves to their journey, and Abraham walked some way with them. The two angels went forward in the direction of Sodom, while the Lord made known to him that, for their enormous iniquities, Sodom and the other "cities of the plain" were about to be made signal monuments of his wrath and of his moral government. Moved by compassion and by remembrance of Lot, the patriarch ventured, reverently but perseveringly, to intercede for the doomed Sodom; and at length obtained a promise that, if but ten righteous men were found therein, the whole city should be saved for their sake. Early the next morning Abraham arose to ascertain the result of this concession; and when he looked toward Sodom, the smoke of its destruction, rising "like the smoke of a furnace," made known to him its terrible overthrow (⁽¹⁷²⁾Genesis 19:1-28). **SEE SODOM.** Tradition still points out the supposed site of this appearance of the Lord to Abraham. About a mile from Hebron is a beautiful and massive oak, which still bears Abraham's name (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 375; 2, 414). The residence of the patriarch was called "the oaks (A. V. "plain") of Mamre" (⁽¹⁷³⁾Genesis 13:18; 18:1); but the exact spot is doubtful, since the tradition in the time of Josephus (*War*, 4, 9, 7) was attached to a terebinth. **SEE MAMRE.** This latter tree no longer remains; but there is no doubt that it stood within the ancient inclosure, which is still called "Abraham's House." A fair was held beneath it in the time of Constantine; and it remained to the time of

Theodosius (Robinson, 2, 443; Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 142). — The same year Sarah gave birth to the long-promised son, and, according to previous direction, the name of Isaac was given to him. *SEE ISAAC*. This greatly altered the position of Ishmael, who had hitherto appeared as the heir both of the temporal and the spiritual heritage; whereas he had now to share the former, and could not but know that the latter was limited to Isaac. This appears to have created much ill-feeling both on his part and that of his mother toward the child; which was in some way manifested so pointedly, on occasion of the festivities which attended the weaning, that the wrath of Sarah was awakened, and she insisted that both Hagar and her son should be sent away. This was a very hard matter to a loving father; and Abraham was so much pained that he would probably have refused compliance with Sarah's wish, had he not been apprised in a dream that it was in accordance with the Divine intentions respecting both Ishmael and Isaac. With his habitual uncompromising obedience, he then hastened them away early in the morning, with provision for the journey (^{<0200>}Genesis 21:1-21), B.C. 2061. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.) *SEE HAGAR*.

Again for a long period (25 years, Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 13, 2) the history is silent; but, when Isaac was nearly grown up (B.C. cir. 2047), it pleased God to subject the faith of Abraham to a most severe trial (see H. Benzenberg, *Noch mehr Recensionen*, Leipz. 1791, No. 5). He was commanded to go into the mountainous country of Moriah (probably where the temple afterward stood) [see MORIAH], and there offer up in sacrifice the son of his affection, and the heir of so many hopes and promises, which his death must nullify. (See Hufnagel, *Christenth. Aufklar.* 1, 7, 592 sq.; J. G. Greneri, *Comment. Miscel. Syntag.* Oldenb. 1794; *Zeitschr. fur Phil. u. kath. Theol.* 20.) It is probable that human sacrifices already existed; and as, when they did exist, the offering of an only or beloved child was considered the most meritorious, it may have seemed reasonable to Abraham that he should not withhold from his own God the costly sacrifice which the heathen offered to their idols (comp. Hygin. *Fab.* 98; Tzetzes in Lycophr. 40, ed. Canter.; see Apollodor. *Bibl.* 1, 9, 1; Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 1, 10, p. 40). The trial and peculiar difficulty lay in the singular position of Isaac, and in the unlikelihood that his loss could be supplied. But Abraham's faith shrunk not, assured that what God had promised he would certainly perform, and "that he was able to restore Isaac to him even from the dead" (^{<8117>}Hebrews 11:17-19), and he rendered a ready, however painful, obedience. Assisted by two of his servants, he

prepared wood suitable for the purpose, and without delay set out upon his melancholy journey. On the third day he descried the appointed place; and, informing his attendants that he and his son would go some distance farther to worship and then return, he proceeded to the spot. To the touching question of his son respecting the victim to be offered, the patriarch replied by expressing his faith that God himself would provide the sacrifice; and probably he availed himself of this opportunity of acquainting him with the Divine command. At least, that the communication was made either then or just after, is unquestionable; for no one can suppose that a young man could, against his will, have been bound with cords and laid out as a victim on the wood of the altar. Isaac would most certainly have been slain by his father's uplifted hand, had not the angel of Jehovah interposed at the critical moment to arrest the fatal stroke. A ram which had become entangled in a thicket was seized and offered; and a name was given to the place (*Jehovah-Jireh* — “the Lord will provide”) allusive to the believing answer which Abraham had given to his son's inquiry respecting the victim. The promises before made to Abraham — of numerous descendants, superior in power to their enemies, and of the blessings which his spiritual progeny, and especially the Messiah, were to extend to all mankind — were again confirmed in the most solemn manner; for Jehovah swore by himself (comp. ^{<3063>}Hebrews 6:13, 17), that such should be the rewards of his uncompromising obedience (see C. F. Bauer, *De Domini ad Abrahamum juramento*, Viteb. 1746). The father and son then rejoined their servants, and returned rejoicing to Beersheba (^{<0219>}Genesis 21:19).

Sarah died at the age of 127 years, being then at or near Hebron, B.C. 2027. This loss first taught Abraham the necessity of acquiring possession of a family sepulcher in the land of his sojourning (see J. S. Semler, *De patriarcharum ut in Palæstina sepelirentur desiderio*, Hal. 1756). His choice fell on the cave of Machpelah (q.v.), and, after a striking negotiation [*SEE BARGAIN*] with the owner in the gate of Hebron, he purchased it, and had it legally secured to him, with the field in which it stood and the trees that grew thereon (see Thomson's *Land and Book*, 2, 381 sq.). This was the only possession he ever had in the Land of Promise (^{<0220>}Genesis 23). The next care of Abraham was to provide a suitable wife for his son Isaac. It has always been the practice among pastoral tribes to keep up the family ties by intermarriages of blood-relations (Burckhardt, *Notes*, p. 154); and now Abraham had a further inducement in the desire to maintain the purity of the separated race from foreign and idolatrous connections.

He therefore sent his aged and confidential steward Eliezer (q.v.), under the bond of a solemn oath to discharge his mission faithfully, to renew the intercourse between his family and that of his brother Nahor, whom he had left behind in Charran. He prospered in his important mission, and in due time returned, bringing with him Rebekah (q.v.), the daughter of Nahor's son Bethuel, who became the wife of Isaac, and was installed as chief lady of the camp, in the separate tent which Sarah had occupied (~~(-0230)~~Genesis 24). Some time after Abraham himself took a wife named Keturah, by whom he had several children. *SEE KETURAH*. These, together with Ishmael, seem to have been portioned off by their father in his lifetime, and sent into the east and southeast, that there might be no danger of their interference with Isaac, the divinely appointed heir. There was time for this; for Abraham lived to the age of 175 years, 100 of which he had spent in the land of Canaan. He died B.C. 1989, and was buried by his two eldest sons in the family sepulcher which he had purchased of the Hittites (~~(-0230)~~Genesis 25:1-10).

II. Traditions and Literature. — The Orientals, as well Christians and Mohammedans, have preserved some knowledge of Abraham, and highly commend his character; indeed, a history of his life, though it would be highly fanciful, might easily be compiled from their traditions. Arabic accounts name his father Azar (Abulfeda, *Hist. Anteisl.* p. 21), with which some have compared the contemporary Adores, king of Damascus (Justin. 36, 2; see Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 7, 2; Bertheau, *Israel. Gesch.* p. 217). His mother's name is given as Adna (Herbelot, *Bib. Orient.* s.v. Abraham). The Persian magi believe him to have been the same with their founder, Zerdoust, or Zoroaster; while the Zabians, their rivals and opponents, lay claim to a similar honor (Hyde, *Bel. Persar.* p. 28 sq.). Some have affirmed that he reigned at Damascus (Nicol. Damasc. apud Josephus, *Ant.* 1, 7, 2; Justin. 36), that he dwelt long in Egypt (Artapan. et Lupolem. apud Euseb. *Praepar.* 9, 17, 18), that he taught the Egyptians astronomy and arithmetic (Joseph. *Ant.* 1, 8, 2), that he invented letters and the Hebrew language (Suidas in *Abraham*), or the *characters* of the Syrians and Chaldeans (Isidor. *Hispal. Orig.* 1, 3), that he was the author of several works, among others of the famous book entitled *Jezira*, or the Creation — a work mentioned in the Talmud, and greatly valued by some rabbins; but those who have examined it without prejudice speak of it with contempt. *SEE CABALA*. In the first ages of Christianity, the heretics called Sethians published "Abraham's Revelations" (Epiphani. *Haeres.* 39, 5). Athanasius,

in his *Synopsis*, speaks of the “Assumption of Abraham;” and Origen (in *Luc. Homil.* 35) notices an apocryphal book of Abraham’s, wherein two angels, one good, the other bad, dispute concerning his damnation or salvation. The Jews (Rab. Selem, in *Baba Bathra*, c. 1) attribute to him the Morning Prayer, the 89th Psalm, a Treatise on Idolatry, and other works. The authorities on all these points, and for still other traditions respecting Abraham, may be found collected in Fabricii *Cod. Pseudepigr.* V. T. 1, 344 sq.; Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenth.* 1, 490; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 2 sq.; Beck, *ad Targ. Chron.* 2, 267; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, p. 2 sq.

We are informed (D’Herbelot, *ut sup.*) that, A.D. 1119, Abraham’s tomb was discovered near Hebron, in which Jacob, likewise, and Isaac were interred. The bodies were found entire, and many gold and silver lamps were found in the place. The Mohammedans have so great a respect for his tomb, that they make it their fourth pilgrimage (the three others being Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem). **SEE HEBRON.** The Christians built a church over the cave of Machpelah, where Abraham was buried, which the Turks have changed into a mosque, and forbidden Christians from approaching (Quaresm. *Elmid.* 2, 772). The supposed oak of Mamre, where Abraham received the three angels, was likewise honored by Christians, as also by the Jews and Pagans (see above). The Koran (4, 124) entitles him “the friend of God” (see Michaelis, *Orient. Bibl.* 4, 167 sq.; Withof, *De Abrah. Amico Dei*, Duisb. 1743; Kurtz, *Hist. of Old Cov.* § 51-68).

III. Typical Character. — The life and character of Abraham were in many respects *typical*.

1. He and his family may be regarded as a type of the Church of God in after ages. They, indeed, constituted God’s ancient Church. Not that many scattered patriarchal and family churches did not remain: such was that of Melchizedek; but a visible church relation was established between Abraham’s family and the Most High, signified by the visible and distinguishing sacrament of circumcision, and followed by new and enlarged revelations of truth. Two purposes were to be answered by this — *the preservation of the true doctrine of salvation in the world*, which is the great and solemn duty of every branch of the Church of God, and *the manifestation of that truth to others*. Both were done by Abraham. Wherever he sojourned he built his altars to the true God, and publicly celebrated his worship; and, as we learn from the Apostle Paul, he lived in

tents in preference to settling in the land of Canaan, though it had been given to him for a possession, in order that he might thus proclaim his faith in the eternal inheritance of which Canaan was a type (^{<816>}Galatians 3:16-29).

2. The numerous natural posterity promised to Abraham was also a type of the spiritual seed, the true members of the Church of Christ, springing from the Messiah, of whom Isaac was the symbol. Thus the Apostle Paul expressly distinguishes between the fleshly and the spiritual seed of Abraham (^{<812>}Galatians 4:22-31).

3. The faithful offering up of Isaac, with its result, was probably the transaction in which Abraham, more clearly than in any other, “saw the day of Christ, and was glad” (^{<816>}John 8:56). He received Isaac from the dead, says Paul, “in a figure” (^{<819>}Hebrews 11:19). This could be a figure of nothing but the resurrection of our Lord; and if so, Isaac’s being laid upon the altar was a figure of his sacrificial death, scenically and most impressively represented to Abraham.

4. The transaction of the expulsion of Hagar was also a type. It was an allegory in action, by which the Apostle Paul teaches us (^{<812>}Galatians 4:22-31) to understand that the son of the bondwoman represented those who are under the law; and the child of the freewoman those who by faith in Christ are supernaturally begotten into the family of God. The casting out of the bondwoman and her son represents also the expulsion of the unbelieving Jews from the Church of God, which was to be composed of true believers of all nations, all of whom, whether Jews or Gentiles, were to become fellow heirs.”

IV. *Covenant Relation.* —

1. Abraham is to be regarded, further, as standing in a *federal* or *covenant* relation, not only to his natural seed, but specially and eminently to all believers. “The Gospel,” we are told by Paul (^{<818>}Galatians 3:8), “was preached to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.” “Abraham believed in God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness;” in other words, he was justified (^{<156>}Genesis 15:6). A covenant of gratuitous justification through faith was made with him and his believing descendants; and the rite of circumcision, which was not confined to his posterity by Sarah but appointed in every branch of his family, was the sign or sacrament of this covenant of grace, and so

remained till it was displaced by the sacraments appointed by Christ. Wherever that sign was, it declared the doctrine and offered the grace of this covenant-free justification by faith, and its glorious results—to all the tribes that proceeded from Abraham. This same grace is offered to us by the Gospel, who become “Abraham’s *seed*,” his spiritual children, with whom the covenant is established through the same faith, and are thus made “the heirs with him of the same promise.”

2. Abraham is also exhibited to us as the *representative* of true believers; and in this especially, that the true nature of faith was exhibited in him. This great principle was marked in Abraham with the following characters: an entire, unhesitating belief in the word of God; an unflinching trust in all his promises; a steady regard to his almighty power, leading him to overlook all apparent difficulties and impossibilities in every case where God had explicitly promised; and habitual, cheerful, and entire obedience. The Apostle has described faith in ~~Scripture~~ Hebrews 11:1, and that faith is seen living and acting in all its energy in Abraham. (Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 2, 72 sq.)

V. The intended offering up of Isaac is not to be supposed as viewed by Abraham as an act springing out of the Pagan practice of human sacrifice, although this may have somewhat lessened the shock which the command would otherwise have occasioned his natural sympathies. The immolation of human victims, particularly of that which was most precious, the favorite, the first-born child, appears to have been a common usage among many early nations, more especially the tribes by which Abraham was surrounded. It was the distinguishing rite among the worshippers of Moloch; at a later period of the Jewish history, it was practiced by a king of Moab; and it was undoubtedly derived by the Carthaginians from their Phoenician ancestors on the shores of Syria. Where it was an ordinary use, as in the worship of Moloch, it was in unison with the character of the religion and of its deity. It was the last act of a dark and sanguinary superstition, which rose by regular gradation to this complete triumph over human nature. The god who was propitiated by these offerings had been satiated with more cheap and vulgar victims; he had been glutted to the full with human suffering and with human blood. In general, it was the final mark of the subjugation of the national mind to an inhuman and domineering priesthood. But the Mosaic religion held human sacrifices in abhorrence; and the God of the Abrahamitic family, uniformly beneficent, had imposed no duties which entailed human suffering, had demanded no

offerings which were repugnant to the better feelings of our nature. The command to offer Isaac as a “burnt-offering” was, for these reasons, a trial the more severe to Abraham’s faith. He must, therefore, have been fully assured of the Divine command, and he left the mystery to be explained by God himself. His was a simple act of unhesitating obedience to the command of God; the last proof of perfect reliance on the certain accomplishment of the Divine promises. Isaac, so miraculously bestowed, could be as miraculously restored; Abraham, such is the comment of the Christian Apostle, “believed that God could even raise him up from the dead” (^{scilicet} Hebrews 11:17).

VI. The wide and deep impression made by the character of Abraham upon the ancient world is proved by the reverence which people of almost all nations and countries have paid to him, and the manner in which the events of his life have been interwoven in their mythology and their religious traditions. Jews, Magians, Sabians, Indians, and Mohammedans have claimed him as the great patriarch and founder of their several sects; and his history has been embellished with a variety of fictions. The ethnological relations of the race of Abraham have been lately treated by Ewald (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*), and by Bertheau (*Geschichte der Israeliten*), who maintain that Abraham was the leader of tribes who migrated from Chaldea to the south-west. *SEE ARABIA.*

VII. For further notices, see Staudlin, *Gesch. der Sittenl. Jesu*, 1, 93 sq.; Eichhorn, *Bibl. d. Bibl. Lit.* 1, 40 sq.; Harenberg, in the *Biblioth. Brem. Nov.* 5, 499 sq.; Stackhouse, *Hist. of the Bible*, 1, 123 sq.; Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 50; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 1, 385 sq.; Gesenius, in the *Hall. Encycl.* 1, 155 sq. See likewise *Acta Sanctorum*, Oct. 9; a, *De Augusti et Factis Abrahami* (Goth. 1730); Hebbing, *Hist. of Abraham* (Lond. 1746); Gilbank, *Hist. of Abr.* (Lond. 1773); Holst, *Leben Abr.* (Cherun. 1826); Michaelis, in the *Biblioth. Brem.* 6, 51 sq.; Goetze, *De Cultu Abr.* (Lips. 1702); Sourie, *D. Gott Abr.* (Hannov. 1806); Hauck, *De Abr. in Charris* (Lips. 1776); the *Christ. Month. Spect.* 5, 397; Beer, *Leben Abr.* (Leipz. 1859); Basil, *Opera*, p. 38; Ephraem. Syrus, *Opera*, 2, 312; Philo, *Opera*, 2, 1 sq.; Ambrose, *Opera*, 1, 278 sq.; Chrysostom, *Opera (Spuria)*, 6, 646; Cooper, *Brief Expos.* p. 107; Whately, *Prototypes*, p. 93; Rabadan, *Mahometism*, p. 1; Debaeza, *Comment.* p. 3; J. H. Heidegger, *Hist. Pat.* p. 2; Abramus, *Pharus V. T.* p. 168; Dulpin, *Nouv. Bible*, p. 4; Barrington, *Works*, 3, 61; Riccaltoun, *Works*, 1, 291; Robinson, *Script. Characters*, p.

1; Rudze, *Lect. on Genesis* 1, 163; Buddicom, *Life of Abr.* (Lond. 1839); Evans, *Script. Biog.* p. 1; Williams, *Characters of O.T.* p. 36; A. H. L., *Life of Abr.* (Lond. 1861); Adamson, *Abraham* (Lond. 1841); Blunt, *Hist. of Abr.* (Lond. 1856); Geiger, *Ueber Abr.* (Altd. 1830); Beck, *Leben Abr.* (Eri. 1877, 8vo).

Abraham's Bosom

(ὁ κόλπος Ἀβραάμ): There was no name which conveyed to the Jews the same associations as that of Abraham. As undoubtedly he was in the highest state of felicity of which departed spirits are capable, "to be with Abraham" implied the enjoyment of the same felicity; and "to be in Abraham's bosom" meant to be in repose and happiness with him (comp. Josephus, *De Macc.* § 13; 4 Maccabees 13:16). The latter phrase is obviously derived from the custom of sitting or reclining at table which prevailed among the Jews in and before the time of Christ. **SEE ACCUBATION.** By this arrangement the head of one person was necessarily brought almost into the bosom of the one who sat above him, or at the top of the triclinium, and the guests were so arranged that the most favored were placed so as to bring them into that situation with respect to the host (comp. ^{<B123>}John 13:23; 21:20). **SEE BOSOM.** These Jewish images and modes of thought are amply illustrated by Lightfoot, Schottgen, and Wetstein, who illustrate Scripture from rabbinical sources. It was quite usual to describe a just person as being with Abraham, or lying on Abraham's bosom; and as such images were unobjectionable, Jesus accommodated his speech to them, to render himself the more intelligible by familiar notions, when, in the beautiful parable of the rich man and Lazarus, he describes the condition of the latter after death under these conditions (^{<B162>}Luke 16:22, 23). **SEE HADES.**

Abraham A Sancta Clara,

a Roman Catholic preacher, highly popular in Vienna, and remarkable for his eccentric writings. His family name was *Ulrich Megerle*, and he was born in Baden, June 2, 1642. In 1662 he entered the order of barefooted Augustinians, and became distinguished, as a preacher, for directness, tact, and pungency, mixed with rudeness. He died Dec. 1, 1709. His sermons and other writings are contained in (unfinished) *Sammtliche Werke nach dem Original-texte* (Lindau, 20 vols. 1835-50). His *Grammatica*

Religiosa, containing 55 sermons, was reprinted in Latin, 1719 (Colon. 4to).

Abraham Ecchelensis.

SEE ECHELENSIS.

Abraham Usque,

a Portuguese Jew, who translated the celebrated Spanish Bible of the Jews, first printed at Ferrara, in 1553. It is translated *Word for word* from the original, which fact, with the use of many old Spanish words, only employed in the synagogues, renders it very obscure. Asterisks (mostly omitted in the Holland ed. of 1630) are placed against certain words to denote that the exact meaning of the original Hebrew words is difficult to determine. — Furst, *Bib. Jud.* 3, 463.

Abrahamites

1. a sect of heretics, named from their founder Abraham (or Ibrahim), of Antioch, A.D. 805. They were charged with the Paulician errors, and some of them with idolatry and licentiousness; but for these charges we have only the word of their persecutors. *SEE PAULICIANS.*
2. a sect of Deists in Bohemia, who existed as late as 1782, and professed the religion of Abraham before his circumcision, admitting no scriptures but the decalogue and the Lord's prayer. They believed in one God, but rejected the Trinity, and other doctrines of revelation. They rejected the doctrines of original sin, the immortality of the soul, and future rewards and punishments. They were required by Joseph II to incorporate themselves with one of the religions tolerated in the empire; and, in case of non-compliance, threatened with banishment. As the result of obstinate refusal to comply with the imperial command, they were transported to Transylvania. Many persons are still found in Bohemia, between whom and the Abrahamites some connection may be traced. They are frequently called Nihilists and Deists. (See an anonymous *Gesch. der Bohmischen Deisten* (1785); Gregoire, *Hist. des Sectes relig.* 5, 419 Sq.)

A'bram

the original name (⁰¹⁷⁰⁵Genesis 17:5) of ABRAHAM *SEE ABRAHAM* (q.v.).

Abraxas

Picture for Abraxas

1. (ἀβράξας or ἀβράσαξ), a mystical word composed of the Greek letters α , β , ρ , α , ξ , α , ς , which together, according to Greek numeration, make up the number 365. Basilides taught that there were 365 heavens between the earth and the empyrean, and as many different orders of angels; and he applied the Cabalistic name *Abraxas* to the Supreme Lord of all these heavens (*Irenaeus*, lib. 1, cap. 24, 67). *SEE BASILIDES*. In his system there was an imitation of the Pythagorean philosophy with regard to numbers, as well as an adoption of Egyptian hieroglyphical symbols. Jerome seems to intimate that this was done in imitation of the practice of thus representing Mithras, the deity of the Persians; or the sun, otherwise Apollo, the god of healing. For instance:

$$\alpha=1$$

$$\beta=2$$

$$\rho=100$$

$$\alpha=1$$

$$\xi=60$$

$$\alpha=1$$

$$\varsigma=200$$

Abraxas = 365

$$\mu=40$$

$$\epsilon=5$$

$$\iota=10$$

$$\theta=9$$

$$\rho=100$$

$$\alpha=1$$

$$\varsigma=200$$

Meithras, or Mithras = 365

Probably Basilides intended, in this way, to express the number of intelligences which compose the Pleroma, or the Deity under various manifestations, or the sun, in which Pythagoras supposed that the intelligence resided which produced the world.

Bellerman derives the word from the Coptic; the syllable *sadsch* (which the Greeks were obliged to convert into $\sigma\alpha\zeta$, or $\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, or $\sigma\alpha\zeta$, as the last letter of this word could only be expressed by Ξ , Σ , or \Z) signifying “word,” and *abrak*, “blessed, holy, adorable;” *abraxas* being, therefore, “adorable word.” Others make it to signify “the new word.” Beausobre derives it from $\acute{\alpha}\beta\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, which he renders *magnificent*; and either $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\omega$, *I save*, or $\sigma\acute{\alpha}$, *safety*. Others assume that it is composed of the initial letters of the following words: $\beta\alpha$; *father*; $\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\sigma\omicron\acute{\nu}$, *spirit*; $dj\ a$, *one* (that is, *one God*); $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, *Christ*; $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$, *man* (that is, *God-man*); $\Sigma\omega\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, *Savior*. The latest suggestion is that it is the Aramaic for *akr aqz[wz*, “this is the great seal,” read backwards. *SEE ABRACADABRA*.

2. Abraxas Gems or Images. — A great number of *relics* (gems and plates, or tablets of metal) have been discovered, chiefly in Egypt, bearing the word *abraxas*, or an image supposed to designate the god of that name. There has been much discussion about these relics, some regarding them as all of Basilidian origin; others holding them, in part or in whole, to be Egyptian. Descriptions of them may be found in Macarii *Abraxas seu de Gem. Basil. Disquisitio*, edited by Chifflet (Antw. 1657, 4to); Montfaucon, *Palaeogr., Groec.* lib. 2, cap. 8; Passeri, *De Gemmis Basilidianis*, in Gori, *Thesaurus Gem. Astrif.* (Flor. 1750, 3 vols. 4to); Bellermann, *Ueb. die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxas-bilde* (Berlin, 1817-1819); Walsh, *Ancient Coins, Medals, etc.* (Lond. 1828, 8vo); Kopp, *Paleographia Critica* (Mannh. 1827, pt. 4). Matter (in Herzog’s *Real-Encyclopadie*, and in his *Histoire du Gnosticisme*, vol. 3) gives a classification of them which will tend greatly to facilitate their study. Some of them contain the *Abraxas* image alone, or with a shield, spear, or other emblems of Gnostic origin. Some have Jewish words (e.g. *Jehovah*, *Adonai*, etc.); others combine the *Abraxas* with Persian, Egyptian, or Grecian symbols. Montfaucon has divided these gems into seven classes.

1. Those having the head of a cock, the symbol of the sun;
2. Those having the head of a lion, expressive of the heat of the sun: these have the inscription *Mithras*;
3. *Serapis*;
4. *Sphinxes*, apes, and other animals;
5. Human figures, with the names of *Iao*, *Sabaoth*, *Adonai*, etc.;

6. Inscriptions without figures;

7. Monstrous forms.

He gives 300 facsimiles of gems with different devices and inscriptions, one of which is shown in the accompanying cut from the collection of Viscount Strangford. It is of an oval form, convex on both sides, and both the surface of the stone and the impression of the sculpture highly polished. On one side is represented a right line crossed by three curved ones, a figure very common on gnostic gems, and perhaps representing the golden “candlestick.” This is surrounded by the legend **ABPAXAΞ IAΩ**, words also of very common use, and which are to be found either by themselves, or accompanied by every variety of figure. The word **IAΩ**, in a variety of modifications, is also found on most of the gems of the Gnostics; and, next to Abrasax, seems to have been the most portentous and mysterious. It is generally supposed to be a corruption of the tetragrammaton, **hw̄hy**, or Jehovah, to which the Jews attached so awful an importance. Irenseus supposes it has allusion to the name by which the Divine character of Christ was expressed; as if the **AΩ** was intended to be the Alpha and Omega of the Revelation, and the characters **IAΩ** stood for Jesus the “Redeemer, the first and the last.” See Mosheim *Comm.* 1, 417; Matter, *Hist. du Gnosticisme*, t. 3; Neander, *Gnost. System*, 1818; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 401; Lardner, *Works*, 8, 352 sq.; Jeremie, *Ch. Hist.* p. 149; Schmid, *Pent. Dissert.* (Helmst. 1716); Jablonski, *Nov. Miscell. Lips.* 7, 1, 63 sq.; Beausobre, *Hist. du Manich.* 2, 50; Gieseler, in the *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1830, p. 413 sq. (who shows that not *all* Abraxas gems were of Gnostic origin); King, *The Gnostics and their Remains* (Lond. 1864), which contains various cuts of gems, but is otherwise of little value. See *SEE GNOSTICISM*; *SEE BASILIDES*.

Abrech

(Heb. *abrek*’, **Ērḇḥi** Sept. **κῆρυξ**, Vulg. *Venuflecterent*), a word that occurs only in the original of ^{<044B>}Genesis 41:43, where it is used in proclaiming the authority of Joseph. Something similar happened in the case of Mordecai, but then several words were employed (^{<0761>}Esther 6:11). If the word be Hebrew, it is probably an imperative (not directly, Buxtorf, *Thes. Gramm.* p. 134; nor the first person future, as explained by Aben-Ezra, but the infinitive absolute used imperatively, Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 19) of **ĒrB**; in Hiphil, and would then mean, as in our version, “bow the

knee” (so the Vulg., Erpenius, Luther, Aquila, and the Ven. Gr. version). We are indeed assured by Wilkinson (*Anc. Egyptians*, 2, 24) that the word *abrek* is used to the present day by the Arabs when requiring a camel to kneel and receive its load. But Luther (subsequently) and others (e.g. Onkelos, the Targum, Syr. and Persic versions) suppose the word to be a compound of *ĒrAba*, “*the father of the state*,” and to be of Chaldee origin. The Sept. and Samar. understand vaguely *a herald*. It is, however, probably Egyptian, slightly modified so as to suit the Hebrew; and most later writers are inclined with De Rossi (*Etym. Egypt.* p. 1) to repair to the Coptic, in which *Aberek* or *Abrek* means “*bow the head*” — *an* interpretation essentially agreeing with those of Pfeiffer (*Opp.* 1, 94) and Jablonski (*Opusc.* 1, 4, 5, ed. Water). **SEE SALUTATION**. But Origen (*Hexapla*, 1, 49, ed. Montfaucon), a native of Egypt, and Jerome (*Comment.* in loc.), both of whom knew the Semitic languages, are of the opinion that *Abrech* means “*a native Egyptian*,” and when we consider how important it was that Joseph should cease to be regarded as a foreigner [**SEE ABOMINATION**], it has in this sense a significance, as a proclamation of naturalization, which no other interpretation conveys (see Ameside, *De Abrech AEgyptior.* Dresd. 1750). Osburn thinks the title still appears in Joseph’s tomb as *hb-resh*, “*royal priest*” (*Mon. Hist. of Eg.* 2. 90).

Abro’nah.

SEE EBRONAH.

Abronas.

SEE ARBONAI.

Ab’salom

(Heb. *Abshalom*’, μ/ι $\nu\beta\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\iota}$ fully *Abishalom*’, μ/ι $\nu\gamma\beta\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\iota}$) 1 Kings, 15:2, 10, *father of peace*, i.e. *peaceful*; Sept. $\text{\AA}\beta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\mu$, Josephus, $\text{\AA}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$, *Ant.* 14, 4, 4), the name of three men.

1. The third son of David, and his only one (comp. ^{<1006>}1 Kings 1:6) by Maacah, the daughter of Talmi, king of Geshur (^{<1008>}2 Samuel 3:3; ^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 3:2), born B.C. cir. 1050. He was particularly noted for his personal beauty, especially his profusion of hair, the inconvenient weight of which often (not necessarily “every year,” as in the Auth. Vers.) compelled

him to cut it off, when it was found to weigh “200 shekels after the king’s weight” — an amount variously estimated from 112 ounces (Geddes) to 71 ounces (A. Clarke), and, at least, designating an extraordinary quantity (^{<045>}2 Samuel 14:25-26; see *Journal de Trevoux*. 1702, p. 176; Diedrichs, *Ueb. d. Haare Absalom’s*, Gott. 1776; *Handb. d. A. T.* p. 142 sq.; Bochart, *Opp.* 2, 384).

David’s other child by Maacah was a daughter named Tamar, who was also very beautiful. She became the object of lustful regard to her half-brother Amnon, David’s eldest son; and was violated by him, in pursuance of a plot suggested by the artful Jonadab (^{<030>}2 Samuel 13:1-20), B.C. cir. 1033. See AMNON. In all cases where polygamy is allowed we find that the honor of a sister is in the guardianship of her full brother, more even than in that of her father, whose interest in her is considered less peculiar and intimate (see Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 39). We trace this notion even in the time of Jacob (^{<0306>}Genesis 34:6, 13, 25 sq.). So in this case the wrong of Tamar was taken up by Absalom, who kept her secluded in his own house, and brooded silently over the injury he had sustained. It was not until two years had passed that Absalom found opportunity for the bloody revenge he had meditated, He then held a great sheep-shearing at Baal-hazoi near Ephraim, to which he invited all the king’s sons and, to lull suspicion, he also solicited the presence of his father. As he expected, David declined for himself, but allowed Amnon and the other princes to attend. They feasted together; and when they were warm with wine Amnon was set upon and slain by the servants of Absalom, according to the previous directions of their master. The others fled to Jerusalem, filling the king with grief and horror by the tidings which they brought. Absalom hastened to Geshur, and remained there three years with his grandfather, king Talmai (^{<033>}2 Samuel 13:23-38). *SEE GESHUR.*

Absalom, with all his faults, was eminently dear to his father. David mourned every day after the banished fratricide, whom a regard for public opinion and a just horror of his crime forbade him to recall. His secret wishes to have home his beloved though guilty son were, however, discerned by Joab, who employed a clever woman of Tekoah to lay a supposed case before him for judgment; and she applied the anticipated decision so adroitly to the case of Absalom, that the king discovered the object and detected the interposition of Joab. Regarding this as in some degree expressing the sanction of public opinion, David gladly commissioned Joab to “call home his banished.” Absalom returned; but

David controlled his feelings, and declined to admit him to his presence. After two years, however, Absalom, impatient of his disgrace, found means to compel the attention of Joab to his case; and through him a complete reconciliation was thus effected, and the father once more indulged himself with the presence of his son (~~1013B~~ 2 Samuel 13:39; 14:33), B.C. cir. 1027. Scarcely had he returned when he began to cherish aspirations to the throne, which he must have known was already pledged to another (see ~~10172~~ 2 Samuel 7:12). His reckless ambition was probably only quickened by the fear lest Bathsheba's child should supplant him in the succession, to which he would feel himself entitled, as of royal birth on his mother's side as well as his father's, and as being now David's eldest surviving son, since we may infer that the second son, Chileab, as dead, from no mention being made of him after ~~1018B~~ 2 Samuel 3:3. It is harder to account for his temporary success, and the imminent danger which befell so powerful, a government as his father's. The sin with Bathsheba had probably weakened David's moral and religious hold upon the people; and as he grew older he may have become less attentive to individual complaints, and that personal administration of justice which was one of an Eastern king's chief duties. The populace were disposed to regard Absalom's pretensions with favor; and by many arts he so succeeded in winning their affections that when, four years (the text has erroneously 40 years; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 7:9, 1; see Kennicott, *Diss.* p. 367; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 2, 637) after his return from Geshur, he repaired to Hebron, and there proclaimed himself king, the great body of the people declared for him. It is probable that the great tribe of Judah had taken some offense at David's government, perhaps from finding themselves completely merged in one united Israel; and that they hoped secretly for pre-eminence under the less wise and liberal rule of his son. Thus Absalom selects Hebron, the old capital of Judah (now supplanted by Jerusalem), as the scene of the outbreak; Amasa, his chief captain, and Ahithophel of Giloh, his principal counsellor, are both of Judah, and, after the rebellion was crushed, we see signs of ill-feeling between Judah and the other tribes (19, 41). But whatever the causes may have been, the revolt was at first completely successful. David found it expedient to quit Jerusalem and retire to Mahanaim, beyond the Jordan. When Absalom heard of this, he proceeded to Jerusalem and took possession of the throne without opposition. Among those who had joined him was Ahithophel, who had been David's counsellor, and whose profound sagacity caused his counsels to be regarded like oracles in Israel. This defection alarmed David more than any other single circumstance in

the affair, and he persuaded his friend Hushai to go and join Absalom, in the hope that he might be made instrumental in turning the sagacious counsels of Ahithophel to foolishness. The first piece of advice which Ahithophel gave Absalom was that he should publicly take possession of that portion of his father's harem which had been left behind in Jerusalem; thus fulfilling Nathan's prophecy (~~<OBJ>~~2 Samuel 13:11). This was not only a mode by which the succession to the throne might be confirmed [*SEE ABISHAG*; comp. Herodotus, 3, 68], but in the present case, as suggested by the wily counsellor, this villainous measure would dispose the people to throw themselves the more unreservedly into his cause, from the assurance that no possibility of reconciliation between him and his father remained. But David had left friends who watched over his interests. Hushai had not then arrived. Soon after he came, when a council of war was held to consider the course of operations to be taken against David. Ahithophel counselled that the king should be pursued that very night, and smitten while he was "weary and weak handed, and before he had time to recover strength." Hushai, however, whose object was to gain time for David, speciously urged, from the known valor of the king, the possibility and disastrous consequences of a defeat, and advised that all Israel should be assembled against him in such force as it would be impossible for him to withstand. Fatally for Absalom, the counsel of Hushai was preferred to that of Ahithophel; and time was thus afforded for the king, by the help of his influential followers, to collect his resources, as well as for the people to reflect upon the undertaking in which so many of them had embarked. David soon raised a large force, which he properly organized and separated into three divisions, commanded severally by Joab, Abishai, and Ittai of Gath. The king himself intended to take the chief command; but the people refused to allow him to risk his valued life, and the command then devolved upon Joab. The battle took place in the borders of the forest of Ephraim; and the tactics of Joab, in drawing the enemy into the wood, and there hemming them in, so that they were destroyed with ease, eventually, under the providence of God, decided the action against Absalom. Twenty thousand of his troops were slain, and the rest fled to their homes. Absalom himself fled on a swift mule; but as he went, the boughs of a terebinth (or oak; see Thomson's *Land and Book*, 1, 374; 2:234) tree caught the long hair in which he gloried, and he was left suspended there (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 7, 10, 2; Celsii *Hierob.* 1, 43). The charge which David had given to the troops to respect the life of Absalom prevented any one from slaying him; but when Joab heard of it, he hastened to the spot

and pierced him through with three darts. His body was then taken down and cast into a pit there in the forest, and a heap of stones was raised upon it as a sign of abhorrence (see Thomson, *ibid.* 2, 234). David's fondness for Absalom was unextinguished by all that had passed; and as he sat, awaiting tidings of the battle, at the gate of Mahanaim, he was probably more anxious to learn that Absalom lived than that the battle was gained; and no sooner did he hear that Absalom was dead, than he retired to the chamber above the gate, to give vent to his paternal anguish. The victors, as they returned, slunk into the town like criminals when they heard the bitter wailings of the king: "O my son Absalom! my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" The consequences of this weakness might have been most dangerous, had not Joab gone up to him, and, after sharply rebuking him for thus discouraging those who had risked their lives in his cause, induced him to go down and cheer the returning warriors by his presence (~~10151~~ 2 Samuel 15:1; 19:8; comp. Psalm 3, title), B.C. cir. 1023.

Absalom is elsewhere mentioned only in 2 S. m. 20, 6; ~~1007~~ 1 Kings 2:7, 28; 15:2, 10; ~~4113~~ 2 Chronicles 11:20, 21; from the last two of which passages he appears to have left only a daughter (having lost three sons, ~~10427~~ 2 Samuel 14:27; comp. 18:18), who was the grandmother of Abijah (q.v.). See, generally, Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 4, 319 sq.; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.; Debaeza, *Com. Allegor.* p. 5; Evans, *Script. Biog.* p. 1; Lindsay, *Lect.* 2; Dietric, *Antiq.* p. 353; Laurie, *Lect.* p. 68; Harris, *Works*, p. 209; Spencer, *Sermons*, p. 273; Simeon, *Works*, 3, 281, 294; Dibdin, *Sermons*, 3, 410; Williams, *Sermons*, 2, 190. **SEE DAVID; SEE JOAB.**

Picture for Absalom's Tomb

ABSALOM'S TOMB. A remarkable monument bearing this name makes a conspicuous figure in the Valley of Jehoshaphat, outside Jerusalem; and it has been noticed and described by almost all travelers. It is close by the lower bridge over the Kedron, and is a square isolated block hewn out from the rocky ledge so as to leave an area or niche around it. The body of this monument is about 24 feet square, and is ornamented on each side with two columns and two half columns of the Ionic order, with pilasters at the corners. The architrave exhibits triglyphs and Doric ornaments. The elevation is about 18 or 20 feet to the top of the architrave, and thus far it is wholly cut from the rock. But the adjacent rock is here not so high as in the adjoining tomb of Zecharias (so called), and therefore the upper part of

the tomb has been carried up with mason-work of large stones. This consists, first, of two square layers, of which the upper one is smaller than the lower; and then a small dome or cupola runs up into a low spire, which appears to have spread out a little at the top, like an opening flame. This mason-work is perhaps 20 feet high, giving to the whole an elevation of about 40 feet. There is a small excavated chamber in the body of the tomb, into which a hole had been broken through one of the sides several centuries ago. Its present Mohammedan name is *Tantur Faraon* (*Biblioth. Sac.* 1843, p. 34). The old travelers who refer to this tomb, as well as Calmet after them, are satisfied that they find the history of it in ^{JOSES-2} Samuel 18:18, which states that Absalom, having no son, built a monument, to keep his name in remembrance, and that this monument was called “Absalom’s Place” (μ/ι vb̄̄idiyi *Absalom’s Hand*, as in the margin; Sept. *Χεῖρ Ἀβεσσαλώμ*, Vulg. *Manus Absalom*), that is, *index*, memorial, or monument. **SEE HAND**. Later writers, however, dispute such a connection between this history and any of the existing monuments on this spot. “The style of architecture and embellishment,” writes Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Res.* 1, 519 sq.), “shows that they are of a later period than most of the other countless sepulchres round about the city, which, with few exceptions, are destitute of architectural ornament. But the foreign ecclesiastics, who crowded to Jerusalem in the fourth century, found these monuments here; and, of course, it became an object to refer them to persons mentioned in the Scriptures. Yet, from that day to this, tradition seems never to have become fully settled as to the individuals whose names they should bear. The *Itin. Hieros.* in A.D. 333 speaks of the two monolithic monuments as the tombs of Isaiah and Hezekiah. Adamnus, about A.D. 697, mentions only one of these, and calls it the tomb of Jehoshaphat The historians of the Crusades appear not to have noticed these tombs. The first mention of a tomb of Absalom is by Benjamin of Tudela, who ‘gives to the other the name of king’ Uzziah; and from that time to the present day the accounts of travelers have been varying and inconsistent.” Yet so eminent an architect as Prof. Cockerell speaks of this tomb of Absalom as a monument of antiquity, perfectly corresponding with the ancient notices (*Athenaeum*, Jan. 28, 1843). Notwithstanding the above objections, therefore, we are inclined to identify the *site* of this monument with that of Scripture. Josephus (*Ant.* 7, 10, 3) says that it was “a marble pillar in the king’s dale [the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which led to “the king’s gardens”], two furlongs distant from Jerusalem,” as if it were extant in his day. The simple monolith pillar may

naturally have been replaced in after times by a more substantial monument. *SEE PILLAR*. It is worthy of remark that the tradition which connects it with Absalom is not a monkish one merely; the Jewish residents likewise, who would not be likely to borrow from Christian legends, have been in the habit from time immemorial of casting a stone at it and spitting, as they pass by it, in order to show their horror at the rebellious conduct of this unnatural son. (See Williams, *Holy City*, 2, 451; Olin's *Travels*, 2, 145; Poccoke, *East*, 2, 34; Richter, *Wallf.* p. 33; Rosenmuller's *Ansichten von Palastina*, 2, plate 14; Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, 1, 488; Thomson's *Land and Book*, 2, 482; *Crit. Sac. Thes. Nov.* 1, 676; Frith, *Palest. photographed*, pt. 21).

2. (Sept. Ἀβεσσάλωμος.) The father of Matathias (1 Maccabees 11:70) and Jonathan (1 Maccabees 13:11), two of the generals under the Maccabees.

3. (Sept. Ἀβεσσαλώμ.) One of the two Jews sent by Judas Maccabaeus with a petition to the viceroy Lysias (2 Maccabees 11:17, in some "Absalon").

Absalon, or Axel

archbishop of Lund, in Sweden, and primate of the kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, was born in the island of Zealand, in 1128. After finishing his studies at Paris, he devoted himself to the priesthood, and was appointed bishop of Roeskilde in 1158. He was at the same time made prime-minister and general of the armies of Waldemar. In the latter capacity he overcame the Wends, and established Christianity there. In 1178 he was made archbishop of Lund, but still retained the see of Roeskilde, and remained in Zealand until 1191. He also quelled a rebellion in the district of Schoonen; and after Canute VI had ascended the throne he helped this prince in repulsing his rival, the Duke of Pomerania, and in conquering Mecklenbourg and Estonia. These occupations did not prevent his attending diligently to his clerical duties. In 1187 he called a national council to regulate the ceremonial of the churches. He was also a patron of the sciences and of literature. He died in the convent of Soroe in 1201. — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 31; Illgen, *Zeitschrift*, 1832, 1.

Absinthium.

SEE WORMWOOD.

Absolution

the act of *loosing* or *setting free*. In civil law it is a sentence by which the party accused is declared innocent of the crime laid to his charge, and is equivalent to acquittal. In the Roman theology it signifies the act by which the priest declares the sins of penitent persons to be remitted to them.

1. In the first centuries, the restoration of a penitent to the bosom of the Christian Church was deemed a matter of great importance, and was designed not only to be a means of grace to the individual, but also a benefit to the whole body. Absolution was at that time simply reconciliation with the Church, and restoration to its communion, without any reference to the remission of sins. Early writers, such as Tertullian, Novatian, Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Cyril, lay great stress on the fact that the forgiveness of sins is the prerogative of God only, and can never belong to any priest or bishop. After the fourth century, as the practice of private penance prevailed, the doctrine of ministerial absolution of sins began to gain ground, and was at length exalted to the rank of a sacrament.

2. Five kinds of absolution are mentioned by the early writers. *a.* That of baptism. *b.* The eucharist. *c.* The word and doctrine. *d.* The imposition of hands, and prayer. *e.* Reconciliation to the Church by relaxation of censures. *Baptism* in the ancient Church was called absolution, because remission of sins was supposed to be connected with this ordinance. It is termed by Augustine “*absolutio*,” or, “*sacramentum absolutionis et remissionis peccatorum*.” It had no relation to penitential discipline, being never given to persons who had once received baptism. The absolution of the *eucharist* had some relation to penitential discipline, but did not solely belong to it. It was given to all baptized persons who never fell under discipline, as well as to those who fell and were restored. In both respects it was called the perfection or consummation of a Christian (τὸ τελειόν). The absolution of the *word and doctrine* was declarative. It was that power which the ministers of Christ have, to make declaration of the terms of reconciliation and salvation to mankind. “The absolution of *intercession and prayer* was generally connected with all other kinds of absolution. Prayers always attended baptism and the Eucharist, and also the final reception of penitents into the Church. The absolution of *reconcilement to the Church* took place at the altar, after canonical penance, and is often referred to, in earlier writers, by the terms, “granting peace,” “restoring to

communion,” “reconciling to the church,” “loosing bonds,” “granting indulgence and pardon.” Some councils enacted that the absolution of a penitent should only be granted by the bishop who had performed the act of excommunication, or by his successor. Severe penalties were inflicted on any who violated this regulation. Various ceremonies accompanied this act. The time selected was usually *Passion-week*; and, from this circumstance, the restoration is called *hebdomas indulgentice*. If not in *Passion-week*, it took place at some time appointed by the bishop. The act was performed *in the church*, when the people were assembled for divine worship, and usually immediately before the administration of the Lord’s supper. The penitent, kneeling before the altar-table, or the reading-desk (*ambo*), was absolved by the bishop, by the imposition of hands, and by prayer. As the act was designated by the phrase *Dare pacem*, it is probable that a form was used which contained in it the expression, “Depart in peace.” The fifty-first Psalm was usually sung on the occasion, but not as a necessary part of the service. Immediately after the ceremony, the absolved were admitted to the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, and from that moment restored to all church privileges, with one exception, that a minister, under these circumstances, was reckoned among the laity, and a layman disqualified for the clerical office. In the case of heretics, *chrism* was added to the imposition of hands, to denote their reception of the Holy Spirit of peace on their restoration to the peace and unity of the Church. The bishop touched with oil the forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears of the penitent, saying, “This is the sign of the gifts of the Holy Ghost.” The Roman Church has also a form of *absolution for the dead* (*absolutio defunctorum*). It consists in certain prayers performed by the priest, after the celebration of the mass for a deceased person, for his delivery from purgatory.

3. The Roman Church practices *sacramental* absolution. According to the decision of the Council of Trent (sess. 14, cap. 6, etc. can. 9), the priest is judge as well as the minister of Jesus Christ; so that the meaning of the words, *ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen*, is not merely, “I declare to thee that thy sins are remitted,” but, “As the minister of Jesus Christ, I remit thy sins.” The view of the Greek Church appears to be that “Penitence is a mystery, or sacrament, in which he who confesses his sins is, on the outward declaration of pardon by the priest, inwardly loosed from his sins by Jesus Christ himself” (*Longer Catechism of the Russian Church*, by Blackmore). It is very plain

that the New Testament does not sanction the power claimed by the Roman hierarchy, and that it is altogether inconsistent with the teaching of the earlier fathers of the Church. When Jesus Christ says to his ministers, “Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained,” he imparts to them a commission to declare with authority the Christian terms of pardon, and he also gives them a power of inflicting and remitting ecclesiastical censures; that is, admitting into a Christian congregation or excluding from it. Absolution in the New Testament does not appear to mean more than this: and in early ecclesiastical writers it is generally confined to the remission of church censures, and re-admission into the congregation. It is generally agreed that the indicative form of absolution—that is, “I absolve thee” — instead of the deprecatory — that is, “Christ absolve thee” — was introduced in the twelfth or thirteenth century, just before the time of Thomas Aquinas, who was one of the first that wrote in defense of it. The Greek Church still retains the deprecatory form. *SEE INDULGENCE.*

4. “The Church of England also holds the doctrine of absolution, but restrains herself to what she supposes to be the Scriptural limits within which the power is granted, which are the pronouncing God’s forgiveness of sins upon the supposition of the existence of that state of mind to which, forgiveness is granted. The remission of sins is God’s special prerogative — ‘Who can forgive sins but God only?’ (~~4062~~ Luke 5:21) but the public declaration of such remission to the penitent is, like all other ministrations in the Church, committed to men as God’s ministers. The Church of England has three forms of absolution. In that which occurs in the morning service, the act of pardon is *declared* to be God’s. The second form, in the communion service, is *precatory*; it expresses the earnest wish that God may pardon the sinner. The third form, in the visitation of the sick, is apparently more unconditional, but not really so; since it is spoken to those who ‘truly repent and believe in God.’ The words of absolution which follow must be interpreted according to the analogy of the two other forms, which refer the act of pardon to God. And that the Church does not regard the pronouncing of this absolution as necessary, or as conducive to the sinner’s pardon, is evident from the absence of any injunction or admonition to that effect. It is noticed in the rubric, apparently, as an indulgence to the sick man if he heartily desire it; but no hint is given that he ought to desire it, nor any exhortation to seek it.” See Palmer *On the Church*, 2, 280; Wheatly *On Common Prayer*, 440 sq.; Bingham, *Orig.*

Eccl. bk. 19, ch. 1; Pascal, *Liturg. Cathol.* p. 34; Coleman, *Christ. Antiq.* ch. 22, § 8; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, 1, 305. **SEE CONFESSION; SEE PENANCE.**

Abstemii

a name given to such persons as could not partake of the cup at the Eucharist on account of their natural aversion to wine.

Abstinence

(ἀσπιτία, *not eating*, ^{<427>}Acts 27:21), a general term, applicable to any object from which one abstains, while *fasting* is a species of abstinence, namely, from food. **SEE FAST.** The general term is likewise used in the particular sense to imply a partial abstinence from particular food, but *fast* signifies an abstinence from food altogether. Both are spoken of in the Bible as a religious duty. Abstinence again differs from *temperance*, which is a *moderate* use of food or drink usually taken, and is sometimes extended to other indulgences; while abstinence (in reference to food) is a refraining entirely, from the use of certain articles of diet, or a very slight partaking of ordinary meals, in cases where absolute fasting would be hazardous to health. **SEE SELF-DENIAL.**

1. Jewish. — The first example of abstinence which occurs in Scripture is that in which the use of blood is forbidden to Noah (^{<1002>}Genesis 9:20). **SEE BLOOD.** The next is that mentioned in ^{<1032>}Genesis 32:32: “The children of Israel eat not of the sinew which shrank, which is upon the hollow of the thigh, *unto this day*, because he (the angel) touched the hollow of Jacob’s thigh in the sinew that shrank.” **SEE SINEW.** This practice of particular and commemorative abstinence is here mentioned by anticipation long after the date of the fact referred to, as the phrase “unto this day” intimates. No actual instance of the practice occurs in the Scripture itself, but the usage has always been kept up; and to the present day the Jews generally abstain from the whole hind-quarter on account of the trouble and expense of extracting the particular sinew (Allen’s *Modern Judaism*, p. 421). By the law abstinence from blood was confirmed, and the use of the flesh of even lawful animals was forbidden, if the manner of their death rendered it impossible that they should be, or uncertain that they were, duly exsanguinated (^{<1023>}Exodus 22:31; ^{<10142>}Deuteronomy 14:21). A broad rule was also laid down by the law, defining whole classes of animals that might not be eaten (^{<10101>}Leviticus 11). **SEE ANIMAL; SEE FOOD.** Certain parts

of lawful animals, as being sacred to the altar, were also interdicted! These were the large lobe of the liver, the kidneys and the fat upon them, as well as the tail of the “fat-tailed” sheep (^{<488D>}Leviticus 3:9-11). Every thing consecrated to idols was also forbidden (^{<47345>}Exodus 34:15). In conformity with these rules the Israelites abstained generally from food which was more or less in use among other people. Instances of abstinence from allowed food are not frequent, except in commemorative or afflictive fasts. The forty days’ abstinence of Moses, Elijah, and Jesus are peculiar cases, requiring to be separately considered. *SEE FASTING*. The priests were commanded to abstain from wine previous to their actual ministrations (^{<4810D>}Leviticus 10:9), and the same abstinence was enjoined to the Nazarites during the whole period of their separation (^{<4905>}Numbers 6:5). *SEE NAZARITE*. A constant abstinence of this kind was, at a later period, voluntarily undertaken by the Rechabites (^{<24516>}Jeremiah 35:16, 18). *SEE RECHABITE*.

Among the early Christian converts there were some who deemed themselves bound to adhere to the Mosaical limitations regarding food, and they accordingly abstained from flesh sacrificed to idols, as well as from animals which the law accounted unclean; while others contemned this as a weakness, and exulted in the liberty wherewith Christ had made his followers free. This question was repeatedly referred to the Apostle Paul, who laid down some admirable rules on the subject, the purport of which was, that every one was at liberty to act in this matter according to the dictates of his own conscience, but that the strong-minded had better abstain from the exercise of the freedom they possessed whenever it might prove an occasion of stumbling to a weak brother (^{<540>}Romans 14:1-3; 1 Corinthians 8). In another place the same apostle reproves certain sectaries who should arise, forbidding marriage, and enjoining abstinence from meats which God had created to be received with thanksgiving (^{<504B>}1 Timothy 4:3, 4). The council of the apostles at Jerusalem decided that no other abstinence regarding food should be imposed upon the converts than “from meats offered to idols, from blood, and from things strangled” (^{<4152>}Acts 15:29). Paul says (^{<4195>}1 Corinthians 9:25) that wrestlers, in order to obtain a corruptible crown, abstain from all things, or from every thing which might weaken them. In his ^{<504B>}First Epistle to Timothy (4:3), he blames certain heretics who condemned marriage, and the use of meats which; God hath created. He requires Christians to abstain from all appearance of evil (^{<5192>}1 Thessalonians 5:22), and, with much stronger

reason, from every thing really evil, and contrary to religion and piety. *SEE FLESH; SEE ALISGEMA.*

The Essenes, a sect among the Jews which is not mentioned by name in the Scriptures, led a more abstinent life than any recorded in the sacred books. *SEE ESSENES.* They refused all pleasant food, eating nothing but coarse bread and drinking only water; and some of them abstained from food altogether until after the sun had set (Philo, *De Vita Contemplativa*, p. 692, 696). That abstinence from ordinary food was practiced by the Jews medicinally is not shown in Scripture, but is more than probable, not only as a dictate of nature, but as a common practice of their Egyptian neighbors, who, we are informed by Diodorus (1, 82), “being persuaded that the majority of diseases proceed from indigestion and excess of eating, had frequent recourse to *abstinence*, emetics, slight doses of medicine, and other simple means of relieving the system, which some persons were in the habit of repeating every two or three days. See Porphyry, *De Abst.* 4. *SEE UNCLEANNES;*

2. *Christian.* —

a. Early. — In the early Church catechumens could be admitted to baptism; they were required, according to Cyril and Jerome, to observe a season of abstinence and prayer for forty days; according to others, of twenty days. Extreme caution and care were observed in the ancient Church in receiving candidates into communion, the particulars of which may be found under the head CATECHUMENS *SEE CATECHUMENS*. Superstitious abstinence by the clergy was deemed a crime. If they abstained from flesh, wine, marriage, or any thing lawful and innocent, in accordance with the heretical and false notions that the creatures of God were not good, but polluted and unclean, they were liable to be deposed from office. *SEE ABSTINENTS.* There was always much disputation between the Church and several heretical sects on the subjects of meats and marriage. The Manichees and Priscillianists professed a higher degree of spirituality and refinement, because they abstained from wine and flesh as things unlawful and unclean, and on this account censured the Church as impure in allowing men the moderate and just use of them. The Apostolical Canons enjoin, “That if any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other clerk, abstain from marriage, flesh, or wine, not for exercise, but abhorrence — forgetting that God made all things very good, and created man male and female, and speaking evil of the workmanship of God, unless he correct his

error, he shall be deposed, and cast out of the church.” At the same time, strict observance of the fasts of the church was enjoined, and deposition was the penalty in case of non-compliance with the directions of the canons on this subject.

b. Romish. — In the Romish Church a distinction is made between fasting and abstinence, and different days are appointed to each. On days of fasting, one meal in twenty-four hours is allowed; but on days of abstinence, provided flesh is not eaten and the meal is moderate, a collation is allowed in the evening. Their days of abstinence are all the Sundays in Lent, St. Mark’s day, if it does not fall in Easter-week, the three Rogation-days, all Saturdays throughout the year, with the Fridays which do not fall within the twelve days of Christmas. The observance of St. Mark’s day as a day of abstinence is said to be in imitation of St. Mark’s disciples, the first Christians of Alexandria, who are said to have been eminent for their prayer, abstinence, and sobriety. The Roman days of fasting are, all Lent except Sundays, the Ember-days, the vigils of the more solemn feasts, and all Fridays except such as fall between Easter and the Ascension. *SEE CALENDAR.*

c. Protestant. — The Church of England, in the table of vigils, mentions fasts and days of abstinence separately; but in the enumeration of particulars, they are called indifferently days of fasting or abstinence, and the words seem to refer to the same thing. The Word of God never teaches us that abstinence is good and valuable *per se*, but only that it ministers to holiness; and so it is an instrument, not an end. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*, bk. 10, ch. 11, § 9. *SEE ASCETICISM.*

Abstinentis

a sect of heretics that appeared in France and Spain about the end of the third century, during the persecutions of Diocletian and Maximin. They condemned marriage and the use of flesh and wine, which they said were made not *by* God, but by the devil. *SEE ABSTINENCE.*

Absus

a river of Palestine, according to Vibius Sequester (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 297), prob. the “gentle stream” (*mollis*) referred to by Lucan (5, 485), and by Caesar (*Bell. Civ.* 3, 13), as having been crossed by Pompey near

Apollonia; hence, no doubt, the brooklet that enters the Mediterranean at this place.

Abu'bus

(Ἀβουβος, prob. of Syrian origin), the father of Ptolemy, the general of Antiochus, who slew Simon Maccabaeus (1 Maccabees 16:11, 15).

Abul-faraj, Gregory

(ABUL-PHARAGIUS, or ABULFARADASCH), (called also Bar-Hebraeus, from his father having been originally a Jew), was the son of Aaron, a physician of Malatia, in Armenia, and was born in 1226, and, like his father, was a Jacobite. He applied himself to the study of the Syriac and Arabic languages, philosophy, theology, and medicine: in the latter he became a great proficient, and acquired a high reputation among the Moslems. When only twenty-one years of age he was made bishop of Guba by the Jacobite patriarch Ignatius; and in 1247 he was made bishop of Aleppo. About 1266 he was made Maphrian, or primate of the Jacobites in the East, which dignity he retained till his death, in 1286. His works are very numerous; the best known is the *Syriac Chronicle*, which is largely cited by Gibbon, and is, in fact, a repository of Eastern history. It consists of two parts:

1. The Dynasties — a Civil Chronicle from Adam to A.D. 1286;
2. An Ecclesiastical History, which again falls into two divisions:
 - (1.) A Catalogue and Chronicle of the Patriarchs of Antioch, called by this author the Pontiffs of the West;
 - (2.) A Catalogue and Chronicle of the Primates, Patriarchs, and Maphrians of the East.

The *Civil Chronicle* is published in Syriac and Latin, from the Bodleian MS., under the title *Chronicon Syriacum*, ed. P. J. Bruns and G. G. Kirsch (Lips. 1788, 2 vols. 4to); an abridgment of the whole chronicle made in Arabic by Abul-faraj, in Arabic and Latin by Pococke, under the title *Historia Compendiosa Danastiarum*, ab Ed. Pocockio interprete (Oxon. 1663, 2 vols. 4to). A complete edition was proposed in Germany by Bernstein, in 1847, but nothing beyond the prospectus has yet appeared. The "Ecclesiastical History" exists in MS. in the Vatican and Bodleian (?) libraries. The autobiography of Abul-faraj is given by Assemanni,

Bibliotheca Orientalis, tom. 2, See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* Ann. 1284; *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. 30, p. 300.

Abuma

SEE RUMAH.

Abuna

(*our father*), the title given by the Abyssinian Christians to their metropolitan. They receive this prelate from the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria. At one time, when the Abyssinians were greatly oppressed, they applied to the pope for help, promising never again to accept their metropolitan from the Coptic patriarch; but this forced submission to Rome did not last long. *SEE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.*

Abyss

(Ἄβυσσος). The Greek word means literally “*without bottom*,” but actually *deep, profound*. It is used in the Sept. for the Heb. *tehom*’ (μ/HT), which we find applied either to the ocean (^{<0002>}Genesis 1:2; 7:11) or to the under world (^{<0721>}Psalms 71:21; ^{<0A75>}Psalms 107:26). In the New Testament it is used as a noun to describe Hades, or the place of the dead generally (^{<5107>}Romans 10:7); but more especially Tartarus, or that part of Hades in which the souls of the wicked were supposed to be confined (^{<083>}Luke 8:31; ^{<690>}Revelation 9:1, 2, 11; 20:1, 3; comp. ^{<6114>}2 Peter 2:4). In the Revelation the authorized version invariably renders it “*bottomless pit*;” elsewhere “*deep*.” *SEE PIT.*

Most of these uses of the word are explained by reference to some of the cosmological notions which the Hebrews entertained in common with other Eastern nations. It was believed that the abyss, or sea of fathomless waters, encompassed the whole earth. The earth floated on the abyss, of which it covered only a small part. According to the same notion, the earth was founded upon the waters, or, at least, had its foundations in the abyss beneath (^{<042>}Psalms 24:2; ^{<0D6>}Psalms 136:6). Under these waters, and at the bottom of the abyss, the wicked were represented as groaning and undergoing the punishment of their sins. There were confined the Rephaim — those old giants who, while living, caused surrounding nations to tremble (^{<1018>}Proverbs 9:18; 29:16). In those dark regions the sovereigns of Tyre, Babylon, and Egypt are described by the prophets as undergoing the

punishment of their cruelty and pride (^{<2654>}Jeremiah 26:14; ^{<580>}Ezekiel 28:10, etc.). This was “the deep” into which the evil spirits, in ^{<4183>}Luke 8:31, besought that they might not be cast, and which was evidently dreaded by them. *SEE CREATION; SEE HADES*. The notion of such an abyss was by no means confined to the East. It was equally entertained by the Celtic Druids, who held that *Annwn* (the deep, the low part), the abyss from which the earth arose, was the abode of the evil principle (Gwarthawn), and the place of departed spirits, comprehending both the Elysium and the Tartarus of antiquity. With them also wandering spirits were called *Plant annwn*, “the children of the deep” (Davis’s *Celtic Researches*, p. 175; *Myth. and Rites of the B. Druids*, p. 49). *SEE DEEP*.

We notice a few special applications of the word “deep,” or abyss, in the Scriptures (see Wemyss, *Symb. Dict.* s.v.). Isaiah (44:27) refers to the method by which Cyrus took Babylon, viz., by laying the bed of the Euphrates dry, as mentioned by Xenophon and others. The same event is noticed in similar terms in ^{<2403>}Jeremiah 1:38 and 2:36. A parallel passage in relation to Egypt occurs in ^{<2895>}Isaiah 19:5, where the exhaustion of the country and its resources by foreign conquerors seems to be pointed out. ^{<500>}Romans 10:7: “Who shall descend into the *abyss* [^{<6503>}Deuteronomy 30:13, “beyond the sea”] to bring up Christ again from the dead?” i.e. faith does not require, for our satisfaction, things impracticable, either to scale the heavens or to explore the profound recesses of the earth and sea. The *abyss* sometimes signifies metaphorically grievous afflictions or calamities, in which, as in a sea, men seem ready to be overwhelmed (^{<3907>}Psalm 42:7; ^{<4711>}Psalm 71:20).

Abyssinia

SEE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

Abyssinian Church

Abyssinia is an extensive district of Eastern Africa, between lat. 70° 30' and 15° 40' N., long. 35° and 42° E., with a population of perhaps four millions. Carl Ritter, of Berlin, has shown that the high country of Habesh consists of three terraces or distinct table-lands, rising one above another, and of which the several grades of ascent offer themselves in succession to the traveler as he advances from the shores of the Red Sea (*Erdkunde*, th. 1, s. 168). The *first* of these levels is the plain of Baharnegash; the *second* level is the plain and kingdom of Tigre, which formerly contained the

kingdom of Axum; the *third* level is High Abyssinia, or the kingdom of Amhara. This name of Amhara is now given to the whole kingdom, of which Gondar is the capital, and where the Amharic language is spoken, eastward of the Takazze. Amhara Proper is, however, a mountainous province to the south-east, in the center of which was Tegulat, the ancient capital of the empire, and at one period the center of the civilization of Abyssinia. This province is now in the possession of the Gallas, a barbarous people who have overcome all the southern parts of Habesh. The present kingdom of Amhara is the heart of Abyssinia, and the abode of the emperor, or *Negush*. It contains the upper course of the Nile, the valley of Dembea, and the lake Tzana, near which is the royal city of Gondar, and likewise the high region of Gojam, which Bruce states to be at least two miles above the level of the sea. *SEE ETHIOPIA.*

I. *History.* — Christianity is believed to have been introduced, about A.D. 330, by Frumentius, who was ordained bishop of Auxuma (now Axum, or Tigre) by Athanasius. *SEE FRUMENTIUS.* As the Alexandrian Church held the Monophysite doctrine, the Abyssinian converts were instructed in this faith, which has maintained itself ever since. From the fifth to the fifteenth century little was known in Western Europe about Abyssinia or its Church. The Portuguese sent out by John II having opened a passage into Abyssinia in the fifteenth century, an emissary (Bermudes) was sent to extend the influence and authority of the Roman pontiff, clothed with the title of patriarch of Ethiopia. The Jesuits sent out thirteen of their number in 1555, but the Abyssinians stood so firm to the faith of their ancestors that the Jesuits were recalled by a bull from St. Peter's. Another Jesuit mission was sent out in 1603, and led to twenty years of intrigue, civil war, and slaughter. In December, 1624, the Abyssinian Church formally submitted to the see of Rome; but the people rebelled, and, after several years of struggle and bloodshed, the emperor abandoned the cause of Rome, and the Roman patriarch abandoned Abyssinia in 1633. After this, little or nothing was heard from Abyssinia till 1763, when Bruce visited the country, and brought back with him a copy of the Ethiopic Scriptures. In 1809 Mr. Salt explored Abyssinia by order of the British government, and described the nation and its religion as in a ruinous condition. Mr. Salt urged the British Protestants to send missionaries to Abyssinia. Portions of the Bible were translated and published in the Amharic and Tigre languages under the auspices of the British and Foreign Bible Society (Jowett, *Christ. Researches*, vol. 1); and in 1826 two missionaries (from the Basle

Missionary Seminary); viz., Dr. Gobat, now bishop of Jerusalem, and Christian Kugler, were sent out by the Church Missionary Society. Kugler dying, was replaced by Mr. Isenberg. He was followed by the Reverend Charles Henry Blumhardt in the beginning of 1837, and by the Reverend John Ludwig Krapf at the close of that year. The Romish Church renewed its missions in 1828, and, by stirring up intrigues, compelled the withdrawal of the Protestant missionaries in 1842. Their labors had already laid the foundation of a reform in the Abyssinian Church. Much had been done also in the way of translations into the Amharic language. Mr. Isenberg carried through the press, after his return to England in 1840, an Amharic spelling-book, 8vo; grammar, royal 8vo; dictionary, 4to; catechism, 8vo; Church history, 8vo; Amharic general history, 8vo. Mr. Isenberg had prepared a vocabulary of the Dankali language, which was likewise printed. The mission aimed not only at the Christian population of Shoa, but the Galla tribes extensively spread over the southeastern parts of Africa. To the Galla language, therefore, hitherto unwritten, Mr. Krapf's attention was much given. During Mr. Isenberg's stay in London, the following Galla works, prepared by Mr. Krapf, were printed: Vocabulary, 12mo; Elements of the Galla Language, 12mo; Matthew's Gospel, 12mo; John's Gospel, 12mo.

In 1849 the Roman Catholic missionaries were expelled, and the prince of Shoa requested the return of Dr. Krapf to the East-African Mission. In 1885 Theodore became king of Abyssinia, and was at first favorable to missions, who had meanwhile recommenced their operations, especially the Society of Basle. In 1858 this last had six laborers in the country. In 1859 the king of Tigre and Samen sent an embassy of submission to the pope, and 50,000 natives are reported to have entered into the papal communion. In 1864 king Theodore imprisoned British residents, and in 1868 an expedition under Lord Napier was sent against him, which reduced him to terms of submission. In 1872 Prince Kassai of Tigre was crowned emperor; but in 1879 king Theodore overthrew the prince of Shoa. In 1885 the Italians occupied Massowah, and relations towards Europeans have since continued unfriendly. The recent disturbances in Egypt have contributed to the decline of missions and all evangelical work along the Upper Nile, and the operations on the Congo have not yet materially aided it. The latest statistics give the Roman Catholic Church but 10,000 adherents in Abyssinia. *SEE AFRICA.*

II. *Doctrines and Usages.* —

1. The Abyssinian creed is, as has been said, Monophysite, or Eutychian; maintaining one nature only in the person of Christ, namely, the divine, in which they considered all the properties of the humanity to be absorbed, in opposition to the Nestorians. In both faith and worship they resemble the Romish Church in many respects; but they do not admit transubstantiation.
2. They practice the invocation of saints, prayer for the dead, and the veneration of relics; and while they reject the use of images, they admit a profusion of pictures, and venerate them. They practice circumcision, but apparently not as a religious rite. They keep both the Jewish and the Christian sabbath, and also a great number of holidays. Their clergy and churches are very numerous, the latter richly ornamented; and the number of monastic institutions among them is said to be great. The monks call themselves followers of St. Anthony, but follow various rules.
3. The supreme government lies with the patriarch, called *Abuna* (q.v.), who resides in Gondar. The Abuna receives his investiture from the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria., who is the nominal head of the Ethiopian Church.
4. They practice an annual ablution, which they term baptism, and which they consider necessary to wash away the defilement of sin. The priests receive the Lord's Supper every day, and always fasting; besides priests and monks, scarcely any but aged persons and children attend the communion. They call the consecration of the element *Mellawat*. At Gondar Bishop Gobat found no person that believed in transubstantiation. In Tigre there are some who believe in it. The wine is mixed with water. They consider fasting essential to religion; consequently their fasts occupy the greater part of the year, about nine months; but these are seldom all observed except by a few monks. The priests may be married men, but they may not marry after they have received orders. The priesthood is very illiterate, and there is no preaching at all. The Abyssinians prostrate themselves to the saints, and especially to the Virgin; and, like the Copts of Egypt, practice circumcision. When questioned on the subject, they answer that they consider circumcision merely as a custom, and that they abstain from the animals forbidden in the Mosaic law, but only because they have a disgust to them; but Dr. Gobat observed that, when they spoke upon these subjects without noticing the presence of a stranger, they attached a religious importance to circumcision, and that a priest would not fail to impose a fast or penance on a man who had eaten of a wild boar or a hare without the pretext of illness. In short, their religion consists chiefly in

ceremonial observances. Their moral condition is very low; facilities of divorce are great, and chastity is a rare virtue; the same man frequently marries several women in succession, and the neglected wives attach themselves to other men. Yet their religion, corrupt as it is, has raised the Abyssinian character to a height far beyond that of any African race. Much authentic information as to this interesting Church and people in modern times is to be found in Gobat, *Three Years' Residence in Abyssinia*; Isenberg and Krapf, *Missionary Journals in Abyssinia* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, vol. 1; Newcomb, *Cyclopoedia of Missions*; Rippell, *Reisen in Abyssinien*, Frankf. 1840; Veitch, W. D. *Notes from a Journal of E. M. Flad, one of Bishop Gobat's missionaries in Abyssinia, with a sketch of the Abyssinian Church* (London, 1869); Schem, *Eccles. year-book for 1859*; *American Theol. Review*, 1860 and later.

Acacia

SEE SHITTAH-TREE.

Acacians

followers of Acacius, *Monophthalmus*, bishop of Cesarea. In the Council of Seleucia, A.D. 359, they openly professed their agreement with the pure Arians, maintaining, in opposition to the semi-Arians, that the Son was not of the same substance with the Father, and that even the likeness of the Son to the Father was a likeness of *will* only, and not of essence. Socrat. *Ecc. Hist.* 3, 25. *SEE ACACIUS.*

Acacius

(surnamed *Monophthalmus*, from his having but one eye), was the disciple of Eusebius of Caesarea, in Palestine, whom he succeeded in the see of Caesarea in 340. He was one of the chiefs of the Arian party, and a man of ability and learning, but unsettled in his theological opinions. He was deposed as an Arian by the Synods of Antioch (A.D. 341) and Seleucia (359). Subsequently he subscribed the Nicene creed, and therefore fell out with the Anomaeans, with whom he had before acted. He died A.D. 363. St. Jerome (*de Scrip.* cap. 98) says that he wrote seventeen books of commentaries upon Holy Scripture, six on various subjects, and very many treatises, among them his book *Adversus Marcellum*, a considerable fragment of which is contained in Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 72. Socrates (lib. 2,

cap. 4) says that he also wrote a life of his predecessor, Eusebius. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno. 340; Lardner, *Works*, 3, 583.

Acacius

bishop of Berea, was born about the year 322, in Syria. He embraced the monastic life at an early age under the famous anchorite Asterius. About A.D. 378 he was promoted to the see of Berea by Eusebius of Samosata; and after 381 Flavian sent him to Rome, to obtain for him communion with the Western bishops, and to effect the extinction of the schism in the Church of Antioch, in both which designs he succeeded. At the commencement of the 5th century he conspired with Theophilus of Alexandria and others against Chrysostom, and was present in the pseudo-council *ad Quercum*, in 403, where Chrysostom was deposed. In the great contest between Cyril and Nestorius, Acacius wrote to Cyril, endeavoring to excuse Nestorius, and to show that the dispute was in reality merely verbal. In 431 the Council of Ephesus assembled for the decision of this question. Acacius did not attend, but gave his proxy to Paul of Emesa against Cyril, and addressed a letter to the Oriental bishop, accusing him of Apollinarianism. In 432 he was present in the synod of Berea, held by John, and did all in his power to reconcile Cyril and the Orientals. His death occurred about 436, so that he must have attained the age of 114 years. Of the numerous letters which he wrote, three only, according to Cave, are extant, viz., two Epistles to his Primate, Alexander of Hierapolis; one to Cyril. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 430; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 4.

Academics

a name given to such philosophers as adopted the doctrines of Plato. They were so called from the *Academia*, a grove near Athens, where they studied and lectured. The Academics are divided into those of the first academy, who taught the doctrines of Plato in their original purity; those of the second, or middle academy, who differed materially from the first, and inclined to skepticism; and those of the new academy, who pursued *probability* as the only attainable wisdom. The Academics and Epicureans (q.v.) were the prevailing philosophical sects at the time of Christ's birth. — Tennemann, *Hist. Philosophy* §§ 127-138.

Ac'atan

(**Ἀκατόν**), the father of Johannes, said to be one of those who returned from the Babylonian captivity (1 Esdras 8:38); evidently the same with HAKATTAN *SEE HAKATTAN* (q.v.) of the parallel text (^{<1982>}Ezra 8:12).

Acatholici

not catholic; a name sometimes used by members of the Papal Church to distinguish Protestants, under the arrogant assumption that the word “Catholic” is to be appropriated solely to Romanists. *SEE CATHOLIC*.

Ac'cad

Picture for Ac'cad

(Heb. *Akkad'*, **dBāi** *fortress*; or, according to Simonis *Onomast.* p. 276, *bond*, i.e. of conquered nations; Sept. **Ἀρχάδ** [prob. by resolution of the Dagesh, like **qcm2ʔrDifor qcMDj**], Vulg. *Achad*), one of the four cities in “the land of Shinar,” or Babylonia, which are said to have been built by Nimrod, or, rather, to have been “the beginning of his kingdom” (^{<0100>}Genesis 10:10). Aelian (*De Animal.* 16, 42) mentions that in the district of Sittacene was a river called *Argades* (**Ἀργάδης**), which is so near the name *Archad* which the Sept. give to this city, that Bochart was induced to fix *Accad* upon that river (*Phaleg*, 4:17). Mr. Loftus (*Trav. in Chald. and Susiana*, p. 96) compares the name of a Hamitic tribe emigrating to the plains of Mesopotamia from the shores of the Red Sea, and which he says the cuneiform inscriptions call *Akkadin*; but all this appears to be little more than conjecture. In the inscriptions of Sargon the name of *Akkad* is applied to the Armenian mountains instead of the vernacular title of Ararat (Rawlinson, in *Herodotus'* 1, 247, note). The name of the city is believed to have been discovered in the inscriptions under the form *Kinzi Akkad* (*ib.* 357). It seems that several of the ancient translators found in their Heb. MSS. *Accar* (**rKāi**) instead of *Accad* (Ephrem Syrus, Pseudo-Jonathan, *Targum Hieros.*, Jerome, Abulfaragi, etc.). Achar was the ancient name of Nisibis (see Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 1, 226); and hence the Targumists give Nisibis or Nisibin (**ʿybyxn**) for *Accad*, and they continued to be identified by the Jewish literati in the times of Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. *Acad*). But Nisibis is unquestionably too remote northward to be associated with Babel, Erech, and Calneh, “in the land of

Shinar," which could not have been far distant from each other. On the supposition that the original name was *Akar*, Colonel Taylor suggests its identification with the remarkable pile of ancient buildings called *Akker-kuf*, in Sittacene, and which the Turks know as *Akker-i-Nimrud* and *Akker-i-Babil* (Chesney's *Survey of the Euphrates*, 1, 117). The Babylonian Talmud might be expected to mention the site, and it occurs accordingly under the name of *Aggada*. It occurs also in Maimonides (*Jud. Chaz. Tract. Madee*, fol. 25, as quoted by Hyde). *Akker-kuf* is a ruin, consisting of a mass of sun-dried bricks, in the midst of a marsh, situated to the west of the Tigris, about five miles from Bagdad (Layard's *Babylon*, 2d ser. p. 407). The most conspicuous part of this primitive monument is still called by the natives *Tel Nimrud*, and *Nimrud Tepasse*, both designations signifying the hill of Nimrod (see Ker Porter's *Travels*, 2, 275). It consists of a mound, surmounted by a mass of building which looks like a tower, or an irregular pyramid, according to the point from which it is viewed, it is about 400 feet in circumference at the bottom, and rises to the height of 125 feet above the elevation on which it stands (Ainsworth's *Researches in Assyria*, p. 175). The mound which seems to form the foundation of the pile is a mass of rubbish, accumulated from the decay of the superincumbent structure (Bonomi's *Nineveh*, p. 41). In the ruin itself, the layers of sun-dried bricks can be traced very distinctly. They are cemented together by lime or bitumen, and are divided into courses varying from 12 to 20 feet in height, and are separated by layers of reeds, as is usual in the more ancient remains of this primitive region (Buckingham, *Mesopotamia*, 2, 217 sq.). Travellers have been perplexed to make out the use of this remarkable monument, and various strange conjectures have been hazarded. The embankments of canals and reservoirs, and the remnants of brick-work and pottery occupying the place all around, evince that the *Tel* stood in an important city; and, as its construction announces it to be a Babylonian relic, the greater probability is that it was one of those pyramidal structures erected upon high places, which were consecrated to the heavenly bodies, and served at once as the temples and the observatories of those remote times. Such buildings were common to all Babylonian towns; and those which remain appear to have been constructed more or less on the model of that in the metropolitan city of Babylon. *SEE BABEL*.

Ac'caron

(1 Maccabees 10:89). *SEE EKRON*.

Accensorii.

In the early Church there was a class of officers called *acolyths*, corresponding to the Roman apparitor or *pedellus*, *bedellus*, beadle. In their ordination, the bishop, after informing them as to the duties of their office, placed in the hands of each a candlestick with a lighted taper in it, intimating that it was their duty to light the candles of the church; hence they were sometimes called *accensorii*, taper-lighters. Jerome says it was a custom in the Oriental churches to set up lighted tapers when the Gospel was read, as a demonstration of joy; but it does not appear that there was a peculiar order of acolyths for this purpose. The duty in question seems to have been nothing more than lighting the candles at night, when the church was to meet at evening prayer. The Romanists contend that their *ceroferarii*, taper-bearers, whose office is only to walk before the deacons, etc., with lighted tapers, are derived from the practice of the acolyths. The two offices are widely different, and the assumption that the Romish practice is derived from apostolical institution is absurd. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 3, ch. 3. *SEE ACOLYTHS.*

Accent

in a grammatical sense, is the *tone* or stress of the voice upon a particular syllable, which is the means of distinguishing or separating words in rapid enunciation, and is not to be confounded with the rhythmical or musical *ictus* or force which regulates poetry or metre, and is, at the same time, independent of the prosodiocal quantity. In English, as in most European languages, there is no fixed rule for the position of the accent, which often differs in words formed after the same analogy. In Latin, in the absence of all positive information as to how the Romans themselves pronounced their language, at least in this particular, an arbitrary rule has been invented and generally acceded to by scholars of all nations, by which the tone is placed upon every *long penult*, and upon the antepenult of words having a short or doubtful (“common”) vowel in the penult. Many apply the same rule to the Greek language; but, as this has a *written* accent, the custom, still preserved among the modern Greeks, is gradually prevailing, of conforming the spoken to the written tone. In Hebrew the place of the accent is carefully designated in the common or Masoretic text (see R. Jehuda Ibn Balam, *Treatise on the Poetic Accents*, in Heb., Paris, 1556; reprinted with annotations; Amst. 1858), although the Jews of some nations, disregarding this, pronounce the words with the accent on the

penult, after the analogy of modern languages, and as is done by natives in speaking Syriac and Arabic (see J. D. Michaelis, *Apfangsgrunde der Hebr. Accentuation*, Hall. 1741; Hirts, *Einleit. in d. Hebr. Abtheilungskunst*, Jena, 1762; Spitzner, *Idea Analyticae V. T. ex Accentibus*, Lips. 1769; Stern, *Grindl. Lehre d. Flebr. Accentuation*, Frankf. 1840). In words anglicized from the Greek the Latin rules are observed for the accent; and in those introduced from the Hebrew, as they have mostly come to us through the Vulgate, the same principle is in the main adhered to. so far as applicable, though with great irregularity and disagreement among orthoepists, and generally to the utter neglect of the proper Hebrew tone. In pronouncing Scripture and other foreign names, therefore, care should be taken to conform to the practice of the best speakers and readers, rather than to any affected or pedantic standard, however exact in itself (see Worcester's *Eng. Dict.* 1860, Append.).

Accept, Acceptable, Accepted

(properly *hxr*; *ratsah* 'to take pleasure in *δέχομαι*). To *accept* is not only to receive, but to receive with pleasure and kindness (^{0132D}Genesis 32:20). It stands opposed to reject, which is a direct mode of refusal, and implies a positive sentiment of disapprobation (^{245D}Jeremiah 6:30; 7:29). To *receive*, is an act of right — we receive what is our own; to *accept*, is an act of courtesy — we accept what is offered by another. Hence an *acceptable time*, or *accepted time* (⁰⁹¹³Psalms 69:13; ^{476D}2 Corinthians 6:2), signifies a favorable opportunity. "No prophet is *accepted* in his own country" (⁰⁹²¹Luke 4:24), that is to say, his own countrymen do not value and honor him as they ought. "Neither *acceptest* thou the person of any" (^{021D}Luke 20:21). The word *person* here is intended to denote the *outward appearance* in contrast with inward character. *SEE ACCESS*.

Acceptance

1. a term which imports the *admission* of man into the *favor* of God. As things are best understood by contrast with their opposites, so acceptance is to be understood from its opposite, rejection, the sense of which will be found by reference to ^{245D}Jeremiah 6:30; 7:29. To understand aright the Scriptural idea of acceptance with God, we must keep in mind the fact that sin is highly displeasing to God, and is attended by the hiding of his face or the withholding of his favor. Sin causes God to refuse to hold friendly intercourse with man; but the mediation of the Son of God restores this

intercourse. Sinners are said to be “accepted in the Beloved” (^{<4006>}Ephesians 1:6); that is, in Christ. They are no longer held in a state of rejection, but are received with approbation and kindness. It is to be noticed that it is an idea of a positive kind which the word acceptance contains. As the rejection which sin occasioned was express, equally express and positive is the acceptance of which Christ is the author. One who had disgraced himself before his sovereign would be particularly refused any share in the favors of the court. When this breach was repaired, the excluded party would again be favorably received (*Eden*). **SEE ACCEPT.**

2. Acceptance (^{<4006>}Ephesians 1:6); in theology, is nearly synonymous with justification. We mistake the terms of acceptance with God *when we trust in*, 1, the superiority of our virtues to our vices (^{<4810>}Romans 3:20; ^{<4910>}James 2:10); 2, in a faith in Christ which does not produce good works (^{<4914>}James 2:14); 3, in the atonement, without personal repentance from sin (^{<4915>}Luke 13:5); 4, in the hope of future repentance, or conversion on a dying bed (Proverbs 4, 24-31). **SEE ADOPTION; SEE JUSTIFICATION.**

Acceptants

a name that arose in the second period of the Jansenist controversy in France. The bull *Unigenitus* (q.v.) of Clement XI, 1713, was accepted by some of the French clergy unconditionally; by others only on condition of its reference to a general council. The former were called *acceptants* or *constitutionalists*; the latter *appellants*. **SEE JANSENISTS.**

Acceptilation

(*acceptilatio*), a term in theology, used, with regard to redemption, to denote the acceptance on the part of God of an atonement not really *equal* to that in place of which it is received, but *equivalent*, not because of its intrinsic value, but because of God's determination to receive it. The term is borrowed from the commercial law of the Romans, in which it is defined “an acquittance from obligation, by word of mouth, of a debtor by a creditor” (Pandects of Justinian), or “an imaginary payment” (Institutes of Justinian). In the theology of the Middle Ages, the term was first used and the theory developed by Duns Scotus in his controversy with the followers of Thomas Aquinas. He defended the proposition that every created oblation or offering is worth what God is pleased to accept it for and no more.” The doctrine continued to be a subject of dispute between the followers of Duns Scotus and those of Thomas Aquinas throughout the

Middle Ages, and still divides the Roman Catholic theologians, as the Popes have never authoritatively settled it. The Lutheran and Calvinistic theologians mostly adopted the doctrine of a strict satisfaction; but the theory of a relative necessity found eloquent defenders in Hugo Grotius (q.v.), and the Arminian theologians Episcopius (q.v.), Limborch (q.v.), and Curcellaeus (q.v.). See Shedd, *History of Doctrines.*, 2, 347 sq.

Access

(προσαγωγή, *a bringing toward*) is the privilege of approaching a superior with freedom. It is distinguished from admittance thus: “We have *admittance* where we enter; we have *access* to him whom we address. There can be no *access* where there is no *admittance*; but there may be *admittance* without *access*. Servants or officers may grant us *admittance* into the palaces of princes; the favorites of princes only have *access* to their persons” (Crabbe, *Engl. Syn.* s.v.). **SEE ACCEPTANCE.**

1. Introduction, free admission into the presence of a superior. In the New Testament it signifies the free intercourse which we enjoy with God in the exercise of prayer, resulting from our having entered into a state of friendship with him (^{<STR>}Romans 5:2; ^{<STR>}Ephesians 2:18; 3:12). It is more than simple admittance; it is such an introduction as leads to future and frequent intercourse. When the vail of the temple was rent at the death of Christ, a new and living way of access to God was opened. Under the law, the high-priest alone had access into the holy of holies. By the death of Christ the middle wall of partition was broken down, and Jew and Gentile have both free access to God; before this, the Gentiles, in the temple-worship, had no nearer access than to the gate of the court of Israel. All the privileges of Christianity are equally bestowed on all believers of all nations. **SEE PRAYER.**

2. In Roman ecclesiastical usage —

- (1.) a collection of preparatory prayers, used by the priests before the celebration of the mass;
- (2.) in the election of the pope, a transfer of votes from one candidate to another to secure the necessary number is called an *access*. If a voter wishes to change his vote to another person, he writes on his paper *accedo domino*, etc.

Ac'cho

Picture for Ac'cho 1

(*Heb. Aisko, /K[ī* from an Arab. root signifying *to be hot* [see Drummond, *Origines*, v. 3], referring to the sultry sand in the neighborhood, used by the Phoenicians in the manufacture of glass [Pliny, v. 19; Strabo, 16:877]; Sept. Ἀκχώ, Josephus, "Ἀκκη, *Ant.* 9, 14, 2), a town and haven within the nominal territory of the tribe of Asher, which, however, never acquired possession of it (^{<003>}Judges 1:31). It is, perhaps, likewise mentioned in ^{<300>}Micah 1:10 (/kB; prob. /KBifor /K[B] in *Accho*; Sept. ἐν Ἀκείμ, Vulg. *lachrymis*, Auth. Vers. "at all;" see Henderson, *Comment.* in loc.). The Greek and Roman writers call it *'&Akh, Ace* (Strab. 16:877; Diod. Sic. 19:93; C. Nep. 14:5); but it was eventually better known as *Ptolemais* (Pliny *Hist. Nat.* 5, 19), which name it received from the first Ptolemy, king of Egypt, by whom it was much improved. By this name it is mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Maccabees 10:56; 11:22, 24; 12:45, 48; 2 Maccabees 13:14), in the New Testament (^{<420>}Acts 21:7), and by Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 12, 2 sq.). It was also called *Colonia Claudii Casaris*, in consequence of its receiving the privileges of a Roman city from the emperor Claudius (Pliny 5:17; 36:65). It continued to be called Ptolemais by the Greeks of the lower empire, as well as by Latin authors; while the Orientals adhered to the original designation (see Mishna, *Abadah Zarah*, 3, 4; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 117), which it still retains in the form *Akka*. During the Crusades the place was usually known to Europeans by the name of *Acon*; afterward, from the occupation of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, as *St. Jean d'Acre*, or simply *Acre*. The Romans at a late date appear to have called it also *Ptolemaida* (the accusative being transformed into a nominative); at least the name appears in this form in the *Itin. Antonin.* and *Hierosol.* The Greeks themselves, although using the name *Ptolemais*, were evidently aware of the original Hebrew (i.e. Phoenician) name Accho, which they merely Graecized into Ace. Thus, the authors of the *Etymologicuem Magnum*, say, "Ace, a city of Phoenicia, which is *now* called Ptolemais. Some say that the citadel of Ptolemais was called Ace because Hercules, being bitten by a serpent and there cured, named it so, from ἀκείσθαι [to heal]." Other ancient authors speak of the place by the same name, and some of them allude to the same fable as the origin of the name (Reland, *Palest.* p. 536, 537). These, however, were evidently but speculations common to the mythology of the Greeks, who were fond of

giving Greek terminations as well as Greek derivations to foreign terms.
SEE PTOLEMAIS.

This famous harbor-city is situated in N. lat. 32° 55', and E. long. 35° 5', and occupies the north-western point of a commodious bay, called the bay of Acre, the opposite or south-western point of which is formed by the promontory of Mount Carmel. The city lies on the plain to which it gives its name. Inland the hills, which from Tyre southward press close upon the sea-shore, gradually recede, leaving in the immediate neighborhood of Accho a plain of remarkable fertility about six miles broad, and watered by the small river Belus (Nahr Naman), which discharges itself into the sea close under the walls of the town; to the S.E. the still receding heights afford access to the interior in the direction of Sepphoris. Accho, thus favorably placed in command of the approaches from the north, both by sea and land, has been justly termed the "key of Palestine." The bay, from the town of Acre to the promontory of Mount Carmel, is three leagues wide. The port, on account of its shallowness, can only be entered by vessels of small burden (Prokesch, p. 146); but there is excellent anchorage on the other side of the bay, before Haifa, which is, in fact, the roadstead of Acre (Turner, 2:111; G. Robinson, 1:198). In the time of Strabo Accho was a great city (16, p. 877), and it has continued to be a place of importance down to the present time. But after the Turks gained possession of it, Acre so rapidly declined, that the travelers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries concur in describing it as much fallen from its former glory of which, however, traces still remained. The missionary Eugene Roger (*La Terre Sainte*, 1645, p. 44-46) remarks that the whole place had such a sacked and desolate appearance that little remained worthy of note except the palace of the grand-master of the Knights Hospitallers and the church of St. Andrew; all the rest was a sad and deplorable ruin, pervaded by a pestiferous air which soon threw strangers into dangerous maladies. The emir Fakr-ed-din had, however, lately built a commodious khan for the use of the merchants; for there was still considerable traffic, and vessels were constantly arriving from France Venice, England, and Holland, laden with oil, cotton, skins, and other goods. The emir had also built a strong castle, notwithstanding repeated orders from the Porte to desist. Roger also fails not to mention the immense stone balls, above a hundred-weight, which were found in the ditches and among the ruins, and which were thrown into the town from machines before the use of cannon. This account is confirmed by other

travelers, who add little or nothing to it (Doublan, Cotovicus, Zuallart, Morison, Nau, D'Arvieux, and others). Morison, however, dwells more on the ancient remains, which consisted of portions of old walls of extraordinary height and thickness, and of fragments of buildings, sacred and secular, which still afforded manifest tokens of the original magnificence of the place. He affirms (2, 8) that the metropolitan church of St. Andrew was equal to the finest of those he had seen in France and Italy, and that the church of St. John was of the same perfect beauty, as might be seen by the pillars and vaulted roof, half of which still remained. An excellent and satisfactory account of the place is given by Nau (liv. 5, ch. 19), who takes particular notice of the old and strong vaults on which the houses are built. Maundrell mentions that the town appears to have been encompassed on the land side by a double wall, defended with towers at small distances; and that without the walls were ditches, ramparts, and a kind of bastions faced with hewn stone (*Journey*, p. 72). Pococke speaks chiefly of the ruins (*East*, 2, 176 sq.). After the impulse given to the prosperity of the place by the measures of sheik Daher, and afterward of Djezzar Pasha, the descriptions differ (Clarke, *Trav.* 2, 379). It is mentioned by Buckingham (1, 116) that, in sinking the ditch in front of the then (1816) new outer wall, the foundations of small buildings were exposed, twenty feet below the present level of the soil, which must have belonged to the earliest ages, and probably formed part of the original *Accho*. He also thought that traces of *Ptolemais* might be detected in the shafts of gray and red granite and marble pillars, which lie about or have been converted into thresholds for large doorways, of the Saracenic period; some partial remains might be traced in the inner walls; and he is disposed to refer to that time the now old khan, which, as stated above, was really built by the emir Fakr-ed-din. All the Christian ruins mentioned by the travelers already quoted had disappeared. In actual importance, however, the town had much increased. The population in 1819 was computed at 10,000, of whom 3000 were Turks, the rest Christians of various denominations (Connor, in Jowett, 1, 423). Approached from Tyre the city presented a beautiful appearance, from the trees in the inside, which rise above the wall, and from the ground immediately around it on the outside being planted with orange, lemon, and palm trees. Inside, the streets had the usual narrowness and filth of Turkish towns; the houses solidly built with stone, with flat roofs; the bazaars mean, but tolerably well supplied (Turner, 2, 113). The principal objects were the mosque, the pasha's seraglio, the granary, and the arsenal (Irby and Mangles, p. 195). Of the

mosque, which was built by Djezzar Pasha, there is a description by Pliny Fisk (*Life*, p. 337; also G. Robinson, 1, 200). The trade was not considerable; the exports consisted chiefly of grain and cotton, the produce of the neighboring plain; and the imports chiefly of rice, coffee, and sugar from Damietta (Turner, 2, 112). As thus described, the city was all but demolished in 1832 by the hands of Ibrahim Pasha; and although considerable pains were taken to restore it, yet, as lately as 1837, it still exhibited a most wretched appearance, with ruined houses and broken arches in every direction (Lord Lindsay, *Letters*, 2, 81). It is only important at present as a military post, and all its municipal regulations are according to the laws of war (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 480). See Rey, *L'Acre* (Par. 1879).

Accho continued to belong to the Phoenicians (Strabo 2, 134; Pliny 5, 17; Ptolmy 5, 15) until they, in common with the Jews, were subjugated by the Babylonians (comp. 1 Maccabees 5:15). By the latter it was doubtless maintained as a military station against Egypt, as it was afterward by the Persians (Strabo, 16, p. 877). In the distribution of Alexander's dominions Accho fell to the lot of Ptolemy Soter, who valued the acquisition, and gave it his own name. In the wars that ensued between Syria and Egypt, it was taken by Antiochus the Great (Ptolmy 5, 62), and attached to his kingdom. When the Maccabees established themselves in Judaea, it became the base of operations against them (1 Maccabees 5:15, 55). Simon drove his enemies back within its walls, but did not take it (1 Maccabees 5:22). In the endeavor of Demetrius Soter and Alexander Balas to bid highest for the support of Jonathan, the latter gave Ptolemais and the lands around to the temple at Jerusalem (10, 1, 39). Jonathan was afterward invited to meet Alexander and the king of Egypt at that place, and was treated with great distinction by them (10, 56-66); but there he at length (B.C. 144) met his death through the treachery of Tryphon (12, 48-50). On the decay of the Syrian power it was one of the few cities of Judaea which established its independence. Alexander Jannseus took advantage of the civil war between Antiochus Philometer and Antiochus Cyzicenus to besiege Ptolemais, as the only maritime city in those parts. except Gaza, which he had not subdued; but the siege was raised by Ptolemy Lathyrus (then king of Cyprus), who got possession of the city (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 12, 2-6), of which he was soon deprived by his mother, Cleopatra (13, 13, 2). She probably gave it, along with her daughter Selene, to Antiochus Grypus, king of Syria. At least, after his death, Selene held possession of that and

some other Phoenician towns, after Tigranes, king of Armenia, had acquired the rest of the kingdom (13, 16, 4). But an injudicious attempt to extend her dominions drew upon her the vengeance of that conqueror, who, in B.C. 70, reduced Ptolemais, and, while thus employed, received with favor the Jewish embassy which was sent by queen Alexandra, with valuable presents, to seek his friendship (13, 16, 4). A few years after, Ptolemais was absorbed, with all the country, into the Roman empire, and the rest of its *ancient* history is obscure and of little note. It is only mentioned in the New Testament from Paul's having spent a day there on his voyage to Coesarea (~~4207~~ Acts 21:7). The importance acquired by the last-named city through the mole constructed by Herod, and the safe harbor thus formed, must have had some effect on the prosperity of Ptolemais; but it continued a place of importance, and was the seat of a bishopric in the first ages of the Christian Church. The see was filled sometimes by orthodox and sometimes by Arian bishops; and it has the equivocal distinction of having been the birthplace of the Sabellian heresy (Niceph. 6:7). Accho (or *Acco* as the Latins style it) was an imperial garrison town when the Saracens invaded Syria, and was one of those that held out until Caesarea was taken by Armu, in A. D. 638 (*Mod. Univ. Hist.* 1, 473).

The Franks first became masters of it in A.D. 1104, when it was taken by Baldwin, king of Jerusalem. But in A.D. 1187 it was recovered by Salah-ed-din, who retained it till A.D. 1191, when it was retaken by the Christians under Richard Coeur-de-Lion. The Christians kept it till A.D. 1291; and it was the very last place of which they were dispossessed. It had been assigned to the Knights Hospitallers of Jerusalem, who fortified it strongly, and defended it valiantly, till it was at length wrested from them by Khalil ben-Kelaoun, sultan of Egypt, who is called Melek Seruf by Christian writers (D'Herbelot, 5, Acca; Will. Tyr. 1, 23, c. 6, 7; Vitriacus, cap. 25, 99, 100; Quaresmius, tom. 2, p. 897). Under this dominion it remained till A.D. 1517, when the Mameluke dynasty was overthrown by Selim 1, and all its territories passed to the Turks (*Chronica de Syria*, lib. 5, cap. 1; *Alod. Utiv. Hist.* b. 15, c. 10, § 2). After this Acre remained in quiet obscurity till the middle of the last century, when the Arab sheik Daher took it by surprise. Under him the place recovered some of its trade and importance. He was succeeded by the barbarous but able tyrant, Djezzar Pasha, who strengthened the fortifications and improved the town. Under him it rose once more into fame, through the gallant and successful

resistance which, under the direction of Sir Sidney Smith, it offered to the arms of Bonaparte. After that the fortifications were further strengthened, till it became the strongest place in all Syria. In 1832 the town was besieged for nearly six months by Ibrahim Pasha, during which 35,000 shells were thrown into it, and the buildings were literally beaten to pieces (Hogg's *Damascus*, p. 160-166). It had by no means recovered from this calamity, when on the 3d of November 1840, it was bombarded by the English fleet till the explosion of the powder-magazine destroyed the garrison, and town (Napier's *War in Syria*). The walls and castles have since been repaired more strongly than ever; but the interior remains in ruins (Thomson. *Land and Book*, 1, 479).

Picture for Ac'cho 2

There are several medals of Accho, or Ptolemais, both Greek and Latin. Most of the former have also the Phoenician name of the city, **k[**, *Ak* (see Gesenius, *Mon. Phoen.* p. 269,270, pl. 35), and the head of Alexander the Great, apparently in consequence of favors received from that prince, perhaps at the time when he was detained in Syria by the siege of Tyre. From others it appears that the city assumed the privilege of asylum and of sanctity; and that it possessed a temple of Diana. (For the ancient history of Acre, see Reland, *Palest.* p. 534-542; for its modern history and appearance, see M'Culloch's *Gazetteer*, s.v. Acre; comp. Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 195; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 477 sq. Arvieux, 1, 241 sq.; Schulz, *Leitungen*, 5, 181 sq.; Niebuhr, *Trav.* 3, 72; Richter, *Wallf.* p. 67 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* II, 2, 60 sq.; Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, 2, 233 sq.; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, 1, 247 sq.; Conybeare and Howson, 2:231). **SEE PHOENICIA.**

Accident

a term of philosophy used to express that which is merely adventitious to a substance, and not essential to it; e.g. roundness is an accident of any body, since it is a body all the same, whether it be round or square. In theology this word is used in connection with the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, which teaches that the *accidents* of the bread and wine in the holy Eucharist continue to subsist without a subject: "Accidentia autem sine subjecto in eodem [sacramento] subsistunt" (Aquinas, *Opuscula*, p. 57). And the catechism of the council of Trent speaks in these terms: "Tertium restat, quod in hoc Sacramento maximum atque mirabile

videatur, panis videlicet et vini species in hoc Sacramento sine aliqua re subjecta constare” (*Par. 2, No. 44*). In defense of this doctrine, Roman writers argue thus: If the eucharistic accidents have any subject, that subject must be either (1) the matter of bread, or (2) the surface of the Lord’s body, or (3) the air and other corpuscles contained in the pores, etc., of the matter, whatever it is, which, by God’s appointment, continue to subsist after the destruction of the matter, so as to produce the same sensations. Now (1) they cannot have the matter of bread for their subject, because that matter no longer subsists, and is changed into the body of Jesus Christ; (2) they cannot have the surface of the Lord’s body for their subject, because it is only present in an invisible manner; and (3) the air cannot be the subject of these accidents, because the same accidents, *numero*, cannot pass from one subject to another; and because, further, the air cannot at the same time be the substance of *its own* proper attributes and of those of bread (*Thomas Aquinas, par. 3, qu. 77, art. 1, in corp.*). They argue further, that the contrary doctrine, *viz.*, that they are not *really* the accidents of bread and wine, but only *appear* such to us, destroys the nature and idea of a sacrament and of transubstantiation. That a sacrament, by its very nature, is essentially a sensible sign, not only in relation to ourselves, but in itself, *i.e.*, in the language of the schools, not only *ex parte nostri*, but *ex parte sui*; and that, consequently, if all that there is *real* and *physical* in the eucharistic accidents consists in this, that God causes them to produce in us, after consecration, the same sensations which the bread did previously, the sacrament is no longer a sensible sign, *ex parte sui*, in itself, but only *ex parte nostri*; and, therefore, when God ceases to produce such sensations in us, as, for instance, when the consecrated host is locked up in the pyx, it is no longer a sacrament. They argue also, that to hold that they are not pure, or *absolute* accidents, destroys equally the nature of transubstantiation, because (1) transubstantiation is a real conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Now, in every *conversion* there must be something common to both substances remaining the same after the change that it was before, else it would be simply a *substitution* of one thing for another. As then, in the holy eucharist, the *substances* of bread and wine do not remain after consecration, it follows that what does remain is the pure accidents. (2) They who oppose the doctrine of *absolute accidents* teach that one body differs from another only in the different configuration of its parts; and that wherever there is the same configuration of parts, there is the same body; and wherever there are the same sensations produced, there is also the

same arrangements of parts to produce them. If this be so, since, in the holy eucharist, the same sensations are produced after the consecration as before, there must be the same configuration of parts after consecration as before, or the same body; in other words, there is no change, no transubstantiation. — Landon, *Eccl. Dictionary*, s.v. *SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION*.

Acclamation

1. in *Roman* use, the unanimous concurrence of all the votes in an election for pope or bishop, without previous balloting, is called *acclamatio* or *quasi-inspiratio*.
2. In the *ancient* Church, the name *acclamatio* was given to shouts of joy, by which the people expressed their approval of the eloquence or doctrine of their preachers. Sometimes in the African Church, when the preacher quoted an apposite text of Scripture in illustration or confirmation of his argument, the people would join him in repeating the close of it. This was encouraged by the minister, in order that the people might gain a familiar acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures. The acclamations were general, and consisted not only of exclamations, but of clapping the hands, and other indications of assent. It is said that the people applauded the sermons of Chrysostom, some by tossing their garments, others by moving their plumes, others laying their hands on their swords, and others waving their handkerchiefs, and crying out, “Thou art worthy of the priesthood! Thou art the thirteenth apostle! Christ hath sent thee to save our souls,” etc. While the ancients did not refuse these acclamations, they took care to exhort those to whom they spoke to show their approval of the sermons they heard by the fruits of godly living. They proved to them that the best praise of the sermon is the compunction of the hearers. Jerome lays it down as a rule, in his directions to Nepotian, that in preaching he should try to excite the groans of the people rather than their applause, and let the tears of the hearer be the commendation of the preacher. Many passages in Chrysostom’s writings show that he desired the practice to be banished from the Church, because it was abused by vain and ambitious persons, who only preached to gain the applause of their hearers, and even hired men to applaud them. He says, “Many appear in public, and labor hard, and make long sermons, to gain the applause of the people, in which they rejoice as much as if they had gained a kingdom; but, if their sermon ends in silence, they are more tormented about that silence than about the pains

of hell. This is the ruin of the Church, that ye seek to hear such sermons as are apt not to move compunction, but pleasure; hearing them as you would hear a musician or singer, with a tinkling sound and composition of words." The practice of giving expression to the feelings in worship has been known in modern times. There was a sect in Flanders, in the fourteenth century, called Dancers, whose practice it was to seize each other's hands, and to continue dancing till they fell down breathless. The Whippers or Flagellants, the Jumpers, the Shakers, have obtained their respective designations from certain customs adopted in worship. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 14, 4:27.

Acco.

SEE ACCHO.

Accolti, Pietro;

known under the title of *Cardinal of Ancona*, was born at Florence in 1497, and died there in 1549. Under Leo X he occupied the place of Apostolical Abbreviator, and in 1549 he drew up against Luther the famous bull which condemned 41 propositions of this reformer. While secretary of Clement VII he was appointed cardinal in 1527, and sent as legate in 1532 into the March of Ancona. Under Paul III he fell into disfavor, and was imprisoned in the castle of San Angelo. He obtained his liberty only upon paying the large sum of 59,000 dollars. He obtained several bishoprics, and left one daughter and two sons. He is the author of a treatise on the rights of the popes upon the kingdom of Naples. Some of his poems are contained in the first volume of the *Carmina illustrium poetarum Italarum* (Florence, 1562, 8vo). — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale*, 1, 165.

Accommodation

a technical term in theology, first innocently used by certain mystical interpreters, who maintained that although the sense of holy Scripture is essentially but one, yet that certain passages were made the vehicle of a higher and more distant import than the mere literal expressions exhibited (Walch, *Bibl. Theol.* 4, 228). **SEE HYPONOIA.** From this, however, the term was extended by writers of a Socinian tendency to indicate a certain equivocal character in the language of the sacred writers and speakers. (See Whately's *Bampton Lect.*; Conybeare, *Lect. on Theol.*; Tittmann's

Meletem. Sacra, pref.; Hauff, *Bemerk. 12b. d. Lehrart Jesu*; Forster, *Crit. Essays*, p. 59; Marsh, in Michaelis's *Introd.* 1, 473 sq. Express treatises on the subject have been written in Latin by Pisansky [Gedan. 1781], Pappelbaum [Stargard, 1763], Weber [Viteb. 1789], Bang [Amst. 1789], Van Hemert [Amst. 1791, and Dortm. 1797], Krug [Viteb. 1791], Kirsten [Amstadt, 1816], Cramer [Havn. 1792], Carus [Lips. 1793], Detharding [Gott. 1782]; in German, by Zacharii [Butz. and Wism. 1762], Eckermann, in his *Theol. Beitr.* 2, 3, 169 sq.; Hauff [Bresl. 1791], Senff [Halle, 1792], Vogel, in his *Aufsätze*, 2, 1 sq.; Flatt, in his *Verm. Versuche*, p. 71 sq.; Gess [Stuttg. 1797], Nachtigal, in Henke's *Mug.* 5, 109 sq.; Hartmann, in his *Blicke* [Dusseld. 1802], p. 1 sq.; Jahn, in his *Nacktraige*, p. 15 sq.; Crell, in Zobel's *Mag.* 1, 2, p. 199-252; Eichhorn, *Allg. Bibl.* 2, 947 sq.; comp. Henke's *Mag.* 2, 2, 638 sq.; also the *Journ. f. Pred.* 42, 129 sq.; 44, 1 sq.; and, generally, Davidson's *Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 199 sq., 334 sq., 487 sq.) It is now applied,

1. To explain the application of certain passages of the Old Testament to events in the New to which they have no apparent historical or typical reference. Citations of this description are apparently very frequent throughout the whole New Testament, but especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The difficulty of reconciling such *seeming* misapplications, or defections from their original design, has been felt in all ages, although it has been chiefly reserved to recent times to give a solution of the difficulty by the theory of *accommodation*. By this it is meant that the prophecy or citation from the Old Testament was not designed literally to apply to the event in question, but that the New Testament Writer merely adopted it in order to produce a strong impression, by showing a remarkable parallelism between two analogous events which had in themselves no mutual relation. Thus Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Commentary on ^{<3815>}Jeremiah 31:15-17, remarks: "St. Matthew, who is ever fond of accommodation, applied these words to the massacre of the children of Bethlehem; that is, they were suitable to that occasion, and therefore he applied them, but they are not a prediction of that event."

There is a catalogue of more than seventy of these accommodated passages adduced by the Reverend T. H. Home, in support of this theory, in his *Introduction* (2, 317, Am. ed. 1835), but it will suffice for our purpose to select the following specimens:

- ~~<1035>~~ Matthew 13:35, cited from ~~<1980>~~ Psalm 78:2.
~~<1087>~~ Matthew 8:17, cited from ~~<2534>~~ Isaiah 53:4.
~~<1025>~~ Matthew 2:15, cited from ~~<2101>~~ Hosea 11:1.
~~<1027>~~ Matthew 2:17, 18, cited from ~~<2615>~~ Jeremiah 31:15.
~~<1083>~~ Matthew 3:3 cited from ~~<2403>~~ Isaiah 40:3.

It will be necessary, for the complete elucidation of the subject, to bear in mind the distinction not only between accommodated passages and such as must be properly explained (as those which are absolutely adduced as proofs), but also between such passages and those which are merely borrowed, and applied by the sacred writers, sometimes in a higher sense than they were used by the original authors. Passages which do not strictly and literally predict future events, but which can be applied to an event recorded in the New Testament by an accidental parity of circumstances, can alone be thus designated. Such accommodated passages therefore, if they exist, can only be considered as descriptive, and not predictive.

The accommodation theory in exegesis has been equally combated by two classes of opponents. Those of the more ancient school consider such mode of application of the Old Testament passages not only as totally irreconcilable with the plain grammatical construction and obvious meaning of the controverted passages which are said to be so applied, but as an unjustifiable artifice, altogether unworthy of a divine teacher. The other class of expositors, who are to be found chiefly among the most modern of the German Rationalists (see Rose's *Protestantism in Germany*, p. 75), maintain that the sacred writers, having been themselves trained in this erroneous mode of teaching, had mistakenly, but *bona fide*, interpreted the passages which they had cited from the Old Testament in a sense altogether different from their historical meaning, and thus applied them to the history of the Christian dispensation. Some of these have maintained that the accommodation theory was a mere shift resorted to by commentators who could not otherwise explain the application of Old Testament prophecies in the New consistently with the inspiration of the sacred writers. *SEE CONDESCENSION*.

2. The word is also used to designate a certain rationalistic theory, viz., that Christ fell in with the popular prejudices and errors of his time; and so *accommodated* himself to the mental condition of the Jews. The Gnostics seem to have first originated this theory. They asserted that Christ's doctrine could not be fully known from Scripture alone, because the

writers of the New Testament *condescended* to the stage of culture existing at the time (Irenaeus, *Adv. Hoer.* 3, 5). The theory derives all its plausibility from confounding two things essentially different, viz., condescension to *ignorance* and accommodation to *error*. The former was indeed employed by the great Teacher (e.g. in his use of parables); the latter would have been utterly unworthy of him. In this last sense, the theory is one of the most pernicious outgrowths of German rationalism. See Home, *Introd.* 1, 317, 324; and for the rationalistic view, Seiler, *Bib. Herm.* 418; Planck, *Introd.* 145; Neander, *Life of Christ*, 113,114.

Ac'cos

(Ἀκκός, prob. for Heb. *Koz*, i.e. *Accoz*, //Qh_i Vulg. *Jacob*), the father of John, and grandfather of the Eupolemus who was one of the ambassadors of Judas Maccabaeus to Rome (1 Maccabees 8:17).

Ac'coz

(Ἀκβός v. r. Ἀκκός, for Heb. *Koz*, with the art. //Qh_i *hak-Kots'*), one of the priests whose descendants returned from the captivity, having lost their pedigree (1 Esdras 5:38); evidently the same with *Koz* (q.v.) of the parallel text (⁴¹⁰³Ezra 2:61).

Accubation

Picture for Accubation 1

the posture of reclining (ἀνάκειμαι, ἀνακλίνω, “sit at meat,” “sit down”) on couches at table, which prevailed among the Jews in and before the time of Christ; a custom apparently derived from Persian luxury, but usual among the Romans likewise. The dinner-bed, or *triclinium*, stood in the middle of the dining-room (itself hence called “triclinium” also), clear of the walls, and formed three sides of a square which enclosed the table. The open end of the square, with the central hollow, allowed the servants to attend and serve the table. In all the existing representations of the dinner-bed it is shown to have been higher than the enclosed table. Among the Romans the usual number of guests on each couch was three, making nine for the three couches — equal to the number of the Muses; but sometimes there were four to each couch. The Greeks went beyond this number (Cic. *In Pis.* 27); the Jews appear to have had no particular fancy in the matter, and we know that at our Lord's last supper *thirteen* persons

were present. As each guest leaned, during the greater part of the entertainment, on his left elbow, so as to leave the right arm at liberty, and as two or more lay on the same couch, the head of one man was near the breast of the man who lay behind him, and he was, therefore, said “to lie in the bosom” of the other. This phrase was in use among the Jews (^{<B162>}Luke 16:22, 23; ^{<B018>}John 1:18; 13:23), and occurs in such a manner as to show that to lie next below, or “in the bosom” of the master of the feast, was considered the most favored place; and is shown by the citations of Kypke and Wetstein (on ^{<B123>}John 13:23) to have been usually assigned to near and dear connections. So it was “the disciple whom Jesus loved” who “reclined upon his breast” at the last supper. *SEE LORD’S SUPPER*. Lightfoot and others suppose that as, on that occasion, John lay next below Christ, so Peter, who was also highly favored, lay next above him. This conclusion is founded chiefly on the fact of Peter beckoning to John that he should ask Jesus who was the traitor. But this seems rather to prove the contrary — that Peter was not near enough to speak to Jesus himself. If he had been there, Christ must have lain near *his* bosom, and he would have been in the best position for whispering to his master, and in the worst for beckoning to John. The circumstance that Christ was able to reach the sop to Judas when he had dipped it, seems to us rather to intimate that *he* was the one who filled that place. The morsel of favor was likely to be given to one in a favored place; and Judas, the treasurer and almoner of the whole party, might be expected to fill that place. This also aggravates by contrast the turpitude and treachery of his conduct. *SEE BANQUET*. The frame of the dinner-bed was laid with mattresses variously stuffed, and, latterly, was furnished with rich coverings and hangings. Each person was usually provided with a cushion or bolster on which to support the upper part of his person in a somewhat raised position, as the left arm alone could not long without weariness sustain the weight. The lower part of the body being extended diagonally on the bed, with the feet outward, it is at once perceived how easy it was for “the woman that was a sinner” to come behind between the dinner-bed and the wall and anoint the feet of Jesus (^{<B07>}Matthew 26:7; ^{<B14B>}Mark 14:3). The dinner-beds were so various at different times, in different places, and under different circumstances, that no one description can apply to them all (see *Critica Biblica*, 2, 481). Even among the Romans they were at first (after the Punic war) of rude form and materials, and covered with mattresses stuffed with rushes or straw; mattresses of hair and wool were introduced at a later period. At first the wooden frames were small, low, and *round*; and it was not until the time of

Augustus that square and ornamental couches came into fashion. In the time of Tiberius the most splendid sort were veneered with costly woods or tortoise-shell, and were covered with valuable embroideries, the richest of which came from Babylon, and cost large sums (Soc. Useful Knowl. *Pompeii*, 2, 88). The Jews perhaps had all these varieties, though it is not likely that the usage was ever carried to such a pitch of luxury as among the Romans; and it is probable that the mass of the people fed in the ancient manner seated on stools or on the ground. It appears that couches were often so low that the feet rested on the ground; and that cushions or bolsters were in general use. It would also seem, from the mention of two and of three couches, that the arrangement was more usually square than semicircular or round (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in ^{<BIBES>}John 13:23). **SEE DIVAN.**

Picture for Accubation 2

It is utterly improbable that the Jews derived this custom from the Romans, as is constantly alleged. They certainly knew it as existing among the Persians long before it had been adopted by the Romans themselves (^{<TOMES>}Esther 1:6; 7:8); and the presumption is that they adopted it while subject to that people. The Greeks also had the usage (from the Persians) before the Romans; and with the Greeks of Syria the Jews had very much intercourse. Besides, the Romans adopted the custom from the Carthaginians (Val. Max. 12, 1, 2; Liv. 28, 28); and that *they* had it, implies that it previously existed in Phoenicia, in the neighborhood of the Jews. It is also unlikely that, in so short a time, it should have become usual and even (as the Talmud asserts, see Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 447) obligatory to eat the Passover in that posture of indulgent repose, and in no other (Gizring, *Accubit. ad Pasch.* Vit. 1735). The literature of this subject has been brought together by Stuckius (*Antiq. Convivialium*, 2, 34); and the works on Pompeii and Herculaneum (see Cockburn's *Pompeii Illustrated*, 2, 5) supply the more recent information. (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Coena, Deipnon, Triclinium.) **SEE EATING.**

Accursed

(in general designated by some form of ללִי; *kalal'*, Gr. καταράομαι, to "curse"), a term used in two senses. **SEE OATH.**

1. *Anathema* ($\mu\rho\eta$ *ēche' rem*, ἀνάθεμα), a vow (^{<0210>}Numbers 21:2), by which persons or things were devoted to Jehovah, whose property they became irrevocably and never to be redeemed (sacer, sacrum esto Jehovae; comp. Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 6, 17; Tacit. *Annal.* 13, 57; Leviticus 3, 55; Diod. Sic. 11, 3; see Mayer, *De Nomin. Piacularibus*, in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 23). Persons thus offered were doomed to death (^{<0272>}Leviticus 27:29; see ^{<0113>}Judges 11:31 sq.; ^{<0144>}1 Samuel 14:44). Cattle, land, and other property were appropriated for the use of the temple, i.e. of the caste of the priests (^{<0273>}Leviticus 27:28; ^{<0184>}Numbers 18:14; ^{<0342>}Ezekiel 24:29). Originally such vows were spontaneous on the part of the Israelites (see ^{<0210>}Numbers 21:2; ^{<0124>}1 Samuel 14:24 [in this latter case, all the individual warriors of an army were bound by the vow made by the leader]); but occasionally the anathema, losing its votive character, assumed that of a theocratic punishment (see ^{<0508>}Ezra 10:8), in consequence of the prescriptions of the law, as, for example, in the case of the anathema (capital sentence) pronounced against an idolatrous Israelite (^{<0221>}Exodus 22:20), or against a whole idolatrous city (^{<0131>}Deuteronomy 13:10 sq.), which was ordered to be destroyed utterly by fire with all that was therein, and the inhabitants and all their cattle to be put to the sword (see ^{<0248>}Judges 20:48; 21:10, 19; comp. Appian. *Pun.* 133; *Mithrid.* 45; Liv. 10, 29; see Miller, *Devotiones veterum in bellis*, Lips. 1730). Essentially identical with this was the anathema against the Canaanitish cities, to be executed by the Israelites when they should enter the land (^{<0234>}Deuteronomy 2:34 sq.; 3:6; ^{<0167>}Joshua 6:17 sq.; 10:28, 35, 37, 40; 11:11), [in consequence of a vow (^{<0210>}Numbers 21:2 sq.), or upon the express command of Jehovah (^{<0162>}Deuteronomy 7:2; 20:16 sq.; see ^{<0153>}1 Samuel 15:3)], in order that they should be secured against all manner of temptation to enter into nearer relations with the idolatrous natives (^{<0168>}Deuteronomy 20:18; see ^{<0232>}Exodus 23:32 sq.). Such city, therefore, was burned with all things therein, and the inhabitants and their cattle were killed, while all metals and metallic utensils were delivered up to the sanctuary (^{<0162>}Joshua 6:21, 24). At times (when the wants of the army made it desirable?) the cattle was spared, and, like other spoils, divided among the warriors (^{<0183>}Joshua 8:26 sq.; ^{<0134>}Deuteronomy 2:34 sq.; 3:6 sq.). Finally, in some cities merely the living things were destroyed (^{<0163>}Joshua 10:28, 30, 32, 37, 39, 40), but the cities themselves were spared. Those who were guilty of any sort of violation of the laws of the anathema were put to death (^{<0171>}Joshua 7:11 sq.; see ^{<0168>}Joshua 6:18; ^{<0137>}Deuteronomy 13:17; Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 6, 17). In the anathema pronounced by a zealous enforcer of the law (^{<0508>}Ezra 10:8) against the

property of such Jews as had married foreign wives and refused to divorce them, the banishment of such persons themselves was comprehended. It does not appear, however, whether their property was destroyed or (as H. Michaelis understood) given to the priests: the latter case would be inconsistent with a strict interpretation of ^{<61316>}Deuteronomy 13:16. *SEE ANATHEMA.*

2. Different from this is the *Ban* of the later Jews, mentioned in the New Testament as a sort of ecclesiastical punishment (for heresy), ^{<4162>}Luke 6:22 (ἀφορίζειν); ^{<4162>}John 9:22; 12:42; 16:2 (ἀποσυνάγωγον γίνεσθαι or ποιεῖν), viz., the exclusion of a Jew from the congregation, and all familiar intercourse with others, by a resolution. “Excommunicated” (*hrWnm*] *menudeh*’) and “excommunication” (*yWḌnæn*] *niddu*’y) are also frequent terms in the Mishna (*Taanith*, 3, 8; *Moed Katon*, 3, 1). Stones were thrown (a mark of dishonor) over the graves of those who died in excommunication (*Eduyoth*, v. 6). The excommunicated person was not permitted to enter the Temple by the common door with others, but was admitted by a separate one (*Middoth*, 2, 2). He was also prohibited from shaving during the time of his excommunication (*Moed. Kat.* 3, 1; see Selden, *Jus Nat. et Gent.* 4, 8 sq.). There is mention in the Gemara, as well as in other rabbinical writings, of another sort of excommunication, *prte che’rem* (the person thus excommunicated was called *prtWm*, *mucharaam*’), more severe than the *yWḌnæn*] *niddu*’y. The difference between the two — according to Maimonides — was,

- (1.) that the *nidduy* was valid only for the thirty days following its date, and was pronounced without accursing; but the *cherem* was always connected with a curse:
- (2.) that *cherem* could be pronounced only by several, at least ten, members of the congregation; but the *nidduy* even by a single Israelite (e.g. by a rabbi):
- (3.) that the *mucharam* was excluded from all intercourse with others; but it was permitted to converse with the *menudeh* at a distance of four cubits, and his household was not subjected even to this restriction.

According to the Gemara, the latter was compelled to wear a mourning dress, in order to be distinguished outwardly from others. Elias Levita (in *Tisbi*, under *ywdyn*) and later rabbis speak of a third and still higher degree

of excommunication, **אֲתַמְוִי** *shammata*, *excretion* (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 2463 sq.), by which an obdurate sinner was delivered up to all sorts of perdition. It does not appear, however, that older Talmudists used this word in a sense different from *nidduy*, [the formula declaration is quoted by Maimonides in the case of the latter, however, is **אֲתַמְוִיבַּ** **הַיְהִיָּאֵי**, *let him be in "shammata,"*] (see Selden, *De Synedr.* 1, 7, p. 64 sq; Ugolino, in Pfeiffer's *Antiqu. Ebr.* 4; *Thesaur.* p. 1294); or perhaps it was the generic term for excommunication (see Danz, in Meuschen, *N.T. Talmn.* p. 615 sq.), and the hypothesis of Elias seems, in fine, to have been founded upon a whimsical etymology of the word *shammata* (q. d. **מִוּ**; *there*, and **אֲתַמְוִי**, *the death*). But it may even be questioned whether *nidduy* and *cherem* were distinguished from each other in the age of Jesus, or in the first centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem, in the sense asserted by Maimonides. In general, it is not improbable that there were even then degrees of excommunication. The formal exclusion from the Hebrew congregation and nationality is mentioned already by ^{<508>}Ezra 10:8 (see above). In the passages of John foregoing a minor excommunication is spoken of; while in that of Luke, without doubt, a total exclusion is understood; even if we take merely the **ἀφορίζειν** in this sense, or (with Lucke, *Commentar zum Ev. Joh.* 2, 387) we suppose that there is a gradation in the passage, so that **ἀφορίζ.** refers to **γῶδναῶνειδίξ. καὶ ἐκβάλλ.** to **μῆρj** ^eMany were of the opinion that the highest degree of excommunication, **אֲתַמְוִי** according to the classification of Elias Levita, is to be found in the formula **παραδιδόναι τῷ Σατανᾷ** (^{<418>}1 Corinthians 5:5; ^{<502>}1 Timothy 1:20). But there is no firm historical ground for such explanation, and the above expression should be explained rather from the usual idiomatic language of the apostle Paul, according to which it cannot mean, surely, a mere excommunication, as has been satisfactorily proved by Flatt (*Vorles. ib. d. Br. an die Kor.* 1, 102 sq.), and concurred in by later commentators. **SEE DEVIL.** Finally, it is not less improbable that, in ^{<508>}Romans 9:3, **ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ** should refer to the Jewish excommunication (as was asserted of late by Tholuck and Ruckert; see Fritzsche, in loc.). **SEE EXECUTION.** (For the Jewish excommunication in general, see Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 554 sq.; Witsii *Miscell.* 2, p. 47 sq.; Vitringa, *De synag. vet.* p. 739 sqq.; Pfeiffer, *Antiqu. Ebr.* c. 22; Bindrim, *De gradib. excommunicat. ap. Hebr.* in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 26; Otho, *Lexic.*

Rabb. p. 212 sq.; Beer, in the *Hall. Encyklop.* 16, 278 sq.; [the last very uncritical.] *SEE EXCOMMUNICATION.*

Accuser

(^{וַי} ; *lashan'*, in Hiph. “accuse,” ^{אָרַם} Proverbs 30:10; and other terms signifying to *slander*; more properly denoted by some form of the verb *byræib*, to *plead* a cause, also in defense; Sept. and N.T. ἀντίδικος, “adversary,” or κατήγορος, *prosecutor*).

1. The original word, which bears this leading signification, means one who has a cause or matter of contention; the accuser, opponent, or plaintiff in any suit (^{אָרַם} Judges 12:2; ^{אָרַם} Matthew 5:25; ^{אָרַם} Luke 12:58). We have little information respecting the manner in which causes were conducted in the Hebrew courts of justice, except from the rabbinical authorities, who, in matters of this description, may be supposed well informed as to the later customs of the nation. *SEE TRIAL.* Even from these we learn little more than that great care was taken that, the accused being deemed innocent until convicted, he and the accuser should appear under equal circumstances before the court, that no prejudicial impression might be created to the disadvantage of the defendant, whose interests, we are told, were so anxiously guarded, that any one was allowed to speak whatever he knew or had to say in his favor, which privilege was withheld from the accuser (Lewis, *Origines Hebraeae*, 1, 68). *SEE ADVOCATE.*

2. The word is also applied in Scripture, in the general sense, to any adversary or enemy (^{אָרַם} Luke 18:3; ^{אָרַם} 1 Peter 5:8). In the latter passage there is an allusion to the old Jewish opinion that Satan was the accuser or calumniator of men before God (^{אָרַם} Job 1:6 sq.; ^{אָרַם} Revelation 12:10 sq.; comp. ^{אָרַם} Zechariah 3:1). In this application the forensic sense was still retained, Satan being represented as laying to man’s charge a breach of the law, as in a court of justice, and demanding his punishment. *SEE SATAN.*

Ace.

SEE ACCHO.

Acel’dama

(Ἀκελδαμά, from the Syro-Chaldaic *amD]l qeDj*, *chakal’ dema’*, *field of the blood*, as it is explained in the text, ἄγρὸς αἵματος, see *Critica*

Biblica, 2, 447), the field purchased with the money for which Judas betrayed Christ, and which was appropriated as a place of burial for strangers — that is, such of the numerous visitors at Jerusalem as might die during their stay, while attending the festivals (~~417B~~ Matthew 27:8; ~~401B~~ Acts 1:19; the slight discrepancy between these passages has been unduly magnified by Alford, *Comment.* in loc. post.; see Olshausen.; *Comment.* 3, 61, Am. ed.). It was previously “a potter’s field.” The field now shown as Aceldama lies on the slope of the hills beyond the valley of Hinnom, south of Mount Zion. This is obviously the spot which Jerome points out (*Onomast.* s.v. Acheldamach) as lying on the south (Eusebius, *on the north*) of Zion, and which has since been mentioned (although with some variation) by almost every one who has described Jerusalem. Sandys describes it (*Relation of a Journey*, p. 187), and relates the common story that the Empress Helena caused 270 ship-loads of its flesh-consuming mold to be taken to Rome, to form the soil of the Campo Santo, to which the same virtue is ascribed. Castela affirms that great quantities of the wondrous mold were removed by divers Christian princes in the time of the Crusades, and to this source assigns the similar sarcophagic properties claimed not only by the Campo Santo at Rome, but by the cemetery of St. Innocents at Paris, by the cemetery at Naples (*Le Sainct Voyage de Hierusalem*, 1603, p. 150; also Roger, p. 160), and by that of the Campo Santo at Pisa. This plot seems to have been early set apart by the Latins, as well as by the Crusaders, for a place of burial for pilgrims (Jac. de Vitriaco, p. 64). The charnel-house is mentioned by Maundeville (*Travels*, 1822, p. 175, Bohn’s ed.) as belonging to the Knights Hospitallers. Sandys shows that, early in the seventeenth century, it was in the possession of the Armenians. Roger (*La Terre Saincte*, p. 161) states that they bought it for the burial of their own pilgrims, and ascribes the erection of the charnel-house to them. They still possessed it in the time of Maundrell, or, rather, rented it, at a sequin a day, from the Turks. Corpses were still deposited there; and the traveler observes that they were in various stages of decay, from which he conjectures that the grave did not make that quick dispatch with the bodies committed to it which had been reported. “The earth, hereabouts,” he observes, “is of a chalky substance; the plot of ground was not above thirty yards long by fifteen wide; and a moiety of it was occupied by the charnel-house, which was twelve yards high” (*Journey*, p. 136). Richardson (*Travels*, p. 567) affirms that bodies were thrown in as late as 1818; but Dr. Robinson alleges that it has the appearance of having been for a much longer time abandoned: “The field or plat is not now marked by

any boundary to distinguish it from the rest of the hill-side; and the former charnel-house, now a ruin, is all that remains to point out the site An opening at each end enabled us to look in; but the bottom was empty and dry, excepting a few bones much decayed” (*Biblical Researches*, 1, 524; comp. Wilde’s *Shores of the Mediterranean*, 1844; Barclay’s *City of the Great King*, p. 207). Its modern name is *Hak ed-damm*. It is separated by no enclosure; a few venerable olive-trees (see Salzmann’s photograph, “*Champ du sang*”) occupy part of it, and the rest is covered by the “charnel-house,” a ruined square edifice — half built, half excavated — perhaps originally a church (Pauli, *Cod. Diplom.* 1, 23), but which the latest conjectures (Schultz, Williams, and Barclay) propose to identify with the tomb of Ananus (Joseph. *War*, 5, 12, 2). It is said (Kraft, *Topogr.* p. 193) to contain the graves of several German pilgrims; but the intimation (Ritter, *Erdk.* 15, 463) that a pottery still exists near this spot does not seem to be borne out by other testimony. (See, on the subject generally, Schlegel, *De agro Sanguinis*, Hamb. 1705; Worger, *Hakeldama*, in Meneltici *Thesaur.* p. 222.) **SEE POTTER’S FIELD.**

Acephali

(ἄ and κεφαλή), literally, those who have no chief. The term is applied to various classes of persons (see Biedermann, *De Acephalis*, Freiberg, 1751).

- 1.** To those at the Council of Ephesus who refused to follow either St. Cyril or John of Antioch.
- 2.** To certain heretics in the fifth century who denied, with Eutyches, the distinction of natures in Jesus Christ, and rejected the Council of Chalcedon. About the year 482 the Emperor Zeno endeavored to extinguish these religious dissensions by the publication of an edict of union, called *Henoticon*. The more moderate of both parties subscribed the decree, but the object was generally unsuccessful. The Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria was among those who signed the decree; which so greatly displeased many of his party that they separated from him, and were denominated *Acephali*, that is, without a head. **SEE MONOPHYSITES** and **SEE HENOTICON**. These *Acephali* were condemned in the synod of Constantinople, 536.
- 3.** To bishops exempt from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of their patriarch.

4. To the Flagellants (q.v.).

Acesius

a Novatian bishop, present at Nicaea, in 325, who agreed with the decisions of the council concerning the time for celebrating Easter, and the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son, but nevertheless refused to communicate with the other bishops. When the emperor asked of him his reason for so doing, he replied (according to the heresy of Novatian) that he could not communicate with those who had fallen after baptism. “Then, Acesius,” answered Constantine, “set up a ladder for yourself, and mount up to heaven alone.” — Soc. *Eccl. Hist.* lib. 1, cap. 10; Soz. *Eccl. Hist.* lib. 1, cap. 22.

Achabara

(*Ἀχάβαρα*), a name designating a certain rock (*Ἀχαβάρων πέτρα*) mentioned by Josephus (*War*, 2, 20, 6) as one of the spots in Upper Galilee fortified by him on the approach of the Romans under Cestius; probably the same place with the *Chabare* (*Χαβάρη*, prob. by erroneously annexing the initial *a* to the preceding word, see Reland, *Palest.* p. 705, a suggestion followed by Hudson and Havercamp, who write *Ἀχαβάρη*), mentioned likewise by Josephus (*Life*, 37) as a place of naturally great strength. Reland (*ib.* p. 542) thinks it is identical with a place called *Akbara* (*arBkI*) by Hottinger, situated between Tiberias and Zephath (Sepphoris?), and perhaps also the residence of the *Akbarites* (*UræBkI ynB*) mentioned in the Gemara (*Baba Metsia*, 84, 2). But the place named by Hottinger would be in *Lower* Galilee. The cliff in question (associated in both passages of Josephus with Jamnia, or Jamnith, and Meroth) appears to have been some eminence of Middle Galilee; probably (as suggested by Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 188) the *Tell Akhbarah* (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 281), about two miles south-east of Safed, having a fine spring (Ritter, *Erchk.* 16, 687, 771).

A'chad

(Heb. *Achad'*, *dj ħj* the “constr.” of *dj a*, *one*, v. r. *Achath'*, *tj ħj* id.), thought by some to be the name of a heathen deity mentioned in the difficult phrase, ²³⁶⁷Isaiah 66:17, *ËyTBidtaïdtaï* *after one* (of them) *in the midst*, Sept. *καὶ ἐν τοῖς προθύροις*, Vulg. *post januam intrinsecus*,

Auth. Vers. “behind one (tree) in the midst.” According to Gesenius (*Commentar*, in loc.) the phraseology is susceptible of three interpretations: (a) “One after another in the midst;” (b) “After Achad in the midst;” (c) “After one (of their number) [i.e. a priest leading the idolatrous rites] in the midst,” a rendering which he prefers (comp. Rosenmüller, *Scholia* in loc.). In favor of the allusion to a heathen deity is only the slender analogy with the name *Adad*, as a Syrian divinity. **SEE HADAD**. (See Mill, *De Idolo rj a*, in his *Dissert. Select.* Lugd. Bat. 1743, p. 137-166; Doderlein, *Philol. Abhandl. v. d. Gott Achad*, in his *Vere. Abhandl.* Halle, 1755, pt. 3). **SEE IDOLATRY**.

Achai' a

(Ἀχαΐα, derivation uncertain), a region of Greece, which in the restricted sense occupied the north-western portion of the Peloponnesus, including Corinth and its isthmus (Strabo, 7, p. 438 sq.). By the poets it was often put for the whole of Greece, whence Ἀχαιοί, *Acheans*, i.e. *Greeks*. The cities of the narrow slip of country, originally called Achaia, were confederated in an ancient league, which was renewed in B.C. 280 for the purpose of resisting the Macedonians. This league subsequently included several of the other Grecian states, and became the most powerful political body in Greece; and hence it was natural for the Romans to apply the name of Achaia to the Peloponnesus and the south of Greece when they took Corinth and destroyed the league in B. C. 146 (Pausan. 7:16, 10). Under the Romans Greece was divided into two provinces, Macedonia and Achaia, the former of which included Macedonia proper, with Illyricum, Epirus, and Thessaly; and the latter, all that lay southward of the former (Cellar. 1, p. 1170, 1022). It is in this latter acceptance that the name of Achaia is always employed in the New Testament (~~4482~~Acts 18:12, 16; 19:21; ~~4556~~Romans 15:26; 16:25; ~~4616~~1 Corinthians 16:15; ~~4706~~2 Corinthians 1:1; 9:2; 11:10; ~~5007~~1 Thessalonians 1:7, 8). In the division of the provinces by Augustus between the emperor and the senate in B.C. 27, Achaia was made a senatorial province (Strabo, 17, p. 840), and, as such, was governed by *proconsuls* (Dion. Cass. 53, p. 704). In A.D. 16 Tiberius changed the two into one imperial province under *procurators* (Tacit. *Annal.* 1, 76); but Claudius restored them to the senate and to the proconsular form of government (Suet. I *Claud.* 25). Hence the exact and minute propriety with which Luke expresses himself in giving the title of *proconsul* (ἀνθύπατος, “deputy”) to Gallio (q.v.), who was appointed to

the province (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v.) in the time of Claudius (^{<418D>}Acts 18:12). (See generally Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.)

Acha'icus

(*Ἀχαϊκός*, an *Acheaun*), a Christian of Corinth, who, with Fortunatus, was the bearer of Paul's first epistle to the Church there, to whom he kindly commends them as having rendered him personal assistance (^{<416I>}1 Corinthians 16:17, subscription; comp. ver. 15, 16), A.D. 54.

A'chan

(Heb. *Akan'*, אַכָּן; prob. *troubler*; Sept. *Ἀχάν* in ^{<162D>}Joshua 22:20, elsewhere *Ἰαχάπ*), a son of Carmi, called also ACHAR (^{<130I>}1 Chronicles 2:7), in commemoration of his crime and awful doom, as related in Joshua 7 (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.). The city of Jericho, before it was taken, was put under that awful ban, of which there are other instances in the early Scripture history, whereby all the inhabitants (excepting Rahab and her family) were devoted to destruction, all the combustible goods to be consumed by fire, and all the metals to be consecrated to God (see ^{<187I6>}Deuteronomy 7:16, 23-26). This vow of devotement was rigidly observed by all the troops when Jericho was taken, save by one man, Achan, a Judahite, who could not resist the temptation of secreting an ingot of gold, a quantity of silver, and a costly Babylonish garment, which he buried in his tent, deeming that his sin was hid. The Israelites were defeated, with serious loss, in their first attack upon Ai; and as Joshua was well assured that this humiliation was designed as the punishment of a crime which had inculpated the whole people, he took immediate measures to discover the criminal by means of the lot (q.v.). The conscience-stricken offender then confessed his crime to Joshua; and his confession being verified by the production of his ill-gotten treasure, the people hurried away not only Achan, but his tent, his goods, his spoil, his cattle, his children, to the valley (hence afterward called) of Achor (q.v.), near Jericho, where they stoned him, and all that belonged to him; after which the whole was consumed with fire, and a cairn of stones raised over the ashes, B.C. 1618. (See Pyle, *Sermons*, 3, 185; Saurin, *Disc. Hist.* 3, 78; Simeon, *Works*, 2, 574; Buddicom, *Christ. Exodus* 2, 350; Origen, *Opp.* 2, 415). The severity of this act, as regards the *family* of Achan, has provoked some remark (see A. Clarke and Keil, in loc.). Instead of vindicating it, as is generally done, by the allegation that the members of

Achan's family were probably accessories to his crime after the fact, we prefer the supposition that they were included in the doom by one of those stern, vehement impulses of semi-martial vengeance to which the Jewish (like all Oriental) people were exceedingly prone, and which, though extreme (comp. ^{<15246>}Deuteronomy 24:16), was *permitted* (for the terms "all that he hath" did not necessarily prescribe it) as a check to a cupidity that tended so strongly both to mutiny and impiety. *SEE ACCURSED*,

A'char

(Heb. *Akar'*, רכ[; *troubler*; Sept. Ἀχάρ), the son of Carmi, who was punished for violating the anathema respecting Jericho (^{<1300>}1 Chronicles 2:7); elsewhere (^{<16271>}Joshua 22:20) called ACHAN *SEE ACHAN* (q.v.).

Achashdarpnim.

SEE SATRAP.

Achashteranim.

See MULE.

A'chaz

(^{<4009>}Matthew 1:9), elsewhere AHAZ *SEE AHAZ* (q.v.).

Ach'bor

(Heb. *Akbor'*, ר/BK[i] *gnawing*, 1, q. *mouse*; Sept. Ἀχοβώρ, v. r. in Jeremiah and Chron. Ἀχοβώρ), the name of two men.

1. An Idumaeen, father of Baal-hanan, one of the Edomitish kings (^{<1358>}Genesis 36:38; ^{<13049>}1 Chronicles 1:49), B.C. prob. considerably ante 1619.

2. The son of Michaiab, and one of the courtiers whom Josiah sent to Huldah to inquire the course to be pursued respecting the newly-discovered book of the law (^{<1222>}2 Kings 22:12, 14), B.C. 623. In the parallel passage (^{<1480>}2 Chronicles 34:20) he is called ABDON *SEE ABDON*, the son of Micah. His son Elnathan was a courtier of Jehoiakim (^{<2432>}Jeremiah 26:22; 36:12).

Achery, Jean Luc D'

a learned Benedictine, of the congregation of Saint Maur, born at St. Quentin, in Picardy, 1609. At a very early age he entered the order of St. Benedict, and devoted himself to study, and his whole after-life was passed in entire abstraction from the world. He died at the abbey of St. Germain-des-Pres, April 29, 1685. To the labors of this learned writer we owe the publication of many MSS. which, but for him, would probably have still remained buried in the libraries. His principal published works are the following:

1. *S. Barnaboe Epistola Groece et Latine, Hugonis Menardi notis illustrata* (Paris, 1645);
2. *Lanfranci Cantuar. Episcopi Opera*, together with *Chronicon Beccense; B. Helluini et 4 priorum Beccensiuin Abbatum; S. Augustini Anglorum Apostoli vita; duo de Eucharistia Tractatus Hugonis Lincolnensis Epis. et Durandi abbat. Troarnensis, adversus Berengarium* (Paris, 1648, fol.);
3. *Indiculus Asceticorum*, etc. (Paris, 1671, 4to, 2d ed.);
4. *Acta Sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti in seculorum classes distributa*. Although D' Achery made the necessary collections for this work, it was published with notes and observations by Mabillon, after his death, at various periods [**SEE ACTA SANCTORUM**];
5. *Veterum aliquot Scriptorum qui in Gallioe Bibliothecis delituerant, maxime Benedictinorum, Spicilegium*. Published at Paris, at different periods, from 1655 to 1677, by different printers, in 13 vols. 4to. A new and improved edition was published by M. de la Barre, at Paris, in 1723, 3 vols. fol., with this title, *Spicilegium, sive Collectio veterum aliquot Scriptorum qui in Gallice Bibliothecis delituerant, olim editum opera et studio D. Lucae d' Achery, etc., ed. Baluze, Martene, et de la Barre*. This collection contains a vast number of works of different authors, Acts and Canons of Councils, Histories, Chronicles, Lives of Saints, Letters, Poems, and Documents, which had not previously appeared. The obligations of subsequent scholars have been so great to the indefatigable industry of d' Achery, that almost every one who has treated of the antiquities of mediaeval and modern European history has been obliged to acknowledge the debt due to him.

Achiach'arus

(Ἀχιάχαρος, for Heb. [~]/rj ʔy2ʔj a) *brother of the following*, perh. i. q. *posthumous* or *latest*), the son of Anael (or Ananiel), and the uncle of Tobit (Tob. 1:21), as also of Nasbas (Tob. 11:18). He had experienced ingratitude at “the hands of Aman (Tob. 14:10), but became the cup-bearer and vizier of Sarchedon (Tob. 1:22), and befriended Tobit (Tob. 2:10).
SEE MORDECAI.

Achi'as

(Lat. id., for the Gr. text is no longer extant; prob. for *Ahijai*), a person named as son of Phinees (Phinehas), and father of Achitob (Ahitub) in the list of sacerdotal ancestors of Esdras or Ezra (2 [Vulg. 4] Esdras 1:2); but, as the parallel list (^{<1300>}Ezra 7:3) gives no corresponding name, it is either an interpolation or, perhaps, a corruption for the AHIMAAZ *SEE AHIMAAZ* of ^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 6:8, 9.

Achilles Tattius.

SEE TATIUS.

A'chim

(Ἀχείμ, perh. for [~]ykʔe *Jachin* [a contracted form of *Jehoiachim*], which the Sept., in ^{<1347>}1 Chronicles 24:17, Graecizes Ἀχίμ [so the Vatican, but other texts have Γαχείμ]), the son of Sadoc and father of Eleazar, among the paternal ancestors of Christ (^{<1014>}Matthew 1:14), B.C. long ante 40, and post 410.

SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).

A'chior

(Ἀχιώρ, for Heb. *Achier'*, r/ayj a) *brother* [i.e. *full*] *of light*; comp. ^{<1087>}Numbers 34:27, where the Sept. has Ἀχιώρ for *Ahihud*, apparently reading r/hyj a), the name given in the Apocrypha as that of the sheik of the Ammonites, who joined Holofernes with auxiliary troops during his expedition into Egypt, and who, when called upon to account for the opposition made by the inhabitants of Bethulia to that general, did so in a speech recounting the history of the country, and the national abhorrence of foreign idolatry (Judith 5). According to the narrative, this so incensed

the haughty general and his associates that they demanded the life of Achior by exposure to his enemies, who thereupon befriended and preserved him (chap. 6) till he was eventually released on the death of Holofernes, and then embraced Judaism (chap. 14). *SEE JUDITH.*

A'chish

(Heb. *Akish'*, *vykæ* perhaps angry; Sept. *Ἀκίς* v. r. *Ἀγχοῦς*), a name which, as it is found applied to two kings of Gath, was perhaps only a general title of royalty, like "Abimelech" (q.v.), another Philistine kingly name, with which, indeed, it is interchanged in the title of ⁽¹³⁴¹⁾Psalm 34.

1. A Philistine king of Gath, with whom David sought refuge from Saul (⁽⁹²¹⁾1 Samuel 21:10-15). By this act he incurred imminent danger; for he was recognised and spoken of by the officers of the court as one whose glory had been won at the cost of the Philistines. This filled David with such alarm that he feigned himself mad when introduced to the notice of Achish, who, seeing him "scrabbling upon the doors of the gate, and letting his spittle fall down upon his beard," rebuked his people sharply for bringing him to his presence, asking, "Have I need of madmen, that ye have brought this fellow to play the madman in my presence? Shall this fellow come into my house?" B.C. 1061. After this David lost no time in quitting the territories of Gath (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.). This prince is elsewhere called ABIMELECH *SEE ABIMELECH* (⁽¹³⁴¹⁾Psalm 34, title), possibly a corruption for "Achish the king" (*Ēl m, vykæ*). David's conduct on this occasion has been illustrated by the similar proceeding of some other great men, who feigned themselves mad in difficult circumstances — as Ulysses (Cic. *Off.* 3, 26; Hygin. f. 95, *Schol. ad Lycophr.* 818), the astronomer Meton (Ælian, *Hist.* 13, 12), L. Junius Brutus (Liv. 1, 56; Dion. Hal. 4:68), and the Arabian king Bacha (Schultens, *Anth. Vet. Hamasa*, p. 535). See MAD.

The same Philistine king of Gath is probably meant by Achish, the son of Maoch, to whom, some time afterward, when the character and position of David became better known, and when he was at the head of not less than 600 resolute adherents, he again repaired with his troop, and by whom he was received in a truly royal spirit, and treated with a generous confidence (⁽⁹²⁷⁾1 Samuel 27:1-4), of which David took rather more advantage than was creditable to him by making excursions from the city of Ziklag, which had been assigned him, against the neighboring nomades, under pretense of

carrying on depredations upon Judah (^{<0275>}1 Samuel 27:5-12), B.C. 1054. In the final conflict with Saul, although the confidence of Achish remained so strong in David that he proposed to appoint him captain of his body-guard, the courtiers revived the old reminiscences against him with such force that the king was compelled to give him leave of absence — a circumstance that spared David a participation in the fatal battle (^{<0281>}1 Samuel 28:1, 2; 29:2-11), B.C. 1053. *SEE DAVID*.

2. Another king of Gath, the son of Maachah, to whom the two servants of Shimei fled, and thereby occasioned their master the journey which cost him life (^{<1029>}1 Kings 2:39, 40), B.C. cir. 1012.

Ach'itob

(Ἀχιτώβ), the Graecized form (1 Esdras 8:2; 2 Esdras 1:1) of the name of AHITUB *SEE AHITUB* (q.v.).

Achlamah

SEE AMETHYST.

Ach'metha

(Heb. *Achmetha'*, **atmj ħj** ^{<1512>}Ezra 6:2; Sept. **Ἀμαθά**, Vulg. *Ecbatana*), the ECBATANA *SEE ECBATANA* of classical writers (**τὰ Ἐκβάτανα**, 2 Maccabees 9:3; Judith 11:1; Tobit 5:9; Josephus, *Ant.* 10:11, 7; 11:4, 6; also, in Greek authors, **Ἐγβάτανα** and **Ἀγβάτανα**), a city in Media. The derivation of the name is doubtful (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 70); but Major Rawlinson (*Geogr. Journal*, 10, 134) has left little question that the title was applied exclusively to cities having a fortress for the protection of the royal treasures. The ancient orthography of this name is traced by Lassen (*Jud. Biblioth.* 3, 36) in the Sanscrit *acradhana*, i.e. **ἵπποστασία**, *stable*. In Ezra we learn that, in the reign of Darius Hystaspis, the Jews petitioned that search might be made in the king's treasure-house at Babylon for the decree which Cyrus had made in favor of the Jews (^{<1517>}Ezra 5:17). Search was accordingly made in the record-office ("house of the rolls"), where the treasures were kept at Babylon (6, 1); but it appears not to have been found there, as it was eventually discovered "at Achmetha, in the palace of the province of the Medes" (6, 2). Josephus (*Ant.* 10:11, 7; 11:4, 6), while retaining the proper name of Ecbatana, yet (like the Sept., which adds the generic name **πόλις**) employs the word

βάρις to express the Chaldee *atryBāBIRTHA* (“the palace”), which is used as the distinctive epithet of the city (¹⁹¹⁰Ezra 6:2).

In Judith 1:2-4, there is a brief account of Ecbatana, in which we are told that it was founded by Arphaxad (Phraortes), king of the Medes, who made it his capital. It was built of hewn stones, and surrounded by a high and thick wall, furnished with wide gates and strong and lofty towers. Herodotus ascribes its foundation to Dejoces, in obedience to whose commands the Medes erected “that great and strong city, now known under the name of Agbatana, where the walls are built circle within circle, and are so constructed that each inner circle overtops its outer neighbor by the height of the battlements alone. This was effected partly by the nature of the ground — a conical hill — and partly by the building itself. The number of the circles was seven, and within the innermost was the palace of the treasury. The battlements of the first circle were white, of the second black, of the third scarlet, of the fourth blue, of the fifth orange; all these were brilliantly colored with different pigments; but the battlements of the sixth circle were overlaid with silver, and of the seventh with gold. Such were the palace and the surrounding fortification that Dejoces constructed for himself; but he ordered the mass of the Median nation to construct their houses in a circle around the outer wall” (Herodot. 1:98). It is contended by Rawlinson (*Geogr. Jour.* 10, 127) that this story of the seven walls is a fable of Sabaeen origin — the seven colors mentioned being precisely those employed by the Orientals to denote the seven great heavenly bodies, or the seven climates in which they revolve.

This Ecbatana has been usually identified with the present *Hamodan* (see *Journal of Education*, 2, 305), which is still an important town, and the seat of one of the governments into which the Persian kingdom is divided. It is situated in north lat. 34° 53', east long. 40°, at the extremity of a rich and fertile plain, on a gradual ascent, at the base of the Elwund mountains, whose higher summits are covered with perpetual snow. Some remnants of ruined walls of great thickness, and also of towers of sun-dried bricks, afford the only positive evidence of a more ancient city than the present on the same spot. Although still declining, it has a population of about 25,000, and contains excellent and well-supplied bazaars, and numerous khans of rather a superior description — it being the great center where the routes of traffic between Persia, Mesopotamia, and Persia converge and meet. Its own manufactures are chiefly in leather. Many Jews reside here, claiming to be descended from those of the captivity who remained in Media.

Benjamin of Tudela says that in his time the number was 50,000. Rabbi David de Beth Hillel (*Travels*, p. 85-87, Madras, 1832) gives them but 200 families. The latest authority (J. J. Benjamin, *Eight Years in Asia and Africa*, Hanover, 1859, p. 204) reckons them at 500 families. They are mostly in good circumstances, having fine houses and gardens, and are chiefly traders and goldsmiths. They speak the broken Turkish of the country, and have two synagogues. *They* derive the name of the town from "Haman" and "*Mede*," and say that it was given to that foe of Mordecai by King Ahasuerus. In the midst of the city is a tomb, which is in their charge, and which is said to be that of Mordecai and Esther. It is a plain structure of brick, consisting of a small cylindrical tower and a dome (the whole about twenty feet high), with small projections or wings on three sides. An inscription on the wall in bass-relief describes the present tomb as having been built by two devout Jews of Kashan, in A.D. 714. The original structure is said to have been destroyed when Hamadan was sacked by Timour. As Ecbatana was anciently the summer residence of the Persian court, it is probable enough that Mordecai and Esther died and were buried there (see Kinneir's *Persia*, p. 126; Morier's *Second Journey*, p. 264 sq.; Southgate's *Tour*, 2, 102 sq.; Buckingham, *Assyria*, 1, 284 sq.; M'Culloch's *Gazetteer*, s.v. Hamadan).

The door of the tomb is very small, and consists of a single stone of great thickness, turning on its own pivot from one side. On passing through the little portal, the visitor is introduced into a small arched chamber, in which are seen the graves of several rabbis, some of which may contain the bodies of the first re-builders of the tomb, after the destruction of the original one by Timour. A second door, of very confined dimensions, is at the end of this vestibule, by which the entrance is made into a large apartment on hands and knees, and under the concave stand two sarcophagi, made of very dark wood, curiously and richly carved, with a line of Hebrew inscription running round the upper ledge of each. Other inscriptions, in the same language, are cut on the walls, while one of the most ancient, engraved on a white marble slab, is let into the wall itself. This slab is traditionally alleged to have been preserved from the ruins of the edifice destroyed by Timour, with the sarcophagi in the same consecrated spot. This last inscription is as follows: "Mordecai, beloved and honored by a king, was great and good. His garments were as those of a sovereign. Ahasuerus covered him with this rich dress, and also placed a golden chain around his neck. The city of Susa (or Shushan) rejoiced at his honors, and

his high fortune became the glory of the Jews." The inscription which encompasses the sarcophagus of Mordecai is to the following effect: "It is said by David, Preserve me, O God! I am now in thy presence. I have cried at the gate of heaven that thou art my God, and what goodness I have received from thee, O Lord! Those whose bodies are now beneath, in this earth, when animated by thy mercy, were great; and whatever happiness was bestowed upon them in this world came from thee, O God! Their griefs and sufferings were many at the first, but they became happy, because they always called upon thy name in their miseries. Thou liftedst me up, and I became powerful. Thine enemies sought to destroy me in the early times of my life; but the shadow of thy hand was upon me, and covered me as a tent from their wicked purposes. — Mordecai." The following is the inscription carved round the sarcophagus of Esther: "I praise thee, O God, that thou hast created me. I know that my sins merit punishment, yet I hope for mercy at thy hands; for whenever I call upon thee, thou art with me; thy holy presence secures me from all evil. My heart is at ease, and my fear of thee increases. My life became, through thy goodness, at the last, full of peace. O God! do not shut my soul out from thy divine presence. Those whom thou lovest never feel the torments of hell. Lead me, O merciful Father, to the life of life, that I may be filled with the heavenly fruits of Paradise. — Esther" (Ker Porter's *Travels*, 2, 88 sq.). *SEE ESTHER.*

Ecbatana, or Hamadan, is not without other local traditions connected with sacred history. On the mountain Orontes, or Elwund, the body of a son of King Solomon is pretended to be buried, but what son is not mentioned. It is a large square platform, little raised, formed by manual labor out of the native rock, which is ascended by a few rugged steps, and is assuredly no covering of the dead. It is a very ancient piece of workmanship, but how it came to be connected with a son of the Jewish monarch does not appear. The Jewish natives of Hamadan are credulous as to the reputed story, and it is not unlikely that it was originally a mountain altar to the sun, illustrating what we often read in Scripture respecting the idolatrous sacrificial worship in "high places." The natives believe that certain ravines of the mountain produce a plant which can transform all kinds of metal into gold, and also cure every possible disease. They admit that no one had ever found it, but their belief in its existence is nevertheless unshaken. They also have a fabulous legend respecting a stone on the side of this mountain, which reminds the English reader of the celebrated story of Ali Baba and

the Forty Thieves in the *Arabian Nights*. This stone contains an inscription in cabalistic characters, unintelligible to every one who has hitherto looked on it; but it is believed that if any person could read the characters aloud an effect would be produced which will shake the mountain to its center, it being the protecting spell of an immense hidden treasure; and these characters once pronounced, would procure instant admittance from the genii of this subterranean cavern, and the wealth it contains would be laid at the feet of the fortunate invoker of this golden." Sesame!" **SEE ECBATANA.**

History mentions another Ecbatana, in Palestine, at the foot of Mount Carmel, toward Ptolemais, where Cambyses died (Herodot. 3, 64; Pliny 5:19). It is not mentioned by this or any similar name in the Hebrew writings. (See Reland, *Paloest.* p. 745.)

A'chor

(Heb. *Akor'*, ר/ק[; *trouble*; Sept. Ἀχωρ), the name of a valley (qm[e Sept. φάραγξ, κοιλάς, "Εμεκ) not far from Jericho, given in consequence of the trouble occasioned to the Israelites by the sin of Achan (q.v.), who was stoned to death and buried there (^{<1074>}Joshua 7:24, 26). It was known by the same name in the time of Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v.). The prophets more than once allude to it typically in predicting the glorious changes under the Messiah, either on account of its proverbial fertility (^{<2560>}Isaiah 65:10) or by way of contrast with the unfortunate entrance of the Israelites near this pass into Canaan on their first approach (^{<2075>}Hosea 2:15). It was situated on the boundary of Judah and Benjamin, between the stone of Ben-Bonan and Debir, south of Gilgal (^{<657>}Joshua 15:7), and was probably the same now called (see Zimmerman's *Map*) *Wady Dabr*, running into the Dead Sea east of Ain Jehair (Robinson's *Researches*, 2, 254). **SEE TRIBE.** Thomson (*Land and Book*, 2, 185) says vaguely that "it runs up from Gilgal toward Bethel;" but this is inconsistent with the above notices of location (comp. Keil, *Comment. on Joshua* p. 201). **SEE CHERITH.**

Ach'sa

a less correct mode (^{<1049>}1 Chronicles 2:49) of Anglicizing the name ACHSAH **SEE ACHSAH** (q.v.).

Ach'sah

(Heb. *Aksah*’, *hsk[ʃ]* *anklet*; Sept. *Ἀχσά*), the daughter of Caleb (and apparently his only daughter, ^{<1324>}1 Chronicles 2:49, “Achsa”), whose hand her father offered in marriage to him who should lead the attack on the city of Debir, and take it, B.C. 1612. The prize was won by his nephew Othniel; and as the bride was conducted with the usual ceremony to her future home, she alighted from the ass which she rode, and sued her father for an addition of springs of water (as being peculiarly necessary, Stanley, *Palest.* p. 161) to her dower in lands, which were situated in the southern part of Judah *SEE GULLOTH*. It is probable that custom rendered it unusual, or at least ungracious, for a request tendered under such circumstances by a daughter to be refused, and Caleb accordingly bestowed upon her “the upper and the nether springs” (^{<1656>}Joshua 15:16-19; ^{<1000>}Judges 1:9-15).

Ach'shaph

(Heb. *Akshaph*’, *āvbʃaj* *fascination*: Sept. *Ἀχσάφ*) a royal city of the Canaanites, in the northern part of Palestine (^{<1610>}Joshua 11:1) whose king was overthrown by Joshua (^{<1621>}Joshua 12:20). It was situated on the eastern boundary of the tribe of Asher, and is named between Beten and Alammelech (^{<1625>}Joshua 19:25). By some (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 543) it has been regarded as the same as *Achzib*, but this is mentioned separately (^{<1629>}Joshua 19:29). By others (e.g. Hammesveld, 3, 237) it has been assumed to be the same as *Accho* or Acre, and Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 191) thinks it is the modern village *Kefr-Yasif*, five miles north-east of that town; but this region is too far west for the Biblical notices. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. *Ἀκσάφ*) locate it at the foot of Mount Tabor, eight miles from Diocaesarea; but they have evidently confounded it with *Chesulloth* (see Keil’s *Comment.* on ^{<1610>}Joshua 11:1). Dr. Robinson is probably correct in identifying it with the ruined village *Kesaf*, around a large tree, two miles north-east of Kubrikah, a little south of the Litany, and nearly midway between the Mediterranean and the Upper Jordan (new ed. of *Researches*, 3, 55).

Achterfeldt, Johann Heinrich

a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, born 1788, at Wesel; died at Bonn, 1864. He was ordained priest in 1813; and, in 1817, was appointed

professor of theology at the seminary of Braunsberg, from which he was called, in 1826, to the chair of dogmatics at the university of Bonn. He was an intimate friend of Professor Hermes (q.v.), and after the death of the latter published his famous work on Systematic Theology (*Christl.-Katholische Dogmatik*, 1831). Achterfeldt was regarded, with his colleague Braun, as the leader of the Hermesian School (q.v.); and when the system of Hermes was condemned by Rome, and he refused to comply with the demands of Rome, he was suspended from his chair. He wrote *Lehrbuch der Christlich-Kathol. Glaubens- und Sittenlehre* (Braunsberg, 1825); *Katechismus der Christlich-Katholischen Lehre* (Braunsberg, 1826); and was, after 1832, one of the editors of a theological and philosophical quarterly (*Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Katholische Theologie*), the chief organ of the Hermesian School. — Pierer, 1, 88; Vapereau, p. 14.

Achu.

SEE FLAG.

Ach'zib

(Heb. *Akzib'*. **byZkḇ**, *falsehood*; Sept. **Αχζείβ**, but in Mic. **μάταιος** and Vulg. *maendacium*), the name of two places, sometimes Latinized *Aczib*.

1. A town in the plain of Judah, adjoining the Highlands, mentioned between Keilah and Mareshah (^{<0154>}Joshua 15:44). It appears to have proved faithless to the national cause on the Assyrian invasion (^{<3001>}Micah 1:14); hence this passage contains a play on the name: “the houses of Achzib (**byZkḇ**) shall be a lie (**bzkḇ**).” It is probably the same as the CHEZIB *SEE CHEZIB* in Canaan where Shelah was born (^{<0185>}Genesis 38:5), and perhaps also the CHOZEBA *SEE CHOZEBA* where his descendants were finally located (1 Chronicles — 4:22). In the time of Eusebius, *Onomast.* s.v. **Χαοβεΐ**) it was a deserted village near Eleutheropolis toward Adullam. From the associated localities, also, it appears to have been situated not far north-east of the former.

2. A maritime city assigned to the tribe of Asher (^{<0192>}Joshua 19:29), but from which the Israelites were never able to expel the Phoenicians (^{<0193>}Judges 1:31). According to Eusebius (*Onom.* s.v. **Αχζίφ**) it was 9 (according to the *Jerusalem Itinerary* 12) Roman miles north of Accho or Ptolemais. In the Talmud (*Shebiith*, 6, 1; *Challah*, 4, 8) it is called *Kezib*

(byzK], and in later times *Ecdippa* (τὰ Ἐκδιππα, Josephus, *War*, 1, 13, 4; Ptolmy 5:15; Pliny, 5:17), from the Aramaean pronunciation (byDkæ). Josephus also (*Ant.* 5, 1, 22) gives the name as *Arce* or *Actippus* (Ἀρκή. . . ἡ καὶ Ἀκτιπούς). In the vicinity (at the mouth of the Nahr Herdawil, comp. Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, 2, 233) was the *Casale Huberti* of the Crusaders (Ritter, *Erchk.* 16, 782). It was first identified by Maundrell (*Journey*, March 21) in the modern *es-Zib* (comp. *Vit. Salad.* p. 98), on the Mediterranean coast, about ten miles north of Acre (Robinson's *Researches*, 3, Append. p. 133; new ed. 3, 628). It stands on an ascent close by the sea-side, overhanging the ancient Roman road, and is a small place with a few palm-trees rising above the dwellings (Pococke, *East*, 2, 115; Richter, *Wallf.* p. 70; Irby and Mangles, p. 196; Buckingham, *Palest.* 1, 99; Legh, in Machmichael's *Journey*, p. 250; De Saulcy's *Narrative*, 1, 66; comp. Lightfoot, *Opp.* 2, 219; Fuller, *Miscel.* p. 4, 15; Cellarii *Notit.* 2, 481; Reland, *Palest.* p. 544; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 674). It has evident traces of antiquity, but could never have been a large city (Thomson's *Land and Book*, 1, 471).

Ac'ipha

(Ἀκιβά, but most copies Ἀχιφά, for Heb. *Chakupha* אַכִּיפָא), the head of one of the families of Nethinim (ἱερύδουλοι "temple-servants") that returned from the captivity (1 Esdras 5:31); evidently the HAKUPHA *SEE* *HAKUPHA* (q.v.) of the parallel lists (Ezra 2:51; Nehemiah 7:53).

Ac'itho

(Ἀκιθών, v. r. Ἀκιδών, while other copies omit entirely, perh. for Heb. *hak-katon'*, אֶחֱיָהּ *the little*; or [as Fritzsche thinks, *Handb.* in loc.] for *Ahitub*, which some copies of the Gr. with the Syr. and Ital. have), the son of Eliu and father of Raphaim, among the ancestors of Judith (Judith 8:1).

Ackermann, Peter Fourer

a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, born Nov. 17, 1771, at Vienna; died Sept. 9, 1831, at Klosterneuburg. He was ordinary professor of Old-Testament language, literature. and theology at Vienna, and choir master of the monastery or cathedral of Klosterneuburg. He was the author of an *Introductio in libros sacros V. T. usibus academidis accommodata* (Vien. 1825), and an *Archeologia, biblica breviter exposita* (Vienna, 1826), both

of which works are not much more than revised editions of Jahn expurgated, so as to rescue them from the Roman *Index*, into which they had been put by Pius VII. His commentary on the Minor Prophets, *Prophetoe Minores perpetua annotatione illustrati* (Vienna, 1830), has some value, on account of the extracts it gives from older writers of the Roman Catholic Church.

Acoemetae

(ἄκοιμηταί, *watchers*), an order of monks instituted at the beginning of the fifth century by Alexander, a Syrian monk (Burger, *De Acoemetis*, Schneeberg, 1686). They were divided into three classes, who performed divine service in rotation, and so continued, night and day, without intermission. They were condemned by a synod held at Rome in 534 for maintaining that Mary was not the mother of God. — Helyot, *Ordres Relig.* 1, 4 sq.

Acolyth or Acolyte

(ἀκόλουθος, *follower*), the name of an inferior order of clergy or servitors. It is not known in the Greek Church, but appears to be of very ancient establishment in the Latin Church, since mention is made of it in the epistles of Cyprian. Their office in the ancient Church was to light the candles and to pour the wine intended to be consecrated into the proper vessels; to wait upon the bishops and their officers, presenting to them the sacerdotal vestments; and to accompany the bishop everywhere, acting as witnesses of his conduct. At present their duties in the Papal Church are to attend upon the deacon and sub-deacon at the altar, to make ready the wine and water at mass, to carry the thurible, and to light and carry the candles, especially at the chanting of the Gospel. At Rome there are three kinds of Acolyths: the Acolyths of the palace, *palatini*, who wait on the pope; those who serve the churches, *stationarii*, when they are stationed; and *regionarii*, who serve with the deacons in different quarters of the city. The order of Acolytes is the fourth of the *ordines minores*, through which a Romish priest must pass. For a full account of the office and its functions, see Boissonnet, *Dict. des Rites*, 1, 87; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 3, ch. 3.

Acontius or Aconzio, James

a native of Trent, and the intimate friend of Francis Betti, a Roman. They both quitted Italy on account of their religion, having both left the

communion of the Church of Rome. Betti, who left first, waited for Acontius at Basle; this was in the year 1557. Hence they went together to Zurich, where they parted, and Acontius, after visiting Strasburg, journeyed into England, where he was well received by queen Elizabeth, who employed him as an engineer. He was a member of the Dutch congregation in Austin-Friars, but falling under the suspicion of “Anabaptistical and Arian principles,” proceedings were taken against him before Grindal, bishop of London, who sentenced him to be refused the Holy Sacrament, and forbade the Dutch congregations to receive him. He died in 1566, according to Niceron. He inclined toward moderation and principles of tolerance in matters of religion. Arminius styled him “divinum prudentina ac moderationis lumen.” He wrote *De Methodo, hoc est, de recte investigandarum tradendarumque Scientiarum ratione* (8vo, Basle, 1558); *Strategemata Satanae* (8vo, Basle, 1565. Transl. into French, 4to. There is also an English translation of the four first books, London, 1648). — Richard and Giraud, *Bib. Sacr.; New General Biographical Dictionary*, 1, 36; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

Acosta, Gabriel

(afterward URIEL), a Portuguese, of Jewish extraction, born at Oporto, and brought up in the Roman Catholic Church. About the age of twenty-two he began to entertain doubts first as to the doctrine of indulgences, and, finally, as to the truth of Christianity; and being unable to satisfy himself, he returned to the religion of his ancestors, became a Jew, retired from Portugal to Amsterdam, and was circumcised. He soon, however, became disgusted with the Pharisaism of the Jews of Amsterdam, and advocated a doctrine like that of the ancient Sadducees. He wrote in the Portuguese language a treatise entitled “*The Traditions of the Pharisees compared with the written Law*” (Amsterd. 1624), which so exasperated the Jews that they accused him of atheism before the civil tribunals. His book was confiscated, he was imprisoned ten days, and fined 300 guilders. He was also expelled from the Jewish synagogue. After seven years he submitted to a painful penance, and was readmitted, though it does not appear that he really changed his views. He died, according to Fabricius, in 1647, whether by suicide or not is uncertain. He left an autobiography which fell into the hands of Limborch, and was reprinted in 1847 (Uriel Acosta’s *Selbstbiographie*, Lat. u. Deutsch, Leipzig). His life afforded Gutzkow the material for a novel, “*The Sadducees in Amsterdam*” (1834, and for a

drama, "*Uriel Acosta*" (Leips. 1847). — Jellinck, *Ueber Acosta's Leben und Lehre* (Zerbst, 1847).

Acosta

Jose d', a Spanish Jesuit, born about 1539, appointed provincial of the Jesuits in Peru, and died rector of the university of Salamanca, Feb. 15, 1600. He wrote *The Natural and Moral History of the Indies* (Seville, 1590, 4to); a treatise *De Christo Revelato libri novem* (Lugd. 1592, 8vo); *De Promulgatione Evangelii apud Barbaros* (Cologne, 1596, 8vo).

Acra

(Ἄκρα), a Greek word, signifying a *summit* or *citadel*, in which sense its Hebraized form *Chakra* (אֲרָא) also occurs in the Syriac and Chaldaic (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 818). Hence the name of Acra was acquired by the eminence north of the temple at Jerusalem, on which a citadel was built by Antiochus Epiphanes, to command the holy place (1 Maccabees 3:45; 4:2, 41; 6:18, 26, 32; 9:52 sq.; 10:6; 11:41; 2 Maccabees 4:12, 27, etc.). It thus became, in fact, the *Acropolis* of Jerusalem (see Michaelis, in *Macc.* p. 30 sq.; Crome, in the *Hall. Encykl.* 2, 291 sq.). Josephus describes this eminence as semicircular (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 852); and reports that when Simon Maccabaeus had succeeded in expelling the Syrian garrison, he not only demolished the citadel, but caused the hill itself to be levelled, that no neighboring site might thenceforth be higher than or so high as that on which the temple stood. The people had suffered so much from the garrison, that they willingly labored day and night, for three years, in this great work (*Ant.* 13, 6, 6; *War.* 5, 4, 1). At a later period the palace of Helena, queen of Adiabene, stood on the site, which still retained the name of Acra, as did also, probably, the council-house, and the repository of the archives (*War.* 6, 6, 3; see also *Descript. Urbis Ierosolmyoe*, per J. Heydenum, lib. 3, cap. 2).

A good deal of controversy has lately arisen as to the position of this eminence, Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Res.* 1, 414; new ed. 3, 207-211) strongly contending for the sloping eminence now occupied by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and others (especially Williams, *Holy City*, 2, 25, 49) placing Acra more north-wardly from the temple. The latter position, in the middle of the Mohammedan quarter, on the whole, seems best to accord with the present state of the surface and the ancient notes of place (see Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels*, Append. 2, p. 4, 5);

especially with Josephus's statements (*War*, 5, 4, 1) respecting the valley of the Tyropoeon (q.v.). *SEE JERUSALEM*.

A place by the name of *Acra* ("Ἄκρα) is mentioned by Josephus (*War*, 2, 2, 2) as having been taken by Simon Maccabaeus, in connection with Gazara, Joppa, and Jamnia; which some suppose to mean *Ekron* (by a change of reading), while others take the word in the ordinary sense of *tower*. The passage is evidently parallel with 1 Maccabees 14:7, where Simon is said, after having taken Gazara and Bethsura, to have cleansed "the tower" (ἄκρα); which, by a comparison with chap. 13:49, appears to mean no other than the above fortress in Jerusalem. See *BARIS*.

For the *Acra* or Acre (Hebraized *yrqa* by Benjamin of Tudela) of the Crusades, *SEE ACCHO*.

Acrabbatine

(Ἀκραβαττίνη sc. χώρα), the name of two regions in Palestine.

1. A district or toparchy of Judea, extending between Shechem (Nablous) and Jericho eastward, being about 12 miles long (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 192). It is mentioned by Josephus (*War*, 2, 12, 4; 20, 4, 22, 2; 3, 3, 4, 5), and doubtless took its name from a town called *Acrabbi*, mentioned by Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v. Ἀκοαββεΐν; Jerome corruptly "Adorabi," see Clerici ed. Amst. 1707, p. 17, note 5) as a large village 9 Roman miles east of Neapolis, on the road to Jericho; probably the same found by Dr. Robinson under the name *Akrabeh* (*Researches*, 3, 103), and described as a considerable town, finely situated on the slope of a fertile hill, with a mosque (new ed. of *Researches*, 3, 296, 297) and a ruined fort (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, 2, 304-307).

2. Another district of Judaea toward the southern end of the Dead Sea, occupied by the Edomites during the captivity (1 Maccabees 5:3, Auth. Vers. "Arabattine;" comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 12, 8, 1). It is supposed to have taken its name from the *MAALEH-ACRABBIM* *SEE MAALEH-ACRABBIM* (q.v.) of ^{אֲרַבְיָה}Numbers 34:4; ^{אֲרַבְיָה}Joshua 15:3, which lay in this vicinity.

Acrab'bim.

SEE MAALEH-ACRABBIM.

Acre

is put by our translators (^{<2150>}Isaiah 5:10) for **dmx**, *tse' med*, which properly means a *yoke*, i.e. as much land as a yoke of oxen can plough in a day. So the Latin *jugerum*, an acre, from *jugum*, a yoke. **SEE MEASURE**. In ^{<0944>}1 Samuel 14:14, the word “acre” is supplied in our translation after **hn[]ni** a *furrow*, which is omitted (see margin).

Acre

SEE ACCHO.

Acrostic

(from **ἄκρον**, *extremity*, and **στίχος**, *verse*), The word commonly signifies the beginning of a verse; but it is sometimes taken for the end or close of it. It ordinarily signifies an ode in which the initial letters of the verses in their order spell a certain word or sentence. In this form acrostics do not occur in the Bible. There are certain parts of the poetical compositions of the Old Testament, however, in which the successive verses or lines in the original begin with the letters of the Hebrew alphabet; these may be called *alphabetical acrostics*. For instance, in ^{<4300>}Psalms 119, there are as many stanzas or strophes as there are letters in the alphabet, and each strophe consists of eight double lines, all of which, in each case, begin with that letter of the alphabet corresponding to the place of the strophe in the Psalm — that is, the first eight lines begin each with **a**, *Aleph*, the next eight with **b**, *Beth*, and so on. **SEE ABECEDARIAN**. Other Psalms have only one verse to each letter, in its order, as Psalms 25 and 34. In others, again, as Psalms 111 and 112, each verse is divided into two parts, and these *hemistichs* follow the alphabetical arrangement, like the whole verses of the last mentioned Psalms. The Lamentations of Jeremiah are mostly acrostic, some of the chapters repeating each letter one or more times. The last chapter of Proverbs also has the initial letters of its last twenty-two verses in alphabetical order. **SEE POETRY**.

The term acrostic is used in ecclesiastical history to describe a certain mode of performing the psalmody of the ancient Church. A single person, called the precentor, commenced the verse, and the people joined with him at the close. We find also the words *hypopsalma* and *diapsalma*, likewise **ἀκροτελεύτιον** and **ἐφύμνιον**, almost synonymous with acrostic, used to

describe the same practice. They do not always mean the end of a verse, but sometimes what was added at the end of a psalm, or something repeated in the middle of it, e.g. the phrase “*for his mercy endureth forever,*” repeated or chanted by the congregation. The *Gloria Patri* is by some writers called the *epode* or *acroteleutic*, because it was always sung at the end of the psalms (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 1, 14).

Act, Conventicle

SEE CONVENTICLE.

Act, Corporation

SEE CORPORATION.

Act, Five-Mile

SEE FIVE-MILE.

Act of Faith

SEE AUTODAFE.

Act, Test

SEE TEST.

Act, Toleration

SEE TOLERATION.

Acta Marterum

(*Acts of the Martyrs*), the title of the record of the lives and actions of martyrs kept in the ancient Church for the edification of the faithful. Whenever a Christian was apprehended, the accusation, defense, and verdict were noted in these Acts. Some of the martyrs also wrote accounts of their own sufferings, or this was done for them by a regular officer of the Church acting as notary, who took down the facts in a prescribed form; and these reports were also designated as *acta martyrii* or *martyrum*. *SEE CALENDARIA; SEE MARTYROLOGIA; SEE MENEION; SEE MENOLOGIUM.* The oldest are those referring to the death of St. Ignatius (q.v.), Bishop of Antioch (died 107), and of Polycarp (q.v.) (died about 165), both of which are given in Dressel’s and Hefele’s editions of the

Patres Apostolici. The oldest collection of Acts of the Martyrs was compiled by the Church historian Eusebius, in his two works *de Martyribus Paloestinoe* and *Synagoge Martyriorum*. The latter, a martyrology of the Church universal, was lost as early as the end of the sixth century; the former has reached us as an appendix to the eighth book of the author's Church history. A second large collection of 12 volumes was in existence at Constantinople in the ninth century, and probably formed the basis of the work of Simeon Metaphrastes, *de Actis Sanctorum*, in the tenth century. In the Latin Church a catalogue of martyrs, containing the names of martyrs from different countries arranged according to the days on which they were commemorated in the mass, as also the place and the day, but not the details, of their martyrdom, was, at the close of the sixth century, in extensive use. It was, though without good reason, ascribed to Jerome. The particular churches used to add to this general catalogue of martyrs their local calendars, a circumstance which explains the diversity of the different copies of this work still extant (ed. by Fr. Mar. Florentinius, Lucae, 1668 sq.; d'Achery, *Spicileg. ed. Nov.* 2, p. 27, according to a manuscript of the French convent Gellou, written about 804; J. B. Sallerius, *Act. Sanctorum*, June tom. 6, according to copies of Reichenau, St. Ulric's at Augsburg, Corvey, etc.). While this work excludes all historical accounts of the lives of martyrs, giving only their names and the place and day of their martyrdom, there are indications that detailed historical works were also compiled at an early period. A council at Carthage 397 permits the reading of the *Passiones Martyrum* on the days of their commemoration, besides the reading-lessons from the Scriptures. Pope Gelasius, on the contrary, excludes this kind of literature from ecclesiastical use, on the ground that the names of the authors were unknown, and that infidels, heretics, and unlearned persons (*idiotae*) had inserted many superfluous and improper things, a conclusive proof of the untrustworthy condition in which this literature, even at that early time, was found. The heads of the monastic orders were in general very urgent in recommending to their monks the reading of the *Gesta Martyrum*, the history of their sufferings. Besides the two classes of works just named, there was a third class, the so-called *Vitas Patrum*, whose object was more literary than edifying, and some of which belong among the most valuable sources of the early Church history. To this class of works belong the very valuable history of Severin, by his disciple Eugippius, the biographies of Columban, Gallus, etc. Collections of accounts of this kind are extant by Palladius (about 420), in his *Historia Lausiaca* (*Λαυσαϊκόν*); by

Heraclides, in his *Paradisus, s. de Vitis Patrum*; by Johannes Moschus (died about 620), the author of the lives of the monks, under the title *Λειμών, Λειμωνάριον*, or *Νεὸς Παράδεισος*. These works are designated in the Greek Church under the name of *Γεροντικά, Κλίμακες, Λαυσαϊκά*, and *Πατεριακά*. They were followed by Simeon Metaphrastes (q.v.), about 901, of whose biographies of saints we have 122 left, while a much larger number have been erroneously ascribed to him. In the Latin Church we have the 14 hymns of Prudentius (q.v.), entitled *Peristephanon s. de Coronis et Passionibus Martyrum*; the *Collationes Patrum*, by Cassian (q.v.); and several historical works of Gregory of Tours (q.v.), as *de Miraculis, Vita Patrum, de Gloria Martyrum*. The biographical material contained in this class of works was gradually worked into the martyrologies. That known under the name of Beda is mostly restricted to statistical statements; yet a copy of it at the beginning of the ninth century received considerable additions from Florus, a sub-deacon at Lyons. Considerable additions to the martyrologies were also made by Hrabanus Maurus (q.v.); ‘Ado, archbishop of Vienna, about 860; Usuard, a monk at Paris (875); and Notker (died 912). This enlargement of the ancient martyrologies forms the transition to the legends of the Middle Ages, which are generally nothing but ecclesiastical novels, and have no claim whatever to credibility. The “Acts of the Martyrs” had, moreover, gradually been enlarged into “Acts of the Saints,” as other saints than martyrs had been added to the catalogues of the latter. **SEE ACTA SANCTORUM**. The most valued collection is Ruinart’s *Acta Martyrum sincera* (Paris, 1689, fol.; 2d ed. Amst. 1713, fol.; B. Galura, Augsb. 1802, 3 vols. 8vo). It is more critical than most Roman biographies, but nevertheless contains many incredible legends. A large collection was also published by the learned Stephen Evodius Assemani, under the title *Acta Sanctorum Martyrum Orientalium et Occidentalium* (Romae, 1748, 2 vols. fol.). — Herzog, 1:100; Wetzer and Welte, 1:88. **SEE MARTYROLOGY**.

Acta Sanctorum

(*Acts of the Saints*), the title given to collections of the lives of martyrs [**SEE ACTA MARTYRUM**] and of saints in the ancient Church.

1. We first find the title *Acta Sanctorum* in Eusebius (fourth century). In consequence of an edict of Diocletian, of the year 303, which commanded the destruction of all the Christian records, a great gap was created in the

records of the Church, which was afterward filled with legends and traditions, abounding in errors, omissions, and exaggerations. Collections of the *Acta Sanctorum*, principally for edification, were made in the *Vitae Patrum*, probably by Jerome of Dalmatia; by Gregory of Tours in the sixth century; in the *Synaxarium* (q.v.) of the Greek Church, in the eighth century, by John of Damascus; by Simeon Metaphrastes in the tenth century; in the *Golden Legend* of Jacob of Viraggio in the thirteenth, which went through 71 editions from 1474 to 1500; and in the *Catalogus Sanctorum* of Peter de Natalibus (Vicenza, 1493). A more critical treatment is found in the *Sanctuarium* of Boninus Mombritius (Venice, 1474, 2 vols.); in Lipoman, *Vitae Sanctor.* (Rome, 1551-1560, 8 vols.); and particularly in Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum sincera* (Paris, 1689, fol.). **SEE MARTYROLOGY.**

2. The most celebrated collection of the *Acta Sanctorum* is that commenced by Bollandus, and still continued by a society of Jesuits. It is one of the most remarkable works ever produced, whether regarded as to the labor and time spent upon it, or to the comparative worthlessness of its matter. It has been two hundred years in progress, has reached the fifty-fifth folio volume, and is still in progress. This stupendous undertaking originated with Rosweyde, a Jesuit, who announced his intention in a *Fasti Sanctorum quorum vita in Belgicis bibliothecis manuscripte asservantur* (Antwerp, 1607); but he died in 1629, before any part was printed. After his death his materials came into the hands of Johannes Bollandus, who established correspondence with all parts of Europe, in order to obtain information from every possible source. In 1635 he associated with himself Godefridus Henschenius; and these two published at Antwerp in 1643 the first two volumes, in folio, under the title of "*Acta Sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur vel a Catholicis Scriptoribus celebrantur.*" These volumes contain the lives of the saints who are commemorated by the Roman Church in the month of January only. In 1658 three more volumes appeared, embracing February. After this, Daniel Papebrochius was associated as coeditor; but Bollandus himself died, Sept. 12, 1665, before the vol. for March appeared. As the work proceeded, other editors were appointed, and generation after generation sank into the grave during its long progress. It would occupy too much time and space to enumerate the separate labor of each. The work itself was published in the following order: January, 2 vols. 1643; February, 3 vols. 1658; March, 3 vols. 1668; April, 3 vols. 1675; May (with a Propylaeum), 8 vols. 1685-1688; June, 6

vols. 1695-1715; July, 7 vols. 1719-1731; August, 6 vols. 1733-1743; September, 8 vols. 1746-1762; October, vol. 1:1765; 2:1768; 3:1770; 4:1780; 5:1786; 6:1794: this volume ended at the 15th of October (see Walch, *Bibl. Theol.* 3, 657 sq.). The work was stopped by the suppression of the Jesuits, and it appeared to be altogether extinguished by the French Revolution; but in 1838 it revived, and there was printed at Namur a prospectus, *De prosecutione operis Bollandiani quod ACTA SANCTORUM* *SEE ACTA SANCTORUM* *inscribitur*. In 1845 appeared vol. 7 of October, in two parts — the first containing the saints of the 15th of October; the second the saints of the 16th. New editions of the first 4 volumes of October appeared in 1859 and 1860. The work is still in progress, and the Jesuits receive for its continuation an annual stipend from the Belgian government. Some idea of its vast extent may be gathered from the fact that the lives of more than 2000 saints remain, and that 50 more vols. fol. may be expected to complete the work.

The editors are as follow, with the number of years and volumes on which they were engaged: Jo. Bollandus (died 1665), 34 years, 8 vols.; Godefr. Henschenius (died 1681), 46 years, 24 vols.; Daniel Papebrochius (died 1714), 55 years, 19 vols.; Conrad Janningus (died 1723), 44 years, 13 vols.; Franc. Baertius (died 1719), 38 years, 10 vols.; Joan. Bapt. Sollerius (died 1740), 38 years, 12 vols.; Joan. Pinius (died 1749), 35 years, 14 vols.; Guil. Cuperus (died 1741), 21 years, 11 vols.; Petrus Boschius (died 1736), 15 years, 7 vols.; Joan. Stillingus (died 1762), 25 years, 11 vols.; Constant. Suyskenus (died 1771), 26 years, 11 vols.; Joan. Perierus (died 1762), 15 years, 7 vols.; Urban. Stickerus (died 1753), 2 years 1 vol.; Joan. Limpenus (retired 1750), 9 years, 3 vols.; Joan. Veldius (retired 1747), 5 years, 2 vols.; Joan. Cleus (retired 1760), 7 years, 3 vols.; Corn. Bueus (died 1801), 33 years, 6 vols.; Jacob. Bueus (died 1808), 32 years, 6 vols.; Joseph Guesquierus (died 1802), 10 years, 4. vols.; Ignat. Hubenus (died 1782), 10 years, 1 vol. The renewal of the work was undertaken in 1838 by Jo. Bapt. Boone, Joseph. Vandermoere, Prosper Coppens, and Joseph. Vanhecke, Jesuits of the college of St. Michael at Brussels. The first 42 vols., coming down to Sept. 14, were reprinted at Venice in 1734 sq.; but in inferior style. A new edition of the entire work has been commenced by Ceirmandet, in 1863. (Paris, tom. 1, p. 821, embracing the first eleven days of January). *SEE SAINTS*.

Action In Speaking

SEE HOMILETICS.

Action Sermon

an old Scottish term for the sermon immediately before the Lord's Supper.

Actippus

SEE ACHZIB.

Acts of The Apostles

(Πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων), the fifth book of the New Testament, and the last of those properly historical. It obtained this title at a very early period, though sometimes the epithet *holy* was prefixed to *apostles*, and sometimes also it was reckoned among the gospels, and called the *Gospel of the Holy Ghost*, or the *Gospel of the Resurrection*. (See; generally, Dr. Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* last ed. 4, 476 sq;)

I. Authorship. — The Acts were evidently written by the same author as the third Gospel (comp. ~~4000~~Luke 1:1-4, with ~~4000~~Acts 1:1), and tradition is firm and constant in ascribing them to Luke (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* lib. 1, c. 31; 3, 14; Clemens Alexandr. *Strom.* 5, p. 588; Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion*, 5, 2; *De Jejun.* c. 10; Origen, apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 6, 23, etc. Eusebius himself ranks this book among the ὁμολογούμενα, *H. E.* 3, 25). The fact that Luke accompanied Paul to Rome (28), and was with him there (~~5044~~Colossians 4:14; Philippians 24), favors the supposition that he was the writer of the narrative of the apostle's journey to that city. See PAUL. The identity of the writer of both books is strongly shown by their great similarity in style and idiom, and the usage of particular words and compound forms. (See Tholuck, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, 3; Klostermann, *Vindiciae Lucanæ*, Gott. 1866.) The only parties in primitive times by whom this book was rejected were certain heretics, such as the Marcionites, the Severians, and the Manichaeans, whose objections were entirely of a dogmatical, not of a historical nature (so those of Baur and his school). At the same time we find Chrysostom complaining that by many in his day it was not so much as known (*Hom.* 1, in *Act.* s. init.). Perhaps, however, there is some rhetorical exaggeration in this statement; or it may be, as *Kuinol* (*Proleg.* in *Acta App. Comment.* 4; 5) suggests, that Chrysostom's complaint refers rather to a prevalent omission of the Acts

from the number of books publicly read in the churches (see Salmerson, *De libri Actorum auctoritate*, in his *Opera*, vol. 12).

II. Source of Materials. — The writer is for the first time introduced into the narrative in ^{<4461>}Acts 16:11, where he speaks of accompanying Paul to Philippi. He then disappears from the narrative until Paul's return to Philippi, more than two years afterward, when it is stated that they left that place in company (^{<4406>}Acts 20:6), from which it may be justly inferred that Luke spent the interval in that town. From this time to the close of the period embraced by his narrative he appears as the companion of the apostle. For the materials, therefore, of all he has recorded from ^{<4461>}Acts 16:11, to ^{<4431>}Acts 28:31, he may be regarded as having drawn upon his own recollection or on that of the apostle. To the latter source also may be confidently traced all he has recorded concerning the earlier events of the apostle's career; and as respects the circumstances recorded in the first twelve chapters of the Acts, and which relate chiefly to the Church at Jerusalem and the labors of the apostle Peter, we may readily suppose that they were so much matter of general notoriety among the Christians with whom Luke associated, that he needed no assistance from any other merely human source in recording them. Some of the German critics (see Zeller, *Die Apostelgesch. nach ihrem Inhalt u. Ursprung kritisch untersucht*, Stuttg. 1854) have labored hard to show that he must have had recourse to written documents, in order to compose those parts of his history which record what did not pass under his own observation, and they have gone the length of supposing the existence of a work in the language of Palestine, under the title of "Acts of Cephas" or his "Preaching" (**αὑκῶν τῶν κῆρυγματῶν τοῦ πέτρου** or **ἡ κήρυξις τοῦ πέτρου**), of which the apocryphal book of the same title (**Πράξεις Πέτρου** or **Κήρυγμα Πέτρου**), mentioned by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 7, p. 736) and Origen (*Comment. in Joh.* p. 298), was an interpolated edition (Heinrichs, *Proleg. in Acta App.* p. 21; Kuinöl, *Proleg.* p. 5). All this, however, is mere ungrounded supposition; and such Hebrew editions, if they at all existed, must have been versions from the Greek (Reland, *Palest.* p. 1038). **SEE PETER.**

III. Design. — A prevalent opinion is, that Luke, having in his Gospel given a history of the life of Christ, intended to follow that up by giving in the Acts a narrative of the establishment and early progress of his religion in the world. That this, however, could not have been his design, is obvious from the very partial and limited view which his narrative gives of the state

of things in the Church generally during the period through which it extends. As little can we regard this book as designed to record the official history of the Apostles Peter and Paul, for we find many particulars concerning both these apostles mentioned incidentally elsewhere, of which Luke takes no notice (comp. ~~4710~~ 2 Corinthians 11; ~~8017~~ Galatians 1:17; 2:11; ~~4053~~ 1 Peter 5:13. See also Michaelis, *Introduction*, 3, 328; Hanlein's *Einleitung*, 3, 150). Heinrichs, Kuinol, and others are of opinion that no particular design should be ascribed to the evangelist in composing this book beyond that of furnishing his friend Theophilus with a pleasing and instructive narrative of such events as had come under his own personal notice, either immediately through the testimony of his senses or through the medium of the reports of others; but such a view savors too much of the lax opinions which these writers unhappily entertained regarding the sacred writers to be adopted by those who regard all the sacred books as designed for the permanent instruction and benefit of the Church universal. Much more deserving of notice is the opinion of Hanlein, with which that of Michaelis substantially accords, that "the general design of the author of this book was, by means of his narratives, to set forth the co-operation of God in the diffusion of Christianity, and along with that, to prove, by remarkable facts, the divinity of the apostles and the perfectly equal right of the Gentiles with the Jews to a participation in the blessings of that religion" (*Einleitung*, 3, 156. Comp. Michaelis, *Introduction*, 3, 380). Perhaps we should come still closer to the truth if we were to say that the design of Luke in writing the Acts was to supply, by select and suitable instances, an illustration of the power and working of that religion which Jesus had died to establish. In his Gospel he had presented to his readers an exhibition of Christianity as embodied in the person, character, and works of its great founder; and having followed him in his narration until he was taken up out of the sight of his disciples into heaven, this second work was written to show how his religion operated when committed to the hands of those by whom it was to be announced "to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (~~2447~~ Luke 24:47). Hence, as justly stated by Baumgarten in his work on the Acts, Jesus, as the already exalted king of Zion, appears, on all suitable occasions, as the ruler and judge of supreme resort; the apostles are but his representatives and instruments of working. It is He who appoints the twelfth witness, that takes the place of the fallen apostle (~~4024~~ Acts 1:24); He who, having received the promise from the Father, sends down the Holy Spirit with power (~~4023~~ Acts 2:33); He who comes near to turn the people from their iniquities and add them to the

membership of his Church (~~Acts~~ Acts 2:47; 3:26); He who works miracles from time to time by the hand of the apostles; who sends Peter to open the door of faith to the Gentiles; who instructs Philip to go and meet the Ethiopian; who arrests Saul in his career of persecution, and makes him a chosen vessel to the Gentiles; in short, who continually appears, presiding over the affairs of his Church, directing his servants in their course, protecting them from the hands of their enemies, and in the midst of much that was adverse, still giving effect to their ministrations, and causing the truth of the gospel to grow and bear fruit. We have therefore in this book, not merely a narrative of facts which fell out at the beginning of the Christian Church, in connection more especially with the apostolic agency of Peter and Paul, but we have, first of all and in all, the ever-present, controlling, administrative agency of the Lord Jesus Christ himself, shedding forth the powers of his risen life, and giving shape and form to his spiritual and everlasting kingdom.

IV. *Time and place of Writing.* — These are still more uncertain. As the history is continued up to the close of the second year of Paul's imprisonment at Rome, it could not have been written before A.D. 56; it was probably, however, composed very soon after, so that we shall not err far if we assign the close of the year 58 as the period of its completion. Still greater uncertainty hangs over the *place* where Luke composed it; but as he accompanied Paul to Rome, perhaps it was at that city and under the auspices of the apostle that it was prepared. Had any considerable alteration in Paul's circumstances taken place before the publication, there can be no reason why it should not have been noticed. And on other accounts also this time was by far the most likely for the publication of the book. The arrival in Rome was an important period in the apostle's life; the quiet which succeeded it seemed to promise no immediate determination of his cause. *SEE THEOPHILUS.*

V. *Style.* — This, like that of Luke's Gospel, is much purer than that of most other books of the New Testament. The Hebraisms which occasionally occur are almost exclusively to be found in the speeches of others which he has reported. These speeches are indeed, for the most part, to be regarded rather as summaries than as full reports of what the speaker uttered; but as these summaries are given in the speaker's own words, the appearance of Hebraisms in them is as easily accounted for as if the addresses had been reported in full. His mode of narrating events is clear,

dignified, and lively; and, as Michaelis observes, he “has well supported the character of each person whom he has introduced as delivering a public harangue, and has very faithfully and happily preserved the manner of speaking which was peculiar to each of his orators” (*Introduction*, 3, 332).
SEE LUKE.

VI. *Contents.* — Commencing with a reference to an account given in a former work of the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ before his ascension, its author proceeds to acquaint us succinctly with the circumstances attending that event, the conduct of the disciples on their return from witnessing it, the outpouring on them of the Holy Spirit according to Christ’s promise to them before his crucifixion, and the amazing success which, as a consequence of this, attended the first announcement by them of the doctrine concerning Jesus as the promised Messiah and the Savior of the world. After following the fates of the mother church at Jerusalem up to the period when the violent persecution of its members by the rulers of the Jews had broken up their society and scattered them, with the exception of the apostles, throughout the whole of the surrounding region, and after introducing to the notice of the reader the case of a remarkable conversion of one of the most zealous persecutors of the Church, who afterward became one of its most devoted and successful advocates, the narrative takes a wider scope and opens to our view the gradual expansion of the Church by the free admission within its pale of persons directly converted from heathenism, and who had not passed through the preliminary stage of Judaism. The first step toward this more liberal and cosmopolitan order of things having been effected by Peter, to whom the honor of laying the foundation of the Christian Church, both within and without the confines of Judaism, seems, in accordance with our Lord’s declaration concerning him (~~Acts~~ Matthew 16:18), to have been reserved, Paul, the recent convert and the destined apostle of the Gentiles, is brought forward as the main actor on the scene. On his course of missionary activity, his successes and his sufferings, the chief interest of the narrative is thenceforward concentrated, until, having followed him to Rome, whither he had been sent as a prisoner to abide his trial, on his own appeal, at the bar of the emperor himself, the book abruptly closes, leaving us to gather further information concerning him and the fortunes of the Church from other sources. *SEE PAUL.*

VII. History. — While, as Lardner and others have very satisfactorily shown (Lardner's *Credibility*, Works, 1; Biscoe, *On the Acts*; Paley's *Horae Paulinae*; Benson's *History of the First Planting of Christianity*, 2, etc.), the *credibility* of the events recorded by Luke is fully authenticated both by internal and external evidence, very great obscurity attaches to the *chronology* of these events (see Davidson's *Introd. to the N.T.*, 2, 112 sq.; Alford's *Greek Test.*, 2, Proleg. p. 23 sq.; Meyer, *Commentar*, 3d ed. pt. 3, s. fin.).

The following is probably the true order of events in the Acts (see *Meth. Quar. Review*, 1856, p. 499 sq.). For further discussion, see Burton, *Attempt to ascertain the Chronology of the Acts* (Lond. 1830); Anger, *De temporum in Actis Apostolorum ratione* (Lips. 1834); Greswell, *Dissert.* 2, 1, etc.; Wordsworth, *Greek Test.* pt. 2; Wieseler, *Chron. d. ap. Zeit* (Gott. 1848).

DATE. LEADING EVENTS. CHAPTER.

- May, A.D. 29. Election of Matthias..... <4015> Acts 1:15-26.
 May A.D. 29. Descent of the Holy Spirit. <4016> Acts 2:1-41.
 June, A.D. 29. Cure of the cripple, etc Acts 3, 4.
 July, A.D. 29. Judgment of Ananias and Sapphira Acts 5.
 Sept., A.D. 29. Appointment of Deacons.... Acts 6.
 Dec., A.D. 29. Martyrdom of Stephen..... Acts 7.
 April, A.D. 30. Conversion of the Eunuch .. Acts 8.
 May, A.D. 30. Conversion of Paul..... <4030> Acts 9:1-21.
 A.D. 31. Prosperity of the Church.... <4031> Acts 9:31.
 A.D. 31. [Matthew's Gospel written in Hebrew.]
 Summer, A.D. 32. Peter's preaching tour <4032> Acts 9:32-43.
 Sept., A.D. 32. Conversion of Cornelius..... Acts 10, 11:1-18.
 Spring, A.D. 33. Paul's escape from Damascus to Jerusalem. <4033> Acts 9:22-30.
 A.D. 34. Founding of the Church at Antioch..... <4119> Acts 11:19-26.
 Spring, A.D. 44. Martyrdom of James and imprisonment of Peter. Acts 7.
 A.D. 44. Paul's eleemosynary visit to Jerusalem <4121> Acts 11:21-30.
 A.D. 44, 45. Paul's first missionary tour . Acts 8, 9.
 Spring, A.D. 47. Paul's "second" visit to Jerusalem . <4150> Acts 15:1-35.
 A.D. 47. [Matthew's Gospel published in Greek]
 A.D. 47-51. Paul's second missionary tour <4153> Acts 15:36 - <4182> Acts 18:22.
 A.D. 49. [1st Epistle to the Thessalonians.]
 A.D. 50. [2d Epistle to the Thessalonians.]

- A.D. 51-55. Paul's third missionary tour. ~~41823~~ Acts 18:23 - ~~4217~~ Acts 21:17.
 A.D. 51. [Epistle to the Galatians.]
 A.D. 54. [1st Epistle to the Corinthians.]
 A.D. 54. [2d Epistle to the Corinthians.]
 A.D. 55. [Epistle to the Romans.]
 A.D. 56-58. Paul's first visit and imprisonment at Rome.... ~~4218~~ Acts 21:18 -
 28:31.
 A.D. 56. [Luke's Gospel written.]
 A.D. 57. [Epistle to the Ephesians.]
 A.D. 57. [Epistle to the Colossians.]
 A.D. 57. [Epistle to Philemon.]
 A.D. 57. [Epistle to the Philippians.]
 A.D. 58. [Epistle to the Hebrews.]
 A.D. 58. [Acts of the Apostles written.]
 A.D. 62. [Epistle of James.]
 A.D. 62 [1st Epistle to Timothy.]
 A.D. 63. [Epistle to Titus.]
 A.D. 64. [Second imprisonment of Paul at Rome.]
 A.D. 64. [2d Epistle to Timothy.]
 A.D. 64. [1st Epistle of Peter.]
 A.D. 65. [2d Epistle of Peter.]
 A.D. 65. [Mark's Gospel written.]
 A.D. 66. [Epistle of Jude.]
 A.D. 90. [John's Gospel written.]
 A.D. 92. [1st Epistle of John.]
 A.D. 92. [2d Epistle of John.]
 A.D. 92. [3d Epistle of John.]
 A.D. 96. [John's Revelation written.]

VIII. Commentaries. — The following is a full list of separate exegetical and illustrative works on the entire Acts of the Apostles, the most important being indicated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Origen, *Opera*, 4, 457 sq.; "Pampilus" (in Hippolyti *Opera*, 2, 205 sq. and in the *Bibl. Patr. Gall.* 4, 3 sq.); Chrysostom *Opera*, 9, 1 sq. (also in Engl. *Homilies*, Oxf. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Cassiodorus, *Acta Ap.* (in *Complexiones*); Euthalius, *Editio* (in *Bibl. Patr. Gall.* 10, 199); Arator, *Carmen* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 10, 125); Theophylact, *Opera*, 3, 1 sq.; OEcumenius, *Enarratio* (in *Opera*, 1); Bede, *Works*, p. 184 sq.; Fathers, in Cramer's *Catena* (Oxon. 1838, 8vo); Mene, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1524, 8vo); Bugenhagen,

Commentarius (Vitemb. 1524, 1624, 8vo); Lambert, *Commentarius* (Arg. 1526; Francf. 1539, 4to); Card. Cajetan, *Actus Apostolor.* (Venice, 1530; Par. 1532, fol.; Par. 1540, 8vo); Gagnaeus, *Scholia* (Par. 1660, 8vo); *Calvin, *Commentaria*, in his *Opera* (Gen. 1560, fol.; tr. into Eng., Lond. 1585, 4to; Edinb. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentaria* (Tiguri. 1540, fol.); Jonas, *Adnotationes* (Norib. 1524; Basil. 1525, 1567, 8vo); Salmeron, *Opera*, p. 12 sq.; Brent, *Predigten* (Norimb. 1554, fol.); Camerarius, *Notationes* (Lips. 1556, 8vo); Capito, *Explicatio* (Venice, 1561, 8vo); *Gualtherus, *Homilioe* (Tiguri. 1557, 4to; in Engl., Lond. 1572); Losse, *Adnotationes*, (Francf. 1558, 2 vols. fol.); *Sarcer, *Scholia* (Basil. 1560, 8vo); Selnecker, *Commentarius* (Jen. 1567, 1586, 8vo); Junius, *Tr. ex Arab.* (L. B. 1578; Frcft. 1618, 8vo); Raude, *Auslegung* (Frcft. 1579, fol.); Aretius, *Digestio* (Lausan. 1579, Genev. 1583, Bern. 1607, fol.); Grynaeus, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1583, 4to); Crispold, *Commentaria* (Firm. 1590, 4to); Stapleton, *Antidota* (Antw. 1595-8, 3 vols. 8vo); Pelargus, *Commentationes* (Francf. 1599, 8vo); Arcularius, *Commentarius* (Franc. 1607, 8vo; Giess. 4to); Lorinus, *Commentaria* (Colossians Ag. 1609, fol.); Malcolm, *Commentarius* (Mediol. 1615, 4to); Sanctus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1616; Colossians 1617, 4to); *Petri, *Commentarius* (Duaci. 1622, 4to); Perezius, *Commnentarius* (Lugd. 1626, 4to); A Lapide, *Acta Apostolor.* (Antw. 1627, 4to); Menoch, *Historia* (Rome, 1634, 4to); De Dieu, *Animadnersiones* (L. B. 1634, 4to); Lenaeus, *Commentarius* (Holm. 1640, 4to); Novarinus, *Actus Apostolor.* (Lugd. 1645, fol.); Price, *Acta Apostolor.* (Par. 1647, 8vo; Lond. 1630, 4to); Major, *Adnotata* (Jen. 1647, 1655, 4to; 1668, 8vo); Amyrald, *Paraphrase* (Salmur, 1654, 8vo); Fromond, *Actus Ap.* (Lovan. 1654, 4to); Calixtus, *Expositio* (Brunsw. 1654, 4to); *Streso, *Comnmentarius* (Amst. 1658; Hafn. 1717, 4to); Faucheur, *Sermons* (Genev. 1664, 4 vols. 4to); Du Bois, *Lectiones*, pt. 1 (Louvain, 1666, 4to); Rothmaler, *Predigten* (Rudolst. 1671-2, 3 vols. 4to); Cradock, *Apost. History* (Lond. 1672, fol.); De Sylveira, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1678, fol.); Lightfoot, *Commentary* (in *Works*, 8, 1 sq.; also *Horoe Hebr.*, ed. Carpzov, Lips. 1679, 4to); Crell, *Opera*, 3, 123 sq.; Wolzogen, *Opera*, vol. 1; Cocceius, *Opera*, vol. 4; Micon, *Apostolica Acta* (Genev. 1681, fol.); Cappel, *Hist. Apostolica* (Salm. 1683, 4to); *De Veiel, *Explicatio* (Lond. 1684, 8vo; in Eng., Lond. 1685); Pearson, *Works*, 1, 317 sq.; Keuchen, *Adtsotata* (Amst. 1689, 1709, 4to); Valla and others, in the *Critici Sacri*, vol. 7; *Arnold and De Sacy, *Note* (Par., Lugd., Amst., Antw. 1700, 8vo; also in French often); *Van Leeuwen, *Paraphrasis* (Amst. 1704, 1724, 8vo; also in Gorm., Brem.

1708, 4to); *Limborch, *Conzmentarius* (Roterd. 1711, fol.); Gerhard, *Commentarius* (Hamb. 1713, 4to); *Herberger, *Stoppel-Postille* (Lpz. 1715, fol.); Anon., *Reflexions* (Par. 1716, 12mo); Lang, *Isagoge* (Hal. 1718, 4to); Grammich, *Anmerkungen* (Lpz. 1721, 4to); Petersen, *Zusammenhang* (Fr. ad M. 1722, 4to); Wolf, *Anecdota*, 3, 92 sq.; 9:1 sq.; Pyle, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1725, 8vo); Plevier, *Handelingen* (Ultraj. 1725, 1734, 4to); *Lindhammer, *Erlidarung* (Hal. 1725, 1734, fol.); Loseken, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1728, 4to); Negelin, *Kern d. Apostelgesch.* (Norimb. 1731, 4to); Anon., *Paraphrase* (Par. 1738, 12mo); *Biscoe, *Hist. of the Acts, confirmed from other Sources, Authors, etc.* (Lond. 1742, 2 vols. 8vo; Oxford, 1829, 1840, 1 vol. 8vo); Barrington, *Works*, vol. 1; Heylin, *The 1. Lect.* 2. 1 sq.; Rambach, *Betrachtungen* (F. ad M. 1748, 4to); *Benson, *Planting of the Chr. Rel.* (2d ed. Lond. 1756, 3 vols. 4to); *Walch, *Dissertt. in Acta App.* (Jen. 1756, 1761, 3 vols. 4to); Am-Ende, *Carmen cum notis* (Vitemb. 1759, 8vo); Semler, *Illustratio* (Hal. 1766, 4to); Coners, *Auslegung* (Brem. 1772, 8vo); Jacob, *Uebersetz.* (Hal. 1779, 8vo); Hess, *Christenlehre* (Winterth. 17819, 8vo, in parts); Paulus, *De Consilio auctoris Act.* (Jen. 1788, 4to); Willis, *Actions of the Ap.* (Lond. 1789, 8vo); Snell, *Uebersetz.* (Frkft. 1791, 8vo); Lobstein, *Commentar*, vol. 1 (Strasb. 1792, 4to); *Morus, *Explicatio Act. App.* (ed. Dindorf, Lips. 1794, 2 vols. 8vo); Clarisse, *Gedenwaarigkeiten* (Leyd. 1797, 4to); *Thiers, *Uebers. m. Anmerk.* (Gera, 1800, 8vo); Stack, *Lectures* (London, 1805, 8vo); Venturini, *Zusammenh. m. d. Weltgesch.* in vol. 1 of his *Urchristenth.* (Copenh. 1807, 8vo); Brewster, *Lectures* (Lond. 1807, 2 vols. 8vo; 1830, 1 vol. 8vo); *Heinrich, *Acta Apostol. perpet. Annot. illustrata* (Gott. 1809, 2 vols. 8vo; also in the *Nov. Test. Keppianum*); Stabcock, *Annotations*, vol. 2: (Falm. 1809, 8vo); Elsley, *Annotations*, vol. 2; Valcknaer, *Selecta* (ed. Wessenberg, Amst. 1815, 8vo); *Kuinol, *Comm. in Acta Apostol.* (vol. 4 of his *Comm. in Libros Hist. N.T.*, Lips. 1818, 8vo; vol. 3, Lond. 1835); Riehm, *Defontibus Act.* (Tr. ad Rh. 1821, 8vo); Thompson, *Discourses* (Lond. 1822, 8vo); Kistemaker, *Gesch. d. Apos. tel* (Miinst. 1822, 8vo); *Hildebrand, *Gesch. d. ap. — exeg. Hermeneut.* (Lpz. 1824, 8vo); Blomfield, *Lectures* (Lond. 825, 8vo); De Meyer, *De Lucae* (Tr. ad R. 1827, 4to); Menken, *Blicke* (Brem. 1828, 8vo); *Stier, *Reden d. Apostel* (Lpz. 1829, 2 vols. 8vo); Wilson, *Questions* (Camb. 1830, 12mo) Anon., *Annotations* (Camb. 1831, 12mo); Wirth, *Apostelgesch.* (Ulm, 1831, 8vo); *Neander, *Planting of the Church* [German, Berl. 1832, Hamb. 1847, 8vo] (Edinb. 1842, Lond. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. 1834, 12mo); Povach, *Sermons* (Lond. 1836, 8vo); Sumner,

Exposition (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Robinson, *Acts of Ap.* (Lond. 1839, 8vo); Schneckenberger, *Zweck d. Apostelgesch.* (Berne, 1841, 8vo); Jones, *Lectures* (Lond. 1842, 2 vols. 12mo); Cary, *Acts of Ap.* (Lond. 1842, 18mo); Livermore, *Acts of Ap.* (Bost. 1844, 12mo); Hodgson, *Lectures* (Lond. 1845, 8vo); Morison, *Commentary* (Lond. 1845, 18mo); Bennett, *Lectures* (Lond. 1846, 8vo); Maskew, *Annotations* (Lond. 1847, 12mo); Trollope, *Commentary* (Camb. 1847, 12mo); *Humphrey, *Commentary* (Lond. 1847, 8vo); Dick, *Lectures* (Glasgow, 1848, 8vo); Pierce, *Notes* (N. Y. 1848, 12mo); *Bornemann, *Acta Apostolorum* (Grossenh. 1849, 8vo); Mrs. Henderson, *Lessons* (Lond. 1849, 8vo); Etheridge, *Tr. from the Syr.* (Lond. 1849, 8vo); Beelen, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1850, 2 vols. 4to); *Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (Lond. 1850, 1856; N. Y. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo); Cook, *Acts* (Lond. 1850, 12mo); *Hackett, *Commentary* (Boston, 1852, 1858, 8vo); *Baumgarten, *Apostelgeschichte* (Braunsch. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo; tr. in Clarke's *Library*, Edinb. 1854, 3 vols. 8vo); *Schaff, *Gesch. d. Ap. Kirche* (Lpz. 1854, 8vo; in English, Edinbl 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); *Zeller, *Ursprung d. Apostelgesch.* (Stuttg. 1854, 8vo); *Lekebusch, *Entstehung d. Apostelgesch.* (Gotha, 1854, 8vo); Ford, *Acts of Ap.* (Lond. 1856, 8vo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1856, 12mo); *Alexander, *Acts explained* (N. Y. 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); Bouchier, *Exposition* (Lond. 1858, 12mo); Macbride, *Lectures* (Lond. 1858, 8vo); McGarvey, *Commentary* (Cincin. 1864, 12mo); Gloag, *Commentary* (Edinb. 1810, 2 vols. 8vo). **SEE NEW TESTAMENT.**

Acts

SPURIOUS or APOCRYPHAL, ancient writings purporting to have been written by or respecting our Savior, his disciples, etc. Of these several are still extant; others are only known by the accounts in ancient authors (Hase, *Hist. of Chr. Church*, p. 96, 102). **SEE CANON** (of Scripture).

Acts of Christ, Spurious

Several sayings attributed to our Lord, and alleged to be handed down by tradition, may be included under this head, as they are supposed by some learned men to have been derived from histories no longer in existence (comp. ^{<400>}Luke 1:1). **SEE APOCRYPHA.**

1. The only saying of this kind apparently genuine is the beautiful sentiment cited by Paul (^{<408>}Acts 20:35), "It is more blessed to give than to receive," to which the term *apocryphal* has been sometimes applied, inasmuch as it

is not contained in any of the Gospels extant (so Gausen, in his *Theopneustia*, Engl. tr. 1842). Heinsius is of opinion that the passage is taken from some lost apocryphal book, such as that entitled, in the *Recognitions* of Clement, “the Book of the Sayings of Christ,” or the pretended *Constitutions of the Apostles*. Others, however, conceive that the apostle does not refer to any one saying of our Savior’s in particular, but that he deduced Christ’s sentiments on this head from several of his sayings and parables (see ⁴⁰²¹Matthew 19:21; 25; and ⁴¹⁶⁹Luke 16:9). But the probability is that Paul received this passage by tradition from the other apostles.

2. There is a saying ascribed to Christ in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, a work at least of the second century: “Let us resist all iniquity, and hate it;” and again, “So they who would see me, and lay hold on my kingdom, must receive me through much suffering and tribulation;” but it is not improbable that these passages contain merely an allusion to some of our Lord’s discourses.

3. Clemens Romanus, the third bishop of Rome after St. Peter (or the writer who passes under the name of Clement), in his *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, ascribes the following saying to Christ: “Though ye should be united to me in my bosom, and yet do not keep my commandments, I will reject you, and say, Depart from me, I know not whence ye are, ye workers of iniquity.” This passage seems evidently to be taken from Luke’s gospel, ⁴¹³⁵Luke 13:25, 26, 27.

There are many similar passages which several eminent writers, such as Grabe, Mill, and Fabricius, have considered as derived from apocryphal gospels, but which seem, with greater probability, to be nothing more than loose quotations from the Scriptures, which were very common among the apostolical Fathers.

There is a saying of Christ’s, cited by Clement in the same epistle, which is found in the apocryphal *Gospel of the Egyptians*: “The Lord, being asked when his kingdom should come, replied, *When two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female neither male nor female.*” **SEE GOSPELS (SPURIOUS).**

We may here mention that the genuineness of the Second Epistle of Clement is itself disputed, and is rejected by Eusebius, Jerome, and others; at least Eusebius says of it, “We know not that this is as highly approved of

as the former, or that it has been in use with the ancients” (*Hist. Eccles.* 3, 38, Cruse’s tr. 1842). *SEE CLEMENT.*

4. Eusebius, in the last chapter of the book just cited, states that Papias, a companion of the apostles, “gives another history of a woman who had been accused of many sins before the Lord, which is also contained in the gospel according to the Nazarenes.” As this latter work is lost, it is doubtful to what woman the history refers. Some suppose it alludes to the history of the woman taken in adultery; others, to the woman of Samaria. There are two discourses ascribed to Christ by Papias preserved in Irenaeus (*Adversus Haeres.*v. 33), relating to the doctrine of the Millennium, of which Papias appears to have been the first propagator. Dr. Grabe has defended the truth of these traditions, but the discourses themselves are unworthy of our blessed Lord.

5. There is a saying ascribed to Christ by Justin Martyr, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, which has been supposed by Dr. Cave to have been taken from the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*. Mr. Jones conceives it to have been an allusion to a passage in the prophet Ezekiel. The same father furnishes us with an apocryphal history of Christ’s baptism, in which it is asserted that “a fire was kindled in Jordan.” He also acquaints us that Christ worked, when he was on earth, at the trade of a carpenter, making ploughs and yokes for oxen.

6. There are some apocryphal sayings of Christ preserved by Irenaeus, but his most remarkable observation is that Christ “lived and taught beyond his fortieth or even fiftieth year.” This he finds partly on absurd inferences drawn from the character of his mission, partly on ~~John~~ John 8:57, and also on what he alleges to have been John’s own testimony delivered to the presbyters of Asia. It is scarcely necessary to refute this absurd idea, which is in contradiction with all the statements in the genuine gospels. There is also an absurd saying attributed to Christ by Athenagoras (*Legat. pro Christianis*, cap. 28).

7. There are various sayings ascribed to our Lord by Clemens Alexandrinus and several of the fathers. One of the most remarkable is, “Be ye skillful money-changers.” This is supposed to have been contained in the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*. Others think it is an early interpolation into the text of Scripture. Origen and Jerome cite it as a saying of Christ’s.

8. In Origen, *Contra Celsum*, lib. 1, is an apocryphal history of our Savior and his parents, in which it is reproached to Christ that he was born in a mean village, of a poor woman who gained her livelihood by spinning, and was turned off by her husband, a carpenter. Celsum adds that Jesus was obliged by poverty to work as a servant in Egypt, where he learned many powerful arts, and thought that on this account he ought to be esteemed as a god. There was a similar account contained in some apocryphal books extant in the time of St. Augustine. It was probably a Jewish forgery. Augustine, Epiphanius, and others of the fathers, equally cite sayings and acts of Christ, which they probably met with in the early apocryphal gospels.

9. There is a spurious hymn of Christ's extant, ascribed to the Priscillianists by St. Augustine. There are also many such acts and sayings to be found in the *Koran* of Mahomet, and others in the writings of the Mohammedan doctors (see Toland's *Nazarenus*).

10. There is a prayer ascribed to our Savior by the same persons, which is printed in Latin and Arabic in the learned Selden's *Commentary on Euty chius's Annals of Alexandria*, published at Oxford, in 1650, by Dr. Pococke. It contains a petition for pardon of sin, such as is sufficient to stamp it as a forgery.

11. There is a curious letter said to have been written to our Savior by Agbarus (or Abgarus), king of Edessa, requesting him to come and heal a disease under which he labored. The letter, together with the supposed reply of Christ, are preserved by Eusebius. This learned historian asserts that he obtained the documents, together with the history, from the public registers of the city of Edessa, where they existed in his time in the Syriac language, from which he translated them into Greek. *SEE ABGARUS*.

These letters are also mentioned by Ephraem Syrus, deacon of Edessa, at the close of the fourth century. Jerome refers to them in his comment on Matthew 10, and they are mentioned by Pope Gelasius, who rejects them as spurious and apocryphal. They are, however, referred to as genuine by Evagrius and later historians. Among modern writers the genuineness of these letters has been maintained by Dr. Parker (in the preface to his *Demonstration of the Law of Nature and the Christian Religion*, part 2, § 16, p. 235); by Dr. Cave (in his *Historia Literaria*, vol. , p. 23); and by Grabe (in his *Spicilegium Patrum*, particularly p. 319). On the other hand, most writers, including the great majority of Roman Catholic divines, reject

them as spurious. Mr. Jones, in his valuable work on the *Canonical Authority of the New Testament*, although he does not venture to deny that the Acts were contained in the public registers of the city of Edessa, yet gives it, as a probable conjecture, in favor of which he adduces some strong reasons, drawn from internal evidence, that this whole chapter (viz. the 13th of the first book) in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius is itself an interpolation. **SEE EPISTLES (SPURIOUS).**

12. The other apocryphal history related by Evagrius, out of Procopius, states that Agbarus sent a limner to draw the picture of our Savior, but that not being able to do it by reason of the brightness of Christ's countenance, our "Savior took a cloth, and laying it upon his divine and life-giving face, he impressed his likeness on it." This story of Christ's picture is related by several, in the Second Council of Nice, and by other ancient writers, one of whom (Leo) asserts that he went to Edessa, and saw "the image of Christ, not made with hands, worshipped by the people." This is the first of the four likenesses of Christ mentioned by ancient writers. The second is that said to have been stamped on a handkerchief by Christ, and given to Veronica, who had followed him to his crucifixion. The third is the statue of Christ, stated by Eusebius to have been erected by the woman whom he had cured of an issue of blood, and which the learned historian acquaints us he saw at Caesarea Philippi (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 7, 18). Sozomen and Cassiodorus assert that the emperor Julian took down this statue and erected his own in its place. It is, however, stated by Asterius, a writer of the fourth century, that it was taken away by Maximinus, the predecessor of Constantine. The fourth picture is one which Nicodemus presented to Gamaliel, which was preserved at Berytus, and which having been crucified and pierced with a spear by the Jews, there issued out from the side blood and water. This is stated in a spurious treatise concerning the passion and image of Christ, falsely ascribed to Athanasius. Eusebius, the historian, asserts (1. c.) that he had here seen the pictures of Peter, Paul, and of Christ himself, in his time (see also Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 5, 21). That such relics were actually exhibited is therefore indubitable, but their genuineness is quite another question. They were probably of a piece with the papal miracles and pious frauds of superstitious times. **SEE JESUS CHRIST.**

Acts of the Apostles, Spurious

Of these several are extant, others are lost, or only fragments of them have come down to us. Of the following we know little more than that they once existed. They are here arranged chronologically: —

1. *The Preaching of Peter*, referred to by Origen (in his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, lib. 14), also referred to by Clemens Alexandrinus.

2. *The Acts of Peter*, supposed by Dr. Cave to be cited by Serapion.

3. *The Acts of Paul and Thecla*, mentioned by Tertullian (*Lib. de Baptismo*, cap. 17). This is, however, supposed by some to be the same which is found in a Greek MS. in the Bodleian Library, and has been published by Dr. Grabe (in his *Spicil. Patrum Soecul. I.*).

4. — *The Doctrine of Peter*, cited by Origen (“Proem.” in *Lib. de Princip.*).

5. *The Acts of Paul* (id. *de Princip.* 1, 2).

6. *The Preaching of Paul*, referred to by St. Cyprian (*Tract. de non iterando Baptismo*).

7. *The Preaching of Paul and Peter at Rome*, cited by Lactantius (*De vera Sap.* 4, 21).

8. *The Acts of Peter*, thrice mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 3, 3); “as to that work, however, which is ascribed to him, called ‘The Acts’ and the ‘Gospel according to Peter,’ we know nothing of their being handed down as Catholic writings, since neither among the ancient nor the ecclesiastical writers of our own day has there been one that has appealed to testimony taken from them.”

9. *The Acts of Paul* (*ib.*).

10. *The Revelation of Peter* (*ib.*).

11. *The Acts of Andrew and John* (*ib.* cap. 25). “Thus,” he says, “we have it in our power to know. . . those books that are adduced by the heretics, under the name of the apostles, such, viz., as compose the gospels of Peter, Thomas, and Matthew, . . . and such as contain the Acts of the Apostles by Andrew and John, and others of which no one of those writers in the ecclesiastical succession has condescended to make any mention in his

works; and, indeed, the character of the style itself is very different from that of the apostles, and the sentiments and the purport of those that are advanced in them deviating as far as possible from sound orthodoxy, evidently proves they are the fictions of heretical men, whence they are to be ranked not only among the spurious writings, but are to be rejected as altogether absurd and impious.”

12. *The Acts of Peter, John, and Thomas* (Athanasius, *Synops.* § 76).

13. *The Writings of Bartholomew the Apostle*, mentioned by the pseudo-Dionysius.

14. *The Acts, Preaching, and Revelation of Peter*, cited by Jerome (in his *Catal. Script. Eccles.*).

15. *The Acts of the Apostles by Seleucus* (id. *Epist. ad Chrom.*, etc.).

16. *The Acts of Paul and Thecla* (id. *Catalog. Script. Eccles.*).

17. *The Acts of the Apostles, used by the Ebionites*, cited by Epiphanius (*Adversus Haeres.* § 16).

18. *The Acts of Leucius, Lentius, or Lenticius*, called the Acts of the Apostles (Augustin. *Lib. de Fid.* c. 38).

19. *The Acts of the Apostles*, used by the Manichees.

20. *The Revelations of Thomas, Paul, Stephen, etc.* (Gelasius, *de Lib. Apoc.*: apud Gratian. *Distinct.* 15, c. 3).

To these may be added the *genuine Acts of Pilate*, appealed to by Tertullian and Justin Martyr, in their *Apologies*, as being then extant. Tertullian describes them as “the records which were transmitted from Jerusalem to Tiberius concerning Christ.” He refers to the same for the proof of our Savior’s miracles. **SEE ACTS OF PILATE.**

The following are the principal spurious Acts still extant: —

1. *The Acts of Paul and Thecla*, said to have been written by a disciple of St. Paul, and who (according to Tertullian, *De Bap.* cap. 17, and Jerome, *De Scrip.* cap. 6), when convicted by John the Evangelist of having falsified facts, confessed that he had done so, but through his love for his master Paul. These Acts were rejected as uncanonical by Pope Gelasius. They were printed, together with some that follow, at London (in English)

in 1821, 8vo, under the title “Apocryphal New Testament” (see Fabricius. *Cod. Apoc. N.T.* 2, 794).

2. *Acts of the Twelve Apostles*, falsely attributed to Abdias of Babylon. **SEE ABDIAS.** These Acts are said to have been written by him in Hebrew, translated into Greek by Eutropius, and into Latin by Julius Africanus, and were published by Lazius, at Basle, in 1551 (Fabric. 2:388). It is a work full of the most extravagant fables, and bears internal evidence of having been written after the second century.

3. *Acts of St. Peter*, or, as the work is sometimes designated, *Recognitionum libri 10*, attributed falsely to Clemens Romanus.

4. The *Acts or Voyages (Periodi) of St. John*, mentioned by Epiphanius and Augustine, is probably that which we now have as the Acts of St. John among those attributed to Abdias.

There exist also the following (for which see each name in its place): — *The Creed of the Apostles; The Epistles of Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; The Shepherd of Hermas; The Acts of Pilate* (spurious), or the *Gospel of Nicodemus; The Constitutions of the Apostles; The Canons of the Apostles; The Liturgies of the Apostles; St. Paul’s Epistle to the Laodiceans; St. Paul’s Letters to Seneca.*

Besides these there are some others still more obscure, for which see Cotelierius’s *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta* (Paris, 1677-92); Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus, N.T.*; Du Pin, *History of the Canon of the New Testament* (London, 1699); Grabe’s *Spicilegium Patrum* (Oxford, 1714); Lardner’s *Credibility*, etc.; Jones’s *New and Just Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*; Birch’s *Auctarium* (Hafniae, 1804); Thilo’s *Acta St. Thomm* (Lips. 1823), and *Codex Apocryphus, N.T.* (Lips. 1832). Tischendorf has published in the original Greek the following apocryphal Acts (*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Lips. 1841, 8vo), several of which had not before been edited: “Acts of Peter and Paul;” “Acts of Paul and Thecla;” “Acts of Barnabas, by Mark;” “Acts of Philip” (ed. princeps); “Acts of Andrew;” “Acts of Andrew and Matthew;” “Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew” (ed. princ.); “Acts of Thomas;” “Consummation of Thomas” (ed. pr.); “Acts of Bartholomew” (e. p.); “Acts of Thaddaeus” (e. p.); “Acts of John” (e. p.). **SEE CANON.**

Acts of Pilate

The ancient Romans were scrupulously careful to preserve the memory of all remarkable events which happened in the city; and this was done either in their “Acts of the Senate” (*Acta Senatus*), or in the “Daily Acts of the People” (*Acta Diurna Populi*), which were diligently made and kept at Rome (see Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. *Acta Diurna*). In like manner it was customary for the governors of provinces to send to the emperor an account of remarkable transactions that occurred in the places where they resided, which were preserved as the *Acts* of their respective governments. Indeed, this would naturally occur in the transmission of their returns of administration (*rationes*), a copy of which was also preserved in the provincial archives (Cicero, *ad Fam.* 3, 17; 5, 20). In conformity with this usage, Eusebius says, “Our Savior’s resurrection being much talked of throughout Palestine, Pilate, informed the emperor of it, as likewise of his miracles, of which he had heard; and that, being raised up after he had been put to death, he was already believed by many to be a god” (*Eccl. Hist.* lib. 2, c. 2). These accounts were never published for general perusal, but were deposited among the archives of the empire, where they served as a fund of information to historians. Hence we find, long before the time of Eusebius, that the primitive Christians, in their disputes with the Gentiles, appealed to these *Acts of Pilate* as to most undoubted testimony. Thus, Justin Martyr, in his first *Apology* for the Christians, which was presented to the Emperor Antoninus Pius and the senate of Rome, about the year 140, having mentioned the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and some of its attendant circumstances, adds, “And that these things were so done, you may know from the *Acts made in the time of Pontius Pilate.*” Afterward, in the same *Apology*, having noticed some of our Lord’s miracles, such as healing diseases and raising the dead, he says, “And that these things were done by him you may know from the *Acts made in the time of Pontius Pilate*” (Justin Martyr, *Apol. Pr.* p. 65, 72, ed. Benedict.).

Tertullian, in his *Apology* for Christianity, about the year 200, after speaking of our Savior’s crucifixion and resurrection, and his appearance to the disciples and ascension into heaven in the sight of the same disciples, who were ordained by him to publish the Gospel over the world, thus proceeds: “Of all these things relating to Christ, *Pilate* himself, in his conscience already a Christian, *sent an account* to Tiberius, then emperor” (Tertull. *Apolog.* c. 21). The same writer, in the same treatise, thus relates the proceedings of Tiberius on receiving this information: “There was an

ancient decree that no one should be received for a deity unless he was first approved by the senate. Tiberius, in whose time the Christian religion had its rise, having received from Palestine in Syria an account of such things as manifested the truth of his” (Christ’s) “divinity, proposed to the senate that he should be enrolled among the Roman gods, and gave his own prerogative vote in favor of the motion. But the senate rejected it, because the emperor himself had declined the same honor. Nevertheless, the emperor persisted in his opinion, and threatened punishment to the accusers of the Christians. *Search your own Commentaries*, or public writings; you will there find that Nero was the first who raged with the imperial sword against this sect, when rising most at Rome” (Tertull. *Apolog.* c. 5).

These testimonies of Justin and Tertullian are taken from public apologies for the Christian religion, which were presented either to the emperor and senate of Rome, or to magistrates of public authority and great distinction in the Roman empire. *SEE PILATE*.

Acu’a

(rather *Acud*, Ἀκούδ by erroneous transcription for Ἀκούβ, *Acub*, 1 Esdras 5:31), the progenitor of one of the families of the temple-servants (ἱερόδουλοι. i.e. Nethinim), said to have returned from the captivity (1 Esdras 5:30); evidently the AKKUB *SEE AKKUB* (q.v.) of the parallel texts (^{<1025>}Ezra 2:45, or rather, ver. 42; comp. ^{<1078>}Nehemiah 7:48, where the name is not found).

A’cub

(rather *Acuph*, Ἀκούφ v. r. Ἀκούμ, *Acum*; both corruptions for Βακβούκ), another head of the Nethinim that returned from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:31); evidently the BAKBUK *SEE BAKBUK* (q.v.) of the genuine texts (^{<1025>}Ezra 2:51; ^{<1078>}Nehemiah 7:53).

Aczib

SEE ACHZIB.

Ad

according to Arabian traditions, was the son of *Udh*, or Uz (the grandson of Shem, ^{<1002>}Genesis 10:23), and the progenitor of a powerful tribe called

the *Adites*, who settled in Er-Raml, or Sandy Arabia (Abulfeda, *Hist. Anteislam.* p. 17, ed. Fleischer). Like the other kindred tribes of those early times, the Adites soon abandoned the true worship of God, and set up four idols whom they worshipped: *Sakia*, whom they imagined to supply rain; *Hafedha*, who preserved them from all foreign and external dangers; *Razeka*, who provided them with food; and *Salema*, who restored them from sickness to health (Sale's *Koran*, p. 122, note). It is said that God commissioned the prophet Hud or Heber to attempt their reformation, but, remaining obstinate in their idolatry, they were almost all destroyed by a suffocating wind. The few who escaped retired with the prophet Hud to another place. Before this severe punishment they had been visited with a dreadful drought for four years, which killed their cattle, and reduced them to great distress (see D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Or.* s.v. Houd). They are often mentioned in the Koran, and some writers, on the authority of that work, affirm that they were of gigantic stature. **SEE ARABIA.**

Adad

the Graecized form of the name of the idol *Hadad* (Josephus, *Ant.* 8, 5, 2); also a less correct form of the name of King *Hadad* (^{<11117>}1 Kings 11:17, original). **SEE HADAD.**

Ad'adah

(Heb. *Adadah'*, **hd[r̄i]** from the Syr., *festival*, or perhaps, by reduplication, *boundary*; Sept. Ἀδαδά, v. r. Ἀρουήλ), a town in the southern part of the tribe of Judah, mentioned between Dimonah and Kedesh (^{<6152>}Joshua 15:22); probably situated in the portion afterward set off to Simeon (^{<6191>}Joshua 19:1-9). It is possibly the village *Gadda* mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Γαδδά), lying on the eastern border of Daroma, opposite the Dead Sea. But see GADDAH. M. de Saulcy believes that he passed some ruins by this name on his way from the southern end of the Dead Sea to Hebron on the high ground after leaving Wady es-Zoweirah (*Narrative*, 1, 360, 430).

A'dah

(Heb. *Adah'*, **hd[]**; *ornament*; Sept. Ἀδά), the name of two women.

1. The first named of the two wives of the Cainite Lamech, and mother of Jabal and Jubal (^{<0019>}Genesis 4:19, 20, 23). B.C. cir. 3600.

2. The first of the three wives of Esau, being the daughter of Elon the Hittite, and the mother of Eliphaz (^{<030>}Genesis 36:2, 4, 10, 12, 16). B.C. 1964. She is elsewhere confounded with BASHMATH *SEE BASHMATH* (^{<026>}Genesis 26:34). *SEE ESAU*.

Adai'ah

(Heb. *Adayah'*, *hyd[]* adorned by *Jehovah*, once in the prolonged form *Adaya'hu*, *Whyd[]* ^{<420>}2 Chronicles 23:1), the name of several men.

- 1.** (Sept. Ἀδαία v. r. Ἀδαί) The son of Ethni and father of Zerah. of the Levitical family of Gershom, in the ancestry of Asaph (^{<130>}1 Chronicles 6:40); apparently the same with IDDO *SEE IDDO* , the son of Joah (ver. 21). B.C. cir. 1530. *SEE ASAPH*.
- 2.** (Sept. Ἀδαία v. r. Ἀλαία.) A son of Shimhi, and chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem before the captivity (^{<130>}1 Chronicles 8:21), B.C. long post 1612.
- 3.** (Sept. Ἀδαία, v. r. Ἀδαί.) The father of Maaseiah, which latter was a “captain of hundred” during the protectorate of Jehoiada (^{<420>}2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. ante 877. He is apparently the same as JUDA *SEE JUDA* the son of Joseph and father of Simeon, among Christ’s maternal ancestry (^{<030>}Luke 3:30). *SEE GENEALOGY*.
- 4.** (Sept. Ἐδειά v. r. Ἰεδία.) The father of Jedidah and maternal grandfather of King Josiah, a native of Boscath (^{<120>}2 Kings 22:1). B.C. ante 648.
- 5.** (Sept. Ἀδαία v. r. Ἀχαία.) A son of Joiarib and father of Hazaiah, of the tribe of Judah (^{<610>}Nehemiah 11:5). B.C. considerably ante 536.
- 6.** A priest, son of Jeroham, who held a prominent post in defending the second temple while building (^{<130>}1 Chronicles 9:12, Sept. Σαδία v. r. Ἀδαία; ^{<612>}Nehemiah 11:12, Ἀδαία), B.C. 518.
- 7.** (Sept. Ἀδαία.) A “son” of Bani, an Israelite who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (^{<150>}Ezra 10:29), B.C. 459.
- 8.** (Sept. Ἀδαίας v. r. Ἀδαία.) Another of the “sons” of Bani, who did likewise (^{<150>}Ezra 10:39), B.C. 459.

Adalbert

SEE ADELBERT.

Adalbert

archbishop of Prague, was born of a princely Slavonic family, about the year 956, at Prague. His parents sent him to Magdeburg to enter upon his studies under the archbishop Adalbert, who gave him his own name at confirmation. Upon his return into Bohemia, touched by the death-bed remorse of Dietmar, bishop of Prague, for not having led a life of greater piety and activity, he at once assumed a penitential dress, praying fervently and giving great alms. In 983 he was elected bishop of Prague with the unanimous consent of the people. He made great efforts to promote the spiritual welfare of his flock, which was in a fearful state of immorality: among the laity polygamy, and among the clergy incontinence were general. Had he been less impatient, he might doubtless have accomplished much more than he did. Finding all his labor in vain, he left his see in 989 by permission of Pope John XV, and retired into the monastery of St. Boniface, at Rome. He was, however, constrained to return to his bishopric, which he again quitted for his monastic retreat; and again was on the point of returning to it, when, finding his people set against him, he finally forsook it, in order to preach the Gospel in Prussia, where he suffered martyrdom, April 23, 997 (after making many converts at Dantzic and in Pomerania), at the hands of seven assassins, whose chief was an idol-priest, and who pierced him with seven lances. Since that period Adalbert has been the patron saint of Poland and Bohemia. For a graphic account of him, see Neander, *Light in Dark Places*, 272. The Martyrologies commemorate him on the 23d of April. — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 322; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, April 23.

Adalbert

archbishop of Bremen and Hamburg, was descended from a noble Saxon family. He served as subdeacon to archbishop Hermann for several years, and himself received that office in 1043 from Henry III, whom in 1046 he accompanied to Rome. There he barely failed of election to the papal throne. Pope Leo IX, in whose behalf he had spoken in the synod at Mentz in 1049, made him in 1050 his legate in the North. Adalbert intended, with the support of the Emperor Henry, to convert the archdiocese of Bremen into a northern patriarchate, which was to be independent of Rome, and

embrace the sees of Northern Germany, of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and England. Henry III compelled the pope, Clement II (one of the three German popes who were in succession elevated to the papal throne by Henry), to recognize Adalbert as his peer. A bull is still extant in which the pope addressed Adalbert with “Vos,” while generally the popes addressed every bishop with “Tu” (hence the principle, *Papa neminem vossitat*). But this was all ended by a bull of Pope Leo IX, recognizing Adalbert as apostolic vicar, but demanding fealty to the Roman see. During the minority of the Emperor Henry IV he usurped, together with archbishop Hanno of Cologne, the administration of the empire. His ambition and violence made him so obnoxious to the German princes that, in 1066, they forcibly separated him from the emperor; but in 1069 he regained his former power, and kept it until his death, March 16, 1072. — Adam Bremensis, *Gesta Hannaburg. pontif.*; Lappenberg, *Hamburgisches Urkundenbuch*; Stenzel, *Gesch. Deutschlands unter den frankischen Kaisern*.

Adaldagus

archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, lived during the reigns of the three emperors Otho (the last of whom died 1002), and enjoyed great influence at court, where he held the office of chancellor. After the victory which Otho I gained over the Danes, he established three episcopal sees in Jutland, viz., Sleswick, Ripen, and Arhusen. He baptized Harold, king of Denmark, and sent missionaries among the northern nations. — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 10, pt. 1, ch. 1, § 7.

Adalgar

a Benedictine monk of Corby, and the companion of Rembertus, or Rheinbertus, whom he succeeded, in 888, in the archiepiscopal chair of Hamburg and Bremen. The archbishop of Cologne claimed supremacy over Cologne, and Pope Formosus cited Adalgar to appear at Rome to prove his rights to the archbishopric, but he refused both to attend in person and to send a deputy. The investigation was intrusted to the archbishop of Mayence, who decided against Adalgar, who was placed among the lowest bishops. The archbishopric was restored by a bull of Sergius III, A.D. 905. Adalgar established a seminary of priests for the propagation of the Gospel in the North, and died May 9, 909, after holding the see for nineteen years.

Adalhard

abbot of Corbie, born about 753, died in 826. He was a son of Count Bernard, and a relative of Charles Martel. He was one of the first to oppose the pretensions of the nobility, and to preach openly that the laws must be equally obeyed by patricians and commoners. Charlemagne confided to him important missions, and appointed him his delegate at the Council of Rome in 809. After the death of this emperor he fell into disfavor, having been represented by the nobility to Louis the Debonair as an ambitious demagogue. He is commemorated as a saint, Jan. 2. Mabillon failed to publish his sermons. His *Statuta Corbiensis Ecclesias* was published, but very incorrectly, by d'Achery. Many other writings of Adalhard are still scattered and inedited. Some extracts of his *Libellus de Ordine Palatii* were given by Hincmar. See Radbert, *Vita S. Adalhardi abbatis Corbiensis*, 1617. — Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 1, 218.

Adali'a

(Heb. *Adalya'*, אַדְיָאָה) probably of Persian origin; Sept. Βαρέλ v. r. Βαρέα, Vulg. *Adalja*), the fifth of the ten sons of Haman slain by the Jews under the royal edict at Shushan (Esther 9:8), B.C. 473.

Ad'am

(Heb. *Adam'*, אָדָם; red *SEE EDOM*; hence אֲדָמָה) the *ground*, from the *ruddiness* of flesh and of clayey soil, see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 24, 25; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 2, 1; Jonathan's *Targum* on Genesis 2:7; Leusden, *Onomast.* s.v.; Marek, *Hist. Paradisi*, 2, 5), the name of a man and a place.

1. The first man, whose creation, fall, and history are detailed by Moses in Genesis 2 - 5, being in fact the same Hebrew word usually rendered "man" (including *woman* also, Genesis 5:1, 2), but often used distinctively with the article אָדָם; *ha-Adam'*, "the man," Sept. and N.T. Ἀδάμ, Josephus Ἄδαμος, *Ant.* 1, 1, 2), as a proper name (comp. Tobit 8, 6). It seems at first thought somewhat strange that the head of the human family should have received his distinctive name from the affinity which he had, in the lower part of his nature, to the dust of the earth — that he should have been called *Adam*, as being taken in his bodily part from *adamah*, the ground; the more especially as the name was not

assumed by man himself, but imposed by God, and imposed in immediate connection with man's destination to bear the image of God: "And God said, Let us make man (Adam) in our image, after our likeness," etc. This apparent incongruity has led some, in particular Richers (*Die Schöpfungs-, Paradieses- und Sündfluthsgeschichte*, p. 163), to adopt another etymology of the term — to make *Adam* a derivative of *damah* (**hmdj** to be like, to resemble). Delitzsch, however (*System der Bibl. Psychologie*, p. 49), has objected to this view, both on grammatical and other grounds; and though we do not see the force of his grammatical objection to the derivation in question, yet we think he puts the matter itself rightly, and thereby justifies the received opinion. Man's name is kindred with that of the earth, *adamah*, not because of its being his characteristic dignity that God made him after his image, but because of this, that God made after his image one who had been taken from the earth. The likeness to God man had in common with the angels, but that, as the possessor of this likeness, he should be *Adam* — this is what brought him into union with two worlds — the world of spirit and the world of matter — rendered him the center and the bond of all that had been made, the fitting topstone of the whole work of creation, and the motive principle of the world's history. It is precisely his having the image of God in an earthen vessel, that, while made somewhat lower than the angels, he occupies a higher position than they in respect to the affairs of this world (^{<0005>}Psalm 8:5; ^{<0005>}Hebrews 2:5).

I. History. — In the first nine chapters of Genesis there appear to be three distinct histories relating more or less to the life of Adam. The first extends from ^{<0000>}Genesis 1:1 to 2:3, the second from 2:4 to 4:26, the third from 5:1 to the end of 9. The word (**t/ri jT**) at the commencement of the latter two narratives, which is rendered there and elsewhere *generations*, may also be rendered *history*. The style of the second of these records differs very considerably from that of the first. In the first the Deity is designated by the word *Elohim*; in the second he is generally spoken of as *Jehovah Elohim*. The object of the first of these narratives is to record the creation; that of the second to give an account of paradise, the original sin of man, and the immediate posterity of Adam; the third contains mainly the history of Noah, referring, it would seem, to Adam and his descendants, principally in relation to that patriarch. The first account of the creation of man is in general terms, the two sexes being spoken of together (^{<0007>}ch. 1:27) as a unit of species; whereas in the second, or resumptive account, the separate formation of the man and the woman is detailed. This simple consideration

reconciles all apparent discrepancy between the two narratives. *SEE GENESIS.*

The representation there given is that Adam was absolutely the first man, and was created by the direct agency of God; that this act of creation, including the immediately subsequent creation of Eve, was the last in a series of creative acts which extended through a period of six literal days. *SEE CREATION.* This Scriptural account is, of course, entirely opposed to the atheistic hypothesis, which denies any definite beginning to the human race, but conceives the successive generations of men to have run on in a kind of infinite series, to which no beginning can be assigned. Such a theory, originally propounded by heathen philosophers, has also been asserted by the more extreme section of infidel writers in Christian times. But the voice of tradition, which, in all the more ancient nations, uniformly points to a comparatively recent period for the origin of the human family, has now received conclusive attestations from learned research and scientific inquiry. Not only have the remains of human art and civilization, the more they have been explored, yielded more convincing evidence of a period not very remote when the human family itself was in infancy, but the languages of the world also, when carefully investigated and compared, as they have of late been, point to a common and not exceedingly remote origin. This is the view of Sir William Jones, and, later, of Bunsen also. The same conclusion substantially is reached by Dr. Donaldson, who, after stating what has already been accomplished in this department of learning, expresses his conviction, on the ground alone of the affinities of language, that “investigation will fully confirm what the great apostle proclaimed in the Areopagus, that God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth” (*New Cratylus*, p. 19). The position is still further confirmed by the results that have been gained in the region of natural science. The most skillful and accomplished naturalists — such as Cuvier, Blumenbach, Pritchard — have established beyond any reasonable doubt the unity of the human family as a species (see particularly Pritchard’s *History of Man*); and those who have prosecuted geological researches, while they have found remains in the different strata of rocks of numberless species of inferior animals, can point to no *human* petrifications — none, at least, but what appear in some comparatively recent and local formations — a proof that man is of too late an origin for his remains to have mingled with those of the extinct animal tribes of preceding ages. Science generally can tell of no separate creations for animals of one and

the same species; and while all geologic history is full of the beginnings and the ends of species, “it exhibits no genealogies of development” (Miller’s *Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 201). That, when created, man must have been formed in full maturity, as Adam is related to have been, was a necessity arising from the very conditions of existence. It has been discovered, by searching into the remains of preceding ages and generations of living creatures, that there has been a manifest progress in the succession of beings on the surface of the earth — a progress in the direction of an increasing resemblance to the existing forms of being, and in particular to man. But the connection between the earlier and the later, the imperfect and the perfect, is not that of direct lineage or parental descent, as if it came in the way merely of natural growth and development. The connection, as Agassiz has said in his *Principles of Zoology*, “is of a higher and immaterial nature; it is to be sought in the view of the Creator himself, whose aim in forming the earth, in allowing it to undergo the successive changes which geology has pointed out, and in creating successively all the different types of animals which have passed away, was to introduce man upon the surface of our globe. *Man is the end toward which the animal creation has tended from the first appearance of the first palaeozoic fishes.*” **SEE GEOLOGY.**

The Almighty formed Adam out of the dust of the earth, breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and gave him dominion over all the lower creatures (^{GENESIS} Genesis 1:26; 2:7), B.C. 4172. He created him in his own image **SEE PERFECTION**, and, having pronounced a blessing upon him, placed him in a delightful garden, that he might cultivate it and enjoy its fruits. **SEE EDEN.** At the same time, however, he gave him the following injunction: “Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” The first recorded exercise of Adam’s power and intelligence was his giving names to the beasts of the field and fowls of the air, which the Lord brought before him for this purpose. The examination thus afforded him having shown that it was not good for man to be alone, the Lord caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and while he remained in a semi-conscious state took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh; and of the rib thus taken from man he made a woman, whom he presented to him when he awoke. **SEE EVE.** Adam received her, saying, “This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man.” **SEE MARRIAGE.**

This woman, being seduced by the tempter, persuaded her husband to eat of the forbidden fruit (comp. Theuer, *De Adamo lapso, divortium c. Eva cogitante*, Jen. 1759). When called to judgment for this transgression before God, Adam blamed his wife, and the woman blamed the serpent-tempter. God punished the tempter by degradation and dread **SEE SERPENT**; the woman by painful travail and a situation of submission; and the man by a life of labor and toil — of which punishment every day witnesses the fulfillment. **SEE FALL**. As their natural passions now became irregular, and their exposure to accidents great, God made a covering of skin for Adam and for his wife. He also expelled them from his garden to the land around it, where Adam had been made, and where was to be their future dwelling; placing at the east of the garden a flame, which turned every way, to prevent access to the tree of life (~~GENESIS~~ Genesis 3). **SEE DEATH**.

It is not known how long Adam and his wife continued in Paradise: some think many years; others not many days; others not many hours. Shortly after their expulsion Eve brought forth Cain (~~GENESIS~~ Genesis 4:1, 2). Scripture notices but three sons of Adam, Cain, Abel, and Seth (q.v.), but contains an allusion (~~GENESIS~~ Genesis 5:4) to “sons and daughters;” no doubt several. He died B.C. 3242, aged 930 (see Bruckner, *Ob Adam wirklich ub. 900 J. alt geworden*, Aurich, 1799). **SEE LONGEVITY**.

Such is the simple narrative of the Bible relative to the progenitor of the human race, to which it only remains to add that his faith doubtless recognised in the promise of “the woman’s seed” that should “bruise the serpent’s head” the atoning merits of the future Redeemer. **SEE MESSIAH**. Whatever difficulties we may find in the Scriptural account, we accept it as a literal statement of facts, and shall therefore dismiss the rationalistic theories and speculations to which it has given rise. The results are of the utmost importance to mankind, and the light that the Bible thus sheds upon the origin of the race and the source of human depravity is of inestimable value even in a historical and philosophical point of view. **SEE MAN**.

See, generally, Eichhorn’s *Urgesch.* ed. Gabler (Nurnb. 1790); Hug, *Mos. Gesch.* (Frankf. und Leipz. 1790). Buttman has collected the parallels of heathen mythology in the *Neue Berl. Monatsschr.* 1804, p. 261 sq.; also in his *Mythologus*, 1, 122 sq.; comp. Gesenius, in the *Hall. Encykl.* 1, 358. In the Hindoo sacred books the first human pair are called *Meshia* and *Meshiam* (*Zend Avesta*, 1, 23; 3:84). For the Talmudic fables respecting

Adam, see Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* 1, 84-365, 830; 2, 417; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 9 sq. Those of the Koran are found in Sura 2, 30 sq.; 7, 11 sq.; see Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 21; comp. D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.* s.v. Christian traditions may be seen in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 46, 2 sq.; Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, 14, 17; Cedrenus, *Hist.* p. 6, 9; see especially Fabricii *Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.* 1, 1 sq. The Vulgate. in ^{<06415>}Joshua 14:15, ranks Adam among the Anakim; see Gotze, *Quanta Adamistatura fuerit* (Lips. 1722); comp. Edzardi, *Ad Cod. Avoda Sara*, p. 530 sq. **SEE ANTEDILUVIANS.**

II. The question of the *unity of the human race*, or the descent of the race from a single pair, has given rise to much discussion of late, after it had been thought to be finally settled. It may be stated thus: "Did the Almighty Creator produce only one man and one woman, from whom all other human beings have descended? or did he create several parental pairs, from whom distinct stocks of men have been derived? The question is usually regarded as equivalent to this: whether or not there is more than one species of men? But we cannot, in strict fairness, admit that the questions are identical. It is hypothetically *conceivable* that the adorable God might give existence to any number of creatures, which should all possess the properties that characterize identity of species, even without such differences as constitute varieties, or with any degree of those differences. But the admission of the possibility is not a concession of the reality. So great is the evidence in favor of the derivation of the entire mass of human beings from one pair of ancestors, that it has obtained the suffrage of the men most competent to judge upon a question of comparative anatomy and physiology.

“(1.) The animals which render eminent services to man, and peculiarly depend upon his protection, are widely diffused — the horse, the dog, the hog, the domestic fowl. Now of these, the varieties in each species are numerous and different, to a degree so great that an observer ignorant of physiological history would scarcely believe them to be of the same species. But man is the most widely diffused of any animal. In the progress of ages and generations, he has naturalized himself to every climate, and to modes of life which would prove fatal to an individual man suddenly transferred from a remote point of the field. The alterations produced affect every part of the body, internal and external, without extinguishing the marks of the specific identity.

“(2.) A further and striking evidence is, that when persons of different varieties are conjugally united, the offspring, especially in two or three generations, becomes more prolific, and acquires a higher perfection in physical and mental qualities than was found in either of the parental races. From the deepest African black to the finest Caucasian white, the change runs through imperceptible gradations; and, if a middle hue be assumed, suppose some tint of brown, all the varieties of complexion may be explained upon the principle of divergence influenced by outward circumstances. Mr. Poinsett saw in South America a fine healthy regiment of spotted men, quite peculiar enough to be held by Professor Agassiz a separate race. And why were they not? Simply because they were a known cross-breed between Spaniards and Indians. Changes as great are exhibited by the Magyars of Europe, and by the Ulster Irish, as quoted by Miller. Sir Charles Lyell was of opinion that a climatic change was already perceptible in the negro of our Southern states. Professor Cabell (*Testimony of Modern Science*, etc.) ably and clearly sustains the doctrine that propagability is conclusive proof of sameness of species. He denies, on good authority, that the mulatto is feebler or less prolific than either unmixed stock. He furnishes abundant proof of the barrenness of hybrids. The fact that the connection of different varieties of the human species produces a prolific progeny, is proof of oneness of species and family. This argument, sustained by facts; can hardly be considered less than demonstration.

“(3.) The objection drawn from the improbability that the one race springing from a single locality would migrate from a pleasanter to a worse region is very completely dispatched. Ample causes, proofs, facts, and authorities are furnished to show that, were mankind now reduced to a single family, only time would be wanting, even without civilization, to overspread the earth. European man and European-American man, as all history agrees, came from Asia. Whence came our aboriginal men? As Professor Cabell shows, they came by an antipodal route from the same Asia. Pursue the investigation, and the clue of history will lead our tremulous feet to about the Mosaic cradle of man.

“(4.) Ethnology, or rather Glottology, the gradually perfecting comparison of languages, is bringing us to the same point. The unscientific attempt to trace the striking analogies of languages to the

mere similarity of human organs, and the still more unscientific attempt of Professor Agassiz to attribute them to a transcendental mental unity in races sprung from different original localities, look like desperation. Meanwhile, comparison is educing wonderful yet rarely demonstrative laws, and laws are guiding threads converging to unity.

“(5.) Another argument is derived from the real mental unity of the universal human soul. Races differ, indeed, in mental power, as do individuals, widely, even in the same family. But there is the same program of mental philosophy for all. The same intellect, affections, instincts, conscience, sense of superior divine power, and susceptibility of religion. For the European, the Esquimaux, the Hottentot, there is the same power in the cross of Christ.

“(6.) Finally, Geology, with her wonderful demonstration of the recent origin of man, proves the same thing. The latest attempts to adduce specimens of fossil man have been failures. Not far back of the period that our best but somewhat hypothetical calculations from Mosaic chronology would assign, Geology fixes the birth of man.

“The conclusion may be fairly drawn, in the words of the able translators and illustrators of Baron Cuvier’s great work: ‘We are fully warranted in concluding, both from the comparison of man with inferior animals, so far as the inferiority will allow of such comparison, and, beyond that, by comparing him with himself, that the great family of mankind loudly proclaim a descent, at some period or other, from one common origin.’

“Thus, by an investigation totally independent of historical authority, we are brought to the conclusion of the inspired writings, that the Creator ‘hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth’ (Acts 17:26).” The more recent authorities on this question are: Prichard, *Researches into the Physiological History of Mankind* (Lond. 4 vols. 8vo, 1836-44); also *Natural History of Man* (London, 3d ed. 8vo, 1848); Bachman, *Unity of the Human Race* (Charleston, 1850, 8vo); Smyth, *Unity of the Races* (New York, 1850); Johnes, *Philological Proofs of the Unity of the Human Race* (London, 1846); *Meih*, *Qu. Rev.* July, 1851, p. 345; Jan. 1859, p. 162; Cabell, *Testimony of Modern Science to the Unity of Mankind* (New York, 1858, 12mo). See also Blumenbach, *De gen. hum. Var. Nativa* (Gott.

1776, 8vo); Quatrefages, in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, 1861; and the article MAN *SEE MAN* .

III. The *original capacities and condition* of the first human pair have also formed the subject of much discussion. It will be found, however, that the *best* conclusions of reason on this point harmonize fully with the brief Scriptural account of the facts as they were.

1. It is evident, upon a little reflection, and the closest investigation confirms the conclusion, that the first human pair must have been created in a state equivalent to that which all subsequent human beings have had to reach by slow degrees, in growth, experience, observation, imitation, and the instruction of others; that is, a state of prime maturity, and with an infusion, so to speak, of knowledge and habits, both physical and intellectual, suitable to the place which man had to occupy in the system of creation, and adequate to his necessities in that place. Had it been otherwise, the new beings could not have preserved their animal existence, nor have held rational converse with each other, nor have paid to their Creator the homage of knowledge and love, adoration and obedience; and reason clearly tells us that the last was the noblest end of existence. The Bible coincides with this dictate of honest reason, expressing these facts in simple and artless language: "And Jehovah God formed the man [*Heb.* the Adam], dust from the ground [*ha-adamah*], and blew into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living animal" (~~Gen~~Genesis 2:7). Here are two objects of attention, the organic mechanism of the human body, and the vitality with which it was endowed.

(a) The mechanical material, formed (molded, or arranged, as an artificer models clay or wax) into the human and all other animal bodies, called "dust from the ground." This expression conveys, in a general form; the idea of *earthy matter*, the constituent substance of the ground on which we tread. To say that of this the human and every other animal body was formed, is a position which would be at once the most easily apprehensible to an uncultivated mind, and which yet is the most exactly true upon the highest philosophical grounds. We now know, from chemical analysis, that the animal body is composed, in the inscrutable manner called *organization*, of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, lime, iron, sulphur, and phosphorus. Now all these are mineral substances, which in their various combinations form a very large part of the solid ground.

(b) The expression which we have rendered “living animal” sets before us the *organic life* of the animal frame, that mysterious something which man cannot create nor restore, which baffles the most acute philosophers to search out its nature, and which reason combines with Scripture to refer to the immediate agency of the Almighty — “in him we live, and move, and have our being.”

2. But the Scripture narrative also declares that “*God created man in his own image*: in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them” (⁽¹⁰⁰¹²⁾Genesis 1:27). *The image* (resemblance, such as a shadow bears to the object which casts it) *of God* is an expression which breathes at once primitive simplicity and the most recondite wisdom; for what term could the most cultivated and copious language bring forth more suitable to the purpose? It presents to us man as made in a resemblance to the Author of his being, a true resemblance, but faint and shadowy; an outline, faithful according to its capacity, yet infinitely remote from the reality: a distant form of the *intelligence, wisdom, power, rectitude, goodness, and dominion* of the Adorable Supreme. As to the precise characteristics of excellence in which this image consists, theologians have been much divided. Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 2, 5, 6) placed it in the faculties of the soul, especially in the power of choice between good and evil. Among the fathers generally, and the schoolmen after them, there were many different theories, nor are the later theologians at all more unanimous. Many unnecessary disputes would have been avoided by the recognition of the simple fact that the phrase *the image of God* is a very comprehensive one, — and is used in the Bible in more than one sense. Accordingly, the best writers speak of the image of God as twofold, *Natural* and *Moral*.

(a) *Natural* — The notion that the original resemblance of man to God must be placed in some *one* quality is destitute of proof either from Scripture or reason; and we are, in fact, taught that it comprises also what is so far from being essential that it may be both lost and regained.

(1.) When God is called “the Father of Spirits,” a likeness is suggested between man and God in the *spirituality* of their nature. This is also implied in the striking argument of St. Paul with the Athenians: “Forasmuch, then, as we are the *offspring* of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device;” plainly referring to the idolatrous statues by which God was represented among heathens. If likeness to God in man

consisted in bodily shape, this would not have been an argument against human representations of the Deity; but it imports, as Howe well expresses it, that “we are to understand that our resemblance to him, as we are his offspring, lies in some higher, more noble, and more excellent thing, of which there can be no figure; as who can tell how to give the figure or image of a thought, or of the mind or thinking power?” In *spirituality*, and, consequently, immateriality, this image of God in man, then, in the first instance, consists.

(2.) The sentiment expressed in Wisdom. 2, 23, is an evidence that, in the opinion of the ancient Jews, the image of God in man comprised *immortality* also.

“For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity;” and though other creatures were made capable of immortality, and at least the material human frame, whatever we may think of the case of animals, would have escaped death had not sin entered the world; yet, without admitting the absurdity of the “natural immortality” of the human soul, that essence must have been constituted immortal in a high and peculiar sense, which has ever retained its prerogative of continued duration amid the universal death not only of animals but of the bodies of all human beings. There appears also a manifest allusion to man’s immortality, as being included in *the image of God*, in the reason which is given in Genesis for the law which inflicts death on murderers: “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in *the image of God* made he man.” The essence of the crime of homicide is not confined here to the putting to death the mere animal part of man; and it must, therefore, lie in the peculiar value of life to an immortal being, accountable in another state for the actions done in this, and whose life ought to be specially guarded for this very reason, that death introduces him into changeless and eternal relations, which were not to be left to the mercy of human passions.

(3.) The *intellectual* faculties of man form a third feature in his natural likeness to God. Some, indeed (e.g. Philo), have placed the *whole* likeness in the *νοῦς*, or rational soul.

(4.) The *will*, or power of choice and volition, is the last of these features. They are all essential and ineffaceable. Man could not be man without them.

(b) Moral. —

(1.) There is an express allusion to the moral image of God, in which man was at first created, in ^{<SIOB>}Colossians 3:10: “And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of Him that created him;” and in ^{<SIOB>}Ephesians 4:24: “Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” In these passages the apostle represents the change produced in true Christians by the Gospel, as a “renewal of the image of God in man; as a new or second creation in that image;” and he explicitly declares, that that image consists in “knowledge,” in “righteousness,” and in “true holiness.”

(2.) This also may be finally argued from the satisfaction with which the historian of the creation represents the Creator as viewing the works of his hands as “*very good*,” which was pronounced with reference to each of them individually, as well as to the whole: “And God saw *every thing* that he had made, and behold it was very good.” But, as to man, this goodness must necessarily imply moral as well as physical qualities. A rational creature, as such, is capable of knowing, loving, serving, and living in communion with the Most Holy One. Adam, at first, did or did not exert this capacity; if he did not, he was not *very good* — not good at all.

3. On the *intellectual and moral endowments* of the progenitor of the human race, extravagant views have been taken on both sides.

(a) In knowledge, some have thought him little inferior to the angels; others, as furnished with but the simple elements of science and of language. The truth seems to be that, as to *capacity*, his intellect must have been vigorous beyond that of any of his fallen descendants; which itself gives us very high views of the strength of his understanding, although we should allow him to have been created “lower than the angels.” As to his *actual knowledge*, that would depend upon the time and opportunity he had for observing the nature and laws of the objects around him; and the degree in which he was favored with revelations from God on moral and religious subjects. The “*knowledge*” in which the Apostle Paul, in the passage quoted above from ^{<SIOB>}Colossians 3:10, places “the image of God” after which man was created, does not merely imply the faculty of understanding, which is a part of the *natural* image of God, but that which might be lost, because it is that in which we may be “*renewed*.” It is,

therefore, to be understood of the faculty of knowledge in right exercise; and of that willing reception, and firm retaining, and hearty approval of religious truth, in which knowledge, when spoken of morally, is always understood in the Scriptures. We may not be disposed to allow, with some, that Adam understood the deep philosophy of nature, and could comprehend and explain the sublime mysteries of religion. The circumstance of his giving names to the animals is certainly no sufficient proof of his having attained to a philosophical acquaintance with their qualities and distinguishing habits, although we should allow their names to be still retained in the Hebrew, and to be as expressive of their peculiarities as some expositors have stated. Sufficient time appears not to have been afforded him for the study of the properties of animals, as this event took place previous to the formation of Eve; and as for the notion of his acquiring knowledge by intuition, this is contradicted by the *revealed* fact that angels themselves acquire their knowledge by observation and study, though, no doubt, with great rapidity and certainty. The whole of this transaction was supernatural; the beasts were “brought” to Adam, and it is probable that he named them under a Divine suggestion. That his understanding was, as to its capacity, deep and large beyond any of his posterity, must follow from the perfection in which he was created; and his acquisitions of knowledge would, therefore, be rapid and easy. It was, however, in moral and religious truth, as being of the first concern to him, that we are to suppose the excellency of his knowledge to have consisted. “His reason would be clear, his judgment uncorrupted, and his conscience upright and sensible.” The best knowledge would, in him, be placed first, and that of every other kind be made subservient to it, according to its relation to that. The apostle adds to knowledge “righteousness and true holiness;” terms which express, not merely freedom from sin, but positive and active virtue.

Sober as these views of man’s primitive state are, it is not, perhaps, possible for us fully to conceive of so exalted a condition as even this. Below this standard it could not fall; and that it implied a glory, and dignity, and moral greatness of a very exalted kind, is made sufficiently apparent from the degree of guilt charged upon Adam when he fell; for the aggravating circumstances of his offense may well be deduced from the tremendous consequences which followed.

(b) As to Adam’s *moral* perfection, it has sometimes been fixed at an elevation which renders it exceedingly difficult to conceive how he could

fall into sin at all. On the other hand, those who deny the doctrine of our hereditary depravity, delight to represent Adam as little superior in moral perfection and capability to his descendants. But if we attend to the passages of Holy Writ above quoted, we shall be able, on this subject, to ascertain, if not the exact degree of his moral endowments, yet that there is a certain standard below which they cannot be placed. Generally, he was made in the *image* of God, which, we have already proved, is to be understood *morally* as well as *naturally*. To whatever *extent* it went, it necessarily excluded all which did not resemble God; it was a likeness to God in “righteousness and true holiness,” whatever the degree of each might be, and excluded all admixture of unrighteousness and unholiness. Man, therefore, in his original state, was *sinless*, both in act and in principle.

4. The rabbis and the Arabians relate many absurd traditions about Adam’s personal beauty, endowments, etc., and such are still current among the Eastern nations. An account of many of them may be found in Bayle (s.v.).

5. That Adam was a type of Christ is plainly affirmed by Paul, who calls him “the figure of him who was to come.” Hence our Lord is sometimes called, not inaptly, the second Adam. This typical relation stands sometimes in *similitude*, sometimes in *contrast*. Adam was formed immediately by God, as was the humanity of Christ. In each the nature was spotless, and richly endowed with knowledge and true holiness. Both are seen invested with dominion over the earth and all its creatures; and this may explain the eighth Psalm, where David seems to make the sovereignty of the first man over the whole earth, in its pristine glory, the prophetic symbol of the dominion of Christ over the world restored. Beyond these particulars fancy must not carry us; and the typical *contrast* must also be limited to that which is stated in Scripture or supported by its allusions. Adam and Christ were each a public person, *a federal head* to the whole race of mankind; but the one was the fountain of sin and death, the other of righteousness and life. By Adam’s transgression “many were made sinners” (Romans 5:14-19). Through him, “death passed upon all men, because all have sinned” in him. But he thus prefigured that one man, by whose righteousness the “free gift comes upon all men to justification of life.” The first man communicated a living soul to all his posterity; the other is a quickening Spirit, to restore them to newness of life new, and to raise them up at the last day. By the imputation of the first Adam’s sin, and the communication of his fallen, depraved nature, death reigned over those

who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression; and through the righteousness of the second Adam, and the communication of a divine nature by the Holy Spirit, favor and grace shall much more abound in Christ's true followers unto eternal life. Watson, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Hunter, *Sac. Biog.* p. 8; Williams, *Characters of O.T.* 1; Kurtz, *Hist. of Old Cov.* § 21, 22. **SEE FALL** and **SEE REDEMPTION**.

2. (Sept. **Ἀδάμ**, but most copies omit; Vulg. *Adom*.) A city at some distance from the Jordan, to which (according to the text, **μδαβ]** in Adam), or beyond which (according to the margin, **μdame** "from Adam," as in our version), the overflow of the waters of that stream extended in its annual inundation, at the time when the Israelites passed over (^{<10816>}Joshua 3:16). The name of the city (*red*) may have been derived from the alluvial clay in the vicinity (comp. ^{<10746>}1 Kings 7:46). It has been incorrectly inferred from the above text that the city Adam was located east of the river, whereas it is expressly stated to have been *beside*. (**dxm**)Zarethan (q.v.), which is known to have been on the west bank, not far from Bethshean (^{<10412>}1 Kings 4:12). It hence appears that the "heap" or accumulation of waters above the Israelites' crossing-place, caused by the stoppage of the stream, reached back on the shore and many miles up the river, over the secondary banks of the Ghor, on which Zarethan stood, as far as the higher ground on which Adam was located (see Keil, *Comment.* in loc.); probably the ridge immediately north of Bethshean, which closes the plain of the Jordan in this direction.

Adam of Bremen

born in Upper Saxony, came to Bremen in 1067, and was made *magister scholarum* in 1069 — hence often named Magister. He died about the year 1076. (See Asmussen, *De fontibus Adami Bremens*, Kilion. 1834.) He wrote the *Gesia Hammenburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, which is our chief source of information for the Church history of Northern Europe from 788 to 1072, the period over which it extends. The best edition is that of Lappenberg, in the *Monumenta Germanioe* (ed. Pertz, tom. 7, p. 266-389); also published separately, "in usum scholarum" (Hanover, 1846). The best treatise on his life, his trustworthiness as a historian, and his sources of information, is the introduction of Lappenberg to his edition. Corrections of some of his statements may be found in *N. Comm. Soc. Goett.* 1, 2, 126 sq.; and in Staphorst, *Hist. Eccles. Hamburg.*

Adam, Melchior

born in Silesia, obtained about 1600 the headship of a college, and finally a professorship in the University of Heidelberg. His chief works are *Vitae Germanorum Philosophorum, Theologorum*, etc. (Heidelberg, 1615-'20, 4 vols. 8vo), and *Decades duae continentes vitas Theologorum exterorum Principum* (Franc. 1618, 8vo), published together, under the title *Dignarumn laude virorum immortalitas* (Francf. 1653, 5 vols. 8vo, and 1706, fol.) — a great repository, from which compilers of church history and of biographical dictionaries have since drawn their materials. He died March 23, 1622, at Heidelberg.

Adam, Thomas

born at Leeds, 1701, was rector of Wintringham, England, fifty-eight years, and died 1784. He was a sensible and voluminous writer: his "*Works*" (Lond. 1822, 3 vols. 8vo) contain a Paraphrase on the *Romans*, *Lectures on the Church Catechism*, and a number of *Sermons*. His *Life*, with his *Exposition of the Gospels*, was published in London in 1837 (2 vols. 8vo).

Ad'amah

(Heb. *Adamah'*, *hmda* } *ground*, as often; Sept. *Ἀδαμί* v. r. *Ἀρμαίθ*, Vulg. *Edema*), a fortified city of Naphtali, mentioned between Chinnereth and Ramnah (⁴⁶⁹⁸Joshua 19:36); probably the same as ADAMI *SEE* ADAMI (q.v.) of the same tribe (ver. 33). Schwarz, however (*Palest.* p. 183), thinks it is the present village *Dama*, situated, according to him, 5 English miles W.N.W. from Safed; but no such name is given by other travelers.

Adamannus or Adamnanus

a Scoto-Irish priest and monk, made in 679 abbot of Hy. In 701 he was sent on a mission to Alfred, king of Northumberland, and on his return endeavored in vain to induce his countrymen to observe Easter after the Roman fashion, which he had learned in England. He then passed over into Ireland, where he persuaded nearly all the people to follow the Roman custom. From Ireland he returned to Hy, and having again tried, but with as little success, to bring his monks round to his newly-adopted views, he died there, aged 80. Sept. 23 704. He edited a *Life of St. Columba*, in three books, which is given by Canisius, tom. 5, part 2, p. 562 (or in the new ed.

tom. 1, p. 680); also *De Locis Terrae Sanctae, libri 3*, published by Serarius, at Ingolstadt, 1619, and by Mabillon, in his *Saec. Bened.* 3, part 2, p. 502. He is also said to have written a book, *De Pascha'e Legitimo*, and some canons. See Sir James Ware's *Irish Writers*, lib. 1, cap. 3, p. 35. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 679; Bede, *Hist.* lib. 5, cap. 16.

Adamant

a term vaguely used to describe any very hard stone, and employed in the Auth. Vers. in ^{<3119>}Ezekiel 3:9; ^{<3172>}Zechariah 7:12, as the rendering of *rymæ* (*shamir'*), elsewhere (^{<2170>}Jeremiah 17:1) rendered DIAMOND (q.v.). *Ἀδάμας*, Ecclus. 16, 16, in some copies.

Ad'ami

(Heb. *Adami'*, *yma*, reddish; Sept. *Ἀδεμμί*, Vulg. *Adami*), a city near the border of Naphtali, mentioned between Zaanaim and Nekeb (^{<0623>}Joshua 19:33). The best interpreters (e.g. Rosenmüller, Keil, in loc.) join this with the following name, Nekeb (*bqNhi*, i. q. in *the hollow*; so the Vulg. *quae est Neceb*, but the Sept. distinguishes them, *καὶ Νάκεβ*), as if an epithet of the same place; although the Jerusalem Talmud (*Megillah*, 70, 1) makes them distinct, and calls the former *Damin* (*yma*), which Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 181) supposes identical with a "village *Dame* 5 English miles west of the S.W. point of the Sea of Tiberias," meaning the ruined site *Dameh* (Robinson, *Researches*, 3, 237), falling on the limits of Naphtali. **SEE TRIBE**. The place appears to be the same elsewhere (^{<0623>}Joshua 19:36) called ADAMAH **SEE ADAMAH** (q.v.), and the enumeration in ver. 38 requires the collocation *Adanminekeb* as one locality. **SEE NEKEB**.

Adamic Constitution

SEE COVENANT.

Adamites

1. a sect of heretics in Northern Africa in the second and third centuries. They pretended to the primitive innocence which Adam had before the fall; and, in imitation of his original condition, they appeared naked in their religious assemblies, which they called *Paradises*. The author of this abominable heresy was a certain Prodicus, a disciple of Carpocrates (August. *De Haeres.* 31).

2. A similar heresy, under the same name, appeared in Bohemia in the fifteenth century. (See Picard, *Ceremonies Religieuses*, fig. 215.) Their founder was a Frenchman, John Picard, after whom they were also called Picardists. From France they spread over a large portion of Germany, especially over Bohemia and Moravia. Their chief seat was a fort on an island of the river Lusinicz, from whence they frequently set out for plundering and murdering. Ziska suppressed them in 1421. For a long time they seemed to be extinct, but in 1781, when Joseph II issued his patent of toleration, the Adamites came again forward and claimed toleration of their principles and meetings. But when they made known the character of both, the government speedily suppressed them. Also this time their extinction was only apparent, and in 1849, after the publication of the edict of toleration, they again showed themselves in public, especially in the district of Chrudim, Bohemia. In five villages they were very numerous, and in one, Stradau, they even succeeded in making many converts. All their members belong to the Czechic (Slavonian) nationality, and are mostly mechanics or peasants. They deny the existence of a personal God, but assume a Supreme Power (Moc) which has created the world, which henceforth exists through itself. Every Adamite claims a spirit who cleanses him from sins. They reject sacraments and worship, but expect a savior (Marokan) from whose appearance they hope the realization of their communistic ideas. Their meetings and the public confession of their principles have been again suppressed by the government, but they are known still to exist in secret. (See Beausobre, *Sur les Adamites en Boheme*, in L'Enfant, *Hist. Huss.* 1, 304 sq.; Pertz, *Script. rer. Austriae*, sect. 14.) — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 2, pt. 2, ch. 5, § 18; Lardner, *Works*, 8, 425; Wetzer and Welte, 12, 11 sq.

Adamnanus

SEE ADAMANNUS.

Adams, Eliphalet

an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Dedham, Mass., March 26, 1677, and graduated at Harvard College in 1694. After preaching in various places for ten years without settlement, he was ordained pastor of the church in New London, Conn., February, 1709, and died April, 1753. He was a man of learning, and was very much interested in the Indians,

whose language he had acquired. He published a number of occasional sermons. Alien, *Amer. Biog.*; Sprague, *Annals*, 1, 234.

Adams, Hannah

was born at Medfield, near Boston, in 1756. She learned Greek and Latin from students who lodged in her father's house. In 1784 she published a *View of all Religions*, which went through several editions in America, and was reprinted in England. In her fourth edition she changed the title to *Dictionary of Religions*. She also published a *History of the Jews* (Boston, 1812). Her *History of New England* appeared in 1799. She died at Brookline, Mass., Nov. 15, 1831.

Adams, Jasper

D.D., President of Charleston College, S. C., was born at Medway, Mass. Aug. 27, 1793, graduated at Brown University in 1815, and studied theology at Andover. In 1819 he was made professor of mathematics at Brown University, and was ordained a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the same year. In 1824 he became President of Charleston College, but in 1826 he removed to the charge of Geneva College, in New York. In 1828 he returned to Charleston, and managed the institution till 1836, when he left it in a highly prosperous state. After preparing and publishing a system of *Moral Philosophy* (New York, 1838, 8vo), he was for two years chaplain at the West Point Academy, and then removed to Pendleton, S. C., where he died, Oct. 25, 1841. Besides the "Moral Philosophy," he published a number of occasional sermons and addresses. Sprague, *Annals*, 5, 641.

Adams, John

was the only son of Hon. John Adams, of Nova Scotia, and was graduated at Harvard College in 1721. He was pastor at Newport, but dismissed, 1730. He died at Cambridge in 1740. He was distinguished for his genius and piety, and is said to have been master of nine languages. A small volume of his poems was published at Boston in 1745. — Alien, *Amer. Biog.*; Sprague, *Annals*, 1, 350.

Adams, Samuel

M.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in 1766, and practiced medicine till mature years, holding infidel opinions in regard

to Christianity. After his conversion, in 1813, he entered the Ohio Conference in 1818 as a travelling minister, and devoted himself to the ministry fifteen years. He died at Beaver, Pa., March 6, 1832. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 2, 214.

Adams, Thomas

a pious and learned English divine, rector of St. Bennet's, London, was sequestered for his loyalty, and died before the Restoration. He was a great favorite with Southey, who says that "he had all the oddity and felicity of Fuller's manner." His *Works*, chiefly sermons, were published in 1630 (fol. Lond.). His *Exposition of St. Peter* was reprinted in 1839 (imp. 8vo, London).

Adams, William

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Fairfax Co., Va., June 29, 1785. Educated in a pious household, he was converted at an early age, and commenced preaching in 1813, in Kentucky, whither his family had removed. His mind naturally vigorous, was cultivated by assiduous study, and he became one of the most acceptable and useful preachers of the Kentucky Conference, of which he was a member from 1814 to the time of his death. For many years he was secretary of the Conference. He died in 1836. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 2, 406.

Adamson Patrick,

archbishop of St. Andrews, and one of the most learned writers of the 16th century, was born at Perth, March 15, 1543. At the age of 23 he went abroad as private tutor, and narrowly escaped death at Bourges at the time of the massacre of Paris. He lived in concealment seven months, during which time he translated into Latin verse the Book of Job, and wrote the tragedy of Herod, also in Latin verse. In 1573 he returned to Scotland, became minister of Paisley, and was soon raised to the archbishopric of St. Andrews, the accepting of which brought him into continual discredit and affliction till his death, in great poverty, Feb. 18, 1592. His *Works* were printed at London in 1619.

A'dar

the name of a month and also of a place. *SEE ADDAR.*

1. (Heb. and Chald. *Adar*, *rdā*}large; ^{<1781E>}Esther 3:7, 13; 8:12; 9:1, 15, 17; 19:21; ^{<1781S>}Ezra 6:15; Sept. Ἀδάρ.) The sixth month of the civil and the twelfth of the ecclesiastical year of the Jews (comp. 1 Maccabees 7:43); from the new moon of March to that of April; or, according to the rabbins, from the new moon of February to that of March. The name was first introduced after the captivity, being the Macedonian *Dystrus* (Ἄδυστρος). (See Michaelis, *Gram. Arab.* p. 25; *Suppl.* p. 25; Golius, in *Lex. ad Alferg.* p. 17, 34; Hyde, *De rel. vet. Pers.* p. 63.) The following are the chief days in it which are set apart for commemoration: The 7th is a fast for the death of Moses (^{<1781S>}Deuteronomy 34:5, 6). There is some difference, however, in the date assigned to his death by some ancient authorities. Josephus (*Ant.* 4, 8, 49) states that he died on the *first* of this month.; which also agrees with Midrash *Megillath Esther*, cited by Reland (*Antiq. Hebr.* 4, 10); whereas the Talmudical tracts *Kiddushim* and *Sotah* give the *seventh* as the day. It is at least certain that the latter was the day on which the fast was observed. On the 9th there was a fast in memory of the contention or open rupture of the celebrated schools of Hillel and Shammai, which happened but a few years before the birth of Christ. The cause of the dispute is obscure (Wolf's *Biblioth. Hebr.* 2, 826). The 13th is the so-called "Fast of Esther." Iken observes (*Antiq. Hebr.* p. 150) that this was not an actual fast, but merely a commemoration of Esther's fast of three days (^{<1781E>}Esther 4:16), and a preparation for the ensuing festival. Nevertheless, as Esther appears, from the date of Haman's edict, and from the course of the narrative, to have fasted in Nisan, Buxtorf adduces from the rabbins the following account of the name of this fast, and of the foundation of its observance in Adar (*Synag. Jud.* p. 554); that the Jews assembled together on the 13th, in the time of Esther, and that, after the example of Moses, who fasted when the Israelites were about to engage in battle with the Amalekites, they devoted that day to fasting and prayer, in preparation for the perilous trial which awaited them on the morrow. In this sense, this fast would stand in the most direct relation to the feast of Purim. The 13th was also, "by a common decree," appointed as a festival in memory of the death of Nicanor (2 Maccabees 15:36). The 14th and 15th were devoted to the feast of Purim (^{<1781E>}Esther 9:21). **SEE PURIM.** In case the year was an intercalary one; when the month of Adar occurred twice, this feast was first moderately observed in the intercalary Adar, — and then celebrated with full splendor in the ensuing Adar. **SEE VE-ADAR.** The former of these two celebrations was then called the *lesser*, and the latter the *great Purim*. Home has erroneously stated (*Introduction*, 3, 177) that these designations

apply to the two days of the festival in an ordinary year. For the Scripture lessons of this month, see *Otho, Lex. Rabb.* p. 8. *SEE CALENDAR; SEE MONTH.*

2. (Heb. *Addar'*, *rDaj splendor*, otherwise *threshing-floor*; Sept. *Ἀδδαρά*, apparently mistaking the appended *h* local for a part of the word; Vulg. *Addar*) a contracted form (^{<065B>}Joshua 15:3) of the name elsewhere (^{<06D4>}Numbers 34:4) written HAZAR-ADDAR (q.v.). *SEE ATAROTH-ADAR.*

Adarconim

SEE DARIC.

Adargazerin

SEE TREASURER.

Ad'asa

(*Ἀδασά*), a village of Judaea, where Judas the Maccabee slew the Assyrian general Nicanor (1 Maccabees 7:40, 45), and where he was himself afterward slain by the generals of Antiochus (Josephus, *War*, 1, 1, 6). It was situated, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 12, 10, 5), 30 stadia from Bethoron, and, according to Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v.), not far from Gophna, but was hardly the HADASHAH *SEE HADASHAH* (q.v.) of the tribe of Judah (^{<0657>}Joshua 15:37). *SEE LAISH.*

Adashim

SEE LENTIL.

Adauctus

an Italian and steward of certain of the royal domains, in a city of Phrygia, the name of which is unknown. He perished during the persecution of Diocletian, about 303. His memory is celebrated by the Latin church on the 7th of February; by the Greeks, October 3d. — Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 8, 1; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, Feb. 7.

Ad'beel

(Heb. *Adbeel'*, אֲבִיעֵל *adbi'el* prob. *miracle of God*, the first member being by Syriasm for אֶבְרָתָא, *finger*; or *progeny of God*, the first member being Arab. *adb*, *offspring*; Sept. Ναβδεήλ [Josephus Ἀβδέηλος, *Ant.* 1, 12, 4], Vulg. *Adbeel*), the third named of the twelve sons of Ishmael, and head of an unknown Arabian tribe (^{<0253>}Genesis 25:13; ^{<1029>}1 Chronicles 1:29). B.C. post 2061. See ARABIA.

Ad'dan

(Heb. *Addan'*, אֲדָן Sept. Ἡδάν), another form (^{<1029>}Ezra 2:59) of the name (^{<1076>}Nehemiah 7:61) ADDON *SEE ADDON* (q.v.).

Ad'dar

(Heb. *Addar'*, אֲדָר *ad-dar* ample or splendid, otherwise [from the Chald. אֲדָרַיִת *ad-dar-ai-t* threshing-floor; Sept. Ἀρέδ v. r. Ἄδιρ, Vulg. *Addar*), a son of Bela and grandson of Benjamin (^{<1088>}1 Chronicles 8:3); elsewhere (^{<0421>}Genesis 46:21) called ARD (q.v.). *SEE ATAROTH-ADDAR*; *SEE HAZAR-ADDAR*.

Adder

in the general sense of a *venomous serpent*. *SEE SERPENT*, is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following Hebrew words in certain passages: אֲשָׁפָט (akshub', perhaps so called from *coiling* and *lying in wait*), an *asp*, or other venomous reptile, only found in ^{<1013>}Psalms 140:3; אֲשָׁפָט (pe'then, probably from *twisting* itself), an equally indefinite term for a *viper* or venomous serpent, ^{<1084>}Psalms 58:4; 91:13 (elsewhere "asp," ^{<1023>}Deuteronomy 32:33; ^{<1014>}Job 20:14, 16; ^{<1018>}Isaiah 11:8); אֲשָׁפָט (tsiphoni', so called from *hissing*), a *basilisk*, or other poisonous serpent, ^{<1022>}Proverbs 23:32 (elsewhere "cockatrice," ^{<1018>}Isaiah 11:8; 59:5; ^{<1017>}Jeremiah 8:17; like the kindred אֲשָׁפָט (pik, tse'pha, ^{<1029>}Isaiah 14:29); אֲשָׁפָט (/pyræi) (*shephiphon'*, so called from *creeping*), apparently an *adder*, or small speckled venomous snake, occurs only in ^{<1017>}Genesis 49:17. Few, if any, of these terms are descriptive of a particular species of serpent, although special traits are given in connection with some of them that enable us to make an approximation toward their identification with those described by modern naturalists. *SEE SNAKE*. The terms *adder* and *viper* are nearly interchangeable in modern science, the latter being strictly the name of a

genus of serpents having the head covered with scales. *SEE VIPER*. The true adders are classed under the sub-genus *Berus*, and are of several species, properly distinguished by the granular scales of the head, sometimes with larger scales intermixed, and having nostrils of a moderate size. *SEE ASP*.