

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Architecture - Astronomy**

*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**

## Architecture

### Picture for Architecture 1

(Lat. *architectura*, from Gr. ἀρχιτέκτων, a *master builder*), though usually ranked as a fine art, is not purely such in the sense that painting, sculpture, music, and poetry are, but must be ranked rather as an applied art. Buildings erected for dwelling, manufacture, merchandise, public business, education, worship, burial, or defense, serve, first and primarily, their practical purposes. In so far as reference is had to the mathematical and physical principles of construction, the choice of material, and the perfect adaptation of the building to its uses, the edifice is a *scientific* achievement, and from this standpoint architecture is a science. In so far as the laws of taste and the power of the imagination are applied to the grouping of the masses, and the invention and distribution of the ornamentation, the edifice is a work of art, and, from this aesthetic standpoint, architecture is a fine art. Embodying thus the material and spiritual wants of an age or people with its knowledge of the resources of nature and the power of its imagination, the history of architecture is a most important element in the history of civilization. The genius of a great architect, though largely controlled by the object of the building, the materials at his command, and other considerations of site, country, and climate, and especially by the prevailing styles and tastes, will always be stamped upon his works, and give them a marked individuality. Though no monuments remain of their earliest history, architecture is generally supposed to have existed as a fine art before the other formative arts of painting and sculpture.

**I.** *Ancient Architecture.* — This period extends from the earliest times to about the time of Constantine the Great, when Christianity took the place of Paganism as the controlling spirit in architecture.

**1.** *Egyptian.* — The earliest authenticated monuments of architecture are to be found in Egypt, where were developed indeed the germs of all the arts. Of the other styles we can trace the rise, culmination, and decadence. Of the rise of Egyptian art we know nothing, but we are placed suddenly face to face with the Pyramids of Gizeh, the Sphinx, and other works, all executed in true taste, and with so great a degree of scientific knowledge as to indicate a long period of anterior development. This first period (in the fourth dynasty) excelled all later periods in some elements of design,

though the second (in the twelfth dynasty) gave the column and other elements, all of which were moulded together, and brought to the highest execution and finish in the third period (in the eighteenth dynasty). Egyptian architecture, in many points, such as the majestic disposition of the masses, the sublime massiveness and durability of its walls, the long vistas through successive courts and lines of columns and sphinxes, the predominance of the interior over exterior ornament, the universal use of color, the subordination of sculpture and painting to architectonic effects, the symbolism of its ornaments and the monumental character of its edifices, was the most perfect the world has yet seen. (See Wilkinson, *Architecture of the Ancient Egyptians*, Lond. 1856.) The Egyptian public edifices consisted of temples, palaces, tombs, and aqueducts. The earliest *Temples* and *Tombs* were doubtless of wood, or were excavated from the solid rock. These two styles of building gave a typical character to the later temples, built mostly aboveground and of cut stone. The temple was usually built upon a high, often a raised foundation, above the flow of the high waters of the Nile. The entranceway was paved with broad stones, and often led from the tomb of a deceased king. This entrance opened on the side facing the Nile to an enclosure surrounded by a massive wall of cut stone, diminishing as it rose, and covered like all the Egyptian walls, as those of temples and tombs, with a broad, simple, spreading cornice. This unbroken massive wall was covered, as were the walls of the temple within, with symbolic paintings of the Egyptian religion, hieroglyphic records of history, or figures of deities and kings. Within the enclosure was the temple, surrounded by rows of trees, and often with an artificial basin of water at one side. From the single opening of the entrance in the wall the way led between two rows of colossal sphinxes or rams to the majestic facade of the temple. Before the door rose two lofty obelisks or sat two colossal figures, and banners floated from high poles at their side. The walls within and without, and the columns, even when made of costly and polished stones, were covered with religious paintings or hieroglyphics. The door opened to a court within, surrounded by a covered passage-way (sometimes a second similar court followed); into these were admitted the awestruck multitude. Into the series of chambers extending back of the courts, covered by stone roofing and lighted by small openings from above, were admitted only priests or sacred persons. In the last chamber was the "sanctum sanctorum," containing the image of the deity. The columns of the Egyptian architecture are of three typical kinds, emblematic of the papyrus, the lotus, and the palm — the fluting, when used, originating in

the columns of the under-ground temples. The temples varied in size, and the general disposition of the courts and chambers, often having the rear half cut out of the living rock. *SEE TEMPLE.*

The *Pyramids*, or tombs of the kings, faced the four cardinal points of the compass. They were first built small, and then enlarged by successive coverings, as the length and prosperity of the reigns of the monarchs permitted. They were built in terraces, and then were filled out and faced with stone, commencing from the upper terrace and going downward. The interiors of the Pyramids and of the successive layers were often filled with brick or loose stone, but the facing was of hard, dressed, often of polished stone. Examination has shown that the interior pyramid was often made with much more care than the subsequent facings. There was only one small chamber (with a narrow passage leading to it), and containing a sealed massive stone sarcophagus, holding the embalmed body of the monarch. Of large and small pyramids there are found in Lower Egypt, where they mostly occur, sixty-seven, counting the finished and unfinished, and those in the different degrees of preservation. They reach from Cairo to Fayoum, along the left shore of the Nile, a distance of about five miles. They are arranged in five principal groups, the chief one being that of *Gizeh*, situated near ancient Memphis, the seat of the earliest Egyptian monarchy. The largest of them, that of Cheops, is now 450 ft. high, and 746 ft. square at the base. All the great pyramids were built between the second and fifth dynasties. The later pyramids were built mostly of brick, and were much smaller, as were also those of Upper Egypt, *SEE ETHIOPIA*, near Meroe, being built about 700 B.C. The private tombs were mostly cut in the living rock, and were often decorated with great taste and labor. *SEE PYRAMID.*

The *villas* of the Egyptians were of great extent, and contained spacious gardens watered by canals communicating with the Nile. The house itself was sometimes ornamented with propylea and obelisks, like the temples; it is even possible that part of the building may have been consecrated to religious purposes, as the chapels of other countries, since we find (in ancient paintings of them) a priest engaged in presenting offerings at the door of the inner chambers; and, indeed, were it not for the presence of the women, the form of the garden, and the style of the porch, we should feel disposed to consider it a temple rather than a place of abode. The entrances. of large villas were generally through folding gates, standing between lofty towers, as at the courts of temples, with a small door at each

side; and others had merely folding gates, with the jambs surmounted by a cornice. One general wall of circuit extended round the premises, but the courts of the house, the garden, the offices, and all the other parts of the villa had each their separate enclosure. The walls were usually built of crude brick, and when in damp places, or within reach of the inundation, the lower part was strengthened by a basement of stone. They were sometimes ornamented with panels and grooved lines, generally stuccoed, and the summit was crowned either with Egyptian battlements, the usual cornice, a row of spikes in imitation of spear-heads, or with some fancy ornament. The plans of the villas varied according to circumstances, but their general arrangement is sufficiently explained by the paintings. They were surrounded by a high wall, about the middle of which was the main or front entrance, with one central and two side gates, leading to an open walk shaded by rows of trees. Here were spacious tanks of water, facing the doors of the right and left wings of the house, between which an avenue led from the main entrance to what may be called the center of the mansion. After passing the outer door of the right wing, you entered an open court, with trees, extending quite round a nucleus of inner apartments, and having a back entrance communicating with the garden. On the right and left of this court were six or more store-rooms, a small receiving or waiting room at two of the corners, and at the other end the staircases which led to the upper story. Both of the inner facades were furnished with a corridor, supported on columns, with similar towers and gateways. The interior of this wing consisted of twelve rooms, two outer and one center court, communicating by folding gates; and on either side of this last was the main entrance to the rooms on the ground floor, and to the staircases leading to the upper story. At the back were three long rooms, and a gateway opening on the garden, which, besides flowers, contained a variety of trees, a summer-house, and a large tank of water. The arrangement of the left wing was different. The front gate led to an open court, extending the whole breadth of the facade of the building, and backed by the wall of the inner part. Central and lateral doors thence communicated with another court, surrounded on three sides by a set of rooms, and behind it was a corridor, upon which several other chambers opened. This wing had no back entrance, and, standing isolated, the outer court extended entirely round it; and a succession of doorways communicated from the court with different sections of the center of the house, where the rooms, disposed, like those already described, around passages and corridors, served partly as sitting apartments and partly as

store-rooms. (See Wilkinson's *Anc, Eg.* abridgm. 1:24 sq.) **SEE BUILDING.**

**2.** The remains of *Persian and Assyrian* palaces are important, as suggesting what may have been the predominant features of the palaces of David, and especially Solomon, although this style was doubtless somewhat modified by the Syrian method of architecture, which was probably more lofty, with several stories, quadrangular, and with flat roofs. In Mr. Fergusson's work (*The Palaces of Ninevah and Persepolis Restored*, Lond. 1851) may be found the latest and most ingenious theory on this subject, with plans and elevations giving a tangible form to his conclusions. The scarcity of wood in the East must have had great effect in architectural style; but stone being abundant in Palestine, there was no occasion for the immense piles and thick walls of sunburnt brick which formed so distinguishing a feature in Assyrian structures. According to Mr. Fergusson, the ground story alone was faced with stone, the upper story being formed upon a system of beams supported by pillars, and enclosed by a high mud wall (see the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1852, p. 422-433). On the numerous points of resemblance between the Assyrian and Jewish palaces, see Layard's *Nineveh*, 2d ser. p. 641 sq. **SEE ASSYRIA.**

**3.** The specimens of the *Indian* styles are of doubtful date, yet the most remarkable were probably erected about one thousand years B.C. They are exclusively Brahminical and Buddhist temples and pagodas. Some of the Brahminical temples are excavations in the rocks, but not closed like the Egyptians, and have columns cut out of the rock without rules or uniformity (e.g. the temple of Ellora and Elephanta); others are provided with cells, with cupolas or pyramidal ceilings, and supported by figures of animals (Kailassa of Ellora). The Buddhist temples are also underground, but closed, and in the shape of a long parallelogram; they have a double row of pillars, a vault resembling the interior of a hollow cylinder, and end in a semicircular recess containing the divinity in the form of a soap-bubble (Dagoss), as in the temple of Wiswakarna at Ellora. The pagodas are built aboveground, generally pyramidal, and terminated by a cupola (e.g. Madura, Brambana of Java). The Indian architecture approaches closely to the Persian and the Assyrian, as exemplified in Persepolis, Nineveh, and Babylon; and also, at a later time, to the Chinese, which adopted the pagoda style in their turrets, but replaced the cupola by a projecting angular roof ornamented with bells (e.g. the porcelain tower at Nankin). But it is with the Egyptian style that the Israelite is connected, as

exemplified in Solomon's Temple (see article). (See Sleeman's *Rambles in India*, Lond. 1844.)

Entirely independent of foreign sources, yet resembling the Indo-Chinese styles in its forms, is the *Mexican* style, especially in its temples (Theocalles), whose form is pyramidal, and of which remarkable remains are yet to be found in Testchuakan, Papantla, Eholula, etc.

## Picture for Architecture 2

## Picture for Architecture 3

**4. Grecian and Roman.** — Greek architecture lacks the size, the majestic grandeur, the long vistas, and the symbolism of the Egyptian, but excels it in freedom of treatment, and in perfection of proportion and execution of detail. It received nearly all its elements from Egypt and Assyria, but molded them into an original and native style, and influenced powerfully the architecture of the Roman and all subsequent styles. It is marked unequally by two great periods, the *heroic* and the *historic*. The *heroic* period extends from the first immigration of the Greek branch of the Greco-Italic division of the Indo-Germanic family into Greece and Asia Minor, to about the fall of Troy (1100 B.C.). The works of this period were mostly fortifications or palaces. The walls were built at first of massive, irregular, untrimmed stones (as at Tiryns, Fig. 1), or of irregular but trimmed stones (as at Argos, Fig. 2), and later of stones laid in broken ranges, as in the treasure-house of Atreus at Mycenae. The stones were laid (as was the case till the latest period of Grecian architecture) without mortar, and these massive walls are often termed Cyclopean. In the *historic* period appeared at first two distinct styles among the two great branches of the Greek people, the Doric and the Ionic. The Doric elements were mostly derived from Egypt, and the Ionic from Assyria.

## Picture for Architecture 4

The Doric order is the most ancient, and is marked by the characteristics of the people from whom it derives its name. It is simple, massive, and majestic. The column is characterized by the absence of a base, by the thickness and rapid diminution of the shaft, and by the simplicity and massiveness of the capital. In the entablature, the architrave is in one surface and quite plain. The frieze is ornamented by triglyphs, so called from the three flat bands into which they are divided by the intervening

channels; while the metopes, or the vacant spaces between the triglyphs, are also adorned with sculptures in high relief. The cornice projects far, and on its under side are cut several sets of drops, called mutules. Its principal specimens are the temples at Corinth (Greece), Girgenti (in Sicily), Paestum (in Italy), at AEGina (Greece), and the Theseum, Parthenon, and Propylseum (at Athens).

The Ionic order is distinguished by simple gracefulness, and by a far richer style of ornament than the Doric. The shaft of the column is much more slender, and rests upon a base, while the capital is adorned by spiral volutes. The architrave is in three faces, each slightly projecting beyond the lower; there is a small cornice between the architrave and the frieze, and all three members of the entablature are more or less ornamented with moldings. The Ionic order was used mostly in temples and theatres. Its finest example is the Erechtheum in the Acropolis.

The Corinthian order is only a later form of the Ionic, and belongs to a period subsequent to that of the pure Grecian style. It is especially characterized by its beautiful capital, which is said to have been suggested to the mind of the celebrated sculptor Callimachus by the sight of a basket, covered by a the, and overgrown by the leaves of an acanthus, on which it had accidentally been placed. The earliest known example of its use throughout a building is in the monument of Lysicrates, commonly called the Lantern of Demosthenes, which was built in B.C. 335.

## Picture for Architecture 5

In Italy we find at first the Etruscan or Tuscan style partaking of the Greek style of the Heroic period, but inclining afterward to the Doric. The temples were built on a quadrangle, the columns Doric, but weak, smooth, with a plinth below the basis, and standing wide apart. The framework was mostly of wood. The temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome was built in that style, of which no specimens now remain, with the exception of a few tombs, such as the Cucumella of Volsci, the so-called tomb of the Horatii near Rome, that of Porsenna near Chiusi, etc. Roman architecture brought forth temples and palaces worthy of a nation which claimed the dominion of the world; among them the most celebrated were the Forum, Basilica, Curiae, etc.; and the triumphal arches (e.g. of Titus, Septimius Severus, Constantine, at Rome; Augustus, at Rimini; Trajan, at Ancona and Benevento, etc.), together with amphitheaters, circuses, and baths. These monuments were mostly in the Corinthian style, but on a gigantic scale.



Their chief characteristic, however, was the union of the horizontal, or Greek style of building, with the Etruscan arch, the result of which was cylindrical vaults, cupolas, and semi-cupolas. This style was introduced by the Romans in all their European and Asiatic possessions; but in the 3d century it fell into a state of tawdry splendor (as in the temples of Palmyra and Baalbek), losing its characteristic features, as well as its original beauty and elegance. *SEE BAALBEK; SEE TADMOR.*

## 5. Jewish. -

(1.) *Sources of Imitation.* — “It was once common to claim for the Hebrews the invention of scientific architecture, and to allege that classical antiquity was indebted to the Temple of Solomon for the principles and many of the details of the art. It may here suffice to remark that temples previously existed in Egypt, Babylon, Syria, and Phoenicia, from which the classical ancients were far more likely to borrow the ideas which they embodied in new and beautiful combinations of their own. There has never, in fact, been any people for whom a peculiar style of architecture could with less probability be claimed than for the Israelites. On leaving Egypt, they could only be acquainted with Egyptian art. On entering Canaan, they necessarily occupied the buildings of which they had dispossessed the previous inhabitants; and the succeeding generations would naturally erect such buildings as the country previously contained. The architecture of Palestine, and, as such, eventually that of the Jews, had doubtless its own characteristics, by which it was suited to the climate and condition of the country, and in the course of time many improvements would no doubt arise from the causes which usually operate in producing change in any practical art. From the want of historical data and from the total absence of architectural remains, the degree in which these causes operated in imparting a peculiar character to the Jewish architecture cannot now be determined, for the oldest ruins in the country do not ascend beyond the period of the Roman domination. It does, however, seem probable that among the Hebrews architecture was always kept within the limits of a mechanical craft, and never rose to the rank of a fine art. Their usual dwelling-houses differed little from those of other Eastern nations, and we nowhere find any thing indicative of exterior embellishment. *SEE HOUSE.* Splendid edifices, such as the palace of David and the Temple of Solomon, were completed by the assistance of Phoenician artists (<sup><1051></sup>2 Samuel 5:11; <sup><1076></sup>1 Kings 5:6, 18; <sup><340></sup>1 Chronicles 14:1). *SEE PALACE.* After the Babylonish exile the assistance of such foreigners was likewise resorted to

for the restoration of the Temple (<sup><1500></sup>Ezra 3:7). *SEE TEMPLE*. From the time of the Maccabean dynasty the Greek taste began to gain ground, especially under the Herodian princes (who seem to have been possessed with a sort of mania for building), and was shown in the structure and embellishment of many towns, baths, colonnades, theatres, and castles (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:8, 1; 15:19,4; 15:10, 3; *War.* 1:4, 1). The Phoenician style, which seems to have had some affinity with the Egyptian, was not, however, superseded by the Grecian; and even as late as the Mishna (*Baba Bathra*, 3, 6), we read of Tyrian windows, porches, etc. See Hirt's *Gesch. der Baukunst bei den Alten*, 1, 113, 120, Schnaase, *Gesch. d. bild. Künste*, 1, 241 sq. Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 3, 1:27; Fergusson, *Illustrated Handbook of Architecture* (London, 1856), Michaelis, *De Judeis architecturæ parum peritis* (Gott. 1771). *SEE ARCH*.

(2.) *History of Biblical Architecture*. — The book of Genesis (<sup><0047></sup>Genesis 4:17, 20, 22) appears to divide mankind into great characteristic sections, viz., the “dwellers in tents” and the “dwellers in cities,” when it tells us that Cain was the founder of a city; and that among his descendants, one, Jabal, was “the father of them that dwell in tents,” while Tubal-cain was “the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron.” It is probable that the workers in metal were for the most part dwellers in towns; and thus the arts of architecture and metallurgy became from the earliest times leading characteristics of the civilized as distinguished from the nomadic tendencies of the human race. To the race of Shem is attributed (<sup><0018></sup>Genesis 10:11, 12, 22; 11:2-9) the foundation of cities in the plain of Shinar, Babylon, Nineveh, and elsewhere; of one of which, Resen, the epithet “great” sufficiently marks its importance in the time of the writer, a period at least as early as the 17th century, B.C., if not very much earlier (Rawlinson, *Outline of Ass. Hist.* p. 10; Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 221, 235, 238). From the same book we learn the account of the earliest recorded building, and of the materials employed in its construction (<sup><0018></sup>Genesis 11:3, 9); and though a doubt rests on the precise site of the tower of Belus, so long identified with the Birs Nimroud (Benjamin of Tudela, p. c. Bohn; Newton, *On Proph.* 10, 155, 156; Vaux, *Nin. and Persep.* p. 173, 178; Keith, *On Proph.* p. 289), yet the nature of the soil, and the bricks found there in such abundance, though bearing mostly the name of Nebuchadnezzar, agree perfectly with the supposition of a city previously existing on the same or a closely neighboring site (Layard, 2:249, 278, and *Nin. and Bab.* p. 531; Plin. 7:56; <sup><1500></sup>Ezra 4:1). In the book of Esther (<sup><1700></sup>Esther 1:2) mention is

made of the palace at Susa, for three months in the spring the residence of the kings of Persia (<sup><1783></sup>Esther 3:13; Xen. *Cyrop.* 8:6, § 22); and, in the books of Tobit and Judith, of Ecbatana, to which they retired for two months during the heat of summer (Tob. 3:7; 14:14; <sup><6012></sup>Jude 1:12; Herod. 1:98). A branch of the same Syro-Arabian race as the Assyrians, but the children of Ham, was the nation, or at least the dominant caste, of the Egyptians, the style of whose architecture agrees so remarkably with the Assyrian (Layard, 2:206 sq.). It is in connection with Egypt that the Israelites appear first as builders of cities, compelled, in common with other Egyptian captives, to labor at the buildings of the Egyptian monarchs. Pithom and Raamses are said to have been built by them (<sup><0211></sup>Exodus 1:11; Wilkinson, 2:195). The Israelites were by occupation shepherds, and by habit dwellers in tents (<sup><0473></sup>Genesis 47:3). The “house” built by Jacob at Succoth is probably no exception to this statement (<sup><0337></sup>Genesis 33:17). They had therefore originally, speaking properly, no architecture. Even Hebron, a city of higher antiquity than the Egyptian Zoan (Tanis), was called originally from its founder, perhaps a Canaanite of the race of Anak, Kirjath-Arba, the house of Arba (<sup><0432></sup>Numbers 13:22; <sup><6445></sup>Joshua 14:15). From the time of the occupation of Canaan they became dwellers in towns and in houses of stone, for which the native limestone of Palestine supplied a ready material (<sup><0843></sup>Leviticus 14:34, 45; <sup><1070></sup>1 Kings 7:10; Stanley, *Palest.* p. 146 sq.); but the towns which they occupied were not all, nor, indeed, in most cases, built from the first by themselves (<sup><0610></sup>Deuteronomy 6:10; <sup><0439></sup>Numbers 13:19).

The peaceful reign and vast wealth of Solomon gave great impulse to architecture; for besides the Temple and his other great works at and near Jerusalem, he built fortresses and cities in various places, among which the names and sites of Baalath and Tadmor are usually thought to be represented by the more modern superstructures of Baalbec and Palmyra (<sup><1095></sup>1 Kings 9:15, 24). Among the succeeding kings of Israel and of Judah more than one is recorded as a builder: Asa (<sup><1153></sup>1 Kings 15:23), Baasha (16:17), Omri (16:24), Ahab (16:34; 22:39); Hezekiah (<sup><1210></sup>2 Kings 20:20; <sup><1427></sup>2 Chronicles 32:27, 30), Jehoash, and Josiah (<sup><1211></sup>2 Kings 12:11, 12; 22:6); and, lastly, Jehoiakim, whose winter palace is mentioned (<sup><1424></sup>Jeremiah 22:14; 36:22; see also <sup><1085></sup>Amos 3:15). On the return from captivity, the chief care of the rulers was to rebuild the Temple and the walls of Jerusalem in a substantial manner, with stone, and with timber from Lebanon (<sup><1438></sup>Ezra 3:8; 5:8; <sup><1418></sup>Nehemiah 2:8; 3:1, 32). During the

government of Simon Maccabaeus, the fortress called Baris, and afterward Antonia, was erected for the defense of the Temple and the city. But the reigns of Herod and of his sons and successors were especially remarkable for the great architectural works in which they delighted. Not only was the Temple restored to a large portion, if not to the full degree, of its former magnificence, but the fortifications and other public buildings of Jerusalem were enlarged and embellished to an extent previously unknown (<sup>4216</sup>Luke 21:5; Benj. of Tudela, p. 83, Bohn). *SEE JERUSALEM*. Besides these great works, the town of Caesarea was built on the site of an insignificant building called Strato's Tower; Samaria was enlarged, and received the name of Sebaste; the town of Agrippium was built; and Herod carried his love for architecture so far as to adorn with buildings cities even not within his own dominions, Berytus, Damascus, Tripolis, and many other places (Josephus, *War*, 1, 21, 1, 11). His son, Philip the tetrarch, enlarged the old Greek colony of Paneas, giving it the name of Caesarea in honor of Tiberias; while his brother Antipas founded the city of Tiberius, and adorned the towns of Sepphoris and Betharamphta, giving to the latter the name Livias, in honor of the mother of Tiberius (Reland, p. 497). Of the original splendor of these great works no doubt can be entertained; but of their style and appearance we can only conjecture, though with nearly absolute certainty, that they were formed on Greek and Roman models. Of the style of the earlier buildings of Palestine we can only form an idea from the analogy of the, Egyptian, Assyrian, and Persian monuments now existing, and from the modes of building still adopted in Eastern countries. The connection of Solomon with Egypt and with Tyre, and the influence of the captivity, may have in some measure successively affected the style both of the two temples and of the palatial edifices of Solomon. The enormous stones employed in the Assyrian, Persepolitan, and Egyptian buildings find a parallel in the substructions of Baalbek, more ancient than the superstructure (Layard, 2:317, 318), and in the stones of so vast a size which still remain at Jerusalem, relics of the building either of Solomon or of Herod (Williams, pt. 2:1). But, as it has been observed again and again, scarcely any connected monuments are known to survive in Palestine by which we can form an accurate idea of its buildings, beautiful and renowned as they were throughout the East (Plin. 5:14; Stanley, p. 183), and even of those which do remain no trustworthy examination has yet been made. It is probable, however, that the reservoirs known under the names of the Pools of Solomon and Hezekiah contain

some portions, at least, of the original fabrics (Stanley, p. 103, 165). — Smith, s.v.

The domestic architecture of the Jews, so far as it can be understood, is treated under HOUSE *SEE HOUSE*. Tools and instruments of building are mentioned by the sacred writers: the plumb-line, <sup><3100></sup>Amos 7:7; the measuring-reed, <sup><3101></sup>Ezekiel 40:3; the saw, <sup><1000></sup>1 Kings 7:9. (See De Vogud, *L'architecture dans la Syrie*, Par. 1865.)

## II. *Mediceval Architecture.* —

**1.** With the victory of Christianity over Paganism, as the religion of state, commences a new era in the history of architecture. Still the Greek, or, rather, Roman art exercised a powerful influence, especially in the details of the new style. When Christianity became the religion of the state, the ancient basilicas (q.v.), or halls of justice, were turned into churches. The lower floor was used by the men, and the galleries devoted to the women. In later edifices the galleries were dispensed with. The church then consisted of a single oblong hall, with one, three, or five aisles, a round apsis at the rear end, an altar, etc. The basilican style prevailed throughout the entire Christian Church throughout the fourth century. It prevailed much later in Syria and Southern France, and remained in Central Italy till the Renaissance period.

**2.** The *Byzantine* was the earliest branching off from the basilican style. It had its rise in Constantinople, and was the fruitful parent of nearly all the later styles of Christian and Mohammedan architecture. Its finest example was the Church of St. Sophia, rebuilt by Justinian (A.D. 538), which has the most perfect interior of any church ever built. *SEE ST. SOPHIA*. The other best examples of this style are the Church of St. Vitale, in Ravenna, and of St. Mark's, in Venice. The style prevailed in Asia when it gave birth to the Saracenic and the Armenian (and hence to the Russian), and in Western and North-western Italy, as well as in parts of France and Spain. Its chief characteristics are a central flat dome, illuminated by a row of small windows at its base; semicircular "apsides" at the ends of the cross, covered with half domes; a profuse use of the round arch in colonnades and galleries within and without, of such varied sizes as to give great apparent size to the edifice; slender windows; a rather low entrance; the walls, and even pillars, covered with mosaic paintings, ornamental and scenic, thus giving the interior the greatest possible brilliancy and dignity;

and capitals ornamented by a most remarkably rich interweaving of conventional elements borrowed from the antique or from life, and interspersed with animals fantastically disposed.

### Picture for Architecture 6

3. The different elements of the basilican and Byzantine styles were united first in Lombardy, then on the Rhine, and produced the *Romanesque*, or *roundarch Gothic*, which, rising from the 7th to the 10th centuries, and extending to the 12th, spread over most of Europe. Among the finest examples of this style are the Cathedrals of Pisa, Vercelli, Parma, Modena, and Lucca (in Italy), of Worms, Bonn, Mayence, Speyer, and the churches of St. Gereon and Sti. Apostoli in Cologne (on the Rhine). To this style belong the peculiar churches and round towers of North Ireland, Scotland, Scandinavia, and the low round tower of Newport, R. I. In the round-arch style the aisles were covered with long arches instead of open wooden roofs. Bell-towers — round (as in Italy, the north of Europe, and elsewhere), or square, or octagonal, built separate from the church edifice (as in Italy) or joined to the edifice (as north of the Alps) — were added. The pillars broke from the antique rules of proportion, and were molded into clustered columns. Small arched galleries ran around parts or the whole of the church, within and without. The exterior especially was covered with numerous well-disposed arches, pilasters, and other ornaments; richly-decorated doorways and windows drew the eye to the central part of the facade, and the whole external had a dignity not to be found in any other style of church architecture. The style prevailed throughout all Europe (excepting part of Italy) till the gradual introduction of the pointed arch gave rise to what is usually called the *Gothic* style.

### Picture for Architecture 7

4. Meanwhile the *Saracenic* style — another outgrowth of the Byzantine — had spread, with its numerous modifications, over all Mohammedan countries. It was modified largely by the Sassanian style (an outgrowth of the late Roman, as developed by the fire-worshippers of Persia) in the East, by the Spanish Romanesque in Spain and Morocco, and by the basilican style in Sicily. It arose in the seventh century, and spread with truly tropical luxuriance and quickness of growth from Persia to the Atlantic. Deprived by the Mohammedan faith of the use of painting or sculpture, it developed an architectonic ornamentation unsurpassed in the history of architecture

by its richness and purely conventional character. Poetry took the place of the formative arts of sculpture and painting in the inscriptions from the Koran that were interwoven with the luxuriant ornament of the walls and columns. The Byzantine dome remained the principal feature of the roof, but this was hung with myriads of little semi-domes, producing a most fairy-like effect. Under the rich fancy of the Orient, color was used as freely as in the Egyptian style. The minaret was added, and gave a marvelous grace and lightness by its slender form. The pointed arch (adopted perhaps first from the court of a Christian monastery in Sicily erected in the sixth century) was soon adopted, and spread into the horseshoe arch, finally developing itself into the complicated interwoven arches of the Moorish style. The style arose in the seventh century, and extended to the fifteenth, its culminating period being from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. The Turkish style is more Byzantine than Saracenic. Among its most important monuments are the mosques and tombs of the sultans at Cairo, and Bejapoor and Delhi (India), the palaces and mosques of the Alhambra and of the Cuba (Palermo), and the Castle of Alcazar at Segovia (Spain). In the twelfth century, Central and Western Europe came into much more intimate contact than formerly with the Orient, especially through the Crusades, and the pointed arch and the spirit of ornamentation of the Saracenic art were borrowed, and added largely to the development of the Gothic from the Romanesque style.

## Picture for Architecture 8

**5. *The Gothic.*** — The roundarch or Romanesque style has given the Christian temple its almost complete plan, as far as concerns the disposition of the aisles, altar, choir, etc. The pointed arch began first in France and Normandy to supplant the round arch. The progress of this new feature was then gradual and fluctuating for over a century. The two arches are found used almost promiscuously till 1280, when the pointed arch, and all the constructive changes it induced, were used, purely and solely, for a century. This is hence called the golden period of the Gothic architecture. The use of this arch required, for harmony, a corresponding additional upward tendency in all the parts of the structure. To this was added a richness of conventionalized, foliated ornamentation, not surpassing, perhaps, that of the windows and doorways of some works of the round-arch style, but far more generally diffused and more harmoniously incorporated with the feeling of the entire edifice. The spire was made more slender, filled with elaborate open-work ornaments, and made, like a

flower on its stalk, the richest part of the edifice. Sculpture was used profusely within and without, and the windows were filled with paintings, in colored glass, from Biblical scenes, making thus (as in the Egyptian arch) the other arts subordinate to the architecture; or, more strictly speaking, mere architectonic adjuncts. The principal characteristics of this style are as follows: The ground-plan is an oblong rectangle, and for churches, the cross; the crypt disappears; the choir becomes smaller in proportion to the building, and ends in a polygon; the walls of the nave are higher, so that the arches spring immediately from the pillars; the walls themselves are divided by arches, and the windows enlarged; the arches are all pointed, and connected by chamfers and astragals, as well as also the pillars. Outside are buttresses and piers to strengthen the building, connected with small turrets and ornamented foliage tracery; the cornices are deeply excavated and much inclined (to facilitate the running off of water); the greatest number of ornaments are displayed on the facade, which is adorned with one or two towers, built on a square basis, but transformed afterward into an octagon, rising with a series of pillars, turrets, and high windows, and ending in an open-work octagonal pyramid; the entrance of the churches consists of either one or three richly decorated portals; the ornaments consist principally of straight lines and segments of circles meeting in acute angles, and of tracery representing natural objects, such as vine or oak leaves, etc. The principal specimens of German Gothic style are to be found in the cathedrals of Cologne, Freiburg, Regensburg, Vienna, Strasburg, etc. The French Gothic presents some peculiarities; thus, the foundation is generally fan-shaped, the choir being encircled by a row of chapels; its principal ornament consists in the three large portals in front; columns replace the pillars; the circles and arches are not connected by chamfers or astragals; the arches and buttresses are plain; the towers mostly square, and without the pyramidal apex; the perpendicular ascending tendency is balanced by a horizontal gallery in the facade. Its best specimens are Notre-Dame of Paris, and the cathedrals of Rouen, Dijon, Chartres, Rheims, Amiens, St. Onen near Rouen, etc. The Spanish Gothic inclines to the horizontal, looks heavy, and the inside is generally overloaded with ornaments, as, for instance, the cathedrals of Toledo, Barcelona, Xeres, etc. The convent of Batalha is a fine specimen of the Portuguese Gothic, which is of purer style than the Spanish. The Gothic of Holland and Belgium partakes of the French and the German; the former preponderates in the inside, and the latter in the outside, where we find large pointed windows, no rosettes, smaller portals, and high towers, as in



the cathedrals of Amsterdam, Brussels, Utrecht, the Oude Kerk of Amsterdam, St. Laurentius of Rotterdam, etc. The English Gothic has many peculiarities. The richest specimens belong to the so-called Tudor style; for instance, the Chapel of Henry VII. The Italian Gothic is distinguished from the same style as found in more northern countries by inclining more to the antique, and presenting the perpendicular features only in false facades, while in the actual buildings the horizontal predominates; it also preserves the walls in their original massiveness, instead of dividing them by means of pillars and windows; the foundations are broad, the choir ends in a quadrangle; they are surmounted by a cupola, but have no towers, as the cathedrals of Florence, Sienna, Orvieto, Assisi, St. Antonio of Padua, St. Petronia of Bologna, St. Maria Novello of Florence, etc., etc. In the 15th and 16th centuries the spirit of the style had died out, though it still gave a tending to the character of the edifices erected in Germany and elsewhere, even as late as the 18th century.

**6. *The Renaissance.*** — In Italy the Gothic style had never taken such deep root as in the other countries of Europe. The revival of classical studies, and the tendency of the age to exalt ancient philosophy over Christianity, led to an extensive study of the antique. This spirit, carried into architecture, produced the Renaissance style, which is marked by an adaptation of classical (especially of Roman) architectural principles and details to the Christian temple. The round arch was again resorted to. A massive dome was built over the center of the cross. The columns resumed the classical proportions, or were made into massive pilasters. In the 17th century, and more especially in the 18th, architecture seemed to have broken away from all laws of proportion and harmony, and to have lost its predominance in church edifices. The churches seemed more galleries of painting or sculpture than architectural structures. The ornament became first massive, then overpowering, and was broken from its structural lines. It finally became trivial and inexpressive. Expensive stones and large gilded surfaces were more prized than aesthetic propriety or architectural effect. And, finally, the extravagant, insincere, almost infidel life of the 17th and 18th centuries manifested themselves in the *Baroco* (or Jesuitical) style of Italy, or the *Rococo* (or French) style of France and Germany.

Thus the greatest genuine architectural life of mediaeval times manifested itself in the great epochs of the Basilican (4th to 6th centuries), Byzantine (7th to 14th centuries), Saracenic (7th to 14th centuries), Romanesque (9th to 12th centuries), Gothic (12th to 15th centuries), and Renaissance (14th

to 17th centuries). Perhaps its highest culmination was in the Middle Gothic (1300). After the 16th century all true architecture died out, and the Rococo period (18th century) closed the second great division of history, and was followed by the modern in the 19th century.

**III. *The Modern.*** — The chief characteristic difference between the modern, and the ancient, and mediaeval architecture, is that it is marked by no *style* such as is followed by all builders of the period in all lands where a certain civilization prevails. The inconsistencies and absurdities of the Rococo style of the latter part of the 18th century were felt under the purer taste awakened by the study of the history of ancient and mediaeval art that has prevailed during the last fifty years. Attempts are making to revive the spirit of the pure ages — of the Gothic (mostly in England), of the Renaissance (mostly in France), and of the Ancient Classical (mostly in Germany). A few architects and critics feel the necessity of having a *new style* of architecture, adapted to the wants of modern society, and to the use of the new materials (especially iron and glass) that science has brought within the reach of the builder.

In America the early church edifices had usually no architectural merits or pretensions. This arose from the poverty of the people, the lack of artistic education in the builders and of a cultivated taste in the community, or from an honest desire to shun any thing that might savor of pompous display in the house of God. Within the last twenty years a different spirit has animated all denominations of Christians, and a most healthy feeling prevails, manifesting itself in honest attempts to make the house of God a building worthy of its high and holy uses. The most important requisite for this is the development of a body of Christian architects from the church itself. These, permeated with the true Christian feeling, knowing the wants of the church, and cultivated in all the required departments of science and art, will be able to give an architecture suited to the wants of the present age. To accomplish this is needed the establishment of academies or departments of architecture in our universities and chairs of the fine arts in the colleges and theological seminaries.

For the history of architecture, see Schnaase's *Gesch. der bild. Kuinste* (Dtisseldorf, 1843-66, 8 vols.); Kugler, *Geschichte der Baukunst* (Stuttgart, 1859, 3 vols.); W. Lubke, *Geschichte der Baukunst* (Stuttgart, 1865); Gailhaband, *Denkmaler der Baukunst aller Zeiten* (Hamburg, 1849, 4 vols.); Fergusson, *Handbook of Architecture* (Lond. 1855, 2 vols.), and

*Modern Styles* (Lond. 1862, 1 vol.); Voillet le Due, *Histoire d'Architecture* (Paris, 4 vols). On the history of church architecture (from the ecclesiological stand-point), see *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1849, p. 184. There are also papers on church architecture in the *Quarterly Review*, 6:62; 75:179; *Church Review*, 3, 372; *Monthly Christian Spectator*, Nov. 1852, p. 654. Valuable practical hints may be found in Trimen, *Chapel Architecture* (London, 1849, 8vo); and in Jobson, *Chapel and School Architecture* (Lond. 1850, 8vo). See also Rickman, *Attempt to distinguish the Styles of Architecture in England* (Lond. 8vo); Sharpe, *Seven Periods of English Architect.* (Lond. 8vo); *Brit. Quart. Rev.* Aug. 1849, art. 2; *Mercersburg Rev.* 1851, p. 358; Bunsen, *Basiliken des christl. Rom's* (Mfnch. 1842); Lenoir, *Architect. Monast.* (Par. 1852); Brown, *Sacred Architect.* (Lond. 1845); Dollman, *Ancient Architecture* (Lond. 1858); Hubsch, *Altchristliche Kirchen* (Karlsru. 1860). See CHURCH EDIFICES.

### Architriclinus

(Ἀρχιτρίκλινος, *master of the triclinium* or dinner-bed, **SEE ACCUBATION**), rendered in ~~John~~ John 2:8, 9, “governor of the feast” (q.v.), equivalent to the Roman *Magister Convivii*. The Greeks also denoted the same social office by the title of *Symposiarch* (συμποσίρχος). He was not the giver of the feast, but one of the guests specially chosen to direct the entertainment, and promote harmony and good fellowship among the company. (See Potter’s *Gr. Ant.* 2, 386.) In the apocryphal *Ecclesiasticus* (35:1, 2) the duties of this officer among the Jews are indicated. He is there, however, called ἡγούμενος: “If thou be made the master [of a feast], lift not thyself up, but be among them as one of the rest; take diligent care for them, and so sit down; and when thou hast done all thy office, take thy place, that thou mayest be merry with them, and receive a crown for thy well ordering of the feast.” (See Walch, *De Architriclinio*, Jen. 1753; Brendel, *De loco Joh.* Eisenb. 1785.) **SEE BANQUET.**

### Archon

(ἄρχων, a ruler), the title properly of the chief magistrates or rather executive officers of the Athenians during their democracy (see Smith’s *Diet. of Class. Ant.* s.v.), and applied to various functionaries,

(1.) specially to the recognized head of the Syrian Jews during the Roman empire, **SEE ALABARCH**, and

(2.) technically a title in the Greek Church of several officers, e.g. the church-keeper, keeper of the book of Gospels, etc.

## Archontici

a sect of the second century who rejected baptism, and held that the world was not created by the Almighty God, but by certain powers, seven or eight in number, whom they called *Archontes* (ἄρχοντες, *rulers*), to the chief of whom they gave the name of Sabaoth, the god of the Jews and the giver of the law, whom they blasphemously distinguished from the true God. Now, as they pretended that baptism was administered in the name of Sabaoth, and not in that of the supreme God, they rejected it, and the holy Eucharist. They held that woman was a creation of the devil. They were a branch of the Valentinians. Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 11, ch. 10, cap. 2; Tillemont, 2:295; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1:493.

## Archpresbyter or Archpriest

the head of the priests, as the archdeacon was originally head of the deacons. Anciently, the minister next in order to the bishop. Generally the senior priest of the diocese bore this title, but Thomassin shows that the bishops frequently chose the ablest and not the senior priest as archpresbyter. This was more frequently the case in the Greek than in the Latin Church, and some popes were altogether opposed to appointing any but the senior priest. The archpresbyter acted as the representative of the bishop at public worship, while the archdeacon represented him in the government of the diocese. At first there was only one archpresbyter in a diocese; but since the 5th and 6th centuries we find, besides one in the diocesan town, several in the country. In the time of the Carolingians, every diocese was divided into a number of archpresbyteral districts, called archpresbyterates, deaneries, Christianities (*Christianitates*), rural chapters. The powers of the archpresbyter were: He had, in the name of his bishop, to superintend the clergymen of his district, to execute the episcopal and synodal decrees, to present the candidates for the priesthood from his district to the bishop, and to settle difficulties between the clergy. On the first day of every month he held conferences with the clergy. He also reported to the archdeacon, and through him to the bishop, the graver offenses of the laymen. The archpriest's church was the only one in the district in which baptism was dispensed (*ecclesia baptismalis*). The whole of the districts was sometimes called *plebs*, and the archpresbyter

*Plebanus*, a title which in several countries is still in use. There are still archpriests in the Greek Church, vested with most of the privileges of *chorepiscopi*, or rural bishops. The name is also still in use in some dioceses of the Roman Church, corresponding to the more common dean (q.v.). — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 2, cap. 19; Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 161; Thomassin, *De nova et veteri ecclesiae disciplina*, pt. 2:1. 2, 100:3; Neller, *De Archipresbyteris* (Trevir. 1771). **SEE PRESBYTER; SEE PRIEST.**

### Arciboldi, Giovanni Angelo

an Italian ecclesiastic at Milan in 1485, was sent by Leo X as papal nuncio to Scandinavia in order to sell papal indulgences. The permission to do so he bought at a high price of King Christian II of Denmark. In the controversies springing up between the Danes and the Swedes, he was first bribed by the Danes and later by the Swedes. On his return to Italy, Leo X ordered a suit to be instituted against him, but in 1525 he was made bishop of Novara, and in 1550 archbishop of Milan. He died in 1555.

### Arctu'rus

(the Latin form of the Gr. ἄρκτοῦρος, *bear-keeper*, designating among the ancients the brightest star in the constellation Bootes, Cic. *Arat.* 99; also the whole constellation Bootes, Hes. *Op.* 564, 608 Virg. *Georg.* 1, 204; and hence the time of its rising in September, Soph. (*Ed. Tyr.* 1137; Thuc. 2, 78; Virg. *Georg.* 1, 68), put in the Auth. Vers. for the Heb. **ו[ ]** (Ash, for **ו[ ]** *neash'*, Arabic the same, <sup><888></sup>Job 9:9, “[God], which maketh *Arcturus*, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south,” Sept. Πλειάδες, Vulg. *Arcturus*), or **וַיִּי** (*A'yish*, a fuller form of the same, prob. signifying *supporter, barrow*, <sup><888></sup>Job 38:32, “canst thou guide *Arcturus* with his sons,” Sept. **Ἔσπερος**, Vulg. *vesper*), is thought by most recent interpreters to denote the constellation of the Great Bear, *Ursa Major*, but on grounds not altogether satisfactory nor with unanimity (see Hyde, ad Ulugh-Beii, *Tab. Stell.* p. 22, 23; Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 1907; Schultens on *Job*, p. 239). The older interpreters understand:

(1.) the *Great Bear*, or the seven stars of the *Wain* (*Septentriones*), so Saadias and Aben Ezra;

(2.) the *Pleiades*, so the Sept. (in one passage only, and there perhaps the terms have become transposed, as **Ἔσπερος** and **Ἄρκτοῦρος** both occur

in the same verse) and the Targum (𐤅𐤂𐤓 in the other passage, according to the Venice and Lond. editions, meaning, however, *hen*, according to Bochart);

(3.) the *evening star, Hesperus, Venus*, so the Sept. (in the latter passage, and perhaps also in the first) and Vulg.;

(4.) the *tail of Aries* (𐤇𐤏𐤓𐤕) or the *head of Taurus* (𐤀𐤏𐤂𐤕𐤓), so the Talmudists (*Berachoth*, p. 586), apparently referring to the bright star in the eye of Taurus (*Aldebaran*), near the tail of Aries;

(5.) *Arcturus*, so the Vulg. (in chap. 9, and perhaps the Sept.);

(6.) the rendering *lyutha* of the Syriac (in both passages, as likewise in ~~Job~~ Job 15:27, for 𐤏𐤕𐤕, and ~~Amos~~ Amos 5:8, for 𐤏𐤕𐤕 comp. Ephraemi *Opera*, 2, 449 a), as this word is itself of doubtful origin and signification, if really genuine (see *Anecdot. Orient.* 2:37; Lach, in Eichhorn's *Bibl.* 7:341), but appears from the lexicographers to bear the general import of *she-goat*, referring to a star in the constellation Auriga. Laying aside those of these interpretations that are evidently mere conjecture (such as Arcturus, Venus), and others that are here out of the question (such as the Pleiades, which in Hebrews are called 𐤇𐤏𐤓𐤕), There remain but two interpretations:

First, that which identifies the Heb. *Ash* with the *Great Bear*, or Ursa Major, the Wain. The superior probability of this is sustained by the following considerations:

(1.) This is so conspicuous a constellation, and so famous in all ancient as well as modern astronomy, that the total silence in these astrological enumerations, otherwise; respecting it is unaccountable, especially as inferior constellations are not omitted;

(2.) The mention of the attendant stars ("sons," 𐤏𐤕𐤕) in the second passage of Job agrees with the ascription among the Arabs of daughters to *Neish*, the corresponding Arabic constellation (Niebuhr, *Beschreib. v. Arabien*, p. 114), these being the three stars in the tail of the Bear.

The other interpretation, namely, the *goat*, can only be sustained by a forced etymology from 𐤀𐤏𐤂𐤕𐤓 goat, and a lesser constellation is then

referred to, namely, Auriga; and the reference to the attendant stars, to those in the right hand of this figure, is not only unnatural, but at variance with its late origin. Schultens (*Comment. in loc.*) derives the Heb. word from an Arabic term signifying the *night-watcher*, because Ursa Major never sets; while Kimchi refers it to the Heb.  $\text{vW}$  [ , in the sense of a *collection* of stars; and Led. de Dieu compares the Ethiopic name of the constellation *Pisces*; but the etymology first proposed above is preferable (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:680; Alferg. p. 8, 63; Ideler, *Unters. ib. d. Stern-Namen*, p. 3, 19; comp. Abulfeda, p. 375; Eutyck. p. 277; Schultens, *Imp. Joctan*, p. 10, 32). — Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 895. **SEE ASTRONOMY; SEE CONSTELLATION.**

### Arcudius, Peter

a native of Corfu. The Popes Gregory XIV and Clement VIII tried, but unsuccessfully, to bring about, through him, a union of the Greek Church in Russia with that of Rome. He died in Rome in 1635. He wrote *Concord. eccles. Orient. et Occident. in septem sacramentis*, etc. (Paris, 1619, fol.). — Nicéron, *Memoires*, 11, 56; Hoefler, *Biog. Gen.* 3, 74.

### Ard

(Heb. id.  $\text{D}\bar{\text{r}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{j}}$  prob. for *dra*, 1:q. *dry*, *descent*; Sept.  $\text{A}\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta$  v. r.  $\text{A}\delta\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ), a grandson of Benjamin through Bela (<sup><035D></sup>Numbers 26:40). B.C. 1856. In <sup><045D></sup>Genesis 46:21, he appears as a son of Benjamin, where, however, the Sept. makes him a great-grandson through Gera as a son of Bela. In <sup><138B></sup>1 Chronicles 8:3, he is called ADDAR. His descendants were called *Ardites*, Heb. *Ardi'*.  $\text{yD}\bar{\text{r}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{j}}$  Sept.  $\text{A}\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}$  (<sup><035D></sup>Numbers 26:40). **SEE BENJAMIN.** He is possibly the same with EZBON **SEE EZBON** (<sup><138E></sup>1 Chronicles 7:7).

### Ar'dath

(Lat. *Ardath*, the Gr. text being no longer extant), the name of a "field" mentioned only in the Apocrypha (2 [Vulg. 4] Esdras 9:26) as the scene of the vision of the bereaved woman; no doubt a fanciful appellation.

### Ard'ite

(<sup><035D></sup>Numbers 26:40). **SEE ARD.**

## Ar'don

(Heb. *Ardon'*, <sup>1</sup>/Dr̄ḥi *descendant*, others *fugitive*; Sept. Ἀρδών v. r. Ὀρνά), the last-named of the three sons of Caleb by his first wife Azubah (<sup>1328</sup>1 Chronicles 2:18). B.C. ante 1658.

## Are'li

(Heb. *Arelī'*, ἡ ἰεραία *heroic*, fr. *Ariel*; Sept. Ἀρηλείς, Ἀριήλ), the last-named of the seven sons of Gad (<sup>4616</sup>Genesis 46:16). B.C. 1873. His descendants were called *Arelites* (Heb. id., Sept. Ἀρηλί, <sup>4617</sup>Numbers 26:17).

## Are'lite

(<sup>4617</sup>Numbers 26:17). *SEE ARELI*.

## Areop'agite

(Ἀρεοπαγίτης), a member (<sup>4173</sup>Acts 17:34) of the court of AREOPAGUS *SEE AREOPAGUS* (q.v.). This, as constituted by Solon, consisted of the nine *archons* (chief magistrates) for the year, and the ex-archons. The latter became members for life; but before their admission, they were submitted, at the close of their annual magistracy, to a rigid scrutiny into their conduct in office and their private morals. Proof of criminal or unbecoming conduct was sufficient also afterward to expel them. Various accounts are given of the number to which the Areopagites were limited. If there was any fixed number, admission to the council could not have been a necessary consequence of honorable discharge from the archonship. But it is more probable that the accounts which limit the number are applicable only to the earlier period of its existence (see the anonymous *argument* to Demosthenes' *Oration against Androtion*). Lysias expressly states that the acting archons had a seat in it (*Areop.* p. 110, § 16-20).

## Areop'agus

### Picture for Areop'agus 1

the Latin form of the Greek words (ὁ Ἄρειος πάγος), signifying, in reference to place, *Mars' Hill*, but, in reference to persons, the council which was held on the hill. The' council was also termed ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλή (or ἡ βουλή ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ), *the Council on Mars'*



*Hill*; sometimes ἄνω βουλή, *the Upper Council*, from the elevated position where it was held, and sometimes simply, but emphatically, ἡ βουλή, *the Council*; but it retained till a late period the original designation of Mars' Hill, being called by the Latins *Scopulus Martis*, *Curia Martis* (Juvenal, *Sat.* 9, 101), and still more literally, *Areum Judicium* (Tacit. *Annal.* 2, 55). The place was a rocky height in Athens, opposite the western end of the Acropolis, from which it is separated only by an elevated valley. It rises gradually from the northern end, and terminates abruptly on the south, over against the Acropolis, at which point it is about fifty or sixty feet above the valley already mentioned. Of the site of the Areopagus there can be no doubt, both from the description of Pausanias, and from the narrative of Herodotus, who relates that it was a height over against the Acropolis, from which the Persians assailed the latter rock (Paus. 1, 28, § 5; Herod. 8, 52). According to tradition, it was called the hill of Mars (Ares) because this god was brought to trial here before the assembled gods by Neptune (Poseidon) on account of his murdering Halirrhothius, the son of the latter. The meetings were held on the south-eastern summit of the rock. There are still sixteen stone steps cut in the rock, leading up to the hill from the valley of the Agora below; and immediately above the steps is a bench of stones excavated in the rock, forming three sides of a quadrangle, and facing the south. Here the Areopagites sat as judges in the open air (ὑπάθριοι ἐδικάζοντο, Pollux, 8, 118). On the eastern and western side is a raised block. These blocks are probably the two rude stones which Pausanias saw there, and which are described by Euripides as assigned, the one to the accuser, the other to the criminal, in the causes which were tried in the court (*Iph. T.* 961). — Smith. *SEE AREOPAGITE*.

## Picture for Areop'agus 2

## Picture for Areop'agus 3

The Areopagus possesses peculiar interest to the Christian as the spot from which Paul delivered his memorable address to the men of Athens (<sup><4472></sup>Acts 17:22-31). It has been supposed by some commentators that he was brought before the Council of Areopagus, but there is no trace in the narrative of any judicial proceedings. Paul “disputed daily” in the “market” or Agora (<sup><4472></sup>Acts 17:17), which was situated south of the Areopagus, in the valley lying between this hill and those of the Acropolis, the Pnyx, and the Museum. Attracting more and more attention, “certain philosophers of

the Epicureans and Stoics” brought him up from the valley, probably by the stone steps already mentioned, to the Areopagus above, that they might listen to him more conveniently. Here the philosophers probably took their seats on the stone benches usually occupied by the members of the council, while the multitude stood upon the steps and in the valley below. The dignified bearing of the apostle is worthy of high admiration, the more so from the associations of the spot (see Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1, 346-379). Nor does his eloquent discourse appear to have been without good effect; for, though some mocked, and some procrastinated, yet others believed, among whom was a member of the council, “Dionysius, the Areopagite,” who has been represented as the first bishop of Athens, and is said to have written books on the “Celestial Hierarchy;” but their authenticity is questioned. The history in the Acts (~~<4172>~~ Acts 17:22) states that the speaker “stood *in the midst of Mars' Hill*” (see Robinson’s *Researches*, 1:10-12). Having come up from the level parts of the city, where the markets (there were two, the old and the new) were, he would probably stand with his face toward the north, and would then have immediately behind him the long walls which ran down to the sea, affording protection against a foreign enemy. Near the sea, on one side, was the harbor of Piraeus, on the other that designated Phalerum, with their crowded arsenals, their busy workmen, and their gallant ships. Not far off in the ocean lay the island of Salamis, ennobled forever in history as the spot near which Athenian valor chastised Asiatic pride, and achieved the liberty of Greece. The apostle had only to turn toward his right hand to catch a view of a small but celebrated hill rising within the city near that on which he stood, called the Pnyx, where, standing on a block of bare stone, Demosthenes and other distinguished orators had addressed the assembled people of Athens, swaying that arrogant and fickle democracy, and thereby making Philip of Macedon tremble, or working good or ill for the entire civilized world. Immediately before him lay the crowded city, studded in every part with memorials sacred to religion or patriotism, and exhibiting the highest achievements of art. On his left, somewhat beyond the walls, was beheld the Academy, with its groves of plane and olive trees, its retired walks and cooling fountains, its altar to the Muses, its statues of the Graces, its Temple of Minerva, and its altars to Prometheus, to Love, and to Hercules, near which Plato had his country-seat, and in the midst of which he had taught, as well as his followers after him. But the most impressive spectacle lay on his right hand; for there, on the small and precipitous hill named the Acropolis were

clustered together monuments of the highest art, and memorials of the national religion, such as no other equal spot of ground has ever borne. The apostle's eyes, in turning to the right, would fall on the north-west side of the eminence, which was here (and all round) covered and protected by a wall, parts of which were so ancient as to be of Cyclopean origin. The western side, which alone gave access to what from its original destination may be termed the fort, was, during the administration of Pericles, adorned with a splendid flight of steps, and the beautiful Propylæa, with its five entrances and two flanking temples, constructed by Mnesicles of Pentelican marble, at a cost of 2012 talents. In the times of the Roman emperors there stood before the Propylæa equestrian statues of Augustus and Agrippa. On the southern wing of the Propylæa was a temple of Wingless Victory; on the northern, a Pinacotheca, or picture gallery. On the highest part of the platform of the Acropolis, not more than 300 feet from the entrance-buildings just described, stood (and yet stands, though shattered and mutilated) the Parthenon, justly celebrated throughout the world, erected of white Pentelican marble, under the direction of Callicrates, Ictinus, and Carpion, and adorned with the finest sculptures from the hand of Phidias. Northward from the Parthenon was the Erechtheum, a compound building, which contained the Temple of Minerva Polias, the proper Erechtheum (called also the Cecropium), and the Pandroseum. This sanctuary contained the holy olive-tree sacred to Minerva, the holy salt-spring, the ancient wooden image of Pallas, etc., and was the scene of the oldest and most venerated ceremonies and recollections of the Athenians. Between the Propylæa and the Erechtheum was placed the colossal bronze statue of Pallas Promachos, the work of Phidias, which towered so high above the other buildings that the plume of her helmet and the point of her spear were visible on the sea between Sunium and Athens. Moreover the Acropolis was occupied by so great a crowd of statues and monuments, that the account, as found in Pausanias, excites the reader's wonder, and makes it difficult for him to understand how so much could have been crowded into a space which extended from the south-east corner to the south-west only 1150 feet, while its greatest breadth did not exceed 500 feet. On the hill itself where Paul had his station, was, at the eastern end, the temple of the Furies, and other national and commemorative edifices. The court-house of the council, which was also here, was, according to the simplicity of ancient customs, built of clay. There was an altar consecrated by Orestes to Athene Areia. In the same place were seen two silver stones, on one of which stood the accuser, on the other the accused. Near them

stood two altars erected by Epimenides, one to Insult (Ὑβρεως, Cic. *Contunelice*), the other to Shamelessness (Ἄναιδείας, Cic. *Impudentiae*).  
**SEE ATHENS.**

The court of Areopagus was one of the oldest and most honored, not only in Athens, but in the whole of Greece, and indeed in the ancient world. Through a long succession of centuries it preserved its existence amid changes corresponding with those which the state underwent, till at least the age of the Caesars (Tacitus, *Ann.* 2, 55). The ancients are full of eulogies on its value, equity, and beneficial influence; in consequence of which qualities it was held in so much respect that even foreign states sought its verdict in difficult cases. But after Greece had submitted to the yoke of Rome, it retained probably little of its ancient character beyond a certain dignity, which was itself cold and barren; and however successful it may in earlier times have been in conciliating for its determinations the approval of public opinion, the historian Tacitus (*ut supra*) mentions a case in which it was charged with an erroneous, if not a corrupt, decision. The origin of the court ascends back into the darkest mythical period. From the first its constitution was essentially aristocratic; a character which to some extent it retained even after the democratic reforms which Solon introduced into the Athenian Constitution. By his appointment the nine archons became for the remainder of their lives Areopagites, provided they had well discharged the duties of their archonship, were blameless in their personal conduct, and had undergone a satisfactory examination. Its power and jurisdiction were still farther abridged by Pericles through his instrument Ephialtes. Following the political tendencies of the state, the Areopagus became in process of time less and less aristocratical. and parted piecemeal with most of its important functions. First its political power was taken away, then its jurisdiction in cases of murder, and even its moral influence gradually departed. During the sway of the Thirty Tyrants its power, or rather its political existence, was destroyed. On their overthrow it recovered some consideration, and the oversight of the execution of the laws was restored to it by an express decree. Isocrates endeavored by his Ἀρεοπαγιτικὸς λόγος to revive its ancient influence. The precise time when it ceased to exist cannot be determined; but evidence is not wanting to show that in later periods its members ceased to be uniformly characterized by blameless morals.

It is not easy to give a correct summary of its several functions, as the classic writers are not agreed in their statements, and the jurisdiction of the

court varied, as has been seen, with times and circumstances. They have, however, been divided into six general classes (*Real-Encyclopadie* von Pauly, s.v.).

(1.) Its judicial function embraced trials for murder and manslaughter (φόνου δίκαι, τὰ φονικά), and was the oldest and most peculiar sphere of its activity. The indictment was brought by the second or king-archon (ἄρχων βασιλεύς), whose duties were for the most part of a religious nature. Then followed the oath of both parties, accompanied by solemn appeals to the gods. After this the accuser and the accused had the option of making a speech (the notion of the proceedings of the Areopagus being carried on in the darkness of the night rests on no sufficient foundation), which, however, they were obliged to keep free from all extraneous matter (ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος), as well as from mere rhetorical ornaments. After the first speech, the accused was permitted to go into voluntary banishment if he had no reason to expect a favorable issue. Theft, poisoning, wounding, incendiarism, and treason belonged also to this department of jurisdiction in the court of the Areopagus.

(2.) Its political function consisted in the constant watch which it kept over the legal condition of the state, acting as overseer and guardian of the laws (ἐπίσκοπος καὶ φύλαξ τῶν νόμων).

(3.) Its police function also made it a protector and upholder of the institutions and laws. In this character the Areopagus had jurisdiction over novelties in religion, in worship, in customs, in every thing that departed from the traditionary and established usages and modes of thought (πατρίοις νομίμοις) which a regard to their ancestors endeared to the nation. This was an ancient and well-supported sphere of activity. The members of the court had a right to take oversight of festive meetings in private houses. In ancient times they fixed the number of the guests, and determined the style of the entertainment. If a person had no obvious means of subsisting, or was known to live in idleness, he was liable to an action before the Areopagus; if condemned three times, he was punished with ἀτημία, the loss of his civil rights. In later times the court possessed the right of giving permission to teachers (philosophers and rhetoricians) to establish themselves and pursue their profession in the city.

(4.) Its strictly religious jurisdiction extended itself over the public creed, worship, and sacrifices, embracing generally every thing which could come under the denomination of τὰ ἱερά sacred things. It was its special duty to

see that the religion- of the state was kept pure from all foreign elements. The accusation of impiety (γραφή ἀσεβείας) — the vagueness of which admitted almost any charge connected with religious innovations — belonged in a special manner to this tribunal, though the charge was in some cases heard before the court of the Heliaste. The freethinking poet Euripides stood in fear of, and was restrained by, the Areopagus (Euseb. *Prep. Evang.* 6, 14; Bayle, s.v. *Eurip.*). Its proceeding in such cases was sometimes rather of an admonitory than punitive character.

(5.) Not less influential was its moral and educational power. Isocrates speaks of the care which it took of good manners and good order (τῆς εὐκοσμίας, εὐταξίας). Quintilian relates that the Areopagus condemned a boy for plucking out the eyes of a quail — a sentence which has been both misunderstood and misrepresented (*Penny Cyclop.* s.v.), but which its original narrator approved, assigning no insufficient reason, namely, that the act was the sign of a cruel disposition, likely in advanced life to lead to baneful actions (Quint. 5, 9). The court exercised a salutary influence in general over the Athenian youth, their educators and their education.

(6.) Its financial position is not well understood; most probably it varied more than any other part of its administration with the changes which the constitution of the city underwent. It may suffice to mention, on the authority of Plutarch (*Themis.* c. 10), that in the Persian war the Areopagus had the merit of completing the number of men required for the fleet by paying eight drachmae to each.

In the following works corroboration of the facts stated in this article, and further details, with discussions on doubtful points, may be found: Sigonius, *De Rep. Ath.* 3, 2, p. 1568; De Canaye, *Recherches sur l'Areopage*, p. 273-316; *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* 10; Schwab, *Num quod Areop. in plebiscita ant confirmanda aut rejicienda jus exercuerit legitimum* (Stutt. 1818); the treatises, *De Areopago*, of Hauer (Hafn. 1708), Meursius (Lugd. B. 1624, and in Gronov. *Thes.* 5, 207), Schedius (Viteb. 1677, and in Iken. *Thes.* 2, 674 sq.), and Bockh (Berl. 1826); Forbiger, *Handb. d. alt. Geogr.* in; Meier, *Von der Blutgerichtsbarkeit des Areopag.*; Matthia, *De Jud. Ath.* in *Misc. Philol.*; Krebs, *De Ephetis*; Potter, *Gr. Antiq.* bk. 1, ch. 19; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. Areiopagus; Grote's *Hist. of Greece* (Am. ed.), 3:73, 79, 122; 4:141; 5:352-366. **SEE MARS HILL.**

Areopolis.

SEE AR; SEE AROER

A' res

(Ἄρες), one of those whose “sons” (to the number of 753) are said (1 Esdras 5:10) to have returned from Babylon; evidently the ARAH *SEE* ARAH (q.v.) of the genuine texts (<sup><4916></sup>Ezra 2:5; <sup><4970></sup>Nehemiah 7:10).

Ar'etas

### Picture for Ar'etas 1

(Ἀρέτας; Arab. *charresh*, Pococke, *Spec. Hist. Arab.* p. 58, or, in another form, *c(haurish=vrēj* , *graver*, Pococke, 1:70, 76, 77, 89), the common name of several Arabian kings (see Diod. Sic. 14:70; comp. Wesseling; Michaelis, in Pott's *Sylog.* 3, 62 sq.).

**1.** The first of whom we have any notice was a contemporary of the Jewish high-priest Jason and of Antiochus Epiphanes, about B.C. 170 (2 Maccabees 5:8): “In the end, therefore, he (Jason) had an unhappy return, being accused before *Aretas, the king of the Arabians.*”

### Picture for Ar'etas 2

**2.** Josephus (*Ant.* 13, 13, 3) mentions an Aretas, king of the Arabians (surnamed *Obedas*, Ὀβέδας, *Ant.* 13, 13, 5), contemporary with Alexander Jannaeus (died B.C. 79) and his sons. After defeating Antiochus Dionysus, he reigned over Coele-Syria, “being called to the government by those that held Damascus (κληθεὶς εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ τῶν τὴν Δαμασκὸν ἐχόντων) by reason of the hatred they bore to Ptolemy Mennaeus” (*Ant.* 13:15, 2). He took part with Hyrcanus, who had taken refuge with him (*War*, 1:6, 2), in his contest (*Ant.* 14:1, 4) for the sovereignty with his brother Aristobulus (q.v.), and laid siege to Jerusalem (B.C. 65), but, on the approach of the Roman general Scourus, he retreated to Philadelphia (*War*, 1, 6, 3). Hyrcanus and Aretas were pursued and defeated by Aristobulus at a place called Papyron, and lost above 6000 men (*Ant.* 14, 2, 3). After Pompey had reduced Syria to a Roman province, Aretas submitted to him again, B.C. 64 (see Dion Cass. 37:15; Appian, *Mithr.* 166; Plut. *Pomp.* 39, 41). Three or four years after, Scourus, to whom Pompey had committed the government of Coele-Syria, invaded

Petraea, but, finding it difficult to obtain provisions for his army, he consented to withdraw on the offer of 300 talents from Aretas (Josephus, *Ant.* 14, 5, 1; *War.* 1, 8, 1). This expedition is commemorated on a coin. **SEE SCAURUS**. The successors of Scaurus in Syria also prosecuted the war with the Arabs (Appian, *Syr.* 50).

### Picture for Ar'etas 3

**3.** Aretas, whose name was originally AENEAS (Αἰνεΐας), succeeded Obodas (Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 9, 4). He was the father-in-law of Herod Antipas. The latter made proposals of marriage to the wife of his half-brother Herod-Philip, Herodias, the daughter of Aristobulus, their brother, and the sister of Agrippa the Great. (On the apparent discrepancy between the Evangelists and Josephus, in reference to the name of the husband of Herodias, see Lardner's *Credibility*, etc., 2:5; *Works*, 1835, 1, 408-416.) In consequence of this the daughter of Aretas returned to her father, and a war (which had been fomented by previous disputes about the limits of their respective countries, see Joseph. *Ant.* 17, 10, 9) ensued between Aretas and Herod. The army of the latter was totally destroyed; and on his sending an account of his disaster to Rome the emperor immediately ordered Vitellius to bring Aretas prisoner alive, or, if dead, to send his head (Joseph. *Ant.* 18, 5, 1). But while Vitellius was on his march to Petra, news arrived of the death of Tiberius (A.D. 37), upon which, after administering the oath of allegiance to his troops, he dismissed them to winter-quarters and returned to Rome (Joseph. *Ant.* 18, 5, 3). The Aretas into whose dominions AELIUS GELLIUS came in the time of Augustus (Strabo, 16:781) is probably the same. There is another coin extant inscribed Φιλέλληνος, i. e. *lover of the Greeks* (Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* 3, 330), that may have belonged to this Aretas.

It has been supposed by many that it was at the above juncture that Aretas took possession of Damascus, and placed a governor in it (ἑθνάρχης) with a garrison, as stated by the Apostle Paul: "In Damascus the governor under Aretas, the king, kept the city of the Damascenes with a garrison, desirous to apprehend me; and through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and escaped his hands" (2 Corinthians 11:32, compared with Acts 9:24). In that case we are furnished with a chronological mark in the apostle's history. From Galatians 1:18, it appears that Paul went up to Jerusalem from Damascus three years after his conversion. **SEE PAUL**. The Emperor Tiberius died March 16, A.D. 37; and, as the affairs of



Arabia were settled in the second year of Caligula, Damascus was then most probably reoccupied by the Romans. The city under Augustus and Tiberius was attached to the province of Syria; and we have Damascene coins of both these emperors, and again of Nero and his successors. But we have none of Caligula and Claudius, and the following circumstances make it probable that the rulership of Damascus was changed after the death of Tiberius. By this occurrence at Rome a complete reversal took place in the situation of Antipas and his enemy. The former was ere long (A.D. 39) banished to Lyons, and his kingdom given to Agrippa, his foe (*Ant.* 18:7), who had been living in habits of intimacy with the new emperor (*Ant.* 18:6, 5). It would be natural that Aretas, who had been grossly injured by Antipas, should, by this change of affairs, be received into favor; and the more so as Vitellius had an old grudge against Antipas (*Ant.* 18:4, 5). Now in the year 38 Caligula made several changes in the East, granting Ituraea to Soanmus, Lesser Armenia and parts of Arabia to Cotys, the territory of Cotys to Rhaemetalces, and giving to Polemon, son of Polemon, his father's government. These facts, coupled with that of no Damascene coins of Caligula or Claudius existing, make it probable that about this time Damascus, which belonged to the predecessor of Aretas (*Ant.* 13:5, 2), was granted to him by Caligula. The other hypotheses, that the ethnarch was only visiting the city (as if he could then have guarded the walls to prevent escape), that Aretas had seized Damascus on Vitellius giving up the expedition against him (as if a Roman governor of a province would allow one of its chief cities to be taken from him merely because he was in uncertainty about the policy of a new emperor), are very improbable (*Wieseler, Chron. des apostolischen Zeitalters*, p. 174). If, then, Paul's flight took place in A.D. 39, his conversion must have occurred in A.D. 36 (*Neander's History of the Planting of the Christian Church*, 1, 107; *Lardner's Credibility*, etc., Supplement, ch. 11; *Works*, 5, 497, ed. 1835; *Schmidt in Keil's Analekt.* 3, 135 sq.; *Bertholdt, Einl.* 5, 2702 sq.). But it is still more likely that the possession of Damascus by Aretas to which Paul alludes occurred earlier, on the affront of his daughter by the espousal of Herodias (~~ⓁⓁⓁ~~ Luke 3:19, 20; ~~ⓁⓁⓁ~~ Mark 6:16; ~~ⓁⓁⓁ~~ Matthew 14:3), which stands in connection with the death of John the Baptist (q.v.); and in that case it affords neither date nor difficulty in the apostle's history (see *Browne's Ordo Saeclorum*, p. 113 n.; *Conybeare and Howson*, 1:82; *Smith's Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.). **SEE CHRONOLOGY.**

**4.** One or more other kings of Arabia by the same name are mentioned in history (Strabo, 16:781; Dio Cass. 37:15; comp. Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 1, 367; 2, 331; 3, 1, 139; and a coin of one of them is extant (Mionet, *Desc. des medailles antiques*, p. 284, 285; comp. Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 1, 107); but it is not clear that the Aretas whom Josephus names as having a contest with Syllaeus (*Ant.* 17, 3, 2; *War*, 1, 29, 3) was different from the preceding, and the succeeding kings of that name are unimportant in any Scriptural relation (see Anger, *De tempor. ratione*, p. 173; Heyne, *De Areta Arabum rege*, Viteb. 1775; Heinold, *De ethnarcha Judeorum Paulo obsidiante*, Jen. 1757).

### Aretas, Or Arethas

a bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, is supposed to have lived in the second half of the sixth century. He wrote a *Commentary on the Revelation* (*Συλλογή ἐξηγησέων*), giving a collection of the opinions of different authors. *SEE ANDREW* (*Bishop of Caesarea*).

### Aretius, Benedictus

a celebrated Swiss theologian; professor of logic at Marburg, in 1548; appointed professor of languages at Berne, in Switzerland, 1563, and professor of theology the same year; in which office he remained until his death in 1574, leaving many works, among them —

1. *Examen Theologicum, or Loci Communes* (Geneva, 1759 and 1617), a voluminous work, much sought after at the time: —
2. *Commentarii Breves in Pentateuchum* (Berne, 1602),
3. *Lectiones viz de Ccena Domini* (Geneva, 1589): —
4. Also Commentaries on the Four Gospels, on the Acts, on all the Epistles of St. Paul, on the Apocalypse.

In 1580 appeared a Commentary on the whole New Testament, in 11 vols. Svo. — Adam, *Vitae Theol. Germ.*; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1, 512.

### Areus

a king of the Lacedaemonians, whose letter to the high-priest Onias is given in 1 Maccabees 12:20 sq. He is so called in the A. V. in ver. 20 and in the margin of ver. 7; but *Oniaries* in ver. 19, and so in the Greek text

Ὀνιάρης (v. r. Ὀνιάρης, Ὀνειάρης) in ver. 20, and *Darivs* (Δαρεῖος) in ver. 7: there can be little doubt, however, that these are corruptions of Ἀρεύς. In Josephus (*Ant.* 12:4, 10) the name is written (Ἄρεῖος) as in the Vulgate *Arsus*. There were two Spartan kings of the name of Areus, of whom the first reigned B.C. 309 265, and the second, the grandson of the former, died when a child of eight years old in B.C. 257. There were three high-priests of the name of Onias, of whom the first held the office B.C. 323 300. This is the one who must have written the letter to Areus I, probably in some interval between 309 and 300 (Grimm, *Zu Maacc.* p. 185). See ONIAS. This Areus was foremost in the league of the Greek states against Anti, onus Gonatus (B.C. 280), and when Pyrrhus attacked Sparta (B.C. 272) he repelled him by an alliance with the Arcives. He fell in battle against the Macedonians at Corinth (Smith's *Diet. of Class. Biog.* s.v.).

### Argenteus, Codex

(*silver manuscript*), a MS. of part of the N. T., so called from the silver letters in which it is written. This codex is preserved in the University of Upsal, and is a copy from the Gothic version of Ulphilas, which was made in the fourth century. It is of a quarto size, is written on vellum, the leaves of which are stained with a violet color; and on this ground the letters, which are all uncial, or capitals, are painted in silver, except the initial letters, which are in gold, of course now much faded. It contains fragments of the four gospels (in the Latin order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark) on 188 (out of about 320) leaves, so regularly written that some have imagined they were impressed with a stamp. This MS. was first discovered by Ant. Morillon in 1597, in the library of the Benedictine abbey of Werden, in Westphalia, but by some means it was deposited in Prague, and was taken to Stockholm by the Swedes on the capture of the former place in 1648. Queen Christina appears to have given it to her librarian Vossius prior to 1655, and while in his hands a transcript of it was made by one Derrer. Through the agency of Puffendorf, it was purchased by Count de la Gardieu for the Swedish library, where it still remains. Vossius had previously placed the MS. in his uncle Junius's hands for publication; and in 1665 the text of the Gothic gospels, so far as contained in this codex, was edited at Dort under his care, accompanied by the AngloSaxon version, edited by Thos. Marshall. This edition was in Gothic characters cut for the purpose, and for it Junius employed the transcript made by Derrer. — Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* 4, 301. **SEE GOTHIC VERSIONS.**

## Argentine Confederation

a confederation of states in South America, consisting in 1865, when Buenos Ayres, which had seceded in 1854, had been reunited with it, of 14 provinces, with a population of about 1,171,800. It constituted itself an independent state in 1816. The population, partly Europeans, partly Africans, partly Indians, partly of mixed descent, belong mostly to the Roman Catholic Church. The inhabitants of the country district (Pamperos) surpass in rudeness all other tribes of South America, and show very little interest in religion. The Roman Catholic Church has five bishoprics, Buenos Ayres. Cordova., Salta, Sarana, and Cuyo, all of which are suffragans' of the archbishop of Charcas, in Bolivia. In 1825 religious toleration was granted to all denominations, and in 1834 mixed marriages were allowed, provided that the parents agreed to bring up all the children in the Roman Catholic Church. The tithes were placed under the administration of the government, which uses one part of them for school and other objects of common interest. The convents were suppressed, except one convent of Franciscans and two convents of nuns, and their property confiscated. Later, the Dominicans were again allowed to settle, and the Franciscans to receive new members from Spain. The Jesuits established themselves at Buenos Ayres in 1841. In 1858 there were disturbances at Buenos Ayres in consequence of the bishop prohibiting ecclesiastical rites at the burial of free-masons. Protestant missionaries came to the Argentine Confederation from the United States in 1835, and many copies of the Scriptures were disseminated. A treaty with the United States in 1852 guaranteed freedom of Protestant worship and burial. The Methodist mission in Buenos Ayres, commenced in 1836, is in a flourishing condition. The church and congregation support the pastor and pay the current expenses of the church and parsonage. According to the report of the Rev. William Goodfellow, superintendent of the Methodist missions in South America, there were, in 1864, appointments at Tatay, Lobos, Guardia del Monte, Canuelas, and Tuyu, all in the province of Buenos Ayres. At Azul, in the same province, about seventy leagues from the city of Buenos Ayres, where there is a fine region, rapidly filling up with good Protestant settlers, a separate charge has been arranged, holding a quarterly conference. In the province of Santa Fe, Rosario, the second city of the confederation, with an aggregate population of 12,000 or more, has a rapidly increasing Protestant population, and already possesses a Protestant cemetery, which was consecrated in 1864. At Esperanza: also in the

province of Santa Fe, there were at that date about 600 Protestants, who were so located as to constitute an important point in reference to further extensions. San Carlos, in the same province, had a Protestant population of 300 Germans and French, whose number bade fair to increase rapidly by immigration. Another settlement of European Protestants was at San Jose, near Parana, in the province of Entre Rios. It was expected that the bulk of these colonists would unite with the M.E. Church. According to the Missionary Report for 1888 there are 15 circuits and stations, with 10 ordained ministers, 39 other workers, 899 members, 4615 adherents, 9 day-schools, with 990 pupils, and property estimated at \$130,000. The largest church is the Second Church of Buenos Avres, with 185 members and 166 probationers. *SEE AMERICA.*

### Argentre, Charles Du Plessis D'

bishop of Tulle, was born in the Castle du Plessis, near Vitre, May 16, 1673, and died Oct. 27, 1740. In 1699 he was appointed by Louis XIV to the abbey of St. Croix de Guingamp, — and in 1700 he became a doctor of the Sorbonne. In 1705 he attended the General Assembly of the clergy of France as a deputy of the second order from the province of Tours. In 1707 he was appointed by the bishop of Treguier vicar general; in 1709, almoner of the king; and in 1723, bishop of Tulle. In 1723 he also attended the General Assembly of the clergy of France as a deputy of the first order from the province of Bourges. He wrote numerous theological and philosophical works, among which are *L'Analyse de la Foi* (against Jurieu, Lyons, 1698, 2 vols. 12mo); *Lexicon Philosophicum* (Hague, 1706, 4to). — Hoefler, *Biographie Generale*, 3, 130.

### Ar'gob

(Heb. *Argob'*, **b/Gr** **ḥj** for **bgṣj** with **a** prosthetic, *stone-hep*), the name of a place and also of a man.

**1.** (Sept. Ἀργώβ, but in Kings Ἐργώβ). A district in Bashan beyond the lake Gennesareth, containing 60 cities ( HAVOTH-JAIR *SEE HAVOTH-JAIR* ), originally ruled over by Og ( <sup><GR04></sup>Deuteronomy 4:4, 13), and eventually formed into a purveyorship by Solomon ( <sup><1043></sup>1 Kings 4:13). The name may probably be traced in the *Ragab* (**bgr**) of the Mishna (*Menachoth*, 8, 3), the *Rigobah* (**habwgr** of the Samaritan version (see Winer's *Diss. de vess. Samar. indole*, p. 55), the *Ragaba* ( Ῥαγαβᾶ ) of Josephus (*Ant.* 13,

15, 5), and the *Arga* or *Ergaba* (Ἐργαβά) placed by Jerome and Eusebius (*Onomas'* s.v. Argob) 15 Roman miles west of Gerasa (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 959). Josephus elsewhere (*Ant.* 8:2, 3) seems to locate it in Trachonitis (q., v.), i.e. Gaulonitis, where Burckhardt is disposed to find it in *El Husn*, a remarkable ruined site (*Syria*, p. 279), but Mr. Banks (*Quar. Rev.* 26, 389) has assigned this to Gamala (comp. *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1852, p. 364). Dr. Robinson identifies it with the modern village with ruins called *Rajib*, a few miles north-east of the junction of the Jabbok with the Jordan (*Researches*, 3, Append. p. 166); and Dr. Thomson very properly remarks that it probably denotes rather the whole adjacent region, for the hill on which Um-Keis (somewhat to the north) stands is called *Arkub* by the Bedouins (*Land and Book*, 2, 54). — Kitto, s.v.

From this special or original locality, however, the term Argob seems to have been extended in its application to designate a large tract to the north-east; for we find it identified (as by Josephus above) with TRACHONITIS *SEE TRACHONITIS* (i.e. the *rough* country) in the Targums (Onkelos and Jonathan *anwkrf*, Jerusalem *anwkf*). Later we trace it in the Arabic version of Saadiah as *Mujeb* (with the same meaning); and it is now apparently identified with the *Lejah*, a very remarkable district south of Damascus, and east of the Sea of Galilee, which has been visited and described by Burckhardt (p. 111-119), Seetzen, and Porter (specially 2:240-245). This extraordinary region — about 22 miles from north to south, by 14 from west to east, and of a regular, almost oval shape-has been described as an ocean of basaltic rocks and boulders, tossed about in the wildest confusion, and intermingled with fissures and crevices in every direction. “It is,” says Mr. Porter, “wholly composed of black basalt, which appears to have issued from innumerable pores in the earth in a liquid state, and to have flowed out on every side. Before cooling, its surface was violently agitated, and it was afterward shattered and rent by internal convulsions. The cup-like cavities from which the liquid mass was extruded are still seen, and likewise the wavy surface a thick liquid assumes which cools while flowing. The rock is filled with little pits and air-bubbles; it is as hard as flint, and emits a sharp metallic sound when struck” (p. 241). “Strange as it may seem, this ungainly and forbidding region is thickly studded with deserted cities and villages, in all of which the dwellings are solidly built, and of remote antiquity” (p. 238). The number of these towns visited by one traveler lately returned is 50, and there were many others to which he did not go. A Roman road runs through the district from south to

north, probably between Bosra and Damascus. On the edge of the *Lejah* are situated, among others, the towns known in Biblical history as Kenath and Edrei. In the absence of more conclusive evidence on the point, a strong presumption in favor of the identification of the *Lejah* with Argob arises from the peculiar Hebrew word constantly attached to Argob, and in this definite sense apparently to Argob only. This word is **לְבַי**, (*Che'bel*), literally “a rope” (**σχοίνισμα, περίμετρον**, *funiculus*), and it designates with striking accuracy the remarkably defined boundary-line of the district of the *Lejah*, which is spoken of repeatedly by its latest explorer as “a rocky shore;” “sweeping round in a circle clearly defined as a rocky shore-line;” “resembling a Cyclopean wall in ruins” (Porter, 2, 19, 219, 239, etc.). The extraordinary features of this region are rendered still more remarkable by the contrast which it presents with the surrounding plain of the Hauran, a high plateau of waving downs of the richest agricultural soil stretching from the Sea of Galilee to the *Lejah*, and beyond that to the desert. almost literally “without a stone;” and it is not to be wondered at — if the identification proposed above be correct — that this contrast should have struck the Israelites, and that their language, so scrupulous of minute topographical distinctions, should have perpetuated in the words Mishor and Chebel (which see severally) at once the level downs of Bashan (q.v.), the stony labyrinth which so suddenly intrudes itself on the soil (Argob), and the definite fence or boundary which incloses it. **SEE HAURAN.**

**2.** (Sept. **Ἀργόβ**.) A subaltern or ally of Pekahiah (B.C. 757), as appears from <sup>121525</sup>2 Kings 15:25, where we read that Pekah conspired against Pekahiah, king of Israel, “and smote him in Samaria, in the palace of the king’s house, with Argob and Arieih.” In giving this version, some think our translators have mistaken the sense of the original, which they therefore render “smote him in the harem of the palace of the king of Argob and Arieih,” as if these were the names of two cities in Samaria. Others, however, maintain, with good reason, that the particle **Ata**, is properly translated *with*, i.e. these two officers were assassinated at the same time; so the Sept. (**μετά**). It will hardly bear the other construction: the word strictly denotes *near* (*Vulg. juxta*), but that would yield no tolerable sense to the whole passage (see Keil, *Comment.* in loc.). According to some, Argob was an accomplice of Pekah in the murder of Pekahiah. But Sebastian Schmid explained that both Argob and Arieih were two princes of Pekahiah whose influence Pekah feared, and whom he therefore slew with the king. Rashi understands by Argob the royal palace,

near which was the castle in which the murder took place. In like manner, Arieh, named in the same connection (“the lion,” so called probably from his daring as a warrior), was either one of the accomplices of Pekah in his conspiracy against Pekahiah, or, as Schmid understands, one of the princes of Pekahiah, who was put to death with him. Rashi explains the latter name literally of a golden lion which stood in the castle. *SEE PEKAH.*

## Argyle

(*Ergadia*), an episcopal see in Scotland; the diocese contains the counties or districts of Argyle, Lorn, Kintire, and Lochaber, with some of the Western Isles, as Lismore, where the see is. The present title of the see is “Argyle and the Western Isles,” and the incumbent in 1865 was Alexander Ewing, D.D., consecrated in 1847.

## Ari

*SEE LION.*

## Arialdus

deacon and martyr of the church of Milan in the 11th century. The Roman Church in the north of Italy was then very corrupt; a wide-spread licentiousness, originating from the unnatural institution of priestly celibacy, prevailed. Great numbers of the clergy kept concubines openly. Some earnest men, shocked by this flagrant evil, vainly imagined the strict enforcement of celibacy the only effectual cure. Chief among these reformers stood Arialdus, whose life was one continued scene of violent controversy. Although successively sanctioned by Popes Stephen X, Nicholas II, and Alexander II, he found little sympathy among his brethren, and used to complain that he could only get laymen to assist him in his agitation. Having at length succeeded in obtaining a papal bull of excommunication against the archbishop of Milan, a fierce tumult ensued in the city, whose inhabitants declared against Arialdus and his coadjutors. Arialdus now fled to the country; but his hiding-place being betrayed, he was conveyed captive to a desert isle in Lake Maggiore, where he was murdered by the emissaries of the archbishop, and his remains thrown into the lake, June 28, 1066. He was afterward canonized by Pope Alexander 2. — *Acta Sanctorum*, June 28.



## Arianism

a heresy with regard to the person of Christ which spread widely in the church from the fourth to the seventh centuries. It took its name from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, said to have been a Libyan, and a man of subtle, but not profound mind. The most probable account is that he was educated in the school of Lucian the martyr at Antioch; and the doctrinal position of Lucian (scientifically nearer to the subsequent doctrine of Arius than of Athanasius) helps to explain not only how Arius's view arose, but also how it happened to be so widely received (comp. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. 1, vol. 2, p. 490; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2, 10; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 5). He is said to have favored Meletius (q.v.), who was deposed A.D. 306; but it appears that Peter, bishop of Alexandria, the great enemy of Meletius, ordained Arius deacon (Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* 1:15) about A.D. 311, but soon, on account of his turbulent disposition, ejected him. When Peter was dead, Arius feigned penitence; and being pardoned by Achillas, who succeeded Peter, he was by him raised to the priesthood, and entrusted with the church of Baucalis, in Alexandria (Epiphan. *Haeres.* 68, 4). It is said that on the death of Achillas, A.D. 313, Arius was greatly mortified because Alexander was preferred before him, and made bishop, and that he consequently sought every occasion of exciting tumults against Alexander; but this story rests simply on a remark of Theodoret (*Hist. Eccles.* 1, 2) that Arius was envious of Alexander.

### I. Ancient Arianism. —

**1. First Period: to the Council of Nice.** — The eloquence of Arius gained him popularity; and he soon began to teach a doctrine concerning the person of Christ inconsistent with His divinity. When Alexander had one day been addressing his clergy, and insisting that the Son is co-eternal, co-essential, and co-equal with the Father (ὁμότιμον τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν οὐσίαν ἔχειν, Theod. 1:11), Arius opposed him, accused him of Sabellianism, and asserted that there was a time when the Son was not (ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ υἱός), since the Father who begot must be before the Son who was begotten, and the latter, therefore, could not be eternal (Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 5). Such is the account, by the early writers, of the origin of the controversy. But if it had not begun in this way, it must soon have begun in some other. The points in question had not arrived at scientific precision in the mind of the church; and it was only during the Arian controversy, and by means of the earnest struggles invoked by it, carried

on through many years, causing the convocation of many synods, and employing some of the most acute and profound intellects the church has ever seen, that a definite and permanent form of truth was arrived at (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. 1, vol. 2, p. 227). **SEE ATHANASIUS**. At length, Alexander called a council of his clergy, which was attended by nearly one hundred Egyptian and Libyan bishops, by whom Arius was deposed and excommunicated (Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 15). This decision was conveyed to all the foreign bishops by circulars sent by Alexander himself (A.D. 321). Arius retired to Palestine, where by his eloquence and talents he soon gained a number of converts. Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, who had also studied under Lucian, and doubtless held his opinions, naturally inclined to favor Arius, who addressed to Eusebius a letter, still extant (Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 69. 6, and in Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 5), from which we derive our knowledge of the *first* stage of Arian opinion.: It runs thus: “We cannot assent to these expressions, ‘always Father, always Son;’ ‘at the same time Father and Son;’ that ‘the Son always co-exists with the Father;’ that ‘the Father has no pre-existence before the Son, no, not so much as in thought or a moment.’ But this we think and teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor a part of the unbegotten by any means. Nor is he made out of any pre-existent thing; but, by the will and pleasure of the Father, he existed before time and ages, the only begotten God, unchangeable; and that before He was begotten, or made, or designed, or founded, he was not. But we are persecuted because we say that the Son has a beginning, and that God has no beginning. For this we are persecuted; and because we say the Son is out of nothing. Which we therefore say, because he is not a part of God, or made out of any pre-existent thing” (διδάσκομεν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγέννητος, οὐδὲ μέρος ἀγεννήτου κατ’ οὐδένα τρόπον, οὐδὲ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινός: ἀλλ’ ὅτι θελήματι καὶ βουλῇ ὑπέστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων πλήρης θεός, μονογενής, ἀναλλοίωτος, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἦτοι κτισθῆναι, ἢ ὀρισθῆναι, ἢ θεμελιωθῆναι, οὐκ ἦν: ἀγέννητος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν: διωκόμεθα ὅτι εἶπαμεν, ἀρχὴν ἔχει ὁ υἱός, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀναρχός ἐστι . . . καὶ ὅτι εἶπαμεν, ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐστίν: οὕτω δὲ εἶπαμεν καθότι οὐδὲ μέρος θεοῦ οὐδὲ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινός).

Voigt (in his *Lehre des Athanasius von Alexandrien*) gives this letter, with critical emendations, which elucidate the development of the opinions of Arius (see transl. from Voigt, by Dr. Schaeffer, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 21, 138). The second direct source of our knowledge of the opinions of Arius is a letter addressed by him to Alexander (preserved in Epiphanius *Haeres.*

69, 7, and in Athanasius, *De Synod.* 16), in which he states his positions plausibly and cautiously, and claims that they are the traditional opinions of the church. “We believe that there are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. God, the cause of all things, is alone without beginning. The Son, begotten of the Father before time, made before the ages were founded, was not before he was begotten. Nor is he eternal, or co-eternal, or begotten at the same time with the Father.” In these two letters Arius teaches that the Father alone is God, and that the Son is his creature. He still regards the Son, however, “as occupying a unique position among creatures; as unalterable and unchangeable; and as bearing a distinctive and peculiar likeness to the Father” (Dorner, l. c. p. 236). He terms the Son “a perfect creature of God, but not as one of the creatures; an offspring, but not as one of those who are generated” (*Ep. ad Alex.*). Alexander now wrote a letter to Alexander of Constantinople (Theod. 1, 4), in which he charges Arius with teaching not only that the Son is less than the Father, but also that he is “liable to change,” notwithstanding that Arius, in the epistles cited above, speaks of the Son as “unalterable and unchangeable” (ἀναλλοίωτος, ἄτρεπτος). But Arius abandoned these terms, and set forth the changeableness of the Son without reservation in his *Thalia* (Θάλεια), the latest of his writings known to us (written during his stay at Nicomedia). It is partly in prose and partly in verse, and obviously addressed to the popular ear. What we have extant of it is preserved in Athanasius (*cont. Arianos*, 1, 5-9; *De Synod.* 15; see citations from all the remains of Arius in Gieseler, *Ch. History*, 1, § 79).

A council was called in Bithynia (A.D. 323) by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and other favorers of Arius, by which an epistle was written to “all bishops,” exhorting them to hold fellowship with Arius (Sozomen, 1:15). Another council was now held at Alexandria (323?), from which Alexander sent forth an encyclical letter against Arius, and also sharply censured Eusebius of Nicomedia, and other Eastern bishops, as supporters of grave heresy (preserved in Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1:6). We now hear, for the first time, the name of Eusebius of Caesarea in connection with the controversy. He did not accept the Arian formula ( *ην πότε ὅτε οὐκ ην*); but, as he had been educated in Origen’s denial of the eternal Sonship of Christ, he was just in the position to suggest a compromise between the opposing parties. He wrote letters in this spirit (excusing Arius) to Alexander; but the question at issue was a fundamental one, ready for its final decision, and the day of compromise was past and gone (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 15;

Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 69, 4; *SEE EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA*). The controversy had now spread like a flame throughout the Eastern empire, and at last Constantine found it absolutely necessary to bring it to a point. At first he sought to reconcile Alexander and Arius by a letter in which he urged them to drop discussion on unessential points, and to agree together for the harmony of the church. This letter was conveyed by his court bishop, Hosius; but he met with no success, and an uproar arose in Alexandria, in which the effigy of the emperor himself was insulted. As all the provincial synods had only helped to fan the flame of strife, Constantine determined to call a general council of bishops, and accordingly the *first oecumenical* council was held at Nice, A.D. 325, consisting of 318 bishops, most of whom were from the East. (*SEE NICE, COUNCIL OF.*)

The gist of the question to be settled by the Council of Nice lay in the summary argument of Arius: “The Father is a Father; the Son is a Son; therefore the Father must have existed before the Son; therefore once the Son was not; therefore he was made, like all creatures, of a substance that had not previously existed.” — This was the substance of the doctrine of Arius. His intellect, logical, but not profound or intuitive, could not embrace the lofty doctrine of an eternal, unbeginning generation of the Son. In a truly rationalistic way, he thought that he could argue from the nature of human generation to divine; not seeing that his argument, while insisting on the truth of the Sonship of Christ, ended by alienating Him wholly from the essence of the Father. “The Arian Christ was confessedly lacking in a divine nature, in every sense of the term. Though the Son of God was united with human nature in the birth of Jesus, yet that Son of God has a *κτίσμα*. He indeed existed long before that birth, but not from eternity. The only element, consequently, in the Arian construction of Christ’s person that was preserved intact and pure was the humanity” (Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, 1, 393). Of the debates upon these great questions in the Council of Nice no full account is extant. Athanasius, who was then a deacon under Alexander, bore a prominent part in the council, and contributed largely to its decisions, in defense of which the remainder of his life was chiefly occupied. *SEE ATHANASIUS*. For an account of the proceedings, as far as known, see Kaye, *Council of Nicaea* (Lond. 1853). Eusebius of Caesarea was also a chief actor in the council, and sought, in harmony with his character and habits, to act as mediator. He proposed, finally, a creed which he declared he had “received from the bishops who had preceded him and from the Scriptures” (Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* 1, 8),

which received the immediate approbation of Constantine. It did not, however, contain the word *ὁμοούσιος*, which was insisted upon by the orthodox. (It is given in parallel columns with the Nicene Creed in *Christian Remembrancer*, January, 1854, p. 133.) The Creed, as finally adopted, condemned the heresy of Arius, and fixed the doctrine of the person of Christ as it has been held in the church to this day, declaring the Son to be “begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made” (see Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* 1, 8; and article *SEE CREED, NICENE*). According to Sozomen (1, 20), all the bishops but fifteen, according to Socrates (1, 8), all but five, signed the Creed. These five were Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, Thomas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais; and of these only the two last held out against the threat of banishment made by the emperor. Arius was excommunicated and banished, and his books ordered by the emperor to be burnt.

**2. From the Council of Nice to the Council of Milan.** — Soon after the close of the Council of Nice, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nice, being found to continue their countenance of the Arian cause by refusing to carry out its anathemas, were deposed, were both subjected to the same penalty of exile by the emperor, and had successors appointed to their sees. By imposing upon the credulity of Constantine, they were in three years restored, and gained considerable influence at court (Sozom. 2, 16, 27). The indulgent emperor, on the statement being made to him (by a presbyter of the household of his sister Constantia, who herself favored Arianism, and on her death-bed recommended this presbyter to Constantine) that Arius had been misrepresented, and differed in nothing that was important from the Nicene fathers, had him recalled from banishment, and required him to present in writing a confession of his faith (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 25). He did this in such terms as, though they admitted a latent reservation, yet appeared entirely orthodox, and therefore not only satisfied the emperor, but offended some of his own friends, who from that time separated from him (see the Creed in Socrates, 1, 26). Athanasius, now bishop of Alexandria, was not so easily imposed upon, but was resolute in refusing Arius admission to the communion, since the Nicene Council had openly condemned him, until a similar synod should receive his submission and restore him. The Synod of Tyre, convened A.D. 335 by the emperor, tried Athanasius on trumped-up charges of immorality, and he was

banished. The emperor then sent for Arius to Constantinople, and, after receiving his signature to the Nicene Creed, insisted on his being received to communion by Alexander, the bishop of that city. On the day before this reception was to have taken place Arius died suddenly (A.D. 336) (Socrates, 1:26-38).

Constantine died A.D. 337, and the empire fell to his three sons, Constantine II in Gaul; Constantius in the East; Constans in Italy and Gaul. The latter was a friend and protector of Athanasius. The religious question was now greatly mixed up with politics. On the death of the younger Constantine, the emperor of the East, Constantius (340), took the Arians formally under his protection (Sozom. 3, 18). Eusebius obtained great influence with Constantius, and became bishop of Constantinople A.D. 339, and secured permission for the Arians to celebrate public worship at Alexandria and other places of the Eastern empire. Nevertheless, a council was held at Antioch, A.D. 341, in which the Eastern bishops declared that they could not be followers of Arius, because "how could we, being bishops, be followers of a presbyter?" In this synod four creeds were approved, in which an endeavor was made to steer a middle course between the Nicaean *Homoousios* and the definitions of Arius, which two points were considered to be the two extremes of divergence from the standard of ecclesiastical orthodoxy in the East. These four Antiochene creeds are extant in Athanasius, *De Synodis*, § 22-25 (see Gieseler, *Ch. History*, 1, § 80). As this middle course originated with Eusebius of Nicomedia, its adherents were called Eusebians. The Council of Antioch deposed Athanasius, who went to Rome, and was fully recognized as orthodox by the Synod of Rome, A.D. 342. Another Arian council met at Antioch, A.D. 345, and drew up what was called *the long Creed* (*μακρόστιχος*, to be found in Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2, 18), leaving out the *homoousion*, which they sent to the council of Western bishops summoned by Constans at Milan (A.D. 346). The Milan council not only rejected this creed, but required the deputies who brought it to sign a condemnation of Arianism. Of course they left the council in wrath. The emperors Constantius and Constans endeavored to reconcile the combatants for Oriental and Occidental orthodoxy by calling a general council of both East and West at Sardica, in Illyricum, A.D. 347 (according to Mansi A.D. 344, putting back also the preceding dates); but the Eusebians refused to remain in the council unless Athanasius and other heterodox bishops were excluded. Failing in this, they retired to the neighboring city of

Philippopolis, leaving their opponents alone at Sardica. Eusebianism was, under Constantius, as victorious in the East as the Nicene Creed was, under Constans, in the West. The Eusebians procured the deposition of Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, on a charge of Sabellianism. After the death of Constans, A.D. 350, and the victory over Masnientius, A.D. 353, Constantius endeavored to establish Arianism by force in the West. In the synods of Arles, A.D. 354, and of Milan, A.D. 355, he compelled the assembled bishops to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, though most of them were, it is thought, orthodox. Hosius of Cordova and Liberius of Rome, refusing to sign, were deprived of their sees. Athanasius was expelled from Alexandria (A.D. 356), and George of Cappadocia put in his place, not without force of arms. Constantius persecuted the orthodox relentlessly, and it seemed for a time as if their cause were irretrievably ruined. Even Hosius (now a century old) and Liberius were brought to sign a confession which excluded the *homoousion*.

### 3. *Divisions among the Arians: History to the Council of Constantinople.*

— A new era now began with this apparent triumph of Arianism. Heretofore the various classes of opponents of the orthodox doctrine had been kept together by the common bond of opposition. Now that the state and church were both in their power, their differences of doctrine soon became apparent. The reins of government were really in the hands of the Eusebians (q.v.), whose opinions were a compromise between strict Arianism and orthodoxy. The *strict* Arians were probably in a minority during the whole period of the strife. Their leaders at this period were Aetius of Antioch, Eunomius of Cappadocia, and Acacius of Caesarea; and from them the parties were called Aetians, Eunomians, Acacians. They were also called **ἀνόμοιοι** (Anomoeans), because they denied the sameness of the essence of the Son with the Father; and also Heterousians, as they held the Son to be **ἕτεροούσιος** (of different essence), inasmuch as the unbegotten, according to their materialistic way of judging, could not be similar in essence to the begotten. Aetius and Eunomius sought, at the first Council of Sirmium (A.D. 351), to put an end to all communion between Arians and orthodox; but they were vigorously met by the *Semi-Arians*, led by “Basilius, bishop of Ancyra, and Georgius, bishop of Laodicea, who held fast by the position of the Eusebians, viz. that the Son is of similar essence with the Father (**ὁμοιούσιος**), and were hence called *Homoiousians* and *SemiArians*. Constantius was attached to the Semi-Arians, but a powerful party about his court exerted themselves with no

less cunning than perseverance in favor of the Anomoeans. And because they could not publicly vindicate their formula, they persuaded the emperor that, in order to restore peace, the formulas of the two other parties also must be prohibited, which measure they brought about at the second synod of Sirmium (A.D. 357. The formula is given in Walch, *Bibl. Symb.* p. 133). On the other hand, Basil, bishop of Ancyra, called together a synod at Ancyra (358), which established the Semi-Arian creed, and rejected the Arian (see the decrees in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 73; the confession of faith adopted by the synod, in Athanasius, *de Syn.* § 41). Constantius allowed himself to be easily convinced that the Sirmium formula favored the Anomoeans, and the confession of faith adopted at the second was now rejected at a third synod of Sirmium (358), and the anathemas of the Synod of Ancyra were confirmed. The Anomoeans, for the purpose of uniting in appearance with the Semi-Arians, and yet establishing their own doctrine, now adopted the formula *τὸν υἱὸν ὅμοιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα ὡς αἱ ἄγιοι γραφαὶ λέγουσι τέ καὶ διδάσκουσι* (the Son is similar to the Father in all respects, as the Scriptures say and teach), and succeeded in convincing the emperor that all parties might be easily united in it. For this all bishops were now prepared, and then the Westerns were summoned to a council at Ariminum, the Easterns to another at Seleucia, simultaneously (359). After many efforts, the emperor at last succeeded in getting most of the bishops to adopt that formula. But, along with this external union, not only did the internal doctrinal schism continue, but there were besides differences among such as had been like-minded, whether they had gone in with that union or not. Thus Constantius, at his death, left all in the greatest confusion (A.D. 360). The new emperor, Julian (361-363), was, as a Pagan, of course equally indifferent to all Christian dogmas, and restored all the banished bishops to their sees. Jovian also († 364), and his successors in the West, Valentinian († 375), then Gratian and Valentinian II, maintained general toleration. On the contrary, Valens, emperor of the East (364-378), was a zealous Arian, and persecuted both orthodox and Semi-Arians.

“Various causes had contributed, since the death of Constantius, to increase in the East the number of adherents to the Nicene Creed. The majority of the Orientals, who held fast by the emanation of the Son from the Father, were naturally averse to strict Arianism; while the Nicene decrees were naturally allied to their ideas, as being fuller developments of them. Moreover, the orthodox were united and steadfast; the Arians were



divided and wavering. Finally, the influence of Monachism, which had now arisen in Egypt, and was rapidly becoming general and influential, was bound up with the fortunes of Athanasius; and in all countries where it was diffused, was busy in favor of the Nicene Creed. One of the first of the important converts was Meletius, formerly an Acacian Arian, who declared himself in favor of the Nicene Creed immediately after he had been nominated bishop of Antioch, A.D. 361. But the old Nicene community, which had still existed in Antioch from the time of Eustathius, and was now headed by a presbyter, Paulinus, refused to acknowledge Meletius as bishop on the charge that he was not entirely orthodox (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2, 44). The Council of Alexandria, assembled by Athanasius (362), sought, indeed, not only to smooth the way generally for the Arians to join their party by mild measures, but endeavored particularly to settle this Antiochian dispute; but Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, gave firm footing to the Meletian schism about the same time by consecrating, as bishop, Paulinus the Eustathian. The Westerns and Egyptians acknowledged Paulinus, the Oriental Nicenes, Meletius, as the orthodox bishop of Antioch. If the emperor Valens (364-378) had now favored the Semi-Arians instead of the Arians, he might, perhaps, have considerably checked the further spread of the Nicene party; but, since he wished to make Arianism alone predominant by horribly persecuting all who thought differently, he drove by this means the Semi-Arians, who did not sink under the persecution, to unite still more closely with the Nicenes. Thus a great part of the Semi-Arians (or, as they were now also called, Macedonians, from Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, who had been deposed in 360, at the instigation of the Arians) declared themselves, at several councils of Asia Minor, in favor of the Nicene confession, and sent an embassy to Rome to announce their assent to it (366). The Arians, supported by the emperor Valens, endeavored to counteract this new turn of affairs; yet the Macedonians were always passing over more and more to the Nicene Creed, and for this the three great teachers of the Church, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa, began now to work. These new Oriental Nicenians did not believe their faith changed by their assent to the Nicene formula, but thought they had merely assumed a more definite expression for it in the rightly-understood ὁμοούσιος. Since they supposed that they had unchangeably remained steadfast to their faith, they also continued to consider their Eusebian and Semi-Arian fathers as orthodox, although condemned by the old Nicenes. Thus the canons of the Oriental councils held during the schism constantly remained in force, particularly those of

the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, and of Laodicea (perhaps A.D. 363), which canons afterward passed over from the Eastern to the Western Church. During this time new schisms arose from new disputes on other points of doctrine. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the controversies respecting the Logos, had for a long time remained untouched. But when, in the East, not only the Semi-Arians, but also many of the new Nicenians, could not get rid of the Arian idea that the Holy Spirit is a creature and servant of God, the other Nicenes took great offense at this, and opposed there errorists as *πνευματομάχους* (afterward *Macedonians*). Finally Apollinarism arose. *SEE APOLLINARIS*.

“Thus Theodosius, who, as a Spaniard, was a zealous adherent of the Nicene Creed, found at his accession to the throne of the West (379) universal toleration; in the East; Arianism prevalent, the Homoousians persecuted, and, besides them, the parties of the Photinians, Macedonians, and Apollinarists, with innumerable other sects, existing. After conquering the Goths, he determined to put an end to these prolonged and destructive strifes. Accordingly, he summoned a general council at Constantinople (381), by which the schism among the Nicenes was peaceably removed, and the Nicene Creed enlarged, with additions directed against heretics who had risen up since its origin, *SEE CREED, NICENE*. Valentinian II allowed the Arians in the West to enjoy freedom of religion some years longer; but the case was quite altered by Theodosius, and a universal suppression of the sect ensued. The last traces of its existence in the Byzantine empire appear under the Emperor Anastasius at Constantinople, 491-518” (Gieseler, *Church History*, § 81).

**4. Closing Period of Ancient Arianism.** — In the West, Arianism maintained itself for a long time among the German tribes, which had received Christianity in the Arian form under the emperor Valens. Arianism was carried by the Ostrogoths into Italy, by the Visigoths into Spain, and by the Vandals into Africa. The Ostrogoths, though strong Arians, did not persecute the orthodox. Arianism retained among them till the destruction of the Ostrogoth kingdom by Justinian (A.D. 553). More intolerant against the Catholics were the Visigoths; but Arianism gradually lost hold upon them, and finally, under the guidance of their king, Reccaredus, they adopted the Nicene Creed, and were received into the Catholic Church by the Council of Toledo (A.D. 589). The Arian Vandals, after conquering Africa in 429, under the leadership of Genseric, instituted a furious persecution against the Catholics, which did not cease until the destruction

of the Vandal empire through Belisarius in 534. The Suevi of Spain became Arians about the middle of the fifth century, probably in consequence of their connection with the Visigoths; they went over to the Catholic Church in 558, under Theodemir. The Burgundians, who came to Gaul as pagans in 417, appear as Arians in 440. The progress of the Catholic Church among this tribe is especially due to Aristus of Vienna, who gained over the son of king Gundobad, Sigismund, who, after his accession to the throne in 517, secured to the Catholic Church the ascendancy. Nowhere did the Arian doctrine maintain itself so long as among the Lombards. They invaded Italy (A.D. 568), and founded a new kingdom at Pavia, and their king, Antharis, embraced Arian Christianity in 587; but when his successor Agilulph married Theudelinda, the Catholic daughter of the duke of Bavaria, the orthodox faith soon found adherents among them, and the son of Theudelinda, Adelward, gave all the churches to the Catholics. But this called forth a reaction. An Arian ascended the throne, who, however, was unable to suppress Catholicism; and we now find in every important city in Lombardy both a Catholic and an Arian bishop. Under Luitprand, who died in 744, the Catholic Church was entirely predominant. But, although Arianism was externally suppressed, its long prevalence in Spain, Gaul, and Northern Italy left behind it a spirit of opposition to the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome, and made these countries a fertile soil for the spreading of dissenting doctrines. See Revillont, *de l'Arianisme des Peuples Germaniques* (Paris, 1850, 8vo).

**II. MODERN ARIANISM.** — After the Reformation, the Antitrinitarians, who soon appeared, were chiefly Socinians. In Italy they especially developed themselves, and Alciati (1555) commenced his heretical course with teaching that Christ was divine, but inferior to the Father. His views were adopted by Job. Val. Gentilis (q. v.), an acute Calabrian, who was beheaded at Berne (1566), after going far beyond Arianism in heresy. The earlier English writers on the Church history of the period tell of Arians put to death in England for heresy under Elizabeth. Plowright († 1579), Lewis († 1583), Cole and Ket († 1588), are named by Fuller, who, as well as Burnet, speak of Arian sentiments as held and propagated by various individuals in England after the Reformation. There is so much vagueness and inaccuracy in the way in which they speak about them that little dependence can be placed on most of the allegations. Arian views were probably held by individuals from time to time; but no important manifestation took place till the beginning of the 18th century, when

Arianism made its appearance in the Church of England, and also among Dissenters. Thomas Emlyn (q.v.), an English Presbyterian (but pastor in Dublin), was deposed for Arianism by the Presbytery of Dublin in 1698 (see Reid, *Hist. of Presbyt. Ch. in Ireland*, 3, 14), and afterward wrote largely on the controversy (Emlyn, *Works, with Life*, Lond. 1746, 3 vols. 8vo). In the Church of England Arian views were set forth by Whiston, professor of mathematics at Cambridge, in his *Primitive Christianity Revived* (Lond. 1711, 4 vols. 8vo), the last volume of which contains an account of what he considered the primitive faith in the person of Christ, and the doctrine of the Trinity, and the first volume a historical account of the proceedings of the University and Convocation against him. His sentiments were declared heretical, and he was ejected from his chair at Cambridge. He still, however, went on to write, and produced a fifth volume of his *Primitive Christianity Revived*, in 1712; his *Council of Nice Vindicated from the Athanasian Heresy*, in 1713; his *Letter to the Earl of Nottingham*, on the Eternity of the Son of God and the Holy Ghost, 1719; to which Lord Nottingham replied in 1720. Whiston went on to the end of his life occasionally publishing on the subject. **SEE WHISTON**. A far more learned and logical champion of error appeared in Dr. Samuel Clarke, who published in 1712 *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, in which he endeavors to show, in a commentary on forty texts of Scripture, the subordination of the Son to the Father. "Reason had so strongly the ascendant in Clarke's composition that every thing must be subjected to its rule and measure; that only must stand, in matters of religious belief, which reason could distinctly grasp and make good by a formal demonstration. His book on *The Trinity* is pervaded by this spirit, and is very artfully planned. It is divided into three parts; in the first of which are set forth all the passages in the New Testament bearing on the Father, then on the Son, and, lastly, on the Spirit; certain of the passages, and particularly those relating to the Son, being accompanied with brief comments, partly furnished by the author, and partly taken from the fathers and from later theologians. In the second part, the import of all these passages so explained is presented in a series of propositions concerning Father, Son, and Spirit respectively, each proposition accompanied with quotations from the Liturgy of the Church of England, to show the conformity of the propositions with the devotional utterances of the church" (Fairbairn, *Appendix to Dorner, Person of Christ*, 5, 373). Clarke was replied to by Dr. Knight in *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity Vindicated against Dr. Clarke* (ed. by Nelson, London, 1713 and 1715, 8vo); by Bishop Gastrell, in *Some Considerations*

of *Dr. Clarke's Doctrine of the Trinity* (republished in Randolph's *Enchiridion Theologicum*, vol. 2); and by various others. Clarke wrote voluminously in reply to these and other attacks (Clarke, *Collected Works*, London, 1738, 4 vols. fol.). His works were translated into German by Semler, and found favor there, at a period in which the tendency of the age was toward "the creaturely aspect of Christ." **SEE CLARKE**. But his superior in learning and controversy appeared in Waterland, who published, at different times. *A Vindictican of Christ's Divinity: — A Further Vindicacion: — A Defence of the Divinity of Christ*, in eight sermons: — *The Case of Arian Subscription Considered: — A Critical History of the Athanasians Creed, and the Importance of the Doctrie of the Trinity asserted*; making six vols. 8vo, besides smaller pieces. Waterland brought to his task a logical intellect, cool, wary, and disciplined, a thorough knowledge of the fathers, and a profound though unimpassioned love of truth. He demonstrated the inaccuracy, to say the least, of Clarke's patristic learning, and proved that the very fathers whom Clarke had cited maintained the strictly divine, uncreated, eternal being of the Son, while, at the same time, he pointed out their defective apprehension of the eternal filiation. **SEE WATERLAND**. On the other side, and in answer to Waterland, Whitby wrote *Disquisitiones Modestae*, and *Reply to Dr. Waterland's Objections against them*, in two parts, with an Appendix. 1720-21. An anonymous country clergyman (afterward known to be Mr. Jackson) produced *A Reply to Dr. Waterland's Defence of his Queries*, 1722, entering very largely into the controversy. It was this book which gave rise to Dr. Waterland's *Second Vindication* (1723), above mentioned. Dr. Sykes wrote several pamphlets on the subject (*Letter to the Earl of Nottingham* (1721); *Answer to Remarks on Dr. Clarke* (1730); *Defence of the Answer* (1730)). In this controversy, Clarke, and those who sided with him generally, refused to be called Arians, while at the same time they affirmed the subordination of Christ, and denied that he was consubstantial with the Father. Dr. Waterland exposed the sophistry of this position sharply: "They deny the *necessary* existence of God the Son. Run them down to but the next immediate consequence, *precarious* existence, and they are amazed and confounded. Push them a little further, as making a creature of God the Son, and they fall to blessing themselves upon it; *they* make the Son of God a creature! not they; God forbid." The Arian controversy commenced about the same time among the Dissenters, and raged as fiercely and more destructively among them than in the Church of England. It began in the west of England with James Pierce, who, and his

colleague Joseph Hallet, were learned Presbyterian ministers in Exeter. The flame spread to London, and occasioned the celebrated Salter's Hall controversy, and led to the most dismal effects on the Presbyterian body. The books and pamphlets written on the subject are very numerous. The principal on the Arian side are the following: *The Case of the ejected Ministers of Exon; Defence of ditto; The Western Inquisition*, by Pierce; *The Case of Martin Tombkins*, 1719. On the other side, Dr. Calamy published nineteen sermons concerning the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, 1722, in which the controversy is discussed with considerable ability and learning; and there appeared also *The Doctrine of the Trinity stated and defended by some Lond)n Ministers*, viz. Long, Robinson, Smith, and Reynolds. The controversy was revived again in the Church of England by Dr. Clayton, bishop of Clogher, and for a while carried on with considerable warmth. He published in 1751 *An Essay on Spirit*, in which the doctrine of the Trinity is considered, etc. This pamphlet was not in reality the bishop's, but the production of a young clergyman, whose cause and sentiments, however, he identified himself with. **SEE CLAYTON**. The most learned of all English Arians was Lardner (q.v.). On the orthodox side were William Jones, in his *Full Answer to the Essay on Spirit*, and afterward in his *Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity* (Jones, *Works*, 1801, vol. 1), and Dr. Randolph, in his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (1753, 8vo). At the present day Arianism has almost become extinct in England, having merged into one or other of the various grades of Socinianism, and is only to be found, in any thing like a systematic form, among the Presbyterians in the north of Ireland, especially those of the Synod of Munster (see Henderson's *Buck*, *Theol. Dictionary*, s.v.; Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, 2, 168 sq.; Reid, *Hist. of Presbyter. Ch. in Ireland*, 3, 14, 489). Both in England and America there are doubtless many Arians among those who are called Socinians and Unitarians. See articles on these titles, and also **SEE ATHANASIUS; SEE TRINITY**.

The sources of information on the early history of Arianism are the church histories of Sozomen, Socrates, and Theodoret, and also of Philostorgius the Arian, with the writings of Epiphanius and Athanasius. See also Maimbourg, *Histoire de l'A rianisme* (Amsterd. 1682, 3 vols.); the same, *History of Ariazism*, transl. by Webster (Lond. 1728, 2 vols. 4to); Stark, *Versuch einer Geschichte d. Arian;smus* (Berl. 1785, 2 vols. 8vo); Tillemont, *Memoires*, t. 6; also, translated, Tillemont, *History of the Arians and the Council of Nice* (London, 1721, 2 vols. 8vo); Whitaker, *Origin of*

*Arianism disclosed* (Lond. 1791, 8vo); Mohler, *Athanasius und seine Zeit* (1827); Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (Lond. 1833, 8vo); Kaye, *Account of the Council of Nicea* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); Hassenkamp, *Hist. Ariane Controversie* (Marburg, 1845); Baur, *Geschichte der Dreieinigkeit* (1841-3, 3 vols. 8vo); Meier, *Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit* (1844, 3 vols. 8vo); Dorner, *Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, bd. 1, abt. 2, 3; Engl. translation, div. 1, vol. 2; Neander, *Church History*, 2:365-425; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 4, pt. 2, ch. 5, § 9 sq.; Walch, *Hist. d. Ketzereien*, thl. 2; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* § 102-106; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, 1, 262 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, §§ 89-92, § 262; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines*, vol. 1, bk. 2; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 1, 490; Watson, *Theol. Institutes*, pt. 2, ch. 16; Bright, *Ch. History from Milan to Chalcedon* (Lond. 1860, 8vo); *Christian Examiner* (Unitarian), 12:298; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, ch. 9; A. de Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au IV Siecle* (6 vols. Paris, 1866; vols. 1 and 2 contain the reign of Constantine; vols. 3 and 4 the reigns of Constans and Julian; vols. 5 and 6 the reigns of Valentinian and Theodosius). On modern Arianism, see, besides the writers named in the course of this article, Van Mildert, *Life of Waterland* (in *Waterland's Works*, vol. 1); Nelson, *Life of Bishop Bull*; Lindsay, *Historical View of Unitarianism* (Socinian, Lond. 1783, 8vo); Fairbairn, Appendix to Dorner's *Person of Christ*, vol. 5.

## Ariara'thes

### Picture for Ariara'thes

(Ἀριαράθης, apparently compounded of the Persian prefix *Ari-*, the essential element of the old national name *Αριοι* or *Αρειοι*, Herod. 3, 93; 7:762; signifying "honorable;" see Dr. Rosen, in the *Quar. Jour. of Educa.* 9, 336; and the Zend *ratu*, "master," Bopp, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, p. 196; Pott, *Etymologische Forschungen*, p. 36), a common name of the kings of Cappadocia (see Smith's *Diet. of Class. Biog.* s.v.), one of whom is named in the Apocrypha (1 Maccabees 15:22), as ruling that country during the time of the Jewish governor Simon, about B.C. 139. **SEE ATTALUS**. The king there designated is doubtless Ariarathes V, surnamed Philopator (Φιλοπάτωρ, *lover of his father*), who reigned B.C. 163-130, called *Mithridates* before his accession (Diod. 31, or vol. 10, p. 25, ed. Bip.), who was supported by Attalus II in his contest with the pretendent to the throne, Holofernes or Orophernes (Polyb. 3, 5; 32:20; Appian, *Syr.* 47; Justin. 35:1), but was hard pressed by the Syrian King

Demetrius. Having been reinstated on his throne by the Romans, among whom he had been brought up (4:42:19), he sent his son Demetrius, in connection with Attalus of Pergamos, to assist Ptolemy Philometor against the usurper Alexander Balas, B.C. 152 (Justin. 35:1). *SEE ALEXANDER*. After a reign of thirty-three years he fell in battle, B.C. 130, while aiding the Romans against Aristonicus, prince of Pergamos, who had inherited the throne of his father Attalus III (Justin. 36:4; 37:1; Liv. *Epit.* 59). Letters were addressed to him from Rome in favor of the Jews (1 Maccabees 15:22), who in after times seem to have been numerous in his kingdom (~~Acts~~ Acts 2:9; comp. ~~1 Peter~~ 1 Peter 1:1).

### Arias Montanus (Benedictus)

a Spanish priest and Orientalist, born in Estremadura (in a mountainous district, whence the name *Montanus*) in 1527, of noble but poor parents. He distinguished himself early by his acquaintance with the Oriental languages, and was ordained priest in the order of St. James, of which he had become a clerk. The bishop of Segovia took him with him to the Council of Trent, after which Arias retired to the monastery of Our Lady “de los Angeles,” in the mountains of Andalusia, whence, however, he was recalled by King Philip II, to labor at the new Polyglot Bible, which he was causing to be made after that of Alcalá, at the suggestion of the celebrated printer Plantin. This Bible was printed at Antwerp, in 1571, under the title *Biblia Sacra, Hebraice, Chaldaice, Greece, et Latine, Philippi II, Regis Catholici Pietate et Studio ad Sacrosanctæ Ecclesie Usus Ch h. Plantinus excudebat* (8 vols. fol.). The “Polyglot” in every respect justified the high expectation which had been formed of it; but in a voyage from the Netherlands to Spain nearly all the copies were lost. The king remunerated Arias’s labors by giving him a yearly pension of 2000 ducats, besides other honorary rewards and lucrative offices. Arias was an upright, sincerely orthodox Romanist, but he was a declared enemy of the Jesuits, and that ambitious order omitted no opportunity to take revenge on so dangerous a foe — the more powerful because his orthodoxy had never been questioned, and was supported by uncommon erudition. He was accused of Judaism because he had inserted in the Polyglot certain Chaldee paraphrases, which tended to confirm the Jews in their errors. He made many voyages to Rome to justify himself, and in 1580 was honorably dismissed, and died at Seville in 1598, prior of the convent of St. Jago. Arias’s numerous and extensive literary works chiefly belong to theological, but partly also to classical literature, but his Polyglot certainly



holds — the principal place; it is generally called the “Antwerp Polyglot,” or, from the patronage bestowed on it by Philip II, “Biblia Regia,” and sometimes also, after the printer, “Biblia Plantiniana.”

### Ariath

a city mentioned in the *Notitia Ecclesiastica*, and thought by Porter (*Damascus*, 2, 136) to be the present large city *Ary*, nearly three hours north of Busrah, at the west base of the Hauran mountains (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 288).

### Arid'ai

(Heb. *Ariday'*, **ydȳrā**) of Persian origin, perhaps meaning *strong*; Sept. **Ἀρσάιος**), the ninth of the ten sons of Haman, slain by the Jews of Babylonia (<sup><1709></sup>Esther 9:9). B.C. cir. 473.

### Arid'atha

(Heb. *Aridatha'*, **atdyrā**) same etymol. as *Aridai*; Sept. **Σαρβαχά** v. r. **Σαρβακά**), the sixth of the ten sons of Haman, slain by the Jews in Babylonia (<sup><1708></sup>Esther 9:8). B.C. cir. 473.

### Ari'eh

(Heb. *Aryeh'*, only with the art., **hyēph**; *the lion*; Sept. **Ἀρία**), the name apparently of one of the body-guard slain with King Pekahiah at Samaria (<sup><1255></sup>2 Kings 15:25). B.C. 757. **SEE ARGOB**.

### A'riel

(Heb. *Ariel'*, **l aȳrā**) Sept. **Ἀριήλ**), a word meaning "*lion of God*," and correctly enough rendered by “lion-like” in <sup><1231></sup>2 Samuel 23:20; <sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 11:22. It was applied as an epithet of distinction to bold and warlike persons, as among the Arabians, who surnamed Ali "*The' Lion of God*" (Abulf. *Ann.* 1, 96; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1, 716). Others, as Thenius, Winer, Furst, look upon it in these passages as a proper name, and translate “two [sons] of Ariel,” supplying the word **ynB**] which might easily have fallen out. **SEE ARELI**.

**1.** One of the chief men sent for by Ezra to procure Levites for' the services of the sanctuary (<sup><1586></sup>Ezra 8:16). B.C. 459.

2. The same word is used as a local proper name in <sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 29:1, 2, 7, applied to Jerusalem, “as victorious under God,” says Dr. Lee; and in <sup><6815></sup>Ezekiel 43:15, 16, to the altar of burnt-offerings. *SEE HAREL*. In this latter passage Gesenius (*Theb. Heb.* p. 147) and others, unsatisfied with the Hebrew, resort to the Arabic, and find the first part of the name in *Ar-i*, *fire-hearth* (cognate with Heb. *r/a*, *light*, i.e. fire), which, with the Heb. *El*, *God*, supplies what they consider a more satisfactory signification (but see Havernick, *Comment.* in loc.). It is thus applied, in the first place, to the altar, and then to Jerusalem as containing the altar. Henderson gives the word this etymology also in the passage in Isaiah (see *Comment.* in loc.).

## A’rim

*SEE KIRJATH-ARIM.*

## Arimathee’a

(**Ἀριμαθαία**, from the Heb. *Ramathaim*, with the art, prefixed), the birth-place of the wealthy Joseph, in whose sepulcher our Lord was laid (<sup><1275></sup>Matthew 27:57; <sup><698></sup>John 19:38). Luke (<sup><2751></sup>Luke 23:51) calls it “a city of the Jews;” which may be explained by 1 Maccabees 11:34, where King Demetrius thus writes: “We have ratified unto them (the Jews) the borders of Judaea, with the three governments of Apherema, Lydda, and *Ramathem* (**Ραμθέμ**), that are added unto Judaea from the country of Samaria.” Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v.) and Jerome (*Epit. Paulae*) regard the Arimathaea of Joseph as the same place as the *RAMATHAIM* *SEE RAMATHAIM* of Samuel, and place it near Lydda or Diospolis (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 579 sq.), Samuel’s birth-place, the *RAMAH* *SEE RAMAH* of <sup><9001></sup>1 Samuel 1:1, 19, which is named in the Septuagint *Armathaim* (**Ἀρμαθαίμ**), and by Josephus *Armatha* (**Ἀρμαθαί**, *Ant.* v. 10, 2). Hence Arimathaea has by most been identified with the existing *Riamleh*, because of the similarity of the name to that of Ramah (of which Ramathaim is the dual), and because it is near Lydda or Diospolis. Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 3, 40, 44; new ed. 3, 141), however, disputes this conclusion on the following grounds:

- (1.) That Abulfeda alleges Ramleh to have been built after the time of Mohammed, or about A.D. 716, by Suleiman Abd-al-Malik;
- (2.) that “Ramah” and “Ramleh” have not the same signification;

(3.) that Ramleh is in a plain, while *Ramah* implies a town on a hill ( $\mu\text{r}$ ; *high*).

To these objections it may be answered,

(1.) That Abulfeda's statement may mean no more than that Suleiman *rebuilt* the town, which had previously been in ruins, just as Rehoboam and others are said to have "built" many towns that had existed long before their time; for the Moslems seldom built towns except on old sites or out of old materials; so that there is not a town in all Palestine that is with certainty known to have been founded by them.

(2.) In such cases they retain the old names, or others resembling them in sound, if not in signification, which may account for the difference between "Ramah" and "Ramleh."

(3.) Neither can we assume that the place called Ramlah could not be in a plain, unless we are ready to prove that Hebrew names were *always* significant and appropriate.

This they probably were not. They were so in early times, but not eventually, when towns were numerous, and took their names arbitrarily from one another without regard to local circumstances. Farther, if Arimathaea, by being identified with Ramah, was necessarily in the mountains, it could not have been "near Lydda," from which the hills are seven miles distant (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 300; comp. Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, 2, 263). *SEE RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM*.

Ramleh is in north lat.  $31^{\circ} 59'$ , and east long.  $35^{\circ} 28'$ , 8 miles south-east from Joppa, and 24 miles northwesterly west from Jerusalem. It lies in the fine undulating plain of Sharon, upon the eastern side of a broad, low swell rising from a fertile though sandy plain. Like Gaza and Jaffa, this town is surrounded by olive-groves and gardens of vegetables and delicious fruits. Occasional palm-trees are also seen, as well as the kharob and the sycamore. The streets are few; the houses are of stone, and many of them large and well built. There are five mosques, two or more of which are said to have once been Christian churches; and there is here one of the largest Latin convents in Palestine. The place is supposed to contain about 3000 inhabitants, of whom two thirds are Moslems, and the rest Christians, chiefly of the Greek Church, with a few Armenians. The inhabitants carry on some trade in cotton and soap. The great caravanroad between Egypt

and Damascus, Smyrna, and Constantinople, passes through Ramleh, as well as the most frequented road for European pilgrims and travelers between Joppa and Jerusalem (Robinson, 3, 27; Raumer, p. 215). The tower is the most conspicuous object in or about the city. It stands a little to the west of the town, on the highest part of the swell of land, and is in the midst of a large quadrangular enclosure, which has much the appearance of having once been a splendid khan. The tower is wholly isolated, whatever may have been its original destination. The town is first mentioned under its present name by the monk Bernard, about A.D. 870. About A.D. 1150 the Arabian geographer Edrisi (ed. Jaubert, p. 339) mentions Ramleh and Jerusalem as the two principal cities of Palestine. The first Crusaders, on their approach, found Ramleh deserted by its inhabitants; and with it and Lyddta they endowed the first Latin bishopric in Palestine, which took its denomination from the latter city. From the situation of Ramleh between that city and the coast, it was a post of much importance to the Crusaders, and they held possession of it generally while Jerusalem was in their hands, and long afterward. In A.D. 1266 it was finally taken from the Christians by the Sultan Bibars. Subsequently it is often mentioned in the accounts of travelers and pilgrims, most of whom rested there on their way to Jerusalem. It seems to have declined very fast from the time that it came into the possession of the Crusaders. Benjamin of Tudela (*Itin.* p. 79, ed. Asher), who was there in A.D. 1173, speaks of it as having *been formerly* a considerable city. Belon (*Observat.* p. 311), in 1547, mentions it as almost deserted, scarcely twelve houses being inhabited, and the fields mostly untilled. This desertion must have occurred after 1487; for Le Grand, *Voyage de Hieirusalem*, fol. 14, speaks of it as a peopled town (though partly ruined), and of the “seigneur de Rama” as an important personage. By 1674 it had somewhat revived, but it was still rather a large unwallled village than a city, without any good houses, the governor himself being miserably lodged (Nau, *Voyage Nouveau*, 1, 6). A century later it remained much in the same state, the governor being still ill lodged, and the population scarcely exceeding 200 families (Volney, 2, 220). Its recent state must, therefore, indicate a degree of comparative prosperity, the growth of the present century (see Robinson’s *Researches*, 3, 33 sq.). **SEE RAMAH.**

### Arindela

(τὰ Ἀρίνδηλα), an episcopal city of the Third Palestine of considerable importance, noticed in the early ecclesiastical lists (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 533,

581); identified by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 2, 496) with the site *Ghurundel*, near the south-east corner of the Dead Sea, consisting of considerable ruins on the slopes of a hill, near a spring.

## A'rioch

(Heb. *Arsyok'*, *Ē/yrḫi* from the Sanscrit *Arjaka*, *venerable*, or perhaps from the Heb. *yrā*} *a lion*; Sept. *Ἀριώχ* [v. r. in Daniel *Ἀριώχης*, in Tob. *Ἐριώχ*], Josephus *Ἀρίουχος*, *Ant.* 1, 9, 1; *Ἀρίουχος*, *Ant.* 10:10, 2), the name of two men and one place.

**1.** A king of Ellasar, confederate with Chedorlaomer against Sodom and Gomorrah (<sup><0140></sup>Genesis 14:1, 9), B.C. cir. 2080 (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1862). *SEE LOT.*

**2.** The captain of the royal guard at the court of Babylon, into whose charge Daniel and his fellow youths were committed (<sup><2124></sup>Daniel 2:14). B.C. 604.

**3.** A “plain” of the Elymaeans (? Persians), mentioned in the apocryphal book of Judith (1, 6) as furnishing aid to Arphaxad in his contest with Nebuchadnezzar; supposed by Grotius to mean the *Oracana* (*Ὀράκανα*) of Ptolemy (6, 2, 11), but more probably borrowed from the first of the above names (see Fritzsche, *Handb.* in loc.).

## Aris'ai

(Heb. *Arisay'*, *ysyrā*} from Sanscrit *Arjasay*, *arrow of Aria*; Sept.

*ῥουφανός* v. r. *ῥουφαῖος*), the eighth of the ten sons of Haman slain by the Jews of Babylonia (<sup><7009></sup>Esther 9:9). B.C. cir. 473.

## Aristar'chus

(*Ἀρίσταρχος*, *best ruler*, a frequent Greek name), a faithful adherent of the Apostle Paul in his labors. A.D. 51-57. He was a native of Thessalonica, and became the companion of Paul in his third missionary tour, accompanying him to Ephesus, where he was seized and nearly killed in the tumult raised by the silversmiths (<sup><4493></sup>Acts 19:29). He left that city with the apostle, and accompanied him in his subsequent journeys (<sup><4404></sup>Acts 20:4), even when taken as a prisoner to Rome (<sup><4472></sup>Acts 27:2); indeed, Aristarchus was himself sent thither as a prisoner, or became such while there (Philem. 24), for Paul calls him his “fellow-prisoner” (<sup><5140></sup>Colossians

4:10). The traditions of the Greek Church represent Aristarchus as bishop of Apamea in Phrygia, and allege that he continued to accompany Paul after their liberation, and was at length beheaded along with him at Rome in the time of Nero. The Roman martyrologies make him bishop of Thessalonica.

### Aristeas

(Ἀριστεύας) or Aristeus (Ἀρισταῖος), a Cyprian by nation, was a high officer at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and was distinguished for his military talents. Ptolemy, being anxious to add to his newly-founded library at Alexandria (B.C. 273) a copy of the Jewish law, sent Aristeas and Andreas, the commander of his body-guard, to Jerusalem. They carried presents to the Temple, and obtained from the high-priest, Eleazar, a genuine copy of the Pentateuch, and a body of seventy elders, six from each tribe, who could translate it into Greek. On their arrival, they are said to have completed the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, usually termed the “Septuagint” from the number of translators. The story about the translation rests chiefly on the reputed letter of Aristeas himself, but it is told, with a few differences, by Aristobulus, the Jewish philosopher (Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 13:12), by Philo Judaeus (*Vit. Mos.* 2), and Josephus (*Ant.* 12, 2); also by Justin Martyr (*Cohort. ad Graec.* p. 13; *Apol.* p. 72; *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 297), Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 3, 25), Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* 1, 250), Tertullian (*Apolog.* 18), Euseb. (*Praep. Ev.* 8:1), Athanasius (*Synsp. S. Scrip.* 2, 156), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* p. 36, 37), Epiphanius (*De Mens. et Pond.* 3), Jerome (*Praef. in Pentateuch; Qucest. in Gen. Promm.*), Augustine (*De civ. Dei*, 18, 42, 43), Chrysostom (*Adv. Jud.* 1, 443), Hilary of Poitiers (*In Psalm.* 2), and Theodoret (*Proof. in Psalm.*). The letter was printed, in Greek and Latin, by Schard (Basil. 1561, 8vo); reprinted at Oxford (1692, 8vo); best ed. in Gallandii *Biblioth. Patr.* 2, 771 (Fabricii *Bibl. Graec.* 3, 669; in Engl. by Lewis (Lond. 1715, 12mo). See First, *Bibl. Jud.* 1, 51 sq. **SEE SEPTUAGINT.**

### Aristides

an Athenian philosopher, who became a Christian, without, however, forsaking his original profession. He presented to the Emperor Adrian, at the same time with Quadratus, an Apology for the Christian Faith, which existed in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, and even as late as that of Usuardus, and Addo of Vienne, if the account given of the passion of St.

Dionysius the Areopagite may be relied on. Aristides flourished about A.D. 123. Jerome says that his Apology was filled with passages from the writings of the philosophers, and that Justin afterward made much use of it. He is commemorated August 31st. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 123; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 4, cap. 3; Lardner, *Works*, 2, 308; Fabricius, *Bibl. Grac.* 6, 39.

### Aristobu'lus

(Ἀριστόβουλος, *best counselor*, a frequent Grecian name), the name of several men in sacred history.

**1.** A Jewish priest (2 Maccabees 1:10), who resided in Egypt in the reign of Ptolemy (VI) Philometor (comp. Grimm, 2 Maccabees 1:9). In a letter of Judas Maccabseus he is addressed (B.C. 165) as the representative of the Egyptian Jews (Ἀριστοβούλω . . . καὶ τοῖς ἐν Αἴγ. Ἰουδ. 2 Maccabees 1. c.), and is further styled “the teacher” (διδάσκαλος, i.e. counsellor?) of the king. Josephus makes no mention of him; and the genuineness of the letter itself is doubtful (De Wette, *Einlcdt.* 1:413); yet there may have lived at this time an eminent Jew of this name at the Egyptian court. Some have thought him identical with the peripatetic philosopher of the name (Clem. Alex. *Str.* 5, 98; Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 8, 9), who dedicated to Ptol. Philometor his allegorical exposition of the Pentateuch (Βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ Μουσέως νόμου, Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 7, 32). Considerable fragments of this work have been preserved by Clement and Eusebius (Euseb. *Prep. Evang.* 7, 13, 14; 8:(8), 9, 10; 13:12; in which the Clementine fragments recur); but the authenticity of the quotations has been vigorously contested. It was denied by R. Simon and especially by Hody (*De bibl. text. orig.* p. 50 sq. Oxon. 1705), who was answered by Valckenaer (*Diatribes de Aristobulo Judaeo*, Lugd. Bat. 1806); and Valckenaer’s arguments are now generally considered conclusive (Gfrorer, *Philo*, 2:71 sq.; Dahne, *Jud. Alex. Relig. Philos.* 2:73 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* 4:294 n.) The object of Aristobulus was to prove that the peripatetic doctrines were based (ἠρτησθαι) on the Law and the Prophets; and his work has an additional interest as showing that the Jewish doctrines were first brought into contact with the Aristotelian and not with the Platonic philosophy (comp. Matter, *Hist. de liecole d’Alex.* 3, 153 sq.). The fragments which remain are discussed at length in the works quoted above, which contain also a satisfactory explanation of

the chronological difficulties of the different accounts of Aristobulus. (See Eichhorn, *Biblioth. d. bibl. Lit.* v. 253 sq.)

**2.** The eldest son of John Hyrcanus, prince of Judaea. In B.C. 110, he, together with his brother Antigonus, successfully prosecuted for his father the siege of Samaria, which was destroyed the following year (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 10, 2 and 3; *War*, 1, 2, 7). ‘Hyrcanus dying in B.C. 107, Aristobulus took the title of king, this being the first instance of the assumption of that name since the Babylonian captivity (but see Strabo, 16:762), and secured his power by the imprisonment of all his brothers except his favorite one Antigonus, and by the murder of his mother, to whom Hyrcanus had left the government by will. The life of Antironus was soon sacrificed to his brother’s suspicions through the intrigues of the queen and her party, and the remorse felt by Aristobulus for his execution increased the illness under which he was at the time suffering, and thus hastened his own death, B.C. 106. During his reign the Iturmans were subdued and compelled to adopt the Jewish law. He also received the name of **Φιλέλλην** from the favor which he showed the Greeks (Joseph. *Ant.* 13, 11; *War*, 1, 3).

**3.** The younger son of Alexander Jannaeus by Alexandra (Josephus, *Ant.* 13, 16, 1; *War*, 1, 5, 1). During the nine years of his mother’s reign he set himself against the party of the Pharisees, whose influence she had sought; and after her death, B.C. 70, he made war against his eldest brother Hyrcanus, and obtained from him the resignation of the crown and the high-priesthood, chiefly through the aid of his father’s friends whom Alexandra had placed in the several fortresses of the country to save them from the vengeance of the Pharisees (Joseph. *Ant.* 13, 16; 14:1, 2; *War*, 1, 5; 6, 1). In B.C. 65 Judaea was invaded by Aretas, king of Arabia Petreæ, with whom, at the instigation of Antipater the Idumæan, Hyrcanus had taken refuge. By him Aristobulus was defeated in a battle and besieged in Jerusalem; but Aretas was obliged to raise the siege by Scarus and Gabinius, Pompey’s lieutenants, whose intervention Aristobulus had purchased (Joseph. *Ant.* 14, 2; 3, 2; *War*, 1, 6, 2 and 3). In B.C. 63 he pleaded his cause before Pompey at Damascus, but finding him disposed to favor Hyrcanus, he returned to Judaea and prepared for war. On Pompey’s approach, Aristobulus, who had fled to the fortress of Alexandrium, was persuaded to obey his summons and appear before him; and, being compelled to sign an order for the surrender of the garrison, he withdrew in impotent discontent to Jerusalem. Pompey still advanced, and



Aristobulus again met him and made submission; but, his friends in the city refusing to perform the terms, Pompey besieged and took Jerusalem, and carried away Aristobulus and his children as prisoners (Joseph. *Ant.* 14, 3, 4; *War.* 1, 6, 7; Plut. *Pomp.* 39, 45; Strabo, 16:762; Dion Cass. 37, 15,16). Appian (*Bell. Mith.* 1117) erroneously represents him as having been put to death immediately after Pompey's triumph. In B.C. 57 he escaped from confinement at Rome with his son Antigonus, and, returning to Judaea, was joined by large numbers of his countrymen, and renewed the war; but he was besieged and taken at Machaerus, the fortifications of which he was attempting to restore, and was sent back to Rome by Gabinius.(Joseph. *Ant.* 14, 6, 1; *War.* 1, 8, 6; Plut. *Ant.* 3; Dion Case. 39:56). In B.C. 49 he was again released by Julius Caesar, who sent him into Judaea to forward his interests there, but he was poisoned on the way by some of Pompey's party (Joseph. *Ant.* 14, 7, 4; *War.* 1, 9, 1; Dion Cass. 41, 18).

**4.** The grandson of No. 3, and the son of Alexander, and brother of Herod's wife Mariamne. His mother Alexandra, indignant at Herod's having bestowed the high-priesthood on the obscure Ananelus, endeavored to obtain that office for her son from Antony through the influence of Cleopatra. Herod, fearing the consequences of this application, and urged by Mariamne's entreaties, deposed Ananelus, and made Aristobulus high-priest, the latter being only 17 years old at the time. The king, however, still suspecting Alexandra, and keeping a strict and annoying watch upon her movements, she renewed her complaints and designs against him with Cleopatra, and at length made an attempt to escape into Egypt with her son. Herod discovered this, and affected to pardon it; but soon after he caused Aristobulus to be treacherously drowned at Jericho, B.C. 35 (Joseph. *Ant.* 15, 3; *War.* 1, 22, 2).

**5.** One of the sons of Herod the Great by Mariamne, and sent with his brother Alexander to Rome, where they were educated in the house of Pollio (Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 10, 1). On their return to Judaea, the suspicions of Herod were excited against them by their brother Antipater (q.v.), aided by Pheroras and their aunt Salome, though Berenice, the daughter of the latter, was married to Aristobulus; the young men themselves supplying their enemies with a handle against them by the indiscreet expression of their indignation at their mother's death. In B.C. 11 they were accused by Herod at Aquilea before Augustus, through whose mediation, however, he was reconciled to them. Three years after Aristobulus was again involved with his brother in a charge of plotting against their father, but a second

reconciliation was effected by Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, the father-in-law of Alexander. A third accusation, through the arts of Eurvales, a Lacedsemonian adventurer, proved fatal. By permission of Augustus, the two young men were arraigned by Herod before a council convened at Berytus (at which they were not even allowed to be present to defend themselves), and, being condemned, were soon after strangled at Sebaste, B.C. 6 (Joseph. *Ant.* 16, 1-4; 8; 10; 11; *War.* 1, 23-27; comp. Strabo, 16:765). — *SEE ALEXANDER.*

**6.** Surnamed “the younger” (ὁ νεώτερος, Josephus, *Ant.* 21, 2), was the son of the preceding Aristobulus and Berenice, and the grandson of Herod the Great. Himself and his two brothers (Agrippa I and Herod, the future king of Chalcis) were educated at Rome, together with Claudius, who was afterward emperor, and who appears to have regarded Aristobulus with great favor (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 5, 4; 6, 3; 20:1, 2). He lived at enmity with his brother Agrippa, and drove him from the protection of Flaccus, proconsul of Syria, on the charge of having been bribed by the Damascenes to support their cause with the proconsul against the Sidonians (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 6, 3). When Caligula sent Petronius to Jerusalem to set up the statues in the Temple, Aristobulus joined in the remonstrance against the procedure (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 8; *War.* 2, 10; Tacit. *Hist.* 5, 9). He died as he had lived, in a private station (Josephus, *War.* 2, 11, 6), having, as appears from the letter of Claudius to the Jews in Josephus (*Ant.* 20, 1, 2), survived his brother Agrippa, who died in A.D. 44. He was married to Jotapa, a princess of Emessa, by whom he left a daughter of the same name (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 5, 4; *War.* 2, 11, 6).

**7.** Son of Herod, king of Chalcis, grandson of the Aristobulus who was strangled at Sebaste, and great-grandson of Herod the Great. In A.D. 55 Nero made him: king of Armenia Minor, in order to secure that province from the Parthians; and in A.D. 61, the emperor added to his dominions some portion of the Greater Armenia, which had been given to Tigranes (Josephus, *Ant.* 20, 8, 4; Tacit. *Ann.* 13, 7; 14, 26). Aristobulus appears (from Josephus, *War.* 7, 7, 1) to have also obtained from the Romans his father’s kingdom of Chalcis, which had been taken from his cousin, Agrippa II, in A.D. 52; and he is mentioned as joining Casennius Paetus, proconsul of Syria, in the war against Antiochus, king of Commagene, in the fourth year of Vespasian, or A.D. 73 (Joseph. *ib.*). He was married to Salome, daughter of the infamous Herodias, by whom he had three sons,

Herod, Agrippa, and Aristobulus; of these, nothing further is recorded (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 5, 4).

**8.** A person, perhaps a Roman, named by Paul in ~~610~~Romans 16:10, where he sends salutations to his household. A.D. 55. He is not himself saluted; hence he may not have been a believer, or he may have been absent or dead. Tradition represents him as brother of Barnabas, and one of the seventy disciples, and alleges that he was ordained a bishop by Barnabas, or by Paul, whom he followed in his travels, and that he was eventually sent into Britain, where he labored with much success, and where he at length died (*Menolog. Graec.* 3, 17 sq.).

### Aristotle

(**Ἀριστοτέλης**), one of the greatest philosophers of ancient times, whose philosophical system has exercised for a long time a controlling influence on the development of Christian philosophy and on Christian literature in general. Aristotle was born in B.C. 384, at Stagira, in Macedonia, whence he received his surname, *The Stagirite*. He was first instructed by his father, Nicomachos, the private physician of King Augustus III of Macedonia; afterward by Proxenos in Atarneus. At the age of 17 years he went to Athens, where he enjoyed for 20 years the instruction of, and intercourse with, Plato. In B.C. 343 he was appointed by Philip of Macedonia teacher of his son Alexander. About 335 he returned to Athens, where he established a new school of philosophy in the “Lyceum” (**Λύκειον**, so called from an epithet of Apollo), a gymnasium near the city. There he instructed in the mornings a select circle of disciples (*Acroatoe*, *Esoterics*), while in the afternoons he gave popular lectures to all kinds of readers (*Esoterics*). After having taught for 13 years he was accused of impiety, and compelled to leave Athens. He went to Chalcis, and died soon after (B.C. 322). At Stagira an annual festival, called the “Aristotelea,” was celebrated in his honor. According to a Jewish legend, he is paid to have turned Jew in consequence of a conversation held with a Jew at Athens. He is said to have composed about 800 works, lists of which are given by Diogenes Laertius and others. Many of his works are lost; while, on the other hand, several that bear his name are undoubtedly spurious. The oldest complete edition of his works was published by Aldus Manutius (Venice, 1495-98, 5 vols. fol.); the latest and best by Imman. Bekker (Berlin, 1831 sq. 4 vols.). — Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.

The influence of the philosophic system of Aristotle on the intellectual development of the human race has been more extensive and more lasting than that of any other philosopher except Plato. This supremacy is to be ascribed (1) to his method, which not only restricted the range of human observation and thought, but, also fixed the laws of their operation, so far as the field of the outer world is concerned, on principles fundamental to the human mind; (2) to his logic, which grew out of his method and also complemented it; (3) to the practical character of his intellect, and the practical tendency of his speculations, even the: most subtle; and (4) to the comparative clearness and simplicity of his system, which arises partly from the really luminous clearness of his own intellect, and partly from the fact that the most profound problems of philosophy do not come within the range of his method when confined to its legitimate application. His method is the so-called empirical one, viz., to begin with the observation of phenomena, and to reason upon them. “‘Art commences when, from a great number of experiences, one general conception is formed, which will embrace all similar cases; experience is the knowledge of individual things; art is that of universals’ (*Metaphys.* 1, 1). What Aristotle here calls ‘art’ is plainly what we now call ‘induction;’ and had he adhered throughout to the method here indicated, he would have been, in reality, what Bacon is called, the father of the inductive philosophy. The distinction between Aristotle and Plato is, that while both held that science could only be formed from universals, τὰ καθόλου, Aristotle contended that such universals had purely a subjective existence, i.e. that they were nothing more than the inductions derived from particular facts. He therefore made experience the basis of all science, and reason the architect. Plato made reason the basis. The tendency of the one was to direct man to the observation and interrogation of nature, that of the other was to direct man to the contemplation of ideas” (Lewes, *Hist. of Philosophy*, 2, 114). In passing from Plato to Aristotle, the thoughtful student observes that he comes into a different if not a lower atmosphere. The end of all Plato’s teaching is to show, in opposition to the Sophists, that the mind of man is not its own standard; the tendency of Aristotle’s teaching is to show that it is. It has been the fashion, since Hegel’s exposition of Aristotle, to deny that his doctrine is substantially realism, in the empirical sense, as opposed to Plato’s idealism. To illustrate: Both Plato and Aristotle could say that “‘dialectics is that science which discovers the difference between the false and the true. But the false in Plato is the semblance which any object presents to the sensualized mind; the true the very substance and meaning

of that object. The false in Aristotle is a wrong affirmation concerning any matter whereof the mind takes cognizance; the true a right affirmation concerning the same matter. Hence the dialectic of the one treats of the way whereby we obtain to a clear and vital perception of things; the dialectic of the other treats of the way in which we discourse of things. Words to the one are the means whereby we descend to an apprehension of realities of which there are no sensible exponents. Words to the other are the formulas wherein we set forth our notions and judgments. The one desires to ascertain of what hidden meaning the word is an index; the other desires to prevent the word from transgressing certain boundaries which he has fixed for it. Hence it happened that the sense and leading maxim of Plato's philosophy became not only more distasteful, but positively more unintelligible to his wisest disciple than to many who had not studied in the Academy, or who had set themselves in direct opposition to it. When Aristotle had matured his system of dialectics, there was something in it so perfect and satisfactory that he could not even dream of any thing lying outside of its circle, and incapable of being brought under its rules. He felt that he had discovered all the forms under which it is possible to set down any proposition in words; and what there could be besides this, what opening there could be for another region entirely out of the government of these forms, he had no conception. At any rate, if there were such a one, it must be a vague, uninhabited world. To suppose it peopled with other, and those more real and distinct forms, was the extravagance of philosophical delirium. Accordingly, when he speaks of the doctrine of substantial ideas of ideas, that is to say, which are the grounds of all our forms of thought, and consequently cannot be subject to them, he is reduced to the strange, and, for so consummate a logician, most disagreeable necessity of begging the whole question; of arguing that, since these ideas ought to be included under some of the ascertained conditions of logic, and by the hypothesis are not included under any, they must be fictitious" (Maurice, *Moral and Metaph. Philosophy*, ch. 6, div. 3, § 2).

In order to classify facts, and to arrive at the universal from the particular, we must reason; and the theory of reasoning is logic, which, according to Aristotle, is the *organon* or instrument of all science, *quoad formam*. In this field the pre-eminence of Aristotle is indisputable; he may, indeed, be said to have invented logic as the *formal* part of reasoning, and it remains to this day substantially what he made it. Grote observes that "what was begun by Socrates, and improved by Plato, was embodied as a part of a

comprehensive system of formal logic by the genius of Aristotle; a system which was not only of extraordinary value in reference to the processes and controversies of its time, but which also, having become insensibly worked into the minds of instructed men, has contributed much to form what is correct in the habits of modern thinking. Though it has now been enlarged and recast by some modern authors (especially by Mr. John Stuart Mill in his admirable *System of Logic*) into a structure commensurate with the vast increase of knowledge and extension of positive method belonging to the present day, we must recollect that the distance between the best modern logic and that of Aristotle is hardly so great as that between Aristotle and those who preceded him by a century Empedocles, Anaxagoras, and the Pythagoreans; and that the movement in advance of these latter commences with Socrates” (*History of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 48).

In Psychology Aristotle anticipated a great deal of what is called “mental philosophy” at present. The soul, he says, is an entity; not the product of matter or of organization, but distinct from the body, though not separable from it as to its form (*De Anima*, 2, 1). In this principle he agrees with Plato, and it saves his doctrine from becoming wholly materialistic, a tendency natural to the empirical method. “The faculties (**δυνάμεις**) of the soul are production and nutrition (*De Anim.* 2, 2, 4; *De Gener. Anim.* 2, 3), sensation (*Ibid.* 2, 5, 6, 12; 3, 12), thought (**τὸ διανοητικόν**), and will or impulse. His remarks are particularly interesting on the manifestations of the cognitive powers (*De Anim.* 2, 6; 3, 12 sq.; *De Sensu et Sensibili*), i.e. on the senses; on common sense (**κοινὴ αἴσθησις**); the first attempt toward a clearer indication of consciousness (*Ibid.* 3, 1 sq.), on imagination, reminiscence, and memory (*Ibid.* 3, 3, *et De Memoria*). The act of intuition and perception is a reception of the forms of objects; and thought is a reception of the forms presupposed by feeling and imagination (*Ibid.* 3, 4). Hence a *passive* (**παθητικός**, intellectus patiens) and an *active understanding* (**ποιητικὸς νοῦς**, intellectus agens). The first implies receptivity for those forms, therefore it has the closest relation with the faculty of feeling, and hence with the body; to the latter, which elaborates those forms into judging (**ὑπολαμβάνειν**) and inferring (**λογίζεσθαι**), and which moreover itself thinks, appertains indestructibility (immortality without consciousness or memory) (*De Anim.* 2, 1-6; 3, 2 sq. 5). Thought itself is a power separate from the body, coming from without into man (*De Gener. Anim.* 2, 3), similar to the element of the stars (*Cic. Acad. Quaest.* 1, 7). Further, the understanding is theoretical or practical; it is the

latter, inasmuch as it proposes ends and aims. The will (ὄρεξις) is an impulse directed toward matters of practice — that is to say, toward good; which is real or apparent, according as it procures a durable or a transient enjoyment (*De An.* 3, 9-11; *Eth.* 3, 6): ὄρεξις is subdivided into βούλησις and ἐπιθυμία — *the will*, properly so called, and *desire*. Pleasure is the result of the perfect exertion of a power — an exertion by which the power again is perfected. The noblest pleasures spring from reason (*Ethic.* 10, 4, 5, 8).” — Tennemann, § 145.

From Psychology we proceed to Metaphysics, or “the first philosophy,” as Aristotle called it, i.e. the attempt to solve the problem of being. Had Aristotle adhered strictly to his own empirical method, he would have confined himself to the relative, and not sought the absolute at all. His *prima philosophia* deals with the unchangeable, while physical science deals with change or movement. “Matter,” he said, “exists in a threefold form. It is,

**I.** Substance, perceptible by the senses, which is finite and perishable. This substance is either the abstract substance, or the substance connected with form (εἶδος).

**II.** The higher substance, which, though perceived by the senses, is imperishable, such as are the heavenly bodies. Here the active principle (ἐνέργεια) steps in, which, in so far as it contains that which is to be produced, is understanding (νοῦς). That which it contains is the purpose (τὸ οὐ ἔνεκα), which purpose is realized in the act. Here we have the two extremes of potentiality and agency, matter and thought. The often-mentioned entelechic is the relation between these two extremes. It is the point of transition between δύναμις and ἐνέργεια, and is accordingly the cause of motion, or efficient cause, and represents the soul.

**III.** The third form of substance is that in which the three forms of power, efficient cause and effect, are united the absolute substance, eternal unmoved, God himself” (Lewes, *Hist. of Philosophy*, 2, 126). As to the relative place of the idea of God in the systems of Plato and of Aristotle, Maurice well remarks that “it cannot be denied that the recognition of an absolute being, of an absolute good, was that which gave life to the whole doctrine of Plato, and without which it is unmeaning; that, on the contrary, it is merely the crowning result, or, at least, the necessary postulate of Aristotle’s philosophy. In strict consistency with this difference, it was a

being to satisfy the wants of man which Plato sighed for; it was a first cause of things to which Aristotle did homage. The first would part with no indication or symbol of the truth that God has held intercourse with men, has made himself known to them; the second was content with seeking in nature and logic for demonstrations of his attributes and his unity. When we use personal language to describe the God of whom Plato speaks, we feel that we are using that which suits best with his feelings and his principles even when, through reverence or ignorance, he forbears to use it himself. When we use personal language to describe the deity of Aristotle, we feel that it is improper and unsuitable, even if, through deference to ordinary notions, or the difficulty of inventing any other, he resorts to it himself" (Maurice, *Moral and Metaph. Philosophy*, ch. 6, div. 3, § 5).

*Practical* philosophy, according to Aristotle, includes ethics, the laws of the individual moral life; oeconomics, those of the family; and politics, those of man in the state. His "inquiry starts from the conception of a sovereign good and final end. The final end (τέλος) is happiness (εὐδαιμονία, εὐπραξία), which is the result of the energies of the soul (ἐν βίῳ τελείῳ) in a perfect life (*Eth. Nic.* 1, 1-7; 10:5, 6); to it appertains true dignity, as being the highest thing. This perfect exercise of reason is virtue, and virtue is the perfection of speculative and practical reason; hence the: subdivision of intellectual virtue (διανοητικὴ ἀρετή) and moral (ἠθικὴ, *Eth. Nic.* 1, 13; 2:1). The first belongs, in its entire plenitude, to God alone, and confers the highest felicity, or absolute beatitude; the second, which he also styles the human, is the constant perfecting of the reasonable will (ἔξις, *habitus*), the effect of a deliberate resolve, and consequently of liberty (προαιρετικὴ), of which Aristotle was the first to display its psychological character, and of which the subjective form consists in always taking the mean between two extremes (τὸ μέσον, μεσότης). Aristotle may be said to have been the first to analyze προαίρεσις, or deliberate free choice (*Eth. Nic.* 2, 6). Ethical virtue presents itself under six principal characters, having reference to the different objects of desire and avoidance (the cardinal virtues), namely, courage (ἀνδρία), temperance (σωφροσύνη), generosity (ἐλευθεριότης), delicacy (μεγαλοπρέπεια), magnanimity and a proper love of glory (*Eth. Nic.* 5, 1, 6 sq.), (μεγαλοψυχία), gentleness and moderation. To these are added the accessory virtues, such as politeness of manners (εὐτραπελία), amiability, the faculty of loving and being beloved (φιλία), and, lastly, justice (δίκαιοσύνη), which comprises and



completes all the others, and on that account is called perfect virtue (*τελεία*). Under the head of justice Aristotle comprehends right also. Justice he regards as the special virtue (applied to the notion of equality, *τὸ ἴσον*) of *giving every man his due*; and its operation may be explained by applying to it the arithmetical and geometrical proportions conformably to the two species, the *distributive* and *corrective*, into which he subdivided the virtue. To these must be added equity, which has for its end the rectification of the defects of law. Under the head of right (*δίκαιον*) he distinguishes that appertaining to a family (*οἰκονομικόν*) from that of a city (*πολιτικόν*), dividing the latter into the natural (*φυσικόν*) and the positive (*νομικόν*). A perfect unity of plan prevails throughout his ethics, his politics, and his economics. Both the latter have for their end to show how the object of man's existence defined in the ethics, viz. virtue combined with happiness, may be attained in the civil and domestic relations through a good constitution of the state and household. The state (*πολις*) is a complete association of a certain number of smaller societies sufficient to satisfy in common all the wants of life (*Pol.* 1, 2). Mental power alone should preponderate. The science of politics is the investigation of means tending to the final end proposed by the state. Its principle is expediency, and its perfection the suitableness of means to the end. By this principle Aristotle would prove the lawfulness of slavery. (W. T. Krug, *De Aristotele Servitutis Defensore* (Lips. 1813, 4to); C. G. Gottling, *Commentatio di Notione Servitutis apud Aristotelem* (Jen. 1821, 4to); Wallon, *Hist. de Esclavage dans P Antiquite* (Paris, 1847, 3 vols. 8vo); Tenneman in, *Manual Hist. Phil.* (§ 147, 148). Professor Shedd (*History of Doctrines*, bk. 1, ch. 1) adopt, perhaps too closely, Ritter's reconciliation of Plato and Aristotle, going so far as to say that "Platonism and Aristotelianism differ only in form, not in substance." While we cannot agree to this broad statement, there is yet, as to the points named, reason for what he says, viz. that, in reference to the principal questions of philosophy, "both are found upon the same side of the line that divides all philosophies into the material, the spiritual, the pantheistic, and the theistic. There is a substantial agreement between Plato and his pupil Aristotle respecting the rationality and immortality of the mind as mind in distinction from matter, respecting the nature and origin of ideas, respecting the relative position and importance of the senses, and of knowledge by the senses. But these are subjects which immediately reveal the general spirit of a philosophic system. Let any one read the ethical treatises of Plato and Aristotle, and he will see that both held the same general idea of the Deity

as a moral governor, of moral law, and of the immutable reality of right and wrong." But the fundamental difference of the two systems still remains, viz. that Plato regards the "ideas" or eternal archetypes of things as forming the true substance of the latter, and as having their existence in themselves, independent of the material things, their soulless shadows; while Aristotle was of opinion that the individual thing contained the true substance, which forms whatever is permanent in the flux of outward appearances.

For a long time the Aristotelian philosophy remained in Greece a rival of the Platonic, but at last the latter gained the ascendancy. In Rome Aristotle found but few adherents. The fathers of the ancient Church were, on the whole, not favorable to Aristotelianism, but it was cultivated with great zeal by several sects, especially those which were inclined toward a kind of rationalism. (Comp. Lecky, *History of Rationalism* 1, 417.) Thus the Artemonites were reproached with occupying themselves more with the study of Aristotle than with that of the Scriptures. The Anomceans of the school of Eunomius were called by the fathers "young Aristotelians" (see, on the opinions of the Greek fathers respecting this point, Launoy, *De varia Aristotelis in Acad. Par. fortuna*, in his *Opera omnia*, 4:175 sq. Colossians 1732; Kuhn, *Katholische Dogmatik*, 2, 369). Nevertheless, the influence of Aristotle commenced to spread in Christian philosophy during the 4th and 5th centuries, especially in the West. Previously the Neo-Platonic philosophy, which tried to reconcile Aristotle with Plato, had given a new impulse to the study of Aristotle, and called forth a number of commentaries, of which that of Porphyry is the most celebrated. Among the Christian Aristotelians of those times was Nemesius, bishop of Emesa, A.D. 400, whose work on "the Nature of the Soul" is based on the Aristotelian anthropology, and remained long in use and influence in Christian philosophy. Eneus of Gaza, toward the end of the 5th century, and Zacharius Scholasticus (first half of 6th century), opposed Aristotle, especially with regard to the world, and approached nearer the doctrine of Plato. Of greater significance was Johannes Philoponus, who called himself "Grammaticus," and is supposed by modern writers to have lived in the first half of the 6th century. He combated the Platonic philosophy, and followed Aristotle so closely as even to deviate from the commonly received doctrines of Christianity. Thus, applying the Aristotelian doctrine that individual things are substances, he changed the doctrine of the Trinity into a kind of Tritheism. John Damascenus, the chief theologian of the

Greek Church, knew and used the dialectics of Aristotle, but made no attempt to thoroughly blend it with the doctrines of Christianity. A new era in the history of the Aristotelian philosophy within the Christian Church begins after the Christianization of the Germanic tribes, for the treatment of which *SEE SCHOLASTICISM*.

A very full account of Aristotle's writings and of his system (from the Hegelian point of view), by Prof. Stahr, is given in Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Roman Biog.* etc., vol. 1. For an excellent sketch of the *Life of Aristotle*, by Prof. Park, see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. 1. The literature of the subject is copiously given in Stahr's article above referred to. See also Maurice, *Moral and Metaph. Philosophy*, ch. 6, div. 3; Haureau, *Philosophie Scholastique*, vol. 1; Gioberti, *Introd. a l'etude de la Philosophie*, 1, 98; Kitter, *History of Philosophy*, vol. 3; *North Brit. Rev.* Nov. 1858; *Ama. Bibl. Repos.* July, 1842; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* July, 1853, p. 342 sq.; Biese, *Philos. des Aristoteles* (Berlin, 1835, 2 vols. 8vo); St. Hilaire, *Logique d'Aristote* (Par. 1838, 2 vols. 8vo); Ravaisson, *La Metaphysique d'Aristote* (Paris, 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Vacherot, *Thorie des prem. principes selon Aristote* (Par. 1836, 8vo); Simon, *Du Dieu d'Aristote* (Par. 1840, 8vo).; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 1:412. For references as to the influence of Aristotle on Christian theology, *SEE SCHOLASTICISM*.

## Arithmetic

or the *science of numbers*, was unquestionably practiced as an art in the dawn of civilization; since to put things or their symbols together (addition), and to take one thing from another (subtraction), must have been coeval with the earliest efforts of the human mind; and what are termed multiplication and division are only abbreviated forms of addition and subtraction. The origin, however, of the earliest and most necessary of the arts and sciences is lost in the shades of antiquity, since it arose long before the period when men began to take special notice and make some kind of record of their discoveries and pursuits. In the absence of positive information, we seem authorized in referring the first knowledge of arithmetic to the East (see *Edinburgh Review*, 18:185). From India, Chaldaea, Phoenicia, and Egypt the science passed to the Greeks, who extended its laws, improved its processes, and widened its sphere. To what extent the Orientals carried their acquaintance with arithmetic cannot be determined. The greatest discovery in this department of the mathematics, namely, the establishment of our system of ciphers, or of figures considered

as distinct from the letters of the alphabet, belongs undoubtedly, not to Arabia, as is generally supposed, but to the remote East, probably India. It is to be regretted that the name of the discoverer is unknown, for the invention must be reckoned among the greatest of human achievements. Our numerals were made known to these Western parts by the Arabians, who, though they were nothing more than the mediums of transmission, have enjoyed the honor of giving them their name. These numerals were unknown to the Greeks, who made use of the letters of the alphabet for arithmetical purposes (see *Encyclopedica Metropolitana*, s.v.). The Hebrews were not a scientific, but a religious and practical nation. What they borrowed from others of the arts of life they used without surrounding it with theory, or expanding and framing it into a system. So with arithmetic, designated by them by some form of the verb חָנַם; *manah'*, signifying to determine, limit, and thence to *number*. Of their knowledge of this science little is known more than may be fairly inferred from the pursuits and trades which they carried on, for the successful prosecution of which some skill at least in its simpler processes must have been absolutely necessary; and the large amounts which appear here and there in the sacred books serve to show that their acquaintance with the art of reckoning was considerable. **SEE NUMBER**. Even in fractions they were not inexperienced (Gesenius, *Lehrgeb.* p. 704). For figures, the Jews, after the Babylonish exile, made use of the letters of the alphabet, as appears from the inscriptions on the so-called Samaritan coins (Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* i, iii, 468); and it is not unlikely that the ancient Hebrews did the same, as well as the Greeks, who borrowed their alphabet from the Phoenicians, neighbors of the Israelites, and employed it instead of numerals (Schmidt, *Biblischer Mathematicus*, Tub. 1735, 1749). **SEE ABBREVIATION**.

### Arius,

born toward the close of the third century, in Libya, according to others, in Alexandria. He wrote a theological work, *Thalia*, extracts from which are given in the writings of Athanasius. He died in 336. For his doctrines and their history, **SEE ARIANISM**.

### Ark

#### Picture for Ark 1

is used in the Bible to designate three vessels of special importance.

**1. NOAH'S ARK** (hb; *Tētebah*'; Sept. *κιβωτός*, *a chest*; Josephus *λάρναξ*, *a coffer*; Vulg. *area*, <sup><0064></sup>Genesis 6:14), different from the term *ʾara*; *aron*', applied to the "ark" of the covenant, and other receptacles which we know to have been chests or coffers, but the same that is applied to the "ark" in which Moses was hid (<sup><008B></sup>Exodus 2:3), the only other part of Scripture in which it occurs. In the latter passage the Septuagint renders it *θήβη*, *a ship*; but the truth seems to be that *aron* denotes any kind of chest or coffer, while the exclusive application of *tebah* to the vessels of Noah and of Moses would suggest the probability that it was restricted to such chests or arks as were intended to float upon the water, of whatever description. The identity of the name with that of the wicker basket in which Moses was exposed on the Nile has led some to suppose that the ark of Noah was also of wicker-work, or rather was wattled and smeared over with bitumen (Auth. Vers. "pitch," <sup><0064></sup>Genesis 6:14). This is not *impossible*, seeing that vessels of considerable burden are thus constructed at the present day; but there is no sufficient authority for carrying the analogy to this extent.

The boat-like form of the ark, which repeated pictorial representations have rendered familiar, is fitted for progression and for cutting the waves; whereas the ark of Noah was really destined to float idly upon the waters, without any other motion than that which it received from them. If we examine the passage in <sup><0064></sup>Genesis 6:14-16, we can only draw from it the conclusion that the ark was not a boat or ship; but, as Dr. Robinson (in Calmet's *Diet. s.v.*) describes it, "a building in the form of a parallelogram, 300 cubits long, 50 cubits broad, and 30 cubits high. The length of the cubit, in the great variety of measures that bore this name, it is impossible to ascertain and useless to conjecture. So far as the *name* affords any evidence, it also goes to show that the ark of Noah was not a regularly-built vessel, but merely intended to float at large upon the waters. We may, therefore, probably with justice, regard it as a large oblong, floating house, with a roof either flat or only slightly inclined. It was constructed with three stories, and had a door in the side. There is no mention of windows *in the side*, but *above*, i.e. probably in the flat roof, where Noah was commanded to make them of a cubit in size (<sup><0066></sup>Genesis 6:16). That this is the meaning of the passage seems apparent from <sup><008B></sup>Genesis 8:13, where Noah removes the covering of the ark in order to ascertain whether the ground was dry—a labor unnecessary, surely, had there been windows in the sides of the ark."

The purpose of this ark was to preserve certain persons and animals from the deluge with which God intended to overwhelm the land, in punishment for man's iniquities. The persons were eight-Noah and his wife, with his three sons and their wives (~~QUOTE~~Genesis 7:7; ~~QUOTE~~2 Peter 2:5). The animals were, one pair of every "unclean" animal, and seven pairs of all that were "clean." By "clean" we understand fit, and by "unclean" unfit, for food or sacrifice. Of birds there were seven pairs (~~QUOTE~~Genesis 7:2, 3). Those who have written professedly and largely on the subject have been at great pains to provide for all the existing species of animals in the ark of Noah, showing how they might be distributed, fed, and otherwise provided for. But they are very far from having cleared the matter of all its difficulties, which are much greater than they, in their general ignorance of natural history, were aware of. These difficulties, however, chiefly arise from the assumption that the species of *all the earth* were collected in the ark. The number of such species has been vastly underrated by these writers, partly from ignorance, and partly from the desire to limit the number for which they imagined they were required to provide. They have usually satisfied themselves with a provision for three or four hundred species at most. "But of the existing mammalia considerably more than one thousand species are known; of birds, fully five thousand; of reptiles, very few kinds of which can live in water, two thousand; and the researches of travellers and naturalists are making frequent and most interesting additions to the number of these and all other classes. Of insects (using the word in the popular sense) the number of species is immense; to say one hundred thousand would be moderate: each has its appropriate habitation and food, and these are necessary to its life; and the larger number could not live in water. Also the innumerable millions upon millions of animalcules must be provided for, for they have all their appropriate and diversified places and circumstances of existence" (Dr. J. Pye Smith, *On the Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some Parts of Geological Science*, p. 135). Nor do these numbers form the only difficulty; for, as the same writer observes: "All land animals have their geographical regions, to which their constitutional natures are congenial, and many could not live in any other situation. We cannot represent to ourselves the idea of their being brought into one small spot, from the polar regions, the torrid zone, and all the other climates of Asia, Africa, Europe, America, Australia, and the thousands of islands, their preservation and provision, and the final disposal of them, without bringing up the idea of miracles more stupendous than any which are recorded in Scripture." These are some of the difficulties

which arise on the supposition that all the species of animals existing in the world were assembled together and contained in the ark.. And if the object, as usually assumed, was to preserve the species of creatures which the Deluge would otherwise have destroyed, the provision for beasts and birds only must have been altogether inadequate. What, then, would have become of the countless reptiles, insects, and animalcules to which we have already referred ? and it is not clear that some provision must not also have been necessary for fishes and shell-animals, many of which cannot live in fresh water, while others cannot live in salt. The difficulty of assembling in one spot, and of providing for in the ark, the various mammalia and birds alone, even without including the otherwise essential provision for reptiles, insects, and fishes, is quite sufficient to suggest some error in the current belief. We are to consider the different kinds of accommodation and food which would be required for animals of such different habits and climates, and the necessary provision for cleansing the stables or dens. And if so much ingenuity has been required in devising arrangements for the comparatively small number of species which the writers on the ark have been willing to admit into it, what provision can be made for the immensely larger number which, under the supposed conditions, would really have required its shelter ? There seems to be no way of meeting these difficulties but by adopting the suggestion of Bishop Stillingfleet, approved by Matthew Poole, Dr. J. Pye Smith, Le Clerc, Rosenmuller, and others, namely, that, as the object of the Deluge was to sweep man from the earth, it did not extend beyond that region of the earth which man then inhabited, and that only the animals of that region were preserved in the ark. *SEE DELUGE*. Bishop Stillingfleet, who wrote in plain soberness long before geology was known as a science, and when, therefore, those discoveries were altogether unthought of, by which, in our day, such warm controversies have been excited, expresses his belief that the Flood was universal as to mankind, and that all men, except those preserved in the ark, were destroyed; but he sees no evidence from Scripture that the whole earth was then inhabited; he does not think that it can ever be proved to have been so; and he asks what reason there can be to extend the Flood beyond the occasion of it. He grants that, as far as the Flood extended, all the animals were destroyed; "but," he adds, " I see no reason to extend the destruction of these beyond the compass of the earth which men then inhabited; the punishment of the beasts was occasioned by, and could not but be concomitant with, the destruction of mankind. But (the occasion of the Deluge being the sin of man, who was punished in the beasts that were

destroyed for his sake, as well as in himself) where the occasion was not, as where there were animals and no men, there seems no necessity for extending the Flood thither" (*Origines Sacre*, bk. iii, ch. iv). The bishop farther argues that the reason for preserving living creatures in the ark was that there might be a stock of the tame and domesticated animals that should be immediately "serviceable for man after the Flood; which was certainly the main thing looked at in the preservation of them in the ark, that men might have all of them ready for use after the Flood; which could not have been had not the several kinds been preserved in the ark, although we suppose them not destroyed in all parts of the world."

As Noah was the progenitor of all the nations of the earth, and as the ark was the second cradle of the human race, we might expect to find in all nations traditions and reports more or less distinct respecting him, the ark in which he was saved, and the Deluge in general. Accordingly, no nation is known in which such traditions have not been found. They have been very industriously brought together by Banier, Bryant, Faber, and other mythologists. *SEE ARARAT*; *SEE NOAH*. And as it appears that an ark—that is, a boat or chest—was carried about with great ceremony in most of the ancient mysteries, and occupied an eminent station in the holy places, it has with much reason been concluded that this was originally intended to represent the ark of Noah, which eventually came to be regarded with superstitious reverence. On this point the historical and mythological testimonies are very clear and conclusive. The tradition of a deluge, by which the race of man was swept from the face of the earth, has been traced among the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Phoenicians, Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Goths, Druids, Chinese, Hindoos, Burmese, Mexicans, Peruvians, Brazilians, Nicaraguans, the inhabitants of Western Caledonia, and the islanders of the Pacific; and among most of them also the belief has prevailed that certain individuals were preserved in an ark, ship, boat, or raft, to replenish the desolated earth with inhabitants. Nor are these traditions uncorroborated by coins and monuments of stone. Of the latter there are the sculptures of Egypt and of India; and it is fancied that those of the monuments called Druidical which bear the name of *kistvaens*, and in which the stones are disposed in the form of a chest or house, were intended as memorials of the ark. The curious subject of Arkite worship is especially illustrated by the two famous medals of Apamea. There were six cities of this name, of which the most celebrated was that of Syria; next to it in importance was the one in Phrygia, called also *Κιβωτός*, *Kibotos*,



which, as we have seen, means an ark or hollow vessel. The medals in question belong, the one to the elder Philip, and the other to Pertinax. In the former it is extremely interesting to observe that on the front of the ark is the name of Noah, **ΝΩΕ**, in Greek characters. In both we perceive the ark floating on the water, containing the patriarch and his wife, the dove on wing, the olive-branch, and the raven perched on the ark. These medals also represent Noah and his wife on *terrafirma*, in the attitude of rendering thanks for their safety. The genuineness of these medals has been established beyond all question by the researches of Bryant and the critical inspection of Abbe Barthelemy. There is another medal, struck in honor of the Emperor Hadrian, which bears the inscription **ΑΠΑΜΕΩΝ ΚΙΒΩΤΟΣ ΜΑΡΣΣΙΑ**, "the ark and the Marsyas of the Apameans." *SEE APAMEA*. The coincidences which these medals offer are at least exceedingly curious; and they are scarcely less illustrative of the prevailing belief to which we are referring, if, as some suppose, the figures represented are those of Deucalion and Pyrrha (Meisner, *De arca Noachi*, Witt. 1622). *SEE FLOOD*.

## Picture for Ark 2

**2.** The ARK OF BULRUSHES (**hbT***etebah'*; Sept. **θίβις**). In Exodus2:3, we read that Moses was exposed among the flags of the Nile in an ark (or boat of bulrushes) daubed with slime and with pitch. The bulrushes of which the ark was made were the papyrus reed (*Cyperus papyrus*), which grows in Egypt in marshy places. It was used for a variety of purposes, even for food. Pliny says, from the plant itself they *weave* boats, and other ancient writers inform us that the Nile wherries were made of papyrus. Boats made of this material were noted for their swiftness, and are alluded to in <sup><23RD></sup>Isaiah 18:2. *SEE REED*.

**3.** The SACRED ARK of the Jews (**^/ra**; or **^ra**; *aron'*; Sept. and New Test. **κιβωτός**), different from the term applied to the ark of Noah. It is the common name for a chest or coffer, whether applied to the ark in the tabernacle, to a coffin, to a mummy-chest (<sup><015D></sup>Genesis 50:26), or to a chest for money (<sup><123D></sup>2 Kings 12:9, 10). Our word *ark* has the same meaning, being derived from the Latin *area*, a chest. The sacred chest is distinguished from others as the "ark of God" (<sup><088B></sup>1 Samuel 3:3), "ark of the covenant" (<sup><088B></sup>Joshua 3:6; <sup><8004></sup>Hebrews 9:4), and "ark of the law" (<sup><023D></sup>Exodus 25:22). This ark was a kind of box, of an oblong shape, made of shittim (acacia) wood, a cubit and a half broad and high, two and a half

cubits long, and covered on all sides with the purest gold. It was ornamented on its upper surface with a border or rim of gold; and on each of the two sides, at equal distances from the top, were two gold rings, in which were placed (to remain there perpetually) the gold-covered poles by which the ark was carried, and which continued with it after it was deposited in the tabernacle. The Levites of the house of Kohath, to whose office this especially appertained, bore it in its progress. Probably, however, when removed from within the veil in the most holy place, which was its proper position, or when taken out thence, priests were its bearers (<sup><1010></sup>Numbers 7:9; 10:21; 4:5, 19, 20; <sup><1008></sup>1 Kings 8:3, 6). The ends of the staves were visible without the veil in the holy place of the temple of Solomon, the staves being drawn to the ends, apparently, but not out of the rings. The ark, when transported, was enveloped in the "veil" of the dismantled tabernacle, in the curtain of badgers' skins, and in a blue cloth over all, and was therefore not seen. The lid or cover of the ark was of the same length and breadth as the ark itself, and made of the purest gold. Over it, at the two extremities, were two cherubim, with their faces turned toward each other, and inclined a little toward the lid (otherwise called the *mercy-seat*). **SEE CHERUB**. Their wings, which were spread out over the top of the ark, formed the throne of God, the King of Israel, while the ark itself was his footstool (<sup><1020></sup>Exodus 25:10-22; 37:1-9). (Comp. Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 6, 5; Philo, *Opera*, ii, 150; Koran, ii, 249, ed. Marrac.; for heathen parallels, see Apulej. *Asin.* 11:262, Bip.; Pausan. 7:19, 3; Ovid, *Ars Am.* ii, 609 sq.; Catull. lxiv, 260 sq. See generally Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* i, 5, 19 sq., 43 sq.; Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 260 sq.; Schaacht, *Animadvers.* p. 334 sq.; Buxtorf, *Hist. arcefoed.* in Ugolini *Thesaur.* viii; Hoffmann, in the *Hall. Encycl.* 14:27 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 60 sq.; Rau, *Nubes super arca fed.* Herbon. 1757, Utrecht, 1760; Thalemann, *Nubes super arcafaed.* Lips. 1752, Vindic. 1771; Lamy, *De tabemac. fed.* p 412 sq.; Van Til, *De tabernac. Mcs.* p. 117 sq.)

### Picture for Ark 3

This ark was the most sacred object among the Israelites; it was deposited in the innermost and holiest part of the tabernacle, called "the holy of holies" (and afterward in the corresponding apartment of the Temple), where it stood so that one end of each of the poles by which it was carried (which were drawn out so far as to allow the ark to be placed against the back wall) touched the veil which separated the two apartments of the tabernacle (<sup><1008></sup>1 Kings 8:8). It was also probably a reliquary for the pot of

manna and the rod of Aaron. We read in <sup><1188></sup>1 Kings 8:9, that "there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb." Yet Paul, or the author of <sup><3004></sup>Hebrews 9:4, asserts that, besides the two tables of stone, the "pot of manna" and "Aaron's rod that budded" were inside the ark, which were directed to be "laid up" and "kept *before the testimony*," i.e. before the tables of the law (<sup><1241></sup>Exodus 40:20); and probably, since there is no mention of any other receptacle for them, and some would have been necessary, the statement of <sup><1188></sup>1 Kings 8:9, implies that by Solomon's time these relics had disappeared. The expression <sup><6316></sup>*dXimi* <sup><6316></sup>Deuteronomy 31:26, obscurely rendered "in the side of the ark" (Auth. Vers.), merely means "beside" it.

### Picture for Ark 4

During the marches of the Israelites it was covered with a purple pall, and borne by the priests, with great reverence and care, in advance of the host (<sup><0445></sup>Numbers 4:5, 6; 10:33). It was before the ark, thus in advance, that the waters of the Jordan separated; and it remained in the bed of the river, with the attendant priests, until the whole host had passed over; and no sooner was it also brought up than the waters resumed their course (Joshua 3; 4:7, 10, 11, 17, 18). We may notice a fiction of the Rabbis that there were *two* arks, one which remained in the shrine, and another which preceded the camp on its march, and that this latter contained the broken tables of the law, as the former the whole ones. The ark was similarly conspicuous in the grand procession round Jericho (<sup><0104></sup>Joshua 6:4, 6, 8, 11, 12). It is not wonderful, therefore, that the neighboring nations, who had no notion of spiritual worship, looked upon it as the God of the Israelites (<sup><0445></sup>1 Samuel 4:6, 7), a delusion which may have been strengthened by the figures of the cherubim on it. After the conquest, the ark generally (see <sup><0707></sup>Judges 20:27) remained in the tabernacle at Shiloh, until, in the time of Eli, it was carried along with the army in the war against the Philistines, under the superstitious notion that it would secure the victory to the Hebrews. They - were, nevertheless, not only beaten, but the ark itself was taken by the Philistines (<sup><0445></sup>1 Samuel 4:3-11), whose triumph was, however, very short lived, as they were so oppressed by the hand of God that, after seven months, they were glad to send it back again (<sup><0445></sup>1 Samuel 5:7). After that it remained apart from the tabernacle, at Kirjath-jearim (7:1, 2), where it continued until the time of David, who purposed to remove it to Jerusalem; but the old prescribed mode of removing it from place to place was so

much neglected as to cause the death of Uzzah, in consequence of which it was left in the house of Obededom (<sup><1000></sup>2 Samuel 6:1-11) but after three months David took courage, and succeeded in effecting its safe removal, in grand procession, to Mount Zion (ver. 12-19). When the Temple of Solomon was completed, the ark was deposited in the sanctuary (<sup><1000></sup>1 Kings 8:6-9). Several of the Psalms contain allusions to these events (e.g. 24, 47, 132), and Psalm 105 appears to have been composed on the occasion of the first of them. *SEE PSALMS*. The passage in <sup><1000></sup>2 Chronicles 35:3, in which Josiah directs the Levites to restore the ark to the holy place, is understood by some to imply that it had either been removed by Amon, who put an idol in its place, which is assumed to have been the "trespass" of which he is said to have been guilty (<sup><1000></sup>2 Chronicles 33:23), or that the priests themselves had withdrawn it during idolatrous times, and preserved it in some secret place, or had removed it from one place to another. But it seems more likely that it had been taken from the holy of holies during the purification and repairs of the Temple by this same Josiah, and that he, in this passage, merely directs it to be again set in its place. Or it may have been removed by Manasseh, to make room for the "carved image" that he placed "in the house of God" (<sup><1000></sup>2 Chronicles 33:7). What became of the ark when the Temple was plundered and destroyed by the Babylonians is not known, and all conjecture is useless. It was probably taken away or destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Esdr. 10:22). The Jews believe that it was concealed from the spoilers, and account it among the hidden things which the Messiah is to reveal (see Ambros. *Off.* iii, 17, 18; Joseph. *Gorionid.* i, 21; Wernsdorf, *De fide Maccab.* p. 183 sq.; Mishna, *Shekal.* 6:1). It is certain, however, from the consent of all the Jewish writers, that the old ark was not contained in the second temple, and there is no evidence that any new one was made. Indeed, the absence of the ark is one of the important particulars in which this temple was held to be inferior to that of Solomon. The most holy place is therefore generally considered to have been empty in the second temple (as Josephus states, *War*, v, 14); or- at most (as the rabbins allege, Mishna, *Yoma*, v, 2) to have contained only a stone to mark the place which the ark should have occupied (comp. Tacit, *hist.* v, 9). The silence of Ezra, Nehemiah, the Maccabees, and Josephus, who repeatedly mention all the other sacred utensils, but never name the ark, seems conclusive on the subject. But, notwithstanding this weight of testimony, there are writers, such as Prideaux (*Connection*, i, 207), who contend that the Jews could not properly carry on their worship without an ark, and that if the original

ark was- not recovered after the Captivity, a new one must have been made (Calmet's *Dissertation sur l'Arche d'Alliance*; Hase, *De lapide cui area imposita fuit*, Erb. and Lpz. n. d. 4to). **SEE TEMPLE.**

## Picture for Ark 5

Concerning the design and form of the ark, it appears that clear and unexpected light has been thrown by the discoveries which have of late years been made in Egypt, and which have unfolded to us the rites and mysteries of the old Egyptians. (See *Descr. de l'Egypte*, Att. i, pl. 11, fig. 4; pl. 12, fig. 3; iii, pl. 32, 34, 36; comp. Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* ii, 96 sq.; Heeren, *Ideen*, II, ii, 831; Spencer, *Leg. rit.* iii, 5, p. 1084 sq.; Bahr, *Symbol.* i, 381, 402 sq.) "One of the most important ceremonies was the ' procession of shrines,' which is mentioned in the Rosetta stone, and frequently occurs on the walls of the temples. The shrines were of two kinds: the one a sort of canopy; the other an ark or sacred boat, which may be termed the great shrine. This was carried with grand pomp by the priests, a certain number being selected for that duty, who supported it on their shoulders by means of long staves, passing through metal rings at the side of the sledge on which it stood, and brought it into the temple, where it was deposited upon a stand or table, in order that the prescribed ceremonies might be discharged before it. The stand was also carried in procession by another set of priests, following the shrine, by means of similar staves; a method usually adopted for carrying large statues and sacred emblems, too heavy or too important to be borne by one person. The same is stated to have been the custom of the Jews in some of their religious processions (comp. <sup><BIB></sup>1 Chronicles 15:2, 15; <sup><BIB></sup>2 Samuel 15:24; and <sup><BIB></sup>Joshua 3:12), as in carrying the ark to its place, into the oracle of the house, to the most holy place, when the Temple was built by Solomon (<sup><BIB></sup>1 Kings 8:6). " ... " Some of the arks or boats contained the emblems of Life and Stability, which, when the veil was drawn aside, were partially seen; and others presented the beetle to the sun, overshadowed by the wings of two figures of the goddess Thenei, or Truth, which call to mind the cherubim of the Jews" (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, v, 271, 275). The ritual of the Etruscans, Greeks, Romans, and other ancient nations, included the use of what Clemens Alexandrinus calls **κίσται μυστικάί** (*Protrept.* p. 12). The same Clemens (*Strom.* v, 578) also contains an allusion of a proverbial character to the ark and its rites, which seems to show that they were popularly known, where he says that "only the master (**διδάσκαλος**) may uncover the ark" (**κιβωτός**). In Latin, also, the word

*arcanum*, connected with *area* and *arceo*, is the recognised term for a sacred mystery. (Illustrations of the-same subject occur also in Plut. *De Is. et Osi.* c. 39; Euseb. *Prcep. Evang.* ii, 3.)

## Picture for Ark 6

These resemblances and differences appear to us to cast a strong light, not only on the form, but on the purpose of the Jewish ark. The discoveries of this sort which have lately been made in Egypt have added an overwhelming weight of proof to the evidence which previously existed, that the "tabernacle made with hands," with its utensils and ministers, bore a designed external resemblance to the Egyptian models, but purged of the details and peculiarities which were the most open to abuse and misconstruction. That the Israelites, during the latter part of their sojourn in Egypt, followed the rites and religion of the country, and were (at least many of them) gross idolaters, is distinctly affirmed in Scripture (<sup>(Gen 31:44)</sup> Joshua 24:14; <sup>(Ezek 23:3, 8, 19)</sup> Ezekiel 23:3, 8, 19), and is shown by their ready lapse into the worship of the "golden calf," and by the striking fact that they actually carried about with them one of these Egyptian shrines or, tabernacles in the wilderness (<sup>(Amos 5:26)</sup> Amos 5:26). From their conduct, and the whole tone of their sentiments and character, it appears that this stiff-necked and rebellious people were incapable (as a nation) of adhering to that simple form of worship and service which is most pleasing to God. (See an article on this subject in the *Am. Bib. Repos.* Oct. 1843, p. 290-312.)

The purpose or object of the ark was to contain inviolate the Divine autograph of the two tables, that "covenant" from which it derived its title, the idea of which was inseparable from it, and which may be regarded as the *depositum* of the Jewish dispensation. The perpetual safe custody of the material tables no doubt suggested the moral observance of the precepts inscribed. The words of the Auth. Vers. in <sup>(1 Chron 13:3)</sup> 1 Chronicles 13:3, seem to imply a use of the ark for the purpose of an oracle; but this is probably erroneous, and "we sought it not" the meaning; so the Sept. renders it (see Gesenius, *Lex.* s.v. *vrd*). Occupying the most holy spot of the whole sanctuary, it tended to exclude any idol from the centre of worship. And Jeremiah (<sup>(Jer 3:16)</sup> Jeremiah 3:16) looks forward to the time when even the ark should be "no more remembered" as the climax of spiritualized religion apparently in Messianic times. It was also the support of the mercy-seat, materially symbolizing, perhaps, the "covenant" as that on which "mercy" rested. It also furnished a legitimate vent to that

longing after a material object for reverential feeling which is common to all religions. It was, however, never seen, save by the high-priest, and resembled in this respect the Deity whom it symbolized, whose face none might look upon and live. That this reverential feeling may have been impaired during its absence among the Philistines seems probable from the case of Uzzah. *SEE MERCY-SEAT.*

## Ar'kite

(Heb. *Arki'*, *אֲרִיקִי*; Sept. and Joseph. *Ἀρουκαῖος*, like the Samar. *Aruki'*, *אֲרִיקִי*), a designation of the inhabitants of *Arka* (Plin. v, 16; *Ἄρκα*, Ptol. v, 15), who are mentioned in <sup><01017></sup>Genesis 10:17; <sup><03015></sup>1 Chronicles 1:15, as descended from the Phoenician or Sidonian branch of the great family of Canaan. This, in fact, as well as the other small northern states of Phoenicia, was a colony from the great parent state of Sidon. *Arka*, or *Arce* (*Ἄρκε*), their chief town, lay between Tripolis and Antaradus, at the western base of Lebanon (Joseph. *Ant.* i, 6, 2; Jerome, *Qucest. in* <sup><01015></sup>*Genesis 10:15*). Josephus (*Ant.* 8:2, 3) makes Baanah, who in <sup><01016></sup>1 Kings 4:16, is said to have been superintendent of the tribe of Asher, governor of *Arka* (*Ἄρκε*) by the sea; and if, as commonly supposed, the capital of the Arkites is intended, their small state must, in the time of Solomon, have been under the Hebrew yoke. In the time of Alexander a splendid temple was erected here in honor of Astarte, the Venus of the Phoenicians (Macrob. *Sat.* i, 21). Subsequently *Arka* shared the lot of the other small Phoenician states in that quarter; but in later times it formed part of Herod Agrippa's kingdom. Titus passed through it on his return from the destruction of Jerusalem (*Ἀρκαία*, Joseph. *War.* 7:5, 1). In the Midrash (*Midr. Rabb.* 37) it is called "Arkam of Lebanon" (*אַרְכָּמִי*). The name and site seem never to have been unknown (Mannert, p. 391), although for a time it bore the name of *Caesarea Libani* (Aurel. Vict. *De Cces.* 24:1), from having been the birthplace of Alexander Severus (Lamprid. *Alex. Sev.*). Coins are extant of it (Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* iii, 360), but not of its Phoenician period (Gesenius, *Monum. Phenic.* ii, 285 sq.). It was eventually the seat of a Christian bishopric (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii, 815, 823). It is repeatedly noticed by the Arabian writers (Michaelis, *Spicil.* ii, 23; also *Orient. Bibl.* 6:99 sq.; Schultens, *Vita Saladini*; Edrisi, p. 13; Rosenmuller, *Barhebr. Chronicles* p. 282). It is mentioned in all the itineraries of this region, and is conspicuous in early ecclesiastical records. It also figures largely in the exploits of the Crusaders, by whom it was

unsuccessfully besieged in 1099, but at last taken in 1109 by Bertrand (see Robinson's *Researches*, new ed. iii, 578 sq.). In 1202 it was totally destroyed by an earthquake. It lay 32 Roman miles from Antaradus, 18 miles from Tripoli, and, according to Abulfeda, a parasang from the sea (*Tab. Syriae*, p. 11). In a position corresponding to these intimations, Shaw (*Observat.* p. 270) noticed the site and ruins. Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 162), in travelling from the north-east of Lebanon to Tripoli, at the distance of about four miles south of the Nahr-el-kebir (Eleutherus), came to a hill called *Tel-Arka*, which, from its regularly flattened conical form and smooth sides, appeared to be artificial. He was told that on its top were some ruins of habitations and walls. Upon an elevation on its east and south sides, which commands a beautiful view over the plain, the sea, and the Anzeiry mountains, are large and extensive heaps of rubbish, traces of ancient dwellings, blocks of hewn stone, remains of walls, and fragments of granite columns. These are no doubt the remains of Arka; and the hill was probably the acropolis or citadel, or the site of a temple (Hamesveld, iii, 39 sq.). The present village has 21 Greek and 7 Moslem families—a wretched hamlet amid the columns of this once splendid city (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1848, p. 16).

## Aries

(*Arelate*), an ancient archiepiscopal see in Lower Provence, on the left of the Rhone, seven leagues from its mouth, about one hundred and eighty-six leagues from Paris. It is said to derive its name from *Ara elata*, a high altar raised here in pagan times. A number of councils and synods were held at Arles, of which the following are the chief:

- (1.) In 314, a general synod for the West, at which Constantine and 600 or 633 bishops were present; 22 canons were framed on the Donatists, etc.;
- (2.) in 428 or 429, at which Germanus and Lupus were deputed to England;
- (3.) in 455, under Ravennius, to settle the dispute between Faustus, abbot of Lerins, and the bishop of Frejus;
- (4.) in 475, against Lucidus, accused of Predestinationism;
- (5.) in 524, under Caesarius, four canons on ordination were published;



(6.) in 1234, under John Baussan, twenty-four canons were published against heretics, chiefly against the Waldenses;

(7.) in 1275, by Bertrand de S. Martin, twenty-two canons were published, and the clergy forbidden making wills.-Landon, *Manual of Councils*; Smith, *Tables of Church Hist.*

## Arm

(usually [*ʔrʒ*] zero-'d, βραχίον) is frequently used in Scripture in a metaphorical sense to denote power. Hence, to "break the arm" is to diminish or to destroy the power (<sup><905></sup>Psalm 10:15; <sup><3721></sup>Ezekiel 30:21; <sup><2485></sup>Jeremiah 48:25). It is also employed to denote the infinite power of God (<sup><4393></sup>Psalm 89:13; 48:2; <sup><2501></sup>Isaiah 53:1; <sup><6128></sup>John 12:38). In a few places the metaphor is, with great force, extended to the action of the arm, as, "I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm" (<sup><1116></sup>Exodus 6:5), that is, with a power fully exerted. The figure is here taken from the attitude of ancient warriors baring and outstretching the arm for fight. Thus, in <sup><2520></sup>Isaiah 52:10, "Jehovah hath made bare his holy arm in the sight of all the nations." Lowth has shown, from the Sept. and other versions, that in <sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 9:20, 'they shall eat every one the flesh of his own arm' should be "the flesh of his neighbor," similar to <sup><2490></sup>Jeremiah 19:9, meaning that they should harass and destroy one another. (See Wemyss's *Clavis Symbolica*, p. 23, 24.)

## Armaged'don

(Ἀρμαγεδδών, <sup><666></sup>Revelation 16:16), properly "the mountain of Megiddo" (Heb. /Dgm]r-h), a city on the west of the river Jordan, rebuilt by Solomon (<sup><1095></sup>1 Kings 9:15). **SEE MEGIDDO.** In the mystical language of prophecy, the word mountain represents the Church, and the events which took place at Megiddo are supposed to have had a typical reference to the sorrows and triumphs of the people of God under the Gospel. "In that day," says Zechariah (<sup><3821></sup>Zechariah 12:11), "shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon;" referring to the death of Josiah (q.v.). "He gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon," is the language of the Apocalypse; and the word has been translated by some as "the mountain of destruction," by others as "the mountain of the gospel"-a passage that probably has reference to the symbolical use of the name in

Zechariah. Into a valley ominous of slaughter the unclean spirits (representing the heathen influence of the Roman empire), under the special guidance of Providence (17:17), conduct the assembled forces of the beast and his allies; and there in due time they come to an overthrow through an almighty conqueror (Stuart, *Comment.* in loc.). The passage is best illustrated by comparing a similar one in the book of Joel (<sup><39RD></sup> Joel 3:2, 12), where the scene of the divine judgments is spoken of in the prophetic imagery as the "valley of Jehoshaphat," the fact underlying the image being Jehoshaphat's great victory (<sup><40BF></sup> 2 Chronicles 20:26; see <sup><384D></sup> Zechariah 14:2, 4). So here the scene of the struggle of good and evil is suggested by that battlefield, the plain of Esdraelon, which was famous for two great victories--of Barak over the Canaanites (Judges 4, 5), and Gideon over the Midianites (Judges 7); and for two great disasters, the death of Saul in the invasion of the Philistines (<sup><080B></sup> 1 Samuel 31:8), and the death of Josiah in the invasion of the Egyptians (<sup><D729></sup> 2 Kings 23:29, 30; <sup><4872></sup> 2 Chronicles 35:22). With the first and fourth of these events, Megiddo (**Μαγεδδών** in the Sept. and Josephus) is especially connected. Hence **Ἄρ-μαγεδών**, "the hill of Megiddo." (See Bihl's *Excursus* on Herod. ii, 159.) As regards the Apocalypse, it is remarked by Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 330) that this imagery would be peculiarly natural to a Galilaean, to whom the scene of these battles was familiar. *SEE ESDRAELON.*

## Armagh

the seat of an archbishopric in Ireland. This church was founded by St. Patrick in 444 or 445. The chapter is composed of five dignitaries, four prebendaries, eight vicars choral, and an organist. The present cathedral is built of red sandstone, and is cruciform--184 by 119 feet. It has recently been repaired and beautified, chiefly at the cost (£10,000) of the present lord primate. A new Gothic Roman Catholic cathedral occupies the principal height to the north, and the primatial palace that to the south of the cathedral. There is a fever hospital for forty patients, maintained by the present primate, and a lunatic asylum for four counties. The archbishop is *Primate and Metropolitan (f all Ireland)*, and has an income of £12,087 a year. The present incumbent is Lord J. G. Beresford, translated from Dublin in 1822.

## Arme'nia

### Picture for Armenia

(*Ἀρμενία*), a country of Western Asia, is not mentioned in the original language of Scripture under that name (on the *Harmonah* of <sup><304B></sup>Amos 4:3, see Rosenmuller, in loc.), though it occurs in the English version (<sup><12957-2></sup>2 Kings 19:37), where our translators have very unnecessarily substituted it for Ararat (comp. marginal reading); but is supposed to be alluded to in the three following Hebrew designations, which seem to refer either to the country as a whole, or to particular districts. *SEE ASIA*.

**1. ARARAT, *frra*** the land upon (or over) the mountains of which the ark rested at the Deluge (<sup><0004></sup>Genesis 8:4; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* i, 3, 5); whither the sons of Sennacherib fled after murdering their father (<sup><12957-2></sup>2 Kings 19:37; <sup><23738></sup>Isaiah 37:38); and one of the "kingdoms" summoned, along with Minni and Ashkenaz, to arm against Babylon (<sup><24517></sup>Jeremiah 51:27). That there was a province of *Ararad* in ancient Armenia we have the testimony of the native historian, Moses of Chorene (*Hist. Armen.* ed. Whiston, Lond. 1736, p. 361). It lay in the centre of the kingdom, was divided into twenty circles, and, being the principal province, was commonly the residence of the kings or governors. *SEE ARARAT*.

**2. MINNI, *yNimi*** is mentioned in <sup><24517></sup>Jeremiah 51:27, along with Ararat and Ashkenaz, as a kingdom called to arm itself against Babylon. The name is by some taken for a contraction of "Armenia," and the Chald. in the text in Jeremiah has *Hurminli* (*ynjmir* 𐤅𐤇). There appears a trace of the name Minni in a passage quoted by Josephus (*Ant.* i, 3, 6) from Nicolas of Damascus, where it is said that "there is a great mountain in Armenia, beyond the *Minyas* (*Μινυάδες*), called Baris, upon which it is reported that many who fled at the time of the Deludre were saved; and that one who was carried in an ark came on shore upon the top of it; and that the remains of the timber were a great while preserved. This might be the man about whom Moses, the legislator of the Jews, wrote." Saint-Martin (*Memoires sur l'Armenie*, i, 249), has the not very probable conjecture that the word "Minni" may refer to the Manavazians, a distinguished Armenian tribe, descended from Manavaz, a son of Haik, the capital of whose country was Manavazagerd, now Melazgerd. It contains the root of the name *Armenia* according to the generally received derivation, Har-Minni, "the mountains of Minni." It is worthy of notice that the spot where

Xenophon ascertains that the name of the country through which he was passing was Armenia, coincides with the position here assigned to Minni (Xen. *An.* 4:5; Ainsworth, *Track of 10,000*, p. 177). In Psalm 45: 8, where it is said, "out of the ivory palaces *whereby* they made thee glad," the Hebrew word rendered "whereby" is *minni* (מִנִּי) and hence some (e.g. Rosenmuller, in loc.) take it for the proper name, and would translate "palaces of Armenia," but the interpretation is forced and incongruous (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 799). *SEE MINNI.*

**3. TOGARAH,** *hmrjīt* in some MSS. TORGAMAH, and found with great variety of orthography in the Sept. and Josephus. In the ethnographic table in the tenth chapter of Genesis (ver. 3; comp. <sup><3006></sup>1 Chronicles 1:6) Togarmah is introduced as the youngest son of Gomer (son of Japhet), who is supposed to have given name to the Cimmerians on the north coast of the Euxine Sea, his other sons being Ashkenaz and Riphath, both progenitors of northern tribes, among whom also it is natural to seek for the posterity of Togarmah. The prophet Ezekiel (<sup><3586></sup>Ezekiel 38:6) also classes along with Gomer "the house of Togarmah and the sides of the north" (in the Eng. Vers. "of the north quarters"), whereas also at <sup><374></sup>Ezekiel 27:14, it is placed beside Meshech and Tubal, probably the tribes of the Moschi and Tibareni in the Caucasus. Now, though Josephus and Jerome find Togarmah in Phrygia, Bochart in Cappadocia, the Chaldee and the Jewish rabbins in Germany, etc., yet a comparison of the above passages leads to the conclusion that it is rather to be sought for in Armenia, and this is the opinion of Eusebius, Theodoret, and others of the fathers. It is strikingly confirmed by the traditions of that and the neighboring countries. According to Moses of Chorene (*Hist. Arm.* ed. Whiston, i, 8, p. 24), and also King Wachtang's *History of Georgia* (in Klapproth's *Travels in the Caucasus*, ii, 64), the Armenians, Georgians, Lesghians, Mingrelians, and Caucasians are all descended from one common progenitor, called Thargamos, a son of Awanaii, son of Japhet, son of Noah (comp. Eusebius, *Chronicles* ii, 12). After the dispersion at Babel he settled near Ararat, but his posterity spread abroad between the Caspian and Euxine seas. A similar account is found in a Georgian chronicle, quoted by another German traveller, Guldenstedt, which states that Targamos was the father of eight sons, the eldest of whom was Aos, the ancestor of the Armenians. They still call themselves "the house of Thorgom," the very phrase used by Ezekiel, the corresponding Syriac word for "house" denoting "land or district" (see Wahl, *Gesch. der Morgenl.*

*Spr. u. Lit.* p. 72). From the house or province of Togarmah the market of Tyre was supplied with horses and mules (<sup>3274</sup>Ezekiel 27:14); and Armenia, we know, was famed of old for its breed of horses; The Satrap of Armenia sent yearly to the Persian court 20,000 foals for the feast of Mithras (Strabo, 11:13, 9; Xenoph. *Anabas.* 4:5,24; Herod. 7:40). **SEE TOGARMAH.**

The **Ἀρμενία** of the Greeks (sometimes aspirated, **Ἀρμενία**, comp. Xen. *Anab.* 4:6, 34) is the *Arminzya* or *Irminiya* of the Arabs, the *Ermenistan* of the Persians. Moses of Chorene (*Hist. Arm.* p. 35) derives the name from *Aram* (q.v.), a son of Shem, who also gave name to Aramaea or Syria; Hartmann (*Aufklar.* i, 34) draws it from *Armenagh*, the second of the native princes; but the most probable etymology is that of Bochart (*Phaleg*, i, 3), viz., that it was originally **YmArhi** *Har-Minni* or Mount Minni, i.e. the Highland of Minyas, or, according to Wahl (*Asien*, i, 807), the Heavenly Mountain (i.e. Ararat), for *mino* in Zend, and *yrno*, *myny*, in Parsee, signify "heaven, heavenly." In the country itself the name Armenia is unknown; the people are called *Haik* (Rosenmiller, *Alterth.* I, i, 267 sq.), and the country *Ha-yotz-zor*, the Valley of the Haiks—from Haik, the fifth descendant of Noah by Japhet, in the traditionary genealogy of the country (comp. Ritter's *Erdkunde*, ii, 714).

The boundaries of Armenia (lat. 37-42°) may be described (Strabo, 11:526) generally as the southern range of the Caucasus on the north, and the Moschian branch of the Taurus on the south; but in all directions, and especially to the east and west, the limits have been very fluctuating (Rennell, *Geogr. Herod.* i, 369). It forms an elevated table-land, whence the rivers Euphrates, Tigris, Araxes, and Acampsis pour down their waters in different directions, the first two to the Persian Gulf, the last two respectively to the Caspian and Euxine seas. It may be termed the *nucleus* of the mountain system of Western Asia: from the centre of the plateau rise two lofty chains of mountains, which run from east to west, converging toward the Caspian Sea, but parallel to each other toward the west, the most northerly named by ancient geographers the Abus Mountains, and culminating in Mount Ararat; the other named the Niphates Mountains. Westward these ranges may be traced in AntiTaurus and Taurus, while in the opposite direction they are continued in the Caspius Mountains. These ranges (with the exception of the gigantic Ararat) are of moderate height, the *plateau* gradually sinking toward the plains of Iran on the east, and those of Asia Minor on the west. The climate is generally cold (Xen. *Anab.*

4:4, 8), but salubrious, the degree of severity varying with the altitude of different localities, the valleys being sufficiently warm to ripen the grape. The country abounds in romantic forest and mountain scenery, and rich pasture-land, especially in the districts which border upon Persia (Herod. i, 194; 7:40; Xen. *Anab.* 4:5. 24; Strabo, 10:528, 558, 587; ~~27:14~~ Ezekiel 27:14; Chardin, *Voyages*, ii, 158; Tournefort, *Reisen*, iii, 179 sq.). The latter supported vast numbers of mules and horses, on which the wealth of the country chiefly depended; and hence Strabo (xi, 529) tells us that the horses were held in as high estimation as the celebrated Nissean breed. The inhabitants were keen traders in ancient as in modern times. Ancient writers notice, also, the wealth of Armenia in metals and precious stones (Herod. i, 194; Pliny, 37:23). The great rivers Euphrates and Tigris both take their rise in this region, as also the Araxes, and the Kur or Cyrus. Armenia is commonly divided into *Greater* and *Lesser* (Lucan. ii, 638), the line of separation being the Euphrates (comp. Ptolem. v, 7 and 13); but the former constitutes by far the larger portion (Strabo, 11:532), and, indeed, the other is often regarded as pertaining rather to Asia Minor. (See, generally, Strabo, 11:526 sq.; Pliny, 6:9; Mannert, V, ii, 181 sq.; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 10:285 sq.) There was anciently a kingdom of Armenia, with its metropolis Artaxata: it was sometimes an independent state, but most commonly tributary to some more powerful neighbor. Indeed, at no period was the whole of this region ever comprised under one government, but Assyria, Media, Syria, and Cappadocia shared the dominion or allegiance of some portion of it, just as it is now divided among the Persians, Russians, Turks, and Kurds; for there is no doubt that that part of Kurdistan which includes the elevated basins of the lakes of Van and Oormiah anciently belonged to Armenia. The unfortunate German traveller Schulz (who was murdered by a Kurdish chief) discovered in 1827, near the former lake, the ruins of a very ancient town, which he supposed to be that which is called by Armenian historians *Shamiramakert* (i.e. the town of Semiramis), because believed to have been built by the famous Assyrian queen. The ruins are covered with inscriptions in the arrow-headed character; in one of them Saint-Martin thought he deciphered the words *Khshearsha*, son of *Dareioush* (Xerxes, son of Darius). In later times Armenia was the border-country where the Romans and Parthians fruitlessly strove for the mastery; and since then it has been the frequent battle-field of the neighboring states. During the recent wars between Russia and Turkey, large bodies of native Armenians have emigrated into the Russian dominions, so that their number in what is termed Turkish

Armenia is now considerably reduced. By the treaty of Turkomanshi (21st Feb. 1828), Persia ceded to Russia the Khanats of Erivan and Naktclevan. The boundary-line (drawn from the Turkish dominions) passes over the Little Ararat; the line of separation between Persian and Turkish Armenia also begins at Ararat; so that this famous mountain is now the central boundary-stone of these three empires. (See, generally, Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr. s.v.*; *Penny Cyclopaedia, s.v.*; M'Culloch's *Geogr. Dict. s.v.*)

The slight acquaintance which the Hebrew writers had of this country was probably derived from the Phoenicians. There are signs of their knowledge having been progressive. Isaiah, in his prophecies regarding Babylon, speaks of the hosts as coming from the " mountains" (<sup>2304</sup>Isaiah 13:4), while Jeremiah, in connection with the same subject, uses the specific names Ararat and Minni (<sup>2617</sup>Jeremiah 51:27). Ezekiel, who was apparently better acquainted with the country, uses a name which was familiar to its own inhabitants, Togarmah. Whether the use of the term Ararat in <sup>2378</sup>Isaiah 37:38, belongs to the period in which the prophet himself lived, is a question which cannot be here discussed. In the prophetic passages to which we have referred, it will be noticed that Armenia is spoken of rather in reference to its geographical position as one of the extreme northern nations with which the Jews were acquainted than for any more definite purpose.-Smith.

Christianity was first established in Armenia in the fourth century; the Armenian Church (q.v.) has a close affinity to the Greek Church in its forms and polity; it is described by the American missionaries who are settled in the country as in a state of great corruption and debasement. The total number of the Armenian nation throughout the world is supposed not to exceed 2,000,000. Their favorite pursuit is commerce, and their merchants are found in all parts of the East.

A list of early works on Armenia may be found in Walch, *Bibl. Theol.* iii, 353 sq. For a further account of the HISTORY of Armenia (*New Englander*, Oct. 1863), see Moses Chorensis, *Historia Armen. lib.* iii (Armen. edid. Lat. vert. notisque illustr. W. et G. Whistonii, Lond. 1736); Chamich, *History of Armenia* (translated from the Armenian original by M. J. Ardall, Calcutta, 1827); *History of Vartan*, translated by Neumann; see also Langlois, *Numismatique de l'Armenie* (Par. 1858); Andrisdogues de Lasdivera, *Histoire d'Armenie* (Par. 1864). On its TOPOGRAPHY, see St.-Martin, *Memoire sur l'Armenie*; Colonel Chesney, *Euphrates*

*Erpedition*, i; Kinneir, *Memoirs of the Persian Empire*, also *Travels in Armenia*; Morier, *Travels in Persia*, i; Ker Porter, *Travels*; Smith and Dwight's *Researches in Armenia* (Bost. 1833); Southgate, *Tour through Armenia* (N. Y. 1840); Curzon, *Residence at Erzeroum* (Lond. 1854), and vols. iii, 6:x of the *Jour. of the Lond. Geog. Soc.* containing the explorations of Monteith, Ainsworth, and others. On the RELIGION of the nation, see Giov. de Serpos, *Compendio storia della nazione Armena* (Ven. 1786); *Kurze histor. Darstellung d. gegenw. Zustandes d. armen. Volkes* (Petersb. and Berl. 1831). *SEE EDEN.*

### Armenian Church.

The designation of a branch of Christians, which, although originating in Armenia, is now disseminated over all the adjacent portions of the East.

**I. History.** — Armenia, it is said, first received Christianity from Bartholomew and Thaddaeus, the latter not the apostle, but one of the seventy, who instructed Abgarus of Edessa (q.v.) in the faith, although the Armenians themselves maintain that he *was* the apostle. The light was very speedily quenched, and was not rekindled until the beginning of the fourth century. About that time Gregory (q.v.) *Illuminator* (or *Lusarovich*, in their tongue) preached the Gospel throughout Armenia, and soon converted the king, Tyridates. Gregory was consecrated first bishop of the Armenians by Leontius of Caesarea, whence the Armenian Church became thenceforward dependent on the see of Caesarea, and for a long period the successors of Gregory were consecrated by that primate. It was to this subjection to the see of Caesarea that the primates of Armenia owed the title of *Catholicos* (or proctor-general), which was assigned them as vicars of the primate of Caesarea in that country. In the fourth century they received many literary institutions through the Catholicos Sahag (after 406), and a translation of the Bible through Mesrob (q.v.). The Armenian Church preserved the faith until the end of the reign of Theodosius the younger; and in 437 a synod was held at Ispahan, composed of many Armenian bishops, who addressed a synodical letter to Proclus, of Constantinople, condemning the impieties of Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia. In the following century the Church of Armenia, from an excess of hatred toward Nestorianism, embraced the Eutychian (q.v.) heresy, and condemned the Council of Chalcedon. The name commonly given to the Church was Gregorian Church (after Gregory *Illuminator*). When, in the fifth century, several kings of Persia made an attempt to force



the doctrines of Zoroaster upon the Armenians, many emigrated to various countries of Asia and Europe. About 554 a synod of Armenian bishops was convened at the city of Thevin, or Tiben, by the patriarch Nierses II, at the command of the King of Persia, who desired to separate the Armenians from the Greeks. In this synod they renounced the communion of the orthodox churches, anathematized that of Jerusalem, allowed only one nature in Jesus Christ, and added to the Tersanctus the words *Qui crucifus es*. **SEE MONOPHYSITES**. An attempt to abolish the schism was made by a synod at Garin in 629, which adopted the resolutions of Chalcedon; but soon the connection between the Armenian and the Greek Church was again dissolved. The metropolis of the Armenian Church was called *Vagarsciabat* in their tongue, but was known to the Latins as Artaxata, the capital of the country. In this city was built, A.D. 650, the monastery of *Eschmiazin* (or Etchmiaz), which contains the sepulchre of St. Gregory, and is now the see of the patriarch, or *catholicos*, as he is called, of Armenia Major. *Vagarsciabat* no longer exists; but the monastery of *Eschmiazin* is the seat of the *catholicos*, and contained three churches built in a triangle. At first the *catholicos* of *Eschmiazin* was the sole patriarch of Armenia; but *before* the year 1341 there were three, viz. a second at *Achtamar*, and a third at *Sis*. *Ricaut*, who wrote an account of "*the Greek and Armenian Churches*". (Lond. 1679, 8vo), mentions, besides these three, a fourth one at *Cansahar*. All four had under them 37 archbishops and 100 bishops. By the treaty of *Unkiar Skelessi* (1828) a large portion of Upper Armenia was ceded to the Czar, and thus also the head of the Church, the *catholicos* of *Eschmiazin*, became a subject of Russia. The attempts of the Russian government to induce the Armenians to enter into a union with the Russian Church have failed. In Turkey the Armenians shared in general the fate of the other Christian denominations. **SEE TURKEY**. In 1848 they elected a council of 12 lay primates, who rule the Church in all its temporal affairs. The patriarch has only the right of presidency.

At an early period efforts were made to establish a closer connection of the Armenians with the Roman Catholic Church. In consequence of the Crusades, several kings, in the twelfth and following centuries, interested themselves in behalf of a corporate union of the churches with Rome, and the synods of *Kromglai* (1179), *Sis* (1307), and *Atan* (1316) declared themselves in the same way. At the Council of *Florence* (1439), the Armenian deputies, together with the Greeks, accepted the union, but

neither people ratified it. Some churches, however, remained, ever since the fourteenth century, when Pope John XXIII sent a Roman archbishop to Armenia, in connection with Rome, and formed the "Armenian Catholic, or United Armenian Church," which in doctrinal points conforms with Rome, but in all other respects agrees with the Gregorian Armenian Church. Through the influence of Mechitar (q.v.) and the Mechitarists, this branch obtained a literary superiority over the main (nonunited) body, which, especially in modern times, has worked not a little in favor of Rome. Of late, not only a number of Armenian villages have accepted the union, but in Turkey, among some of the leading men of the national (Gregorian) Armenian Church, a disposition has been created to try anew the accomplishment of a corporate union. *SEE UNITED ARMENIAN CHURCH.*

The efforts made by the High-Church Episcopalians for establishing a closer intercommunion between the Church of England and the Eastern churches was favorably received by many Armenians of Turkey. A pamphlet was published in 1860, in Constantinople, with the *imprimatur* of the Armenian patriarch, to show how nearly the Armenian Church is like that of England. The pamphlet, to this end, quotes from the prayer-book the whole of the twenty-fifth Article of Religion, but so shapes the translation as to make it appear that the Church of England, as well as the Armenian, believe in *seven* sacraments, though five of them, the pamphlet says, are received only, *as they are by the Armenian Church*, as secondary sacraments. Several Armenian theologians are quoted in support of this theory. In the same year (1860), Rev. G. Williams, of Cambridge (England), had an interview with the Armenian archbishop of Tiflis, in Georgia, relative to the scheme of a union between the English and Armenian churches. Mr. Williams was the bearer of letters from the bishops of Oxford and Lincoln, who, it appears, assumed to speak in the name of the Church of England to the "catholicos, patriarch, bishops, etc., of the orthodox Eastern Church." He was to see "the holy catholicos," the head of the entire Armenian Church, at Eschmiazin; but, being somewhat unwell, and his time of absence having almost expired, he abandoned his journey to Eschmiazin, and spent ten days in Tiflis to confer with the archbishop of that city. He expressed, *in the name of the Church of England*, his acknowledgment of the Armenian Church as a true, orthodox, and apostolic church, and kissed "the sacred hand of his holiness." The archbishop, in return, granted to him his episcopal blessing, and expressed

a thousand good wishes for himself and his people. To the proposition of Mr. Williams to send a few young Armenians to Cambridge for an education, no definite answer was given.

The Armenian Church has produced a numerous theological literature, the chief works of which have been published at Venice by the Mechitarists, and at Constantinople. The translation of the Bible by Mesrob is still regarded as a model of classic language. The most celebrated Armenian writers were Gregory Illuminator and David the philosopher. A martyrologium was compiled in the ninth century by Kakik and Gregory, an enlarged edition of which (Haismavark, Constantinople, 1847) is still read in the Armenian churches. See Neumann, *Versuch einer Geschichte d. Armenisch. Literatur* (Leipz. 1836). **SEE MEKHITAR.**

**II. Doctrines, Usages, and Polity.** -The Armenians are said to be Monophysites, but modern "missionaries are generally disposed to regard them as differing more in terminology than in idea from the orthodox faith on that point. They agree with the Greeks and other Oriental churches in rejecting the 'filio-que' from the Nicene Creed, and maintaining the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only. With some difference in forms and modes of worship, the religious opinions of the Armenians are mostly like those of the Greeks. The sign of the cross is used on all occasions; but made by the Greeks with three fingers, by the Armenians with two, by the Jacobites with one the Greek usage pointing to the Trinity, the Armenian to the two natures made one in the person of Christ, and the Jacobite to the Divine unity. They profess to hold to the seven sacraments of the Latin Church; but, in fact, extreme unction exists among them only in name, the prayers so designated being intermingled 'with those of confirmation, which latter rite is performed with the 'holy chrism' by the priest at the time of baptism. Infants are baptized, as commonly in the Greek and other Oriental churches, by a partial immersion in the font and three times pouring water on the head. Converted Jews, etc., though adults, are baptized in the same manner. They readily admit to their communion Romanists and Protestants baptized by sprinkling, differing in this from the Greeks, who receive none, however previously baptized, without rebaptizing them. They believe firmly in the 'real presence' in the Eucharist, and adore the host in the mass. The people partake, however, in both kinds, the wafer or broken bread (unleavened) being dipped in undiluted wine (the Greeks use leavened bread and wine mixed with water), and laid carefully on the tongue. It must be received fasting. They

reject the Latin purgatory, but, believing that the souls of the departed may be benefited by the aid of the church (which, of course, must be paid for), they pray for the dead. Saint-worship is carried to an extraordinary length, the addresses to saints being often grossly idolatrous, and the mediation of Christ lost sight of in the liturgical services of the church, as it is in the minds of the people. The cross, and pictures of the saints, are also objects of worship, as possessing inherent efficacy. The Supreme Being is likewise represented under the form of an aged, venerable man, with whom, and the Son, under the form of a young man, and the Holy Spirit, symbolized as a dove, the Virgin Mary is associated in the same picture. The perpetual virginity of the latter is held as a point of pre-eminent importance. Confession to the priesthood, in order to absolution, is deemed essential to salvation. Penances are imposed; but absolution is without money, and indulgences are never given. Baptism confers regeneration and cleansing from sin, original and actual; spiritual life is maintained by penances and sacraments; and the priest holds in his hand the passport to heaven. The merit of good works is acknowledged, particularly of asceticism. Monachism, celibacy, fasting, etc., are viewed as in other Eastern churches, but fasts are more lengthened and severe; the number of fast-days, when no animal food of any kind can be eaten, is 165 in the year. On the fourteen great feast-days the observance of the day is more strict than that of the Sabbath, which last is as in Roman Catholic countries. Minor feasts are even more numerous than the days in the year. The Church services are performed in the ancient tongue, not now understood by the common people, and in a manner altogether perfunctory and painful to an enlightened mind.

"There are *nine* different grades of clergy, each receiving a distinct ordination by the laying on of hands. Four of these are below the order of deacon, and are called porters, readers, exorcists, and candle-lighters. After these come the sub-deacons, the deacons, the priests, then the bishops, and, last of all, the catholicos. The catholicos is ordained by a council of bishops. He is the spiritual head of the church, who alone ordains bishops, and can furnish the *meiron*, or sacred oil used by bishops in ordaining the inferior clergy, and in the various ceremonies of the church, The priests are obliged to be married men, and can never rise higher than the priesthood, except in case of the death of a wife, when, not being allowed to marry a second time, they may enter among the

*Vartabedsan* order of celibate priests, who are attached to the churches as preachers (the married priests do not usually preach), or live together in monasteries, and from among whom the bishops, etc., on whom the law of celibacy is imposed, are taken" (Newcomb, *Cyclopaedia of Missions*).-*Bekenntn. d. Christl. Glaubens d. armen. Kirche* (Petersb. 1799); *Armenionorum Conjessio* (Viteb. 1750); *Liturgia Armena* (cura G. Andichian, Ven. 1826); *Taufritual des armenischen Kirche in Russland* (Petersb. 1799).

There are among the Gregorian (Non - united) Armenians a great number of monks. They follow either the rule of St. Anthony or that of St. Basil. The monks of St. Anthony live in solitude and in the desert, and surpass in austerity almost all the orders of the Roman Church. There are sometimes as many as a hundred monks in one monastery. The order of St. Basil (introduced into the Armenian Church in 1173) is less strict; their convents are in the towns, and from them the bishops and *vartabeds* are taken. Their principal convent, called "Three Churches," is at Eschmiazin. Most of their convents are poor, but they have three very rich ones in Jerusalem. The United Armenians have the following orders:

(1.) A congregation of *monks of St. Anthony*, still existing, under a general abbot, who resides on Mount Lebanon, while a procurator general represents the order at Rome.

(2.) A congregation of *Basilians*, also called *Bartholomites*, founded in 1307 at Genoa by a fugitive monk, Peter Martin. They obtained many convents in Italy, assumed in 1356 the rule of Augustine and the garb of the Dominican lay brothers, and were suppressed in 1650.

(3.) In 1330 a number of Armenian monks and priests were induced by some Dominican friars to join the Church of Rome, and formed a monastic congregation, called the *United Brethren of St. Gregory Illuminator*. They likewise adopted the rule of St. Augustine, and the constitutions and habit of the Dominicans. In 1356 they fused entirely with the Dominican order, and were formed into the province of Nakhchevan.

(4.) The most celebrated of the Armenian monks are the *Mechitarists* (q.v.).

**III. Present Condition and Statistics.**-The estimates of the present number of Armenians greatly vary. According to the latest information (1887) they amount to about 3,000,000 souls. Russia had, in 1851, 372,535 Gregorian (Non-united) and 22,253 Catholic (United) Armenians. Persia has, according to the "Missionary Herald" of 1859, about 30,000; according to Ubcini (*Letters on Turkey*), 600,000 Armenians. Ubcini gives 40,000 for India, and 60,000 for Western Europe; but other statements give lower figures. The Armenians of Western Europe are mostly United; of those in India, Persia, and Turkey, only a minority (in Asiatic Turkey 75,000 in 1844, which number has since increased). The number of Armenians in Turkey who had declared themselves Protestants amounted in 1858 to nearly 6000. The catholicos of Eschmiazin (now in Russia) is still regarded as the chief bishop of the church. He is appointed by the Czar, and has under him a synod, an imperial procurator, and 67 bishoprics. Also the bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem assume the title Patriarch, though they are said not to be strictly such, but rather superior bishops, possessing certain privileges conferred by the patriarch. The United Armenians have in European Turkey 1 archbishop at Constantinople; in Asiatic Turkey, 1 patriarch in Cilicia, 1 archbishop at Seleucia, and 9 bishops; in Persia, 1 bishop at Ispahan; in Austria, 1 archbishop at Lemberg, besides whom also the Mechitarist abbots of Venice and Vienna are archbishops *in partibus*.

**IV. Armenian Protestant Missions.**-The history of Protestantism among the Armenians forms one of the most interesting chapters in the history of modern Protestant missions. As a forerunner in the reformation of the Armenian Church we may regard a priest by the name of Debajy Oghlu, about 1760. He lived in Constantinople, and wrote a book in which he praised Luther, and castigated both clergy and people with an unsparing hand. His book, though never published, circulated from hand to hand, and was later used by the Protestant missionaries with some effect. The efforts of the Protestant Church in behalf of the Armenian Church began with the circulation of the Bible. In 1813 the British Bible Society began the publication of the Armenian Bible (the translation made by Mesrob in the fifth century), and in 1815 an edition of 5000 copies was issued at Calcutta. The same society published in 1823 at Constantinople an edition of 5000 copies of the New Testament, and of 3000 copies of the four Gospels alone. Simultaneously with the British society, the Russian Bible Society undertook the publication of the Armenian Bible, and issued at St. Petersburg, in 1817, an edition of 2000 copies, and soon after an edition of

the ancient Armenian New Testament. A great enthusiasm manifested itself in Russia for this work, the Emperor Alexander, the archbishops and bishops of the Greek and the Armenian churches, and nearly all the Russian nobility being among its patrons. The Armenian Bibles and New Testaments thus printed were widely circulated through various agencies. But it was soon discovered that the mass of the people did not understand the old Armenian language, and that one portion (perhaps one third, chiefly in the more southern portions of Asia Minor) had even lost the use of the modern Armenian, speaking only Turkish. This led to the translation of the Bible into modern Armenian and into Armeno-Turkish (Turkish written with Armenian characters). The former translation was issued by the Russian society in 1822, the latter by the British society in 1823. These translations, however, called forth the opposition of the Armenian patriarch of Constantinople and the Armenian clergy in general.

A Protestant mission was established among the Armenians by the American Board in 1830, after the way had been previously prepared by the conversion of three Armenian priests (two of whom were bishops) by the American missionaries of Syria, and by the famous school of Pestitimalyan, a man conversant not only with Armenian, but also with Western literature and theology. The first missionaries were E. Smith and H. G. O. Dwight, who were joined in the following years by W. Goodell, J. B. Adger, B. Schneider, C. Hamlin, and others. The missionaries soon organized several schools at Constantinople, Pera, Brousa, Hass-Keuy, Bebek, and through them worked successfully for spreading evangelical views in the Armenian Church. In 1834 the mission press was transferred from Malta to Smyrna, and there soon began a most successful operation, printing, up to the 1st of January, 1838, two and a half million pages in the Armenian languages. In the following years Mr. Goodell completed the translation of the whole Old Testament into the Armeno-Turkish language, and W. Adger issued an improved translation of the New Testament into modern Armenian. The missionaries early found devoted co-laborers among the Armenians; among whom Sahakyan, who was converted when a student, in 1833, and a pious priest, Der Kevork, were prominent. Though not interrupted, they encountered a strong opposition, which was generally headed by the patriarchs and the chief Armenian bankers in Constantinople, and sometimes manifested itself as open and cruel persecution. That was especially the case when, in 1844, Matteos, formerly bishop of Brousa, was made patriarch of Constantinople. For two years he

used all means within his reach against the favorers of the Protestant missions, and it required the interference of the Christian ambassadors to obtain an order from the sultan, which put an end to further persecutions (March, 1846). Up to that time the converts had not formally separated from the church; but when they were now formally excommunicated by the patriarch Matteos, and thus also cut off from the civil rights of the Armenian community, *SEE TURKEY*, they organized independent *evangelical Armenian churches*. The first churches thus organized were those of Constantinople, Nicomedia, Adabazan, and Trebizond. Their number has since steadily increased. In 1850 the Protestants were placed on an equality with the other Christian denominations, and, in 1853, even on an equality with the Mussulmans before the law. The report made by the American Board on the Armenian missions in 1859 shows them to be in a very prosperous condition. They are now divided into two separate missions, the Eastern Turkey and Central Turkey. The former contained, in 1888, 95 stations occupied by missionaries; 115 out-stations, occupied by native teachers or helpers; 15 missionaries, of whom one is a physician; 26 female assistant missionaries; 27 native pastors; 51 native preachers; 48 other native helpers (not including 170 native teachers). The number of churches was 41, with 2542 members; the total number of adherents 15,413; the number of common schools 144, with 5261 pupils. There were also 14 higher schools of learning, with 526 scholars; also a theological school with 8 students. In addition to these there were 5 girls' schools, with 213 scholars. The average Sabbath congregations were 11,010. The Central Turkey Mission presented 2 stations; 51 out-stations; 7 missionaries; 3 physicians 16 assistant female missionaries, 19 native pastors; 27 native preachers; 110 native teachers; 4 other native helpers, 33 churches, with 4050 members, 17,056 adherents average Sabbath congregations, 10,000 1 theological school, with 7 students; 2 advanced schools with 89 students, 4 girls' schools, with 195 scholars; 95 common schools, with 4157 scholars. In 1889 a great revival occurred at Aintab, resulting in the conversion of 600 souls. In 1859 the Turkish government appointed an Armenian Protestant censor, in order to relieve the Protestants from the annoyances which they had suffered from the (Gregorian) Armenian censor. The civil community of the Protestant Armenians was at that time greatly suffering from pecuniary embarrassment, as the Protestants, on account of their poverty, find it difficult to pay the tax levied on them for supporting their civil organization. Until 1859 the American missionaries had mostly confined



themselves to the Armenians of Turkey, but in that year one of the missionaries visited several Armenian villages of Persia for the purpose of establishing a Protestant mission.

**V. Literature.** — For the Armenian Church, see Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 113, 553; Ricaut, *Greek and Armenian Churches* (London, 1679); St.-Martin, *Memoires historiques et geographiques sur l'Armenie* (Paris, 1819, vol. ii); *Hisfoire, Dogmes, Traditions, etc., de l'Eglise Armenienne* (Paris, 1855, 8vo); Ubicini, *Letters on Turcey*, translated by Lady Easthope (Lond. 1856); Neale, *History of the Eastern Church*, vol. i (Lond. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo); and especially the *History of Armenia* by the Mechitarist Tchamtchenanz (3 vols. 4to, Venice, 1784-1786). On the introduction of Christianity, see F. Bodenstedt, *Ueber die Einfuhrung des Christenthums in Armenien* (Berlin, 1850). On the statistics, Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, vol. i; Newcomb, *Cyclopedia of Missions*; Smith and Dwight, *Missionary Researches in-Armenia*; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. xxvii; *Christian Remembrancer*, 23:349; *Church of England Quarterly*, July, 1854; Dwight, *Christianity Revived in the East; Reports of A. B. C. F. M.*; Schem, *Am. Ecclesiast. Year-book*. **SEE ASIA.**

### Armenian Language.

The ancient Armenian or Haikan language (now dead), notwithstanding the great antiquity of the nation to which it belongs, possesses no literary documents prior to the fifth century of the Christian aera. The translation of the Bible, begun by Mesrob (q.v.) in the year 410, is the earliest monument of the language that has come down to us. The dialect in which this version is written, and in which it is still publicly read in their churches, is called the old Armenian. The dialect now in use—the modern Armenian—in which they preach and carry on the intercourse of daily life, not only departs from the elder form by dialectual changes in the native elements of the language itself, but also by the great intermixture of Persian and Turkish words which has resulted from the conquest and subjection of the' country. It is, perhaps, this diversity of the ancient and modern idioms which has given rise to the many conflicting opinions that exist as to the relation in which the Armenian stands to other languages. Thus Cirbied and Vater both assert that it is an original language; that is, one so distinct from all others in its fundamental character as not to be classed with any of the great families of languages. Eichhorn, on the other hand (*Sprachenkunde*, p. 349), affirms that the learned idiom of the Armenian undoubtedly

belongs to the MedoPersian family; whereas Pott (*Untersuchungen*, p. 32) says that, notwithstanding its many points of relation to that family, it cannot strictly be considered to belong to it; and Gatterer actually classed it as a living sister of the Basque, Finnish, and Welsh languages.

As to form, it is said to be rough and full of consonants; to possess *ten* cases in the noun-a number which is only exceeded by the Finnish; to have no dual; to have no mode of denoting gender in the noun by change of form, but to be obliged to append the words *man* and *woman* as the marks of sex-thus, to say *prophet-woman* for *prophetess* (nevertheless, modern writers use the syllable *ouhi* to distinguish the feminine; Wahl, *Geschichte d. Morgenl. Sprachen*, p. 100); to bear a remarkable resemblance to Greek in the use of the participle, and in the whole syntactical structure; and to have adopted the Arabian system of metre.

### Picture for Armenian

The history of its alphabetical character is briefly this: until the third century of our aera, the Armenians used either the Persian or Greek alphabet (the letter in Syrian characters, mentioned by Diodor. 19:23, is not considered an evidence that they wrote *Armenian* in Syrian characters, as that letter was probably Persian). In the fifth century, however, the translation of the Bible created the necessity for characters which would more adequately represent the peculiar sounds of the language. Accordingly, after a fruitless attempt of a certain Daniel, and after several efforts on his own part, Mesrob saw a hand in a dream v write the very characters which now constitute the Armenian alphabet. The 38 letters thus obtained are chiefly founded on the Greek, but have partly made out their number by deriving some forms from the Zend alphabet. The order of writing is from left to right. Mesrob employed these letters in his translation of the Bible, and thus insured their universal and permanent adoption by the nation (Gesenius, article *Palceographie*, in Ersch und Gruber). See Tromler, *Bibliothecae Armenicae spec.* (Plan. 1758); Schroder, *Thesaurus ling. Armen. antique et nove* (Amsterd. 1711); Cirbied, *Gram. Armenienne* (Par. 1822); Petermann, *Grammatica Armen.* (Berol. 1837); also, *Brevis linguae Armenicae grammatica, literatura, chrestomathia, c. glossario* (ib. 1841); Calfa, *Dictionnaire Armenienne* (Par. 1861). **SEE SEMITIC LANGUAGES.**

## Armenian Version.

This translation of the Bible was undertaken in the year 410 by Mesrob, with the aid of his pupils Joannes Eccelensis and Josephus Palnensis. It appears that the Patriarch Isaac first attempted, in consequence of the Persians having destroyed all the copies of the Greek version, to make a translation from the Peshito; that Mesrob became his coadjutor in this work; and that they actually completed their translation from the Syriac. But when the above-named pupils, who had been sent to the ecclesiastical council at Ephesus, returned, they brought with them an accurate copy of the Greek Bible. Upon this, Mesrob laid aside his translation from the Peshito, and prepared to commence anew from a more authentic text. - Imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, however, induced him to send his pupils to Alexandria, to acquire accurate Greek scholarship; and, on their return, the translation was accomplished. Moses of Chorene, the historian of Armenia, who was also employed, as a disciple of Mesrob, on this version, fixes its completion in the year 410; but he is contradicted by the date of the Council of Ephesus, which necessarily makes it subsequent to the year 431.

In the Old Testament this version adheres exceedingly closely to the Septuagint (but in the book of Daniel has followed the version of Theodotion). Its most striking characteristic is, that it does not follow any known recension of the Sept. Although it more often agrees with the Alexandrine text, in readings which are peculiar to the latter, than it does with the Aldine or Complutensian text, yet, on the other hand, it also has followed readings which are only found in the last two. Bertholdt accounts for this mixed text by assuming that the copy of the Greek Bible sent from Ephesus contained the Lucian recension, and that the pupils brought back copies according to the Hesychian recension from Alexandria, and that the translators made the latter their standard, but corrected their version by aid of the former (*Einleit.* ii, 560). The version of the New Testament is equally close to the Greek original, and also represents a text made up of Alexandrine and Occidental readings.-Kitto.

This version was afterward revised and adapted to the Peshito in the sixth century, on the occasion of an ecclesiastical union between the Syrians and Armenians. Again, in the thirteenth century, an Armenian king, Hethom or Haitho, who was so zealous a Catholic that he turned Franciscan monk, adapted the Armenian version to the Vulgate, by way of smoothing the

way for a union of the Roman and Armenian churches. Lastly, the Bishop Uscan, who printed the first edition of this version at Amsterdam, in the year 1666, is also accused of having interpolated the text as it came down to his time by adding all that he found the Vulgate contained *more* than the Armenian version. The existence of the verse <sup><אנר></sup>1 John 5:7, in this version, is ascribed to this supplementary labor of Uscan. It is clear, from what has been said, that the critical uses of this version are limited to determining the readings of the Sept. and of the Greek text of the New Testament which it represents, and that it has suffered many alterations, which diminish its usefulness in that respect. See generally Walch, *Bibl. Theol.* 4:50, 247; Rosenmüller, *Handb. d. Literatur*, iii, 78-84, 153 sq. The following are the forms of this version hitherto published: 1. *Biblit*, jussu Jacobi protopatriarchae (Amst. 1666, 4to); *Biblia*, jussu patriarchae Nahabiet (Constpl. 1705, 4to); *Biblia*, jussu Abrahai patriarchae (Ven. 1733, fol.); *Biblia* (ed. Dr. Zohrab, Ven. 1805, 4 vols. 8vo and 1 vol. 4to); *id.* (Petropol. 1817, 4to; also Serampore, 1817, 4to); *Bible*, in mod. Armen. (Smyrna, 1853, 4to). 2. *Nov. Test.* (ed. Uscan, Amst. 1668, 8vo); *id.* (Amst. 1698, 12mo; Ven. 1720 and 1789, 8vo; Lond. 1818); *Nov. Test.*, in anc. and mod. Armen. (ed. Dr. Zohrab, Par. 1825, Ovo). Special parts and treatises are: *Obadias Armenus*, cur. A. Acoluthio (Lips. 1680); *Quatuor prima cap. Evang. Matthai* (ed. C. A. Bode, Hal. 1756); Bredenkamp, *Genauere Vergleichung d. armen. Uebersetzung des N.T.*, in Michaelis's *N. Orient. Bibl.* 7:139 sq.; Schroder, in his *Thes. ling. Armen.* **SEE VERSIONS.**

## Arm-Hole

(**dy**; **l yXai** *atstsil' yad*, *joinat of the hand*; Sept. **ἀγκὼν χειρός**). "Woe to the women that sew pillows to all arm-holes" (<sup><אנר></sup>Ezekiel 13:18), i.e. *elbows*, although the term has also been taken for the wrist, or for the knuckles of the hand. The true meaning is somewhat doubtful, for it evidently refers to some custom with which we are unacquainted. The women spoken of are no doubt the priestesses of Ashtaroth, and the object of the prophet is to denounce the arts they employed to allure God's chosen people to a participation in their idolatrous worship. Orientals, when they wish to be at their ease, recline on or against various kinds of rich pillows or cushions. The adulteress in the Proverbs (vii, 16) alludes to the costliness and richness of those that belonged to her divan or "bed" among the circumstances by which she sought to seduce "the young man

void of under. standing;" it is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that something of the same kind may be here intended. *SEE PILLOW*. The term also occurs in <sup>2482</sup>Jeremiah 38:12, in describing the release of the prophet from the dungeon of Malchiah.

## Armies.

*SEE ARMY*.

## Arminianism,

properly, the system of doctrine taught by James Arminius, especially with regard to the Augustinian theory of unconditional predestination, as revived and extended by Calvin and others in the Reformation. It is designated by Guthrie as that "gigantic recoil from Calvinism, than which no reaction in nature could have been more certainly predicted. Of all the actors in that movement-so fertile of mighty actors-no one played a more conspicuous, important, and trying part than Arminius. To high talent and cultivation, and to consummate ability as a disputant, Arminius added the ornament of spotless Christian consistency (his enemies being judges), and of a singularly noble, manly, and benevolent nature. This, with his conspicuous position, made his personal influence to be very potent and extensive. And yet few names have ever been overshadowed by a deeper and denser gloom of prejudice than his; to utter which, as Wesley remarked, was much the same, in some ears, as to raise the cry of *mad dog*. This is attributable partly to the latitudinarianism of some of his followers, who, revolting at the dominant faith, and maddened by oppression, resiled to the opposite extreme; and partly to the accidental circumstance that his milder scheme found general favor in the Church of England at a time when she stood in hostile relations to the English Puritans and the Scottish Presbyterians. But these were results with which neither the *man* Arminius nor the Arminian *principle* of conditionalism had any thing whatever to do. To trace them to him were not more just than to trace German Neology to Luther and Melancthon, and Socinianism to Calvin." (Preface to Brande's *Life of Arminius*.)

**I.** *Life, of Arminius and the Controversy in his time.* -The following sketch, so far as the facts of the life of Arminius is concerned, is modified from the *Biographical Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*.

JAMES ARMINIUS (Lat. *Jacobus Arminius*; Dutch, *Jacob Hermanson* or *Van Ierman*) was born Oct. 10, 1560, at Oudewater, a small town of Holland. As Oudewater means in Dutch "Old Water," Veteres Aquse, Arminius is sometimes surnamed in his works Veteraquinas. He lost his father, a cutler, in his infancy; but he found a protector in Theodorus Emilius, who had once been a Roman Catholic priest. AEmilius took Arminius with him to Utrecht, and sent him to the school of that place. In his 15th year Arminius lost his patron by death, but another protector, Rudolph Snellius, took him under his care, and removed him to Marburg (1575). Arminius had scarcely arrived at Marburg when he heard that his native town had been sacked by the Spaniards. Hurrying back to Oudewater, he found that his mother and his other relatives had been killed. He returned to Marburg on foot. He went thence to Rotterdam, and was received into the house of Peter Bertius, pastor of the Reformed Church. In the same year (1575) he was sent, with Peter Bertius the younger, to the University of Leyden, which had just been founded. After he had studied at Leyden for six years," the directors of the body of merchants" of Amsterdam undertook to bear the expenses of his education for the ministry, Arminius agreeing that after he had been ordained he would not serve in the church of any other city without the permission of the burgomasters of Amsterdam. In 1582 he was sent to Geneva, which was then the great school of theology for all the Reformed churches, and where the doctrines of Calvin were taught in their most rigorous shape by Theodore Beza. At Geneva Arminius formed a close friendship which united him through life with Uyttenbogaert of Utrecht. During his residence at Geneva he gave great offence to some of the Aristotelian teachers of the Geneva school by advocating in public and lecturing in private to his friends on the logic of Ramus as opposed to that of Aristotle. **SEE RAMUS.** This course created so much commotion that he left Geneva and went to Basle, where the faculty of divinity offered to confer upon him the degree of doctor gratis; but he declined it, considering himself too young, and in 1583 returned to Geneva, Where he continued his theological studies for three years more. In 1586 the fame of Zabarella, professor of philosophy at Padua, induced him to take a journey into Italy. From Padua he proceeded to Rome. After this journey Arminius came back to Geneva, and soon received an order from the burgomasters of Amsterdam to return to that town. He had taken this journey without their knowledge, and rumors had spread abroad that he had kissed the pope's slipper, held intercourse with the Jesuits, and especially with Cardinal

Bellarmino that, in short, he had become a Roman Catholic. The testimony of a friend who had travelled with him cleared him from these charges. Arminius used afterward to say that he derived no little benefit from this journey, as "he saw at Rome a mystery of iniquity much more foul than he had ever imagined." He was ordained at Amsterdam on the 11th of August, 1588, and he soon became distinguished as a preacher. The mild opinions of Melancthon on predestination had spread into Holland even before those of Calvin. In 1589 Theodore Koornhert, of Amsterdam, published several works, in which he attacked the doctrine of predestination, which was taught by Beza and the Genevan school. To obviate Koornhert's objections, some ministers of Delft proposed a change in Beza's doctrine. They agreed with Beza that divine predestination was the antecedent, unconditional, and immutable decree of God concerning the salvation or damnation of each individual; but whereas Beza represented that man, not considered as fallen, or even as created, was the object of this unconditional decree, the ministers of Delft made this peremptory decree subordinate to the creation and fall of man; that is to say, they adopted *sublapsarianism* in place of the *supralapsarianism* of Calvin and Beza. They thought this hypothesis would do away with Koornhert's objection that the doctrine of absolute decrees represented God as the author of sin—as such decrees made sin necessary and inevitable no less than damnation. Their view was published under the title *Responsio ad argumenta quaedam Bez, et Caklni, ex tractatu de Preadestinatione, in Cap. IX ad Romanos*. The book was sent to Lydius, professor at Franeker, who requested Arminius to answer it. He consented; but in studying the subject he began to doubt which of the two views to adopt, and at length became inclined to embrace the doctrine which he had undertaken to refute. Meanwhile, on the 16th of September, 1590, he married Elizabeth Reael, daughter of Laurent Rea'el, a judge and senator of Amsterdam. In the course of his sermons at Amsterdam, Arminius commenced an exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, in which some of the new views which he had adopted found expression. In 1593 he published *Lectures in Rom. IX*, in which he questions the view of that chapter given by Calvin and Beza. Disputes arose, but the consistory of Amsterdam gave an audience to the contending parties, and ordered them to cease all controversy until a general synod could be summoned to determine the subject of the dispute. In 1602 a pestilence raged at Amsterdam, during which Arminius showed the greatest courage and kindness in visiting the sick. The disease carried off two of the professors of the University of Leyden, Lucas Trelcatius, the

elder, and Francis Junius, professor of divinity. The curators of the university turned their eyes upon Arminius as a fit successor to Junius; but it was only after repeated applications on the part of the university that the authorities of Amsterdam consented to give him permission to leave on the 15th of April, 1603. As he had been charged with holding Pelagian views, before he was finally appointed he held a conference with Francis Gomar, who was also professor of divinity at Leyden, and who became afterward his capital enemy, at the Hague, the 6th of May, 1603, and the result was that Gomar declared the charge that he was a Pelagian to be groundless. At the same time, not only the curators of the university, but Gomar himself, were thoroughly aware that on the subject of predestination Arminius differed from the Genevan school. He underwent another examination, a private one, conducted by Gomar, for the degree of D.D., which he received 11th July, 1603. Arminius was the first on whom the University of Leyden conferred the degree of Doctor. One of the first observations of Arminius, after entering on the duties of his chair, was that the students were much more Liven to scholastic subtleties and disputations than to the thorough study of Scripture. He determined to cure this evil. With this view he reckoned nothing more important than to foreclose, as far as he could, crabbed questions and the cumbrous mass of scholastic assertions, and to inculcate on his disciples that divine wisdom which was drawn from the superlatively pure fountains of the Sacred Word, and was provided for the express purpose of guiding us to a life of virtue and happiness. From his first introduction into the academy it was his endeavor to aim at this mark, and give a corresponding direction to his studies both public and private. But truly this laudable attempt was in no small degree thwarted, partly by the jealousy which some had conceived against him, and partly also by a certain inveterate prejudice as to his heterodoxy, with which many ministers of religion had long been imbued, and under the impulse of which they stirred up his colleagues against him. The first germs, indeed, of this budding jealousy betrayed themselves in the following year (1604); for when Arminius, who had undertaken the task of interpreting the Old Testament in particular, proceeded also now and then to give a public exposition of certain portions of the New Testament, Gomar took this amiss, and began to allege that the right of expounding the New Testament belonged solely to him, as Primarius Professor of Sacred Theology, for this title had been conceded to him by the Senatus Academicus a short time prior to the arrival of Arminius. Nay, more; happening to meet Arminius, he felt unable to contain himself, and, in a burst of passion, broke out in



these words: 'You have invaded my professorship.' Arminius replied that he did not mean to detract any thing Whatever from the primacy of his colleague, and from the academic titles and privileges conferred upon him; and that he had not done him the slightest injury, having obtained license from the honorable curators to select themes of prelection at any time, not only from the Old-Testament, but also from the New, provided he did not encroach on the particular subject in which Gomar might be engaged" (Brandt, *Life of Arminius*, ch. vii).

On the 7th of February, 1604, Arminius propounded certain theses on predestination, of which the sum was this: " Divine predestination is the decree of God in Christ by which he has decreed with himself from eternity to justify, adopt, and gift with eternal life, to the praise of his glorious grace, the faithful whom he has decreed to gift with faith. On the other hand, reprobation is the decree of the anger or severe will of God, by which he has determined from eternity, for the purpose of showing his anger and power, to condemn to eternal death, as placed out of union with Christ, the unbelieving who, by their own fault and the just judgment of God, are not to believe." On the last day of October Gomar openly attacked these positions, and from this day may be dated the tumults which ensued. In 1605 Arminius was created rector magnificus of the University, which office he quitted February 8th, 1606. Meanwhile the disputes continued. Festus Honimius, a minister of Leyden, Johannes Kuchlinus, rector of the Theological Faculty, and uncle of Arminius, were among his warmest adversaries. Deputies from the churches of all the provinces of Holland, and deputies from the Synod of Leyden, required from him a conference on the subject of his opinions. Preachers attacked him from the pulpit as a Pelagian, and worse than a Pelagian. A national synod was demanded to settle the disputes. On 22d May, 1607, an assembly was held at the Hague, at which Arminius was present, to settle the manner in which the synod was to be held. In 1608 Arminius and Uytenbogaert applied to the States of Holland to convoke a synod, that these grave controversies might be settled. In the same year Arminius and Gomar held a conference before the Supreme Court of the Hague, which declared in its report that these two professors differed on points of little importance, and unessential to religion. Arminius gave in an account of his opinions to the States at the Hague on the 30th of October, 1608. (See the *Declaratio*, in his works.) Before the proposed synod could be held Arminius died. The disease which carried him off at last had long lain latent. It broke out on the 7th of

February, 1609, but he recovered so far as to resume the usual duties of his professorship, though still weak. At last he sunk under his disorder, and expired 19th October, 1609. His death was most painful; and to bodily pain was added mental anguish at the misrepresentations of his religious opinions and of his personal character made by his embittered foes. The curators of the University of Leyden allowed his wife and children a pension.

Arminius was one of the most learned men of a learned age. His natural faculties were singularly acute; his mind was at once inquisitive and profound; and his industry in study equalled his capacity. As a preacher he was exceedingly popular; in sweetness of voice, ardor of manner, and finish of style, he was distinguished above all his contemporaries. His personal manners were of the most attractive kind; he grappled his friends by hooks of steel. The funeral oration delivered by Bertius ends with the phrase, "fuisse in Batavia virum quem qui norant non potuerunt satis existimare; qui non aestimarunt, non satis cognoverunt." His writings, though inferior in point of Latinity to those of Calvin and Grotius, bear ample testimony to his learning, and to his skill in logic. He was so thoroughly versed in the ancient fathers, and so much of an adept in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, that his opinions carried along with them a weight among the learned which his antagonists could not well resist. Neander calls him the "model of a conscientious and zealously investigating theologian" (*Hist. of Dogmas*, ii, 276). His opponents accused him of Pelagianism and Arianism, but no theologian of any pretence to learning will at present sustain these accusations. The same temper of mind which led him to renounce the peculiarities of Calvinism induced him also to adopt more enlarged and liberal views of church communion than those which had prevailed before his time. While he maintained that the mercy of God is not confined to a chosen few, he conceived it to be quite inconsistent with the genius of Christianity that men of that religion should keep at a distance from each other, and constitute separate churches, merely because they differed in their opinions as to some of its doctrinal articles. He thought that Christians of all denominations should form one great community, united and upheld by the bonds of charity and brotherly love; with the exception, however, of Roman Catholics, who, on account of their idolatrous worship and persecuting spirit, must be unfit members of such a society. His great disciple, the republican Barneveldt, was perhaps the first European statesman that made religious toleration one of his maxims. In fact, the

Arminians of Holland were the real fathers of religious toleration; they were the first society of Protestants who, when in possession of power, granted the same liberty of conscience to others which they claimed for themselves.

Before setting forth the theological views of Arminius, a brief historical review of the church doctrine as to predestination may not be out of place. Before the time of Augustine (fourth century), the unanimous doctrine of the church fathers, so far as scientifically developed at all, was, that the Divine decrees, as to the fate of individual men, were conditioned upon their faith and obedience, as foreseen in the Divine mind. Augustine, in his controversy with Pelagius, with a view to enhance the glory of grace, was the first to teach, unequivocally, that the salvation of the elect depends upon the bare will of God, and that his decree to save those whom he chooses to save is unconditioned. Augustine did not teach the doctrine of unconditional reprobation; that doctrine was first formally taught by Gottschalk (q.v.) in the ninth century. His views were condemned at Mentz, A.D. 848. In the Reformation period, Luther and Melancthon first inclined to Augustine's theory, but, finding that it involved the reception of Gottschalk's as well, they went back to the primitive doctrine of conditional election. Luther, indeed, never formally retracted some of his characteristically strong expressions made at early periods in his history; but there are indications enough that his views coincided with those of Melancthon, who took out of the later editions of his *Leci Communes* all expressions favoring unconditional predestination. The Lutheran Church to this day follows Melancthon. Calvin, however, adopted unconditional election and reprobation in the strongest form, and built his whole theological system upon it. His genius impressed the age wonderfully, and the Reformed churches generally adopted his doctrines. The churches of the Netherlands were founded partly by Lutherans and partly by Calvinists. and so both sets of opinions had currency there. But the Belgic Confession (q.v.), which was Calvinistic, was invested with a *quasi* national authority from the year 1570. The larger part of the clergy of the Netherlands were undoubtedly Calvinists at the time of the appearance of Arminius, though freedom of thought on the controverted points had not been suppressed before his time. His rejection of the doctrine was the result of long, calm, and patient study of the Scriptures. His task was to restore the primitive and scriptural view of the relations between God and man in the work of salvation, and of the sole responsibility of man for his own damnation; and

nobly did he perform it. "The great error which he had to combat consisted in making the Divine efficiency with relation to *one* temporal phenomenon, viz., the readjustment of the disturbed relation of God and the sinner an exception-making the relation of the Divine efficiency to that phenomenon essentially unlike its relation to any other temporal phenomenon in the universe. The church had held that every exercise of the Divine efficiency, in relation to temporal phenomena, was subjectively conditioned by Divine wisdom, omniscience, and goodness; Calvinism, on the other hand, maintained that *this particular* exercise of Divine efficiency was absolutely unconditioned, and was grounded solely upon the arbitrary good pleasure of God. The refutation of this error, and the re-establishment of the opposite view, was the mission of Arminius." (Warren, in *Meth. Quarterly Review*, July, 1857, 350.)

The views of Arminius on the points of predestination and grace are presented in the following articles, drawn up almost entirely in words which may be found in his writings:

**(1.)** God, by an eternal and immutable decree, ordained in Jesus Christ, his Son, before the foundation of the world, to save in Christ, because of Christ, and through Christ, from out of the human race, which is fallen and subject to sin, those who by the grace of the Holy Spirit believe in the same his Son, and who, by the same grace, persevere unto the end in that faith and the obedience of faith; but, on the contrary, to leave in sin and subject to wrath those who are not converted and are unbelieving, and to condemn them as aliens from Christ, according to the Gospel, ~~ARMS~~ John 3:36.

**(2.)** To which end Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, died for all and each one, so that he has gained for all, through the death of Christ, reconciliation and remission of sins; on this condition, however, that no one in reality enjoys that remission of sins except the faithful man, and this, too, according to the Gospel, ~~ARMS~~ John 3:16, and ~~ARMS~~ 1 John 2:2.

**(3.)** But man has not from himself, or by the power of his free will, saving faith, inasmuch as in the state of defection and sin he cannot think or do of himself any thing good, which is, indeed, really good, such as saving faith is; but it is necessary for him to be born again and renewed by God in Christ through his Holy Spirit, in his mind, affections, or will, and all his faculties, so that he may be able to understand, think, wish, and perform something good, according to that saying of Christ in ~~ARMS~~ John 15:5.

(4.) It is this grace of God which begins, promotes, and perfects every thing good, and this to such a degree that even the regenerate man without this preceding or adventitious grace, exciting, consequent, and co-operating, can neither think, wish, or do any thing good, nor even resist any evil temptation: so that all the good works which we can think of are to be attributed to the grace of God in Christ. But as to the manner of the operation of that grace, it is not irresistible, for it is said of many that they resisted the Holy Spirit, in ~~405~~ Acts 7:51, and many other places.

(5.) Those who are grafted into Christ by a true faith, and therefore partake of his vivifying Spirit, have abundance of means by which they may fight against Satan, sin, the world, and their own flesh, and obtain the victory, always, however, by the aid of the grace of the Holy Spirit; Jesus Christ assists them by his Spirit in all temptations, and stretches out his hand; and provided they are ready for the contest, and seek his aid, and are not wanting to their duty, he strengthens them to such a degree that they cannot be seduced or snatched from the hands of Christ by any fraud of Satan or violence, according to that saying, ~~308~~ John 10:28, " No one shall pluck them out of my hand." But whether these very persons cannot, by their own negligence, desert the commencement of their being in Christ, and embrace again the present world, fall back from the holy doctrine once committed to them, make shipwreck of their conscience, and fall from grace; this must be more fully examined and weighed by the Holy Scripture before men can teach it with full tranquillity of mind and confidence. This last proposition was modified by the followers of Arminius so as to assert the possibility of falling from grace. In his scheme of theology Arminius "accepted the church's developed ideas respecting God and respecting man, and then expounded with keen dialectical rigor the only doctrine which could harmonize the two. His mission was to point out *how* God could be what the church taught that he was, and man what the church declared him to be, at one and the same time. The readjustment of the disturbed and abnormal relations of man to God, by justification, is the central thought of Protestant theology; the announcement and exposition of their relations in that readjustment was the work of Arminius. Magnify either of the related terms to the final suppression of the other, and error is the result. Magnify the Divine agency to the complete suppression of the human in that readjustment, and fatalism is inevitable. Magnify the human to the complete suppression of the Divine, and extreme Pelagianism is the result. To Arminius is the church indebted for her first vivid apprehension and

scientific statement of the Christian doctrine of the relation of man to God."

The services of Arminius to theology are summed up as follows by Watson (*Miscellaneous Works*, 7:476): "They preserved many of the Lutheran churches from the tide of supralapsarianism, and its constant concomitant, Antinomianism. They moderated even Calvinism in many places, and gave better countenance and courage to the sublapsarian scheme; which, though logically, perhaps, not much to be preferred to that of Calvin, is at least not so revolting, and does not impose the same necessity upon men of cultivating that hardihood which glories in extremes and laughs at moderation. They gave rise, incidentally, to a still milder modification of the doctrine of the decrees, known in England by the name of Baxterianism, in which homage is, at least in words, paid to the justice, truth, and benevolence of God. They have also left on record, in the beautiful, learned, eloquent, and, above all these, the scriptural system of theology furnished by the writings of Arminius, how truly man may be proved totally and hereditarily corrupt, without converting him into a machine or a devil; how fully secured, in the scheme of the redemption of man by Jesus Christ, is the divine glory, without making the Almighty partial, wilful, and unjust; how much the Spirit's operation in man is enhanced and glorified by the doctrine of the freedom of the human will, in connection with that of its assistance by Divine grace; with how much lustre the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ shines, when offered to the assisted choice of all mankind, instead of being confined to the forced acceptance of a few; how the doctrine of election, when it is made conditional on faith foreseen, harmonizes with the wisdom, holiness, and goodness of God, among a race of beings to all of whom faith was made possible; and how reprobation harmonizes with justice, when it has a reason, not in arbitrary will, the sovereignty of a pasha, but in the principles of a I righteous government."

The earliest authority for the life of Arminius is Petrus Bertius, *De Vita et Obitu J. Arminii Oratio*. The fullest account is given by Caspar Brandt, *Historia Vitae J. Arminii* (Amst. 1724, 8vo), a posthumous work, edited by Gerhard Brandt, son of Caspar. It was republished, with a preface and notes, by Mosheim (Brunswick, 1725, 8vo); and a translation, by Guthrie (Lond. 1854, 18mo). See also Bangs, *Life of Arminius* (N. Y. 1843). The chief sources of information as to the early period of the controversy between the Arminians and Calvinists are as follows: Arminian writers,

Uyttenbogaert, *Kerckelijcke Historie... oornamentlijck in deze geunieerde provincien* (Rotterdam, 1647, fol.); Gerhard Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie*, etc., which is the most copious account extant (Amst. 1663, 8vo; 1671, 4to; transl. into English by Chamberlayne, Lond. 1720, 4 vols. fol.); Limborch, *Historia Vitae Sim. Episcopi* (Amst. 1701, 8vo), and *Relatio Historica de Origine et Progressu Controversiarum in Foederato Belgio de Praedestinatione*, etc., which last work is subjoined to the later editions of his *Theologia Christiana* (transl. *Methodist Quarterly*, July, 1844, p. 425). For other writers, see Cattenburgh, *Bibliotheca Scriptor. Remonstrant.* (Amst. 1728, 4to); and citations under art. **SEE REMONSTRANTS**. On the Calvinistic side the chief works are, Jac. Triglandius, *Den recht-ghematichden Christen* (Amst. 1615, 4to); *Kerckelijcke geschiedenessen van de vereen. Nederlanden* (Lugd. Bat. 1650, fol., written to oppose Uyttenbogaert's history); Jacobus Leydekker, *Eere van de Nationale Synode van Dordrecht* (Amst. 1705-1707, 4to); *Acta Synodi Nationalis*, etc. (Dort, 1620, 4to). **SEE DORT**. The writers on the Synod of Dort are enumerated by Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, lib. 6:c. 4, vol. 11:p. 723. Mosheim (*Eccl. Hist.*) had well studied the whole controversy, and his account is impartial. Prof. Stuart, of Andover, published a favorable and able treatise on "The Creed of Arminius, with a brief Sketch of his Life and Times," in the *Biblical Repository* (Andover, 1831, vol. i). See also *Lit. and Theol. Review*, 6:337. But the views of Arminius are nowhere better set forth, in small compass, than by the Rev. W. F. Warren (*Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1857), and by Dr. Whedon (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1864).-*Arminii. Opera Theologica* (Lugd. Bat. 1629, 4to); *Works of James Arminius*, translated by Nicholls and Bagnall (best ed. 3 vols. 8vo, N.Y. 1843).

## II. *From the death of Arminius to the present time.*

1. The dispute ran high after the death of Arminius, and with increased bitterness. The clergy and laity of Holland were arrayed into two hostile armies Gomarists and Arminians; the former being the most numerous, but the latter including the leading scholars and statesmen. In 1610 the Arminians presented a petition to the States of Holland and West Friesland, which was called a "Remonstrance" (*Remonstrantia, libellus supplicis adhibitus Hollandice et West Frisice ordinibus*). They were named REMONSTRANTS **SEE REMONSTRANTS** (q.v.) in consequence; and, as the Calvinists presented a "Counter-Remonstrance," they were called Contra- Remonstrants. The "Remonstrance" sets forth the Arminian theory

over against the Calvinistic in five articles, substantially as given above, but in briefer form. Attempts were made by the authorities to reconcile the two contending parties by a conference between them at the Hague in 1611, a discussion at Delft in 1613, and also by an edict in 1614, enjoining peace. At last the States-General issued an order for the assembling of a national synod. It met at Dort, in Holland, and opened on November 13th, 1618, and its sittings continued through that and the following year. This famous synod condemned entirely the " five articles" in which the Arminians expressed their opinions. *SEE DORT*. These articles had been drawn up in 1610, presented in the conference at the Hague in 1611, and finally laid before the Synod of Dort. To fix the sense of the passages in the Scriptures which related to the dispute, a new Dutch translation of the whole Bible, from the original Hebrew and Greek, was undertaken at the command of the synod. This new version was published in 1637. The Arminians, being dissatisfied with the version of the New Testament, made another version of the New Testament from the Greek, which was published at Amsterdam in 16e0. The Arminians were subjected to severe penalties. Their great leader, Barneveldt, died on the scaffold on a political pretence. They were all deprived of their sacred and civil offices, and their ministers were forbidden to preach. For an account of these persecutions, see Calder, *Life of Episcopius*, xv. Many retired to Antwerp and France; a considerable body emigrated to Holstein, upon the invitation of Friederich, duke of Holstein, and built the town of Frederickstadt in the duchy of Schleswig. After the death of Maurice in 1625, the Arminians were allowed to return, and a decree of 1630 authorized them to build churches and schools. The exiles from France and the Spanish Netherlands came back and established congregations in various places, particularly at Rotterdam and Amsterdam. At Amsterdam they founded a school, in which Simon Episcopius was the first professor of theology. *SEE EPISCOPIUS*; and for a fuller account of the fortunes of the Remonstrant party, *SEE REMONSTRANTS*.

**2.** In 1621, Episcopius, at the request of the leading Remonstrants, drew up a formula of faith under the title *Confessio seu declaratio sententiae pastorum qui in Fad. Belg. Remonstrantes vocantur* (Episc. *Opp.* ii, 69), in 25 chapters, which was widely circulated. A *censura* of this confession was published by Polyander and four other Leyden professors, to which Episcopius replied in his *Apologia pro Confessione*, 1630. The "Confessio" disappointed the Gomarists, for it was perfectly sound on the Trinity, thus refuting the charge of Socinianism brought against the Arminians. It was



received with great favor by the Lutherans. A number of eminent names adorn the literary history of Arminianism in Holland and France; among them the most prominent, besides Episcopius, are Curcellaeus, Vossius, Grotius, Casaubon, Limborch, Le Clerc, and Wetstein (all to be found under the proper heads in this Cyclopaedia). It is to be regretted that in the hands of some of these eminent men Arminianism was corrupted by semi-rationalism.

**3.** The effect of the controversy appeared in France in the modified Calvinism of Amyraldus (q.v.). Nor was the dispute confined to the reformed churches. During the whole of the sixteenth century the Church of Rome was agitated with the controversy upon grace and free-will. The Benedictines and Dominicans had already broken the ground; but the battle raged in its greatest fury between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, the latter being ably represented by the religious of the monastery of Port Royal, near Paris. Here again it happened, as in Holland, that the controversy extended itself from religion to politics. The Jansenists of France became the reformers of the age, the men of free thought and bold discussion, while the Jesuit party were the advocates of the court and the old abuses, both in church and state. At the same time, it is a curious fact that in Holland the Arminians were the friends of liberty and free discussion, in France the Calvinists; the two parties had changed places. The Jesuits, who were Arminians, were now the persecutors, and the Jansenists, or Calvinists, the patient and afflicted sufferers. *SEE JANSENISTS.*

**4.** In Germany, the Lutherans, of course, sympathized fully in the Arminian movement. In the Reformed Church the decisions of Dort were admitted as authoritative for a time; but "this outward show of victory was really a defeat; for the true elements of Arminianism were not killed at Dort, but grew up, silently but surely, within the bosom of the orthodox Reformed Church.... In the period of Wolfianism the Reformed dogmatics were finally purged from the doctrine of absolute predestination" (Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik*, i, § 38). It is a shrewd remark of Nicholls, that had there been a great religious body, apart from Calvin's followers, with which all Protestants who did not adopt Luther's doctrine of the sacraments might have united themselves, the doctrines of Calvin would not have been so widely diffused on the Continent between 1540 and 1600 (*Calvinism and Arminianism*, I. iv).

5. In England the so-called Arminian doctrines were held, in substance, long before the time of Arminius. The Articles of Religion are regarded by some writers as Calvinistic, by others as Arminian. The truth seems to be that they were meant to be ambiguous, or, to use a kinder word, comprehensive, so as to leave liberty of opinion in the church on a question so obscure and difficult. On this point, see, on the Arminian side, Burnet, *Exposition of Thirty-nine Articles*; Laurence, *Bampton Lecture*, 1804; Fletcher, *Works*, ii, 216, 218; Browne, *On Thirty-nine Articles* (Lond. 1864, 4th ed.): and on the Calvinistic side, Cunningham, *Reformers and Theology of the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1862, Essay iv; also in *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* No. 35, and reprinted in *Amer. Theol. Rev.* Oct. 1861, art. v). It is certain that Cranmer had a hand in drawing up the *Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man* (1543), just before the compilation of the Articles, and that book (*the Eracdition*) is by no means Calvinistic. Latimer, Hooper, Bilson, Andrews, Overall, and Hooker "might with propriety have been called Arminians, had Arminianism, as a system of doctrine, prevailed when they wrote" (Nicholls, *Calvinism and Arminianism*, I, xcvi). Bare (q.v.), professor of divinity at Cambridge, taught Arminianism, and his case gave rise to the Lambeth Articles (q.v.). But Arminianism unfortunately became a political question. Two Arminian bishops, Laud and Juxon, became members of his majesty's privy council at the precise juncture when the liberty of the subject and the prerogative of the crown were brought into direct competition. John Playfere, Margaret professor at Cambridge (t 1608), published a strong defence of the Arminian doctrine, under the title of *An Appeal to the Gospel for the true Doctrine of Predestination* (republished in Cambridge Tracts, 1717). Dr. Samuel Hoard, rector of Moreton (t 1657), originally a Calvinist, became a strong Arminian, and published *God's Love to Mankind manifested by disproving his absolute Decree for their Damnation* (Lond. 1633, 4to), which called forth answers by Davenant, Twisse, and Amyraut. In the civil war the Arminians gradually ranged themselves with King Charles, the Calvinists with Parliament. But John Goodwin (q.v.), who was ejected in 1645, was one of the ablest defenders of Arminianism in his time. See Jackson, *Life of Goodwin* (1822, 8vo). When the war was over the Church of England was destroyed, and Arminianism seemed to have perished with it. The restoration of Charles II took place (1660); Arminianism returned with prelacy, and held for more than half a century almost undisputed sway in the Church of England. It must be observed, however, that as the Arminianism of Laud differed from that of the Dutch leader in many points,

so did that of the divines of Charles II and their successors in many more. Laud combined it with views of sacramental efficacy which Arminius would have denounced as superstitious; the later school of divines, though far from Socinianism, threw the doctrines of grace into the shade, and dwelt more on the example of Christ than his atonement. Among the eminent Episcopal Arminian divines of England are Cudworth, Pierce, Jeremy Taylor, Tillotson, Chillingworth, Stillingfleet, Womack, Burnet, Pearson, Sanderson, Heylyn, Whitby, Patrick, Tomline, Coplestone, Whately, etc. Arminianism at last, in the Church of England, became a negative term, implying a negation of Calvinism rather than any exact system of theology whatever. Much that passed for Arminianism was, in fact, Pelagianism. In the Church of England, most of those theologians who have deviated from the golden mean maintained by Arminianism (between Calvinism on the one hand and Pelagianism on the other) have fallen into error as to the Trinity, while those who have adhered to the evangelical doctrine of Arminius have retained all the verities of the orthodox faith. The pure doctrine of Arminianism arose again in England in the great Wesleyan Reformation of the seventeenth century. Its best expositions may be found in the writings of John Wesley, John Fletcher, and Richard Watson, whose *Theological Institutes* (best edit. N. Y. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo) is the most complete Arminian body of divinity extant in English. Its system is the same as that of the orthodox Protestant churches in general, except so far as the question of predestination and the points connected with it are concerned. "As some heterodox writers have called themselves Arminians, and as the true theory of Arminianism has been often grossly maligned, it may be proper here to allude to certain points with regard to which it has been especially misrepresented. If a man hold that good works are necessary to justification; if he maintain that faith includes good works in its own nature; if he reject the doctrines of original sin; if he deny that divine grace is requisite for the whole work of sanctification, if he speak of human virtue as meritorious in the sight of God, it is very generally charged by Calvinists that he is an Arminian. But the truth is, that a man of such sentiments is properly a disciple of the Pelagian - and Socinian schools. To such sentiments pure Arminianism is as diametrically opposite as Calvinism itself. The genuine Arminians assert the corruption of human nature in its full extent. They declare that we are justified by faith only. They assert that our justification originates solely in the grace of God. They teach that the procuring and meritorious cause of our justification is the righteousness of Christ. *Propter quam*, says

Arminius, *Deus credentibus peccatum condonat, eosque pro justis riputat non aliter atque si legem perfect implevissent.* [For the sake of which God pardons believers, and accounts them as righteous precisely as if they had perfectly obeyed the law.] They admit in this way that justification implies not merely forgiveness of sin, but acceptance to everlasting happiness. *Junctam habet adoptionem in filios, et collationem juris in hereditatem vitæ eterne.* [It has connected with it adoption to sonship, and the grant of a right to the inheritance of eternal life.] They teach, in fine, that the work of sanctification, from its very commencement to its perfection in glory, is carried on by the operation of the Holy Spirit, which is the gift of God by Jesus Christ" (*Edinb. Encyclopedia*, s.v.).

"The whole sum and substance of religious doctrine and theory is embraced in these three terms: God's nature, man's nature, and the relation subsisting between the two. Theology is nothing more than the systematic definition, adjustment, and exposition of these three terms. Christian theology, or genuine orthodoxy, is simply a system of theological views upon these three points, which is self-coherent, and harmonious with the teachings of Scripture. For the development of such a system, exhibiting the precise truth relative to these cardinal points, without redundancy or defect, it is necessary that each of these three points be made a special object of scrutiny and discussion. An error in respect to either will not only destroy at once the system's self-coherence, but infallibly conduct to the gravest heresies. For example, an error respecting the first (Theology) may give us Pantheism; an error on the second point (Anthropology) may lead to Atheism; while an erroneous theory respecting the third gives us the two extremes of an iron fate or a groundless chance. True orthodoxy states and maintains a consistent doctrine respecting each, authenticated by the assertions of God's revelations. Casting now a philosophic eye upon the doctrine of the church as developed in history, we cannot fail to be struck by the remarkable fact that the three great controversies which trisect the historic developments of Christian doctrine as a scientific system have followed without deviation the natural order of these three terms. That development has hinged successively upon each in order. Athanasius, Augustine, and Arminius represent in themselves the whole sweep of the dogmatic unfoldment of Christianity; these factors being given, we can construct the whole history of Christian doctrine. The first is the representative of that speculative movement which developed into scientific form and defensible shape the ecclesiastical doctrine respecting

God's nature; the second, of the subsequent movement by which the true doctrine of man's being was evolved; the third, of the still later and scarcely yet completed one by which the relations of the two are instigated and defined.

"The ancient church believed vaguely in the true divinity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit; but Athanasius was raised up to explain with clearness, to maintain, and to bring forth into suitable prominence the great doctrine of a substantial triunity of the Divine essence, under all temporal manifestations of separate bypostases, on which suppositions only the ancient beliefs of the church and the unqualified declarations of Scripture could be true. His mission was the enunciation, exposition, and defence of a great truth respecting the Divine nature, and round that truth was grouped all the Christian thinking of that age. There was no great doctrinal system of the time, heretical or not, which was not logically related to this centre thought of the church. It implied in itself all anterior and all subsequent speculations upon the Divine nature, Origenistic, Arian, Sabellian, Monophysitic, Nestorian, or orthodox.

"Augustine was commissioned for another *work*. The church, in the centuries antecedent to his appearance, had vaguely believed in the depravity and helplessness of human nature; but Augustine was raised, up to explain with clearness, and to maintain, and to bring forth in suitable prominence, the great doctrine of the native corruption and moral ruin of man; his utter hopelessness apart from the remedial agencies of Divine grace, on which supposition only the ancient beliefs of the church and the unqualified declarations of Scripture could be true. His mission was the enunciation, exposition, and defense of a great truth, respecting human nature, and round that truth as grouped all Christian thinking of that age. It is this which gives that age its character. The whole scholastic theology is but the radicated and ramified outgrowth of that vital germ of truth. To him is the church indebted for her first vivid apprehension and scientific statement of the Christian doctrine of man. Augustine is the historical representative of that organic evolution. The third of these divinely appointed representative men laid hold of both these truths, which for sixteen centuries had been developing; accepted the church's developed ideas respecting God; and respecting man, and then expounded with keen dialectical rigor the only doctrine which could harmonize the two. His mission was to point out how God could be what the church taught that he was, and man what the church declared him to be, at one and the same

time. The readjustment of the disturbed and abnormal relations of man to God by justification is the central thought of Protestant theology; the announcement and exposition of their relations in that readjustment was the work of Arminius. And not until Arminius is placed in this relation to the doctrinal development of Christianity in the church is there attained a true perception of the grand and growing rhythm of its history." The Predestinarians (as remarked above) erred by maintaining that the particular exercise of Divine efficiency, by which the abnormal relation of God to a sinner is readjusted, was unconditioned by anything whatsoever, and was grounded solely upon the arbitrary good pleasure of the Almighty. Maintaining this unconditioned elective volition, they naturally demanded an "effectual calling," "irresistible grace," and "persevering success," for all these were-necessary concomitants. The refutation of this error, and the establishment of the opposite view, was the mission of Arminius. His labors gave scientific form to the ecclesiastical opinion upon the third great point, and completed the cycle of Christian theology. As in the development of apostolic doctrine, the Pauline and Petrine clements were unified in John, so, in its uninspired development, after Athanasius had set forth his truth, and Augustine his, Arminius steps forth the later apostle of dogmatic completion (Dr. Warren, in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1857, p. 346 sq.). *SEE WESLEYANISM.*

The Arminian doctrine on predestination is now very widely diffused in the Protestant world. It is, in the main, coincident with that of the Lutherans in Germany; is held by the Wesleyan Methodist churches throughout the world; by a large part of the Church of England, and by many of the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. It is substantially the doctrine (on the question of predestination) of the Greek and Roman churches; and it is also held by several of the minor sects. For the sources of information, see the writers above referred to, and also Episcopius, *Institut. Theol.* (1650); Limborch, *Theologia Christiana* (1686); Calder, *Lije of Episcopius* (N. Y. 12mo); Wesley, *Works* (N.Y. 7 vols. 8vo); Watson, *Theol. Institut.* (2 vols. 8vo); Nicholls, *Calvinism and Arminianism compared* (Lond. 1824, 2 vols. 8vo); Fletcher, *Complete Works* (N. Y. 1850, 4 vols. 8vo); Neander, *Hist. rf Christ. Dogmas*, ii, 678 sq.; Art. *Arminius*, by W. F. Warren, *Meth. Q. Rev.* July, 1857; Schweitzer, *Die Protest. Ctetraldogmen*, ii, 31 sq.; Gass, *Geschichte d. Prot. Dogmatic*, i, 379 sq.; Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik*, § 24-43 (transl. in *Mercersburg Review*, ix and x); Francke, *Hist. Dgm. Armin.* (Kiel, 1814,

8vo); Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, ch. xxv (Calvinistic; Edinb. 1864, 2 vols. 8vo); Schneckenburger, *Vergl. Darstellung d. luther. und reform. Lehrbegriffs* (Stuttg. 1855, 8vo); Schenkel, *Wesen des Protestantismus* (Schaffhauien, 2d ed. 1862, 8vo); Whedon, *Freedom of the Will* (N. Y. 1864, 12mmo); Warren, *Systematische Theologie*, Einleitung (Bremen, 1865, 8vo); Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, l.k. 4:ch. viii; Lk. v, ch. vi; Smith's Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 225, 235; Gieseler, *Ch. History*, 4:§ 43 (N. Y. ed.). A list of the earlier Arminian writings is given in Van Cattenburgh, *Bibloth. Script. Remonstr.* (Amstel. 1728, 8vo). **SEE CALVINISM; SEE BAXTER; SEE DORT; SEE METHODISM; SEE GRACE; SEE PREDESTINATION; SEE REMONSTRANCE.**

**Arminius.**

**SEE ARMINIANISM.**

**Armlet**

**Picture for Armlet 1**

**Picture for Armlet 2**

**Picture for Armlet 3**

(represented by **hd** [ **x** **h** ], *etsadah*, <sup><0615></sup>Numbers 31:50; <sup><1010></sup>2 Samuel 1:10; Sept. **κλιδών**; Aquila **βραχιάλιον**; *Vulg. periscelis armilla*; properly a fetter, from **d** [ **k** ; to *step*; comp. <sup><2130></sup>Isaiah 3:20, and **SEE ANKLET** ), an ornament universal in the East, especially among women; worn by princes as one of the insignia of royalty, and by distinguished persons in general. The word is not used in the A. V., as even in <sup><1010></sup>2 Samuel 1:10, they render the Heb. term "by the bracelet on his arm." Sometimes only one was worn, on the right arm (Ecclus. 21:21). From <sup><2136></sup>Song of Solomon 8:6, it appears that the signet sometimes consisted of a jewel on the armlet. These ornaments are frequent on the sculptures of Persepolis and Nineveh, and were set in rich and fantastic shapes resembling the heads of animals (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 250). The kings of Persia wore them, and Astyages presented a pair, among other ornaments, to Cyrus (Xen. *Cyr.* i, 3). The Ethiopians, to whom some were sent by Cambyses, scornfully characterized them as weak fetters (Herod. ii, 23). Nor were they confined to the kings, since Herodotus (viii, 113) calls the Persians generally "wearers of bracelets" (**ψελιοφόροι**). In the Egyptian monuments kings

are often represented with armlets and bracelets (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 375, and Plates 1, 2, 14). They were even used by the old British chiefs (Turner, *Angl. Sax.* i, 383). The story of Tarpeia shows that they were common among the ancient Sabines, but the Romans considered the use of them effeminate, although they were sometimes given as military rewards (Liv. 10:44). Finally, they are still worn among the most splendid regalia of modern Oriental sovereigns, and it is even said that those of the King of Persia are worth a million sterling (Kitto, *Pict. Hist. of Pal.* i, 499). They form the chief wealth of modern Hindu ladies, and are rarely taken off. They are made of every sort of material, from the finest gold, jewels, ivory, coral, and pearl, down to the common glass rings and varnished earthenware bangles of the women of the Deccan. Now, as in ancient times, they are sometimes plain, sometimes enchased; sometimes with the ends not joined, and sometimes a complete circle. The arms are sometimes quite covered with them, and if the wearer be poor, it matters not how mean they are, provided only that they glitter. It is thought essential to beauty that they should fit close, and hence Harmer calls them "rather manacles than bracelets," and Buchanan says that "the poor girls rarely get them on without drawing blood, and rubbing part of the skin from the hand; and as they wear great numbers, which often break, they suffer much from their love of admiration." Their enormous weight may be conjectured from <sup>(1218)</sup>Genesis 24:24. *SEE BRACELET.*

### Armon.

*SEE CHESTNUT.*

### Armo'ni

(Heb. *Armoni'*, *יְנוֹמֵי*) prob. inhabitant of a *fortress*, q. d. *Palatinus*; Sept. *Ἀρμωνί*, *Ἐρμωνοΐ*), the first named of the two sons of Saul and Rizpah, who was given up by David to be hanged with his brethren by the Gibeonites (<sup>(1218)</sup>2 Samuel 21:8, 9). B.C. cir. 1019.

### Armor

represented in the Auth. Vers. by several Heb. words, Gr. *ὄπλα*), properly distinguished from ARMS as being military equipment for the *protection* of the person, while the latter denotes implements of *aggressive* warfare; but in the English Bible the former term alone is employed in both senses. In the records of a people like the children of Israel, so large a part of whose



history was passed in warfare, we naturally look for much information, direct or indirect, on the arms and modes of fighting of the nation itself and of those with whom it came into contact. Unfortunately, however, the notices that we find in the Bible on these points are extremely few and meagre, while even those few, owing to the uncertainty which rests on the true meaning and force of the terms, do not convey to us nearly all the information which they might. This is the more to be regretted because the notices of the history, scanty as they are, are literally every thing we have to depend on, inasmuch as they are not yet supplemented and illustrated either by remains of the arms themselves, or by those commentaries which the sculptures, vases, bronzes, mosaics, and paintings of other nations furnish to the notices of manners and customs contained in their literature. (See, generally, Jahn's *Archeology*, § 266-285.) In order to give a clear view of this subject, we shall endeavor to show, succinctly and from the best authorities now available, what were the martial instruments borne upon the person, whether for attack or resistance, by the ancient Asiatics, leaving for other proper heads an explanation of the composition and tactical condition of their armies, their systems of fortification, their method of conducting sieges and battles, and their usages of war as regards spoil, captives, etc. *SEE BATTLE; SEE FORTIFICATION; SEE SIEGE; SEE WAR, SEE ARMY; SEE FIGHT, SEE FORTRESS*, etc.

## I. OFFENSIVE WEAPONS.

### Picture for Armor 1

1. The instruments at first employed in the chase or to repel wild beasts, but converted by the wicked to the destruction of their fellow-men, or used by the peaceable to oppose aggression, were naturally the most simple. Among these were the club and the throwing-bat. The first consisted originally of a heavy piece of wood, variously shaped, made to strike with, and, according to its form, denominated a mace, a bar, a hammer, or a maul. This weapon was in use among the Hebrews, for in the time of the kings wood had already been superseded by metal; and the *l zrbifbye sherbet barzel'*, "rod of iron" (<sup>300</sup>Psalm 2:9), is supposed to mean a mace, or gavellock, or crowbar. It is an instrument of great power when used by a strong arm; as when, in modern menageries, a man with one in his hand compels a tiger's ferocity to submit to his will. (See Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, i, 327, fig. 3, 4; and mace, fig. 1, 2. The throw. stick, or *lissan*, occurs p. 329.) *SEE ROD; SEE SCEPTRE*. The other was also known if,

as is probable, /ypimēphits' (<sup><1258></sup>Proverbs 25:18), be a "maul," a martel, or a war-hammer. It is likely metal was only in general use at a later period, and that a heavy crooked billet continued long to serve both as a missile and a sword. The throwstick, made of thorn-wood, is the same instrument which we see figured on Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. By the native Arabs it is still called *Asian*, and was anciently known among us by the name of crooked billet. The Australians are exceedingly skillful in the use of this implement, called by them the *boomerang*. These instruments, supplied with a sharp edge, would naturally constitute a battle-axe and a kind of sword; and such in the rudest ages we find them, made with flints set into a groove, or with sharks' teeth firmly secured to the staff with twisted sinews. On the earliest monuments of Egypt, for these ruder instruments is already seen substituted a piece of metal, with a steel or bronze blade fastened into a globe, thus forming a falchion-axe; and also a lunateblade, riveted in three places to the handle, forming a true battle-axe (Wilkinson, i, 325, 326); and there were, besides, true bills or axes, in form like our own. *SEE MAUL; SEE AXE.*

## Picture for Armor 2

2. Next came the *dirk* or poniard, which, in the Ho brew word *brj* , *chereb'* (usually translated "sword"), may possibly retain some allusion to the original instrument made of the antelope's horn, merely sharpened, which is still used in every part of the East where the material can be procured. From existing figures, the dirk appears to have been early made of metal in Egypt, and worn stuck in a girdle (Wilkinson, i, 319); but, from several texts (<sup><1173></sup>1 Samuel 17:39; <sup><1118></sup>2 Samuel 20:8; <sup><1111></sup>1 Kings 20:11), it is evident that the real sword was slung in a belt, and that "girding" and "loosing the sword" were synonymous terms for commencing and ending a war. The blades were, it seems, always short (one is mentioned of a cubit's length); and the dirk-sword, at least, was always double-edged. The sheath was ornamented and polished. In Egypt there were larger and heavier swords, more nearly like modern *tulwars*, and of the form of an English round-pointed table-knife. But, while metal was scarce, there were also swords which might be called quarter-pikes, being composed of a very short wooden handle, surmounted by a spear-head. Hence the Latin *telum* and *ferrum* continued in later ages to be used for *gladius*. In Nubia swords of heavy wood are still in use. *SEE SWORD; SEE KNIFE.*

### Picture for Armor 3

3. The "spear, *j mīrōro'mach*, was another offensive weapon common to all the nations of antiquity, and varied much in size, weight, and length. Prob. ably the shepherd Hebrews, like nations similarly situated in northern Africa, anciently made use of the horn of an oryx, or a leucoryx, above three feet long, straightened in water, and sheathed upon a thornwood staff. When sharpened, this instrument would penetrate the hide of a bull, and, according to Strabo, even of an elephant: it was light, very difficult to break, resisted the blow of a battle-axe, and the animals which furnished it were abundant in Arabia and in the desert east of Palestine. At a later period the head was of brass, and afterward of iron. Very ponderous weapons of this kind were often used in Egypt by the heavy infantry; and, from various circumstances, it may be inferred that among the Hebrews and their immediate neighbors, commanders in particular were distinguished by heavy spears. Among these were generally ranked the most valiant in fight and the largest in stature; such as Goliath, "whose spear was like a weaver's beam" (<sup><B170></sup>1 Samuel 17:7), and whose spear's head weighed six hundred shekels of iron, which by some is asserted to be equal to twenty-five pounds' weight. The spear had a point of metal at the butt end to fix it in the ground, perhaps with the same massy globe above it which is still in use, intended to counterbalance the point. It was with this ferrel that Abner slew Asahel (<sup><B122></sup>2 Samuel 2:22, 23). The form of the head and length of the shaft differed at different times both in Egypt and Syria, and were influenced by the fashions set by various conquering nations. *SEE SPEAR.*

### Picture for Armor 4

The *javelin*, named *tynj }chanith'* (usually rendered "spear"), and *~/dyKi kidon'* (variously rendered " spear," " shield," etc.), may have had distinct forms: from the context, where the former first occurs, it appears to have been a species of dart carried by light troops (<sup><B132></sup>1 Samuel 13:22; Psalm iv); while the latter, which was heavier, was most likely a kind of *pilum*. In most nations of antiquity, the infantry, not bearing a spear, carried two darts, those lightly armed using both for long casts, and the heavy-armed only one for that purpose; the second, more ponderous than the other, being reserved for throwing when close to the enemy, or for handling in the manner of a spear. This explanation may throw light on the fact of the

*chanith* being named in connection with the **חנאי** *tsinnaht*, or larger buckler (<sup><13234></sup>1 Chronicles 12:34), and may reconcile what is said of the *chidon* (<sup><1323></sup>Job 39:23; 41:29, and <sup><1380></sup>Joshua 8:10). While on the subject of the javelin, it may be remarked that, by the act of casting one at David (<sup><1369></sup>1 Samuel 19:9,10), Saul virtually absolved him from his allegiance; for by the customs of ancient Asia, preserved in the usages of the Teutonic and other nations, the *Sachsenrecht*, the custom of the East Franks, etc., to throw a dart at a freedman, who escaped from it by flight, was the demonstrative token of manumission given by his lord or master; he was thereby sent out of hand, *manumissus*, well expressed in the old English phrase "scot-free." But for this act of Saul, David might have been viewed as a rebel. *SEE DART; SEE JAVELIN; SEE LANCE.*

## Picture for Armor 5

**4.** But the chief offensive weapon in Egypt, and, from the nature of the country, it may be inferred, in Palestine also, was the *war-bow*, **tvq**, *ke'sheth* ("bow"), the *arrow* being denominated **/j** *echets*. From the simple implements used by the first hunters, consisting merely of an elastic reed, a branch of a tree, or rib of palm, the bow became in the course of time very strong and tall, was made of brass, of wood backed with horn, or of horn entirely, and even of ivory; some being shaped like the common English bow, and others, particularly those used by riding nations, like the buffalo horn. There were various modes of bending this instrument, by pressure of the knee, or by the foot, treading the bow, or by setting one end against the foot, drawing the middle with the hand of the same side toward the hip, and pushing the upper point forward with the same hand, till the thumb passed the loop of the string beyond the neck. The horned bows of the cavalry, shaped like those of the Chinese, occur on monuments of antiquity. They cannot be bent from their form of a Roman C to that of what is termed a Cupid's bow, but by placing one end under the thigh; and as they are short, this operation is performed by Tatar riders while in the saddle. This was the Parthian bow, as is proved by several Persian bass-reliefs, and may have been in use in the time of the Elamites, who were a mounted people. These bows were carried in cases to protect the string, which was composed of deer sinews, from injury, and were slung on the right hip of the rider, except when on the point of engaging. Then the string was often cast over the head, and the bow hung upon the breast,

with the two nocks above each shoulder, like a pair of horns. *SEE BOW; SEE ARCHER.*

### Picture for Armor 6

The arrows were likewise enclosed in a case or "*quiver*," *yl ꞒꞒ' teli'*, hung sometimes on the shoulder, and at other times on the left side; and six or eight flight-arrows were commonly stuck in the edge of the cap, ready to be pulled out and put to the string. The infantry always carried the arrows in a quiver on the right shoulder, and the bow was kept unbent until the moment of action. On a march it was carried on the shield arm, where there was frequently also a horn bracer secured below the elbow to receive the shock from the string when an arrow was discharged. The flight or long-range arrows were commonly of reed, not always feathered, and mostly tipped with flint points; but the shot or aimed arrows, used for nearer purposes, were of wood tipped with metal, about thirty inches long, and winged with three lines of feathers, like those in modern use: they varied in length at different periods, and according to the substance of the bows. *SEE ARROW; SEE QUIVER; SEE SHOOT.*

### Picture for Armor 7

5. The last missile instrument to be mentioned is the "*sling*," *[Ꞓ Ꞓ, ke'la* (<sup><18428></sup>Job 41:28), an improvement upon the simple act of throwing stones. It was the favorite weapon of the Benjamites, a small tribe, not making a great mass in an order of battle, but well composed for light troops. They could also boast of using the sling equally well with the left hand as with the right. The sling was made of plaited thongs, somewhat broad in the middle, to lodge the stone or leaden missile, and was twirled two or three times round before the stone was allowed to take flight. Stones could not be cast above 400 feet, but leaden bullets could be thrown as far as 600 feet. The force as well as precision of aim which might be attained in the use of this instrument was remarkably shown in the case of David; and several nations of antiquity boasted of great skill in the practice of the sling. *SEE SLING.*

### Picture for Armor 8

All these hand-weapons were in use at different periods, not only among the Hebrews and Egyptians, but likewise in Assyria, Persia, Greece, and Macedonia; in which last country the *sarissa* carried by the heavy infantry

of the phalanx differed from the others only in the great length of the shaft. The Roman *pilum* was a kind of dart, distinguished from those of other nations chiefly by its weight, and the great proportional length of the metal or iron part, which constituted one half of the whole, or from two and a half to three feet. Much of this length was hollow, and received nearly twenty inches of the shaft within it; the point was never hooked like that of common darts, because, the weapon being nearly indestructible, the soldiers always reckoned upon advancing in battle and recovering it without trouble when thrown; whereas, if it had been hooked or hamate, they could not have wrenched it out of hostile shields or breast-plates without trouble and delay. *SEE WEAPON.*

## II. DEFENSIVE ARMS.

1. The most ancient protective piece of armor was the *Shield*, buckler, roundel, or target, composed of a great variety of materials, very different in form and size, and therefore in all nations bearing a variety of names. The Hebrews used the word **hNxi**; *tsinnah'* (rendered "shield," "target," or "buckler"), for a great shield-defence, protection (<sup>Q150</sup>Genesis 15:1; <sup>Q179</sup>Psalms 47:9; <sup>Q185</sup>Proverbs 30:5) which is commonly found in connection with spear, and was the shelter of heavily-armed infantry; **gæ**; *magen'* (rendered "shield" or "buckler"), a buckler or smaller shield, which, from a similar juxtaposition with sword, bow and arrows, appears to have been the defence of the other armed infantry and of chiefs; and **hrj so** *socherah'* (only once, <sup>Q194</sup>Psalms 91:4, "buckler"), *parma*, a roundel, which may have been appropriated to archers and slingers; and there was the **fl v**, *she' let* ("shield"), synonymous with the *magen*, only different in ornament. In the more advanced eras of civilization shields were made of light wood not liable to split, covered with bull-hide of two or more thicknesses, and bordered with metal; the lighter kinds were made of wicker-work or osier, similarly, but less solidly covered; or of double oxhide cut into a round form. There were others of a single hide, extremely thick from having been boiled; their surface presented an appearance of many folds, like round waves up and down, which might yield, but could rarely be penetrated.

### Picture for Armor 9

We may infer that at first the Hebrews borrowed the forms in use in Egypt, and that their common shields were a kind of parallelogram, broadest and

arched at the top, and cut square beneath, bordered with metal, the surface being covered with raw hide with the hair on. The lighter shields may have been soaked in oil and dried in the shade to make them hard; no doubt hippopotamus, rhinoceros, and elephant skin shields were brought from Ethiopia and purchased in the Phoenician markets; but small round hand-bucklers of whale-skin, still used by Arabian swordsmen, came from the Erythrean Sea. During the Assyrian and Persian supremacy the Hebrews may have used the square; oblong, and round shields of these nations, and may have subsequently copied those of Greece and Rome. The princes of Israel had shields of precious metals; all were managed by a wooden or leathern handle, and often slung by a thong over the neck. With the larger kinds a testudo could be formed by pressing the ranks close together; and, while the outside men kept their shields before and on the flanks, those within raised theirs above the head, and thus produced a kind of surface, sometimes as close and fitted together as a pantile roof, and capable of resisting the pressure even of a body of men marching upon it. The *tsinnah* was most likely what in the feudal ages would have been called a *pavise*, for such occurs on the Egyptian monuments. This weapon was about five feet high, with a pointed arch above and square below, resembling the feudal knight's shield, only that the point was reversed. This kind of large-sized shield, however, was best fitted for men without any other armor, when combating in open countries, or carrying on sieges; for it may be remarked in general that the military buckler of antiquity was large in proportion as other defensive armor was wanting. Shields were hung upon the battlements of walls, and, as still occurs, chiefly above gates of cities by the watch and ward. In time of peace they were covered to preserve them from the sun, and in war uncovered; this sign was poetically used to denote coming hostilities, as in <sup>2326</sup>Isaiah 22:6, etc. In Europe, where the Crusaders could imitate the Saracens, but not introduce their climate, shields were carved in stone upon towers and gates, as at York, etc. The Eastern origin of this practice seems to be attested by the word *Zinne*, which, in German, still denotes a battlement, something pointed, a summit, and conveys the idea of a pavise with the point uppermost, a shape such as Arabian battlements often assume. *SEE SHIELD; SEE BUCKLER.*

## Picture for Armor 10

## Picture for Armor 11

2. The *Helmet* was next in consideration, and in the earliest ages was made of osier or rushes, in the form of a bee-hive or of a skull-cap. The skins of the heads of animals--of lions, bears, wild boars, bulls, and horses--were likewise adopted, and were adorned with rows of teeth, manes, and bristles. Wood, linen cloth in many folds, and a kind of felt, were also in early use, and helmets of these materials may be observed worn by the nations of Asia. At war with the conqueror kings of Egypt, even before the departure of Israel. At that time also these kings had helmets of metal, of rounded or pointed forms, adorned with a figure of the serpent *Kneph*; and an allied nation, perhaps the Carian, reported to have first worn a military crest, bears on the skull-cap of their brazen helmets a pair of horns with a globe in the middle--the solar arkite symbol. The nations of farther Asia, however, used the woolen or braided caps still retained, and now called *kaoukl* and *fez*, around which the turban is usually wound. These were almost invariably supplied with long lappets to cover the ears and the back of the head, and princes usually wore a radiated crown on the summit. This was the form of the Syrian, and probably of the Assyrian helmets, excepting that the last mentioned were of brass, though they still retained the low cylindrical shape. The [b/K, *ko'ba* ("helmet"), some helmet of this kind, was worn by the trained infantry, who were spearmen among the Hebrews; but archers and slingers had round skull-caps of skins, felts, or quilted stuffs, such as are still in use among the Arabs. The form of Greek and Roman helmets, both of leather and of brass, is well known; they were most likely adopted also by the Hebrews and Egyptians during their subjection to those nations, but require no farther notice here. *SEE HELMET.*

## Picture for Armor 12

## Picture for Armor 13

3. *Body Armor.*--The most ancient Persian idols are clad in shagged skins, such as the Aegis of Jupiter and Minerva may have been, the type being taken from a Cyrenaean or African legend, and the pretended red goat-skin may be supposed to have been that of a species of gnu (*Catoblepas Gorgon*, Ham. Smith), an animal fabled to have killed men by its sight, and



therefore answering to the condition both of a kind of goat and of producing death by the sight alone. In Egypt cuirasses were manufactured of leather, of brass, and of a succession of iron hoops, chiefly covering the abdomen and the shoulders; but a more ancient national form was a kind of thorax, tippet, *ʿyrvi shiryon'* ("coat of mail," "habergeon"), or *ʿyrvi shiryān'* ("harness," "breastplate"), or square, with an opening in it for the head, the four points covering the breast, back, and both upper arms. This kind in particular was affected by the royal band of relatives who surrounded the Pharaoh, were his subordinate commanders, messengers, and body-guards, bearing his standards, ensign-fans, and sun-screens, his portable throne, his bow and arrows. Beneath this square was another piece, protecting the trunk of the body, and both were in general covered with red-colored cloth or stuff. On the oldest fictile vases a shoulder-piece likewise occurs, worn by Greek and Etruscan warriors. It covers the upper edge of the body armor, is perforated in the middle to allow the head to pass, but hangs equal on the breast and back, square on the shoulders, and is evidently of leather. (See the figure of Menelaus discovering Helen in the sack of Troy, Millin, *Mon. inedits.*) This piece of armor occurs also on the shoulders of Varangi (northmen, who were the bodyguards of the Greek emperors); but they are studded with roundels or bosses, as they appear figured in mosaic or fresco on the walls of the cathedral of Ravenna, dating from the time of Justinian. The late Roman legionaries, as published by Du Choul, again wear the tippet armor, like that of the Egyptians, and one or other of the above forms may be found on figures of Danes in illuminated manuscripts of the eleventh century. By their use of metal for defensive armor the Carians appear to have created astonishment among the Egyptians, and therefore may be presumed to have been the first nation so protected in western Asia; nevertheless, in the tombs of the kings near Thebes, a tegulated hauberk is represented, composed of small three-colored pieces of metal—one golden, the other reddish and green. It is this suit which Denon represents as composed of rings set on edge; but they are all parallelograms, with the lower edge forming the segment of a circle, and each piece, beside the fastening, has a button and a vertical slit above it, giving flexibility by means of the button of each square working in the aperture of the piece beneath it. This kind of armor may be meant by the word *arj Ti tachra'* ("habergeon," only <sup>1283</sup>Exodus 28:32; 39:23), the closest interpretation of which appears to be *decussatio, tegulatio*, a tiling. The expression in <sup>1483</sup>2 Chronicles 18:33, may be that Ahab was struck in one of the grooves or slits in the squares of such a *shirsyan*, or between

two of them where they do not overlap; or perhaps, with more probability, between the metal hoops of the trunk of the *shiryon* before mentioned, where the thorax overlaps the abdomen. The term ϣϣϣϣϣϣ *kaskassim'* (elsewhere "scales"), in the case of Goliath's armor, denotes the squamous kind, most likely that in which the pieces were sewed upon a cloth, and not hinged to each other, as in the *tackha*. It was the defensive armor of Northern and Eastern nations, *tnh* Persian Cataphracti, Parthians, and Sarmatians. But of true annular or ringed mail, Denon's figure being incorrect, we doubt if there is any positive evidence, excepting where rings were sewn separately upon cloth, anterior to the sculpture at Takt-i-Bustan, or the close of the Parthian era. The existence of mail is often incorrectly inferred from our translators using the word wherever flexible armor is to be mentioned. The *tachra* could not well be worn without an undergarment of some density to resist the friction of metal; and this may have been a kind of *sagum*, the *shiryon* of the Hebrews, under another form—the dress Saul put upon David before he assumed the breastplate and girdle. The Roman *sagum* offers a parallel instance. Under that name it was worn at first a *lorica*, then beneath it, and at last again without, but the stuff itself made into a kind of felt.

## Picture for Armor 14

## Picture for Armor 15

The *Cuirass* and *Corslet*, strictly speaking, were of prepared leather (*corium*), but often also composed of quilted cloths: the former in ancient times generally denoted a suit with leathern appendages at the bottom and at the shoulder, as used by the Romans; the latter, one in which the barrel did not come down below the hips, and usually destitute of leathern *vittce*, which was nationally Greek. In later ages it always designates a breast and back piece of steel. It is, however, requisite to observe that, in estimating the meaning of Hebrew names for armor of all kinds, they are liable to the same laxity of use which all other languages have manifested; for in military matters, more perhaps than in any other, a name once adopted remains the same, though the object may be changed by successive modifications till there remains but little resemblance to that to which the designation was originally applied. The objects above denominated appendages and *vittce* (in the feudal ages, lambrequins), were straps of leather secured to the lower rim of the barrel of a suit of armor, and to the openings for arm-holes the first were about three and a half inches in width; the second, two

and a half. They were ornamented with embroidery, covered with rich stuffs and goldsmiths' work, and made heavy at the lower extremity, to cause them always to hang down in proper order; but those on the arm-holes had a slight connection, so as to keep them equal when the arm was lifted. These vittae were rarely in a single row, but in general formed two or three rows, alternately covering the opening between those underneath, and then protecting the thighs nearly to the knee, and half the upper arm. In the Roman service, under the suit of armor, was the *sagum*, made of red serge or baize, coming down to the cap of the knee and folding of the arm, so that the vittae hung entirely upon it. Other nations had always an equivalent to this, but not equally long; and, in the opinion of some, the Hebrew *shiryon* served the same purpose. The Roman and Greek suits were, with slight difference, similarly laced together on the left, or shield side; and on the shoulders were bands and clasps, comparatively narrow in those of the Romans, which covered the joinings of the breast and back pieces on the shoulders, came from behind. and were fastened to a button on each breast. At the throat the suit of armor had always a double edging, often a band of brass or silver; in the Roman, and often in the Greek, adorned with a lion's or a Gorgon's head. It was here that, in the time of Augustus, and probably much earlier, the warriors distinguished for particular acts of valor wore insignia; a practice only revived by the moderns under the names of crosses and decorations. The Romans, it appears, had *phiale* and *phalerce* of honor, terms which have been supposed to signify bracelets and medals; but all opinion on the subject was only conjectural previously to the discovery, on the borders of the Rhine, of a monumental bass-relief, raised by the freedman of Marcus Cnilius Lembo, tribune of the (xix) 18th legion, who fell in the disastrous overthrow of Varus. The effigy is of three-quarter length, in a full suit of armor, with a laurel crown on the head, a Gallic twisted *torque* round the neck; and from the lion-head shoulder-clasps of the cuirass hang two embossed bracelets, having beneath them a label with three points, from which are suspended five medals of honor; one large, on the pit of the stomach, representing a face of Medusa; and two on each side, one beneath the other; and all, as far as can be seen, charged with lions' faces and lions' heads in profile. The monument is now in the museum of the university at Bonn. *SEE COAT OF MAIL.*

## Picture for Armor 16

The *girdle*, or, more properly, the baldric or belt (*cingula* or *balteus*), was used by the Hebrews under the name of *r/zaʕezor'* ("girdle"); it was of leather, studded with metal plates or *bulge*; when the armor was slight, broad, and capable of being girt upon the hips; otherwise it supported the sword scarf-wise from the shoulder. *SEE GIRDLE.*

## Picture for Armor 17

4. *Greaves* were likewise known, even so early as the time of David, for Goliath wore them. They consisted of a pair of shin-covers of brass or strong leather, bound by thongs round the calves and above the ankles. They reached only to the knees, excepting among the Greeks, whose greaves, elastic behind, caught nearly the whole leg, and were raised in front above the knees. The Hebrew word *ʕ/\$] seona* ("battle"), in <sup><395></sup>Isaiah 9:5, is supposed to mean a halfgreave, though the passage is altogether obscure. Perhaps the war-boot may be explained by the warshoe of Egypt with a metal point; and then the words might be rendered, "For every greave of the armed foot is with confused noise and garments rolled in blood," etc., instead of "every battle of the warrior," etc. But, after all, this is not, quite satisfactory. *SEE BREASTPLATE GREAVES.*

## Armor-Bearer

(*ʕyl kəʕʕvn*, *nose' kelim'*), an officer selected by kings and generals from the bravest of their favorites, whose service it was not only to bear their armor, but to stand by them in danger and carry their orders, somewhat after the manner of adjutants in modern service. (<sup><705></sup>Judges 9:54; <sup><946></sup>1 Samuel 14:6; 16:21; 33:4.)

## Armory

(*h/YPI T] talpiyoth'*, *destructives*, i.e. *weapons*, Cant. 4:4), the place in which armor was deposited in times of peace. Solomon had a naval arsenal at Ezion-geber (<sup><200></sup>Jeremiah 1:25; <sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 9:26). There is mention made in <sup><1089></sup>Nehemiah 3:19, of an armory (*qvne'shek*, elsewhere *armor*) in Jerusalem, "at the turning of the wall," meaning probably the bend in the brow of Zion opposite the south-western corner of the Temple, near where the bridge connected them, although Josephus (*Ant.* 9:7, 2) speaks of the

armory as being in the temple itself. This was probably the arsenal ("house of armor") which Hezekiah took so much pride in showing to the Babylonian ambassadors (<sup><230E></sup>Isaiah 39:2). Dr. Barclay (*City of the Great King*, p. 155) thinks it was the same as "the house of the forest of Lebanon" (<sup><2007></sup>2 Kings 10:17; <sup><2218></sup>Isaiah 22:8), and locates it at the north-eastern corner of Zion, adjoining the north-western angle of the Xystus.  
*SEE ARSENAL.*

### Armstrong, James,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Ireland in 1787 or 8, emigrated in childhood, was converted in Philadelphia at seventeen, licensed as local preacher in Baltimore at twenty-four, emigrated to Indiana in 1821 and entered the itinerant ministry, in which he labored with ability and great success until his death, which occurred in Laporte county Sept. 12, 1834.-*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 344.

### Armstrong, John,

a Baptist minister, was born Nov. 27, 1798, at Philadelphia, graduated at Columbian College, Washington, D. C., in 1825, and became pastor of the Baptist Church in Newbern, N. C., where he remained several years. In 1835 Mr. Armstrong was appointed professor in Wake Forest Institute; and, being desirous of increasing his usefulness, travelled for some time in 1837-39 in Europe. In 1840 he became pastor of the church in Columbus, Miss., whence he removed in 1843 to his plantation in Noxubee county, Miss., where he died Sept. 15, 1844.-Sprague, *Annals*, 6:753.

### Armstrong, William Jessup, D.D.,

an eminent Presbyterian minister, born at Mendham, N. J., Oct. 29, 1796, and graduated at Princeton in 1816, was licensed to preach in 1818. He labored in Trenton and Richmond till 1834, when he became secretary to the Am. Bd. Comm. for Foreign Missions. By the wreck of the steamer Atlantic in Long Island Sound, Nov. 27, 1846, he was drowned. A *Memoir*, by Rev. H. Read, with *A Selection of Armstrong's Sermons*, was published in 1853.-Sprague, *Annals*, 4:612.

### Army,

represented by several Heb. and Gr. words. *SEE WAR.*

**I. Jewish.** — The military organization of the Jews commenced with their departure from the land of Egypt, and was adapted to the nature of the expedition on which they then entered. Every man above 20 years of age was a soldier (<sup><0400></sup>Numbers 1:3); each tribe formed a regiment, with its own banner and its own leader (<sup><0402></sup>Numbers 2:2; 10:14); their positions in the camp or on the march were accurately fixed (Num. 2); the whole army started and stopped at a given signal (<sup><0405></sup>Numbers 10:5, 6); thus they came up out of Egypt ready for the fight (<sup><0238></sup>Exodus 13:18). That the Israelites preserved the same exact order throughout their march may be inferred from Balaam's language (<sup><0406></sup>Numbers 24:6). On the approach of an enemy, a conscription was made from the general body under the direction of a muster-master (originally named **rfwp** <sup><0515></sup>Deuteronomy 20:5, "officeri" afterward **rpēs**, <sup><0259></sup>2 Kings 25:19, "scribe of the host," both terms occurring, however, to ether in <sup><0401></sup>2 Chronicles 26:11, the meaning of each being primarily a *writer*), by whom also the officers were appointed (<sup><0519></sup>Deuteronomy 20:9). From the number so selected some might be excused serving on certain specified grounds (<sup><0515></sup>Deuteronomy 20:5-8; 1 Macc. 3:56). The army was then divided into thousands and hundreds under their respective captains (**μϋϗ aη; rçī** and **t/Wāirci** <sup><0514></sup>Numbers 31:14), and still farther into families (<sup><0424></sup>Numbers 2:34; <sup><0425></sup>2 Chronicles 25:5; 26:12), the family been regarded as the unit in the Jewish polity. From the time the Israelites entered the land of Canaan until the establishment of the kingdom, little progress was made in military affairs: their wars resembled *border forays*, and the tactics turned upon stratagem rather than upon the discipline and disposition of the forces. Skilfully availing themselves of the opportunities which the country offered, they gained the victory sometimes by an ambush (<sup><0604></sup>Joshua 8:4), sometimes by surprising the enemy (<sup><0609></sup>Joshua 10:9; 11:7; <sup><0072></sup>Judges 7:21), and sometimes by a judicious attack at the time of fording a river (<sup><0038></sup>Judges 3:28; 4:7; 7:24; 12:5). No general muster was made at this period; but the combatants were summoned on the spur of the moment either by trumpet-call (<sup><0027></sup>Judges 3:27), by messengers (<sup><0405></sup>Judges 6:35), by some significant token (<sup><0117></sup>1 Samuel 11:7), or, as in later times, by the erection of a standard (**sne** <sup><0383></sup>Isaiah 18:3; <sup><0402></sup>Jeremiah 4:21; 51:27), or a beacon-fire on an eminence (<sup><0401></sup>Jeremiah 6:1). **SEE BATTLE.**

With the kings arose the custom of maintaining a body-guard, which formed the *nucleus* of a standing army. Thus Saul had a band of 3000

select warriors (<sup><0132></sup>1 Samuel 13:2; 14:52; 24:2), and David, before his accession to the throne, 600 (<sup><0213></sup>1 Samuel 23:13; 25:13). This band he retained after he became king, and added the CHERETHITES and PELETHITES (<sup><0158></sup>2 Samuel 15:18; 20:7), together with another class, whose name, *Shaleshim'* ( $\mu\upsilon\nu\alpha\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ ; Sept.  $\tau\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota$ , Auth. Vers. "a third part"), has been variously interpreted to mean

- (1.) a corps of veteran guards = Roman *triarii* (Winer, *Lex. Heb.* p. 991);
- (2.) chariot warriors, as being *three* in each chariot (Gesen. *Thes.* p. 1429);
- (3.) officers of the guard, *thirty* in number (Ewald, *Gesch.* ii, 601). The fact that the Egyptian war-chariot, with which the Jews were first acquainted, contained but two warriors, forms an objection to the second of these opinions (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*, i, 335), and the frequent use of the term in the singular number (<sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 7:2; 9:25; 15:25) to the third. Whatever be the meaning of the name, it is evident that it indicated officers of high rank, the chief of whom ( $\nu\upsilon\lambda\ \mu\eta\iota$ ; "lord," <sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 7:2, or  $\mu\upsilon\nu\upsilon\lambda\ \mu\eta\iota\ \nu\alpha\rho$ , "chief of the captains," <sup><1218></sup>1 Chronicles 12:18) was immediately about the king's person, as adjutant or secretary-at-war. David further organized a national militia, divided into twelve regiments, each of which was called out for one month in the year under their respective officers (<sup><1270></sup>1 Chronicles 27:1); at the head of the army when in active service he appointed a commander-in-chief ( $\alpha\beta\chi\ \alpha\rho\kappa\iota$ ; "captain of the host," <sup><0145></sup>1 Samuel 14:50).

Hitherto the army had consisted entirely of infantry ( $\gamma\iota\ \gamma\upsilon\tau\iota$ ; <sup><0040></sup>1 Samuel 4:10; 15:4), the use of horses having been restrained by divine command (Deut, 17:16). The Jews had, however, experienced 'the great advantage to be obtained by chariots, both in their encounters with the Canaanites (<sup><0176></sup>Joshua 17:16; <sup><0019></sup>Judges 1:19), and at a later period with the Syrians (<sup><1004></sup>2 Samuel 8:4; 10:18). The interior of Palestine was indeed generally unsuited to the use of chariots; the Canaanites had employed them only in the plains and valleys, such as Jezreel (<sup><0176></sup>Joshua 17:16), the plain of Philistia (Judges i, 19; <sup><0135></sup>1 Samuel 13:5), and the upper valley of the Jordan (<sup><0109></sup>Joshua 11:9; <sup><0042></sup>Judges 4:2). But the border, both on the side of Egypt and Syria, was admirably adapted to their use; and accordingly we find that as the foreign relations of the kingdoms extended, much importance was attached to them. David had reserved a hundred chariots from the spoil of the Syrians (<sup><1004></sup>2 Samuel 8:4): these probably served as

the foundation of the force which Solomon afterward enlarged through his alliance with Egypt (<sup><1208></sup>2 Kings 10:28, 29), and applied to the protection of his border, stations or barracks being erected for them in different localities (<sup><1009></sup>1 Kings 9:19). The force amounted to 1400 chariots, 4000 horses, at the rate (in round numbers) of three horses for each chariot, the third being kept as a reserve, and 12,000 horsemen (<sup><1208></sup>2 Kings 10:26; <sup><4014></sup>2 Chronicles 1:14). At this period the organization of the army was complete; and we have, in <sup><1022></sup>1 Kings 9:22, apparently a list of the various gradations of rank in the service, as follow:

- (1.) **hmj l Mhiyvæþi**; "men of war" = *privates*;
- (2.) **µydbf**; "servants," the lowest rank of officers = *lieutenants*;
- (3.) **µyrç**; "princes" = *captains*;
- (4.) **µyvjl iv**; "captains," already noticed, perhaps = *staff-officers*;
- (5.) **bkrh;yre**; and **µyvrPhiyre**; "rulers of his chariots and his horsemen" = *cavalry officers*. *SEE CAPTAIN*.

It does not appear that the system established by David was maintained by the kings of Judah; but in Israel the proximity of the hostile kingdom of Syria necessitated the maintenance of a standing army. The militia was occasionally called out in time of peace, as by Asa (<sup><1448></sup>2 Chronicles 14:8), by Jehoshaphat (<sup><4474></sup>2 Chronicles 17:14), by Amaziah (<sup><4275></sup>2 Chronicles 25:5), and lastly by Uzziah (<sup><4451></sup>2 Chronicles 26:11); but these notices prove that such cases were exceptional. On the other hand, the incidental notices of the body-guard lead to the conclusion that it was regularly kept up (<sup><1148></sup>1 Kings 14:28; <sup><2104></sup>2 Kings 11:4, 11). Occasional reference is made to war-chariots (<sup><1181></sup>2 Kings 8:21), and it would appear that this branch of the service was maintained until the wars with the Syrians weakened the resources of the kingdom (<sup><1237></sup>2 Kings 13:7); it was restored by Jotham (Isaiah ii, 7), but in Hezekiah's reign no force of the kind could be maintained, and the Jews were obliged to seek the aid of Egypt for horses and chariots (<sup><1283></sup>2 Kings 18:23, 24). This was an evident breach of the injunction in <sup><1576></sup>Deuteronomy 17:16, and met with strong reprobation on the part of the prophet Isaiah (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 31:1). *SEE CHARIOT*.

With regard to the arrangement and manœuvring of the army in the field, we know but little. A division into three bodies is frequently mentioned (<sup><0776></sup>Judges 7:16; 9:43; <sup><0911></sup>1 Samuel 11:11; <sup><1082></sup>2 Samuel 18:2); such a division served various purposes: in action there would be a centre and two



wings; in camp, relays for the night-watches (<sup><0179></sup>Judges 7:19); and by the combination of two of the divisions, there would be a main body and a reserve, or a strong advanced guard (<sup><093E></sup>1 Samuel 13:2; 25:13).

Jehoshaphat divided his army into five bodies, corresponding, according to Ewald (*Geschichte*, iii, 192), to the geographical divisions of the kingdom at that time: may not, however, the threefold principle of division be noticed here also, the heavy-armed troops of Judah being considered as the proper army, and the two divisions of light-armed of the tribe of Benjamin as an appendage (<sup><4474></sup>2 Chronicles 17:14-18)? *SEE FIGHT*.

The maintenance and equipment of the soldiers at the public expense dates from the establishment of a standing army; before which, each soldier armed himself, and obtained his food either by voluntary offerings (<sup><1078></sup>2 Samuel 17:28, 29), by forced exactions (<sup><0253></sup>1 Samuel 25:13), or by the natural resources of the country (<sup><0947></sup>1 Samuel 14:27); on one occasion only do we hear of any systematic arrangement for provisioning the host (<sup><0210></sup>Judges 20:10). It is doubtful whether the soldier ever received pay even under the kings (the only instance of pay being mentioned applies to mercenaries, <sup><4236></sup>2 Chronicles 25:6); but that he was maintained, while on active service, and provided with arms, appears from <sup><1047></sup>1 Kings 4:27; 10:16, 17; <sup><1234></sup>2 Chronicles 26:14: notices occur of an arsenal or armory, in which the weapons were stored (<sup><1143></sup>1 Kings 14:28; <sup><4689></sup>Nehemiah 3:19; <sup><2044></sup>Song of Solomon 4:4). *SEE ARMOR*.

The numerical strength of the Jewish army cannot be ascertained with any degree of accuracy; the numbers, as given in the text, are manifestly corrupt, and the various statements therefore irreconcilable. At the Exodus the number of the warriors was 600,000 (<sup><0237></sup>Exodus 12:37), or 603,350 (<sup><0335></sup>Exodus 38:26; Num. i, 46); at the entrance into Canaan, 601,730 (Num. 26:51). In David's time the army amounted, according to one statement (<sup><1349></sup>2 Samuel 24:9), to 1,300,000, viz. 800,000 for Israel and 500,000 for Judah; but according to another statement (<sup><3205></sup>1 Chronicles 21:5, 6) to 1,470,000, viz. 1,000,000 for Israel and 470,000 for Judah. The militia at the same period amounted to 24,000X12=288,000 (<sup><3200></sup>1 Chronicles 27:1 sq.). At a later period the army of Judah under Abijah is stated at 400,000, and that of Israel under Jeroboam at 300,000 (<sup><4438></sup>2 Chronicles 13:3). Still later, Asa's army, derived from the tribes of Judah and Benjamin alone, is put at 530,000 (<sup><4448></sup>2 Chronicles 14:8), and Jehoshaphat's at 1,160,000 (<sup><4474></sup>2 Chronicles 17:14 sq.). *SEE NUMBER*.

Little need be said on this subject with regard to the period that succeeded the return from the Babylonish captivity until the organization of military affairs in Judaea under the Romans. The system adopted by Judas Maccabaeus was in strict conformity with the Mosaic law (1 Mac. 3:55); and though he maintained a standing army, varying from 3000 to 6000 men (1 Mac. 4:6; 2 Mac. 8:16), yet the custom of paying the soldiers appears to have been still unknown, and to have originated with Simon (1 Mac. 14:32). The introduction of mercenaries commenced with John Hyrcanus, who, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 13:8, 4), rifled the tombs of the kings in order to pay them; the intestine commotions that prevailed in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus obliged him to increase the number to 6200 men (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:13, 5; 14, 1); and the same policy was followed by Alexandra (*Ant.* 13:16, 2), and by Herod the Great, who had in his pay Thracian, German, and Gallic troops (*Ant.* 17:8, 3). The discipline and arrangement of the army was gradually assimilated to that of the Romans, and the titles of the officers borrowed from it (Josephus, *War*, ii, 20, 7).  
**SEE SOLDIER.**

**II. Roman Army.**-This was divided into *legions*, the number of which varied considerably, each under six *tribunes* (χιλίαρχος, "chief captain," Acts 21:31), who commanded by turns. The legion (q.v.) was subdivided into ten *cohorts* (σπεῖρα, "band," Acts 10:1), the cohort into three *maniples*, and the maniple into two *centuries*, containing originally 100 men, as the name implies, but subsequently from 50 to 100 men, according to the strength of the legion. (See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Ant.* s.v.) There were thus 60 centuries in a legion, each under the command of a centurion (ἑκατονταρχῆς, Acts 10:1, 22; ἑκατόνταρχος, Matthew 8:5; 27:54). In addition to the legionary cohorts, independent cohorts of volunteers served under the Roman standards; and Biscoe (*History of Acts*, p. 220) supposes that all the Roman forces stationed in Judaea were of this class. Josephus speaks of five cohorts as stationed at Caesarea at the time of Herod Agrippa's death (*Ant.* 19:9, 2), and frequently mentions that the inhabitants of Caesarea and Sebaste served in the ranks (*Ant.* 20:8, 7). One of these cohorts was named the "Italian" (Acts 10:1), not as being a portion of the *Italica legio* (for this was not embodied until Nero's reign), but as consisting of volunteers from Italy (Gruter, *Inscr.* i, 434). This cohort probably acted as the body-guard of the procurator. The cohort named "Augustus" (σπεῖρα Σεβαστή, Acts 27:1) may have consisted of the volunteers from

Sebaste (Josephus, *War*, ii, 12, 5; Biscoe, p. 223). Others, however, think that it was a *cohors Augusta*, similar to the *legio Augusta*. The headquarters of the Roman forces in Judaea were at Caesarea. A single cohort was probably stationed at Jerusalem as the ordinary guard; at the time of the great feasts, however, and on other public occasions, a larger force was sent up, for the sake of preserving order (Josephus, *War*, ii, 12, 1; 15, 3). Frequent disturbances arose in reference to the images and other emblems carried by the Roman troops among their military ensigns, which the Jews regarded as idolatrous; deference was paid to their prejudices by a removal of the objects from Jerusalem (*Ant.* 18:3, 1; 5, 3). For the sentry (<sup><4124></sup>Acts 12:4) and their "captain" (<sup><4236></sup>Acts 28:16), **SEE GUARD**. The δεξιόλαβοι (Vulg. *lancearii*; A. V. "spearmen,"), noticed in <sup><4233></sup>Acts 23:23, appear to have been light-armed, irregular troops; the origin of the name is, however, quite uncertain (Alford, *Comm.* in loc.). **SEE HOST**.

### Ar'na

(Lat. *Arna*, for the Greek text is not extant), a name given as the father of Marinoth and son of Ozias, in the genealogy of Ezra (2 [Vulg. 4] Esdr. 1:2); evidently meaning the ZERAHIAH **SEE ZERAHIAH** (q.v.) of the genuine list (<sup><4508></sup>Ezra 7:3).

### Arnald, Richard, M.A.,

a divine of the Church of England, born in London about 1696(?); entered Benedict College, Cambridge, 1714; became fellow of Emanuel College, Cambridge, 1720; afterward rector of Marcaston, Leicestershire, where he died in 1756. He is known chiefly by his *Critical Commentary on the Apocrypha* (new ed. Lond. 1822, 4to), which is printed together with Patrick's, Louth's, and Whitby's *Commentaries* (best ed. Tegg, Lond. 4 vols. 8vo).-Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 99; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 69.

### Arnaldo.

**SEE ARNOLD OF BRESCIA.**

### Ar'nan

(Heb. *Arnan'*, אֲרָנָי *nimble*; Sept. Ὀρνά), the great-grandson of Zerubbabel (<sup><4321></sup>1 Chronicles 3:21). He is probably the same with Christ's

maternal ancestor Joanna, in ~~1187~~ Luke 3:27 (see Strong's *Harmony and Exposition*, p. 17). B.C. considerably post 536.

### Arnaud, Henri,

pastor and military leader of the Vaudois, was born at La Tour, in Piedmont, 1641. His early history is obscure, but he is said to have been a soldier before entering the ministry among the persecuted Vaudois. In 1689 he led his people in their efforts to recover their native land and their right to worship God in peace. William III of England gave him a colonel's commission, and he served with great distinction, at the head of 1200 Vaudois, under Marlborough. When his people were exiled in 1698, he became their pastor at Schiinberg, and died there, Sept. 8, 1721. In this retirement he wrote the history of his enterprise, under the title *Histoire de la glorieuse Rentree des Vaudois dans leurs Vallees*, printed in 1710, and dedicated to Anne, Queen of Great Britain. The French edition of this work is very rare; it has been translated into English, under the title *The glorious Recovery by the Vaudois of their Vallees*, trans. by H. D. Ackland (Lond. 1827, 8vo). *SEE VAUDOIS*.

### Arnaud Or Arnauld De Villeneuve.

*SEE ARNOLD*.

### Arnaud Of Bresse.

*SEE ARNOLD OF BRESCIA*.

### Arnauld, Angelique,

abbess of Port-Royal, a daughter of Robert Arnauld d'Andilly, was born November 28, 1624. From her earliest years she exhibited an extraordinary force and resoluteness of character, and excited much anxious speculation concerning her future career among her relatives. When not quite twenty years of age she became a nun at Port Royal des Champs, where she had been educated by her aunt, Marie Jaqueline Angelique Arnauld, sister of the great Arnauld. Nine years after she was made sub-prioress; and on removing some years later to Port-Royal de Paris, she held the same office. During the persecution of the Port-Royalists, Angelique, by her piety and courage, sustained the spirit of the sisterhood. The whole family, male and female, were determined Jansenists, and none more so than Mere Angelique de St. Jean (her conventual name). She had much to endure, but

she met misfortune with earnest intrepidity. A royal order was issued to break up the nunnery. The police arrested the inmates, who were dispersed in various convents throughout France, and constant efforts were made by the Jesuits to induce them to sign the "Formulary of Alexander VII." Angelique was alone exempted from listening to their arguments and solicitations, her "obstinacy" being supposed invincible. At length, by command of the Archbishop of Paris, the nuns were restored to Port Royal des Champs; but for some years they were subjected to a strict surveillance by soldiers, who watched all their movements, and allowed them no intercourse with persons out of the convent. In 1669, however, was issued the edict of Clement IX for the peace of the church, which was a kind of compromise on this vexed question of Jansenism and Jesuitism. The nuns received back the privileges of which they had been stripped, and constituted their society anew. Angelique was again elected prioress. In 1678 she was made abbess. The next year her protectress, the Duchesse de Longueville, died, and the persecution recommenced by the prohibition to receive any more novices. Still Angelique did not despair. She consoled the nuns, and exerted all her influence with persons in power, but with little effect. At last she sank under a complication of griefs, and expired on the 29th of January, 1684, leaving behind her as bright and beautiful a memory as any of her countrywomen. She was learned without being pedantic, pious without bigotry, and gentle to others in proportion as she was severe to herself. Angelique wrote several works. Of these, one, perhaps the most valuable work relative to Port-Royal, is entitled *Miemoires pour servir a l'Histoire de Port-Royal, et a la Vie de la Reverende Mre Mari Audaite deeie Alique de Sainte Adeleine Arnauld, Reformatrice de ce Monastere* (Utrecht, 1742, 12mo, 3 vols.). While the *Memoires* of Du Fosse, Fontaine and Lancelot detail the external history of Port-Royal, these *Memoires* represent its internal history, with the mind and habits of its members, particularly of the elder Angelique. The *Memoires* were edited by Barbeau de la Bruyere in 1742. The originals, from which Barbeau de la Bruyere printed the *Memoires*, were preserved in the library of Saint Germain des Pres at Paris. Angelique also took a great part in the composition of the *Necrologe de Port-Royal des Champs* (Amst. 1723, 4to), and wrote other works in defence of the *monastery*.--*Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, iii, 498, etc.; Querard, *La France Litteraire*; Reuchlin, *Geschichte v. Port-Royal* (Lips. 1839); *Edinb. Review*, No. cxlviii; *Methodist Quarterly*, April, 1853; *Princeton Review*, 21:467; *English Cyclopaedia*.

## Arnauld, Antoine,

one of a family distinguished for piety, talent, and suffering, and which greatly influenced both religion and literature in France, was born at Paris Feb. 6, 1612. His father, named also Antoine Arnauld (died 29th Dec. 1619), was a distinguished advocate, and a great antagonist of the Jesuits. The Jesuits met with an opponent in the younger Arnauld as determined as his father had been. Arnauld the younger was educated at Calvi. He originally studied for the law, but was induced by the Abbot de St. Cyran to turn his attention to theology. In 1641 he was made priest and doctor of the Sorbonne, where he had been pupil of Lescot (afterward Bishop of Chartres), who taught him the scholastic theology. In this period of study he imbibed a love for Augustine and his writings, which he ever after preserved. In 1643 he was made an honorary member of the Society of Sorbonne for his extraordinary merit. In this year, 1643, he published his famous work, *De la frequente Communion* (7th ed. 1783), which excited great attention, and was vigorously attacked by the Jesuits. Arnauld now put forth, in reply, his *Theologie Morale des Jesuites*—the beginning of a fierce and protracted controversy. The Jesuits endeavored to have Arnauld sent to Rome; to escape this peril, he retired from public life for many years, but kept his pen ever busy, at the convent of Port-Royal des Champs, near Paris. **SEE PORT-ROYAL.** Soon after, he became involved in the disputes about Jansenius (q.v.), bishop of Ypres, and his book *Augustinus*, several propositions of which concerning the intricate questions of grace and freewill had been condemned by Pope Urban VII (Aug. 1, 1641). Arnauld boldly ventured to defend it against the censures of the papal bull. He published several pamphlets, closing with a first and second *Apologie de Jansenius*. In these years of strife, whenever a moment of armistice permitted, he occupied it in writing such works as *Maeurs de l'Eglise Catholique*, *La Correction*, *La Grece*, *La Verite de la Religion*, *De la Foi*, *de l'Esperance*, *et de la Charite*, and the *Manuel de Saint Augustine*. He also varied these occupations by translating into Latin his *Frequent Communion*, and by the composition of his *Nove objectiones contra Renat. Descartis Meditationes*, and several smaller tractates. In addition to his literary labors, he undertook the direction of the nuns at Port-Royal, of which his sister, Marie Jaqueline Angelique Arnauld, was abbess. In his retreat he had the society of such men as Pascal, Nicole, etc. Here they wrote in common numerous excellent works, e.g. *Grammaire Generale Raisonnee*, *Elements de Geonmetrie*, and *L'Art de Penser*. In

1649 the Jansenist controversy broke out more fiercely than ever. The *Augustinus* of the Bishop of Ypres was again attacked and condemned by the Sorbonne and the pope. Arnauld replied in his *Considerations*. In 1650 appeared what he conceived to be his best work, *L'Apologie pour les Saints Peres*. For the next half dozen years he was engaged in constant and painful disputes; yet, in spite of the polemical character of his life, the impression of his piety and earnestness was deepened in the mind of the nation; and, on reading some of his compositions, even Alexander VII is reported to have praised the author, and to have exhorted him for the future to despise the libels of his adversaries. During the strife he published *La Concorde des Evangiles* and *L'Office du Saint-Sacrement*. In 1655-56, for prudential reasons, he left his retreat at Port-Royal, and sought a secret place of security. About the same time he was expelled from the Sorbonne and the faculty of theology. Seventy-two doctors and many licentiates and bachelors went with him. In 1656, the war with the Jesuits was renewed - not, however, by Arnauld in person. Under the nom *deplume* of Louis de Montalto, the great Pascal (q.'v.) discharged his scorpion wit against the Jesuits for about a year and a half in the *Provincial Letters*. Arnauld furnished him with materials. In 1658 he took the field in *propria persona*, by publishing his *Cinq Ecrits en faveur des Cures-de Paris contre les Casuistes reldches*. In 1662 appeared *La Nouvelle Heresie* (of the Jesuits); in 1669 the first volume of his *Morale Pratique* (of the Jesuits), the last of which was not published until the year of his death. After the peace of Clement IX, which for a time allayed the Jansenist controversy, and to which Arnauld contributed by an eloquent memorial to the pontiff, he was presented to the pope's nuncio, and also to Louis XIV, who received him graciously, and invited him " to employ his golden pen in defence of religion." His next work, in which he was associated with his friend Nicole, *De la Perpetuite de la Foi de l'Eglise Catholiquea touchant l'Eucharistie*, was dedicated to the pope. This occasioned a warm controversy between Arnauld and the reformed minister Claude, in the course of which Arnauld wrote *Du Renversement de la Morale de J. C. par la Doctrine des Calvinistes touchant la Justification* (Paris, 1672). Arnauld at the same time continued his war against the Jesuits, and wrote the greater part of the work styled *Morale Pratique des Jesuites* (8 vols. 12mo), in which many authentic facts and documents are mixed up with party bitterness and exaggeration. The Jesuits, of course, an ambitious society, did not bear this patiently. Harlay, the archbishop of Paris, assisted in prejudicing the king against Arnauld, and Louis XIV issued an order for his arrest. Arnauld

concealed himself for some time at the house of the Duchess of Longueville; but in 1679 he repaired to Brussels, where the Marquis of Grana, the Spanish governor of the Low Countries, assured him of his protection. There he published in 1681 his *Apologie pour les Catholiques*, a defence of the English Romanists against the charges of Titus Oates's conspiracy. In this work he undertook the defence of his old antagonists the Jesuits, whom he considered as having been calumniated in those transactions. Another work, not so creditable to Arnauld's judgment, is one against the Prince of Orange, William III of England, whom he styled a new Absalom, a new Herod, and a new Cromwell (8vo, 1689). It was published anonymously, but it afterward appeared that he was the author. In refutation of his old friend Malebranche's opinions, Arnauld wrote his *Traite des Vraies et des Fausses Idees* (Cologne, 1683); and afterward, *Rflexions Philosophiques et Theologiques sur le Nouveau Systeme de la Nature et de la Grace du Pere Malebranche* (1685). He continued to the last, although past 80 years of age, to carry on his various controversies with the Jesuits, with Malebranche, with the Calvinists, and with the sceptic philosophers, among whom was Bayle. His last work was *Reflexions sur l'Eloquence des Predicateurs*, 1694. He died in his exile at Brussels, on the 8th of August of that year, after receiving the sacrament from the curate of his parish. His works, which filled more than 100 volumes of various sizes, were collected and published at Lausanne and at Paris, in 48 volumes, 4to, 1775-83. The last volume contains the author's biography. Moreri gives a catalogue of his writings, 320 in number. - *Penny Cyclopedia*; Ranke, *History of Papacy*, ii, 259 sq.; *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1841; *Princeton Review*, 21:467; *Biog. Universelle*, ii, 501; St. Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vol. ii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, ii, 286.

### Arnauld, Henri,

brother of Antoine, was born in Paris in 1597. He was originally designed for the bar, but, on receiving from the court the abbey of St. Nicholas, he entered the church. He was elected bishop of Toul by the diocesan chapter; but, as the election gave rise to disputes, he would not accept it. In 1645 he went to Rome to appease the quarrel between the Barberini family and Pope Innocent X; and such was his success that the family had a medal struck and a statue erected in his honor. On his return to France, he was made bishop of Angers in 1649, devoted himself to his sacred calling, and became, like the rest of his family, a zealous Jansenist. He was one of the four bishops who refused to sign the acceptance of the pope's bull



condemning the 'Augustinus' of Jansenius. He was accustomed to take only five hours' sleep, that he might have time for prayer and the reading of the Scriptures without encroaching on the duties of his episcopal office. He was regular in visiting the sick. When there was a scarcity of provisions at Angers, on one occasion, he sent ten thousand livres so secretly that the donation was attributed to another, and the real donor was only discovered by accident some time afterward. His diocese he never left but once, and that was to reconcile the Prince of Tarento to his father, the Duke de la Tremouille. When Angers revolted in 1652, the queen-mother was about to take heavy vengeance upon it, but was prevented by this bishop, who, as he administered the sacrament to her, said. "Take the body of Him who forgave His enemies when on the cross." Some one advising him to take one day in the week for recreation, he replied, "Yes, I will, when you find me a day in which I am not bishop." His *Negociations a la Cour de Rome* (1748, 5 vols.) contain many curious facts and anecdotes. He died at Angers, June 8, 1694.--*Memoires de, Port-Royal* (Utrecht, 1742), vol. i; Besoigne, *Vie de Henri Arnauld* (Cologne, 1756, 2 vols. 12mo); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, ii, 290.

### Arnauld (Of Andilly), Robert,

eldest brother of Antoine Arnauld, was born at Paris in 1588, and entered early into public life, and filled several offices at the French court. At fifty-two he retired into the convent of Port-Royal, where he wrote numerous I translations, and other works, printed in 8 vols. fol. 1675. He died Sept. 27, 1674. His *Vies des Saints Peres du desert* were translated into English: *Lives of the Fathers of the Desert* (London, 1757, 2 vols. 8vo). -Collier, *Hist. Diet. s.v.*; Hoefler, *Biog. Generale*, ii, 282.

### Arnd Or Arndt, Johann,

the first of the Pietists (q.v.), was born December 27, 1555, at Ballenstadt, at the foot of the Harz Mountains. He studied at the University of Helmstadt, and, devoted himself at first to medicine, but afterward applied himself to theology at Strasburg under Pappus, a theologian of the rigid Lutheran school. In 1583 he became pastor of the Lutheran church at Badeborn, in Anhalt; in 1590, at Quedlinburg; in 1599, at St. Martin's, Brunswick. His theological learning was varied and accurate; but his chief peculiarity was his *heart* religion, in which respect he was the Spener or the Wesley of his time. While at Brunswick he published (1605) the first

volume of his "True Christianity" (*Vier Bücher vom wahren Christenthum*), designed to awaken students, ministers, and others to practical and experimental religion, and to mend, if possible, the loose morals of the age. The book created a great sensation, and was at once translated into several languages. Its revivalism also brought out the enmity of the scholastic theologians and of the "dry" religionists; a controversy of many years' duration was the result. See Scharff, *Supplem. Hist. Litisque Arndtiance* (1727). In 1608 Arndt was called to Eisleben, and in 1609 the three other books of his *True Christianity* were given to the press. No book of practical religion has been more widely circulated, not even Bunyan's *Pilgrim* or Baxter's *Saints' Rest*. The substance of the book is as follows: Book I is called the Book of Scripture: it seeks to show the way of the inward and spiritual life, and that Adam ought to die every day more and more in the heart of a Christian, and Christ to gain the ascendant there. The second is called the Book of Life: he proposes in it to direct the Christian to a greater degree of perfection, to give him a relish for sufferings, to encourage him to resist his enemies after the example of his Saviour. The third is entitled the Book of Conscience: in this he recalls the Christian within himself, and discovers to him the kingdom of God seated in the midst of his own heart. The last book is entitled the Book of Nature: the author proves here that all the creatures lead men to the knowledge of their Creator. New editions of the work are very numerous; those by J. F. von Meyer (4th ed. Francf. 1857) and Krummacher (4th ed. Leipz. 1859) contain biographies of the author. For a complete list of the new German editions of Arndt's work, see Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* s.v. Arndt. The work was translated into many different languages: Latin, Luneburg, in 1625; Frankfort, in 1628; and Leipsic, in 1704. It was printed in Low Dutch in 1642 and 1647, and translated into Danish and Bohemian. It was translated into French by Samuel Basnage de Beauval. The first book was printed in English in 1646; in 1708 the Latin translation was reprinted at London; an English translation was published in 1712, 8vo, dedicated to Queen Anne, by M. Boehm. A new English translation was published in 1715 by William Jacques-*True Christianity, or the whole Economy of God toward Man, and the whole Duty of Man toward God* (2 vols. 8vo, Lond.), and an American edition (Philad. 1842, 8vo). In 1611 Arndt was transferred to Celle, when the duke of Luneburg made him court chaplain and superintendent, and his last years were spent in promoting the religious interests of the duchy. He died May 11 1621. Among the charges brought against Arndt, one was that he was a member of the Rosicrucian fraternity;

but that has been disproved (Henke, *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, 1852, No. 35); yet his medical studies had undoubtedly led him to dabble in alchemy. Besides the *True Christianity*, he published a number of minor writings, which may be found in the edition of his works by Rambach (Leipzig, 1734, 3 vols. 8vo). See Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie*, II, 17:§ 6; F. Arndt, *Joh. Arndt, ein biogr. Versuch* (Berlin, 1838); Pertz, *De Joanne Arndtio*, etc. (Hanover, 1852); Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, i, 540; Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, ch. i; Morris, *Life of John Arndt* (Baltimore, 1853, 12mo).

### Arndt, Joshua

a Lutheran clergyman, born in 1626, was a professor at Rostock, and published several works on philosophy, divinity, and history; among others, *Lexicon Antiquitatum Ecclesiasticarum* (4to, Greifswald, 1669). He died in 1685.

### Arnebeth.

*SEE HARE.*

### Arno, Archbishop Of Salzburg,

frequently called, with a Latin name, Aquila, was probably a native of Germany, and not, as has been erroneously inferred from some figurative expressions of Alcuin, a brother of the latter. Arno (or, as he calls himself, Arn) was educated at Freising (Bavaria), and was consecrated in the same city deacon in 765, and priest in 776. He was a frequent attendant of Duke Thassilo, of Bavaria, and no less than 23 documents of the church of Freising have his name as a witness. He became, in 782, abbot at Elnon, in the Netherlands, and in the same year began his intimate relations with Alcuin, who at that time was residing near Ellon. In 785 he returned to Bavaria, having been appointed by Duke Thassilo bishop of Salzburg. While sojourning at Rome in 798, -he was, in accordance with the wish of Charlemagne and the Bavarian bishops, raised to the dignity of archbishop. Arno presided at several synods, and was, in 813, one of the presidents of the Council of Mentz. He also converted many Huns and Wends, and died Janu- ary 24, 821. He wrote, together with Deacon Benedict, the *Congestum (Indiculus) Arnonis*, a list of all the churches, villages, etc., of the archbishopric of Salzburg, which is a very valuable contribution to the

early Church history of southwestern Germany. Herzog, *Real Encyclopaedia*, i, 542.

### Arnobius, The Elder,

also called "Afer," lived about 297, and taught rhetoric at Sicca, in Africa. He was originally a pagan, and the master of Lactantius, but about the time of Diocletian he embraced the Christian faith, and, according to Jerome (*De Viris Flust.* c. 79), in order the more readily to induce the bishops to receive him among the number of the faithful, he composed, before his baptism, about the year 303, seven books against the Gentiles (*adversus Gentes*, libri vii). This account of Jerome's is followed by many writers (e.g. Tillemont, Cave; Smith, *Dictionary*, s.v.); but Lardner's argument against it (iii, 458) seems to be conclusive. Arnobius writes in the tone, not of a catechumen, but of a Christian; and he nowhere hints at any necessity or compulsion for his task, but, on the contrary, in the beginning of his book, he speaks of it as a task voluntarily undertaken in view of the injurious reproaches cast upon the Christians. The book begins with a vindication of Christianity from the charges brought against it by the pagans. In a few points Arnobius makes statements savoring of Gnosticism, and he does not manifest a complete acquaintance with the Christian system or with the Scriptures. He shows, however, an extensive knowledge of pagan worship and literature, and the book is a valuable source of information on these topics. The marked peculiarity of his Apology, as distinguished from those of his predecessors, consists in the fact that he not only repels the charges made against Christianity, but also undertakes to show that Christianity itself is demonstrable by evidence. In his argument for the divinity of Christ and of his religion, he anticipates many of the leading arguments of modern apologists, especially of Paley. For a very clear summary of it, see Woodham, Introduction to *Tertulliani Liber Apologeticus*, ch. iii. Villemain gives Arnobius a very high place among the early writers, in Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generate*, iii, 311. See also Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. i, vol. ii, p. 190. The works of Arnobius were published, for the first time, by Faustus Sabeus, at Rome, in 1542, but with many faults. Many editions have since been issued, but the best are those of Orelli (Leips. 1816, 3 vols. 8vo), of Hildebrandt (Halle, 1844, 8vo). See Geret, *De Arnobio judicia* (Viteb. 1752); Meyer, *De ratione Arnobiana* (Hafn. 1815); Cave, [*fist. Lit.* i, 112.

## Arnobius, The Younger

lived about 460, and is said to have been a priest of Gaul, brought up in the monastery of Lerins. He wrote a *Commentarius in Psalmos Davidis* (Basle, 1522; Paris, 1639), which shows him to have been a semi-Pelagian. His extant remains may be found in *Bib. Max. Patr.* vol. viii. Cave, *Hist. Lut.* cent. v; Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v.; Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, cent. v.

## Arnold (Arnoldo, Arnaud) Of Brescia

was born in the town of Brescia: about the beginning of the twelfth century. Our information as to his history is scant-, and depends chiefly upon the accounts of his enemies. The chief sources are Otto of Freisingen, *de Gestis Frider. I.* and Ginther, *Lgurinus* (12th cent., both printed together, Basle, 1569, fol.). He studied under Abelard at the desert of Nogent. Having returned to Italy he became a monk. The corruption of the clergy was very great at that time, and Arnold, endowed with an impassioned oratory, began to preach against the ambition and luxury of abbots, prelates, and cardinals, not sparing the pope himself. He maintained that ecclesiastics as well as laymen ought to be subordinate to the civil power; that the disposal of kingdoms and principalities did not belong to the Church of Christ; that the clergy should not accumulate wealth, but should depend upon the offerings of the faithful, or, at most, upon tithes, for their support. His vehement eloquence inflamed the minds of the people, who had been alienated from the clergy before by the excessive corruption of the times. Brescia revolted against its bishop, the fermentation spread to other towns, and complaints against the author of all this poured in at Rome. Innocent II had Arnold condemned, together with other heretics, in the council of Lateran, in 1139. Such, at least, is the positive statement of Otto of Freisingen and other historians of those times, but Arnold's name is not mentioned in the canons of the council; and it is only clear that, by Innocent's order, he was prohibited from preaching, was banished from Italy, and forbidden to return without the pope's permission. He then proceeded to France, where he fell in with an old fellow-student, the papal legate Guido, afterward Pope Celestinus II; but he met with an unrelenting adversary in Bernard of Clairvaux, who forced him to seek refuge at Zirich, and afterward at Constance (about 1140). He there resumed his preaching against the abuses of the clergy, and found many favorable listeners. But Bernard traced him there also, and caused the Bishop of Constance to banish him. After the death of Innocent II (1143),

Arnold returned to Italy, and, hearing that the people of Rome had revolted against the pope, he put himself at the head of the insurrection. Lucius II had died of the wounds received in a popular affray, and Eugenius III, a disciple of Bernard, succeeded him in the papal chair, but was driven away from the city by the people and the senate. The multitude hurried on to excesses which Arnold probably had never contemplated. They attacked the houses of the cardinals and nobles, and shared the plunder. Arnold, however, still remained poor; he really despised wealth, and his morals were irreproachable. Rome continued for ten years in a state of agitation little differing from anarchy, at war with the pope and the people of Tibur, and at variance within itself. Bernard, in his epistles, draws a fearful picture of the state of the city at that time. Eugenius III died in 1153, and his successor, Anastasius IV, having followed him to the grave shortly after, Adrian IV was elected pope in 1154. He was a man of a more determined spirit than his predecessors. A cardinal having been attacked and seriously wounded in the streets of Rome, Adrian resorted to the bold measure of excommunicating the first city in Christendom, a thing without a precedent. The Romans, who had set at naught the temporal power of the pope, quailed before his spiritual authority. In order to be reconciled to the pontiff they exiled Arnold, who took refuge among some friendly nobles in Campania. When the Emperor Frederick I came to Rome to be crowned, the pope applied to him to have Arnold arrested. Frederick accordingly gave his orders, and Arnold was strangled, his body burnt, and the ashes thrown into the Tiber in the year 1155 (*Penny Encyclopaedia*). **SEE ADRIAN IV.** The Roman Catholic writers naturally give Arnold a bad character. In truth, he was a great reforming spirit—the Savonarola or Luther of his time—but driven by the evil circumstances of his age into errors and excesses. Neander is doubtless only just in saying that the inspiring idea of his movements was that of a holy and pure church, a renovation of the spiritual order after the pattern of the apostolic church. Baptist writers class him among the forerunners of their church, as one of the charges brought against him in 1139 was the denial of infant baptism. Baronius calls him "the patriarch of political heretics" (*Annals*, anno 1155). See Koler, *De Arnoldo Brixienti* (Gott. 1742, 4to); Francke, *Arnold v. Brescia u. seine Zest* (Ziurich, 1825, 8vo).—*Biog. Diet. Soc. Useful Knowl.*; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4:149 sq.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 12:pt. ii, ch. v, § 10; *N. Brit. Rev.* i, 458; Bohringer, *Die Kirche Christi und ikre Zeugen*, ii, 719; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, iii, 276. Compare **SEE ARNOLDISTS.**

## Arnold Of Ussingen.

*SEE ARNOLDI, BARTHOLOMEW.*

## Arnold Of Villeneuve,

a celebrated physician of the thirteenth century, was born about 1240. He was eminently skilled in natural science and general literature. In 1285 he was made physician to Pedro III of Aragon; but his heterodox opinions brought on his excommunication by the bishop of Tarragona, and he wandered from place to place for years, until finally he found refuge with Frederick II at Palermo. The monks stigmatized him as a magician, not so much for his science as for his attacks upon their bad lives and principles. He taught that the monks had corrupted the doctrine of Christ, and that the founding of masses and benefits was useless. In 1311, Pope Clement V, being ill of gravel, sought the medical skill of Arnold, who was shipwrecked, and perished on the voyage to Rome. His remains were buried at Genoa in 1313, and his writings were afterward burnt by the Inquisition. Among the propositions in them which were condemned are the following:

1. that the human nature of Christ is equal to the divinity;
2. that the soul of Christ, immediately after the union, knew as much as the divinity;
3. that the devil has perverted :the whole human race, and destroyed faith;
4. that the monks corrupted the doctrine of Jesus Christ;
5. that the study of philosophy ought to be banished from the schools;
6. that the revelation made to Cyril is more valuable than Holy Scripture;
7. that works of mercy are more pleasing to God than the sacrifice of the altar;
8. that founding benefices and masses is useless;
9. that he who gathers a great number of beggars, and founds chapels and perpetual masses, incurs everlasting damnation;
10. that the sacrificing priest and the offerer offer nothing of their own to God;

11. that the passion of Jesus Christ is better represented by the giving of alms than by the sacrifice of the altar;
12. that God is not honored in *deed* in the mass, but in *word* only;
13. that the papal constitutions are simply the works of men;
14. that God threatens with damnation, not all those who Sin, but all those who afford a bad example;
15. that the end of the world would happen in 1335, 1345, or 1376. His works were printed at Lyons in 1520, in one vol. fol.; and 1585; also at *Basle.--Niceron, Mem. toem. 34:p. 82*; Landon, *Eccl. Diet. i, 541*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, iii, 281*.

### Arnold, Gottfried,

an eminent German Pietist and Mystic, born at Annaberg, Saxony, September 5, 1665. Educated at Wittenberg, he became a tutor, 1689, at Dresden, where he imbibed an ardent Pietistic tendency from Spener, who obtained him a situation as private tutor at Quedlinburg, where he devoted himself to the study of the mystic writers and of Church history. After condemning marriage, he married in 1700, and lost some of his fanatical views. In 1707 he obtained a pastorate in Perleberg, where he remained until his death, May 30, 1714. In spite of all his errors, Arnold was eminently pious, and was a faithful preacher. He wrote largely, but his most important work is his *Unparteiische Kirchen- und Ketzergeschichte* (Frankf. 1698/1700; repub. at Schaffhausen, with additions, 1740/1743, 3 vols.). This "Impartial Church History" was the first written in German instead of Latin. It makes *personal piety* the central idea of Christianity. But, while bent on showing fair play, as no historian before had done, to all sorts of heretics and schismatics, particularly to the Mystics, for whom he had a special predilection, Arnold fell into the most gross wrong toward the representatives of orthodoxy, ascribing to them the basest motives, and aspersing their character in every possible way. See Schaff, *History of the Apostolic Church*, § 30; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, i, 548. The number of works which were published against Arnold is very large. A list of them is given in the preface to the third volume of his works in the Schaffhausen edition. The most important among these is by Groschius, *Nothwendige Vertheidigung der evangelischkn Kirche wider die Arnold:sche Ketzerhistorie* (Frankf. 1745). Among the other works of Arnold are,



*Historia et descriptio theosophias*, 1702 (German, 1703); *Das Geheimniss der gottlichen Scphia* (Leipz. 1700). Some of the works of Arnold continue to be in common use among the German Pietists, and are still being published in new editions; as, *D.e Erste Liebe* (an essay on the life of the first Christians; new edit. by Lammert, Stuttgart, 1844; and with an appendix containing all the religious poems of Arnold, by Knapp, Stuttgart, 1844); *Paradiesischer Lustgarten* (a Prayerbook; with biography of Arnold, and selection of his religious poems by Ehmann, Reutlingen, 1852); *Geistliche Esfahrungslehre* (an essay on experimental Christianit-, from the beginning of the conversion to its completion; Milford Square, Pennsylvania, 1855). Complete collection of the religious poems of Arnold ("*Sammtliche Geistliche Lieder*") have been published by Knapp (Stuttgart, 1845) and Ehmann (Stuttgart, 1856); a selection ("*Geistliche Minnelier*") by Ehmann, Stuttgart, 1856). See G. Arnold's *Gedoppelter Lebenslauf* (partly autobiography, 1716); Coler, *Summarische Nachricht von G. Arnold's Leben und Schriften* (Wittenberg, 1718); Knapp, *Biographie G. Arnold's'* (Stuttgart, 1845); Gobel, *Gesch. des Christlichin Lebens in der rheinisch-westphdischen evangelischen Kirche* (vol. ii, p. 698-753).

### Arnold, Nicolaus,

a Protestant theologian, was born at Lesna, in Poland, Dec. 17, 1618; died Oct. 15, 1680. He became, in 1639, rector of the school in Jablonow, and in 1654 succeeded Cocceius as- professor of theology at Franeker, where he became especially noted as a pulpit orator. His writings were chiefly polemical, e.g. *Religio Sociniana refutata* (Franeker, 1654, 4to):-*Atheismus Socinianus* (1659, 4to):-*Discurs. theol. cont. Comeniu'* (1660, 4to):-a refutation of the Catechism of the Socinians (*Atheismus Socin;anus F. Bidalli refutatus*, Amst. 1659):-a work entitled *Lux in Tenebris* (*Light in Darkness*), in which he explains those passages of Scripture which the Socinians use as arguments for their doctrines (Franeker, 1662, 2 vols.): - and a *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*.-*Hoefler, Biog. Generale*, iii, 326.

### Arnold, Smith

a highly esteemed Methodist preacher, was born at Middlebury, Conn., March 31, 1766, and removed in 1791 to Herkimer Co., N. Y. In the year 1800 he connected himself with the itinerant ministry, and continued in the

field of active labor until 1821, when he assumed a supernumerary relation. He died at Rochester, March 16, 1839.-Wakely, *Heroes of Methodism; Min. of Confer.* ii, 670; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:337.

### Arnold, Thomas, D.D.,

was born at Cowes, England, June 13th, 1795. In 1803 he was sent to Winchester school, where he remained until 1811. In 1811 he obtained a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and in 1815 a fellowship in Oriel, where he was associated with Coplestone, Whately, and Hampden, a noble band. In 1818 he was ordained deacon, in 1819 settled at Laleham, where he opened a school to fit a few young men for the university. In 1820 he married. In 1828 he was made head master of Rugby school, and ordained priest. It soon began to be noised abroad that a reform was in progress in Rugby; and the effects of Dr. Arnold's administration of the school are visible to-day, not only in Rugby, but in most schools in England. In this occupation he spent the last fourteen years of his life, and during that period took the deepest interest in all the political questions of the time. He was one of the most decided opponents of the Oxford new school of theology. His idea of a Christian Church was first given in his pamphlet on "Church Reform," which he was induced to publish in 1833, in consequence of the apprehensions he entertained of the danger which then threatened the Establishment. His theory is much the same as Hooker's --that the church and state are identical; that a church is a Christian state. His views on this subject are again stated in his *Fragment on the Church*, subsequently published, in which he hits the key-stone of the Tractarian heresy in attacking what he considers to be their false notions of the Christian priest's "hood." Dr. Arnold's mind was early directed to the social condition of the working classes; and many efforts were made, and a variety of plans devised by him, not only for improving it, but for directing the attention of the public to a subject of so much importance. In 1841 he was appointed by Lord Melbourne to the Regius-Professorship of Modern History at Oxfordan appointment which gave him the most lively satisfaction. But he lived to deliver only his introductory course of lectures. When at the very summit of his reputation as a teacher, and at the time when the odium in which, for the liberality of his religious and political opinions, his name had been held by men of his own profession was fast disappearing, and the grandeur of his' character was every day becoming more manifest and more distinctly understood, he was seized with a fatal disease, which carried him off in a few hours. He died on the 12th of June,

1842, of spasm at the heart. His great work, and the one by which he will be remembered, is his *History of Rome* (Lond. 1840-1843, 3 vols. 8vo), comprehending the period between the origin of the state and the end of the Second Punic War; with his *History of the later Roman Commonwealth* (Lond. 1849, 2d ed. 2 vols. 8vo), reprinted from the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*, carrying on the history to the time of Trajan. In the Notes and Dissertations to his edition of Thucydides he has given a social and political, as well as a critical interest to his author. History and divinity-man and man's relation to God-were his favorite studies. In both he preferred the practical to the theoretical. His *Sermons* (5 vols. 8vo) demonstrate with what earnestness and devotion he labored to bring religion into the daily concerns of men, and to invest every act of life with a Christian character. His remaining productions are, a volume of *Lectures on Modern History*, delivered at Oxford (London, 1843, 8vo), and *Miscellaneous Works* (Lond. 1845, 8vo), which include many articles written for reviews, etc., and essays. Most of Dr. Arnold's writings have been reprinted in New York. They are not important to scientific theology, a branch to which Arnold seems to have given no serious or prolonged study. In some points he approximated to rationalistic views of inspiration and interpretation, but his hold of Christ and of the atonement saved him from going to extremes. Still he is, perhaps justly, styled the founder of the "Broad School" of the Church of England.-Stanley, *Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold*; *Eng. Encyclop.*; *Methodist Quart. Rev.* April, 1846, p. 266; *North Brit. Rev.* ii, 403; *Quarterly Rev.* (Lond.) lxxiv, 252; *Edinb. Rev.* lxxxi, 99; *Princeton Rev.* 17:283.

### Arnoldi, August Wilhelm,

a Roman Catholic bishop of Germany, born at Baden, near Treves, in Prussia, died in 1864. He was ordained priest in 1825, became professor of Oriental languages and eloquence at the seminary of Treves, and subsequently canon at the Cathedral. He was elected bishop of Treves in 1839, but the Prussian government refused to ratify the election. He was again elected in 1842, when he was recognised by the government, but was at once involved in new difficulties by his refusal to take the constitutional oath. He became widely known, and produced a great commotion in 1845 by ordering the public exhibition of a relic of the Church of Treves, claimed to be "the holy coat" of Christ. He is the author of a German translation of the *Homilies* of Chrysostom and his book on the priesthood.-Pierer, i, 753; Vapereau, p. 66.

## Arnoldi (Arnold), Bartholomew,

a German Augustine monk. He was a professor of theology at Erfurt. He was Luther's teacher, and at first agreed with his views; but when he broke with the papacy, Arnoldi became his warm antagonist. He wrote many' works, chiefly against the Lutherans. He died at Erfurt in 1532.

## Arnoldists,

followers of Arnold of Brescia (q.v.). Many seem to have adhered to the doctrines of Arnold even after his death, and to have propagated them in Upper Italy. The Arnoldists were condemned by Pope Lucius III at the council of Verona in 1184. The name occurs also later, as in a law of Frederick II against the heretics (1224); but it is doubtful whether the name was merely copied from the condemnatory decree, or whether they continued to exist as a sect.

## Ar'non

(Heb. *Arnon'*, <sup>~</sup>/nr̥ḫi a murmur; Sept. Ἀρνῶν, sometimes Ἀρνών), a river (l j ni torrent, Deuteronomy ii, 24, forming the southern boundary of trans-Jordanic Palestine (originally of the Amoritic territory, <sup>-0213</sup>Numbers 21:13, 26), and separating it from the land of Moab (<sup>-1888</sup>Deuteronomy 3:8, 16; <sup>-1611</sup>Joshua 12:1; <sup>-0712</sup>Judges 11:22; <sup>-2362</sup>Isaiah 16:2; <sup>-2480</sup>Jeremiah 48:20). Josephus speaks of it as issuing from the mountains of Arabia (*Ant.* 4:5, 1). Among these hills are probably to be sought the "heights of Arnon" (<sup>-0213</sup>Numbers 21:28). **SEE BAMOTH**. It is also named in <sup>-1826</sup>Deuteronomy 2:36; 3:12; 4:48; <sup>-1612</sup>Joshua 12:2; 13:9, 16; <sup>-0713</sup>Judges 11:13, 26. From <sup>-0718</sup>Judges 11:18, it (i.e. one of its branches N.E. of Arnon) would seem to have been also the *east* border of Moab (see also <sup>-1203</sup>2 Kings 10:33). In many of the above passages it occurs in the formula for the site of Aroer, "which is by the brink of the river Amnon." In Numbers it is simply "Arnon," but in Deuteronomy and Joshua generally "the river Arnon" (A. V. sometimes "river of Arnon"). Isaiah (<sup>-2362</sup>Isaiah 16:2) mentions its fords; and in <sup>-0712</sup>Judges 11:26, a word of rare occurrence (**dy**; hand, comp. <sup>-0132</sup>Numbers 13:29) is used for the *sides* of the stream. In the time of Jerome it was still known as Arnon; but in the Samaritan-Arabic version of the Pentateuch by Abu-Said (10th to 12th century) it is given as *el Afojeb*. There can be no doubt that the *Wady el-Mojeb* of the present day is the Arnon (Seetzen, *Reise*, 1854, ii, 347; and in Ritter, *Erdk.* 15:1195). The

ravine through which it flows is still the "locum vallis in praerupta demersae satis horribilem et periculosum" which it was in the days of Jerome (*Onom.*). The Roman road from Rabba to Dhiban crosses it at about two hours' distance from the former. On the south edge of tile ravine are some ruins called Mehatet el-Haj, and on the north edge, directly opposite, those still bearing the name of Arair. *SEE AROER*. Burckhardt was the first to give a satisfactory account of this river under the name which it now bears. It rises in the mountains of Gilead, near Katrane, whence it pursues a circuitous course of about eighty miles to the Dead Sea. It flows in a rocky bed, and, at the part visited by Burckhardt, in a channel so deep and precipitous as to appear inaccessible (comp. Seetzen, *Monatl. Corresp.* 18:432); yet along this, winding among huge fragments of rock, lies the most frequented road, and, being not far from Diton, probably that taken by the Israelites. The descent into the valley from the south took Irby and Mangles (*Letters*, p. 461) one hour and a half; the descent from the north took Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 372) thirty-five minutes. The last-named traveller declares that he had never felt such suffocating heat as he experienced in this valley from the concentrated rays of the sun and their reflection from the rocks. The stream is almost dried up in summer; but huge masses of rock, torn from the banks, and deposited high above the channel, evince its fulness and impetuosity in the rainy season. Irby and Mangles suppose that it is this which renders the valley of the Arnon less shrubby than that of most other streams in the country. "There are, however, a few tamarisks, and here and there are oleanders growing about it." On each face of the ravine traces of the paved Roman road are still found, with milestones, and one arch of a bridge, 31 feet 6 inches in span, is standing. The stream runs through a level strip of grass some 40 yards in width, with a few oleanders and willows on the margin. Lieut. Lynch describes it at its mouth in April as "a considerable stream of water, clear, fresh, and moderately cool, and having some small fish in it" (*Expedition*, p. 299). Where it bursts into the Dead Sea this stream is 82 feet wide and 4 feet deep, flowing through a chasm with perpendicular sides of red, brown, and yellow sandstone, 97 feet wide. It then runs through the delta in a S.W. course, narrowing as it goes, and is 10 feet where its waters meet those of the Dead Sea (Lynch, *Report*, May 3, 1847, p. 20).

According to the information given to Burckhardt, its principal source is near Katrane, on the Haj route. Hence, under the name of Seil es-Saideh, it

flows N.W. to its junction with the W. Lejum, one hour E. of Arair, and then as W. Mojeb, more directly W. to the Dead Sea. The W. Mojeb receives on the north the streams of the W. Waleh, and on the south those of W. Shekik and W. Saliheh. At its junction with the Lejum (W. Enkeileh) is a piece of pasture-ground, in the midst of which stands a hill with ruins on it (Burck. p. 374). May not these ruins be the site of the mysterious "city that is in the midst of the river" (~~637~~ Joshua 13:9, 16; Deuteronomy ii, 36) so often coupled with Aroer? From the above description of the ravine, it is plain that that city cannot have been situated immediately below Aroer, as has been conjectured.

### Arnoul, Bishop Of Lisieux,

born at the beginning of the twelfth century, died August 3d, 1183.- He made fruitless efforts to reconcile King Henry II of England with Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury. In his old age he resigned his bishopric, and retired to the abbey of St. Victor of Paris, where he died. We have from him a volume of epistles, of discourses, and epigrams (*Epistolæ, Conciones, et Epigrammata*, published by Turnebe, Paris, 1585, 8vo), which contains interesting details on the history of ecclesiastical discipline during his time. He is also the author of some poems, and of an essay on the schism which followed the death of Honorius II (published in the *Bibliotheca Potrum*, and the *Spicilegium d'Archry*).-*Hoefer, Biographie Generale*, iii, 333.

### Arnulphus, ST., Bishop Of Metz.

In 609, at the entreaty of his parents, he married, but in 612 his wife took the veil in the monastery of Treves; and in 614, the bishopric of Metz becoming vacant, the people insisted on having Arnulphus for their bishop. As bishop he managed his diocese with rare excellence, and was made by King Clotaire prime minister of his son Dagobert, whom he had associated with him in the empire. Upon the death of Clotaire, Arnulphus retired into a solitude, where he passed the rest of his life in prayer and mortification, and in every work of charity. He died in 641, and his relics are preserved in the abbey of St. Arnoul de Metz. He is commemorated on the 16th of August.-*Baillet, Vies des Saints*, Aug. 16; Landon, *Eccl. Dictionary*, i, 547.

## Arob.

SEE FLY.

## A'rod

(Heb. *Arod'*, **d/ra**) perhaps *affliction*, otherwise a *wild ass*, Sept.

**Ἀροαδί**), the sixth son (or branch of the family) of Gad (<sup><0057></sup>Numbers 26:17). B.C. 1856. His descendants (Heb. *Arodi'*, **yd/ra**) are called *Arodi* (<sup><0436></sup>Genesis 46:16, Sept. **Ἀρονδείς**) or *Arodites* (<sup><0057></sup>Numbers 26:17; Sept. **Ἀροαδί**).

## Arod.

SEE ASS.

## Ar'odi, A'rodite.

SEE AROD.

## Ar'oer

(Heb. *Aroer'*, **r[ar]** [once **r/[r]i** <sup><07125></sup>Judges 11:26], *ruins*, as in <sup><2486></sup>Jeremiah 48:6, "*heath*;" Sept. **Ἀρωήρ** and **Ἀροήρ**), the name of three places. In <sup><2372></sup>Isaiah 17:2, "cities of Aroer" are mentioned; which some think should be translated "ruined cities," as Aroer was not a metropolis, but the name probably stands as a representative of the two towns in that region.

**1.** A town "by the brink," or "on the bank of" (both the same expression--Heb. "on the lip"), or "by," i.e. on the north side of the torrent Arnon (<sup><0148></sup>Deuteronomy 4:48; <sup><07125></sup>Judges 11:26; <sup><1213></sup>2 Kings 10:33; <sup><1318></sup>1 Chronicles 5:8), and therefore on the southern border of the territory conquered from Sihon, which was assigned to the tribes of Reuben and Gad (<sup><0123></sup>Deuteronomy 2:36; 3:12; <sup><0122></sup>Joshua 12:2; 13:9). The Amorites had previously dispossessed the Ammonites of this territory; and although the town seems to be given to Reuben (<sup><0536></sup>Joshua 13:16), it is mentioned as a Moabitish city by Jeremiah (<sup><2489></sup>Jeremiah 48:19). According to Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v. **Ἀρωήρ**) it stood "on the brow of the hill." Burckhardt (comp. Macmichael, *Journey*, p. 242) found the ruins of this town, under the name of *Araayr*, on the edge of a precipice overlooking Wady Mojob (*Travels in Syria*, p. 372). They are also mentioned under the

name *Arar* in Robinson's *Researches* (App. to vol. iii, p. 170, and Map). Schwarz places it 15 miles from the Dead Sea (*Palest.* p. 226). Aroer is always named in conjunction with "the city that is in the midst of the river;" whence Dr. Mansford (*Script. Gaz.*) conjectures that, like Rabbath Ammon (q.v.), it consisted of two parts, or distinct cities; the one on the bank of the river, and the other in the valley beneath, surrounded, either naturally or artificially, by the waters of the river. For another explanation, *SEE ARNON*.

**2.** One of the towns "built," or probably rebuilt, by the tribe of Gad (<sup>40435</sup>Numbers 32:34). It is said in <sup>46135</sup>Joshua 13:25, to be "before (ynEAI [ ] Rabbah" [of Ammon]; but, as Raumer well remarks (*Palistina*, p. 249), this could not possibly have been in the topographical sense of the words (in which *before* means *east of*), seeing that Aroer, as a town on the eastern border of Gad, must have been west of Rabbah; while to a person in Palestine proper, or coming from the Jordan, Aroer would be *before* Rabbah in the ordinary sense. It is (see Ritter, *Erdk.* 15:1130) apparently the place discovered by Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 335), who, in journeying toward Rabbath Ammon, notices a ruined site, called *Ayra*, about seven miles south-west from es-Salt; probably the same with the *Array* el-Emir visited by Legh (p. 246) on his way from Heshbon to es-Salt (comp. Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 231). It is also called *Aireh* in Robinson's *Researches* (iii, App. p. 169). Aroer of Gad is also mentioned in <sup>47133</sup>Judges 11:33, and <sup>40435</sup>2 Samuel 24:5, in which latter passage it is stated to have been situated on the "river" (brook) of Gad, i.e. apparently on the Wady Nimrin (and not the Arnon, see Reland, *Palest.* p. 533). Keil (*Comment. on Joshua* p. 339), approved by Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 288), fixes upon Kulat Zeska Gadda, as lying *in a wady* and *east of Rabbah*; but the passage in 2 Samuel ("and they passed over Jordan, and pitched in Aroer, on the right side of the city, that lieth in the midst of the river of Gad. and toward Jazer") can only signify [if, indeed, the word rva} which, do not signify here merely "to wit," or rather be not altogether spurious] that the party of Joab encamped just across the Jordan, in the bed of one of the brooks of Gad (the Wady Nimrin), south of Aroer and not far from Jaazer. Jerome speaks of it as *Aruir* (Euseb. Ἀρουεΐ), a village still found on a hill 20 Roman miles south of Jerusalem (*Onomast.* s.v.); but this, if correct, can only mean south-east.



**3.** A city in the south of Judah (i.e. in Simeon), to which David sent presents after recovering the spoil of Ziklag (<sup><1314></sup>1 Samuel 30:26, 28). It appears to have been the native city of two of David's warriors (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 11:44). At the distance of twenty geographical miles south by west from Hebron, Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 618) came to a broad wady where there are many pits for water, which are called *Ararah*, and which gave name to the valley. In the valley and on the western hill are evident traces of an ancient village or town, consisting only of foundations of unhewn stones, now much scattered, but yet sufficiently distinct to mark them as foundations. Small fragments of pottery are also everywhere visible. The same identification is proposed by Schwarz, who calls the place "the modern village *Arar*, two and a half English miles south of Moladah" (*Palest.* p. 113).

**Aroer.**

*SEE HEATH.*

**Ar'oerite**

(Heb. *Aroeri'*,  $\gamma\rho\{\epsilon\phi\}$  Sept.  $\text{Αραρί}$ ), an inhabitant of one of the cities of AROER, probably that in the tribe of Judah (<sup><1314></sup>1 Chronicles 11:44).

**A'rom**

( $\text{Αρόμ}$ , prob. interpolated), the name of a man whose descendants (or of a place whose inhabitants), to the number of thirty-two, are said to have returned from the Babylonian captivity (1 Esdr. v, 16); but the genuine text (<sup><1317></sup>Ezra 2:17, 18) has no corresponding name, unless it be a mistake for *Asons*, and represents the HASHUM of Ezra 11:19.

**Aromatics**

(from the Gr.  $\text{ἄρωμα}$ , a pleasant *smell*) is a general term including all those odoriferous substances denoted by several Hebrew words, frequently designated as "spices" in the Auth. Vers., e.g. *ahalim* ("aloes"), "*alnmug*" or "*afgum*," *bedolach* ("bdellium"), *chelbenah* ("galbanum"), *basam*, or balsam, *kaneh* ("calamus"), *ketsioth* and *kiddah* ("cassia"), "*cinnamon*," *lebonah*, ("frankincense"), *lot* and *mor* ("myrrh"), *nerd* ("spikenard"), *nataf* ("stacte"), *tseri* ("balm"), *shecheleth* ("onycha"), also *rekach*, *bosen* or *besen*, *sammnim*, and *nekoth* ("spice"), all which see in their alphabetical place, and compare "mint," "rue," "anise," "thyine wood," etc., mentioned

in the N.T. It is difficult to determine the exact products which the most of the words refer to, but when they are separately noticed, especially when several are enumerated, their names may lead us to their identification. Dr. Vincent has observed that "in Exodus 30 we find an enumeration of cinnamon, cassia, myrrh, frankincense, stacte, onycha, and galbanum, all of which are the produce either of India or Arabia." More correctly, cinnamon, cassia, frankincense, and onycha were probably obtained from India; myrrh, stacte, and some frankincense, from the east coast of Africa, and galbanum from Persia. More than 1000 years later, or about B.C. 588, in Ezekiel 27 the chief spices are referred to, with the addition, however, of calamus. They are probably the same as those just enumerated. Dr. Vincent refers chiefly to the *Perip us*, ascribed to Arrian, written in the second century, as furnishing a proof that many Indian substances were at that time well known to commerce, as aloe or agila wood, gum bdellium, the googal of India, cassia and cinnamon, nard, costus, incense that is, olibanumginger, pepper, and spices. If we examine the work of Dioscorides, we shall find all these, and several other Indian products, not only mentioned, but described, as *schoenanthus*, *calamus aromaticus cyperus*, *malabathrum*, *turmeric*. Among others, *Lycium indicum* is mentioned. This is the extract of barberry root, and is prepared in the Himalayan Mountains (Royle, on the *Lycium* of Dioscorides, *Lincenan Trans.*). It is not unworthy of notice that we find no mention of several very remarkable products of the East, such as camphor, cloves, nutmeg, betel-leaf, cubeb, gamboge, all of which are so peculiar in their nature that we could not have failed to recognise them if they had been described at all, like those we have enumerated as the produce of India. These omissions are significant of the countries to which commerce and navigation had not extended at the time when the other articles were well known (*Hindoo Medicine*, p. 93). If we trace these up to still earlier authors, we shall find many of them mentioned by Theophrastus, and even by Hippocrates, and if we trace them downward to the time of the Arabs, and from that to modern times, we find many of them described under their present names in works current throughout the East, and in which their ancient names are given as synonyms. We have, therefore, as much assurance as is possible in such cases, that the majority of the substances mentioned by the ancients have been identified; and that among the spices of early times were included many of those which now form articles of commerce from India to Europe. *SEE SPICERY, SEE PERFUME.*

## Arophaeus.

SEE AMARIAH.

## Ar'pad

(<sup><2369></sup>Isaiah 36:19; 37:13) or Ar'phad (Heb. *Arpad'*, **dPr̄ḫi**) perhaps a *support*; but see below; Sept. in 2 Kings **Ἀρφάδ**, elsewhere **Ἀρφάθ**, in <sup><2309></sup>Isaiah 10:9 undistinguishable), a Syrian city, having its own king (<sup><12913></sup>2 Kings 19:13; <sup><23713></sup>Isaiah 37:13), in the neighborhood of Hamath (<sup><12834></sup>2 Kings 18:34; <sup><2309></sup>Isaiah 10:9; 36:19) and Damascus (<sup><2423></sup>Jeremiah 49:23), with both of which it appears to have been conquered by the Assyrians under Sennacherib. Michaelis and others seek Arphad in *Raphance* or *Raphanee* of the Greek geographers (Ptol. v, 15; Steph. Byzant. in **Ἐπιφάνεια**; Joseph. *War*, 7:1, 3; 7:5, 1), which was a day's journey west of Hamath (Mannert, VI, i, 431). Paulus (*Comment.* in <sup><2309></sup>Isaiah 10:9) thinks it was a city in the neighborhood of the Tigris and Euphrates. Some, however, are content to find this Arphad in the *Arpha* (**Ἀρφαῶ**) which Josephus (*War*, iii, 3, 5) mentions as situated on the north-eastern frontier of the northernmost province of Herod Agrippa's tetrarchy; also called *Artha* (**Ἄρθᾶ**) or *Arfa* by other ancient writers (Reland, *Palcest.* p. 584). But it seems best (with Doderloin and others) to refer it to the Phoenician island city *Arvad* or Aradus (q.v.), which was opposite Hamath (the interchange of **p** and **w** being very natural).

## Arpha.

SEE ARPAD.

## Arphax'ad

(Heb. *Arpakshad'*, **dvkPr̄ḫi** [on the signif. see below]; Sept. and N.T. **Ἀρφαξάδ**, Josephus **Ἀρφαξάδης**), the name of two men.

**1.** The first postdiluvian patriarch, son of Shem, and father of Salah; born one year after the end of the Deluge, and died B.C. 2075, at the age of 438 years (<sup><0110></sup>Genesis 11:10-13; <sup><13017></sup>1 Chronicles 1:17, 18; <sup><4036></sup>Luke 3:36). From <sup><0102></sup>Genesis 10:22, 24, it appears that the region settled by this patriarch's descendants likewise took his name. The conjecture of Bochart (*Pkaleg*, ii, 4) has been adopted by several others (Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 129; *Orient. Bibl.* 17:77 sq.; Mannert, v, 439), that it is the province

*Arrhaphachitis* (Ἀρράπαχίτις), in northern Assyria, near Armenia (Ptol. 6:1), the primitive country of the Chaldaeans (Josephus, *Ant.* i, 6, 4; comp. Syncell. *Chronicles* p. 46), whose national title (𐤎𐤕𐤕𐤍 *Kasdin*) appears to form the latter part of the name Arphaxad (𐤕𐤕𐤕); the first part being referred by Michaelis (*Spicileg.* i, 73 sq.) to an Arabic root signifying *boundary* (q. d. "border of the Chaldaeans"), but with as little felicity (see Tuch, *Genesis* p. 256) as the derivation by Ewald (*Isr. Gesch.* i, 333) from another Arabic root signifying to *bind* (q. d. "fortress of the Chaldaeans"). (See Gesenius, *Commentar ub. Jesa.* 23:13; and comp. Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assur's*, p. 414, note.) Bohlen (*Genesis* in loc.), with even less probability, compares the Sanscrit *Arjapakshata* " (a land) by the side of Asia;" comp. Porussia, i. q. *Po-rus*, i.e. near the Russians. (See Schlozer in the *Repert. f. bibl. Lit.* 8:137; Lengerke, *Kanaan*, i, 211; Knobel, *Volkertofel d. Genesis*, Giess. 1850.)

**2.** A king of Media at Ecbatana, which city he had fortified during an open campaign and siege by his contemporary Nebuchadnezzar (Judith i, 1 sq.). From the connection of his name with Ecbatana he has been frequently identified with *Deioces* (Ctes. "Artaeus"), the founder of Ecbatana (Herod. i, 98); but as Deioces died peaceably (Herod. i, 102), it seems better to look for the original of Arphaxad in his son *Phraortes* (Ctes. "Artynes"), who greatly extended the Median empire, and at last fell in a battle with the Assyrians, B.C. 633 (Herod. i, 102). But this would disagree with the date and circumstances of Nebuchadnezzar; moreover, the half-fabulous book of Judith abounds with statements respecting the Median kings scarcely reconcilable with genuine history. *SEE MEDIA*; *SEE JUDITH*. Niebuhr (*Gesch. Assur's*, p. 32) endeavors to identify the name with "*Astyages*" = *Ashdahak*, the common title of the Median dynasty, and refers the events to a war in the twelfth year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, B.C. 592 (*Ibid.* p. 212, 285). *SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR*.

## Arrhabon

(ἄρραβών, *earnest* or *pledge*). The early church used a great variety of expressions to describe the elements of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and among the rest, the expressions ἄρραβών and ἄρραβών τῆς μελλούσης ζωῆς, *earnest of the life to come*, probably with reference to <sup>40022</sup>2 Corinthians 1:22; 5:5; and <sup>40014</sup>Ephesians 1:14. *SEE EARNEST*. The *Arrhabonarii* were sacramentarians in the 16th century who held that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are neither the real body and blood of

Christ, nor the signs of them, but only the pledge and earnest thereof. *SEE PLEDGE.*

### Arriaga, Pablo Jose De,

a Spanish Jesuit, born at Vergara in 1562. Having been sent by his superiors to Peru, he founded several educational institutions, and was, in succession, rector of the college of Arequipa and of that of Lima. He perished in a shipwreck, but it is not known in what year. He is the author of a work on the Indians in Peru (*Extirpacion de la idolatria de los Indios del Peru*, Lima, 1621), and of several other works.-Hoefler, *Biog. Generale*, iii, 354.

### Arriaga, Roderigo De,

an eminent Spanish Jesuit, was born at Logroffio, Spain, Jan. 17, 1592. At fourteen he entered the order of Jesuits, and afterward taught philosophy and theology at Valladolid and Salamanca. He was sent to Prague in 1624, and taught theology there till 1627. He was a man of great acuteness of mind, and had deservedly a great reputation in his day for learning and skill in dogmatic theology. He died at Prague June, 17, 1667. Bayle hints that he was inclined to Pyrrhonism. Among his writings are *Cursus Philosophice* (Antwerp, 1632, fol.); *Disput. Theol. in summam Aquinatis* (8 vols. fol., 1643-1655; and again at Lyons, 1669).-Bayle, *Dictionary*, s. y.; Walch, *Bibliotheca*, i, 152; Sotuel, *Script. Soc. Jesu*, 729.

### Arrow.

#### Picture for Arrow 1

#### Picture for Arrow 2

There are several words thus rendered in the English Bible, namely properly /j ꞥchets, from its *sharpness*), of frequent occurrence (rendered "dart" in <1073>Proverbs 7:23; "wound," i.e. of an arrow, <18906>Job 34:6; "staff" by an error of transcription for / [e]the *haft* of a spear, <9170>1 Samuel 17:7), with its derivatives yxj ꞥchetsi', <9171>1 Samuel 20:86, 37, 38; <12921>2 Kings 9:24) and /xj ;(chatats', <9777>Psalm 77:17; elsewhere "gravel"); poetically āvr,(re'sheph, <9783>Psalm 76:31, *lightning*, as it is elsewhere rendered), and hvqā^B,(ben-ke'ssheth, i.e. *son of a bow*, <18428>Job 41:28). Among the

Hebrews arrows were probably at first made of reed, as common among the Egyptians; subsequently they were made from some light sort of wood, and tipped with an iron point. Whether they were ever dipped in poison is not clear from <sup><1804></sup>Job 6:4; <sup><1524></sup>Deuteronomy 32:24. They were often composed, in part at least, of the shrub **utro**'them, "juniper," which, being discharged from the bow while on fire, kindled upon the baggage or armament of the enemy (<sup><1504></sup>Psalm 120:4; <sup><1804></sup>Job 30:4). Hence arrows are sometimes put tropically for *lightnings* (<sup><1523></sup>Deuteronomy 32:23, 42; <sup><1973></sup>Psalm 7:13; <sup><1804></sup>Zechariah 9:14). Arrows were used in war as well as in hunting (<sup><1023></sup>Genesis 27:3; 47:22). **SEE ARCHER**. They were kept in a case called a quiver (q.v.), which was slung over the shoulder in such a position that the soldier could draw them out when needed (<sup><1905></sup>Psalm 91:5; 120:4). **SEE BOW**. They were also used in divination (<sup><1521></sup>Ezekiel 21:21). **SEE DIVINATION**. The arrows of the ancient Egyptians varied from 22 to 34 inches in length; some were of wood, others of reed; frequently tipped with a metal head, and winged with three feathers, glued longitudinally, and at equal distances, upon the other end of the shaft, as on modern arrows. Sometimes, instead of the metal head, a piece of hard wood was inserted into the reed, which terminated in a long tapering point; but these were of too light and powerless a nature to be employed in war, and could only have been intended for the chase; in others, the place of the metal was supplied by a small piece of flint or other sharp stone, secured by a firm black paste; and although used occasionally-in battle, they appear from the sculptures to have belonged more particularly to the huntsman; while the arrows of archers are generally represented with bronze heads, some barbed, others triangular, and many with three or four projecting blades, placed at right angles and meeting in a common point (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt*. i, 356). The ancient Assyrians appear also to have used arrows made of reeds, which were kept in a quiver slung over the back. The barbs were of iron and copper, several of which have been discovered among the ruins (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 263). **SEE ARMOR**.

### Picture for Arrow 3

### Picture for Arrow 4

The word "arrow" is frequently used as the symbol of calamity or disease inflicted by God (<sup><1804></sup>Job 6:4; 34:6; <sup><1802></sup>Psalm 38:2; <sup><1523></sup>Deuteronomy 32:23; comp. <sup><1516></sup>Ezekiel 5:16; <sup><1804></sup>Zechariah 9:14). The metaphor thus applied was also in use among the heathen (Ovid, *Ep*. 16:275). It derived its

propriety and force from the popular belief that all diseases were immediate and special inflictions from heaven. *Lightnings* are, by a very fine figure, described as the arrows of God (<sup><1984></sup>Psalm 18:14; 144:6; <sup><1981></sup>Habakkuk 3:11; compare Wisd. v, 21; <sup><1215></sup>2 Samuel 22:15). "Arrow" is occasionally used to denote some sudden or inevitable danger, as in <sup><1905></sup>Psalm 91:5: "The arrow that flieth by day." It is also figurative of any thing injurious, as a deceitful tongue (<sup><1904></sup>Psalm 129:4; <sup><2407></sup>Jeremiah 9:7), a bitter word (<sup><1943></sup>Psalm 64:3), a false testimony (<sup><1258></sup>Proverbs 25:18). As symbolical of oral wrong the figure may perhaps have been derived from the darting "arrowy tongue" of serpents. The arrow, however, is not always symbolical of evil In <sup><1904></sup>Psalm 127:4, 5, well-conditioned children are compared to "arrows in the hands of a mighty man." i.e. instruments of power and action. The arrow is also used in a good sense to denote the efficient and irresistible energy of the word of God in the hands of the Messiah (<sup><1916></sup>Psalm 45:6; <sup><2442></sup>Isaiah 44:2; comp. Lowth's note thereon). (See Wemyss, *Claris Symbolica*, s.v.)

### Arrow-Headed Writing.

SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS.

### Arrowsmith, John, D.D.,

a Puritan divine, was born at Newcastle, March 29, 1602, and died Feb. 1659. He was educated at Cambridge, became minister at Lynn, and afterward in London. He was a member of the Westminster Assembly, and afterward master of St. John's College and of Trinity College, Cambridge. Of his numerous writings, the most important are *Arsmilla Catechetica*, a *chain of theological aphorisms* (Cambr. 1659, 4to):-*Tactica Sacra, de milite spirituali pugnante, vincente et triumphanti, dissertatio* (Cantab. 1657, 4to). See Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, iii, 315; Neal, *History of the Puritans*. iii. 115; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 71.

### Ar'saces

(Ἀρσάκης, prob. of Persian or Armenian origin, Pott, *Etymol. Forschungen*, ii, 172), the name of the founder of the Parthian empire (Justin. xli, 5, 5), and hence borne by his successors, the Arsacida (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.). The name occurs in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. 14:2, 3; 15:22) as that of the king of Parthia and Media (Diod. Sic. *Excerpt.* p. 597, ed. Wessel), B.C. 138. The Syrian king Demetrius (II)

Nicator, having invaded his country, at first obtained several advantages. Media declared for him, and the Elymeans, Persians, and Bactrians joined him; but Arsaces having sent one of his officers to him, under pretence of treating for peace, he fell into an ambuscade, his army was cut off by the Persians, and he himself fell into the hands of Arsaceg (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:5, 11). As Arsaces is the common name of all the Parthian kings (Strabo, 15:702), and of many Armenian (see Kosegarten in the *Hal. Encyclop.* v, 408 sq.), the one here intended is probably Arsaces VI, properly named Mithridates (or Phraates) I, a prince of distinguished bravery, who conquered Bactria, penetrated India, reduced the Medes and Persians, and greatly improved the condition of the Parthian empire (Justin. 36:1; 38:9; xli, 6; Oros. v, 4; Strabo, 11:516, 517, 524 sq.). Mithridates treated his prisoner Demetrius with respect, and gave him his daughter in marriage (App. Syr. 67), but kept him in confinement till his own death, cir. B.C. 130 (App. Syr. 68; Diod. ap. Muller, *Fragm. Hist.* ii, 19). The reference to him in the Maccabees is, however, somewhat confused (see Wernsdorf, *De fide Maccab.* p. 175).

### Ar'sareth

(Lat. *Arsareth*, for the Greek text is not extant), a region beyond the Euphrates, apparently of great extent if the fanciful passage (2 [Vulg. 4] Esdr. 13:45) where alone it occurs can be relied upon as historical.

### Arsenal.

The ancient Hebrews had each man his own arms, because all went to the wars; they had no arsenals or magazines of arms, because they had no regular troops or soldiers in constant pay. *SEE ARMY*. There were no arsenals in Israel till the reigns of David and Solomon. *SEE ARMOR*. David made a large collection of arms and consecrated them to the Lord in his tabernacle (<sup><1929></sup>1 Samuel 21:9; <sup><1087></sup>2 Samuel 8:7-12; <sup><1355></sup>1 Chronicles 26:26, 27). The high-priest Jehoiada took them out of the treasury of the temple to arm the people and Levites on the day of the young king Joash's elevation to the throne (<sup><1429></sup>2 Chronicles 23:9). Solomon collected a great quantity of arms in his palace of the forest of Lebanon, and established well-provided arsenals in all the cities of Judah, which he fortified (<sup><14112></sup>2 Chronicles 11:12). He sometimes compelled the conquered and tributary people to forge arms for him (<sup><11025></sup>1 Kings 10:25). Uzziah not only furnished his arsenals with spears, helmets, shields, cuirasses, swords,



bows, and slings, but also with such machines as were proper for sieges (~~1494~~ 2 Chronicles 26:14, 15). Hezekiah had the same precaution; he also made stores of arms of all sorts (see ~~1495~~ 2 Chronicles 32:5; comp. ~~1203~~ 2 Kings 20:13). Jonathan and Simon Maccabseus had arsenals stored with good arms; not only such as had been taken from their enemies, but others which they had purchased or commissioned to be forged for them (1 Macc. 10:21; 14:23, 42; 2 Macc. 8:27; 15:21). **SEE ARMORY.**

### Arsenius,

an anchorite, born at Rome in 350; died in 445. While a deacon of the Church of Rome, he was chosen, in 383, by Pope Damasus as tutor of Arcadius, the elder son of Theodosius. As Arsenius did not succeed in the education of this prince, he quitted the court, and penetrated into the desert of Said (Thebais), where he remained until his death. Arsenius is commemorated in the Roman martyrology on July 19 (Hoefler, *Biographie Generale*, ii, 369).

### Arsenius, Antorianus,

head of a monastery in Nicea, afterward a hermit on Mt. Athos. He was appointed Greek patriarch about 1255, and ordained deacon, priest, and patriarch in the same week. On the death of Th. Lascaris II he was charged with the tutelage of his son John. Michael Palaeologus, aiming at the sole authority, put out the eyes of the young prince, and Arsenius excommunicated him, and refused to remit the sentence unless he would abdicate in favor of the legitimate heir. Palaeologus refused. Arsenius remaining firm, a synod held in Constantinople, 1264, deposed him. He died on an island in the Propontis in 1267. Here he wrote his *Ecclesies Græcæ Monumenta* (Paris, 1681, 4to); and also *Synopsis Divinorum Canonum*, published in Justellus's *Bibliotheca Jur. Canon.* vol. ii (Paris, 1661).-Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 1255.

### Arsenius Of Elasso,

a dignitary of the Greek Church, lived toward the close of the 17th century. He is the author of a "History of the Variations of the Greek Church." From the introduction of Christianity into Russia (992) until 1587, this church was governed by metropolitans dependent upon foreign patriarchs. In 1587, Job, the first Russian patriarch, was consecrated by Jeremiah II, patriarch of Constantinople; and this form of ecclesiastical

government continued until 1700, when the Czar put himself at the head of the Russian Church. The details which Arsenius gives us on these "variations in the Greek Church" have been printed in 1749, in the first part of the Catalogue of Manuscripts of Turin. A Latin translation was given in 1820 by Wichmann, in his *Sanmlung kleiner Schriften.-Hoefers, Biographie Universelle*, iii, 370.

### Arsuf.

*SEE APOLLONIA.*

### Art, Sacred.

Art is the embodiment of aesthetic feeling in human productions. The Fine Arts-or the different methods of this embodiment-are classified into two grand divisions: (1) those that reach the soul through the channel of the eye, termed *the formative arts* (in German, the *bildende Kiinste*); and (2) those that reach the soul through the channel of the ear (termed in German the *redende Kiinste*, but for which we have no appropriate word in English). To the former belong *architecture, sculpture, painting, engraving, etc.*; to the latter, *music, poetry, and oratory*. The *applied arts* are those in which the ornamentation is applied to productions that are not, in their primary purpose, works of art. In all nations, and in all ages of the world, the emotions of the human soul have sought expression in esthetic or artistic forms. Especially has this been the case with the highest emotions of the heart-the religious. In return, the propagators of all religions have availed themselves of aesthetic forms and modes of presenting their doctrines and creeds to the consciences and hearts of men; some employing all the fine arts, others only a part of them. Thus has been developed religious art, both pagan and sacred. Sacred art, or that of revealed religion, divides itself into (1) Jewish and (2) Christian.

**I. Jewish.** — Under the Old-Testament covenant, the arts of architecture, music, poetry, dancing (and, to a limited degree, sculpture and the applied arts), were used in the worship of God. For *SEE ARCHITECTURE, SEE MUSIC, and SEE POETRY*, see the separate articles, as in this article we treat of *art* mostly in its restricted, popular signification, embracing only the formative arts of painting and sculpture. That the second commandment was not intended to prohibit the making of all artistic representations, as is often supposed, but that it referred to the *making and worshipping of idols, is* shown by the fact that Moses himself had images

of cherubim made for the service of the tabernacle, and that in the Temple of Solomon the cherubim retained their place over the mercy-seat, and the molten sea rested upon twelve oxen, and the base of the sea was adorned with figures of cherubim, oxen, and lions, while carvings of cherubim, palms, and flowers covered many of the doors, pillars, and walls of the interior of the temple. The golden candlestick was also adorned with knobs of flowers, and the garments of the priests were richly embroidered. In short, no pains were spared to make the temple glorious, not only by its rich and gorgeous construction, but also by its truly aesthetic character. *SEE ART, JEWISH* (below).

## II. *Christian.*

**1. First Period** (1st to 4th centuries). -The earliest Christians made use, in their service, of only the arts of music, poetry, and oratory. In the second and third centuries they availed themselves of painting and sculpture in their retired places of worship and burial in the catacombs. As the societies increased in numbers and wealth, and, by the cessation of persecution, were permitted to build churches above-ground, and more especially on Christianity being declared the religion of the state, architecture was used, and soon, in its most impressive forms, gave dignity and attractiveness to the house of God. The first period of Christian, as of all other arts, was one of symbolism. The letters X p and A w were placed on the tombs and the vessels of the sanctuary. Then appeared the mystical word *ἰχθῦς*, afterward represented by a fish carved and painted. *SEE ICHTHUS*. Christ was introduced as the Good Shepherd, etc. *SEE CHRIST, IMAGES OF*. The parables of the New Testament were introduced with parallel scenes or subjects from the Old Testament, evincing a deep feeling for scriptural types and allegory. Plants and animals were used symbolically, and symbols of Christian doctrine and life were drawn from the pagan mythology of the Greeks and Romans. A study of the doctrine, customs, and spirit of the early church, as shown in its monuments of art, is a most useful complement to the study of the writings of its great minds. *SEE ARCHAEOLOGY*. The composition and execution of the paintings and sculptures in the catacombs are far superior to those of the immediately succeeding ages; but the artists lived among the finest works of Greek and Roman art, and drew from them their technical knowledge. At the same time, they were inspired by the deep emotions of the new Christian faith.

**2. *Second Period*** (4th to 12th centuries).-As church edifices were erected, the arts that had sprung up in the catacombs were transplanted to the stately house of God, and, though subordinate to the architecture, were developed into styles consistent with their monumental character and use, but not without remonstrance from some of the synods. *SEE* **ICONOCLAST**. Mosaic painting gradually supplanted the fresco style, and in the Byzantine churches was applied with all the splendor of the Oriental fancy. The Greek Church permitted no sculpture in its edifices of worship, but it developed a style of painting marked, in its best periods, by the dignity of its composition, the grandeur of the outlines, and the expressiveness of its figures and the brilliancy of its colors. Later, the composition of the mystic cycluses of painting that adorned the walls of the churches, and even of the altar-pieces, was prescribed by the theologians; the colors to be used had their symbolical doctrinal significance, and were also prescribed. This led to the stiffness of drawing, and the deadness of all art-feeling, that marks the Byzantine school after the eighth century.

In the Western Church painting and sculpture rapidly sank to a most degraded technical condition. Among the most important works of the period are the mosaic paintings of Ravenna and Rome, and the bronze doors of Amalfi and Verona. Both in its technical knowledge, and in the rules of its composition, the Byzantine school influenced the arts, not only of Italy, but of all Europe, especially that of South France.

**3. *Third Period*** (12th to 16th centuries)-- The extraordinary activity of the twelfth century in Europe extended to every department of life, and gave a great impulse to the fine arts, as a means in the hands of the church to teach its doctrines. The purest religious feeling still animated the artists, who, for piety of life, were often reckoned superior to many of the priests or other persons in holy orders. Indeed the artists often were themselves of the holy orders. Gradually (first in Tuscany) the sombre color, the formal composition and stiffness of figure of the decadent Byzantine style, gave way to better drawing, freer treatment, and brilliant coloring. In short, Christian art, for religious character and technical merits, reached its highest climax under such artists as Cimabue, Giotto, Oreagna, and Fra Angelico. In Italy fresco painting kept its predominance in the church edifice, and largely modified the architecture. In other parts of Europe, especially during the Gothic period, sculpture gained a large predominance over painting, and was confined mostly to adorning the windows with biblical scenes and subjects. The progress in sculpture was perhaps more

tardy than that of painting. Its first works of excellence were carvings in ivory on vessels of the sanctuary (often of complicate composition). The doors, doorways, columns, pulpits, altars, and baptismal fonts were covered with bronze or marble works, often of great merit. Giotto and the Pisanos (13th century) marked the first great epoch of progress in sculpture, and introduced a perfection of composition and execution hardly excelled in later times, and never surpassed for religious spirit.

During the Gothic period of architecture schools of sculpture grew up in most countries of Europe, and sculpture was profusely distributed in every part of the church edifice, especially in the exterior.

**4. *Fourth Period*** (16th to 19th centuries).—The introduction of the use of oil in painting, the invention of chiaroscuro, the growing devotion of the age to classicism, the decadence of Christian life in the church, all contributed to change the character of Christian art. What was gained in technical knowledge was lost in inspiration. After the sublime compositions of the massive genius of Michael Angelo in the Sistine Chapel and the Transfiguration by Raphael, religious art fell from its pure character of the preceding century into a depth of sensuousness and extravagance. For the next century, what then existed that was noble in art was to be sought mostly north of the Alps. During the eighteenth century an almost entire blank marks the history of religious art.

**5. *Fifth Period*** (19th century). — At the beginning of this century art had sunk (like the society of-the age) to the lowest sensuousness, and was separated almost entirely from its divine mission. Overbeck, Cornelius, and Schnorr, in Germany, tried to stem the tide, and return art to the mission it filled from the second to the fifteenth centuries. Their labors were seconded later by such artists as Ary Scheffer and Flandrin in France, and Holman Hunt, and Millais in England. The *Cyclus of Revelation*, now being prepared by Cornelius at Berlin, is perhaps the most complete work of Christian art ever undertaken. Sculpture has not been imbued as much as painting with the religious feeling of its earlier history.

**6. *Protestant Art***. — The Roman Church has always availed itself of all the fine arts in its worship. The Protestant Church in Germany, while cutting away every work of Roman tendency, has always retained a free use of the arts of painting and sculpture, which were rejected by the Reformers in England and Holland as inherently Popish in nature and tendency, and as opposed to the second commandment. America has inherited this feeling

from the two countries (Holland and England) from which she was colonized. The art of engraving, however, is freely used in both countries to illustrate religious books and periodicals, and even the Bible itself, though the same work would give offence if painted upon the walls of a church. In the Church of England there is a strong tendency to return to the use of sculpture and painting in filling up the walls of the cathedral and other churches.

**7.** The history of religious art has recently been studied with great zeal. In the Roman Church generally the opinion prevails that a return to the art of the Middle Ages, and that alone, can bring back the olden age of art. Art associations are especially numerous in France and Germany, the literature on religious art is becoming very extensive, and periodicals exclusively devoted to it have been established in both countries. The Protestant churches of Germany are generally in favor of making a more extended use of art for religious purposes than has been the case heretofore. The church diet of Elberfeld, in 1851, discussed the question of Protestant Art Unions, and in 1853 several evangelical societies were established. In 1858, a paper (*Christliches Kunstblatt*) devoted to the cultivation of religious art from a Protestant point of view was established by Schnaase, the author of the *Lest* "History of Plastic Art," in connection with Schnorr von Karolsfeld, the director of the art-gallery in Dresden, and Griineisen, court preacher at Stuttgart.

**8. Literature.** — The best work on the history of Christian art, though not extending over the entire field, is Schnaase, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste* (Dusseldorf, 1844-66). Other works: Kugler, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 3d. ed. 1855; English translation [partial] in Bohn's library, *Historical Manual of Sculpt., Paint., Arch., anc. and mod.*, Lond. 1852); Kinkel, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Christlichen Völkern* (Bonn, 1845); Lord Lindsay, *Sketches of the History of Christian Art* (Lond. 1847, 3 vols. 8vo); *Geschichte der Malerei* (Berlin, 1847, translated into English); Luibke, *Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1864); *Geschichte der Plastik* (Leipzig, 1863); Piper, *Mythologie und Symbolik der Christlichen Kunst* (Weimar, 1851-66); Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of Christian Art, etc.* (Bost. 1866); Wornum, *Epochs of Painting* (London, 1865); Jarves, *Art Studies* (N. Y. 1861).

## Art, Jewish

(*hc[ ]ni maaseh'*, work, as elsewhere rendered), <sup><0205></sup>Exodus 30:25; <sup><4164></sup>2 Chronicles 16:14 (τέχνη, elsewhere "craft," "occupation"), <sup><4172></sup>Acts 17:29; Wisd. 14:4; 17:7 ἔργον, "work"), Ecclus. xlix, 1 (πράσσω, to do, "practise"), <sup><4193></sup>Acts 19:19. (See Cleghorn, *Hist. of Anc. and Mod. Art*, Edinb. 1848; Rochette, *Lectures on Anc. Art*, Lond. 1854; Gugler, *Kunst der Hebrder*, Landshut, 1614; De Saulcy, *Hist. de l'Art Judaique*, Par. 1858.) **SEE ARTIFICER.**

The rudiments of- the arts, which are now among civilized nations brought to such an admirable state of perfection, exist also among the rudest nations, whence we infer that they must have originated partly in necessity and partly in accident. At first their processes were doubtless very imperfect and very limited; but the inquisitive and active mind of man, impelled by his wants, soon enlarged and improved them. Accordingly, in the fourth generation from Adam, we find mention made of "Tubal-Cain, an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron;" and also of Jubal, as " the father of all such as handle the harp and organ;" but in the fragments of antediluvian history preserved by Moses, there is nothing more explicit on this subject, as the book of Genesis appears to be designed chiefly as an introduction to the history of the Mosaic legislation. **SEE ANTEDILUVIANS.** The first man undoubtedly kept his children and other descendants about him as long as possible, and exercised paternal authority over them. Cain was the first who separated from his father's society, and he was impelled to this step through fear of punishment for the murder of his brother. In the course of time various motives, such as a desire to obtain land for cultivation or pasturage for cattle, might induce others to follow his example. Thus there arose separate families, which were governed by their own patriarchs: When families had increased to tribes and nations, we find that men were engaged in agriculture and in the improvement of the arts. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations*, 1st series, 4th week, Sat.) The family of Noah preserved the knowledge of the first principles of civil society and of the infant arts which had existed before the Deluge, and as early as the time of Jacob it appears that the laboring class comprehended husbandmen, mechanics, artists, and merchants. Egypt, in the early ages of the world, excelled all other nations in a knowledge of the arts, as may be sufficiently proved by the extraordinary magnitude and permanency of the Egyptian monuments, the magnificent temples'

dedicated to their gods, and the splendid obelisks erected in honor of their kings. The learning of the Egyptians has been made known to us by the sacred historian. By this record we have been taught to believe in the wisdom of this ancient people, and to feel astonishment at the nature of their institutions, the extent of their learning, and the perfection they had attained in the arts at so early a period. Moses, it is true, did not enact any special laws in favor of the arts among the Hebrews, nor did he interdict or endeavor to lessen them in the estimation of the people, but, on the contrary, speaks in praise of artificers (<sup><1251></sup>Exodus 35:30, 35). The descendants of Jacob having lived on terms of amity with their neighbors of Mizraim, "until another king arose who knew not Joseph," they undoubtedly borrowed from them many of their instruments of agriculture, of commerce, and of luxury, and as the artists of Egypt descended to depict the minutest particulars of their household arrangements, and every circumstance connected with their national habits and observances was faithfully represented, we have the means of forming a judgment respecting the arts and usages which prevailed among the Hebrews. *SEE EGYPT*. No one can pretend to doubt that the scriptural narrative is singularly illustrated and confirmed by the monuments. A rich vein of illustration is thus opened by comparing the various processes depicted on those monuments with the statements scattered throughout the inspired records, more especially the numerous metaphors employed by the prophets in relation to many of these arts and manufactures; and we shall, therefore, in the order of the alphabetical series, give descriptive particulars of the various arts as practised among the Egyptians, presuming that those subsequently practised by the Hebrews differed but little from them. *SEE CARPENTER*.

Soon after the death of Joshua a place was expressly allotted by Joab to artificers; it was called the valley of craftsmen, מַיְרֵי הַיָּדָאִים <sup><1344></sup>1 Chronicles 4:14; comp. <sup><1315></sup>Nehemiah 11:35). *SEE CRAFTSMAN*. About this time mention is also made of artificers in gold and silver (<sup><1778></sup>Judges 17:3, 5). *SEE METAL*. Some of the less complicated instruments used in agriculture every one made for himself. The women spun, wove, and embroidered; they made clothing, not only for their families, but for sale (<sup><1235></sup>Exodus 35:25). *SEE WOMAN*. Artificers among the Hebrews were not, as among the Greeks and Romans, servants and slaves, but men of some rank, and as luxury increased, they became very numerous (<sup><1241></sup>Jeremiah 24:1; 29:2). *SEE HANDICRAFT*. In the time of David and



Solomon there were Israelites who understood the construction of temples and palaces, but they were still inferior to the Tyrans, from whom they were willing to receive instruction (<sup><340></sup>1 Chronicles 14:1; 22:15). *SEE ARCHITECTURE*. During the captivity many of the Hebrews applied themselves to the arts and merchandise; and subsequently, when they were scattered abroad among different nations, a knowledge of the arts became so popular that the Talmudists taught that all parents should have their children instructed in some art or handicraft. They mention many learned men of their nation who practised some kind of manual labor, or, as we should term it, followed some trade; and we find the circumstance frequently alluded to in the New Testament (<sup><435></sup>Matthew 13:55; <sup><496></sup>Acts 9:43; <sup><504></sup>2 Timothy 4:14, etc.). The Jews, like other nations of their time, reckoned certain trades infamous; among these, the Rabbins classed the drivers of asses and camels, barbers, sailors, shepherds, and inn-keepers, placing them on a level with robbers. *SEE PUBLICAN*. The more eminent Greek tradesmen in the apostolic age were united, it appears, in a sort of corporation or society (<sup><485></sup>Acts 19:25), and such was probably the case with the Jews also. *SEE MECHANIC*.

## Artaba

(Ἀρτάβη), a dry measure used by the Babylonians (Herod. i, 192), containing seventy-two sextarii according, to Epiphanius (*de Ponderib. et Mens.*) and Isidore of Seville (lib. 16, Origen); or, according to Dr. Arbuthnot's tables, one bushel, one gallon, and one pint, allowing, with him, four pecks and six pints to the medimnus, and one pint to the choenix (for it was equal to 1 medimnus + 2 choenices). It is found only in the apocryphal Daniel, or Dan. 14:3, Vulg. (Auth, Vers. "measure," Bel, ver 3). *SEE MEASURE*.

## Artaxer'xes,

### Picture for Artaxerxes

the Greek form (Ἀρταξέρξης) of the name, or rather title, of several Persian kings (on each of which see fully in Smith's *Diet. of Class. Biog.* s.v.), and applied in the Auth. Vers. to several of them occurring in the O.T. The Hebrew form (*Artachshast'*, אֲרַחְשָׁשְׁתַּיִם <sup><1570></sup>Ezra 7:1, 7; or *Artachshasht'*, אֲרַחְשָׁשְׁתַּיִם <sup><1508></sup>Ezra 4:8, 11, 26; 6:14; once *Artachshashta'*, אֲרַחְשָׁשְׁתַּיִם <sup><1507></sup>Ezra 4:7; Sept. Ἀρθασασθά) is a slight

corruption of *rtvj tra*, which letters De Sacy has deciphered in the inscriptions of Nakshi Rustam, and which he vocalizes *Artahshetr* (*Ant. i. d. I. Perse*, p. 100). Gesenius pronounces them *Artachshatr*; and, by assuming the easy change of r into s, and the transposition of the s, makes *Artachshast* very closely represent its prototype (*Thes. Heb.* p. 155). The word is a compound, the first element of which, are found in several Persian names is generally admitted to mean *great*; the latter part being the Zend *khshethro*, *king* (Lassen, in the *Zeitschrift für d. Kunde d. Morgenl.* 6:161 sq.). Thus the sense of *great warrior* (μέγας ἄρῆιος), which Herodotus (vi, 98) assigned to the Greek form *Artaxerxes*, accords with that which etymology (see Lassen, *Keilschrift*, p. 36) discovers in the original Persian title (particularly when we consider that as the king could only be chosen from the soldier-caste—from the *Kshatriyas* warrior and king are so far cognate terms); although Pott, according to his etymology of *Xerxes*, takes *Artaxerxes* to be more than equivalent to *Artachshatr* to be "magnus regum rex" (*Etym. Forsch.* i, p. lxxvii). **SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS; SEE HIEROGLYPHICS.**

**1.** The Persian king who, at the instigation of the adversaries of the Jews, obstructed the rebuilding of the Temple, from his time to that of Darius, king of Persia (<sup><480></sup>Ezra 4:7-24). The monarch here referred to is probably, **SEE AHASUERUS**, not *Cambyzes* (as Josephus says, *Ant.* 11:2, 1), but the immediate predecessor of Darius Hystaspis, and can be no other than the Magian impostor *Smerdis* (Σμέρδης), who seized on the throne B.C. 522, and was murdered after a usurpation of less than eight months (Herod. iii, 61-78). Profane historians, indeed, have not mentioned him under the *title* of *Artaxerxes*; but neither do Herodotus and Justin (the latter of whom calls him *Oropastes*, i, 9) agree in his *name* (see Bertheau, *Gesch. d. Isr.* p. 397). **SEE SMERDIS.**

**2.** As to the *second* *Artaxerxes*, in the seventh year of whose reign Ezra led a second colony of the Jewish exiles back to Jerusalem (<sup><450></sup>Ezra 7:1 sq.), the opinions are divided between *Xerxes* (with Michaelis in loc.; Jahn, *Einl.* II, i, 276; *Archaeol.* II, i, 259; De Wette, *Einl.* § 195, and others) and his son *Artaxerxes Longimanus* (so H. Michaelis; Offerhaus; Eichhorn, *Einl.* iii, 697; Bertholdt, *Einl.* iii, 989; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 156; Kleinert, in the *Dorpat. Beitr.* i, 1; Keil, *Chronicles* p. 103; Archinard, *Chronology*, p. 128, and many others). Josephus (*Ant.* 11:5, 6) calls him *Xerxes*; but, from various considerations (chiefly that because the first portion of the book of Ezra relates to Darius Hystaspis, it does not follow that the next king

spoken of must be his successor Xerxes; that Nehemiah's absence of twelve years is ample to allow the confusion in the infant colony under the merely moral sway of Ezra; and that Josephus likewise confounds the Artaxerxes of Nehemiah with Xerxes, while the author of the apocryphal version of Esdras [1 Esdr. ii, 17; 7:4; 8:8] correctly calls both these kings Artaxerxes, a name, moreover, more like the Heb. form, and in that case not conflicting with the distinctive title of Xerxes in Esther), it is nearly certain that (as in Syncell. *Chronicles* p. 251) he is the same with the *third* Artaxerxes, the Persian king who, in the twentieth year of his reign, considerably allowed Nehemiah to go to Jerusalem for the furtherance of purely national objects, invested him with the government of his own people, and allowed him to remain there for twelve years (Nehemiah ii, 1 sq.; v, 14). It is almost unanimously agreed that the king here intended is *Artaxerxes Longimanus* (Ἀρταξέρξης [otherwise Ἄρτοξέρξης, Bahr *ad Ctes.* p. 166, 175]). **SEE NEHEMIAH.** As this prince began to reign B.C. 466, the restoration under Ezra will fall in B.C. 459, and the first under Nehemiah in B.C. 446. See the *Meth. Quart. Review*, July, 1850, p. 495. Others (as J. D. Michaelis) understand *Artaxerxes Memon* (reigned B.C. 404-359) to be meant (comp. <sup><K838></sup>Nehemiah 13:28, with Josephus, *Ant.* 11:8, 3 and 4); but Bertholdt (*Einleit.* iii, 1014) shows that the age of Eliashib (q.v.) will not allow this (comp. <sup><K810></sup>Nehemiah 3:1, with 12:1, 10); for Eliashib, who was high-priest when Nehemiah reached Jerusalem (<sup><K810></sup>Nehemiah 3:1), i.e. on this last supposition, B.C. 385, was grandson of Jeshua (<sup><K620></sup>Nehemiah 12:10), high-priest in the time of Zerubbabel (<sup><K810></sup>Ezra 3:2), B.C. 535. We cannot think that the grandfather and grandson were separated by an interval of 150 years. Besides, as Ezra and Nehemiah were contemporaries (<sup><K810></sup>Nehemiah 8:9), this theory transfers the whole history contained in Ezra 7, ad fin., and Nehemiah to this date, and it is hard to believe that in this critical period of Jewish annals there are no events recorded between the reigns of Darius Hystaspis (Ezra 6) and Artaxerxes Mnemon. As already observed, there are again some who maintain that as Darius Hystaspis is the king in the sixth chapter of Ezra, the king mentioned next after him, at the beginning of the seventh, must be Xerxes, and thus they distinguish *three* Persian kings called Artaxerxes in the Old Testament, (1) Smerdis in Ezra 4:(2) Xerxes in Ezra 7, and (3) Artaxerxes Longimanus in Nehemiah. But (in addition to the arguments above) it is almost demonstrable that Xerxes is the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther, **SEE AHASUERUS**, and it is hard to suppose that besides his ordinary name he would have been called both Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes in the O. T. it seems, too, very probable that the

policy of Nehemiah ii was a continuation and renewal of that of Ezra 7, and that the same king was the author of both. Now it is not possible for Xerxes to be the Artaxerxes of Nehemiah, as Josephus asserts (*Ant.* 11:5, 6), for Xerxes only reigned 21 years, whereas Nehemiah (~~13:6~~ Nehemiah 13:6) speaks of the 32d year of Artaxerxes. Nor is it necessary to believe that the book of Ezra is a strictly continuous history. It is evident from the first words of ch. 7 that there is a pause at the end of ch. 6. Indeed, as ch. 6 concludes in the 6th year of Darius, and ch. 7 begins with the 7th year of Artaxerxes, we cannot even believe the latter king to be Xerxes without assuming an interval of 36 years (B.C. 516-479) between the chapters, and it is not more difficult to imagine one of 56, which will carry us to B.C. 1459, the 7th year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. We conclude, therefore, that this is the king of Persia under whom both Ezra and Nehemiah carried on their work; that in B.C. 457 he sent Ezra to Jerusalem; that after 13 years it became evident that a civil as well as an ecclesiastical head was required for the new settlement, and therefore that in 446 he allowed Nehemiah to go up in the latter capacity. From the testimony of profane historians, this king appears remarkable among Persian monarchs for wisdom and right feeling, and with this character his conduct to the Jews coincides (Diod. 11:71).

### Artaxerxes I,

surnamed LONGIMANUS (Gr. *Μακρόχειρ*, *long-handed*), from the circumstance that his right hand was longer than his left (Plutarch, *Artax.* 1), was king of Persia for forty years, B.C. 465-425 [strictly 466-425] (Diod. 11:69; 12:64; Thuc. 4:50). He ascended the throne after his father, Xerxes I, had been murdered by Artabanus, and after he had himself put to death his own brother Darius, at the instigation of Artabanus (Justin, iii, 1; Ctesias ap. Phot. *Bibl.* p. 40, a, ed. Bekk.). His reign is characterized (Plut. *ut sup.*) as wise and temperate, but it was disturbed by several dangerous insurrections of the satraps; and after the reduction of these, by a revolt of the Egyptians (B.C. 462 [Clinton, 460]), in the course of which the Athenians became involved, and gained two memorable victories over the forces of Artaxerxes (B.C. 449), the one by land and the other by sea (Diod. 12:4; Thucyd. i, 104 sq.). This is said to have led to a treaty between the Greeks and Persians, on terms very favorable to the former (Thirlwall's *History of Greece*, i, 304; Smith's *Hist. of Greece*, p. 262). Artaxerxes appears to have passed the remainder of his reign in peace. He was succeeded by his son Xerxes II (Clinton, *Fasti Hell.* ii, 380).

## Ar'temas

(Ἄρτεμᾶς for Ἄρτεμίδωρος, *Artemidorus*, i.e. given by *Diana*) occurs once (Tit. iii, 12) as the name of an esteemed disciple in connection with Tychichus, one of whom Paul designed to send into Crete to supply the place of Titus, when he invited the latter to visit him at Nicopolis. A.D. 63. Ecclesiastical tradition makes him to have been bishop of Lystra.

## Artemis.

SEE DIANA.

## Artemon.

SEE MAINSAIL.

## Artemon,

a heretic; toward the end of the second century. Little is known of his history; even his name is sometimes given Artemon and sometimes Artemas. The principal sources of our scanty information are Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* v, 28, where he uses the name Artemon, and 7:30, where it is Artemas; Theodoret, *Iceret. Fab. Epit.* ii, 4; Epiphanius, *Her.* lxx, 1, 4; Photius, *Biblioth.* 48. Eusebius cites names of writers against Artemon, and gives some hints of his doctrine as being the same with that of Theodotus the tanner, viz. that Christ was a mere man. Theodoret (1. c.) says that Artemon believed in God the creator, but asserted Christ to be a mere man; born of a virgin, however, and superior to the prophets. Eusebius speaks of Artemon and his followers as abandoning the Scriptures for "syllogisms, and geometry." He states also that Paul of Samosata revived the heresy of Artemon. Schleiermacher (*Theol. Zeitschr.* i 1822, iii, 295 sq.; translated by Moses Stuart in *Bibl. Repository*, v, 334 sq.) goes into a careful examination of the fragments of our knowledge about Artemon, and adopts the view previously given out by Gennadius of Marseilles, that Artemon was, in reality, a Sabellian. See also Lardner, *Works*, ii, 403 sq.; Schaffhausen, *Historia Artemonis et Artemonitarum*, Leipzig, 1737, 4to; Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. i, vol. ii, 8; Neander, *Church History*, i, 580.

## Artemonites,

followers of Artemon (q.v.). A small remnant of the Artemonites existed in the third century.-Euseb. *Ch. Hist.* v, 28.

## Article, In Grammar.

Of this part of speech, but one kind, the *definite* article, requires any consideration here, since the indefinite article in those languages where it is grammatically treated as a peculiar form is, after all, but a modification of the numeral for *one* (Gr. εἷς, ἕνός; Lat. *unus*; French, *un*; Germ. *ein*; Eng, *an*, etc.). In Hebrew the definite article is denoted by the syllable **hi** prefixed to the noun (or other word so employed), and the Dagesh forte inserted in the following letter (whenever this will admit) shows that this was but a contraction for some older form, probably **l hi** (or perhaps a modified form of the demonstrative pronoun, **hLā**, corresponding to the Arabic *al* or *el*, which in like manner assimilates its last letter to that of many words with which it is joined. In Chaldee and Syriac, however, this prefix is never employed, but in its stead the letter **a** (or syllable *ah*) is *appended* to the noun, which is then said to be in the "definite or emphatic state." In the Greek language, on the other hand, the article is pronominal in form and construction, being, in fact, originally (e.g. in Homer) actually a *demonstrative* pronoun. The point of the greatest importance in biblical criticism, and that for the interest connected with which the subject is here introduced, is the frequent omission of the definite article in the New Testament, where in classical Greek its presence is grammatically requisite. Bishop Middleton has treated copiously of this peculiarity (*Doctrine of the Greek Article*, Lond. 1824, and often since); but many of the "canons" that he lays down for its use or disuse, upon which important theological conclusions have often been made to depend, are highly fanciful, and unsupported by general Hellenistic usage. The idiom in question is, in fact, nothing more than a transfer of the Hebrew laws for the omission or insertion of the article prefix, which may be found clearly drawn out in Nordheimer's *Heb. Gram.* ii, § 716-729, especially § 717, 718; and depend upon this essential principle, that the article may be omitted before any word that is regarded as being *already sufficiently definite*, either by reason of being in construction with another noun, adjective, pronoun, or other qualifying term, or by being distinctive in itself, so as not to be specially liable to misinterpretation.

## Article

(λόγος) OF AGREEMENT (1 Macc. 13:29; 2 Macc. 14:28). *SEE ALLIANCE.*

## Articles Of Faith,

statements of the main points of belief of any single church framed by authority of the church, and binding upon its ministers or members, or upon both. Some object to Articles of Faith. Among the grounds of objection are the following, viz. that they infringe Christian liberty, and supersede the Scriptures by substituting- in their place a number of humanly-formed propositions; that to exhibit the Christian faith in any limited number of statements is virtually to declare that all besides is superfluous. It is objected, also, that such articles nourish hypocrisy, and hinder advancement in divine knowledge. "If employed at all," it is said, "they should be in the words of Scripture." The advocates for " articles of faith," on the other hand, affirm that it is not their purpose to sum up the whole of Christianity in any number of propositions, but merely to set forth the belief of a given church upon the leading truths of religion, as well as upon those matters which have at any period been subjects of heretical corruption or of controversy, and respecting which it is necessary that there should be agreement among such as are to be members of the same church; that articles are not intended to be guides through the whole voyage of Christian inquiry, but only beacon-lights to inform the mariner where lie those rocks and shoals on which preceding voyagers have made shipwreck. It is clear that there is a necessity for such articles, because the sense of Scripture upon any one point of faith lies scattered over too large a surface to be easily collected for himself by every individual member of the church; that scriptural truths are as capable as any other of being translated into common language; and that controversies within the church upon the meaning of Scripture would abound, if the church itself should give no interpretation of them (comp. ~~ROM~~Romans 6:17; ~~2TIM~~2 Timothy 1:13). The most important of these are specially treated below. *SEE CONFESSIONS, SEE CREEDS.*

## Articles, Lambeth.

The Calvinistic doctrine concerning Predestination, Free-will, etc., which had been the cause of vehement disputes on the Continent, had been brought into England by the refugees, and gained great footing, about the

year 1594, at Cambridge, by the influence of Cartwright, the Lady Margaret professor. Barret, a fellow of Caius College, preached *ad clerum* against Calvin's doctrines. Archbishop Whitgift at first took Barret's part; but at last, urged by the heads of colleges, sent for him to Lambeth, and directed him not to preach such doctrine again. Dr. Whittaker, the regius professor, supported the novel doctrines; and this party, having stated the controversy to their own liking, drew up nine articles into form, and laid them before Archbishop Whitgift, who called, November 10th, an assembly at Lambeth to consider the question, consisting of Fletcher, the elect of London; Vaughan, elect of Bangor; Trindall, dean of Ely; and Whittaker and the Cambridge divines. They drew up the following nine articles, known as the "Lambeth Articles:"

- 1.** God hath from eternity predestinated certain persons to life, and hath reprobated certain persons unto death.
- 2.** The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing that is in the persons predestinated, but the alone will of God's good pleasure.
- 3.** The predestinati are a predetermined and certain number, which can neither be lessened nor increased.
- 4.** Such as are not predestinated to salvation shall inevitably be condemned on account of their sins.
- 5.** The true, lively, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, doth not utterly fail, doth not vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally.
- 6.** A true believer-that is, one who is endued with justifying faith-is certified by the full assurance of faith that his sins are forgiven, and that he shall be everlastingly saved by Christ.
- 7.** Saving grace is not allowed, is not imparted, is not granted to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.
- 8.** No man is able to come to Christ unless it be given him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to his Son.



9. It is not in the will or power of every man to be saved." The archbishop approved the articles Nov. 20, 1595, and sent them to Cambridge; but the queen ordered them to be recalled, and censured Whitgift severely. As the meeting at Lambeth was not a lawful synod, its resolutions cannot be regarded as the act of the church of that day; nor, indeed, in any other light than as declaring the opinion of some of the church authorities of that period upon the subject of predestination. The very effort to enact them seems to show that the Calvinistic bishops of the time were not satisfied that the Thirty-nine Articles were Calvinistic.-Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* 7:187; Hardwick, *Hist. of 39 Articles*, ch. 7:and Appendix, No. vi; Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 462; Browne *On 39 Articles*, p. 379.

### Articles Of Perth,

five articles agreed upon at a General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, convened at Perth by command of James VI on the 25th of August, 1618. These articles enjoined kneeling at the Lord's Supper, the observance of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, and Pentecost, and confirmation, and sanctioned the private administration of baptism and of the Lord's Supper. They were highly obnoxious to the Presbyterians of Scotland, not only on their own account, but as part of an attempt to change the whole constitution of the church; and because they were adopted without free discussion in the Assembly, and in mere compliance with the will of the king, who was also regarded as having unduly interfered with the constitution of the Assembly itself. They were, however, ratified by the Parliament on the 4th of August, 1621-a day long remembered in Scotland -as *Black Saturday*-were enforced by the Court of High Commission, and became one of the chief subjects of that contention between the king and the people which produced results so grave and sad for both in the subsequent reign.' The General Assembly of Glasgow in 1638 declared that of Perth to have been "unfree, unlawful, and null," and condemned the Five Articles.-Chambers's *Encyclopaedia*, s.v.; Calderwood, *History of Church of Scotland*, vol. ii; Hetherington, *Church of Scotland*, i, 239.

### Articles Of Schmalkald.

The Protestants had formed the Schmalkaldic League (q.v.) in 1531, and the emperor, by the Religious Peace of 1532, had agreed to maintain the *status quo* until a council should meet to settle all questions. He endeavored to have a papal council called in 1537; but the Wittenberg

divines, not willing to trust such a body, agreed to certain articles drawn up by Luther, and presented at the meeting of the electors, princes, and states at Schmalkald (Feb. 15, 1537). They were principally designed to show how far the Lutherans were disposed to go in order to avoid a final rupture with Rome, and in what sense they were willing to adopt the doctrine of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. In these articles opposition to the Romish doctrine is very strongly expressed. The articles afterward became one of the authoritative symbolical books of the Lutheran Church. Dr. Murdoch, in his notes to Mosheim (*Ch. History* cent. 16:sec. i, ch. iii, § 9), gives the following account of them: "The Augsburg Confession was intended to soften prejudice against the Lutherans, and to conciliate the good-will of the Catholics. Of course, the gentle Melancthon was employed to write it. The Articles of Schmalkald, on the contrary, were a preparation for a campaign against an enemy with whom no compromise was deemed possible, and in which victory or death was the only alternative. Of course,, all delicacy toward the Catholics was dispensed with, and Luther's fiery style was chosen, and allowed full scope. In words the Articles flatly contradict the Confession in some instances, though in some they are the same. Thus the Confession (article 24) says: 'We are unjustly charged with having abolished the mass. For it is manifest that, without boasting, we may say the mass is observed by us with greater devotion and earnestness than by our opposers.' But in the Articles of Schmalkald, part ii, art. 11, it is said that the popish mass is the greatest and most horrid abomination, as militating directly and violently against these articles; and yet it has become the chief and most splendid of all the popish idolatries.' In the Confession they applied the name of the mass to the Lutheran form of the Eucharist; but in these Articles they confine that term to the proper import, the ordinary public service among the Catholics. The Articles of Schmalkald cover 28 folio pages, and are preceded by a preface, and followed by a treatise on the power and supremacy of the pope. The first part contains four concise articles respecting God, the Trinity, and the incarnation, passion, and ascension of Christ, in accordance with the Apostles' and the Athanasian Creeds. On these articles the Protestants professed to agree together with the Papists. The second part also contains four articles of fundamental importance, but in which the Protestants and Papists are declared to be totally and irreconcilably at variance. They relate to the nature and to the grounds of justification, the mass and saint worship, ecclesiastical and monkish establishments, and the claims of the pope. The third part contains fifteen articles, which the

Protestants considered as relating to very important subjects, but on which the Papists laid little stress. The subjects are sin, the law, repentance, the Gospel, baptism, the sacrament of the altar, the keys (or spiritual power), confession, excommunication, ordination, celibacy of the clergy, churches, good works, monastic vows, and human satisfaction for sin. When the Protestants subscribed these articles, Melancthon annexed a reservation to his signature purporting that he could admit of a pope, provided he would allow the Gospel to be preached in its purity, and would give up his pretensions to a divine right to rule, and would found his claims wholly on expediency and human compact. In consequence of this dissent from Luther, Melancthon was requested to draw up an article on the power and supremacy of the pope. He did so, and the Protestants were well pleased with it, and subscribed to it. It is annexed to the Articles of Schmalkald." See J. G. Walch's *Introd. to Biblioth. Theol.* i, 317, 362.

The first edition of the Articles of Schmalkald appeared in Wittenberg, 1538, 4to, in German; in Late in (by Generanus), 1541, 8vo. Selnekker afterward made a new Latin version, which is the one adopted in the collection of Lutheran creeds in Latin. A new edition of the German text, with the literature of the subject, was published by Marheineke (Berlin, 1817, 4to). See also, for the text and history, Francke, *Libri Symbolici Eccl. Lutherance* (Lips. 1847, 12mo); Guericke, *Christl. Symbolik*, § 14; Ranke, *History of the Reformation*, vol. iii.

### Articles, Six.

This was an act (known as "the bloody statute") passed during that period of reaction against the Reformation in the mind of Henry VIII, which lasted from 1538 to 1544. Gardiner and Tonstall took advantage of this mood of the king's mind, and procured the enactment, June 28, 1539, of the "six articles for the abolishing of diversity of opinions;" in reality, a law to punish with death all persons who should adopt the doctrines of the Reformers on the points covered by it. These points were, that in the sacrament of the altar, after consecration, there remains no substance of bread and wine, but the natural body and blood of Christ; that communion in both kinds is not necessary; that priests, according to the law of God, may not marry; that vows of chastity ought to be observed; that private masses ought to be continued; and that auricular confession is expedient and necessary, and ought to be retained in the church. Cranmer strenuously opposed this act, but afterward I complied. Latimer and Shaxton resigned

their bishoprics. It was under this act that Anne Askew (q.v.), or Ascough, was executed in 1546.-- Burnet, *Hist. Engl. Reform.* i, 416; ii, 63; Maitland, *Essays of the I Reformation*, essay xii; Hardwick, *Church History*, iii, 205; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, vol. i, ch. i.

### Articles, Twenty-Five,

of the Methodist Episcopal Church. They are as follows:

**I.** *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.* — There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

**II.** *Of the Word, or Son of God, who was made very Man.* -The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and per- feet natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

**III.** *Of the Resurrection of Christ.* — Christ did truly rise again from the dead, and took again his body, with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith lie ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

**IV.** *Of the Holy Ghost.* — The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty. and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

**V.** *The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.* -The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to b- required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the church.

*The Names of the Canonical Books:* Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, The First Book of Samuel, The Second Book of Samuel, The First Book of Kings, The Second Book of Kings, The First Book of Chronicles, The Second Book of Chronicles, The Book of Ezra, The Book of Nehemiah, The Book of Esther, The Book of Job, The Psalms, The Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, Four Prophets the greater, Twelve Prophets the less; all the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account canonical.

**VI.** *Of the Old Testament.*-The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

**VII.** *Of Original or Birth Sin.*-Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

**VIII.** *Of Free Will.* —The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.

**IX.** *Of the Justification of Man.*-We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.

**X.** *Of Good Works.*-Although good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins and endure the

severity of God's judgments, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and spring out of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by its fruit

**XI.** *Of Works of Supererogation.*--Voluntary works, besides over and above God's commandments, which are called works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that is commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

**XII.** *Of Sin. after Justification.* — Not every sin willingly committed after justification is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after justification; after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and, by the grace of God, rise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

**XIII.** *Of the Church.*— The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity and requisite to the same.

**XIV.** *Of Purgatory.* — The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardon, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but repugnant to the Word of God.

**XV.** *Of speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue as the People understand.* — It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood by the people.

**XVI.** *Of the Sacraments.* — Sacraments ordained of Christ are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but, rather, they are certain signs of grace, and God's good will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have partly grown out of the *corrupt* following of the apostles, and partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not the like nature of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, because they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them) And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them un a worthily purchase to themselves condemnation, as St. Paula saith, <sup><4112></sup>1 Corinthians 11:29.

**XVII.** *Of Baptism.* — Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church.

**XVIII.** *Of the Lord's Supper.* — The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of our Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

**XIX.** *Of both Kind.* — The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people; for both the parts of the Lord's Supper, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christians alike.

**XX.** *Of the one Oblation of Christ, finished upon the Cross.* -The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in the which it is commonly said that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit.

**XXI.** *Of the Marriage of Ministers.* -The ministers of Christ are not commanded by God's law either to vow the state of single life, or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christians, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve best to godliness.

**XXII.** *Of the Rites and Ceremonies of Churches.* -It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike; for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the rites and ceremonies of the church to which he belongs, which are not repugnant to the Word of God, and are ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like, as one that offendeth against the common order of the church, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren.

Every particular church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies, so that all things may be done to edification.

**XXIII.** *Of the Rulers of the United States. of America.* — The President, the Congress, the General Assemblies, the governors, and the Councils of State, *as the delegates of the people*, are the rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the Constitution of the United States, and by the Constitutions of their respective states. And the said states are a sovereign and independent nation, and ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction. As far as it



respects civil affairs, we believe it the duty of Christians, and especially all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and to use all lawful means to enjoin obedience to the powers that be; and therefore it is expedient that all our preachers and people, who may be under the British or any other government, will behave themselves as peaceable and orderly subjects.

**XXIV.** *Of Christian Men's Goods.* — The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as some do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

**XXV.** *Of a Christian Man's Oath.* — As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ and James his apostle, so we judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

These are, in substance, the Articles of the Church of England, omitting the 3d, 8th, 13th, 15th, 17th, 18th, 20th, 21st, 23d, 26th, 29th, 33d, 34th, 36th, and 37th. On comparison, it will be found that these omissions are nearly all made in order to greater comprehension and liberality in the Creed. The 23d article (adopted in 1804) is especially to be noted, as giving the adherence of the church at that early period to the doctrine that the "United States" constitute "a sovereign nation." The articles, in their present form, are a modification of those originally framed for the church by Wesley, and printed in the *Sunday Service of the Methodists*. They were adopted, with the Liturgy, at the Christmas Conference of 1784. The changes made in them since that period (except the political one above referred to, made necessary by the adoption of the national Constitution) are chiefly verbal; and some of them appear to be due to typographical errors in successive reprints of the Book of Discipline. For a list of the changes, see Emory, *History of the Discipline*, ch. i, § 2. See also Jameson, *Notes on the 25 Articles* (Cincinnati, 1853, 12mo); Comfort, *Exposition of the Articles* (N. Y. 1847, 12mo); Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (N. Y. 1865, 3 vols. 8vo). **SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.**

## Articles (The Thirty-Nine)

of the Church of England contain what may be called the "symbol," "creed." or "confession of faith" of the Church of England. especially as to the points on which, at the time of the adoption of the articles, disputes existed. They constitute also, substantially, the Creed of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States (see below).

The history of their origin, as nearly as can be ascertained, is about as follows. As early as 1549 Cranmer drew up and circulated a series of articles designed "to test the orthodoxy of preachers and lecturers in divinity." Hooper objected to them because of the impression that "the sacraments confer grace," and for other reasons (Hooper, *Original Letters*, p. 71). About this time three eminent Continental reformers were domiciled in England, viz. John a Lasco or Laski (q.v.), as preacher in London, Bucer (q.v.), as theological lecturer at Cambridge, and Peter Martyr (q.v.), as professor at Oxford. The influence of these great men went all in the current of thoroughly Protestant reformation, and was especially felt in the revision of the Prayer-book and of the Articles, in which they were consulted to a greater or less extent. Calvin, Melancthon, Bullinger, and other eminent Continental Protestants were in correspondence with Cranmer on the settlement of doctrinal points. In 1549, an act of Parliament was passed empowering the king to appoint a commission of 32 persons to make ecclesiastical laws. Under this act a commission of 8 bishops, 8 divines, 8 civilians, and 8 lawyers (among whom were Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Coverdale, Scory, Peter Martyr, Justice Hales, etc.), was appointed in 1551. Cranmer seems to have laid before this body, as a basis, a series of 13 articles, chiefly from the Augsburg Confession (reported in Hardwick, *History of the Article* App. iii). Finally, "Forty-two articles" were laid before the royal council, Nov. 24, 1552 (text given in Burnet, 4:311). In March, 1553, they were laid before Convocation, but whether adopted by that body or not is undecided. Strype and others assert that they were; Burnet, that they were not (*Hist. Ref.* iii 316). Fuller, speaking in his quaint way of this convocation, declares that it had "no commission from the king to meddle with church business, and," he adds, "every convocation in itself is born deaf and dumb, so that it can neither hear nor speak concerning complaints in religion till first *Ephphtha*, 'Be thou opened,' be pronounced unto it by royal authority. However," he continues, "this barren convocation is entitled the parent of those forty-two articles which are printed with this title, *Articuli de quibus in Synoda Londinensi*

1552 A.D. *inter Episcopos et alios convenerat.* " To these articles was prefixed the Catechism, and the preparation of them was chiefly the work of Cranmer and Ridley, on the basis of the Augsburg Confession (Laurence, *Bampton Lecture*, p. 230). Immediately after their publication Edward died (July 6, 1553). Under Queen Mary. Cranmer and Ridley went to the stake, and Gardiner and the Papists took their places as authorities in religion. In 1558 Mary died. Soon after the accession of Elizabeth, Matthew Parker (q.v.) was made archbishop of Canterbury (1559). One of his first tasks was to restore and recast the XLII articles. He expunged some parts and added others, making special use of both the Augsburg and Württemberg Confessions (Laurence, *Bampt. Lect.* 233; Browne, *XXXIX Articles*, 15). The revised draught was laid before Convocation, which body made some minor alterations, and finally adopted the Thirty-eight Articles (January, 1562-3). They are given in Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, p. 124.

In 1566 a bill was brought into Parliament to confirm them. The bill passed the Commons, but by the queen's command was dropped in the Lords. In 1571 the Convocation revised the articles of 1562, and made some alterations in them. In the same year an act was passed "to provide that the ministers of the church should be of sound religion." It enacted that all ecclesiastical persons should subscribe to "all the articles of religion which only contained the confession of the true faith and of the sacraments, comprised in a book imprinted, entitled 'Articles,' whereupon it was agreed by the archbishops and bishops, and the whole clergy in convocation holden in London, in the year of our Lord God 1562, according to the computation of the Church of England, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion, put forth by the queen's authority." In 1628 an English edition was published by royal authority, to which is prefixed the declaration of Charles I.

The following are the Articles in full, as found in the Prayer-book of the Church of England:

**I. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.**— There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

**II.** *Of the Word or Son of God, which was made very Man.* -The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

**III.** *Of the going down of Christ into Hel.* — As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed that he went down into hell.

**IV.** *Of the Resurrection of Christ.* — Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men at the last day.

**V.** *Of the Holy Ghost.*—The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

**VI.** *Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.* -Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the church.

Of the names and number of the Canonical Books: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, The First Book of Samuel, The Second Book of Samuel, The First Book of Kings, The Second Book of Kings, The First Book of Chronicles, The Second Book of Chronicles, The First Book of Esdras, The Second Book of Esdras, The Book of Esther, The Book of Job, The Psalms, The Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, or Preacher, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, Four Prophets the greater, Twelve-Prophets the less. And the other Books (as *Hiero mee* saith) the church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine; such are these following:

The Third Book of Esdras, The Fourth Book of Esdras, The Book of Tobias, The Book of Judith, The rest of the Book of Esther, The Book of Wisdom, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Baruch the Prophet, The Song of the Three Children, The Story of. Susanna, Of Bel and the Dragon, The Prayer of Manasses, The First Book of Maccabees, The Second Book of Maccabees. All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical.

**VII.** *Of the Old Testament.* — The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

**VIII.** *Of the Three Creeds.* — The Three Creeds, *Nicene Creed*, *Athanasius's Creed*, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles' Creed*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

**IX.** *Of Original or Birth Sin.* — Original sin standeth not in the following of *Adam* (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk), but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of *Adam*; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit; and therefore, in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek *phronem sarko*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

**X.** *Of Free Will.*—The condition of man after the fall of *Adam* is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good

works, to faith and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.

**XI.** *Of the Justification of Man.* — We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

**XII.** *Of Good Works.* — Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure' the severity of God's judgment, yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith: insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

**XIII.** *Of Works before Justification.* — Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

**XIV.** *Of Works of Supererogation.* - Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

**XV.** *Of Christ alone without Sin.* — Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world, and sin, as Saint *John* saith, was not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

**XVI.** *Of Sin after Baptism.* — Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

**XVII.** *Of Predestination and Election.* — Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace be the calling; they be justified freely; they be made sons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of his onlybegotten Son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love toward God, so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture, and, in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

**XVIII.** *Of obtaining eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.* — They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, That every man shall

be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature; for -Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved.

**XIX.** *Of the Church.* — The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch* have erred, so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

**XX.** *Of the Authority of the Church.* — The church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.

**XXI.** *Of the Authority of General Councils.* -General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

**XXII.** *Of Purgatory.* — The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

**XXIII.** *Of Ministering in the Congregations.* —It is not lawful for any person to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent



which be chosen and called to this a work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

**XXIV.** *Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth.*—It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God and the custom of the primitive church to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people.

**XXV.** *Of the Sacraments.* — Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and God's good will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, an Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.

**XXVI.** *Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament.* — Although in the visible church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and sacraments, yet orasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God and in receiving the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the sacraments ministered unto

them ; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the church that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offenses; and finally, being found guilty, by just judgment be deposed.

**XXVII.** *Of Baptism.* — Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

**XXVIII.** *Of the Lord's Supper.* — The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, litted up, or worshipped.

**XXIX.** *Of the Wicked which, eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.*—The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise tare they

partakers of Christ, but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign and sacrament of so great a thing.

**XXX.** *Of both kinds.* — The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people, for both the parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

**XXXI.** *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.* — The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

**XXXII.** *Of the Marriage of Priests* — Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God's law either to avow the estate of single life or to abstain from marriage; therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

**XXXIII.** *Of excommunicate Person, how they are to be avoided.* — That person which by open denunciation of the church is rightly cut off from the unity of the church and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an heathen and publican until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the church by a judge that hath authority thereunto.

**XXXIV.** *Of the Traditions of the Church.* — It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly like, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of counties, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

**XXXV.** *Of the Homilies.* — The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly that they may be understood of the people.

Of the names of the Homilies

1. Of the right Use of the Church;
2. Against peril of Idolatry;
3. Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches;
4. Of good Works: first, of Fasting;
5. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness;
6. Against Excess of Apparel;
7. Of Prayer;
8. Of the Place and Time of Prayer;
9. That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue;
10. Of the reverend estimation of God's Word;
11. Of Alms-doing;
12. Of the Nativity of Christ;
13. Of the Passion of Christ;
14. Of the Resurrection of Christ;
15. Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ;
16. Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost;
17. For the Regation days;
18. Of the state of Matrimony;
19. Of Repentance;
20. Against Idleness;
21. Against Rebellion.

**XXXVI.** *Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.* — The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at

the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering; neither hath it anything that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the forenamed King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

**XXXVII.** *Of the Civil Magistrates.* — The queen's majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all cases doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the queen's majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the sacraments, that which thing the injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our queen do most plainly testify but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with tile civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.

The laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death' for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons and serve in the wars.

**XXXVIII.** *Of Christian men's Goods, which are not common.*—The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching tie right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

**XXXIX.** *Of a Christian man's Oath.* — As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ and James the apostle, so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and

charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States adopted in convention, September 12, 1801, the Thirty-nine Articles, except the 21st, with certain modifications, which are stated as follows by the American editor of Hook's *Church Dictionary*:

"In the eighth article we have left out the words 'three creeds' and 'Athanasius creed,' having rejected that creed as an exponent of our faith. The 21st article, 'Of the authority of general councils,' is left out altogether; and, though the No. 21 and title is retained, an asterisk refers us to a foot-note which says, 'the 21st of the former articles is omitted because it is partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for as to the remaining part of it in other articles.' After the 35th article, 'Of homilies,' our reviewers have inserted the following explanation in bracket. 'This article is received in this church so far as it declares the books of homilies to be an explication of Christian doctrine, and instructive on piety and morals. But all references to the constitution and laws of England are considered as inapplicable to the circumstances of this church, which also suspend the order for the reading of said homilies in churches, until a revision of them may be conveniently made, for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words and phrases as from the local references.' The 36th article, 'Of the consecration of bishops and ministers,' is altered to suit the peculiarities of the American Church. The 37th article 'Of the power of the civil magistrates,' is a new one entirely superseding that of the Church of England, which sets forth the queen's supremacy in church and state, the annulling of papal jurisdiction in England, the power of the laws of the realm to punish with death, and the lawfulness of wearing weapons and serving in wars at the commandment of the magistrates. The American article is a biblical statement of a great and fundamental principle, applicable to all men, and under all circumstances. The American articles were ordered to be set forth by the General Convention assembled in Trenton, New Jersey, in September, 1801."

As to the sources of the English articles, besides what has been said above, it may not be amiss to add that the 1st, 2d, 25th, and 31st agree not only in

their doctrine, but in most of their wording, with the Confession of Augsburg. The 9th and 16th are clearly due to the same source. Some of them, as the 19th, 20th, 25th, and 34th, resemble, both in doctrine and/language, certain articles drawn up by a commission appointed by Henry VIII, and annotated by the king's own hand. The 11th article, on justification, is ascribed to Cranmer, but the latter part of it only existed in the articles of 1552. The 17th, on predestination, has afforded matter of great dispute as to the question whether it is meant to affirm the Calvinistic doctrine or no. On this point, see Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*; Browne *On 39 Articles*, p. 420 sq., and our articles *SEE ARMINIANISM*, *SEE CALVINISM*, with further references there. The Thirty-nine Articles have been described as "containing a whole body of divinity." This can hardly be maintained. They contain, however, what the Church of England holds to be a fair scriptural account of the leading doctrines of Christianity, together with a condemnation of what she considers to be the principal errors of the Church of Rome and of certain Protestant sects. As far as they go (and there are many things unnoticed by them), they are a legal definition of the doctrines of the Church of England and Ireland, though the members of that communion look to the Prayer-book as well as to the articles for the genuine expression of her faith. The articles are far more thoroughly Protestant than the Prayer-book, taken as a whole. Although the articles expressly assert that the Church of Rome has erred, attempts have repeatedly been made by the High-Church party of the Church of England to show that there is no irreconcilable difference between the Thirty-nine Articles and the decrees of the Council of Trent, and that a construction can be put upon them fully harmonizing them. To show this was, in particular, the object of Dr. Newman's celebrated tract (*Tracts for the Times*, No. 90, Oxf. 1839), and more recently of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* (Lond. 1865; N. Y. 1866). See also *Christ. Remembr.* Jan. 1866, art. vi. The articles were adopted by the Convocation of the Irish Church in 1635, and by the Scotch Episcopal Church at the close of the 18th century. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, contains the only copies of the articles in manuscript or print that are of any authority. Among them are the Latin manuscript of the articles of 1562 and the English manuscript of the articles of 1571, each with the signatures of the archbishops and bishops who subscribed them. See Lamb, *Account of the Thirty-nine Articles* (Camb. 2d ed. 1835). One of the best accounts of the origin of the Thirty-nine Articles is given by Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion* (Lond. 1855, 8vo). For expositions of them, see Burnet *On the Thirty-nine*

*Articles* (N.Y. 1845, 8vo); Welchman, *XXXIX Articles* (Lond. 1834, 8vo, 13th ed.); Sworde, *The first Seventeen Articles* (Lond. 1847, 8vo); Wilson, *XXXIX Articles Illustrated* (Oxf. 1840, 8vo); Dimock, *XXXIX Articles Explained* (Lond. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo); Browne, *Exposition of Thirty-nine Articles* (Lond. 1851, 8vo; N. Y. ed. by Williams, 1865, 8vo); Cardwell, *Synodalia*; Palmer *On the Church*, ii, 242 sq.; Lee, *The Articles paraphrastically explained by Sancta Clara* (Dr. Davenport) (from the edition of 1646; London, 1865, post 8vo).

## Artificer

(some form of the verb **vrj** ; *charash'*, to engrave, as elsewhere), a person engaged in any kind of trade or manual occupation, **SEE CARPENTER**, **SEE MASON**, etc., <sup><0002></sup>Genesis 4:22; <sup><23RB></sup>Isaiah 3:3. **SEE HANDICRAFT**. In the early periods to which the scriptural history refers, we do not meet with those artificial feelings and unreasonable prejudices against hand-labor which prevail and are so banefully influential in modern society. **SEE LABOR**. Accordingly, even the creation of the world is spoken of as the work of God's hands, and the firmament is said to show his handiwork (<sup><19RB></sup>Psalm 8:3; 19:1; <sup><001D></sup>Genesis 2:2; <sup><184D></sup>Job 34:19). The primitive history, too, which the Bible presents is the history of hand-laborers. Adam dressed the garden in which God had placed him (<sup><0015></sup>Genesis 2:15), Abel was a keeper of sheep, Cain a tiller of the ground (<sup><004B></sup>Genesis 4:3), Tubal-Cain a smith (<sup><0022></sup>Genesis 4:22). **SEE ART**. The shepherd-life which the patriarchs previously led in their own pasture-grounds was not favorable to the cultivation of the practical arts of life, much less of those arts by which it is embellished. Egypt, in consequence, must have presented to Joseph and his father not only a land of wonders, but a source of rich and attractive knowledge. Another source of knowledge to the Hebrews of handicrafts were the maritime and commercial Phoenicians. Commerce and navigation imply great skill in art and science; and the pursuits to which they lead largely increase the skill whence they emanate. **SEE COMMERCE**. It is not, therefore, surprising that the origin of so many arts has been referred to the north-eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea; nor is there any difficulty in understanding how arts and letters should be propagated from the coast to the interior, conferring hi-h advantages on the inhabitants of Syria in general, as well before as after the settlement of the Hebrew tribes in the land of promise. At first the division of labor was only very partial. The master of the family himself exercised such arts as were found of



absolute necessity. Among these may be reckoned not only those which pasturage and tillage required, but most of those which were of that rough and severe nature which demand strength as well as skill; such, for instance, as the preparation of wood-work for the dwelling, the slaying of animals for food, which every householder understood, together with the art of extracting the blood from the entire carcass. The lighter labors of the hand fell to the share of the housewife; such as baking bread-for it was only in large towns that baking was carried on as a trade (<sup><1038></sup>2 Samuel 13:8)-such also as cooking in general, supplying the house with water-no very easy office, as the fountains often lay at a considerable distance from the dwelling; moreover, weaving, making of clothes for males as well as females, working in wool, flax, hemp, cotton, tapestry, richly-colored hangings, and that not only for domestic use, but for "merchandise," were carried on within the precincts of the house by the mistress and her maidens (<sup><1255></sup>Exodus 35:25; 1 Samuel ii, 19; <sup><1231></sup>2 Kings 23:7; Proverbs 31). *SEE WEAVING.*

The skill of the Hebrews during their wanderings in the desert does not appear to have been inconsiderable; but the pursuits of war and the entire absorption of the energies of the nation in the one great work of gaining the land which had been given to them, may have led to their falling off in the arts of peace; and from a passage in 1 Samuel (<sup><1933></sup>1 Samuel 13:20) it would appear that not long after they had taken possession of the country they were in a low condition as to the instruments of handicraft. A comparatively settled state of society, however, soon led to the revival of skill by the encouragement of industry. A more minute division of labor ensued. Trades, strictly so called, arose, carried on by persons exclusively devoted to one pursuit. Thus, in <sup><1774></sup>Judges 17:4, and <sup><2404></sup>Jeremiah 10:14, "the founder" is mentioned-a trade which implies a practical knowledge of metallurgy; the smelting and working of metals were well known to the Hebrews (<sup><1878></sup>Job 37:18); brass was in use before iron; arms and instruments of husbandry were made of iron. In Exodus (<sup><1253></sup>Exodus 35:30-35) a passage occurs which may serve to specify many arts that were practised among the Israelites, though it seems also to intimate that at the time to which it refers artificers of the description referred to were not numerous: " See, the Lord hath called by name Bezaleel, and hath filled him with the spirit of God, in knowledge and all manner of workmanship, and to devise curious works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in the cutting of stones, to set them, and in carving of wood, to make

any manner of cunning work; and he hath put in his heart that he may teach; both he and Aholiab: them hath he filled with wisdom of heart to work all manner of work of *the engraver*, and of the cunning workman, and of *the embroiderer* in blue and in purple, in scarlet and in fine linen, and of *the weaver*." From the ensuing chapter (ver. 34) it appears that gilding was known before the settlement in Canaan. The ark (<sup><1370></sup>Exodus 37:2) was overlaid with pure gold within and without. The cherubim were wrought ("beaten," <sup><1370></sup>Exodus 37:7) in gold. The candlestick was of beaten gold (verses 17, 22). Wire-drawing was probably understood (<sup><1384></sup>Exodus 38:4; 39:3). Covering with brass (<sup><1384></sup>Exodus 38:2) and with silver (<sup><1383></sup>Proverbs 26:23) was practised. Architecture and the kindred arts do not appear to have made much progress till the days of Solomon, who employed an incredible number of persons to procure timber (<sup><1363></sup>1 Kings 5:13 sq.); but the men of skill for building his temple he obtained from Hiram, King of Tyre (1 Kings 5 sq.; <sup><1340></sup>1 Chronicles 14:1; <sup><1407></sup>2 Chronicles 2:7). Without pursuing the subject into all its details (see Scholz, *Handb. der Bib. Archæol.* p. 390 sq.; De Wette, *Lehrb. der Archdol.* p. 115 sq.), we remark that the intercourse which the Babylonish captivity gave the Jews seems to have greatly improved their knowledge and skill in both the practical and the fine arts, and to have led them to hold them in very high estimation. The arts were even carried on by persons of learning, who took a title of honor from their trade (Rosenmuller, *Morganl.* 6:42). It was held a sign of a bad education if a father did not teach his son some handicraft: "Whoever does not teach his son a trade, teaches him robbing" (Lightfoot, p. 616; Mishna, *Pirke Aboth*, ii, 2; Wagenseil's *Sota*, p. 597; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 491).

In the Apocrypha and New Testament there are mentioned tanners (<sup><4194></sup>Acts 9:41), tent-makers (<sup><4188></sup>Acts 18:3); in Josephus (*War*, v, 4, 1), cheese-makers; domestics (*κουρῆις*, *Ant.* 16:11, 5); in the Talmud, with others, we find tailors, shoe-makers, blood-letters, glaziers, goldsmiths, plasterers. Certain handicraftsmen could never rise to the rank of high-priest (Mishna, *Kiddush*, 82, 1), such as weavers, barbers, fullers, perfumers, cuppers, tanners; which pursuits, especially the last, were held in disesteem (Mishna, *Megillah*, iii, 2; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 155; Wetstein, *N.T.* ii, 516). In large cities particular localities were set apart for particular trades, as is the case in the East to the present day. Thus in Jeremiah (<sup><24372></sup>Jeremiah 37:21) we read of "the bakers' street." So in the Talmud (*Mishna*, v, 169, 225) mention is made of a flesh-market; in Josephus

(*War*, v, 4, 1), of a cheese-market; and in the New Testament (<sup><RB></sup>John 5:2) we read of a sheep-market, or at least a sheep-gate, which, like several other gates, *SEE JERUSALEM*, appears to have been named from some special bazaar (q.v.) adjoining. (See Iken, *Antiq. Hebr.* 3-9, p. 578 sq.; Bellermann, *Handb.* i, 22 sq.) *SEE MECHANIC*.

## Artillery

(yl K] *keli'*, *apparatus*, elsewhere rendered "vessel," "instrument," etc.) occurs in <sup><RB></sup>1 Samuel 20:40, where it signifies collectively any missile *weapons*, as arrows and lances. *SEE ARMOR*. In 1 Macc. 6:51, the term so rendered is βελόστασις, i.e. *balista*, or "catapult," a machine for hurling darts or stones. *SEE ENGINE*.

## Artomachy

(q. d. ἄρτομαχία, *dispute respecting bread*, from ἄρτος and μάχη), a controversy respecting the bread of the Eucharist, originated in 1053 by Michael Cerularius. This dispute existed between the Greek and Latin churches; the former contending that the bread used should be *leavened*, the latter urging the necessity of being *unleavened* bread. Protestant writers have taken part with the Greek Church in this controversy. Early Christian writers make no mention of the use of unleavened bread; the same kind of bread was eaten in the agapa that was consecrated for the Eucharist, viz., common bread. Leavened bread appears to have been in use when Epiphanius and Ambrose wrote. Unleavened bread was generally discontinued at the Reformation; but the Lutherans retain it; *SEE AZYMITES*.

## Artotyritee

(q. d. ἄρτοτυριταί, from ἄρτος, *bread*, and τυρός, *cheese*), a branch of the Montanists, who first appeared in the second century. They used bread and cheese in the Eucharist; or, perhaps, bread baked with cheese. The reason assigned was, according to Augustine (*Hcer.* cap. xxviii), that the first men offered to God not only the fruits of the earth, but of their flocks also. The Artotyritae admitted women to the priesthood, and even consecrated them bishops.-Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 15:2, 8; Epiphanius. *Haer.* xlix. *SEE MONTANISTS*.

## Arts,

one of the faculties in which degrees are conferred in the universities. The circle of the arts was formerly divided into the *Trivium*, viz. grammar, rhetoric, and logic; and the *Quadrivium*, viz. arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. It now includes all branches not technical or professional.-Hook, *Church Dict.* s.v. *SEE DEGREES; SEE UNIVERSITIES.*

## Ar'uboth

(Heb. *Arubboth'*, **t/Bra**) a lattice; Sept. **Ἀραβώθ**), a city or district, probably in the tribe of Judah (or Simeon), being the third of Solomon's purveyorships, under the charge of Hessed or Ben-Hessed, and including Socoh and Hephher within its limits (<sup><10100></sup>1 Kings 4:10). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 237) fancies it is represented by the modern village and wady *Rabith* in the limits of Zebulon; but the associated names indicate the region *Jebel Khalil*, S.W. of Hebron.

## Aruch

(Heb. *Aruk'*, **ĒWr** [; *arranged*, sc. in alphabetical order), the title of a Talmudical lexicon, compiled by R. Nathan ben-Jechiel, who was rector of the synagogue at Rome A.D. 1106, according to the *Chronicon "Zemach David,"* and who is usually styled by the Jewish writers **ĒWr** [; **I** [ **Bi** *Auctor Aruch* (Buxtorf, *Lex Talm.* col. 1605). It was first published by Soucini (Pesaro, 1517, fol.), and edited by Archinotti (Venice, 1531, 1533, fol.), Eckendorf (Basle, 1599, fol.), Musafia (Amst. 1655, fol.), and with Germ. notes by Landau (Prague, 1819-24, 5 vols. 8vo), also in Latin, by Kohut (Vien. 1878 sq.). See Furst, *Bib. Jud.* iii, 20 sq., Berlin, *Additamenta zum Aruch* (Vien. 1830-59, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Aru'mah

(Heb. *Arumah'*, **hm** **Wr** **a**) prob. for *Rumah*, with **a** prosthetic; Sept. **Ἀρημά**), a city apparently near Shechem, in which Abimelech the son of Gideon resided (<sup><10941></sup>Judges 9:41). It has been conjectured that the word in ver. 31, **hm** **r** **t** **B** rendered "privily," and in the margin "at Tormah," may signify "at Arumah" by changing the **t** to an **a**. It seems to be confounded with *Rumah* (<sup><1236></sup>2 Kings 23:36) by Euseb. and Jerome, who state (*Onomast.* s.v. Ruma) that it (**Ἀρίμ**, 'Arima) was then called *Remphis* or

*Arimathceal* The suggestion of Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 288) appears to be correct that it is represented by the modern ruin *ElOrmah*, on the brow of a mountain S.E. of Shechem.

### Arundel, Thomas

archbishop of Canterbury, was second son of Robert Fitz-Alan, earl of Arundel and Warren, and was born at Arundel Castle in 1353. His powerful family connections gave him early promotion: at 20 he was archdeacon of Taunton, and in 1374 the pope nominated him to the vacant see of Ely, the king and the monks of Ely having, at the same time, respectively nominated two others; but Arundel was consecrated without dispute. In 1388 he was removed to the see of York, and was the first archbishop of that see who was translated to Canterbury, which was the case in 1396. Very shortly after Arundel was forced into banishment by Richard II, as an accomplice of his brother, the earl of Arundel (executed as a partisan of the duke of Gloucester), and Roger Walden was put into the chair of Canterbury, and acted as archbishop for about two years. (Johnson, *Eccl. Canons*, ii, A.D. 1398.) The archbishop, in the mean time, went to Rome, and afterward to Cologne. He figured largely in the political intrigues by which Richard was deposed, and on the accession of Henry IV, 1399, he was restored to his see. He was a great persecutor of the Wickliffites, and in 1408 he published, in convocation at Oxford, "Ten Constitutions against the Lollards." He established in that year an inquisition for heresy at Oxford, and put in force the statute *de hceretico comburendo* (2 Hen. IV, ch. xv), and prohibited the circulation of the English Scriptures. He built the tower called the "Arundel Tower," and gave to the cathedral of Canterbury a chime of bells, known as "ArundeFs ring," and was a great benefactor in many ways to the cathedral establishments. He died February 20th, 1414.-Collier, *Eccl. Hist. of England*, iii, 213-301.

### Ar'vad

### Picture for Arvad

(*Heb. Arvad'*, *dwr ʕaj* wandering; Sept. Ἀράδιοι, but properly Ἄραδος, 1 Mace. 15:23, or, as it might be spelt, ARUD, *dWraʕ*) whence the present name *Ruad*), a small island and city on the coast of Syria, called by the Greeks *Aradus* (q.v.), by which name it is mentioned in the above passage

of the Apocrypha. It is a rocky islet, opposite the mouth of the river Eleutherus (Mel. ii, 7), 50 miles to the north of Tripoli (*Itin. Anton.*), about one mile in circumference (Curt. 4:1, 6), and two miles (Pliny, v, 17) from the shore (Rosenmiuller, *Handb. der Bibl. Ant.* II, i, 7; Mannert, VI, i, 398; Pococke, *E'lst*, ii, 292 sq.; Hamesveld, iii, 44 sq.). Strabo (xvi, p. 753) describes it as a rock rising in the midst of the waves; and modern travellers state that it is steep on every side. (See Volney, ii, 131; Niebuhr, *Reisen*, iii, 92; Buckingham, ii, 435; Chesney, *Euphrat. Exped.* i, 451; Shaw, p. 232.) Strabo also describes the houses as exceedingly lofty, and they were doubtless so built on account of the scantiness of the site; hence, for its size, it was exceedingly populous (Pomp. Mela, ii, 7, 6). Those of the Arvadites whom the island could not accommodate found room in the town and district of Antaradus (q.v.), on the opposite coast, which also belonged to them (*Targ. Hieros.* in <sup><0108></sup>Genesis 10:18). Arvad is usually regarded as the same with *Arpad* (q.v.) or Arphad (but see Michaelis, *Oriental. Bibl.* 8:45). It is mentioned in <sup><0278></sup>Ezekiel 27:8, 11, as furnishing mariners and soldiers for Tyre, was situated on the shore not far away. In agreement with this is the mention of "the Arvadite" (q.v.) in <sup><0108></sup>Genesis 10:18, and <sup><0306></sup>1 Chronicles 1:16, as a son of Canaan, with Zidon, Hamath, and other northern localities. It was founded, according to Strabo (xvi, 2, § 13), by fugitives from Sidon (comp. Josephus, *A nt.* i, 6, 2); hence probably the etymology of the name as above. Tarsus was settled by a colony from it (Dion Chrys. *Orat. Tarsen.* ii, 20, ed. Reiske). Although originally independent (Arrian, *Alex.* ii, 90), and, indeed, the metropolis of the strip of land adjoining it, it eventually fell under the power of Persia, but assisted the Macedonians in the siege of Tyre (Arrian, *Anab. i.* 13, 20). It thence passed into the hands of the Ptolemies (B.C. 320); but, regaining its liberty under Seleucus Callinicus (B.C. 242), it attained such importance as to form an alliance with Antiochus the Great (Eckhel, *Doctr. num.* i, 393). Antiochus Epiphanes, however, took forcible mastery over it (Jerome in *Dan.* xi), and after becoming involved in the broils of his successors, it finally came under the power of Tigranes, and with his fall became subject to Rome, into whose triumphal wars its history enters (Appian, *Bell. Civ.* 4:69; v, 1). Under the Emperor Constans, Muawiyeh, the lieutenant of the Caliph Omar, destroyed the city and expelled its inhabitants (*Cedren. Hist.* p. 355; Theophan. p. 227). It was not rebuilt in mediaeval times (Mignot, *Mem. de l'A cad. des Inscript.* 34:229). The curious submarine springs from which the ancient city was supplied with water (Strabo, ed. Groskund, p. 754 n.) have been partially discovered (Walpole, *Ansayrii*, iii,

391). The site is now covered, except a small space on the east side, with heavy castles, within which resides a maritime population of about 2000 souls. On the very margin of the sea there are the remains of double Phoenician walls, of huge bevelled stones, which mark it as being anciently a very strong place (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1848, p. 251). The nautical pursuits of the inhabitants, attested also by Strabo (*ut sup.*), remain in full force (see Allen's *Dead Sea*, ii, 183, at the end of which vol. may be found a plan of the island, from the Admiralty Charts, 2050, "Island of Ruad").  
**SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS.**

### Ar'vadite

(Heb. *Arvadi'*, *ydwr ʕi* Sept. Ἀράδιος, <sup><0108></sup>Genesis 10:18; <sup><13016></sup>1 Chronicles 1:16), an inhabitant of the island Aradus or ARVAD **SEE ARVAD** (q.v.) (so Josephus explains Ἀρουδαῖοι, *Ant.* i, 6, 2), and doubtless also of the neighboring coast. The Arvadites were descended from one of the sons of Canaan (<sup><0108></sup>Genesis 10:18). Strabo (xvi, 731) describes the Arvadites as a colony from Sidon. They were noted mariners (<sup><2708></sup>Ezekiel 27:8, 11; Strabo, 16:754), and formed a distinct state, with a king of their own (Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* ii, 90); yet they appear to have been in some dependence upon Tyre, for the prophet represents them as furnishing their contingent of mariners to that city (<sup><2708></sup>Ezekiel 27:8, 11). The Arvadites took their full share in Phoenician maritime traffic, particularly after Tyre and Sidon had fallen under the dominion of the Graeco-Syrian kings. They early entered into alliance with the Romans, and *Aradus* is mentioned among the states to which the consul Lucius formally made known the league which had been contracted with Simon Maccabaeus (1 Macc. xv, 23).

### Aryeh.

**SEE LION.**

### Ar'za

(Heb. *Artsa'*, *axr ʕi* an Aramaean form, *the earth*; Sept. Ὠρσά v. r. Ἀρσᾶ), a steward over the house of Elah, king of Israel, in whose house at Tirzah, Zimri, the captain of the half of the chariots, conspired against Elah, and killed him during a drinking debauch (<sup><1169></sup>1 Kings 16:9), B.C. 926.

## Arzan,

an Armenian writer (died A.D. 459), who translated into the language of his country the works of Athanasius.-Hoefer, *Biog. Genesis* iii, 409.

## A'sa

(Heb. *Asa'*, **asa**; *healing*, or *physician*), the name of two men.

**1.** (Sept. **Ἀσά**, Josephus, **Ἄσανος**.) The son of Abijah, grandson of Rehoboam, and third king of the separate kingdom of Judah (<sup><115E></sup>1 Kings 15:2 <sup><115E></sup>Chronicles 14-16; <sup><110E></sup>Matthew 1:7, 8). He began to reign two years before the death of Jeroboam, in Israel, and he reigned forty-one years (B.C. 953-912). As Asa was very young at his accession, the affairs of the government were administered by his mother, or, according to some (comp. <sup><115E></sup>1 Kings 15:1, 10), his grandmother Maachah, who is understood to have been a granddaughter of Absalom. **SEE MAACHAH.** But the young kin., on assuming the reins of government; was conspicuous for his earnestness in supporting the worship of God, and rooting out idolatry with its attendant immoralities, and for the vigor and wisdom with which he provided for the prosperity of his kingdom. In his zeal against heathenism he did not spare his grandmother Maachah, who occupied the special dignity of "King's Mother," to which great importance was attached in the Jewish court, as afterward in Persia, and to which parallels have been found in modern Eastern countries, as in the position of the Sultana Valide in Turkey (see 1 Kings ii, 19; <sup><124E></sup>2 Kings 24:12; <sup><24E></sup>Jeremiah 29:2; also Calmet, *Fragm.* xvi; and Bruce's *Travels*, ii, 537, and 4:244). She had set up some impure worship in a grove (the word translated "*idol*," <sup><115B></sup>1 Kings 15:13, is **txl pñi**, *afright* or horrible image, while in the Vule. we read *ne esset [Maacha] princeps in sacris Priap'*); but Asa burnt the symbol of her religion, and threw its ashes into the brook Kidron, as Moses had done to the golden calf (<sup><123E></sup>Exodus 32:20), and then deposed Maachah from her dignity. He also placed in the Temple certain gifts which his father had dedicated, probably in the earlier and better period of his reign, **SEE ABIJAH.**, and which the heathen priests must have used for their own worship, and renewed the great altar which they apparently had desecrated (<sup><415B></sup>2 Chronicles 15:8) during his minority and under the preceding reigns, and only the altars in the "high-places" were suffered to remain (<sup><115B></sup>1 Kings 15:11-13; <sup><44E></sup>2 Chronicles 14:2-5). He neglected no human means of putting his kingdom in the best possible military condition, for which ample



opportunity was afforded by the peace which he enjoyed for ten years (B.C. 938-928) in the middle of his reign. His resources were so well organized, and the population had so increased, that he fortified cities on his frontiers, and raised an army amounting, according to <sup><440B></sup>2 Chronicles 14:8, to 580,000 men; but the uncertainty attaching to the numbers in our present text of Chronicles has been pointed out by Kennicott and by Davidson (*Introduction to the O. T.* p. 686), who consider that the copyists were led into error by the different modes of marking them, and by confounding the different letters which denoted them, bearing as they do a great resemblance to each other. **SEE NUMBER.** Thus Asa's reign marks the return of Judah to a consciousness of the high destiny to which God had called her, and to the belief that the Divine power was truly at work within her. The good effects of this were visible in the 13th year of his reign, when, relying upon the Divine aid, Asa attacked and defeated the numerous host of the Cushite king Zerah (q.v.), who had penetrated through Arabia Petraea into the vale of Zephathah with an immense host, reckoned at a million of men (which Josephus distributes into 900,000 infantry and 100,000 cavalry, *Ant.* 8:12,'1) and 300 chariots (<sup><440D></sup>2 Chronicles 14:9-15). As the triumphant Judahites were returning, laden with spoil, to Jerusalem, they were met by the prophet Azariah, who declared this splendid victory to be a consequence of Asa's confidence in Jehovah, and exhorted him to perseverance. Thus encouraged, the king exerted himself during the ten ensuing years of tranquillity to extirpate the remains of idolatry, and caused the people to renew their covenant with Jehovah (<sup><445B></sup>2 Chronicles 15:1-15). It was this clear knowledge of his dependent political position, as the vicegerent of Jehovah, which won for Asa the highest praise that could be given to a Jewish king—that he walked in the steps of his ancestor David (<sup><445I></sup>1 Kings 15:11). Nevertheless, toward the latter end of his reign (the numbers in <sup><445D></sup>2 Chronicles 15:19, and 16:1, should be 25th and 26th) the king failed to maintain the character he had thus acquired. When Baasha, king of Israel, had renewed the war between the two kingdoms, and had taken Ramah, which he was proceeding to fortify as a frontier barrier, Asa, the conqueror of Zerah, was so far wanting to his kingdom and his God as to employ the wealth of the Temple and of the royal treasury to induce the King of Syria (Damascus) to make a diversion in his favor by invading the dominions of Baasha (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.). By this means he recovered Ramah, indeed; but his treasures were squandered, and he incurred the rebuke of the prophet Hanani, whom he cast into prison, being, as it seems, both alarmed and

enraged at the effect his address was calculated to produce upon the people. Other persons (who had probably manifested their disapprobation) also suffered from his anger (<sup><1156></sup>1 Kings 15:16-22; <sup><1460></sup>2 Chronicles 16:1-10). The prophet threatened Asa with war, which appears to have been fulfilled by the continuance for some time of that with Baasha, as we infer from an allusion, in <sup><1470></sup>2 Chronicles 17:2, to the cities of Ephraim which he took, and which can hardly refer to any events prior to the destruction of Ramah. In the last three years of his life Asa was afflicted with a grievous "disease in his feet," probably the gout, *SEE DISEASE*; and it is mentioned to his reproach; that he placed too much confidence in his physicians (q.v.), i.e. he acted in an arrogant and independent spirit, and without seeking God's blessing on their remedies. At his death, however, it appeared that his popularity had not been substantially impaired, for he was honored with a funeral of unusual cost and magnificence (<sup><1461></sup>2 Chronicles 16:11-14; with which <sup><1152></sup>1 Kings 15:24, does not conflict). He was succeeded by his son Jehoshaphat. *SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF*.

2. (Sept. Ὠσά.) A Levite, son of Elkanah and father of Berechiah, which last was one of those who resided in the villages of the Netophathites on the return from Babylon (<sup><1396></sup>1 Chronicles 9:16). B.C. ante 536.

### Asadi'as

(Ἀσαδίας, i.e. *Hasadiah*), the son of Chelcias and father of Sedecias, in the ancestry of Baruch (q.v.), according to the apocryphal book that bears his name (Bar. i, 1). Comp. <sup><1321></sup>1 Chronicles 3:21.

### Aset'as

(or rather *Asai'as*, Ἀσαΐας), one of the "sons" of Annas that divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdr. 9:32); evidently the ISHIJAH *SEE ISHIJAH* (q.v.) of the genuine text (<sup><1508></sup>Ezra 10:31).

### As'ael

(or rather *A'siel*, Ἀσιήλ, prob. for *Jahziel*), the father of Gabael, of the tribe of Naphtali, among the ancestors of Tobit (Tob. i, 1).

### As'ahel

(Heb. *Asah-el'*, אֶחָד לְאֵל, *creature of God*), the name of four men.

**1.** (Sept. **Ἀσαήλ**, Josephus, **Ἀσάηλος**, *Ant.* 7:3, 1.) The youngest son of David's sister Zeruah (<sup><4028></sup>2 Samuel 2:18), and brother of Joab and Abishai (<sup><4126></sup>1 Chronicles 2:16). He was one of David's early adherents (<sup><4034></sup>2 Samuel 23:24), and with his son Zebadiah was commander of the fourth division of the royal army (<sup><4370></sup>1 Chronicles 27:7). He was noted for his swiftness of foot, a gift much valued in ancient times (comp. *Iliad*, 15:570; Plutarch, *Vit. Romuli*, 25; Liv. 9:16; Curt. 7:7, 32; Veget. Mil. i, 9); and after the battle at Gibeon he pursued and overtook Abner (q.v.), who, with great reluctance, in order to preserve his own life, slew him by a back-thrust with the sharp iron heel of his spear, B.C. cir. 1051 (<sup><4028></sup>2 Samuel 2:18-23). To revenge his death, his brother Joab some years after treacherously killed Abner, who had come to wait on David at Hebron (<sup><4035></sup>2 Samuel 3:26, 27). *SEE JOAB*.

**2.** (Sept. **Ἀσαήλ** v. r. **Ἰασιήλ**.) One of the Levites sent by Jehoshaphat to teach the people of Judah the law of the Lord (<sup><4478></sup>2 Chronicles 17:8), B.C. 909.

**3.** (Sept. **Ἀσαήλ**.) One of the Levites appointed by Hezekiah as overseer of the contributions to the house of the Lord (<sup><4413></sup>2 Chronicles 31:13), B.C. 726.

**4.** (Sept. **Ἀσαήλ**.) The father of Jonathan, which latter was one of the elders who assisted Ezra in putting away the foreign wives of the Jews on the return from Babylon (<sup><4505></sup>Ezra 10:15). B.C. ante 459.

**Asahi'ah.**

*SEE ASAIAH*, 3.

**Asa"ah**

(Heb. *Asayah'*, **הַסַּאִיָּה** } constituted by *Jehavxh*; Sspt. **Ἀσαΐα** or **Ἀσαΐας** v. r. **Ἀσά** in <sup><4305></sup>1 Chronicles 1:5), the name of four men.

**1.** The son of Haaiah (<sup><4350></sup>1 Chronicles 6:30) and chief of the 220 Levites of the family of Merari, appointed by David to remove the ark of the covenant from the house of Obed-edom, and afterward to take charge of the singing exercises (<sup><4356></sup>1 Chronicles 15:6, 11). B.C. cir. 1043.

- 2.** The head of one of the families of the tribe of Simeon, mentioned in <sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 4:36, as dispossessing the descendants of Ham from the rich pastures near Gador in the time of Hezekiah, B.C. cir. 712.
- 3.** A servant of Josiah, sent with others to consult the prophetess Huldah concerning the book of the law found in the Temple (<sup><1221></sup>2 Kings 22:12, 14 [where the name is less correctly Anglicized "Asahiah"]; <sup><1391></sup>2 Chronicles 34:20). B.C. 623.
- 4.** The "first-born" of the Shilonites (q.v.) who returned to Jerusalem after the captivity (<sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 9:5). B.C. 536. *SEE MAASEIAH* 9.

## Asamon

(**Ἀσαμών**), a mountain in the central part of Galilee, opposite Sepphoris, where the rebels from this city having taken refuge, were destroyed by the Roman general Gallus (Josephus, *War*, ii, 18, 11), It is thought by Robinson (*Later Bib. Res.* p. 77) to be the broken ridge which commences with the high summit of Jebel Kaukab on the W. and runs eastward along the N. side of the plain El-Buttauf (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 288).

## Asamonaean, Asamonceus.

*SEE ASMONAEAN.*

## As'ana

(**Ἀσανά**), a man (or place) whose "sons" (servants of the Temple) returned from the captivity (1 Esdr. v, 31); evidently the ASNAH *SEE ASNAH* (q.v.) of <sup><1520></sup>Ezra 2:50, rather than the ASHNAH *SEE ASHNAH* (q.v.) of <sup><1653></sup>Joshua 15:33 or 43.

## A'saph

(Heb. *Asaph'*, *āsā*; *assembler*; Sept. **Ἀσάφ**), the names of three persons. *SEE EBIASAPH.*

**1.** A Levite of the family of Gershom (see below), son of Barachiah (<sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 6:39; 15:17), eminent as a musician, and appointed by David to preside over the sacred choral services which he organized (<sup><1365></sup>1 Chronicles 16:5), B.C. 1014. The "sons of Asaph" are afterward mentioned as choristers. of the Temple (<sup><1371></sup>1 Chronicles 25:1, 2; <sup><1404></sup>2 Chronicles 20:14; 29:13; <sup><1511></sup>Ezra 2:41; 3:10; <sup><1674></sup>Nehemiah 7:44; 11:22); and this

office appears to have been made hereditary in his family (<sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 25:1, 2). Asaph was celebrated in after times as a prophet (<sup>hzhq</sup>seer) and poet (<sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 29:30; <sup><1624></sup>Nehemiah 12:46), and the titles of twelve of the Psalms (50, 73, to 83) bear his name, in some of which he evidently stands (as a patronymic, <sup><1617></sup>Nehemiah 11:17) for the Levites generally (see Huetii *Demonstr. ev.* p. 332; Bertholdt, v, 1956; Herder, *Ebr. Poesie*, ii, 331; comp. Niemeyer, *Charakterist.* 4:356 sq.; Carpzov, *Introd.* 103 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einl.* v, 17 sq.); or he may have been the founder of a school of poets and musical composers, who were called after him " the sons of Asaph" (comp. the Homeridae). **SEE PSALMS**. The following is his ancestry (see Reinhard, *De Asapho*, Vien. 1742).

Name	1 Chron. 6	1 Chron. 6	Born, cir. B.C.
Levi	1	16	1917
Gershom	20	43	1860?
Libni	20	17	1805?
Jahath	20	43	1750?
Shimei		42	1695?
Zimmah	20	42	1640?
Joah	21		
or Ethan		42	1585?
Adaiah		41	
or Iddo	21		1530?
Zerah	21	41	1475?
Ethni		41	
or Jeaterai	21		1420?
Malchiah		40	1365?
Baaseiah		40	1310?
Michael		40	1255?
Shimea		39	1200?
Berachiah		39	1145?
<i>Asaph</i>		39	1090?

**2.** The "father" of Joah, which latter was "recorder" in the time of Hezekiah (<sup><1288></sup>2 Kings 18:18, 37; <sup><2318></sup>Isaiah 36:3, 22). B.C. ante 726. Perhaps i. q. No. 1.

3. A "keeper of the king's forests" (prob. in Lebanon), to whom Nehemiah requested of Artaxerxes Longimanus an order for timber to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem (<sup><4118></sup>Nehemiah 2:8). B.C. 446.

### Asaph's, St.,

a bishop's see in Flintshire, Wales, founded in the 6th century. The chapter consists of a dean, precentor, chancellor, treasurer, three canons, two archdeacons, seven curial canons, and two minor canons. The present incumbent is Thomas Vowler Short, D.D., transferred from Sodor and Man in 1846.

### Asar'eel

(Heb. *Asarel'*, **אֶסַרְעֵל**) *bound by God*, sc. under a vow; Sept. Ἐσεράηλ v. Ἐσερήλ), the last named of the four sons of Jehaleleel, of the tribe of Judah (<sup><13046></sup>1 Chronicles 4:16). B.C. prob. post 1618.

### Asare'lah

(Heb. *Ashare'lah*, **אֶשְׂרָאֵל**) *upright before God*; Sept. Ἐσειήλ v. Ἐραήλ, Ἀσιηλά, Ἀσειρηλά), the last named of the four sons *at* the Levite Asaph, who were appointed by David in charge of the Temple music in connection with others (<sup><13310></sup>1 Chronicles 25:2);- elsewhere (ver. 14) called by the equivalent name JESHARELAH *SEE JESHARELAH* (q.v.).

### Asbury, Daniel

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Fairfax county, Va., Feb. 18, 1762. He served in the war of the Revolution, and soon after its close was converted. In 1786 he entered the itinerant ministry, and continued in it, with an interval of nine, years, up to 1824, and during this long service his fidelity and diligence were signally manifest. He died suddenly in 1827.-*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 506; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:127.

### Asbury, Francis,

the first bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church ordained in America, was born at Handsworth, Staffordshire, England, Aug. 20, 1745. His parents were pious Methodists, and trained him with religious care, so that it is no wonder that he was converted at thirteen. In his youth he sat under

the ministry of Ryland, Hawes, and Venn, as well as of the Methodist preachers. He obtained the rudiments of education at the village school of Barre, and in his fourteenth year was apprenticed to a maker of "bucklechapes." At sixteen he became a local preacher; at twenty-two he was received into the itinerant ministry by Mr. Wesley. In 1771 he was appointed *missionary to America*, and landed at Philadelphia, with the Rev. Richard Wright as his companion, on the 27th October in that year. The first Methodist church in America had been built three years before; and in 1771 the whole number of communicants was about 600, chiefly in Philadelphia and New York. The country was disturbed by political agitation, soon to develop into revolution. In 1772 Asbury was appointed Mr. Wesley's "general assistant in America," with power of supervision over all the preachers and societies, but was superseded in the year following by an older preacher from England, Mr. Rankin. When the war broke out Rankin returned to England; but Asbury, foreseeing the great work of the church in America, remained. He thought it would be an eternal disgrace to forsake in this time of trial the thousands of poor sheep in the wilderness who had placed themselves under the care of the Methodists, and, fully sympathizing with the cause of the struggling colonies, he resolved to remain and share the sufferings and the fate of the infant connection and of the country. Like many religious people of those times, he was, from conscientious scruples, a non-juror, as were all the other Methodist preachers, and also many of the clergy of the Episcopal Church, who yet chose to remain in the country. As their character and motives were not understood, they were exposed to much suffering and persecution. The Rev. F. Garrettson and Joseph Hartley were imprisoned on the Eastern Shore of Maryland; Mr. Chew, also one of the preachers, being brought before the sheriff of one of the counties of the same state, and required to take the oath of allegiance, replied that scruples of conscience would not permit him to do so. The sheriff then informed him that he was bound by oath to execute the laws, and if he persisted in his refusal, no alternative was left but to commit him to prison. To this the prisoner answered very mildly that he by no means wished to be the cause of perjury, and was therefore perfectly resigned to bear the penalty. "You are a strange man," said the sheriff; "I cannot bear to punish you, and therefore my own house shall be your prison." He accordingly formally committed him to his own house, and kept him there three months. In the course of this time this gentleman and his wife were both converted to God, and joined the Methodist Church. On the 20th of June, 1776, Mr.

Asbury, notwithstanding his extreme prudence, was arrested near Baltimore, and fined five pounds; and in March, 1778, he retired to the house of his friend, Thomas White, a judge of one of the courts of Delaware, where he remained comparatively secluded for ten months. Although his movements were now circumscribed, yet he was by no means idle, and remarks that it was "a season of the most active, the most useful, and the most suffering part of his life." Indeed, two years elapsed before he presumed to leave his retreat, and to travel extensively in the performance of his duties as superintendent; when, the authorities becoming convinced that there was no treason in the Methodist preachers, but that their scruples were of a religious, not of a political nature, and that they were merely intent upon preaching the gospel of peace as humble evangelists, they were permitted to exercise their functions unmolested. At the close of the war in 1783 there were 83 Methodist ministers in the work, with nearly 14,000 members. In 1784 the Methodist societies were organized into an Episcopal Church, four years before the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and Mr. Asbury was elected bishop, and consecrated by Dr. Coke, who had been ordained in England by Wesley. From this time to the day of his death his whole life was devoted to the preaching of the Gospel and to the superintendence of the churches. His personal history is almost the history of the growth of Methodism in his time. His *Journals* (3 vols. 8vo) contain a wonderful record of apostolic zeal and fidelity, of a spirit of self-sacrifice rivalling that of the saints and martyrs of the early church, of an industry which no toils could weary, of a patience which no privations could exhaust. He remained unmarried through life, that he might not be hindered in his work. His *salary* was sixty-four dollars a year. His horses and carriages were given by his friends, all donations of money from whom he assigned to his fellow-sufferers and fellow-laborers. At one of the early Western Conferences, where the assembled itinerants presented painful evidences of want, he parted with his watch, his coat, and his shirts for them. He was asked by a friend to lend him fifty pounds. "He might as well have asked me for Peru," wrote the bishop. "I showed him all the money I had in the world, about twelve dollars, and gave him five." In spite of his defective education, he acquired a tolerable knowledge of Greek and Hebrew; but his wisdom was far greater than his learning. As early as 1785 he laid the foundation of the first Methodist college; and some time after he formed a plan for dividing the whole country into districts, with a classical academy in each. As a preacher, he was clear, earnest, pungent, and often powerfully eloquent. The monument of his organizing and administrative



talent may be seen in the discipline and organization of the Methodist Church, which grew under his hands, during his lifetime, from a feeble band of 4 preachers and 316 members to nearly 700 itinerants, 2000 local preachers, and over 214,000 members. Within the compass of every year, the borderers of Canada and the planters of Mississippi looked for the coming of this primitive bishop, and were not disappointed. His travels averaged 6000 miles a year; and this not in a splendid carriage, over smooth roads; not with the ease and speed of the railway, but often through pathless forests and untravelled wildernesses; among the swamps of the South and the prairies of the West; amid the heats of the Carolinas and the snows of New England. There grew up under his hands an entire church, with fearless preachers and untrained members; but he governed the multitude as he had done the handful, with a gentle charity and an unflinching firmness. In diligent activity, no apostle, no missionary, no warrior ever surpassed him. He rivalled Melancthon and Luther in boldness. He combined the enthusiasm of Xavier with the far-reaching foresight and keen discrimination of Wesley. With a mind untrained in the schools, he yet seemed to seize upon truth by intuition; and though men might vanquish him in logic, they could not deny his conclusions. His unremitting labors exhausted a constitution originally frail; yet, with the old martyr spirit, he continued to travel and to preach, even when he was so weak that he had to be carried from the couch to the pulpit. He died in Spottsylvania, Va., March 31, 1816.

In Church History Francis Asbury deserves to be classed with the greatest propagators of Christianity in ancient or in modern times; and when the secular history of America comes to be faithfully written, his name will be handed down to posterity as having contributed, in no small degree, to the progress of civilization in the United States. In the language of Dr. Stevens, in the *Knickerbocker Magazine* (January, 1859), "He sent his preachers across the Alleghanies, and kept them in the very van of the westward march of emigration. The first 'ordination' in the valley of the Mississippi was performed by his hands; and it is a grave question what would have been the moral development of the mighty states throughout that imperial domain, had it not been for the brave 'itinerant' corps of Asbury, which carried and expounded the Bible among its log cabins at a time in our national history when it was absolutely impossible for the American churches to send thither regular or educated clergymen in any proportion to the growth of its population. If what is called the 'Methodist

itinerancy' has done any important service for the moral salvation of that vast region, now the theatre of our noblest states, the credit is due, in a great measure, to the unparalleled energy of Francis Asbury. He not only pointed his preachers thither, but led the way. *No records of American frontier adventure show greater endurance or courage than Asbury's travels beyond the mountains. Armed hunters, twenty-five or fifty in number; used to escort him from point to point to protect him from the Indians, and great were the gatherings and grand the jubilees wherever he appeared.*" -- Asbury, *Journals* (N.York, 1852, 3 vols. 8vo); Bangs, *History of the M. E. Church* (N. York, 1849, 4 vols. 12mo); *Meth. Qu. Review*, April, 1852, and July, 1854; Strickland, *Life of Asbury* (N. York, 1858, 12mo); Wakely, *Heroes of Methodism* (N. York, 1859, 12mo); Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism* (2 vols. 12); Stevens, *Hist. of the .M. E. Churchs* (N. York, 1864); *Centenary of Methodism* (N. York, 1866, 12mo); Sprague, *Annals*, 7:13; Boehm, *Reminiscences Historical and Biographical*, edited by Wakeley(N. Y. 1865, 12mo) ; Larrabee, *Asbury and his Coadjutors* (N.Y. 2 vols. 12mo). **SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.**

## As'calon

(Judith 2:28; 1 Macc. 10:86; 11:60; 12:33). **SEE ASHKELON.**

## Ascension Of Christ,

his visible passing from earth to heaven in the presence of his disciples, on the Mount of Olives, forty days after the resurrection (~~4169~~Mark 16:19; ~~4283~~Luke 24:50, 51; ~~4400~~Acts 1:1-11).

**(1)** The ascension was a necessary consequence of the resurrection. Had Christ died a natural death, or simply disappeared from view in obscurity, the resurrection, as a proof of Divine power, would have gone for nothing. It was essential that He should "die no more," so as to demonstrate forever his victory over death.

**(2)** It was predicted in the O. T. in several striking passages (e.g. Psalm 24, 68, 103, 110); and also by Christ himself (~~4166~~John 6:62; 20:17).

**(3)** It was prefigured in the patriarchal dispensation by the translation of Enoch (~~4062~~Genesis 5:24; ~~3816~~Hebrews 11:5); and in the Jewish, by the translation of Elijah (~~4121~~2 Kings 2:11); so that each of the three dispensations have had a visible proof of the immortal destiny of human nature.

(4) The fact of the ascension is given by two evangelists only; but John presupposes it in the passages above cited. It is referred to, and doctrines built upon it, by the apostles (<sup><4700></sup>2 Corinthians 13:4; <sup><4006></sup>Ephesians 2:6; 4:10; <sup><4082></sup>1 Peter 3:22; <sup><4086></sup>1 Timothy 3:16; <sup><4060></sup>Hebrews 6:20). "The evidences of this occurrence were numerous: the disciples saw him ascend (<sup><4000></sup>Acts 1:9); two angels testified that he did ascend (<sup><4000></sup>Acts 1:10, 11); Stephen, Paul, and John saw him in his ascended state (<sup><4075></sup>Acts 7:55, 56; 9:3-5; <sup><4000></sup>Revelation 1:9-18); the ascension was demonstrated by the descent of the Holy Ghost (<sup><4067></sup>John 16:7-14; <sup><4023></sup>Acts 2:33); and had been prophesied by our Lord himself (<sup><4064></sup>Matthew 26:64; <sup><4082></sup>John 8:21).

(5) The time of Christ's ascension was forty days after his resurrection. He continued that number of days upon earth in order that he might give repeated proofs of the fact of his resurrection (<sup><4003></sup>Acts 1:3), and instruct his apostles in every thing of importance respecting their office and I ministry, opening to them the Scriptures concerning himself (<sup><4065></sup>Mark 16:15; <sup><4005></sup>Acts 1:5-8).

(6) As to the manner of his ascension, it was from Mt. Olivet, not in appearance only, but in reality, and that visibly and locally. It was sudden, swift, glorious, and in a triumphant manner. *SEE GLORIFICATION*. He was parted from his disciples while he was solemnly blessing them, and multitudes of angels attended him with shouts of praise (<sup><4047></sup>Psalm 24:7-10; 47:5, 6; 68:18)" (Watson, *Theol. Dictionary*, s.v.).

(7) Its *results* to the church are:

- (a) the assumption of regal dominion by Christ, the head of the church (<sup><4002></sup>Hebrews 10:12, 13; <sup><4008></sup>Ephesians 4:8, 10; Psalm 68);
- (b) the gift of the Holy Spirit (<sup><4067></sup>John 16:7, 14; <sup><4023></sup>Acts 2:33; <sup><4046></sup>John 14:16-19);
- (c) the intercession of Christ, as mediator, at the right hand of God (<sup><4084></sup>Romans 8:34; <sup><4060></sup>Hebrews 6:20).

The 3d Article of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church runs thus: "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men at the last day." The corresponding article of the Methodist Episcopal Church is the same, omitting the words "with flesh,

hones, and;" an omission which does not affect the substance of the article. Browne's note on this article is as follows: "It is clear" (from the account in the Gospel) that "our Lord's body, after he rose from the grave, was that body in which he was buried, having hands and feet, and flesh and bones, capable of being handled, and in which he spoke, and ate, and drank (~~24D~~ Luke 24:42, 43). Moreover, it appears that our Lord thus showed his hands and feet to his disciples at that very interview with them in which he was parted from them and received up into heaven. This will be seen by reading the last chapter of St. Luke from verse 36 to the end, and comparing it with the first chapter of the Acts, verse 4-9; especially comparing ~~24D~~ Luke 24:49, 50, with ~~400B~~ Acts 1:4, 8, 9. In that body, then, which the disciples felt and handled, and which was proved to them to have flesh and bones, these disciples saw our Lord ascend into heaven; and, immediately after his ascent, angels came and declared to them that that same Jesus whom they had seen taken up into heaven should so come in like manner as they had seen him go into heaven (~~401B~~ Acts 1:11). All this, connected together, seems to prove the identity of our Lord's today after his resurrection, at his ascension, and so on, even till his coming to judgment, with the body in which he suffered, and in which he was buried, and so fully justifies the language used in the article of our church. But because we maintain that the body of Christ, even after his resurrection and ascension, is a true human body, with all things pertaining to the perfection of man's nature (to deny which would be to deny the important truth that Christ is still perfect man as well as perfect God), it by no means, therefore, follows that we should deny that his risen body is now a glorified, and, as St. Paul calls it, a spiritual body. "But, after his ascension, we have St. Paul's distinct assurance that the body of Christ is a glorious, is a spiritual body. In 1 Corinthians 15, we have St. Paul's assertion that, in the resurrection of all men, the body shall rise again, but that it shall no longer be a natural body, but a spiritual body; no longer a corruptible and vile, but an incorruptible and glorious body (~~455C~~ 1 Corinthians 15:42-53); and this change of our bodies from natural to spiritual is expressly stated to be bearing the image of our glorified Lord the image of that heavenly man the Lord from heaven (ver. 47-49). So, again, the glorified state of the saint's bodies after the resurrection, which in 1 Corinthians 15 had been called the receiving a spiritual body, is in ~~502B~~ Philippians 3:21 said to be a fashioning of their bodies to the likeness of Christ's glorious body: 'who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body.' We must therefore conclude that, though Christ rose with the same body in

which he died, and that body neither did nor shall cease to be a human body, still it acquired, either at his resurrection or at his ascension, the qualities and attributes of a spiritual as distinguished by the apostle from a natural body, of an incorruptible as distinguished from a corruptible body" (*On Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 115).

On the fact and doctrine of the ascension, see Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 437 sq.; Olshausen, *Comm.* on ~~4000~~ Acts 1:1-11; Baumgarten, *Apostolic History*, i, 2428; Bossuet, *Sermons*, 4:88; Watson, *Sermons*, ii, 210; Farindon, *Sermons*, ii, 477-495; South, *Sermons*; iii, 169; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 152; ii, 162; Knapp, *Theology*, § 97; Dorner, *Doct. of Person of Christ*, vol. ii; Barrow, *Sermons*, ii, 501, 608; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, -vi, 106; Maurice, *Theol. Essays*, p. 251. Monographs connected with the subject have been written, among others, by Ammon (Gott. 1800), Anger (Lips. 1830), Bose (Lips. 1741), Crusius (Lips. 1757), Deyling (*Obs.* iii, 198), Doederlein (*Opp.* p. 59), Eichler (Lips. 1737), Fliigge (Han. 1808), Fogtmann (Hafn. 1826), Georgius (Viteb. 1748), Griesbach (Jen. 1793), Himly (Argent. 1811), Hasse (Regiom. 1805), Loescher (Viteb. 1698), Mayer (Gryph. 1704), C. B. Michaelis (Hal. 1749), Otterbein (Duisb. 1802), Schlegel (Henke's *Mag.* 4:277), Seiler (Erlang. 1798), id. (ib. 1803), Steenbach (Hafn. 1714), Weichert (Viteb. 1811), Zickler (Jen. 1758), Brennecke (Luxemb. 1819 [replies by Haumann, Iken, Soltmann, Starum, Tinius, Weber, Witting]), Kikebusch (Schneeb. 1751), Korner (*Sachs. Geistl. Stud.* i, 10), Liebknecht (Giess. 1737), -Mosheim (Helmst. 1729), Schmid (Lips. 1712), Andreai (Marb. 1676), Mahn (Lips. 1700), Remling (Viteb. 1685). **SEE JESUS.**

### Ascension Day, Or Holy Thursday,

a festival of the church held in commemoration of the ascension of our Lord, forty days after Easter, and ten before Whitsuntide. Augustine (*Ep.* 54,) supposed it to be among the festivals instituted by the apostles themselves, but it was not observed in the church until the third century. It is also noticed in the *Apostolical Constitutions*. It is especially observed in the Roman Church, and also, though with less form, in the Church of England. It is one of the six days in the year for which the Church of England appoints special psalms. -Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 20, cap. 6, § 5; Procter, *On the Common Prayer-book*, p. 288.

## Ascension Of Isaiah.

*SEE ISAIAH.*

Ascent (some form of **הל** [; *alah'*, to *go up*, as elsewhere often rendered), <sup><1053></sup>2 Samuel 15:30; 1 Kings, 10:5; <sup><1404></sup>2 Chronicles 9:4. *SEE AKRABBIM; SEE CAUSEWAY.*

## Asceterium

(**ἀσκητήριον**), the place of retreat of ascetics; in later times, often applied to monasteries. -Suice-', *Thesaurus*, s.v.

## Asceticism, Ascetics.

The name **ἀσκητής** (from **ἀσκέω**, to *exercise*) is borrowed from profane writers, by whom it is generally employed to describe the athletes, or men trained to the profession of gladiators or prize-fighters. In the early Christian church the name was given to such as inured themselves to greater degrees of fasting and abstinence than other men, in order to subdue or mortify their passions. *SEE EXERCISE.* The Christian ascetics were divided into *abstinentes*, or those who abstained from wine, meat, and agreeable food, and *contineites*, or those who, abstaining from matrimony also, were considered to attain to a higher degree of sanctity. Many laymen as well as ecclesiastics were ascetics in the first centuries of our era, without retiring on that account from the business and bustle of life. Some of them wore the *pallium philosophicum*, or the philosophic mantle, and were therefore called Christian philosophers, and formed thus the transition link to the life of hermits and monks. Romanist writers pretend that the ascetics were originally the same with monks: the monastic life, however, was not known till the fourth century (Pagi, *Crit. in Bar.* A.D. 62, N. 4). The difference between ascetics and monks may be thus stated:

1. The monks were such as retired from the business and conversation of the world to some desert or mountain; but the ascetics were of an active life, living in cities as other men, and only differing from them in: the ardor of their devotional acts and habits.
2. The monks were only laymen; the ascetics were of any order.

**3.** The monks were bound by certain laws and disciplinary regulations; but the ancient ascetics had no such laws. The habits and exercises of the ascetics may nevertheless be regarded as the introduction of monasticism. The root of asceticism in the early Christian church is to be found in a Gnostic leaven, remaining from the early struggle of the church with Gnosticism (q.v.). The open Gnosticism was crushed; but its more seductive principle was imbibed, to a large extent, even by the best of the church fathers, and remained to plague Christianity for hundreds of years in the forms of asceticism, celibacy, monasticism, and the various superstitions of the same class in the Romish Church. That principle makes the "conditions of animal life, and the common alliances of men in the social system, the antithesis of the Divine perfections, and so to be escaped from, and decried by all who pant after the highest excellence." See Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, vol. i, where this subject is treated at length and with great mastery of both history and philosophy. *SEE ABSTINENCE; SEE FASTING; SEE MONKS.*

As soon as the inward and spiritual life of the Christians declined, the tendency to rely on external acts and forms increased; and if the previous bloody persecutions had driven individuals from human society into the deserts, the growing secularization of the church, after Christianity became the state religion, had the same effect to a still greater degree. All this paved the way for monasticism (q.v.); and the church thought herself compelled by the overwhelming tide of opinion within and without to recognise this form of asceticism, and to take it under her protection and care. From the African Church a gloomy and superstitious spirit spread over the Western Church, intensifying the ascetic tendencies. There were not wanting healthier minds-as Vigilantius (q.v.) and others-to raise their voices against fasting, monkery, and the outward works of asceticism generally; but such protests were vain, and became ever rarer. From the 11th century, the Cathari, Waldenses, and other sects assailed the external asceticism of the church; the classic Petrarch fought on the same side; and so did Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome of Prague, in their struggles at reformation. After a preliminary skirmish by Erasmus, the struggle was decided in the Reformation of the 16th century. The fundamental principle of that movement, that salvation is secured by justification through faith, and not through dead works, struck at the root of monkery and mortification in general. But the victory has not been so complete as is often assumed. The ascetic spirit often shows itself still alive under various

disguises even in Protestantism. *SEE SHAKERS*. The great error of asceticism is to hold self-denial and suffering to be meritorious in the sight of God, in and for itself. Its germinant principle, in all ages of the church, has been, as stated above, a Gnostic way of viewing the relations between God, man, and nature, tending to dualism and to the confounding of sin with the very nature of matter. See Zockler, *Kritische Geschichte der Askese* (Frankf. 1863, 8vo); Schaff, *Church History*, § 94; *Mercersburg Review*, 1858, p. 600; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 7:§ 5; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1858, p. 600; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 7:ch. i; Mosheim, *Comm.* i, 381. *SEE HERMIT*.

### Asche.

*SEE ASSER*.

### Ascitee

(q. d. ἄσκίται, *replete*) or ASCODROGITE, heretics who appeared in Galatia about 173. They pretended to be filled with the "paraclete" of Montanus, and introduced bacchanalian indecencies into the churches, where they brought a skin of wine, and, marching round it, declared that they were the vessels filled with new wine of which the Lord speaks in the Gospels. Hence their name from the Greek ἄσκός, which means "a skin."-Augustine, *liaer.* 62; Landon, *Eccl. Diet.* i, 566. *SEE MONTANISTS*.

### Ascough,

or, according to Godwin, "WILLIAM AYSCOTH, doctor of laws and clerk of the counsel, was consecrated in the chapel of Windsor, July 20, 1438. The year 1450 it happened the commons to arise in sundry parts of the realm, by the stirring of Jack Cade, naming himself John Mortimer. A certain number of lewd persons (tenants for the most part to this bishop), intending-to join themselves to the rest of that crew, came to Evendon, where he was then saying of mass. What was their quarrel to him I find not. But certain it is, they drew him from the altar in his alb, with his stole about his neck, to the top of a hill not far off, and there, as he kneeled on his knees praying, they cleft his head, spoiled him to the skin, and, rending his bloody shirt into a number of pieces, took every man a rag to keep for a monument of their worthy exploit. The day before they had robbed his carriages of 10,000 marks in ready money. This abarbarous murder was committed June 29th, the year aforesaid." Dr. Fuller supposes that the



bishop was attacked because he was "learned, pious, and rich, three capital crimes in a clergyman." He also gives us the following distich, which may be applicable in other times:

*" Sic concusso cadit populari mitra tumultu,  
Protegat optamus nunc diadema Deus.*

*"By people's fury mitres thus cast down  
We pray hence orward God preserve the crown."*

-*Biog. Britannica*; Hook, *Ecci. Biog.* i, 323.

*SEE ASKEW.*

Ase'as.

*SEE ASEAS.*

Asebebi'a

(**Ἀσεβηβία**), one of the Levites who, with his sons, joined the caravan under Ezra (1 Esdr. 8:47); evidently the SHEREBIAH *SEE SHEREBIAH* (q.v.) of the genuine text (<sup><1878></sup>Ezra 8:18).

Asebi'a

(**Ἀσεβία**), another of the Levites who returned in Ezra's party to Palestine (1 Esdr. 8:48); evidently the HASHABIAH *SEE HASHABIAH* (q.v.) of the true text (<sup><1729></sup>Ezra 2:19).

As'enath

(Heb. *Asenath'*, תַּנְיַשׁ אַ, on the signif. see below; Sept. **Ἀσενέθ** v.r. **Ἀσεννέθ**), the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On, whom the king of Egypt bestowed in marriage upon Joseph (<sup><0445></sup>Genesis 41:45; 46:20), with the view probably of strengthening his position in Egypt by this high connection, B.C. 1883. *SEE JOSEPH*. She became the mother of Ephraim and Manasseh (<sup><0450></sup>Genesis 41:50). No better etymology of Asenath has been proposed than that by Jablonski, who (*Pansfh. Egypt.* i, 56; *Opuscul.* ii, 208) regards it as representative of a Coptic compound, *Assheneit*. The latter part of this word he takes to be the name of Neith, the titular goddess of Sais, the Athene of the Greeks. and considers the whole to mean *worshipper Nf Neith*. Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus*, suggests that the original Coptic form was *Asncith*, which means *who belongs to Neith*: That the

name refers to this goddess is the generally received opinion (in modern times Von Bohlen alone has, in his *Genesis*, proposed an unsatisfactory Shemitic etymology [see Lepsius, *Chronicles d. dEgypter*, i, 382]): it is favored by the fact that the Egyptians, as Jablonski has shown, were accustomed to choose names expressive of some relation to their gods; and it appears liable to no stronger objection than the doubt whether the worship of Neith existed at so early a period as that of the composition of the Book of Genesis (see Champollion, *Pantheon Egyptienne*, No. 6). Even this doubt is now removed, as it appears that she was really one of the primitive deities of Lower Egypt (Bunsen, *Egypt's Place*, i, 389), for her name occurs as an element in that of Nitocris (*Neith-akri*), a queen of the sixth dynasty (Wilkinson, in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, ii, 142, note 2).

### A'ser

(Ἀσήρ), the Graecized form of ASHER *SEE ASHER* (q.v.), both the tribe (ⲀⲓⲤⲉⲗ Luke 2:36; ⲀⲓⲤⲉⲗ Revelation 7:6) and the city (Tobit i, 2).

### Ase'rer

(Σεράρ), one of the heads of the templeservants that returned from the captivity (1 Esdr. v, 32); evidently the SISERA *SEE SISERA* (q.v.) of the true text (ⲀⲓⲤⲉⲗ Ezra 2:53).

### Asgill, John,

member of the Irish Parliament, and author of an eccentric book entitled *An Argument proving that, according to the Covenant of eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures, Man may be translated hence into that eternal Life without passing through Death, although the humane Nature of Christ himself could not thus be translated till he had passed through Death* (Dublin, 1698, 8vo). The Irish Parliament voted it a blasphemous libel, and expelled Asgill from the House after four days. In 1705 he entered the English Parliament as member for Bramber, in Sussex. But the English Hoage, resolving to be not less virtuous than the Irish, condemned his book to be burnt by the common hangman as profane and blasphemous, and expelled Asgill on the 18th December, 1707. After this his circumstances rapidly grew worse, until at last he found something like peace in the King's Bench and the Fleet, between which two places his excursions were confined for the term of his natural life. He died in

Nosvember, 1738. See Southey, *The Doctor*, pt. ii; Coleridge, *Works* (Harpers' ed.), vol. v; Allibone, i, 73.

## Ash

(*ʿra*, *o'ren*, probably *tremulous*, from the motion of the leaves) occurs only once in Scripture as the name of a tree, in connection with other trees, of whose timber idols were made, <sup>2344</sup>Isaiah 44:14: "He heweth him down *cedars*, and taketh the *cypress* and the *oak*, which he strengtheneth for himself among the trees of the forest; he planteth an *ash* (*oren*), and the rain doth nourish it." Others consider *pine-tree* to be the correct translation; but for neither does there appear to be any decisive proof, nor for the *rubus* or *bramble* adopted for *oren* in the fable of the Cedar and Rubus, translated from the Hebrew of R. Berechia Hannakdan by Celsius (*Hierobot.* i, 186). *Oren* is translated *pine-tree* both in the Sept. (πίτυς) and the Vulg., and this has been acquiesced in by several of the most learned critics, and among them by Calvin and Bochart. Celsius (ut sup. p. 191) states, moreover, that some of the rabbins also consider *oren* to be the same as the Arabic *sunober* (which is no doubt a pine), and that they often join together *arzim*, *orn'm*, and *beroshim*, as trees of the same nature (ϣϫϫ}μϣϫϫ} ϣϫϫ} ϣϫϫ} "cedars" and "ash-trees" and "cypresses," Talmud Ba.byl. *Pora*, fol. xcvi, 1). Luther and the Portuguese version read *cedar*. Rosenmuller (*Alierth.* IV, i, 243 sq.; comp. Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 152) contends that it is not the common wild pine (*Pinus sylvestri*), which is intended, but what the ancients called the domestic pine, which was raised in gardens en account of its elegant shape and the pleasant fruit it yields, the Pignole nuts of the Italians (*Pinus pinea* of Linnaeus), and quotes Virgil (*Ecl.* 7:65; *Georg.* 4:112). The English version, in the translation of *oren*, follows those interpreters who have adopted *ornus*, apparently only because the elementary letters of the Hebrew are found also in the Latin word. **SEE PINE**. Celsius objects to this as an insufficient reason for supposing that the ash was intended; and there does not appear to be any other proof. *Ornus Europea*, or manna ash (*Fraxinus ornus*, Linnaeus, *Pranzensyst.* ii, 516), does, however, grow in Syria, but, being a cultivated plant, it may have been introduced. **SEE MANNA**. The common ash was anciently associated with the oak (Stat. *Theb.* 6:102) as a hard (Ovid, *Met.* 12:337; Lucan. 6:390; Colum. 11:2) and durable (Horace, *Od.* i, 9, 2) tree (Pliny, 16:30; Virg. *Geo.* ii, 65 sq.), of hardy growth (Virar. *Geo.* ii, 111; *AEEn.* ii, 626). Celsius (ut sup. p. 192) quotes from the Arab

author 'Abu-l-Fadli the description of a tree called *aran*, which appears well suited to the passage, though it has not yet been ascertained what tree is intended. The *aran* is said to be a tree of Arabia Petraea, of a thorny nature, inhabiting the valleys, but found also in the mountains, where it is, however, less thorny. The wood is said to be much valued for cleaning the teeth. The fruit is in bunches like small grapes. The berry is noxious while green, and bitter like galls; as it ripens it becomes red, then black and somewhat sweetish, and when eaten is grateful to the stomach, and seems to act as a stimulant medicine. Sprengel (*Hist. reilherb.* i, 14) supposes this to be the caper plant (*Capparis Spinosa* of Linnaeus). Faber thought it to be the *Rhlamnus siculus pentaphyllus* of Shaw. Link (in Schrader's *Journ. of Botan.* 4:252) identifies it with *Flacourtia sepiaria* of Roxburgh, a tree, however, which has not been found in Syria. It appears to agree in some respects with the *Salvadora Persica*, but not in all points, and therefore it requires further investigation by some traveller in Syria conversant both with plants and their Oriental names and uses. **SEE BOTANY.**

## Ash

**SEE ARCTURUS; SEE MOTH.**

## Ash, St. George,

bishop of Derry, was born in 1658, became fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, 1679, and provost of Trinity, 1692. He was appointed bishop of Cloyne in 1695, was translated to Clogher, 1697, and thence to Derry in 1716. He died in Dublin in 1717. He published a number of separate sermons, and contributed to the papers of the Royal Society, of which he was a member.

## Ash, John, LL.D.

an Independent minister, was born in Dorsetshire in 1724, and died in 1779. At first he pursued mathematics, but afterward studied theology, and entered the ministry. He was associated with Dr. Caleb Evans in founding the "Bristol Education Society." He settled as pastor at Pershore, Worcestershire, and devoted a large part of his time to the preparation of *A New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language* (2 vols. large 8vo, 1775), on an extended plan, and the best work of its class at the time. He also published *Sentiments oh Education* (1777, 2 vols. 12mo):-*The*

*Dialogues of Eumenes.-Gentleman's Magazine*, xlix, 215; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* i, 113.

## A'shan

(Heb. *Ashan'*, אֶשָׁן; *smoke*; Sept. Ἀσάν; in <sup><1342></sup>1 Chronicles 4:32, Ἀισάν v. r. Ἀισάρι; in <sup><1652></sup>Joshua 15:42, omits), a Levitical city in the low country of Judah named in <sup><1652></sup>Joshua 15:42 with Libnah and Ether. In <sup><1697></sup>Joshua 19:7, and <sup><1342></sup>1 Chronicles 4:32, it is mentioned again as belonging to Simeon, but in company with Ain and Rimmon, which (see <sup><1652></sup>Joshua 15:31) appear to have been much more to the south. In <sup><1349></sup>1 Chronicles 6:59, it is given as a priests' city, occupying (perhaps 1)- error of transcription) the same place as the somewhat similar word *Ain* (אֵין) does in the list of Joshua 21:I 16. In <sup><1333></sup>1 Samuel 30:30, the fuller form *Chorashan* is named with Hormah and other cities of "the South." Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v.) mention a village named *Bethasan* as 15 or 16 miles west of Jerusalem; but this, though agreeing sufficiently with the position of the place in <sup><1652></sup>Joshua 15:42, is not far enough south for the indications of the other passages; and indeed this is a doubtful intimation (*Cellar. Notit.* ii, 496). **SEE ASHNAH.** It appears to have been situated in the southern part of the hilly region adjoining the plain (Keil, *Comment.* on <sup><1652></sup>Joshua 15:42); perhaps not far from the present *Deir Samil.* **SEE AIN.** The above conflicting notices of its position would almost seem to require two cities of the name of Ashan, one in Judah (? =Eshean), and the other in Simeon (distinctively Chorashan); but, on the whole, they may best be reconciled by supposing one locality, properly in the plain of Judah, but assigned (with Ether, q.v.) to Simeon. **SEE TRIBE.**

## Ash'bea

(Heb. *As'bei*, אֶשְׁבַּע, *adjuration*, otherwise *swelling*; Sept. Ἔσοβά), the head of a family mentioned as working in fine linen, a branch of the descendants of Shelah, the son of Judah (<sup><1342></sup>1 Chronicles 4:21). B.C. prob. cir. 1017. The clause in which the word occurs is obscure (see Bertheau, *Comment.* in loc.). Houbigant and Bootruyd understand a *place* to be meant by the expression *Beth-ashbea*. The Targum of R. Joseph (ed. Wilkins) paraphrases it " the house of Eshba."

## Ash'bel

(Heb. *Ashbel'*, **אשבל** prob. for *Eshbaal*; Sept. **Ἀσβήλ**; in Numbers **Ἀσουβήλ** v. r. **Ἀσубήρ**), the second son of Benjamin (<sup><042></sup>Genesis 46:21; <sup><131></sup>1 Chronicles 8:1). B.C. 1856. *SEE JEDIAEL*. His descendants were called *Ashbelites* (<sup><038></sup>Numbers 26:38). *SEE BECHER*.

## Ash'belite

(Heb. with the art. *ha-Ashbeli'*, **אשבלים**; Sept. **οἱ Ἀσουβηλί** v. r. **Ἀσουβηρί**, Vulg. *Asbelitce*, A. V. "the Ashbelites"), the descendants of Ashbel (q.v.), son of Benjamin (<sup><038></sup>Numbers 26:38).

## Ash-Cake

(**חג[מ]וגה'**, or **חג[מ]וגגה'**, "cake," "cake baked on the hearth," <sup><186></sup>Genesis 18:6; 19:3; <sup><173></sup>1 Kings 17:13; <sup><412></sup>Ezekiel 4:12, etc.; Sept. **ἔγκρυφία**), a thin round pancake baked over hot sand or a slab of stone by means of ashes or coals put over them, or between two layers of hot embers of the dung of cows or camels (see Schubert, iii, 28; Arvieux, iii, 227). Such are still relished in the East (by the Arabs of the desert) as a tolerably delicious dish (see Thevenot, ii, 12, p. 235; Schweigger, p. 283; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 52). *SEE CAKE*. Such cake is made especially when there is not much time for baking. It must be turned in order to be baked through and not to burn on one side (<sup><108></sup>Hosea 7:8). It was made commonly of wheat flour (<sup><186></sup>Genesis 18:6). Barley-cakes are mentioned (for the time of scarcit) in <sup><412></sup>Ezekiel 4:12. *SEE BREAD*;

## Ash'chenaz

(Heb. *Ashkenaz'*, **אשכנז** Vulg. *Ascenez*), a less correct form (<sup><106></sup>1 Chronicles 1:6; Sept. **Ἀσχενάξ** v. r. **Ἀσχανάξ**; <sup><127></sup>Jeremiah 2:27, Sept. **οἱ Ἀσχαζαῖοι** v. r. **Ἀσχανάζεοι**, **Ἀχανάζεοι**, **Ἀσκαναζαῖοι**) of Anglicizing the name ASHKENAZ *SEE ASHKENAZ* (q.v.).

## Ash'dod

(Heb. *Ashdod'*, **אשדוד** a *stronghold*; Sept. and N.T. **Ἄζωτος**), the *Azotus* of the Greeks -and Romans, and so called in 1 Macc. 4:15; <sup><181></sup>Acts 8:40 (see also Plin. *Hist. Nat.* v, 14; Ptolem. v, 16); a city of the Philistine Pentapolis, on the summit of a grassy hill (Richardson, *Travels*, ii, 206),

near the Mediterranean coast (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 14:4, 4), nearly midway between Gaza and Joppa, being 18 geographical miles north by east from the former (270 stadia north, according to Diod. Sic. 19:85), and 21 south from the latter; and, more exactly, midway between Askelon and Ekron, being 10 geographical miles north by east from the former, and south by west from the latter (see Cellar. *Notit.* ii, 599; Mannert, VI, i, 261 sq.). Ashdod was a city of the Philistines, and the chief town of one of their five confederate states (<sup><633></sup>Joshua 13:3; <sup><667></sup>1 Samuel 6:17). It was the seat of the worship of Dagon (<sup><685></sup>1 Samuel 5:5; 1 Macc. 11:4), before whose shrine in this city it was that the captured ark was deposited and triumphed over the idol (<sup><691></sup>1 Samuel 5:1-9). Ashdod was assigned to Judah (<sup><657></sup>Joshua 15:47); but many centuries passed before it and the other Philistine towns were subdued (<sup><1021></sup>1 Kings 4:24), *SEE PHILISTINES*; and it appears never to have been permanently in possession of the Judahites, although it was dismantled by Uzziah, who built towns in the territory of Ashdod (<sup><436></sup>2 Chronicles 26:6). It is mentioned to the reproach of the Jews after their return from captivity that they married wives of Ashdod; the result of which was that the children of these marriages spoke a mongrel dialect, compounded of Hebrew and the speech of Ashdod (<sup><633></sup>Nehemiah 13:23, 24). It was a place of great strength; and being on the usual military route between Syria and Egypt, the possession of it became an object of importance in the wars between Egypt and the great northern powers. Hence it was secured by the Assyrians under Tartan (B.C. 715) before invading Egypt (<sup><231></sup>Isaiah 20:1 sq.); and about B.C. 630 it was taken by Psammetichus, after a siege of twenty-nine years, the longest on record (Herodot. ii, 157). That it recovered from this blow appears from its being mentioned as an independent power in alliance, after the exile, with the Arabians and others against Jerusalem (<sup><647></sup>Nehemiah 4:7). The destruction of Ashdod was foretold by the prophets (<sup><252></sup>Jeremiah 25:20; Amos 1:8; 3:9; <sup><314></sup>Zephaniah 2:4; <sup><306></sup>Zechariah 9:6), and was accomplished by the Maccabees (1 Macc. 5:68; 10:77-84; 11:4). It is enumerated among the towns which Pompey joined to the province of Syria (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:4, 4; *War*, i, 7, 7), and among the cities ruined in the wars, which Gabinius ordered to be rebuilt (*Ant.* 14:5, 3). It was included in Herod's dominion, and was one of the three towns bequeathed by him to his sister Salome (*War*, 17:8, 1; 11:5). The evangelist Philip was found at Ashdod after he had baptized the Ethiopian eunuch (<sup><484></sup>Acts 8:40). Azotus early became the seat of a bishopric; and we find a bishop of this city present at the councils of Nice, Chalcedon, A.D. 359, Seleucia, and Jerusalem, A.D. 536

(Reland, *Palestina*, p. 609). Ashdod subsisted as a small unwall'd town in the time of Jerome. It was in ruins when Benjamin of Tudela visited Palestine (*Itin.* ed. Asher, i, 79); but we learn from William of Tyre and Vitriacus that the bishopric was revived by the Latin Christians, at least titularly, and made suffragan of Treves. Sandys (*Travailes*, p. 151) describes it "as a place of no reckoning;" and Zuallart (*Voyage*, 4:132) speaks of it as an Arab village (comp. Van Troilo, 1666, p. 349). Irby and Mangles (p. 180) describe it as an inhabited site marked by ancient ruins, such as broken arches and partly-buried fragments of marble columns; there is also what appeared to these travellers to be a very ancient khan, the principal chamber of which had obviously, at some former period, been used as a Christian chapel. The place is still called *Esdud* (Volney, *Trav.* ii, 251; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 120). The name occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.). The ancient remains are few and indistinct (Hackett, *Illustra. of Script.* p. 185). The ruined khan to the west of the village marks the Acropolis of the ancient town, and the grove near it alone protects the site from the shifting sand of the adjoining plain, which threatens, at no distant day, entirely to overwhelm the spot (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 319).

The inhabitants are styled (yḏī/Dvḥj <sup><1617></sup> Nehemiah 5:7; "Ashdothites," <sup><1617></sup> Joshua 13:3; the dialect is the Pim. tyḏī/Dvḥj Ashdodith', Sept. Ἀζωτισί, Vulg. *Azotice*, A. V. "in the speech of Ashdod," <sup><1617></sup> Nehemiah 13:24).

### Ash'dodite

(Heb. in the plur. with the art. *haAshdodim'*, μyḏī/Dvḥh; Sept. omits, but some copies have Ἀζώτιοι, Vulg. *Azot i*, A.V. "the Ashdodites"), the inhabitants (<sup><1617></sup> Nehemiah 4:7 [Heb. 1]) of ASHDOD **SEE ASHDOD** (q.v.).

### Ash'dothite

(Heb. with the art. *ha-Ashdodi'*, yḏī/Dvḥj ; Sept. οἈζώτιος, Vulg. *Azotil*, A.V. " the Ashdothite"), a less correct mode (<sup><1617></sup> Joshua 13:3) of Anglicizing the name *Ashdodite* (<sup><1617></sup> Nehemiah 4:7), or inhabitant of ASHDOD **SEE ASHDOD** (q.v.).



## Ash'doth-Pis'gah

(Heb. *AshdOTH' hap-Pisgah'*, ἡῶςPhi t /Dvāi ravines of Pisgah; Sept. Ἀσηδῶθ [τὴν] Φασγά, and Ἀσ. τὴν λαξευτήν), apparently the water-courses running from the base of Mount Pisgah, which formed the southern boundary of the territory of Sihon, king of the Amorites ("Springs of Pisgah," <sup><R04></sup>Deuteronomy 4:49); transferred as a proper name in <sup><R12></sup>Joshua 12:3; 13:20; <sup><R17></sup>Deuteronomy 3:17). **SEE PISGAH**. This curious and (since it occurs in none of the later books) probably very ancient term in the two passages from Deuteronomy forms part of a formula by which, apparently, the mountains that enclose the Dead Sea on the east. side are defined. Thus in iii, 17, we read, "the 'Arabah' also (i.e. the Jordan valley) and the 'border,' from Cinnereth (Sea of Galilee) unto the sea of the 'Arabah,' the Salt Sea, under AshdOTH hap-Pisgah eastward;" and so also in 4:49, though here our translators have chosen to vary the formula for English readers. The same intention is evident in the passages cited from Joshua; and in 10:40, and 12:8, of the same book, AshdOTH is used alone- "the springs," to denote one of the main natural divisions of the country. The only other instance of the use of the word is in the highly poetical passage, <sup><P15></sup>Numbers 21:15, "the 'pouring forth' of the 'torrents,' which extendeth to Shebeth-Ar." This undoubtedly refers also to the east of the Dead Sea. Doubtless, like the other topographical words of the Bible, it has a precise meaning; but whether it be the streams poured forth at the foot of the mountains of Moab, or the roots or spurs of those mountains, or the mountains themselves, it is impossible, in our present ignorance of the country east of the Dead Sea, to determine with certainty.

## Ashdowne, William,

an English Unitarian, who wrote a number of controversial pieces toward the close of the 18th century, viz. *An Essay Concerning the true Meaning of Jesus in his Parables* (Canterbury, 1780, 8vo);-*The Unitarian, Arian, and Trinitarian Opinions respecting Christ tried by Scripture* (Canterbury, 1789, 8vo) ;-*The Doctrine of Satan, as Tempter, etc. not founded in Scripture* (1791, 8vo);-*Proofs that Adults only are included in the New Covenant* (1792, 8vo).*Gentleman's Magazine*, 1790, 1800,1805; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, iii, 435.

Ashe.

SEE ASSER.

Ashe, Simeon,

a Nonconformist and Presbyterian, was educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and afterward settled in Staffordshire, from whence he removed to London, where he exercised his ministry twenty-three years. He was one of the deputies who went to congratulate Charles II on his restoration at Breda. He died in 1662; "a man of holy life, cheerful mind, and fluent elegancy" (Baxter). He published a treatise on the Power of Godliness, and several single sermons.-Hook. *Eccl. Biog.* s.v.; Orme, *Life of Baxter*, i, 217.

Ashe.

SEE ASSER.

Asher Ben-Jechiel,

called Magister Asher, a Jewish writer, was born at Rothenburg toward the end of the 13th century, and died in 1327. He was considered one of the most learned of the Spanish Jews, and taught with high repute at Toledo; but he did not escape the persecuting spirit of the time, and was driven from Toledo. He published chiefly

- (1.) various commentaries or special tracts of the Talmud (printed at different times and places, especially Prague, 1725, and Leghorn, Berlin, Amst. etc. later);
- (2.) a general collection of decisions relating to the entire Talmud, entitled **t/kl h}yqsPi** (usually contained in extended editions of the Talmud), more commonly denominated, from him, **yrivah**; *the Asheri*, abstracts. of which, under the title of **varh;yqsPirWxq]** (Constantinople, 1520, fol. and later), **t/ps}t yqsPi** etc have been made;
- (3.) **t/l aœ]** etc. questions and answers on Jewish ceremonies- (Venice, 1552, fol. and since);

(4.) **hghnhj** moral precepts or institutes (Ven. 1579, 4to, and often since).- Bartolucci, *Bibl. Magn. Rabbin.* i, 493; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generate*, iii, 437; Furst, *Bib. Jud.* i; 57 sq.

### Ash'er

(Heb. *Asher'*, **rva**; *happiness*; Sept. and New Test. **Ἀσήρ**), the name of a man (and the tribe descended from him), and of one or two places.

**1.** The eleventh of the sons of Jacob, and his third by Zilpah, the handmaid of Leah (<sup><0133></sup>Genesis 35:26), and founder of one of the twelve tribes (Num. 26:4447). Born B.C. 1914. The name is interpreted in a passage full of the paronomastic turns which distinguish these very ancient records: "And Leah said, 'In my happiness am I (**yrivḅB**), for the daughters have called me happy' (**ynlrvḅ**), and she called his name Asher" (**rva**), i.e. "happy" (<sup><0133></sup>Genesis 30:13). A similar play occurs in the blessing of Moses (<sup><0133></sup>Deuteronomy 33:24). Gad was Zilpah's other and elder son, but the fortunes of the brothers were not at all connected. Asher had four sons and one daughter (<sup><0420></sup>Genesis 49:20; <sup><0133></sup>Deuteronomy 33:24).

TRIBE OF ASHER. — Of the tribe descended from Asher no action is recorded during the whole course of the sacred history. Its name is found in the various lists of the tribes which occur throughout the earlier books, as Genesis 35, 46, Exodus 1, Numbers 1, 2, 13, etc., and like the rest, Asher sent his chief as one of the spies from Kadesh-barnea (Numbers 13). During the march through the desert his place was between Dan and Naphtali, on the north side of the tabernacle (<sup><0127></sup>Numbers 2:27); and after the conquest he took up his allotted position without any special mention. On quitting Egypt the number of adult males in the tribe of Asher was 41,500, which made it the ninth of the tribes (excluding Levi) in numbers—Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin only being below it. But before entering Canaan an increase of 11,900—an addition exceeded only by Manasseh — raised the number to 53,400, and made it the fifth of the tribes in population (comp. <sup><0140></sup>Numbers 1:40, 41; 26:47). The genealogy of the tribe appears in some instances to have been preserved till the time of Christ (<sup><0126></sup>Luke 2:36, "Aser").

The limits of the territory assigned to Asher are, like those of all the tribes, and especially of the northern tribes, extremely difficult to trace. This is partly owing to our ignorance of the principle on which these ancient

boundaries were drawn and recorded, and partly from the absence of identification of the majority of the places named. The general position of the tribe was on the sea-shore from Carmel northward, with Manasseh on the south, Zebulun and Issachar on the south-east, and Naphtali on the north-east (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1, 22). The boundaries and towns are given in ~~<0602>~~Joshua 19:24-31; 17:10, 11; and Judges i, 31, 32. From a comparison of these passages it seems plain that Dor (*Tantura*) must have been just without the limits of the tribe, in which case the southern boundary was probably one of the streams which enter the Mediterranean north of that place, apparently the embouchure of Wady Milheh. Crossing the promontory of Carmel, the tribe then possessed the maritime continuation of the rich plain of Esdraelon, probably for a distance of five or six miles from the shore. The boundary then ran northward from the valley of Jiphthah-el (*Jefat*) to that of the Leontes, and reaching Zidon, it turned and came down by Tyre to Achzib (Ecdippa, now *es-Zib*). **SEE TRIBE.** It is usually stated that the whole of the Phoenician territories, including Sidon, were assigned to this tribe (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1, 22; see Reland, *Palcest.* p. 575 sq.). But there are various considerations which militate against this conclusion (see the *Pictorial Bible*, Num. 26:24; ~~<0602>~~Joshua 19:24; Judges i, 31), and tend to show that the assigned frontier-line was drawn out to the sea south of Sidon. The strongest text for the inclusion of Sidon (Tyre was not then founded) is that in which it is mentioned to the reproach of the Asherites, that they did not drive out the Sidonians (Judges i, 31). This Michaelis is disposed to reject as an interpolation; but Kitto (*Pict. Bib.* in loc.) conceives it to denote that the Asherites were unable to expel the Sidonians, who by that time had encroached southward into parts of the coast actually assigned to the Asherites; and he strengthens this by referring to the subsequent foundation of Tyre, as evincing the disposition of the Sidonians to colonize the coast south of their own proper territories. The Asherites were for a long time unable to gain possession of the territories actually assigned them, and "dwelt among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land" (~~<0003>~~Judges 1:32); and, "as it is not usual to say of a larger number that it dwells among the smaller, the inference is that they expelled but comparatively few of the Canaanites, leaving them, in fact, a majority of the population" (Bush, note on ~~<0003>~~Judges 1:2). **SEE SIDON.**

The following is a list of the places within this tribe that are mentioned in the Bible, with the modern localities to which they appear to correspond.

Such of the latter as have not been identified by any traveller are enclosed in brackets:

- Abdon. Town. *Abdah*.  
 Accho. do. *Akka*  
 Achshaph. do. *Kesaf*.  
 Achzib. do. *Es-Zib*.  
 Ahlab. do. [*Athlil*] ?  
 Alammelech. do. [*El-Habafie*] ?  
 Aloth. District. **SEE BEALOTH**.  
 Amad. Town. [*Ama*,] ?  
 Aphek or Aphik. do. [*Tell Kisol*,] ?  
 Bealoth. District. [Pl. of *Akka*] ?  
 Beten. Town. *El-Baneh*.  
 Beth-dagon. do. [*Eajel*] ?  
 Beth-emek. do. *Amkae*.  
 Cabul. do. *Kabul*.  
 Carmel. Mountain. *Jebel Mar-Elias*.  
 Hali. Town. *Alia*.  
 Hammon. do. *Hanal*  
 Hebron. do. **SEE ABRON**.  
 Helbah. do. [*Haifo*] ?  
 Helkath. do. *Ukrith* ?  
 Hosah. do. [*El-Ghaziye*] ?  
 Jiphthah-el. Valley. *Wady Abilin*  
 Kanah. Town. *Kana*.  
 Kishon. Brook. *Nar Mukatta*.  
 Mashal or Mishal. Town. *Misalli*.  
 Neiel. do. [*Eista*-] ?  
 Ptolemais. do. **SEE ACCHO**.  
 Ramah. do. *Ramah*.  
 Rehob (<sup>1680</sup>Joshua 19:30). do. [*Tell Kurdan*] ?  
 Rehob (<sup>1628</sup>Joshua 19:28). do. [*Reziel*,] ?  
 Shihor-libnath. River. [*Wady Milhel*] ?  
 Ummah. Town. *Alma* ?  
 Zebulon. do. *Abilin* ?

This territory contained some of the richest soil in all Palestine (Stanley, p. 265; Kenrick, *Pholn*. p. 35), and in its productiveness it well fulfilled the promise involved in the name "Asher," and in the blessings which had been

pronounced on him by Jacob and by Moses. Here was the oil in which he was to "dip his foot," the "bread" which was to be "fat," and the "royal dainties" in which he was to indulge (for the crops, see Robinson, new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 102; for the oil, Kenrick, p. 31; Reland, p. 817); and here in the metallic manufactures of the Phoenicians (Kenrick, p. 38) were the "iron and brass" for his "shoes." The Phoenician settlements were even at that early period in full vigor (Zidon was then distinguished by the name Rabbah "the Strong," <sup><6693></sup>Joshua 19:28); and it is not surprising that Asher was soon contented to partake their luxuries, and to "dwell among them" without attempting the conquest and extermination enjoined in regard to all the Canaanites (<sup><7013></sup>Judges 1:31, 32). Accordingly he did not drive out the inhabitants of Accho, nor Dor (Sept. adds this name), nor Zidon, nor Ahlab, nor Achzib, nor Helbah, nor Aphik, nor Rehob (<sup><7013></sup>Judges 1:31), all which seem to have been in the shore-strip preoccupied by the Phoenicians, are the natural consequence of this inert acquiescence is immediately visible. While Zebulun and Naphtal "jeopardied their lives unto the death" in the struggle against Sisera, Asher was content to forget the peril of his fellows in the creeks and harbors of his new allies (<sup><7013></sup>Judges 5:17, 18). At the numbering of Israel at Sinai, Asher was more numerous than either Ephraim, Manasseh, or Benjamin (<sup><4013></sup>Numbers 1:32-41), but in the reign of David, so insignificant had the tribe become, that its name is altogether omitted from the list of the chief rulers (<sup><1376></sup>1 Chronicles 27:16-22); and it is with a kind of astonishment that it is related that "divers of Asher and Manasseh and Zebulun" came to Jerusalem to the Passover of Hezekiah (<sup><4011></sup>2 Chronicles 30:11). With the exception of Simeon, Asher is the only tribe west of the Jordan which furnished no hero or judge to the nation. "One name alone shines out of the general obscurity—the aged widow, 'Anna, the daughter of Phanuel of the tribe of Aser,' who, in the very close of the history, departed not from the Temple, but 'served God with fastings and prayers night and day' " (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 261). The inhabitants of the tribe were also called *Asherites* (*Heb.* *Asheri'*, *yrivā*; Sept. ἐν Ἀσήρ, <sup><7013></sup>Judges 1:32).

## Picture for Asher

**2.** A city on the boundary of the tribe of Manasseh, near Michmethah and east of Shechem (<sup><6670></sup>Joshua 17:7); according to Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v. Ἀσήρ) a village 15, according to the *Itin. Hieros.*, 9 Roman miles from Shechem toward Scythopolis, near the highway. This position nearly

corresponds to that of the modern village *Yasir*, containing ruins, about half way between Nablous and Beisan (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 289) the *Teyasir* suggested by Porter (*Handb.* p. 348). 3. A city in Galilee near Thesbe (Tobit i, 2, Engl. Vers. "Aser"), possibly a corruption for *Hazor* (q.v.), a city in the tribe of Naphtali (see Fritzsche, *Comment.* in loc.), or perhaps identical with the foregoing place,

## Asherah

{hrva} *Assherah'*; Auth. Vers. "grove," after the Sept. ἄλσος; Vulg. *lucus*), a Canaanitish (Phoenician) divinity, whose worship, in connection with that of Baal. spread among the Israelites already in the age of the judges (<0007>Judges 3:7; 6:25), was more permanently established later by the Queen Jezuebel in the land of Ephraim (<1163>1 Kings 16:33; 18:19), but at times prevailed in the kingdom of Judah also (<1284>2 Kings 18:4; 21:3; 23:4; <1450>2 Chronicles 31:1 sq.). **SEE GROVE**. She had prophets, like Baal (<1188>1 Kings 18:19), and her rites were characterized by licentiousness (<1237>2 Kings 23:7; <2634>Ezekiel 23:42) Her images, {μyriβα} or {t/rva} were of wood (<0065>Judges 6:26), (as appears ever from the words used to express their annihilation, Gesen. *Thes.* p. 162; Movers *Phoniz.* p. 567), which were erected sometimes together with those of Baal, as θεοὶ σύμβωμοι, over the altar of the latter (<0065>Judges 6:25) ; at one time even in, the Temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem (<1237>2 Kings 21:7 23:6); besides, there is mention of {μyTB} (*houses*) tents or canopies, woven by the women for the idol (<1237>2 Kings 23:7), which circumstance in itself would be indicative of a connection with the worship of Baa' (<0007>Judges 3:7; 6:25; <1163>1 Kings 16:32 sq.; 18:19) That Asherah is an identical divinity with *Astoret* or *Astarte* is evident from the translation of the Sept at <14516>2 Chronicles 15:16; 24:18, from that of Symmachui or Aquila at Judges iii, 7; <1270>2 Kings 17:10 (as also from the Syriac at <0007>Judges 3:7; 6:25; see Gesen *Thes.* p. 163); and this was the prevailing opinion of the Biblical antiquarians up to Movers, who (*Phsnizn* p. 560) thinks that Asherah should be distinguished from Astoreth, and declares Asherah to be a sort of Phallus erected to the telluric goddess Baaltis (Dea Syra, whence the goddess herself was then called Asherah, i.e. ὀρθία), while Astarte should be considered a sidereal divinity. **SEE ASTARTE**. It may appear strange that the same divinity is mentioned under two names in the historical books of the O.T., and it remains doubtful in what sense Astarte might have been called Asherah; the identity of the two idols however, is evident from

<sup><1021></sup>Judges 2:13 (see 3:7); and this invalidates also the objection that there is no mention of obscene rites in the worship of Astarte (<sup><1237></sup>2 Kings 23:7). It does not appear from 2 Kings 23, that Asherah and Astoreth were two distinct divinities, for the only distinction made here is between the different places of worship; ver. 6 mentions an Asherah erected in the Temple in Jerusalem (see <sup><1207></sup>2 Kings 21:7), and ver. 13 speaks of the idols which were on the high-places before Jerusalem (since the times of Solomon? see <sup><1107></sup>1 Kings 11:7); ver. 14 is connected with ver. 13, and treats of the same idols, while ver. 15 refers to another locality (see <sup><1230></sup>2 Kings 23:10). Finally, though Asherah is never expressly called a Sidonian divinity like Astarte, yet she is mentioned (<sup><1163></sup>1 Kings 16:33; 18:19) with the idols introduced by Jezebel (see De Wette, *Archol.* p. 323 sq.). Hence Bertheau (*Richt.* p. 66 sq.) declares himself also in favor of the identity of Astoreth with Asherah, supposing, however, that the former might have been the name of the goddess, and the latter that of her idol (see Movers, p. 565), and agrees with Movers in thinking that **hrva** signifies *erect* (pillar), and is indicative of the Phallus worship. But though Asherim and Asheroth are so often mentioned separately from statues that we could hardly think these terms to have been used likewise to signify carved idols, but are rather inclined to suppose they must have been something more rough and simple (though, perhaps, not a mere tree, as in <sup><1621></sup>Deuteronomy 16:21; see <sup><2145></sup>Daniel 11:45); yet from this it does not follow that the word should originally have signified the (wooden) *fetish*; and against the translation with *recta* we might adduce, that *to be erect* is more properly expressed in the Hebrew by the verb **rvj**; than by **rvā**; and if we would grant the above distinction in such passages as <sup><1189></sup>1 Kings 18:19; <sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 23:4, undoubtedly **t22rTvI** should have been written.

Consequently we must let the Phallus character of Asherah also rest as it is; and until more correct explanations can be given, we must be content with the result that Asherah is essentially identical with Astarte; and both these are not differing from the Syrian goddess, whose rites were of obscene character, who is certainly reflected in the Cyprian Aphrodite, and is furthermore blended with the Western mythological representations. (See J. van Yperen, *Obs. crit. de sacris quibusd. fluvialibus et Ashera dea*, in the *Bibl. Hagan.* 4:81-122; Gesenius, *Comment. z. Jesa.* ii, 338; Stuhr, *Relig. d. Orients*, p. 439; Vatke, *Relig. d. 1 lt. Test.* p. 372; Dupuis, *Orig`ne d. cultes*, i, 181; iii, 471; Schwenk, *Mythol. d. Semiten*, p. 207 comp. Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, 4:10; ii, 3.) **SEE ASHTORETH**



## Ash'erite

(<sup><0013></sup>Judges 1:32). *SEE ASHER*.

## Ashes

(properly *ῥπαε'pher*, from its *whiteness*, *σποδός*; twice *ῥπ[*; *aphar'*, <sup><0497></sup>Numbers 19:17; <sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 23:4, elsewhere "dust;" also *^VD*, *de'shen*, lit. *fatness*, i.e. the fat ashes from the victims of the altar, <sup><0316></sup>Leviticus 1:16; 4:12; 6:10, 11; <sup><1133></sup>1 Kings 13:3, 5; or of corpses burnt, <sup><2614></sup>Jeremiah 31:40, ashes being used as a manure for land, Plin. 17:9. In <sup><1138></sup>1 Kings 20:38, 41, *ῥπα}apher'*, incorrectly rendered "ashes," signifies a covering for the head or *turban*, Sept. *τελαμών*, and so the Chaldee and Abulwalid represent it by this latter word, which in Syriac means a priestly tiara; New Test. *σποδός*). *SEE ASH-C:AKE*.

In general, respecting the Biblical mention of ashes (*^VD*, *de'shen*; *ῥπαε'pher*), the following things deserve notice:

(1.) As the ashes of the sacrifices consumed upon the altar of burnt-offerings accumulated continually (<sup><0863></sup>Leviticus 6:3 sq.), they were from time to time removed so as to cleanse (*^VΘ*) the altar. For this purpose there were in the sanctuary shovels (*μυ[ῖ]*) and ash-pots (*t/rys*) of brass (<sup><0273></sup>Exodus 27:3; 33). The performance of this office (by the priests) is not prescribed in the law; but, according to the Mishna (*Tamid*, i and ii), the scouring of the altar was as. signed by lot to a priest, who, after the top of the altar had been cleared of coals, etc., swept the ashes together into a heap (*j WPTi* *apple*, from its shape), and (according to the rabbins) took the greatest part of it away (for some of the ashes must always be allowed to remain), in order that they might be carried out of the city to a spot undisturbed by the wind. Only on high festivals the ashes were suffered to lie upon the altar as an ornament (Mishna, *Tamid*, ii, 2). Also upon the altar of incense ashes gradually accumulated; and the removal of these was likewise apportioned among the priests by lot. The priest to whom this function fell gathered them in a basket, and then, after another priest had used a part in cleansing the candlestick, carried out and poured the contents on the floor of the porch (Mishna, *Tamid*, iii, 9; 6:1; i, 4). *SEE ALTAR*.

(2.) On the expiatory ashes of the red heifer (רַפֵּאֵם Numbers 19), *SEE PURIFICATION*.

(3.) In deep affliction persons were accustomed, as an act suitable to the violence of internal emotions, to scatter dust or ashes (רַפֵּאֵם on their heads or in their hair, and to sit, or lie, or even roll in ashes, whence ashes became the symbol of penitential mourning (<sup><3806></sup>Job 42:6; <sup><4012></sup>Matthew 11:21). *SEE GRIEF*. The Mishna (*Taamith*, ii, 1) mentions a custom of covering the ark that contained the law with ashes on fast-days, and the rabbins even allude to a ceremonial sprinkling of persons with ashes on the same occasions (see Bartenora, *on Taamith* ii). (See generally Reinhard, *De sacco et cinere*, Vitemb. 1698; Plade, *De cineris usu lugentibus*, Hafn. 1713; Schmid, *De cinerum in sacris usu*, Lips. 1722; Carpzov, *Cinerum ap. Heb. usus*, Rost. 1739; Quant, *De cinere in sacris Hebr. Regiom.* 1713; Goetze, *De cinerum in sacris usu*, Lips. 1722.)

(4.) The ancient Persians had a punishment which consisted in executing certain criminals by stifling them in ashes (Valerius Maximus, 9:2). Thus the wicked Menelaus was despatched, who caused the troubles which had disquieted Judaea (2 Macc. 13:5, 6), being thrown headlong into a tower fifty cubits deep, which was filled with ashes to a certain height. The action of the criminal to disengage himself plunged him still deeper in the whirling ashes; and this agitation was increased by a wheel, which kept them in continual movement till he was entirely choked. *SEE EXECUTION*.

Ashes were a symbol of human frailty (<sup><01827></sup>Genesis 18:27); of deep humiliation (<sup><0701></sup>Esther 4:1; <sup><3186></sup>Jonah 3:6; <sup><0121></sup>Matthew 11:21; <sup><2103></sup>Luke 10:13; <sup><3806></sup>Job 42:6; <sup><3466></sup>Jeremiah 6:26; <sup><2703></sup>Daniel 9:3); a ceremonial mode of purification (<sup><3803></sup>Hebrews 9:13; <sup><0497></sup>Numbers 19:17); they are likened to hoar-frost (<sup><0476></sup>Psalms 147:16). In <sup><2673></sup>Ezekiel 27:30, we find the mourning Tyrians described as wallowing in ashes; and we may remark that the Greeks had the like custom of strewing themselves with ashes in mourning (Homer, *Iliad*, 18:22; *Odyss.* 24:315; comp. Virgil, *En.* 10:844, and Ovid's *Metam.* 8:528). <sup><3808></sup>Job 2:8, "And he sat down among the ashes." So Ulysses in *Odyssey*, 7:153 (see also *Iliad*, 18:26). <sup><0920></sup>Psalms 102:9, "I have eaten ashes like bread, and mingled my drink with weeping," i.e. I have eaten the bread of humiliation, and drunk the water of affliction; ashes being the emblem of the one, and tears the consequence of the other (see Home, *in loc.*). So <sup><2303></sup>Isaiah 61:3, "A beautiful crown instead of ashes" (see Lowth's note). See <sup><0442></sup>2 Samuel 14:2; Judith 10:3. <sup><2440></sup>Isaiah 44:20,

"He feedeth on ashes," i.e. on that which affords no nourishment; a proverbial expression for using ineffectual means, and bestowing labor to no purpose. In the same sense Hosea says (<sup><3812></sup>Hosea 12:1), "Ephraim feedeth on wind" (see Lowth, *in loc.*). **SEE MOURNING.**

## Ash'ima

(Heb. *Ashima'*, **amyvā**) etymology unknown; Sept. **Ἀσιμάθ**), is only once mentioned in the Old Testament as the god of the people of Hamath, whose worship the colonists settled by Shalmanezar introduced into Samaria (<sup><4273></sup>2 Kings 17:30). The Babylonian Talmud, in the treatise *Sanhedrin* (cited in Carpzov's *Apparatus*, p. 516), and the majority of Jewish writers (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 236), assert that Ashima was worshipped under the form of a *goat without wool*; the Talmud of Jerusalem (Carpzov, *ib.*) says under that of a *lamb*. Elias Levita, a learned rabbi of the sixteenth century, assigns the word the sense of *ape*; in which he was, in all probability, deceived by the resemblance in sound to the Latin *simia*. Jurieu and Calmet have proposed other fanciful conjectures. Aben Ezra's ascription (*Praef. ad Esth.*) of the name to the Samaritan Pentateuch at <sup><1000></sup>Genesis 1:1, may be seen in Hottinger's *Exercit. Antimo in.* p. 40. The opinion, however, that this idol had the form of a goat appears to be the one best supported by arguments as well as by authorities (see Seyffarth, *Systema astron.* p. 154 sq.). This agrees with the Egyptian worship of *Pan* (see Selden, *De diis Syr.* p. 327, 305 sq.), as well as the appearance of the goat among the sacred animals delineated on the Babylonian relics (Millin, *Monumens ineditis*, i, tab. 8, 9). Some have compared the Samaritan *Ashmath* (**tmva**) of <sup><645></sup>Deuteronomy 14:5 (see Castell, *Annot. Samar.*), a kind of buck. Barkey, on the other hand (in the *Biblioth. Brem. nov.* I, i, 125 sq.; II, iii, 572 sq.), refers to the Phoenician god *Esmun* (**Εσμοῦνος**, Damasc. in Photii *Biblioth.* p. 242, 573; in Phoenician **ḥmṣa**, Gesenius, *Monum. Phcen.* i, 136), corresponding to the god of health, the Greek *AEsculapius* (see Movers, *Phoniz.* i, 529 sq.). Hiller (*Onomast.* p. 609) proposes a Semitic etymology from the Arabic *asamat*, a title of the lion applied to the *sun*; and Lette (in the *Biblioth. Brem. nov.* I, i, 60 sq.) compares *Asam*, the Arabic name for a valley or river of the infernal regions. Gesenius (*Comment. iub. Jesa.* ii, 348) refers to *Ashuma*, or the genius (star) of Jupiter (the heaven), i.e. Mercury, of the Zend-Avesta (*Bundehesh*, iii, 66); but against this Kleuker (in *loc.*) objects

that in the Paris edition (ii, 356) the name is *Anhouma*. (See Schulde, *De Asima Hamathweor. idolo*, Viteb. 1722.)

## Ash'kelon

(Heb. *Ashkelon'*, אֲשְׁכֶלֶן *qāṣṣhāi* prob. *migration* [the usual form would be אֲשְׁכָלֶן *Ashkal*; Rodiger (in Gesenius, *Theis.* p. 1476) suggests that the uncommon termination is a Philistine form]; Sept. and Josephus, ἄσκαλων; Auth. Vers. "Askelon," in אֲשְׁכֶלֶן Judges 1:18; אֲשְׁכֶלֶן 1 Samuel 6:17; אֲשְׁכֶלֶן 2 Samuel 1:20; the *Ascalon* of the Greeks and Romans and mediaeval writers), a city of the Philistines, and the seat of one of their five states (אֲשְׁכֶלֶן Judges 14:19; אֲשְׁכֶלֶן 1 Samuel 6:17; אֲשְׁכֶלֶן 2 Samuel 1:20), but less often mentioned, and apparently less known to the Jews than the other four. This, doubtless, arose from its remote situation, alone, of all the Philistine towns, on the extreme edge of the shore of the Mediterranean (אֲשְׁכֶלֶן Jeremiah 47:7), and also well down to the south. Gaza, indeed, was still farther south, but then it was on the main road from Egypt to the centre and north of Palestine, while Ashkelon lay considerably to the left. The site fully bears out the above inference; but some indications of the fact may be traced, even in the scanty notices of Ashkelon which occur in the Bible. Thus, the name is omitted from the list in Joshua 15 of the Philistine towns falling to the lot of Judah (but comp. Joseph. *Ant.* v, 1, 22, where it is specified), although Ekron, Ashdod, and Gaza are all named; and considerable uncertainty rests over its mention in Judges i, 18' (see Bertheau in *Exeg. Handb.* in loc.). Samson went down from Timnath to Ashkelon, when he slew the thirty men and took their spoil, as if to a remote place whence his exploit was not likely to be heard of; and the only other mention of it in the historical books is in the formulistic passages, אֲשְׁכֶלֶן Joshua 13:3, and אֲשְׁכֶלֶן 1 Samuel 6:17, and in the casual notices of אֲשְׁכֶלֶן Judges 2:28; 1 Macc. 10:86; 11:60; 12:33. The other Philistine cities are each distinguished by some special occurrence or fact connected with it, but except the one exploit of Samson, Ashkelon is to us no more than a name. In the poetical passage אֲשְׁכֶלֶן 2 Samuel 1:20, it is named among heathen foes. The inhabitants were called *Ashkelonites* (Heb. *Ash. keloni'*, אֲשְׁכֶלֶן *qāṣṣhāi* Sept. ἄσκαλωνίτης, Auth. Vers. "Eshkalonites," אֲשְׁכֶלֶן Joshua 13:3).

It was a port on the Mediterranean coast between Gaza and Jamnia (Joseph. *War.* 4:11, 5), 12 geogr. miles N. of the former, 10 S. by W. from Ashdod, and 37 W.S.W. from Jerusalem (comp. Reland, *Palest.* p. 443).

Ashkelon was assigned to the tribe of Judah (~~4133~~ Joshua 13:13; comp. ~~4008~~ Judges 1:18); but it was never for any length of time in possession of the Israelites (comp. ~~1005~~ 1 Kings 4:24). It is farther mentioned in the denunciations of the prophets (~~250~~ Jeremiah 25:20; 47:5, 7; Amos 1:8; ~~3004~~ Zephaniah 2:4, 7; ~~3005~~ Zechariah 9:5). The part of the country in which it stood abounded in aromatic plants (Plin. 12:51), and especially onions (shallots, *ascalonice*, Plin. 19:32; Strabo, 16:759; Athen. ii, 68; Theophr. *Plant.* 7:4; Dioscor. i, 124; Colum. 12:10), and vines (Alex. Trall. 8:3). The soil around the town was remarkable for its fertility; the wine of Ashkelon was celebrated, and the *Al-henna* plant flourished better than in any other place except Canopus (Kenrick, p. 28). It was also celebrated for its cypresses, for figs, olives, and pomegranates, and for its bees, which gave their name to a valley in the neighborhood (Ibn Batuta in Ritter, *Palastina*, 88). It was well fortified (Joseph. *War*, iii, 21; comp. Mela, i, 11), and early became the seat of the worship of Derceto (Diod. Sic. ii, 4), the Syrian Venus, whose temple was plundered by the Scythians (Herod. i, 105). She represented the passive principle of nature, and was worshipped under the form of a fish with a woman's head (comp. Ovid, *Fast.* ii, 406). **SEE ATERGATIS.** "The sacred doves of Venus still fill with their cooings the luxuriant gardens which grow in the sandy hollow within the ruined walls" (Stanley, p. 257). After the time of Alexander, Ashkelon shared the lot of Phoenicia and Judaea, being tributary sometimes to Egypt (Joseph. *Ant.* 12:4, 5), and at other times to Syria (1 Macc. 10:86; 11:60; 12:33). Herod the Great was born at Ashkelon, and although the city did not belong to his dominion, he adorned it with fountains, baths, and colonnades (*War*, i, 21, 11); and after his death Salome, his sister, resided in a palace at Ashkelon which Caesar bestowed upon her (*Ant.* 17:11, 5). It suffered much in the Jewish war with the Romans (*War*, ii, 18, 5; iii, 2, 1-3); for its inhabitants were noted for their dislike of the Jews, of whom they slew 2500 who dwelt there (ii, 18, 5; iii, 2, 1). After this Ashkelon again revived, and in the Middle Ages was noted not only as a stronghold, but as a wealthy and important town (Will. Tyr. 17:21). In the fourth century it was the see of a bishop, but in the seventh century it fell into the hands of the Saracens. Abulfeda (*Tab. Syr.*) speaks of it as one of the famous strongholds of Mohammedanism; and the Orientals call it the Bride of Syria (Schultens, *Index Geogr.* s.v.; Edrisi, ed. Jaubert, i, 340). It shared with Gaza an infamous reputation for the steadfastness of its heathenism and for the cruelties there practised on Christians by Julian (Reland, p. 588, 590). As a sea-port merely it never could have enjoyed much advantage,

the coast being sandy and difficult of access. There is no bay or shelter for ships, but a small harbor toward the east advanced a little way into the town, and anciently bore, like that of Gaza, the name of *Majumas* (Kenrick, p. 28). In the time of Origen some wells of remarkable shape were shown near the town which were believed to be those dug by Isaac, or, at any rate, to be of the time of the patriarchs. In connection with this tradition may be mentioned the fact that in the Samaritan version of ~~<100>~~Genesis 20:1, 2, and 26:1, Ashkelon (𐤀𐤌𐤍𐤊𐤏) is put for the "Gerar" of the Hebrew text. The town bears a prominent part in the history of the Crusades (see Ibn Ferath, in Reinand's *Extracts*, p. 525). After being several times dismantled and re-fortified in the times of Saladin and Richard, its fortifications were at length totally destroyed by the Sultan Bibars A.D. 1270, and the port filled up with stones, for fear of future attempts on the part of the Crusaders (Wilkin, *Gesch. d. Kreuzziige*, 7:586). This, no doubt, sealed the ruin of the place (see Cellar. *Notit.* ii, 600 sq.; Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* II, ii, 377 sq.). Sandys (*Travailes*, p. 151. A.D. 1610) describes it as "now a place of no note, more than that the Turke doth keep there a garrison." Fifty years after (A.D. 1660), Von Troilo found it still partially inhabited. But its desolation has long been complete, and little now remains of it but the walls, with numerous fragments of granite pillars (Arvieux, ii, 59; Joliffe, p. 270). The situation is described as strong; the thick walls, flanked with towers, were built on the top of a ridge of rock that encircles the town, and terminates at each end in the sea (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 368 note). The ground within sinks in the manner of an amphitheatre (Richardson, ii, 202204; Eli Smith, in *Missionary Herald* for 1827, p. 341). The place still bears the name of *Askulan*, and is inhabited by Arabs and Christians (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 120). The modern village is a little north of the old site, and the houses are built of the fragments of the ancient city. It is situated in a cove formed by a lofty ridge rising abruptly near the shore, running up eastward, then, bending to the south, next to the west, and finally to the north-west again. The position, now surrounded with desolate ruins of its former grandeur, is still beautiful, the whole interior being planted with orchards (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 327 sq.). **SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS.**

### Ash'kenaz

(Heb. *Ashkenaz'*, זנכֿןֿזַיֿ signif. unknown [comp. ASHPENAZ]; Sept. Ἀσχανάζ, ~~<100>~~Genesis 10:3, v. r. Ἀσχενέζ, in ~~<100>~~1 Chronicles 1:6;

Ἀσχαναζαῖοι v. r. Ἀχαναζέοι in Jeremiah li, 27; in both the latter passages Auth. Vers. "Ashchenaz"), the first named of the three sons of Gomer, son of Japhet (B.C. cir. 2478), and of a tribe of his descendants. In Jeremiah it is placed with Ararat and Minni, provinces of Armenia; whence it is probable that Ashkenaz was a province of Armenia (q.v.), or, at least, that it lay not far from it, near the Caucasus, or toward the Black Sea (see Rosenmuller, *Bibl. Geogr.* I, i, 258). Among other less probable conjectures may be named the following: Bochart (*Phaleg*, iii, 9) refers it to the lake *Ascanius* in Bithynia (Strabo, 12:563 sq.; Plin. v, 43; 31:46, 2), and the city and region of *Ascania* in Phrygia Minor (*Arrian, Alex.* i, 30; Plin. v, 40; see Michaelis, "*Spicileg.* i.:58 sq.); Calmet to the *Askantians* at Tanais land the marsh Maeotis-(Plin. 6:7, where, however, the best editions read "Contacaptas" for "Ascanticos"); 'Schulthess (*Parad.* p. 178) to the district *Astaunitis* (in the vicinity of Ararat) and the neighboring city of *Asltanaca*. Hasse (*Entdeck.* i, 19) regards the word as a -corruption -for "Pontus *Axenus*," so as to designate the inhabitants of the province of Pontus; Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 1) merely says "Aschei-az (Ἀσχάναζος) founded the Aschanazians -(Ἀσχανάζους), whom the Greeks now call *Rhazians* (Ῥηζῖνες);" but this latter name does not occur in classical geography (Joseph Mede conjectures the Rhaetians, Ῥηζῖνες, but these are as far from probability as the supposition of the modern Jews that the *Germans* are meant, see Vater, *Com.* i, 100). The Targum of Jonathan understands *Adiabene* (bydḥ), a province of Assyria; and the Arabic in Genesis the *Sclavi*, in Jeremiah the inhabitants near the Caspian Sea. Assuming that the Japhetic tribes migrated from their original seats westward and northward **SEE JAPHET**, thus peopling Asia Minor and Europe, we may perhaps recognise the tribe of Ashkenaz (as having migrated along the northern shore of Asia Minor) in Europe in the name *Scandia*, *Scandinavia*. Knobel (*Volkertafel*, p. 35) regards the word as a compound (znKAça), the latter element being equivalent to the Gr. γένος, Lat. *gens*, *genus*, Eng. *kind*, *kin*; the meaning, therefore, being the As-race. If this were so, it might seem that we here find the origin of the name *Asia*, which has subsequently been extended to the whole eastern part of the world. The slightness of the foundation, however, of all these identifications is evident. The opinion of Gorres (*Volkertafel*, p. 92) that Ashkenaz is to be identified with the *Cymry* or Gaelic race seems even less probable than that of Knobel. **SEE ETHNOLOGY**;

## Ashmead, William

a Presbyterian minister, born at Philadelphia in 1798, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1818. After studying under Dr. J. P. Wilson, he was licensed to preach in 1820. He labored in Lancaster till 1828, when he accepted a-call to Charleston, S.C., and entered on his duties there in May, 1829. Returning to the north for his family, he was taken ill, and, after one or two relapses, died at Philadelphia, Dec. 2, 1829. He was an accomplished scholar and a devoted minister. After his death appeared *Sermons, with Sketch of Life* (Philad. 1830, 8vo).-Sprague, *Annals*, 4:643.

## Ashmun, Jehudi

agent of the American Colonization Society, was born at Champlain, N.Y., in April, 1794. He was educated at Burlington, where he graduated in 1816. Some time after he was made a professor in the "Maine Charity School," where his stay was brief. He afterward removed to the District of Columbia, where he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and edited the "Theological Repertory." Being appointed to take charge of a re-enforcement to the colony at Liberia, he embarked for Africa June 19, 1822, and arrived at Cape Monserado August 8. About three months after his arrival, while his whole force was 35 men and boys, he was attacked by 800 armed savages, but by his energy and desperate valor the assailants were repulsed, and again, in a few days, when they returned with redoubled numbers, were utterly defeated. When ill-health compelled him in 1828 to take a voyage to America, he left behind him in Africa a community of 1200 freemen. He died at New Haven August 25, 1828. He was a person of great energy of character, and most devoted piety, and his services to the infant colony were invaluable.-Gurley, *Life of Ashmun* (Washington, 1835); *Quarterly Christian Spectator*, 7:330; *North Amer. Review*, xli, 565.

## Ash'nah

(Heb. *Ashnah'*, חֲנַףַי, *fortified*, otherwise *bright*; Sept. Ἀσνά), the name of two cities, both in the "plain" of the tribe of Judah.

1. One mentioned between Zorah and Zanoah (<sup>6653</sup>Joshua 15:33), apparently in the region north of Eleutheropolis and west of Jerusalem (see Keil, *Comment.* in loc.), and near the boundary-line, almost within the territory afterward assigned to Dan (see <sup>6694</sup>Joshua 19:41), and probably



near Beth-Shemesh, possibly at the site of the modern "large village *Deir Aban*" (Robinson, *Researches*, new ed. iii 154). It is probably the *Asan* (Ἀσάν) or *Bethasan* (Θηβασά) placed by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v.) at 15 or 16 Roman miles west of Jerusalem.

2. Another town, certainly in Judah, mentioned between Jiphtah and Nezib (<sup><165B></sup>Joshua 15:43); apparently in the region immediately south and east of Eleutheropolis (comp. Keil, *Comment.* in loc.), probably not very far from this last; possibly the present *Beit Alanm*, a ruined village on a low mound (Robinson, *Researches.* ii, 403). Eusebius and Jerome also speak of an *Asna* (Ἀσνά, *Onomast.* s.v.), but without any particulars.

### Ash'penaz

(Heb. *Ashpenaz'*, אֲשַׁפְנָזִי perh. from Persic and Sanscrit *afnas*, horse, and *nasa*, nose, i. q. "horse-nose;" Sept. Ἀσφανεζ), the master of the eunuchs, or, rather, one of the principal chamberlains of Nebuchadnezzar (B.C. 604), who was commanded to select certain Jewish captives to be instructed in the literature and science of the Chaldeans (<sup><200B></sup>Daniel 1:3). In this number he included Daniel and his three companions, whose Hebrew names he changed to Chaldee (<sup><200C></sup>Daniel 1:7). Their refusal to partake of the provisions in from the monarch's table filled Ashpenaz with apprehension, for at that time, as in our days, the Asiatic despots frequently punished with death the least infraction of their will. He had, however, the generosity not to use constraint toward them. In acceding to the request of Daniel, Ashpenaz had every thing to apprehend; and the grateful prophet specially records that God had disposed Ashpenaz to treat him with kindness (ver. 8-16). *SEE DANIEL.*

### Ash'riel

(<sup><1374></sup>1 Chronicles 7:14). *SEE ASRIEL*

### Ash'taroth

(Heb. *Ashtaroth'*, אֲשֶׁתֵּרֶת plur. of *Ashtoreth*, <sup><1890></sup>Joshua 9:10; 12:4; 13:12, 31; Sept. Ἀστάρωθ; but Auth. Vers. "Astaroth," in <sup><1804></sup>Deuteronomy 1:4; Sept, in <sup><1367></sup>1 Chronicles 6:71, v; r. Ἀσηρώθ and Ῥαμώθ), a city on the east of Jordan, in Bashan, in the kingdom of Og, doubtless so called from being a seat of the worship of the goddess of the same name. *SEE ASHTORETH.* It is generally mentioned as a description

or definition of Og, who "dwelt in Ashtaroth in Edrei" (<sup><1004></sup>Deuteronomy 1:4), "at Ashtaroth and at Edrei" (<sup><1014></sup>Joshua 12:4; 13:12), or "who was at Ashtaroth" (9:10). It fell into possession of the half tribe of Manasseh (<sup><1033></sup>Joshua 13:31), and was given with its suburbs or surrounding pasture-lands (<sup>vrgjñi</sup>) to the Gershonites (<sup><1067></sup>1 Chronicles 6:71 [56]), the other Levitical city in this tribe being Golan. In the list in <sup><1027></sup>Joshua 21:27, the name is given as BEESHTERAH ("house of Ashtoreth;" Reland, p. 621). Nothing more is heard of Ashtaroth, except that Uzziah, an Ashterathite, is named in <sup><1044></sup>1 Chronicles 11:44. It is not named in any of the lists, such as those in Chronicles, or of Jeremiah, in which so many of the trans-Jordanic places are enumerated; and hence it has usually been considered the same with the place elsewhere called *SEE ASHTEROTH-KARNAIM* (q.v.). Eusebius and Jerome, however (*Onomast. s.v. Astaroth, Ἀσταρώθ*), mention it as situated 6 Roman miles from Adraa or Adar (Edrei), which again was 25 from Bostra; and the former adds that it lay on higher ground (<sup><1076></sup>ἄνωτέρω) than Ashteroth-karnaim, which: they farther distinguish by stating (in the next art.) that there were two villages (<sup><1081></sup>κῶμαι, *castella*) lying 9 miles apart, between Adara and Abila. One of these was probably that called Ashtaroth simply, and the other may have been Ashteroth-karnaim. The only trace of the name yet recovered in the region indicated is *Tell-Ashterah* or *Asherah* (*Ritter, Erdk. 15:819*; Porter, ii, 212); and as this is situated on a hill, it would seem to correspond to the Ashtaroth in question.

### Ash'terathite

(Heb. *Asterathi'*, <sup>ytr̄ṭyṭi</sup>; Sept. Ἀστερωθί), an epithet of Uzziah, one of David's braves (<sup><1044></sup>1 Chronicles 11:44), prob. as being an Ashtarothite, or citizen of ASHTAROTH *SEE ASHTAROTH* (q.v.) in Bashan.

### Ash'teroth-Kar'naim

(Heb. *Ashteroth' Karna'yign*, <sup>myæḥj t/rṭyṭi</sup>; *Ashtaroth* of the two horns, from the horned image of Ashtoreth, <sup><1045></sup>Genesis 14:5; Sept. Ἀσταρῶθ [καὶ] Καρνάιν), a place of very great antiquity, the abode of the Rephaim at the time of the incursion of Chedorlaomer (<sup><1045></sup>Genesis 14:5), while the cities of the plain were still standing in their oasis. Its name of Ashtaroth appears to be derived from the worship of the moon under that name, *SEE ASTARTE*; there is little need to look further than the crescent of that luminary and its symbolical image for an explanation of the

addition KARNAIM, "horned" (Sanhoniathton, in Euseb. *Prcep. Ev.*, 10; ed. Orelli, p. 35). In 2 Mace. 12:21, 26, mention is made of the temple of Atergatis (Ashtoreth) in *Carnion* (Καρνίον), which is described as a strongly fortified town of difficult access, but which was taken by Judas Maccabaeus, who slew 25,000 of the people therein. The same place is doubtless that called *Carnain* (Καρναίν) in 1 Macc. v, 43 (comp. *Καρναίν*, Josephus, *Ant.* 12:8, 4). These notices, however, give us no indication of its locality beyond its being in "the land of Galaad;" the inference of Ritter (*Erdk.* 15:822) that the Carnion of the Apocrypha was in a narrow valley, is not sustained by the passages themselves. It is usually assumed to be the same place as the preceding ASHTAROTH, but the few facts that can be ascertained are all against such an identification.

(1.) The affix "Karnaim," which certainly indicates some distinction, and which in the time of the Maccabees, as quoted above, appears to have superseded the other name.

(2.) The fact that Eusebius and Jerome in the *Onomasticon*, though not very clear on the point, yet certainly make a distinction between Ashtaroth and A.-Carnaim, describing the latter (s.v. *Καρναίμ*, Carnaim) as a "large village" (κωμὴ μεγιστὴ τῆς Ἀραβίας, vicus grandis in angulo Batanaese).

(3.) Some weight is due to the rendering of the Samaritan version, and of the Arabic version of Saadia, which give Ashtaroth as in the text, but A.-Karnaim by entirely different names; the former rendering it *Aphinith*, which does not appear to have been yet recognised; but the latter, *es-Sanamein*, apparently meaning the still important place which continues to bear precisely the same name, on the Haj route, about 25 miles south of Damascus, and to the N.W. of the Lejah (Burckh. p. 55; Ritter, *Erdk.* 15:812), but which seems to be identical with another place, *SEE AERE*, and is too far from Edrei. *SEE ASHTAROTH*. Ashtaroth-Karnaim is now usually identified with *Mezareib*, the situation of which corresponds accurately enough with the distances given by Eusebius (Leake, *Preface* to Burckhardt's *Travels*, p. xii). Here is the first castle on the great pilgrim road from Damascus to Mecca. It was built about 340 years ago by the Sultan Selim, and is a square structure, about 100 feet on each side, with square towers at the angles and in the centre of each face, the walls being 40 feet high. The interior is an open yard, with ranges of warehouses against the castle wall to contain stores of provisions for the pilgrims.

There are no dwellings beyond the castle. and within it only a few mud huts upon the flat roofs of the warehouses, occupied by the peasants who cultivate the neighboring grounds. Close to this building on the north and east side are a great number of springs, whose waters at a short distance collect into a lake or pond about a mile and a half in circumference. In the midst of this lake is an island, and at an elevated spot at the extremity of a promontory advancing into the lake stands a sort of chapel, around which are many remains of ancient buildings. There are no other ruins.

(Burckhardt, *Travels*, p. 211 sq.; Buckingham's *Arab Tribes*, p. 162; Chesney, *Euphrat. Exped.* i, 511; Capt. Newbold, in the *Lond. Geog. Jour.* 16:333; comp. Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 223, 236.) **SEE ASHTORETH; SEE CHALAMISH.**

### Ashton, Wm. Easterly,

a Baptist minister, was born May 18, 1793, in Philadelphia, licensed as a preacher in 1814, and was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church at Hopewell, *N. J.*, the following year. In 1816 he removed to Blockley, Philadelphia county, Pa., where he labored successfully for seven years. Mr. Ashton devoted part of his time to teaching, establishing a female school in Philadelphia, which soon became very popular. In 1823 he accepted a call from the third Baptist Church in Philadelphia, which charge he held till the year before his death, when disease compelled him to relinquish it. He died July 26, 1836.-Sprague, *Annals*, 6:631.

### Ash'toreth

#### Picture for Ashtoreth 1

(Heb. *Ashto'reth*, תַּרְטֻוֹיִי <sup><11105></sup>1 Kings 11:5, 33; <sup><12213></sup>2 Kings 23:13; Sept. Ἀστάρτη), also in the plur. ASHTAROTH (Heb. *Ashtaroth'*, תַּרְטֻוֹיִי Sept. in <sup><07005></sup>Judges 10:6; <sup><08004></sup>1 Samuel 7:4, Ἀσταρόθ; in Judges ii, 13, αἱ Ἀσάρται; in <sup><08003></sup>1 Samuel 7:3; 12:10, τὰ ἄλση; in <sup><08110></sup>1 Samuel 31:10, τὸ Ἀσταρτεῖον), the name of a goddess of the Sidonians (<sup><11105></sup>1 Kings 11:5, 33), and also of the Philistines (<sup><08110></sup>1 Samuel 31:10), whose worship was introduced among the Israelites during the period of the Judges (<sup><07013></sup>Judges 2:13; <sup><08004></sup>1 Samuel 7:4), was celebrated by Solomon himself (<sup><11105></sup>1 Kings 11:5), and was finally put down by Josiah (<sup><12213></sup>2 Kings 23:13). She is frequently mentioned in Connection with Baal, as the corresponding female divinity (<sup><07013></sup>Judges 2:13); and, from the addition of the words " and all the

host of heaven," in <sup><12204></sup>2 Kings 23:4, *SEE ASHERAH*, it is probable that she represented one of the celestial bodies. There is also reason to believe that she is meant by the "queen of heaven," in <sup><2478></sup>Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17; whose worship is there said to have been solemnized by burning incense, pouring libations, and offering cakes. Further, by comparing the two passages <sup><12204></sup>2 Kings 23:4, and <sup><2482></sup>Jeremiah 8:2, which last speaks of the "sun and moon, and all the host of heaven, whom they served," we may conclude that the *moon* was worshipped under the names of queen of heaven and of Ashtoreth, provided the connection between these titles is established. *SEE IDOLATRY*.

## Picture for Ashtoreth 2

The worship of Astarte was very ancient and very widely spread. We find the plural Ashtaroth united with the adjunct Karnaim, as the name of a city, so early as the time of Abraham (<sup><0145></sup>Genesis 14:5), and we read of a temple of this goddess, apparently as the goddess of war, among the Philistines in the time of Saul (<sup><0810></sup>1 Samuel 31:10). From the connection of this goddess with BAAL or BEL, we should, moreover, naturally conclude that she would be found in the Assyrian Pantheon, and, in fact, the name *Ishtar* appears to be clearly identified in the list of the great gods of Assyria (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 352, 629; Rawlinson, *Early-History of Babylon*, Lond. 1854, p. 23; Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 634). There is no reason to doubt that this Assyrian goddess is the Ashtoreth of the Old Testament and the Astarte of the Greeks and Romans. The worship of Astarte seems to have extended wherever Phoenician colonies were founded. Thus we find her name in inscriptions still existing in the island of Cyprus, on the site of the ancient Citium, and also at Carthage (Gesenius, *Mon. Phœn.* p. 125, 449), and not unfrequently as an element in Phoenician proper names, as *Ἄσταρτος, Ἄβδαστάρτος, Δελειατάρτος* (Joseph. *Ap.* i, 18). The name occurs, moreover, written in Egyptian hieroglyphics, as *Astart* (Gesenius, *Thes.* s.v. For evidence of her wide-spread worship, see also Eckhel, *Doct. Num.* iii, 369 sq.). It is worthy of remark that Rodiger, in his recently published Addenda to Gesenius' *Thesaurus* (p. 106), notices that in the inscription on the sarcophagus of a king named Esmunazar, discovered in January, 1855 (see Robinson, *Researches*, new ed. iii, 36 note), the founding, or at least restoration of the temple of this goddess, at Sidon, is attributed to him and to his mother, Amashtoreth, who is farther styled priestess of Ashtoreth. According to the testimonies of profane writers, the worship of this goddess, under different names, existed in all countries and

colonies of the Syro-Arabian nations. She, as especially the chief female divinity of the Phoenicians and Syrians—the *Baalit* or female Baal; *Astarte the Great*, as Sanchoniathon calls her (ed. Orelli, p. 34). She was known to the Babylonians as *Mylitta* (i.e. possibly *atdl wm*, the emphatic state of the femn. participle act. Aphel of *dl y*, *genetrix*) (Herod. i, 31); to the Arabians as *Alitta* or *Alilat* (Herod. iii, 8) (i.e. according to Pococke's etymology [*Specin.* p. 110], *allahat*, *the goddess* [which may, however, also mean the *crescent moon*--see Freytag's *Lex. Ar.*]; or *alHiddl*, *the moon*; or, according to Kleuker's suggestion, *al-Walid*, *genetrix* [see Bergmann, *De Relg. Arab. Anteislamica*, Argentor. 1834, p. 7]). The supposed Punic name *Tholath*, *tl t*, which Manter, Hamaker, and others considered to mean *genetrix*, and to belong to this goddess, cannot be adduced here, as Gesenius has recently shown that the name has arisen from a false reading of the inscriptions (see his *Monum. Ling. Phaonic.* p. 114). But it is not at all open to doubt that this goddess was worshipped at ancient Carthage, and probably under her Phoenician name. The classical writers, who usually endeavored to identify the gods of other nations with their own, rather than to discriminate between them, have recognised several of their own divinities in Ashtoreth. Thus she was considered to be *Juno* (Augustin. *Quaest. in Jud.* xvi); or *Venus*, especially *Venus Urania* (Cicer. *Nat. Deor.* iii, 23; Theodoret, *In Libr.* iii, *Reg. Quest.* L; and the numerous inscriptions of *Bona Dea Coelestis*, *Venus Coelestis*, etc., cited in Miunter's *Religion der Karthager*, p. 75); or *Luna* (Herodian, v, 13, where she is named *Ἀστροῦρχη*; Lucian, *De Dea Syra*, iv). A part of the Phoenician *m.ythus* respecting Astarte is given by Sanchoniathon (Euseb. *De Prep. Evang.* i, 10): "Astarte the most high, and Jupiter Demarous, and Adodus, king of the gods, reigned over the country, with the assent of Saturn. And Astarte placed the head of a bull upon her own head, as an emblem of sovereignty. As she was journeying about the world, she found a star wandering in the air, and having taken possession of it, she consecrated it in the sacred island of Tyre. The Phoenicians say that Astarte is Venus." This serves to account for the horned figure under which she was represented, and affords testimony of a star consecrated as her symbol. *The fact that* there is a connection between all these divinities cannot escape any student of ancient religions; but it is not easy to discover the precise link of that connection. Ashtoreth was probably confounded with Juno, because she is the female counterpart to Baal, the chief god of the Syrians—their Jupiter, as it were; and with Venus, because the same

lascivious rites were common to her worship and to that of Ashtoreth and her cognate Mylitta (Creuzer, *Symbolik*, ii, 23). But so great is the intermixture and confusion between the gods of pagan religions, that Munter further identifies Ashtoreth—due allowance being made for difference of time and place—with the female Kaliar, *Axiokersa*, with the Egyptian *Isis*, with the Paphian *Venus*, with the Taurian and Ephesian *Diana*, with the *Bellona* of Comana, with the Armenian *Andhid*, and with the Samian, Maltesian, and Lacinian *Juno*. She has also been considered to be the same as the Syrian *fish-deity*, the *Atergatis* of 2 Macc. 12:26, whose temple appears, from 1 Mace. v, 43, to have been situated at Ashteroth-Kamain. **SEE ATARGATIS**. Her figure (in various forms) is certainly found on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments (Layard's *Nineveh*, ii, 169); which likewise contain illustrations of most of the attributes ascribed to her in scriptural as well as profane authorities (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1852, p. 88 sq.). As for the power of nature, which was worshipped under the name of Ashtoreth, Creuzer and Munter assert that it was the principle of conception and parturition—that subordinate power which is fecundated by a superior influence, but which is the agent of all births throughout the universe. As such, Maiter maintains (*Religion der Babylonier*, p. 21), in opposition to the remarks of Gesenius (*Jesaias*, iii, 337), that the *original* form under which Ashtoreth was worshipped was the *moon*; and that the transition from that to the *planet Venus* (which we will immediately notice) was unquestionably an innovation of a later date. It is evident that the moon alone can be properly called the queen of heaven; as also that the dependent relation of the moon to the sun makes it a more appropriate symbol of that sex, whose functions as female and mother, throughout the whole extent of animated nature, were embodied in Ashtoreth. **SEE BAAL**. Movers (*Phon.* 607) distinguishes two Astartes, one Carthaginian-Sidonian, a virgin goddess symbolized by the moon, the other Syro-Phoenician, symbolized by the planet Venus. But it seems most likely that both the moon and the planet were looked upon as symbols, under different aspects and perhaps at different periods, of the goddess, just as each of them may in different aspects of the heavens be regarded as the "queen of heaven" (q.v.).

### Picture for Ashtoreth 3

The rites of her worship, if we may assume their resembling those which profane authors describe as paid to the cognate goddesses, in part agree with the few indications in the Old Testament, in part complete the brief

notices there into an accordant picture. The *cakes* mentioned in <sup><2478></sup>Jeremiah 7:18, which are called in Hebrew מִנִּיכִי *kavuanim'*, were also known to the Greeks by the name καβῶνες, and were by them made in the shape of a sickle, in reference to the new moon. Among animals, the dove, the crab, and, in later times, the lion were sacred to her, and among fruits the pomegranate. No blood was shed *on* her altar; but male animals, and chiefly *kids*, were sacrificed to her (Tacit. *Hist.* ii, 3). Hence some suppose that the reason why Judah promised the harlot a kid was that she might sacrifice it to Ashtoreth (see Tuch's note to <sup><0387></sup>Genesis 38:17). The most prominent part of her worship, however, consisted of those libidinous orgies which Augustine, who was an eye-witness of their horrors in Carthage, describes with such indignation (*De Civit. Dei*, ii, 3). Her priests were eunuchs in women's attire (the peculiar name of whom is μυνδαί; *kadeshim'*, male devotees, *sacri*, i.e. cinsedi, Galli, <sup><1142></sup>1 Kings 14:24), and women (t/vdqj *kedeshoth'*, female devotees, *sacrce*, i.e. meretrices, <sup><2044></sup>Hosea 4:14, which term ought to be distinguished from ordinary harlots, t/n/z), who, like the Bayaderes of India, prostituted themselves to enrich the temple of this goddess. **SEE SODOMITE**. The prohibition in <sup><0238></sup>Deuteronomy 23:18, appears to allude to the dedication of such funds to such a purpose. As for the places consecrated to her worship, although the numerous passages in which the Auth. Vers. has erroneously rendered hrva} *Asherah*, by *grove*, are to be deducted, **SEE GROVE**, there are yet several occasions on which *gardens* and *shady trees* are mentioned as peculiar seats of (probably *her*) lascivious rites (<sup><2302></sup>Isaiah 1:29; 65:3; <sup><1143></sup>1 Kings 14:23; <sup><2043></sup>Hosea 4:13; <sup><2421></sup>Jeremiah 2:20; 3:13). She also had celebrated temples (<sup><0810></sup>1 Samuel 31:10). As to the form and attributes with which Ashtoreth was represented, the oldest known image, that in Paphos, was a white conical stone, often seen on Phoenician remains in the figure which Tacitus thus describes, l.c.: "The statue of the goddess bears no resemblance to the human form: you see around figure, broad at the base, but growing fine by-degrees, till, like a cone, it lessens to a point." In Canaan she was probably represented as a *cow*. It is said in the book of Tobit, i, 5, that the tribes which revolted sacrificed "to the *heifer* Baal." In Phoenicia she had the head of a cow or bull, as she is seen on coins. At length she was figured with the human form, as Lucian expressly testifies of the Syrian goddess, which is substantially the same as Ashtoreth; and she is so found on coins of Severus, with her head surrounded with rays, sitting on a lion, and holding a thunderbolt and a sceptre in either hand.



What Kimchi says of her being worshipped under the figure of a *sheep* is a mere figment of the rabbins, founded on a misapprehension of <sup><08713></sup>Deuteronomy 7:13. As the words "flocks (*Ashtaroth*) of sheep" there occurring may be legitimately taken as the *loves* of the flock (*Veneres pecoris*), i.e. either the *ewes* or the *lambs*, the whole foundation of that opinion, as well as of the notion that the word *means* sheep, is unsound.

The word Ashtoreth cannot be plausibly derived from any root or - combination of roots in the SyroArabian languages. The best etymology, that approved by Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 1083), deduces it from the Persian *sitarah*, *star*, with a prosthetic guttural (i. q. **רִטְשָׁה**, "Esther," **ῶστήρ**). Ashtoreth is feminine as to form; its plural ASHTAROTH also occurs (<sup><07115></sup>Judges 2:13; 10:16; <sup><07074></sup>1 Samuel 7:4; 12:10; 31:10), as is likewise the case with Baal, with which it is in this form often associated (<sup><07115></sup>Judges 10:6; <sup><07074></sup>1 Samuel 7:4; 12:10); and this peculiarity of both words is thought (by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v.) to denote-a plurality of *images* (like the Greek *Hermae*), or to belong to that usage of the plural which is found in words denoting *lord* (Ewald, *Hebr. Gram.* § 361). Movers, however, contends (*Phin.* i, 175, 602) that the plurals are used to indicate different modifications of the divinities themselves. In the earlier books of the O.T. only the plural, Ashtaroth, occurs, and it is not till the time of Solomon, who introduced the worship of the Sidonian Astarte, and only in reference to that particular goddess, Ashtoreth of the Sidonians, that the singular is found in the O.T. (<sup><11115></sup>1 Kings 11:5, 33; <sup><12313></sup>2 Kings 23:13). **SEE ASTARTE.**

## Ash-Tree.

**SEE ASH.**

## Ash'ur

(Heb. *Ashchur'*, **רַשְׁיִי** **וַחֲבִי** perh. *black*, otherwise *man of nobility*; Sept. **Ἀσχώ** v. r. **Ἀσδώδ**, and **Ἀσοῦρ** v. r. **Ἀχούρ**), a posthumous son of Hezron (grandson of Judah), by one of his wives (the daughter of Machir), Abiah (<sup><13124></sup>1 Chronicles 2:24). He had several sons by each of his two wives (<sup><13045></sup>1 Chronicles 4:5), and through these he is called (in both passages) the "father" (founder) of Tekoa, which appears to have been the place of their eventual settlement. B.C. cit. 1658. Schwarz suggests (*Palest.* p. 119) that

the name may be connected with the *Beth-Zacharias* (q.v.) of Josephus (*War*, i, 1, 5); but this lies at some distance from Tekoa. **SEE ASSHUR.**

### Ash'urite

(Heb. *Ashuri'*, *yrʾlva*}) prob. originally from *rʾlva*}) a *step*; Sept. Ἀσέρι, *Vulg. Gessuri*; Auth. Vers. "Ashurites"), apparently the designation of a tribe in the vicinity of Gilead, one of the trans-Jordanic districts over whom the revolting Abner made Ishbosheth king (<4019>2 Samuel 2:9). The Chaldee paraphrast (*Targum* of Jonathan) supposes the inhabitants of *Asher* (*rva*; *tybθ*}) "of the house of Asher"), which is supported by several MSS. that read *yrçah* (Davidson, *Hebr. Text*, ad loc.). "The Asherites" will then denote the whole of the country west of the Jordan above Jezreel (the district of the plain of Esdraelon), and the enumeration will proceed regularly from north to south, Asher to Benjamin. The form "Asherite" occurs in <4013>Judges 1:32. **SEE ASHER.** By some of the old interpreters-Arabic, Syriac, and Vulgate versions-and in modern times by Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* iii, 145), the name is taken as meaning the Geshurites, the members of a small kingdom to the S. or S.E. of Damascus, one of the petty states which were included under the general title of Aram (q.v.). The difficulty in accepting this substitution is that Geshur had a king of its own, Talmai, whose daughter, moreover, was married to David somewhere about this very time (<4382>1 Chronicles 3:2, compared with 4), a circumstance not consistent with his being the ally of Ishbosheth, or with the latter being made king over the people of Geshur. Talmai was still king many years after this occurrence (<4037>2 Samuel 13:37). In addition, Geshur was surely too remote from Mahanaim and from the rest of Ishbosheth's territory to be intended here. **SEE GESHUR.** Still others understand that the clan referred to are the same with the *Asshurites* (Heb. *Asshurime'*, *myrʾlva*}) Sept. Ἀσσοურიείμ, *Vulg. Assurism*; Auth. Vers. "Asshurim"), an Arab tribe said (with the Letushim and Leummim) to be descended from Dedan (<4020>Genesis 25:4), and who appear from these notices to have settled in the south-western part of the Hauran, where they became somewhat incorporated with the Israelites. **SEE ARABIA.**

In <4276>Ezekiel 27:6, Ashur (*rʾlva*}) plur. *Ashurim'*, in the expression, *myriva*}) *tbi* } *vallc* [; *Èvèthi* } *thy benches* [or *decks*] *they have made of ivory, the daughter of the ashur-trees*, i.e. inlaid or bordered with that wood; Sept. τὰ ἱερά σου ἐποίησαν ἐξ ἐλέφαντος, οἴκους ἀλσώδεις,

Vulg. *et transtra tuafecerunt tibi ex ebore Indico et pcceteriola*, Auth. Vers. "the company of the Ashurites have made thy benches of ivory") evidently stands for *tedsshur'* (*רִבְוֵאִי*), or box-wood. *SEE BOX-TREE*.

### Ash'vath

(Heb. *Ashvath'*, *תַּוְּשִׁי* perh. for *t/v* [; *bright*; Sept. *Ἀσειθ* v. r. *Ἀσίθ*, Vulg. *Asoth*), the last named of the three sons of Japhlet, great-grandson of Asher (<sup><3173></sup>1 Chronicles 7:33). B.C. cir. 1612.

### Ash-Wednesday

(*dies cinerum*), the first day of Lent. It is so called from the custom observed in the ancient Church of penitents expressing their humiliation at this time by appearing in sackcloth and ashes. But it is not certain that this was always done precisely on Ash-Wednesday, there being a perfect silence in the most ancient writers about it. The discipline used toward penitents in Lent, as described by Gratian, differed from their treatment at other times; for on Ash-Wednesday they were presented to the bishop, clothed in sackcloth, and barefooted; then the seven penitential psalms were sung; after which the bishop laid his hands on them, sprinkled them with holy water, and poured ashes upon their heads, declaring to them that as Adam was cast out of paradise, so they, for their sins, were cast out of the Church. Then the inferior ministers expelled them out of the doors of the church. In the end of Lent, on the Thursday. before Easter., they were again presented for reconciliation by the deacons and presbyters at the gates of the church. But this method of treating penitents in Lent carries with it the marks of a more modern practice; for there was no use of the holy water in the ancient discipline, nor seven penitential psalms in their service, but only one, viz. the fifty-first.. Neither was Ash-Wednesday anciently the first day of Lent, till Gregory the Great first added it to Lent to make the number of fasting-days completely forty, which before were but thirty-six. Nor does it appear that anciently the time of imposing penance was confined to the beginning of Lent, but was granted at all times, whenever the bishop thought the penitent qualified for it. In Rome the spectacle on this occasion is most ridiculous. After giving themselves up to all kinds of gayety and licentiousness during the Carnival, till twelve o'clock on Tuesday night, the people go on Ash-Wednesday morning into the churches, when the officiating priests put ashes on their head, repeating the words, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." The day is kept

in the English Church by proper collects and lessons, but without the *ashes* ceremony. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 18, ch. ii, § 2; Procter, *Common Prayer*, p. 278; Burnet, *Hist. of Eng. Ref.* ii, 94; Iartene, *De Ant. Eccl. Ritibus*, lib. 4: cap. xvii. Treatises on this observance have been written by Gleich (Viteb. 1689), Mittwoch (Lips. 1693), Schmid (Helmst. 1702), Siber (Lips. 1709). **SEE ASHES.**

### Ashwell, George,

born in 1612, became a fellow of Wadham College, and afterward rector of Hanwell, Oxfordshire, England. He died in 1693, leaving the following works:

1. *Fides Apostolica* (Oxon. 1653):
2. *Gestus Eucharisticus* (Oxon. 1663):
3. *De Socino et Socinianismo* (Oxon. 1680):
4. *De Ecclesia* (Oxon. 1688).

### A'sia

(**Ἀσία**, referred by the Greeks to a person, Herod. 4:45, but by moderns to an Eastern, usually Shemitic etymology, comp. Bochart, *Phaleg*, 4:33, p. 3379; Sickler, *Alte Geogr.* p. 89; Wahl, in the *Hall. Encycl.* 6:76 sq.; Forbiger, *Alte Geogr.* ii, 39; Hitzig, *Philist.* p. 93), a geographical name which is employed by the writers of antiquity to denote regions of very different extent, designating as early as the time of Herodotus (iv, 36) an entire continent, in contrast with Europe and Africa (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 14:10, 1), the boundaries of which have been clearly defined (Forbiger, *Alte Geogr.* ii, 39) since the descriptions of Strabo (i, 35) and Ptolemy (iv, 5); in the Roman period, however, it was generally applied only to a single district of Western Asia (Asia Minor). It is in the latter sense alone that the word occurs in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. 8:6; 11:13; 12:39; 13:32; 2 Macc. 3:3; 10:24) and New Test. (~~400~~ Acts 2:9; 6:9; 16:6; 19:10, 22, 26, 27; 20:4, 16, 18; 21:27; 27:2; Rom. 16:5 [where the true reading is **Ἀσίας**]; ~~669~~ 1 Corinthians 16:19; ~~5008~~ 2 Corinthians 1:8; ~~5015~~ 2 Timothy 1:15; ~~6000~~ 1 Peter 1:1; ~~6000~~ Revelation 1:4, 11).

### Picture for Asia 1

**1. CONTINENT OF ASIA.** The ancient Hebrews were strangers to the division of the earth into parts or quarters, and hence we never find the

word Asia in any Hebrew book. It occurs first in Biblical writers in the books of the Maccabees, and there in a restricted sense. In its widest application, however, as designating in modern geography a leading division of the globe, it is of the deepest interest in sacred literature. This part of the world is regarded as having been the most favored. Here the first man was created; here the patriarchs lived; here the law was given; here the greatest and most celebrated monarchies were formed; and from hence the first founders of cities and nations in other parts of the world conducted their colonies. In Asia our blessed Redeemer appeared, wrought salvation for mankind, died, and rose again; and from hence the light of the Gospel has been diffused over the world. Laws, arts, sciences, and religions almost all have had their origin in Asia. *SEE ETHNOLOGY.*

**I.** *Geographical Description.*-Asia, which forms the eastern and northern portion of the great tract of land in the eastern hemisphere, is the oldest known portion of the globe, and is usually called the cradle of the human race, of nations, and of arts. It is separated from Australia by the Indian and Pacific Oceans; from America on the north-east by Behring's Straits, and on the east by the great Eastern or Pacific Ocean; from Africa by the Arabian Sea (at the west by the Mediterranean Sea) and by the Arabian Gulf, or Red Sea, with the Straits of Babelmandeb; from Europe by the Kaskaia Gulf (at the extreme north-west), by the Caspian Sea and the River Ural, by the Black Sea and the Bosphorus, by the Sea of Marmora and the Dardanelles, and by the Grecian Archipelago. It is united with Africa by the desert Isthmus of Suez, and with Europe by the lofty Caucasian Mountains and the long Ural range. The area is, about 16,175,000 square miles.

The inhabitants of Asia (whose number is variously estimated at from 500,000,000 to 800,000,000) are divided -into three great branches: The Tatar-Caucasian, in the Western Asia, exhibits the finest features of our race in the Circassian form; the Mongolian race is spread through Eastern Asia; the Malay in Southern Asia and the islands. The north is inhabited by the Samoiedes, Tchooktches, and others. The following tribes, of different language and origin, may be distinguished, some of which are relics of scattered tribes of nomades: Kamtschatdales, Ostiacs, Samoiedes, Koriacks, Kurilians, Aleutians, Coreans, Mongols, and Kalmucks, Mantchoos (Tungoos, Daurians, and Mantchoos Proper), Finns, Circassians, Georgians, Greeks, Syrians and Armenians, Tatars and Turks, Persians and Afghans, Thibetans, Hindoos, Siamese, Malays, Annamites (in Cochin China and Tonquin), Burmese, Chinese and Japanese, besides the

indigenous inhabitants of the East Indian islands, Jews and Europeans. The principal languages are the Arabian, Persian, Armenian, Turkish, Tatar, Hindoo, Malay, Mongol, and Chinese, and Sanscrit. The principal religions which prevail are Mohammedanism in the western parts, the worship of the Lama of Thibet in the central region, Buddhism in the Burmese territory, and Hindooism or Brahminism in India. For farther details and statistics of the Asiatic countries, see each in its alphabetical place, especially Turkey, Persia, China, and India.

From this great continent must undoubtedly have issued at some unknown period that extraordinary emigration which peopled America. It cannot be questioned that the inhabitants of the north-eastern parts of Asia, little attached to the soil, and subsisting chiefly by hunting and fishing, might pass either in their canoes in summer, or upon the ice in winter, from their own country to the American shore. Or a passage of this kind may not be necessary, for it is by no means unlikely that the Straits of Behring were formerly occupied by the land, and that the isthmus which joined the old world to the new was subverted and overwhelmed by one of those great revolutions of nature which shake whole continents, and extend the dominion of the sea to places where its waters are unknown. Dr. Prichard, in his *Researches into the Physical History of Man*, is decidedly of opinion that America was peopled by an Asiatic migration; and in the examples he gives of the coincidences of words, he has fully established the fact of an intercourse between the nations of Northern Asia and those of America, long before the very existence of the latter continent was known to modern Europe. Later investigations have, almost without exception, tended to confirm this conclusion.

The Scriptures make no mention of many of the empires and nations of Asia, such as the Chinese empire, the Hindoos, and the numerous tribes inhabiting the extensive region of Siberia or Asiatic Russia. India is mentioned in the Book of Esther, but only in reference to the extensive dominions of Ahasuerus. The Medo-Persian branch of the Indo-European nations who inhabited Asia, of whom were the Medes and ancient Persians, Parthians, and Armenians, are, however, mentioned in sacred history; and among the nations of Asia Minor we have the Phrygians, the Mysians, and the Bithynians. Of the ancient western Asiatic nations, those connected with sacred history are the Elamites, or descendants of Elam; the Assyrians, or descendants of Ashur; Hebrews and Idumaeans, or Edomites; Beni-Jaktan, or Arabs; the Chasdim, or Chaldaeans; the

Aramaeans, who inhabited Syria and Mesopotamia; the Phoenicians, or descendants of Canaan; the Mizraim, or the Egyptians; the Cushites, or Ethiopians; and the Philistines. Of the ancient empires mentioned in the Scriptures, the Assyrian is the earliest, so called from Asshur, the son of Shem. Out of the empire founded by Naimrod at Babylon sprung the Babylonian or Chaldaean, the capital of which was Babylon, while that of Assyria was Nineveh. The empire of the Medes also sprung, from the Assyrian, and was at length united by Cyrus with Persia, a country which, previous to the reign of that great prince, did not contain more than a single province of the present extensive kingdom, and which continued to rule over Asia upward of two centuries, until its power was overthrown by Alexander the Great. Elam, which originally denoted the country of the Elymaei in the modern Khusistan, afterward became the Hebrew term for Persia and the Persians, who were allied to the Madai or Medes. The other nations of Asia mentioned in the Scriptures have each their appropriate designations, such as the Arphaxad, or Arph-Chesad, supposed to be the Chaldzeans; the Lud or Ludim, alleged by Josephus and Bochart to be the Lydians; and the Aramites or the Syrians. The Asiatic countries more especially mentioned as the scenes of great events and important transactions are Arabia, Armenia, Assyria, Babylonia, Syria, and Judaea or Palestine, Phoenicia and Persia. See each in its alphabetical order.

**II. Church History.**-*Christianity* spread rapidly in the first centuries in Western Asia, which, after the times of Constantine, belonged among the Christian countries. The apostolic churches of Antioch (q.v.) and Jerusalem (q.v.) received along with Rome and Alexandria the rank of patriarchates. The diocese of Asia, of which Ephesus was the metropolis, was reckoned next in rank to the four patriarchates up till the council of Chalcedon, which subordinated the diocese to the Patriarch of Constantinople. In the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries the Nestorians and Monophysites were excluded by ecumenical synods from the Church, and organized themselves as independent denominations, which still exist. *SEE NESTORIANS; SEE ARMENIANS; SEE JACOBITES.* Down to the twelfth century the churches of Western Asia were still in a moderately flourishing condition; but about that time the Saracens succeeded in establishing several principalities, which were the cause of sad desolation to the Church. The Turks, who succeeded, completed the wreck. For the Church history of the following centuries, we refer, besides to the articles already mentioned, to *SEE TURMEY; SEE GREEK CHURCH.* Also in other portions of Asia the

Gospel was early proclaimed, and Christianity flourished for some time in Persia, till it succumbed to the rising power of Mohammedanism. The outposts of Christianity in China and India, which probably reach back to an early period, were lost sight of by the Latin and Greek churches. The Roman Church, in the Middle Ages and modern times, made great effort to unite with itself the churches of Western Asia, and to convert the pagans in various Asiatic countries. She succeeded in most of the Portuguese and Spanish possessions, and founded a number of dioceses in other countries. The history of Protestantism begins with the establishment of the rule of the East India Company; and in the nineteenth century its missions have developed on so large a scale that the time appears to be near when it will have the ascendancy in a large portion of Eastern Asia. For more details on the history of both the Roman and the Protestant churches, we refer to the articles *SEE PERSIA*; *SEE CHINA*; *SEE INDIA*; *SEE FARTHER INDIA*; *SEE INDIAN ARCHIPELAGO*; *SEE JAPAN*.

**III. Ecclesiastical Statistics.**-The following tabular survey of the total Christian population is taken from the latest accessible sources (1880), the number of Mohammedans in Asia being about 115,144,000.

Countries	Sum.	Rom.Cath	Protestant	Eastern
Russia	13,471,000	51,000	15,000	5,941,000
Turkey	16,170,000	260,000	25,000	3,000,000
Persia	7,000,000	10,000	3,000	50,000
China and Depend-encies	435,000,000	483,000	50,000	5,000
Japan	34,338,000	21,000	4,000	6,000
Burmah	21,000,000	480,000		
Siam	5,750,000	25,000	4,000	6,000
British possessions	243,898,000	1,264,000	2,600,000	400,000
French “	2,770,000	300,000		
Spanish “	6,300,000	5,501,000		
Portuguese “	882,000	350,000		
Dutch “	26,745,000	80,000	170,000	
Other Countries	17,443,000			
Totals	834,767,000	8,830,000	2,868,000	9,402,000

The Greek Church is the largest Christian body in Asiatic Russia and Asiatic Turkey, and is at present spreading, together with Russian



influence, in Central Asia and China. Armenians are numerous in Russia, Turkey, and Persia, and scattered in India. Nestorians and Jacobites are mostly found in Turkey and India, the former also in Persia. By many it is believed that there are still numerous descendants of Christians in various parts of Asia as yet unknown to the rest of the Christian world. In 1859 it was asserted that 30,000 native Christians had been discovered in the island of Celebes. Buddhism, Brahminism, and the other religious systems of India, China, and Japan, count together a population of about 600 millions. Mohammedanism prevails in Asiatic Turkey, Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan, Beloochistan, and Tartary, and is, in general, professed by a population of about 50 millions. The Jews in Asiatic Turkey are estimated at about 350,000; small numbers live scattered in nearly every country. The rest belong to a great variety of pagan systems.

**2.** ASIA MINOR was the name anciently given to the region nearly inclosed by the Euxine, AEGæan, and Mediterranean Seas, and now forming a part of Turkey. Respecting the Biblical notices of this district we have to remark:

### Picture for Asia 2

**(a)** Antiochus the Great is called king of Asia in 1 Macc. 8:6; a title that he assumed as master (not only of Syria, but also) of the greater part of Asia Minor (which had passed over to the Macedonian princes as a Persian province), but was compelled (B.C. 189) to relinquish all the Asiatic districts west of the Taurus to the Romans (Liv. 38:38; 1 Macc. 8:8), who committed Mysia, Lydia, and Phrygia to Eumenes (II), king of Pergamus (Liv. 37:55; 38:39). Hence

**(b)** the kingdom of Pergamus was called the Asiatic empire, although the Syrian Seleucidae, who only occupied Cilicia, likewise (perhaps only out of empty pretence) assumed this title (1 Macc. 12:39; 13:32; 2 Macc. 3:3), and so the empires of Egypt and Asia are found in contrast (1 Macc. 13:13).

**(c)** By the will of Attalus (III) Philometor (q.v.), the kingdom of Pergamus passed over (B.C. 133) as a province into the hands of the Romans, in whose diplomatic phraseology Asia was now termed simply '*Asia cis Tanurum*' (comp. Cicero, *Flacc.* 27; Nep. *Attic.* 54; Plin. 40), i.e. including the districts Mysia, Lydia, Phrygia, and Caria (which last the Rhodians obtained after the conquest of Antiochus the Great). It was

governed by a praetor until the Emperor Augustus made it a proconsular province. In this extent it is styled *Asia Proper* (ἡ ἰδίως καλουμένη Ἀσία, Ptolem. v, 2; comp. Strabo, 12:577). To this connection appear to belong the following passages of the N.T. <sup><410></sup>Acts 6:9 (where Asia and Cilicia are names of Roman provinces in Asia Minor); 20:16; <sup><4100></sup>1 Peter 1:1 (see Steiger, in loc.); <sup><4100></sup>Revelation 1:4; comp. 2 and 3, where letters to the Christian communities in the seven cities of (proconsular) Asia designate those in Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea (q.v. severally) (see Lucke, *Ofenbar. Joh.* p. 201; comp. T. Smith, *Septem Asice ecclesiar. notitia*, Lond. 1671, Utr. 1694; Arundell, *Visit to the Seven Churches of Asia*, Lond. 1828). On the other hand, in Acts ii, 9 (comp. 16:6; see Wiggers, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, i, 169), it appears to denote Phrygia, or, as the commentators will have it, only Ionia (see Kuinol, in loc.); but it is not certain that in Roman times Ionia was called Asia by pre-eminence (see Pliny, v, 28; comp. Solin. 43). The extent in <sup><4100></sup>2 Corinthians 1:8, is uncertain, and, moreover, the boundaries of Asia Minor varied at different periods (see Mannert, VI, ii, 15 -sq.; Wetstein, ii, 464). Thus it may be retarded as pretty well settled:

(1.) That "Asia" denotes the whole of ASIA MINOR, in the texts <sup><4100></sup>Acts 19:26, 27; 21:27; 24:18; 27:2; but

(2.), that only ASIA PROPER, the Roman or Proconsular Asia, is denoted in <sup><4100></sup>Acts 2:9; 6:9; 16:6; 19:10, 22; 20:4, 16, 18 [<sup><5165></sup>Romans 16:5]; <sup><4160></sup>1 Corinthians 16:19; 2 Corinthians 1:8; <sup><5115></sup>2 Timothy 1:15; <sup><4100></sup>1 Peter 1:1; <sup><4100></sup>Revelation 1:4, 11. ASIA MINOR comprehended Bithynia, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Phrygia, Mysia, Troas (all of which are mentioned in the New Testament), Lydia, Ionia, AEolis (which are sometimes included under Lydia), Caria, Doris, and Lycia. ASIA PROPER, or Proconsular Asia, comprehended the provinces of Phrygia, Mysia, Caria, and Lydia (Cicero, *Ep. Fam.* ii, 15). But it is evident that Luke uses the term Asia in a sense still more restricted; for in one place he counts Phrygia (<sup><4100></sup>Acts 2:9, 10), and in another Mysia (<sup><4100></sup>Acts 16:6, 7), as provinces distinct from Asia. Hence it is probable that in many, if not all, of the second set of references above, the word Asia denotes only Ionia, or the entire western coast, of which Ephesus was the capital, and in which the seven churches were situated. See generally, Usher, *De Asia proconsulari* (Lond. 1681); id. *De episcop. metropol. in Asia proconsulari* (Lond. 1687); Carpzov, *De Asice ecclesis* (Lips. 1698); Cellarius, *id.* (Hal. 1701); Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul*, i, 237; Penny

Cyc. s.v. Anatolia; Smith's *Diet. of Class. Geogr.* i, 232 sq., 238 sq.; Texier, *Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1863); Le Bas and Cbheron, *Hist. Ancienne de l'As. Min.* (Par. 1864); Perrot, *Voyage en As. Min.* (Paris, 1864).

**3. PROCONSULAR ASIA**, therefore, seems to be usually that designated in the New Test., being a Roman province which embraced the western part of the peninsula of Asia Minor, and of which Ephesus was the capital. This province originated in the bequest of Attalus, king of Pergamus, or king of Asia, who left by will to the Roman Republic his hereditary dominions in the west of the peninsula (B.C. 133). Some rectifications of the frontier were made, and "Asia" was constituted a province. Under the early emperors it was rich and flourishing, though it had been severely plundered under the republic. In the division made by Augustus of senatorial and imperial provinces, it was placed in the former class, and was governed by a proconsul. (Hence ἀνθύπατοι, ~~4198~~ Acts 19:38, and on coins.) It contained many important cities, among which were the seven churches of the Apocalypse, and it was divided into assize districts for judicial business. (Hence ἀγοραῖοι, i.e. ἡμέραι, Acts, *ibid.*) It is not possible absolutely to define the inland boundary of this province during the life of the' Apostle Paul; indeed, the limits of the provinces were frequently undergoing change; but generally it may be said that it included the territory anciently subdivided into AEolis, Ionia, and Doris, and afterward into Mysia, Lydia, and Caria. *SEE MYZIA; SEE LYCIA; SEE BITHYNIA; SEE PHRYGIA; SEE GALATIA.* These were originally Greek colonies (see Smith's *Smaller Hist. of Greece*, p. 40 sq.). Meyer (in his *Comment.* on ~~4166~~ Acts 16:6) unnecessarily imagines that the divine intimation given to Paul had reference to the continent of Asia, as opposed to Europe, and that the apostle supposed it might have reference simply to "Asia cis Taurum," and therefore attempted to penetrate into Bithynia. The view of Meyer and De Wette on ~~4170~~ Acts 27:2 (and of the former on ~~4190~~ Acts 19:10), viz. that the peninsula of Asia Minor is intended, involves a bad geographical mistake; for this term "Asia Minor" does not seem to have been so applied till some centuries after the Christian era. Neither is it strictly correct to speak of Asia in the N.T. as being at that time called *A. proconsularis*; for this phrase also was of later date, and denoted one of Constantine's subdivisions of the province of which we are speaking. (See Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, ch. xiv; Marquardt's *Roim. Alterthiimer*, iii, 130-146.) *SEE ASIARCH.*

**4. SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.** — These, celebrated in the Apocalypse, in the apostolic times, and in ecclesiastical history, were, as they are classified by the writer of the book of Revelation (ch. i-iii), Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea, which see under the respective names. *SEE ASIA MINOR* (No. 2, above); see *REVELATION*.

## Asiarch

### Picture for Asiarch

(Ἀσιάρχης, *ruler of Asia Minor*, in the plur., <sup><448B></sup>Acts 19:31; Vulg. *Asiceprincipes*; Auth. Vers. "the chief of Asia"), the title of the ten persons annually chosen in Proconsular Asia as chief presidents of the religious rites (*prresides sacerdotales*, Tertull. *De Spect.* 2), and whose office it was to exhibit solemn games in the theatre every year, in honor of the gods and of the Roman Emperor (*Cod. Theodos.* 15:9, 2). This they did at their own expense (like the Roman aediles), whence none but the most opulent persons could bear the office, although only of one year's continuance (see Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, ii, 83). The appointment was much as follows: at the beginning of every year (i.e. about the autumnal equinox), each of the cities of Asia held a public assembly, in order to nominate one of their citizens as asiarch (Spanheim, *De usu et prcestant. num.* p. 694). A person was then sent to the general council of the province, at some one of the principal cities, as Ephesus, Smyrna, Sardis, etc., to announce the name of the individual who had been selected (11. Arist. p. 34,4 sq., ed. Jebb; p. 613 sq., ed. Cant.). Of the persons thus nominated by the cities the council designated ten. As the asiarchs are repeatedly mentioned in the plural, some suppose that the whole ten presided as a college over the sacred rites (comp. Strabo, 14:649). But in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* 4:15) Polycarp is said to have suffered martyrdom when "Philip was *asiarch* and Statius Quadratus proconsul of Asia ;" from which and other circumstances it is deemed more probable that, as in the case of the irenarch, the names of the ten nominated by the general council were submitted to the proconsul, who chose one of the number to be asiarch (see Vales. in loc.; Deyling, *Observ.* iii, 379 sq.). Kuinol (at <sup><448B></sup>Acts 19:31) admits that one chosen by the proconsul was pre-eminently the asiarch, but conceives that the other nine acted as his assessors, and also bore that title. Others, however, think the plurality of asiarchs sufficiently accounted for by supposing that those who *had* served

the office continued to bear the title, as was the case with the Jewish highpriests; but the other branch of the alternative is usually preferred. It is probable that in the course of time changes were made in the office, which our fragmentary information does not enable us to trace; and that the solitary testimony of Eusebius amounts to no more than that one asiarch, Philip, then and there presided at the public games, but not that the arrangements of all the games were made and provided by that one asiarch. Even the college of these officers appear to have had jurisdiction in Proconsular Asia (q.v.) only, for we find mention of similar functionaries in the other provinces of Asia Minor, e.g. Bithyniarch, Galatarch, Lyciarch, Cariarch, etc. (Strabo, 14:3; Malalas, p. 285, 289, ed. Bonn), and likewise in other parts of the Roman empire, e.g. Syriarch (Liban. *Ep.* 1217), Phoeniciarch, Cypriarch (2 Mace. 12:2), etc., each charged with similar duties in their respective districts (see the *Hall. Encycl.* iii, 284 sq.). There is no ground for the supposition of Schottgen (*Miscel. Lips.* v, 178 sq.), that the asiarchs were city magistrates, having appellate or superior jurisdiction over the decisions of local courts: they should by no means be confounded with the archon, or chief magistrate of Ephesus; for they were representatives, not of a single city, but of many cities united. This notion of the asiarchs is confirmed by a medal of Rhodes, struck under Hadrian, on the reverse of which we read, "A coin struck in common by thirteen cities, in honor of the magistrate of Rhodes, Claudio Fronto, *asiarch* and highpriest of the thirteen cities." The office might be filled by the same person several times (Akerman, *Num. Ill.* p. 51). Their place of residence was at Ephesus, Smyrna, Sardis, Cyzicus, or at any other city where the council was held. Their office was thus, in a great measure at least, religious, and they are, in consequence, sometimes called "priests" (*ἀρχιερεῖς*), and their office a "priesthood" (*ἱερωσύνη*) (*Mart. S. Polycarp.* in *Patr. Ap.* c. 21). Probably it represented the religious element of the ancient Panionian League, to the territorial limits of which also the circle of the functions of the asiarchs nearly corresponded (see Herod. i, 142). Coins or inscriptions bearing the names of persons who had served the office of asiarch one or more times, are known as belonging to the following cities: Aphrodisias, Cyzicus, Hypsepa, Laodicea, Pergamos, Philadelphia, Sardis, Smyrna, Thyatira. (Aristid. *Or.* 26:518, ed. Dind.; Eckhel, ii, 507; 4:207; Bockh, *Inscr.* vol. ii; Krause, *Civitates Neocorcorce*, p. 71; Wetstein, *On Acts XIX*; Herod. v, 38; Hammond, *On N.T.* in loc.)

These chiefs, then holding such games at Ephesus, out of friendly consideration for Paul, restrained him from appearing, as he proposed, in the theatre, during the sedition raised by Demetrius, the goldsmith, respecting Diana of Ephesus (~~<416B>~~Acts 19:31). The consideration of these asiarchs for the Apostle Paul, during the tumult, is not only extremely honorable to his character and to theirs, but is also a strong confirmation of the remark made by the evangelist (ver. 10), that "all they who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks" (see Conybeare and Howson, ii, 86). It shows also in what light the tumult of Demetrius was beheld, since he took especial care to observe that "all Asia" worshipped their goddess. Yet were the very asiarchs, now engaged in this worship, intent on saving the man whom Demetrius represented as its most formidable enemy (Carstens, *De Asiarchis Paulo quondam amicis*, Lubec. 1744). See generally Salmas. *ad Solin.* 40, p. 566; Van Dale, *Dissert. ad antiq. et marmor.* p. 273 sq.; Carstens, *Mleditat. subseciv. spec.* ii (Lubec. 1744); Ziebich, *Observ. e numis antiq. sacr.* (Viteb. 1745), p. 36 sq.; Smith's *Diet. of Class. Ant.* s.v.; and the treatises *De Asiarchis*, of Boysen (Hal. 1716), Lintrup (Hafn. 1715), Siber (Viteb. 1683), Sontag (Altdorf, 1712), and Wesseling (Utr. 1753).

### Asiatic Brethren,

a secret society greatly resembling the Rosicrucians (q.v.). It arose in Austria in 1780, spread throughout Germany, applied itself chiefly to cabalistics and theosophy, and occasioned many frauds. Baron Ecker von Eckhofen and one Boheman at Stockholm were the principal defenders of this order. See *Die Briider St. Johannis des Evang. aus Asien* (Berl. 1830).

### Asibi'as

(Ἀσεβίας, comp. *Asebia*, 1 Esdr. 8:48), one of the Israelites who renounced his Gentile wife after the captivity (1 Esdr. 9:26); doubtless a corruption for the MALCHIJAH *SEE MALCHIJAH* (q.v.) of the genuine text (~~<4510B>~~Ezra 10:25).

### A'siel,

the name of two men.

**1.** (Heb. *Asiel*, אַסִּיעֵל] created by God; Sept. Ἀσιήλ.) The father of Seraiah, and progenitor of one of the Simeonite chiefs that expelled the

Hamite aboriaines from the fertile valleys near Gedor in the time of Hezekiah (<sup><13065></sup>1 Chronicles 4:35). B.C. ante 712.

2. (Vulg. *Asiel*, for the Greek text is not extant.) The last named of the five scribes whom the divine voice is represented, in the fanciful vision of 2 Esdr. 14:24, as directing Ezra to bring for the purpose of recording the revelation about to be communicated to him.

### Asinaeus

(Ἀσινᾶϊος), a Jew during the captivity at Babylon, of whose exploits, in connection with his brother Anilaeus (Ἀνιλαῖος), in raising himself from obscurity to the chief power in the province of Mesopotamia, and of whose reverses afterward in consequence of an idolatrous marriage, Josephus gives a detailed but apparently apocryphal account (*Ant.* 18:9).

### As'ipha

(Ἀσιφά), one of the family-heads of the "temple-servants" that returned from Babylon (1 Esdr. v, 29); evidently the HASUPHA *SEE HASUPHA* (q.v.) of the true text (<sup><13065></sup>Ezra 2:43).

### A's'kelon

(<sup><0018></sup>Judges 1:18).

*SEE ASHKELON.*

### Askew, Anne

(otherwise Ascough or Ascue), born in 1521, was second daughter of Sir Wm. Askew, of Lincolnshire. By the study of the Scriptures she became a convert to the opinions of the Reformers, at which her husband, one Kyme, a papist, turned her out of doors. She came up to London to sue for a separation, and appears to have attracted the favorable notice of some ladies high at court. She was soon accused of heresy and committed to prison. Being examined before the Bishop of London and others, she is said to have replied boldly to the lord-mayor's question, "Whether the priests cannot make the body of Christ?" "I have read that God made man; but that man can make God I never yet read" (Strype, *Memorials*, i, 387). Yet it is said by Burnet that "after much pains she set her hand to a recantation, by which she acknowledged that the natural body of Christ was present in the sacrament after the consecration, whether the priest

were a good or an ill man; and that, whether it was presently consumed or reserved in the pix, it was the true body of Christ" (*Hist. of Reformation*, bk. iii). Her recantation, however, was not effectual, for she was soon apprehended again and committed to Newgate, where she was again strictly questioned as to what ladies at court had shown her favor and encouragement. She was placed on the rack and cruelly tortured in the sight, and, as Fox says, by the hand of the Lord Chancellor Wriothesly, whose eagerness in this matter is ascribed to his desire to gain some ground of offence against the Duchess of Suffolk, the Countess of Hertford, or some other ladies. But her patience and fortitude could not be shaken. She was burnt with four others at the stake in Smithfield, July 16, 1546. She wrote several works, one of which is entitled *Examinationes pice.-Penny Cyclop.* s.v.; :Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 600-614; Burnet, *Hist. of Reformation*, bk. i, p. 547.

### Aslac, Conrad,

a learned Danish divine, born at Bergen, in Norway, in 1564, studied at Copenhagen, and in the years 1593-99 travelled through Germany, Switzerland, France, England, and Ireland. He returned to Copenhagen in 1600, and professed the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages, and theology. He died in 1624, leaving among other works:

1. *A Treatise on Election* (Danish, Copenhagen, 1612, 8vo):
2. *Physica et Ethica Mosaica* (Hanau, 1613):
3. *De Di. cendi et Disserendi Ratione*, lib. iii (Copenhagen, 1612, 4to. This book is placed on the *Roman Index*):
4. *De Christo vero Deo et Homine in una Indivisa Persona*, etc. (Frankfort, 1620, 8vo):
5. *De Statue Christi ante Incarnationem et in Incarnatione* (Copenhagen, 1622, 4to):
6. *Oratio de Statu Religionis in Dania, ab 1517 ad 1628* (Copenhagen, 1631, 4to):
7. *De Religionis per Lutherum Plantatione in Daniam et Norvegiam* (Copenhagen, 1620, 4to); besides many disputations, etc., on Free Will, Original Sin, the Creation, etc.



## Asmodee'us

(Ἄσμοδαῖος), a daemon or evil spirit mentioned in the apocryphal book of Tobit (iii, 8) as having become enamored of Sara, the daughter of Ragunl, and killed the seven husbands whom she had married (Tob. 6:14), but as being put to flight by the charm used by Tobias on his marriage with her (Tob. 8:2, 3). The rabbins have a number of absurd traditions respecting Asmodaeus (יַדְמִיָּהִי or יַאֲדְמִיָּהִי Talm. *Getten*, lxviii, 1) as a libidinous daemon (comp. ~~Gen~~Genesis 6:1), and indeed the Talmudists represent him as the prince of devils, even Satan himself (see Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenth.* ii, 440; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* ad Luc. 11:15). Hence Beelzebub has been supposed to refer to the same daemon. But a similar title they also give to "the angel of death," as the destroyer of all mankind; hence some derive the name Asmodaeus from the Hebrew דְּמִיָּהִי; *shamad'*, to *exterminate*, which identifies it also with Abaddon (q.v.), the same as Apollyon (Rev. 9:11, where he is called "a king, the angel of the bottomless pit"), and οὐλοθρεύων, Wisd. 18:25, where he is represented as the "evil angel" (~~Ps~~Psalm 78:49) of the plague (Schleusner's *Thesaur.* s.v.), the angel of death (see Ilgen, *Zu Tob.* p. 42). Thus the story in Tobit means no more than that the seven husbands died successively on their marriage with Sara. (For other interpretations, see Fritzsche, *Comment.* p. 38). Others, however (Ges. *Allgem. Literatur-Zeit.* 1815, No. 123; De Wette, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 146; Reland, *Ant. Sacr.* 4:6), rather refer it to the Persic word *azmadan*, to *tempt* (Castelli *Lex. Pers.* col. 24 sq.). In the book of Tobit, this evil spirit is represented as causing, through jealousy, the death of Sara's seven husbands in succession on the bridal night; gaining the power to do so (as is hinted) through their incontinence. Tobias, instructed by Raphael, burns on "the ashes of perfume" the heart and liver of the fish which he caught in the Tigris; "the which smell when the evil spirit had smelled, he fled into the utmost parts of Egypt, and the angel bound him" (Tob. 8:3). It is obviously a vain endeavor to attempt to rationalize this story, since it is throughout founded on Jewish demonology, and "the loves of the angels," a strange fancy derived from ~~Gen~~Genesis 6:2. Those, however, who attempt this task make Asmodaeus the daemon of impurity, and suppose merely that the fumes deadened the passions of Tobias and his wife. The rabbins (among other odd fables) make this daemon the offspring of the incest of Tubalcain with his sister Noema, and say (in allusion to Solomon's many wives) that Asmodaeus once drove him from his kingdom, but, being dispossessed, was forced to

serve in building the Temple, which he did noiselessly, by means of a mysterious stone Shamir (Calmet, s.v. and *Fragments*, p. 271, where there is a great deal of fanciful and groundless speculation). See generally Wichmann, *De Asmodceo spiritu maligno ἀνθρωποκτόνῳ* (Lub. 1666); Hosum, *De Aschmodceo dcemonio maligno* (Hafn. 1709); Neubauer, *De angelo mortis ex mente Ebr. et Muthammedanorum*, (Hal. 1732); Hezel, *Schriftforscher* (Giessen, 1792), ii, 1 sq.; Calmet's *Dissertation on the ckemon Asmodceus* (translated in Arnald's *Commentary on the Apocrypha*); Ode, *De Angelis*, p. 611 sq. **SEE DAEMON.**

### Asmonaeen

(Ἀσαμωναῖος, Ἀσσαμωναῖος, Joseph. *Ant.* 12:6,1 sq.; in Joseph. Gorionid. plur. **μyn/mvj** ἰ *Chashmonim*'; more fully **yaæ/mvj** ἰ *tyBə* Jonathan's *Targ.* on <sup><1111></sup>1 Samuel 2:4; comp. Arab. *chashim*, noble; **μyNmiv** ἰ <sup><1112></sup>Psalm 68:32; *fat* ones, i.e. opulent), the proper designation of the family of the priest Mattathias, whose sons became better known by the surname of the Maccabees. (For the lineage and history of the Asmonaeans in full, see the *Penny Cyclopedia*, s.v.) **SEE JUDAS MACCABEUS.** With Mattathias (B.C. 167) began the exploits of the Asmonaeans in delivering the Jewish people from the oppressive yoke of the Syrian Seleucidee, which was accomplished by Jonathan, son of Mattathias, already a high-priest in rank—a dignity that was now attached to that of Syrian "meridarch." Simon, another son of Mattathias, became himself hereditary prince of the Jews. His grandson Aristobulus assumed the diadem, and the royal dynasty of the Asmonaeans continued on the Jewish throne till the interference of Pompey in Jewish affairs. Aristobulus II, the third king of the Asmonean line, was dethroned by the Romans, and upon his sons devolved the perilous endeavor of regaining their ancestral crown, but without permanence. They both paid therefor the penalty of their lives, the last being Antigonus (whom Antony caused to be beheaded at Antioch, Joseph. *Ant.* 15:1, 2), with whom the Asmonaeen *dynasty* expired, after a duration of 126 years, in the consulship of M. Vips. Agrippa and Canin. Gallus, i.e. B.C. 37 (see Joseph. *Ant.* 14:16, 4). The two surviving members of the family, Aristobulus and Mariamne, grandchildren of Aristobulus II, appear, it is true, at first to have striven to maintain a position in life under the Herodian sway suitable to their rank; but they soon fell under the suspicion of King Herod, and, with the assassination of Mariamne, *the family* of the Asmoneans likewise became extinct

(apparently after Herod's return from Antioch, where he had met Octavianus on his return from Egypt, B.C. 9; Joseph. *Ant.* 15:7,4). The exploits of the Maccabees under Simon are related in the books of the Apocrypha that bear their name (1 and 2 Macc. among the Jews, **μυανωμϙ j rps**, *books of the Chashmonceans*; see Eichhorn, *Finl. in die Apokr. Schl. d. A. T.* p. 208 sq.; Jahn, II. 4:949 sq.; Bertholdt, iii, 1036); but the complete history of the Asmonseans is given by Josephus (*Ant.* 12:6 to 14:16), who was himself a descendant of their lineage (*Ant.* 16:7, 1). **SEE MACCABEE.**

### As'nah

(Heb. *Asnah'*, **hnsʕj** perh. *hateful*, or *thorn*, otherwise *store-house*; Sept. **Ἀσενά**), the head of one of the families of the Nethinim that returned from the Babylonian captivity with Zerubbabel (<sup><1520></sup>Ezra 2:50). B.C. ante 536.

### Asnap'per

(Chald. *Osnappar'*, **rPišʕ**; some MISS. **rPišʕ a**, *Asenappar'*, whence Sept. **Ἀσσηναφάρ** v. r. **Ναφάρ**; Vulg. *Asenaphar*), the name of an Assyrian king or satrap who is said to have planted colonies (probably from some distant conquered territory) in Samaria, or perhaps other parts of Palestine and Syria (<sup><1540></sup>Ezra 4:10). On the supposition that a king of Assyria is meant, and by comparison with <sup><1272></sup>2 Kings 17:24, many (with Grotius) identify him with Shalmaneser; others (as Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* I, ii, 109; Hengstenberg, *Authent. Dan.* p. 178) understand Esarhaddon (comp. <sup><1540></sup>Ezra 4:2; so Michaelis; but' see on the contrary Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, i, 473); while most of the Jewish interpreters assume Sennacherib to be meant. He was probably, however, only a satrap of some of the Assyrian provinces (B.C. cir. 712), and the epithet applied to him in the passage in Ezra **aryQjw]aBrj** *the great and the excellent*, i.e. *most eminent* [comp. **κράτιστος**, <sup><1203></sup>Luke 1:3]; Auth. Vers. "the great and noble") is apparently the usual title of persons in that capacity, being indeed perhaps the translation of the official title Osnapper itself (**sʕ**; =Sanskrit *osna*, *great*; **rPi**= Sanskrit *para*, *noble*; see Luzath, *Le Sanscritisme de la langue Assyrienne*, p. 38-40). Bohlen, on the other hand, compares Sanskrit *Senapa*, *leader of an army*; according to which the name would become merely a designation of an Assyrian general.

## A'som

(Ἀσόμ), one of the Israelites whose "sons" had taken foreign wives on the return from Babylon (1 Esdr. 9:33); evidently the HASHUM *SEE* *HASHUM* (q.v.) of the true text (<sup><1508></sup>Ezra 10:33).

## A'sor

(Ἀσόρ), a plain in Galilee near the Sea of Gennesaret (1 Macc. 11:67, according to the Vulg. and Syr.; the common Greek has *Νασώρ*, Auth. Vers. "Nasor;" but the initial *v* has apparently been borrowed from the preceding *πεδίον*), probably *Hazor* (*ר/xj* ; which is thus Gracized in the Sept.), in the tribe of Naphtali (comp. Joseph. Ant. xiii, 5, 7). *SEE* *HAZOR*.

## Asp

### Picture for Asp 1

### Picture for Asp 2

(<sup><1508></sup>ⲧⲠⲡ, *pe'then*, so called probably from *extending* itself, <sup><6323></sup>Deuteronomy 32:33; <sup><1814></sup>Job 20:14, 16; <sup><2318></sup>Isaiah 11:8; "adder"; <sup><1504></sup>Psalms 57:4; 91:13; ἄσπις, <sup><1818></sup>Romans 3:3), a venomous kind of serpent, perhaps correctly designated by this rendering, since the Chald., Syr., and Arabic equivalents appear to denote some member of the *Coluber* family (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1140). Bochart (*Hieroz.* iii, 156, ed. Lips.) incorrectly refers to the Syr. name for *dragon* (comp. his treatise *De aspide surda ad* <sup><1818></sup>Psalms 58:5, *ibid.* p. 161 sq.). Kitto (*Pict. Bible*, at <sup><1814></sup>Job 20:14) compares the *bceten* of the Arabs, called by the Cyprians *kufi* (*κωφή*, *deaj*; comp. Psalm lviii, 4). This reptile, which more exactly corresponds in name to the Heb., is thus described by Forskal (*Descr. Anin.* p. 15): "Spotted all over with black and white; a foot long, and about twice as thick as one's thumb; oviparous; the bite instantly fatal, causing the body to swell." *SEE* *ADDER*. The "asp" is often mentioned by ancient authors (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. *Aspis*), but in such vague terms (except that they agree in its extreme venom, whence it was selected by Cleopatra as the surest and speediest means of her suicide) that little can be positively determined respecting it, if indeed several species of serpent are not thus designated. From the description of Pliny, however (*Hist. Nat.* 8:35), naturalists have generally fixed upon the *el-Haje* (or *Nasher*, described by

Forsk. *Anim.* p. 14) of the Arabs (*Vipera Haje* of Daudin) as representing the ancient asp. It is from three to five feet in length, of a dark green color, marked obliquely with bands of brown, and closely allied to the celebrated cobra-de-cal pello of India in its power of swelling the neck when irritated, and of rising on its tail in striking its prey (see *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). It is often figured as a sacred symbol on the Egyptian monuments under the name *Kneph* (Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, ii, 105). **SEE SERPENT.**

## Aspal'athus

(ἀσπάλαθος), a word which occurs only in Ecclus. 24:15, of the Apocrypha, where the substance which it indicates is enumerated with other spices and perfumes to which wisdom is compared. It was no doubt one of the drugs employed by the ancients as a perfume and incense, as it is described by Ly Dioscorides (i, 19), as well as enumerated by Ly Theophrastus (ix, 7), and by both among aromatic substances. It forms one of the ingredients of the *eydh*, or compound incense made use of by the Egyptian priests, as related both by Plutarch and Dioscorides. From the notices in the classical authors (comp. Theogn. 1193; Theocr. 24:87; Plin. 12:24, 52) we can only gather that it was a thorny shrub, whose bark, especially of the roots, yielded a fragrant oil. In the Arabian works on husbandry the plant is stated to have an acid taste, and to bear a purple flower, but no fruit (see Smith's *Diet. of Class. Antiq.* s.v.). *Lignum Rhodium* is sometimes considered to be one of the kinds of aspalathus described by Dioscorides, but this is a produce of the Canary Islands, and of the plant called *Convolvulus scoparius*. By others aspalathus, which has been supposed to be the same thing as Syrian aloe, or that of Rhodes and of Candia, is thought to have been yielded by species of the genus which has been called *Aspalathus*, and especially by the species *A. Creticus*, which is now called *Anthyllis Hernannice*; but there does not seem to be sufficient proof of this. Others again have held that aspalathus was a kind of agallochum, **SEE ALOE**, and Dr. Harris (sub. Lign.-aloe) seems to have thought that he got rid of a difficulty by suggesting that *ahalim*, which was probably agallochum, should be rendered *Aspalathus*. Arab authors, as Avicenna and Serapion, give *Dar-shishan* as the Arabic synonym of aspalathus. They quote some of their own countrymen as authorities respecting it, in addition to Galen and Dioscorides. Hence it would appear to have been a product of the East rather than of the West, as for such they usually give only the Greek name or its translation, and quote only Greek authorities. Avicenna, in addition to his description, says that some think it

may be the root of Indian nard. Hence it may justly be inferred that *Dar-shishan*, which the Arabians thought to be aspalathus, must have come to them from India, or they would not have hazarded this supposition. In India the name *Dar-shishan* is applied to the bark of a tree which is called *kaiphul* or *kyphul*. This tree is a native of the Himalayan Mountains from Nepal to the Sutlej, and has been figured and described by Dr. Wallich, in his *Tentamen Florce lepalensis*, p. 59, t. 45, by the name *Myrica sapida*, in consequence of its fruit, which is something like that of the arbutus, being edible. The leaves, on being rubbed, have a pleasantly aromatic though faint smell. The bark forms an article of commerce from the hills to the plains, being esteemed in the latter as a valuable stimulant medicine. It may be seen mentioned by the name *ka-i-phul* in Gladwin's translation of the Persian *Ulfaz-i-Udwieh*, No. 884, as a synonym of *Dar-sheeshan*, which is described as an aromatic bark, while at No. 157 *Dar-shishan* is considered to be a synonym of *ishtelayus*, which seems to be a corruption of aspalathus from the errors of transcribers in the diacritical points. *Kaiphul* has, moreover, been long celebrated by Sanscrit authors, and it may therefore have easily formed one of the early articles of commerce from the East to the West, together with nard, costus, and lycium from these mountains. *SEE SPICERY*.

### As'patha

(Heb. *Aspatha'*,  $\alpha\tau\text{P}\sigma\eta\iota$  prob. Sanscrit *Aspadata*, given by a horse, i.e. by Brahmah in the form of a horse [comp. the Persian name  $\text{Ἀσπαδάτης}$  or  $\text{Ἀσπάδης}$ , Died. Sic. ii, 33]; Sept.  $\text{Φασγά}$ , etc.), the third of the sons of Hainan slain by the Jews of Babylonia (<sup><1707></sup>Esther 9:7). B.C. 473.

### Aspergillum

or Aspensorium, the brush or mop from which holy water (q.v.) is sprinkled in the Roman Church.

### Aspersio,

(1.) a name given by the early writers to baptism by pouring or sprinkling. *SEE BAPTISM*.

(2.) In the Roman Church, sprinkling of person or things with the so-called *holy water* is called "aspersio." The water is mixed with salt, and blessed

by a given form of benediction for use in the church or at the altar.-  
Boissonnet, *Diet. des Ceremonies*, p. 105. *SEE HOLY WATER.*

## Asphaltites.

*SEE DEAD SEA.*

## Asphaltum

is probably the substance denoted by the Heb. רמֵיךְ *echemar'*; Arab. *chomar* (Sept. ἄσφαλτος, Auth. Vers. "slime," <sup><0118></sup>Genesis 11:3; 14:10; <sup><0118></sup>Exodus 2:3, where Luther, like the modern rabbins, translates by "clay"). The Hebrew and Arabic names probably refer to the reddish color of some of the specimens (Dioscorides, i, 99). (The Greek name, whence the Latin asphaltum, has doubtless given name to the Lake Asphaltites [Dead Sea], whence it was abundantly obtained.) Usually, however, asphaltum, or compact bitumen, is of a shining black color; it is solid and brittle, with a conchoidal fracture, altogether not unlike common pitch. Its specific gravity is from 1 to 1.6, and it consists chiefly of bituminous oil, hydrogen gas, and charcoal. It is found partly as a solid dry fossil, intermixed in layers of plaster, marl, or slate, and partly as liquid tar flowing from cavities in rocks or in the earth, or swimming upon the surface of lakes or natural wells (Burckhardt, ii, 77). To judge from <sup><0140></sup>Genesis 14:10, mines of asphaltum must have existed formerly on the spot where subsequently the Dead Sea, or Lake Asphaltites, was formed, such as Mariti (*Travels*, 4:27) discovered on the western shore of that sea. The Palestine earth-pitch, however, seems to have had the preference over all the other sorts (Plin. 28:23; Discor. i, 100). It was used among the ancients partly for covering boats, paying the bottoms of vessels (comp. Niebuhr, ii, 336; <sup><0054></sup>Genesis 6:14; <sup><0118></sup>Exodus 2:3; Josephus, *War*, 4:8, 4; Buckingham, *Mesopot.* p. 346), and partly as a substitute for mortar in buildings; and it is thought that the bricks of which the walls of Babylon were built (<sup><0118></sup>Genesis 11:3; Strabo, 16:743; Herod. i, 179; Plin. 35:51; Ammian. Marcell. 23:6; Virtruv. viii 3; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* i, 4, 3) had been cemented with hot bitumen, which imparted to them great solidity. In ancient Babylon asphaltum was made use of also for fuel, as the environs (in the place called *Is* or *Hit*, see D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* s.v. Hit) have from the earliest times been renowned for the abundance of that substance (Diod. Sic. ii, 12; Herod. i, 179; Dion. Cass. lxxviii, 26; Strabo, 14:8, 4; Plut. *Alex.* c. 35; Theodoret, *Qucest. in Genes.* 59; Ritter, *Erdk.* ii, 345;

Buckingham, *Mesopot.* p. 346). Neither were the ancient Jews unacquainted with the medicinal properties of that mineral (Josephus, *War.* 4:8, 4). Asphaltum was also used among the ancient Egyptians for embalming the dead. Strabo (xvi) and many other ancient and modern writers assert that only the asphalt of the Dead Sea was used for that purpose; but it has in more recent times been proved, from experiments made on mummies, that the Egyptians employed slaggy mineral pitch in embalming the dead. This operation was performed in three different ways: first, with slaggy Mineral pitch alone; second, with a mixture of this bitumen and a liquor extracted from the cedar, called *cedoria*; and third, with a similar mixture, to which resinous and aromatic substances were added (Haüy, *Mineral.* ii, 315). *SEE BITUMEN.*

Asphaltum is found in masses on the shore of the Dead Sea, or floating on the surface of its waters. Dr. Shaw (*Travels 'in Barbary and the Levant*) was told that this bitumen, for which the Dead Sea is so famous, rises at certain times from the bottom of the sea in large pieces of semi-globular form, which, as soon as they touch the surface and the external air operates upon them, burst asunder in a thousand pieces with a terrible crash, like the *pulvisfulminans* of the chemists. This, however, he continues, only occurs along the shore; for in deep water it is supposed that these eruptions show themselves in large columns of smoke, which are often seen to rise from the lake. The fact of the ascending smoke has been much questioned by naturalists; and although apparently confirmed by the testimonies of various travellers, collected by Biisching in his *Erdbeschreibung*, it is not established by the more observant travellers of recent years. Pococke (*Description of the East*, etc., ii, 46) presumes that the thick clumps of asphalt collected at the bottom of the lake have been brought up by subterranean fire, and afterward melted by the agitation of the waters. Also Strabo (xvi, 764) speaks of subterraneous fires in those parts (comp. Burckhardt, *Syria*, 394). Dr. Robinson, when in the neighborhood, heard from the natives the same story which had previously been told to Seetzen and Burckhardt, namely, that the asphaltum flows down the face of a precipice on the eastern shore of the lake until a large mass is collected, when, from its weight or some shock, it breaks off and falls into the sea (Seetzen, in *Zach's flonatl. Correspond.* 18:441; Burckhardt, p. 394; Robinson, ii, 229). This, however, he strongly doubts for assigned reasons, and it is agreed that nothing of the kind occurs on the *western* shore. He rather inclines to receive the testimony of the local Arabs, who affirm that



the bitumen only ,appears after earthquakes. They allege that after the earthquake of 1834 huge quantities of it were cast upon the shore, of which the Jehalin Arabs alone took about 60 kuntars (each of 98 lbs.) to market; and it was corroboratively recollected by the Rev. Eli Smith that a large amount had that year been purchased at Beirut by the Frank merchants. There was another earthquake on January 1, 1837, and soon after a large mass of asphaltum (compared by one person to an island, and by another to a house) was discovered floating on the sea, and was driven aground on the western side near Usdum. The neighboring Arabs assembled, cut it up with axes, removed it by camel loads, and sold it at the rate of four piastres the *rutl*, or pound; the product is said to have been about \$3000. Except during these two years, the sheik of the Jehalin, a man fifty years old, had never known bitumen appear in the sea, nor heard of it from his fathers (Robinson's *Bib. Resedrches*, ii, 230). This information may serve to illustrate the account of Josephus that "the sea in many places sends up black masses of asphaltum, which float on the surface, having the form and size of headless oxen' (*War*, 9:8, 4); and that of Diodorus (ii, 48), who states that the bitumen is thrown up in masses, covering sometimes two or three *plethra*, and having the appearance of islands. *SEE PITCH*.

### As'phar

(*Ἀσφάρ* v. r. *Ἀσφάδ*, 1 Mace. 9:33), a "pool" (*λάκκος*, not *sea*, as the Vulg. and some other versions render, but which often stands in the Sept. for *r/B*, a *pit*, or *raB*] a *well*), i.e. fountain or cistern in the south or south-east of Palestine (in the " wilderness of Thecoe" or Tekoa), where the Jews under Jonathan Maccabaeus had an encampment at the beginning of their struggle with Bacchides (see Josephus. *Ant.* 13:1, 2); meaning doubtless (if the Dead [*Asphaltic*] Sea, as Grotius and others suppose) some considerable reservoirs in the direction of Arabia (comp. ver. 35), near the territory of the Nabathaeans (see Diod. Sic. 19:94).

### Asphar'asus

(*Ἀσφάρασος*; Vulg. *Mechpsator*), one of the associates of Zerubbabel in the return from Babylon (1 Esdr. 5:8); doubtless a corruption of the MIZPAR *SEE MIZPAR* (q.v.) of the true text (<sup>451B</sup>Ezra 2:2).

## Aspland, Robert,

an English Unitarian minister, born in 1742, educated for the Calvinistic ministry at Highgate and Hackney, and afterward at Aberdeen, where he threw up his beneficiary scholarship on becoming a Unitarian in 1800. At 20 he was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church at Newport, Isle of Wight, with liberty to preach Unitarianism. In 1805 he was installed at Gravel Pit Chapel, Hackney, where he remained pastor till his death, Dec. 30, 1845. For years he was a leader among English Unitarians, edited the "Monthly Repository" and the "Christian Reformer," and published a number of sermons and pamphlets. His *Life, Works, and Correspondence* were published by his son (Lond. 1850, 8vo).

## As'riel

(Heb. *Asriel'*, **אֲשֵׁרֵיֵל**; a fuller form of *Asareel*; Sept. **Ἐσρίηλ**), a son of Manasseh (<sup><067D></sup>Joshua 17:2), apparently his first by a Syrian concubine (<sup><1374></sup>1 Chronicles 7:14, where the name is improperly Anglicized "Ashriel"). B.C. post 1856. His descendants were called *Asrielites* (Heb. *Asrieli*, **אֲשֵׁרֵיֵלִי**; Sept. **Ἐσριηλί**, <sup><027B></sup>Numbers 27:31).

## As'rielite.

SEE ASRIEL.

## Ass

(properly **r/mj** } *chamor'*, from the reddish dun color of the hair of the wild ass; female **^/ta**; *athon'*; Gr. **ὄνος**),

(**L**) a domestic animal (<sup><0126></sup>Genesis 12:16; 24:35; 30:43; 32:5; <sup><06E2></sup>Joshua 6:21; 7:24; comp. <sup><0207></sup>Exodus 20:17; 22:4; 23:4 sq.; <sup><0086></sup>1 Samuel 8:16; <sup><0135></sup>Luke 13:15; 14:5), found generally in the East (comp. <sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 27:30; for Mosaic precepts respecting the animal, see <sup><0207></sup>Exodus 20:17; 21:33; 22:10; 23:4 sq.; <sup><021B></sup>Deuteronomy 22:3 sq.; comp. Mishna, *Baba Mtez.* 6:3; *Baba Bathra*, v, 2), and very serviceable (particularly in the cultivation of the soil, Varro, *R. R.* ii, 6; Pallad. 18:14), although not to be compared with the modern ass of northern countries, but by far more stately (Olear. *Trav.* p. 301, estimates a Persian ass to be worth nearly \$100; comp. Plin. 8:68; see Hasselquist, *Tray.* p. 67), more active, more mettlesome, and quicker (according to Niebuhr, *Reisen*, i, 311, an ass of

ordinary speed will go over 1750 double paces of a man in half an hour: comp. Abdallatif, *Denkw.* p. 1375; Sonini, ii, 89 sq.). Asses were therefore (as still) held in great estimation; so that while with us the word ass is a low term of contempt, with the Orientals anciently as now the very opposite was the case (<sup><0494></sup>Genesis 49:14; comp. *Iliad*, 11:588 sq.; see D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.* s.v. Hamar; Freytag, *Ad select. ex histor. Halebi*, p. 59; Gessner, in the *Commentar. Soc. Gott.* ii, 32 sq.; Jablonski, *Panth. DEg.* iii, 45; Michaelis, in the *Commentar. Soc. Gott.* 4:6 sq.). The ass (perhaps the young ass, <sup><0803></sup>Job 1:3; <sup><0221></sup>Numbers 22:21; <sup><1204></sup>2 Kings 4:24; <sup><0102></sup>Matthew 21:2 sq.) was, on account of his sure step over hilly tracts, the usual animal for riding (<sup><0103></sup>Exodus 4:20; <sup><0221></sup>Numbers 22:21; <sup><0704></sup>Judges 10:4; 12:14; <sup><1004></sup>1 Kings 2:40; 13:27; <sup><1005></sup>2 Samuel 19:26), even for ladies (<sup><0518></sup>Joshua 15:18; <sup><0014></sup>Judges 1:14; <sup><0253></sup>1 Samuel 25:23; <sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 4:22, 24; comp. Fabric. *Cod. Apogr.* i, 104; see Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 44; Schweiger, *Reisen*, p. 272; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iii, 222) and nobles (<sup><0723></sup>2 Samuel 17:23; <sup><1133></sup>1 Kings 13:13, 23; <sup><3009></sup>Zechariah 9:9; comp. <sup><0102></sup>Matthew 21:2 sq. [see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in loc. p. 408; Schottgen, i, 169 sq.]; <sup><1101></sup>Mark 11:1 sq.; <sup><0909></sup>Luke 19:29 sq.; <sup><0124></sup>John 12:14 sq.; see Russel, *Aleppo*, ii, 49; Pococke, *East*, i, 309). The last preferred *dappled* asses, i.e. such as had a brownish-red skin marked with white streaks (<sup><0650></sup>Judges 5:10; comp. Morier, *Trav.* p. 136; Paulus, *Samil. i*, 244). No saddle, however, was used from the earliest time (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 66), but simply a covering consisting of a piece of cloth or a cushion (hence **vWbj** ; **rmpj**) a bound or girt ass, means a beast saddled and bridled, <sup><0203></sup>Genesis 21:3; <sup><0221></sup>Numbers 22:21; <sup><0700></sup>Judges 19:10), so that the driver (<sup><0703></sup>Judges 19:3; <sup><1204></sup>2 Kings 4:24; Talm. **rMj i chammar'**, Mishna, *Erub.* 4:10, etc.) ran beside or behind the rider (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 66). The ass, moreover, was not only employed for bearing burdens (<sup><0635></sup>Nehemiah 13:15; <sup><0604></sup>Joshua 9:4; <sup><0161></sup>1 Samuel 16:20; 25:18), but even for distant journeys (<sup><0435></sup>Genesis 43:26; 44:3, 13; 45:23; comp. Josephus, *Life*, 24; Mishna. *Parah*, 12:9), and also for drawing the plough (<sup><0210></sup>Deuteronomy 22:10; comp. <sup><0232></sup>Exodus 23:12; <sup><2304></sup>Isaiah 30:24; 32:20; so, too, among the Romans, Plin. 8:68; 17:3; Varro, *R. R.* ii, 6; Colum. 7:1) and in mills (<sup><0805></sup>Matthew 18:6; <sup><0170></sup>Luke 17:2; "asinus molaris," Colum. 7:2; **pyyj yrh** **rwmj** , Buxtorf, *Floril. Hebr.* p. 308; comp. Brouckhus, *ad Tibull.* ii, 1, 8). In war they carried the baggage (<sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 7:7; comp. Polluc. *Onom.* i, 10); but, according to <sup><2207></sup>Isaiah 21:7, the Persian king Cyrus had cavalry mounted on asses; and not only Strabo (xv, 726) assures us that the

Caramanians, a people forming part of the Persian empire, rode on asses in a battle, but Herodotus (iv, 129) expressly states that Darius Hystaspis made use of the ass in a fight with the Scythians (comp. Allian, *Anim.* 12:32). See, generally, Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 148 sq.; ii, 214 sq.; Lengerke, *Kenaan*, i, 140 sq., 146, 165.-Winer, i, 346.

The *domestic* ass, being an animal of a patient, laborious, and stupid nature, the emblem of persons of a similar disposition. Issachar is called a *strong ass* (<sup><494></sup>Genesis 49:14), in reference to his descendants, as being a settled agricultural tribe, who cultivated their own territory with *patient labor*, emblemized by the ass. We rarely read of Issachar being engaged in any war, which is ever hostile to agriculture. Of Jehoiakim it is said, in <sup><429></sup>Jeremiah 22:19, "With the burial of an ass shall he be buried, dragged along, and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem;" an event mentioned by Josephus, who says that "the king of Babylon advanced with an army, that Jehoiakim admitted him readily into Jerusalem, and that Nebuchadnezzar, having entered the city, instantly put him to death, and cast his dead body unburied without the walls." It is recorded of Christ in <sup><389></sup>Zechariah 9:9, and quoted thence in <sup><426></sup>Matthew 21:5, that he should be "humble, and sitting on an ass, even on a colt the foal of an ass." As horses were used in war, Christ may be supposed, by this action, to have shown the humble and peaceable nature of his kingdom. On the contrary, Ephraim is compared to a *wild ass*, in <sup><389></sup>Hosea 8:9, i.e. he was untamed to the yoke, and traversed the desert as earnestly in the pursuit of idols as the *onager* in quest of his mates.

In the gospels is mentioned the , **μύλος ἰνικός** (<sup><486></sup>Matthew 18:6; <sup><404></sup>Mark 9:41), to express a large mill-stone, turned by asses, heavier than that turned by women or by slaves. See Jahn's *Archceol.* § 118, 189.

(II.) The ass is the *Equus Asinus* of Linnaeus; I y some formed into a sub-genus, containing that group of the Equidae which are not striped like zebras, and have forms and characters distinguishable from true horses, such as a peculiar shape of body and limbs, long ears, an upright mane, a tail only tufted at the end, a streak along the spine, often crossed with another on the shoulders, a braying voice, etc. To designate these animals the Hebrews used various terms, by which, no doubt, though not with the strict precision of science, different species and distinct races of the group, as well as qualities of sex and age, were indicated; but the contexts in general afford only slight assistance in discriminating them; and reliance on

cognate languages is often unavailing, since we find that similar words frequently point to secondary and not to identical acceptations. The name is assigned by the 'Auth. Vers. to several distinct Heb. words, viz.  $\text{~}^{\prime}/\text{ta}$ ;  $\text{r}/\text{mj}$  }  $\text{ry}[\text{i} \text{d}/\text{r}[\text{;}$  and  $\text{arP}$ , and the Greek words. It occurs also in two passages of Eccclus. 13:19; 33:24, in the first of which it stands for *ovaypog*. *SEE HE-ASS*; *SEE SHE-ASS*; *SEE FOAL*.

## Picture for Ass 1

**1.** The ordinary term  $\text{r}/\text{mj}$  } (*chamor'*,  $\delta\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ) we take to be the name of the common working ass of Western Asia, an animal of small stature, frequently represented on Egyptian monuments with panniers on the back, usually of a reddish color (the Arabic *hamar* and *chanara* denoting red), and the same as the Turkish *hymar*. It appears to be a domesticated race of the wild ass of Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Southern Persia, where it is denominated *gour*. In Scripture this wild original variety is distinguished by the name  $\text{d}/\text{r}[\text{;}$  (*arod'*,  $\text{~}^{\prime}\text{Job 39:5}$ ; Chald.  $\text{dr}\{\}$  } *arad'*,  $\text{~}^{\prime}\text{Daniel 5:21}$ ; both rendered "wild ass"), a term most likely derived from the braying voice of the animal. In its natural state it never seeks woody, but upland pasture, mountainous and rocky retreats; and it is habituated to stand on the brink of precipices (a practice not entirely obliterated in our own domestic races), whence, with protruded ears, it surveys the scene below, blowing and at length braying in extreme excitement. This habit is beautifully depicted by Jeremiah ( $\text{~}^{\prime}\text{Jeremiah 17:6; 48:6}$ ). Varieties of this species are designated by the following terms:  $\text{ry}[\text{i}$  (*ayir*) is translated in the 'Auth. Vers. young ass," "colt," "foal ;" but this rendering does not appear on all occasions to be correct, the word being sometimes used for animals that carry loads and till the ground, which seems to afford evidence of at least full growth ( $\text{~}^{\prime}\text{Isaiah 30:6, 24}$ ).  $\text{~}^{\prime}/\text{ta}$ ; (*athon'*, usually "ass" simply) is sometimes unsatisfactorily rendered "she-ass," unless we suppose it to refer to a breed of greater beauty and importance than the common, namely, the silver-gray of Africa, which, being large and indocile, the females were anciently selected in preference for riding, and on that account formed a valuable kind of property. From early ages a white breed of this race was reared at Zobeir, the ancient Dassora and capital of the Orcheni, from which place civil dignitaries still obtain their white asses and white mules. It is now the fashion, as it was during the Parthian empire, and probably in the time of the judges, to dapple this breed with spots of orange or crimson, or of both colors together; and this is probably the

meaning of the word רַגְלָאֵי (checked?), rendered "white" in ~~Q150~~Judges 5:10; an interpretation which is confirmed by the Babylonian Sanhedrim, who, in answer to King Sapor's offer of a horse to convey the Jewish Messiah, say, "Thou hast not a hundred-spotted horse, such as his (the Messiah's) ass." Horses and asses thus painted occur frequently in Oriental illuminated MSS., and although the taste may be puerile, we conceive that it is the record of remote conquest achieved by a nation of Central Asia, mounted on spotted or clouded horses, and revived by the Parthians, who were similarly equipped (see *Introd. to the Hist. of the Horse*, in the *Naturalist's Library*, vol. xii).. No other primeval invasion from the East by horsemen on such animals than that of the so-called Centaurs is recorded; their era coincides nearly with that of the judges (see Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, at ~~Q150~~Judges 5:10).

## Picture for Ass 2

Asses have always been in extensive use in the East (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 407); and they were employed by Joseph's brethren to carry grain from Egypt -a journey to which they are competent, notwithstanding the intervening deserts (Hackett's *Illustra. of Script.* p. 29). They were abundant in Ancient Egypt (as donkeys still are, Lane's *Mod. Eg.* i, 209), where they were employed in treading out grain, and for other purposes (Wilkinson's *Anc. Eg.* i, 231). They are not represented on the Assyrian monuments (Layard's *Nineveh*, ii, 323), although the *onager* or wild ass is still celebrated in that region for its swiftness (*ib.* i, 265).

## Picture for Ass 3

2. *arp*, *pe're*, rendered likewise "wild ass," is a derivative of the same root which in Hebrew has produced *paras*, horse, and *parasim*, horsemen, Persians and Parthians. Though evidently a generical term, the Scripture uses it in a specific sense, and seems to intend by it the horse-ass or wild mule, which the Greeks denominated *hemionos*, and the moderns *jiggetai*; though we think there still remains some commixture in the descriptions of the species-and those of the *koulan*, or wild ass of Northern Asia. Both are nearly of the same stature, and not unlike in the general distribution of colors and markings, but the *hemionos* is distinguished from the other by its neighing voice and the deficiency of two teeth in the jaws. The species is first noticed by Aristotle, who mentions nine of these animals as being brought to Phrygia by Pharnaces the satrap, of which three were livinT in

the time of his son Pharnabazus. This was while the *onager* still roamed wild in Cappadocia and Syria, and proves that it had until then been considered the same species, or that from its rarity it had escaped discrimination, but no doubt remains that it was the *gourkhur*, or horse-ass, which is implied by the name *hemionos*. The allusion of Jeremiah, in speaking of the *pere* (xiv, 6), most forcibly depicts the scarcity of food when this species, inured to the desert and to want of water, are made the prominent example of suffering. **SEE MULE**. They were most likely used in traces to draw chariots. The animals so noticed in ~~2207~~ Isaiah 21:7, and by Herodotus, are the same which Pliny, Strabo, and Arnobius make the Caramanians and Scythians employ in the same way. We claim the *pere*, and not the *arod*, to be this species, because the *hemionos*, or at least the *gourkhur*, does not bray, as before noticed; and because, notwithstanding its fierceness and velocity, it is actually used at present as a domestic animal at Luckrow, where it was observed by Duvaucel. The *hemionos* is little inferior to the wild horse; in shape it resembles a mule, in gracefulness a horse, and in color it is silvery, with broad spaces of flaxen or bright bay on the thigh, flank, shoulder, neck, and head; the ears are wide like the zebra's, and the neck is clothed with a vertical dark mane prolonged in a stripe to the tuft of the tail. The company of this animal is liked by horses, and, when domesticated, it is gentle. It is now found wild from the deserts of the Oxus and Jaxartes to China and Central India. In Cutch it is never known to drink, and in whole districts which it frequents water is not to be found; and though the natives talk of the fine flavor of the flesh, and the *gour* in Persia is the food of heroes, to a European its smell is abominable. **SEE WILD ASS**.

### Ass's Head.

1. By the law of Moses the ass was declared unclean, and therefore was not used as food, excepting, as it would appear, in cases of extreme famine. This inference, however, is drawn from a case where the term "ass's head" may be explained to mean not literally the head of an ass, but a certain measure or weight so called, as in ~~1011~~ 1 Samuel 16:20, where it is said that Jesse sent to Saul "an ass of bread;" for, in our version, "laden with" is an addition to the text. Although, therefore, the famine in Samaria may possibly have compelled the people to eat asses, and a head may have been very dear, still the expression may denote the measure or weight which bore the same name. The prohibition, however, had more probably an economical than a religious purpose; hunting was thus discouraged, and

no horses being used, it was of importance to augment the number and improve the qualities of the ass. This example of the use of asses' flesh (an "ass's head") in extreme famine (sometimes the flesh was regarded as a delicacy, Apul. *Metanm.* 7:p. 158, Bip. ed.; comp. Galen, *Facult. alim.* i, 2, p. 486, ed. Kuhn; Plin. 8:68) occurs in <sup><1165></sup>2 Kings 6:25 (comp. Plutarch, *Vit. Artax.* 24; Barhebr. *Chronicles* p. 149, 488), although it was unclean (Philo, *Opp.* ii, 400; comp. <sup><1133></sup>Exodus 13:13; 34:20), and the ass could not be offered in sacrifice (Porphyr. *Abstin.* ii, 25; but it was otherwise among the Persians, Strabo, 15:727; even in magic its flesh was used, Ammian. Marc. 30:5, p. 228, Bip. ed.). **SEE FOOD.**

2. As this animal was most serviceable to man, its name was held in respect rather than contempt. The slander, therefore, current among the Romans, and directed against the Jews, that they adored the head of an ass in secret, may not have originated in direct malice or misinterpretation, but have arisen out of some Gnostic fancies, in which the Alexandrian Jews, who had nearly forsaken the Scriptures in search of the magical delusions of the Cabala, and new semi-Christians in that city so deeply indulged during the first centuries of our era. Hence the Ophite sect figured in the circles of Behemoth, the last genius or Eon (?), under the name of Onoel, shaped like an ass; and there exists an engraved abraxas, or talisman, of Gentile or Gnostic origin, bearing the whole length form of a man in flowing robes with an ass's head, and holding an open book with the inscription "Deus Christianorum menenychites." It is not likely that mere malice would engrave its spite upon amulets, although, if Jablonski be correct, the ass was held in contempt in Egypt, and, therefore, in Alexandria; but among the Arabs and Jews we have "the voice of one crying in the wilderness," a solemn allusion derived from the wild ass, almost the only voice in the desert; and in the distinguishing epithet of Mirvan II, last Ommiad caliph, who was called Hymar al-Gezerah, or wild ass of Mesopotamia-proofs that no idea of contempt was associated with the prophet's metaphor, and that, L;y such a designation, no insult was intended to the person or dignity of the prince. In more remote ages Tartak or Tarhak was an ass-god of the Avim, and Yauk was the Arabian name of another equine divinity, or a different name for the same Tartak, whose form may possibly be preserved to the present day in the image of the Borak, or mystical camel, which, according to the Koran, bore Mohammed, and is now carried in processions at the Nurus. It is shaped like a horse, having a white body with red legs, a peacock's tail, and a woman's instead of an ass's head. Yet



this attributing of the worship of the ass (ass's head) to the Jews (Plut. *Sympos.* 4:5; Tacit. *Hist.* v, 4; Diod. Sic. *Exc.* ii, 225; comp. Josephus, *Apion*, ii, 7) was a highly odious misconstruction (see Bernhold, in the *Erlang. Anzeig.* 1744, No. 52). The historical foundation of this tradition cannot be traced to the well-known legend of a fountain of water discovered in the desert by an ass (Tacit. *ut supra*), for the arguments adduced by Creuzer (*Comment. Herod.* i, 270 sq.) lead to no clear result (see Fuller, *Miscell.* iii, 8, p. 332 sq.), and the etymological reference by Hase (*De lapidefundamenti*, in Ugolini *Thesaur.* viii) to the idol Ashimam (q.v.) is as little satisfactory (see Muller, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, 4:909 sq.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 199 sq.; comp. Minuc. Fel. 9:4; and the Talmud, *Shabb.* v, 1). See generally, on this subject of onolatry, the treatises of Polemann (Brem. 1706); Morinus (in his *Dissert.* p. 285-336); Haseus and Ottius (Erf. 1716); Del Monaco (Neap. 1715); Bernhard (in the *Erl. Gel. Anzeig.* 1744, No. 52); Linder (*Exc. ad Minuc. Fel.* 9:4); Grape (Lips. 1696); Haseus (in the *Bibl. Brem.* iii, 1036 sq.); Heine (in his *Dissert.* ii, 1. c. 10); Schulze (in his *Dissert.* i); Schumacher (*De cultu animalium*, p. 60-90); Munter (*D. Christen im heidn. Hause*, p. 118 sq.). **SEE ONOLATRY.**

### Ass Of Balaam.

Here we shall only inquire whether it were a reality or an allegory; an imagination, or a vision of Balaam. Augustine, with the greater number of commentators, supposes it was a certain fact, and takes it literally (*Qucest. in Genesis* 48, 50). He discovers nothing in the whole relation more surprising than the stupidity of Balaam, who heard his ass speak to him, and who replied to it, as to a reasonable person; and adds, as his opinion, that God did not give the ass a reasonable soul, but permitted it to pronounce certain words, to reprove the prophet's covetousness. Gregory of Nyssa (in *Vita Mosis*) seems to think that the ass did not utter words; but that, having brayed as usual, or a little more than usual, the diviner, practised in drawing presages from the voices of beasts and of birds, easily comprehended the meaning of the ass; and that Moses, designing to ridicule this superstitious art of augury, relates the matter as if the ass really spoke articulately. (But see <sup>6026</sup>2 Peter 2:16.) Maimonides asserts the whole dialogue to be but a kind of fiction and allegory, whereby Moses relates what passed only in Balaam's imagination as real history. Philo, in his life of Moses, suppresses it entirely. So most Jewish authors (not Joseph. *Ant.* 4:6, 3) consider it, not as a circumstance which actually took place, but as a vision, or some similar occurrence. Le Clerc solves the

difficulty by saying Balaam believed in the transmigration of souls, passing from one body into another, from a man into a beast, reciprocally.; and, therefore, he was not surprised at the ass's complaint, but conversed with it as if it were rational.. Others have imagined different ways of solving the difficulties of this history. In considering this question, Mr. Taylor (in Calmet, *Diet.*) assumes as facts,

(1.) That Balaam was accustomed to augury and presages.

(2.) That on this occasion he would notice every event capable of such interpretation, as presages were supposed to indicate.

(3.) That he was deeply intent on the issue of his journey.

(4.) That the whole of his conduct toward Balak was calculated to represent himself as an extraordinary personage.

(5.) That the behavior of the ass did actually PREFIGURE the conduct of Balaam in the three particulars of it which are recorded. *First*, the ass turned aside, and went into the field, for which she was smitten, punished; reproved; so Balaam, on the first of his perverse attempts to curse Israel, was, as it were, smitten, reproved, punished, [1.] by God, [2.], by Balak. The *second* time the ass was more harshly treated for hurting Balaam's foot against the wall; so Balaam, for his second attempt, was, no doubt, still farther mortified. *Thirdly*, the ass, seeing inevitable danger, fell down and was smitten severely; in like manner, Balaam, the third time, was overruled by God to speak truth, to his own disgrace, and escaped, not without hazard of his life, from the anger of, Balak. Nevertheless, as Balaam had no sword in his hand, though he wished for one, with which to slay his ass, so Balak, notwithstanding his fury, and his seeming inclination, had no power to destroy Balaam. In short, as the ass was opposed by the angel, but was driven forward by Balaam, so Balaam was opposed by God, but was driven forward by Balak, against his better knowledge. Were we sure that Balaam wrote this narrative, and that Moses copied it, as the rabbins affirm, this view of the subject would remove the difficulties which have been raised against it. It might then be entitled "a specimen of Balaam's augury." **SEE BALAAM.**

## Assabi'as

(Ἀσαβίας v. r. Σαβίας), one of the "captains over thousands" who presented victims for the Passover under Josiah (1 Esdr. 1:9); evidently the HASHABIAH *SEE HASHABIAH* (q.v.) of <sup><4830></sup>2 Chronicles 35:9.

## Assal'imoth

(Ἀσσαλιμώθ v. r. Σαλιμώθ), son of Josaphias of the "sons" of Bania, who returned with 160 retainers from their exile (1 Esdr. 8:36); evidently the SHELOMITH *SEE SHELOMITH* (q.v.) of the genuine text (<sup><4830></sup>Ezra 8:10).

## Assam,

a British province of Farther India, having an area estimated at 18,200 square miles, and a population of 602,500 souls. It was an independent state until 1822, when it was incorporated with Burmah. In 1826 it was ceded to the English. The prevailing religion is Brahminism, which in this province has superseded Buddhism. Among the tribes which inhabit the country, the Assamese, the Khamtis, the Singphos, and the Nagas are the most important. The first mission in Assam was established by the American Baptist Union in 1837, on the invitation of Captain Jenkins, commissioner general of India for Assam. It was at first intended to embrace all the four principal tribes in the missionary operations, but insurrectionary movements in 1839 and 1842 induced them to restrict their labors to the Assamese. In 1844 the missionaries established an orphan institution at Nowgong, which numbered for several years from 50 to 75 members. In 1849 the translation of the New Testament in Assamese was completed, and printed at Sibsagar, in Assam, in 1849. There were in Assam, in 1859, 7 American and 3 native missionaries, 3 churches, 50 church-members, 1 boarding-school with 45 pupils.-Newcomb, *Cyclopaedia of Missions*; (*Boston*) *Missionary Magazine*, 1859, p. 276. *SEE INDIA*.

## Assani'as

(Ἀσσαμίας v. r. Σαμίας, *Vuig. Assannas*), one of the twelve priests selected by Ezra to transport the sacred vessels to Jerusalem (1 Esdr. 8:54); a corruption for HASHABIAH *SEE HASHABIAH* (q.v.) of the original text (Ezra, 8:24).

## Assarius.

SEE FARTHING.

## Assassins,

a secret military and religious order in Syria and Persia, a branch of the "Ismaelites" (q.v.) or "Shiites." They were suppressed in the 11th and 12th centuries, but their principles to some extent survive in the *Ansarians* (q.v.). The secret doctrines of the Ismaelites, who had their head-quarters in Cairo, declared the descendants of *Ismael*, the last of the seven so-called imaums, to be alone entitled to the caliphate; and gave an allegorical interpretation to the precepts of Islam, which led, as their adversaries asserted, to considering all positive religions equally right, and all actions morally indifferent. The atrocious career of the Assassins was but a natural sequence of such teaching. The founder of these last, Hassen ben-Sabbath el-Homairi, of Persian descent, about the middle of the 11th century, studied at Nishpur, under the celebrated Mowasek, and had subsequently obtained from Ismaelite *dais*, or religious leaders, a partial insight into their secret doctrines, and a partial consecration to the rank of dai. But, on betaking himself to the central lodge at Cairo, he quarreled with the sect, and was doomed to banishment. He succeeded, however, in making his escape from the ship, and reaching the Syrian coast, after which he returned to Persia, everywhere collecting adherents, with the view of founding, upon the Ismaelite model, a secret order of his own, a species of organized society which should be a terror to his most powerful neighbors. The internal constitution of the order, which had some resemblance to the orders of Christian knighthood, was as follows: First, as supreme and absolute ruler, came the Sheikh-al-jebal, the Prince or Old Man of the Mountain. His vicegerents in Jebal, Kuhistan, and Syria were the three *Dai-al kebir*, or grand priors of the order. Next came the dias and refiks, which last were not, however, initiated, like the former, into every stage of the secret doctrines, and had no authority as teachers. To the uninitiated belonged, first of all, the fedavis or fedais-i.e. the devoted; a band of resolute youths, the ever-ready and blindly obedient executioners of the Old Man of the Mountain. Before he assigned to them their bloody tasks, he used to have them thrown into a state of ecstasy by the intoxicating influence of the *hashish* (the hemp-plant), which circumstance led to the order being called Hashishim, or hemp-eaters. The word was changed by Europeans into *Assassins*, and transplanted into the languages of the West

with the signification of murderers. The Lasiks, or novices, formed the sixth division of the order, and the laborers and mechanics the seventh. Upon these the most rigid observance of the Koran was enjoined; while the initiated, on the contrary, looked upon all positive religion as null. The catechism of the order, placed by Hassan in the hands of his dais, consisted of seven parts, of which the second treated, among other things, of the art of worming themselves into the confidence of men. It is easy to conceive the terror' which so unscrupulous a sect must have inspired. Several princes secretly paid tribute to the Old Man of the Mountain. Hassan, who died at the age of 70 (1125 A.D.), appointed as his successor Kia-Busurgomid, one of his grand priors. Kia-Busurg-Omid was succeeded in 1138 by his son Mohammed, who knew how to maintain his power against Nureddin and Jussuf-Salaheddin. In 1163, Hassan II was rash enough to extend the secret privilege of the initiated-exemption, namely, from the positive precepts of religion to the people generally, and to abolish Islam in the Assassin state, which led to his falling a victim to his brother-in-law's dagger. Under the rule of his son, Mohammed II, who acted in his father's spirit, the Syrian Dai-al-kebir, Sinan, became independent, and entered into negotiations with the Christian king of Jerusalem for coming over, on certain conditions, to the Christian faith; but the Templars killed his envoys and rejected his overtures, that they might not lose the yearly tribute which they drew from him. Mohammed was poisoned by his son, Hassan III, who reinstated Islamism, and thence obtained the surname of the New Moslem. Hassan was succeeded by Mohammed III, a boy of nine years old, who, by his effeminate rule, led to the overthrow of the order, and was eventually murdered by command of his son, token-eddin, the seventh and last Old Man of the Mountain. In 1256, the Mongolian prince, Hulagu, burst with his hordes upon the hill-forts of Persia held by the Assassins, which amounted to about a hundred, capturing and destroying them. The Syrian branch was also put down about the end of the 13th century, but remnants of the sect still lingered for some time longer in Kuhistan. In 1352 the Assassins reappeared in Syria, and, indeed, they are still reported to exist as a heretical sect both there and in Persia. The Persian Ismaelites have an imaum, or superintendent, in the district of Kum, and still inhabit the neighborhood of Alamut under the name of Hosseinis. The Syrian Ismaelites live in the district of Massiat or Massyad. Their castle was taken in 1809 by the Nossaries, but restored.-Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, . v. Withof, *Das Rich der Assassinen* (Cleve, 1765); Hammer, *Geschichte der Assassinen* (Stuttg. and Tub. 1818).

## Assdmani,

the family name of three of the most eminent Orientalists of the eighteenth century. They were Maronites (q.v.), born in Mt. Lebanon, Syria.

**I.** JOSEPH SIMON, came to Rome toward the beginning of the eighteenth century, was made archbishop *in partibus* of Tyre, and librarian of the Vatican, by Clement XI. He was sent by that pontiff on a literary mission to Egypt and Syria in the years 1715-1716, and he brought back to Rome 150 valuable MSS. On a second visit to the East (1735-1738) he obtained many more MSS., with 2000 ancient coins, medals, etc. Assemani was a man of immense erudition and industry. His most important publications were:

1. *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino Vaticana* (Rome, 1719-1728, 4 vols. fol.), a biographical account of the Syrian writers, divided into three classes, i.e. Orthodox, Jacobites, and Nestorians, with copious extracts in the Syriac text, and a Latin version, lists of their works, and comments on the same. He intended to proceed with the Arabian, Copt, and other Eastern writers, but nothing appeared in print beyond the Syriac. The fourth volume of the *Bibliotheca* is engrossed by a learned dissertation on the Syrian Nestorians.
2. *St. Ephraem Syri Opera omnia quae extant* (Rome, 1732-1746, 6 vols. fol.). This edition of the works of St. Ephraim, one of the old Syrian fathers, containing the Syriac text and a Latin translation, was begun by Ambarach, another learned Maronite, living at Rome, and better known as Father Benedetti, being a member of the society of the Jesuits, and after his death was completed by Assemani. This work is much esteemed, and the Latin is better than that of the other works of Assemani, who was more skilled in the Oriental than in the Latin language.
3. *Kalendaria Ecclesiae univ[er]sae, in quibus Sanctorum nomina, imagines, festi dies, Ecclesiarum Orientis ac Occidentis, praemissis unius cujusque Ecclesiae originibus, recensentur, describuntur, et notis illustrantur* (Rome, 1755-1757, 6 vols. 4to)
4. *Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis Canonici et Civilis* (Rome, 1762-1764, 4 vols. 4to). Besides these, he published *Rudimenta Linguae Arabicce* (Rome, 1732, 4to) and other works. Many of his writings were burned in a fire at the Vatican in 1768. He died at Rome Jan. 13, 1768, at the age of

eighty. He left MSS., several historical dissertations, and other fragments, on the Christian population of the ancient patriarchate of Antioch, on the nation of the Copts, on the Nestorians, and other Eastern sects, etc., which have been published by Mal It is said that there are still at Rome MSS. in his hand. writing enough to fill 100 volumes.

**II.** JOSEPH ALOYSTUS, nephew of the preceding, professor of Oriental languages at Rome, where he died, Feb. 9, 1782. His most. important work is the *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesice Universe* (Rome, 1749-1766, 13 vols. 4to). This vast work was intended to include all Oriental and Western liturgies, but was never completed. Still it is of great value. He also wrote *Commentarius hist.-theologicus de Catholicis sen Patriarch s Chaldceorum et Nestorianorum* (Romse, 1775, 4to):-*Dissertatio de Sacris Ritibus* (Rome, 1757, 4to):-*Comment. de ecclesiis, earum ciever(ntia et asylo* (1766, fol.).

**III.** STEPHEN EVODIS, another nephew of Joseph Assemani, was Lorn at Tripoli in Syria about 1707. He studied at Rome, and returned to Syria as a missionary of the Propaganda. He was present at the Synod of Lebanon, 1736, at which his uncle acted as legate. Subsequently-he spent some months in England, where he was elected a member of the Royal Society. Having established himself at Rome, he was employed as assistant to his uncle, at the Vatican, and on his uncle's death succeeded him as upper keeper of the library. He also became titular Bishop of Apamea. He died Nov. 24, 1782. His literary reputation is not very high. The only works of any consequence which he published are the following: *Bibliothecce Mediceo-Laurentiance et Palatine Codicum.*MSS. *Orientalium Catalogus* (Flor. 1742, fol.), with notes by Gori :-*Acts Sanctorum Martyrum Orientalium et Occidentalium* (Rome, 1748, 2 vols. fol.). To this work, which he compiles from manuscripts in the Vatican, he added the *Acts of St. Simon*, called " Stylite" in Chaldaic and Latin. He also began a general catalogue of the Vatican manuscripts, divided into three classes, Oriental, Greek and Latin, Italian and other modern languages, of which, however, he published only the first volume, in 1756, the fire in the Vatican having destroyed his papers. Mai has continued parts of this catalogue in his *Scriptorum Veterum nova collectio.*-*Herzog*, i, 560.

## Assembly

(in Heb. **עֲדָתָא**, *moed'*, etc.; in Gr. **ἐκκλησία**), a term used in the New Testament to denote a convocation or congregation of persons legally called out or summoned. **SEE CONGREGATION.**

(1.) In the usual or secular sense (<sup><4199></sup>Acts 19:39). Asia Minor, in the time of the apostles, was divided into several districts, each of which had its own legal assembly. **SEE ASIARCH.** Some of these are referred to by Cicero, and others by Pliny, particularly the one at Ephesus. The regular periods of such assemblies, it appears, were three or four times a month; although they were convoked extraordinarily for the dispatch of any urgent business. **SEE ASIA (MINOR).**

(2.) In the Jewish sense, the word implies a religious meeting, as in a synagogue (<sup><4187></sup>Matthew 18:17); and in the Christian sense, a congregation of believers (<sup><4118></sup>1 Corinthians 11:18); hence a church, the Christian Church, and is used of any particular church, as that at Jerusalem (<sup><4101></sup>Acts 8:1) and Antioch (<sup><4113></sup>Acts 11:26). **SEE SYNAGOGUE; SEE CHURCH.**

MASTERS OF ASSEMBLIES (**ת/פסא׳ל ע׳ב׳** *baaley' asuphoth'*, *lords of the gdttherings*; Sept. **οἱ παρὰ τῶν συναγμάτων**, Vulg. *per magistrorum consilium*), is a phrase occurring in <sup><2121></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:11, and supposed to refer to the master-spirits or associates of the meetings of the wise and curious (**μυμκ׳** } of the parallel clause), held in Eastern countries, and where sages and philosophers uttered their weighty sayings. **SEE MASTER.** The preacher endeavored to clothe the infinitely wise and perfect doctrines which he taught in proper language. They were the words of truth, and were designed to prove quickening to the sluggish soul as goads are to the dull ox (<sup><4127></sup>Acts 2:37). They were received from the one great shepherd or teacher, and came with great power as the sayings of the most wise and eloquent of their learned assemblies; and they would take hold of the hearts and consciences of men, holding them to the obedience of the truth, as nails driven through a sound board firmly bind and fasten it where we will (see Stuart, *Comment.* in loc.). Hengstenberg, however (*Comment.* in loc.), fancifully understands the *participators in the sacred collection* (or apothegms of Scripture) to be meant. **SEE ECCLESIASTES.**



## Assembly, General, In Scotland, Ireland, And The United States,

denotes the highest court of the Presbyterian Church. It differs from the Anglican Convocation at once in its constitution and in its powers, representing as it does both the lay and the clerical elements in the Church, and possessing supreme legislative and judicial authority in all matters purely ecclesiastical. The General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland consists of representatives, clerical and lay, from all the presbyteries of the Church. The royal burghs of Scotland also return elders to the General Assembly of the Established Church, and each of the Scottish universities sends a representative. The Assembly meets once a year in the middle of May, at Edinburgh, and sits for ten days. Its deliberations are presided over by a moderator, whose election is the first step in the proceedings, after a sermon by his predecessor. In former times this office was sometimes filled by laymen: among others, in 1567, by George Buchanan. In modern times the moderator is always a clergyman. 84 presbyteries, composing 16 synods, return members to the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland. Its relation to the state is represented by a royal commissioner, who exercises no function in the Assembly beyond that of adding by his presence the sanction of the civil authority to its proceedings. The other functionaries are a principal and a deputy clerk, both clergymen, a procurator, and an agent. All business not dispatched during the session of the Assembly is referred to a commission, with the moderator as convener, which meets immediately after the dissolution of the Assembly, and again quarterly. The General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, which has 16 synods, comprising 71 presbyteries, and of the Irish Presbyterian Church, are similarly constituted, the principal point of difference being the absence of the royal commissioner. *SEE PRESBYTERY; SEE SYNOD; SEE FREE CHURCH.* For the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, *SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.*

### Assembly Of Divines.

*SEE WESTMINSTER.*

## Asser,

or more correctly Ashe, the principal author of the Babylonian Talmud. He was born at Babylon A.D. 353 (A.M. 4113). His Jewish biographers relate that he was appointed head of the college of Sori, in Babylon, at the age of fourteen! He held this post till his death in 426. Rabbi' Abraham benDior asserts, in his *Kabbalah*, p. 68, that since the days of Rabbi Jehuda-Hannasi, or Rabbenu-Hakkadosh, in no one but Ashe had been combined at once knowledge of the law, piety, humility, and magnificence. His fame attracted to his lectures many thousands of students. The expositions of the Mishna which he delivered in his lectures were collected, and form the basis of the Babylonian Talmud. The continuation was the work of his disciples and followers: it was completed seventy-three years after the death of Ashe by R. Jose, president of the college of Pumbedita in Balylon. (Compare the *Tsema h David*, first part, in the years 4127 and 4187; *Sepher Juchtsion*, fol. 117; *Hal'choth Olam*, p. 18; *Wolfii Bibliotheca Illebra*, i, 224.) **SEE TALMUD.**

## Asser,

a learned monk of St. David's, whence (the name of that place in Latin being written Menapia or Menevia) he obtained the appellation of ASSERIUS MENEVENSIS. Asser was invited to the court of Alfred the Great, as is generally believed, in or about the year 880, but probably earlier, merely from the reputation of his learning. His name is preserved by his *Annales Rerum Gestarum -Efredi Magni.-Cave, Hist. Lit. anno 890; Eng. Cyclop. SEE ALFRED.*

## Asses, Feast Of.

**SEE FEAST OF ASSES.**

## Assessment

(aCmior taEjñi also skm, and µySm) among the Israelites was of two kinds:

**(a) ECCLESIASTICAL.**-According to <sup><0203></sup>Exodus 30:13, each Israelite (over twenty years old) was obliged to contribute yearly a silver half-shekel (a didrachm, about 35 cents) to the Temple (<sup><4206></sup>2 Chronicles 24:6). This tax existed still in full force after the Babylonian exile (<sup><0172></sup>Matthew 17:24; comp. Philo, *Opp.* iii, 224; Josephus, *War*, 7:6, 6), and all Jews residing in

Palestine were under the obligation of paying it (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 9, 1). See generally the Mishna (*Shekalim*, ii, 4), according to which this payment became due between the 15th and 25th of Adar (in March or April). **SEE TEMPLE.** After the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem, the Jews were obliged by a decree of the Emperor Vespasian to pay this sum yearly for the maintenance of the Capitoline at Rome (Joseph. *War*, 7:6, 6; Dio Cass. lxvi, 7, p. 1082). An increase of the temple-tax, which the pressure of circumstances appears to have compelled, is mentioned in <sup><1602></sup>Nehemiah 10:32 (see Rambach, in loc.). Besides this, there were for the support of the Temple certain definite assessments (<sup><1274></sup>2 Kings 12:4), such as the tithes, first-fruits, and first-born offerings (see each of these in alphabetical order). Yet, on account of the great fertility of the soil and the original proprietorship of each Israelite over it, these sacred laws were certainly not onerous, however much they may resemble direct imposts upon the citizens of modern states.

**(b) CIVIL.**-Of these no trace appears prior to the introduction of royalty. But the kings not only required liege duties (<sup><982></sup>1 Samuel 8:12, 16), but also tribute in kind (<sup><985></sup>1 Samuel 8:15), from which exemption was allowed only in certain cases (<sup><975></sup>1 Samuel 17:25), and likewise personal service (<sup><100></sup>Amos 7:1), as well as a capitation-tax in extraordinary emergencies (<sup><250></sup>2 Kings 15:20; 23:35). They also received voluntary presents from their subjects and chief vassals (<sup><907></sup>1 Samuel 10:27; 16:20; <sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 10:25; <sup><1024></sup>2 Chronicles 9:24; 17:5), as is still customary in the East. **SEE KING; SEE GIFT.** Crown-lands (or royal private property?) seem also to be alluded to (<sup><1027></sup>1 Kings 4:27 sq.; <sup><1726></sup>1 Chronicles 27:26 sq.; 26:10 sq.), as well as tolls on goods in transit (<sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 10:15), and even regal privileges and monopolies of a commercial character (<sup><1108></sup>1 Kings 10:28; comp. 9:26 sq.; 22:49). During the exile and later, the Jews of Palestine paid taxes of various kinds to their foreign masters, and so the remnant of the Jews under the Chaldaean regents (see Josephus, *Ant.* 10:9, 1 and 3). As *Persian* taxes levied upon the new Jewish colonies are mentioned (<sup><1543></sup>Ezra 4:13, 20; 7:24), **hDmī** tribute, **/I B]** excise, and **Ēl h}** toll (Sept. and Joseph. *Ant.* 11:2, 1, in general φόροι, duties; as the Auth. Vers. "tribute" for the first two, "custom" for the last). The distinction between these terms, it is true, is not at all clear; the foregoing renderings follow the etymology; the last term (**Ēl h}** *halak'*) signifying *way-money* (from **Ēl h;** to go), the second (**/I B]** *belo'*), *consumption-tax* (from **hI B;** to consume); the first (**hDmī** *middah'*), the direct (ground or income) tax

(*apportionment*, from *hdm*; to *measure* out), which individuals had to pay (comp. Lat. *demensum*), as Grotius and Cocceius have supposed (see Gesenius, *Heb. Lex.* s. vv. severally). Aben-Ezra's interpretation of this last by *cattle-tax* has no good foundation. The governors increased the severe taxation of the people (<sup><1497></sup>Nehemiah 9:37) by many additional assumptions of extortion (Nehemiah v, 15). We find mention (<sup><1498></sup>Ezra 6:8; 7:20 sq.) of royal exchequers., The priests and Levites were (under Artaxerxes ?) exempt from taxes (<sup><14724></sup>Ezra 7:24). In the Ptolemaic period of the Egyptian rule over Palestine instances occur of the farming or leasing out of the collection of the public revenues (tolls ?) to the highest bidder (Joseph. *Ant.* 12:4, 1, 4 and 5). The yearly rent of all such dues in Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine amounted under/ Ptolemy Evergetes to 16 talents of silver; and we may easily imagine what vexation it occasioned when the taxes reached so enormous a sum (Joseph. *Ant.* 12:4, 5). Imposts by the Syrian rulers of Palestine are also named (1 Macc. 10:29; 11:35; 13:39). They consisted in the levy of duties (φόροι) upon salt (τιμὴ ἀλός); the royal tribute,(στέφανοι, *crown dues*, comp. the Lat. "aurum coronarium," see Adams's *Rom. Ant.* i, 295; in a rescript of Antiochus the Great [Joseph. *Ant.* 12:3, 3] this assessment is called technically στεφανίτης φόρος. At first the Jews were obliged to bring a gold "crown-piece" as the [expected] "gift," but afterward it might be rendered in any coin; such a regal due is indicated in 2 Macc. 4:9); the third of the seed (τρίτον τῆς σποράς), and the half of the produce of the trees (ἡμισυ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξυλίνου), these latter being payments in kind common to most nations of antiquity (comp. Pausan. 4:14,3; see the *Hall. Encyclop.* 21:90). There existed also tolls and polltaxes (Joseph. *Ant.* 12:3, 3; 13:8, 3), as these are not classed under the usual name (φόροι) of impost (on 1 Macc. 10:33, see Michaelis in loc.). The priests and Levites mostly enjoyed an exemption from these assessments (Joseph. *Ant.* 12:3, 3). Letting out of the (royal) ground-rents (of single districts) was also, at this time, not uncommon (1 Macc. 11:28; 13:15). A species of forced contribution also appears to be referred to (1 Macc. 15:31). Judaea was first brought under tribute (ὑποτελής φόρου, Joseph. *Ant.* 14:4, 4; perhaps, however, this refers to Jerusalem only) to the Romans by Pompey, although the country as yet does not seem to have been subject to a yearly payment, but rather to occasional exactions at the caprice of the governor in power at the time. The regular taxes were raised by the native princes (whether yearly is uncertain, comp. Appian, *Civ.* v, 75; but the Romans were accustomed to impose tribute upon their dependencies, 1 Macc. 8:7; 2 Macc. 8:10), and Julius Caesar ordained this

by a special decree (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:10, 5 sq.; comp. 22). These revenues were not inconsiderable (Joseph. *Ant.* 19:8, 2), and were derived partly from royal lands (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:10, 6), partly from the ground and income taxes (Joseph. *Ant.* 15:9, 1; 10, 4; 17:2, 1; 8, 4. Josephus, *Ant.* 19:6, 3, likewise mentions a house-tax, either a duty upon the simple dwelling, or the premises in general), and partly from tolls (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:10, 6, 22); and under the Herods were also added very oppressive city taxes (Joseph. *Ant.* 17:8, 4; comp. 18:4, 3). In addition to all these, the Jews, in consequence of their partisan' warfare against the Romans, were compelled to pay many special war taxes (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:11, 2). As at first single parts of Judaea, and finally the whole country, came under the immediate Roman government, the Jews were obliged (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 12:54), like other Roman provinces (see Savigny, in the *Abhandl. der Berl. Akademie*, 1822 and 1823, *Histor. philol. Class.* p. 27 sq.), to pay the ground and head tax (<sup>41217</sup> Matthew 22:17), with a view to which a census and assessment had already been made out by Augustus (Luke ii, 1, 2; comp. Acts v, 37; see Joseph. *Ant.* 18:1, 1); moreover, the city consumption excise (in Jerusalem) continued still for a long time (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:4, 3), and the tolls (on φόρος and τέλος, the Lat., *tributum* and *vectigal*, <sup>41317</sup> Romans 13:7, see Kype, *Observ.* ii, 183 sq.), which were considerable along the commercial routes (especially between Damascus and Ptolemais) and at the sea-ports, and also from the export of balsam and cotton, were exacted as elsewhere. **SEE CUSTOM.** These united imposts, but especially the capitation-tax (Appian, *Syr.* 50), severely oppressed the people (Tacit. *Annals*, ii, 42), particularly, no doubt, because they were not apportioned according to an exact ratio of taxation; and, in addition, the procurators, who superintended the collection, and were responsible for the return of the duties into the imperial treasury, as well as the principal collectors themselves (one such, φόρων ἐκλογεύς, under the Emperor Caius, by the name of Capito, is depicted in Philo, ii, 575, comp. 325 sq.), in various ways made use of extortion. **SEE PUBLICAN.** The power of remitting taxes, where circumstances rendered it reasonable, belonged, under the direct Roman rule, only to the President of Syria (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:4, 3). See, generally, P. Zorn, *Historia fisci Jud. sub imperio vet. Roman.* (Alton. 1734; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxvi); Jost. *Gesch. d. Isruelit.* 1. Anhang, p. 49 sq. **SEE CENSUS; SEE TAX.**

## As'shur

(Heb. *Ashshur'*, רַׁשְׁׁוּרִי prob. i. q. רַׁשְׁׁוּרִי} a *step*; Sept. Ἀσσοῦρ and Ἀσσοῦριοι; Auth. Vers. "Asshur," in <sup><0101></sup>Genesis 10:11; <sup><0402></sup>Numbers 24:22, 24; <sup><1317></sup>1 Chronicles 1:17; <sup><3723></sup>Ezekiel 27:23; 32:22; <sup><3848></sup>Hosea 14:3; "Assur" in <sup><1902></sup>Ezra 4:2; <sup><3808></sup>Psalms 83:8; "Assyrian" or "Assyrians" in <sup><0942></sup>Psalms 14:25; 19:23; 30:31; 31:8; 52:4; <sup><2186></sup>Lamentations 5:6; <sup><3168></sup>Ezekiel 16:28; 23:9, 12, 23; <sup><3813></sup>Hosea 5:13; 11:5; 12:1; <sup><3385></sup>Micah 5:5, 6; elsewhere and usually "Assyria" in very many occurrences) appears in the O.T. to be the name

(1.) properly (<sup><0101></sup>Genesis 10:11; see Michaelis, *Spic.* i, 235 sq.; Vater, *Comm.* i, 125, in loc.) of a state in Western Asia, different from Babylonia (Shinar), of which it was accounted a colony. The metropolis was Nineveh (q.v.), i.e. the Ninus of the Greeks; besides which the cities Resen, Rehoboth, and Calnah (q.v. severally) are named, apparently as included in the same district, although the signification and application of these names are uncertain.

(2.) In the books of the Kings (and the prophets) it designates a victorious and tyrannical kingdom, which (according to <sup><2181></sup>2 Kings 18:11) included also Mesopotamia, Media (comp. <sup><2372></sup>Isaiah 7:20; 10:8, 9; 22:26), as well as (according to <sup><1272></sup>2 Kings 17:20; <sup><4811></sup>2 Chronicles 33:11) Babylonia, and whose inhabitants are described (<sup><3706></sup>Ezekiel 23:6, 17, 23) as wealthy (Nineveh being a mart, <sup><3486></sup>Nahum 3:16, the entrepot between the eastern, and western trade), but also arrogant (<sup><2309></sup>Isaiah 10:9 sq.; <sup><3801></sup>Zechariah 10:11), and occupying a fertile tract (<sup><2382></sup>Isaiah 18:2, 7; <sup><3489></sup>Nahum 3:19). It is the region also well known to the Greeks as *Assyria* (once, <sup><3385></sup>Micah 5:5, called "the land of Nimrod"), which, together with its capital Ninus, was destroyed by the Medes and Chaldaeans. As in the Bible, we find likewise

(a.) in Greek and Roman writers *Assyria* (Ἀσσυρία, Ptol. 6:1; oftener Ἀσουρία, Strabo, 16:507, or Ἀτυρία, Dio Cass. lxxviii, 28) named as the country shut in on the north by the high mountain range (Mt. Niphates) of Armenia, on the south almost entirely level, watered by several rivers, and hence very fruitful; which was bounded on the east by Media, on the south by Susiana and Babylonia, on the west (by means of the Tigris) by Mesopotamia, and now forms the greater part of the province of *Kurdistan* (comp. Plin. v, 13; Strabo, 16:736; see Bernhard, *ad Dionys. Perieg.* p.

739). (b.) Far oftener Assyria was the name given by the ancients to the provincial satrapy of the Persian empire, consisting of the joint districts Assyria and Babylonia (Herod. i, 178; comp. 106; Strabo, 16:507; Ammian. Marc". 23:20), including Mesopotamia (Arrian, *Alex.* 7:21, 2; Ammian. Marc. 24:2), and even extended at times its name to a part of Asia Minor (Dionys. Perieg. 975; comp. Mannert, V, ii, 424 sq.). Assyria Proper (Herod. i, 102, "the Assyrians who live in Ninus") is, on the other hand; called *Adiabene* (Plin. v, 13, 6; Strabo, 16:512; Ammian. Marc. 23:6; in the Syriac, *Chedib*, Assemani, *Biblioth. Or.* III, ii, 708; by the Talmudists, *Chadib*, **bydj i** comp. *Dib*, the Arabic name of two streams of this province, Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* I, ii, 113), which was only a province of Assyria, lying between Arrapachitis and the Garamaeans (Plin. 6:16; Mannert, V, ii, 450 sq.). **SEE BABYLONIA; SEE MESOPOTAMIA.**

Little is known of the early history of the Assyrian empire, for the ancient accounts are not only scanty, but confused, and in some cases contradictory, so that the most deserving efforts of modern (especially recent) scholars have scarcely availed to clear it up (see Schroer, *Imperium Babylon. et Nini ex monument. antiq.* Frckf. 1726; Uhland, *Chronologia sacra in præcip. chron. et hist. Babylon. Assy. monumentis vindicata*, Tubing. 1763). The Biblical notices, which embrace but a small part of its history, do not form a connected whole with those of profane (Greek) authors. According to the former (<sup><01010></sup>Genesis 10:10) the kingdom of Assyria was founded by Nimrod (q.v.) of Babylon, but its princes are not named earlier than the Israelitish king Menahem (<sup><2159></sup>2 Kings 15:19 sq.), and they appear subsequently in the hostile collisions with the two Hebrew kingdoms (comp. <sup><2388></sup>Hosea 5:3; 7:11). Those thus mentioned are the following:

- (1.) *Pul* (2 Kings, as above), who exacted tribute (B.C. 769) of Israel (under Menahem).
- (2.) *Tiglath-Pileser* (<sup><1267></sup>2 Kings 16:7-10; <sup><1336></sup>1 Chronicles 28:16 sq.), in the time of Ahaz of Judah and Pekah of Israel, the latter of whom, with his ally Rezin (of Damascene Syria), was beaten by him (as a mercenary ally of Ahaz), and many of their subjects carried into captivity (B.C. 739).
- (3.) *Shalmaneser*, who (B.C. 720) overthrew the kingdom of Israel and carried away the rest of the inhabitants into exile (<sup><1275></sup>2 Kings 17:5 sq.; 18:9). Judah was also tributary to him (<sup><1287></sup>2 Kings 18:7). Media and Persia

formed part of this Assyrian king's dominions (<sup><2181></sup>2 Kings 18:11), and he made successful incursions against Phoenicia (Joseph. *Ant.* 9:14, 2).

(4.) *Sennacherib*, who (B.C. 713) appeared before Jerusalem under Hezekiah after an attack upon Egypt (<sup><2183></sup>2 Kings 18:13 sq.; 19:39; Isaiah 17, 18).

(5.) *Esarhaddon* (B.C. post 712), the son of the preceding (<sup><2185></sup>2 Kings 19:37; <sup><2378></sup>Isaiah 37:38; <sup><1501></sup>Ezra 4:2). There is, moreover, mention made of *Sargon* (only <sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 20:1), who probably reigned but for a short time between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib (B.C. 715). None of these names except Sennacherib (*Sanacharib*, *Σαναχάριβος*, Herod. ii, 141), the contemporary of the Egyptian king Setho (comp. Berosus, in Joseph. *Ant.* 10:1, 4), occur in Grecian authors (allusion is made to Shalmaneser in the passage cited by Joseph. *Ant.* 9:14, 2, from Menander the Ephesian, although the *name* does not occur in the extract). Moreover, Ctesias (in Diod. Sic. ii; comp. Agathias, *De rebus Justiniani*, 2), Julius Africanus, Eusebius (*Chronicles Armen.* i, 98 sq., 599; ii, 15 sq.), and Syncellus begin their series of *proper* Assyrian kings, whose empire extended during its prime to the Euphrates (although the notices in the Hebrew writers from the time of David are silent respecting its growth), with *Ninus* (Belus), and close it (260 years before Cyrus) with *Sardanapalus* (after a duration of 6520 years, according to Herod. i, 95, 130; of 1306 [1360] years according to Ctesias, in Diod. Sic. ii, 21, 28; of 1460 years according to Syncellus, p. 165; of 1240 years according to Eusebius, *Chronicles Armen.* ii, 16, 167) or (in Syncellus) Thonoscon-Colerus (Euseb. *Chronicles* ii, 167, places this Sardanapalus in the time of, Jeroboam II, and makes him a contemporary of Lycurgus). From this point they begin, with Arbaces, the conqueror of Sardanapalus, a new *Median* dynasty (comp. Athen. 12:528 sq.), which is continued down to Astyages (Marsham, *Can. Chronicles* p. 517 sq., 525 sq.; Vignoles, *Chronologie*, ii, 161 sq.). Herodotus, who, however, gives merely general references to Assyrian history, names (i, 98 sq.) as *the first* independent king of Media, Dejoces (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 10:2, 2), and reckons to Astyages only, *four* (comp. Dion. Hal. i, 2) Median princes, including Astyages (according to him, these four Median kings reigned 150 years; according to Diod. Sic. the Median kingdom lasted from Arbaces over 282 years; according to Syncellus, 275 years, according to Eusebius, 259 years; the statements of Ctesias can hardly be reconciled with those of Herodotus; see Larcher, *Chronolog. zu Herod.* p. 144 sq.; Volney, *Chronol. d'Herod.* p. 199 sq.). Now, in order to reconcile the Biblical



notices with those of the Greek historians and chronographers, nearly all modern investigators of history have been compelled to assume a *new Assyrian* empire (subsequent to this Sardanapalus), which Herodotus appears to sustain, in as much as after the revolt of the Medes under Dejoces he still constantly speaks of a not inconsiderable (comp. i, 102) Assyrian kingdom, with Ninus as its capital, which (but with the exception of the Babylo. nian portion, *πλὴν τῆς Βαβυλωνίης μοίρης*) Cyaxares first (i, 106) subdued (comp. Gatterer, *Handb.* p. 288 sq.; Beck, *Weltgesch.* i, 605 sq.; Jahn, *Archaol.* II, i, 184; *Einl.* II, ii, 605; Bredow, *Handbuch*, p. 192, sq.; Kannegiesser, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* 6:131 sq.; Raumer, *Vorles.* i, 98; in vain opposed by Hartmann, in the *Allg. Lit.-Zeit.* 1813, No. 39; and *Linguist. Einleit.* p. 145 sq.). The late independence of Assyria, which, in consequence of this Median revolution, had become for a long time merely a satrapy (comp. Syncellus, *Chronicles* p. 205), must have been established before B.C. 759, which is the latest date assignable to Pul; Tiglath-Pileser succeeded in conquering Western Asia; Shalmaneser (B.C. cir. 728) was already master of Babylon and Media (<sup>12172A</sup>2 Kings 17:24; 18:1), and extended the Assyrian rule (Menander Ephes. in Joseph. ut sup.) in the west (as far as Phoenicia); and Sennacherib even attacked Egypt (Herod. ii, 141), but was compelled to retire. The attempt of the Babylonians to free themselves from the dominion of the Assyrians was not yet successful (Euseb. *Chronicles Armen.* i, 42 sq.); but under Esarhaddon the empire appears to have declined. Babylonia renewed her efforts to free herself from the Assyrian yoke, as Media (under Dejoces, according to Herod.) had earlier done (perhaps during Sennacherib's campaigns in the West), and finally (B.C. 625) the Median. king Cyaxares (probably with Babylonian aid; see Abyden. in Eusel). *Chronicles* p. 54) took and destroyed Ninus (Herod. i, 103, 106; Offerhaus, *De regno Assy.* Hans. 1700). **SEE NINEVEH.**

The lately discovered abstract of Assyrian history in the *Armenian Chronicle* of Eusebius enables us to connect it more closely with the Biblical notices, although they by no means agree entirely with each other. In the extracts by Alexander Polyhistor from Berosus (in Euseb. *Chronicles Armen.* i, 44 sq.), Assyrian kings (of the later period) are named in the following series: Phul (more than 520 years after Semiramis); Sanherib, 18 years; Asordam, 8 years; Sammughes, 21 years; his brother, 21 years; Nabupalassar, 20 years; Nabucodrossor (Nebuchadnezzar), 43 years. Yet Sardanapal is mentioned (p. 44) as having engaged his son

Nabucodrossor in a matrimonial alliance with the daughter of the Median king Asdahages (Astyages)., Abydenus gives (Euseb. *Chronicles Armen.* i, 53 sq.) the Assyrian princes in the following order: Sanherib, Nergilus (Adrameles), Axerdis, Sardanapallus, Saracus. This last introduced a barbarian army from beyond the sea, and sent his general, Busalossor (Nabopolassar), to Babylon; but the latter set himself up as King of Babylonia, and married his son Nabucadrossor to the daughter of the Median Prince Astyages, and thus Nineveh was overthrown. With the position, which both these references assign to Sardanapalus (*after* Sennacherib) essentially agrees Moses Chorensis (who, however, probably makes Sardanapalus a contemporary of the Median Arbaces). This so disagrees with the accounts of Herodotus, Ctesias, and Syncellus (see Baumgarten, *Allgem. Welthist.* iii, 549), as to lead to the supposition of a *second* Sardanapalus (see Suidas, s.v.; the name is perhaps rather a royal title than a personal appellation; comp. Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* I, ii, 129). Otherwise the revolution of Dejoces will fall during the reign of Sennacherib, about the same time when the Babylonians also revolted under Merodach-Baladan (q.v.). **SEE CHALDEAN; SEE SENNACHERIB.** In Persian cuneiform (q.v.) the name is written

or *Athura*; comp. the Ἀτυρία of Dio Cass., Ἀτουρία of Strabo. (See Hertz, *Cat. of Assy. and Bab. Ant.* Lond. 1852.) -Winer, i, 102. **SEE ASSYRIA.**

### As'shurim

(<sup>027B</sup>Genesis 25:3). **SEE ASHURITE.**

### Assidae'an

only in the plur. Ἀσιδαῖοι, Vulg. *Assidai*, prob. for **μυδῖςj } chasidim'**, *saints*) occurs only in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. 2:42; 7:13; 2 Macc. 14:18), where it is applied to the body of zealous and devoted men who rose at the signal for armed resistance given by Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, and who, under him and his successors, upheld with the sword the great doctrine of the unity of God, and stemmed the advancing tide of Grecian manners and idolatries. The epithet evidently designates a section of the orthodox Jews (1 Macc. 2:42, v. Ἰουδαίων probably by correction), as distinguished from "the impious" (οἱ ἄσεβεῖς, 1 Macc. 3:8; 6:21; 7:5, etc.), "the lawless" (οἱ ἄνομοι, 1 Macc. 3:6; 9:23, etc.), "the transgressors" (οἱ παράνομοι, 1 Macc. i, 11, etc.); that is, the Hellenizing

faction. When Bacchides came against Jerusalem, they used their influence (1 Macc. 7:13, **πρῶτοι οἱ Ἀσιδ. ἦσαν ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ**) to conclude a peace, because "a priest of the seed of Aaron" (Alcinus) was with him, and sixty of them fell by his treachery. *SEE ALCINUS*. The Jews at a later period gave the name of *Chasidim* to those pious persons who devoted themselves to a life of austerities and religious exercises in the hope of hastening the coming of the Messiah, and of making an atonement for their own sins and for the sins of others (see Solomon Maimon. *Memoirs*, Berlin, 1792). The name of Chasidim has also been assumed by a Jewish sect which originated in Poland about a hundred years since, who took as the basis of their mystical system the doctrines of the cabalistic book Zohar (Beer, in *Ersch und Gruber*, s.v. Chassidier), and which still subsists (see the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. Assidians). The ideas connected with this later appropriation of the term have, by an obvious association, been carried back to and connected with the Chasidim or Assidaeans who joined Mattathias, and who have generally been regarded as a sect subsisting at that time. No such sect, however, is mentioned by Josephus in treating of the affairs of that period; and the texts in the books of the Maccabees which refer to them afford no sufficient evidence that the Assidaeans formed a sect distinct from other pious and faithful Jews. Yet they may have existed as an undefined party before the Maccabean rising, and were probably thereupon bound by some peculiar vow to the external observance of the Law (1 Macc. ii, 42, **ἐκουσιάζεσθαι τῷ νόμῳ**). They seem afterward to have been merged in the general body of the faithful (2 Mace. 14:6, **οἱ λεγόμενοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων Ἀσιδαῖοι, ὧν ἀφηγείται Ἰούδας ὁ Μακκαβαῖος . . .**). The analogous Hebrew term Chasidim (=οἱ εὐσεβεῖς, οἱ ὄσιοι) occurs in various passages of Scripture appellatively for good and pious men (<sup><19510></sup>Psalm 145:10; 149:1; <sup><2501></sup>Isaiah 57:1; <sup><3101></sup>Micah 7:2), but is never applied to any sect or body of men. Upon the whole, in the entire absence of collateral information, it seems the safest course to conclude that the Assidaeans were a body of eminently zealous men, devoted to the Law, who joined Mattathias very early, and remained the constant adherents of him and his son Judas-not, like the mass of their supporters, rising occasionally and then relapsing into the ordinary pursuits of life. It is possible that, as Jennings conjectures (*Antiq.* p. 298), the name **ἀσιδαῖοι**, or "saints," came to be applied to them by their enemies as a term of reproach, like "Puritans" formerly, and "saints" very often in the present day. *SEE SAINT; SEE CHASIDIM*.

## As'sir

(Heb. *Assir'*, **רַשְׁאִי** *prisoner*), the name of two or three men.

**1.** (Sept. **Ἀσεῖρ** v. r. **Ἀσήρ**.) A son of Korah (of the Kohathite Levites), father (brother) of Elkanah, and grandfather (brother) of Abiasaph (q.v.) or Ebia.' saph (<sup><1064></sup>Exodus 6:24; <sup><1362></sup>1 Chronicles 6:22). B.C. cir. 1740.

**2.** (Sept. **Ἀσεῖρ** v. r. **Ἰσσαάφ** or **Ἰσαάφ** and **Ἀσήρ**.) A great-grandson of the preceding, and father of Tahath (<sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 6:23, 37). B.C. cir. 1620. See SAMUEL. There is some suspicion, however, that the name here has crept in by repetition from the preceding (see *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Apr. 1852, p. 200; comp. Bertheau, *Comment.* in .loc.).

**3.** "*Assir*" (**רַשְׁאִי** Sept. **Ἀσεῖρ** v. r. **Ἀσίρ**) occurs (<sup><1367></sup>1 Chronicles 3:17) as the name of a son of Jeconiah the king, but it is more likely an appellative, referring to the captivity of that prince at Babylon (see Strong's *Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels*, note 1, at the close of § 9). **SEE JEHOIACHIN.**

Assisi, Francis Of.

**SEE FRANCIS DASSISI.**

Associate Presbyterian Church.

See Antiburghers;

**SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.**

Associated Baptists, a name often given:to the main body of Baptists in the United States, who are associated by their pastors in District Associations.

**SEE BAPTISTS.**

As'sos Or Assus

## Picture for Assos

(**Ἄσσος**, also **Ἄσσον**, and *Apollonia*, Plin. v, 32), a town and sea-north of the Roman province of ASIA, in the district anciently called Mysia. It was situated on the northern shore of the Gulf of Adramyttium (Ptol. v, 2; Plin. ii, 98; Strabo, 13:581, 614; Athen. 9:375; Pausan. 6:45). It was only about seven miles from the opposite coast of Lesbos (or Mitylene), near

Methymna (Strab. 13:p. 616). ,A good Roman road, connecting the towns of the central parts of the province with Alexandria Troas (q.v.), passed through Assos, the distance between the two latter places being about 20 miles (*Itin. Anton.*). These geographical points illustrate the Apostle Paul's rapid passage through the town, as he came hither on foot from Troas to meet with his friends, in order to take shipping for Mitylene (<sup>4013</sup>Acts 20:13, 14). The ship in which he was to accomplish his voyage from Troas to Caesarea went round Cape Lectum, while he took the much shorter journey by land. Thus he was able to join the ship without difficulty, and in sufficient time for her to anchor off Mitylene at the close of the day on which Troas had been left (see Conybeare and Howson, ii; 209). It was noted for its wheat (Strabo, p. 735) and for a peculiar stone (lapis Assius) that was used for sarcophagi, on account of its flesh-consuming properties (Plin. ii, 96). It was founded (according to different authors) by a colony from Lesbos, by Gargara, the LEolian, and by the Methymnsei, and was the birthplace of Cleanthes the stoic. Strabo (p. 610) describes it as well fortified both by nature and art. The chief characteristic of Assos was that it was singularly Greek. Fellows found there "no trace of the Romans." It is now a miserable village (the neighborhood of which still bears the name *A sso*), built high upon the rocks on the side toward the land (Richter, p. 465 sq.). The remains are numerous and remarkably well preserved, partly because many of the buildings were of granite. The citadel, above the theatre, commands a glorious view, and must itself have been a noble object from the sea. The Street of Tombs, leading to the Great Gate, is one of the most remarkable features of Assos.

Leake (*Travels in Asia Minor*, p. 128) says: " The ruins of Assos at *Behrem* or *Beridm Kalesi* are extremely curious. There is a theatre in very perfect preservation, and the remains of several temples lying in confused heaps upon the ground. An inscription upon an architrave belonging to one of these buildings shows that it was dedicated to Augustus; but some figures in low relief on another architrave appear to be in a much more ancient style of art, and they are sculptured upon the hard granite of Mount Ida, which forms the materials of several of the buildings. On the western side of the city the remains of the walls and towers, with a gate, are in complete preservation; and without the walls is seen the cemetery, with numerous sarcophagi still standing in their places, and an ancient causeway leading through them to the gate. Some of these sarcophagi are of gigantic dimensions. The whole gives, perhaps, the most perfect idea of a Greek

city that anywhere exists." See also Fellows's *Asia Minor*, p. 46; Wetstein, ii, 592; comp. Quandt, *De Asso* (Regiom. 1710); Amnell, *De Ἰασσῶ* (Upsal. 1758).

### Assue'rus

(Ἀσούρος v. r. Ἀσοῦρος), the GrSecized form (Tobit 14:15) of the Persian royal title usually Anglicized AHASUERUS *SEE AHASUERUS* (q.v.).

### Assumption Of The Virgin,

a festival instituted in the Roman Church in commemoration of the death and pretended resurrection of the Virgin Mary, and her triumphant entry into heaven. The apocryphal tradition upon which this festival is founded is as follows: "That the Blessed Virgin died at the age of seventy-two (one hundred and fifty-nine, according to Nicephorus), and that at her death all the apostles of our Lord, except St. Thomas, were miraculously present, having been conveyed in clouds from the various countries where they were preaching; that they buried her at Gethsemane; and that St. Thomas, upon his return from Ethiopia at the end of three days, expressed such a longing desire to see her face once again, that they opened her tomb, but found there nothing but the grave-clothes, although the grave had been fastened and watched, day and night, by some of the apostles and, many other Christians." The ASSUMPTION OF MARY was not always a point of faith in the Roman Church, but is now universally received. The day of celebration is Aug. 15. It is also celebrated in the Greek Church. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 7:367; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.*, s.v.

### Assumption Of Moses,

an apocryphal book so called, said to contain an account of the death of Moses and of the translation of his soul to Paradise. Some have supposed that the particulars of the combat between St. Michael and the devil, alluded to in the Epistle of Jude (ver. 9), were contained in this book (Moreri, who cites Calmet).-J. A. Fabric. *Cod. Pseudep. V. T.* i, 839-847. *SEE MOSES.*

### As'sur,

a less correct form of two names.

**1.** (Heb. *Ashshur'*, רַׁשְׁׁשׁוּרִי Sept. and Apoc. Ἀσσοῦρ.) An inaccurate method of Anrlcizing (<sup><15412></sup>Ezra 4:2; <sup><15813></sup>Psalm 83:8) or Graecizing (2 Esd. 2:8; <sup><17214></sup>Judges 2:14; 5:1; 6:1, 17; 7:20, 24; 13:15; 14:3; 15:6; 16:4) the original *SEE ASSHUR* word for ASSYRIA *SEE ASSYRIA* (q.v.).

**2.** (Ἀσοῦρ v. r. Ἀσοῦβ, while other copies omit; Vulg. *Azi*.) One of the heads of the "temple servants," whose descendants are said to have returned from Babylon (1 Esdr. 5:31), doubtless a corruption for the HARHUR *SEE HARHUR* (q.v.) of the true text (<sup><15151></sup>Ezra 2:51).

## Assurance

in theology, is *affirm persuasion of our being in a state of salvation*.

**(1.)** "The doctrine itself has been matter of dispute among divines, and when considered as implying not only that we are now accepted of God through Christ, but that we shall be finally saved, or when it is so taken as to deny a state of salvation to those who are not so assured as to be free from all doubt, it is in many views questionable. Assurance of *final salvation* must stand or fall with the doctrine of personal unconditional election, and is chiefly held by divines of the Calvinistic school. The 18th article of the Westminster Confession (*Of the Assurance of Grace and Salvation*) says, 'Although hypocrites, and other unregenerated men, may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes and carnal presumptions of being in the favor of God and estate of salvation; which hope of theirs shall perish; yet such as truly believe in the Lord Jesus, and love him: in sincerity, endeavoring to walk in all good conscience before him, may in this life be certainly assured that they are in a state of grace, and may rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, which hope shall never make them ashamed. This, certainly, is not a bare conjectural and probable persuasion, grounded upon a fallible hope, but an infallible assurance of faith, founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces unto which these promises are made, the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God; which Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance, whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption. This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties before he can be a partaker of it; yet, being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain

thereunto. And, therefore, it is the duty of every one to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure, that thereby his heart may be enlarged in peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, in love and thankfulness to God, and in strength and cheerfulness in the duties of obedience, the proper fruits of this assurance: so far is it from inclining men to looseness. True believers may have the assurance of their salvation divers ways shaken, diminished and intermitted; as by negligence in preserving it; by falling into some special sin, which woundeth the conscience, and grieveth the Spirit; by some sudden or vehement temptation; by God's withdrawing the light of his countenance, and suffering even such as fear him to walk in darkness and to have no light. Yet are they never utterly destitute of that need of God, and life of faith, that love: of Christ and the brethren, that sincerity of heart and conscience of duty out of which, by the operation of the Spirit, this assurance may in due time be revived, and by the which, in the mean time, they are supported from utter despair.'

On the other hand, that nothing is an evidence of a state of present salvation but so entire a persuasion as amounts to assurance in the strongest sense, might be denied upon the ground that degrees of grace, of real saving grace, are undoubtedly mentioned in Scripture. Assurance, however, is spoken of in the New Testament, and stands prominent as one of the leading doctrines of religious experience. We have 'full assurance of understanding;' that is, a perfect knowledge and entire persuasion of the truth of the doctrine of Christ. The 'assurance of faith,' in <sup><8012></sup>Hebrews 9:22, is an entire trust in the sacrifice and priestly office of Christ. The 'assurance of hope,' mentioned in <sup><8011></sup>Hebrews 6:11, relates to the heavenly inheritance, and must necessarily imply a full persuasion that we are the children of God, and therefore 'heirs of his glory;' and from this passage it must certainly be concluded that such an assurance is what every Christian ought to aim at, and that it is attainable. This, however, does not exclude occasional doubt and weakness of faith from the earlier stages of his experience.

(2.) "A comforting and abiding persuasion *of present acceptance by God, through Christ*, we may therefore affirm, must in various degrees follow true faith. In support of this view the following remarks may be offered: If the Bible teaches that man is by nature prone to evil, and that in-practice he violates God's law, and is thereby exposed to punishment; that an act of grace and pardon is promised on condition of repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; that repentance implies consideration of our



ways, a sense of the displeasure of Almighty God, contrition of heart, and consequently trouble and grief of mind, mixed, however, with a hope inspired by the promise of forgiveness, and which leads to earnest supplication for the actual pardon of sin so promised; it will follow from these premises either,

1. that forgiveness is not to be expected till after the termination of our course of probation, that is, in another life; and that, therefore, this trouble and apprehension of mind can only be assuaged by the hope we may have of a favorable final decision on our case; or,
2. that sin is, in the present life, forgiven as often as it is thus repented of, and as often as we exercise the required and specific acts of trust in the merits of our Saviour; but that this forgiveness of our sins is not in any way made known unto us; so that we are left, as to our feelings, in precisely the same -state as if sin were not forgiven till after death, namely, in grief and trouble of mind, relieved only by hope; or,
3. that (and this is the scriptural view) when sin is forgiven by the mercy of God through Christ, we are by some means assured of it, and peace and satisfaction of mind take the place of anxiety and fear. The first of these conclusions is sufficiently disproved by the authority of Scripture, which exhibits justification as a blessing attainable in this life, and represents it as actually experienced by true believers. 'Therefore being justified by faith.' 'There is *now* no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus.' 'Whosoever believeth is justified from all things,' etc. The quotations might be multiplied, but these are decisive. The notion that, though an act of forgiveness may take place, we are unable to ascertain a fact so important to us, is also irreconcilable with many passages, in which the writers of the New Testament speak of an experience not confined personally to themselves, or to those Christians who were endowed with spiritual gifts, but common to all Christians. 'Being justified by faith, we have *peace* with God.' 'We joy in God, by whom we have received the *reconciliation*.' 'Being reconciled unto God by the death of his Son.' 'We have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but the spirit of adoption, by which we cry, Abba, Father.' To these may be added innumerable passages which express the comfort, the confidence, and the joy of Christians; their 'friendship' with God; their 'access' to him; their entire union and delightful intercourse with him; and their absolute confidence in the success of their prayers. All such passages are perfectly consistent with deep humility and

self-diffidence, but they are irreconcilable with a state of hostility between the parties, and with an unascertained and only hoped-for restoration of friendship and favor. An assurance, therefore, that the sins which are felt to 'be a burden intolerable' are forgiven, and that the ground of that apprehension of future punishment which causes the penitent to '*bewail* his manifold sins,' is taken away by restoration to the favor of the offended God, must be allowed, or nothing would be more incongruous and impossible than the comfort, the peace, the rejoicing of spirit, which in the Scriptures are attributed to believers.

"Few Christians of evangelical views have, therefore, denied the possibility of our becoming assured of the favor of God in a sufficient degree to give substantial comfort to the mind. Their differences have rather respected the means by which the contrite become assured of that change in: their relation to Almighty God, whom they have offended, which in Scripture is expressed by the term justification. The question has been (where the notion of an assurance of eternal salvation has not been under discussion), by what means the assurance of the divine favor is conveyed to the mind. Some have concluded that we obtain it by *inference*, others by the *direct testimony of the Holy Spirit to the mind*" (Watson, s.v.).

**(3.)** With regard to the history of the doctrine, Wesley remarks: "I apprehend that the whole Christian Church in the first centuries enjoyed it. For, though we have few points of doctrine explicitly taught in the small remains of the ante-Nicene fathers, yet I think none that carefully read Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Origen, or any other of them, can doubt whether either the writer himself possessed it, or all whom he mentions as real Christians. And I really conceive, both from the *Hurmonia Confessionum* and whatever else I have occasionally read, that all reformed churches in Europe did once believe, 'Every true Christian has the divine evidence of his being in favor with God.'" "I know likewise that Luther, Melancthon, and many other (if not all) of the reformers frequently and strongly assert that every believer is conscious of his own acceptance with God, and that by a supernatural evidence" (see below).

Thomas Aquinas supposed (*Summn.* pt. ii, 1, quest. 112, art. 5) a threefold way in which man could ascertain whether he was a subject of divine grace or not: 1. By direct revelation on the part of God; 2. By himself (certitudinaliter); 3. By certain indications (conjecturaliter per aliqua signa). But the last two were, in his opinion, uncertain; as for the first, God very

seldom makes use of it, and only in particular cases (revelat Deus hoc aliquando aliquibus ex speciali privilegio), so that no one can have perfect certainty on the subject; only there are signs, if proper attention be paid, such as that a man has his joy in God, that he despises the world, and is conscious of no gross sins. A presage may thus be formed of his forgiveness (nullus certitudinaliter potest scire se habere caritatem, sed potest e aliquibus signis probabili. bus conjicere. -In lib. i. Sentt. dist. 17, quest. 1, art. 4). Alexander of Hales contended that on this point there was a peculiar knowledge—since neither the cause nor the effect fell within the province of human knowledge, yet a certain feeling of knowledge might be possessed upon it; only it is not infallible, but verifies itself by experience in the feelings when these three signs concur, light, peace, and joy. God does not will either to give to us complete certainty, or to leave us wholly in uncertainty.. If man experienced nothing of the sweetness of the divine life, he would not be attracted to the love of God; if he had perfect assurance it would easily seduce him into pride. Luther denounced the notion of the uncertainty of man being in a state of grace (in his Comment. upon <sup><8016</sup>Galatians 4:6) as a dangerous and sophistical doctrine. The doctrine that personal assurance is involved in saving faith is taught in the Augsburg Confession (art. iv), and also in the *Apologia Confessionis*. The doctrine of the *certitudo salutis* (certainty of salvation) is taught by Calvin (*Institutes*, iii, c. 24, § 4).

Sir W. Hamilton, in a foot-note to his article on the English Universities (*Discussions on Philosophy*, etc.), while speaking on religious tests as a term of admission, has the following passage: " Assurance, personal assurance (the feeling of certainty that God is propitious to me, that *my* sins are forgiven, *Judcia, plerophoriafideza*), was long universally held in the Protestant communities to be the criterion and condition of a true or *saving faith*. Luther declares that he who hath not assurance spews faith out; and Melancthon makes assurance the discriminating line of Christianity from heathenism. It was maintained by Calvin, nay, even by Arminius, and is part and parcel of all the confessions of all the churches of the Reformation down to the Westminster Assembly. In that synod assurance was, in Protestantism, for *the first* time declared *not to be of the essence of faith*; and, accordingly, the Scottish General Assembly has subsequently, once and again, condemned the holders of this, the doctrine of Luther, of Calvin, and of the older Scottish Church itself. In the English, and more particularly in the Irish Establishment, it still stands a necessary tenet of

belief. The doctrine is now, however, disavowed, when apprehended, by Anglican churchmen." These strong statements are controverted in the *Brit. and For. Evangelical Review* (Oct. 1856), by Cunningham (see the article, enlarged, in Cunningham, *Theology of the Reformation*, "Essay iii), who shows that Sir William Hamilton has greatly mistaken the reformed doctrine in representing assurance as, in the opinion of all the reformed churches, an essential part of saving faith. Dr. Cunningham proves, on the contrary, from several of the confessions of the churches of the Reformation, and from the writings of some leading reformers, that, in their opinion, "this assurance was not the proper act of justifying and saving faith, and did not belong to its essence;... that it was a result or consequence of faith, posterior to it in the order of nature, and frequently also of time." Regarded as an exposure of Sir William Hamilton's historical inaccuracies, this essay is complete, but as an exhibition of the scriptural doctrine of assurance it is seriously defective. It not only encumbers the doctrine by adding the assurance of final salvation to that of present forgiveness—a mistake full both of embarrassment to timid consciences, and of peril to the interests of practical religion—but it almost puts out of sight that direct and blessed witness of the Spirit to the believer's acceptance which is so prominent a feature of the experimental theology of the Bible, and without which—the Christian life must be one of distressing uncertainty and doubt. But Sir William was quite right in saying that the Westminster Assembly was the first Protestant synod that formally declared assurance not to be of the *essence* of faith. Yet it declares that assurance is practicable and obligatory in very strong language, and calls it "an infallible assurance" [see above, (1)].

Wesley, and the Methodist theologians generally, advocate the doctrine of assurance of present (not of eternal) salvation in the sense stated above (2), connecting it with the "witness of the Spirit," as in the following practical passage: "Every man, applying the scriptural marks to himself, may know whether he is a child of God. Thus, if he know, first, As many as are led by the Spirit of God into all holy tempers and actions, they are the sons of God (for which he has the infallible assurance of Holy Writ); secondly, I am thus 'led by the Spirit of God,' he will easily conclude, therefore I am a son of God. Agreeably to this are those plain declarations of John in his first epistle: 'Hereby we know that we do know him, if we keep his commandments' (ch. ii, 3). 'Whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him;' that we are

indeed the children of God (ver. 5). 'If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him' (ver. 29). 'We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren' (ch. iii, 14). 'Hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him' (ver. 19), namely, because we 'love one another, not in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth.' See also ch. iii, 24, and 4:13. It is highly probable there never were any children of God, from the beginning of the world unto this day, who were further advanced in the grace of God, and the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, than the apostle John at the time when he wrote these words, and the fathers in Christ to whom he wrote. Notwithstanding which, it is evident both the apostle himself, and all those pillars in God's temple, were very far from despising these marks of their being the children of God; and that they applied them to their own souls for the confirmation of their faith. Yet all this is no other than rational evidence, the witness of our spirit, our reason, our understanding. It all resolves into this: Those who have these marks are children of God: but we have these marks, therefore we are children of God. But how does it appear that we have these marks? This is a question which still remains. How does it appear that we do love God and our neighbor, and that we keep his commandments? Observe that the meaning of the question is, How does it appear to *ourselves*? not to *others*. I would ask him, then, that proposes this question, How does it appear to you that you are alive? and that you are now in ease, and not in pain? Are you not immediately conscious of it? By the same immediate consciousness you will know if your soul is alive to God; if you are saved from the pain of proud wrath, and have the ease of a meek and quiet spirit. By the same means you cannot but perceive if you love, rejoice, and delight in God. By the same you must be directly assured if you love your neighbor as yourself; if you are kindly affectioned to all mankind, and full of gentleness and long-suffering. And with regard to the outward mark of the children of God, which is, according to John, the keeping his commandments, you undoubtedly know in your own breasts if, by the grace of God, it belongs to you. Now this is properly the testimony of our own spirit, even the testimony of our own conscience, that God hath given us to be holy of heart, and 'holy in outward conversation. It is a consciousness that we are inwardly conformed, by the Spirit of God, to the image of his Son, and that we walk before him in justice, mercy, and truth, doing the things which are pleasing in his sight' (Wesley, *Sermons*, i, 86, 87). **SEE SPIRIT, WITNESS OF.**

The Council of Trent (sess. 6:ch. 9:*De. Justificatione*) decided that it is on no account to be maintained that those who are really justified ought to feel fully assured of the fact, without any doubt whatever; or that none are absolved and justified but those who believe themselves to be so; or that by this faith only absolution and justification are procured; as if he who does not believe this doubts the promises of God, and the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ. For, while no godly person ought to doubt the mercy of God, the merit of Christ, or the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, so, on the other hand, whoever considers his own infirmity and corruption may doubt and fear whether he is in a state of grace, since no one can certainly and infallibly know that he has obtained the grace of God."

For the Roman Catholic doctrine as contrasted with that of Calvin, see Mohler, *Symbolism*, § 20. See also the *Methodist Quarterly*, Oct. 1857, art. iv; Watson, *Theol. Inst.* ii, 280; Smith's Hagenlach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 65, 277; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, ii, 586; Wesley, *Works*, v, 19 sq.; Cole, *Godly Assurance* (1633, 4to); Petto, *Treatise on Assurance* (1693); Hamilton, *On Assurance of Faith* (1830, 12mo).

## Assyr'ia

### Picture for Assyria 1

(**Ἀσσυρία**). We must here distinguish between the *country* of Assyria and the Assyrian *empire*. They are both designated in Hebrew by **רַבְּבַיִשׁוּר** ASSHUR, the people being also described by the same term, only that in the latter sense it is masculine, in the former feminine. In the Septuagint it is commonly rendered by **Ἀσσοῦρ** or **Ἀσσύριοι**, and in the Vulgate by *Assur* and *Assyrii*, and seldom or never by **Ἀσσυρία**, or *Assyria*. The Asshurim (**Ἀσσοσυριεῖμ**) of <sup><1028></sup>Genesis 25:3, were an Arab tribe; and at <sup><1016></sup>Ezekiel 27:6, the word *ashurim* (in our version "Ashurites") is only an abbreviated form of *tedshur*, box-wood. Assyria derived its name from the progenitor of the aboriginal inhabitants-Asshur, the second son of Shem (<sup><1012></sup>Genesis 10:22; <sup><1017></sup>1 Chronicles 1:17), a different person from Ashchur, son of Hezron, and Caleb's grandson (<sup><1024></sup>1 Chronicles 2:24; 4:5). In later times it is thought that Asshur was worshipped as their chief god-by the Assyrians (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 537). **SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS**. The extent of Assyria differed greatly at different periods. Probably in the earliest times it was confined to a small tract of low

country between the Jebel Maklub, or Taurus range on the N., and the Lesser Zab (Zab Asfal) toward the S., lying chiefly on the immediate bank of the Tigris. Gradually its limits were extended, until it came to be regarded as comprising the whole region between the Armenian mountains (lat. 37° 30') upon the north, and upon the south the country about Bagdad (lat. 33° 30'). Eastward its boundary was the high range of Zagros, or mountains of Kurdistan; westward it naturally retained the Tigris as its boundary, although, according to the views of some, it was eventually bounded by the Mesopotamian desert, while, according to others, it reached the Euphrates. Taking the greatest of these dimensions, Assyria may be said to have extended in a direction from N.E. to S.W. a distance of nearly 500 miles, with a width varying from 350 to 100 miles. Its area would thus a little exceed 100,000 square miles, or about equal that of Italy.

## I. ASSYRIA PROPER.

**1. Ancient Notices of its Position.**—This was a great and powerful country, lying on the east of the Tigris (<sup>10024</sup>Genesis 2:14), the capital of which was Nineveh (<sup>10101</sup>Genesis 10:11, etc.). Its exact limits in early times are unknown; but when its monarchs enlarged their dominions by conquest, the name of this metropolitan province was extended to the whole empire. Hence, while Homer calls the inhabitants of the country north of Palestine *Arimoi* (evidently the Aramim or Aramesans of the Hebrews), the Greeks of a later period, finding them subject to the Assyrians, called the country Assyria, or (by contraction) *Syria*, a name which it has ever since borne. It is on this account that, in classical writers, the names Assyria and Syria are so often found interchanged (Henderson, *On Isaiah* p. 173; Hitzig, *Begriff d. Krit. d. A lt. Test.* p. 98); but it may be questioned whether in Hebrew "Asshur" and "Aram" are ever confounded. The same, however, cannot be affirmed of those parts of the Assyrian empire which lay *east* of the Euphrates, but west of the Tigris. The Hebrews, as well as the Greeks and Romans, appear to have spoken of them in a loose sense as being in Assyria, because in the Assyrian empire. Thus Isaiah (<sup>2380</sup>Isaiah 8:20) describes the Assyrians as those "beyond the river," i.e. east of the Euphrates, which river, and not the Tigris, is introduced at 8:7, as an image of their power. In <sup>102518</sup>Genesis 25:18, the locality of the Ishmaelites is described as being east of Egypt, "as thou goest to Assyria," which, however, could only be reached through Mesopotamia or Babylonia, and this idea best reconciles the apparent incongruity of the statement in the

same book (ii, 14), that the Hiddekel, or Tigris, runs "on the east of Assyria," i. e. of the Assyrian provinces of Mesopotamia and Babylonia; for there can be no doubt that, not only during the existence of the Assyrian monarchy, but long after its overthrow, the name of Assyria was given to those provinces, as having once formed so important a part of it. For example, in <sup>1239</sup>2 Kings 23:29, Nebuchadnezzar is termed the king of Assyria, though resident at Babylon (comp. <sup>2428</sup>Jeremiah 2:18; <sup>2516</sup>Lamentations 5:6; Judith 17; 2:1); even Darius, king of Persia, is called, in <sup>1512</sup>Ezra 6:22, king of Assyria (comp. Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 19:19); and, on a similar principle, in 2 Macc. 1:19, the Jews are said to have been carried captive to Persia, i.e. Babylonia, because, as it had formerly been subject to the Assyrians, so it was afterward under the dominion of Persia. (Comp. Herodotus, i, 106, 178; iii, 5; 7:63; Strabo, ii, 84; 16:1; Arrian, vii; *Exped. Alex.* 7:21, 2; Ammianus Marcellinus, 23:20; 24:2; Justin, i, 2, 13.) One writer, Dionysius Periegetes (v, 975), applies the designation of Assyria even to Asia Minor, as far as the Black Sea. Yet, ultimately, this name again became restricted to the original province east of the Tigris, which was called by the Greeks Ἀσσυρία (Ptolemy, 6:1), and more commonly Ἀσουρία (Strabo, 16:507), or Ἀτυρία (Dion Cassius, lxxviii, 28), the latter being only a dialectic variety of pronunciation, derived from the Aramaean custom of changing *s* into *t*. A trace of the name is supposed to be preserved in that of a very ancient place, *Athur*, on the Tigris, from four to six hours N.E. of Mosul. Rich, in his *Residence in Kurdistan* (ii, 129), describes the ruins as those of the "city of Nimrod," and states that some of the better informed of the Turks at Mosul "said that it was *Al Athur*, or *Ashur*, from which the whole country was denominated.

**2. Boundaries.** — According to Ptolemy, Assyria was in his day bounded on the north by Armenia, the Gordieean or Carduchian mountains, especially by Mount Niphates; on the west by the River Tigris and Mesopotamia; on the south by Susiana, or Chuzistan, in Persia, and by Babylonia; and on the east by a part of Media, and Mounts Choathras and Zagros (Ptolemy, 6:1; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 13; Strabo, 16:736). It corresponded to the modern *Kurdistan*, or country of the Kurds (at least to its larger and western portion), with part of the pashalic of Mosul.

Toward the north Assyria bordered on the strong and mountainous region of Armenia, which may have been at times under Assyrian dominion, but was never reckoned an actual part of the country. (See <sup>1239</sup>2 Kings 19:37.) Toward the east her neighbors were originally a multitude of independent



tribes, scattered along the Zagros chain, who have their fitting representatives in the modern Kurds and Lurs—the real sovereigns of that mountain range. Beyond these tribes lay Media, which ultimately subjected the mountaineers, and was thereby brought into direct contact with Assyria in this quarter. On the south, Elam or Susiana was the border state east of the Tigris, while Babylonia occupied the same position between the rivers. West of the Euphrates was Arabia, and higher up Syria, and the country of the Ilittites, which last reached from the neighborhood of Damascus to Antitaurus and Amanus.—Smith.

**3. General geographical character.** — The country within these limits is of a varied aspect. "Assyria," says Mr. Ainsworth (*Researches in Assyria, Babylonia, and Chaldea*, Lond. 1838, p. 17), "including Taurus, is distinguished into *three* districts: by its *structure*, into a district of plutonic and metamorphic rocks, a district of sedimentary formations, and a district of alluvial deposits; by *configuration*, into a district of mountains, a district of stony or sandy plains, and a district of low watery plains; by *natural productions*, into a country of forests and fruit-trees, of olives, wine, corn, and pasturage, or of barren rocks; a country of mulberry, cotton, maize, tobacco, or of barren clay, sand, pebbly or rocky plains; and into a country of date-trees, rice, and pasturage, or a land of saline plants." The northern part is little else than a mass of mountains, which, near Julamerk, rise to a very great height, Mount Jewar being supposed to have an elevation of 15,000 feet; in the south it is more level, but the plains are often burnt up with scorching heat, while the traveller, looking northward, sees a snowy alpine ridge hanging like a cloud in mid air. On the west this country is skirted by the great river Tigris, the Hiddekel of the Hebrews (<sup>Gen 2:14</sup>Genesis 2:14; <sup>Dan 10:4</sup>Daniel 10:4), the Dijlah of the Arabs, noted for the impetuosity of its current. Its banks, once the residence of mighty kings, are now desolate, covered, like those of its twin river the Euphrates, with relics of ancient greatness, in the ruins of fortresses, mounds, and dams, which had been erected for the defence or irrigation of the country. Niebuhr describes a large stone dam at the castle of Nimrod, eight leagues below Mosul, as a work of great skill and labor, and now venerable for its antiquity; and some suppose that it was from the circumstance of so many canals from the Tigris watering the country, and rendering it fruitful, that that river received the Arabic name of *Nahres-Salam*, the River of Peace, i.e. prosperity. It leaves the high land at some distance above Tekrit, rushing with great velocity through a pass in the Hamrine mountains. In its

progress along Assyria, the Tigris receives from that country, besides other rivers, two rapid mountain streams—the Great and Little Zab (Arab. *Dhab*, i.e. Wolf), called by the Greeks the Lykos, or Wolf, and the Capros, or Wild Boar. The Greater Zab (called by the Kurds *Zerb*), used to be laid down as a different river from the Hakkary, but Dr. Grant found them to be identical; and he likewise detected an error of Kinneir, in representing the Bitlissu as the same as the Khabur, whereas they are different streams. (See Grant's *Nestorians*, p. 46.)

On the north and east the high mountain chains of Armenia and Kurdistan are succeeded by low ranges of limestone hills of a somewhat arid aspect, which detach themselves from the principal ridges, running parallel to them, and occasionally inclosing, between their northern or north-eastern flank and the main mountain-line, rich plains and fertile valleys. To these ridges there succeeds at first an undulating zone of country, well watered and fairly productive, which finally sinks down with some suddenness upon the great Mesopotamian plain, the modern district of ElJezireh. This vast flat, which extends in length for 250 miles from the latitude of Mardin (37° 20') to that of Tekrit (34° 33'), and which is in places of nearly equal width, is interrupted only by a single limestone range, a narrow ridge rising abruptly out of the plain, which, splitting off from Zagros in lat. 33° 30', may be traced under the names of Sarazur, Hamrin, and Sinjar, from Iwan in Luristan nearly to Rakkah on the Euphrates. "From all parts of the plain the Sinjar is a beautiful object. Its limestone rocks, wooded here and there with dwarf oak, are of a rich golden color; and the numberless ravines which furrow its sides form ribs of deep purple shadow" (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 265). Above and below this barrier, stretching southward and westward farther than the eye can reach, and extending northward and eastward 70 or 80 miles to the hill-country before mentioned, is an immense level tract, now for the most part a wilderness, scantily watered on the right bank of the Tigris, but abundantly supplied on the left, which bears marks of having been in early times throughout well cultivated and thickly peopled. This plain is not alluvial, and most parts of it are even considerably raised above the level of the rivers. It is covered in spring time with the richest vegetation, presenting to the eye a carpet of flowers, varying in hue from day to day; but as the summer advances it is parched up, and gradually changes to an arid and yellow waste, except along the courses of the rivers. All over this vast flat, on both sides of the Tigris, rise "grass-covered heaps, marking the site of ancient habitations" (Layard, p.

245). Mr. Layard counted from one spot nearly a hundred (*Nineveh and its Remains*, i7 315); from another above 200 of these lofty mounds (*Nin. and Bab.* p. 245). Those which have been examined have been uniformly found to present appearances distinctly connecting them with the remains of Nineveh. *SEE NINEVEH*. It may therefore be regarded as certain that they belong to the time of Assyrian greatness, and thus they will serve to mark the extent of the real Assyrian dominion. They are numerous on the left bank of the Tigris from Bavian to the Diyaleh, and on the right they thickly stud the entire country both north and south of the Sinjar range, extending eastward beyond the Khabour (Layard, chs. xii-xiv), northward to Mardin, and southward to the vicinity of Bagdad.-Smith.

**4. Natural Productions.**-The most remarkable feature, says Ainsworth, in the vegetation of Taurus, is the abundance of trees, shrubs, and plants in the northern, and their comparative absence in the southern district. Besides the productions above enumerated, Kurdistan yields gall-nuts, gum Arabic, mastich, manna (used as sugar), madder, castor-oil, and various kinds of grain, pulse, and fruit. An old traveller, Rauwolf, who passed by Mosul in 1574, dwells with admiration on the finely-cultivated fields on the Tigris, so fruitful in corn, wine, and honey as to remind him of the Assyrian Rabshakeh's description of his native country in ~~DISC~~ 2 Kings 18:32. Rich informs us that a great quantity of honey, of the finest quality, is produced; the bees (comp. ~~37B~~ Isaiah 7:18, "the bee in the land of Assyria") are kept in hives of mud. The naphtha springs on the east of the Tigris are less productive than those in Mesopotamia, but they are much more numerous. The zoology of the mountain district includes bears (black and brown), panthers, lynxes, wolves, foxes, marmots, dormice, fallow and red deer, roebucks, antelopes, etc., and likewise goats, but not (as was once supposed) of the Angora breed. In the plains are found lions, tigers, hyenas, beavers, jerboas, wild boars, camels, etc.-Kitto.

**5. Subdivisions and Principal Towns.** — Assyria in Scripture is commonly spoken of in its entirety, and unless the *Huzzab* (**bXh**) of Nahum (~~37B~~ Nahum 2:7) is an equivalent for the Adiabene of the geographers, no name of a district can be said to be mentioned. The classical geographers, on the contrary, divided Assyria into a number of regions-Strabo (16:1 and 4) into *Aturia*, *Arbelitis*, *Artacene*, *Apolloniatis*, *Chalonitis*, *Dolomene*, *Calachene*, *Adiabene*, *Mesopotamia*, etc.; Ptolemy (vi, 1) into *Arrapachitis*, *Adiabene*, the *Garamcean* country, *Apolloniatis*, *Arbelitis*, the country of the *Sambatce*, *Calacine*, and *Sittacene*. These provinces

appear to be chiefly named from cities, as Arbelitis from Arbela; Calcine (or Calachene) from Calah or Halah (<sup><01011></sup>Genesis 10:11); Apolloniatis from Apollonia; Sittacene from Sittace, etc. Adiabene, however, the richest region of all, derived its appellation from the *Zab* (*Diab*) rivers on which it lay, as Ammianus Iarcellinus informs us xxiii, 20). Ptolemy (v, 18) made Mesopotamia (which he understood literally as the whole country between the Euphrates and the Tigris) distinct from Assyria, just as the sacred writers distinguish "Aram-Naharain" from "Asshur." Strabo (xvi, 1) extended Assyria to the Euphrates, and even across it into Arabia and Syria! Farthest north lay the province *Arrapachitis*, so called, as Rosenmuller conjectures, from Arphaxad, Asshur's brother (<sup><01022></sup>Genesis 10:22-24; but see Vater *on Genesis*, i, 151). South of it was *Calacine*, by Strabo written *Calachene*; perhaps the *Chalach* of <sup><12705></sup>2 Kings 17:6; 18:11. Next came *Adiabene*, so important a district of Assyria as sometimes to give name to the whole country. **SEE ADIABENE**. In Aramsean it is called *Chadyab* or *Hadyab*. North-east of it lay *Arbelitis*, in which was Arbela (now *Arbil*, of which see an account in Rich's *Kurdistan*, ii, 14; and Appendix, No. i and ii), famous for the battle in which Alexander triumphed over Darius. South of this lay the two provinces of *Apolloniatis* and *Sittacene*. The country of Kir, to which the Assyrians transported the Damascene Syrians (<sup><12609></sup>2 Kings 16:9; Amos 1:5), was probably the region about the river Kur (the Cyrus of the Greeks), i.e. Iberia and Georgia.

The chief cities of Assyria in the time of its greatness appear to be the following: Nineveh, which is marked by the mounds opposite Mosul (*Nebbi-Yunus* and *Kouyunjik*); Calah or Halah, now *Nimrud*; Asshur, now *Kaleh Sherghat*; Sargina, or Dur-Sargina, now *Khorsabad*; Arbela, still *Arbil*; Opis, at the junction of the *Diyaleh* with the Tigris; and Sittace, a little farther down the latter river, if this place should not rather be reckoned to Babylonia. (See the *Journal of the Geograph. Soc.* vol. 9:part i, p. 35, Lond. 1830.) The capital of the whole country was Nineveh, the Ninos of the Greeks (Herodot. i, 102), the Hebrew name being supposed to denote "the abode of Ninus," the founder of the empire. Its site is believed to have been on the east bank of the Tigris, opposite the modern town of Mosul, where there is now a small town called Nebbi Yunus (i.e. the prophet Jonah), the ruins around which were explored by Rich, and are described in his work on *Kurdistan*. **SEE NINEVEH**. In <sup><01011></sup>Genesis 10:11, 12, three other cities are mentioned along with Nineveh, viz. *Rehoboth Ir*, i.e. the city of Rehoboth, the locality of which is unknown. *Calach* (in our

version Calah), either a place in the province of Calachene above mentioned, or the modern Hulwan, called by the Syrians Chalach; and *Resen*, " a great city between Nineveh and Calach," which Bochart identifies with the Larissa of Xenophon (*Anabasis*, iii, 47), and Michaelis with a place called Ressin (Rish-Ain, caput fontis?), destroyed by the Arabs A.D. 772. Rich notices an old place and convent of that name near Mosul (ii, 81). At the town of Al-Kosh, north of Mosul, tradition places the birth and burial of the prophet Nahum, and the Jews resort thither in pilgrimage to his tomb. But, though he is styled an Elkoshite (~~300~~ Nahum 1:1), his denunciation against Assyria and Nineveh were evidently uttered in Palestine; and St. Jerome fixes his birthplace at Helkesei, a village in Galilee.-Kitto; Smith. *SEE JONAH*.

**6. Present Condition.** — The greater part of the country which formed Assyria Proper is under the nominal sway of the Turks, who compose a considerable proportion of the population of the towns and larger villages, filling nearly all public offices, and differing in nothing from other Osmanlis. The Pasha of Mosul is nominated by the Porte, but is subject to the Pasha of Bagdad; there is also a pasha at Solymaneah and Akra; a bey at Arbil, a mussellim at Kirkuk, etc. But the aboriginal inhabitants of the country, and of the whole mountain tract that here divides Turkey from Persia, are the *Kurds*, the Carduchii of the Greeks; from them a chain of these mountains were anciently called the Carduchian or Gordymean, and from them now the country is designated Kurdistan. Klaproth. in his *Asia Polyglotta* (Paris, 1823, 4to, p. 75), derives the name from the Persian root *kurd*, i.e. strong, brave. They are still, as of old, a barbarous and warlike race, occasionally yielding a formal allegiance, on the west, to the Turks, and on the east to the Persians, but newer wholly subdued; indeed, some of the more powerful tribes, such as the Hakkary, have maintained an entire independence. Some of them are stationary in villages, while others roam far and wide, beyond the limits of their own country, as nomadic shepherds; but they are all more or less addicted to predatory habits, and are regarded with great dread by their more peaceful neighbors. They profess the faith of Islam, and are of the Sunite sect. All travellers have remarked many points of resemblance between them and the ancient Highlanders of Scotland. (See Mr. Ainsworth's second work, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia*, etc., Lond. 1842, 2 vols.)

The Christian population is scattered over the whole region, but is found chiefly in the north. It includes Chaldaeans, who form that branch of the

Nestorians that adheres to the Church of Rome, a few Jacobites, or monophysite Syrians, Armenians, etc. But the most interesting portion is the ancient Church of the primitive *Nestorians*, a lively interest in which has lately been excited in the religious world by the publications of the American missionaries (see, especially, *The Nestorians*, by Asahel Grant, M.D., Lond. 1841; and compare Dr. E. Robinson, in the *Am. Bibl. Repos.* Oct. 1841; Jan. 1842; Rev. J. Perkins, *ib.* Jan. 1843; and *Residence in Persia*, N. Y. 1843). **SEE NESTORIANS.** Another peculiar race that is met with in this and the neighboring countries is that of the Yezidecs (q.v.), whom Grant and Ainsworth would likewise connect with the ten tribes; but it seems much more probable that they are an offshoot from the ancient Manichees, their alleged worship of the Evil Principle amounting to no more than a reverence which keeps them from speaking of him with disrespect (see Homes, in the *Am. Bibl. Repos.* for April, 1842). Besides the dwellers in towns and the agricultural population, there are a vast number of wandering tribes, not only of Kurds, but of Arabs, Turkomans, and other classes of robbers, who, by keeping the settled inhabitants in constant dread of property and life, check every effort at improvement; and, in consequence of this and the influence of bad government, many of the finest portions of the country are little better than unproductive wastes. A copy of a famous history of Kurdistan, entitled *Tarikh al-Akrad* (Akrad being the collective name of the people), was procured by Mr. Rich when in the country, and is now, along with the other valuable Oriental MSS. of that lamented traveller, preserved in the British Museum. **SEE KURDISTAN.**

**II. THE ASSYRIAN EMPIRE.** — No portion of ancient history is involved in greater obscurity than that of the empire of Assyria. Nor is this obscurity in any very great degree removed by the recent remarkable discoveries of the monumental records of the nation by Layard, Botta, and Loftus.

**1. Scriptural Notices of Assyrian History.** — In attempting to arrange even the facts deducible from Scripture, a difficulty presents itself at the outset, arising from the ambiguity of the account given of the origin of the earliest Assyrian state in <sup><CHIEF></sup>Genesis 10:11. After describing Nimrod, son of Cush, "as a mighty one in the earth," the historian adds (ver. 10), "And the beginning of his kingdom (or, rather, the first theatre of his dominion) was Babel, and Erech, and Accad; and Calneh, in the land of Shinar," *i.e.* *Babylonia*. Then follow the words (as it is in the margin), "Out of that

land he (*i.e.* Nimrod) went out into Assyria and builded Nineveh," (comp. Noldius, *Concord. Hebr. Particles*, ed. Tymph., p. 223.) Moses is enumerating the descendants of Ham, and it is not likely that he would interrupt the details to give an account of Asshur, a son of Shem, whose posterity are not introduced till ver. 21. Besides, in the circumstance of Asshur leaving one country to settle in another, there was nothing remarkable, for that was the case with almost all Noah's grandchildren. But if we understand it of Nimrod, both the connection and the sense will be manifest. The design obviously is to represent him as a potent monarch and ambitious conqueror. His brethren, the other sons of Cush, settled in the south, but he, advancing northward, first seized on Babylonia, and, proceeding thence into Assyria (already partially colonized by the Asshurites, from whom it took its name), he built Nineveh and the other strongholds mentioned, in order to secure his conquests. This view is confirmed by a passage in ~~3816~~ Micah 5:6, where, predicting the overthrow of Assyria by the Medes and Babylonians, the prophet says, "They shall devour the land of Asshur with the sword: even the land of Nimrod in the entrances thereof" (comp. v. 5). It likewise agrees with the native tradition (if we can depend on the report of Ctesias), that the founder of the Assyrian monarchy and the builder of Nineveh was one and the same person, viz., Ninus, from whom it derived its name (q. d. *Nin's Abode*), and in that case the designation of Nimrod (*the Rebel*) was not his proper name, but an opprobrious appellation imposed on him by his enemies. Modern tradition likewise connects Nimrod with Assyria; for while, as we have seen, the memory of Asshur is preserved in the locality of *Athur*, that place is also termed the "city of Nimrud," and (as the above-mentioned dam on the Tigris is styled Nimrod's Castle) Rich informs us that "the inhabitants of the neighboring village of Deraweish consider him as their founder." He adds, that the village story-tellers have a book they call the *Kisseh-Nimrud*, or "Tales of-Nimrod."

It is true that the Authorized Version of ~~4001~~ Genesis 10:11 is countenanced by most of the ancient translators and by Josephus; but, on the other hand, the one we have preferred is that of the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and of Jerome; and (among the moderns) of Bochart, Hyde, Marsham, Wells, Faber, Hales, and many others. Yet, though Nimrod's "kingdom" embraced the lands both of Shinar and Asshur, we are left in the dark as to whether Babylon or Nineveh became the permanent seat of government, and consequently whether his empire should be designated that of

Babylonia or that of Assyria. No certain traces of it, indeed, are to be found in Scripture for ages after its erection. In the days of Abraham, we hear of a king of Elam (*i.e.* Elymais, in the south of Persia) named Chedorlaomer, who had held in subjection for twelve years five petty princes of Palestine (<sup><0144></sup>Genesis 14:4), and who, in consequence of their rebellion, invaded that country along with three other kings, one of whom was "Amraphel, king of *Shinar*." Josephus says "the Assyrians had then dominion over Asia;" and he styles these four kings merely commanders in the Assyrian army. It is possible that Chedorlaomer was an Assyrian viceroy, and the others his deputies; for at a later period the Assyrian boasted, "Are not my princes altogether kings?" (<sup><2308></sup>Isaiah 10:8.) Yet some have rather concluded from the narrative that by this time the monarchy of Nimrod had been broken up, or that at least the seat of government had been transferred to Elam. Be this as it may, the name of Assyria as an independent state does not again appear in Scripture till the closing period of the age of Moses. Balaam, a seer from the northern part of Mesopotamia, in the neighborhood of Assyria, addressing the Kenites, a mountain tribe on the east side of the Jordan, "took up his parable," *i.e.* raised his oracular, prophetic chant, and said, "Durable is thy dwelling-place! yea, in a rock putteth thou thy nest: nevertheless, wasted shall be the Kenite, until Asshur shall lead them captive." In this verse, besides the play upon the word *ken* (the Hebrew for a nest), the reader may remark the striking contrast drawn between the permanent nature of the abode, and the transient possession of it by the occupants. The prediction found its fulfilment in the Kenites being gradually reduced in strength (comp. <sup><0156></sup>1 Samuel 15:6), till they finally shared the fate of the Transjordanite tribes, and were swept away into captivity by the Assyrians (<sup><1355></sup>1 Chronicles 5:26; <sup><2169></sup>2 Kings 16:9; 19:12, 13; <sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 2:55.) But, as a counterpart to this, Balaam next sees a vision of retaliatory vengeance on their oppressors, and the awful prospect of the threatened devastations, though beheld in far distant times, extorts from him the exclamation, "Ah! who shall live when God doeth this? For ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict ASSHUR, and shall afflict Eber, but he also [the invader] shall perish forever." This is not without obscurity; but it has commonly been supposed to point to the conquest of the regions that once formed the Assyrian empire, first by the Macedonians from Greece, and then by the Romans, both of whose empires were in their turn overthrown.



In the time of the Judges, the people of Israel became subject to a king of Mesopotamia, Chushan-rishathaim (<sup><ORR></sup>Judges 3:8), who is by Josephus styled King of the Assyrians; but we are left in the same ignorance as in the case of Chedorlaomer as to whether he was an independent sovereign or only a vicegerent for another. The eighty-third Psalm (ver. 9) mentions Ashur as one of the nations leagued against Israel; but as the date of that composition is unknown, nothing certain can be founded on it. The first king of Assyria alluded to in the Bible is he who reigned at Nineveh when the prophet Jonah was sent thither (<sup><RRR></sup>Jonah 3:6). Hales supposes him to have been the father of Pul, the first Assyrian monarch *named* in Scripture, and dates the commencement of his reign B.C. 821. By that time the metropolis of the empire had become "an exceeding great" and populous city, but one pre-eminent in wickedness (<sup><RRR></sup>Jonah 1:2; 3:3; 4:11). *SEE JONAH.*

## Picture for Assyria 2

The first expressly recorded appearance of the Assyrian power in the countries west of the Euphrates is in the reign of Menahem, king of Israel, against whom "the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of *Pul* or (*Phul*), king of Assyria" (<sup><RRR></sup>1 Chronicles 5:26), who invaded the country, and exacted a tribute of a thousand talents of silver "that his hand," *i.e.* his favor, "might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand" (<sup><RRR></sup>2 Kings 15:19, 20). Newton places this event in the year B.C. 770, in the twentieth year of Pul's reign, the commencement of which he fixes in the year B.C. 790. As to his name, we find the syllable *Pal*, *Pel*, or *Pul* entering into the names of several Assyrian kings (e.g. *Pileser*, *Sardanapal-us*); and hence some connect it with the Persian "*balm*," *i.e.* high, exalted, and think it may have been part of the title which the Assyrian monarchs bore. Hales conjectures that Pul may have been the second *Belus* of the Greeks, his fame having reached them by his excursions into Western Asia. About this period we find the prophet Hosea making frequent allusions to the practice both of Israel and Judsea, of throwing themselves for support on the kings of Assyria. In ch. 5:13; 10:6, our version speaks of their specially seeking the protection of a "King Jareb," but the original there is very obscure; and the next Assyrian monarch mentioned by name is *Tiglath-pileser*. The supposition of Newton is adopted by Hales, that at Pul's death his dominions were divided between his two sons, Tiglath-pileser and Nabonassar, the latter being made ruler at Babylon, from the date of whose government or reign the celebrated *era of Nabonassar* took its rise,

corresponding to B.C. 747. The name of the other is variously written Tiglath and Tilgath, Pileser and Pilreser: the etymology of the first is unknown (some think it has a reference to the river Dijlath, *i.e.* the Tigris). Pileser signifies in Persian "exalted prince." When Ahaz, king of Judah, was hard pressed by the combined forces of Pekah, king of Israel, and Rezin, king of Damascene Syria, he purchased Tiglath-pileser's assistance with a large sum, taken out of his own and the Temple treasury. The Assyrian king accordingly invaded territories of both the confederate kings, and annexed a portion of them to his own dominions, carrying captive a number of their subjects (<sup><12159></sup>2 Kings 15:29; 16:5-10; <sup><13136></sup>1 Chronicles 5:26; <sup><14316></sup>2 Chronicles 28:16; <sup><21008></sup>Isaiah 7:1-11; comp. Amos 1:9:7). His successor was *Shalman* (<sup><28004></sup>Hosea 10:4), *Shalmaneser* or *Salmanassar*, the Enemessar of the apocryphal book of Tobit (ch. 1:2). He made Hoshea, king of Israel, his tributary vassal (<sup><12178></sup>2 Kings 17:3); but finding him secretly negotiating with So or Sabaco (the Sabakoph of the monuments), king of Egypt, he laid siege to the Israelitish capital, Samaria, took it after an investment of three years (B.C. 720), and then reduced the country of the ten tribes to a province of his empire, carrying into captivity the king and his people, and settling Cutheans from Babylonia in their room (<sup><12178></sup>2 Kings 17:3-6; 18:9, 11). Hezekiah, king of Judah, seems to have been for some time his vassal (<sup><12187></sup>2 Kings 18:7); and we learn from the Tyrian annals, preserved by Menatlder of Ephesus (as cited by Josephus, *Ant.* 10:14, 2), that he subdued the whole of Phoenicia, with the exception of insular Tyre, which successfully resisted a siege of five years. The empire of Assyria seems now to have reached its greatest extent, having had the Mediterranean for its boundary on the west, and including within its limits Media and Kir on the north, as well as Elam on the south (<sup><12169></sup>2 Kings 16:9; 17:6; <sup><23116></sup>Isaiah 20:6). In the twentieth chapter of Isaiah (ver. 1) there is mention of a king of Assyria, *Sargon*, in whose reign Tartan besieged and took Ashdod in Philistia (B.C. 715) **SEE SARGON**; and as Tartan is elsewhere spoken of (<sup><12187></sup>2 Kings 18:17) as a general of Sennacherib, some have supposed that Sargon is but another name of that monarch, while others would identify him either with Shalmaneser, or with Esarhaddon, Sennacherib's successor. But the correctness of all these conjectures may fairly be questioned; and we adhere to the opinion of Gesenius (*Comment. zu Jesa.* in loc.), that Sargon was a king of Assyria, who succeeded Shalmaneser, and had a short reign of two or three years. He thinks the name may be equivalent to *Ser-jaumeh*, "Prince of the Sun." Von Bohlen prefers the derivation of *sergun*, "gold-colored." His attack on Egypt may

have arisen from the jealousy which the Assyrians entertained of that nation's influence over Palestine ever since the negotiation between its king So, and Hoshea, king of Israel. From many incidental expressions in the book of Isaiah we can infer that there was at this time a strong Egyptian party among the Jews, for that people are often warned against relying for help on Egypt, instead of simply confiding in Jehovah (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 30:2; 31:1; comp. 20:5, 6). The result of Tartan's expedition against Egypt and Ethiopia was predicted by Isaiah while that general was yet on the Egyptian frontier at Ashdod (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 20:1-4); and it is not improbable that it is to this Assyrian invasion that the prophet Nahum refers when he speaks (<sup><3408></sup>Nahum 3:8-10) of the subjugation of No, i.e. No-Ammun, or Thebes, the capital of Upper Egypt, and the captivity of its inhabitants. The occupation of the country by the Assyrians, however, must have been very transient, for in the reign of Sargon's successor, *Sennacherib*, or *Sancherib*, we find Hezekiah, king of Judah, throwing off the Assyrian yoke, and allying himself with Egypt (<sup><2187></sup>2 Kings 18:7, 21). This brought against him Sennacherib with a mighty host, which, without difficulty, subdued the fenced cities of Judah, and compelled him to purchase peace by the payment of a large tribute. But "the treacherous dealer dealt very treacherously" (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 33:1), and, notwithstanding the agreement, proceeded to invest Jerusalem. In answer, however, to the prayers of the "good king" of Judah, the Assyrian was diverted from his purpose, partly by the "rumor" (<sup><2306></sup>Isaiah 37:6) of the approach of Tirhakah, king of Ethiopia, and partly by the sudden and miraculous destruction of a great part of his army (<sup><2183></sup>2 Kings 18:13-37; 19; Isaiah 36 and 37). He himself fled (B.C. 712) to Nineveh, where, in course of time, when worshipping in the temple of his god Nisroch, he was slain by his sons Adrammelech and Sharezer, the parricides escaping into the land of Armenia—a fact which is preserved in that country's traditional history. *SEE ARARAT*. Regarding the period of Sennacherib's death chronologists differ. Hales, following the apocryphal book of Tobit (i, 21), places it fifty-five days after his return from his Jewish expedition; but Gesenius (*Comment. zu Jesa.* p. 999) has rendered it extremely probable that it did not take place till long after. He finds this opinion chiefly on a curious fragment of Berosus, preserved in the Armenian translation of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius. It states that, after Sennacherib's brother had governed Babylon as the Assyrian viceroy, the sovereignty was successively usurped by Acises, Merodach, or Berodach-Baladan (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 39:1; <sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 20:12), and Elibus or Belibus. But, after three years, Sennacherib regained dominion in

Babylonia, and appointed as viceroy his own son Assordan, the Esarhaddon of Scripture.' This statement serves to explain how there was in Hezekiah's time a king at Babylon, though, both before and after, it was subject to Assyria. *SEE SENNACHERIB*. Sennacherib was succeeded by his son Esarhaddon, or Assarhaddon, who had been his father's viceroy at Babylon (<sup><12657></sup>2 Kings 19:37; <sup><23378></sup>Isaiah 37:38). He is the Sacherdon or Sarchedon of Tobit (i, 21), and the Asaradinus of Ptolemy's Canon (B.C. 680). Hales regards him as the first Sardanapalus. The chief notice taken of him in Scripture is that he settled some colonists in Samaria (<sup><15012></sup>Ezra 4:2), and as (at ver. 10) that colonization is ascribed to the "great and noble Asnapper," it is supposed that that was another name for Esarhaddon, but it may have been one of the great officers of his empire. It seems to have been in his reign that the captains of the Assyrian host invaded and ravaged Judah, carrying Manasseh, the king, captive to Babylon. The subsequent history of the empire is involved in almost as much obscurity as that of its origin and rise. The Medes had already shaken off the yoke, and the Chaldaeans soon appear on the scene as the dominant nation of Western Asia; yet Assyria, though much reduced in extent, existed as an independent state for a considerable period after Esarhaddon. Hales, following Syncellus, makes him succeeded by a prince called Ninus (B.C. 667), who had for his successor Nebuchodonosor (B.C. 658), for the transactions of whose reign, including the expedition of his general Holofernes into Judesa, Hales relies on the apocryphal book of Judith, the authority of which, however, is very questionable. The *last* monarch was Sarac, or Sardanapalus II (B.C. 636), in whose reign Cyaxares, king of Media, and Nabopolassar, viceroy of Babylon, combined against Assyria, took Nineveh, and, dividing what remained of the empire between them, reduced Assyria Proper to a province of Media (B.C. 606).

**2. Comparison with ancient Historians and the Intimations on the Monuments.** —The original sources of profane history on this subject are Herodotus and Ctesias; but every attempt to reconcile their statements with those of Scripture, or even with each other, has hitherto failed. The former fixes the duration of the Assyrian dominion in Upper Asia at 520 years (Herod. i, 95), while the latter again assigns to the Assyrian empire, from Ninus to Sardanapalus, no less a period than 1305 years (Diodor. Sicul. ii, 21). The authority of Ctesias, however, is very generally discredited (it was so even by Aristotle), though he has recently found a defender in Dr. Russell, in his *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*. The truth is (as

is remarked by the judicious Heeren), that the accounts of both these historians are little better than mere traditions of ancient heroes and heroines (witness the fables about Semiramis!), without any chronological data, and entirely in the style of the East. To detail all the fanciful hypotheses which have been propounded, with the view of forming out of them a consistent and coherent narrative, forms no part of our present design. Considerable light, however, has been thrown, by recent researches, upon certain points of this history.-Kitto.

**(1.)** *The original Settlement of the Country.*—Scripture informs us that Assyria was peopled from Babylon (<sup><010B></sup>Genesis 10:11), and both classical tradition and the monuments of the country agree in this representation. In Herodotus (i, 7), Ninus, the mythic founder of Nineveh, is the son (descendant) of Belus, the mythic founder of Babylon—a tradition in which the derivation of Assyria from Babylon, and the greater antiquity and superior position of the latter in early times, are shadowed forth sufficiently. That Ctesias (ap. Diod. Sic. ii, 7). inverts the relation, making Semiramis (according to him, the wife and successor of Ninus) found Babylon, is only one out of a thousand proofs of the untrustworthy character of his history. The researches recently carried on in the two countries clearly show, not merely by the statements which are said to have been deciphered on the historical monuments, but by the whole character of the remains discovered, that Babylonian greatness and civilization was earlier than Assyrian, and that, while the former was of native growth, the latter was derived from the neighboring country. The cuneiform writing, for instance, which is rapidly punched with a very simple instrument upon moist clay, but is only with much labor and trouble inscribed by the chisel upon rock, must have been invented in a country where men "had brick for stone" (<sup><010B></sup>Genesis 11:3), and have thence passed to one where the material was unsuited for it. It may be observed, also, that while writing occurs in a very rude form in the earlier Babylonian ruins (Loftus's *Chaldae*, p. 169), and gradually improves in the later ones, it is in Assyria uniformly of an advanced type, having apparently been introduced there after it had attained to perfection.

**(2.)** *Date of the Foundation of the Kingdom.*—With respect to the exact time at which Assyria became a separate and independent country, there is an important difference between classical authorities, Herodotus placing the commencement of the empire almost a thousand years later than Ctesias! Scripture does but little to determine the controversy; that little,

however, is in favor of the former author. Geographically, as a *country*, Assyria was evidently known to Moses (<sup><OR14></sup>Genesis 2:14; 25:18; <sup><OR12></sup>Numbers 24:22, 24); but it does not appear in Jewish history as a *kingdom* till the reign of Menahem (B.C. cir. 770). In Abraham's time (B.C. 2000 ?) it is almost certain that there can have been no Assyrian kingdom, or its monarch would have been found among those who invaded Palestine with Chedorlaomer' (<sup><OR10></sup>Genesis 14:1). In the time of the early judges (B.C. 1575), Assyria, if it existed, can have been of no great strength; for Chushan-Rishathaim, the first of the foreigners who oppressed Israel (<sup><OR13></sup>Judges 3:8), is master of the whole country between the rivers (*Aram Naharim*= " Syria between the two rivers"). These facts militate strongly against the views of Ctesias, whose numbers produce for the founding of the empire the date of B.C. 2182 (Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* i, 263). The more modest account of Herodotus is at once more probable in itself, more agreeable to Scripture, and more in accordance with the native writer Berosus. Herodotus relates that the Assyrians were "lords of Asia" for 520 years, when their empire was partially broken up by a revolt of the subject-nations (i, 95). After a period of anarchy, the length of which he does not estimate, the Median kingdom was formed, 179 years before the death of Cyrus, or B.C. 708. He would thus, it appears, have assigned to the foundation of the Assyrian empire a date not very greatly anterior to B.C. 1228. Berosus, who made the empire last 526 years to the reign of Pul (ap. Euseb. *Chronicles Arm.* i, 4), must have agreed nearly with this view—at least he would certainly have placed the rise of the kingdom within the 13th century. This is, perhaps, the utmost that can be determined with any approach to certainty. If, for convenience' sake, a more exact date be desired, the conjecture of Dr. Brandis has some claim to be adopted, which fixes the year B.C. 1273 as that from which the 526 years of Berosus are to be reckoned (*Rerum Assyriarum Tempora Emendata*, p. 17).

**(3.) Early Kings, from the foundation of the Kingdom to Pul.** — The long list of Assyrian kings which has come down to us in two or three forms, only slightly varied (Clinton, *F. H.* i, 267), and which is almost certainly derived from Ctesias, must of necessity be discarded, together with his date for the kingdom. It covers a space of above 1200 years, and bears marks besides of audacious fraud, being composed of names snatched from all quarters, Arian, Semitic, and Greek-names of gods, names of towns, names of rivers—and in its estimate of time presenting the impossible average of 34 or 35 years to a reign, and the very improbable phenomenon of reigns in

half the instances amounting exactly to a decimal number. Unfortunately, we have no authentic list to substitute for the forgery of Ctesias. Berosus spoke of 45 kings as reigning during his period of 526 years, and mentioned all their names (Euseb. *ut sup.*); but they have unluckily not been preserved to us. The work of Herodotus on Assyrian history (Herod. i, 106 and 184) has likewise entirely perished, and neither Greek nor Oriental sources are available to supply the loss, which has hitherto proved irreparable. Recently the researches in Mesopotamia have done something toward filling up this sad gap in our knowledge; but the reading of names is still so doubtful that it seems best, in the present condition of cuneiform inquiry, to treat the early period of Assyrian history in a very general way, only mentioning kings by name when, through the satisfactory identification of a cuneiform royal designation with some name known to us from sacred or profane sources, firm ground has been reached, and serious error rendered almost impossible.

The Mesopotamian researches have rendered it apparent that the original seat of government was not at Nineveh. The oldest Assyrian remains have been found at Kaleh-Sherghat, on the right bank of the Tigris, 60 miles south of the later capital; and this place the monuments show to have been the residence of the earliest kings, as well as of the Babylonian governors who previously exercised authority over the country. The ancient name of the town appears to have been identical with that of the country, viz. *Asshur*. It was built of brick, and has yielded but a very small number of sculptures. The kings proved to have reigned there are fourteen in number, divisible into three groups; and their reigns are thought to have covered a space of nearly 350 years, from B.C. 1273 to B.C. 930. The most remarkable monarch of the series was called Tiglath-Pileser. He appears to have been king toward the close of the twelfth century, and thus to have been contemporary with Samson, and an earlier king than the Tiglath-Pileser of Scripture. He overran the whole country between Assyria Proper and the Euphrates; swept the valley of the Euphrates from south to north, from the borders of Babylon to Mount Taurus; crossed the Euphrates, and contended in northern Syria with the Hittites; invaded Armenia and Cappadocia; and claims to have *subdued forty-two* countries " from the channel of the Lower Zab (Zab Asfal) to the Upper Sea of the Setting Sun." All this he accomplished in the first five years of his reign. At a later date he appears to have suffered defeat at the hands of the king of Babylon, who had invaded his territory and succeeded in carrying off to Babylon

various idols from the Assyrian temples (Offerhaus, *De ant. Assyr. imperio*, Linga, 1727).

The other monarchs of the Kaleh-Sherghat series, both before and after Tiglath-Pileser, are comparatively insignificant. The later kings of the series are only known to us as the ancestors of the two great monarchs Sardanapalus the first and his son, Shalmaneser or Shalmanubar, who were among the most warlike of the Assyrian princes. Sardanapalus the first, who appears to have been the warlike Sardanapalus of the Greeks (Suidas, s.v.; comp. Hellan. *Frag.* p. 158), transferred the seat of government from Kaleh-Sherghat to Nimrud (probably the Scriptural Calah), where he built the first of those magnificent palaces which have recently been exhumed by English explorers. A great portion of the Assyrian sculptures now in the British Museum are derived from this edifice. A description of the building has been given by Mr. Layard (*Nin. and its Remains*, vol. ii, ch. 11). By an inscription repeated more than a hundred times upon its sculptures we learn that Sardanapalus carried his arms far and wide through Western Asia, warring on the one hand in Lower Babylonia and Chaldea, on the other in Syria and upon the coast of the Mediterranean. His son, Shalmaneser or Shalmanubar, the monarch who set up the Black Obelisk, now in the British Museum, to commemorate his victories, was a still greater conqueror. He appears to have overrun Cappadocia, Armenia, *Azerbaijan*, great portions of Media Magna, the Kurdish mountains, Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Phoenicia; everywhere making the kings of the countries tributary to him. If we may trust the reading of certain names, on which cuneiform scholars appear to be entirely agreed, he came in contact with various Scriptural personages, being opposed in his Syrian wars by Benhadad and Hazael, kings of Damascus, and taking tribute from Jehu, king of Israel. His son and grandson followed in his steps, but scarcely equalled his glory. The latter is thought to be identical with the Biblical Pul, Phul, or Phaloch, who is the first of the Assyrian kings of whom we have mention in Scripture. *SEE PUL*.

**(4.)** *The Kings from Pul to Esarhaddon.* — The succession of the Assyrian kings from Pul almost to the close of the empire is rendered tolerably certain, not merely by the inscriptions, but also by the Jewish records. In the 2d book of Kings we find the names of Pul, Tiglath-Pileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon, following one another in rapid succession (<sup>~1259</sup>2 Kings 15:19 and 29; 17:3; 18:13; 19:37); and in Isaiah we have the name of "Sargon, king of Assyria" (xx, 1), who is a



contemporary of the prophet, and who must evidently, therefore, belong to the same series. The inscriptions, by showing us that Sargon was the father of Sennacherib, fix his place in the list, and give us for the monarchs of the last half of the 8th and the first half of the 7th century B.C. the (probably) complete list of TiglathPileser II, Shalmaneser II, Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon. For a detailed account of the actions of these kings, see each name in its place. (See Oppert, *Chronologie des Assyriens et des Babylonens*, Paris, 1857.)

### Picture for Assyria 3

(a.) *Establishment of the Lower Dynasty.* — It seems to be certain that at or near the accession of Pul a great change of some kind or other occurred in Assyria. Berosus is said to have brought his grand dynasty of forty-five kings in 526 years to a close at the reign of Pul (Polyhist. ap. Euseb. 1. c.), and to have made him the first king of a new series. By the synchronism of Menahem (~~2~~<sup>1</sup> Kings 15:19), the date of Pul may be determined to about B.C. 770. It was only twenty-three years later, as we find by the Canon of Ptolemy, that the Babylonians considered their independence to have commenced (B.C. 747). Herodotus probably intended to assign nearly to this same era the great commotion which (according to him) broke up the Assyrian empire into a number of fragments, out of which were formed the Median and other kingdoms. These traditions may none of them be altogether trustworthy; but their coincidence is at least remarkable, and seems to show that about the middle of the eighth century B.C. there must have been a break in the line of Assyrian kings—a revolution, foreign or domestic and a consequent weakening or dissolution of the bonds which united the conquered nations with their conquerors.

It was related by Bion and Polyhistor (Agathias, ii, 25), that the original dynasty of Assyrian kings ended with a certain Belochus or Beleus, who was succeeded by a usurper (called by them Beletaras or Balatorus), in whose family the crown continued until the destruction of Nineveh. The general character of the circumstances narrated, combined with a certain degree of resemblance in the names—for Belochus is close upon Phaloch, and Beletaras may represent the second element in *Tiglath-Pileser* (who in the inscriptions is called “Tiglath-Palatsira”)-induce a suspicion that probably the Pul or Phaloch of Scripture was really the last king of the old monarchy, and that TiglathPileser II, his successor, was the founder of what has been called the "Lower Empire." It maybe suspected that Berosus

really gave this account, and that Polyhistor, who repeated it, has been misreported by Eusebius. The synchronism between the revolution in Assyria and the era of Babylonian independence is thus brought almost to exactness, for Tiglath-Pileser is known to have been upon the throne about B.C. 740 (Clinton, *Fast. Tell.* i, 278), and may well have ascended it in B.C. 747.

**(b.)** *Supposed Loss of the Empire at this Period.* Many writers of repute—among them Clinton and Niebuhr—have been inclined to accept the statement of Herodotus with respect to the breaking up of the whole empire at this period. It is evident, however, both from Scripture and from the monuments, that the shock sustained through the domestic revolution has been greatly exaggerated. Niebuhr himself observes (*Vortrige uber alte Geschichte*, i, 38) that, after the revolution, Assyria soon "recovered herself, and displayed the most extraordinary energy." It is plain, from Scripture, that in the reigns of Tiglath-Pileser, Shalmaneser, Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon, Assyria was as great as at any former era. These kings all warred successfully in Palestine and its neighborhood; some attacked Egypt (<sup><23104></sup>Isaiah 20:4); one appears as master of Medil (<sup><12716></sup>2 Kings 17:6); while another has authority over Babylon, Susiana, and Elymais (<sup><12724></sup>2 Kings 17:24; <sup><15100></sup>Ezra 4:9). So far from our observing symptoms of weakness and curtailed dominion, it is clear that at no time were the Assyrian arms pushed farther, or their efforts more sustained and vigorous. The Assyrian annals for the period are in the most complete accordance with these representations. They exhibit to us the above-mentioned monarchs as extending their dominions farther than any of their predecessors. The empire is continually rising under them, and reaches its culminating point in the reign of Esarhaddon. The statements of the inscriptions on these subjects are fully borne out by the indications of greatness to be traced in the architectural monuments. No palace of the old monarchy equalled, either in size or splendor, that of Sennacherib at Nineveh. No series of kings belonging to it left buildings at all to be compared with those which were erected by Sargon, his son, and his grandson. The magnificent remains at Kouyunjik and Khorsabad belong entirely to these later kings, while those at Nimrud are about equally divided between them and their predecessors. It is farther noticeable that the writers who may be presumed to have drawn from Berosus, as Polyhistor and Abydenus, particularly expatiated upon the glories of these later kings. Polyhistor said (ap. Euseb. i, 5) that Sennacherib conquered

Babylon, defeated a Greek army in Cilicia, and built there Tarsus, the capital. Abydenus related the same facts, except that he substituted for the Greek army of Polyhistor a Greek fleet; and added that Esarhaddon (his Axerdis) conquered Lower Syria and Egypt (*ibid.* i, 9). Similarly Menander, the Tyrian historian, assigned to Shalmaneser an expedition to Cyprus (ap. Joseph. *Ant.* 9:14), and Herodotus himself admitted that Sennacherib invaded Egypt (ii, 141). On every ground it seems necessary to conclude that the second Assyrian kingdom was really greater and more glorious than the first; that under it the limits of the empire reached their fullest extent, and the internal prosperity was at the highest.

The statement of Herodotus is not, however, without a basis of truth. It is certain that Babylon, about the time of Tiglath-Pileser's accession, ventured upon a revolt, which she seems afterward to have reckoned the commencement of her independence. *SEE BABYLON*. The knowledge of this fact may have led Herodotus into his error; for he would naturally suppose that, when Babylon became free, there was a general dissolution of the empire. It has been shown that this is far from the truth; and it may farther be observed that, even as regards Babylon, the Assyrian loss was not permanent. Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon all exercised full authority over that country, which appears to have been still an Assyrian fief at the close of the kingdom.

(5.) *Successors of Esarhaddon.* — By the end of the reign of Esarhaddon the triumph of the Assyrian arms had been so complete that scarcely an enemy was left who could cause her serious anxiety. The kingdoms of Hamath, of Damascus, and of Samaria had been successively absorbed; Phoenicia had been conquered; Judsea had been made a feudatory; Philistia and Idumaea had been subjected, Egypt chastised, Babylon recovered, cities planted in Media. Unless in Armenia and Susiana there was no foe left to reduce, and the consequence appears to have been that a time of profound peace succeeded to the long and bloody wars of Sargon and his immediate successors. In Scripture it is remarkable—that we hear nothing of Assyria after the reign of Esarhaddon, and profane history is equally silent until the attacks begin which brought about her downfall. The monuments show that the son of Esarhaddon, who was called Sardanapalus by Abydenus (ap. Euseb. i, 9), made scarcely any military expeditions, but occupied almost his whole time in the enjoyment of the pleasures of the chase. Instead of adorning his residence—as his predecessors had been accustomed to do—with a record and representation of his conquests,

Sardanapalus II covered the walls of his palace at Nineveh with sculptures exhibiting his skill and prowess as a hunter. No doubt the military spirit rapidly decayed under such a ruler; and the advent of fresh enemies, synchronizing with this decline, produced the ruin of a power which had for six centuries been dominant in Western Asia.

(6.) *Fall of Assyria.* — The fate of Assyria, long previously prophesied by Isaiah (<sup>23015</sup>Isaiah 10:5-19), was effected (humanly speaking) by the growing strength and boldness of the Medes. If we may trust Herodotus, the first Median attack on Nineveh took place about the year B.C. 633. By what circumstances this people, who had so long been engaged in contests with the Assyrians, and had hitherto shown themselves so utterly unable to resist them, became suddenly strong enough to assume an aggressive attitude, and to force the Ninevites to submit to a siege, can only be conjectured. Whether mere natural increase, or whether fresh immigrations from the east had raised the Median nation at this time so far above its former condition, it is impossible to determine. We can only say that soon after the middle of the seventh century they began to press upon the Assyrians, and that, gradually increasing in strength, they proceeded, about the year B.C. 633, to attempt the conquest of the country. For some time their efforts were unsuccessful; but after a while, having won over the Babylonians to their side, they became superior to the Assyrians in the field, and about B.C. 625, or a little earlier, laid final siege to the capital. *SEE MEDIA.* Saracus, the last king—probably the grandson of Esarhaddon—made a stout and prolonged defence, but at length, finding resistance vain, he collected his wives and his treasures in his palace, and with his own hand setting fire to the building, perished in the flames. This account is given in brief by Abydenus, who probably follows Berosus; and its outline so far agrees with Ctesias (ap. Diod. ii, 27) as to give an important value to that writer's details of the siege. *SEE NINEVEH.* In the general fact that Assyria was overcome, and Nineveh captured and destroyed by a combined attack of Medes and Babylonians, Josephus (*Ant.* 10:5) and the book of Tobit (xiv, 15) are agreed. Polyhistor also implies it (ap. Euseb. i, 5); and these authorities must be regarded as outweighing the silence of Herodotus, who mentions only the Medes in connection with the capture (i, 106), and says nothing of the Babylonians.

(7.) *Fulfilment of Prophecy.*—The prophecies of Nahum and Zephaniah (<sup>30123</sup>Zephaniah 2:13-5) against Assyria were probably delivered shortly before the catastrophe. The date of Nahum is very doubtful, but it is not

unlikely that he wrote about B.C. 718, or at the close of the reign of Hosea. Zephaniah is even later, since he prophesied under Josiah, who reigned from B.C. 639 to 609. If B.C. 625 be the date of the destruction of Nineveh, we may place Zephaniah's prophecy about B.C. 635. Ezekiel, writing in B.C. 588, bears witness historically to the complete destruction which had come upon the Assyrians, using the example as a warning to Pharaoh-Hophra and the Egyptians (ch. 31).

It was declared by Nahum (q.v.) emphatically, at the close of his prophecy, that there should be "no healing of Assyria's bruise" (<sup><3189></sup>Nahum 3:19). In accordance with this announcement we find that Assyria never rose again to any importance, nor even succeeded in maintaining a distinct nationality. Once only was revolt attempted, and then in conjunction with Armenia and Media, the latter heading the rebellion. This attempt took place about a century after the Median conquest, during the troubles which followed upon the accession of Darius Hystaspis. It failed signally, and appears never to have been repeated, the Assyrians remaining thenceforth submissive subjects of the Persian empire. They were reckoned in the same satrapy with Babylon (Herod. iii, 92; comp. i, 192), and paid an annual tribute of a thousand talents of silver. In the Persian armies, which were drawn in great part from the subject-nations, they appear never to have been held of much account, though they fought, in common with the other levies, at Thermopyle, at Cunaxa, at Issus, and at Arbela.

**(8.) *General Character of the Empire.*** — In the first place, like all the early monarchies which attained to any great extent, the Assyrian empire was composed of a number of separate kingdoms. In the East, conquest has scarcely ever been followed by amalgamation, and in the primitive empires there was not even any attempt at that governmental centralization which we find at a later period in the satrapial system of Persia. As Solomon "reigned over *all the kingdoms* from the river (Euphrates) unto the land of the Philistines and the border of Egypt," so the Assyrian monarchs bore sway over a number of petty kings--the native rulers of the several countries--through the entire extent of their dominions. These native princes--the sole governors of their own kingdoms--were feudatories of the Great Monarch, of whom they held their crown by the double tenure of homage and tribute. Menahem (<sup><1259></sup>2 Kings 15:19), Hoshea (<sup><1274></sup>2 Kings 17:4), Ahaz (<sup><1268></sup>2 Kings 16:8), Hezekiah (<sup><1284></sup>2 Kings 18:14), and Manasseh (<sup><1431></sup>2 Chronicles 33:11-13), were certainly in this position, as were many native kings of Babylon, both prior and subsequent to

Nabonassar; and this system (if we may trust the inscriptions) was universal throughout the empire. It naturally involved the frequent recurrence of troubles. Princes circumstanced as were the Assyrian feudatories would always be looking for an occasion when they might revolt and re-establish their independence. The offer of a foreign alliance would be a bait which they could scarcely resist, and hence the continual warnings given to the Jews to beware of trusting in Egypt. Apart from this, on the occurrence of any imperial misfortune or difficulty, such, for instance, as a disastrous expedition, a formidable attack, or a sudden death, natural or violent, of the reigning monarch, there would be a strong temptation to throw off the yoke, which would lead, almost of necessity, to a rebellion. The history of the kings of Israel and Judah sufficiently illustrates the tendency in question, which required to be met by checks and remedies of the severest character. The deposition of the rebel prince, the wasting of his country, the plunder of his capital, a considerable increase in the amount of the tribute thenceforth required, were the usual consequences of an unsuccessful revolt; to which were added, upon occasion, still more stringent measures, as the wholesale execution of those chiefly concerned in the attempt, or the transplantation of the rebel nation to a distant locality. The captivity of Israel is only an instance of a practice long previously known to the Assyrians, and by them handed on to the Babylonian and Persian governments.

It is not quite certain how far Assyria required a religious conformity from the subject people. Her religion was a gross and complex polytheism, comprising the worship of thirteen principal and numerous minor divinities, at the head of the whole of whom stood the chief god, Asshur, who seems to be the deified patriarch of the nation (<sup><1102></sup>Genesis 10:22). The inscriptions appear to state that in all countries over which the Assyrians established their supremacy, they set up "the laws of Asshur," and "altars to the Great Gods." It was probably in connection with this Assyrian requirement that Ahaz, on his return from Damascus, where he had made his submission to Tiglath-Pileser, incurred the guilt of idolatry (<sup><1160></sup>2 Kings 16:10-18). The history of Hezekiah would seem, however, to show that the rule, if resisted, was not rigidly enforced; for it cannot be supposed that he would have consented to re-establish the idolatry which he had removed, yet he certainly came to terms with Sennacherib, and resumed his position of tributary (<sup><1284></sup>2 Kings 18:14). In any case it must be understood that the worship which the conquerors introduced was not intended to supersede

the religion of the conquered race, but was only required to be superadded as a mark and badge of subjection.

The political constitution of the Assyrian empire was no doubt similar to that of other ancient states of the East, such as Chaldaea and Persia. The monarch, called "the great king" (<sup><12189></sup>2 Kings 18:19; <sup><23104></sup>Isaiah 36:4), ruled as a despot, surrounded with his guards, and only accessible to those who were near his person (Diod. Sicul. ii, 21, 23; comp. Cephalion, in Syncell. p. 167). Under him there were provisional satraps, called in <sup><23108></sup>Isaiah 10:8, 'princes,' of the rank and power of ordinary kings (Diod. Sic. ii, 24). The great officers of the household were commonly eunuchs (comp. Gesenius on <sup><23110></sup>Isaiah 36:2). The religion of the Assyrians was, in its leading features, the same as that of the Chaldaeans, *viz.* the symbolical worship of the heavenly bodies, especially the planets. In Scripture there is mention of Nisroch (<sup><23178></sup>Isaiah 37:38), Adrammelech, Anammelech, Nibhaz, Tartak (<sup><12173></sup>2 Kings 17:31), as the names of idols worshipped by the natives either of Assyria Proper or of the adjacent countries which they had subdued, besides planets (see Gesenius, *Zu Jesaias*, ii, 347). The language did not belong to the Semitic, but to the Medo-Persian family. As Aramaic, however, was spoken by a large part of the Western population, it was probably understood by the great officers of state, which accounts for Rabshakeh addressing Hezekiah's messengers in Hebrew (<sup><12185></sup>2 Kings 18:26), although the rabbins explain the circumstance by supposing that he was an apostate Jew (but see Strabo 16:745).

(9.) *Its Extent.* With regard to the extent of the Assyrian empire very exaggerated views have been entertained by many writers. Ctesias took Semiramis to India, and made the empire of Assyria at least coextensive with that of Persia in his own day. This false notion has long been exploded, but even Niebuhr appears to have believed in the extension of Assyrian influence over Asia Minor, in the expedition of Memnon whom he considered an Assyrian-to Troy, and in the derivation of the Lydian Heraclids from the first dynasty of Ninevite monarchs (*Alte Geschichte*. i, 28-9). The information derived from the native monuments tends to contract the empire within more reasonable bounds, and to give it only the expansion which is indicated for it in Scripture. On the west, the Mediterranean and the river Halys appear to have been the extreme boundaries, but the dominion beyond the confines of Syria and Asia Minor was not of a strict character; on the north, a fluctuating line, never reaching the Euxine, nor extending beyond the northern frontier of Armenia; on the

east, the Caspian Sea and the Great Salt Desert; on the south, the Persian Gulf and the Desert of Arabia. The countries included within these utmost limits are the following: Susiana, Chaldea, Babylonia, Media, Matiene, Armenia, Assyria Proper, Mesopotamia, parts of Cappadocia and Cilicia, Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine, and Idumaea. Cyprus was also for a while a dependency of the Assyrian kings, and they may perhaps have held at one time certain portions of Lower Egypt. Lydia, however, Phrygia, Lycia, Pamphylia, Pontus, Iberia, on the west and north, Bactria, Sacia, Parthia, India-even Carmania and Persia Proper-upon the east, were altogether beyond the limit of the Assyrian sway, and appear at no time even to have been overrun by the Assyrian armies.

### **Picture for Assyria 5**

**(10.)** *Civilization of the Assyrians.*— This, as has been already observed, was derived originally from the Babylonians. They were a Semitic race, originally resident in Babylonia (which at that time was Cushite), and thus acquainted with the Babylonian inventions and discoveries, who ascended the valley of the Tigris and established in the tract immediately below the Armenian mountains a separate and distinct nationality. Their modes of writing and building, the form and size of their bricks, their architectural ornamentation, their religion and worship, in a great measure, were drawn from Babylon, which they always regarded as a sacred land — the original seat of their nation, and the true home of all their gods, with the one exception of Asshur. Still, as their civilization developed, it became in many respects peculiar. Their art is of home growth. The alabaster quarries in their neighborhood supplied them with a material unknown to their southern neighbors, on which they could represent, far better than upon enamelled bricks, the scenes which interested them. Their artists, faithful and laborious, acquired a considerable power of rendering the human and animal forms, and made vivid and striking representations of the principal occupations of human life. If they do not greatly affect the ideal, and do not, in this branch, attain to any very exalted rank, yet even here their emblematic figures of the gods have a dignity and grandeur which is worthy of remark, and which implies the possession of some elevated feelings. But their chief glory is in the representation of the actual. Their pictures of war, and of the chase, and even sometimes of the more peaceful incidents of human life, have a fidelity, a spirit, a boldness, and an appearance of life, which place them high among realistic schools. Their art, it should be also noted, is progressive. Unlike that of the Egyptians,



which continues comparatively stationary from the earliest to the latest times, it plainly advances, becoming continually more natural and less uncouth, more life-like and less stiff, more varied and less conventional. The latest sculptures, which are those in the hunting-palace of the son of Esarhaddon, are decidedly the best. Here the animal forms approach perfection, and in the striking attitudes, the new groupings, and the more careful and exact drawing of the whole, we see the beginnings of a taste and a power which might have expanded under favorable circumstances into the finished excellence of the Greeks. The advanced condition of the Assyrians in various other respects is abundantly evidenced alike by the representations on the sculptures and by the remains discovered among their buildings. They are found to have understood and applied the arch; to have made tunnels, aqueducts, and drains; to have used the lever and the roller; to have engraved gems; to have understood the arts of inlaying, enamelling, and overlaying with metals; to have manufactured glass, and been acquainted with the lens; to have possessed vases, jars, bronze and ivory ornaments, dishes, bells, ear-rings, mostly of good workmanship and elegant forms in a word, to have attained to a very high pitch of material comfort and prosperity. They were still, however, in the most important points barbarians. Their government was rude and inartificial; their religion coarse and sensual; their conduct of war' cruel; even their art materialistic and so debasing; they had served their purpose when they had prepared the East for centralized government, and been God's scourge to punish the people of Israel (<sup>2301B</sup> Isaiah 10:5-6); they were, therefore, swept away to allow the rise of that Arian race which, with less appreciation of art, was to introduce into Western Asia a more spiritual form of religion, a better treatment of captives, and a superior government.

A fuller account of the customs and antiquities of Assyria than has heretofore been possible may be found in the recent works of Rich, Botta, and Layard; see also *Manners, Customs, Arts, and Arms of Assyria, restored from the Monuments*, by P. H. Gosse (Lond. 1852); Fresnel, Thomas, and Oppert, *Expedition en Mesopotamie* (Par. 1858); *Outline of the Hist. of Assyria*, by Col. Rawlinson (Lond. 1852); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* 2d ser. 4:373 sq.; *Critica Biblica*, vol. i; Fergusson, *Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis* (Lond. 1851). **SEE NINEVEH; SEE BABYLON.** On the recent efforts to decipher the cuneiform inscriptions on the Assyrian monuments, see Rawlinson, in the *Jour. As. Soc.* 12, No. 2; 14, No. 1; Hincks, *ib.* 12, No. 1; Botta, *Mim. sur l'Ecriture Ass.* (Par. 1848); Lowenstein, *Essai de*

*dechiffr. de l'Ecrit. ssyr.* (Par. 1850). **SEE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS.** For the geography, see Captain Jones's paper, in vol. 14 of the *Asiatic Society's Journal* (pt. 2); Col. Chesney's *Euphrates Expedition* (Lond. 1850). **SEE EDEN.** For the historical views, see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. i; Brandis's *Rerum Assyriarum Temporaq Emendata*; Sir H. Rawlinson's *Contributions to the Asiat. Soc.-Journ.* and the *Alhenceum*; Bosanquet's *Sacred and profane Chronology*; Oppert's *Rapport a son Excellence M. le Ministre de l'Instruction*; Dr. Hincks's *Contributions to the Dublin University Magazine*; Vance Smith's *Exposition of the Prophecies relating to Nineveh and Assyria*; and comp. Niebuhr's *Vortrage uber alte Geschichte*, vol. i; Clinton's *Fasti Hell.* vol. i; Niebuhr's *Geschichte Assurs's und Babel's*; Gumpach, *Abriss der Babylonish-Assyrischen Geschichte* (Mannheim, 1854). **SEE ASSHUR.**

## Assyr'ian

(Heb. same as ASSHUR; Sept. and Apocrypha Ἀσσύριος). **SEE ASSYRIA.**

## As'taroth

(<sup><1114></sup>Deuteronomy 1:14). **SEE ASHTAROTH.**

## Astarte

### Picture for Astarte

(Ἀστάρτη), the Greek form of the Heb. ASHTORETH or ASHERAH **SEE ASHERAH** (q.v.), Gracized also *Astroarche* (Ἀστροάρχη, Herodian, v, 6, 10), the chief Syrian deity (Lucian, *De dea Syr.* 4), being the goddess of the Sidonians (<sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 11:5, 33), also introduced (from the Tyrians, see Josephus, *Apion*, i, 18) among the Philistines (<sup><810></sup>1 Samuel 31:10), and worshipped by the apostate Israelites (<sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 23:4; <sup><3153></sup>Micah 5:13). She was likewise adored by the Phoenician colony at Carthage (Augustine, *Qucest. in Jud.* xvi; comp. Creuzer, *Symbol.* ii, 270 sq.), among whom her name appears as a component of common appellations of individuals (Gesenius, in the *Hall. Encycl.* 21:98: comp. *Abdastartus* [i.e. "servant of Astarte"], in Josephus, *Apion*, i, 18). She was also worshipped in Phrygia and at Hierapolis (Creuzer, *Symbol.* ii, 61). She is usually named in connection with Baal (<sup><1013></sup>Judges 2:13;. 3:7; 10:6; <sup><1010></sup>1 Samuel 7:4; 12:10; <sup><1189></sup>1 Kings 18:19; <sup><1234></sup>2 Kings 23:24, etc.), and corresponds to the female

(generative) principle, otherwise called *Baalit* (**Βααλίς**, worshipped especially at Bylus, see Philo, in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* i, 10), the chief goddess of the Phoenicians and Syrians ("Astarte the Great," Sanchoniath. *Frag.* ed. Orelli, p. 34), and probably the same with the "queen of heaven" (~~247B~~Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17; comp. ~~123B~~2 Kings 23:4). Many (Creuzer, *Symbol.* ii, 65 sq.) identify her with *Atergatis* (q.v.) or *Derceto* (comp. Herod. i, 105); but this latter, as a fish-goddess, hardly agrees with the description of Ashtoreth (q.v.) by Sanchoniathon (*Frag.* ed. Orelli, p. 34; and in Euseb. *Prep. Ev.* i, 10), nor does Astarte appear in this form on coins (see Montfaucon, *Antiq. expliq.* II, ii, 386; Eckhel, *Doctr. Numor.* I, iii, 369 sq., comp. 372; Gesenius, in the *Hall. Encycl.* xxi, 99). The Greeks and Romans, according to their usual method in treating foreign divinities, compare her to Venus, i.e. Urania (comp. Cic. *Nat. Deor.* iii, 23; Euseb. *Prep. Ev.* i, 10; Theodoret, iii, 50; Nonni *Dionys.* iii, 110); sometimes with Juno (Augustine, *Quaest. in Jud.* xvi; comp. Creuzer, *Symbol.* ii, 270); and sometimes with Luna (Lucian, *De dea Syria*, 4; comp. Herodian, v, 6, 10). She also appears as the Mylitta of the Babylonians (Herod. i, 131, 199), the Alytta of the Arabians and Armenians (of Anaitis, Strabo, 15:806), a general representation of the goddess of love and fruitfulness (Herod. i, 144; Baruch 6:43; Euseb. *Vit. Constant.* iii, 55; Val. Max. ii, 6, 15; comp. ~~123B~~2 Kings 23:7; see Creuzer, *Symbolik*, ii, 23 sq.). Some also find traces of the name in the Persic and Syriac terms of the Sabian religious books (Nordberg, *Onom.* p. 20 sq.). Under the form Asherah (**hrvā**) it appears to designate the goddess of good fortune (from **rvā**; *to be happy*). **SEE MENII.** (See generally Selden, *Dz diis Syris*, ii, 2; Gruber, in the *Hall. Encycl.* 4:135; Gesenius, *Comment.* z. *Jesa.* ii, 338; *Thes. Heb.* p. 1082 sq.; Hase, in the *Biblioth. Brem.* 8:707 sq.; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxiii; Fourmont, *Reflexions critiques sur les histoires des anciens peuples*, ii, 301 sq.; Graff, *Beitriige z. richtig. Beurth- ilung d. Hauptmonmente in d. alten Gesch. d. Assyrier, Babylonier, u. Meder*, Wetzlar, 1828; Hug, *Myth.* p. 118 sq.; Movers, *Phonizier*, i; Miinter, *Rel. d. Karthaeger*; Stuhr, *Relig. des Orients*, p. 439; Vatke, *Relig. d. Alten Test.* p. 372 sq.; Dupuis, *Origine des Cultes*, i, 181 sq.; iii, 471 sq.; Schwenk, *Mythol. deri Semiten*, p. 207; Van Dale, *De oragine idolatries*, p. 17 sq.)-Winer, i. 108. **SEE ASHTORETH; SEE QUEEN OF HEAVEN.**

## As'that

(Ἀσθόθ, Vulg. *Ezead*), one of the heads of Israelitish families, whose members (to the number of 120) returned (with Johannes, the son of Acatan) in the party of Ezra from Babylon (1 Esdr. 8:38); evidently the AZGAD *SEE AZGAD* (q.v.) of the true text (~~1812~~ Ezra 8:12).

## Asterius.

There were several ancient writers of this name.

- 1.** A Cappadocian, converted from paganism to Christianity, who became an Arian. He flourished after the Nicene Council, about the year 330, when he published his celebrated *Syntagma*, or *Syntagmateon*, which is repeatedly mentioned by Athanasius, in which he openly declares that there is in God another wisdom than Christ, which was the creator of Christ himself and of the world. Nor would he allow that Christ was the virtue of God in any other sense than that in which Moses called the locusts "a virtue of God." Athanasius quotes from this work in his *Ep. de Synod. Arimin. et Seleuc.* p. 684, and elsewhere.-Baronius, *Annales*, 370; Lardner, *Works*, iii, 587 sq.
- 2.** Bishop of Petra, in Arabia. He was originally an Arian, and accompanied the Arian bishops to the Council of Sardica in 347; but when there he renounced Arianism. Hence he suffered, and was banished into Upper Libya. In 362 he attended the council held by Athanasius at Alexandria, and was deputed to endeavor to restore union to the Church of Antioch.
- 3.** Archbishop of Amasea; flourished about 401. Eleven sermons and homilies of his are given in Combefis, *Bibl. Patr. Appendix*, 1648.

## Astorga,

a town and diocese of Spain. In 446 a council was held in the town of Astorga on account of the Priscillianists.

## Astric.

*SEE ANASTASIUS.*

## Astrologer

(Heb. and Chald. *āVai asshlaph'*, an *enchanter*, <sup>2013</sup>Daniel 1:20; 2:2, 10, 27; 4:7; 5:7, 11, 15; once Heb. *μυμiv; rbēh*, *hober' shama'yim*, *sky-divider*, i.e. former of horoscopes; Sept. *ἀστρολόγος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*; Vulg. *augur caeli*, <sup>23713</sup>Isaiah 47:13), a person who professes to divine future events by the appearance of the stars. **SEE ASTROLOGY**. The Babylonians were anciently famous for this kind of lore (Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, Essay x; Simplicius ad Aristot. *De Calo*, ii, 123; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 7:56; Vitruv. 9:9). **SEE ASTRONOMY**.

## Astrology

(*ἀστρολογία*, *science of the stars*), a pretended science, which was said to discover future events by means of the stars. Astrology (according to the old distinction) was of two kinds' *natural* and *judicial*. The former predicted certain natural effects which appear to depend upon the influence of the stars, such as winds, rain, storms, etc. By the latter, it was pretended, could be predicted events which were dependent upon the human will, as particular actions, peace, war, etc. Astrology accords well with the predestinarian doctrines of Mohammedanism, and was accordingly cultivated with great ardor by the Arabs from the seventh to the thirteenth century. Some of the early Christian fathers argued against the doctrines of astrology; others received them in a modified form. In its public capacity the Roman Church several times condemned the system, but many zealous churchmen cultivated it. Cardinal D'Ailly, "the eagle of the doctors of France" (died 1420), is said to have calculated the horoscope of Jesus Christ, and maintained that the Deluge might have been predicted by astrology. Regiomontanus, the famous mathematician Cardan, even Tycho Brahe and Kepler could not shake off the fascination. Kepler saw the weakness of astrology as a science, but could not bring himself to deny a certain connection between the positions ("constellations") of the planets and the qualities of those born under them. The Copernican system gave the death-blow to astrology. Belief in astrology is not now ostensibly professed in any Christian country, though a few solitary advocates have from time to time appeared, as J. M. Pfaff in Germany, *Astrologie* (Nurnb. 1816). But it still holds sway in the East, and among Mohammedans wherever situated. Even in Europe the craving of the ignorant of all countries for divination is still gratified by the publication of multitudes of

almanacs containing astrological predictions, though the writers no longer believe in them.

Many passages of our old writers are unintelligible without some knowledge of astrological terms. In the technical rules by which human destiny was foreseen, the heavenly *houses* played an important part. Astrologers were by no means at one as to the way of laying out those houses. A very general way was to draw great circles through the north and south points of the horizon as meridians pass through the poles, dividing the heavens, visible and invisible, into twelve equal parts-six above the horizon, and six below. These were the twelve houses, and were numbered onward, beginning with that which lay in the east immediately below the horizon. The first was called the house of life; the second, of fortune, or riches; the third, of brethren; the fourth, of relations; the fifth, of children; the sixth, of health; the seventh, of marriage; the eighth, of death, or the upper portal; the ninth, of religion; the tenth, of dignities; the eleventh, of friends and benefactors; the twelfth, of enemies, or of captivity. The position of the twelve houses for a given time and place-the instant of an individual's birth, for instance, was a *theme*. To construct such a plan was to *cast* the person's nativity. The houses had different powers, the strongest being the first; as it contained the part of the heavens about to rise, it was called the *ascendant*, and the point of the ecliptic cut by its upper boundary was the *horoscope*. Each house had one of the heavenly bodies as its *lord*, who was strongest in his own house. See Ptolemeei *Opus quadripartitum de astrorum judiciis*; Schoner, *De nativitatibus* (Nurnb. 1532); Kepler, *Harmonia mundi* (Linz. 1619); Prodomus, *Diss. cosmograph.* (Tub 1596); Pfaff, *Astrologische Taschenbiccher* for 1822 and 1823; Meyer's *Blotter fir hahere Wahrheit*, ii, 141; *Quarterly Review*, 26:180; *Westminster Review*, Jan. 1864. **SEE ASTRONOMY.**

## Astronomy

(ἄστρονομία, the *laws of the stars*), a science which appears to have grown out of astrology (q.v.). The cradle of astronomy is to be found in Asia. Pliny, in his celebrated enumeration (*Hist. Nat.* 7, 57) of the inventors of the arts, sciences, and conveniences of life, ascribes the discovery of astronomy to Phoenician mariners, and in the same chapter he speaks of astronomical observations found on burnt bricks (*coctilibus laterculis*) among the Babylonians, which ascend to above 2200 years before his time. Alexander sent to Aristotle from Babylon a series of astronomical

observations, extending through 1900 years. The astronomical knowledge of the Chinese and Indians goes up to a still earlier period (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 6, 17-21). From the remote East astronomy traveled in a westerly direction. The Egyptians at a very early period had some acquaintance with it. To them is to be ascribed a pretty near determination of the length of the year, as consisting of 365 days (Herodotus, 2:4). The Egyptians were the teachers of the Greeks. Some portion of the knowledge which prevailed on the subject would no doubt penetrate to and become the inheritance of the Hebrews, who do not, however, appear to have possessed any views of astronomy which raised their knowledge to the rank of a science, or made it approach to a more correct theory of the mechanism of the heavens than that which was generally held. A peculiarity of the greatest importance belongs to the knowledge which the Israelites display of the heavens, namely, that it is thoroughly imbued with a religious character; nor is it possible to find in any other writings, even at this day, so much pure and elevated piety, in connection with observations on the starry firmament, as may be gathered even in single books of the Bible (<sup><3108></sup>Amos 5:8; <sup><3901></sup>Psalms 19). This was no doubt owing in part to the fact that the practice of astrology was interdicted to the Hebrews (<sup><6380></sup>Deuteronomy 18:10). As early as the time of the composition of perhaps the oldest book in the Bible, namely, that of Job, the constellations were distinguished one from another, and designated by peculiar and appropriate names (<sup><3809></sup>Job 9:9; 38:31). In the Bible are found,

(1) *Heylel* (לילה), “the morning star,” the planet *Venus* (<sup><2442></sup>Isaiah 14:12; <sup><6128></sup>Revelation 2:28);

(2) *Kimah*’ (חמלק) “Lucifer,” “Pleiades,” “the seven stars” (<sup><3809></sup>Job 9:9; 38:31; <sup><3108></sup>Amos 5:8), *the Pleiades*;

(3) *Kesil*’ (כסיל), “Orion,” a large and brilliant constellation, which stands in a line with the Pleiades. The Orientals seem to have conceived of Orion as a huge giant who had warred against God, and as bound in chains to the firmament of heaven (<sup><3831></sup>Job 38:31); and it has been conjectured that this notion is the foundation of the history of Nimrod (*Gesen. Comment. zu Jesaja*, 1, 457).

(4) *Ash* (אש), (<sup><3809></sup>Job 9:9), “Arcturus,” *the Great Bear*, which has still the same name among the Arabians (Niebuhr, p. 113). See <sup><3832></sup>Job 38:32,

where the sons of Arcturus are the three stars in the tail of the Bear, which stand in a curved line to the left.

(5) *Nachash'* (װ נ), (<sup>4313</sup>Job 26:13, the “crooked serpent”), *Draco*, between the Great and the Little Bear; a constellation which spreads itself in windings across the heavens.

(6) *Dioscziiri*, Διόσκουροι (<sup>4481</sup>Acts 28:11, “Castor and Pollux”), *Gemini*, or the Twins, on the belt of the *Zodiac*, which is mentioned in <sup>4231</sup>2 Kings 23:5, under the general name of “the planets” (ם/ם זמם Mazz-loth'), a word which signifies dwellings, stations in which the sun tarries in his apparent course through the heavens; and also by the kindred term “MAZZAROTH” (ם/ם זמם <sup>4382</sup>Job 38:32). (Compare <sup>4379</sup>Genesis 37:9.) The entire body of the stars was called “the host of heaven” (<sup>2416</sup>Isaiah 40:26; <sup>2432</sup>Jeremiah 33:22). (See each of the words here enumerated in its alphabetical order.) No trace is found in the Old Testament of a division of the heavenly bodies into planets, fixed stars, and comets; but in <sup>4613</sup>Jude 1:13, the phrase “wandering stars” (ἀστέρες πλανήται) is employed figuratively. After the Babylonish exile, the Jews were compelled, even for the sake of their calendar, to attend at least to the course of the moon, which became an object of study, and delineations were made of the shapes that she assumes (Mishna, *Rosh Hassh.* 2, 8; Mitchell, *Astron. of Bible*, N.Y. 1863). **SEE YEAR.**

At an early period of the world the worship of the stars arose from that contemplation of them which in every part of the globe, and particularly in the East, has been found a source of deep and tranquil pleasure, **SEE ADORATION.** “Men by nature” “deemed either fire or wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars. or the violent water, or the lights of heaven to be the gods which govern the world;” “with whose beauty being delighted, they took them to be gods” (Wisdom 13:2). Accordingly, the religion of the Egyptians, of the Chaldees, Assyrians, and the ancient Arabians, was nothing else than star-worship, although in the case of the first its origin is more thickly veiled. The sun, moon, and seven planets (those, that is, of the fixed stars which shine with especial brightness) excited most attention, and won the greatest observance. We thus find, among the Babylonians, *Jupiter* (Belus, *Gad*, םגם <sup>2361</sup>Isaiah 65:11), *Venus* (םנאםם *Meni'*, <sup>2361</sup>Isaiah 65:11, where the first is rendered in the common version “that troop,” the second, “that number”). Both these were considered good principles, the



Hebrews words both signifying *fortune*, i.e. good luck. *Mercury*, honored as the secretary of heaven, is also found in <sup><2340></sup>Isaiah 46:1, “NEBO (/bn] stoopeth;” *Saturn* (‘WYKāKiyun’, “Chiun,” <sup><3085></sup>Amos 5:26); *Mars* (I girīe “NERGAL,” <sup><1273></sup>2 Kings 17:30); the last two were worshipped as principles of evil. The character of this worship was formed from the notions which were entertained of the good or ill which certain stars occasioned. Astrology found its sphere principally in stars connected with the birth of individuals. Thus Herodotus (2, 82) states that among the Egyptians every day was under the influence of some god (some star), and that according to the day on which each person was born, so would be the events he would meet with, the character he would bear, and the period of his death. Astrology concerned itself also with the determination of lucky and unlucky days; so in <sup><1888></sup>Job 3:3, “Let the day perish wherein I was born;” and <sup><840></sup>Galatians 4:10, “Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.” The Chaldaeans, who studied the stars at a very early period, were much given to astrology, and were celebrated for their skill in that pretended science (<sup><2373></sup>Isaiah 47:13). (See further on this general subject, Hammer, *Ueber die Sternbilder der Araber*; Ideler, *Untersuchungen ub. d. Sternnamen*, Berl. 1809; also *Ueb. die Astron. der Alten*, Berl. 1806; Weidler, *Hist. Astronom. Viteb.* 1714; Neumann, *Astrognostische Benennungen im A. T.* Bresl. 1819.) **SEE STAR.**