THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Astruc, Jean - Azzur

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

Astruc, Jean

an eminent French physician, was born at Sauve, in Languedoc, March 19, 1684. His father was a Protestant minister, who, on the revocation of the edict of Nantes, became a Roman Catholic. The son studied in the University of Montpellier, and became M.D. in 1703. In 1710 he was made professor of anatomy and medicine in Toulouse; and he was called to Montpellier in 1715, where he remained until 1728. In 1731 he was appointed professor of medicine in the College of France, and he remained in Paris until his death, May 5, 1766. In his profession Astruc was very eminent as teacher, practitioner, and writer; but he is entitled to a place here from a work published in 1753, entitled *Conjectures sur les Memoires originaux dont il parait que Moise s'est servi pour conmposer le livre da la Genese* (Bruxelles and Paris, 1753, 12mo), in which he started for the first time the theory now so prevalent, that the fact that Moses compiled Genesis, in part at least, from pre-existing documents, is shown by the distinction in the use of the two names Elohim and Jehovah in the different parts of the book. The work is marked by great skill and acuteness, and opened a new aera in the criticism of the Pentateuch. *SEE GENESIS*. In 1755 Astruc published a treatise *Sur l'immortalite, l'immaterialite, et la liberte de l'ame* (Paris, 12mo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, 3,* 487; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* Suppl. 1:103.

Astyages

(Ἀστυάγης, Diodorus Ἀσπάδας) was the son and successor of Cyaxares (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.), and the last king of the Medes, B.C. 595-560 or B.C. 592-558, who was conquered by Cyrus (Bel and Dragon 1). The name is identified by Rawlinson and Niebuhr *(Gesch. Assur's,* p. 32) with Deioces = Ashdahak *(Arm.),* Ajis Dahaka *(Pe's.), the biting snake,* the emblem of the Median power. *SEE DARIUS THE MEDE*. According to Herodotus, he married the daughter of Abyaltes (i. 74), ascended the throne B.C. 595, and reigned thirty-five years (i. 130), with great severity (i. 123). The same historian states that his daughter was married to Cambyses, a Persian noble, but that, in consequence of a dream, the king caused her child (Cyrus) to be exposed by a herdsman, who, on the contrary, brought him up, till, on attaining manhood, he dethroned his grandfather (i. 107). The account of Ctesias (who calls him *Astygas,* Ἀστυΐγας) makes him to have been only the father-in-law of Cyrus, by whom he was conquered and deposed, but treated with respect, until at

length treacherously left to perish by a royal eunuch (Ctes. *Ap. Phot.* cod. 72, p. 36, ed. Bekker). Xenophon, like Herodotus, makes Cyrus the grandson of Astyages, but says that Astyages was succeeded by his son Cyaxares II, on whose death Cyrus succeeded to the vacant throne *(Cyrop.* 1, 5, 2). This account tallies better with the notices in the Book of Daniel (<270531>Daniel 5:31; 6:1; 9:1) and Josephus *(Ant.* 10:11, 4), where "Darius (q.v.) the Mede" appears to be the same with this Cyaxares (q.v.). In that case Astyages will be identical with the "Ahasuerus" (q.v.) there named as the father of Darius. *SEE CYRUS*.

Asup'pim

(Hebrews *Asuppim'*, µyPæsuaæ}- *collections;* Sept. Ἀσαφείν v. r. Ἐσεφίμ), a part of the Temple, to which two of the Levites of the family of Obed-edom were assigned as guards (<132615>1 Chronicles 26:15, 17). They were apparently the two northernmost gates in the western outer wall of the Temple, the space between them being inclosed for *store-chambers*, by the name of the "house of Asuppim" (see Strong's *Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels*, Appendix 2, p. 30). In the reference to the same building, as restored after the captivity (<161225>Nehemiah 12:25), the term is falsely rendered *"thresholds"* (µyræ[;V]hiyPesuaæB], *in the store-houses of the gates,* Sept. πυλωροὶ φυλακῆς). *SEE TEMPLE*.

Asylum

(fl;q]mæ, *miklat'*, φυγαδεῖον, *"refuge")*, a place of safety, where it is not permitted to offer violence to, or touch any person, even though a criminal.

I. Such a purpose was served (see Mishna, *Maccoth*, 2, 1-3; comp. Philo, *De profugiis*, in his *Opp.* 1, 546 sq.) for the unpremeditated murderer, in accordance with an ancient usage, by the altar (in the Tabernacle and Temple, <022114>Exodus 21:14; <110150>1 Kings 1:50), the horns of which were seized by the refugee. *SEE ALTAR*. Under the Law there were instituted, in order to rescue such manslayers from the (doubtless very barbarous) blood-revenge (<043506>Numbers 35:6 sq.; <050441>Deuteronomy 4:41 sq.; 19:3 sq.; comp. <022113>Exodus 21:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 4, 7, 4), six *free cities* (fl;q]mæ yri[; Sept. πόλεις φυγαδευτηρίων, πόλεις καταφυγῆς, Vulg. *urbes fugitivorum*, Auth. Vers. "cities of refuge"), which lay in different parts of the entire country, and were some of them sacerdotal, others Levitical cities, namely, east of the Jordan, Bezer, Ramoth-Gilead, and Golan; west

of the Jordan, Kedesh, Shechem, and (Hebron) Kirjath-Arba (Joshua 20:7, 8). Here the fugitive, after having undergone a strict investigation to prove that he had not committed the slaughter intentionally, was obliged to remain until the death of the then incumbent of the high-priesthood (comp. the similar exile according to the Athenian statutes, Heffter, *Athen. Gerichtsverf.* p. 136); if he quitted the city earlier, the blood-avenger might kill him with impunity (Numbers 35:24 sq.). The roads to the cities of refuge were to be kept in good order (Deuteronomy 19:3; for other particulars, see *Maccoth,* 2, 5; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 66; on the boundaries of these cities, see the Mishna, *Maaser.3,* 10). Willful murderers (Numbers 35:12; compo Mishna, *Miaccoth,* 2, 6) were to be put to death, after a legal investigation, even if they had escaped to a city of refuge. See generally Michaelis, *Mos. Recht,* 2, 434 sq.; Moebii *Disputat. theol.* p. 105 sq.; Wichmannshausen, *De Praesidiariis Levitarum urbibus (Viteb.* 1715); Reis, *De urbibus refugii V. T. eorumque fructu* (Marburg, 1753); Osiander, *De asylis Hebr.* (Tubing. 1672, also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 31). The reason for assigning the Levitical cities for this purpose was probably in part from their connection with the sacredness of Jehovah, and partly because the Levites, as guardians of the Law, were present to decide concerning the murder as to whether it was intentional or not (see Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 340). It is not easy to explain the connection of the expiration of the bloods revenge with the death of the high-priest, except that this was regarded as beginning a fresh era *(Tabulme noave).* Baihr *(Symbol.* 2, 52), following Maimonides *(More Nevochim),* advances the not imlprobable supposition that the high-priest was so eminently the head of the theocracy, and representative of the whol nation, that upon his demise every other death should be forgotten, or, at least, mortal enmities buried (for allegorical significations, see Philo, *De profugiis,* 1, 466). *SEE BLOOD-REVENGE*.

II. Grecian and Roman antiquity likewise affords mention of the light of asylum (Serv. *ad AEn.* 8, 341), not only at altars, and temples, and sacred places (Herod. 2, 113; Eurip. *Hec.* 149; Pausan. 2, 5, 6; 3, 5, 6; Dio Cass. 47, 14; Strabo, 5, 230; Tacit. *Annal.3,* 60, 1; Flor. 2, 12), but also in cities and their vicinity (Polyb. 6, 14, 8; comp. Potter, *Greek Ant.* 1, 48; see Cramer, *De ara exter. templi sec.* p. 16 sq.; Dougtaei *Anal.* 1, 102 sq.), for insolvent debtors (Plutarch. *De vitando aere al.* 3), for slaves who had fled from the severity of their masters (comp. Philo, *Opp.* 2, 468), also for murderers. An especially famous city of exemption was Daphne, near

Antioch (2 Maccabees 4:33), as also the temple of Diana at Ephesus (Strabo, 14:641; Apollon. Ephes. *Ep.* 65). But as the abuse of the privileges of asylum often interfered with criminal jurisprudence, it was circumscribed by Tiberius throughout the Roman empire (Suet. *Tib.* 37; comp. Ernesti *Excurs.* in loc.). On the immunities referred to in <44162>Acts 16:12, *SEE COLONY*. (On cities of refuge in Abyssinia, see Ruppell, 2:71.) *SEE CITY OF REFUGE*.

III. The privilege of asylum was retained in the Christian Church, probably in imitation of the cities of refuge, under the old dispensation. All criminals who fled to such asylums were held to be safe, and any person violating an asylum was punished with excommunication. All Christian churches, in the early ages, possessed this privilege of affording protection or asylum. It was introduced by Constantine, and first regulated by law under the emperors Theodosius the Great, Arcadius, Honorius, Theodosius, and Justinian. The multiplication of these privileged places soon became exceedingly inconvenient, and it was found necessary, from time to time, to circumscribe the ecclesiastical right of asylum by various limitations. Bishops and councils became jealous of the interference of the civil power in this matter: they contended strongly for the right of sanctuary, and continued to uphold it to an injurious and demoralizing extent. The privilege was extended by the councils of Orange, A.D. 441; of Orleans, 511; of Arles, 541; of Macon, 586; of Rheims, 630; of Toledo, 681. It was recognised:and confirmed by Charlemagne and his successors. The practice long prevailed in popish countries; but the evils at length became so enormous, that even popes and councils were obliged to set limits to the privilege. The custom has now become extinct, or has been greatly reformed. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 8, ch. 11.

IV. The laws of King Alfred recognized the right of asylum in England. It was not till the year 1487, in the reign of Henry VII, that by a bull of Pope Innocent VIII it was declared that, if thieves, robbers, and murderers, having taken refuge in sanctuaries, should sally out and commit fresh offenses, and then return to their place of shelter, they might be taken out by the king’s officers. It was only by an act of Parliament, passed in 1534, after the Reformation, that parsons accused of treason were debarred of the privilege of sanctuary. After the complete establishment of the Reformation, however, in the reign of Elizabeth, neither the churches nor sanctuaries of any other description were allowed to become places of

refuge for either murderers or other criminals. But various buildings and precincts in and near London continued for a long time after this to afford shelter to debtors. At length, in 1697, all such sanctuaries, or pretended sanctuaries, were finally suppressed by the act 8 and 9 William III, chap. 26. — *Penny Cyclop.* s.v.

On the subject generally, see Helfrecht, *Abhandluny von den Asylen* (Haf. 1801, 8vo); Dann, *Ueber den Ursprung des Asylrechts und dessen Schicksale und Ueberreste in Europa* (in Reyscher and Wilda, *Zeitschrift fur deutsches Recht,3,* 327 sq.); Pauly, *leall-Enlcykl.* 1, 889 sq.; comp. Lielbner, *De asylis* (Lips. 1673); Moebius, Ασυλολογία (Lips. 1673); Kampmüller, *De asyllspontificorum* (Lips. 1711); Bdhner, *De sanctitate ecclesiar.* (Hal. 1732); Zech, *De jure casyli eccl.* (Ingolst. 1761; also in Schmidt's *Thes. jur. eccl.* 5, 284); Neininger, *De orig. asyli eccl.* (Frib. 1788). Other treatises are by Benzel (in his *Dissertt. Acad.* 1, 437), Carlholm (Upsal. 1682), Goetze (Jen. 1660), Ehrenbach (Tub. 1686), Engelbrecht (Helmst. 1720), Gronwall (Lips. 1726), Ginther (Lips. 1689), Lobbetius (Leod. 1641), Tophoff (Paderb. 1839), Lyncker (Freft. 1698). See SANCTUARY.

Asyn'critus

(Ἀσύγκριτος, *not* to be *compared),* the name of a Christian at Rome to whom Paul sent a salutation (Romans 16:14), A.D. 55. The Greek Church hold that he was a bishop of Hyrcania, and observe his festival April 8.

A'tad

(Hebrews *Atad',* דָּטַא; a *thorn;* Sept. Ἀτάδ), the person (B.C. 1856 or ante) on whose threshingfloor the sons of Jacob and the Egyptians who accompanied them performed their final act of solemn mourning for Jacob (Genesis 1, 10, 11); on which account the place was afterward called ABEL-MIZRAIM *SEE ABEL-MIZRAIM* (q.v.), "the mourning of the Egyptians." Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 79) causes unnecessary difficulty by placing it *east* of the Jordan; whereas the expression "*beyond* Jordan" is to be understood with reference to a foreign approach from the east. According to Jerome *(Onom. s.v. Area-atad),* it was in his day called Bethgla or Bethacla (Beth-Hogla), a name which he connects with the gyratory dances or races of the funeral ceremony: "'locus gyri; eo quod ibi more plangentium circumierint." Beth-Hoglah is known to have lain

between the Jordan and Jericho, therefore on the west side of Jordan *SEE BETH-HOGLAH*; and with this agrees the fact of the mention of the Canaanites, “the inhabitants of the land,” who were confined to the west side of the river (see, among others, verse 13 of this chapter), and one of whose special haunts was the sunken district “by the ‘side’ of Jordan” (<041329>Numbers 13:29). *SEE CANAAN*. The word r b,[, “beyond,” although usually signifying the east of Jordan, is yet used for either east or west, according to the position of the speaker. So Jerome quotes *“trans* Jordanem;” but Dr. Thompson, rejecting this authority, supposes Abel-mizraim to have been located near Hebron *(Land and Book*, 2, 385). Atad, as a name, is possibly only an appellative descriptive of a “thorny” locality (d f ;ah; ˆ r Gø =“the floor [or trodden space] of the thorn”). *SEE JACOB*.

Atad

SEE THORN.

Atalleph

SEE BAT.

At’arah

(Hebrews *Atarah’*, h r ;f ;[} a *crown;* Sept. Ἐτέρα *v*. r. Ἀτάρα), the second wife of Jerahmeel, of the tribe of Judah, and mother of Onam (<130226>1 Chronicles 2:26). B.C. ante 1658.

Atar’gatis

Picture for Atar’gatis

(Ἀταργάτις, Strab. 16, p. 785 [Ἀταργατίου δὲ τὴν Ἀθάραν ..... οἱ Ἕλληνες ἰκάλουν] v. r. Ατεργάτις, also Ἀτεργάτης) is the name of a Syrian goddess whose temple (Ἀταργατεῖον v. *r*. Ἀτεργατεῖον) is mentioned in 2 Maccabees 12:26. It was destroyed by Judas Maccabaeus (1 Maccabees 5:43, 44), from which passage it appears to have been situated-at Ashteroth-Karnaim. Her worship also flourished at Mabug (i.e. Bambyce, afterward called Hierapolis),: according to Pliny *(Hist. Nat*. 5, 19), who also states that Atergatis is the same divinity as *Derceto*, Δερκετώ (Diod. Sic. 7:4), or *Dercetio* (Ovid, *Met*. 4, 45). Besides internal evidences of identity (see Creuzer, *Symbol*. 2, 76 sq.), Strabo incidentally

cites Ctesias to that effect (16, p. 1132). Derceto was worshipped in rhenicia and at Ascalon (where fountains containing sacred fish are still kept — Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 330) under the form of a woman with a fish's tail, or with a woman's face only and the entire body of a fish (Athen, 8:346). Fishes were sacred to her, and the inhabitants abstained from eating them in honor of her (Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, 14). Farther, by combining Diodorus (2, 4) with Herodotus (1, 105), we may legitimately conclude that the Derceto of the former is the *Venus (Aphrodite) Urania* of the latter. Lucian compared her with Here, though he allowed that she combined traits of other deities (Aphrodite, Rhea, Selene, etc.). Plutarch *(Crass.* 17) says that some regarded her as "Aphrodite, others as Here, others as the cause and natural power which provides the principles and seeds for all things from moisture." This last view is probably an accurate description of the attributes of the goddess, and explains her fishlike form and popular identification with Aphrodite. Lucian also mentions a ceremony in her worship at Hierapolis which appears to be connected with the same belief, and with the origin of her name. Twice a year water was brought from distant places and poured into a chasm in the temple; because, he adds, according to tradition, the waters of the Deluge were drained away through that opening *(De Syria dea*, p. 883). Compare Burns, ad Ovid, *Met.* 4, 45, where most of the references are given at length; Movers, *Phoniz.* 1, 584 sq. Atergatis is thus a name under which they worshipped some modification of the same power which was adored under that of *Astarte* (q.v.). That the Ἀτεργατεῖον of 2 Maccabees 12:26} was at Ashteroth-Karnaim, shows also an immediate connection with *Ashtoreth* (q.v.). Whether, like the latter, she bore any particular relation to the moon or to the planet Venus, is not evident. Macrobius *(Sat.* 1, 23, p. 322, Bip. ed.) makes *Adargatis* to be the *earth* (which, as a symbol, is analogous to the *moon),* end says that her image was distinguished from that of the sun by the direction of the rays around it (but see Swinton, in the *Philosoph. Transactions,* 41, pt. 1, p. *245* sq.). Creuzer maintains that those representations of this goddess which contain parts of a fish are the most ancient, and endeavors to reconcile Strato's statement that the Syrian goddess of Hierapolis was Atergatis, with Lucian's express notice that the former was represented under the form of an entire woman, by distinguishing between the forms of different periods *(Symbolik,* 2, 68). This fish form shows that Atergatis bears some relation, perhaps that of a female counterpart, to DAGON *SEE DAGON* (q.v.). There is an antique

coin extant representing this goddess (Swinton, in the *Philosoph. Transactions*, LXI, 2, 345 sq.).

No satisfactory etymology of the word has been discovered. That which assumes that Atergatis is ryDaigD; *addir' dag*, i.e. magnificent fish, which has often been adopted from the time of Selden down to the present day, cannot be taken exactly in that sense. The syntax of the language requires, as Michaelis has already objected to this etymology *(Orient. Biblioth.* 6, 97), that an adjective placed before its subject in this manner must be the *predicate* of a proposition. The words, therefore, would mean "the fish *is* magnificent" (Ewald's *Hebr. Gram. §* 554); Michaelis himself, as he found that the Syriac name of some idol of Haran was at[rt, which might mean *aperture* (see Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* 1, 327 sq.), asserts that that is the Syriac form of Derceto, and brings it into connection with the *greatfissure* in the earth mentioned in Lucian (ut sup. 13) which swallowed up the waters of the Flood (see his edition of Castell's *Lex. Syr.* p. 975). On the other hand, Gesenius *(Thesaur.* sub voce ^wgd) prefers considering Derceto to be the Syriac atgrd for atgd, 1 *fish;* and it is certain that such an intrusion of the Resh is not uncommon in Aramaic. (For other etymological derivations, see Alphen, *Diss. de terra Chadrach,* c. 5.) It has been supposed that Atargatis was the tutelary goddess of the first Assyrian dynasty *(Dercetadce,* fr. Derceto; Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assur's,* p. 131, 138), and that the name appears in *Tiglath-* or *Tilgath* Pileser *(ibid.* p. 37).

At'aroth

(Hebrews *Ataroth',* t/rf;[} *crowns;* Sept. Ἀταρώθ), the name of several places in Palestine.

1. A city east of Jordan, not far from Gilead, and in the vicinity of Dibon, Jazer, and Aroer, in a fertile grazing district (Numbers 32:3), rebuilt by the Gadites (ver. 34), although it must have lain within the tribe of Reuben, probably on the slope of the hill still retaining the name *Attarus* (Burckhardt, 2, 630), where there is a river having the same name (Van de Velde, *Memoir,* p. 220).

2. A city on the border of Ephraim and Benjamin, between Janohah and Naarath, toward Jericho (Joshua 16:7), and also between Archi and Japhleti (ver. 2). Professor Robinson discovered a place by the name of *Atara,* perhaps identical with this, now a large village on the summit of a

hill, about six miles N. by W. of Bethel *(Researches, 3,* 80). The ruins of another place by the same name, nearer Jerusalem on the north, have also been noticed *(ibid. 3,* Appendix, p. 122), situated at both ends of a defile, leading into the Wady *Atara,* which extends a distance of 2000 yards, about halfway between Beeroth and Mizpah (De Saulcy, 1, 101; 2, 257). This locality agrees better with the Ataroth of Ephraim than the other (see Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 146). The *Ataroth* (Ἀταρούθ) of Eusebius *(Onomast.* s.v.) lay four miles north of Samaria. This Ataroth is also called "'ATAROTH-ADDAR" or "ATAROTH-ADAR" (Hebrews *Atroth' Addar',* rDa;i t/r f][; *crowns of Addar [greatness];* Sept. Ἀταρὼθ Ἀδάρ and Ἀθάρ) in Joshua 16:5; 18:13; where, as well as above, it is located between Bethel and Beth-horon (see Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 124).

3. "ATAROTH [OF] THE HOUSE OF JOAB" (Hebrews *Atroth' Beyth Yoab,* ba;y tyBet/r f][; *crowns of* the *house of Joab;* Sept. Ἀταρὼθ οἴκου Ἰωβάβ. v.r. Ἰωάβ), a city (nominally) in the tribe of Judah, founded by the descendants of Salma (1 Chronicles 2:54). Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 143) identifies it with *Latrum* (for *el-Atron),* on the road from Jerusalem to Jaffa, west of Saris, which (although slightly beyond the ancient bounds of Judah) appears plausible, as the well *Ayub* in the immediate vicinity may be a relic of the epithet here applied distinctively to this place.

4. ATAROTH-SHOPHAN (Hebrews *Atroth' Shophan',* ^p;v t/r f][; *crowns of Shophan [hiding];* Sept. merely Σοφάρ), another city (nominally) of the tribe of Gad, mentioned in connection with No. 1 (Numbers 32:35). The English version overlooks the distinction evidently intended by the suffixed word, translating "Atroth, Shophan," as if two places were thus denoted. The associated names would appear to indicate a locality not far from the border between Gad and Reuben (probably, however, within the latter), perhaps at the head of Wady Eshteh, near *Merj-Ekkeh* (Robinson's *Milap),* as the place was famous for pasturage.

At'aroth-A'dar, At'aroth-Ad'dar

SEE ATAROTH.

Atbach

(j Bif ;a) is not a real word, but a factitious cabalistic term denoting by its very letters the mode of changing one word into another by a peculiar

eommutation of letters. The system on which it is founded is this: as all the letters have a numerical value, they are divided into three classes, in the first of which every pair makes the number *ten;* in the second, a *hundred;* and in the third, *a thousand.* Thus:

wd, zg, jb, fa, every pair making ten.

sm, [l, pk, xy, "a hundred.

µt, ^ç, ãr, /q, "a thousand.

Three letters only cannot enter into any of these numerical combinations, h, n and Ë. The first two are nevertheless coupled together; and the last is suffered to stand without commutation. The commutation then takes place between the two letters of every pair; and the term *Atbach* thus expresses that a is taken for f, and b for j, and conversely. To illustrate its application, the obscure word ^wnm, in <20>Proverbs 29:21, may be turned by Atbach into hdhs, *testimony* (Buxtorf, *De Abbreviaturis, s.v.*).

ATHBASH

(vBitÞa) is a similar term for a somewhat different principle of commutation. In this, namely, the letters are also mutually interchanged by pairs; but every pair consists of a letter from each end of the alphabet, in regular succession. Thus, as the technical term Athbash shows, a and t, and b and v, are interchangeable; and so on throughout the whole series. By writing the Hebrew alphabet twice in two parallel lines, but the second time in an inverse order, the two letters which form every pair will come to stand in a perpendicular line. This system is also remarkable on account of Jerome having so confidently applied it to the word *Sheshak,* in <24>Jeremiah 25:26. He then propounds the same system of commutation as that called Athbash (without giving it that name however, and without adducing any higher authority for assuming this mode of commutation than the fact that it was customary to learn the Greek alphabet first straight through, and then, by way of insuring accurate retention, to repeat it by taking a letter from each end alternately), and makes vv to be the same as lbb. (See Rosenmüller's *Scholia,* ad loc.) Hottinger possessed an entire Pentateuch explained on the principle of Athbash *(Thesaur. Philol.* p. 450).

There is also another system of less note, called ALBAI (µBil]ai), which is only a modification of the preceding; for in it the alphabet is divided into halves, and one portion placed over the other in the natural order, and the pairs are formed out of those letters which would then stand in a row together. — Kitto, s.v.

All these methods belong to that branch of the Cabala (q.v.) which is called hr;WmT], *commutation.*

A’ter

(Hebrews *Ater’*, r fia; *shut* up; Sept. Ἀτήρ v. r. in <150242>Ezra 2:42, Ἀττήρ), the name of three men.

1. A descendant(?) of one Hezekiah (q.v.), whose family, to the number of 98, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (<150216>Ezra 2:16; <160721>Nehemiah 7:21). B.C. ante 536.

2. The head of a family of Levitical “porters” to the Temple, that returned at the same time with the above (<150242>Ezra 2:42; <160745>Nehemiah 7:45). B.C. 536.

3. One of the chief Israelites that subscribed the aacred covenant with Nehemiah (<161017>Nehemiah 10:17). B.C. cir. 410.

Aterezi’as

(Ἀτὴρ Ἐζεκίου), a mistake (1 Esdras 5:15) for the phrase “ ATER *SEE ATER* (q.v.) of Hezekiah” (<150216>Ezra 2:16; <160721>Nehemiah 7:21). *SEE HEZEKIAH*.

A thach

(Hebrews *Athak’*, Ët;[} *lodging;* Sept. Ἀθάχ v. *r.* ῎Νομβέ), one of the cities of Judah (i.e. Simeon) to which David sent a present of the spoils recovered from the Amalekites who had sacked Ziklag (<093030>1 Samuel 30:30). According to Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 113), it is marked by the modern valley *Athaca*, north of Jebel Madurah, on the edge of the Idumnaan deserts; given on Zimmermann’s map as *Wady Ateiche*, S. of Hebron, opposite the extremity of the Dead Sea, perhaps at the ruins (with water) marked as *Abu Teraifeh* on Van de Velde’s *Map*. Others regard the name as an error of transcription for Ether (<061542>Joshua 15:42).

Athai'ah

(Hebrews *Athayah',* hy;t ;[} perhaps the same as *Asaiah;* Sept. Åθαΐα), a son of Uzziah of the tribe of Judah, who returned to Jerusalem from Babylon (<161104>Nehemiah 11:4). B.C. 536. *SEE UTHAI*.

Athali'ah

(Hebrews *Athalyah,* hy;l]t i[} <122101>2 Kings 11:1, 3, 13, 14; <130826>1 Chronicles 8:26; <142212>2 Chronicles 22:12; <150817>Ezra 8:17; in the prolonged form *Athalya'hu,* Why;l]t i[} <122602>2 Kings 8:26; 11:2, 20; <142202>2 Chronicles 22:2, 10, 11; 23:12, 13, 21; 24:7; *afflicted* by *Jehovah),* the name of two men and one woman.

1. (Sept. Γοθολία, and so Josephus, *Ant.* 9, 7, 1.) The daughter of Ahab, king of Israel, doubtless by his idolatrous wife Jezebel. She is also called the daughter of Omri (<142202>2 Chronicles 22:2), who was the father of Ahab; but by a comparison of texts it would appear that she is so called only as being his granddaughter. Athaliah became the wife of Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. This marriage may fairly be considered the act of the parents; and it is one of the few stains upon the character of the good Jehoshaphat that he was so ready, if not anxious, to connect himself with the idolatrous house of Ahab. Had he not married the heir of his crown to Athaliah, many evils and much bloodshed might have been spared to the royal family and to the kingdom. When Jehoram came to the throne, he, as might be expected, "walked in the ways of the house of Ahab," which the sacred writer obviously attributes to this marriage by adding, "for he had the daughter of Ahab to wife" (<142106>2 Chronicles 21:6). Jehoram died (B.C. 884) of wounds received in a war with the Syrians into which his wife's counsel had led him, and was succeeded by his youngest son Ahaziah, who reigned but one year, and whose death arose from his being, by blood and by circumstances, involved in the doom of Ahab's house. *SEE AHAZIAH*. Before this Athaliah had acquired much influence in public affairs (comp. <110101>1 Kings 10:1; <202101>Proverbs 21:1), and had used that influence for evil; and when the tidings of her son's untimely death reached Jerusalem, she resolved to seat herself upon the throne of David at whatever cost (B.C. 883), availing herself probably of her position as *king's mother, SEE ASA*, to carry out her design. Most likely she exercised the regal functions during Ahaziah's absence at Jezreel (<122901>2 Kings 9), and resolved to retain her power, especially after seeing the danger to which

she was exposed by the overthrow of the house of Omri, and of Baal-worship in Samaria. It was not unusual in those days for women in the East to attain a prominent position, their present degradation being the result of Mahommedanism. Miriam, Deborah, Abigail, are instances from the Bible, and Dido was not far removed from Athaliah, either in birthplace or date, if Carthage was founded B.C. 861 (Josephus, *c. Apion.* 1, 18). In order to remove all rivals, Athaliah caused all the male branches of the royal family to be massacred (<12101>2 Kings 11:1); and by thus shedding the blood of her own grandchildren, she undesignedly became the instrument of giving completion to the doom on her father's house, which Jehu had partially accomplished. From the slaughter of the royal house one infant named Joash, the youngest son of Ahaziah, was rescued by his aunt Jehosheba, daughter of Jehoram (probably by another wife than Athaliah), who had married Jehoiada (<14221>2 Chronicles 22:11), the high-priest (<14246>2 Chronicles 24:6). The child, under Jehoiada's care, was concealed within the walls of the Temple, and there brought up so secretly that his existence was unsuspected by Athaliah. But in the seventh year (B.C. 877) of her bloodstained and evil reign, Jehoiada thought it time to produce the lawful king to the people, trusting to their zeal for the worship of God, and loyalty to the house of David, which had been so strenuously called out by Asa and Jehoshaphat. After communicating his design to five "captains of hundreds," whose names are given in <14231>2 Chronicles 23:1, and securing the co-operation of the Levites and chief men in the country-towns in case of necessity, he brought the young Joash into the Temple to receive the allegiance of the soldiers of the guard. It was customary on the Sabbath for a third part of them to do duty at the palace, while two thirds restrained the crowd of visitors and worshippers who thronged the Temple on that day, by occupying the gate of Sur (rWs, <111106>1 Kings 11:6, called *of the foundation*, d/sy], <14235>2 Chronicles 23:5, which Gerlach, *in loco*, considers the right reading in Kings also), and the gate "behind the guard" (Vulg. *porta uce est post habitaculum scutariorum),* which seem to have been the N. and S. entrances into the Temple, according to Ewald's description of it *(Geschichte,3,* 306-7). On the day fixed for the outbreak there was to be no change in the arrangement at the palace, lest Athaliah, who did not worship in the Temple, should form any suspicions from missing her usual guard, but the latter two thirds were to protect the king's person by forming a long and closely-serried line across the Temple, and killing any one who should approach within certain limits. They were also furnished with David's spears and shields, that the work of restoring his descendant

might be associated with his own sacred weapons. When the guard had taken up their position, the young prince was anointed, crowned, and presented with the Testimony or Law, and Athaliah was first roused to a sense of her danger by the shouts and music which accompanied the inauguration of her grandson. She hurried into the Temple, but found Joash already standing "by a pillar," or more properly *on* it, i.e. on the tribunal or throne apparently raised on a massive column or cluster of columns, which the king occupied when he attended the service on solemn occasions. The phrase in the original is dWM[Al[; rendered ἐπί τοῦ στύλου by the Sept., and *super tribunal* in the Vulgate, while Gesenius gives for the substantive *a stage* or *pulpit.* (Comp. 2 Kings 23:3, and Ezekiel 46:2.) She arrived, however, only to behold the young Joash standing as a crowned king by the pillar of inauguration, and acknowledged as sovereign by the acclamations of the assembled multitude. Her cries of "Treason!" failed to excite any movement in her favor, and Jehoiada, the high-priest, who had organized this bold and successful attempt, without allowing time for pause, ordered the Levitical guards to remove her from the sacred precincts to instant death (2 Kings 11; 2 Chronicles 21:6; 22:10-12; 23). The Tyrians afterward avenged her death (Joel 2). The only other recorded victim of this happy and almost bloodless revolution was Mattan, the priest of Baal. (On its plan, see De Wette, *Beiti Aige*, p. 95 sq.; Gramberg, *Chron.* p. 135 sq.; Keil, *Chron.* p. 361 sq.; Ewald, *Geschichte, 3,* 574 sq. The latter words of 2 Kings 11:6, in our version, "*that it be not broken down,*" are probably wrong: Ewald translates "*according to custom;*" Gesenius gives in his Lexicon "*a keeping off.*") In modern times the history of Athaliah has been illustrated by the music of Handel and of Mendelssohn, and the stately declamation of Racine.

2. (Sept. Γοθολίας v. r. Γοθολία.*)* One of the "sons" of Jeroham and chieftains of the tribe of Benjamin, resident at Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 8:27). B.C. apparently 536.

3. (Sept. Ἀθελία v. r. Ἀθλία) The father of Jeshaiah, which latter was one of the "sons" of Elam that returned with seventy dependents from Babylon under Ezra (Ezra 8:7). B.C. ante 459.

Athanasian Creed

SEE CREED (ATHANASIAN).

Athanasius

Patriarch of Alexandria, was born in that city about A.D. 296. The precise date is not known, nor have we any accurate knowledge of his family or of his earlier years. It is clear, however, that he was brought up and educated with a view to the Christian ministry by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and gave promise of his future eminence in early youth. When a young man, he became very intimate with the hermit Anthony (q.v.), whose life he afterward wrote. His intellect matured so early that before he was twenty-four he wrote the treatises *Against the Greeks,* and *Concerning the Incarnation of the Word* (of which see an account below). While only a deacon he was sent to the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), where he contributed largely to the decision against the Arians, and to the adoption of the Nicene Creed. *SEE NICE*, Council of. It was the great task of his whole after life to defend this creed against the Arians and other heretical sects. On the death of Alexander (A.D. 326), he was made bishop of Alexandria by the voice of the people as well as of the ecclesiastics. He discharged his duties with exemplary fidelity; but the Arians soon commenced a series of violent attacks upon him, which embittered all his remaining life. About 331, Arius, who had been banished after his condemnation by the Council of Nice made a plausible confession of faith, and Constantine recalled him, directing that he should be received by the Alexandrian Church. But Athanasius firmly refused to admit him to communion, and exposed his prevarication. The Arians, upon this, exerted themselves to raise tumults at Alexandria, and to injure the character of Athanasius with the emperor. In 334 a synod of hostile bishops was called to meet at Caesarea. To this council Athanasius was summoned to defend himself against the charge of having murdered a certain Meletian bishop called Arsenius; but, knowing the enmity entertained by all the members of the council against him, he refused to attend. In the following year a more important council was convoked at Tyre, at which sixty Arian bishops were present, and many of the orthodox faith. No accusation was brought against the faith of Athanasius, but the old charge of the murder of Arsenius was renewed, and he was also accused of having violated the person of a virgin. The first accusation was most clearly refuted by the appearance of Arsenius himself before the synod; and the falsehood of the second as clearly proved by the woman (who was, in fact, a common prostitute, and who had never before seen the bishop) fixing, by mistake, upon another man, Timotheus, who stood near Athanasius, and declaring

that it was he who had committed the sin. But Athanasius, seeing that his condemnation was resolved on by the majority, left the council. Athanasius was deposed, fifty bishops, however, protesting against the judgment. Athanasius went at once to the emperor, and laid his complaint before him, upon which, in 336, Constantine called the leaders of the opposing party before him, who, seeing that some new charge must be trumped up to support their conduct, declared that Athanasius had threatened that he would prevent the yearly export of corn from Alexandria to Constantinople; upon which the emperor exiled him to Treves. At the expiration of a year and six months, i.e. in June, 337, Constantine the Great being dead, Athanasius was restored to his see. In 340 Constantine the younger, who was the friend of Athanasius, was killed; and in 341 Athanasius was again deposed in a synod held at Antioch, and Gregory of Cappadocia was elected to succeed him. — In the mean time Athanasius betook himself to Rome, where Pope Julius declared his innocence in a synod held in 342. At Rome or in the West he remained till the Synod of Sardica, in 347, had pronounced his acquittal of all the charges brought against him; after which the emperor Constantius, at the entreaty of his brother Constans, recalled him to his see (A.D. 349). In the very next year Constans was slain by Magnentius in Gaul, and in him Athanasius lost his protector. Constantius, now sole emperor, soon gathered the Arians around him, and the court determined to ruin Athanasius. New accusations were trumped up, and he was condemned by a council convened at Arles (353), and by another at Milan (355), and was a third time obliged to flee into the deserts of Thebais. His enemies pursued him even here, and set a price upon his head. In this situation Athanasius composed his most important writings to strengthen the faith of believers, and expose the falsehood of his enemies. He returned with the other bishops whom Julian the Apostate recalled from banishment, and in A.D. 362 held a council at Alexandria, where the belief of a consubstantial Trinity was openly professed. Julian soon became alarmed at the energy with which Athanasius opposed paganism, and banished him, even (according to Theodoret) threatening him with death. He escaped to the desert (A.D. 362). The accession of Jovian brought him back in 363; but Jovian died in 364, and Valens, being an Arian, compelled him to retire from his see (A.D. 367). He hid himself in his father’s tomb at the gates of Alexandria for four months. At last Valens (according to one account, for fear of the people of Alexandria, who took arms in favor of Athanasius) recalled the heroic bishop, and he was permitted to sit down in quiet and govern his

affectionate Church of Alexandria until his death, May 2, 373 (according to Baronius, 372). Of the forty-six years of his official life he spent twenty in banishment. Athanasius was perhaps the greatest man in the early church. "With the most daring courage and perseverance of purpose, he combined a discreet flexibility, which allowed him after defeats to wait for new contingencies, and prepare himself for fresh exertions. He was no less calm and considerate than determined; and while he shunned useless danger (see his 'Apology for his Flight'), he never admitted the slightest compromise of his doctrine, nor attempted to conciliate by concession even his imperial adversaries. 'In his life and conduct,' says Gregory of Nazianzus, 'he exhibited the model of episcopal government — in his doctrine, the rule of orthodoxy.' Again, the independent courage with which he resisted the will of successive emperors for forty-six years of alternate dignity and misfortune introduced a new feature into the history of Rome. An obstacle was atonce raised against imperial tyranny: a limit was discovered which it could not pass over. Here was a refractory subject who could not be denounced as a rebel, nor destroyed by the naked exercise of arbitrary power; the weight of spiritual influence, in the skillful hand of Athanasius, was beginning to balance and mitigate the temporal despotism, and the artifices to which Constantius was compelled to resort, in order to gain a verdict from the councils of Aries and Milan, proved that his absolute power had already ceased to exist. Athanasius did not, indeed, like the Gregories, establish a system of ecclesiastical policy and power — that belonged to later ages and to another climate — but he exerted more extensive personal influence over his own age, for the advancement of the church, than any individual in any age, except perhaps Bernard. 'In all his writings,' says Photius, 'he is clear in expression, concise, and simple; — acute, profound, and very vehement in his disputations, with wonderful fertility of invention; and in his method of reasoning he treats no subject with baldness or puerility, but all philosophically and magnificently."'

Gregory of Nazianzus has an oration on Athanasius, from which the following passage is given by Cave *(Lives of the Fathers,* vol. 2): "He was one that so governed himself that his life supplied the place of sermons, and his sermons prevented his corrections; much less need had he to cut or lance where he did but once shake his rod. In him all ranks and orders might find something to admire, something particular for their imitation: one might commend his unwearied constancy in fasting and prayer; another, his vigorous and incessant persevering in watchings and praise; a

third, his admirable care and protection of the poor; a fourth, his resolute opposition to the proud, or his condescension to the humble. The virgins may celebrate him as their bridesman, the married as their governor, the hermits as their monitor, the cenobites as their lawgiver, the simple as their guide, the contemplative as a divine, the merry as a bridle, the miserable as a comforter, the aged as a staff, the youth as a tutor, the poor as a benefactor, and the rich as a steward. He was a patron to the widows, a father to orphans, a friend to the poor, a harbor to strangers, a brother to brethren, a physician to the sick, a keeper of the healthful, one who 'became all things to all men, that, if not all, he might at least gain the more.'... With respect to his predecessors in that see, he equalled some, came near others, and exceeded others; in some he imitated their discourses, in others their actions; the. meekness of some, the zeal of others, the patience and constancy of the rest; borrowing many perfections from some, and all from others; and so making up a complete representation of virtue, like skillful limners, who, to make the piece absolute, do first from several persons draw the several perfections of beauty within the idea of their own minds; so he, insomuch that in practice he outdid the eloquent, and in his discourses outwent those who were most versed in practice; or, if you will, in his discourses he excelled the eloquent, and in his practice those who were most used to business; and for those that had made but an ordinary advance in either, he was far superior to them, as being eminent but in one kind; and for those who were masters in the other, he outdid them in that he excelled in both."

The aptitude of his remarkable intellect for grappling with the deepest problems is shown in all his writings, even in the earliest (λόγος κατὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, *Oration against the Greeks),* an apologetic work to refute the Grecian attacks on Christianity, which evinces his culture in Greek learning, as well as rare metaphysical acuteness, written as it was before the author was twenty-five (A.D. 318?) The treatise *De Incarnatione verbi* appeared about the same time, and, indeed, is cited by Jerome as the same work. It treats of the deepest themes, God, creation, .anthropology, and Christology. His other most important writings are *Epistola de decretis Nicence Synodi contra Ariaios; Epist. de sententia Dionysii; Orationes contra Arianos; 'Epistolce od Serapionem; Epistola ad Epictetum; Epistola ad Adelphum; Contra Apollinarium.* Besides these are *Apologia de Fuga sua* (to justify his flight from persecution); *Epistola ad Monachos,* written by request of certain monks, to give an account of his sufferings

and of the Arian heresy. The first, or dogmatical part, is lost. The following passage from this book manifests the modest ‘humility of a grand intellect. Speaking of his attempts to explain the doctrine of the *Logos,* he says: “The more I think on the subject, the more incomprehensible it appears to me; and I should abandon it entirely were it not for *your* importunity and the blasphemy of your opponents. I therefore think it ploper to say something on the subject; for, though it be impossible to comprehend what God *is,* yet it is possible to tell what *he is not.* In like manner, though it is impossible fully to explain the nature of the *Logos,* yet it is easy to condemn and refute what his adversaries have said against him.” After having made this apology, he begs them to return the letter after they had read it, without either copying or permitting it to be copied, as it was at least but an inadequate defense of that a great truth, and was too inconsiderable to deserve being transmitted to posterity. In this epistle his views on persecution contrast nobly with those of Augustine’s later years. “Nothing,” he observes, “more forcibly marks the weakness of a bad cause. Satan, who has no *truth* to propose to men, comes with axe and sword to make way for his errors. The method made use of by Christ to persuade men to receive his beneficent religion is widely different, *for .ie* teaches the truth, and says, *If any man* WILL *come after in me, and be my disciple,* etc. When he comes to the heart he uses no *violence,* but says, *Open to me, my sister, my spouse;* if we open, he comes in; if we *will not* open, he retires; for the truth is not preached with swords and spears, nor by the authority of soldiers, but by counsel and persuasion. But of what use can persuasion be where the *imperial terror* reigns? And what place is there for counsel where resistance to the imperial authority in these matters must terminate in exile or death? It is the property of the true religion to have no recourse *to force,* but to persuasion. But the state makes use of compulsion in matters of religion, and what is the consequence? Why, the church is filled with hypocrisy and impiety, and the faithful servants of Christ are obliged to hide themselves in caves and holes of the earth, or to wander about in the deserts.”

The *Orationes contra Arianos,* four in number, were written, it is supposed, during the stay of Athanasius in Egypt. In *the first* discourse he answers the objections which the Arians brought against what is now commonly termed the *Eternal Sonship of Christ.* In the *second* he shows the dignity of Christ’s nature, and its superiority to that of angels and to all created beings, and explains several portions of Scripture, especially

Proverbs 8, which he applies to Christ, pointing out what parts relate to his divine nature, and those which are to be understood of his human nature. The *third* may be divided into *three parts.* In *the first* he shows the essential *unity* and *identity* of the Father and Son; in the *second* he explains certain passages of Scripture which relate only to the *human nature* of Christ, and which the Arians had perverted by applying them to his *divinity,* in order the better to serve their own cause; in the *third* part he answers their objections; in *the fourth* discourse Athanasius shows the unity of the divine nature, and, at the same time, the distinct personality of the Father and the Son. Most of this oration refers to other heresies than Arianism. "We do not hesitate to affirm that the four orations of Athanasius against the Arians contain a dialectics as sharp and penetrating, and a metaphysics as transcendental as any thing in Aristotle or Hegel" (Shedd, *History of Doctrines,* 1, 73). Bishop Kaye gives a digest of the four orations in his *Council of Nicea* (Lond. 1853, pt. 2).

The *Epistolae ad Serapionem* (four in number) were written in reply to Serapion, an Egyptian bishop, who asked Athanasius to answer certain heretics who maintained that the Holy Spirit was a *creature,* and one of the ministering spirits of God, different from angels only in *rank,* but not in *nature.* "If," say they, "the Holy Spirit be neither an angel nor created being, if he proceed from the Father, he is his *Son,* and the *Logos* and he are *brothers;* if so, how can the *Logos be* called the *only son* of God? If they be equal, why is he called the Holy Spirit, and not *Son;* and why is it that he is not also said to have been begotten by the Father?" To show them the futility of such objections, which suppose that, in speaking of God and his son Jesus, we must be governed by the ideas of natural generation, Athanasius asks in his turn, "Who, then, is the father of the Father, the son of the Son? who the grandchildren, seeing, among men, *father* implies *father antecedent,* and *son* implies *son consequent,* and so on *ad infinitum?* Son among men is only a portion of his father; but in God, the Son is the entire image of the Father, and always Son, as the Father is always Father; nor can the Father be the Son, nor the Son the Father. We cannot, therefore, speak of God as having brother or ancestor of any kind, seeing the Scriptures speak of no such thing; nor do they ever give the Holy Spirit the name of *Son,* but only that of the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son. The holy Trinity has one and the same godhead or divinity; it is all but *one God;* we must not attach the idea of creature to it; human reason can penetrate no further; the cherubim cover the rest with

their wings." In the *second* letter Athanasius combats those who place the Son in the rank of created beings, and advances the proofs of his divinity. The *third* letter shows that what the Scriptures say of the Son as to his divine nature, they say the same also of the Holy Spirit; and that the proofs which establish the divinity of the one, establish also the divinity of the other. In the *fourth* letter he shows how the Holy Spirit cannot be termed Son, and insists on the necessity of saying nothing of God but what he has revealed concerning himself; and that we must not judge of the divine nature by what we see in men; and that the mystery of the Trinity cannot be fathomed by human wisdom. As Serapion had asked his opinion concerning that text, *He who blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost hath no forgiveness, neither in this world nor in that which is to come,* he employs the conclusion of this letter in discussing this point. *Origen* and *Theognostus,* he observes, asserted that the sin against the Holy Ghost was *apostasy after baptism.* This Athanasius denies, because the words were addressed to the *Pharisees, who had not been baptized,* and yet are charged with having committed this sin; he then asserts that as the Jews had seen the miracles which Christ wrought, and attributed them to the power of Beelzebub, thereby denying his divinity, that this alone constitutes the sin against the Holy Ghost. Those, says he, who consider only the *human acts* of Christ, and suppose him, therefore, to be a *man* only, are in some sort excusable. Those also who, seeing his *miracles,* doubted whether he was a man, could scarcely be deemed culpable; but those who, seeing his miracles and divine actions, obstinately' attributed them to the power of the devil, — as the Pharisees did, committed a crime so enormous that there is reason to fear such a sin is unpardonable. This, therefore, is the sin against the Holy Ghost of which Christ speaks. The treatise *against Apollinaris* and the *Epistle to Epictetus* treat with unrivalled skill and acumen of the true doctrine of the humanity of Christ.

The *Athanasian Creed,* so called, is not the work of Athanasius. *SEE CREED, ATHANASIAN*. For the doctrinal views of Athanasius, and for his great services to the church in settling the scientific doctrine of the Trinity, see Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine,* bk. 3, ch. 3; bk. 5, ch. 6; Smith's Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines, §* 87-105; Neander, *History of Dogmas,* 2, 290 sq. Bishop Kaye's *Account of the Council of Nicea* (Lond. 1853, 8vo) gives a history of the Arian heresy from its rise to the death of Athanasius, and also a digest of the "Four Orations against the Arians." See also the articles *SEE ARIANISM*; *SEE TRINITY*.

Athanasius brought against the Arian and other heresies three classes of arguments: (1) from the authority of preceding writers and the general sense of the church; (2) philosophical and rational arguments; (3) scriptural and exegetical proofs. In each of these fields he showed entire mastery of the material. But the great merit of his position was his assertion of the supreme authority of Scripture as against the assertions or presuppositions of reason. The Arians, Sabellians, etc. were simply precursors of the modern Rationalism; Athanasius, on the other hand, maintained that the mind of man is not, and cannot be, the I measure of the universe, still less of God, the creator of the universe. Neander sums up his share in the Arian controversy as follows: When the Arians maintained that the Son of God was only distinguished from other created beings by the fact that God created him first of all, and then all other beings by him; Athanasius, on the contrary, said It is a narrowminded representation that God, must require an instrument for creation; it looks as if the Son of God came into existence only for our sakes; and by such a representation we might be led to regard the Son of God, not as participating immediately in the divine essence, but as requiring an intermediate agency for himself. What, then, could that agency be between him and God? Grant that such existed, then that would be the Son of God in a proper sense; nothing else, indeed, than the divine essence communicating itself. If we do not stand in connection with God through the Son of God as thus conceived of, we have no true communion with him, but something stands between us and God, and we are, therefore, not the children of God in a propersense. For, in reference to our original relation, we are only creatures of God, and he is not in a proper sense our Father; only so far is he our Father as we are placed in communion with the Father through Christ, who is the Son of God by a communication of the divine essence: without this I doctrine it could not be said that we are partakers of the divine nature *(Orat. contr. Arian. 1, 16)* ἀνάγκη λέγειν τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδιον αὐτοῦ σύμπαν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν: τὸ γὰρ ὅλως μετέχεσθαι τὸν θεὸν, ἴσὸν ἐστι λέγειν ὅτι καὶ γεννᾷ: τὸ δὲ γεννᾷν τί σημαινει ἢ υἱὸν; αὐτοῦ γοῦν τοῦ υἱοῦ μετέχει τὰ πάντα κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος γινομένην παῤ αὐτοῦ χάριν, καὶ φανερὸν ἐκ τούτου γένεται, ὅτι αὐτός μεν ὁ υἱὸς οὐδενὸς μετέχει, τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μετχόμενον, τοῦτό ἐστι ὁ υἱός: αὐτοῦ γάρ τοῦ υἱοῦ μετέχοντες τοῦ θεοῦ μετέχειν λεγόμεθα (῾ ἵνα γένητε θείας κοινωνοὶφύσεως ῾ οὐκ οἴδατε, ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε; ῾῾ ἡμεῖς, γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμεν ζῶντος, 2, 59). Thus, in Athanasius, the ideas of redemption, adoption,

and communion with God were connected with the idea of Jesus as the true Son of God. As the Arians believed that they ought to pay divine honor to Christ according to the Scriptures, he charged them with inconsistency, since, on their principles, men were made idolaters and worshippers of a creature. The Arians objected to the Nicene doctrine that the idea of the Son of God could not be distinguished from that of a created being unless anthropopathical notions were admitted, Athanasius replied that certainly all religious expressions are symbolical, and have something anthropopathical at their basis, which we must abstract from them in order to get the correct idea. But the same is the case with the idea of creation, which the Arians are willing to maintain; we should fall into error if we tried to develop this according to human representations. In like manner we must abstract from the ideas *Son of God* and *begotten of God* what belongs to sensuous relations, and then there is left to us the idea of unity of essence and derivation of nature. Athanasius objects to the Semi-Arians that the ideas of likeness and unlikeness suit only creaturely relations; in reference to God we can speak only of unity or diversity. It belongs to the idea of creation. that something is created out of nothing, *ab extra,* by the will of God; to the idea of the Son of God belongs derivation from the essence of God. It was a difficulty to the Semi-Arians in general, as well as to the Arians, that the Son of God was asserted to maintain his existence not by a direct act of the Father's will, and both parties urged against the Nicseans the dilemma that either God brought the Son into being by his own will, or that he was begotten against his will by necessity. Athanasius emphatically maintained the doctrine they impugned. If the will of God be supposed to be the origin of the Son's existence, then the Son of God belongs to the class of creatures. The existence of the divine Logos precedes all particular acts of the divine will, which are all effectuated only by the Logos, who himself is the living divine will. Our opponents think only of the contrast between will and compulsion; they ignore what is higher, namely, the idea of that which is founded in the divine essence. We cannot say God is good and merciful first of all, by a special act of his will, but all the acts of the divine will presuppose the being of God. The same holds good of the Logos and the acts of God's will." — Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas,* 1, 295.

Athanasius must be classed among the greatest of Christian theologians. Yet in some points he was "weak like other men;" and the ascetic and monastic spirit received a strong impulse from his writings, and especially

from his Life of St. Anthony (q.v.). This and some other of his writings were doubtless interpolated by later writers in the interest of Romish corruptions, yet enough remains to show that he shared in some of the Gnostic errors, especially with regard to religious virginity and celibacy. Thus, in his oration Against the Greeks, the following passage occurs: "The Son of God," says Athanasius (i. 698), "made man for us, and having abolished death, and having liberated our race from the servitude of corruption, hath, besides his other gifts, granted to us to have upon earth an image of the sanctity of angels, namely, virginity. The maids possessing this (sanctity), and whom the church catholic is wont to call the brides of Christ, are admired, even by the gentiles, as being the temple of the Logos. Nowhere, truly, except among us Christians, is this holy and heavenly profession fully borne out or perfected; so that we may appeal to this very fact as a convincing proof that it is among us that true religion is to be found." And thus, in the undoubted tract of the same father on the Incarnation, we meet the very same prominent doctrine spoken of as *a characteristic of the Christian system,* and even including the Gnostic phrase applied to virginity, that it was an excellence obeying a rule "above law." "Who is there but our Lord and Savior Christ that has not deemed this virtue (of virginity) to be utterly impracticable (or unattainable) among men, and yet he has so shown his divine power as to impel youths, as yet under age, to profess it, a virtue beyond law?" (1, 105). (Taylor, *Ancient Christianity,* 1, 222; see also Taylor's remarks on Athanasius's *Life of Anthony,* p. 280.)

The most complete edition of the works of Athanasius is that of the Benedictines *(Athanasii Opera omnia quae extant, vel quce ejus nomine circumferuntur,* etc. Padua, 1777, 4 vols. fol.). Very convenient for ordinary students is *Athanasii opera dogmatica selecta,* ed. Thilo, (Lips. 1853, 1000 pp. 8vo), which contains all the really important writings of Athanasius. The *Four Orations against the Arioans* were translated by S. Parker (Oxf. 1713, 2 vols. 8vo). We have also in English, *Select Treatises in Controversy with the Arians,* in the "Library of the Fathers," vols. 8, 19 (Oxf. 184244); *Historical Tracts* (Lib. of Fathers, 13, Oxf. 1843). The "Festal Letters" of Athanasius were long lost, but were edited in 1848 by Mr. Cureton, from a newlyfound Syrian MS., and translated into German under the title *Die Fest-Briefe des Heiligen Athanasius, aus dem Syrischen fibersetzt und durch Annmerkungen erlautert* von F. Larzow (Leipzig, 1852, pp. 156); also into English by Burgess (Oxf. 1854, 8vo, pp. 190).

See *Journal of Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1855, p. 255. A complete list of the works of Athanasius, including the doubtful and supposititious as well as the genuine, is given in Fabricius, *Bibl. Grce.*, ed. Harles, 7, 184-215. The sources of information as to the life of Athanasius, besides his own writings, are the church histories of Socrates (lib. 1, 2), Sozomen (2, 3), Theodoret (1, 2), and the material is well arranged by Montfaucon, *Vita A thanasii,* prefixed to the Benedictine ed. of his works. There is also a modern biography by Mohler, *Athanasius d. Grosse und die Kir he seiner Zeit,* which gives a careful analysis of his doctrine and writings. See also Bohninger, *Kirchengeschichte in Biographien* (vol. 1, pt. 2, Zurich, 1842); Ritter, *Gesch. der Christlich. Philosophie,* vol. 2; Baur, *Christl. Lehre v. der Dreieinigkeit,* vol. 1; Dorner, *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ,* vol. 1, div. 2 (Edinb. ed.); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 380; Murdoch's Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 239; *Eng. Cyclopedia;* Gibbon, *Decline and Fall,* ch. 21 - 24; Dupin, *Eccl. Script.* 1; Tillemont, *Memoires,* vol. 5; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 326; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature,* 1, 260; Voigt, *Die Lehre d. Athanasius von Alexandrien* (partly transl. in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* Jan. 1864); Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine,* bk. 3, ch. 3; Kaye, *Council of Nicaea* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); *Christian Remembrancer,* Jan. 1854, art. 4; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 1, 571 sq.; Villemain, *Eloquence Chret. au Ame siecle,* 92 sq.

Athanasius

a priest of Alexandria, was the son of Isidora, sister of Cyril of Alexandria. He was robbed of his property and degraded by Dioscorus, and, being driven out of Egypt, wandered about in poverty and distress until 451, in which year he carried his complaint before the Council of Chalcedon. This complaint is given in Labbe, 4, 405. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 451.

Athanasius (Junior)

or CELETES, surnamed HERNIOSUS, was bishop of Alexandria from about A.D. 490 to 497, and was esteemed a good Biblical scholar, an active bishop, and a devout man. He is supposed to be the author of several works ascribed to Athanasius the Great, particularly the *Sacrae Scripturae Synopsis; Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Antiochunm;* two tracts, *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei; Syntagnma Doctrinsa ad Clericos et Laicos; de Virginitate sive Ascesi.* *SEE ATHANASIUS.*

Athari’as

(Ἀτθαρίας), a name given (1 Esdras 5:40) in connection with that of Nehemias (Nehemiah), evidently by the translator misunderstanding the title TIRSHATHA (q.v.) of the original text (<150263>Ezra 2:63; comp. <160809>Nehemiah 8:9).

Ath’arim

(Hebrews *Atharinm’*, µyræt;a} *regions;* Sept. Ἀθαρείμ), a place in the south of Palestine near which the Israelites passed on their way thither (<042101>Numbers 21:1, where the English version improperly renders Ërd,, µyræt;a}h; *“the way of the spies;”* see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 171). It was, perhaps, a general designation of the region north of Mount Seir through which the Canaanites presumed that the Israelites were about to pass, as indeed they would have done but for the Edomites’ refusal of a passage to them. *SEE EXOIC*.

Athbash

SEE ATBACH.

Atheism

(from ἄθιος, *without God),* in popular language, means the negation of the existence of God.

1. *Use of the Word.* — In all ages the term has been applied according to the popular conception of Θεός *(God).* Thus the word ἄθεος, *atheist*, in old Greek usage, meant one who denied “the gods,” especially the gods recognized by the law of the state. In this way several of the Greek philosophers (even Socrates) were called atheists (Cicero, *Nat. Deorum,* 1, 23). Cicero himself defines an atheist as one who in theory denies the existence of any God, — or practically refuses to worship any *(Atheus, qui sine Deo est, impius, qui Deuma esse non credia, aut si credat, non colit, Deorum contemptor).* This distinction of atheism into *theoretical* and *practical* has remained, in popular language, to this day. At a later period the Pagans applied the term atheists to the Christians as a generic name of reproach, because they denied the heathen gods and derided their worship (Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.* 4, 15; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 1, ch. 2, § 1). In the theological strifes of the early church it was not uncommon for the

contending parties to call each other atheists, and, later still, the burning of heretics was justified by calling them atheists. The term was applied, in scientific theology, to such forms of unbelief as that of Pomponatius (Pomponazzi, † 1524) and Vanini († 1619). Bacon *(Essay* 16) uses the term to designate infidelity in general, and the denial of God in particular ("I had rather believe," he says, "all the fabulous tales in the Talmud and the Alcoran, than that the universal frame is without a mind"). So also in the *De Augmentis* (1, 11) he speaks of "'*a* little knowledge inclining the mind of man to atheism." Toward the end of the 17th century the term is not unfrequently found, e.g. in Kortholt's *De Tribus Impostoribus,* 1680, to include Deism such as that of Hobbes, as well as blank Pantheism like Spinoza's, which more justly deserves the name. The same use is seen in Colerus's work against Spinoza, *Arcana Atheismi Revelata.* Tillotson (Serm. 1 *on Atheism)* and Bentley *(Boyle Lectures)* use the word more exactly, and the invention of the term deism induced in the writers of the 18th century a more limited and exact use of the word atheism. But in Germany, Reimannus *(Historia Univ. Atheismi.* 1725, p. 437 sq.) and Buddaeus *(De Atheismo et Superstitione,* 1723, ch. 3, § 2) use it most widely, and especially make it include disbelief of immortality (Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought,* 414). Walch *(Bibliotheca Theol. Selecta,* 1757, 1:676, etc.) uses it to include Spinoza, Hobbes, and Collins as writers who, if not avowed atheists, are yet substantially such. It is a great mistake, in the interest of truth as well as in view of charity, to extend too far the application of the word atheist. Bayle does it *(Bib. Crit.),* also Brucker *(Hist. Phil.* t. i), both probably of design; and Harduin *(Athei Detect.* 1, Amsterd. 1733) puts Jansenius, Mialebranche, Quesnel, and others in his black list. On the other hand, it is both unwise and uncritical to except the extreme Pantheists (e.g. Spinoza) and Materialists from the number of Atheists. Lewes, in his *Biographical History of Philosophy,* and also in *Fortnightly Review,* 1866, p. 398, vindicates Spinoza from the charge of *spiritual* atheism, and states that Spinoza himself emphatically repudiated Atheism; but yet Lewes admits that logically there is little difference between Spinoza's Acosmism, which makes God the one universal being, and Atheism, which makes the cosmos the one universal existence. This point is fully discussed in Brenna, *De gen. human. consensu in agnoscenda Divinitate* (Florence, 1773, 2 vols. 4to). See also Perrone, *Praelect. Theologicae* (Paris, 1856, 1:238).

2. In scientific theology, atheism is opposed to *theism.* The doctrine of Christian theism is that God is absolute, self-conscious personal spirit, the beneficent creator and upholder of the universe. Every system of philosophy or religion must be built upon this principle or its opposite; that is, must be either theistic or atheistic. Hence a great deal of what passes for Deism and Pantheism is in fact Atheism. Christianity apprehends God not as entirely apart from the world and exerting no providence (Deism), nor as existing only in the world (Pantheism), but as existing apart from creation, but himself creator and controller (i.e. Providence). On this theory of a living and personal God Christianity undertakes to explain the phenomena of the universe. Those who seek to explain these phenomena by substituting other ideas for this idea of God are, in the view of Christian theology, atheists. The term should be applied to none who profess to believe in a personal, self-conscious, spiritual God. Atheism is divided into positive or dogmatic, which absolutely declares that there is no God, and negative or skeptical, which declares either (a) that, if there be a God, we cannot know either the fact or the nature of his existence, and therefore it is no concern of ours, or (b) that, if there be a God, we can only know of him by tradition or by faith, and can never have proof satisfactory to the intellect of his existence. Some Christian writers and philosophers have incautiously attempted to stand upon this latter ground. The so-called Positive Philosophy stands upon the first ground (a), but logically leads (in spite of Mr. J. S. Mill's denial, in his *Exposition of Comte)* to dogmatical atheism. To state that we only know, and only can know phenomena, is to exclude God; for God is not only no phenomenon, but is, in the Christian sense, the absolute ground of all phenomena. The theories which attempt to explain phenomena without the idea of God may be classed as (1) the Idealistic, which substitutes for the absolute, self-conscious Spirit, a so-called world-spirit; not a living, personal being, but an unconscious and abstract one — in a word, a mere *conception* of ideal being as the abstract totality of all individual conceptions; (2) the Materialistic, which substitutes far a personal God the forces inherent in matter, and holds that these sufficiently explain all phenomena; (3) the Subjective-idealistic, which asserts that phenomena are nothing but the creations or modifications of the thinking mind or subject, and that thought creates not only matter, so called, but God. To the first and third of these classes belong Fichte, Hegel, and (during his early life) Schelling, among the Germans, and their followers in England and America. To the second class belong Comte, and the socalled Positive philosophers in general. It is true that Lewes

(Philosophy of the Sciences, p. 24) denies that Comte was an atheist; and Wallace *(Art, Scenery, and Philosophy in Europe)*, while admitting Comte's individual atheism, denies that atheism is a characteristic of Positivism. But these denials are vain, so long as the very aim of the Positive method is to eliminate mind and will from the universe. A science of pure phenomenalism can never coexist with Christian theism. Perhaps the most open declarations of atheism in modern times are to be found in D'Holbach's *Systreme de la Nature* (1770), the ultimate fruit, in atheistic materialism, of the sensational philosophy. Even Voltaire pronounced it "abominable" (see note to Brougham, *Discourse on Natural Theology;* Renouvier, *Philosophie Moderne*, bk. 5, § 2). The doctrine of the book is that nothing, in fact, exists but matter and motion, which are inseparable. "If matter is at rest, it is only because hindered in motion, for in its essence it is not a dead mass. Motion is twofold, attraction and repulsion, and the different motions we see are the products of these two; and through these arise the different connections and the whole manifoldness of things, under laws which are eternal and unchangeable. It flows from these positions, first, that man is material, and, secondly, that the belief in God is a chimera. Another chimera, the belief in the being of a God, is the twofold division of man into body and soul. This belief arises like the hypothesis of a soul-substance, because mind is falsely divided from matter, and nature is thus made twofold. The evil which men experienced, and whose natural cause they could not discover, they assigned to a deity which they imagined for the purpose. The first notions of a God have their source, therefore, in sorrow, fear, and uncertainty. We tremble because our forefathers for thousands of years have done the same. This circumstance awakens no auspicious prepossession. But not only the rude, but also the theological idea of God is worthless, for it explains no phenomena of nature. It is, moreover, full of absurdities; for since it ascribes moral attributes to God, it renders him human; while, on the other hand, by a mass of negative attributes, it seeks to distinguish him absolutely from every other human being. The true system, the system of nature, is hence atheistic. But such a doctrine requires a culture and a courage which neither all men nor most men possess. If we understand by the word atheist one who considers only *dead* matter, or who designates the *moving power* in nature with the name God, then is there no atheist, or whoever would be one is a fool. But if the word means one who denies the existence of a spiritual being, a being whose attributes can only be a source of annoyance to men, then are there indeed atheists, and there would be more of them, if a correct knowledge

of nature and a sound reason were more widely diffused. But if atheism is true, then should it be diffused. There are, indeed, many who have cast off the yoke of religion, who nevertheless think it is necessary for the common people in order to keep them within proper limits. But this is just as if we should determine to give a man poison lest he should abuse his strength. Every kind of Deism leads necessarily to superstition, since it is not possible to continue on the stand-point of pure Deism. With such premises the freedom and immortality of the soul both disappear. Man, like every other substance in nature, is a link in the chain of necessary connection, a blind instrument in the hands of necessity. If any thing should be endowed with self-motion, that is, with a capacity to produce motion without any other cause, then would it have the power to destroy motion in the universe; but this is contrary to the conception of the universe, which is only an endless series of hincessary motions spreading out into wider circles continually. The claim of an individual immortality is absurd. For to affirm that the soul exists after the destruction of the body, is to affirm that a modification of a substance can exist after the substance itself has disappeared. There is no other immortality than the remembrance of posterity" (Schwegler, *History of Philosophy,* § 32). The *Dictionnaire des Athees* of Sylvain Marechal, edited by Lalande (Paris, 1799), is a flagrant specimen of the same kind. The strongest German development is Strauss's identification of God with the universal being of man, in his *Dogmatik;* and Feuerbach's bald atheism, in his *Wesen des Chr7istenthums* (Smith's Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines, §* 293). The so-called English '"secularism" is an atheistic doctrine resting on, or similar to that of the Positive Philosophy. It holds the eternity of matter; it knows of nothing greater than nature; its creed is a stern fatalism; its worship is labor; its religion is science; its future is — a "black, impenetrable curtain." One of its advocates says, "A deep silence reigns behind the curtain; no one within will answer those he has left without; all that you can hear is a hollow echo of your question, as if you shouted into a cavern" (Holyoake, *Logic of Death).* Such is the wretched atheism which is expounded by itinerant lecturers, and disseminated by periodical pamphlets throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain, and which is perverting and contaminating the minds of the more thoughtful and inquisitive among the working classes of that country to an unprecedented and incredible extent *(London Review,* 11, 20. See also *Christian Examiner,* Boston, Nov. 1859; *North British Review,* Nov. 1860).

We close this article with the following admirable passage from a modern writer: “The whole history of philosophy and theology shows that, when the material world is taken by itself, it is a contradiction of God. Atheism was not coeval with man. No atheist pretends that it was. It was always a denial, and a denial presupposes an affirmation. The denial of a God presupposes the existence in man of some faculty anterior to reflection which may apprehend Infinite Being. It is a denial, also, which has always been preceded by misapprehension of God. Pseudo-theism precedes atheism. The first denial of God is made unintentionally. Men begin to worship remarkable peculiarities of the material universe. Thus worship fell from its primitive spirit and truth into deification of the heavens and earth, to which the overflowing soul of man lent some of its own unbounded life. The Book of Job, one of the oldest of human writings, refers to this primitive idolatry in the following words: ‘If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand, this also were an iniquity to be punished by the judge; for I should have denied the God that is above.’ This declaration plainly shows that such things had begun to be in his day, but were not universal. It is a very simple exposition of the rise of idolatry everywhere. Pseudo-theism is incipient atheism; but it testifies to a pure theism going before it. The mistake of this early false worship is, as every one sees, the radical mistake of materializing the conception of God. It is the result of idly resting in an impression made by material objects. This impression would never have been made unless those objects expressed a life corresponding to ours. It was an impression at first perhaps innocently cherished as a religious influence; but it proved the means of shutting out God, the Being of love, wisdom, and power, as an object of true faith, and the source of a glowing worship. It ended in atheism. In modern times, the same result has followed from men’s seizing on the external as their means of making clear the Divine Life. It would be quite possible to trace a parallel between the consequences of giving the great name of God to the sun, moon, and earth, and the consequences of giving the same august name to laws of nature which are simple categories of the human understanding; for the forms of the understanding may stand between the soul and God, preventing his immanence in the consciousness, no less than the stars of heaven and the imposing forms of earth. The forms of the understanding, though impalpable, are *media,* no less than visible and palpable matter; and it is important to observe that they are as much so. They have proved as fruitful sources of atheism when rested on as ultimate;

for if they have not corrupted man's sensual nature by making his rites of worship bodily vice, they have paralyzed his spirit by substituting intellectual speculation for the fervent spiritual exercise which involves his might and heart, no less than his mind, in a reasonable service. But to give a logical priority of matter to mind, in an argument for the being of the spiritual God, is to beg the question at once. This Plato has observed. He says in his *Laws:* 'Atheists make the assumption that fire and water, earth and air, stand first in the order of existences, and calling them nature, they evolve soul out of them. In scrutinizing this position of the class of men who busy themselves with physical investigations, it will perhaps appear that those who come to conclusions so different from ours, and irreverent of God, follow an erroneous method. The cause of production and dissolution, which is the mind, they make, not a primary, but a secondary existence" *(Christian Examiner,* Sept. 1858). *SEE INFIDELITY*; *SEE MATERIALISM*; *SEE PANTHEISM*; *SEE THEISM*. See also, besides the authors cited in the course of this article, Buddaeus, *Theses de Atheismo* (Jena, 1717; in German, 1723); Heidenreich, *Briefe ib. d. Atheismus* (Leipzig, 1796); Reimann, *Historia atheismi* (Hildesh. 1725); Stapfer, *Instit. Theol. Polem.* vol. 2, ch. 6; Doddridge, *Lectures on Pneumatology,* etc., Lect. 33; Cudworth, *Intellectual System,* bk. 1, ch. 3; Buchanan, *Modern Atheism, under its 'Forms of Pantheism, Secularism, Development, and Natural Laws* (Boston, 1859, 12mo); Gioberti, *L'etude de la Philosophie, 2.* 105; Thompson, *Christian Theism* (N. Y. 1855,12mo); Tulloch, *Theism* (N. Y. 1855, 12mo); *Morell- History of Modern Philosophy;* Constant, *De la Religion, 3,* 20; *New American Cyclopedia,* s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 1, 577; Bartholmess, *Hist. Crit. des .Doctrines de la Philosophie Moderne,* bk. 13; Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought,* chap. 7; Pearson, *Modern Infidelity,* chap. 1, and Appendix; Chalmers, *Institutes of Theology,* book 1, chap. 3; Riddle, *Bampton Lecture,* 1862, Lecture in; Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures* (London, 1820, 2 vols. 8vo); Watson, *Theological Institutes,* part 2, chap. i.

Athenagoras

(Ἀθηναγόρας, a frequent Greek name), a philosopher of Athens, celebrated for his knowledge of theology and science, both Christian and pagan. He flourished about 177. (This has been shown by Mosheim in his essay *De vera cetate Apologetici quem Athen. scripsit,* in his *Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertin.* 1, 272 sq.) Neither Eusebius nor Jerome mention Athenagoras, but he is cited by Methodius in a passage preserved by

Epiphanius *(Haer.* 65) and by Photius *(Biblioth.* Cod. 234). Philip Sidetes (5th century) gives an account of him in a fragment first published by Dodwell *(Append. ad Dissert. in Irenaeum),* but Basnage and others have shown that this account is inaccurate, to say the least. It is said that when a Gentile, Athenagoras strove against the Christian faith; but as he was engaged in searching the Holy Scriptures for weapons to turn against the faithful, it pleased God to convert him. After this he left Athens and went to Alexandria, where, according to the account of Sidetes, he became head of the catechetical school there; but this account is not to be relied upon. He wrote a work called Πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν, *An Apology* (or *Embassy) in behalf of the Christians,* and addressed it either to Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Verus (about A.D. 166), or to the emperors Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus (about A.D. 177). In this apology he refutes the three chief calumnies urged against the Christians in that day, viz. (1) that they were atheists; (2) that they ate human flesh; (3) that they committed the most horrible crimes in their assemblies. He also claimed for the Christians the benefit of the toleration which in the Roman Empire was granted to all religions. Athenagoras wrote another treatise on the doctrine of the Resurrection (περὶ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν*),* arguing the doctrine from the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, together with the natural constitution of man. On the clearness of his conception of God, see Dorner, *Doct. of the Person of Christ,* 1, 283. The best editions of his works are those of the Benedictines (Par. 1742, fol.) and of Otto (Jena, 1857, 8vo). Separate editions of his *Apology* were published by Lindner (Langensal. 1774) and by Paul (Halle, 1856). There is an English translation by David Humphreys, *The Apologetics of Athenagoras* (Lond. 1714, 8vo); and an older one of *The Resurrection* by Richard Porder (Lond. 1573, 8vo). See Landon, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary,* 1, 602; Leyserus, *Diss. de Athenagora philos. christiano* (Lips. 1736, 4to); Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca,* 6, 86; Clarisse, *De Athenagorae Vita et Scriptis* (Lugd. Bat. 1819); Mosheim, *Comm.* 1, 394; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 673; Guericke, *De schol i quae Alex. floruit. catech.;* Dupin, *Hist. Eccles. Writers,* 1, 69; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 177; Lardner, *Works,* 2, 193; Smith's *Dict. of Classical Biog.* s.v.; *Zeitschr. far d. histor. Theol.* 1856, 4; Donaldson, *Hist. of Christ. Lit.3,* 107 sc.

Athe'nian

(Ἀθηναῖος, <44821>Acts 18:21, rendered "of Athens" in ver. 22, also in 2 Maccabees 6:7; 9:15), an inhabitant of the city of ATHENS *SEE ATHENS* (q.v.).

Atheno'bius

(Ἀθηνόβιος), a "friend" of the Syrian king Antiochus (VII) Sidetes, sent by him as a special ambassador to Simon, the Jewish high-priest. to demand possession of the chief fortresses of Palestine; which being refused, the envoy, although greatly impressed with what he saw of the splendor of Jerusalem, yet returned enraged to his inaster (1 Maccabees 15:28-36). Josephus, however, gives a somewhat different account of the negotiation *(Ant. 1*3, 7, 2; *War*, 1, 2, 2), and does not name Athenobius. *SEE ANTIOCHUS.*

Ath'ens

Picture for Ath'ens 1

(Ἀθῆναι, plural of Ἀθήνη, *Minerva*, the tutelary goddess of the place), mentioned in several passages of Scripture (2 Maccabees 9:15; <44715>Acts 17:15 sq.; 18:1; <52301>1 Thessalonians 3:1), a celebrated city, the capital of Attica and of the leading Grecian republic, and the seat of the Greek literature in the golden period of the nation (Müller, *Topog. of Athens,* trans. by Lockhart, Lond. 1842; Kruse, *Hellas,* Lpz. 1826, II, 1:10 sq.; Leake, *Topography of Athens,* Lond. 1841, 2d ed.; Forchhammer, *Topographie von Athen,* Kiel, 1841; Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth.* 1, 1783 sq.; Grote, *Hist. of Greece,* 6, 20 sq.; Wordsworth, *Athens and Attica,* Lond. 1836; Stuart and Revelt, *Antiquities of Athens,* Lond. 1762-1816, 4 vols., and later; Dodwell, *Tour through Greece,* Lond. 1819; Pittakis, Αἱ παλαιαὶ Αθῆναι Athens, 1835; Prokesch, *Denkwiurdigkeiten,* Sttuttg. 1836, 2; Mure, *Journal of a Tour in Greece.* Edinb. 1842, 2; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul,* 1, 344 sq.), belonged in the apostle's time to the Roman province of Achsea (q.v.). The inhabitants had the reputation of being fond of novelty (<44721>Acts 17:21; comp. *A*Elian, *Var. Hist.* 5, 13; Demosth. <50104>*Philippians* 1:4; Schol. *ad Thuc.* 2, 38; *ad* A ristopb. *Plut.* 338: see Wetstein, 2:567), and as being remarkably zealous in the worship of the gods (<44716>Acts 17:16; comp. Pausan. 1:24, 3; Stralbo, 10:471; Philostr. Apol. 6:3; 4:19; AElian, *Var. Hist. 5.* 17; Himer, in Phot.

cod. 243; see Eckhard, *Athenae superstitiosc*, Viteb. 1618); hence the city was full of temples, altars, and other sacred places (Liv. 45:27). Paul visited Athens on his second missionary journey from Bercea (<44174>Acts 17:14 sq.; comp. <52301>1 Thessalonians 3:1), and delivered in (but not before) the Areopagus (q.v.) his famous speech (<44172>Acts 17:22-31).

Picture for Ath'ens 2

The earlier and more obscure period of the Grecian province named Attica reaches down nearly to the final establishment of democracy in it, and even then the foundations of her greatness were already laid. The infertile soil and dry atmosphere of Attica, in connection with the slender appetite of the people, have been thought favorable to their mental development; the barrenness of the soil, moreover, prevented invaders from coveting it; so that, through a course of ages, the population remained unchanged, and a moral union grew up between the several districts. To a king named Theseus (whose deeds are too much mixed with fable to be narrated as history) is ascribed the credit of uniting all the country towns of Attica into a single state, the capital of which was Athens. The population of this province was variously called Pelasgian, Achaian, and Ionian, and probably corresponds most nearly to what was afterward called *A*Eolian (Prichard, *Phys. Hist. of Man*, 3, 404). When the Dorians, another tribe of Greeks of very different temperament, invaded and occupied the southern peninsula, great numbers of its Achaian inhabitants took refuge in Attica. Shortly after, the Dorians were repulsed in an inroad against Athens, an event which has transmitted to legendary renown the name of King Codrus, and thenceforward Athens was looked upon as the bulwark of the Ionian tribes against the barbarous Dorians. Overloaded with population, Attica now poured forth colonies into Asia, some of which, as Miletus, soon rose to great eminence, and sent out numerous colonies themselves, so that Athens was reverenced as a mother of nations by powerful children scattered along the western and northern coasts of Anatolia. Dim tradition shows us isolated priesthoods and elective kings in the earliest times of Attica; these, however, gradually gave way to an aristocracy, which in a series of years established themselves as a hereditary ruling caste. But a country "ever unravaged"' (such was their boast) could not fail to increase in wealth and numbers; and after two or three centuries, while the highest commoners pressed on the nobles, the lowest became overwhelmed with debt. The disorders caused by the strife of the former were vainly sought to be stayed by the institutions of Draco; the sufferings of the latter were ended, and the

sources of violence dried up by the enactments of Solon. Henceforth the Athenians revered *the laws of Solon* (νόμοι) as the groundwork of their whole civil polity; yet they retained by the side of them *the ordinances of Draco* (θεσμοί*)* in many matters pertaining to religion. The date of Solon's reforms was probably B.C. 594. The usurpation of Pisistratus and his sons made a partial breach in the constitution; but upon their expulsion, a more serious change was effected by Clisthenes, head of the noble house of the Alcmoeonidoe (B.C. 508), almost in the same year in which Tarquin was expelled from Rome. An entirely new organization of the Attic tribes was framed, which destroyed whatever remained of the power of the nobles as an order, and established among the freemen a democracy, in fact as well as in form. Out of this proceeded all the good and all the evil with which the name of Athens is associated; and though greatness which shot up so suddenly could not be permanent, there can be no difficulty in deciding that the good greatly preponderated. Very soon after this commenced hostilities with Persia; and the self-denying, romantic, successful bravery of Athens, with the generous affability and great talents of her statesmen, soon raised her to the head of the whole Ionian confederacy. As long as Persia was to be feared, Athens was loved; but after tasting the sweets of power, her sway degenerated into a despotism, and created at length, in the war called the Peloponnesian, a coalition of all Dorian and *A*Eolian Greece against her (B.C. 431). In spite of a fatal pestilence and the revolt of her Ionian subjects, the naval skill of Athenian seamen and the enterprise of Athenian commanders proved more than a match for the hostile confederacy; and when Athens at last fell (B.C. 404), she fell by the effects of internal sedition more truly than by Spartan lances or Persian gold, or even by her own rash and over-grasping ambition. The demoralizing effects of this war on all Greece were infinitely the worst result of it, and they were transmitted to succeeding generations. It was substantially a *civil* war in every province; and, as all the inhabitants of Attica were every summer forced to take refuge in the few fortresses they possessed, or in Athens itself, the simple countrymen became transformed into a hungry and profligate town rabble. From the earliest times the Ionians loved the lyre and the song, and the hymns of poets formed the staple of Athenian education. The constitution of Solon admitted and demanded in the people a great knowledge of law, with a large share in its daily administration. Thus the acuteness of the lawyer was grafted on the imagination of the poet. These are the two intellectual elements out of which Athenian wisdom was developed; but it was stimulated and enriched

by ex. tended political action and political experience. History and philosophy, as the words are understood in modern Europe, had their birth in Athens about the time of the Peloponnesian war. Then first, also, the oratory of the bar and of the popular assembly was systematically cultivated, and the elements of mathematical science were admitted into the education of an accomplished man. This was the period of the youth of Plato, whose philosophy was destined to leave so deep an impress on the Jewish and Christian schools of Alexandria. Its great effort was to unite the contemplative mysticism of Eastern sages with the accurate science of Greece; to combine, in short, the two qualities — intellectual and moral, argumentative and spiritual — into a single harmonious whole; — and whatever opinion may be formed of the success which attended the experiment, it is not wonderful that so magnificent an aim attracted the desires and riveted the attention of thoughtful and contemplative minds for ages afterward. In the imitative arts of sculpture and painting, as well as in architecture, it need hardly be said that Athens carried off the palm in Greece; yet, in all these, the Asiatic colonies vied with her. Miletus took the start of her in literary composition; and, under slight conceivable changes, might have become the Athens of the world. That Athens after the Peloponnesian war never recovered the political place which she previously held, can excite no surprise that she rose so high toward it was truly wonderful. Sparta and Thebes, which successively aspired to the "leadership" of Greece, abused their power as flagrantly as Athens had done, and, at the same time, more coarsely. The never-ending cabals, the treaties made and violated, the coalitions and breaches, the alliances and wars, recurring every few years, destroyed all mutual confidence, and all possibility of again uniting Greece in any permanent form of independence; and, in consequence, the whole country was soon swallowed up in the kingdom of Macedonia. With the loss of civil liberty, Athens lost her genius, her manly mind, and whatever remained of her virtue: she long continued to produce talents, which were too often made tools of iniquity, panders to power, and petty artificers of false philosophy. Under the Roman empire, into which it was absorbed with the rest of Greece, its literary importance still continued, and it was the great resort of students from Rome itself. During the Middle Ages it languished under the Ottoman yoke in every respect, but since Greece regained its independence (in 1834), it has revived (see Schubert, *Reisen, 3,* 473 sq.) as the capital of the new European king. dom. (For a detailed account of the history and topography of Athens, see the *Penny Cyclopadia, s.v.*; M'Culloch's

Gazetteer, s.v.; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v. Athenai.) *SEE GREECE*. In order to understand the localities mentioned in the sacred narrative, it may be observed that four hills of moderate height rise within the walls of the city. Of these, one to the north-east is the celebrated Acropolis, or citadel, being a square craggy rock of about 150 feet high. Immediately to the west of the Acropolis is a second hill of irregular form, but inferior height, called the Areopagus. To the south-west rises a third hill, the Pnyx, on which the assemblies of the citizens were held; and to the south of the latter is a fourth hill, known as the Museum. *SEE AREOPAGUS*.

Picture for Ath'ens 3

A Christian Church existed in Athens soon after the apostolic times, having doubtless been planted by the labors of Paul (although no allusions to it occur in the N.T.), but as the city had no political importance, the Church never assumed any eminent position (see Baronius, *Annal. Eccl.* an. 354, n. 25, 26). Tradition, however (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl. 3*, 4), assigns as its first bishop Dionysius (q.v.) the Areopagite (<44173 4>Acts 17:34). There are two points requiring special elucidation connected with the N.T. mention of Athens (from Winer):

(1.) Respecting the "altar on which was inscribed, To the *Unknown God,"* referred to in <44172 3>Acts 17:23, various opinions have been expressed by interpreters (see Fabric. *Bibliogr. antiq,* p. 296; Wolf, *Cur.* 2, 1261 sq.; Dougtsei *Anal.* p. 86 sq.; Kuinol, *Comment.* 4, 598 sq.; comp. also Grube [Segers], *De ara ignoti dei,* Regiom. 1710; Heller, *De leo ignoto Athen.* in Gronov. *Thes.* 7, 223 sq.; Schickendanz, *De ara ignoto deo consecrate,* Tervest. 1748; Geiger, *De ignoto Athen. deo,* Marb. 1754;1 Wallenius, *De deo ignoto,* Gryph. 1797; Baden, *Diss. arce deo ignoto dicatas,* Havn. 1787). It by no means follows from the classical passages usually adduced (Pausan. 1:1, 4; Philostr. *Apoll.* 6, 3; comp. Lucian, *Philopatr.* 9, 29), that any of the single altars mentioned in these writers had the inscription "to unknown gods" (ἀγνώστοις θεοῖς), in the plural, but more naturally that each was dedicated separately to an unknown deity (ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ)*;* yet these instances in the singular must have been collectively employed with a plural reference, since they unitedly speak of all such altars. There appear, moreover, to have been several altars in various parts of Athens with the inscription "to an unknown god," a circumstance that is not invalidated by the mention (Pausan. v. 14, 6) of a single (in Elis!) "altar of unknown gods

(βωμὸς ἀγνώστων θεῶν). One plausible interpretation respecting the altar in question (in Eichhorn's *Bibl. d. bibl. Lit. 3,* 414) supposes that, as in ancient times the art of writing was not generally known, or but little practiced, there were (perhaps several) altars at Athens without any inscription (βωμοὶ ἀνώνυμοι, Diog. Laert. 1:10, 3). Eventually these, when found standing thus indefinite by the religious Athenians, would be marked by the words *"to some unknown god"* (ἀγν. θεῷ). It is simpler, however, to suppose that in spots where some supposed preternatural event had occurred, which persons sought by a memorial to attribute to some distinct deity as author, they erected such an altar, that profane steps might not approach too near (compare the phrases *Si deo, Si deoe,* used in such cases, Gell. 1:28, 3; Macrob. *Saturn. 3,* 9, ed. Bip.; see Dougtaei *Anal.* 2, 87) the unrecognized deity (comp. Neander, *Planting,* 1, 262 sq.). That the expression was intended to designate specially the God of the Jews (comp. the ironical expression "Judaea devoted to the worship of *an uncertain god,"* in Lucian, 2:592), as Anton insists *(Progr. in Act. 17,* 22 sq., Gorlic. 1822), is very unlikely. (The treatise of Wolle, *De ignoto Judaeor. et Athen. deo,* Lips. 1727, is without worth; and Mosheim, *Cogit. in N.T. loc.* 1, 77 sq., treats the subject in an unantiquarian manner.) *SEE ALTAR.*

(2.) The "market" -(ἀγορά) at Athens, mentioned (<44 17 17>Acts 17:17) as the place where Paul spoke to the assembled populace, has (with most modern interpreters since Kuinol) been understood as meaning, not the proper definite market-place called "the Forum in the Ceramicus" (ἀγορὰ ἐν Κεραμεικῶ), but a so-called new market-place lying much farther north, to which Meursius *(Ceramic. gemin.* c. 16) was the first to call attention, and which Müller *(Hall. Encyclop.* 6, 132) located on his plan from the notice in Pausanias (1, 17) and Strabo (10, 447); according to the latter of which; this spot appears to have borne the designation of the *Erestria (*Ἐρετρία*).* Pausanias, however, refers to no other market-place than the well-known one lying between the Acropolis, the Pnyx, and the place of holding the Areopagus (Forchhammer, *ut sup.* p. 53 sq.); and Strabo's words ("from the Eretria at Athens, which is now the market-place"), which have been regarded as indicating that the Forum was situated there in his time, are susceptible of another and more probable interpretation (Leake, *Attica,* p. 21). Later inquirers have therefore acquiesced in the opinion that the passage in the Acts refers to nothing more than the usual market-place, in the neighborhood of which (see Forchhammer's *Plan,*

opposite the Acropolis on the west), moreover, lay the "miscellaneous porch" (στοὰ ποικίλη), of which avail may be made (as has usually been found necessary) for the explanation of Acts 17:18 (Cookesly, *Map of Athens*, Lond. 1852). *SEE MARKET*.

Picture for Ath'ens 4

Treatises on Paul's proceedings in Athens have been written by Olearius (Lips. 1706, and since), Strimesius (Lund. 1706), Majus (Giess. 1727, and in Ikenii *Thess. Diss.* 2, 669 sq.); on his address in the Areopagus, by Anspach (Lugd. B. 1829), Anton (Gorl. 1822), Bentzel (Upsal, 1669), Eskuche (Rint. 1735), Heumann (Gott. 1724); on his disputations with the philosophers, by Boemer (Jen. 1751); also the essays of Joch, *De Spiritu Attico* (Viteb. 1726); Schurtzmann, *De* ἀναστάσει *dea Atheniensibus credita* (Lips. 1708); Zorn, *De Atheniensium sarcasmo* (Kilon. 1710); Alexander, *St. Paul at Athens* (Edinb. 1865). *SEE PAUL*.

Ath'lai

(Hebrews *Athlay'*. y l it][į *oppressive;* Sept. Ὀθαλί v. r. Θαλί, Θαλείμ), one of the "sons of Bebai," who divorced his foreign wife married on the return from Babylon (Ezra 10:28). B.C. 459.

Athom

SEE ASS.

Athos

a mountain at the extremity of the promontory of Chalcis, in the province of Salonica, in European Turkey. It was an early resort of monks and anchorets, and is called *Monte Santo*, or "Holy Mountain," in the *lingua franca*, and in Greek ἅγιον ὄρος. There are now upon the sides of the mountain between twenty and thirty monasteries, and a vast multitude of hermitages, which contain more than six thousand monks called *Caloyers* (q.v.), mostly Russian, of the order of St. Basil. Here they live in a state of complete abstraction from the world; and so strict are their regulations that they do not tolerate any female being, not even of the class of domestic animals, among them. They still own considerable possessions in Bulgaria, Servia, the Danubian Principalities, and Russia. They elect annually a common council of administration, call*ed Prototaton.* They are now chiefly occupied in carving little images of the saints, which they send down to the

market-town of Kareis, where a weekly market is held, and where purchases are made for various parts, especially Russia; but formerly they were occupied with the nobler work of transcription. The libraries of the monasteries are particularly rich in MSS. and other literary treasures. Many of these works have of late years been purchased by travelers, and thus found their way into various libraries of Europe. The monasteries and churches on this mountain are the only ones in the Ottoman empire that have bells. Under the reign of Catharine II of Russia. the learned Eugen Bulgaris took up his abode on Mount Athos as director of an academy founded by Patriarch Cyril of Constantinople. For some time the academy was very flourishing, but at length the patriarch had to yield to the demands of the ignorant portion of the monks and to abolish it. From that time ignorance has generally prevailed among the monks, and only recently (1859) they have set up a printing-press and commenced the publication of a religious newspaper. No complete list of the MSS. extant at Mount Athos has yet been made. See Curzon, *Monasteries of the Levant* (N. Y. 1851, 12mo); Leake, *Trav. in N. Greece,* vol. 3; *Jour. of Geog. Soc. of Lond.* 1837, 7:61; Fallmerayer, *Fragmente aus dem Orient,* 2, 1 sq. (Stuttg. 1845); Didron aine, *Ann. Archeolog.* 1, 29 sq., 173 sq.; 4:70 sq.; 5, 148 sq.; 7:41 sq.; Miller, in Miclosich's *Slav. Bib.* vol. 1 (Vienna, 1837); Pischon, *Die Monchsrepublik des Athos,* in Raumer's *Tist. Taschenbuch* (Leipz. 1860); Gass, *Zur Geschichte der Athos-Kloster* (Giessen, 1863).

Athronges

(Ἀθρόγγης), a person of mean extraction, and by occupation a shepherd, who, without any other advantages than great bodily stature and undaunted hardihood, raised a body of banditti in Judaea, in connection with his four brothers, during the rule of Gratus, so powerful that they at last assumed royalty, and were with difficulty subdued in detail and captured by the successive procurators (Joseph. *Ant.* 17, 10, 7). In the parallel account *(War,* 2, 4, 3) he is called *Athrongaeus* (Ἀθρογγαῖος).

At'ipha

(Ἀττεφά, Vulg. *Agisti),* one of the "temple-servants" whose "sons" returned from the captivity (1 Esdras 5:32); evidently the HATIPHA *SEE HATIPHA* (q.v.) of the true text (Ezra 2:54).

Atonement

(expressed in Hebrews by rpK; *kaphar',* to *cover* over sin, hence to *forgive;* Gr. καταλλαγή, *reconciliation,* as usually rendered), the satisfaction offered to divine justice for the sins of mankind by the death of Jesus Christ, by virtue of which all penitent believers in Christ are reconciled to God, and freed from the penalties of sin.

I. *Scripture Doctrine.* —

1. *The words used to describe Christ's work.* — The redeeming work of Christ, in its several aspects, is denoted in Scripture by various terms, namely, reconciliation, propitiation, expiation, atonement, redemption, satisfaction, substitution, and salvation. The following summary of the uses and meanings of these terms is taken, with slight modifications, from Angus, *Bible Hand-book,* § 329.

(a.) Looking into the English N.T., we find "reconciliation" and "reconcile" in several passages, in all of which (except one) the Greek word is some form of ἀλλάσσω, "to produce a change between parties" (when, for example, they have been at variance); in turning to the Sept. we find this word never used in this sense at all, nor have the many passages in the O.T., which speak of "making reconciliation," any verbal reference to these passages in the N.T. The *idea* is involved in several passages, but it is never expressed by this word, nor by any single word. "To turn away anger," "to restore to favor," "to accept," are the common expressions, generally forms of hxr; and δεκτός (<23607>Isaiah 56:7; 60:7; <24160>Jeremiah 6:20; <03107>Leviticus 19:7). Hence the conclusion, that in the word of the N.T. translated "reconcile" there is reference only to the change or effect produced by some measure of mercy, and not to the nature of that measure itself: it describes merely the change produced in our relation to God; his moral sentiment of displeasure against sin (called his "wrath") is appeased, and the sinner's enmity and misgivings are removed. That there is this *double* change may be gathered from the following passages: <58106>Hebrews 10:26, 27; <45519>Romans 5:9; <58926>Hebrews 9:26, 28; <47518>2 Corinthians 5:18-20; <49216>Ephesians 2:16; <46711>1 Corinthians 7:11; <51220>Colossians 1:20, 21.

(b.) In one passage, however (<58217>Hebrews 2:17), we have in Greek another word, ἱλάσκομαι, translated also "make reconciliation." *Its*

meaning may be gathered from the passages in the O.T. in which it occurs. It is, in fact, the constant rendering of a word translated in the English version “to make reconciliation” or “to atone for” (<03110>Leviticus 6:30; 8:15; <26520>Ezekiel 45:20; <27024>Daniel 9:24, etc.).

(c.) But it would excite surprise if this were the only passage in the N.T. where this phrase is found. It occurs again, in fact, in <45325>Romans 3:25; <62202>1 John 2:2; 4:10; but in each of these passages it is translated PROPITIATION, a word which does not occur in the O.T. EXPIATION, again, does not occur in the N.T., and but once in the O.T. (<04533>Numbers 35:33, marg.); it is the same word, however, as is translated elsewhere “to make reconciliation” or “to atone for.” ATONEMENT itself does not occur in the N.T., except in <45511>Romans 5:2, and there it has no connection with the O.T. phrase, but is the same word as is translated “reconciliation” in the first sense above indicated; a change, that is, of state between parties previously at variance.

(d.) Thus far, therefore, the result is clear. Reconciliation and atonement are, *in all the N.T.*, except <58217>Hebrews 2:17, translations of the same word, and mean the state of friendship and acceptance into which the Gospel introduces us. “Reconciliation” in the sense in which it is used in <58217>Hebrews 2:17, and “atonement” in the uniform sense of the *Old Testament*, “propitiation” in the New Testament, and “expiation” in the Old, are all different renderings of one and the same Hebrew and Greek words רפכ; *kaphar* (in the Piel form רפכ) and ἐξιλάσκομαι, in some of their forms. These words, which may be regarded as one, have two senses, each involving the other. They mean to appease, pacify, or propitiate (<01320>Genesis 33:20; <20164>Proverbs 16:14; <26663>Ezekiel 16:63); and also to clear from guilt (<09314>1 Samuel 3:14; <19503>Psalm 65:3; <20606>Proverbs 16:6; <23607>Isaiah 6:7, etc.). In *propitiation*, we have prominence given to the first idea; in *expiation*, to the second; in *atonement*, we have a distinct reference to both.

(e.) The thing which atones, propitiates, or expiates is called in Greek ἱλασμός, ἐξιλασμός, and λύτρον, all translations of two derivatives of the Hebrew word רפכ; (תרפכמ) and רפכ, i.e. price or covering.

(f.) The use of λύτρον for רפכ introduces another form of expression, “redemption.” This word, as a noun, always represents in the N.T.

λύτρωσις or ἀπολύτρωσις. Both are descriptive of the *act* of procuring the liberation of another by paying some λύτρον or ἄποινα, i.e. “ransom” or “forfeit,” and hence always in the N.T. of the *state* of being ransomed in this way. These words mean (1) to buy back, by paying the price, what has been sold (<032525>Leviticus 25:25), and (2) to redeem what has been devoted by substituting something else in its place (<032727>Leviticus 27:27; <021313>Exodus 13:13; <197214>Psalm 72:14; <19D008>Psalm 130:8; <236309>Isaiah 63:9). The price paid is called λύτρον (<402028>Matthew 20:28; <411045>Mark 10:45), ἀντίλυτρον (<540206>1 Timothy 2:6), the Hebrew terms being hL;aG] and ˆwOdP] answering precisely to λύτρον, and rp,Ko which again answers to ἱλασμός. In <540206>1 Timothy 2:6, this ransom is said to be Christ himself. “Redemption,” therefore, is generally a state of deliverance by means of ransom. Hence it is used to indicate *deliverance from punishment* or guilt (<490107>Ephesians 1:7; <510114>Colossians 1:14); *sanctification,* which is deliverance from the *dominion* of sin (<600118>1 Peter 1:18); the *resurrection*, which is the actual deliverance of the body from the *grave*, the consequence of sin (<450823>Romans 8:23); *completed salvation*, which is actual deliverance from all evil (<490114>Ephesians 1:14; 4:30; <460130>1 Corinthians 1:30; <560214>Titus 2:14). Once it is used without reference to *sin* (Hebrews). 11:35), and perhaps in <422128>Luke 21:28.

(g.) Another word, translated “redemption” (ἀγοράζω, <480313>Galatians 3:13; 4:5; <660509>Revelation 5:9; 14:3, 4), means, as it is everywhere else translated, to buy, referring to a purchase made in the *market.* What is paid in this case is called τηεή (price), and this price is said to he Christ (<480313>Galatians 3:13), or his blood (<450509>Romans 5:9). In <442028>Acts 20:28, the word rendered “purchase” (περιποιεῖσθαι) has no reference to redemption or to price, but means simply “acquired for himself:” the following words, however, indicate that the sense is not materially different from purchasing, as that term is used elsewhere.

(h.) The word *“satisfaction”* is not found in the N.T., but it occurs twice in the Old (<043531>Numbers 35:31, 32). It is there a translation of rp,Ko or λύτρον, “that which expiates” or “ransoms.” The use of these terms, in reference to the N.T. doctrine, implies that what was done and paid in the death of our Lord satisfied the claims of justice, and answered all the moral purposes which God deemed necessary, under a system of holy law..

(i.) The word "*substitution*" is not to be found in either Testament, but the idea is frequently expressed in both: "it shall be accepted FOR him" (<03104>Leviticus 1:4; 7:18) is the O.T. phrase, and the New corresponds. There we find in frequent use ὑπέρ and ἀντί, the former meaning "on behalf of," "for," and "instead," and the latter meaning undoubtedly "instead of." Much stress ought not to be laid upon the first of these terms, as it is frequently used where it may mean "for the advantage of" (<45826>Romans 8:26, 31; <47012>2 Corinthians 1:2); yet in <43153>John 15:13, and <62316>1 John 3:16, it seems to mean "instead of;" and this is certainly the meaning of ἀντί (<40128>Matthew 20:28; <41045>Mark 10:45; see <40222>Matthew 2:22, "*in the room of*"). Apart, however, from particular prepositions, three sets of phrases clearly teach this doctrine. (1) Christ was *made a curse for us* (<48313>Galatians 3:13); so a similar phrase (<47521>2 Corinthians 5:21). (2)He gave himself as a *sacrifice for our sins* (<46503>1 Corinthians 15; <49502>Ephesians 5:2; <48104>Galatians 1:4; <54206>1 Timothy 2:6, 14; <58727>Hebrews 7:27; 5:1,3; 10:12; <45606>Romans 5:6, 7,8; <46013>1 Corinthians 1:13; 5:7; 11:24; <60318>1 Peter 3:18; 4:1). (3) Christ *gave his life for* our life, or we live by his death (<48220>Galatians 2:20; <45145>Romans 14:15; <47515>2 Corinthians 5:15. Compare <45604>Romans 16:4; <23504>Isaiah 53:45). The idea of *substitution* is in all these passages, and the phrase, though not scriptural, is a convenient summary of them all.

(j.) "*Salvation*" is everywhere in the N.T. the representative of σωτηρία or σωτήριον; σωτηρία is always translated "salvation" except in three passages (<44725>Acts 7:25; 27:34, and <58107>Hebrews 11:7, where it refers to temporal deliverance), and the idea included in the term is whatever blessings redemption includes, but without any reference to λύτρον, or anything else as the ground of them. It includes *present* deliverance (<42919>Luke 19:9) *or future* (<50119>Philippians 1:19; <45631>Romans 13:11). "Salvation," therefore, is the *state* into which the Gospel introduces all who believe, and without reference to the means used. On turning to the Sept., however, we find that the idea of propitiation is involved even here; σωτήριον is very frequently the translation of μ l ,v , (j bz), peace-offering, θυσία σωτηρίου (<03301>Leviticus 3:1-3; 4:10; 7:20; 11:4; <07206>Judges 20:26; 21:4). μ l ,v , is the sacrifice or retribution restoring peace, and thus the meaning of σωτήριον touches upon the meaning of propitiation.

"From this comparison, therefore, of the N.T.. the Sept., and the Hebrew, we gather the following conclusions: *Propitiation,* giving prominence to the secondary meaning of r pK; *kaphar,* and the primary meaning of ἐξιλάσκομαι, is an act prompting to the exercise of mercy, and providing for its exercise in a way consistent with justice; *Expiation,* giving prominence to the primary meaning of r pK;and the secondary meaning of ἐξιλάσκομαι, is an act which provides for the removal of sin, and cancels the obligation to punishment; *Atonement,* giving prominence to both, and meaning expiation and propitiation combined. Christ's atonement is said to be by *substitution,* for he suffered *in our stead,* and he *bears our sin;* and it is by *satisfaction,* for the broken law is vindicated, all the purposes of punishment are answered with honor to the Lawgiver, and eventual holiness to the Christian. Its *result* is *reconciliation* (καταλλαγή)*;* the moral sentiment of justice in God is reconciled to the sinner, and provision is made for the removal of our enmity; and it is *redemption,* or actual deliverance for a price from sin in its guilt and dominion, from all misery and from death. *Salvation* is also actual deliverance, but without a discinct reference to a price paid. *Atonement,* therefore, is something offered to God; *redemption* or *salvation* is something bestowed upon man; *atonement* is the ground of *redemption,* and *redemption* is the result of *atonement* (<2504>Isaiah 53:4-9, 10, 12). The design of the first is to satisfy God's justice, the design of the second to make man blessed; the first was finished upon the cross, the second is in daily operation, and will not be completed in the case of the whole church till the consummation of all things (<2724>Daniel 9:24; <4030>Ephesians 4:30)."

2. The *Scripture doctrine* of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ is taught in the passages above cited, and indeed seems to underlie the whole "gospel" of salvation contained in the teaching of Christ and his apostles. It may be stated further

(1) that the sacrifices of the O.T. were (at least many of them) expiatory [see this shown under EXPIATION *SEE EXPIATION*], and the terms used by Christ and his apostles (ransom, sacrifice, offering, etc.) were necessarily understood by their hearers in the sense which they had been accustomed for ages to attach to them.

(2) If this be so, then nothing could "be more misleading, and even absurd, than to employ those terms which, both among Jews and .Gentiles, were in use to express the various processes and means of atonement and piacular

propitiation, if the apostles and Christ himself did not intend to represent his death strictly as an expiation for sin; misleading, because such would be the natural and necessary inference from the terms themselves, which had acquired this as their established meaning; and absurd, because if, as Socinians say, they used them metaphorically, there was not even an ideal resemblance between the figures and that which it was intended to illustrate. So totally irrelevant, indeed, will those terms appear to any notion entertained of the death of Christ which excludes its expiatory character, that to assume that our Lord and his apostles used them as metaphors is profanely to assume them to be such writers as would not in any other case be tolerated; writers wholly unacquainted with the commonest rules of language, and, therefore, wholly unfit to be teachers of others, and that not only in religion, but in things of inferior importance" (Watson, *Dict.* s.v. Expiation).

Immediately upon the first public manifestation of Christ, John the Baptist declares, when he sees Jesus coming to him, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (⁴⁰⁰¹John 1:29); where it is obvious that, when John called our Lord "the Lamb of God," he spoke of him under a sacrificial character, and of the effect of that sacrifice as an atonement for the sins of mankind. This was said of our Lord even before he entered on his public office; but if any doubt should exist respecting the meaning of the Baptist's expression, it is removed by other passages, in which a similar allusion is adopted, and in which it is specifically applied to the death of Christ as an atonement for sin. In the Acts (⁴⁴⁰⁸Acts 8:32) the following words of Isaiah (²³⁰⁷Isaiah 53:7) are by Philip the Evangelist distinctly applied to Christ and to his death: "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: in his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." This particular part of the prophecy being applied to our Lord's death, the whole must relate to the same subject, for it is undoubtedly one entire prophecy; and the other expressions in it are still stronger: "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed: the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." In the First Epistle of Peter is also a strong and very apposite text, in which the application of the term "lamb" to our Lord, and the sense in which it *is* applied, can admit of no doubt: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things,

but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Peter 1:18, 19). It is therefore evident that the prophet Isaiah, seven hundred years before the birth of Jesus; that John the Baptist, at the commencement of Christ's ministry; and that Peter, his companion and apostle, subsequent to the transaction, speak of Christ's death as an atonement for sin under the figure of a lamb sacrificed. The passages that follow plainly and distinctly declare the atoning efficacy of Christ's death: "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (Hebrews 9:26, 28). "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sin, forever sat down on the right hand of God; for by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Hebrews 10:12). It is observable that nothing similar is said of the death of any other person, and that no such efficacy is imputed to any other martyrdom. "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us; much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him; for if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life" (Romans 5:8-10). The words "reconciled to God by the death of his Son" show that his death had an efficacy in our reconciliation; but reconciliation is only preparatory to salvation. "He has reconciled us to his Father in his cross, and in the body of his flesh through death" (Colossians 1:20, 22). What is said of reconciliation in these texts is in some others spoken of sanctification, which is also preparatory to salvation. "'We are sanctified" — how? "by the offering of the body of Christ once for all" (Hebrews 10:10). In the same epistle (Hebrews 10:29), the blood of Jesus is called "the blood of the covenant by which we are sanctified." In these and many other passages that occur in different parts of the New Testament, it is therefore asserted that the death of Christ was *efficacious* in the procuring of human salvation. Such expressions are used concerning no other person, and the death of no other person; and it is therefore evident that Christ's death included something more than a confirmation of his preaching; something more than a pattern of a holy and patient martyrdom; something more than a necessary antecedent to his resurrection, by which he gave a grand and clear proof of our resurrection from the dead. Christ's death was all these, but it was much more. It was an *atonenment for the sins of mankind*, and in this way only it became the accomplishment of our eternal redemption.

The teaching of the New Testament, and the agreement of the statements of Christ with those of his apostles on this subject, are thus set forth (without regard to *theological* distinctions) by Dr. Thomson, bishop of Gloucester: "God sent his Son into the world to redeem lost and ruined man from sin and death, and the Son willingly took upon him the form of a servant for this purpose; and thus the Father and the Son manifested their love for us. God the Father laid upon his Son the weight of the sins of the whole world, so that he bare in his own body the wrath which men must else have borne, because there was no other way of escape for them; and thus the atonement was a manifestation of divine justice. The effect of the atonement thus wrought is that man is placed in a new position, freed from the dominion of sin, and able to follow holiness, and thus the doctrine of the atonement ought to work in all the hearers a sense of love, of obedience, and of self-sacrifice. In shorter words, the sacrifice of the death of Christ is a proof of divine love and of divine justice, and is for us a document of obedience. Of the four great writers of the New Testament, Peter, Paul, and John set forth every one of these points. Peter, the 'witness of the sufferings of Christ,' tells us that we were 'redeemed with the blood of Jesus, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot;' says that 'Christ bare our sins in his own body on the tree.' If we 'have tasted that the Lord is gracious,' we must not rest satisfied with a contemplation of our redeemed state, but must live a life worthy of it. No one can well doubt, who reads the two epistles, that the love of God and Christ, and the justice of God, and the duties thereby laid on us, all have their value in them; but the love is less dwelt on than the justice, while the most prominent idea of all is the moral and practical working of the cross of Christ upon the lives of men. With St. John, again, all three points find place: that Jesus willingly laid down his life for us, and is an advocate with the Father; that He is also the propitiation, the suffering sacrifice for our sins; and that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin, for that whoever is born of God doth not commit sin: all are put forward. The death of Christ is both justice and love — both a propitiation and an act of loving self-surrender; but the moral effect upon us is more prominent even than these. In the epistles of Paul the three elements are all present: in such expressions as a ransom, a propitiation who was 'made sin-for us,' the wrath of God against sin, and the mode in which it was turned away, are presented to us. Yet not wrath alone: 'The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto

themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again.' Love in him begets love in us; and, in our reconciled state, the holiness which we could not practice before becomes easy. Now in which of these points is there the semblance of contradiction between the apostles and their Master? In none of them. In the gospels, as in the epistles, Jesus is held up as the sacrifice and victim, quaffing a cup from which his human nature shrank, feeling in him a sense of desolation such as we fail utterly to comprehend on a theory of human-motives. Yet no one takes from him his precious redeeming life; he lays it down of-himself out of his great love for men; but men are to deny themselves, and take up their cross, and tread in his steps. They are his friends only if they keep his commands and follow his footsteps" *(Aids to Faith,* p. 337. See also Starr and Flatt, *Biblical Theology,* § 65-70).

II. *History of the Doctrine. —*

1. *The Fathers. —* In the early ages of the church the atoning work of Christ was spoken of generally in the words of Scripture. The value of the sufferings and death of Christ, in the work of redemption, was from the beginning both held in Christian faith, and also plainly set forth, but the doctrine was not *scientifically* developed by the primitive fathers. But it is one thing to admit that the atonement was not *scientifically* apprehended, and quite another thing to assert that it was not really held at all in the sense of vicarious sacrifice. The relation between the death of Christ and the remission of sins was not a matter of much dispute in that early period. The person of Christ was the great topic of metaphysico-theological inquiry, and it was not until after this was settled by the general prevalence of the Nicene Creed that anthropological and soteriological questions come up into decided prominence. Baur (in whose *Versohnungslehre* this subject is treated with ample learning, though often with dogmatic assertion of conclusions arrived at hastily and without just ground) admits that in the writings of the *apostolical fathers* there is abundant recognition of the sacrificial and redemptive death of Christ. Thus Barnabas: "The Lord condescended to deliver his body to death, that, by remission of our sins, we might be sanctified, and this is effected by the shedding of his blood" (c. v). So also Clement quotes <2350>Isaiah 53 and <1922>Psalm 22:7, 9, adding, "His blood was shed for our salvation; by the will of God he has given his body for our body, his soul for our soul." Similar passages exist in Ignatius and Polycarp, and stronger still in the *Epist. ad Diognet.* ch. 9. (See citations in Shedd, *History of Doctrines,* bk. 5, ch. 1; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* § 68; Thomson, *Bampton Lectures,* 1853, Lect. 6). In the

second century Justin Martyr (A.D. 147) says that "the Father willed that his Christ should take upon himself the curses of all for the whole race of man" *(Dial. c. Tryph.* 95). "In Justin may be found the idea of satisfaction rendered by Christ through suffering, at least lying at the bottom, if not clearly grasped in the form of conscious thought" *(Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 30; Neander, *Ch. History,* 1, 642). The victory of the death of Christ over the power of the devil begins now to play a prominent part in the idea of the atonement. Baur maintains that this was really due to Gnostic ideas taken up into the line of Christian thought; "that as the relation between the Demiurge and Redeemer was, in the Marcionite and Ophitic systems, essentially hostile, so the death of Jesus was a contrivance of the Demiurge, which failed of its purpose and disappointed him." Baur asserts that Irenaeus (A.D. 180) borrowed this idea from Gnosticism, only substituting Satan for the Demiurge. But Dorner shows clearly that Irenseus, with entire knowledge of Gnosticism, repelled all its ideas, and that Baur's charge rests upon a misinterpretation of a passage *(adv. Hoer.* v. 1, 1) in which, although the Satanic idea is prominent, it is far removed from Gnosticism (Dorner, *Person of Christ,* 1, 463; see also Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 2, 213). Baur's theory that the foundations of the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction were laid in the notion that it was the claims of Satan, and not of God, that were satisfied, falls to the ground; for "if this theory can be found in any of the fathers, it is in Irenaeus" (Shedd, 1. c.). Nevertheless, it is true (though not in the Gnostic spirit) that Irenaeus represents the sufferings of Christ as made necessary by the hold of Satan on man, and in order to a rightful deliverance from that bondage. Tertullian (A.D. 200) uses the word *satisfactio,* but not with reference to the vicarious sufferings of Christ, yet in several of his writings he assumes the efficacious work of Christ's sufferings for salvation. In the Alexandrian fathers we find, as might be expected, the Gnostic influence more obvious, and the idea of ransom paid to the devil comes out fully in Origen (A.D. 230). Yet it is going quite too far to say that Origen does not recognize the vicarious suffering of Christ; so *(Hom.* 24 *on Numbers)* he says that "the entrance of sin into the world made a propitiation necessary, and there can be no propitiation without a sacrificial offering." Dr. Shedd finds the *general* doctrine of the Alexandrian school inconsistent with vicarious atonement, and interprets the special passages which imply it accordingly; but in this he differs from Thomasius *(Origenes,* Nurnb. 1837) and Thomson *(Bampton Lectures).* Origen doubtless held the vicarious atonement, though it was mixed up with speculations as to the value of the

blood of the martyrs, and debased by his fanciful views of the relation of Christ's work to the devil. This was carried to a greater extent by later fathers, e.g. Gregory of Nyssa (A.D. 370), who says in substance that the devil was cheated in the transaction by a just retaliation for his deception of men: "Men have come under the dominion of the devil by sin. Jesus offered himself to the devil as the ransom for which he should release all others. The crafty devil assented, because he cared more for the *one* Jesus, who was so much superior to him, than for all the rest. But, notwithstanding his craft, he was deceived, since he could not retain Jesus in his power. It was, as it were, a deception on the part of God (ἀπάτη τίς ἐστι τρόπον τινά), that Jesus veiled his divine nature, which the devil would have feared, by means of his humanity, and thus deceived the devil by the appearance of flesh" *(Orat. Catech.* 22-26). Athanasius (A.D. 370), on the other hand, not only maintained the expiation of Christ, but rejected the fanciful Satan theory *(De Incarn. Erbi,* 6, et al.). Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 350) *(Catech.* 12, § 33) enters more deeply into this doctrine, developing a theory to show *why* it was necessary that Jesus should die for man. Similar views were expressed by Eusebius of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, and Chrysostom (see Giescler, *Dogmengeschichte,* p. 383). Several of these fathers also maintain that Christ, by his death, did more than would have been necessary for the redemption of men. They undertook to show that Christ alone was able to achieve redemption, and discussed the qualities which were necessary for his redemptive character. These discussions are especially met with in the writings against the Arians and the Nestorians. Augustine (A.D. 398) was occupied more, in all his controversies, with anthropology than with soteriology, but the vicarious atonement is clearly taught or implied in his *De Peccat. Meritis,* 1, 56, and in other places; but he called those dolts *(stuli)* who maintained that God could provide no other means of redemption *(De Agone Christ.* c. 10). Gregory the Great (A.D. 590) taught the doctrine with great clearness, and approached the scientific precision of a later age *(Moralia,* 17, 46). Little is to be added to these statements up to the time of Anselm. Enough has been said to show that, although the earlier view may have been incomplete and mingled with error, it is wrong to assert, as Baur and his English followers (Jowett, Garden, etc.) do, that the "doctrine of substitution is not in the fathers, and lay dormant till the voice of Anselm woke it; or that Anselm was the inventor of the doctrine." (Comp. *Brit. and For Ex. Review,* Jani. 1861, p. 48.)

2. *The Scholastic Period.* — Nevertheless, Anselm *(t* 1109) undoubtedly gave the doctrine a more scientific form thy giving the central position to the idea of satisfaction to the divine justice *(Cur Dens homo?* transl. in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* vols. 11, 12). Nicholas of Methone (11th or 12th century?), in the Greek Church, developed the necessity of vicarious satisfaction from the nature of God and his relations to man, but it is not certain that he had not seen Anselm's writings. Anselm's view is, in substance, as follows: "'The infinite guilt which man had contracted by the dishonor of his sin against the infinitely great God could be atoned for by no mere creature; only the God-man Christ Jesus could render to God the infinite satisfaction required. God only can satisfy himself. The human nature of Christ enables him to incur, the infinity of his divine nature to pay this debt. But it was incumbent upon Christ as a man to order his life according to the law of God; the obedience of his life, therefore, was not able to render satisfaction for our guilt. But, although he was under obligation to live in obedience to the law, as the Holy One he was under no obligation *to die.* Seeing, then, that he nevertheless voluntarily surrendered his infinitely precious life to the honor of God, a recompense from God became his due, and his recompense consists in the forgiveness of the sins of his brethren" (Chambers, *Encycl.* s.v.; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas,* Bohn's ed. 2:517). Anselm rejects entirely the claims of Satan, and places the necessity of atonement entirely in the justice of God. His theory is defective with regard to the *appropriation* of the merits of Christ by the believer; but, on the whole, it is substantially that in which the Christian Church has rested from that time forward. His doctrine was opposed by Abelard, who treated the atonement in its relation to the love of God, and not to his justice, giving it moral rather than legal significance. Peter Lombard seems confusedly to blend Abelard's views and Anselm's. Thomas Aquinas developed Anselm's theory, and brought out also the *superabundant* merit of his death, while he does not clearly affirm the *absolute* necessity of the death of Christ (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* § 181). *SEE AQUINAS*. Bernard of Clairvaux, in opposition to Abelard, brought up again the idea of the claims of Satan. Duns Scotus, in opposition to Anselm, denied the *necessity* of Christ's death, and denied also that the satisfaction rendered was an equivalent for the claims of justice, holding that God *accepted* Christ's sacrifice as sufficient. *SEE ACCEPTILATIO*. On the whole, the scholastic period left two streams of thought closely allied, yet with an element of difference afterward fully developed, viz. the Anselmic, of the satisfaction of divine justice,

absolutely considered; and that of Aquinas, that this satisfaction was relative, and also superabundant. The Romish doctrine of supererogation and indulgence doubtless grew out of this.

3. *From the Reformation* — All the great confessions — Greek, Roman, Lutheran, Reformed, and Methodist — agree in placing the salvation of the sinner in the mediatorial work of Christ. But there are various modes of apprehending the doctrine in this period ‘(see Winer, *Comparat. Darstellung,* ch. 7). The Council of Trent confounds justification with sanctification, and hence denies that the satisfaction of Christ is the *sole* ground of the remission of sin *(Canones, De Justificatione,* 7, 8). The Romanist writers generally adopt the “acceptilation” theory of Scotus rather than that of Anselm, and hold that the death of Christ made satisfaction only for sins before baptism, while as to sins *after* baptism only the eternal punishment due to them is remitted; so that, for the temporal punishment due to them, satisfaction is still required by penance and purgatory. Luther does not treat of satisfaction in any special treatise; he was occupied rather with the *appropriation* of salvation by faith alone, though he held fast the doctrine of expiation through Christ. So, in Melancthon’s *Loci,* and in the Augsburg Confession (A.D. 1530), the atoning work of Christ is fully stated, but under the head of justifying faith. “Men are justified gratuitously for Christ’s sake through faith when they believe that they are received into favor, and that their sins are remitted on account of Christ, who made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death. This faith God imputes to us as righteousness” *(Augsburg Confession,* art. 4). The distinction between the *active* and *passive* obedience of Christ came later; its first clear statement in the Lutheran Church is in the *Formula of Concord* (1576): “That righteousness which is imputed to the believer simply by the grace of God is the *obedience,* the suffering, and the resurrection of Christ, by which he has satisfied the claims of the law and atoned for our sins. For as Christ is not merely man, but God and man in one person, he was, as Lord of the law, no more subject to it than he was subject to suffering death; hence not only his obedience to God the Father, as exhibited in his sufferings and death, but also by his righteous fulfillment of the law on our behalf, is imputed to us, and God acquits us of our sins, and regards us as just in view of his complete obedience in what he did and suffered, in life and in death” (Francke, *Lib. Symb.* 685). Nor did this distinction appear early among the Calvinists any more than among the Lutherans. Calvin joins them together

(Institutes, bk. 2, § 16, 5). None of the reformed confessions distinguish between the active and passive obedience before the *Formula Consensus Helvetica* (1675; comp. Guericke, *Symbolik,* § 47).

The Socinians deny the vicarious atonement entirely. They assert that satisfaction and forgiveness are incompatible ideas; that the work of atonement is subjective, i.e. the repentance and moral renovation of the sinner; that God needs no reconciliation with man. Christ suffered, not to satisfy the divine justice, but as a martyr to his truth and an example to his followers. Socinus did, however, admit that the death of Christ affords a pledge of divine forgiveness, and of man's resurrection as following Christ's (see Winer, *Comp. Darstellung,* 7, 1; and comp. Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* § 268; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines,* bk. 5).

In opposition to Socinus, Grotius wrote his *Defensio fidei Cathol. de Satisfactione* (1617), which forms an epoch in the history of the doctrine. He deduced the necessity of satisfaction from the administrative or rectoral justice of God, and not from his retributive justice. He taught that the prerogative of punishing is to be ascribed to God, not as an injured party, but as moral governor of the world. So the prerogative of substitution, in place of punishment, belongs to God as moral governor. If, by any other means than punishment, he can vindicate the claims of justice, he is at liberty, as moral governor, to use those means. The atonement does thus satisfy justice; and through Christ's voluntary offering, the sinner can be pardoned and the law vindicated. The defect of this theory lies in its not referring the work of Christ *sufficiently* to the nature of God, contemplating it rather in its moral aspects as an exhibition of the evil of sin. The Dutch Arminian divines bring out more prominently the idea of sacrifice in the death of Christ. The Methodist theology asserts the doctrine of satisfaction strongly, e.g. Watson: Satisfaction [by the death of Christ] by Christ is not to be regarded as a merely fit and wise expedient of government (to which Grotius leans too much), for this may imply that it was one of many other possible expedients, though the best; whereas we have seen that it is everywhere in Scripture represented as necessary to human salvation, and that it is to be concluded that no alternative existed but that of exchanging a righteous government for one careless and relaxed, to the dishonor of the divine attributes, and the sanctioning of moral disorder, or the upholding of such government by the personal and extreme punishment of every offender, or else the acceptance of the vicarious death of an infinitely dignified and glorious being, through whom

pardon should be offered, and in whose hands a process for the moral restoration of the lapsed should be placed. The humiliation, sufferings, and death of such a being did most obviously demonstrate the righteous character and administration of God; and if the greatest means we can conceive was employed for this end, then we may safely conclude that the righteousness of God in the forgiveness of sin could not have been demonstrated by inferior means; and as God cannot cease to be a righteous governor, man in that case could have had no hope" (Watson, *Theol. Institutes,* vol. 2, pt. 2, ch. 20). The Arminian theology did nevertheless maintain that God is free, not necessitated as moral governor, and that the satisfaction of Christ has reference to the general justice of God, and not to his distributive justice. The Methodist theology also brings out prominently the *love* of God, which is organic and eternal in him — his essential nature — as the source of redemption, and holds that the free manifestation of the divine love is under no law of necessity. Even Ebrard, one of the most eminent modern writers of the Reformed Church, sets this forth as a great service rendered to theology by the Arminians (Ebrard, *Lehre der stellvero tretenden Genugthuung,* Konigsb. 1857, p. 25; compare also Warren, in *Methodist Quarterly,* July, 1866, 390 sq.; and, on the other side, Shedd, *History of Doctrines,* bk. 5, ch. 5; and his *Discourses and Essays,* 294). Hill (Calvinist), in his *Lectures on Divinity* (bk. 4, ch. 3), appears to adopt the Grotian theory.

Extent of the Atonement. — One of the most important questions in the modern Church with regard to the atonement is that of its extent, viz. whether the benefits of Christ's death were intended by God to extend to the whole human race, or only to a part. The former view is called universal or general atonement; the latter, particular, or limited. What is called the *strict* school of Calvinists holds the latter doctrine, as stated in the Westminster Confession. "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only" (ch. 3, § 6; comp. also ch. 8, §§ 5 and 8). The so-called moderate (or modern) Calvinists, the Arminians, the Church of England, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, adopt the doctrine of general or

universal atonement. *SEE CALVINISM*. The advocates of a *limited* atonement maintain that the atonement cannot properly be considered apart from its actual application, or from the intention of the author in regard to its application; that in strictness of speech, the death of Christ is not an atonement to any until it be applied; that the sufferings of the Lamb of God are therefore truly vicarious, or, in other words, that Christ, in suffering, became a real substitute for his people, was charged with their sins, and bore the punishment of them, and thus has made a full and complete satisfaction to divine justice in behalf of all who shall ever believe on him; that this atonement will eventually be applied to all for whom in the divine intention it was made, or to all to whom God in his sovereignty has been pleased to decree its application. But they believe that although the atonement is to be properly considered as exactly commensurate with its *intended application*, yet that the Lord Jesus Christ did offer a sacrifice sufficient in its intrinsic value to expiate the sins of the whole world, and that, if it had been the pleasure of God to apply it to every individual, the whole human race would have been saved by its immeasurable worth. They hold, therefore, that, on the ground of the infinite value of the atonement, the offer of salvation can be consistently and sincerely made to all who hear the Gospel, assuring them that if they will believe they shall be saved; whereas, if they willfully reject the overtures of mercy, they will increase their guilt and aggravate their damnation. At the same time, as they believe, the Scriptures plainly teach that the will and disposition to comply with this condition depends upon the sovereign gift of God, and that the actual compliance is secured to those only for whom, in the divine counsels, the atonement was specifically intended. The doctrine, on the other hand, that Christ died for all men, so as to make salvation attainable by all men, is maintained, first and chiefly, on scriptural ground, viz. that, according to the whole tenor of Scripture, *the atonenment of Christ was made for all men*. The advocates of this view adduce,

(1.) Passages which *expressly declare* the doctrine.

[a] Those which say that Christ died “for all men,” and speak of his death as an atonement for the sink of the whole world.

[b] Those which attribute an equal extent to the death of Christ as to the effects of the fall.

(2.) Passages which *necessarily imply* the doctrine, viz.

[*a*] Those which declare that Christ died not only for those that are saved, but for those who do or may perish.

[b] Those which make it the duty of men to believe the Gospel, and place them under guilt and the penalty of death for rejecting it.

[c] Those in which men's failure to obtain salvation is placed to the account of their own opposing wills, and made wholly their own fault. (See the argument in full on the Arminian side, in Watson, *Theol. Institutes,* 2, 284 sq.; Storr and Flatt, *Bibl. Theology,* bk. 4, pt. 2; Fletcher, *Works,* 2, 63 et al.)

The Arminian doctrine is summed up in the declaration that Christ "obtained (impetravit) for all men by his death reconciliation and the forgiveness of sins, but upon this condition, that none actually possess and enjoy this forgiveness of sins except believers" *(Acta Synod. Remonst.* pt. ii, p. 280; Nicholls, *Arminianism and Calvinism,* p. 114 sq.). It has been asserted (e.g. by Amyraut, q.v.) that Calvin himself held to general redemption; and certainly his language in his *Comm. in* Job 3:15, 16, and in 1 Timothy 2:5, seems fairly to assert the doctrine. Comp. Fletcher, *Works* (N. Y. ed. 2:71); but see also Cunningham, *The Reformers* (Essay 7). As to the variations of the Calvinistic confessions, see Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* § 249. In the French Reformed Church, the divines of Saumur, Camero, Amyraldus, and Placaeus maintained universal grace (see the articles on these names). The English divines who attended the Synod of Dort (Hall, Hales, Davenant) all advocated general atonement, in which they were followed by Baxter *(Universal Redemption; Methodus Theologias;* Orme, *Life of Baxter,* 2, 64). The most able advocate of universal grace in the 17th century was John Goodwin, *Redemption Redeemed,* 1650 (see Jackson, *Life of Goodwin,* 1828).

On the other hand, Owen, the so-called strict Calvinists of England, and the Old-School Presbyterian Church in America, adhere to the Westminster Confession, interpreting it as maintaining limited atonement. Their doctrine on the whole subject in substance is, that the atonement was made and intended only for the elect; and that its necessity with respect to them arose out of the eternal justice of God, which required that every individual should receive his due desert; and, consequently, that the sufferings of Christ were the endurance of punishment equivalent in amount of suffering, if not identical in nature (as Owen maintains) with that to which the elect were exposed; and, moreover, that the Meritorious obedience of Christ in

fulfilling the law imputes a righteousness to those for whom the atonement secures salvation, which gives them a claim to the reward of righteousness in everlasting life. The differences of view in the two divisions of the Presbyterian Church in America are thus stated by Dr. Duffield: “Old-School Presbyterians regard the satisfaction rendered to the justice of God by the obedience and death of Christ as explicable upon principles of justice recognized among men in strict judiciary procedures. While they concede that there is grace on the part of God in its application to the believer, inasmuch as he has provided in Christ a substitute for him, they nevertheless insist that he is pardoned and justified of God as judge, and as matter of right and strict justice in the eye of the law, inasmuch as his claims against him have all been met and satisfied by his surety. The obligations in the bond having been discharged by. his security, the judge, according to this view, is bound to give sentence of release and acquittal to the original failing party, the grace shown being in the acceptance of the substitute. Their ideas of the nature of the divine justice, exercised in the pardon and justification of the sinner because of the righteousness of Christ, are all taken from the transactions of a court of law. New-School Presbyterians, equally with the Old, concede the grace of God in the substitution of Christ, the whole work of his redemption to be the development of ‘the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Jesus Christ;’ but they prefer to regard and speak of the atonement of Christ, his obedience and death, by which he satisfied the justice of God for our sins, as the great expedient and governmental procedure adopted by the great God of heaven and of earth in his character of chief executive, the governor of the universe, in order to magnify his law and make it honorable, rather than as a juridical plea to obtain a sentence in court for discharging an accused party on trial” *(Bibliotheca Sacra*, 20, 618).

The doctrine of Payne, Wardlaw, Pye Smith, and other so-called moderate Calvinists in England, and of many in America, is in substance that the atonement consists in “that satisfaction for sin which was rendered to God as moral governor of the world by the obedience unto death of his son Jesus Christ. This satisfaction preserves the authority of the moral government of God, and yet enables him to forgive sinners. That this forgiveness could not be given by God without atonement constitutes its necessity. The whole contents of Christ’s earthly existence, embracing both his active and passive obedience-a distinction which is unsupported by the Word of God-must be regarded as contributing to the atonement which he

made. As to the ‘extent’ of the atonement, there is a broad distinction to be made between the *sufficiency* of the atonement and its *efficiency*. It may be true that Jehovah did not intend to exercise that influence of the Holy Spirit upon all which is necessary to secure the salvation of any one; but as the atonement was to become the basis of moral government, it was necessary that it should be one of infinite worth, and so in itself adequate to the salvation of all.” In New England the younger Edwards († 1801) modified the Calvinistic doctrine of the atonement, representing it, as the Arminians do, as a satisfaction to the general justice, and not to the distributive justice of God. Among American Calvinistic divines Dr. E. D. Griffin holds a very high place. His *“Humble Attempt to reconcile the Differences of Christians”* was republished by Dr. E. A. Park in 1859. in a volume of essays on the atonement by eminent New England divines. A summary of it is given in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for Jan. 1858, and is noticed in the *Methodist Quarterly,* April, 1858, p. 311. “Dr. Griffin held that the atonement was not a literal suffering of the penalty, nor a literal satisfaction of the distributive justice of God, nor a literal removal of our desert of eternal death, nor a literal surplusage of Christ’s meritorious personal obedience becoming our imputed obedience. On the other hand, the atonement was a divine method by which the literal suffering of the penalty might be dispensed with, by which government could be sustained and honored without inflicting distributive justice, by which *the acceptors* of the work might be saved, without the removal of their intrinsic desert of hell; and all this without imputing Christ’s personal obedience as our personal obedience, but by Christ obtaining a meritorious right to save us, as his own exceeding great reward from God.” The article named in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* contains a valuable sketch of the rise of the “Edwardean theory of the atonement,” and sums up that theory itself as follows:

“**1.** Our Lord suffered pains which were substituted for the penalty of the law, and may be called punishment in the more general sense of that word, but were not, strictly and literally, the penalty which the law had threatened.

2. The sufferings of our Lord satisfied the general justice of God, but did not satisfy his distributive justice.

3. The humiliation, pains, and death of our Redeemer were equivalent in meaning to the punishment threatened in the moral law, and thus they

satisfied Him who is determined to maintain the honor of this law, but they did not satisfy the demands of the law itself for our punishment.

4. The active obedience, viewed as the holiness of Christ, was honorable to the law, but was not a work of supererogation performed by our substitute, and then transferred and imputed to us, so as to satisfy the requisitions of the law for our own active obedience. The last three statements are sometimes comprehended in the more general proposition that the atonement was equal, in the meaning and spirit of it, to the payment of our debts; but it was not literally the payment of either our debt of obedience or our debt of punishment, or any other debt which we owed to law or distributive justice. Therefore,

5. The law and the distributive justice of God, although honored by the life and death of Christ, will yet eternally demand tie punishment of every one who has sinned.

6. The atonement rendered it consistent and desirable for God to save all who exercise evangelical faith, yet it did not render it obligatory in him, in distributive justice, to save them.

7. The atonement was designed for the welfare of all men, to make the eternal salvation of all men possible, to remove all the obstacles which the honor of the law and of distributive justice presented against the salvation of the non-elect as well as the elect.

8. The atonement does not constitute the reason why some men are regenerated and others not, but this reason is found only in the sovereign, electing will of God: ‘Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.’

9. The atonement is useful on men’s account, and in order to furnish new motives to holiness; but it is necessary on God’s account, and in order to enable him, as a consistent ruler, to pardon any, even the smallest sin, and therefore to bestow on sinners any, even the smallest favor.” That this so-called “Edwardean theory” is in substance the Arminian theory, is shown by Dr. Warren in the *Methodist Quarterly* for July, 1860. See also Fiske, *The New England Theology (Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1865, p. 577).

As to minor forms of opinion we must be very brief. The orthodox Quakers admit the doctrine of the atoning death of Christ, but not the full Anselmic doctrine of satisfaction; thus W. Penn: “We cannot say the sufferings and death of Christ were a strict and rigid satisfaction for that

eternal death and misery due to man for sin and transgression. As Christ died for sin, so we must die to sin, or we cannot be saved by the death and sufferings of Christ." Barclay treats redemption as twofold: one wrought out in the body of Christ upon the cross, the other wrought in man by the spirit of Christ *(Apol. Thes.* 7, 3). Zinzendorf and the Moravians made the doctrine of atonement, in its more internal connection with the Christian life, the essence of Christianity, but at the same time gave to it a certain sensuous aspect. On mystical grounds, the doctrine of atonement was altogether rejected by Swedenborg. Kant assigned to the death of Christ only a symbolico-moral significance: "Man must, after all, deliver himself. A substitution, in the proper sense of the word, cannot take place; moral liabilities are not transmissible like debts. The sinner who reforms suffers,: as does the impenitent; but the former suffers willingly for the sake of virtue. Now what takes place internally in the repentant sinner takes place in Christ, as the personification of the idea of suffering for sin. In the death which he suffered once for all, he represents for all mankind what the new man takes upon himself while the old man is dying" *(Religion innerhalb d. Grenzen d. blossen Vernunft*, p. 87, cited by Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines, §* 300). The Rationalists of Germany lost sight even of the symbolical in the merely moral, but De Wette made the symbolical more prominent. Schleiermacher represented the sufferings of Christ as vicarious, but not as making satisfaction; and his obedience as making satisfaction, but not as vicarious. He held that "the redeeming and atoning principle is not the single fact that Christ died, but the vital union of man with Christ. By means of this vital union, man appropriates the righteousness of Christ" (Schleieirmacher, *Christ. Glaube*, 2, 103, 128, cited by Hagenbach, 1. c.). The Hegelian *speculative* school of German theology regards the death of the God-man as "the cessation of being another (Aufheben des Anderssein), and the necessary return of the life of God, which had assumed a finite form, into the sphere of the infinite." Some of the strict supernaturalists (e.g. Stier) find fault with the theory of Anselm, and endeavor to substitute for it one which they regard as more scriptural; and in 1856, even among the strict Lutherans of Germany, a controversy arose on this doctrine which is at present (1866) not yet ended; Prof. Hofiann, in Erlangen, rejects the idea of vicarious satisfaction, which is defended by Prof. Philippi and others. Schneider, in *Stud. u. Krit.* Sept. 1860, shows clearly that Anselm's doctrine is that of the Lutheran as well as of the Reformed Church, in opposition to Hofmann, who maintains that his view accords with the church doctrine as well as with Scripture.

See also Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* § 300, and the references there given. The modern Unitarian view may perhaps be safely gathered, in its best form, from the following statement of one of its ablest writers: "'There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.' This can only refer to unrivalled pre-eminence, not to exclusive function. For all higher minds do, in fact, mediate between their less gifted fellow-creatures and the great realities of the invisible world. This 'one' is a *human* mediator, 'the man Christ Jesus;' not a being from another sphere, an angel, or a God, but a brother from the boson of our own human family. 'He gave himself a ransom for *all'* who embrace his offers and will hearken to his voice. He brings from God a general summons to repent, and with that he conveys, through faith, a spiritual power to shake off the bondage of sin, and put on the freedom of a new heart and a new life. He is a deliverer from the power of sin and the fear of death. This is the *end* of his mediation. This is the redemption of which he paid the price. His death, cheerfully met in the inevitable sequence of faithful duty, was only one among many links in the chain of instrumentalities by which that deliverance was effected. It was a proof such as could be given in no other way of trust in God and immortality, of fidelity to duty, and of love for mankind. In those who-earnestly contemplated it and saw all that it implied, it awoke a tender response of gratitude and confidence which softened the obdurate heart, and opened it to serious impressions and the quickening influences of a religious spirit'" (Tayler, *Christian Aspects of Faith and Duty).*

The semi-infidelity which has recently sprung up in high places in the Church of England, so far as it refers to the atonement, may be represented by Jowett as follows: "The only sacrifice, atonement, or satisfaction with which the Christian has to do is a moral and spiritual one; not the pouring out of blood upon the earth, but the living sacrifice 'to do thy will, O God;' in which the believer has part as well as his Lord; about the meaning of which there can be no more question in our day than there was in the first ages." "Heathen and Jewish sacrifices rather show us what the sacrifice of Christ was not, than what it was. They are the dim, vague, rude, almost barbarous expression of that want in human nature which has received satisfaction in him only. Men are afraid of something; they wish to give away something; they feel themselves bound by something; the fear is done away, the gift offered, the obligation fulfilled in Christ. Such fears and desires can no more occupy their souls; they are free to lead a better life;

they are at the end of the old world, and at the beginning of a new one. The work of Christ is set forth in Scripture under many different figures, lest we should rest in one only. His death, for instance, is described as a ransom. He will set the captives free. Ransom is deliverance to the captive. 'Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.' Christ delivers from sin. 'If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.' To whom? for what was the ransom paid? are questions about which Scripture is silent, to which reason refuses to answer" (Jowett, *On St. Paul's Epistles,* 2, 568). See also *Essays and Reviews; Replies to Essays and Reviews; Aids to Faith* (all republished in New York). Maurice *(Theological Essays; Doctrine of Sacrifice; Tracts for Priests and People)* is uncertain and obscure in this, as in other points of theology (see Rigg, *Anglican Theology;* and *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1865, 659). The so-called Broad School, in the Church of England, tends to eviscerate the atonement of all meaning except as a moral illustration or example. Dr. Bushnell (of Hartford) has set forth some of the old heresies in very attractive style in his *God in Christ* (1849), and *Vicarious Sacrifice* (1865). In the former work he distinguishes three forms of the doctrine of atonement — "the *Protestant* form, which takes the ritualistic (objective) side of the Gospel, but turns it into a human dogma; the *speculative,* or philosophic form, identifying atonement with reconciliation of men unto God, one of the varieties of which is the Unitarian doctrine, which 'pumps out' the contents of these holy forms; and the *Romish* form, which passes beyond the ritual, objective view, and Judaizes or paganizes it by dealing with blood as a real and miraculous entity." In the later work he makes "the sacrifice and cross of Christ his simple duty, and not any superlative, optional kind of good, outside of all the common principles of virtue ... It is only just as good as it ought to be, or the highest law of right required it to be." He holds that Christ did not satisfy, by his own suffering, the violated justice of God. Christ did not come to the world to die, but died simply because he was here; there was nothing penal in the agony and the cross; the importance of the physical sufferings of Christ consists to us not in what they are, but in what they express or morally signify; Christ is not a ground, but a power of justification; and the Hebrew sacrifices were not types of Christ to them who worshiped in them, but were only necessary as types of Christian language (see *Methodist Quarterly,* Jan. 1851, p. 114; *American Presbyt. Review,* Jan. 1866, p. 162). A view somewhat similar to Bushnell's is given by Schultz, *Begriff d. stellvertretenden Leidens* (Basel, 1864). See *N. Brit. Rev.* June, 1867, art. 3.

III. *Literature.* — For *the history* of the doctrine of atonement, see Ziegler, *Hist. dogm. de Redempiionc* (Getting. 1791); Baur, *Lehre v. d. Versohnung* (Tubing. 1828, 8vo); Thomasius, *Hist. dogm. de Obed. Christi Activa* (Erlanz. 1845); Cotta, *De Hist. Doct. de Redempt.* (in Gerhard's *Loci,* t. 4, p. 105 sq.); Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines;* Shedd, *History of Doctrines,* bk. 5; Neander, *Planating and Training,* bk. 6, ch. 1; Ibid. *History of Doctrines;* Cunningham, *Historical Theology,* vol. 2, ch. 24; Beck, *Dogmengeschichte,* p. 199 sq.; Knapp, *Theology, §* 110-116; Hase, *Dogmatik, §* 149; Wilson, *Historical Sketch of Opinions on the Atonenent* (Philadel. 1817); Gass, *Geschichte d. Prot. Dogmatik* (Berlin, 1854-66, 3 vols.); Heppe, *Dogmatik d. Evang. Ref. Kirche,* loc. 18; Weber, *Vom Zorne Gottes,* 1862 (with preface by Delitzsch, containing a good condensed history of the doctrine of atonement). — On the *doctrine of atonement,* besides the books on systematic theology and the works named in the course of this article, see Leblanc, *Genugthuung Christi* (Giessen, 1733 8vo); Loffler, *Die kirchl. Genugthuungslehre* (1796, 8vo; opposes vicarious atonement); Tholuck, *Lehre v. d. Sinde und v. Versohner;* Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk,* t. 3; Sykes, *Scriptural Doctrine of Redemption* (Lond. 1756, 8vo); Kienlen, *De Christi Satisfact. Vicaria* (Argent. 1839); Edwards, *Necessity of Satisfaction for Sin* (Works, vol. 2); Baur, *On Grotian Theory,* transl. in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 9, 259; Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection,* and review in *Am. Bib. Repos.* July, 1844; Baxter, *Universal Redemption* (1650); Goodwin, *Redemption Redeemed* (1650, 8vo); and in Dunn, *Goodwin's Theology* (Lond. 1836, 12mo; also in Goodwin's *Exposition of Romans* 9, 1663, 8vo); Owen, *Works,* vol. 5, 6 (reply to Goodwin); Horne, *Extent of the Death of Christ* (reply to Owen, 1650); Barrow, *Works* (N. Y. ed. 2, 77 sq.); Stillingfleet, *On Christ's Satisfaction* (maintains the view of Grotius; *Works,* vol. 3); Magee, *On Atonement and Sacrifice* (Lond. 1832, 5th ed. 3 vols. 8vo); J. Pye Smith, On *the Sacrifice of Christ* (Lond. 1813, 8vo); Jenkyn, *On the Extent of the Atonement* (Lond. 1842, 3d ed. 8vo; Boston, 12mo); Symington, *On Atonement and Intercession* (New York, 12mo); Shinn, *On Salvation* (Philadel. 8vo); Trench, *Hulsean Lectures* (1846), and *Five Sermons;* Gilbert, *The Christian Atonement* (London, 1852, 8vo); Wardlaw, *Discourses on the Atonement;* Marshall, *Catholic Doctrine of Redemption,* in answer to Wardlaw (Glasgow, 1844, 8vo); Beman, *Christ the only Sacrifice* (N. Y. 1844, 12mo); reviewed in *Princeton Rev.* 17, 84, and *Meth. Quarterly,* 7, 379; Penrose, *Moral Principle of the Atonement* (London, 1843, 8vo, maintains the natural availableness of repentance);

Thomson (Bp. of Gloucester), *Bampton Lecture,* 1853; Oxenham (Roman Catholic), *Doctrine of the Atonement* (Lond. 1865, 8vo); J.M.L. Campbell, *Nature of the Atonement* (1856; makes atonement a moral work of confession and intercession); Candlish, *On the Atonement,* reply to Maurice (London, 1861); Wilson, *True Doctrine of Atonement* (London, 1860); Mellor, *Atonement in Relation to Pardon* (1860); Kern, *The Atonement* (Lond. 1860); M'Ilvaine, *The Atonement* (Lond. 1860); Solly, *Doctrine of Atonement* (Lond. 1861); Shedd, *Discourses and Essays,* 272 sq. (Andover, 1862); various articles in the *Princeton Review* and *Bibliotheca Sacra* on the two sides of the controversy within the Calvinistic school as to the nature and extent of the atonement; also Barnes, *The Atonement* (Philadel. 1859), reviewed in *Princeton Rev.* July, 1859. For the Methodist view, *Methodist Quarterly,* 1846, p. 392; 1847, p. 382, 414; 1860, 387; 1861, 653; and Dr. Whedon's article on Methodist theology, *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1862, 256. For.

Unitarian views, *Christian Examiner,* I, 367; 18:142; 28:63; 34:146; 36:331; 37:403. *SEE EXPIATION*; *SEE REDEMPTION*; *SEE SATISFACTION*.

Atonement, Day Of

(µyrePuKhi µ/y, *yoma hakkippurim', day of the expiations;* Sept. ἡμέρα ἐξιλασμοῦ, Vulg. *dies expiationum* or *diespropitiationis),* the Jewish day of annual expiation for national sin. In the Talmud this day is called hl;/dG] tynæ[}Ti, *great fasting,* and so in Philo, νηστείας ἑορτή *(Lib. de Sept.* v. 47, ed. Tauchn.); and in <442709>Acts 27:9, ἡ νηστεία. The Talmudical writers, however, often designate it merely as am/y, THE *day;* a circumstance which has suggested to some commentators the notion that by ἡμέρα (<580727>Hebrews 7:27) the apostle intended this *atonement day.* Though perhaps originally meant as a temporary day of expiation for the sin of the golden calf (as some would infer from <023301>Exodus 33), yet it was permanently instituted by Moses as a day of atonement for sins in general; indeed, it was the great day of national humiliation, and the only one commanded in the Mosaic law, though the later Jews, in commemoration of some disastrous events, especially those which occurred at and after the destruction of the two temples, instituted a few more fast days, which they observed with scarcely less rigor and strictness than the *one* ordained by

Moses for the purpose of general absolution (Hottinger, *Solen. expiationum diei*, Tirur. 1754). *SEE FAST*.

I. *The Time.* — It was kept on the tenth day of Tisri, that is, from the evening of the ninth to the evening of the tenth of that month, five days before the Feast of Tabernacles. *SEE FESTIVAL*. This would correspond to the early part of *October*. *SEE CALENDAR (JEWISH)*. This great fast, like all others among the Jews, commenced at sunset of the previous day, and lasted twenty-four hours, that is, from sunset to sunset, or, as the rabbins will have it, until three stars were visible in the horizon. — Kitto, s.v. See DAY.

II. *Commemorative Signification.* — Some have inferred from ‹0301›Leviticus 16:1, that the day was instituted on account of the sin and punishment of Nadab and Abihu. Maimonides *(More Nevochim*, 18) regards it as a commemoration of the day on which Moses came down from the mount with the second tables of the law, and proclaimed to the people the forgiveness of their great sin in worshipping the golden calf (q.v.).

III. *Scriptural Prescriptions respecting it.* — The mode of its observance is described in ‹0301›Leviticus 16, where it should be noticed that in v. 3 to 10 an outline of the whole ceremonial is given, while in the rest of the chapter certain points are mentioned with more details. The victims which were offered, in addition to those strictly belonging to the special service of the day, and to those of the usual daily sacrifice, are enumerated in ‹0429›Numbers 29:7-11; and the conduct of the people is emphatically enjoined in ‹0323›Leviticus 23:26-32. The ceremonies were of a very laborious character, especially for the high-priest, who had to prepare himself during the previous seven days in nearly solitary confinement for the peculiar services that awaited him, and abstain during that period from all that could render him unclean, or disturb his devotions. It was kept by the people as a solemn sabbath. They were commanded to set aside all work and “to afflict their souls,” under pain of being “cut off from among the people.” It was on this occasion only that the high-priest was permitted to enter into the Holy of Holies.

1. Having bathed his person and dressed himself entirely in the holy white linen garments, he brought forward a young bullock for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering, purchased at his own cost, on account of himself

and his family, and two young goats for a sin-offering with a ram for a burnt-offering, which were paid for out of the public treasury, on account of the people. He then presented the two goats before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle and cast lots upon them. On one lot the word hwhl (i.e. *for Jehovah)* was inscribed, and on the other lzaz; l (i. e *for Azazel).* He next sacrificed the young bullock as a sin-offering for himself and his family. Taking with him some of the blood of the bullock, he filled a censer with burning coals from the brazen altar, took a handful of incense, and entered into the most holy place. He then threw the incense upon the coals and enveloped the mercy-seat in a cloud of smoke. Then, dipping his finger into the blood, he sprinkled it seven times before the mercy-seat, eastward. (See <031614>Leviticus 16:14. The English version, "upon the mercy-seat," appears to be opposed to every Jewish authority. [See Drusius in loc. in the *Critici Sacri.*] It has, however the support of Ewald's authority. The Vulgate omits the clause; the Sept. follows the ambiguity of the Hebrew. The word *eastward* must mean either the direction in which the drops were thrown by the priest, or else on *the east side* of the ark, i.e. the side toward the vail. The last clause of the verse may be taken as a repetition of the command, for the sake of emphasis on the number of sprinklings: "And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and sprinkle it before the mercy-seat, on the east; and *seven times* shall he sprinkle the blood with his finger before the mercyseat.") The goat upon which the lot *"for Jehovah"* had fallen was then slain, and the high-priest sprinkled its blood before the mercy-seat in the same manner as he had done that of the bullock. Going out from the Holy of Holies, he purified the holy place, sprinkling some of the blood of both the victims on the altar of incense. (That the altar of incense was thus purified on the day of atonement we learn expressly from <023010>Exodus 30:10. Most critics consider that this is what is spoken of in <031618>Leviticus 16:18 and 20. But some suppose that it is the altar of burnt-offerings in which is referred to in those verses, the purification of the altar of incense being implied in that of the holy place mentioned in ver. 16. Abenezra was of this opinion [see Drusius in loc.]. That the expression "before the Lord" does not necessarily mean within the tabernacle, is evident from <022911>Exodus 29:11. If the golden altar is here referred to, it seems remarkable that no mention is made in the ritual of the cleansing of the brazen altar. But perhaps the practice spoken of by Josephus and in the Mishna of pouring what remained of the; mixed blood at the foot of the large altar was an ancient one, and was regarded as its purification.) At this time no one besides the high-priest was suffered to be present in the holy

place. The purification of the Holy of Holies, and of the holy place, being thus completed, the high-priest laid his hands upon the head of the goat on which the lot *"for Azazel"* had fallen, and confessed over it all the sins of the people. The goat was then led, by a man chosen for the purpose, into the wilderness, into "a land not inhabited," and was there let loose.

2. The high-priest after this returned into the holy place, bathed himself again, put on his usual garments of office, and offered the two rams as burnt-offerings, one for himself and one for the people. He also burnt upon the altar the fat of the two sin-offerings, while their flesh was carried away and burned outside the camp. Those who took away' the flesh and the man who had led away the goat had to bathe their persons and wash their clothes as soon as their service was performed.

The accessory burnt-offerings mentioned Numbers 29:7-11, were a young bullock, a ram, seven lambs, and a young goat. It would seem that (at least in the time of the second Temple) these were offered by the high-priest along with the evening sacrifice (see below, V, 7).

3. The ceremonies of worship peculiar to this day alone (besides those which were common to it with all other days) were:

(1.) That the high-priest, in a simple dress, confessed his own sins and those of his family, for the expiation of which he offered a bullock, on which he laid them;

(2.) That two goats were set aside, one of which was by lot sacrificed to Jehovah, while the other (AZAZEL), which was determined by lot to be set at liberty, was sent to the desert burdened with the sins of the people.

(3.) On this day, also, the high-priest gave his blessing to the whole nation; and the remainder of the day was spent in prayers and other works of penance.. It may be seen that in the special rites of the Day of Atonement there is a natural gradation. In the first place, the high-priest and his family are cleansed; then atonement is made by the purified priest for the sanctuary and all contained in it; then (if the view to which reference has been made be correct) for the brazen altar in the court; and, lastly, reconciliation is made for the people. *SEE SIN-OFFERING*.

IV. *Statement of Josephus.* — In the short account of the ritual of the day which is given by this Jewish writer in one passage *(Ant.3,* 10, 3), there are a few particulars which are worthy of notice. His words, of course, apply to the practice in the second Temple, when the ark of the covenant had disappeared. He states that the high-priest sprinkled the blood with his finger seven times on the ceiling and seven times on the floor of the most holy place, and seven times toward it (as it would appear, outside the vail), and round the golden altar. Then, going into the court, he either sprinkled or poured the blood round the great altar. He also informs us that along with the fat, the kidneys, the top of the liver, and the extremities (αἱ ἐξοχαι) of the victims were burned.

V. *Rabbinical Details.* — The treatise of the Mishna, entitled *Yoma,* professes to give a full account of the observances of the day according to the usage in the second Temple. The following particulars appear either to be interesting in themselves, or to illustrate the language of the Pentateuch.

1. The high-priest himself, dressed in his colored official garments, used, on the Day of Atonement, to perform all the duties of the ordinary daily service, such as lighting the lamps, presenting the daily sacrifices, and offering the incense. After this he bathed himself, put on the white garments, and commenced the special rites of the day. There is nothing in the Old Testament to render it improbable that this was the original practice.

2. The high-priest went into the Holy of Holies four times in the course of the day: first, with the censer and incense, while a priest continued to agitate the blood of the bullock last it should coagulate; secondly, with the blood of the bullock; thirdly, with the blood of the goat; fourthly, after having offered the evening sacrifice, to fetch out the censer and the plate which had contained the incense. These four entrances, forming, as they do, parts of the one great annual rite, are not opposed to a reasonable view of the statement in ⁵⁸Hebrews 9:7 (where the apostle tells us that the high-priest entered only *once* on that day, since the expression, ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιατοῦ, may refer to the *one day* in the year when such a service alone took place), and that in Josephus *(War,* 5, 5, 7). Three of the entrances seem to be very distinctly implied in ³Leviticus 16:12, 14, and 15.

3. It is said that the blood of the bullock and that of the goat were each sprinkled *eight* times — once toward the ceiling, and seven times on the floor. This does not agree with the words of Josephus (see above, IV).

4. After he had gone into the most holy place the third time, and had returned into the holy place, the high-priest sprinkled the blood of the bullock eight times toward the vail, and did the same with the blood of the goat. Having then mingled the blood of the two victims together and sprinkled the altar of incense with the mixture, he came into the court and poured out what remained at the foot of the altar of burnt-offering.

5. Most careful directions are given for the preparation of the high-priest for the services of the day. For seven days previously he kept away from his own house and dwelt in a chamber appointed for his use. This was to avoid the accidental causes of pollution which he might meet with in his domestic life. But, to provide for the possibility of his incurring some uncleanness in spite of this precaution, a deputy was chosen who might act for him when the day came. In the treatise of the Mishna entitled "Pirke Aboth," it is stated that no such mischance ever befell the highpriest. But Josephus *(Ant.* 17, 6, 4) relates an instance of the high-priest Matthias, in the time of Herod the Great, when his relation, Joseph, took his place in the sacred office. During the whole of the seven days the high-priest had to perform the ordinary sacerdotal duties of the daily service himself, as well as on the Day of Atonement. On the third day and on the seventh he was sprinkled with the ashes of the red heifer, in order to cleanse him in the event of his having touched a dead body without knowing it. On the seventh day he was also required to take a solemn oath before the elders that he would alter nothing whatever in the accustomed rites of the Day of Atonement. (This, according to the "Jerusalem Gemara" on *Yoma* [quoted by Lightfoot], was instituted in consequence of an innovation of the Sadducean party, who had directed the high-priest to throw the incense upon the censer outside the vail, and to carry it, smoking, into the Holy of Holies.)

6. Several curious particulars are stated regarding the scape-goat. The two goats of the sin-offering were to be of similar appearance, size, and value. The lots were originally of boxwood, but in later times they were of gold. They were put into a little box or urn, into which the high-priest put both his hands and took out a lot in each, while the two goats stood before him, one at the right side and the other on the left. The lot in each hand

belonged to the goat in the corresponding position; and when the lot *"for Azazel"* happened to be in the right hand, it was regarded as a good omen. The high-priest then tied a piece of scarlet cloth on the scape-goat's head, called "the scarlet tongue" from the shape in which it was cut. Maimonides says that this was only to distinguish him, in order that he might be known when the time came for him to be sent away. But in the Gemara it is asserted that the red cloth ought to turn white, as a token of God's acceptance of the atonement of the day, referring to Isaiah 1:18. A particular instance of. such a change, when also the lot *"for Azazel"* was in the priest's right hand, is related as having occurred in the time of Simon the Just. It is farther stated that no such change took place for forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem. The prayer which the highpriest uttered over the head of the goat was as follows: "O Lord, the house of Israel, thy people, have trespassed, rebelled, and sinned before thee. I beseech thee, O Lord, forgive now their trespasses, rebellions, and sins which thy people have committed, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant, saying that in that day there shall be an atonement for you to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord'" (Gemara on *Yoma,* quoted by Frischmuth). The goat was then goaded and rudely treated by the people till it was led away by the man appointed. As soon as it reached a certain spot, which seems to have been regarded as the commencement of the wilderness, a signal was made by some sort of telegraphic contrivance to the high-priest, who waited for it. The man who led the goat is said to have taken him to the top of a high precipice and thrown him down backward, so as to dash him to pieces. If this was not a mistake of the writer of Yoma, it must have been, as Spencer argues, a modern innovation. It cannot be doubted that the goat was originally set free. Even if there be any uncertainty in the words of the Hebrew, the explicit rendering of the Sept. must be better authority than the Talmud (καὶ ὁ ἐξαποστέλλων τὸν χίμαρον τὸν διεσταλμένον εἰς ἄφεσιν κ. τ. 50: Leviticus 16:26).

7. The high-priest, as soon as he had received the signal that the goat had reached the wilderness, read some lessons from the law, and offered up some prayers. He then bathed himself, resumed his colored garments, and offered either the whole or a great part of the necessary offering (mentioned Numbers 39:711) with the regular evening sacrifice. After this he washed again, put on the white garments, and entered the most holy

place for the fourth time, to fetch out the censer and the incense-plate. This terminated the special rites of the day.

8. The Mishna gives very strict rules for the fasting of the people. In the law itself no express mention is made of abstinence from food; but it is most likely implied in the command that the people were "to afflict their souls." According to *Yoma,* every Jew (except invalids, and children under thirteen years of age) is forbidden to eat anything so large as a date, to drink, or to wash from sunset to sunset.

VI. On the *Scape-goat, SEE AZAZEL*.

VII. *Modern Observance of the Day*. — The day previous to the day of expiation, the strict class of Jews provide a cock, which they send to an inferior rabbi to be slain; the person whose property it is then takes the fowl by the legs, and with uplifted hands swings it nine times over the heads of himself and his company, and at the same time prays to God that the sins they have been guilty of during the year may enter into the fowl. This cock, which they call hrPKi (pardon, atonement), seems to be substituted for the scape-goat of old. They then take the fowl and give it to the poor to eat, with a donation according to their means. On the same evening, one hour before synagogue service, they partake of a sumptuous feast, which they call taking their fast, after which they go to the synagogue. In the great synagogue in London, the clerk stands up in the midst, where a large stage is erected for the accommodation of the singers, who chant the customary prayers. The clerk offers up a blessing, and afterward the free-gift offering. Every man, according to his capacity (but it is not compulsory), gives a sum, which is offered up, and inserted in a book kept for that purpose. Most of the Jews endeavor on this occasion to provide themselves with the best apparel, as they say they appear before the King of kings to have their final doom settled upon them. Then begins the evening prayer of the fast, when the reader and chief rabbi, and many of the congregation, are clad with the shroud in which they are to be buried, continuing in prayer and supplication for upward of three hours. There are many who will stand upon one spot from the ninth day (of Tisri) at even until the tenth day at even; and when the service is ended on the ninth eve, those who return home to their dwellings come again in the morning at five o'clock, and continue until dark, observing the following order: First are said the morning prayers, which commence as soon as they come to the synagogue. After saying the usual prayers and supplications peculiar to the

day, they then take forth the Law, and read the portion <03160>Leviticus 16; the *mophter* (a certain portion of the Law so named by the Jews) is <04297>Numbers 29:7-11; the portion from the prophets from <23574>Isaiah 57:14, to the end of chap. 58. They then say the prayer for the prosperity of the government under which they dwell, and then put the Law into the ark again, which ends the morning prayer, after having continued for six hours without intermission. They next say the prayer of the *masoph* (i.e. "*addition"),* which makes mention of the additional sacrifice of the day (<04297>Numbers 29:7), and supplicates the Almighty to be propitious to them. They finally say the offering of the day from <04297>Numbers 29:7-27. They abstain from food altogether during the day. For many more ceremonies observed among the present Jews on the Day of Atonement, see Picard, *Ceremonies et Coutumes Religieuses,* etc. t. i, c. 6, p. 18.

VIII. *Typical Import of the Entire Observance.* — As it might be supposed, the Talmudists miserably degraded the meaning of the Day of Atonement. They regarded it as an opportunity afforded them of wiping off the score of their more heavy offenses. Thus *Yomar* (cap. 8) says, "The day of atonement and death make atonement through penitence. Penitence itself makes atonement for slight transgressions, and in the case of grosser sins it obtains a respite until the coming of the Day of Atonement, which completes the reconciliation." More authorities to the same general purpose are quoted by Frischmuth (p. 917), some of which seem also to indicate that the peculiar atoning virtue of the day was supposed to rest in the scapegoat. Philo *(Lib. de Septenario)* regarded the day in a far nobler light. He speaks of it as an occasion for the discipline of self-restraint in regard to bodily indulgence, and for bringing home to our minds the truth that man does not live by bread alone, but by whatever God is pleased to appoint. The prayers proper for the day, he says, are those for forgiveness of sins past and for amendment of life in future, to be offered in dependence, not on our own merits, but on the goodness of God. It cannot be doubted that what especially distinguished the symbolical expiation of this day from that of the other services of the law was its broad and national character, with perhaps a deeper reference to the sin which belongs to the nature of man. Ewald instructively remarks that, though the least uncleanness of an individual might be atoned by the rites of the law which could be observed at other times, there was a consciousness of secret and indefinite sin pervading the congregation which was aptly met by this great annual fast. Hence, in its national character, he sees an

antithesis between it and the Passover, the great festival of social life; and in its atoning significance, he regards it as a fit preparation for the rejoicing at the ingathering of the fruits of the earth in the Feast of Tabernacles. Philo looked upon its position in the Jewish calendar in the same light.

In considering the meaning of the particular rites of the day, three points appear to be of a very distinctive character:

1. The white garments of the highpriest.

2. His entrance into the Holy of Holies.

3. The scape-goat. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (⁵⁸⁹⁰⁷Hebrews 9:7-25) teaches us to apply the first two particulars.

The high-priest himself, with his person cleansed and dressed in white garments, was the best outward type which a living man could present in his- own person of that pure and holy One who was to purify His people and to cleanse them from their sins. But respecting the meaning of the scape-goat we have no such light to guide us, and (as may be seen from the discussion under the word Azazel) the subject is one of great doubt and difficulty. — Of those who take Azazel for the Evil Spirit, some have supposed that the goat was a sort of bribe or retaining fee for the accuser of men. Spencer, in supposing that it was given up with its load of sin to the enemy to be tormented, made it a symbol of the punishment of the wicked; while, according to the strange notion of Hengstenberg, that it was sent to mock the devil, it was significant of the freedom of those who had become reconciled to God. Some few of those who have held a different opinion on the word Azazel have supposed that the goat was taken into the wilderness to suffer there vicariously for the sins of the people. But it has been generally considered that it was dismissed to signify the carrying away of their sins, as it were, out of the sight of Jehovah. (In the similar part of the rite for the purification of the leper [⁵⁸⁴⁰⁶Leviticus 14:6, 7], in which a live bird was set free, it must be evident that the bird signified the carrying away of the uncleanness of the sufferer in precisely the same manner.) If we keep in view that the two goats are spoken of as parts of one and the same sin-offering, and that every circumstance connected with them appears to have been carefully arranged to bring them under the same conditions up to the time of the casting of the lots, we shall not have much difficulty in seeing that they form together but one symbolical expression. Why there were two individuals instead of one may be simply this — that a

single material object could not, in its nature, symbolically embrace the whole of the truth which was to be expressed. This is implied in the reasoning of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews on the office and sacrifice of Christ (Hebrews 9). Hence some, regarding each goat as a type of Christ, supposed that the one which was slain represented his death, and that the goat set free signified his resurrection (Cyril, Bochart, and others, quoted by Spencer). But we shall take a simpler, and perhaps a truer view, if we look upon the slain goat as setting forth the act of sacrifice, in giving up its own life for others "to Jehovah," in accordance with the requirements of the divine law; and the goat which carried off its load of sin "to an utter distance" as signifying the cleansing influence of faith in that sacrifice. Thus, in his degree, the devout Israelite might have felt the truth of the Psalmist's words, "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us." But for us the whole spiritual truth has been revealed in historical fact in the life, death, and resurrection of Him who was made sin for us, who died for us, and who rose again for our justification. This Mediator it was necessary should, "in some unspeakable manner, unite death and life" (Maurice, *On Sacrifice,* p. 85). See *Journ. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1849, p. 74 sq.

IX. *Literature. — Josephus, Ant.* 3, 10, 3; the Talmud (Mishna, tract *Yoma,* ed. by Sheringham [Franeq. 1696, 17108], also with notes in Surenhusius, 2:5), with the Jerus. Gemara thereupon; Maimonides µwy twdb[µyrwpkh *(Worship of the Day of Atonement);* also in Crenii, *Opusc. ad philol. sacr. spect.* 7, 651 sq., 819 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 216 sq.; Spencer, *De legibus Hebrcebrum Ritualibus,* lib. 3, diss. 8; Lightfoot's *Temple Service,* c. 15; Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica,* cap. 20; Ugolini *Thesaur.* 18; see Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* 4, 6; Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 433 sq.; Moller, *De ritib.festi expiat.* (Jen. 1689); Hochstetter, *Defesto expiat.* (Tub. 1707); Hottinger, *De ministerio diei erpiationis* (Marb. 1708; Tur. 1754); Danz, in Menschen's *Nov. Test. Talm.* p. 912; BShr, *Symbol.* 2, 664 sq.; Langenberg, *De pontif. in expiationis die vicario* (Greifsw. 1739); Michaelis, *Num esp. dies sub templo secundo fuerit celebratus* (Hal. 1751); Danzere's two *Dissertationes de Functione Pontificis Maximi in Adyto Anniversario;* Kraft, *De mysterio Diei inaugurationum* (Marb. 1749); Cohn, *Bedeutung und Zweck des Versihnungstages* (Lpz. 1862); Ewald, *Die Alterthuimer des Volkes Israel,* p. 370 sq.; Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses,* on Leviticus 16 (English translation); Thomson's *Bampton Lectures,* lect. 3, and notes. *SEE EXPIATION.*

Atrium

In ancient churches, between the first porch, called the *propylaeum,* or *vestibulum magnum,* and the church itself, was a large area or square plot of ground, which the Latins called *atrium* or *impluvium,* because it was a court open to the air without any covering. It was surrounded by cloisters. In this place stood the first class of penitents, according to Eusebius, who says it was the mansion of those who were not allowed to enter farther into the church. They generally stood in this porch to beg the prayers of the faithful. — Binghamn, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 8, ch. 3, § 5.

A’troth

(<04225>Numbers 32:35). *SEE ATAROTH*.

At’tai

(Hebrews *Attay*, yTi[; perhaps *opportune,* comp *Ittai),* the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Ἰεθθεί v. r. Ἐθί.) A son of the daughter of Sheshan (of the tribe of Judah) by his Egyptian servant Jarha, and the father of Nathan (<13025>1 Chronicles 2:35, 36). B.C. prob. ante 1658.

2. (Sept. Ἐθθεί v. r. Ἰεθί.) The sixth of David’s mighty men from the tribe of Gad during his freebooter’s life in the desert of Judaea (<13211>1 Chronicles 12:11). B.C. cir. 1061.

3. (Sept. Ἰεθθί v. r. Ἰετθί.) The second of the four sons of King Rehoboam, by his second and favorite wife Maachah, the daughter of Absalom (<14120>2 Chronicles 11:20). B.C. post 972.

Attali’a

(Ἀττάλεια), a maritime city of Pamphylia (near Lycia, to which it is assigned by Stephen of Byzantium), in Asia Minor, near the mouth of the river Catarrhactes (see Wesseling, *ad Antonin. Itin.* p. 579, 670). It derived its name from its founder, Attalus Philadelphus, king of Pergamus (Strabo, 14:657), who ruled over the western part of the peninsula from the north to the south, and was in want of a port which should be useful for the trade of Egypt and Syria, as Troas was for that of the *A*Egean. All its remains are characteristic of the date of its foundation. It was visited by Paul and

Barnabas on their first missionary tour, being the place from which they sailed on their return to Antioch from their journey into the inland parts of Asia Minor (<4445>Acts 14:25). It does not appear that they made any stay, or attempted to preach the Gospel in Attalia (see Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul,* 1, 200). This city, however, though comparatively modern at that time, was a place of considerable importance in the first century. Its name in the twelfth century appears to have been *Satalia,* a corruption, of which the crusading chronicler, William of Tyre, gives a curious explanation. It still exists under the name of *Adalia* (Busching, *Erdbeschr.* 11, 1, 121), and extensive and important ruins attest the former consequence of the city (Leake's *Asia Minor,* p. 193). This place stands on the west of the Catarrhactes, where Strabo (14, 4) places it; Ptolemy, however (v. 5, 2), places the ancient city on the east of the river, on which accounts Admiral Beaufort *(Karamania,* p. 135) held the present *Laara* to be the representative of Attalia, and the modern *Adalia* (or *Satalia)* to be the site of the ancient Olbia, which Mannert *(Geog.* 6, 130) thought to be the same with Attalia (see Forbiger, *Alte Geogr.* 2, 268); but Spratt and Forbes *(Lycia,* 1, 217) have found the remains of Olbia farther west, and it is therefore probable that the bed of the Catarrhactes changed at different times (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v.).

At'talus

(Ἄτταλος, a Macedonian name of uncertain signification), a king of Pergamus in the time of the Jewish prince Simon (Maccabees 11:22), and, as would appear from the connected circumstances, about B.C. 139; a closer determination of the date depends upon the year of the consul Lucius (q.v.), named in the same connection (ver. 16), which is itself doubtful. As Attalus was the name of three kings of Pergamus, who reigned respectively B.C. 241-197, 159-198 (Philadelphus), 138-133 (Philometor), and were all faithful allies of the Romans (Liv. 45:13), it is uncertain whether the letters sent from Rome in favor of the Jews (1 Maccabees 15:22) were addressed to Attalus II (Polyb. 25:6; 31:9; 32:3, 5, 8, etc., 25 sq.; Just. 35:1; 36:4, 5; App. *Milh.* 62), known as the "friend of the Roman people" (Strabo, 13, p. 624), or Attalus III (Philometor), the nephew and successor of Attalus II, and son of Eumenes II, who ascended the throne B.C. 138, and by whose testament the kingdom of Pergamus passed over (B.C. 133) into the hands of the Romans (Justin, 36:4; Flor. 2:20; Strabo, 13:624). Josephus quotes a decree of the Pergamenes in

favor of the Jews *(Ant.* 14, 10. 22) in the time of Hyrcanus, about B.C. 112 (comp. Revelation 2:12-17). — Smith, s.v.

Attendant Genius

SEE GUARDIAN ANGEL.

Atterbury, Francis

bishop of Rochester, was born March 6th, 1662, at Milton-Keynes, Bucks, where his father was rector. *SEE ATTERBURY, LEWIS*, below. He began his studies at Westminster, and finished his course at Christ Church, Oxford. He first distinguished himself by the publication, at Oxford, in 1687, of a "Reply to some Considerations on the Spirit of Martin Luther, and the Original of the Reformation," a tract written by Walker, master of University College. In the same year he took the degree of Master of Arts, and became tutor to the earl of Orrery's son. In 1690 he married, and soon after went to London, and established so high a reputation by his preaching that he was made almoner to the king. In 1700 he published a vindication of the rights, powers, and privileges of the Lower House of Convocation, which occasioned a warm controversy with Archbishop Wake and others, and raised up a host of adversaries (see Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography,* 1, 358, and Lathbury, *History of Convocation).* The University of Oxford, however, testified its approval of his work by granting him the degree of D.D. without the usual fees. In 1704 he became dean of Carlisle. In 1706 he had a controversy with Hoadley as to "the advantages of virtue with regard to the present life." In a funeral sermon he had asserted that, "if the benefits resulting from Christianity were confined to our present state, Christians would be, of the whole human race, the most miserable." Hoadley, on the contrary, maintained, in a printed letter to Atterbury, that it was a point of the utmost importance to the Gospel itself to vindicate the tendency of virtue to the temporal happiness of man. In 1707 he had another controversy with Hoadley concerning "passive obedience." Under Queen Anne, Atterbury was in high favor, and in 1713 was made bishop of Rochester and dean of Westminster, and was on the point of being made archbishop of Canterbury, when George I, who had justly conceived a strong prejudice against him, came to the throne. From this time he opposed the house of Hanover, and used all his energies to secure the return of the Stuarts. In 1715, when an attempt was made to restore the Stuarts, the archbishop of Canterbury drew up an address to the bishops of

his province, exhorting them to excite the devotion of the clergy of their dioceses toward the house of Brunswick. This address Atterbury, and Smalridge, the bishop of Bristol, refused either to sign or to publish in their dioceses.; and this conduct rendered him suspected at court. In 1722 he was accused of being in correspondence with “the Pretender,” and was seized and sent to the Tower. No proof was alleged sufficient to warrant the charge; but, on the 9th of April, 1723, a bill of attainder was introduced into the House of Lords, and he was called upon to make his defense, which he did in the most admirable manner, in a speech abounding in eloquence. The court influence, however, was too great: a special law was introduced against him and passed, and he was condemned to be stripped of all his places and dignities, and to be banished from his country forever. On the 18th of June he left England for Calais. He retired first to Brussels, and afterward to Paris, where he died, February 15th, 1732.

The fame of Atterbury rests chiefly on his sermons, which are both argumentative and unaffectedly eloquent, and on his epistolary correspondence with Pope. His familiar letters, for their ease and elegance, are preferred to the more labored efforts of his correspondent, Pope. As a controversialist, his parts were splendid; but his prejudices were too strong, and his judgment not sufficiently cool to entitle him to a high rank among the inquirers after truth. It was, however, thought at the time that no man understood better than he the points in dispute between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as well as the dissenters of all denominations. Atterbury has been somewhat absurdly charged, on the strength of an improbable anecdote which Dr. Maty says Lord Chesterfield related to him, with having been, at least in early life, a skeptic; but the whole tenor of his conduct, and every reference in his private as well as public writings, contradict such a supposition. He was a worldly minded and ambitious man, but that he firmly believed the religious truths which he so eloquently defended there can be no reasonable doubt. (See a refutation of this story, in detail, in the *New and General Biographical Dictionary*, 1784, 1:389.) The conduct of Atterbury with reference to the Stuart dynasty is the great blot on his public career, and though perhaps illegally convicted, he was undoubtedly guilty of the treason for which he was condemned. But it was for no selfish ends that he adhered to its desperate fortunes, nor was his conduct wholly inconsistent with his position as a prelate of the English Church. The plan on which he had fixed his hope of securing the restoration of the Stuarts was that of inducing James to

educate his son in the Protestant faith; an absurd expectation undoubtedly, but it was characteristic of Atterbury to overlook obstacles when he had set his heart on accomplishing a great purpose. Hook *(Eccles. Biography,* 1, 374) calls him "an ecclesiastical politician and intriguer, devoting himself, not-to the establishment of a principle, but to the mere triumph of a party. Great principles were injured by his advocacy of them, since he gave to them a party coloring, and made what was heavenly appear earthly." In private life the haughtiness and asperity of the politician and controversialist wholly disappeared, and no man ever succeeded in winning a more affectionate attachment from friends as well as relatives. As a preacher, a speaker, and a writer, he had few rivals; and Lord Mahon *(Hist. of Eng.* c. 12) hardly exaggerates his literary merits when he says that "few men have attained a more complete mastery over the English language than Atterbury; and all his compositions are marked with peculiar force, elegance, and dignity of style" *(English Cyclopoedia).* Doddridge *(Lectures on Preaching,* 4, 18) calls him the "glory of English pulpit orators." Wesley *(Works,* 7, 420) says that in Atterbury "all the qualities of a good writer meet." The *Tatler* (No. 66), having observed that the English clergy too much neglect the art of speaking, makes a particular exception with regard to Atterbury, who "has so particular a regard to his congregation that he commits to his memory what he has to say to them, and has so soft and graceful a behavior that it must attract your attention. His person," continues this author, "it is to be confessed, is no small recommendation; but he is to be highly commended for not losing that advantage, and adding to propriety of speech (which might pass the criticism of Longinus) an action which would have been approved by Demosthenes. He has a peculiar force in his way, and has many of his audience who could not be intelligent hearers of his discourse were there no explanation as well as grace in his action. This art of his is used with the most exact and honest skill. He never attempts your passions till he has convinced your reason. All the objections which you can form are laid open and dispersed before he uses the least vehemence in his sermon; but when he thinks he has your head, he very soon wins your heart, and never pretends to show the beauty of holiness till he has convinced you of the truth of it." His writings include *Sermons* (Lond. 1740, 4 vols. 8vo, 5th ed.): — *Correspondence and Charges* (Leond. 1783-87, 4 vols. 8vo); besides many controversial tracts and pamphlets of temporary interest. See Stackhouse, *Memoirs of Atterbury,* 1727, 8vo; Burnet, *History of his Own*

Times; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1, 80; Hook, *Eccesiastical Biography,* 1, 350 sq.

Atterbury, Lewis

father of Bishop Atterbury, was born about the year 1681. He was the son of Francis Atterbury, rector, of Milton, Northamptonshire, who, among other ministers, subscribed the Solemn League and Covenant in 1648. Lewis was entered a student of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1647, took the degree of bachelor of arts February 23, 1649, and was created M.A. by a dispensation from Oliver Cromwell March 1, 1651. He was one of those who submitted to the authority of the visitors appointed by the Parliament. In 1654 he became rector of Great or Broad Rissington, in Gloucestershire, and, after the Restoration, took a presentation for that benefice under the great seal, and was instituted again, to confirm his title to it. On the 11th of September, 1657, he was admitted rector of Middleton or Middleton Keynes, in Bucks, and at the return of Charles II took the same prudent method to corroborate his title to this living. July 25, 1660, he was made chaplain extraordinary to Henry, duke of Gloucester, and on the 1st of December, in the same year, was created doctor in divinity. Returning from London, whither the lawsuits he was frequently involved in had brought him, he was drowned near his own house in the beginning of December, 1693. He published three occasional sermons, the titles of which may be seen in Wood's *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2, col. 911. — *New Genesis Biog. Dict.* 1, 377.

Atterbury, Lewis

eldest son of the preceding, was born at Caldecot, in Bucks, on the 2d of May, 1656. He was educated at Westminster School under Dr. Busby, and at Christ Church, Oxford. He was ordained deacon in September, 1679. In 1683 he served as chaplain to Sir William Pritchard, lord-mayor of London. In February, 1684, he was instituted rector of Symel, in Northamptonshire. In 1691 we find him lecturer of St. Mary Hill, in London; Soon after his marriage he settled at Highgate, where he supplied the pulpit of the reverend Mr. Daniel Lathom, on whose death, in June, 1695, he became pastor of the chapel. He had a little before been appointed one of the six preaching chaplains to the princess Anne of Denmark at Whitehall and St. James's, which place he continued to supply after she came to the crown, and likewise during part of the reign of George 1. To

help the poor of his parish, he studied physic; and after acquiring considerable skill, practiced gratis among his poor neighbors. In 1707 the queen presented him to the rectory of Shepperton, in Middlesex, and in March, 1719, the bishop of London collated him to the rectory of Hornsey. In 1720, on a report of the death of Dr. Sprat, archdeacon of Rochester, he applied to his brother to succeed him. The bishop giving his brother some reasons why he thought it improper to make him his archdeacon, the doctor replied, "Your lordship very well knows that Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, had a brother for his archdeacon, and that Sir Thomas More's father was a puisne judge when he was lord chancellor. And thus, in the sacred history, did God himself appoint that the safety and advancement of the patriarchs should be procured by their younger brother, and that they, with their father, should live under the protection and government of Joseph." In answer to this, the bishop informs his brother that the archdeacon was not dead, but well, and likely to continue so. He died, however, soon after; and on the 20th of May, 1720, the bishop collated Dr. Brydges, the duke of Chandos's brother, to the archdeaconry, after writing thus in the morning to the doctor: "I hope you are convinced, by what I have said and written, that nothing could have been more improper than the placing you in that post immediately under myself. Could I have been easy under that thought, you may be sure no man living should have had the preference to you." To this the doctor answered: ".... There is some show of reason, I think, for the non-acceptance, but none for the not giving it. And since your lordship was pleased to signify to me that I should overrule you in this matter, I confess it was some disappointment to me . . . . I hope I shall be content with that meaner post in which I am; my time at longest being but short in this world, and my health not suffering me to make those necessary applications others do, nor do I understand the language of the present times; for I find I begin to grow an old-fashioned gentleman, and am ignorant of the weight and value of words, which in our times rise and fall like stock." This correspondence is creditable to the bishop, at least.

Dr. Atterbury died at Bath, October 20 1731. He published *Twelve Sermons* (London, 1720, 8vo): — Tens *Sermons* (Lond. 1699, 8vo): — *Select Sermons,* edited by Yardley, with a life of Dr. Atterbury (2 vols. 8vo, *1745*): — *Letters on the Council of Trent;* and several translations from the French. In his will he gave some few books to the libraries at Bedford and Newport, and his whole collection of pamphlets, amounting

to upward of two hundred volumes, to the library of Christ Church, Oxford. He charged his estate forever with the payment of ten pounds yearly to a schoolmistress to instruct girls at Newport-Pagnel, which salary he had himself in his lifetime paid for many years. He remembered some of his friends, and left a respectful legacy of one hundred pounds to his "dear brother, in token of his true esteem and affection," as the words of the will are, and made the bishop's son Osborn (after his granddaughter, who did not long survive him) heir to all his fortune. — New *Genesis Biog. Dictionary*, 1, 377; *Biographica Britannica*, vol. 1.

Attersoll, William

a clergyman of the Church of England, rector of East Hoadley, was ejected for non-conformity in 1662, and was subsequently minister at Isfield, Sussex. His writings include *A Commentary on the Epistle to Philemon* (London, 1612 and 1633, fol.): — A *Commentary on the History of Balaam and Balac* (4to): — A *Commentarie upon the Fourth Book of Moses, called Numbers* (London, 1618; and in Dutch, at Amsterdam, in 1667): — *The Trumpet of God* (London): — De *Sacramentis (4to):* — *Catechismus.* The work on the sacraments was printed in English in 1614, under the title *The New Covenant.* He also wrote *Three Treatises,* on (Luke 12:1; 13:1;) (Jonah 3:4.) — Landon, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, 1, 610; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* 1, 81.

Atthar'ates

(Ἀτθαράτης), given (1 Esdras 9:49) as a person's name; evidently by a mistake of the translator, *SEE ATHARIAS* for the title TIRSHATHA *SEE TIRSHATHA* (q.v.) of the original text ((Nehemiah 8:9)).

Atticus

ST., patriarch of Constantinople in 406, during the life of the rightful patriarch, Chrysostom; he succeeded Arsacius, who was intruded into the throne when Chrysostom was driven away. He was born at Sebaste, in Armenia, and led an ascetic life under Eustathius, the bishop of that see. He was a man of ability. Palladius accuses him of being the author of the conspiracy against Chrysostom; and the share he took in the persecution of that saint, and his refusal after his death to replace his name on the diptychs, caused the Western bishops and the people of Constantinople to refuse him their communion until the name of St. Chrysostom was

restored. Socrates, who was no great admirer of Chrysostom, gives a more favorable account of Atticus (lib. 6, cap. 20; 7, cap. 2). He died Oct. 10, 426, having filled the see twenty years. Socrates has preserved a letter of this patriarch to Calliopius, bishop of Nicaea, in which he informs him that he has sent him three hundred golden crowns for the poor of that city. He directs him to administer to the wants of those poor persons who were ashamed to come forward for relief, and on no account to give anything to those who made a business of begging. He also recommends that the distribution should be made without any distinction as to religious grounds *(Hist. Eccles.* 7, 25). Sozomen *(Hist. Eccles.* 8, 27) says of him that "he possessed more natural gifts than literary attainments, while he evinced aptitude for the management of affairs, and was as skillful in carrying on intrigues as in evading the machinations of others. His sermons did not rise above mediocrity, and were not accounted by his auditors of sufficient value to be preserved in writing," and asserts that "as Atticus was distinguished alike for learning, piety, and discretion, the churches under his episcopate attained a very flourishing condition." He also wrote to Eupsychius concerning the incarnation *(Theodoret),* and to St. Cyril of Alexandria concerning the restitution of the name of St. Chrysostom in the diptychs, and another to Peter and *A*Edesius, deacons of the church of Alexandria, concerning the restoration of peace in that church. A fragment of a homily on the Nativity will be found in Labbe, 3, 116. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1, 384; Landon, *Eccles. Dict.* 1, 610.

Attila

(called by the ancient Germans Etzel, in the Magyar language Atzel), a celebrated king of the Huns, ruled from 434 to 453. He assured his people that he had discovered the sword of their god, with which he was to procure for them the dominion of the world. He called himself the Scourge of God, and his subjects looked upon him with superstitious awe. He extended his sway over a large portion of Europe and Asia, and but for his defeat by *A*Etius in the Catalaunian plains, in 451, would have destroyed the Roman Empire. He spared the city of Rome in consequence, it is believed, of the impression made upon his mind by Pope Leo I. See LEO I, Pope.

Attire

Picture for Attire 1

Picture for Attire 2

(µyræeq], *keshurim', girdles,* <24032>Jeremiah 2:32; "headbands," <23320>Isaiah 3:20). Under this head we propose to bring together a general description of the various articles of apparel with either sex among the ancient Jews, so far as this can be gathered from the notices of antiquity, leaving a more detailed account to each portion of dress in its alphabetical place, while a comparison with modern Oriental styles will be found under COSTUME *SEE COSTUME* , and a statement of the materials under CLOTHING *SEE CLOTHING* . (See generally Jahn's *Archceology,* § 118-135.) Compare also DRESS *SEE DRESS* .

I. MALE garments. — The regular pieces of raiment worn by men were chiefly the following, to which may be added, in cases of royalty or eminence, the signet, crown, and scepter, and (for ornament) the anklet, bracelet, etc. (which see severally).

1. The *shirt* or *tunic,* in Hebrews tn,ToK, *kitto'neth,* generally rendered by the Sept. χιτών, which indeed is but a Graecized form of the Hebrews word (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 724). It was the usual under-garment (comp. <031604>Leviticus 16:4) of youths (<012703>Genesis 27:3, 23, etc.) and men (<101532>2 Samuel 15:32), also of the priests and Levites in their service (<022840>Exodus 28:40; <030807>Leviticus 8:7, 13; 10:5). *Female* tunics or "chemises" were also called by the same name (<101318>2 Samuel 13:18; <220503>Song of Solomon 5:3). The *kittoneth* was commonly quite short, scarcely reaching to the knee; but eventually, as a peculiar kind, there is mentioned (<012703>Genesis 27:3; 23:32; <101318>2 Samuel 13:18 sq.), as an ornamental dress of young persons of either sex, the *kittoneth passim',* tn,ToK;µyS'Pi, *tunsic of the extremities,* i.e. reaching to the feet (for so the word appears to signify; see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1117; rather than *party-colored tunic,* "coat of many colors," as in the Auth. Vers. after the Sept. and Vulg.), which was an under-dress with sleeves, and extending to the ankles (Josephus, *Ant.* 7, 8, 1). *SEE TUNIC*.

2. The *mantle* or *robe,* a comprehensive term that appears to include several Hebrews words, signifying not only a long flowing outer garment,

but sometimes also a wide under-garment or double tunic. *SEE ROBE*. It sometimes approaches the signification of "veil" (see below), as this was often like a modern cloak, or at least shawl. Wide flowing mantles were a fashion introduced by the ancients from the Babylonians, Medes, and Persians (Herod. 1:195; Strabo, 11:526). Such are doubtless referred to in <270321>Daniel 3:21; it only remains uncertain which of the Chaldee terms there employed (אלבכרכי, *karbela'*, Auth. Vers. "hat," or אלבכרבי, *sarbela'*, "coat") has this signification. Gesenius *(Thes. Heb.* in verb.) renders both *pallium*, or cloak, against the improbability that in a single verse two kinds of mantle. would be named. Others, as Lengerke, understand the second word to mean *stockings*, which would yield a good sense, and one agreeable to etymology, could we be sure that hosiery. was employed by the ancient Babylonians. The word איגפתכין, *petchigil'* (<230324>Isaiah 3:24, Auth. Vers. "stomacher"), which some regard as a *cloak*, is probably a *festive* garment or finery (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1137). Ewald separates the word thus: איגפתכין *breadth of mantle* (comp. Syr. אתוג). In the N.T. the mantle is denoted by στολή, *a robe*, such as the scribes wore (<411238>Mark 12:38), a long garment like a gown, reaching to the feet. For the χλαμύς and φαιλόνης, *SEE APPAREL*.

3. The *girdle*, in Hebrews חגור (*hagor'*, or חגורה, *chagorah'* (the usual name both for male and female girdles, <230324>Isaiah 3:24; whether the same article of apparel is designated by מיזנקים, *genazimn'*, "chests," in <262724>Ezekiel 27:24, as supposed by Hartmann, is doubtful), Gr. ζώνη, one of the most distinguished articles of attire among the Hebrews and Orientals generally (comp. <262315>Ezekiel 23:15; <270105>Daniel 10:5), except the Phoenicians (Auson. *Paneg. Grat.* 14; Tertull. *Pall.* 1; Plant. Pan. v. 2, 15; see Credner, *Joel*, p. 146 sq.), being a belt by which the under-garment (tunic) was gathered at the waist, and thus prevented from floating, as well as hindering the person in walking (<111846>1 Kings 18:46; <120429>2 Kings 4:29; 9:1) or in any other bodily motion (sometimes dancing, <100614>2 Samuel 6:14). Hence girdles were often bestowed as presents (<100811>2 Samuel 18:11; 1 Maccabees 10:87), and were an article of fancy goods (<203124>Proverbs 31:24). The poor and ascetic classes wore girdles of leather (<120108>2 Kings 1:8; <400304>Matthew 3:4; <410106>Mark 1:6, as they still do in the East, of half a foot in width), the rich of linen (<241301>Jeremiah 13:1; comp. Arvieux, 3, 247) or byssus (<261610>Ezekiel 16:10; the moderns even of silk, of some four fingers' breadth, Mariti, p. 214; Chardin, 3, 68), ornamented (<270105>Daniel

10:5; 1 Maccabees 10:89; 11:58; 14:44; Curt. 3, 3, 18; comp. Arvieux, 3, 241; a Persian fashion, Xenoph. *Anab.* 1, 4, 9; comp. Brisson, *Regn. Pers.* p. 169 sq.) in a costly manner (with gold, jewels, etc.); this last description was especially valued in female girdles, which, being an indispensable part of household manufacture (Proverbs 31:17), was probably the chief article of feminine luxury (Isaiah 3:20, 24; comp. *Iliad*, 14, 181; *Odyss.v.* 231; Hartmann, *Hebraerin.* 2, 299 sq.). The men wore girdles about the loins (1 Kings 2:5; 18:46; 2 Kings 4:29; Jeremiah 13:11; Revelation 1:13; 15:6, etc.), but the priests somewhat higher around the breast (Josephus, *Ant.3*, 7, 2); the women, as still in the East, wore the girdle lower and looser (Niebuhr, *Reis.* 2, 184, pl. 27; 236, pl. 64; comp. *Odyss.3*, 154). The sacerdotal girdle is called fnbja, *abnet'*, and was tied up in front, so that the two ends hung down to the feet; female girdles were called µyrvqa, *kishshurin'* (Isaiah 3:20; Jeremiah 2:32); while men's girdles were generally called rzae, *ezor'*. Anciently, as still, persons wore in the girdle the sword (dagger, 2 Samuel 20:8; 25:13; Judges 3:16; Curt. 3:3, 18; comp. Arvieux, 3, 241; hence a secure girdle was an essential part of a good equipment of the warrior, 1 Kings 2:5; Isaiah 5:27; and the phrase "to gird one's self" is tantamount to arming for battle, Isaiah 8:9; Psalm 76:11; 1 Maccabees 3:58; comp. Herod. 8:120; Plutarch, *Coriol.* 9) and the inkstand (Ezekiel 9:2; comp. Shaw, p. 199; Schulz, *Leit.* v. 390); it also served as a purse (Matthew 10:9; Mark 6:8; comp. 2 Samuel 18:11; Jamblich. *Vit. Pythag.* 27, p. 121; Liv. 33:29; Suet. *Vit.* 16; Plaut. *Paen.* v. 2, 48 sq.; Juven. 14:297; Gell. 15:12, 4; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 64; Shaw, p. 199; see Rost, *De vet. zona pecuniaria*, Jen. 1681). The passing over one's girdle to another is among friends a mark of great confidence and intimate relation (1 Samuel 18:4; see Rosenmüller, *Morgenl. 3*, 103); when it occurs between (high) functionaries it is a symbol of installation into honor (Isaiah 22:21; on Isaiah 3:24, see Gesenius, in loc.; and in general see Credner, *Joel*, p. 142 sq.). *SEE GIRDLE*.

4. The *turban*, of which there were various kinds:

(1.) Among the ancient Hebrews of either sex, coifs, formed of folds wound about (comp. ãnx, vbj) the head, were in common use, but nothing distinct is given as to their shape. Their usual names are as follows:

(a.) ãynæ; *tsaniph'*, which is applied to men (Job 29:14), women (Isaiah 3:23), and the highpriest (Zechariah 3:5); but which, according to all the passages, was a prominent distinctive costume.

(b.) tpnxmæ; *mitsne'pheth* (Sept. κίδαρις or μίτρα), which occurs more frequently of the cap of the high-priest (Exodus 28:4, 37, 39; 29:6; Leviticus 16:4, etc.), and but once of the king (Ezekiel 21:31). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*.

(c.) h[bgmæ; *migbaah'*, simply the bonnet of the ordinary priests (Exodus 28:40; 29:9; Leviticus 8:13; see the description of Josephus, under the article SACERDOTAL ORDER *SEE SACERDOTAL ORDER*).

(d.) raep; *per'*, which occurs of the head-dress of men (Isaiah 61:3, 10; Ezekiel 24:17) and women (Isaiah 3:20), and sometimes stands in connection with the foregoing term (t/[bgmæ raep; Exodus 39:28; comp. Ezekiel 44:18).

This was likewise a piece of special apparel. Schroeder *(Vestit. Mul.* p. 94 sq.) understands a hightowering turban. The hrypæ; *tsephirah'* (Isaiah 28:5), signifies a crown or diadem, and does not belong here (see Gesenius in loc.); on the other hand, Hartmann *(flebr-erin, 3,* 262) explains it of a chaplet of gorgeous flowers. *SEE CROWN*. Among the modern Arabs and Persians there are very various kinds of turbans (some of them exceedingly costly), which are always wound out of a long piece of muslin (Arvieux, *Voyage,3,* 243; Niebuhr, *Reisen*, 1, 159, comp. pl. 14-23). Nevertheless, this species of head attire appears not to have been customary in the ancient East. On the ruins of Persepolis are delineated sometimes caps (flat and pointed), sometimes turbans, which were wholly wound out of strips of cloth, and ended in a point (Niebuhr, *Reisen*, 2, pl. 21, 22). The latter is the more probable form of the coiffure of the Hebrews. Ordinary Israelites, i.e. laborers, probably bound the hair about only with a cord or ribbon (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 64; *Reisen*, 1, 292; comp. the Persepolitan figures in vol. ii, pl. 22, fig. 9; pl. 23, fig. 5, 6, 11), or wrapped a cloth around the head, as is yet customary in Arabia. The *nets* (twkbs) mentioned in the Talmud (Mishna, *Chel. 2*4, 16) were not hoods (of women), but protectives for the eye-sight.

(2.) The tiaras of the Chaldaeans (Herod. 1:195) are called µylWbf] *tebulim'* (<262315>Ezekiel 23:15), probably from their colored material; they were, according to the monuments (Munter, *Rel. d. Babyl.* p. 97), high in form; and such some interpreters (as Jahn, *Archs ol.* I, 2:118 sq.) find among the Persians (Ëyræ]T'i *takrik',* <170815>Esther 8:15; alB]r]Ki *karbel',* <270321>Daniel 3:21), although both these passages rather refer to *cloaks* (see Lengerke, in loc.). *SEE HEADRESS*.

5. The *shoe* (l[æni *na'al;* ὑπόδημα, σανδάλιον, *sandal)* was among the Orientals (as also among the Greeks and Romans), and still is, a simple *sole* of leather or wood, which was fastened under the foot (comp. Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 63, pl. 2; Mariti, *Trav.* p. 214; Harmer, *Obs.* 2, 304 sq.) by a thong (Ë/rc] *serok',* <011423>Genesis 14:23; <230527>Isaiah 5:27; ἱμάς, <410107>Mark 1:7; <420316>Luke 3:16, etc.; comp. Perizzonius *ad AElian. Var. Hist.* 9, 11) passing over it. This protection for the feet, at once suitable to the climate of the East, and probably cheap (comp. <300206>Amos 2:6; 8:6), is found very generally represented on the Persepolitan monuments (Niebuhr, *Reisen,* 2, 132, pl. 23, 6; Ker Porter, *Trav.* 1, pl. 39, 40, 41, 47). Females probably wore a more costly sort of sandals (Jugdes 16:11; comp. <220701>Song of Solomon 7:1 [see the *Targ.*]; <261610>Ezekiel 16:10), since also among the Syrians (Virg. *En.* 1, 366 sq.), the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans (Martial, 2:29,8), shoes of varierated (especially purple-colored) leather, and even gilt (calcei aurei), were a favorite article of luxury; and, although a considerable part of this decoration might be expended upon the latchet merely, yet there is also evidence that sandals with a side and upper leather (like slippers) were employed. The (eminent) Persians certainly wore actual shoes (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8, 1, 41; Strabo, 15:734), and the monuments represent a kind of half-boot (Ker Porter, *Trav.* 1, pl. 39); the shoes of the Babylonians, according to Strabo (16. 746), were no ordinary sandal, and it is possible that the later Hebrews wore a covering for the feet similar to theirs. The task of binding on and unbinding (λύειν, Aristoph. *Thesmoph.* 1183; in Hebrews lvæn; /lj ; or ãlv) these soles, and of carrying them about for one's use, was assigned to (menial) slaves (<400311>Matthew 3:11; <410107>Mark 1:7; <430127>John 1:27; <441325>Acts 13:25; comp. Talm. Bab. *Kiddush,* 17, 2; *Kethuboth,* 66, 1; Plutarch, *Sympos.* 7, 8, 4; Arrian, *Epict.3,* 26, 21; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 15; see Kype, *Observ.* 1, 12 sq.; C. W. Volland [A. Plathner], *De sandaligerulis Hebr.* Viteb. 1712; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 29). Indoors the Orientals wore no shoes, which visitors were required to

leave in the outer hall (comp. also Plat. *Sympos.* p. 213). Only at the paschal meal were the Israelites to keep their shoes on (Exodus 12:11), in order to complete their equipment for travelling, since for a journey and on going out persons of course assumed their sandals (Acts 12:8). It was customary in very early times, however, to walk *barefoot* (ãjø;/Wlj} l[Nhi; *nudopede)* in sacred spots, where the Deity was believed to have been disclosed (Exodus 3:5; Acts 7:33; Joshua 5:15); and, according to Jewish tradition (see Josephus, *Ant.* 2, 15, 1), which the O.T. by no means contradicts, the Jewish priests performed their sacred services unsandalled (comp. Ovid, *Fast.* 6, 397; see Balduin, *De calceo,* p. 23; Dougtaei *Analect.* 1, 57sq.; Spanheim *ad Callim. Cerer.* 325; Carpzov, *De discalcatione in loco sacro,* Lips. 1729; also in his *Apparat. antiq.* p. 769 sq.; Walch, *De religiosa veterum* ἀνυποδησίᾳ, Jen. 1756; also in his *Dissert. ad Acta Ap.* 1; Wichmannshausen, *De calceo in Ebrtcor. sacris deponendo,* Viteb. 1721; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxix). Also, in deep grief, persons went unshod (2 Samuel 15:30; Ezekiel 24:17, 23; Isaiah 20:2; comp. Bion, *Idyll.* 1:21; Stat. *Theb.* 9, 572; Kirchmann, *De funerib. Romans* p. 355; Rosenmüller, *Morgen.* 4, 340). The pulling off the shoe was a legal act, symbolical, with respect to the Levirate marriage (Deuteronomy 25:9, 10; Ruth 4:7; comp. Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 112), that the individual surrendered his title or passed it over to anoth*er,* who thus, as it were, stepped into his shoes (Rosenmüller, *Morgen.3,* 71 sq.), a usage that seems to be alluded to in Psalm 60:10; 108:10 (comp. Castell. *Lex. heptaglott.* 2342; Balduin, *De calceo,* p. 217 sq.; see Ewald, *Psalm.* p. 313). The generally unavoidable collection of dust and stains upon the covering of the feet among the Israelites rendered the frequent washing of the feet necessary. *SEE UNCLEANNESS*. *Shoemakers* are named in the Talmud, *SEE MECHANIC*; among the Persians the fabrication of foot-clothing was carried on in manufactories (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8, 2, 5). On the subject generally, see Bynseus, *De calceis vet. Hebr.* (Dordr. 1682, 1715; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 29); Rottboll, *De vestib. et calceis Israelit.* (Hafn. 1755); Balduin, *Calceus antiq.;* and Nigron, *De caliga vet.* (L. B. 1711). *SEE SANDAL*.

II. FEMALE articles of apparel consisted, in addition to the foregoing, of the following pieces of ornament (unless we except the veil) rather than necessity. *SEE PAINT*; *SEE ORNAMENT*; *SEE HEAD-DRESS*.

6. The *veil* (in general perhaps µyni[e tWsK], *a covering of the eyes,* <012016>Genesis 20:16) belongs throughout the East to this day as a most indispensable piece of female attire, and no lady of character and respectability allows herself to be seen without it in public, or even by strangers within doors (comp. the *Koran,* 33:56). Only female slaves (Niebuhr, *Reisen,* 2, 162), public dancing-girls (who are probably always prostitutes, yet do not usually dispense with the veil, Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 73, but are easily induced to lay it aside, Niebuhr, *Reisen,* 1, 184), and in general women of the lowest class constitute an exception to this universal custom. These usages appear, on the whole, to have been prevalent among the Israelites (see Bucher, *Antiquit. Hebr. et Graec. de velatis feminis,* Budiss. 1717), since we cannot suppose the privacy and restraint of females to have been less than in modern Oriental society, *SEE WIFE*, although in patriarchal times a less strict etiquette would seem to have prevailed with regard to the use of the veil. Virgins (<012415>Genesis 24:15 sq.) and even wives (<011214>Genesis 12:14) of the old Hebrew nomads, especially in domestic employments, appear to have gone unhesitatingly without a veil, as still in Arabia (Wellsted, 1:249) and Palestine (Russegger, 3, 109); but the betrothed covered herself in the presence of her bridegroom (<012465>Genesis 24:65; comp. the phrase *nubere viro),* and to this act of delicacy the apostle appears to allude in <461105>1 Corinthians 11:5 sq. Courtesans were known by their deep veiling (<013815>Genesis 38:15; comp. Petron. 16), and sought the more to decoy by this mark of modesty. That the veil was a principal article of female costume in the Israelitish republic appears from <230322>Isaiah 3:22; <220507>Song of Solomon 5:7; and ladies of rank may have worn several veils, one over the other, like the modern Oriental women (Buckingham, 2:383). The various species of veils designated by the several Hebrews terms having this general significance are but uncertainly indicated by the etymologies of the different words:

(1.) l [ri, *ra'dl* (<230319>Isaiah 3:19), is thought (in accordance with its Arabic synonym *ral)* to be the large general covering thrown loosely around the head and temples, and hanging down in walking, yet so arranged about the eyes as to allow the female to see through the folds (see Jahn, pl. 9, fig. 10). In the Talmud (Mishna, *Shabb.* 6, 6) Arab women are designated (twlw[r) from this peculiarity of dress.

(2.) dydær, *radid'* (<230323>Isaiah 3:23; <220507>Song of Solomon 5:7), may denote the thin covering that Oriental females still wear over the entire clothing,

and might have been earlier styled a mantle (see Jahn, pl. 8, fig. 12; comp. Schroder, *Vestit. mulier.* p. 368 sq.).

(3.) A still different kind of veil, which is vet worn in Egypt (Niebuhr, *Reisen,* 1, 166) and Syria (Arvieux, *Voyage, 3,* 247), covered the bosom, neck, and cheek as far as the nose, while the eyes were left free (see Jahn, pl. 10, fig. 1). This form is depicted on the Persepolitan ruins, and may also have been in common use by the Hebrewesses. Yet this import cannot, on intrinsic grounds, be assigned to either of the words ãy[æ; *tsaiph'* (<01245>Genesis 24:65; 38:14, 19; Sept. θέριστρον), or hMɣi *tsammah'* (<22041>Song of Solomon 4:1, 3; 6:7, <23472>Isaiah 47:2); and whether this last means in general *veil* (Hartmann, *Hebrderin, 3,* 236 sq.) is doubtful (Gesenins, *Jesa.* in loc.; Rosenmüller, *Song of Solomon* in loc.). See VEIL.

7. The *armlet,* or band for the wrist (dymx; *tsamida,* or hdymæ; *tsamidah'),* was a very favorite ornament, not only of all ancient nations (Plin. 33:10, 12; 12:42; 7:29; Liv. 10:44; Suet. *Ner.* 30), but especially of Orientals (so much so that gold and silver ones are forbidden in the Koran, 18:30; 35:30; 76:21; on the forms of ancient Egyptian ones, see Wilkinson, 3, 374), being worn by men as well as women (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 1, 3, 2; *Anab.* 1, 5, 8; Curt. 8:9, 21; Petron. *Sat.* 32; comp. Bartholin, *De armillis vet.* Amst. 1676; Schroder, *De Vestit. mul. p.* 56 sq.). Among the Hebrew females it was general from the earliest times (<01242>Genesis 24:22, 30, 47; comp. <23319>Isaiah 3:19; <26161>Ezekiel 16:11; 23:42; Jud. 10:14), but among the men those of rank only appear to have worn it (<10110>2 Samuel 1:10; comp. <04315>Numbers 31:50; see Harmer, 2:126 sq.; Ker Porter, 2, pl. 60). They consisted either of rings (of ivory, precious metals, etc.; among the poor probably likewise of horn, as in modern *times,* Harmer, 3, 368) or of cords and chains, t/rve; *sheroth'* (<23319>Isaiah 3:19). They were worn on both arms or (more usually) on one arm (the right? Sirach, 21:23), and partly covered the wrist (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 6, 4, 2); but (in Persia) they are often so broad as to reach to the elbows (comp. Niebuhr, *Reisen,* 1, 164; Hartmann, *Hebr.* 2, 178 sq.; Buckingham, *Mesopot.* p. 433). *SEE BRACELET*. Like the ear-rings, the armlets also generally served as amulets (Plin. 28:47). *SEE TALISMAN*.

8. The *anklet* (sk,[, *e'kes;* comp. περισφύριον, Herod. 4:168, *periscelis;* also πέδη, Lucian, *Lexiphan.* 9), of metal, horn, ivory, etc., was in ancient times, as still by Eastern ladies, extensively worn about the feet

(<230318>Isaiah 3:18; see Michaelis, in Pott's *Sylloge,* 2, 90; Niebuhr, *Reisen,* 1, 164; Russell, *Aleppo,* 2, 130; Harmer, 2:400 sq.; Riippel, *Abyss.* 1, 201; 2:179; comp. Longi *Pastor,* 1, 2; Arista-net. *Ep.* 1, 19), being indeed an Oriental fashion (Horace, *Ep.* 1, 17, 56; Plin. 33:54; comp. Jud. 10:4). They are generally so arranged that in walking a clapping or clinking is heard (<230316>Isaiah 3:16; comp. Koran, 24:32; Tertull. *Cult. fem.* 7; Dougtai *Analect.* 1, 243; Arvieux, 3, 251; Shaw, p. 211), of which the wearer is greatly proud (comp. Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 4, 212), especially among coquettish females (comp. Aristenet. *Ep.* 1, 4; Dougtaei *Analect.* 1, 248). Sometimes small chains (t/r[x;, *tsearoth',* <230320>Isaiah 3:20; Talm. µylæbæK], *kebalil')* were fastened from one foot to the other, probably in order to secure a short genteel step (Harmer, 3, 468; Riippel, *Abyss.* 2, 53; comp. Clem. Alex. *Paedag.* 2, 89; and the Gemara, in *Shabb.* 6, 4); according to the rabbins (see Surenhusius's *Mischna,* 2, 25), perhaps to prove their maidenly innocence (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* 2, 156 sq.). (See generally Schroder, *De Vestit. mul.* c. 1, § 3; Bynaeus, *De calceis Hebr.* 1, 8; Hartmann, *Hebraerin,* 2, 183 sq.; 3, 217 sq.; [P. Lyser] C. G. Blumberg, *De* µysæk;[}, Lips. 1683; also in Hassei et Ikenii *Nov. thes.* 1, 853 sq.; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 29). *SEE ANKLET*.

9. The *necklace,* dybær;, *rabid',* a still every favorite ornament in the East (<200109>Proverbs 1:9; 3:3; 25:12; <261611>Ezekiel 16:11; <280213>Hosea 2:13), which not only women (<220409>Song of Solomon 4:9; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 8, 5, 18), but also (eminent) men, even warriors, perhaps the last, however, among the Medes and Persians (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 1, 3, 2; 2:4, 6; *Anab.* 1, 5, 8; 8, 29; Curt. 3, 3,13; Philostr. Apoll. 2:1; Strabo, 4:197; comp. *Odyss.* 15, 460; Adams, *Rom. Antiq.* 2, 198), as among the Belgic Gauls (Strabo, 4:197), for we find no trace of this as an article of male attire among the Israelites (see Scheffer, *De torquibus,* Holm. 1658; c. notis a J. Nicolai, Hamb. 1707). Necklaces were made sometimes of metal, at others of stones or pearls, which were strung upon a cord (µyzæWrj}, *charuzin',* <220110>Song of Solomon 1:10; comp. Frahn, *ad Ibn Foszlan.* Petropol. 1823, p. 86 sq.; the µyræT;, *torim',* <220110>Song of Solomon 1:10, are probably not a necklace [Vulg. *nmurcenulce],* but an ornament for the head, most likely strings of pearls entwisted in the hair or attached to the head-dress [q.v.] and flowing down, see Michaelis, in loc.), and hung down to the breast, or even as far as the girdle (Jerome *ad Ezech.* 17, 11; Arvieux, 3, 253). Persons of rank perhaps

wore several such. Other articles of finery were also at times attached to them, such as

(1.) µynæøh}&ci, *saharonim’, half-moons* or crescents, <230318>Isaiah 3:18 (Sept. μήνισκοι; comp. *lunule,* Plant. *Epid.* v, 1:34; see Tertull. *Cult. fer.* 2, 10; called in Arabic *ahalat);* comp. <070821>Judges 8:21 (where similar trinkets appear as ornaments for camels’ necks);

(2.) *Smelling-bottles,* vp,n,yTeB;, *bottey’ ne’phesh* (lit. *houses of the soul),* <230320>Isaiah 3:20 (comp. Le Bruyn, *Voyage,* 1, 217; Chardin, 3, 72);

(3.) perhaps little stellated *studs,* µysæybæv], *shebisim’,* <230318>Isaiah 3:18; and

(4.) *serpents,* µyvæj;l], *lechashim’,* <230320>Isaiah 3:20, probably as amulets (q.v.); but see Gesenius, *Comm. z. Jesa.* 1, 209, 211. Ladies may also have worn rings (collars) of metal around the neck (see Niebuhr, *Reisen,* 1, 164; comp. Virg. *AEn.* v. 559). Among the Persians kings used to invest men with a necklace (Ëynæm]h', *hamnik’,* which, however, may mean *armlet)* as a mark of favor (<270507>Daniel 5:7; 16:29; comp. Xenoph. *Anab.* 1, 2, 27; *Cyrop.* 8, 5, 18); and it appears that a higher rank was associated with this distinction (<270507>Daniel 5:7). In Egypt the prime minister of state was adorned with a (state) necklace (<014142>Genesis 41:42); the chief-justice also wore a golden chain, with the symbol of truth attached (Diod. Sic. 1:48; comp. Hengstenberg, *Moses,* p. 29 sq.). (See generally Schroder, *Vestit. mulier.* p. 130 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebraerin,* 2, 172 sq., 259 sq.; 3, 208, 267 sq.). *SEE NECKLACE.*

10. *Earrings* were universal in the East with women (<023202>Exodus 32:2; <261612>Ezekiel 16:12; <071004>Judges 10:4) and children of both sexes (<023202>Exodus 32:2; comp. Buckingham, *Trav.* p. 241, 342). Travelers have found them sometimes small and closely fitting the ear, sometimes very large and heavy (Mandelslo, *Reisen,* p. 21; in North Africa as thick as a good-sized pipe-stem, Host, *Marocco,* p. 119), four fingers’ breadth in diameter; they so enlarge the hole through the lobe of the ear that it is said one can pass two fingers through it (Harmer, *Obs. 3,* 314). Luxury has carried the fashion to such a pitch that women puncture as many apertures in the ear-lobe as possible, and hang a ring through each (Arvieux, 3, 25); Wellsted *(Travels,* 1, 224) counted sometimes fifteen in a single ear, and Russegger (II, 2:180) speaks of even twenty. The ancient Hebrews designated this ornament by the terms µz,n,, *ne’zem* (e.g. <013504>Genesis 35:4, rv,a}µymæz;N]h'

µhyneza]B;, *the rings that were in their ears),* and lygæ[; *agl’* (<261602>Ezekiel 16:2), which almost everywhere also signify ring or hoop. See RING. Besides proper rings (of horn, bone, or metal), persons also wore other trinkets in the ear, which were called, for example,

(1.) t/pyf\æ]*, netiphoth’*, little *drops* (<070826>Judges 8:26; <230319>Isaiah 3:19), i.e. ear pendants with tiny bells, namely pearls (Gr. στάλαγμα, Lat. *stalagmium, Plant. Men. 3,* 18);

(2.) zm;WK, *kumaz’*, on the other hand, is probably not an ear-ring, but necklace or amulet (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 692);

(3.) for a peculiar kind of Jewish ear-ring, see the Mishna *(Chelim,* 11, 9; according to the Mishna, *Shabb.* 6, 6, the girls first drew a cord through the ear after piercing, until it was healed). Whether men among the Jews made use of ear ornaments is uncertain; Pliny (xi. 50) asserts the custom of Orientals without distinction, and other writers state the usage in the case of men with respect to several Eastern nations more or less positively and reliably: e.g. the inhabitants along the Euphrates (Juven. 1, 104), the Lydians (Xenoph. *Anab. 3,* 1, 31), the Libyans (Macrob. *Sat.* 7, 3), the Arabians (Petron. *Sat.* 102), the Carthaginians (Plant. *Pan.* 5, 2, 21), the Indiais (Curt. 9:1, 30), the Parthians (Tertull. *Cult. fern.* 10), the Assyrians *(Asiatic Journ.* 1843, No. 8, pl. 17), and probably others (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1, 342). The modern Arabs likewise certainly wear ear-rings (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 65; *Reisen,* p. 164 sq,), as anciently the Midianites (<070824>Judges 8:24). Among the Greeks only children wore rings, and that but in the right ear (Isid. *Orig. 19,* 31, 10; Appul. *Habit.* 1, 160, ed. Bip.; yet see Dio Chrys. 32:361 [or 654 ed. Reiske]); among the Romans the women had reached the highest pitch of luxury in earrings, wearing gold, jewels, and the most costly pearls in their ears, not singly, but in pairs and triple (Seneca, *Benef.* 7, 9; *Vit. beat.* 17; Pliny, 9:56). Nevertheless, <023202>Exodus 32:2, appears indirectly to forbid the supposition that they were at that time worn by male Israelites; and we may assume from the Mishna *(Shabb.* 6, 6) that among the later Jews even children did not usually have these ornaments. It remains to notice that in early times ear-rings were employed as charms (<013504>Genesis 35:4; comp. Jonathan’s *Targ.* in loc.; see Maimonid. *Idolol.* 7, 10; Augustine, *Ep.* 73); and Eichhorn *(Enleit. his N.T.* 1, 524) would introduce their mention into <400706>Matthew 7:6, as the rendering (for “pearls”) of the original Aramaean Gospel. *SEE AMULET*. On the boring the ear of a slave (<051517>Deuteronomy 15:17), *SEE SERVANT*.

(See generally Schroder, *Vestit. mul.* p. 187 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebrderin,* 2, 163 sq.; Bartholin, *De inaurib. vet. syntaqma,* Amstel. 1676; Rathgeber, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* III, 2:333 sq.). *SEE EARRING*.

11. The *nose-ring* (in general µzn, *ne'zemn,* comp. <20112>Proverbs 11:22; <26162>Ezekiel 16:12; more definitely ãah;µzn, *ne'zem ha-a/h, jewel of the nose,* <23321>Isaiah 3:21; probably also j j; *chath,* <12532>Exodus 35:22), a very favorite adornment among Oriental females from the earliest times (<01242>Genesis 24:22, 47; comp. Mishna, *Shabb.* 6, 1, where it appears that the Jewesses wore no nose-rings on the Sabbath, but ear-rings only). Eastern women to this day wear in the perforated extremity of the cartilage of the left (Chardin, in Harmer, 3, 310 sq.) or right nostril (see the fig. in Hartmann, *Hebrderin,* pt. 2), or even in the middle partition of the nose (Mariti, p. 216), a ring of ivory or metal (doubtless often decorated with jewels) of two or three inches diameter, which hangs down over the mouth, and through which the men are fond of applying their kiss (Arvieux, 3, 252; see Tavernier, 1:92; Shaw, p. 211; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 65; Joliffe, p. 35; Ritppel, *Arab.* p. 203; comp. Hartmann, *Hebrderin,* 2, 1C6 sq., 292; Bartholin, *De annulis narium,* in his treatise *De morbis Bibl.* c. 19; also in his work *De inauribus vet.* Amstel. 1767). Even among the aborigines of America this ornament has been found. Occasionally men also in the East affect the use of the nose-ring (Russegger, II, 2:180). But whether it was derived from the practice of treating animals thus (as Hartmann thinks) is not clear; for the female love of decoration might naturally introduce nose-rings as well as ear-rings, since the nose and the ears are such conspicuous parts of the person as readily to lead to a desire to set them off by artificial finery. — Wild beasts were led (as still bears and buffaloes are) by a ring through the nose, as the easiest mode of subduing and holding them; the same is sometimes done with large fishes that have been caught and again placed in the water (comp. Bruce, 2:314). Such a ring is likewise called j j; *chach,* or jwOj, *cho'ach* (<18402>Job 40:26 [21]; comp. <12908>2 Kings 19:28; <23729>Isaiah 37:29; <26904>Ezekiel 19:4; 29:4; 38:2), by the Arabs *Chizam.* *SEE NOSE-JEWEL*.

Attitude

Picture for Attitude 1

From the numerous allusions in Scripture to postures expressive of adoration, supplication, and respect, we learn enough to perceive that the

usages of the Hebrews in this respect were very nearly, if not altogether, the same as those which are still practiced in the East, and which the paintings and sculptures of Egypt show to have been of old employed in that country. *SEE SALUTATION*.

I. ADORATION AND HOMAGE. — The Moslems in their prayers throw themselves successively, and according to an established routine, into the various postures (nine in number) which they deem the most appropriate to the several parts of the service. For the sake of reference and comparison, we have introduced them all at the head of this article; as we have no doubt that the Hebrews employed on one, occasion or another nearly all the various postures which the Moslems exhibit on one occasion. This is the chief difference. (See Lane's *Arabian Nights*, passim; *Mod. Egyptians*, 1, 105 sq.; Thomson's *Land and Book*, 1, 26.) In public and common worship the Hebrews prayed *standing* (<1054>1 Kings 8:54; <1505>Ezra 9:5; <2710>Daniel 6:10; <1463>2 Chronicles 6:13); but in their separate and private acts of worship they assumed the position which, according to their modes of doing homage or showing respect, seemed to them the most suitable to their present feelings or objects. It would appear, however, that some form of kneeling was most usual in private devotions. *SEE ADORATION*.

Picture for Attitude 2

Picture for Attitude 3

1. *Standing* in public prayer is still the practice of the Jews. This posture was adopted from the synagogue by the primitive Christians, and is still maintained by the Oriental Churches. This appears, from their monuments, to have been the custom also among the ancient Persians and Egyptians, although the latter certainly sometimes knelt before their gods. In the Moslem worship, four of the nine positions (1, 2, 4, 8) are standing ones; and that posture which is repeated in three out of these four (2, 4, 8) may be pointed out as the proper Oriental posture of reverential standing, with folded hands. It is the posture in which people stand before kings and great men.

While in this attitude of worship, the hands were sometimes stretched forth toward heaven in supplication or invocation (<1022>1 Kings 8:22; <1462>2 Chronicles 6:12, 29; <2315>Isaiah 1:15). This was perhaps not so much the conventional posture (1) in the Moslem series, as the more natural posture of standing adoration with outspread hands, which we observe on the

Egyptian monuments. The uplifting of one hand (the right) only in taking an oath was so common, that to say "I have lifted up my hand" was equivalent to "I have sworn" (<01422>Genesis 14:22; comp. 41:44; <05240>Deuteronomy 32:40). This posture was also common among other ancient nations; and we find examples of it in the sculptures of Persia (fig. 1) and Rome (fig. 2, above).

Picture for Attitude 4

2. *Kneeling* is very often described as a posture of worship (<11054>1 Kings 8:54; <15905>Ezra 9:5; <27010>Daniel 6:10; <14613>2 Chronicles 6:13; comp. <11918>1 Kings 19:18; <42241>Luke 22:41; <44760>Acts 7:60). This is still an Oriental custom, and three forms of it occur (5, 6, 9) in the Moslem devotions. It was also in use, although not very frequent, among the ancient Egyptians; who likewise, as well as the Hebrews (<02348>Exodus 34:18; <14229>2 Chronicles 29:29; <23015>Isaiah 1:15), sometimes prostrated themselves upon the ground. The usual mode of prostration among the Hebrews by which they expressed the most intense humiliation was by bringing not only the body, but the head to the ground. The ordinary mode of prostration at the present time, and probably anciently, is that shown in one of the postures of Moslem worship (5), in which the body is not thrown flat upon the ground, but rests upon the arms, knees, and head. In order to express devotion, sorrow, compunction, or humiliation, the Israelites threw dust upon their heads (<06706>Joshua 7:6; <18212>Job 2:12; <25210>Lamentations 2:10; <26407>Ezekiel 24:7; <66819>Revelation 18:19), as was done also by the ancient Egyptians, and is still done by the modern Orientals. Under similar circumstances it was usual to smite the breast (<42183>Luke 18:13). This was also a practice among the Egyptians (Herod. 2:85). and the monuments at Thebes exhibit persons engaged in this act while they kneel upon one knee.

Picture for Attitude 5

Picture for Attitude 6

Picture for Attitude 7

3. In <13716>1 Chronicles 17:16, we are told that "David the king came and *sat* before the Lord," and in that posture gave utterance to eloquent prayer, or rather thanksgiving, which the sequel of the chapter contains. Those unacquainted with Eastern manners are surprised at this. But there is a mode of sitting in the East which is highly respectful and even reverential.

It is that which occurs in the Moslem forms of worship (9). The person first kneels. and then sits back upon his heels. Attention is also paid to the position of the hands, which they cross, fold, or hide in the opposite sleeves. The variety of this formal sitting which the annexed figure represents is highly respectful. The prophet Elijah must have been in this or some other similar posture when he inclined himself so much forward in prayer that his head almost touched his knees (<11842>1 Kings 18:42). *SEE SITTING*.

Picture for Attitude 8

II. SUPPLICATION, when addressed externally to man, cannot possibly be exhibited in any other forms than those which are used in supplication to God. Uplifted hands, kneeling, prostration, are common to both. On the Egyptian monuments suppliant captives, of different nations, are represented as kneeling or standing with outspread hands. This also occurs in the sculptures of ancient Persia (Persepolis). The first of the accompanying figures is of peculiar interest, as representing an inhabitant of Lebanon.

Picture for Attitude 9

1. *Prostration, or falling at the feet* of a person, is often mentioned in Scripture as an act of supplication or of reverence, or of both (<091521>1 Samuel 25:21; <120437>2 Kings 4:37; <170803>Esther 8:3; <401829>Matthew 18:29; 28:9; <411522>Mark 5:22; <420841>Luke 8:41; <431132>John 11:32; <441025>Acts 10:25). In the instance last referred to, where Cornelius threw himself at the feet of Peter, it may be asked why the apostle forbade an act which was not unusual among his own people, alleging as the reason, “I myself also am a man.” The answer is that, among the Romans, prostration was *exclusively* an act of adoration, rendered only to the gods, and therefore it had in him a significance which it would not have had in an Oriental (Kuinol, *ad Act.* 10:26). This custom is still very general among the Orientals; but, as an act of reverence merely, it is seldom shown except to kings; as expressive of alarm or supplication, it is more frequent (Hackett’s *Illustra. of Script.* p. 109).

2. Sometimes in this posture, or with the knees bent as before indicated, the Orientals bring their forehead to the ground, and before resuming an erect position either kiss the earth, or the feet, or border of the garment of the king or prince before whom they are allowed to appear. There is no doubt that a similar practice existed among the Jews, especially when we

refer to the original words which describe the acts and attitudes of salutation, as hx;r]ai lpn; *to bend down to the earth*, hx;r]ai hw;j}Tvhæ, *to fall prostrate on the earth*, hx;r]ai µyPæi [rK; *to fall with the face to the earth*, and connect them with allusions to the act of kissing the feet or the hem of the garment (<400920>Matthew 9:20; <420738>Luke 7:38, 45).

Picture for Attitude 10

3. *Kissing the hand* of another as a mark of affectionate respect we do not remember as distinctly mentioned in Scripture. But as the Jews had the other forms of Oriental salutation, we may conclude that they had this also, although it does not happen to have been specially noticed. It is observed by servants or pupils to masters, by the wife to her husband, and by children to their father, and sometimes their mother. It is also an act of homage paid to the aged by the young, or to learned and religious men by the less instructed or less devout. Kissing one's own hand is mentioned as early as the time of Job (<183127>Job 31:27), as an act of homage to the heavenly bodies. It was properly a salutation, and as such an act of adoration to them. The Romans in like manner kissed their hands as they passed the temples or statues of their gods. *SEE ADORATION*. It appears from <091001>1 Samuel 10:1; <111918>1 Kings 19:18; <190212>Psalm 2:12, that there was a peculiar kiss of home age, the character of which is not indicated. It was probably that kiss upon the forehead expressive of high respect which was formerly, if not now, in use among the Bedouins (*Antar*, 2, 119). *SEE KISS*.

Picture for Attitude 11

Picture for Attitude 12

III. BOWING. — In the Scriptures there are different words descriptive of various postures of respectful bowing: as ddiq; *to incline or bow down the head;* [rK; *to bend down the body very low;* Ërb; *to bend the knee,* also *to bless.* These terms indicate a conformity with the existing usages of the East, in which the modes of bowing are equally diversified, and, in all likelihood, the same. These are, 1, touching the lips (is this the kissing of the hand noticed above?) and the forehead with *the* right hand, with or without an inclination of the head or of the body, and with or without previously touching the ground; 2, placing the right hand upon the breast, with or without an inclination of the head or of the body; 3, bending the

body very low, with folded arms; 4, bending the body and resting the hands on the knees: this is one of the postures of prayer, and is indicative of the highest respect in the presence of kings and princes. In the Egyptian paintings we see persons drop their arms toward the ground while bowing to a superior, or standing respectfully with the right hand resting on the left shoulder. *SEE BOWING*.

Picture for Attitude 13

It is observable that, as before noticed, the word רבב, *barak*, means *to bless* and *to bend the knee*, which suggests the idea that it was usual for a person to receive a blessing in a kneeling posture. We know also that the person who gave the blessing laid his hands upon the head of the person blessed (Genesis 48:14). This is exactly the case at the present day in the East, and a picture of the existing custom would furnish a perfect illustration of the patriarchal form of blessing.

4. For the attitude at meals, *SEE ACCUBATION*.

Atto

SEE HATTO.

Attributes of God

SEE GOD.

Attrition

in the Romish theology, means imperfect contrition. *SEE CONTRITION*. The term was introduced by the schoolmen in the twelfth century, to make a distinction between a perfect and an imperfect repentance, after they had brought penance into the number of the sacraments. By *contrition* they mean a thorough or complete repentance *(contritio cordis),* the spirit being crushed under a sense of sin; by *attrition* they mean an inferior degree of sorrow, such as may arise from a consideration of the turpitude of sin or from the fear of hell *(timor servilis).* Alexander of Hales distinguishes as follows (p. 4, qu. 74, membr. 1): Timor servilis principium est attritionis, timor initialis (i.e. that with which the life of sanctification begins) principium est contritionis . . . . Item contritio est a gratia gratum faciente, attritio a gratia gratis data. Comp. Thom. Aquinas, qu. 1, art. 2; Bonaventura, in lib. 4, dist. 17, p. 1, art. 2, qu. 3 (Hagenbach, *Hist. of*

Doctrines, § 198). This distinction is maintained by the Council of Trent as follows: “Imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, commonly arising from a consideration of the turpitude of sin and a fear of hell and punishment, the intention of continuing in sin with the hope of receiving pardon at last being disavowed, not only does not make a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner, but is really a gift of God and an impulse of the Holy Spirit; not that the Spirit does as yet dwell in the soul, but merely excites the penitent, who, thus aided, prepares his way to righteousness. And although it cannot of itself conduct the sinner to justification without the sacrament of penance, yet it disposes him to seek the grace of God in the sacrifice of penance” *(Sess.* 14, c. 4). To Protestant eyes, *attrition* seems to have been devised to make a way of salvation easier than contrition. If attrition, with penance and priestly absolution, avail before God unto justification, then imperfect repentance, arising from fear, is all the repentance necessary in practice to a sinner, whatever the theory may be. So Dens: “Imperfect contrition is required, and it is sufficient; perfect contrition, though best, is not absolutely required, because this last justifies without the sacrament” *(Theologia,* t. 6, no. 51). This is one of the worst features of the Romish theology. “A belief in sacerdotal power to procure acceptance for those who merely feel a servile fear of divine wrath is one of those things that require to be plucked up by the roots,” if human society, in Roman Catholic countries, is to be preserved pure. The better class of divines in that church seek to palliate this doctrine; they would do better to conspire for its subversion. Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism,* bk. 2, c. 10; Bergier, *Dict. de Thiologie,* 1, 210; Perrone, *Prcelect. Theologicae,* 2, 337; Gibson, *Preservative against Popery,* 2, 36 (fol. ed.); Soames, *Latin Church,* p. 98; Ferraris, *Prorata Bibliothecat,* s.v. Baptismus.

Attud

SEE GOAT.

Atwater Jeremiah,

D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at New Haven in 1774; graduated at Yale College in 1793; was tutor in that college from 1795 to 1799; president of Middlebury College from 1800 to 1809; and president of Dickinson College, Carlisle, from 1810 to 1818. From that period he lived in retirement until his death, July 29th, 1858. Dr. Atwater was a man

of great reading, and of a retentive memory, especially of historical events, and the lives and characters of men he had known, but he had no fondness for writing, and has left, it is believed, but few literary remains. — Am. *Cong. Year-book* (vol. 6, 1859, p. 118).

Auberlen Karl August,

an eminent German theologian, was born November 19, 1824, at Fellbach, near Stuttgart. He studied four years, from 1837, at Blaubeuern, and in 1841 entered the University of Tubingen as theological student. F. C. Baur (q.v.) was then at the height of his glory, and Auberlen for a time was carried away by this brilliant Rationalist: a discipline which probably helped to fit him for his later work in resisting the destructive school of theologians. The lectures of Schmid and Beck (who came to Tubingen in 1843) helped to save him from the abyss of Pantheism. He had hardly taken his doctor's degree when he published *Die Theosophie Oetinger's, ein Beitrag z. Dogmengeschichte,* etc. (Tibinaen, 1847, 8vo), showing the higher sphere into which his studies bad ascended. *SEE OETINGER*. He had previously (1845) become a pastor; and in 1848 he followed Hofacker (q.v.) in that office. In 1849 he became repentent at Tubingen, and in 1851professor extraordinary at Basel. In the same year he married the daughter of Wolfgang Menzel. From this time his labors as teacher, preacher, and author were most abundant and successful to the time of his death. He published in 1855 *Zehn Predigten* (Basel,,8vo); *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis* (Basel, 1854, 2d ed. 1857; translated into both French and English), a work which contributed greatly to the revival of sound Biblical theology in Germany; *Zehn Vortrage zur Verantwortung des Christlichen Glaubens* (Basel, 1861, 8vo); *Die Gottliche Offenbarung, ein apologet. Versuch* (vol. 1:1861; vol. ii, posthumous, 1864). In part one he undertakes to show "that, even if we accept only those New Testament Scriptures which the most destructive of the Tubingen critics grant to be genuine, to wit, the Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans, a strictly scientific and logical method of interpretation forces us to the inevitable conclusion that the extraordinary gifts of the apostolic church, the miracles of the apostles, the resurrection of Christ, his manifestation of himself to Saul on the way to Damascus, as also his continued intercourse with him, are FACTS. In the gospels he asks but one concession, to wit, the historical genuineness of Christ's testimony respecting himself when on trial (and this is granted by Baur, Strauss, etc.), in order to put all deniers of the divinity of Christ in a

very disagreeable predicament. In the same regressive way he goes back to the Old Testament, and by a sure induction mounts from the patent and undeniable fact-phenomena of the Old Dispensation to a supernatural and divine factor in the whole history. The result of this part of the discussion is this: 'Were the revelations of God, the miracles, not facts, then has the inmost consciousness of all the holy men of old — that is to say, of the noblest and mightiest spirits, the real pillars of human history — reposed upon illusion and mental derangement. The world is either a Bedlam, an insane asylum, or it is a temple, a place of divine epiphanies.' The second, or historical part, is a succinct history of the long struggle in Germany between rationalism and supranaturalism." A translation of part of vol. 1, by Professor Hackett, is given in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* July, 1865. His career was prematurely cut short by consumption, May 2, 1864. In the last hour he said, in the fullness of Christian faith, "God be thanked, of death I have no fear; the Lord Jesus is my light and my song" (sketch of his life in preface to 2d vol. of *Die Gttl. Offenbarung*). — *Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie,* Supplem. 1:793; *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1865, p. 395, 517.

Aubertiin Edme,

one of the most learned divines of the French Protestant Church, was born at Chalons-sur-Marne in 1596, and became minister at Chartres in 1618. He was called to Paris in 1631, and died there April 5th, 1652. He wrote *Conformite de la Creance de l'elise et de St. Augustine sur le Sacrement de l'Eucharistie* (1626, 8vo), which attracted great attention, and was afterward enlarged into *L'Eucharistie de I'ancienne cglise,* etc. (1683, fol.). This work awakened great attention and controversy. Arnauld answered it, but ineffectively. It was translated into Latin by Blondel, *De Eucharistia site cena Domini libri tres* (Deventer, 1654). — Haag, *La France Protestante,* 1, 149.

Aubigne Theodore-Agrippa D',

a French writer and historian, born the 8th of February, 1550, at Saint-Maury en Saintonge. He showed at a very early age signs of what he was afterward to become. At six years of age he studied Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; at ten he translated the Crito of Plato, on his father's promise to print it with his portrait. A year after, his father, who was a zealous Protestant, made him swear (upon the scaffold on which some Protestants were executed) eternal hatred to Rome. He kept the vow. At fifteen he was

a student at Geneva under Beza, but soon quit his studies to serve in the army under the Prince de Conde and the King of Navarre. He soon rose to the first rank of Protestant warriors, and did not lay down his sword till Henry IV was established on the throne. He served his king only too faithfully, and by his plain rebukes often brought down upon his head the wrath of the monarch. After the death of Henry he published *l'Histoire universelle de son temps de* 1550 a 1601 (Paris and Amsterdam, 1616-26, 3 vols. fol.). The book was condemned to be burnt by the Parliament, and the author took refuge at Geneva, where he died the 29th of April, 1630. He was a species of Admirable Crichton, combining the statesman's skill, the warrior's intrepidity, the scholar's learning, and the poet's genius with all the sterling virtues of the Christian. His daughter became afterward the mother of Madame de Maintenon, who inherited many of the qualities of her ancestor, but not his religion. A new Life of D'Aubigne, from a MS. found in the library of the Louvre in 1851, was published in 1854 by M. Lalanne (Paris, 8vo), who also published reprints of the minor writings of D'Aubigne *(Les Tragiques,* 1857; *A ventures de Faeneste,* edited by Merimee, with a sketch of D'Aubigne, 1855). — Haag, *La France Protestante,* s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* Suppl. p. 117; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, 3,* 576.

Aucher Pascal

an Armenian monk, born 1771 in Armenia, died 1854. He was, while yet very young, sent, together with his elder brother, J. B. Aucher (born 1760, died 1853), to the Armenian convent of San Lazaro at Venice, where they were educated, and subsequently joined the order of Mechitarists. Both deserved well of the theological literature of Armenia by publishing a number of important works of ancient Armenian literature (e.g. the Chronicles of Eusebius, the Discourses of Philo, etc.). Paschal Aucher also published an Armenian-English Dictionary (2 vols. Venice, 1821).

Audaeans, Audeans, Or Audians

followers of Audseus or Audius (A.D. 340 or 350), a native of Syria, who boldly castigated the luxury and vice of the clergy, and who finally left the church. He and his followers afterward deviated from the usages of the church, especially on the date of Easter. He was charged with anthropomorphism. He had himself irregularly consecrated as bishop; was banished to Scythia, and died before 372. His personal character was

remarkably pure. The sect died out in the fifth century. See Schroder, *De Audeo et Audianis* (Marburg, 1716); Lardner, *Works*, 4, 176; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 309; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2, 705.

Audientes

SEE HEARERS.

Audientia Episcopalis

(i.e. *episcopal judgment),* a name first used in the code of Justinian, and thence generally employed in the ecclesiastical law of the Middle Ages to designate the right of the bishops to act as arbiters in civil affairs. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop. s.v. SEE BISHOP*; *SEE JURISDICTION.*

Audin J. M. Vincent

a French *litterateur,* was born at Lyons in 1793, and studied theology at the seminary of Argentibre. He soon abandoned theology for the study of the law, but after being admitted to the bar he never practiced. In 1814 he came to Paris and commenced bookseller, at the same time keeping up his literary pursuits. The books for which his name is mentioned here are *Histoire de la St. Barthlenmy* (1826, 2 vols. 12mo); *Histoire de la Vie, des Ouvrages, et des Doctrines de Luther* (2 vols. 8vo; translated by Turnbull, London, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); *Histoire de la Vie, etc., de Calvin* (1843, 2 vols. 8vo); *Henry VIII et le Schisme d'Angleterre* (2 vols. 8vo; transl. by Browne, Lond. 1852, 8vo). He died February 21st, 1851. His lives of Luther and Calvin are written in a controversial spirit, and are often unjust as well as inaccurate. Brownson (Roman Catholic) says of him that, as a writer of history, "he is conscientious and painstaking, but we cannot regard him as very sagacious or profound; and, under the relation of style and manner, he is not sufficiently grave and dignified to suit our taste, or to inspire us with full confidence in his judgment. He takes too much pains to be striking and brilliant, and appears to weigh the phrase more than the thought. Regarded as popular works, as they probably were designed to be, we esteem very highly Audin's biographies; but, regarded as *studies* on the Reformation, they are deficient in philosophical depth and comprehensiveness. They take, in our judgment, quite too-narrow and too superficial a view of the great Protestant movement, and afford us very little aid in understanding its real causes and internal character." — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, 3,* 604; *Brownson's Review,* January, 1855.

Auditores

(hearers). The Manichaeans were divided into *electi* and *auditores,* corresponding, according to some writers, to clergy and laity, and, according to others, to the faithful and catechumens. By the Manichaean rule a different course of conduct was prescribed to the elect from that of the auditors. The latter might eat flesh, drink wine, bathe, marry, trade, possess estates, etc., all which things were forbidden to the elect. — Mosheim, *Comm.* 2, 399.

Au'gia

(Αὐγία), the daughter of Berzelees and wife of Addus (1 Esdras 5:38), probably a conjecture of the copyists or translator, since her name is not given in either of the genuine texts (<1561>Ezra 2:61; <1663>Nehemiah 7:63), nor even in the Vulg. at the passage in Esdras.

Augian Manuscript

(CODEX AUGIENSIS), a Creek and Latin MS. of the epistles of Paul, supposed to have been written in the latter half of the ninth century, and so called from *Augia major,* the name of a monastery at Rheinau, to which it belonged. After passing through several hands, it was, in 1718, purchased by Dr. Bentley for 250 Dutch florins, and it is now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. This noted MS, F, is contained on 136 leaves of good vellum, 4to (the *signatures* proving that 7 more are lost), 9 inches by 73, with the two languages in parallel columns of 28 lines on each page, the Greek being always inside, the Latin next the edge of the book. It is neatly written in uncial letters, and without accents; not *continua serie,* as is common with more ancient copies, but with intervals between the words, and a dot at the end of each. The Greek text is very valuable. The Latin is a pure form of the Vulgate, but in the style of character usually called the Anglo-Saxon, whence it is tolerably clear that it must have been written in the west of Europe, where that formation of letters was in general use between the seventh and twelfth centuries. The first sheets, containing <4501>Romans 1:1-3, 19, are wholly absent; in four passages (<4608>1 Corinthians 3:8-16; 6:7-14; <5101>Colossians 2:1-8; Philemon 21-25), the Greek column is empty, although the Latin is given; in the epistle to the Hebrews, the Latin occupies both columns, the Greek being absent. Tischendorf examined it in 1842, and Tregelles in 1845. Scrivener published an edition of this Codex in common type (Lond. 1859, 8vo),

with prolegomena and a photograph of one page. — Tregelles, in Home's *Introd.* 4, 197, 255; Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 133 sq. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS*.

Augsburg Confession

(Confessio Augustana), the first Protestant confession of faith.

I. *History.* — After Charles V concluded peace with France, he summoned a German Diet to meet at Augsburg April 8, 1530. The writ of invitation called for aid against the Turks, who in 1529 had besieged Vienna; it also promised a discussion of the religious questions of the time, and such a settlement of them as both to abolish existing abuses and to satisfy the demands of the pope. Elector John of Saxony, who received this writ March 11, directed (March 14) Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen, and Melancthon to meet in Torgau (q.v.), and draw up a summary of the most important and necessary articles of faith, in support of which the evangelical princes and states should combine. These theologians (with the exception of Jonas, who joined them somewhat later) drew up a profession of their faith on the ground of the seventeen articles which had been prepared by Luther for the convention at Schwalbach (q.v.), and fifteen other articles, which had been drawn up at the theological colloquy at Marburg (q.v.), Oct. 3, 1529, and subsequently presented to the Saxon elector John at Torigau. (The original articles were for the first time published by Heppe, in Niedner's *Zeitschrift fur histor. Theologie,* 1848, 1st number.) The first draft made by the four theologians, in seventeen articles, was at once published, and called forth a joint reply from Wimpina, Mensing, Redoerfer, and Dr. Elgers, which Luther immediately answered. The subject of the controversy had thus become generally known. Luther, Melancthon, and Jonas were invited by the Saxon elector to accompany him to Augsburg. Subsequently it was, however, deemed best for Luther's safety to leave him behind. Melancthon, soon after his arrival at Augsburg, completed the Confession, and gave to it the name of *Apologia.* On May 11 he sent it to Luther, who was then at Coburg, and on May 15 he received from Luther an approving answer. Several alterations were suggested to Melancthon in his conferences with Jonas, the Saxon chancellor Briick, the conciliatory bishop Stadion of Augsburg, and the imperial secretary Valdes. To the latter, upon his request, 17 articles were handed by Melancthon, with the consent of the Saxon elector, and he was to have a preliminary discussion concerning them with the papal legate Pimpinelli. Upon the opening of the Diet, June 20, the

evangelical theologians who were present — Melancthon, Jonas, Agricola, Brenz, Schnepf, and others-presented the Confession to the elector. The latter, on June 23, had it signed by the evangelical princes and representatives of cities who were present. They were the following: John, elector of Saxony; George, margrave of Brandenburg; Ernest, duke of Lunenburg; Philip, landgrave of Hesse; John Frederic, duke of Saxe; Francis, duke of Lunenburg; Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt; and the magistrates of Nuremberg and Reutlingen. The emperor had ordered the Confession to be presented to him at the next session, June 24; but when the evangelical princes asked for permission to read it, their petition was refused, and efforts were made to prevent the public reading of the document altogether. The evangelical princes declared, however, that they would not part with the Confession until its reading should be allowed. The 25th was then fixed for the day of its presentation. In order to exclude the people, the little chapel of the episcopal palace was appointed in the place of the spacious City Hall, where the meetings of the Diet were held. In this episcopal chapel the Protestant princes assembled on the appointed day, Saturday, June 25, 1530, at 3 P.M. The Saxon chancellor Bruck (Pontanus) held in his hands the Latin, Dr. Christian Bayer the German copy. They stepped into the middle of the assembly, and all the Protestant princes rose from their seats, but were commanded to sit down. The emperor wished to hear first the Latin copy read, but the elector replied that they were on German ground; whereupon the emperor consented to the reading of the German copy, which was done by Dr. Bayer. The reading lasted from 4 to 6 o'clock. The reading being over, the emperor commanded both copies to be given to him. The German copy he handed to the archbishop of Mayence, the Latin he took along to Brussels. Neither of them is now extant. He promised to take this highly important matter into serious consideration, and make known his decision; in the mean while the Confession was not to be printed without imperial permission. The Protestant princes promised to comply with this; but when, soon after the reading, an erroneous edition of the Confession appeared, it became necessary to have both the Latin and German texts published, which was done through Melancthon. On June 27 the Confession was given, in the presence of the whole assembly, to the Roman Catholic theologians to be refuted. The most prominent among them were Eck, Faber, Wimpina, Cochlaeus, and Dietenberger. Before they got through with their work a letter was received from Erasmus, who had been asked for his opinion by cardinal Campegius, recommending caution, and the concession of the

Protestant demands concerning the marriage of the priests, monastic vows, and the Lord's Supper. On July 12 the Roman Catholic "Confutation" was presented, which so little pleased the emperor, that "of 280 leaves, only twelve remained whole." A new "Confutation" was therefore prepared and read to the Diet, August 3, by the imperial secretary Schweiss. No copy of it was given to the evangelical members of the Diet, and it was not published until 1573 (by Fabricius, in his *Harmonia Conf. Aug.* Cologne, 1573; the German text in Chytrsus, *Historie der Augsburg.* Conf., Rostock, 1576). Immediately after the reading of the Confutation, the Protestants were commanded to conform to it. Negotiations for effecting a compromise were commenced by both parties, but led to no result. Negotiations between the Lutherans and the Zuinglians were equally fruitless. Zuinglius had sent to the emperor a memorial, dated July 4 *(Ad Carolum Romans Imperatorem comitia Augustae celebrantem fidei Huldrychi Zwinglio ratio)*, and Bucer, Capito, and Hedio had drawn up, in the name of the cities of Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, the *Confessio Tetrapolitana*, which was presented to the emperor July 11. Neither of these two confessions was read, and both were rejected.

Against the Roman Catholic "Confutation," Melancthon, at the request of the evangelical princes and cities, prepared an "Apology of the Confession" *(Apologia Confessionis)*, which was presented by the chancellor Bruck, on Sept. 22, to the emperor, who refused to receive it. Subsequently Melancthon received a copy of the "Confutation," which led to many alterations in the first draft of the Apology. It was then published in Latin, and in a German translation by Jonas (Wittenberg, 1531). A controversy subsequently arose, in consequence of which Melancthon after 1540 made considerable alterations in the original Augsburg Confession, altering, especially in Art. 10, the statement of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in favor of the Reformed view. Melancthon, who had already before been charged with "crypto-Calvinism," was severely attacked on account of these alterations; yet the "*Confessio Variata"* remained in the ascendency until 1580, when the *Confessio Invariata* was put into the "Concordienbuch" in its place, and thus the unaltered Confession has come to be generally regarded as the standard of the Lutheran churches. But the altered Confession has not ceased to find advocates, and several branches of the Lutheran Church have even abrogated the authoritative character of the Confession, and do not demand from the clergy a belief in all its doctrines.

II. The following is the table of *contents* of the Confession and of the Apology:

Part I. —

1. Acknowledges four oecumenical councils: —

2. Declares original sin to consist wholly in concupiscence: —

3. Contains the substance of the Apostles' Creed: —

4. Declares that justification is the effect of faith, exclusive of good works: —

5. Declares the Word of God and the sacraments to be the means of conveying the Holy Spirit, but never without faith: —

6. That faith must produce good works purely in obedience to God, and not in order to the meriting justification: —

7. The true church consists of the godly only: —

8. Allows the validity of the sacraments, though administered by the evil: —

9. Declares the necessity of infant baptism.

10. Declares the real presence in the Eucharist, continued with the elements only during the period of receiving; insists upon communion in both kinds: —

11. Declares absolution to be necessary, but not so particular confession: —

12. Against the Anabaptists: —

13. Requires actual faith in all who receive the sacraments: —

14. Forbids to teach in the church, or to administer the sacraments, without being lawfully called: —

15. Orders the observation of the holy days and ceremonies of the church: —

16. Of civil matters and marriage: —

17. Of the resurrection, last judgment, heaven, and hell: —

18. Of free will: —

19. That God is not the author of sin: —

20. That good works are not altogether unprofitable: —

21. Forbids the invocation of saints.

Part II. —

1. Enjoins communion in both kinds, and forbids the procession of the holy sacrament: —

2. Condemns the law of celibacy of priests: —

3. Condemns private masses, and enjoins that some of the congregation shall always communicate with the priest: —

4. Against the necessity of auricular confession: —

5. Against tradition and human ceremonies: —

6. Condemns monastic vows: —

7. Discriminates between civil and religious power, and declares the power of the church to consist only in preaching and administering the sacraments.

The *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* contains sixteen articles, which treat of original sin, justification by faith, fulfillment of the law, penitence, repentance, confession, satisfaction, number and use of the sacraments human ordinances, invocation of the saints, communion in both kinds, celibacy, monastic vows, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The “Confessio,” with the “Apologia,” may be found in Francke, *Libri Symbolici Ecclesiae Lutherance* (Lips. 1847, 12mo); in *Hase, Libri Symbolici Eccl. Evangelicae* (Lips. 1846, 12mo), which contains also the papal *Augustance Confessionis Responsio* of Faber, in Tittmann, *Libri Symbolici* (1817, 8vo). It has also been edited by Winer (1825), Zweiten (1840, 1850), Francke (1846), Miuller (1848), Heppe (Kassel, 1855). There are works on the history of the Confession by Chytraeus (Rost. 1576); Miller (Jena, 1705); Cyprian (Gotha, 1730); Salig *(Historie der A. C. und deren Apologie,* Halle, 1730, 3 vols.); Weber *(Kritische Gesch. der A. C.* Leipz.

1783, 2 vols.); Rottermund (Hann. 1830); Danz *(De A. C. nach ihrer Gesch.* Jena, 1829); Rudelbach *(Historische Einleitung in die A. C.* Dresd. 1841),; Rickert *(Lumhers Verhaltniss zur A. C.* Jena, 1854); Calinich *(Luther und die A. C.* Leipzig, 1861). See also *Evang. Qu. Review,* April, 1864, art. 6; *Zeitschriiftfur hist. Theol.* 1865, Heft. 3; Hardwick, *Hist. of 39 Articles,* ch. 2; Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrine, §* 215; Gieseler, *Church History* (Smith's edit.), 4:432. The history and literature of the "Confession" are given in a very summary but accurate way by Hase, in his *Prolcgomena,* etc., to the *Lib. Symb.;* see also Guericke, *Christliche Smymbolik, §* 14. On the relation of the *Variata* edition of 1540 to the original, see Heppe, *Die confessionelle Elntwicklung der alt-protsstantischen Kirche Deutschlands* (Marb. 1854); Fbrstemann, *Urkundenbuch* (Halle, 1833-35). English versions of the "Confession" have been published by Rev. W. H. Teale (Leeds, 1842); also in P. Hall's h*armonyi of Confessions* (Lond. 1842), and in Barrow, *Summary of Christian Faith and Practice,* vol. 1 (London, 1822, 3 vols. 12mo); the latest American edition is Henkel's, of Baltimore, 1853 (a revised translation). *SEE CONFESSIONS.*

Augsburg Interim

SEE INTERIM.

Augusta John

a Bohemian theologian, born at Prague in 1500, died Jan. 13th, 1575. He studied at Wittenberg under Luther and Melancthon, with whom he subsequently remained in correspondence, without, however, adopting all the views of Luther. He became a minister of the Bohemian brethren, and subsequently a bishop in the Church. He tried to bring about an understanding among the Protestants at an interview with Luther in 1542. After the Schmalkaldie war many of the Bohemian brethren were banished, and Augusta, together with the chief preachers, was arrested. To recover his liberty, he consented to join again the "Utraquists," to whom he had originally belonged, but he refused to make a public retractation. He was liberated in 1564, but had to pledge himself by an oath not to teach or preach. He is the author of an "Outline of the doctrine of the Bohemian Brethren," and of two works on "the Duties of the Christian Religion" and on "Temptations." — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale, 3,* 642.

Augusti Johann Christian Wilhelm

a German theologian, was born 27th of October, 1772, at Eschenberg, near Gotha, where his father was pastor. He was educated in the gymnasium of Gotha and at the University of Jena, where, under Griesbach, he devoted himself to theology and philology. In 1798 he began teaching at Jena. In 1800 he was made professor extraordinary, and in 1803 he succeeded Ilgen in the chair of Oriental literature, which he exchanged in 1807 for that of theology. In 1812 he accepted the chair of theology in the University of Breslau, in addition to which he was honored with a seat in the consistory of the province of Silesia. His influence upon the University of Breslau, and upon all the educational establishments of Silesia, was very great. At the time when the French marched into Russia, Augusti was rector of the university, and it was owing to his intrepidity and patriotic spirit that the property of the university was saved. In 1819 he was appointed professor of theology in the newly-established University of Bonn, and received the title of councillor of the Consistory at Cologne. In 1828 he was appointed director of the Consistory of Coblenz. Notwithstanding his numerous duties, he still continued his lectures in the university until his death, 28th April, 1841. Augusti was one of the most voluminous theological writers of Germany. He was originally led by the influence of Griesbach to join the critical or philosophical school of theology, but this did not suit his natural bias, which was more inclined to maintain things as they are than to speculative investigations; and during the last forty years of his life he was a zealous, although not a bigoted advocate of the established form of religion. In doctrine he may be considered an orthodox Lutheran. His writings, most of which are of a historical or archaeological nature, are useful as works of reference, but they are deficient in elegance and simplicity of form, and contain more evidence of learning and industry than of the true spirit of a historian. The most important of all his works is the *Denkwiirdigkeiten acs der christlichen Archaologie* (12 vols. 8vo, Leipz. 1817-1831), which he subsequently condensed into the *Handbuch d. christl. Archaologie* (Leipz. 1837, 3 vols, 8vo). Among his other works are *Lehrbuch d. christl. Dogmengeschichte* (Leipz. 1835, 4th ed. 8vo); *Beitrige z. christl. Kunstgeschichte u. Liturgik* (Leipz. 1841-46, 2 vols. 8vo); *Einleitung in das alte Testament* (Leipz. last ed. 1827); *System der christl. Dogmatik* (Leipz. last ed. 1826); *Corpus librorum symbol. ecclesice reform.* (Elberf, *1827). — English Cyclopcedia;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* Supplem. 1:123.

Augustine

(Aurelius Augustinus), bishop of Hippo, was born at Tagaste, in Numidia, Nov. 13, 354. His mother, Monica, was a Christian and a woman of piety, who took care to have her son instructed in the true faith and placed among the catechumens. His father was as yet unbaptized, and appears to have cared more to advance his son in worldly knowledge: he spared nothing for his education; and, after giving him the rudiments of grammar at Tagaste, sent him to Madaura, a town in the neighborhood, and afterward removed him to Carthage, to learn rhetoric (this was about the end of the year 371); and here he first imbibed the Manichaean errors. He also fell into immoral habits, of which he afterward gave a minute account in his remarkable "Confessions." In 383 he left Carthage, against the will of his mother, and repaired to Rome; and, still adhering to his sect, he lodged at the house of a Manichaean, where he fell ill. After his recovery be was sent by Symmachus, the prefect of the city, to Milan, where the inhabitants were in want of a professor of rhetoric. Here he came into intercourse with Ambrose, and was in a short time so convinced by his doctrine that he resolved to forsake the Manichaean sect: this design he communicated to his mother, who came to Milan to see him. "Augustine listened to the preaching of Ambrose frequently, but the more he was forced to admire his eloquence, the more he guarded himself against persuasion. Obstinate in seeking truth outside of her only sanctuary, agitated by the stings of his conscience, bound by habit, drawn by fear, subjugated by passion, touched with the beauty of virtue, seduced by the charms of vice, victim of both, never satisfied in his false delights, struggling constantly against the errors of his sect and the mysteries of religion, an unfortunate running from rock to rock to escape shipwreck, he flees from the light which pursues him — such is the picture by which he himself describes his conflicts in his Confessions. At last, one day, torn by the most violent struggles, his face bathed in tears, which flowed involuntarily, he fled for solitude and calm to a retired spot in his garden. There, throwing himself on the ground, he implored, though confusedly, the aid of Heaven. All at once he seemed to hear a voice, as if coming from a neighboring house, which said to him, Tolle; lege: *Take and read.* Never before had such emotion seized his soul. Surprised, beside himself, he asks himself in vain whence came the voice, or what he was to read. He was sustained by a force he knew not, and sought his friend Alype. A book was placed before him-the epistles of St. Paul. Augustine opens it at hazard, and falls upon this passage of the

apostle: ‘Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness... But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof.’ Augustine needed not any further reading. Hardly had he finished this passage before a ray of divine light broke upon him, enlightening his understanding, dissipating all his shadows, and kindling in his heart a flame of celestial fire. The conversion of Augustine was fully as striking and efficacious as St. Paul’s had been. All the apostle’s spirit had passed in an instant into the new proselyte. He was then in his thirty-second year. When once again with his mother, the virtuous Monica, to whom his wanderings had cost so many tears, he related to her all that had passed, and also communicated his new resolutions, with that peaceful firmness which changes not. Monica heard this consoling recital with lively joy. All these particulars he himself gives in his *Confessions,* with a charm and simplicity which have, before or since, never been surpassed.”

After remaining for the space of two years among the catechumens, he was baptized by Ambrose at Easter, 387. Soon after his baptism, having given up his profession, he resolved to return to his own country; and on his way thither, while at Ostia, his mother died. About this time he wrote his treatises *De Moribus Eccl. Catholicae et de Moribus Manichceorum,* also *De Quantitate Animr.* He arrived in Africa at the end of 388, and removed to Tagaste, where he dwelt for three years with some of his friends, occupied solely with prayer, meditation, and study. At this period he wrote the treatises *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* and *De Vera Religione.* In 391 he went to Hippo; and while there, in spite of his tears and reluctance, the people of that city chose him to fill the office of priest in their *church,* and brought him to Valerius, their bishop, that he might ordain him. When priest, he instituted a monastery in the church of Hippo, where he entirely devoted himself to works of piety and devotion, and to teaching. Valerius, the bishop, contrary to the custom of the African churches, permitted Augustine to preach in his place, even when he himself was present; and, when this was objected to, he excused himself on the ground that, being himself a Greek, he could not so well preach in Latin. After this the practice became more general. About 393 Augustine wrote the treatise *De duabus animabus, contra Manichceos.* In 395 he was elected colleague to Valerius in his episcopacy, and consecrated Bishop of Hippo, contrary to the canons of the church. The duties of his office were discharged with the greatest fidelity; but, amid all his labors, he found time for the composition

of his most elaborate works. His treatise *De Libero Arbitrio* was finished in 395; the *Confessionum Libri XIII* in 398; most of the treatises against the Donatists between 400 and 415; those against the Pelagians between 412 and 428. The *De Civitate Dei* was begun in 413 and finished in 426. The singular candor of Augustine is shown in his *Retractationes* (written in 428), in which he explains and qualifies his former writings, and not unfrequently acknowledges his mistakes opinion. In 430, the Vandals, under Genseric, laid siegeto Hippo, and in the third month of the siege (August 28) Augustine died, in his 76th year.

His whole career, after his profession of the Christian faith, was consistent with his high calling; the only faults with which he can be charged are an occasional undue severity in controversy and the share which he bore in the persecution of the Donatists (q.v.). His intellect was acute, vigorous, and comprehensive; his style rapid and forcible, but not remarkable for purity or elegance. “Of all the fathers of the Latin Church” (says M. Villemain, in his *Tableau de l’Eloquence de la chaire au quatrieme siecle*, 1849, 8vo), “St. Augustine brought the highest degree of imagination in theology, and the most eloquence and even sensibility in scholasticism. Give him another century, place him in the highest civilization, and a man never will have appeared endowed with a vaster or more flexible genius. Metaphysics, history, antiquities, science, and manners, Augustine had embraced them all. He writes on music as well as on the freedom of the will; he explains the intellectual phenomenon of the memory as well as reasons on the fall of the Roman Empire. His subtile and vigorous mind has often consumed in mystical problems an amount of sagacity which would suffice for the most sublime conceptions. His eloquence, tinged with affectation and barbarisms, is often fresh and simple. His austere morality displeased the corrupt casuists whom Pascal had so severely handled. His works are not only the perennial source of that scientific theology which has agitated Europe for so many ages, but also the most vivid image of Christian society at the end of the fourth century.”

“If we contemplate Augustine as a scholar, our judgment of him will vary according to the different demands we make of a theologian. If we compare the famous bishop with learned theologians of the present time, he can scarcely deserve the name of such a one; for we shall not readily reckon among learned theologians any one who knows nothing at all of Hebrew and but little of Greek. But if we estimate Augustine according to his own period, as it is proper we should, he was by all means a learned

man, and was surpassed by but few, and among the Latin fathers perhaps only by Jerome, though by him in a high degree. Thus much, however, is certain, Augustine had more genius than learning, more wit and penetration than fundamental science. Augustine's was a philosophical and especially a logical mind. His works sufficiently prove his talent for system-making and a logical development of ideas. *We* also find in them much philosophical speculation peculiar to himself. But the value of those speculations is not to be highly rated, since he was far from being so much of a metaphysician in general as he was of a logician. Nor was he wanting in a knowledge of philosophical systems and the speculations of others. His weakest point as a scholar was in a knowledge of languages. In this he was surpassed even by Pelagius, who was only a layman; for although, as before remarked, he was not entirely ignorant of Greek, his knowledge of it was very limited, and we meet with a multitude of oversights on this account. Hence he generally used only the Latin translation of the Bible, which is so often faulty; and even in the New Testament he recurs but seldom to the original text. His ignorance and incapacity in expounding the Scriptures, at least of the Old Testament, he himself acknowledges *(Retract.* 1, 18). Hence he very often founds his arguments from the sacred books on erroneous interpretations. He also employed philosophical reasons to support his positive doctrines, and strove to unite the rational with the revealed belief, as Christian theologians had before attempted to do from the time of Justin. His supernatural system he defended not only with exegetical, but also with philosophical weapons. His knowledge of the opinions of the earlier fathers often failed him. In a letter to Jerome *(Ep.* 67; *Omh Hieron. Vall. ed.),* he frankly confesses that he knows not the errors charged upon Origen, and begs Jerome to point them out to him.c. His taste was not sufficiently formed by the study of the classics. Hence his style (though we find some good remarks of his on grammar, and his ability for eloquence is sufficiently manifest in particular passages) was on the whole defective in purity and elegance, as could not but be expected in an age when the study of Cicero had begun to be regarded as a sin. He also believed that rhetorical euphony was rather hurtful than beneficial to the presentation of Christian truths, as they thus lose their dignity. In other respects he did not despise the liberal arts, but believed they could be profitably used only when those who practice them are inspired by the Christian spirit *(Ep.* 101, *ad Memorium." — Wiggers, Augustinism and Pelagianism,* chap. 1.) His knowledge of Greek *was* moderate, and his biblical criticisms are therefore of comparatively little value (see Clausen, *Augustinus S. Scr. interpres,*

Hafn. 1828); but as a theologian he made a deep impression upon his own age, and, indeed, upon the whole theology of the church down to the present time. “His influence may be compared with that of Origen in the East, but it was more general and enduring in the West. He was one of those great men, of world-wide celebrity, whose agency is not limited to their own times, but is felt afresh at various epochs. in the lapse of centuries. His position in reference to theology was similar to that of Plato and Aristotle in the department of philosophy. On the one hand, the development of the Catholic dogma which appears in the writings of the schoolmen proceeded from him, and, on the other hand, a reaction of the pure Christian consciousness against the foreign elements of the Catholic dogma. Those tendencies within the pale of the Catholic Church from which a new Christian life emanated connect themselves with him. Even the more complete reaction at the Reformation, and the various revivals which the evangelical church has experienced, may be traceable to the same source. He resembled Origen in his turn for speculation, but surpassed him in originality, depth, and acuteness. Both passed through Platonism in the process of their culture; he did not, however, like Origen, mingle the Christian and Platonic elements, but developed the principles of Christianity independently of Platonism, and even in opposition to it. But Origen excelled him in greater mental freedom and erudite historical culture, while Augustine’s mind was fettered by a definite church-system. The union of their mental elements would, without doubt, have made the most complete church teacher. Nevertheless, many qualities were united in Augustine, which we find scattered in separate tendencies of theological development, and hence we see the various periods of the church shadowed forth in his mental career” (Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas,* 2, 258).

“In estimating Augustine as a theologian, we must remember that he commenced life as a Manichaean; and many believe that traces of the Manichaean doctrine (of the evil nature of matter, etc.) can be traced in the later and severer forms of his belief. In attacking the Manichaeans, he wrote his treatise De *Libero Arbitrio,* which certainly would have received a different shape had he written it at a later period, i.e. during his disputes with the Pelagians. In the various discussions which have arisen concerning predestination and the doctrines with which it is connected, some modern divines have quoted the arguments of Augustine against the Manichaeans, and others those which he employed against the Pelagians, according to the discordant views which the combatants severally entertain on these

controverted points. One of them has thus expressed himself, in his endeavor to reconcile Augustine with himself: ‘The heresy of Pelagius being suppressed, the catholic doctrine in that point became more settled and confirmed by the opposition; such freedom being left to the will of man as was subservient unto grace, co-operating in some measure with those heavenly influences. And so much is confessed by Augustine himself, where he asks this question, “Doth any man affirm that free will is perished utterly from man by the fall of Adam?” And thereunto he makes this answer: “Freedom is perished by sin; but it is that freedom only which we had in Paradise, of having perfect righteousness with immortality.” For, otherwise, it appears to be his opinion that man was not merely passive in all the acts of grace which conduced to glory, according to the memorable saying of his, so common in the mouths of all men, “He who first made us without our help, will not vouchsafe to save us at least without our concurrence.” If any harsher expressions have escaped his pen (as commonly it happeneth in the heats of a disputation), they are to be qualified by this last rule, and by that before, in which it was affirmed that “God could not with justice judge and condemn the world, if all men’s sins proceeded not from their own free will, but from some overruling providence which enforced them to it.”’ Another admirer of this father offers the following as an attempt at reconciliation: Augustine denied that the co-operation of man is at all exerted to produce the renewal of our nature; but, when the renewal had been produced, he admitted that there was an exercise of the will combined with the workings of grace. In the tenth chapter of his work against the Manichaeans, the bishop of Hippo thus expresses himself: “Who is it that will not exclaim, *How foolish it is to deliver precepts to that man who is not at liberty to perform what is commanded! And how unjust it is to condemn him who had not power to full the commands!* Yet these unhappy persons [the Manichaeans] do not perceive that they are ascribing such injustice and want of equity to God. But what greater truth is there than this, that God has delivered precepts, and that human spirits have freedom of will?” Elsewhere he says, “Nothing is more within our power than our own will. The will is that by which we commit sin, and by which we live righteously.” — Nothing can be plainer than that the writer of these passages admitted the liberty of the human will, and the necessity of our own exertions in conjunction with divine grace. How this is to be reconciled with his general doctrine is perhaps indicated in the following passage from his book *De Gratia et lib. Arbitrio*, c. 17. Speaking of grace, he says “that we may *will* God *works* without us;

but when we *will,* and so *will* as to *do,* he *co-works* with us; yet, unless he either *works* that we may will, or *co-works* when we do will, we are utterly incapable of doing any thing in the good works of piety.'" These are but very slight specimens of the mode in which learned and ingenious — men have tried to give a kind of symmetrical proportion to this father's doctrinal system. Several large treatises have been published with the same praiseworthy intention; the pious authors of them either entirely forgetting, or having never read the rather 'latitudinarian indulgence of opinion which St. Augustine claims for himself in his 'Retractations.' If. however, an estimate may be formed of what this father intended in his various pacificatory doctrinal explanations from what he has actually admitted and expressed, it may be safely affirmed that no systematic a writer of theology seems so completely to have entered into the best views of the bishop of Hippo, or so nearly reconciled the apparent discordances in them, as ARMINIUS has done" (Watson, *Theol. Dictionary,* s.v.). The changes in Augustine's theolory are described as follows by Neander *(History of Dognzas,* 2, 347). "In his treatises *de Lib. Arbitrio* and *de Vera Religione* he supposes everything in man to be conditioned on free will. In his exposition of Romans 9 (A.D. 394) he expressly opposes the interpretation of that passage as implying predestination and the exclusion of free will. Man indeed, he says, could not merit divine grace by his works, for, in order to perform works that are truly pious, he must have first a suitable state of heart, the inward *justitia.* But this source of goodness man has not from himself; only the Holy Spirit can impart it to him in regeneration; antecedently to this all men are in equal estrangement from God; but it depends on themselves whether, by believing, they make themselves susceptible for the Holy Spirit or not. (Cap. 60. — Quod credimus nostrum est; quod autem bonum operamur illius qui credentibus in se dat Spiritumn Sanctum.) God has chosen faith. It is written, God works all in all men, but he does not believe all in all. Faith is man's concern. (Non quidem Deus elegit opera quae ipse largitur quum dat Spiritum Sanctum ut per caritatem bona operemur; sed tamen elegit fidem.) From this point we can trace the gradual revolution in Augustine's mode of thinking to its later harsher form. Yet in his treatise *De* 83 *diversis quaestionibus* (written about A.D. 388), he says, in explaining Romans 9:18 ('Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and I whom he will he hardeneth'). This will of God is not unrighteous, for it is conditioned by the most secret relations of congruity; all men, indeed, are corrupt, but yet there is a difference among them; there is in sinners something antecedent by which they become I

deserving of justification or of hardening (Quaestio 168, § 4. — Venit enim de occultissimis meritis, quia et ipsi peccatores cum propter generale peccatum unam massam fecerint, non tamen nulla est inter illos diversitas. Praecedit ergo aliquid in peccatoribus quo, quamvis nondum sint justificati digni efficiantur justificatione et item praecedit in aliis peccatoribus quo digni sunt obtusione). The calling of individuals and of whole nations belongs to those high and deep things which man does not understand if he is not spiritually minded. But it must be always maintained that God does nothing unrighteous, and that there is no being who does not owe everything to God. The more Augustine advanced in a deeper perception of faith, the more he recognized it as a living principle, and not as a mere faith of authority, and he acquired a stronger conviction that faith presupposed a divine operation in the soul of man, and that the Bible referred it to divine agency. He was now easily impelled to the other extreme, and to give a one-sided prominence to the divine factor in faith. Resignation to God became his ruling principle, and. looking back at his earlier life, he learned more and more to trace everything to his training by divine grace. He now allowed the conditioning element of free human susceptibility to vanish altogether. That theodicy now appeared to him untenable, which made the attainment of faith by individuals or nations, or their remaining strangers to the Gospel, dependent on their worthiness and the divine prescience; in opposition to this view, he now sought for a foundation in the secret absolute decrees of God, according to which one was chosen and another not. This view was confirmed by the opinion prevalent in the North African Church, that outward baptism was essential to salvation. He now inquired how it was that one child received baptism and another not, and this seemed to confirm the unconditionality of the divine predestination. The alteration in his mode of thinking occupied perhaps a space of four years. In the *diversae questiones ad Simplicianum,* written about A.D. 397, this is shown most decidedly, as he himself says in his treatise *de dono perseverantice* that he had then arrived at the perception that even the beginning of faith was the gift of God. In that work (lib. 1, questio 2) he derives all good in man from the divine agency; from the words of Paul, ‘What hast thou that thou hast not received?’ (⁴⁶⁰⁷1 Corinthians 4:7), he infers that nothing can come from man himself. ‘How can it be explained,’ he asks, ‘that the Gospel reaches one man and not another? and that even the same dispensations act quite differently on different persons? It belongs to God to furnish the means which lead every man to believe; consequently, the reason of the difference can only be that,

according to his own decree, it seems good to withhold it from one and not from another. All men, in consequence of the first transgression, are exposed to perdition; in this state there can be no higher movement, therefore none at all, in them toward conversion. But God, out of compassion, chooses some to whom he imparts divine grace, *gratia efficax*, which operates upon them in an irresistible manner, but yet in accordance with their rational nature, so that they cannot do otherwise than follow it. The rest he leaves to their merited perdition.' From the preceding remarks it is clear that Augustine reached the standpoint fixed by his own experience; and we perceive how false it is that his system in this form was derived from his excessive opposition to Pelagianism, since it had been formed ten years before his conflict with it. We might rather affirm of Pelagius that he would not have developed his doctrine in its actual form had he not been opposed to Augustine."

In the year 412 Augustine began to write against the doctrines of PELAGIUS, a native of Britain, who had resided for a considerable time at Rome, and acquired universal esteem by the purity of his manners, his piety, and his erudition. In the defense of his opinions Pelagius was seconded by Celestius, a man equally eminent for his talents and his virtues. Their principles were propagated rapidly, and were speedily transplanted to almost every corner of Christendom. If the brief notices which have come down to us respecting their tenets, in the writings of their adversaries, be correct, they

(1) denied the regeneration of infants in baptism and the damnation of all unbaptized infants;

(2) they denied that Adam's sin was imputed to his posterity, and went so far as to reject original sin entirely;

(3) they asserted the freedom of the will, and its capacity for good without supernatural grace.

"It is not," they said, "*free* will if it requires the aid of God; because every one has it within the power of his own will to do any thing, or not to do it. Our victory over sin and Satan proceeds not from the help which God affords, but is owing to our own free will. The unrestricted capability of men's own free will is amply sufficient for all these things, and therefore no necessity exists for asking of God those things which we are able of ourselves to obtain; the gifts of grace being only necessary to enable men

to do that more easily and completely which yet they could do themselves though more slowly and with greater difficulty, seeing that they are perfectly free creatures." These opinions were assailed by St. Augustine and St. Jerome, as well as by Orosius, a Spanish presbyter, and they were condemned as heresies in the Council of Carthage and in that of Milevis. In his eagerness to confute these opponents, St. Augustine employed language so strong as made it susceptible of an interpretation wholly at variance with the accountability of man. This led to farther explanations and modifications of his sentiments, which were multiplied when the Semi-Pelagians arose, who thought that the truth lay between his doctrines and those of the Pelagians. Concerning original sin, he maintained that it was derived from our first parents; and he believed he had ascertained in what the original sin conveyed by Adam to his posterity consisted. In his sentiments, however, upon the latter point he was rather inconsistent, at one time asserting that the essence of original sin was concupiscence, and at another expressing doubts respecting his own position. This subject was bequeathed as a legacy to the schoolmen of a subsequent age, who exercised their subtle wits upon all its ramifications down to the period of the Council of Trent. On the consequences of the fall of our first parents, St. Augustine taught that by it human nature was totally corrupted, and deprived of all inclination and ability to do good. Before the age in which he lived, the early fathers held what, in the language of systematic theology, is termed the synergistic system, or the needfulness of human co-operation in the works of holiness; but, though the freedom of the will was not considered by them as excluding or rendering unnecessary the grace of God, yet much vagueness is perceptible in the manner in which they express themselves. In fact, there was no scientific view as yet on these topics. Those early divines generally used the language of Scripture, the fertile invention of controversial writers not having as yet displayed itself, except on the divine nature of Jesus Christ, and subsidiary terms and learned distinctions not being then required by any great differences of opinion. But as soon as Pelggius broached his errors, the attention of Christians was naturally turned to the investigation of the doctrine of grace. The personal experience of Augustine, coinciding with the views of the great body of the Christian Church, admitted the necessity of divine grace, or the influence of the Holy Spirit, for our obedience to the law of God. He ascribed the renovation of our moral constitution wholly to this grace, denied all cooperation of man with it for answering the end to be accomplished, and represented it as irresistible. He farther affirmed that it

was given only to a certain portion of the human race, to those who showed the fruits of it in their sanctification, and that it secured the perseverance of all upon whom it was bestowed. His view of predestination has been summed up as follows:

1. That God from all eternity decreed to create mankind holy and good.

2. That he foresaw man, being tempted by Satan, would fall into sin, if God did not hinder it; he decreed not to hinder.

3. That out of mankind, seen fallen into sin and misery, he chose a certain number to raise to righteousness and to eternal life, and rejected the rest, leaving them in their sins.

4. That for these his chosen he decreed to send his Son to redeem them, and his Spirit to call them and sanctify them; the rest he decreed to forsake, leaving them to Satan and themselves, and to punish them for their sins.

After Augustine had thus almost newly-molded the science of theology, and had combined with it, as an essential part of divine truth, that the fate of men was determined by the divine decree independently of their own effirts and conduct, and that they were thus divided into the elect and reprobate, it became necessary, in order to preserve consistency to introduce into his system a limitation with respect to baptism, and to preserve the opinions concerning it from interfering with those which flowed from the doctrine of predestination. He accordingly taught that baptismn brings with it the forgiveness of sins; that it is so essential that the omission of it will expose us to condemnation; and that it is attended with regeneration. He also affirmed that the virtue of baptism is not in the water; that the ministers of Christ perform the external ceremony, but that Christ accompanies it with invisible grace; that baptism is common to all, while grace is not so; and that the same external rite may be death to some and life to others. By this distinction he rids himself of the difficulty which would have pressed upon his scheme of theology, had pardon, regeneration, and salvation been *necessarily* connected with the outward ordinance of baptism, and limits its proper efficacy to those who are comprehended, as the heirs of eternal life, in the decree of the Almighty. Many, however, of those who strictly adhere to him in other parts of his doctrinal system desert him at this point. *SEE PELAGIANISM*. His honest anxiety for the honor of the grace of God led him to overlook the human

side of the question, and to make the operation of grace more like physical necessity than moral influence. The traces of his Manichaean habit of thought appear plainly here. “Here,” says Kling, in his excellent article on Augustine in Herzog’s *Real-Encyklopadie* (1, 623), “is a weak side in Augustine’s system. In the attempt of his fiery and impulsive intellect to give fixity and stability to the doctrine of Christian anthropology, and to leave no room in his system for self-righteousness, he fell into the labyrinth of unconditional predestination, implying a dualism in the Divine will which has never gained the mind of the Christian Church as a correct interpretation of Scripture as a whole. In fact, the system has been a stumbling-block in the church from Augustine’s time till now. As for the better part of Augustine’s doctrine, which is, in fact, its true essence, viz. that the entire glory of the renewal of human nature is due to divine grace, and is due in no respect whatever to mere human ability, because the consequences of the fall have left that nature incapable of renewal except by a divine power of renovation, this doctrine has penetrated the heart and intellect of the church, and has found expression in her creeds and confessions in all ages.” *SEE AUGUSTINISM*.

The *Donatist* controversy was one of the bitterest waged by Augustine, and was, perhaps, on the whole, the least honorable to him. Before this controversy, and even during the earlier period of it, he had always treated heretics with mildness and charity, and opposed the passage of several laws against the Donatists. “But at a later period, after the Donatists had made alarming progress among the African churches, the urgent representations of his colleagues caused a radical change of his views. He became the most ardent advocate of the compulsory suppression of every heresy, and he based this shocking theory on the passage in Luke 14, where the master of a house, after the invited guests have declined to come, orders the servants to bring in the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind, from the streets and lanes of the city, and, when there was yet room, to ‘go out into the highways and hedges, and *compel them to come* in.’ This interpretation by a church father so profoundly revered, has been, in all following centuries, the source of incalculable mischief. It is one of the principal weapons with which ecclesiastical and royal despots have attempted to justify the murder of millions on the charge of heresy. Even men like Bossuet were induced, by the weight of Augustine’s authority, to advocate compulsory measures against heretics” (Neander, *Church History, 3,* 197-217; Flottes, *Etudes sur Saint Augustin,* Paris, 1862).

St. Augustine's works have been printed in a collected form repeatedly: at Paris, in 10 vols. folio, 1532; by Erasmus, from Frobenius's press, 10 vols. folio, 1540-43; by the divines of Louvain, 10 vols. folio, Lugd. 1586; and by the Benedictines of the congregation of St. Maur, 10 vols. folio, Paris, 1679-1700, 12 vols. folio, 1688-1703, and 12 vols. folio, Antwerp, 1700-1703; reprinted, Paris, 1836-39, 11 vols. 4to. The latest edition (not the best) is that of the Benedictines, edited by Migne (Paris, 1842, 15 vols. imp. 8vo). A review of his literary activity is given by Busch, *Librorum Augustini recensus* (Dorpat. 1826). Of his separate works many editions have been published. The Benedictine edition gives a copious *Life* of Augustine; and the 13th vol. of Tillemont's *Mesmoires pour servier l'Histoire Ecclesiastique* is a 4to of 1075 pages devoted entirely to his biography. Dupin *(Eccles. Writers)* gives a copious and minute analysis of all of Augustine's works. English versions of the *Confessions,* and of the *Expositions* of the *Gospels* and *Psalms,* may be found in the *Library of the Fathers* (Oxf. 1839-1855). A translation of the *Confessions,* with an introduction by Prof. Shedd, has also been published at Andover (1860). M. Poujoulat, the author of a *Life* of St. Augustine and numerous other works, has commenced (1864), in connection with abbe Raulx, a translation of the complete works of St. Augustine. The translators claim that this is the first complete French translation of the great church father. The work will be completed in twelve volumes *(Saint Augustin; CEuvres Completes).* Recent editions of the *De Ciitate Dei* have been published by Bruder (Leipsic, 1838) and Strange (Cologne, 1850); of the *Confessiones,* by Bruder (Leipsic, 1837), Pusey (Oxford, 1838), Raumer (Stuttgart, 1856); of the *AMelitationes,* by Sintzel (Sulzbach, 1844) and Westhoff (Mainster, 1854). German translations of the *Confessiones* have been published by Rapp (3d edition, Stuttgart, 1856), Groninger (4th edit. Minster, 1859), and by several anonymous translators (Passau, 6th edit. 1856; Ratisbon, 1853; Reutlingen, 1858); and of the *City of God,* by Silbert (1825, 2 vols.) — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:354, 564; *Hist. of Dogmnas,* vol. 1, *pdssia;* Mozley, *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination* (Lond. 1855); Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 110, 156; Wigoers, *History of Augustinianism and Pelagianism* (vol. 1 trans. by Emerson, And. 1840, 8vo); Schaff, *Life and Labors of Augustine* (N. Y. 1854, 12mo); Bohringer, *Kircheng. in Biogqraphien,* I, pt. 3, 99 sq.; Kloth, *Der heil. Kirchenlehrer Augustinus* (Aachen, 1840); Bindemann, *Des' heil. Augustinus* (Berlin, 1844); Poujoulat, *Histoire de St. Augustin* (Paris, 1844, 3 vols.); Shedd, *History of Doctrines,* bk. 4; *Am. Bib. Repos.* 5, 195;

Meth. Qu. Rev. 1857, 352 sq.; *Princeton Rev.* July, 1862, art. in; Watson, *Dictionary*, s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.*. vol. 1; Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, 1, 231; *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie*, 1862; *Church Review*, July, 1863, 316.

Augustine

(or AUSTIN), first archbishop of Canterbury, was a monk of the Benedictine monastery of St. Andrew, at Rome, and was sent by Pope Gregory, who had been prior of that convent, soon after his accession to the papal throne, as a missionary into England, together with forty companions, also Benedictines, A.D. 596 (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 23). Augustine and his company became discouraged, and Augustine was dispatched back to Rome to obtain the pope's leave for their return; but Gregory disregarded his remonstrances, and, providing him with new letters of protection, commanded him to proceed. Augustine and his companions landed late in 596 in the isle of Thanet, whence they sent messengers to Ethelbert, king of Kent, to inform him of the object of their mission. Ethelbert's queen, Bertha, daughter of Cherebert, king of the Parisii, was a Christian, and by the articles of her marriage (as early as 570) had the free exercise of her religion allowed her. Ethelbert ordered the missionaries at first to continue in the isle of Thanet, but some time after came to them and invited them to an audience in the open air. Although he refused at first to abandon the gods of his fathers, he allowed them to preach without molestation, and assigned them a residence in Canterbury, then called Dorobernia, which they entered in procession, singing hymns. After the conversion and baptism of the king himself, they received license to preach in any part of his dominions, which Bede assures us (c. 25) extended (probably over tributary kingdoms) as far as the river Humber, and proselytes were now made in remarkable numbers. — In 597, Augustine, by direction of Pope Gregory, went over to Aries, in France, where he was consecrated archbishop, and metropolitan of the English nation, by the archbishop of that place; after which, returning into Britain, he sent Lawrence, the presbyter, and Peter, the monk, to Rome, to acquaint the pope with the success of his mission, and to desire his solution of certain questions respecting church discipline, the maintenance of the clergy, etc. which Bede (1. 1, c. 27) has reported at length in the form of interrogatories and answers. Gregory sent over more missionaries, and directed him to constitute a bishop at York, who might have other subordinate bishops, yet in such a manner that Augustine of Canterbury

should be metropolitan of all England. Augustine now made an attempt to establish uniformity of discipline in the island, and, as a necessary step, to gain over the Welsh bishops to his opinion. For this purpose a conference was held in Worcestershire, at a place since called Augustine's Oak, where the archbishop endeavored to persuade the prelates to make one communion, and assist in preaching to the unconverted Saxons; but neither this, nor a second conference, in which he threatened divine vengeance in case of non-obedience, was successful. After Augustine's death, Ethelfrid, king of Northumberland, marched with an army to Caerleon, and near twelve hundred monks of Bangor were put to the sword. In the year 604 Augustine consecrated two of his companions, Mellitus and Justus, the former to the see of London, the latter to that of Rochester. He died at Canterbury, probably in 607, but the date of his death is variously given from 604 to 614. The observation of the festival of St. Augustine was first enjoined in a synod held under Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury (Gervase, *Act. Pontff. Cantuar.* Script. 10, col. 1641), and afterward by the pope's bull in the reign of Edward III. See Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 1 and 2; Gregorius, *Epistolc,* 1. 7, ep. 5, 30; 1. 9, ep. 56; Joan Diacon. *Vita S. Greg.;* Stanley, *Memorials of Canterbury* (London, 1855); *Acta Sanctorum,* Mensis Maii, 6, 378; *English Cyclopcedia;* Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3, 11-18; Smith, *Religion of Ancient Britain,* ch. 10. *SEE ENGLAND*, CHURCH OF.

Augustinian Monks

Picture for Augustinian Monks

are divided into two classes:

I. CANONS REGULAR. — In the year 1038, four canons of the Church of Avignon, called Arnaldus, Odelo, Pontius, and Durandus, being desirous of leading a more strictly religious life, betook themselves, with the permission of the bishop Benedict, to a solitude, where they led an ascetic life; and having thus originally been under the *canonical* institution before the *monastic,* they acquired the name of "regular canons." A large number of canons, both lay and clerical, induced by their example, set themselves to follow this new rule of life, and ere long monasteries were built in various places, but chiefly in solitudes, and filled with these new candidates for the regular life, who differed from the monks in name only. At first they appear to have had no rule peculiar to themselves, and probably followed

that of Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 816); but subsequently they assumed for their rule that of Augustine (i.e. his letter *ad Sanctimoniales),* adding to it various constitutions taken from the rule of Benedict and elsewhere. Stevens says that they did not take any vows until the twelfth century, nor do they appear to have assumed the name of "Regular Canons of St. Augustine" until Innocent II, at Lateran, in 1139, ordained that all regular canons should be under the rule of St. Augustine, contained in his 109th epistle. The dress of the regular canons was usually a long black cassock, and a white rochet over it, and over that a black cloak and hood; they also wore beards and caps. They were a numerous body in England, where they were probably first settled at Colchester in 1105. They are said to have had 170 houses in-England. — They were established in Scotland in 1114, at the desire of Alexander I, and had in that country 28 monasteries, of which the chief were Scone, Loch Tay, Inch Colme, St. Andrew's, Holyrood, Cambuskenneth, and Jedburgh. — Dugdale, Mo*nasticon,* 6, 37.

II. HERMITS, one of the four great mendicant orders, *SEE MENDICANT ORDERS*, of the Roman Catholic Church. The Augustinians endeavor to trace their origin back to the time when St. Augustine, after his conversion, lived for three years in a villa near Tagaste, wholly given up to ascetic exercises. But even the Romanist historians generally reject this claim as utterly without foundation. The order originated in 1256, when Pope Alexander IV, in pursuance of a decree, compelled eight minor monastic congregations, among which the John-Bonites (founded in 1168 by John Bon), the Brittinians, and the Tuscan hermits were the most important, to unite. The united order was called the *Hermits of St. Augustine,* because most of the congregations followed the *Rule of Augustine,* a compilation of precepts taken from two sermons of St. Augustine on the morals of priests and from his letter to the nuns of Hippo. Though now monks, they retained the name hermits, because all the congregations had been hermits. In 1257 they were exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and divided into four provinces, Italy, Spain, France, and Germany. Unlike the other mendicant orders, they started with a lax rule, and gross disorders and immorality grew up among them sooner and more generally than among the others.

Since the fourteenth century many attempts at introducing a stricter discipline have been made by zealous members, and have resulted in the formation of a large number of *special congregations,* of which the congregation of Lombardy, with 86 convents, became the most numerous.

The congregation of Saxony, which was established in 1493, and with which the convents of Germany generally connected themselves, separated itself entirely from the order, and its superior, John Staupitz, assumed the title of vicar-general. Among the friends of Staupitz was MARTIN LUTHER, the most celebrated of all who ever wore the habit of Augustine, and through whose influence the majority of the convents of the Saxon congregation seceded from the Roman Catholic Church.

Augustinians, The Discalceated Or Barefooted

(Observants, Recollects) owe their origin to the Portuguese monk Thomas a Jesu de Andrade (died in 1582), though their first convent was not organized until after his death, in 1588, by order of the king of Spain. They adopted a rule which in strictness surpasses the primitive one, and were afterward divided into three separate congregations, the Italian-German, until 1656, in four provinces, subsequently in seven (2 of Naples, 2 of Sicily, 1 of Genoa, 1 of Germany, 1 of Piedmont), the French in three provinces, and the Spanish, the most rigorous of all, which extended to the East and West Indies, to the Philippine Islands, to Japan and Rome. They have in every province a retired convent, with a hermitage close by, in which monks desirous of a particular ascetic perfection may live.

In the sixteenth century, when Pius V conferred on them the privileges of the other mendicant orders, the Augustinians counted 2000 convents of men and 300 of females, together with 35,000 inmates. The order has fallen in the general suppression of convents in Portugal, Spain, France, Northern and Western Germany, and quite recently in Italy. At the beginning of 1860, the Augustinian Hermits had 131 convents in Italy, 10 in Germany, 6 in Poland, 1 in France, 13 in Great Britain, 1 in Holland, 2 in Belgium, 22 in Mexico, 2 in the United States (in the dioceses of Philadelphia and Albany), 13 in South America, and 1 in the Philippine Islands. The Barefooted Augustinians had 6 monasteries in Italy, 1 in Germany, 2 in South America, and 6 in the Philippine Islands.

The Augustinians have never been able to gain the same importance as the other mendicant orders, and at present they exert no great influence in the Church of Rome. The most remarkable men, besides Luther, which the order has produced, are Onuphrius Panvini (of the sixteenth century), Cardinal Norris, Abraham a Santa Clara, and Ludovicus Leon. The constitution, which was established at the general chapters of 1287, 1290, 1575, and especially at that of 1580, is aristocratic. The general chapters,

which assemble every sixth year, elect a prior-general, and may depose him. His power is limited by the *definitores,* who, as his councillors, reside with him. Every province has a provincial, four definitores, and one or several visitatores. Every convent has a prior. The Discalceated Augustinians have their vicar-generals, while the general of the order is taken from the calceated (conventuals).

The sources of information are Bingham, *Orig, Eccles.* book 7; Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum,* 6; Fehr's *Geschichte der Mnchsorden;* Helyoot, *Ordres Religieux,* 1, 288 sq., with the authorities cited there, especially N. Crusenii *Mosasticon Augustinianum* (1623); St. Martin, *Vie de St. Augustin,* etc. (Toulouse, 1641); Osingeri *Bibliotheca Augustina* (Ingolstadt, 1768, fol.); Zungo, *Historiae Can. Reg. August. Prodromius* (Ratisb. 1742, 2 vols. fol.); P. Karl vom heil. Aloys, *Jahrbuch der Kirche* (Regensb. 1860); Migne, *Dictionnaire des Ordres Religieur,* tom. 4 (Paris, 1859).

Augustinian Nuns

a religious order of the Roman Catholic Church following the rule of Augustine. Like the Augustinian monks, they have claimed Augustine as founder, without, however, any historical proofs. They partly form congregations under the guidance of the Augustinian monks, and partly are placed under the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishops. Congregations of Discalceated or Barefooted Augustinian nuns were founded in 1589, 1597, and 1604 in Spain, and one about the same time in Portugal by Queen Louisa, wife of John IV. The most recent congregation of Augustinian nuns is that called *Augustines de l'Interieur de Marie,* established on Oct. 14, 1829. It had, in 1839, only one house, at Grand Montrouge. In 1860 the Augustinian nuns had, altogether 42 establishments in France, and a few others in Italy, Switzerland, Prussia, Spain, Holland and Belgium, Poland, Canada (at Quebec), and South America. The sources of information are the same as those mentioned at the close of the preceding article. See also Migne, *Diet. des Ordres Religieux,* tom. 4, p. 105-116.

Augustinism

the theological system of St. Augustine, as developed in opposition to Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism. "Augustine considered the human race as a compact mass, a collective body, responsible in its unity and solidarity. Carrying out his system in all its logical consequences, he laid down the

following rigid proposition as his doctrine: ‘As all men have sinned in Adam; they are subject to the condemnation of God on account of this hereditary sin and the guilt thereof’” (Smith’s Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, 1, 299). Wiggers *(Augustinisnm and Pelagianism,* p. 268) gives the following summary view of the theological system of Augustine:

I. *Infant Baptism.* — The baptism of infants as well as adults is for the forgiveness of sin. Children have, indeed, committed no actual sins, yet by original sin they are under the power of the devil, from which they are freed by baptism. Hence Christian children who die before baptism no more escape positive punishment in the future life than do all who are not Christians.

II. *Original Sin.* — By Adam’s sin, in whom all men jointly sinned together, sin, and the other positive punishments of Adam’s sin, came into the world. By it human nature has been both physically and morally corrupted. Every man brings into the world with him a nature already so corrupt that he can do nothing but sin. The propagation of this quality of his nature is by concupiscence.

III. *Free Will.* — By Adam’s transgression, the freedom of the human will has been entirely lost. In his present corrupt state, man can will and do only evil.

IV. *Grace.* — If nevertheless man, in his present state, wills and does good, it is merely the work of grace. It is an inward, secret, and wonderful operation of God upon man. It is a preceding as well as an accompanying work. By preceding grace, man attains faith, by which he comes into an insight of good, and by which power is given him to will the good. He needs co-operating grace for the performance of every individual good act. As man can do nothing without grace, so he can do nothing against it. It is irresistible. And as man by nature has no merit at all, no respect at all can be had to man’s moral disposition in imparting grace, but God acts according to his own free will. V. *Predestination and Redemption.* — From eternity God made a free and unconditional decree to save a few from the mass that was corrupted and subjected to damnation. To those whom he predestinated to this salvation, he gives the requisite means for the purpose. But on the rest, who do not belong to this small number of the elect, the merited ruin falls. Christ came into the *world and died* for the elect only.

These are the principles of Augustinism. Its anthropological principle, of the native corruption of man, and of his utter incapacity to do good apart from divine grace, has remained fixed in the church to this day. Pelagius maintained, on the contrary, that "every man, in respect to his moral nature, is born in precisely the same condition in which Adam was created, and has the capacity of willing and doing good without God's special aid. It was Augustine's mission to enunciate clearly and to fix forever the Christian doctrine as to the condition of *human nature* in its fallen state. But the anxiety of Augustine to save the divine glory in the work of man's salvation led him to the doctrine of unconditional election and predestination — a doctrine to which the mind and heart of the church, as a whole, has never acceded. It has been a stumbling-block from Augustine's day until now. But Augustine, in his combat against Pelagius, was entirely successful. The church of his times sided with him, and Pelagius and his adherents were condemned by a number of synods, and by Zosimus, the bishop of Rome. After the death of Augustine, the controversy about the chief points of his system continued for a long time to agitate the entire church. The General Synod of Ephesus (431) condemned the Pelagians, together with the Nestorians; yet, on the whole, the Greek Church did not take any real interest in the controversy, and never adopted the doctrines of absolute predestination and irresistible grace. In Africa and Rome a tendency to Augustinism prevailed; and at the synods of Arausio (Orange) and Valentia (529) a decision was obtained in favor of the exclusive operation of divine grace, although predestination was evidently evaded. In Gaul Augustinism did not exercise the same influence; and although the authority of Augustine was too great to permit an open opposition to his system, Semi-Pelagian tendencies seemed to be for a long time in the ascendency.

The authority of Augustine's name remained unimpaired, although his peculiar doctrines were but little understood by the church of the Middle Ages. The first important controversy concerning Augustinism was that called forth by the monk Gottschalk (q.v.), who in the most decided forms of expression announced the doctrine of a double predestination, founded upon the absolute foreknowledge of God, according to which some were devoted to life, and others were consigned to destruction. Gottschalk, who pretended to be a strict follower of Augustine, was condemned by the Synod of Mayence (848), and died in prison (868). His doctrine was a development, not of the good side of Augustinism, viz. its anthropology,

but of the false side, viz. its view of the relations between God and man in the work of salvation. Augustine maintained unconditional election, but not reprobation; he held that God chose from the *massa perditionis* such and such persons to be saved, because he pleased to choose them, and for no other reason whatever; while the rest were lost, not because God chose to damn them, but because they were sinners. Gottschalk was the first to announce in clear terms the doctrine of the divine reprobation of sinners, i.e. that they are damned, not simply because of their sins, but because of God's decree to damn them, for no other reason than because it pleased him so to do. In the subsequent centuries, the rise of scholasticism and mysticism, and the controversy between these two systems, diverted the attention of the church from Augustinism. Anselm, Peter Lombard, and Thomas Aquinas endeavored to retain Augustine's doctrine of an unconditional election, though with many limitations. The current of theological opinion in the church in general was in a direction toward Pelagianism, and the learned Thomist, Thomas de Bradwardina (q.v.), a professor at Oxford, and subsequently archbishop at Canterbury (d. 1349), charged the whole age with having adopted Pelagianism. On the whole, the Thomists claimed to stand on the same ground as Augustine; yet, while they regarded original sin as a culpable offense, and divine grace as predestination, they nevertheless believed that man has some remnants of power by which he may make himself worthy of divine favor *(meritum e congruo),* and regarded divine grace as dependent upon divine foreknowledge. The Scotists (adherents of Duns Scotus), on the other hand, described both original sin and grace as rather the invariable condition of all men, and as developments of the spiritual world in the course of Providence. As Thomas was a Dominican and Duns Scotus a Franciscan, the controversy between Thomists and Scotists on the subject of original sin and divine grace gradually became a controversy between the two orders of mendicant friars. After the Reformation, the Jesuits, in accordance with the moral system of their school, adopted the views of the Scotists. Augustinism found very zealous champions in the professors of the University of Louvain. One of them, Baius (q.v.), was denounced by the Franciscans to Pope Pius V, who in 1567 condemned 79 propositions extracted from the writings of Baius, a sentence which was confirmed by Gregory XIII (1579). In return, the theological faculty of Louvain censured 34 propositions in the works of the Jesuits Less and Hamel, as opposed to the teachings of St. Augustine, and to the absolute authority of the Scriptures. As the controversy waxed very warm, Sixtus V forbade its

continuance; but when this proved fruitless, a committee (the celebrated *congregatio de auxiliis*) was appointed by Clement VIII for the full decision of the question, “In what way is the assistance of divine grace concerned in the conversion of the sinner?” The congregation was, however, dismissed in 1607, without having accomplished its object, and the antagonism between the Augustinian school and its opponents continued as before. An elaborate representation of the Augustinian and Pelagian systems was given by Bishop Jansenius, of Ypres, in his work *Augustinus s. doctrina Augustini de humanae naturae sanitate, cegritudine, et medicina adversus Pelagium et Massilienses,* which was published after the death of the author, and gave rise to the celebrated Jansenist controversy, and to the exclusion of the Jansenists from the church. *SEE JANSENIUS* and *SEE JANSENISTS*. The condemnation of Jansenius and the Jansenists did, however, not terminate the controversy in the Roman Catholic Church concerning the Augustinian theology, though the subsequent history of the controversy is not marked by any prominent event. But the Roman Catholic Church, as a whole, rejects that part of Augustinism which teaches absolute predestination (see Mohler, *Symbolism,* ch. 3, § 10).

Some of the forerunners of the Reformation during the Middle Ages, as Wickliffe and Savonarola, were strict Augustinians; but others, e.g. Wessel, urged the necessity of a free appropriation of divine grace on the part of man as a *conditio sine qua non.* Luther was an Augustinian monk; and, as a reformer, he was at first confirmed in his Augustinian views by the contests which he had to maintain against the doctrine of the meritoriousness of works. But there is reason to believe that, in common with Melancthon, he modified his views as to absolute predestination; and, under the guidance of Melancthon, the Lutheran Church has avoided the strict consequences of the Augustinian system by asserting that the decrees of God are conditional. Calvin was a strict Augustinian, and even went beyond Augustine, by maintaining reprobation. He, and the early reformed theologians generally, in their religious controversies, not only admitted all the consequences of the Augustinian system, but, having once determined the idea of predestination, went beyond the premises so far as to maintain that the fall of man was itself predestinated by God (supralapsarianism). This view, however, did not meet with much approbation, and was at last almost entirely abandoned. In opposition to the ultra Augustinian views, Arminius, admitting Augustine’s anthropology, defined the true doctrine of

the relations between God and man in the work of salvation. In Germany, the Rationalists and the school of Speculative Philosophy discarded Augustinism, while the Pietists, and other theologians who returned to the old faith of the church, and (though with various modifications) the followers of Schleiermacher, revived it in its essential points. At present, hardly one of the great theologians of Germany holds the extreme Augustinian doctrine of absolute predestination.

The first good work on the Augustinian system was written by Wiggers, *Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Avgustinismus und Pelagianismus* (Berlin, 1821; Hamlurg, 1833, vol. 1 translated by Prof. Emerson, Andover, 1840, 8vo). See also Gangauf, *Psychologie des heil. Augustinus* (Augsb. 1852). More philo, sophical than theological, yet of great value for the history of the theological system of Augustine, is the work of Nourrisson on "The Philosophy of St. Augustine" *(La Philosophie de Saint Augustin,"* Par. 1865, 2 vols.). 'This work received a prize from the French *A cadmie des Sciences Morales et Politiques.* The first volume contains a memoir of the bishop, and a detailed exposition of his philosophical views; the second gives an account of the sources from which Augustine borrowed his ideas, an estimate of the influence which the Augustinian theories exercised, especially during the seventh century, and a critical discussion of the Augustinian theories. *SEE ARMINIANISM*; *SEE AUGUSTINE*.

Augustus

Picture for Augustus 1

(*venerable,* Graecized Αὔγουστος.), the imperial title assumed by Octavius, or Octavianus, the successor of Julius Caesar, and the first peacefully acknowledged emperor of Rome. He was emperor at the birth and during half the lifetime of our Lord (B.C. 30 to A.D. 14), but his name occurs only once (Luke 2:1) in the New Testament, as the emperor who appointed the enrolment in consequence of which Joseph and Mary went to Bethlehem, the place where the Messiah was to be born. *SEE JESUS*. The successors of the first Augustus took the same name or title, but it is seldom applied to them by the Latin writers. In the eastern part of the empire the Greek Σεβαστός (which is equivalent) seems to have been more common, and hence is used of Nero (Acts 25:21). In later times (after Diocletian) the title of "Augustus" was given to one of the two heirs-

apparent of the empire, and “Caesar” to their younger colleagues and heirs-apparent.

Picture for Augustus 2

Augustus was descended from the Octavian family (gens Octavia), being the son of a certain praetor, Caius Octavius, and born in the year of Rome 691, B.C. 62 (Sueton. *Octav.* 5). His mother was Atia, daughter of Julia, the sister of C. Julius Caesar. He bore the same name as his father, Caius Octavius. Being adopted and educated by his great uncle Julius Caesar, he changed his name from Octavius to that of Caius Julius Caesar Octavianus (i.e. ex-Octavius), in accordance with Roman usage. After the assassination of Caesar, he went, although still a youth, into Italy, and soon acquired such political connections and importance (Suet. *Ces.* 83 sq.; *Octav.* 8) that Antony and Lepidus took him into their triumvirate (Suet. *Octav.* 13). After the removal of the weak Lepidus, he shared with Antony the chief power over the entire Roman empire, having special charge of the western provinces, as Antony did over the eastern (Suet. *Octav.* 16, 54; Appian. *Civ.* 5, 122 sq.). But there was no cordial union between these two ambitious men; their opposition gradually developed itself, and soon reached its crisis in the decisive naval battle of Actium (B.C. 31), in which Octavius was victor (Suet. *Octav.* 17; Dio Cass . 1.5 sq.; Vell. Paterc. 2:85). Two years afterward he was greeted as “emperor” (imperator) by the senate, and somewhat later (B.C. 27), when he desired voluntarily to receive the supreme power, as “Augustus” (Vell. Paterc. 2:91; Dio Cass. 53:16). Liberality toward the army, moderation toward the senate, which he allowed to retain the semblance of its ancient authority, affability and clemency toward the populace, strengthened the supremacy which Augustus, uniting in his own person the highest offices of the republic, maintained with imperial power, but without a regal title. To Herod, who had attached himself to the party of Antony, he was unexpectedly gracious, instated him as king of Judaea (“rex Judaeorum,” Joseph. *Ant.* 15, 7, 3), raising also somewhat later his brother Pheroras to the tetrarchate (Joseph. *Ant.* 15, 10, 3). In thankfulness for these favors, Herod built him a marble temple near the source of the Jordan (Joseph. *Ant.* 15, 10, 3), and remained during his whole life affirm adherent of the imperial family. After the death of Herod (A.D. 4) his dominions, almost in exact accordance with the will which he left, were divided among his sons (Joseph. *Ant.* 17, 11, 4) by Augustus, who was soon compelled, however (A.D. 6), to exile one of them, Archelaus, and to join his territory of Judaea and Samaria to their

rovincce of Syria (Joseph. *Ant.* 22, 13, 2). Augustus died in the 76th year of his age at Nola in Campania, August 19, in the year of Rome 767 (see Wurm, in Belgel's *Archiv*, 2, 8 sq.), or A.D. 14 (Suet. *Octav.* 99 sq.; Dio Cass. 56:29 sq.; Joseph. *Ant.* 18; 3, 2; *War*, 2, 9, 1), having some time previously nominated Tiberius as his associate (Suet. *Tib.* 21; Tacit. *Annal.* 1, 3). The kindness of Augustus toward the Herods, and the Jews through them (Philo, 2:588, 591, 592), was founded, not upon any regard for the Jewish people themselves (as the contrary appears to have been the case with all the Roman emperors, Suet. *Octav.* 93), but upon political considerations, and, as it would seem, a personal esteem for Herod. Augustus not only procured the crown of Judaea for Herod, whom he loaded with honors and riches, but was pleased also to undertake the education of Alexander and Aristobulus, his sons, to whom he gave apartments in his palace. When he came into Syria, Zenodorus and the Gadarenes waited on him with complaints against Herod; but he cleared himself of the accusations, and Augustus added to his honors and kingdom the tetrarchy of Zenodorus. He also examined into the quarrels between Herod and his sons, and reconciled them. *SEE HEROD*. Syllaeus, minister to Obodas, king of the Nabathaeans, having accused Herod of invading Arabia, and destroying many people there, Augustus, in anger, wrote to Herod about it; but he so well justified his conduct that the emperor restored him to favor, and continued it ever after. He disapproved, however, of the rigor exercised by Herod toward his sons, Alexander, Aristobulus, and Antipater; and when they were executed he is said to have observed "that it were better a great deal to be Herod's swine than his son" (Macrob. *Saturn.* 2, 4). It was through the warm attachment of Augustus for M. Vipsanius Agrippa that the latter was enabled to exercise a strong influence in favor of the Jews. *SEE AGRIPPA*. After the death of Lepidus, Augustus assumed the office of high-priest, a dignity which gave him the inspection over ceremonies and religious concerns. One of his first proceedings was an examination of the Sibyls' books, many of which he burnt, and placed the others in two gold boxes under the pedestal of Apollo's statue, whose temple was within the enclosure of the palace. This is worthy of note, if these prophecies had excited a general expectation of some great person about that time to be born, as there is-reason to suppose was the fact. It should be remembered, also, that Augustus had the honor to shut the temple of Janus, in token of universal peace, at the time when the Prince of Peace was born. This is remarkable, because that temple was shut but a very few times. For further details of the life of Augustus, see

Smith's *Dict. of Biog.* s.v. On the question whether this emperor had any knowledge respecting Christ, there are treatises by Hasse (Regiom. 1805), Hering (Stettin, 1727), Kiber (Gerl. 1669), Sperling (Viteb. 1703), Ziebich (Gera, 1718, and in his *Verm. Beitr.* 1, 3), Zorn *(Opusc.* 2, 481 sq.).

Augustus' Band

(σπειρὴ Σεβαστή) *S-Eaa* r, the *Augistan cohort),* the title of the body of Roman imperial troops to which the centurion who had charge of Paul on his voyage to Rome belonged (Acts 27:1). *SEE COHORT*.

Aunt

(hdfD, *dodah',* fem. of dWD, a *friend,* hence *uncle),* one's father's sister (Exodus 6:20), also an uncle's wife (Leviticus 18:14; 20:20). *SEE AFFINITY*.

Aurandt John Dietrich

a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born on Maiden Creek, Berks county, Pa., 1760, and in his youth was apprenticed to a miller. In 1778 he enlisted as a soldier in the brigade of the Pennsylvania Regulars under Genesis Wayne. He continued in the army till 1781, when he received an honorable discharge. He now resumed his business as a miller, but after several years turned his attention to farming. Meanwhile his mind had been strongly turned toward the holy ministry. He began by exhorting in meetings for prayer, studying privately as best he could. He was licensed to preach in 1806, and ordained in 1809. He settled in Huntington County, Pa. His field of labor extended east and west sixty miles, north and south from forty to fifty miles. Here he labored with apostolic zeal as a pioneer, laying the foundation of numerous and flourishing congregations. His travelling over these mountain regions of Pennsylvania was done on horseback. This was his first and also his last field of labor. His health failed toward the last, and sometimes for a short period his labors were interrupted; but he continued his work, though often amid much suffering, till near his end. He preached his last sermon the latter part of the summer of 1830, and died April 24th, 1831, in the 71st year of his age. Mr. Aurandt's power of usefulness lay in extraordinary natural gifts, deep and earnest piety, rather than in acquired learning or intellectual polish. He was gifted with a good memory, quick perception, a ready flow of language, and a clear enunciation. He preached only in the German language.

Auranitis

SEE HAURAN.

Aura'nus

(Αὔρανος), given as the name of the leader in the riots at Jerusalem against Lysimachus (2 Maccabees 4:40), where he is described as "a man far gone in years, and no less in folly." Other MSS., however (followed by the Vulg.), read Τύραννος, *Tyrannus*, which may be taken either as a proper name or appellative, q. d. *ringleader*.

Aurelius Marcus Annius Verus Antoninus

Roman emperor from 161 to 180, was born in 121, and at the age of eighteen adopted by the Emperor Antoninus Pius, whom he succeeded, in 161, on the throne. He was educated by Sextus of Chaeronea, a grandson of Plutarch, and became early in life an ardent admirer and adherent of the Stoic philosophy. On his accession to the throne he magnanimously shared the government with his adopted brother Verus. Shortly after a war broke out with the Parthians, which was victoriously terminated by the generals of Verus. Both emperors held a triumph, and assumed the title Parthicus. A more dangerous war broke out on the northern frontier of the empire with a number of German tribes, as the Marcomanni, Alani, and many others. It was carried on, with many vicissitudes, until 169, when the barbarians sued for peace. In the same year Verus died. Soon the war was renewed; and in the course of it, in 174, a celebrated victory was gained by Marcus Aurelius over the Quadri in consequence of a sudden thunder-storm, by which the Romans, who greatly suffered from want of water, were saved from apparently imminent defeat. The emperor ascribed the victory to Jupiter Tonans; but the twelfth legion, composed largely of Christians, ascribed it to their prayers. The statement of Eusebius, that the emperor gave to this legion the name *Legio Fulminatrix* (Thundering Legion), and threatened penalties on such as accused Christians merely on account of their religion, is generally rejected as inaccurate (Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.* 5, 5). See Lardner, *Works*, 7, 178-198. Avidius Cassius rebelled against Aurelius, but was murdered by his own adherents. Aurelius pardoned the rebels, revisited Rome in 176, celebrated his victories by a triumph, and soon after marched again, with his son Commodus, against the Marcomanni; but before the conclusion of the war he died at Vindobona (now Vienna), in 180. Aurelius was one of the best emperors the Roman Empire ever had;

truthful, just, severe against himself, but mild toward all other men; and his life, in the main, corresponded to his philosophical principles. The only blot in his reign is the persecution of Christians. The first persecution during his reign seems to have occurred at Lingona in 167, and in it Polycarp, the last surviving disciple of the apostle John, lost his life. In 177, the Christians of Gaul, especially the churches of Lyons and Vienna, were subjected to a cruel persecution, in which a great many Christians fell, and among them Pothinus, bishop of Lyons. *SEE PERSECUTIONS*. The philosophical emperor acted logically in persecuting the Christians, who disobeyed the laws of Rome, while he held it his duty to uphold those laws. He believed that the new religion was a superstition, and that it was dangerous to the state. This was enough for him. Aurelius wrote a work (in Greek) entitled Τὰ εἰς ἑαυτόν *(Meditations),* from the composition of which he has received the title of "Philosopher." There are editions of it by Casaubonus (London, 1643), Gataker (Cambr. 1654), Schulz (Schlesw. 1802). and Koraes (Par. 1816). It has been translated into the languages of all civilized nations, and even into Persian by Hammer (Vienna, 1831). A new English version by G. Long appeared in 1863 (London). — Smith's *Diet. of Class. Biog.* s.v.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1, 105-115; Lardner, *Works,* 1. c. Neander, *On Greek Ethics, Bibliotheca Sacra,* 10:476 sq.

Aurela or Aureole

(gold-co!ored), the crown of rays designed to represent flame, put by the old painters around the figures of saints, investing the whole body, as the *nimbus* (q.v.) does the head. Its form is generally ovoidal. — Didron, *Chr. Iconography,* 107 sq.

Auricular Confession

the confession of sin *into the ear* of the priest, which, as part of *penance,* is one of the sacraments of the Romish Church.

1. Before the time of Leo the Great (fifth century) it had been the custom for the more grievous offenders to make confession of their sins publicly, in the face of the congregation, or, at least, for the ministers occasionally to proclaim before the whole assembly the nature of the confessions which they had received. This public act, called *exomologesis,* included not only public confession, but public mortification in sackcloth and ashes; and, as such, was entirely different from auricular confession, which was wholly unknown to the ancient Church (see the authorities in Bingham, *Orig.*

Eccl. bk. 18, ch. 3; Daille, *De Confess. Auricular.* 4, 25). As for the Eastern Church, Sozomen, in his account of the confessional, says that the public confession in the presence of all the people, which formerly obtained, having been found grievous (φορτικὸν ὡς εἰκός), a well-bred, *silent,* and prudent presbyter was set in charge of it; thus plainly denoting the change from public to auricular confessions. It was this penitential presbyter whose office was abolished by Nectarius in the fourth century, on account of ‘a rape committed on a female penitent by the priest (Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* 7, 16; Socrat. *Hist Eccl.* 5, 19). Pope Leo discouraged the ancient practice of public oonfession, or, rather, the publication by the priest of flagrant sins confessed, and permitted, and even enjoined with some earnestness, that confession should rather be private, and confided to the priest alone. The evil most obviously proceeding from this relaxation was the general increase, or, at least, the more indecent practice of the mortal sins, and especially (as Mosheim, *Church. Hist.* cent. 5, pt. 2, ch. iv, has observed) of that of incontinence; unless, indeed, we are to suppose that the original publicity of confession was abandoned from its being no longer practicable in a numerous body and a corrupt age. But another consequence which certainly flowed from this measure, and which, in the eye of an ambitious churchman, might counterbalance its demoralizing effect, was the vast addition of influence which it gave to the clergy. When he delivered over the conscience of the people into the hands of the priests, when he consigned the most secret acts and thoughts of individual imperfection to the torture of private inquisition and scrutiny, Leo the Great had indeed the glory of laying the first and corner-stone of the papal edifice-that on which it rose and rested, and without which the industry of his successors would have been vainly exerted, or (as is more probable) their boldest projects would never have been formed.

2. But Leo made no *law* requiring private confession before communion. That step was not taken till the fourth council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, when it was decreed that all persons should confess privately, and be absolved once a year, under pain of excommunication (can. 21; *Hard. Cone.* t. 7). The doctrine that penance is a *sacrament* seems to have been first broached by Aquinas *(Summa,* pt. 3, 2, 84). The Romish system of sacramental penance was completed by the Council of Trent (sess. 14, cap. 5, 6), which declared that “from the institution of the sacrament of penance already set forth, the Church has always understood that an entire confession of sins was also appointed by the Lord, and that it is of divine right necessary to

all who have lapsed after baptism. Because our Lord Jesus Christ, when about to ascend from earth to heaven, left his priests, his vicars to be, as it were, the presidents and judges, to whom all mortal sins into which Christ's faithful people should fall should be brought, in order that, by the power of the keys, they might pronounce sentence of remission or retention. For it is plain that the priests cannot exercise this judgment without knowledge of the cause, nor can they observe equity in enjoining penalties if men declare their sins only generally, and not rather particularly and separately. From this it is inferred that it is right that the penitents should recount in confession all the deadly sins of which, upon examination, their conscience accuses them, even though they be most secret, and only against the last two commandments, which not unfrequently grievously wound the soul, and are more dangerous than those which are openly practiced," etc. Here an attempt is made to invest the Christian priesthood with the prerogative of the Most High, who is a searcher of the hearts and a discerner of the thoughts, in forgetfulness of the very distinction which God drew between himself and all men, "Man looketh to the outward part, the Lord trieth the heart." As Christ has invested his ministers with no power to do this of themselves, the Tridentine fathers have sought to supply what they must needs consider a grievous omission on his part by enjoining all men to unlock the secrets of their hearts at the command of their priest, and persons of all ages and sexes to submit not only to general questions as to a state of sin or repentance, but to the most minute and searching questions as to their inmost thoughts. Auricular confession is unquestionably one of the greatest corruptions of the Romish Church. It goes upon the ground that the priest has power to forgive sins; it establishes the tyrannical influence of the priesthood; it turns the penitent from God, who only can forgive sins, to man, who is himself a sinner; and it tends to corrupt both the confessors and the confessed by a foul and particular disclosure of sinful thoughts and actions of every kind without exception.

3. The *confessor* must be an ordained priest; and no penitent can confess to any other than his parish priest without the consent of the latter, except in *articulo morris.* Special confessors are provided for monks and nuns. For the place of confession, *SEE CONFESSIONAL*. The laws of confession may be found in the Romish directories and books of moral theology; and a glance at them is enough to satisfy any candid mind of the fearful dangers of such a system. Any one who may think it necessary to satisfy himself

upon the point may consult the cases contemplated and provided for (among others) by Cardinal Cajetan in his *Opuscula* (Lugd. 1562), p. 114. In the Bull of Pius IV, *Contra solicitantes in confessione,* dated Apr. 16, 1561 *(Bullarium Magn.* Luxemb. 1727, 2:48), and in a similar one of Gregory XV, dated Aug. 30, 1622 *(Gregory XV Constit. Romans* 1622, p. 114), there is laid open another fearful scene of danger to female confitents from wicked priests. For a full account of the history of the system, its laws and its dangers, see Hopkins, *History of the Confessional* (N. Y. 1850, 12mo).

4. The *Protestant* churches reject auricular confession. The Lutheran Church, however, allows confession, only with this difference, that while!he Catholic Church requires from the penitent the avowal of his particular and single crimes, the Lutheran requires only a general acknowledgment, leaving it, however, at the option of its members to reveal their particular sins to the confessor, and to relieve the conscience by such an avowal. The Reformed churches of the Continent generally practice only *general* confession preparatory to the sacrament. There is a tendency, however, in the high Lutheran reaction in Germany, to return to auricular confession. The *Church of England,* in some cases, exhorts to confession, but she makes it no part of her discipline, nor does she (as the ‘Church of Rome insists upon, or as some of her own members would fondly introduce the practice) prescribe regular, complete, periodical confession. For the doctrine of the Church of England upon the subject of confession to a pastor, see (in the Prayer-book) the former of the two exhortations in giving warning for the Communion, and the order for the Visitation of the Sick. The Church of England has recently been greatly agitated by what appears to be a concerted attempt on the part of the Romanizing part of her clergy to restore auricular confession. — Binghaml, 1. c.; Hopkins, *Hist of. the Confessional;* Elliott, *On Romanism,* 1, 312 sq.; Klee, *Die Beichte, eine histor. — krit. Untersuch.* (Frankf. 1 828); Kliefoth, *Die Beichte und Absolution* (Schwerin, 1856). *SEE PENANCE*; *SEE CONFESSION*.

Austin David

a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Haven, Conn., 1760, and graduated at Yale College, 1779. After studying with Dr. Bellamy, he spent some time in European travel, and in 1788 was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Elizabethtown, N. J. He labored faithfully till

1795, when he became deranged from fever. On his recovery the derangement continued, and he preached that Christ would appear in May, 1796. The failure of his prediction only confirmed his delusion, and he went about preaching the advent with great zeal, and creating great excitement. In 1797 he was dismissed from his pastorate. After some years he recovered his sanity, and was installed in 1815 pastor at Bozrah, Conn., where he remained until his death in 1831. He edited a Commentary and published several millennial pamphlets. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2, 197.

Austin, Samuel

D.D., was born in New Haven, 1760, graduated at Yale College in 1783. After teaching and travelling a few years, he was ordained, as the successor of Allen Mather, at Fairhaven, Conn., Nov. 9, 1786, where he remained until 1790. He then became pastor of a church in Worcester, Mass., where he labored faithfully nearly 25 years. In 1815 he was elected president of the University of Vermont, which office he resigned in 1821. After preaching a few years in Newport, he fell into ill health and melancholy, and died at Glastonbury, Conn., Dec. 4, 1830. He was eminently pious and distinguished as a minister. He published letters on baptism, examining Merrill's seven sermons, 1805; a reply to Merrill's twelve letters, 1806; and a number of occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:224.

Austin, St.

SEE AUGUSTINE.

Australasia

a division of the globe forming a part of Oceanica. It comprises the continent of Australia, Tasmania (Van Diemen's Land), New Guinea, and the Louisiade Archipelago, New Britain, New Ireland, and neighboring islands, Solomon's Islands, New Hebrides, New Caledonia, New Zealand, and the isles to the southward, Kergueland Islands, St. Paul, and Amsterdam, and numerous coral reefs and islets. — Newcomb, *Cyclopedia of Missions*. *SEE AUSTRALIA*.

Australia

or NEW HOLLAND, a vast extent of land forming the main portion of Australasia. Its area is about 2,700,000 square miles. The population in the five English colonies, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, West

Australia, and Queensland, was, in 1862, about 1,240,000 souls. The native population is rapidly decreasing. Their numbers are estimated at from 15,000 to 20,000. Toward the close of the last century Episcopal chaplains were appointed by the British government in New South Wales, which at that time was a penal settlement. In 1795 the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts commenced its missionary operations. In 1836 the first bishop was consecrated, and in 1847 three new sees were constituted. In 1865 the Anglican Church had in Australia (exclusive of Tasmania, q.v.) seven dioceses, Sydney, Newcastle, Melbourne, Adelaide, Perth, Brisbane, and Goulburn. The Roman Church has an archbishop at Sydney, and bishops at Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Maitland, and Brisbane, and a population of about 80,000 souls. The Moravians established a mission to the aborigines in 1849. In 1858 they sustained there two missionaries, but no specific results are yet reported. The Wesleyan Missionary Society opened a mission in New South Wales in 1815, in South Australia in 1838, in Western Australia in 1839. Their missions, both among the English population and the natives, have been blessed with remarkable success. They had, in 1865, 99 circuits, 484 chapels, 256 other preaching places, 145 missionaries and assistant missionaries, 5226 subordinate agents, 16,246 members, 2707 on trial for membership, 35,612 scholars in schools, 91,870 attendants on public worship. There are also Congregationalists, Baptists, German Lutherans, and other denominations, though less numerous. The government contributes to the support of the churches and clergy of the Episcopalians, Wesleyans; Presbyterians, and Roman Catholics. In 1855 there were 613 public, Roman Catholic, and private schools, in which 40,000 children received instruction. — *Almanac de Gotha;* Schem, *Ecclesiastical Year-book.*

Austria

Picture for Austria 1

Picture for Austria 2

one of the principal states of modern Europe (q.v.), with an area of 11,751 geogr. sq. miles, and a population in 1857 of 35,040,810 souls.

I. *Church History.* — For the introduction of Christianity into those countries which now constitute Austria, and for their early church history,

we refer to the articles GERMANY *SEE GERMANY* ; SCLAVONIANS *SEE SCLAVONIANS* ; and to those on the several provinces of Austria (see below). The Reformation spread at first in Austria with great rapidity. In Bohemia, Moravia, Austria Proper (the archduchy), Styria, Carinthia, and the Tyrol, it soon became very powerful. *SEE REFORMATION*. Even one of the emperors, Maximilian II, favored it, and was believed secretly to belong to it. But Ferdinand II (1619-37), the most fanatic adherent of the Church of Rome in the entire series of Austrian rulers, initiated a period of long and cruel persecution, by which thousands were frightened into apostasy, and many more thousands expelled from their native land. This rigorous legislation lasted until the accession of Joseph II (1765-90), who not only endeavored to loosen the connection of the Roman Catholic Church: with the Pope, but who gave also to the Protestants, by his celebrated Edict of Toleration, Oct. 31, 1781, protection of their religious worship, and declared them admissible to the highest civil offices. Still, in those provinces where they were *merely* tolerated, they were not allowed to have churches, but only chapels without steeples and bells; nor could they have independent parishes, but they had to pay the fees for ecclesiastical functions to the Roman Catholic parish priest. In Hungary and Transylvania, they possessed from the time of the Reformation, and preserved unimpaired, much greater rights. The successors of Joseph II revoked a part of his legislation, and, in general, seconded the diplomacy of the Pope abroad, but continued to withhold from the Roman. Church in Austria many rights which she possessed in most other states (as holding of councils, connection of the monastic orders with their several superiors in Rome, formations of religious associations, etc.). The year 1848 brought to all the religious denominations the promise of selfgovernment, and independence of both the state and other denominations. The “Provisional Decrees” of 1849 redressed several of the Protestant grievances; thus, e.g., the term “acatholic,” by which Protestants had before been officially designated, was abolished, the official character of the lists of baptisms, marriages, and deaths kept by Protestant clergymen was recognized, and the taxes which Protestants had to pay to Catholic priests were abolished. Notwithstanding these partial concessions made to the spirit of the times, the emperor Francis Joseph openly favored the schemes of the ultramontane party. The Concordat, signed on Aug. 18,1855, *SEE CONCORDAT*, did away with the whole Josephine legislation, and recognized, in its first article, all the rights and prerogatives which the R. C. Church derived from the canon law. Through the Concordat the R. C.

Church reobtained the right of holding councils (a conference of fourteen archbishops and forty-eight bishops met in 1856), a great influence on public education, an extensive jurisdiction in marriage affairs, and, in general, a vigorous support on the part of the government. The relation between the monastic orders of Austria and their superiors was also restored, and the bishops, at the wish of Rome and with the aid of the government, commenced to enforce again the old strict monastic disciplines. A majority of the members of every order which was thus to be brought back to its former condition opposed this plan, but unsuccessfully. The reformatory measures were carried through in all the monastic orders in 1859. The Protestants received. after the publication of the Concordat, the promise that also their church should receive a greater independence and a higher degree of self-government; but, in fact, their grievances became much greater under the influence which the Concordat gave to the priests. Important decrees concerning the reorganization of the Protestant churches of Hungary were issued on Aug. 21, 1856, and Sept. 1, 1859, for which we refer to the article HUNGARY. For the Protestants in the provinces forming part of the German Confederacy it was, in 1859. provided that in future the Protestant Consistory of Vienna should always be presided over by a Protestant, and not, as had been the custom until that date, by a Roman Catholic. On April 8,1861, an imperial letter was issued, and on April 9 a draft of a church constitution, to regulate provisionally the affairs of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches in the German and Slavic provinces. Each of these two churches was to have a general synod, which was to revise the draft of church constitution prepared by the government, and have hereafter the chief control of the ecclesiastical affairs of the two churches. The convocation of the first general synod was delayed no less than three years, and did not take place until the 22d of May, 1864. The synods of both the churches met in Vienna on the same day. Both synods passed a resolution to discuss such topics as are not of a strictly denominational character in joint session. The provisional draft of a church constitution was adopted in all its essential points. The synods resolved to present conjointly to the emperor the following memorial, containing the chief demands of the Protestants of the empire: The General Synod protests —

1. Against the denomination of *non-catholic*, which is the term used in the decrees and ordinances of the political authorities to designate the

adherents of the two Protestant confessions, the Augsburg and the Helvetian;

2. The Synod demands that those obstacles which, in some parts of the monarchy, are still presented to the establishment of Protestant congregations, shall be removed;

3. That booksellers shall be allowed to deal in Protestant books;

4. A community of cemeteries;

5. The admission of Protestant pastors, as of priests, into houses of retirement and charitable institutions, to exercise their functions in them;

6. The establishment of the equality of the Protestant and the Catholic festivals, in order that the authorities may be bound to protect the festivals of the Protestants in the localities in which they are the most numerous;

7. The Synod protests against all interference by the subordinate political authorities in the affairs of the schools of the Protestant congregations;

8. It protests against the ordinance which prohibits the children of Jews from frequenting Protestant, if there are Catholic schools in existence in the same locality; as it also protests against the ordinance which forbids Catholic parents placing their children with Protestant foster-parents;

9. The General Synod advances claims on the funds of the normal schools in favor of the Protestant schools;

10. It demands the admission of Protestant teachers in the medial Catholic schools;

11. The institution of Protestant catechists in the schools;

12. The incorporation of the Protestant theological faculty into the University of Vienna;

13. The representation of the Evangelical Church in the Diet and in the Municipal Council. The proceedings in both the General Synods were very harmonious. A union between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, as it has been consummated in several German countries, was not resolved upon, but both synods will continue to melet simultaneously, and at the same place, and to deliberate on all subjects not strictly denominational in joint session. The nationality question, which produces so much trouble in

the politics of Austria, led on some questions to a disagreement between the German majority and the Slavic minority, as the former were unwilling to concede everything the latter demanded, but it produced no open rupture.

II. *Ecclesiastical Statistics.* — The following table exhibits the membership of the several denominations in every province according to the census of 1880. It appears from this table that the Roman Catholic Church, even without the United Greeks, has a majority in every province except Galicia. In Galicia the United Greeks are a little less in number than the Roman Catholics of the Latin rite. The Roman Catholic Church (Latin rite) had, in 1859, 13 archbishoprics: Agram, Colocza, Erlau, Gran, Goeritz and Gradisca, Lemberg, Olmutz, Prague, Salzburg, Udine, Venice, Zara. The archbishop of Venice has the title patriarch, and the archbishop of Udine is merely nominal, not being at the head of an ecclesiastical province. The number of bishops since the separation of Lombardy is 53. There were. in 1851, 4285 parishes and local chaplaincies, and 40,816 priests. The Greek United Church has two archbishoprics, Lemberg and Fogaras (the latter of recent erection), and 8 bishops; the United Armenian Church, 1 archbishop at Lemberg; these two churches together had, in 1851, 4285 parishes and local chaplaincies, and 5098 secular priests. The Greek (non-united) Church has a patriarch-archbishop at Carlovitz, 10 bishops, 3201 parishes or local chaplaincies, and 4036 secular priests. The number of convents is constantly increasing. In 1849, 739 convents of monks and 176 of nuns were counted in the Roman Catholic Church, and 44 convents of monks, with 271 members, in the Greek (nonunited) Church. The Protestants of the Confession of Augsburg (Lutherans) were, until 1859, divided into 10 superintendencies, and the Protestants of the Helvetic Confession (Reformed Church) into 8, 4 superintendencies of each church being in Hungary. In a territorial respect the Protestant churches are divided into three groups, which, with regard to church government, are independent of each other: viz. 1, Hungary, with the adjacent countries; 2, Transylvania; 3, the other provinces. The two Protestant churches of the last group are under the jurisdiction of the Consistory of Vienna. Together they had, in 1851, 3162 parishes, which number has since considerably increased. The Unitarians have 1 superintendent at Klausenburg, Transylvania. *Theological faculties* for education of Roman Catholic priests are connected with each of the nine Austrian universities; that of the University of Innspruck has been wholly

transferred to the order of the Jesuits. Besides these theological faculties there are episcopal seminaries, in which theology and philosophy are taught, in nearly every diocese. In addition to them, *seminaria puerorum* (seminaries for boys who have the priesthood in view) have, since 1848, been erected in many dioceses. The priests of the United Greeks are educated at Lemberg and Fogaras, those of the Non-united Greeks at Czernowicz (Galicia) and Carlovitz (Hungary). For Protestant theologians there is a theological faculty at Vienna, which, however, is not connected with the university. Hungary has six schools for the study of theology and philosophy, three for each of the two churches. The Unitarians have a college at Klausenburg. See Coxe, *History of the House of Austria,* Lichnowsky, *Gesch. d.s Hauses Habsburg* (Wien, 8 vols. 1836-1844); Mailath, *Gesch. des oster. Kaiserstaats* (Hamburg, 5 vols. 1834-1850); Hoffmann, *Ueber den Gottesdienst und die Religion in den ostreichischen Staaten* (Wien, 1783-1785, 6 vols.); Helfert, *Die Rechte und Verfassung der Acatholiken in Oestreich* (Wien, 2d ed. 1827); Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik;* Schem, *Eccles. Year-book.*

Autae'as

(Αὐταίας), one of the Levites who expounded the law as read by Ezra (1 Esdras 9:48); evidently a corruption for the HODIJAH *SEE HODIJAH* (q.v.) of the true text (comp. Nehemiah 8:7).

Autenrieth Johann Hermann Ferdinand Von, M.D.,

was born at Stuttgart, 20th October, 1772, and died 2d May, 1835, at Tubingen, where he was professor of medicine. He was the author of a treatise, *Ueber das Buch Hiob* (Tub. 1823), and of an essay, *Ueber den Ursprung der Beschneidung bei wilden und halbwilden Volk-ern* (Tub. 1829), besides many medical essays, for which see Hoefer, *Biog. Generale,* s.v.

Authenticity

a term frequently used in reference to the literary history of the Holy Scriptures.

(1.) In a broad and loose sense, by the authenticity of the canonical books is meant that they were really written by the authors whose names they

bear; that those which are anonymous were written at the time in which they profess that they were written; and that their contents are credible.

(2.) In careful and scientific language, authenticity implies authority; an authentic account is truthful, and therefore credible. A *genuine* book, on the other hand, is one written by the person whose name it bears, whether it be truthful or not. Thus, for instance, Alison's *History of Europe* is genuine, because it was written by Alison; but it is not authentic, because it looks at facts with partisan eves. — Horne, *Introduction,* 2, 1.

Authority

(1.) in matters religious and ecclesiastical, an assumed right of dictation, attributed to certain fathers, councils, or church courts. On this subject Bishop Hoadley writes: "Authority is the greatest and most irreconcilable enemy to truth and argumlent that this world ever furnished. All the sophistry — all the color of plausibility — all the artifice and cunning of the subtlest disputer in the world may be laid open and turned to the advantage of that very truth which they are designed to hide; but against authority there is no defense." He shows that it was authority which crushed the noble sentiments of Socrates and others, and that by authority the Jews and heathens combated the truth of the Gospel; and that, when Christians increased into a majority, and came to think the same method to be the only proper one for the advantage of their cause which had been the enemy and destroyer of it, then it was the authority of Christians, which, by degrees, not only laid waste the honor of Christianity, but well-nigh extinguished it among men. It was authority which would have prevented all reformation where it is, and which has put a barrier against it wherever it is not. The remark of Charles II. is worthy of notice-that those of the established faith make much of the authority of the church in their disputes with dissenters, but that they take it all away when they deal with papists. — Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.

(2.) In a proper sense, by the "authority of the church" is meant either the power' residing generally in the whole body of the faithful to execute the trust committed by Christ to his church, or the particular power residing in certain official members of that body. The first-named authority is vested in the clergy and laity jointly; the latter in the clergy alone. In the interpretation of Scripture for any particular church, that church's authority does not belong to all divines or "distinguished theologians" who may be

members of the church, but only to the authorized formularies. Single writers of every age are to be taken as expressing only their individual opinions. The agreement of these opinions at any one period, or for any lengthened space of time, may and must be used as proof to ourselves, privately, as to the predominant sentiments of the church at that time, but no opinions can be quoted as deciding authoritatively any disputed question. The universal church *deserves deference* in all controversies of faith; and *every* particular church has a right to *decree* such rights and ceremonies as are not contrary to God's written word; but no church has a right to enforce any thing as necessary for salvation, unless it can be shown so to be by the express declaration of Holy Scripture. See the 20th and 34th Articles of the Church of England, and the 5th and 22d of the Methodist Episcopal Church. *SEE RULE OF FAITH*; *SEE TRADITION*.

Authorized (English) Version Of The Holy Scriptures.

As this was not a strictly new or original translation, it will be necessary to consider briefly those earlier English versions upon which it was founded, and it will enable the reader better to appreciate its value and character if we prefix some account of the still earlier Anglo-Saxon versions which led the way to these. (See Mrs. Conant's *Hist. of Engl. Bible Translation,* N. Y. 1856.) *SEE VERSIONS (OF THE BIBLE)*.

I. *Anglo-Saxon Translations.* — Though our Anglo-Saxon ancestors early possessed translations, chiefly from the Latin, of at least portions of the Scriptures, the first attempt with which we are acquainted is the rude but interesting poem ascribed to CAEDMON, a monk of Whitby, in the seventh century. It contains the leading events of Old-Testament history, and renders several passages with tolerable fidelity; but the epic and legendary character of the composition preclude it from being ranked among the versions of Holy Writ. The first portion of it, entitled *The Fall of Man,* has been translated into verse by Bosanquet (Lond. 1860, 8vo). This work was succeeded in the following century by the Anglo-Saxon Psalter, said to have been translated by ALDHELM, bishop of Sherborn, who died in 709; the first fifty Psalms are in prose, the others in verse. About the same period, GUTHLAC, the first Saxon anchorite, is reported to have translated the Psalms. The next laborer in the field was the Venerable BEDE, who turned the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer into Anglo-Saxon. He also translated the Gospel of John, and completed it just as death put an end to his learned labors, in the monastery of Jarrow, on the south bank of

the Tyne, A.D. 735. The close of the next century probably produced the celebrated *Durham Book,* containing the four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, written between the lines of an earlier Latin copy, by ALDRED, a priest. The following is the Lord's Prayer from this version — [4069]Matthew 6:9-13:

> Fader uren thu arth in heofnum, sic gehalgud noma thin: to cymeth ric thin; sic willo thin sumels inheofne & in eortho; hlaf useune ofer wistlic sel us todseg: & forgef us seylda usna suae uae forgeofon seyldgum usum: and ne inlsed usih in costunge nlu gefrigusich from yfle.

The *Rushworth Gloss,* having the Anglo-Saxon word placed over the corresponding Latin, was probably executed about the same period, by OWUN, aided by FARMEN, a priest at Harewood. About this time, ALFRED the Great set at the head of his laws an Anglo-Saxon translation of the Ten Commandments, with such of the Mosaic injunctions from the 21, 22, 23 chapters of Exodus as were most to his purpose. He is also said to have entered upon a translation of the Psalms, which be did not live to finish. Next in order come some fragments of an imperfect interlinary version of the Book of Proverbs. Similar glosses were made on the Psalter; also on the Canticles of the Church, the Lord's Prayer, and other portions of Scripture. In the latter part of the tenth century, the monk JELFRIC translated — omitting some parts, and greatly abridging others — the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, a portion of the Books of Kings, Esther, Job, Judith, and the Maccabees. He also drew up, in Anglo-Saxon, a brief account of the books of the Old and New Testaments; and, by the texts and quotations used in his homilies, he contributed greatly to the knowledge of the Scriptures. A third Anglo-Saxon version of the four Evangelists, of which there are two copies, and a few copies of the Psalms, appear to have been executed at a later period, probably but a little before the time of the Norman Conquest. With these, the series of Anglo-Saxon translations of parts of Scripture would seem to end; though it is not improbable that other portions of Scripture were translated which have not come down to us.

Before the middle of the eleventh century the language of Caedmon and Bede had undergone important changes, probably through the influence of Edward the Confessor and his Norman associates, among whom he had been educated. At the period of the Conquest, A.D. 1066, the Norman began rapidly to revolutionize the old Anglo-Saxon language. Soon after

this period a version of the Gospels appears to have been made, of which there are three copies, and it is difficult to determine whether they are to be assigned to the Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman class of literary remains. Before the year 1200 the Anglo-Normans had translated into their own dialect, in prose, the Psalter and Canticles of the Church; and towards the middle of the following century appear to have possessed not only a history of the Old Testament in verse, as far as the end of the books of Kings, but also, it is supposed, a prose version of a great part of the Bible. Nevertheless, the Anglo-Saxon versions and glosses of the Gospels, and other portions of Scripture, remained long after in partial use. *SEE ANGLO-SAXON VERSIONS.*

II. *Early English Translations.* — The earliest essays of Biblical translation assumed in English, as in most other languages, a poetical form. The *Ormulum,* written perhaps at the commencement of the thirteenth century, is a paraphrase in verse of the narrative of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. The Biblical poem called "Soulhele" was probably written about the same period. To a later period of the same century belongs the poem reciting the principal events in the books of Genesis and Exodus. Apparently coeval with this is the metrical version, from the Latin, of the whole book of Psalms. In some manuscripts a version is found partly similar, but with amendments and revisions, probably the partial adaptation of the same version to a more modern diction and orthography. The 100th Psalm is here given as a specimen of this ancient English version:

Mirthes to God al erthe that es
Serves to louerd in faines.
In go yhe ai in his siht,
In gladness that is so briht.

Whites that louerd god is he thus,
He us made and our self noht us,
His folke and shep of his fode:
In gos his yhates that are gode;

In schrift his worches belive,
In ympnes to him yhe schrive.
Heryhes his name for louerde is HENDE,
In all his merci do in strende and strende.

The earliest version in English prose of any entire book of Scripture is the book of Psalms, translated by WILLIAM DE SCHORHAM, vicar of Chart

Sutton, in Kent. The translation is generally faithful and literal. The following is a specimen of this version — [1920]Psalm 23:1-6:

> Our Lord governeth me and nothyng shal defailen to me; in the stede of pasture he sett me ther. He noriised me vp water fyllynge; he turned my soule fram the fende. He lad me vp the blistiyets mf riytfulnes; for his name. For yif that ich haiue _on amiddes of the shadowe of deth. Y shal nouyt douten inels, for thou art wyth me. Thy disciplinn and thyn amendyng; confolted me. Thou maaest radi grace in my sight; oyayns hem that trublen me. Thou makest fatt myn heued wyth mercy; and my drynke makand drunken ys ful clere. And thy merci shal folwen me; alle daies of mi lif. And that ich woonne in the hous of our Lord; in lengthe of daies.

Schorham's version of the Psalms could scarcely have been completed, when another was undertaken by RICHARD ROLLE, chantry priest at Hampole, near Doncaster, who died in 1349. Of this work of Rolle, to which he subjoined a commentary, there were copies which differed from each other, showing that the original must have been altered to some extent. The following is a specimen of this version — [1990]Psalm 79:1-6:

> God, gens come in thin heritage; thei filed thi holy tempul, thei sette Jerusalem in kepyng of appuls. Thei sette the dyande bodyes ofthi selurauntes mete to the fowles of the lyft; flesche of thli halowes to bestis of erthe. Thei spill bhore blode as watir in vmgong of Jerusalem; and none was for to graue, hade we are reproft to oure neghbors; skornynge and hething to alle that in oure vmgong are. Howe longe, Lord, shalt thou be wrothe in ende; kyndelt shal be thi luf as fire. Helde, *or het*, thi wrathe in gens that thee not knew; and in kyngdoms that thi nome incalde not.

All these versions were made from the Latin; and some of the venerable relics still exist in manuscript in the public libraries in the kingdom. A few of them have been printed as objects of literary curiosity.

It was not till about the year 1382 that our language was enriched with a complete copy of the Scriptures, by the hands of WYCLIFFE and his coadjutors, not improbably with the aid of other fragmentary portions then existing. This translation was made from the Latin Vulgate, collated with other old copies. For several centuries there had occasionally been found in England some scholars acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek languages;

and, though Wycliffe occasionally introduced Greek words in some of his writings, yet it seems scarcely probable that the knowledge of Greek possessed by him was at all sufficient to enable him to translate from that language. Hence, if the Bible must be translated at all, it must be from the Latin. It belonged to a later and more critical age to use the originals in forming vernacular versions of the Scriptures. The translation of the New Testament was probably the work of Wycliffe himself. During its progress, the Old Testament was taken in hand by one of Wycliffe's coadjutors; and from a note written in one manuscript, at the end of a portion of the Book of Baruch, the translation is assigned to NICHOLAS DE HEREFORD. Not unlikely the cause of this manuscript, and also of another which is probably a copy, suddenly breaking off in the Book of Baruch, was the summons which Hereford received to appear before the Synod in 1382. The translation was evidently completed by a different hand, not improbably by Wycliffe himself. However this may be, it was certainly through Wycliffe's energy that the earliest translation of the whole Bible in the English language was carried on and executed. Many of the peculiarities of this translation are to be attributed to the time in which Wycliffe lived; and it is remarkable that, in his version of the Scriptures, he writes far more intelligible English than is found in his original works; the — dignity of the book which he translated seems to have imparted an excellence of expression to the version itself. No part of the genuine version of Wycliffe was printed, excepting the Song of Solomon, by Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Com*mentary*, until 1848, when Mr. L. Wilson published the New Testament in a beautiful Gothic-letter quarto volume. More recently, the entire Bible, accompanied with Purvey's revision, has been published. The following are specimens of Wycliffe's translation — Genesis 3:7, 8; Luke 8:31-33:

> And the eizen of both being openyd; and whanne thai knewen hem silf to be nakid, thei soweden to gidre leeues of a fige tree, and maden hem brechis. And ywhanne thei herden the voys of the Lord God goynge in paradis at the shynyng after myd dai, Adam hid hym and his wijf fio the face of the Lord (od in the myddel of the tree of paradis.
>
> And thei preiden him, that he schulde not comaunde hem, that thei echulden go in to the depnesse. Forsothe a flok of manye hoggis was there lesewynge in an hil, and thei preieden him, that lie schulde suffre hem to entre in to hem. And he suffride hem.

> Therefore fendis wenten out fro the man, and entride in to hoggis; and with bire the floc wente hedlinge in to the lake of water, and was stranglid.

As Wycliffe's translation was completed in a comparatively short space of time, and necessarily possessed blemishes incident to a first edition, it is not surprising that a revised version was contemplated even in the lifetime of Wycliffe himself. Accordingly, about the year 1388, not more than four years after the death of Wycliffe, the revision was accomplished, but with few substantial differences of interpretation, by PURVEY, who had been Wycliffe's curate, and, after his death, became the leader of the Lollard party. Purvey's revision rendered the version more correct, intelligible, and popular, and caused the earlier translation to fall into disuse. Copies of this revision were rapidly multiplied; even now, more than one hundred and fifty copies of the whole or part of Purvey's Bible are in existence. The following are specimens of Purvey's version — Genesis 3:7, 8; Luke 8:31-33:

> And the izen of bothe weren opened; and whanne thei knewen that thei weren nakid, thei sewiden the leeues of a fige tre, and maden brechis to hem ilf. And whanne thei herden the vois of the Lord God goynge in paradijs at the wynd after myd-dai, Adam and his wijf hidden them fro the face of the Lord God in the middis of the tre'of pardijs.

> And thei preiden hym, that hoe schulde not comaunde hem, that thei schulden go in to helle. And there was a flok of many swyne lesewynge in an hil, and thei preid n hym, that he schulde suffre hem to eintre into hem. And he suffride hem. And so the deuelis wenten out fro the man. and entriden in to the swyne; and with a birre the flok went heedlyng in to the pool, and was drenchid.

Notwithstanding the prohibitory constitutions of Archbishop Arundel in 1408, and the high price of manuscripts, both versions were extensively multiplied; they contributed largely to the religious knowledge which prevailed at the commencement of the Reformation, and probably hastened that event. In the year 1420, the price of one of Wycliffe's Testaments was not less than four *marks and forty pence,* or *£2 16s. 8d.,* equal to *£42 6s. 8d.* now, taking sixteen as the multiple for bringing down the money of that time to our standard. It is somewhat remarkable that the revised version by Purvey has been taken until recently for Wycliffe's own translation, and as

such the New Testament portion was published by Lewis, 1731; by Baber, 1810; and again by Bagster, in his *English Hexapla.* It is, however, now known that the most ancient version is Wycliffe's, and. the revised or more modern one is by Purvey. These two earliest English versions of the entire Bible by Wycliffe and Purvey were printed, column by column on the same page, with various readings from the several manuscripts, in four splendid quarto volumes, under the care of the Rev. J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden, Oxford University Press, 1850.

The circulation of Wycliffe's version, and that of his reviser, Purvey, in manuscript, was the sowing of seed destined to yield a mighty harvest.. The downfall of the Eastern empire in 1453 contributed to the revival of learning by scattering learned Greeks, who carried with them manuscript treasures from Constantinople. The printing-press contributed immensely to revolutionize society throughout Europe. In several places on the Continent the Scriptures were printed not only in Latin, but in Hebrew and Greek, thus providentially preparing for setting forth the Inspired Oracles in the vernacular tongues. In England, however, the operation of the press was slow. In vain do we look over the list of works by Caxton, the father of the press in England, for a copy of any portion of the Scriptures. The earliest attempt at giving forth any portion of the Scriptures in print in English was a translation and exposition of the seven penitential Psalms, in 1505, by FYSHER, the Romish bishop of Rochester; and even this was printed on the Continent, though published at London. The instrument in the hand of God for translating the New Testament, and a great part of the Old, out of the original tongues into English, was WILLIAM TYNDALE. But in England Tyndale could find no place to print his translation of the New Testament. In the year 1524 he passed over to Hamburg, where he is said to have published the same year the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. As, however, no fragment of this first fruit of Tyndale's labor is known to be remaining, we suspect that it is merely another reference to the following fragment, printed at Cologne. In September, 1525, Tyndale, with his assistant Roye, was at Cologne, actually engaged in bringing the first edition of his New Testament, in quarto, through the press. When the sheets of this edition were printed as far as the signature K, the printer, through the influence of Cochlaeus, a Romish deacon, was interdicted from proceeding further with the work. Tyndale and his assistant snatched away some of the printed sheets, and fled to Worms. In this city Tyndale immediately printed an octavo edition of his Testament; then, it is said, he

completed the quarto which had been interrupted, and published both editions at the close of 1525 or early in 1526. The only relic of the precious old quarto, which was the first partially printed edition, for we are inclined to think that it never was completed, was discovered in 1834 by the late Mr. Rodd, and is now in the British Museum. It only contains the prologue, a table of the books of the New Testament, and part of the Gospel of Matthew—chap. 1-22. The following is a specimen of this fragment, printed at Cologne by P. Quentell-<4010> Matthew 2:1, 2:

> When Jesus was borne in bethlehem a toune of iury, in the time kynge Herode, beholde, there came wyse men from the este to Jerusalem sayinge: where is he that is borne kinge of the iewes, we have sene his starre in the este, and are come to worshippe hym.

The only known perfect copy of the octavo, which was the second printed, but the first published complete edition of Tyndale's New Testament, is preserved in the Baptist College Library, Bristol. The following is a specimen of this edition, printed at Worms at the close of 1525 or early in 1526 — <4014> Mark 14:3-5:

> When he was in bethania in the housse off Simon the leper, even as he sate att meate, there cam a woma with an alablaster boxe of oyntment, called narde, that was pure and costly, and she brake the boxe ad powred it on his heed. There were some that disdayned i themselves, and sayde: what neded this waste of oyntment? For it might have bene soolde for more the two houndred pens, and bene geve unto the poure. And they grudged agaynste her.

In November, 1534, Tyndale published at Antwerp a third edition, "dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke." The second or first complete edition, though a most important advance, certainly bears marks of haste; but the edition of 1534, revised by himself, stands in the first place as exhibiting Tyndale as a translator. The following is a specimen of this edition — <4014> Mark 14:3-5:

> When he was in Bethania, in the housse of Simon the leper, even as he sate at meate, ther came a woma hauynge an alablaster boxe of oyntment called narde, that was pure and costly: and she brake the boxe and powred it on is heed. And ther were some that were not content in themselves, & sayde: what neded this waste of oyntment:

> For it might have bene soolde for more than thre hundred pens, and been geve unto the poore. And they grudged agaynst hir.

That Tyndale's New Testament was translated from the Greek, no one can question who has examined it with care: it will be found continually to leave the readings of the Latin Vulgate, and adhere to the third edition of Erasmus's Greek Testament, printed in 1522. Sometimes, indeed, great deference is paid to the critical observations of Erasmus; but still the translation is made from the Greek, and not from his Latin version. When Erasmus departed from the Greek, as he does in several places, apparently through inadvertence, Tyndale does not follow him, but adheres closely to the original. As Tyndale's New Testaments were eagerly bought up, partly by earnest inquirers, and partly by others for destruction, numerous surreptitious copies rapidly issued from different presses, chiefly by the Dutch printers; so that in the translator's time about fourteen editions were issued, and eight or nine in 1536, the year of his death. A very curious edition of Tyndale's Testament was printed, probably at Antwerp in 1535, during the translator's imprisonment at Vilvorde. The letter and the spelling prrve that it was printed in the Low Countries. Some suppose that it is executed in a provincial orthography, probably that of Tyndale's native county, peculiarly adapted to agricultural laborers; and that, by this edition, he nobly redeemed his bold pledge given to the priest in Gloucestershire many years before, "If God spare me life, ere many years I will cause the boy that driveth the plow to know more of the Scriptures than you do." He also put headings for the first time to the chapters. The following is a specimen of this edition — <4654>1 Corinthians 15:41:

> Thear is oone manner glory of the sunne, & a noether glory of the moane, & a nother glory ye starres. For oone starre differth fro a noether in glory.

The edition of Tyndale's New Testament, printed in folio, at London, by Thomas Berthelet, in 15-6, from the revised edition of 1534, was the first portion of the English Scriptures printed on English ground. The following is a specimen of this rare and interesting edition — <4656>1 Corinthians 15:45, 46:

> The fyrst man Adam was made a lyvynge soule, and the last Adam was made a quyckenyng spiryte. Howe be it, that is nat fyrst which is spiritliall: but that which is naturall, & than that which is spirituall.

The martyr Tyndale was also the first to translate the five books of Moses into English from the Hebrew. As the books of Genesis and Numbers are in Gothic letter, while those of Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy are in Roman type, it would appear that these books were printed at separate times and in different places. The following occurs at the end of Genesis: "Emprented at Malborow, in the lande of Hesse, by me, Hans Luft, the yere of oure Lorde 1530, the 17 dayes of Januarii." Tyndale also translated and published the Book of Jonah. In the succeeding years of his life he was engaged in translating, perhaps in conjunction with Rogers, the remaining books of the Bible. Tyndale's translation, as far as the end of Chronicles, and other manuscripts, appear, at the time of his martyrdom, to have been in the possession of Rogers. The following is a specimen of Tyndale's Pentateuch of 1530 — [01218]Genesis 24:18-20:

> And she hasted and late downe her pytcher apon hyr arme and gaue him drinke. And whe she had geuen hym drynke, she sayde: I will drawe water for thy camels also, vntill they haue dronke ynough. And she poured out hyr pitcher in to the trough hastely and ranne agayne unto the well, to fett water: and drewe for all his camels.

During the year 1530, the *Argentine English Psalter* was printed. The translator, who rendered from the Latin, calls himself JOHAN ALEPH. The date at the end of this Psalter is January 10, 1530; it thus seems to have been, perhaps by antedating, the first whole book of the Old Testament which was printed in English, the completion of Tyndale's Genesis having been *one* day subsequent. In 1531 there was published a translation of Isaiah by GEORGE JOYE; in 1533, two leaves of Genesis; and in 1534 he published a translation of Jeremiah and the Book of Psalms. These portions were also translated from the Latin Vulgate.

MYLES COVERDALE was the first to publish, if not to translate, the whole Bible into English. He commenced this work in November, 1534, and it was printed, probably at Zurich, in October, 1535. Though Coverdale had evidently the Hebrew and Greek before him, he freely used the translations of Tyndale, both printed and perhaps manuscript. He speaks of his having been aided by five sundry interpreters in the Dutch, German, and Latin languages. In the Old Testament he may have had, 1st, the Latin Vulgate; 2d, Pagninus's version; 3d, Luther's German translation; 4th, Leo Juda's German-Swiss version; 5th, the Latin version connected with Sebastian Munster's Hebrew Bible, the first volume of which was printed in 1534.

The New Testament appears to be in part a revision of Tyndale's, in which Coverdale took much care, and availed himself both of the edition of 1525 and the amended one of 1534. This Bible, which was dedicated to King Henry VIII, had the following as the title: "BIBLIA. The Bible, that is, the holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe. 1535." However, it must be observed, the use of the words "out of Douche, i.e. German, and Latyn," was merely a bookselling artifice by the printers, to make the work circulate better, as being intimately connected with the reformed doctrines, which were then equally well known by the name of German or Dutch doctrines. In the new title inserted the following year, these terms were left out. Coverdale certainly did not follow the Latin, nor even Luther's version, but he no doubt availed himself of all the different means of assistance within his power. This Bible was reprinted with some amendments at Zurich in 1537, with a London title-page, and was then allowed by the king to "go abroad among the people," but without any regal imprimatur or license. The following is a specimen of Coverdale's translation—[1000] Psalm 90 (91), 4, 5:

> He shal couer the vnder his wynges, that thou mayest be safe vnder his fethers: his faithfulnesse and trneth shal be thy shylde and buckler. So yt thou shalt not nede to be afrayed for eny bugges by night, ner for arowe that flyeth by daye.

In the year 1537, the translations of Tyndale were published in a collected form, under the name of "Thomas Matthew." The editing of this Bible was really the work of the martyr Rogers. To this edition was prefixed, An Exhortation to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, beneath which stand J. R., the initials of his name. In the execution of this work, Rogers had the whole of Tyndale's translations, whether imprint or manuscript, before him. The Old Testament is a reprint of Tyndale's Pentateuch; the remainder, as far as the Second Book of Chronicles, was copied from Tyndale's manuscripts, which were undoubtedly in Rogers's safe keeping. The New Testament was Tyndale's of 1534 This Bible has the character of *Tyndale's* labors so stamped upon it as clearly to show that at least two thirds of the translation were his work; the remainder is the work of Rogers, who was probably aided by Coverdale's sheets. At the end of the Old Testament, the letters W. T. are printed in *very* large text capitals curiously flourished. This Bible was probably printed at Lubeck; and it is not improbable that it was actually in the press, under the joint labors of

Tyndale and Rogers, at the time of Tyndale's arrest and martyrdom. Much credit is due to Rogers, who probably resided at the place of printing, as the careful editor I of this Bible; he was evidently a fine scholar, and he seems to have acted both as desiring to give his countrymen a Bible as correct as possible, and likewise to perpetuate the labors of Tyndale, his friend and instructor in the truth of the Gospel. This Bible was translated by the first Hebrew, Greek, and English scholars, and is executed most in conformity with the views of the latest and best Biblical critics. This revision, which is frequently but not inaptly called "Tyndale's Bible," appeared with the then much coveted words, "Set forth with the king's most gracious license;" hence it was the first properly authorized edition of the English Bible. This Bible — at least part of it — appears to have been printed at the expense of Richard Grafton and his partner, Edward Whitchurch I — who afterwards married the widow of Archbishop Cranmer. They, about the same period, became printers themselves, as their initials appear at the beginning of the Prophets, where, perhaps, the part of the expense which they defrayed commenced. "Thomas Matthew" may actually have been the person at whose cost the preceding portion was printed. This Bible was the popular translation, and from the various editions it appears to have been much used for many years. The following is a fine specimen of Tyndale's rendering from the Hebrew — <100117>2 Samuel 1:17,18:

> And Dauid sang thyg songe of moulnynge ouer Saul and ouer Jonathas hys sonne, & bad to teache the chyldren of Israell the staues thereof.

In 1538, several editions of Coverdale's new version of the New Testament were published. He also issued several editions of the English New Testament, together with the text of the Latin Vulgate. The printing of this Diglott Testament was executed with great carelessness, so that Coverdale had it speedily reprinted in Paris. It is probable that Nicholson the printer, hearing that Coverdale's Latin and English Testament was about to be reprinted at Paris, with more attention to accuracy, printed the one bearing the name of "Johan Hollybushe" without delay, in order to anticipate the Paris edition. The following is a specimen of Coverdale's Testament — <400513>Matthew 5:13:

> Ye are the salt of the earth. Put yf ye salt vanishe away, wherin shal it be salted? It is thece forth good vnto nothing, but yt it be cast out, & trode vndr of men.

In the year 1539 was published the English translation known by the name of the "Great Bible." This edition was executed under the superintendence of GRAFTON, to whom Coverdale lent his aid as corrector. This Bible was printed at' Paris by the permission of Francis I., obtained by Henry VIII. But, notwithstanding the royal license, just as the work was well advanced, the Inquisition interposed, and issued an order, dated December 17,1538, summoning the French printers, their English employers, and Coverdale, the corrector of the work, and inhibited their farther proceeding. The impression, consisting of 2500 copies, was seized, confiscated, and condemned to the flames. Four great dry-fats full, however, of these books escaped the fire by the avarice of the person appointed to superintend the burning of them; and the English proprietors, who had fled on the first alarm, returned to Paris as soon as it subsided, and not only recovered some of these copies, but brought with them to London the presses, types, and even the workmen, and resuming the work, finished it in the following year. This Bible, which is a revision of Matthew's version, probably by the hand of Coverdale, has been unhappily confounded with "Cranmer's Bible," issued in 1540. The preface written by Cranmer for the edition of 1540 was inserted in some copies of the Great Bible, but subsequently to their completion. The statesman Cromwell, not Cranmer, was the master-spirit, not only in getting up this edition, but in securing the royal injunction that "the whole Bible, of the *largest* volume in English," should be set up in the churches. This continued, with slight alterations, to be the authorized English version of the Bible — except, of course, during the revival of popery in Mary's reign — until, in 1568, it was superseded by the Bishops' Bible. The Psalms in this Bible were the same as those found in the book of Common Prayer, having seventeen interpolations from the Septuagint or Latin Vulgate, but printed in a smaller type, and between parentheses. These readings were marked in Coverdale's Bible as not being in the Hebrew text; they are also continued in Cranmer's editions. The following is a specimen, with the interpolation in smaller type, which includes three verses — ^[9143]Psalm 14:3, 4.

> But they are all gone out of the waye, they are altogether: become abbominable: there is none that doth good, no not one (theyr throte is an open sepulcher: wyth their tonges they haue dysceaued, the

> poyson of aspes is under theyr lyppes Theyr mouth is full of cursynge and bytterness. theyr fete are swyft to shede bloude Destruccyon and unhappynes isin theyr wayes, and the wave of peace haue they not knowen, there is no feare of God before theyr eyes). Halie they no knowledge that they are all such workers of myscheffe, eatynge up my people as it were breade.

In the year 1539, another edition of the Bible appeared, dedicated to the king. It was a mere recension of Matthew's Bible, executed by RICHARD TAVERNER, under the patronage of Lord Cromwell. The three editions through which this Bible almost immediately went prove that its circulation was considerable, though it is to be observed that they were private readers alone who used it, as it was never, even for a time, publicly made an authorized version. Taverner's New Testament, of which he published two editions, is a different recension from that which accompanied his "Recognition of the Bible."

In the year 1540 "CRANMER'S Bible" was issued from Grafton and Whitchurch's press. This was probably the first complete Bible ever printed in England. This edition, of which only five hundred copies were printed, was a mere revision of the Great Bible of 1539, and had a preface by Cranmer. Another edition, "overseen and perused," by the king's command, by CUTHBERT TONSTALL, bishop of Durham, and NICHOLAS HEATH, bishop of Rochester, who also made a few variations in the text, appeared in 1541. The following is a specimen from Cranmer's New Testament — Matthew 6:9-13:

> Oure father which art in heauen, halowed be thy name. Let thy kingdome come. Thy will be fulfilled, as well in erth, as it is in leuen. Geue vs this daye-oure dayly bred. And forgeue vs oure dettes, as we forgeue oure detters. And leade vs not into temptation: but delyuer vs from euyll. For thyne is the kyngdom and the power, and the glorye for euer. Amen.

The only impressions of. any portions of the Scriptures which were printed during the remainder of the reign of Henry appear to have been the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays, in 1542, probably an edition of the Pentateuch in 1544, Joye's book of Daniel and the books of Solomon in 1545, and the New Testament according to the text of the Great Bible in 1546. The number of copies of the Scriptures in circulation at this time must, however, have been very considerable. In 1543 the Parliament

prohibited the use of Tyndale's version; and in 1546 Coverdale's translation, as well as Tyndaleus, was prohibited by. a stringent proclamation, and all such books were to be delivered up to persons appointed for the purpose, in order that they might be burned. The diligence with which Henry's proclamation was executed, in the destruction of the earlier editions, accounts for the very few copies which have come down to our time. The destruction appears to have been almost as complete as that of the earlier editions of Tyndale's New Testament.

Among the early acts of the reign of Edward VI was the reversing of the restrictions which had been laid on the circulation and the reading of the Scriptures. Yet no new recension or translation was published, except a translation of the paraphrase of Erasmus in 1549-50. Among those who took part in this work was Coverdale; and the Princess Mary — the future persecuting queen — translated a portion of the Gospel of John. Cranmer contemplated a new translation of the Bible; but Fagius and Bucer died, and the work was frustrated. An edition of Coverdale's Bible, said to have been printed at Zurich, was published in 1550. This edition was probably one of the two revisions which Coverdale mentioned in his sermon at Paul's Cross, in which he defended his version, and said "if he might review the book once again, as he had twice before, he doubted not he should amend." During some part of this reign Sir JOHN CHEKE translated the Gospel of Matthew, and perhaps part of Mark, but the translation was not then published. The following is a specimen of Cheke's version — Matthew 2:1:

> When Jesus was boorn in Bethlem a citi of Juri in king Herood's dais, lo then the Wisard's cam fro thest parties.

However, many editions of the Bible were printed, some being reprints of Matthew's Bible, some of Cranmer's, and some of Taverner's Recognition. The total number of impressions of the Bible in the reign of Edward was at least *thirteen.* There were also several editions of the New Testament, some of Tyndale's translations, some of Coverdale's version, and some according to Cranmer's Bible. The number of these editions of the New Testament amounts to at least *twenty-five,* so that the whole number of Bibles and Testaments in circulation comprised many *thousand copies.*

On the accession of Mary the printing and the circulation of the Scriptures in English was hindered, so that her reign only witnessed the printing of one edition of the New Testament, printed at Geneva in 1557. The

translator of the *Genevan Testament* was WILLIAM WHITTINGHAM, a native of Holmset, six miles from Durham, who was one of the exiles from England. This was a small square volume, printed in Roman letters, with the supplementary words in italics. — It was the first English New Testament divided into verses and *broken* into small sections or paragraphs. The preface was written by John Calvin, whose sister Catharine was married to Whittingham. In the manner of rendering not a few passages the translator followed the judgment of Beza in his theological views. The following is a specimen of this version — [40]Matthew 13:19:

> When soeur a man heareth the worde of the kyngdome, and vnderstandeth it not, there commeth that euyl one, and catcheth away that which was sewen in his heart, and this is the come which was sowen by the way syde.

Whittingham and his companions in exile also executed a translation of the whole Bible at Geneva, and it is not unlikely that Coverdale aided in the work. The translators probably had motives which sufficiently influenced them in executing a new version, instead of giving a mere reprint or revision of any which had preceded. The intention of such a work had been entertained in the reign of Edward VI, and it is probable that in this projected revision, from the manner in which the name of Bucer was connected with it, there would have been embodied whatever might be learned from the biblical knowledge possessed by the Reformers on the Continent. This translation differed from all that had preceded it not only in its plan, but also in its execution. The other versions had been generally the work or the revision of an individual, or, at most, a revision in which certain individuals executed certain particular parts; in this translation we find, on the contrary, many acting unitedly in the formation of a version, and thus, in the plan of operation, there was a principle of completeness which had not been acted on previously. The translators, by the use of supplementary words, often aided the sense without seeming to insert what was not found in the original. It was also stored with marginal notes. This version of the whole Bible was printed at Geneva by Rowland Hall in 1560, so that it was not published until after many of the exiles had returned home. In this translation, which was the first complete English Bible — divided by verses, it is to be observed that the translation of the New Testament *differs* in several respects from that which had been separately printed in 1556. The expense o preparing the Genevan Bible was

chiefly borne by John Bodley, the father of Sir Thomas, the founder of the noble library at Oxford. On the return of the exiles, Queen Elizabeth granted a patent to Bodley solely, for the term of seven years, to print this edition; yet, on account of the interference of Archbishop Parker, no edition of the Genevan Testament or Bible was published in England till the year 1576. Immediately after Parker's death this version was published; it continued to be frequently reprinted in this country, and was for many years the popular version in England, having been only gradually displaced by King James's translation, which appeared fifty-one years afterward. From the peculiar reading in <01307>Genesis 3:7, the editions of the Geneva version have been commonly known by the name of "Breeches Bibles;" but this reading, as we have already seen, is as old as Wycliffe's time, and occurs in his translation. To some editions of the Geneva Bible is subjoined Beza's translation of the New Testament, Englished by L. Thomson. The following are specimens of the Geneva Bible — <01442>Genesis 41:42, 43, and <40139>Matthew 13:19:

> And Pharaoh toke of his ring from his hand, and put vpon Ioseph's hand, and araied him in garments of fine linen and put a golden cheine about his necke. So he set him vpon the best charet that he had, sane one: & they cryed before hime Abrech, and placed him oner all the land of Egypt.

> Whensoeur a man heareth the worde of the kingdome, and vnderstandeth it not, the enil one cometh, and catcheth away that which was sowen in his heart: and this is he which hathe receiued the sede by the way side.

The next version of the Bible was superintended by Archbishop PARKER, hence sometimes called "Parker's Bible," and published in 1568. This version was executed with great care by more than fifteen learned men, the initials of whose names occur at the end of the portions executed by them. From the greater part of those who were engaged in its preparation being bishops, this version is also called the "Bishops' Bible." This edition is adorned with one hundred and forty-three engravings, including portraits and maps, which give it quite a pictorial appearance. The passages from the Vulgate, which had been introduced into Cranmer's Psalms, are omitted in this edition. This continued to be the version authorized to be read in the parish churches for forty-three years; but in private use it never displaced the Geneva version. Though the Bishops' Bible was the avowed basis of

our authorized version, this latter was executed upon wholly different principles, and is very different in its general character. To this Bible was prefixed, among other things, *the sum of Scripture,* tables of genealogy, and a preface written by Parker. In 1585, under Archbishop Whitgift, the seventeen readings from the Latin Vulgate were re-introduced, so as to harmonize with the Psalms in the Prayerbook. The edition of 1572 contains a double version of the Psalms, that of Cranmer's and that of the bishops'. The edition of 1595 has the Psalms according to Cranmer's Bible. The following is a specimen of this version — [3917]Malachi 3:17:

> And they shal be to me, saith the Lorde of hoastes, in that day wherein I shall do [iudgment], a flocke: and I wyl spare them as a man spareth his owne sonne which serueth him.

In the year 1582 was published the *Anglo-Rhemish* version of the New Testament. The circumstances which led to the execution of this version are to be found in the history of the expulsion of Romanism from England in the reign of Elizabeth. The versions of the New Testament previously executed, from that of Tyndale to the Bishops' Bible inclusively — the English text of Coverdale's Diglott New Testament excepted — had been made from the original Greek; but the Rhemish translators took for their basis the Latin Vulgate. One of the principal objects which the Rhemish translators had in view was evidently to circulate their doctrinal and controversial notes, together with the Scriptures translated by them. Though the translators desired anything rather than to give the rendering of the text simply and fairly, few passages show a really dishonest perversion; yet very many passages exhibit a desire of expressing the sense obscurely, or at least in such a way that a common reader may find not a little difficulty in gathering from the words a definite meaning. However, if we take the whole version, we shall find a very large portion well translated, and truly exhibiting the sense of the Latin Vulgate, such as they had it. Though the Council of Trent had defined the Latin Vulgate to be the "authentic" version, as yet, when the Rhemish version was printed, there had been no decision as to what copy was to be regarded as such. The Rhemish translators, as may be supposed, do not exactly agree with either the Sixtine published in 1590, or the Clementine edition published in 1592. Sometimes they have the reading adopted afterward by the one, sometimes that which is found in the other. This may be said to be a matter of comparatively small importance, so long as they used the best readings which were within their reach, in the absence of an authentic edition of the

Latin Vulgate. The following is a specimen of this version — ⁵⁸Hebrews 11:4:

> By faith Abel offered a greater hoste to God then Cain; by which he obtained testimonie that lie was iust, God giving testimonie to his guifts, and by it, he being dead yet speaketh.

The Romish translation of the Old Testament was published at *Douay,* in two volumes, in the years 1609 and 1610. The editors of this part of the version speak of it as having been executed many years before, but that the poor estate of the English Romanists, in their banishment, hindered its publication. They say that they have revised the version according to the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, that thus it might be fully in accordance with "the authenticated Latin." The following is a specimen of this version — ⁰¹Genesis 49:10:

> The scepter shal not be taken away from, Ivdas, and a dvke ovt of his thigh, til he doe come that is to be sent, and the same shal be the expectation of the gentiles.

In the modern editions of the Douay Bible and the Rhemish Testament, many changes have been introduced, some of which approximate to the authorized version, while others are not improvements.

It is marvellous how editions of the Scriptures were multiplied after the time of Tyndale, notwithstanding the severity of occasional persecutions. Besides about fourteen editions issued in Tyndale's life-time, eight or nine were issued in the year of his death. From the death of Tyndale to the close of Mary's reign, 1558, no fewer than fifty editions of the New Testament and twenty-six of the entire Bible were printed, and from 1558 to 1611 there were issued more than fifty editions of the New Testament. and about one hundred and twenty of the Bible, besides separate books. Of this number, twenty-one editions of the New Testament and sixty-four of the Bible were of the Genevan translation. Still the work of Tyndale forms substantially the basis of every revision, not excepting the translation now in common use.

III. *History of the English Translation now in common Use* — The authorized version was undertaken at the command of King James I, in consequence of several objections having been made by the Puritans to the bishops' translation at the second day's sitting of the conference held at the

palace of Hampton Court, January 16th, 1603-4. The method proposed by the king for the accomplishment of the new translation was thus That the version should be made by some of the most learned men in both the universities; that it then should be reviewed by certain of the bishops; that it should then be laid before the privy council; and, last of all, be ratified by royal authority. Accordingly, fifty-four men, pre-eminently distinguished for piety and learning, were appointed to execute this great work. However, the list of persons actually employed in the translation contains only *forty-seven* names. Though several of the persons thus appointed were made bishops before the work was completed, yet, as none of them were so at the time of the appointment, it would appear that the number needed to make up the deficiency is to be found in the fact of certain bishops having been especially named as having the work in some manner under their control. This view is not improbable when it is known that Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, is said to have made some alterations in the version; and Bilson, bishop of Winchester, was one of those who gave the work its final revision. The following is a list of the translators' names, with the parts assigned to each company (see Clarke's *Comment.* Genesis Pref. to O.T.; Macclure, *Authors of Engl. Bible,* N.Y. 1853):

1. *The Pentateuch; the story from Joshua to the First Book of the Chronicles exclusively;* these ten persons at Westminster: Dr. ANDREWS, fellow and master of Pembroke Hall, in Cambridge; then dean of Westminster; afterward bishop of Westminster. Dr. OVERALL, fellow of Trinity Coll.; master of Kath. Hall, in Cambridge; then dean of St. Paul's; afterward bishop of Norwich. Dr. SARAVIA. Dr. CLARKE, fellow of Christ Coll., in Cambridge; preacher in Canterbury. Dr. LAIFIELD, fellow of Trin. Coll., in Cambridge; parson of St. Clement Danes. (Being skilled in architecture, his judgment was much relied on for the fabric of the Tabernacle and Temple.) Dr. LEIGH, archdeacon of Middlesex; parson of All-Hallows, Barking. Master BURGLEY. Mr. KING. Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. BEDWELL, of Cambridge; vicar of Tottenham, near London.

2. *From the First of the Chronicles, with the Rest of the Storj, and the Hagiographa, viz., Job, Psalms, Proverb., Canticles, Ecclesiastes;* the following eight persons at Cambridge: Master EDWARD LIVELY. Mr. RICHARDSON, fellow of Emman. Coll., afterward D.).; master first of Peter-House Coll., then of Trin. Coll. Mr. CHADERTON, afterward D.D.; fellow first of Christ Coll., then master of Emman. Coll. Mr. DILLINGHAM, fellow of Christ Coll.; beneficed at ——, in Bedfordshire, where he died, a

single and a wealthy man. Mr. ANDREWS, afterward D.D., brother to the Bishop of Winchester, and master of Jesus Coll. Mr. HARRISON, the rev. vice-master of Trinity Coll. Mr. SPALDING, fellow of St. John's Coll., in Cambridge, and Hebrew professor there. Mr. BING, fellow of Peter-House Coll., in Cambridge, and Hebrew professor there.

3. *The Four Greater Prophets, with the Lamentation, and the Twelve Lesser Prophets;* these seven persons at Oxford: DR. HARDING, pres. of Magdalen Coll. Dr REYNOLDS, pres. of Corpus Christi Coll. Dr. HOLLAND, rector of Exeter Coll., and king's professor. Dr. KILBY, rector of Lincoln Coll., and regius professor. Master SMITH, afterward D. D., and bp. of Gloucester. (He wrote the preface to the version.) Mr. BRETT, of a good family, beneficed at Qainton, in Buckinghamshire. Mr. FAIRCLOWE.

4. *The Prajyer of Manasseh, and the Rest of the Apocrypha;* the following seven at Cambridge: Dr. DUPORT, prebend of Ely, and master of Jesus Coll. Dr. BRAINTHWAIT, first master of Emmanuel Coll., then master of Gonvil and Caius Coll. Dr. RADCLYFFE, one of the senior fellows of Trinity Coll. Master WARD, of Emman. Coll., afterward D.D.; master of Sidney Coll., and Margaret professor. Mr. DOWNS, fellow of St. John's Coll., and Greek professor. — Mr. BOYCE, fellow of St. John's Coll., prebend of Ely, parson of Boxworth, in Cambridgeshire. Mr. WARD, regal, afterward D.D., prebend of Chichester, rector of Bishop-Waltham, in Hampshire.

5. *The Fours Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Apocalypse;* these eight at Oxford Dr. RAVIS, dean of Christ Church, afterward bp. of London. Dr. ABBOTT, master of University Coll., afterward archbp. of Canterbury. Mr. ERDES. Mr. THOMSON. Mr. SAVILL. Dr. PERYN. Dr. RAVENS. Mr. HARMER.

6. *The Epistles of St. Paul, and the Canonical Epistle.;* these seven at Westminster: Dr. BAULOWE, of Trinity Coll., in Cambridge dean of Chester, afterward bishop of Lincoln. Dr. HUTCHENSON. Dr. SPENCER. Mr. FENTON. Mr. RABBET. Mr. SANDERSON. Mr. DAKINS.

The following instructions were drawn up for their proceedings:

1. "The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit."

2. “The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, to be retained as near as may be, according as they are vulgarly used.”

3. “The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word church not to be translated congregation.”

4. “When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith.”

5. “The division of the chapters to be altered either not at:ill, or as little as may be, if necessity so require.”

6. “No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot, without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text.”

7. “Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as shall serve for the fit references of one Scripture to another.”

8. “Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter or chapters; and having translated or amended them severally by himself, where he think good, all to meet together, to confer what they have done, and agree for their part what shall stand.”

9. “As any one company has despatched any one book in this maniner, they shall send it to the rest, to be considered of seriously and judiciously; for his majesty is very careful in this point.”

10. “If any company, upon the review of the book so sent, shall doubt or differ upon any places, to send them word thereof to note the places, and therewithal to send their reasons; to which if they consent not, the difference to be com. pounded at the general meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company, at the end of the work.”

11. “When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority, to send to any learned in the land for his judgment in such a place.”

12. “Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as, being skillful in the tongues, have taken pains in that kind, to send

their particular observations to the company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford, according as it was directed before in the king's letter to the archbishop."

13. "The directors in each company to be the deans of Westminster and Chester for Westminster, and the king's professors in Hebrew and Greek in the two Universities."

14. "These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible, viz., Tyndale's, Cover dale's, Matthew's, Whitchurch's, Geneva."

To these the following rule was added: 15. "Besides the said directors before mentioned, three or four of the most ancient and grave divines in either of the universities, not employed in translating, to be assigned by the vice-chancellor, upon conference with the rest of the heads, to be overseers of the translation, as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the 4th rule above specified."

According to these regulations, each book passed the scrutiny of all the translators successively. In the first instance, each individual translated every book which was allotted to his division. Secondly, the readings to be adopted were agreed upon by the whole of that company assembled together, at which meeting each translator must have been solely occupied by his own version. The book thus finished was sent to each of the other companies to be again examined; and at these meetings it probably was, as Selden informs us, that "one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or French, Spanish, Italian, etc. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on." In this way every precaution was taken to secure a faithful translation, as the whole Bible underwent at least six different revisions by the most learned men in the kingdom. The translation was commenced in the spring of 1607, and occupied about three years, and the revision of it occupied about three quarters of a year more. It was printed in Gothic letter, and first published in folio in 1611, with the title, "The Holy Bible Conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: Newly translated out of the originall Tongues: And with the former translations diligently compared and reuised by his Maiesties speciall Comandement. Appointed to be read in Churches." The expense of this translation appears not to have been borne by the king, nor by any government commission, but chiefly, if not entirely, by Mr. Barker.

IV. *Critical Estimate of the Authorized Version.* — It has often been affirmed that "King James's Bible is in no part a new translation taken directly from the originals, but that it is merely a revision of the earlier English versions, and compared with various Continental translations." These remarks are not strictly correct. The translators themselves give us a correct view of the nature of their work. In their dedication to King James, they observe, "Your highness, out of deep judgment, apprehended how convenient it was that, *out of the original tongues*, together with comparing of the labors, both in our own and other foreign languages, of many worthy men who went before us, there should be one more exact translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue." It must be admitted, however, that they closely followed the Septuagint and Vulgate in their emendations of previous English translations to suit the originals. As King James's version has been as extravagantly eulogized by some as it has been unduly decried by others, it will be well calmly and briefly to consider its merits as well as its faults.

The most prominent perhaps among its *excellences* is its simple, pure, and nervous style. Its words are usually chosen from the old — and more expressive Saxon element. It is this feature, no doubt, that has so endeared it to the popular heart, and which gives it a charm to the youngest reader. There are some noticeable exceptions to this remark, however, for it sometimes uses Latin terms when Saxon were at hand, e.g. "cogitation" for *thought;* "illuminate" for *enlightened;* "matrix" for *womb;* "prognosticator" for *foreteller;* "terrestrial" for *earthly;* "vocation" for *calling,* etc. In the Lord's Prayer, at both passages (<4006>Matthew 6:13; <4204>Luke 11:4), our translators employ "temptation" instead of *trial.* Another marked excellence that has usually been attributed to the Auth. Vers. is its general accuracy and fidelity to the original. In this respect it compares to great advantage with the Septuagint, which not only very often misses or misconstrues the entire drift of a clause, but sometimes interpolates words and whole verses from apocryphal sources; and also with the Vulgate and other ancient versions, which, if they do not, like the Targums, run into paraphrase, yet are very often misled into fanciful and erroneous interpretations. To this commendation, however, there must, in candor and truth, be made very large drawbacks in many individual renderings of the A.V., and even in whole classes of renderings. Not only were the sciences of sacred philology, and especially of Biblical geography and antiquities, in too crude a state to enable the translators to fix the exact

meaning of obscure and doubtful terms with precision, but they have totally ignored the diction, style, and arrangement of the poetic portions, especially the laws of *parallelism* (q.v.), reducing poetry to prose, and transposing the words in the clauses arbitrarily and without reference to the original. They habitually neglect the import of moods and tenses, especially in the Hebrew (constantly rendering the *praeter or future* by the *present* or indefinite *past*, or the reverse), and they constantly lose the true force of particles and the nice shades of meaning in the prepositions, the article, and syntactical construction. Occasionally they are very happy in their renderings, but there is scarcely a verse, especially in the more highly-wrought and terse utterances of the O.T., that is not marred or obscured by some loose or incorrect expression. It may safely be said that one half of modern popular commentaries is taken up with the correction of errors and the solution of difficulties, which a close, idiomatic, lucid, and judicious translation would at once have dissipated. It is true, few if any who have tried their hand at improved versions have succeeded any better; but this has usually been either because they were incompetent persons, or by reason of some dogmatic aim they had in view. Scholars who have been otherwise qualified have not themselves sufficiently appreciated the poetic element pervading the Hebrew writings, or they have overdone the task by embellishing rather than following the text.

Among the more obvious blemishes of the A. V. are its obsolete and indelicate phrases, its arbitrary and often absurd, always confusing, subdivision into chapters and verses, and its inexact and defective mode of punctuation. These are so objectionable, that, but for the attachment which long and early association produces for the version, it would often be laid aside for any other which avoided these faults. ‘From these causes alone the Song of Solomon has been practically discarded from both public and private reading, and many parts of the Bible cannot be safely ventured upon in a promiscuous company. The difficulty, it is true; sometimes lies in the passage itself, but there are very few instances where such phraseology might not properly be employed as would obviate all embarrassment. If any other book were as badly edited as out common Bibles, it would have provoked severe literary animadversion. But the inherent interest of the volume, the ineffaceable beauty of its sentiments, and the irrepressible force of its teachings break through every disguise, and command the attention of all minds and hearts.

Among the lesser failings of the Auth. Version may be mentioned its frequent renderings of the same word or phrase in the original by various terms or expresssions. This want of uniformity (which those who use this Cyclopaedia will continually have occasion to observe) was the result, probably, in part at least, of the execution of the translation by various, parties. In proper names and technical terms, the identification not unfrequently becomes impossible to ordinary readers. Other infelicities seem to have been, in part at least, the result of king James's restrictive rules.

We cannot conclude this criticism, which may appear harsh to those who have not minutely investigated the matter, without expressing the hope that the day is not far distant when a thorough revision on liberal principles will be made of the common version by a committee of learned men chosen from all evangelical denominations; or, what would perhaps be still more satisfactory, a new translation be put forth under the auspices of such an authority, and then left to secure its acceptance for critical purposes by its intrinsic merits. However excellent, it could not be expected to supersede the extensively circulated and familiar version for general use. *SEE VERSIONS (of the Bible).*

V. *Standard English Bibles. —*

1. *The Original Edition*. — This, as stated above, was published in the year 1611, the translation having been commenced in 1604. The probability is that the translation was finished in 1608, at the latest, leaving the unnecessarily long time of three years occupied in printing; but the reasons for this delay are not now known.

The volume is a stately folio, each page measuring 14.25 inches by 8.875, exclusive of margin. Two columns of text are on each page, each having 59 lines when full, and two marginal columns. The text is printed from an uncommonly heavy and noble Old-English type — "great primer" in size, reduced by the shrinking of the paper to nearly "two-line brevier." The head-lines of the pages are in a very large Roman letter, three quarters of an inch deep. Each chapter commences with an engraved initial, about an inch square; and each book with one yet larger, often 2.5 inches square. In addition, engraved ornaments are at the beginning of every book, and the title-page consists of a heavy engraved border, having a very little place for letter-press. The effect of this display, however, is somewhat reduced when we learn that none of these embellishments were provided expressly for

this Bible, but that they had all appeared in previous editions of other translations. One or two of the large initials, indeed, were engraved for an edition of Ovid. The parts usually printed in italic, as the headings and supplied words, are in Roman.

The volume contains, besides the text and Apocrypha (this latter being printed from the same type as the rest of the book), the Address to the Reader, a very valuable document, which, most unfortunately, is now almost entirely lost sight of; the Dedication "to the most high and mighty Prince James," which is just as worthless as the other is valuable, and is nevertheless printed in all English Bibles to this day; Speed's Genealogies, covering 34 pages, very intricate, profound, ingenious, and dry; and, apparently, a Calendar, though copies containing this last are very rare. The pages are not numbered, but the signatures, or printer's guide-letters, placed at the foot of certain pages, run up in the Apocrypha to Ccccc, which is equal, counting by sixes, to 1368 pages, and in the New Testament to Aa, which counts 300 more. This covers the text only.

The spelling and punctuation are very irregular, as in all books of the time. The following two verses, taken at random, will be a sufficient example — Matthew 9:1, 2:

> And hee entred into a ship, and passed ouer, and came into his owne citie.
>
> 2 And behold, they brought to him a man ficke of the pal-fie, lying on a bed: and Iefus feeing their faith, faid vnto the ficke of the palfie, Sonne, be of good cheere, thy finnes be for-giuen thee.

There are also many typographical errors — more, indeed, than would be borne with in any Bible printed now. The most striking is in Exodus 14:10, which reads thus, modernizing the spelling:

> 10 And when Pharaoh drear nigh, the children of Israel lift up their eyes, and behold, the Egyptians marched after them, and they were sore afraid: and the children of Israel lift up their eyes, and behold, the Egyptians marched after them, and they were sore afraid: and the children of Israel cried out unto the Lord.

Other notable errors are in Leviticus 13:56, "the plain be somewhat dark," where we must read, "the plague be somewhat dark;" Leviticus 17:14, "Ye shall not eat the blood." for "Ye shall eat ;" Jeremiah 22:8,

"deliver the spoiler," instead of "deliver the spoiled;" <26247>Ezekiel 24:7, "poured it upon the ground," for "not upon;" <28605>Hosea 6:5, "shewed them," for "hewed them;" and many others. These, however, were soon corrected.

Notwithstanding that by the king's command marginal notes were not to be affixed, some were found indispensable. For instance, at <40212>Matthew 22:2, we have the note, "The Roman penny is the eighth part of an ounce, which, after five shillings the ounce, is seven-pence halfpenny." Others of this class are found. In other places, the translators did not even avoid critical rotes. Baruch 1:10, at "prepare ye manna," has "Gr. corruptly for mincha, that is, a meat-offering." Others of these notes might be pointed out; but, as a general thing, these would be quite as well omitted, as they now generally are. The number of marginal references is very small — only 8980, including the Apocrypha. At present the best Bibles, without the Apocrypha, have over seventy thousand. Bagster's Comprehensive Bible claims to have "nearly half a million," which, we opine, is incorrect.

The translators' manuscript has been lost. According to a pamphlet published in 1660, it was, five years previously, in the possession of the king's printers. It has not since been heard of. The manuscript of the Translators' Address to the Reader is said to be preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Copies of this edition are now pretty scarce. The commonest loss, as with other books, is of title-pages.

Much care is necessary to identify an imperfect copy of this edition, for a second was printed in 1611, and others in 1613, 1617, 1634, and 1640, from the same type, and running page for page. Each edition presents typographical errors peculiar to itself. The only clew we have here space to give is, that the two editions of 1611 are the only ones in which the signatures recommence with the New Testament, and the second of that year has the before-mentioned errors corrected. Many bad ones, however, are found in it, not the least of which is the enumeration of "1 Corinthians" and "2 Corinthians" in the list of the hooks of the Old Testament instead of Chronicles. In 1833 a reprint of this first edition, page for page, but in Roman letter, was made at Oxford, so exact as to follow even the most obvious typographical errors, and showing the ancient spelling throughout. Bagster's *English Hexa-pla* also contains the text of the New Testament printed verbatim from this edition; and where the book itself is

unattainable, these are perhaps the best substitutes for those who, for any reason, require to go behind the Bibles now in use.

A close scrutiny of the volume reveals indisputably the facts that no member of the original companies of translators took cognizance of the volume as it passed through the press, but that the printer was depended on to secure accuracy; and that, notwithstanding the lapse of three, perhaps four years between the completion of the translation and its publication, it was run through the press with great haste. Add to this the fact that from 1600 to 1670 the British press was at its lowest point in improvement, and it will at once be seen that the chances of obtaining correct Bibles at first, or subsequently, were very. small. Upon its publication, editions were very rapidly multiplied. Each new one partly copied and partly corrected the errors of its exemplar; but each, to some extent, created new errors of its own, to be in like manner perpetuated. In 1638, for instance, a Cambridge Bible printed “ye” for “we” in <4603>Acts 6:3, thus throwing the appointment of deacons into the hands of the laity rather than the apostles; and this error continued down to 1691. It has been insinuated that the Independents made this change intentionally; D’Israeli, indeed, goes so far as to charge Field, the king’s printer, with receiving a present of £1500 to make it; and only the fact of its being first found in a Cambridge University edition disproves the statement. Many other errata, curious, whimsical, absurd, and shocking by turns, might be brought up from Bibles of the period, such as, for a few instances, “I pray God it may be laid to their charge,” <5546>2 Timothy 4:16, in 1613; “Thou shalt commit adultery,” in 1632; “the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God,” <4609>1 Corinthians 6:9, in 1653. In each of these cases “not” is omitted; but often words are transposed or changed, and the quarto of 1613 leaves two verses entirely out. The first attempt at correcting these errors seems to have been made by a Dr. Scattergood about 1680. From a collation of various old Bibles, we have come to the conclusion that he did but little. The next notable edition was that of Archbishop Tenison, 1701. This was intended for a standard, but unluckily was so full of typographical errors that a complaint was entered against the printers by Convocation.

2. *Blayney’s Edition. — Sufficient* care not being yet taken, King George I, in 1724, directed that the persons licensed to print the Bible — for in England, for the sake of insuring accuracy as far as possible, the book can only be printed by the universities, the king’s printers, and persons by them licensed — should employ such correctors of the press, and pay them such

salaries as the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London should approve. Errors, however, most pertinaciously crept in, and at length the University of Oxford employed Dr. Blayney to revise the English Bible and correct it throughout. His work was published in 1769. It was issued in two forms, folio and quarto, the former being claimed to be the most correct. His collation was made by comparing throughout the edition of 1611 (but which one cannot now be known, for it has only recently keen settled that two editions were published in that year), that of 1701, which has already been mentioned for its incorrectness, and two recent Cambridge copies. From these somewhat unpromising materials he claims to have reformed the text "to such a standard of purity as, it is presumed, is not to be met with in any other edition hitherto extant." How far this is the case will be seen by-and-by. Besides this, the punctuation was revised throughout "with a view to preserve the true sense;" upon comparison with the Hebrew and Greek originals, many alterations were made in the words printed in italic; "considerable alterations were made in the "heads or contents prefixed to the chapters;" many proper names were translated in the margin, where the narrative contained an allusion to their meaning (this should have been done fully); the chronology, which was first added in 1680, was rectified; and the marginal references were compared and corrected throughout, besides having 30,495 new ones added.

Dr. Blayney makes an accidental admission, tending to lower confidence in the book, that two proofs were read, "and, generally speaking, the third likewise," which is quite insufficient for a standard edition of any work, or even an ordinary edition of the Bible. Four proofs are the least allowable on such a work. It is no wonder that afterward one hundred and sixteen typographical errors were discovered in it. The most important is in Revelation 18:22, which in the quarto copy reads:

> 22 And the voice of harpers, and musicians, and of pipers, and trumpeters, shall be heard no more in thee; and the sound of a milstone shall be heard no more at all in thee;

Reference to a correct Bible will show that the following words are omitted: "at all in thee; and no craftsman, of whatsoever craft he be, shall be found any more." But, saying nothing of accidental errors like this, there is yet abundant ground for complaint against the text for incorrectness. In Joshua 3:12, all previous editions had read "Take ye twelve men;" it appears here, to the confusion of the grammar, "Take you twelve men." In

<06119>Joshua 11:19, “unto my place” is changed to “into my place;” and, so far as there is a difference in the sense, the change is incorrect. But these errors, though utterly out of place in a standard Bible, are venial by the side of others. In <07107>Judges 11:7, all editions before, and most after, read “the elders of Gilead;” he has, “the children of Gilead.” In <19403>Psalm 24:3, instead of “and who shall stand in his holy place?” he introduced “or who shall stand.” In <19A716>Psalm 107:16, he, followed only by editions copied from him, reads “for he hath broken the gates of brass, and cut the gates of iron in sunder,” the true reading being “bars of iron.” In <19B503>Psalm 115:3, he is the first to read “whatsoever he hath pleased,” the inserted “hath” being quite superfluous. His is the only edition we have met with which reads, in <23409>Isaiah 47:9 “But these two things which shall come in a moment.” Most important is the change he introduced into <40616>Matthew 16:16, where he reads “Thou art the Christ” instead of “Thou art Christ.” In this edition we find, for the first time, in <47202>2 Corinthians 12:2, “I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago” instead of “above.” In <62104>1 John 1:4, the reading “our joy” for “your joy,” though often met with now, is only an error first made in this edition. In punctuation, too, Blayney did but little better. There are few places where he for the first time mispointed a verse, but he has perpetuated many errors. In <05903>Deuteronomy 9:3, the original, and all down to his time, are pointed substantially thus: “The Lord thy God is he which goeth over before thee as a consuming fire: he shall destroy them,” etc.; but the sense is entirely changed by putting the colon after “thee,” and no point at “fire.” In <44218>Acts 27:18, the translators placed the comma after “day,” but he perpetuated the mistake of placing it after ‘‘tempest,” the effect of which is to make the mariners endure an exceeding storm for twenty-four hours before they lightened the ship. In <58102>Hebrews 10:12, the sense is entirely lost by placing the comma after “sins” instead of at “forever,” according to the translators. Other typographical errors remained uncorrected. For instance, the marginal reading of <32006>Jonah 4:6, is the meaningless “palmerist.” In <54209>1 Timothy 2:9, Blayney reads “shamefacedness” instead of “shamefastness,” a word of an entirely different meaning; and this error, unfortunately, has been continued to our day. In the same text he perpetuated the nonsensical corruption “broidered;” and in <54046>1 Timothy 4:16, he continues the error made a century before of “thy doctrine” for “the doctrine.” He is faulty in a critical point: the distinction between “LORD” and “Lord.” The word seems to be uniformly printed “LORD” with him; certainly in every case we have noticed, including many where the Hebrew is *Adonai*. On the other hand,

Blayney did some good things. He changed the obsolete “sith” into “since” in two places, though he left it unchanged in two others: Ezekiel 35:6, and the heading to Romans 5. In a few cases in which “mo” had remained unaltered to his time, he changed it to “more.” He changed “fet,” taken as a preterite, into “fetched;” as a verb present it had been altered before. He attempted, too, to change “glister,” but, as with “sith,” only partially. Had he carried out his plan of translating signifcant proper names, he would have conferred a great benefit on his readers but here again he stopped half way.

The quarto edition, the one here referred to, is in three volumes, containing respectively the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and the New; Testament. It contains no special preface, or mention of its peculiarities on the title-page or elsewhere, but is simply dated “Oxford: Printed by T. Wright and W. Gill, printers to the University.” It was published at four guineas.

The University of Oxford paid Dr. Blayney £5000 for his labor in revising the Bible. They thereupon concluded that they had an available standard, and incontinently adopted it. The other privileged presses followed. But very soon his errors, one by. one, came to, light; some were corrected at one press, some at another; just as had been the case before, passages really correct were changed in ignorance, and the upshot of it all was, that in a very few years there was no standard again.

In 1804 the British and Foreign Bible Society was formed, and proceeded to work on the principle of buying the cheapest Bibles it could and trusting to the printers for accuracy. The American Revolution had erected a new Bible-reading nation; an effort made in its first Congress to restrict the printing of the book to licensed houses was cut short by the first amendment to the Constitution, and the book was thrown into the hands of the trade at large, with anything but a beneficial effect on its general integrity. To crown all, the English printers became careless in supplying the foreign market. Charles Knight tells us of a Bible so full of typographical errors that its printers dare not publish it in England, and he was assured “we had to send the whole edition to America!”

The editions of 1806 and 1813, though adopted as standards by the Protestant Episcopal Church, were but careful reprints of Blayney without further editorial care.

3. *The American Bible Society's Revision.* — This society was formed in 1816, and proceeded to print its own Bibles, thus making itself responsible for their correctness. For the first thirty years it seems to have followed almost any respectable copy that came to hand, disregarding discrepancies. But in so many editions as were now produced in England and here, these differences were constantly increasing in number. They were chiefly in punctuation, the use of capitals and italics, and such minor points. At length, in 1847, these had accumulated to such an extent that the proof-readers of the Society really did not know what to follow. The matter was now referred to the Board of Managers of the Society, and in February, 1848, they resolved to have a thorough collation of the English Bible made, and appointed Rev. J. W. McLane, D.D., of the (New-School) Presbyterian Church of Williamsburg, N. Y., to proceed with it. Accordingly, recent copies from the four "standard" British houses were obtained, an American Bible Society's copy was the fifth, and the edition of 1611 the sixth. Blayney was ignored. These were carefully compared throughout; every variation, no matter how minute, noted; and this comparison furnished the data whence to prepare the text of a future edition. The number of variations found was about twenty-four thousand. The Apocrypha formed no part of the work.

The rules governing the formation of this standard text were simple. The reading of a majority of the copies was to be followed; when the three English copies agreed as to the use of the hyphen, their usage was to be accepted. In other matters, where each copy wass inconsistent with itself, a system was agreed on. For instance, each copy had in one place "a highway," in another "an highway." So, too, every copy had sometimes "a husband" and "an husband," "a hole" and "an hole," "a hill" and "an hill," "a hammer" and "an hammer," and so on. Here the strict grammatical rule was enforced. The distinction between "O" and "Oh," which had been lost sight of, was brought out, either form being used, as the sense of the passage required. In capital letters the words "Spirit" and "Scripture" were found very irregular; the first was made to be capital when referring to the Spirit of God, not elsewhere; the second, when referring to the whole volume. Some spellings, now obsolete, were reformed, as "spunge," "sope," "cuckow," "plaister," "rasor," "morter," "asswaged," and others; and, what was of more importance, some names of Old-Testament characters given in the New Testament, and there spelled according to the Greek, were changed to the ordinary Old-Testament spelling. Thus "Juda"

was changed to “Judah,” because it was already spelled so in the Old Testament; “Gedeon” to “Gideon,” “Jephthae” to “Jephthah,” “Sina,” to “Sinai,” “Chanaan” to “Canaan,” “Core” to “Korah,” and so with some — not all — others. In the words of the text the following changes from the modern copies were made. In <061902>Joshua 19:2, “and Sheba” was made “or Sheba.” In <080315>Ruth 3:15, “she went” was changed to “he went.” In Solomon’s Song 2:7, “he please” was made “‘she please.” In <230116>Isaiah 1:16, “wash you” was altered to “wash ye.” But all of these corrections were according to the original edition, which had been departed from in each case wrongly. Farther, in <401241>Matthew 12:41, “in judgment” was made “in the judgment,” because the Greek required it, and very many early English copies had it, though not the first. Also in Solomon’s Song 3:5, and 8:4, the same change was made as in 3:7; for, though the original edition here read “he,” the probability, all things considered, was that it was but a typographical error in each case. In prosecuting the collation, the headings of the chapters came under notice. These often differed; but, so far as they agreed with the edition of 1611, or that of Blayney, they were frequently faulty. Some were distinctly and positively false, as those to <270801>Daniel 8, <234101>Isaiah 41, <380701>Zechariah 7; others were comments on the text, as those to <190401>Psalm 49, <271101>Daniel 11, and the whole of Solomon’s Song; others were incomprehensibly clumsy, as the few first of Acts; some positively shocking, as “the Lord refuseth to go as he had promised with his people” (<023301>Exodus 33); “Samuel sent by God under pretense of a sacrifice” (<091601>1 Samuel 16). These headings had not been prepared by the body of the original forty-seven translators, but by one of their number and one other person; they never were considered as forming part of the version; they had been extensively altered before, both by Blayney and by many anonymous parties, and therefore the committee under whose care the collation was going on resolved to remodel these where necessary. Wherever “Christ” or “the Church” was mentioned in any Old-Testament heading, “Messiah” and “Zion,” the equivalent words used in the Old-Testament text, were substituted, in order to avoid comment. The marginal references were again rectified, many errors corrected, and their number, upon the whole, diminished. A very few marginal readings were added, chiefly explanatory of proper names. To <402324>Matthew 23:24, where “at” is now generally considered to be a misprint from the first for “out,” a note was put, “Or, strain out;” and to “Jesus,” in <440745>Acts 7:45, the committee put the note, “That is, Joshua,” as the translators themselves had done in <580408>Hebrews 4:8. (See, on the whole subject, the Society’s pamphlet

entitled “Report on the History of the Recent Collation of the English Version of the Bible,” N. Y. 1857.)

The standard thus prepared was published in 1851. Though issued in a quiet way, it was received with general approval. For six years it remained the standard of the Society, and during that time not a whisper of disapprobation was heard. But in 1857 a Protestant Episcopal clergyman of Baltimore published a pamphlet aimed at this work, in which, while carefully avoiding specific charges, the most severe spirit was exhibited. The Society was accused of an attempt to “supersede the time-honored version in its integrity;” it was making a “half-way adventure” toward a new translation; it was “debasing the standard;” its Bible was “a vulgarized work,” and so on. The committee had found twenty-four thousand variations in the Bibles in common use; their language was converted into a statement that they had made twenty-four thousand changes. The New-York organ of the same church at once joined in the attack, but the amount of its charge was that the standard was different from every copy collated. In the General Assembly of the Old-School Presbyterian Church in the same year, the same subject was brought up by a speaker who stigmatized the standard as being “tinkered up” by “an anonymous printer and a New-School preacher!” Asking, “Why discard these captions that have been acquiesced in two hundred years?” he forgot that they had *not* been so acquiesced in, and that abundant reason had been shown for “discarding” them. In July, 1857, the (Presbyterian) *Princeton Review* had a most bitter article on the same subject. — The only attempt to meet the difficulties of the case was the statement (page 510) that the Society should “give up entirely all idea of producing a standard text,” or otherwise should “take the standard editions and collate them.” But if this latter course was followed, as it had been, “the Society would have no right to exercise its own discretion in selecting the readings or the punctuation it would adopt.” In compliance with these and similar demands from auxiliary bodies, the Board of Managers, in February, 1858, revoked this standard. Their present imperial quarto edition is now their *printer’s* guide. With this action perished the hope of having for the present a generally-accepted standard of King James’s translation. One cannot now be got up in England by any one church, because dissent in many branches is so extensive; nor by cooperation, because they have no union; nor by their Bible Society, because it does not print its own books. In this country the American Bible Society is the only body which has any general authority. It

is to be regretted that this society has not felt itself authorized by its constitution to retain and prosecute the needed work. *SEE BIBLE SOCIETIES*, 3, 12.

VI. *Marginal Readings.* — These are generally passed over by Bible readers, but a careful student will find them invaluable for ascertaining the precise meaning of any text. They are of two kinds: the first, commonly marked by a dagger (†), giving the literal translation of a peculiar idiom in the originals where it could not be rendered in good English, also the translation of significant proper names; and the other, marked by a parallel (II), representing a possible different rendering where the original is in doubt from any cause. They are further distinguished by being prefaced by "That is," in the translations of names, or "Heb.," "Chald.," or "Gr.," according to the original language in the first class; and "Or," in the second class. In many modern Bibles they are referred to by consecutive figures or Greek letters; but the system here described is that used by the original translators and by the American Bible Society. The translators regarded these readings as a component part of their work; and to the present day ministers of the Church of England read and use either the marginal rendering or that in the text at pleasure. They were first used by the translators of the Geneva version of the Bible half a century before ours was made.

Since the publication of our translation in the year 1611, the marginal readings have at various times been enlarged and improved. There are now about three hundred of these more than the original number, and a few have been omitted. Of the others, many have been extended by adding the necessary expletives. A few palpable errors have been corrected, as in the note to 1 Samuel 5:4, where the stump of the fish-idol Dagon was ludicrously described as "the filthy part," now correctly printed "the fishy part." In other cases one note has been divided into two, one of each class. In one instance an odd typographical error has been introduced into a note and perpetuated; Jonah's gourd (Jonah 4:6) is in the first edition described as a "palme-crist," or *palma christi* (the castor-oil plant), in the margin; but the word has been corrupted into "palmerist," to which no meaning can be attached.

There is no trace of any person or body authorized to make these changes, and except in the correction of palpable typographical errors, as above noticed, it would seem that they should no more be meddled with than

should those other readings which form the body of the text. Both came originally from the same translators, and both were intended to be of equal authority. This fact at once places them above the rank of mere commentary, and renders their study most important. <8012>Ruth 1:20, for example, is almost meaningless as commonly printed; but when opposite '"Naomi" we read "that is, Pleasant," and opposite "Mara," "that is, Bitter," we see at once a beauty in the passage of which otherwise we could form no idea. So, also, with strength of expression. Verse 13 of the same chapter is made much stronger when, instead of "it grieveth me much for your sakes," we read, "I have much bitterness for your sakes." <1803>Job 16:3, is wonderfully strengthened if we adopt the Hebrew idiom — never mind if the English is not so good — and instead of "vain words," read "words of wind." So when, in <1807>Job 5:7, we read "sons of the burning coal" instead of "sparks," we at once see, better than by any commentary ever written, the metaphorical character of Old-Testament poetry, and thenceforth can read the poetical books with vastly-increased appreciation.

VII. *Chapter and Verse.* — Among the Jews, with whom the only divisions of the Scripture was into books, according to authorship, references were made by citing the subject treated of near where the passage quoted was to be found. In this way Jesus referred the Sadducees to what we call <0206>Exodus 3:6, as we see by <4126>Mark 12:26. The meaning here is not that God spoke to Moses in the bush, for the text says that he spoke to him *out of* it; but rather, "Have ye not read in the Book of Moses, in The Bush, how God spake unto him?" that is, "in that part of the Book of Moses called The Bush." "I may observe," says Archbishop Trench, "that <4502>Romans 11:2, is a quotation of the same kind. It can never mean 'of Elias,' as in our version, but is rather 'in [the history of] Elias,' in that portion of Scripture which tells of him." The Koran is quoted by this means now. Its chapters are called from their subjects by such names as "The Cow," "Thunder," "Smoke," "The Moon," "Divorce," "The Spider," "The Resurrection," "The Slanderer," and so on.

The division into chapters was made by a cardinal, Hugo de Sancto Caro, about the year 1250. He was employed in compiling a Latin Concordance, the first of which we have any account, and invented this division to facilitate his labor. The Book of Psalms is naturally divided. Paul quotes "the second Psalm" and "another Psalm" in <4433>Acts 13:33, 35. The chapters having been marked, greater precision was obtained by putting capital A, B, C, and so on, at regular distances down in the margin, so that

any passage near the beginning of a chapter would be quoted; as, for example, “John, 10, A;” further down, “Jeremiah, 14, D,” and so on. The early English versions all showed this arrangement, and Marbeck’s Concordance, the first one in English, makes its references in this manner. These smaller divisions by letters were inconvenient, because they were not made by any system, and in different translations were of different lengths. They generally embraced about six or seven verses under one letter. The divisions into chapters were not uniform; at least they are not so in our early English translations. Wycliffe, for instance, divides Jude into two chapters; and Coverdale makes thirty chapters in 1 Chronicles by dividing the fourth chapter into two. Very frequently in the Pentateuch and Job, and occasionally elsewhere, there is a difference of one to four verses in the beginning of a chapter. Where this is the case, too, our version often makes the division in the worst place.

The divisions into verses were made by several persons. About 1430 Rabbi Mordecai Nathan divided the Hebrew Bible thus, using Cardinal Hugo’s chapters. In 1527 a Latin Bible was published at Lyons in which this division of the Old Testament was followed, and the New Testament also divided, but into verses averaging twice as long as ours. But our present arrangement in this part of the Scriptures was made about 1550, by Robert Stephens, a printer of Paris, who executed the work ,while making a horseback journey from Lyons to Paris. This was done only as an advertisement for an edition of the Testament he soon after published in Greek, with two Latin versions. The circumstances under which the work was done effectually prevented the exercise of any scholastic or critical care or ability. But, though the Old Testament was divided first, no edition of it in Hebrew was printed thus till 1661. The first English Scripture printed with verses was the Testament printed at Geneva, 1557, and in 1560 the whole Bible at the same place. The Bishops’ Bible, next in order, published in 1568, had them, but also had the marginal guide letters, as in the earlier translations, and in its marginal references it uses the letters instead of the verses. In the next Protestant translation, King James’s, or’ our present one, the letters are altogether omitted. It seems never to have been considered that the division into verses superseded chapters; but really a reference to Luke 243 would be much shorter than to <2213>Luke 12:13. The Psalms are, by their structure, naturally divided into verses. But yet our translations are not uniform in this, even here. <1901>Psalm 42, for instance, is in Coverdale’s Bible made one paragraph; Matthew’s, twelve

verses; Cranmer's, fifteen, Geneva and Bishops', eleven; and the Douay, twelve. In Cranmer's Bible each of the alphabetical sections of Psalm 119 is numbered independently, 1 to 8.

From all this it appears that these divisions have no divine warrant whatever, were carelessly made, and should be disregarded in seeking the sense of any part of Scripture. Hence it follows that the best Bibles for common use are those called Paragraph Bibles, in which the. matter is reduced to ordinary prose form, except in the poetical books, which are printed in short lines, so as to show their poetic structure. Unfortunately, but few editions are thus published. The Religious Tract Society of London issue a few; one in 12mo, some thirty years ago, was the best. One they have recently got out, in royal 8vo, with notes and maps, has all the parallel passages, and, though very useful, is so encumbered with reference marks in the text as to distract the reader's attention constantly. Rev. T. W. Colt published a very good one in Cambridge, Mass., 1834. Before that, others had been got out at Oxford, chiefly objectionable as not showing the poetic form of some parts. One of the most useful Paragraph Bibles to the English student is that of Bishop Wilson, Bath, 1785, 3 vols. 4to; but it labors under the disadvantage just spoken of.

After all, the best way of making references would have been by a system like the "folios" of the lawyers. Put a special mark at every hundredth word, and a corresponding number in the margin, and you have not only a ready means of reference, but a guard against changes in the text, and are yet at full liberty to print the matter either as prose or poetry, without distracting the eye or breaking the sense in the slightest degree. It is, however, too late to do this with our present version. As the next best thing, more Paragraph Bibles should be printed, in all respects like other books, except that the commencement of each verse may be shown by a Very small mark in the body of the line, and its number in the margin opposite. — *Christian Advocate (N.* Y.). *SEE BIBLE*.

VIII. *Literature.* —

1. On the *history* of the subject: Baber, *Account of Saxon and English Versions* (in his ed. of Wycliffe's N.T.); Newcome, *English Biblical Translations,* etc Duibl. 1792), Tomline, *Engl. Translation of the Bible* (in his *Christ. Theol.* 2); Timperley, in his *Encycl. of Typographical A necdote,* passim; Wilson, *Catalogue of Bibles,* etc. (Lond. 1845); Hewlet, in his *Bible,* p. 1; M'Clure, *The Translators Reviewed* (N. Y. 1853). 2. On

the *criticism* of the present and proposed versions; Macknight On the *Epistles,* 1; Campbel On the *Gospels,* 2, 141, 241; Broughton, *Works,* p. 557, 575; Fulke, *Defence,* etc. (reprinted for the Parker Soc., Cambr. 1843); Killburn, *Dangerous Errors,* etc. (Lond. 1659); Lee, *Memorial,* etc. (Edinb. 1824); Curtis, *The Monopoly,* etc. (Lond. 1833; answered by Cardwell [Oxf. 1833], and Tutton [Cambr. 1833, again 1834]); Whetenhall, *Scripture Authentic* (Lond. 1686); Gell, *Essay toward Amendments,* etc. (Lond. 1659); Le Cene, *Essay for a New Translation* (Lond. 1727); Lookup, *Erroneous Translations,* etc. (Lond. 1739); Brett, *Letter,* etc. (Lond. 1743; enlarged, 1760; also in Bp. Watson's *Tracts);* Penn, *Mistranslations,* etc. (in his *Tracts* [1757], p. 367); Garnham, *Letter to Bp. of Norwich* (Lond. 1789); Roberts, *Corrections,* etc. (Lond. 1794); Ward, *Errata,* etc. (Lond. 1688; Dublin, 1807; replied to by Ryan [Dublin, 1808], and Grier [Lond. 1812]); White, *Sermon,* etc. (Oxf. 1779, p. 24); Symonds. *Observations,* etc. (Cambr. 1789-94); Burgess, *Reasons,* etc. (Durham, 1816); Wemyss, *Biblical Gleanings* (York, 1816); Fuller, *Remarks,* etc. *(Works,* p. 990); Burges, *Reasons,* etc. (Lond. 1819); Whittaker, *Inquiry,* etc. (Lond. 1819, 1820); Hurwitz, *Defence,* etc. (Lond. 1820); Laurence, *Remarks,* etc. (Oxf. 1820).; Harness, *State of the Engl. Bible* (Lond. 1856); Malan, *Vindication,* etc. (Lond. 1856); Iliff, *Plea,* etc. (Lond. 1856); Cumming, *Bible Revision* (Lond. 1856); Baber, *Plea,* etc. (Lond. 1857); M'Caul, *Reasons,* etc. (Lond. 1857); Burgess, *Revision,* etc. (Lond. 1857); Trench, *Revision,* etc. (new ed. Lond. 1859).

The following are the principal editions referred to in this article (see also Bagster's "English Hexapla," containing the versions of Wycliffe, Tyndale, Cranmer, Genevan, Anglo-Rhemish, Authorized, etc., Lond. 1841, 4to; also the exact reprint of the A. V. of 1611, issued from the Clarendon Press, 1833, 4to).

I. ANGLO-SAXON.

1. *Caedmon,* original, with translation and notes by Thorpe (Lond. 1832, 8vo).

2. *Gospels,* ed. by Abp. Parker (Lond. 1571, 4to); by Thorpe (Lond. 1842, 12mo).

3. *Psalter,* Latin-Saxon, ed. by Spelman (Lond. 1640, 4to); by Thorpe (Oxford, 1835, 8vo). 4. *Job,* etc., Anglo-Saxon, ed. by Thwaites (Oxford, 1699, Svo).

II. EARLY ENGLISH.

1. WYCLIFFE: *Bible* (ed. by Forshall and Madden, Oxf. 1850, 4 vols. 4to); *New Test.* (? Worms, 1525, 8vo [exactly reprinted at Lond. 1836]; Cologne and Worms, 1525, 4to; also in 1526, 1527, 1528, 1530; ed. by Lewis, Lond. 1731, fol.; by Baber, Lond. 1810, 4to).

2. TYNDALE: *New Test.* (Antw. 1534,-12mo; altered by Joyce, Antw. 1534,16mo): *Matthew and Mark* (1534); the rest uncertain.

3. COVERDALE: *Bible* (? Zurich, 1535, fol. [reprinted by Bagster, Lond. 4to, 1835, 1847]; fol. and 4to, 153T; Zur. and Lond. 4to, 1550 [and 1553]).

4. MATTHEW (i.e. John Rogers): *Bible* (fol. Lond. 1537, 1549 twice, 1551 twice).

5. CRANMERS: *Bible* (fol. Lond. 1539, 1540, 1541, 1549 twice; 4to, 1550, 1552,1553; fol. 1558; 4to, 1561; fol. 1526, 1566; 8vo, 1566; 4to, 1568, 1569).

6. TAVERNER: *Bible* (fol. Lond. 1539; 5 vols. 8vo, 1549).

7. GENEVAN: *Bible* (Geneva, 4to, 1560; fol. 1561; 4to, 1569, 1570, 1575, Lond. fol. 1576, 1577, 1578; Edinb. 1579, fol.; Lond. 4to, 1579, 1580, 1581; 8vo, 1581, fol. 1582, 1583; 4to, 1585, 1586, Svo, 1586; 4to. 1587, 1588, 1589, 1590; 8vo, Camb. 1591; fol. Lond. 1592; 8vo, 1593, 4to, 1594; fol. and 4to, 1595; 4to, 1596; fol. 1597; 4to, 1598, 1599, 1600, Dort, 1601, 16mo; Lond. fol. 1602; 4to and Svo, 1603, 1606; fol., 4to, and 8vo, 1607; 4to and 8vo, 1618; 4to, 1609; fol., 4to, and 8vo, 1610; fol. and 4to, 1611; Edinb. fol 1610; Lond. 4to, 1613, 1614, 1615; fol. 1616; Amst. fol. 1617; 4to, 1633, etc.): *New Test.* (Geneva, 1557, 8vo).

8. BISHOPS' (or Parker's): *Bible* (Lond. 4to, 1568; 4to, 1569; fol. 157-?; 4to, 1573; fol. 1574, 1575; 4to, 1576, 1577; fol. 1578, 1584; 4to, 1584; fol. 1585, 1588, 1591, 1595, 1598, 1602, 1606).

9. BEZA'S Lat. tr. by Tomson; *New Test.* (Lond. 1576, 8vo); afterward in many "Genevan" Bibles.

III. KING JAMES'S.

The editions of this have been innumerable (see the Appendix to Anderson's *Annals of the Bible*, Lond. ed.).

The following are some of the attempts at an improved English version of the Scriptures (not including those for critical purposes contained in commentaries, etc.): Harwood, *New Test.* (Lond. 1768, 2 vols. 8vo); Purver, *Old and New Test.* (Lond. 1764, 2 vols. fol.); Worsley, *New Covenant* (Lond. 1770, 8vo); Geddes, *Bible* [Genesis to Ruth] (Lond. 1792-1800, 3 vols. 4to); Wakefield, *New Test.* (Lond. 1795, 2 vols. 8vo); Newcome, *New Covenant* (Dubl. 1796, 2 vols. 8vo); McRae, *Eastern Bible* (Lond. 1799, 8vo; Glasg. 1815, 4to, and 3 vols. 8vo); Tomlinson, Attempt, etc. (Lond. 1803, 8vo); Bellamy, *Bible* (incomplete, Lond. 1818 sq., 4to; severely criticized); Webster, *Bible* (N. H. 1833, 8vo); Penn, *New Covenant* (Lond. 1836, 8vo); Greaves, *Gospel*, etc. (Lond. 1828, 18mo); Hussey, *Bible* (Lond. 1844, 3 vols. 8vo); Cambpell, *New Test.* — (3d ed. Bethany, Va. 1833, 24mo); Sawyer, *New Test.* (Bost. 1858, 8vo); Boothroyd, *Bible* (Lond. 1853, royal 8vo); Norton, *Gospels* (Bost. 1855, 8vo); and the publications of the Am. [Bapt.] Bible Union (q.v.). *SEE ENGLISH VERSIONS*.

Autocephali

(αὐτοκέφαλοι), a term applied, in the Greek Church, to bishops not subject to patriarchal jurisdiction. Such were, in the Greek Church, the Archbishop of Bulgaria and some other metropolitans, I who claimed to be independent of the see of Constantinople; in the Church of Antioch, the Archbishop of Salamis, in Cyprus; and among the Latins, the Archbishop of Ravenna, who denied all dependence on the popes. Such also was the ancient liberty of the British Church, of which the remaining seven bishops, in the time of St. Augustine, acknowledged no superior but the Archbishop of Caerleon (Spelman, *Con. Brit.* A.D. 601). Originally all metropolitans were independent of any patriarch or exarch, ordering the affairs of their own province with their provincial bishops, and accountable to no superior but a synod; but in process of time the bishops of the great cities of the empire arrogated to themselves rights over the provinces of their dioceses, such as that of ordaining metropolitans, convoking the synod of the diocese, and of inspection over all the provinces in their obediences. Such were the rights of the Bishop of Rome over the diocese of the vicariate of Rome, or the suburbicarian churches (6th can. of Nicaea), and those of the see of Alexandria over Egypt, Libya, and the Thebaid. Besides these

autocephali, those bishops who were subject to no metropolitan, but were immediately dependent on the patriarch, who was to them instead of a metropolitan, were so styled. In the diocese of Constantinople there were thirty-nine, or, as some accounts have it, forty-two such bishops; in that of Antioch, sixteen; in that of Jerusalem, twenty-five. The earliest mention of such bishops is in the *Notitia* of the Emperor Leo in the ninth century. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 2, ch. 29, § 1, 2, 3; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

Auto da Fe

(Spanish, from the Latin ACTUS FIDET, "act of faith"), a ceremony in the acts of the Spanish Inquisition in which condemned heretics were punished, and those acquitted of heresy were released. The auto da fe generally took place on a Sunday, between Pentecost and Advent, and very often on All-saints'-day. The procession was headed by the Dominican monks, carrying the banner of the Inquisition. Following these, and separated from them by a crucifix, were those whom the Inquisition had pardoned. Next marched those who were condemned to death, attired in a peculiar habit, barefooted, their head covered with a high cap, on which were painted devils and flames. Finally came effigies of such as had avoided condemnation by flight, and the coffins of the victims, painted black, with images of devils and flames on them. The march was closed by priests, who accompanied the procession through the principal streets of the city as far as the church, where a sermon *on faith* was delivered. The verdict of the Inquisition was then read to the accused, who were obliged to stand in front of a cross, with extinguished tapers in their hands. As soon as the sentence of death was read against any one, an officer of the Inquisition gave the accused a slight tap on the chest to signify his surrendering the culprit to the secular authorities. The condemned were then loaded with. chains, taken to prison, and two hours afterward cited before the higher court, where they were asked in what religion they preferred to die. Such as declared their adherence to the Roman Church were strangled, the others burnt alive. A stake was prepared on the place of execution for each victim. Two priests invited each of them to make their peace with the church, and, when all their efforts failed, solemnly consigned them to the devil. The burning then commenced; and the remains of such as were already dead, together with the effigies of such as had fled, were also thrown into the fire. The day after the auto da fe, those whom the Inquisition had pardoned were (after swearing never to reveal what had taken place during their trial) restored to the places from whence they had

been taken when arrested. On the occasion of an auto da fe, the Inquisitors were accompanied by the civil and military authorities, the nobility, and even the king and princes, while people of all ranks crowded to see the exhibition. No auto da fe has taken place since the middle of the 18th century; and the sentences after that time, up to the abolition of the Inquisition in 1808 by Joseph Napoleon, were carried into execution privately, in the buildings of the Inquisition. *SEE INQUISITION*.

Auvergne, Guillaume d'

bishop of Paris, born at Aurillac in the second half of the 12th century, died March 30, 1249. He was one of the most learned theologians and philosophers of his day, and undertook to refute Aristotle on metaphysical questions. He was doctor of the Sorbonne and professor of theology, and subsequently was called to the see of Paris. His sermons and essays on several points of ethics were published by Le Feron in 1674 (2 vols. fol.). — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale, 3,* 795.

Auvergne, Pierre d'

or PETRUS DE CROS, a French theologian and philosopher, died Sept. 25, 1307 (according to others, 1301). He became, under the guidance of Thomas Aquinas, a distinguished theologian and philosopher. He was doctor of the Sorbonne and canon of the chapter of Paris. According to Samarthanus (in *Gallia Christiana),* he was subsequently bishop of Clermont. He wrote a number of commentaries to Aristotle. — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale,* 3, 795.

Auxentius

1. Arian bishop of Milan, A.D. 355-374 (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 6, 23). He was the leader of the Arians in the Western churches. When the orthodox bishops, at a provincial, synod held in 369, under the presidency of Bishop Damasus of Rome, condemned Arianism, they did not dare to pronounce the anathema against Auxentius, because they knew him to be protected by the favor of the Emperor Valentinian I. Although they were at last prevailed upon by Athanasius to mention in their synodal epistle to the Illyrians the condemnation of Auxentius, the latter maintained himself in his see until his death. He was succeeded by Ambrose (q.v.).

2. Abbot, born in Syria, being the son of Abdus, who was compelled by the persecution under King Sapor to leave his country and settle in Syria. In 432 Auxentius came to Constantinople, where he received an appointment in the royal guards, but afterward retired to a solitary mountain in Bithynia, named Oxius, where, clothed only in the skins of animals, he led a life of the most complete austerity. When the Council of Chalcedon was convoked, Auxentius was unwillingly compelled to attend, and subscribed the decrees. After this he retired to a more remote mountain, called Siope, where multitudes of persons flocked to hear him. Of these, many continued to abide near him in cells, and followed the example of his ascetic course of life. He died in 470. His memory is celebrated on the 14th of February. — Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 7, 21; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, Feb. 14; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

A'va

(Hebrews *Avva'*, עַוָּא *ruin;* Sept. Ἀουά, 2 Kings 17:24), also IVAH (Hebrews *Ivvah'*, עִוָּה same signif.; Sept. Ἀουά, 2 Kings 18:34; 19:13; but in Isaiah 37:13, unites with the preceding word, Ἀναεγγουγαυά v. *r.* Ἀναγουγάυα), the capital of a small monarchical state conquered by the Assyrians, and from which King Shalmaneser sent colonies into Samaria. The early Jewish translators (Symmachus and the Targums) understand it as a mere appellative; but it is associated with other proper names as a city. Some take it for the river, or rather the town which gave name to the river *Ahava* of Ezra 8:21 (Bellermann, *Handbuch*, 3, 374); but this name is quite different in the Hebrews (אַהֲוָא). Iken *(Dissertt. Philol. Theolog.* p. 152) would identify it with the Phoenician town *Avatha*, mentioned in the *Notitia Vet. Dignitatum Imper. Romans* (but the reading here is rather doubtful, see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 232 sq.); or with the town of *Abeje*, between Beirut and Sidon, which Paul Lucas mentions as the seat of a Druse prince. Michaelis supposes it to be the land of the Avites between Tripoli and Beirut, because they are described as worshippers of Nibhaz (2 Kings 17:31), an idol which he compares with the great stone dog that formerly stood in that quarter, on which account the Lycus obtained its name of Nahr el-Kelb, Dog River (comp. Mannert, VI, 1:380). This, however, rests upon a confusion of the Avim of 2 Kings 17:31, with those of Deuteronomy 2:23; Joshua 13:3. *SEE AVITE*. Avva or Ivvah was doubtless a city of Mesopotamia, in the region indicated by the

associated names (Babylon, Cuth, Hamath, Sepharvaim), perhaps somewhere farther east, in the direction of the classical *Aria.*

Avalonius Elvan

an apostle of England, lived in the second century. He preached Christianity to the Britons, and converted king Lucius, with his entire court. This king sent him to bishop Eleutherus to Rome, who made him bishop of London about 181. An "Essay on the Origin of the Church of Great Britain" is attributed to Avalonius. — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale*, 3, 804.

Av'aran

(Αὐαράν, Josephus Αὐράν, *Ant.* 12, 6,1; Vulg. *Auram* and *Abaron;* prob. of Arabic derivation, see Grimm, in loc.), an epithet of Eleazar, the brother of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Maccabees 2:5).

Avarice

(from Lat. *avarus,* from *aveo,* crave, strive after), an undue love of money. Avarice consists not merely in seeking after worldly wealth too eagerly, or by unjust means, but in loving it excessively, even though it be our own. Avarice is in its nature sin, and, according to St. Paul, a kind of idolatry. Gregory the Great enumerates seven particular sins which spring from avarice, or, as he calls them, "daughters of avarice," viz. treasons, frauds, lies, perjuries, restlessness, violences, hardness of hearts *(Mor. in Jobum,* lib. 31, cap. 17). The cause of this vice is really unbelief. It "is because men believe not Providence, therefore do they so greedily scrape and hoard" (Barrow *On the Creed, Sermon I).* It grows by indulgence, and is strongest in the aged, as if, by a penal irony, they who can least enjoy riches should most desire, them (Wesley, *Sermons,* serm. 130).

Avaris

(Αὔαρις), the name of a city on the borders of Egypt and Syria, which the shepherd-kings (Hyksos) again occupied after their expulsion from it, according to Manetho, as recited by Josephus *(Apion,* 1, 26). Rawlinson *(Historical Ev.* p. 74) thinks it is a corruption of the name *Hebrews.* who are referred to as being settled in Goshen. See ABARIM.

Avatar Or Avatara

a term in Hindoo mythology for the incarnation of the Deity. The number of I the Avataras mentioned in the Puranas, or legendary poems of the Hindoos, is very great. Those of Vishnu alone, who is distinguished by the character of ‘Preserver” in the Trimurti, or triad of the principal Hindoo deities, are stated to be endless. They are variously enumerated; but all accounts seem to agree in selecting the following ten as the most conspicuous:

1. *Matsya,* the Fish, under whose form Vishnu preserved Manu, the ancestor of the present human race, during a universal deluge.

2. *Kurma,* the Tortoise, which incarnation Vishnu underwent in order to support Mount Mandara, or rather the entire earth, when the celestial gods and their opponents the Asuras, or Daityas, were churning the sea for the beverage of immortality (amrita).

3. *Varaha,* the Boar Vishnu, with the head of a monstrous boar, is represented as slaying Hiranyaksha, the chief of the Asuras, who had taken possession of the celestial regions, and as uplifting the earth, which had been sunk to the bottom of the sea.

4. In his incarnation as *Narasinha,* a being half man and half lion, Vishnu killed Hiranyakasipu, the brother of Hiranyaksha.

5. The form of *Vamana,* the Dwarf, was assumed by Vishnu to humble the pride of King Bali. He went to a sacrifice which the king was performing and supplicated for as much ground as he could measure with three steps, which request being granted, the dwarf suddenly grew to an immense size, and with his steps comprised earth, mid-air, and heaven.

6. Vishnu appeared in a human form, as *Parasurama,* the son of Jamadagni and Renuka, in order to preserve mankind, and especially the Brahmins, from the tyranny of the military tribe of the Kshatriyas.

7. Vishnu was born as the son of King Dasaratha, and under the name of *Rama,* in order to destroy Ravana, the Daitya sovereign of Ceylon, and other demons who were then infesting the earth. The actions of Rama form the subject of a celebrated epic poem in Sanscrit, called the Ramayana, and attributed to the ancient sage Valmiki.

8. The most celebrated of the Avataras of Vishnu is his appearance in the human form of *Krishna,* in which he is supposed to have been wholly and completely incarnate, whereas the other Avataras are only considered as emanations from his being. Krishna assisted the family of the Pandavas in their war with the Kurus, and through them relieved the earth from the wicked men who oppressed it. The history of this conflict is told at length in the Mahabharata, another great epic poem in Sanscrit.

9. *Buddha* is, by the followers of the Brahminical religion, considered as a delusive incarnation of Vishnu, assumed by him in order to induce the Asuras to abandon the sacred ordinances of the Vedas, by which they lost their strength and supremacy.

10. *Kalki* is the name of an Avatara in which Vishnu will appear at the end of the Kaliyuga, or present age of the world, to destroy all vice and wickedness, and to restore the world to virtue and purity. *SEE BUDDHISM*; *SEE HINDOOISM*.

Ave Maria Or Ave Mary

(Hail, Mary!), the angel Gabriel's salutation of the Virgin Mary when he brought her the tidings of the incarnation (<40128>Luke 1:28). It is now a prayer or form of devotion in the Romish Church, called the *Angelic Salutation* (q.v.), and used to invoke the aid of Mary. The chaplets and rosaries are divided into so many Ave-Marys and so many Pater-nosters. The papists ascribe a wonderful efficacy to the Ave Mary. The following is the prayer: "Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners, now, and in the hour of death. Amen." The practice of using this prayer at all is not older than the eleventh century, and its use before sermon is to be traced to the fifteenth century, when Vincentius Ferrerius, a Spanish Dominican, began to use it before his sermons, from whose example it rained such authority as not only to be prefixed to sermons, but to be joined to the Lord's Prayer in the Roman breviary. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* Luke 14, ch. 4; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirche -Lexikon,* s.v. *SEE ROSARY*.

A'ven

(Heb. id., ^wa; *nothingness,* hence *iniquity,* as often, especially *idolatry,* and so concretely an *idol* itself, as in <23803>Isaiah 66:3), a contemptuous name

given to three places on account of the idolatry practiced there. *SEE BEN-ONI*.

1. (Sept. Ων.) A plain (h[qBi *bikah', valley),* "the plain of the sun," of Damascene Syria, mentioned by Amos (1, 5) in his denunciation of Aram (Syria) and the country to the north of Palestine. It is usually supposed to be the same as the plain of Baalbek, or valley of Baal, where there was a magnificent temple dedicated to the sun. *SEE BAALBEK*. Being between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, it is supposed by Rosenmüller and others (in loc.) to be the same plain or valley that is mentioned as "the valley of Lebanon" in <061117>Joshua 11:17 (comp. Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 52). Some, however, would rather seek Aven in the plain four leagues from Damascus toward the desert, where Michaelis *(Notes on Amos)* heard from a native of Damascus of a valley near that city called *Un*, and he quotes Ia Damascene proverb referring thereto; but this locality lacks confirmation (see Henderson, in loc.); for the information was at best suspicious, and has not been confirmed, although the neighborhood of Damascus has been tolerably well explored by Burckhardt *(App.* 4) and by Porter. The prophet, however, would I seem to be alluding to some principal district of the country of equal importance with Damascus itself; and I so the Sept. have understood it, taking the letters as if pointed, ˆ/a, *On*, and expressing it in their version as I "the plain" of On, by which they doubtless intend the great plain of Lebanon, Coele-Syria, in which the renowned idol-temple of Baalbek or Heliopolis was situated, and which still retains the very same name by I which Amos and Joshua designated it, *el-Buka'a*. The application of Aven as a term of reproach or contempt to a flourishing idol-sanctuary, and the play or paronomasia therein contained, is quite in keeping with the manner of Amos and of Hosea. The latter frequently applies the very same word to Bethel. *SEE BETHAVEN*.

2. (Sept. ῾Ηλιούπολις, Eng. marg. "Heliopolis.") Another name for ON (q.v.) in Egypt (<263017>Ezekiel 30:17). The intention of the prophet is doubtless to play upon the name in the same manner as Amos and Hosea. See No. 1, above.

3. (Sept. Ων) A shorter form (Amos 10:8) of BETHAVEN *SEE BETHAVEN* (q.v.) or BETHEL.

Avenarius Johannes

a Protestant theologian, born at Eger in 1520, died at Zeitz, Dec. 5,1590. After having been in succession pastor at Plauen, Gessnitz, Schoenfels, he was appointed professor of theology at Jena, and in 1575 became superintendent at Zeitz. He is the author of a celebrated Prayer-book, which went through a great number of editions (Strasburg, 1578, etc.), and was translated by Zader into Latin. He also published a Hebrew Grammar and Dictionary, and several other works. — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale,* 3, 826.

Avenger of Blood

(l aeGø, *goa’*, fully µD;hi l aeGø), a term applied to the nearest relative of a murdered person, inasmuch as he had the right, and on him devolved the obligation of killing the murderer ([101407]2 Samuel 14:7, 11) wherever he met him (outside any of the cities of refuge). Respecting this custom, universal among the Hebrews from the earliest times ([011014]Genesis 10:14; 27:45), as among other nations of antiquity (e.g. the Greeks; see Welker, p. 361 sq.; Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth. 3,* 241, 284; the inhabitants of Trachonitis; see Josephus, *Ant.* 16, 9, 1), and in the East to this day among the Arabians, Persians, Abyssinians, Druses, Circassians, etc. (see Chardin, 3, 417 sq.; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 33 sq.; *Reisen*, 2, 430; *East Ind. Mission. Her. 3,* 491; Burckhardt, *Trav.* 2, 872,1011; Lobo, *Relation d’Abyss.* p. 123 sq.), the Jewish lawgiver, in order to restrain its abuse, appointed ([022113]Exodus 21:13; [043509]Numbers 35:9 sq.; [051901]Deuteronomy 19:1 sq.; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 4, 7, 4) six cities of refuge (f l q]MiAyre[;) in different parts of the country, to which the manslayer might have recourse, and where, if his offense had not been premeditated, he might remain in safety till the death of the high-priest at that time acting should release him from the danger of retribution, while, on the other hand, the willful murderer was to be in any case surrendered to the pursuer for vengeance. If, however, the man-slayer quitted the city ([051906]Deuteronomy 19:6), or even went beyond the prescribed limits of its environs ([043525]Numbers 35:25 sq.), the avenger might kill him with impunity. *SEE ASYLUM*. A similar provision prevailed among the Athenians (see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth.* II, 1:268; Hefter, *Athen. Gerichtsverf.* p. 136) for the rescue of the accidental man-slayer. (See generally Michaelis, *Mos. Recht,* 2, 401 sq.; 6:32 sq.; Hoffmann, in the *Hall. Encycl.* 11:89 sq.; Jahn, *Archaol.* II, 2:372 sq.). *SEE BLOOD-REVENGE.*

Avera

SEE AARA.

Avesta

SEE ZEND-AVESTA.

Avignon

(Avenio), an episcopal see of France, on the Rhone, capital of the department of Vaucluse, 20 miles N.E. of Nismes. In 1348 it passed into the possession of Pope Clement VI and his successors, and was the see of the pontiffs from Clement X to Gregory XI, i.e. for sixty years. Baluze's *Vies des Papes d' Avignon* (1693, 2 vols. 4to) is an admirable refutation of the ultramontane pretensions. It maintains that the holy see is not necessarily fixed at Rome. By the Concordat of 1801 Avignon ceased to be a metropolis, but by that of 1821 it was re-established. *SEE PAPACY*.

Several COUNCILS were held in Avignon. The most important were.

1, in 1209, in which 29 canons were adopted, some concerning discipline, and the others I against heretics; the inhabitants of Toulouse were ex-communicated for not having expulsed the Albigenses;

2, in 1327, against the antipope Pierre de Corbiere. — Landon, *Manual of Councils;* Smith, *Tables of Church Hist.*

Avila, Juan De,

a famous Spanish preacher, surnamed the "Apostle of Andalusia," because he spent 40 years of his life in preaching to the towns and villages of Andalusia, was born in 1500 at Almodovar del Campo, in New Castile, and died May 10, 1569. He is the author of a number of religious works, which are still held in great esteem by Roman Catholics. A complete edition of his works, together with a biography, was published by Martin Ruiz under the. title *Vida y Obras de Juan de Avila, predicador apostolico de l'Andaluzia* (Madrid, 1618, 2 vols. 4to, reprinted in 1757). A French translation of his works was published by Arnauld d'Andilly (Paris, 1673, fol.), and a German by Schermer (Ratisbon, 3 vols. 1861).

A’vim

(Hebrews *Avvim’*, with the article, µyW[h; *the ruins,* or *the Avvites’* tower; Sept. Αὐίμ v. r. Αὐείν), a city in the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Bethel and Parah (<061823>Joshua 18:23). It may have been so named as having been settled by the Avites (q.v.) when expelled from Philistia, although it is uncertain whether they penetrated so far into the interior of the country (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.). The associated names afford a conjectural location eastward of Bethel, and it is possibly the same with AI (q v). *SEE AVITE*.

Avis Or Aviz

Picture for Avis or Aviz

knights of a military order of Portugal (order of *St. Benito de A viz),* instituted by Alphonso I, in 1147 or 1162, in commemoration of the capture of Evora from the Moors, whence the knights of this order were at first called knights of *Santa Maria d’Evora.* They were afterward styled the Knights of Avis. from a place of that name where they built a fortress. These knights followed the rule of Citeaux, with some variations, and their duty was to defend the true faith by force of arms, to keep chastity, and to wear a religious dress, consisting of a scapulary and hood, so made that it did not hinder their fighting. Their dress of ceremony is a white cloak, having on the left side a cross *fleur-de-lisee,* at the foot of which are two birds. In their armorial bearings they also have two birds and a tower. They possessed in Portugal about forty commanderies, and since 1550 the grand mastership of the order has been in the crown. — Helyot, *Ordres Relig.* 1, 350; Landon, *Eccl. Dict.* 1, 674.

A’vite

(Hebrews *Avvi’*, only in the plur. µyW[i, gentile from *Ava),* the name of two tribes of people.

1. (Sept. Εὐαῖοι, Auth. Vers. ‘Avims,” in Deuteronomy; Ευαῖος, “Avites” in Josh.) A people who originally occupied the southernmost portion of that territory in Palestine along the Mediterranean coast which the Caphtorim or Philistines afterward possessed (<051223>Deuteronomy 2:23). They are usually considered a branch of the Hivites, a people descended from Canaan (<011017>Genesis 10:17). *SEE HIVITE*. As the territory of the

Avites is mentioned in ⁰⁶¹³Joshua 13:3, in addition to the five Philistine states, it would appear that it was not included in theirs, and that the expulsion of the Avites was by a Philistine invasion prior to that by which the five principalities were founded. Their territory began at Gaza, and extended southward to "the river of Egypt" (⁰⁵²³Deuteronomy 2:23), forming what was the Philistine kingdom of Gerar in the time of Abraham, when we do not hear of any other Philistine states. There were then Avites, or Hivites, at Shechem (⁰¹³⁴Genesis 34:2), and we afterward find them also at Gibeon (⁰⁶⁰⁷Joshua 9:7), and beyond the Jordan, at the foot of Mount Hermon (⁰⁶¹¹Joshua 11:3); but we have no means of knowing whether these were original settlements of the Avites, or were formed out of the fragments of the nation which the Philistines expelled from southern Palestine. *SEE GERAR*; *SEE PHILISTINE*. According to Ewald *(Geschichte,* 1, 310) and Bertheau, the Avvim were the aborigines of Palestine Proper. They may have been so, but there is nothing to prove it, while the mode of their dwellings points rather to a nomadic origin. Thus they may have made their way northward from the Desert (Stanley, *Sinai and Pal.* App. § 83). In ⁰⁵²³Deuteronomy 2:23, we see them "dwelling in 'the' villages" (or nomade encampments — *Chatzerim)* in the south part of the "plain," or great western lowland, "as far as Gaza." In these rich possessions they were attacked by the invading Philistines, "the Caphtorim which came forth out of Caphtor," and who, after "destroying" them and "dwelling in their stead," appear to have pushed them farther north. This must be inferred from the terms of the passage in ⁰⁶¹²Joshua 13:2, 3, the enumeration of the rest of the land still remaining to be conquered. (The punctuation of this passage in our Bibles is not in accordance with the Hebrew text, which has a full stop at Geshuri [ver. 2], thus: "This is the land that yet remaineth, all the borders of the Philistines and all the Geshurite. From Sihor... even to the border of Ekron northward, is counted to the Canaanite," etc.) Beginning from "Sihor, which is before Egypt," probably the Wady el-Arish, the list proceeds northward along the lowland plains of the sea-coast, through the five lordships of the Philistines — all apparently taken in their order from south to north-till we reach the Avvim, as if they had been driven up out of the more southerly position which they occupied at the date of the earlier record into the plains of Sharon. It is perhaps worth notice, where every syllable has some significance, that while "the Gazathite . . . . the Ekronite," are all in the singular, "the Avvim" is plural. So with the other aboriginal names. Nothing more is told us of this ancient people, whose very name is said to

signify “ruin.” Possibly a trace of their existence is to be found in the town “‘Avim” (accurately, as in the other cases, “the Avvim”), which occurs among the cities of Benjamin (<06822>Joshua 18:23), and which may have preserved the memory of some family of the extinct people driven up out of their fertile plains to take refuge in the wild hills of Bethel; just as in the “Zemaraim” of the preceding verse we have probably a reminiscence of the otherwise forgotten Zemarites. But, on the other hand, it is possible that the word in this place is but a variation or corruption of the name of Ai. *SEE AVIM*. The inhabitants of the north-central districts of Palestine (Galilseans) were in later times distinguished by a habit of confounding the gutturals, as, for instance, [with h (see Lightfoot, *Chor. Cent.* ch. 87. Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 434). It is possible that yWh, *Hivite*, is a variation, arising from this cause, of yW[} *Avite*, and that this people were known to the Israelites at the date of the conquest by the name of Hivites. At any rate, it is a curious fact that both the Sept. and Vulg. identified the two names, and also that the town of ha-Avvim was in the actual district of the Hivites. in the immediate neighborhood of Gibeon, Chephirah, and their other chief cities (<06907>Joshua 9:7, 17, compared with 18:22-27). The name of the Avvim has been derived from Avva (Ava), or Ivvah (Ivah), as if they had migrated thence into Palestine; but there is no argument for this beyond the mere similarity of the names. *SEE AVA*.

2. (Sept. Εὐαῖοι, Auth. Vers. “Avites.”) The original designation of the colonists transported from Ava into Samaria by Shalmaneser (<12731>2 Kings 17:31). They were idolaters, worshipping gods called Nibhaz and Tartak. *SEE AVA*.

A’vith

(Hebrews *Avith’*, tywi[} *ruins;* Sept. Γεθαίμ, Vulg. *Avith),* a city of the Edomites, and the native place (capital) of one of their kings, Hadad ben-Bedad; before there were kings in Israel (<01365>Genesis 36:35; <13046>1 Chronicles 1:46, where the Hebrews text has t/y[} *Ayoth’*, Sept, Γεθθάμ v. r. Γεθαίμ, Εὐιθ, Vulg. *Avith).* It would seem to have been situated at the north-eastern extremity of the range of Mount Seir, as the king is stated to have thence made a hostile incursion into the territory of his Moabitish neighbors who were leagued with the Midianites. The name may be compared with *el-Ghoweitheh,* a “chain of low hills” mentioned by

Burckhardt (p. 375) as lying to the east of the district of Kerek in Moab (Knobel, *Genesis*, p. 257).

Avitus

(properly *Sextus Alcimus Edicus*, or *Ecditius, Avitus)*, bishop of Vienne, was born at Vienne about the middle of the fifth century. At a religious disputation between the orthodox and Arian theologians in 499, he was the leading spokesman of the orthodox, and gained the confidence of king Gondebaud of Burgundy, whose son and successor, Sigismund, he converted from Arianism (after Gondebaud's death). He vigorously attacked the Arian heresy, both by writing and speaking, and presided at the council of Epaone in 517. He died, according to the commonly received opinion, February 5th, 525,, although other accounts assign an earlier date. He was a man of great learning, and there are still extant a number of his letters, homilies, and poems, which may be found in *Bib. Max. Patr.* 9, 560; and in *Bib. Patr. Galland.* t. x. — Dupin, *Hist. Eccl Writers,* v. 4.

Avoidance

in the Church of England, takes place where a benefice becomes *void* of an incumbent. This happens either by the death of the incumbent, or by his being appointed to a preferment of such a kind as necessarily makes the living vacant; as when a clergyman is made a bishop all the preferments he holds fall to the crown, who is the patron for that time, unless there be some special dispensation; or, finally, by cession, deprivation, or resignation. In the first-named instance, which is avoidance by fact, the patron must take notice of the avoidance at his peril; in the last case, which is avoidance by law, the ordinary must give notice to the patron to prevent a lapse.

Avrillon Jean Baptiste Elie

a Franciscan (Minim), born at Paris, Jan. 1, 1652; he made profession, Jan. 3, 1671, in the convent of the Minims (called *Bons-hommes)* at Nigeon. He began his career as a preacher in 1676, and continued until 1728, i.e. for fifty-three years, and died at Paris, May 16th, 1729, aged seventy-eight. He was much sought after as a preacher, and left many devotional works, which are highly esteemed in the Roman Church. The following have been translated by the Romanizing party of the Church of England: "Conduite

pour passer saintement le temps de l'Avent," *Guide for passing Advent holily,* with preface by Dr. Pusey (Lond. 1844, 12mo); "Conduite pour passer saintement le Careme," *Guide for passing Lent holily,* ed. by Pusey (Lond. 1844, 12mo); "L'Annee Affective," *The Year of Affections,* ed. by Pusey (Lond. 1845,12mo); *Eucharistic Meditations,* ed. by Shipley (Lond. 1862, 12mo).

Awakening

(1) is used with regard to individuals, and designates the first work of the Spirit in conversion, i.e. *conviction;*

(2) it is also applied to *revivals of* religion, in which multitudes of sinners are awakened.

The state of sin is in the New Testament represented as a sort of sleep or death; Ephesians 5:14, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." When man, then, is brought to a consciousness of his sins, and to feel sorrow and contrition on account of them, and these are followed by a desire for the forgiving and renewing grace of God, and partly for improvement, the process is called *awakening.* The expression is not found in the New Testament, although the thing itself is largely explained therein. The prodigal son was awakened by his self-inflicted poverty, Peter by the correcting look of the Lord, Paul by the miraculous apparition of Christ, Judas by the consequences of his betrayal, and many by the preaching of Jesus or by his miracles. Awakening takes place when the sinner, who before did either not know the truth, or else treated it lightly, becomes strongly impressed with it, and gives up his heart and mind to it. Comp. Acts 2:36, 37: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified -both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (Comp. also Acts 2:43; 4:4; 5:11; 11:23, 24.) One of the principal aims of the preacher in presenting the word of God and of the church in the exercises of divine worship is to produce the awakening of sinners.

As, according to the doctrine of the New Testament, all possible agencies of deliverance and of moral improvement in humanity are to be ascribed to the Holy Spirit, the church holds, and rightly, that the operation of the Holy Spirit is united with the word of Christian truth, and also with visible

religious exercises, in the awakening of sinners. It is also right in considering the *word* as the messenger or the medium of the Holy Spirit. Awakening may also result from external changes and events in life, by which truth, previously received into the heart and mind of the sinner, after lying apparently dead, is rendered active, as if awakened from slumber, so that the sinner himself awakes from the sleep or death of sin. Among the outward causes often producing awakening are sickness, either our own or others, particularly such as is the result of sin; the death of those we love, or sometimes of those who have fallen victims to their sins or to those of others, or perhaps have ended their life by suicide; or the death of such as were associated with us in our sinful career; also shame and contumely, or a fall into gross sin, either by ourselves or others, which discloses to us the bottomless nature of sin; deliverance out of danger, or, on the other hand, undeserved blessings. Intercourse with pious and good persons, or sometimes of the bad, may lead to awakening. Sometimes the Spirit uses the memories of youth and of its inexplicable feelings and of confused impulses; sometimes solitary meditation; sometimes the contemplation of nature; the reading of biographies; the study of works of art, as means of awakening. Both good and evil can be made awakening in the life of man; thus <450204>Romans 2:4: “Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?” <451122>Romans 11:22: “Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off;” <461006>1 Corinthians 10:6, 11: “Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.”

The *effects* produced by an awakening cause differ widely, both for objective and subjective reasons. In more quiet and tranquil natures, its effect may be slow and gentle; in the more vigorous ones it is more forcible, and often sudden. But the weaker natures are, on the other hand, more easily awakened than stronger ones, while the latter, though requiring a stronger impulse, are more likely to be lastingly impressed. Where moral self-consciousness, or conscience, is yet awake, the feeblest awakening can act effectually; but where conscience has become benumbed and dormant, a more powerful impression is required. It is evident, besides, that the

result will be influenced by a variety of other causes, such as the more or less enlightened state of the subject, the energy of the impulses, the relations of life, either favorable or unfavorable to the development of moral sense, etc. Of course, to produce saving effects, the impression must be lasting, i.e. it must not merely lead to a resolve to amendment, but must work it out also. This, however, is not the work of a moment, but of a whole lifetime, through which the awakening must steadfastly and unceasingly act. The sinner must do all in his power to apply the prevenient grace, which is the source of the awakening, to the redemption of his soul; for without the sinner's own co-operation, the work of sanctification will not be accomplished. In order, then, to render the effect of awakening persistent, it is necessary to keep the memory of it continually in the soul, and to connect with it all that follows. We see, therefore, how great an obstacle is frivolity, which never looks back, but only considers the present or the future; and for that reason the sanguine temperament, while more readily awakened for a moment, is more difficult to impress lastingly; choleric natures are touched easily and deeply, the melancholy lastingly, and the phlegmatic with difficulty. The strength of the awakening is measured by the inward pains of penitence, but cannot be estimated by the outward tears or demonstrations, partly on account of difference in temperaments. Sanguine and choleric subjects will be more demonstrative than phlegmatic or melancholic while under the same force of awakening. — Krehl, *N. — T. Handiworterbuch,* s.v. *SEE CONVICTION*; *SEE REVIVAL*.

Awl

Picture for Awl

([ixæ]mi, *martse'd, perforator,* Sept. ὀπήτιον), an instrument for boring a small hole (<02106>Exodus 21:6; <051517>Deuteronomy 15:17). Considering that the Israelites had recently withdrawn from their long sojourn in Egypt, there can be no doubt that the instruments were the same as those of that country, used by the sandalmakers and other workers in leather (Wilkinson, 2, 105). In the above passages the word is employed in reference to piercing the ear as a sign of perpetual servitude, which it seems was a custom among other Oriental nations (Petronius. *Satyr*. 102), and it was the practice in Lydia, India, and Persia to perforate the ears of boys dedicated to the service of the gods (Xen. *Anab*. 3, 1, 31; Plutarch, *Sympos*. 2, 1, 4). *SEE SERVANT*.

Axe

Picture for Axe 1

Picture for Axe 2

Several instruments of this description are so discriminated in Scripture as to show that the Hebrews had them of different forms and for various uses.

(1.) ˆz,r]Gi, *garzen'* (so called from *chopping),* which occurs in <051905>Deuteronomy 19:5; 20:19; <110607>1 Kings 6:7; <231015>Isaiah 10:15; ἀξίνη, <400310>Matthew 3:10; <420309>Luke 3:9; corresponding to the Lat. *securis).* From these passages it appears that this kind was employed in felling trees (comp. <231034>Isaiah 10:34), and in hewing large timber for building. The conjecture of Gesenius, that in <110507>1 Kings 5:7, it denotes the axe of a stone-mason, is by no means conclusive. The first text supposes a case of the head slipping from the helve in felling a tree (comp. <120605>2 Kings 6:5). This would suggest that it was shaped like fig. 3, which is just the same instrument as our common hatchet, and appears to have been applied by the ancient Egyptians to the same general use as with us. The reader will observe the contrivance in all the others (wanting in this) of fastening the head to the haft by thongs.

(2.) dx;[]m', *madtsad'* (a *hewing* instrument), which occurs only in <234412>Isaiah 44:12 (where it is rendered "tongs") and <241003>Jeremiah 10:3. From the latter of these passages it appears to have been a lighter instrument than the preceding, or a kind of adze, used for fashioning or carving wood into shape; it was probably, therefore, like figs. 4 to 7, which the Egyptians employed for this purpose. Other texts of Scripture represent such implements as being employed in carving images, the use to which the prophets refer. The differences of form and size, as indicated in the figures, appear to have been determined with reference to light or heavy work. The passage in Isaiah, however, as it refers to the blacksmith's operations at the forge, may possibly designate some kind of chisel.

(3.) µDor]q', *kardom'* (from its *sharpness);* this is the commonest name for an axe or hatchet. It is of this which we read in <070948>Judges 9:48; <197405>Psalm 74:5; <091320>1 Samuel 13:20, 21; <244622>Jeremiah 46:22. It appears to have been more exclusively employed than the *garzen* for felling trees, and had therefore probably a heavier head. In one of the Egyptian sculptures the

inhabitants of Lebanon are represented as felling pine-trees with axes like fig. 1. *SEE LEBANON*. As the one used by the Egyptians for the same purpose was also of this shape, there is little doubt that it was also in use among the Hebrews.

(4.) The term brij, *che'reb (destroyer)*, usually "a sword," is used of other cutting instruments, as a "knife" (<165152>Joshua 5:2), or razor (<263601>Ezekiel 6:1), or a tool for hewing or dressing stones (<022025>Exodus 20:25), and is once rendered "axe" (<262609>Ezekiel 26:9), and there may probably mean a heavy cutlass, like fig. 2, or perhaps battle-axe, or possibly even pick-axe, as it is there used to denote a weapon for destroying buildings.

(5.) A similar instrument, lyVKi, *kashshil' (feller)*, is once spoken of (<197406>Psalm 74:6) as a battle-axe. It also occurs in the Targum (<244622>Jeremiah 46:22) in the sense of broad-axe.

(6.) Iron implements of severe labor, hrzgmi, *magzerah'* ("axe," <101231>2 Samuel 12:31), and hrgem, *megerah'* ("axe," <141803>2 Chronicles 20:3; also in the same verse more properly "saw," and in <101231>2 Samuel 12:31; <110709>1 Kings 7:9), were used by David in the massacre of the inhabitants of Rabbah, but their form cannot be made out. *SEE SAW*.

(7.) The word lzrB, *barzel'*, rendered "axe-head" in <120605>2 Kings 6:5, is literally "Iron;" but, as an axe is certainly intended, the passage is valuable as showing that the axe-heads among the Hebrews were of iron. Those which have been found in Egypt are of bronze, which was very anciently and generally used for the purpose. But this does not prove that they had none of iron; it seems rather to suggest that those of iron have been consumed by the corrosion of three thousand years, while those of bronze have been preserved. *SEE HELVE*.

(8.) The "battle-axe," /Pem, *mappets'* (<245120>Jeremiah 51:20), was probably, as its root indicates, a heavy mace or maul, like that which gave his surname to Charles *Martel*. *SEE BATTLE-AXE*.

The most common use of the axe, as is well known, is to cut down trees; hence the expression in <400310>Matthew 3:10, and <420309>Luke 3:9, "the axe is laid at the root of the trees" (comp. Silius Italicus, 10; also Virgil, *A*En. 6:180; <230833>Isaiah 10:33). That trees are a general symbol of men is well known.

SEE FOREST; *SEE TREE*. (See also <263103>Ezekiel 31:3; <270407>Daniel 4:7, 8; <401907>Matthew 7:19; 12:33; <190103>Psalm 1:3; <381101>Zechariah 11:1, 2). What John Baptist therefore refers to is probably the excision of the Jewish nation. But there is a force in the preposition used here which escapes the ordinary reader: the expression πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται, denotes that it had already been struck *into* the tree preparatory to felling it, and now only awaited the signal for the utter vengeance of Heaven. The axe was also used as the instrument of decollation, to which there is allusion in <660104>Revelation 20:4, "The souls of them that were *leheaded* for the testimony of Jesus," literally, "cut with an axe." Hence the axe becomes a symbol of the divine judgments. Sometimes it is applied to a human instrument, as in <231015>Isaiah 10:15, "Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith?" i.e. Shall the proud king of Assyria boast himself against God, whose instrument he is to execute his purpose? In <245120>Jeremiah 51:20, the army of the Medes and Persians is most probably intended, as elsewhere the instrument of God's vengeance is called a sword, a rod, a scourge (see also <244622>Jeremiah 46:22). By. axes, which were a part of the insignia of the Roman magistracy, was denoted the power of life and death and of supreme judgment. Axes were also used in war (Sidonius, *Carm. El.* 5, 247; Horace, *Ode* 4, 4 *Carm. Secul.* 54; Virgil, *dan.* 2, 480). Axes were used in sacrifice; hence called the axe of the Hierophant. These are seen on various coins (Smith's *Hist. of Class. Ant.* s.v. Securis).

Axel

SEE ABSALON.

Axiormnus

*(*Ἀξιώραμος*)*, given by Josephus *(Ant. 10:*8, 6) as the son (or successor) of Isus, and father (or predecessor) of Phideas, in the list of the Jewish high-priests, apparently instead of JEHOIADA *SEE JEHOIADA* (q.v.). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*.

Axle

Picture for Axle

occurs only in <111732>1 Kings 7:32, 33, as a translation of dy; *yad*, *hand*, in the phrase µyNpi/ah; t/dy] *yedoth' ha-ophannim', hands of the wheels*, i.e.

their *axle-trees,* as in the Auth. Vers.; Sept. χεῖρες ἐν τοῖς τροχοῖς, Vulg. *axes. SEE CHARIOT.*

Axtell Henry, D.D.,

was born at Mendham, N. J., June 9, 1773, and graduated at Princeton in 1796. After teaching several years in New Jersey, he removed in 1804 to Geneva, N. Y, where he kept a classical school. In 1810 he was licensed, and in 1812 called to the Presbyterian Church in Geneva. At the time of his ordination in 1812, his church consisted of 70 members; at the time of his death of about 400. In two revivals his labors had been particularly blessed. He died Feb. 11, 1849. His eldest daughter died a few days after him, and was placed in the same grave. — Sprague, *Annals,* 4, 453.

Ayah

SEE KITE.

Aydelott, Joseph

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Feb. 26, 1758, and entered the itinerant ministry in the Philadelphia Conference in 1802. After 23 years of active service, he died at Philadelphia, May 11, 1824. “Perhaps no man gave a more decided character to the purity and excellence of religion. His life, as well as his preaching, was a living comment upon the doctrines and precepts of Christ, and his Master owned his labors.” — *Minutes of Conferences,* 1, 475.

Ayir

SEE FOAL.

Ayliffe, John, LL.D.,

fellow of New College, Oxford; degraded and expelled for the publication of work said to contain scandalous aspersions, entitled, “The Ancient and Present State of the University of Oxford” (2 vols. 8vo, 1714), taken, in fact, chiefly from Wood’s *Athenae.* He also published *Parergon Juris Canonici Anglicani.* 1726, and a “New Pandect of the Roman Civil Law” (Lond. 1734, fol.), one of the most elaborate works in English on the civil law. No other particulars are recorded of him.

Aylmer, John

bishop of London, born in 1521, of a good family, in Norfolk. He studied at Oxford and Cambridge, but chiefly at the latter; and after leaving the universities was appointed tutor to the celebrated Lady Jane Grey. In 1553 he was made archdeacon of Stow, but on the accession of Queen Mary was obliged to leave England, and retired to Zurich. In 1562 he became archdeacon of Lincoln, and in 1576 succeeded Sandys in the see of London. He seems to have been as vigorously opposed to the Puritans as to the Romanists; and unhappily, amid many excellencies of character, he had a persecuting spirit. On more than one occasion his severity was rebuked by the privy council. In the case of a clergyman named Benison, who was imprisoned by Aylmer for a supposed irregularity in regard to his marriage, the bishop was desired by the privy council to make him compensation, lest in an action for false imprisonment he should recover damages "which would touch his lordship's credit." By the Puritans Aylmer was ridiculed in pamphlets, scandalous reports were actively circulated to his injury, and frequent complaints of his conduct were made to the privy council. Aylmer would gladly have exchanged into a more retired diocese, but none of his plans for this purpose succeeded; and he was still bishop of London when he died on June 3d, 1594. See Maitland, *Essays on the Reformation;* Neal, *Hist. of Puritans,* 1, 224, 365, etc.

Aylworth, James P.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and one of the fathers of the Oneida Conference, was born in 1783. He entered the ministry in 1822, serving chiefly in Central New York, until his superannuation in 1847. He died in 1848. *Minutes of Conferences.*

Aymo

SEE HAYMO.

Aymon, John

a French writer, lived at the close of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century. He was at first a Catholic priest, then left the Roman Catholic Church at Geneva, and married at the Hague. He again returned to the Church of Rome, and in 1706 was put by the Cardinal de Noailles in the Seminary of Foreign Missions. In 1707 he fled to Holland with a

manuscript (the original of the Acts of the Council held at Jerusalem in 1672 and 1673), and had it printed at the Hague under the title *Monuments Authentiques de l'Eglise Grecque* (1708, 4to), reproduced under the title *Lettres et Anecdotes de Cyril Lucar* (Amsterdam, 1708). Aymon was judicially pursued by Clement, the librarian of the French king, and in 1709 the States-General ordered the restoration of the manuscript. Aymon wrote also *Actes Ecclesiastiques et civils de tous les Synodes Nationanx des Eglises Reformees de la France* (Rotterdam, 1710, 4to), and several works on the Roman Catholic Church. — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale, 3,* 900.

A'zael

Ἀζαῆλος), the father of Jonathan, which latter was one of those who superintended the repudiation of the Gentile wives after the return from Babylon (1 Esdras 9:14); evidently the ASAHEL *SEE ASAHEL* (q.v.) of the genuine text (<15105>Ezra 10:15).

Azae'lus

(Ἀζαῆλος), one of the Israelites, sons of Maani," who is said to have divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdras 9:34); but the name is apparently an erroneous repetition for the Esril just preceding it (Azareel of <15104>Ezra 10:41). *SEE AZAEL*.

A'zal

(Hebrews *Atsal',* lx,a; prob. the same as *Azel,* in pause; Sept. Ασαήλ. v. r. Ἰασόδ*),* apparently a place near Jerusalem on the east, mentioned only in <381405>Zechariah 14:5, as the limit to which the "ravine" or cleft (ayGe) of the Mount of Olives will extend when "Jehovah shall go forth to fight." Henderson *(Comment.* in loc.) regards it as the proper name of a place close to one of the gates on the east side of Jerusalem, to, which the cleft or valley was to extend westward, so as at once to admit those who should flee from the enemy; but this seems too strict a literalism for so figurative a prophecy. Furst *(Heb. Worterb.* s.v.) inclines to identify it with the *Beth-ezel* of <330101>Micah 1:11. Perhaps the conjecture of Gesenius *(Thes. Heb.* p. 144) is the most easy of adoption, that the term is simply an appellative for lx,a,e, q. d. at: the *side,* i.e. foot of the mountain, sc. Olivet. The supposition of Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 135) that it is the present village *Azaria,* or Bethany (according to him, the *Huzal* of the Talmud, *Megillah,* v. 6),

evidently proceeds from his Jewish prejudices against the account respecting Lazarus in the Gospels. *SEE EROGE*.

Azali'ah

(Hebrews in the prolonged form *Atsalya'hu*, Why;lx;a} *reserved by Jehovah;* Sept. Ἐσσελίας v. r. Ἐζελίας; in Chronicles Ἐσελία v. r. Σελία), the son of Meshullam (2218)2 Kings 22:3), and father of the scribe Shaphan, which last was sent with others by Josiah to repair the Temple (1408)2 Chronicles 34:8). B.C. ante 623.

Azani'ah

(Hebrews *Azanyah'*, hy;n:x;a} *heard* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Ἀζανία), the father of Jeshua, which latter was one of the Levites that subscribed the sacred covenant after the exile (1609)Nehemiah 10:9). B.C. ante 410.

Aza'phion

(Ἀσσαπφιώθ), given in 1 Esdras 5:33, as the first named of the family heads of the "sons of Solomon's servants" that returned from Babylon; apparently meaning the SOPHERETH *SEE SOPHERETH* (q.v.) of the genuine text (1525)Ezra 2:55), where the Hebrews has the article, t r p;Sho; *has-Sophereth.*

Az'ara

(Ἀσαρά), one of the heads of the "temple servants," said to have returned from the exile (1 Esdras 5:31); but the genuine text (1524)Ezra 2:49) has no such name at all.

Azar'ael

(1626)Nehemiah 12:36). *SEE AZAREEL*.

Aza'reel

(Hebrews *Azarel'*, l aer:z[} *helped by God),* the name of five men.

1. (Sept. Ὀζριήλ v. r. Ἐλιήλ.) One of the Benjamite slingers and archers that repaired to David at Ziklag (1206)1 Chronicles 12:6). B.C. 1054.

2. (Sept. Ἐζριήλ v. r. Ἀσριήλ.*)* The head of the eleventh division of the musicians in the Temple, consisting of himself and eleven others of his family (<1258>1 Chronicles 25:18; called UZZIEL in ver. 4). B.C. 1014.

3. (Sept. Ἐζριήλ v. r. Ἀζαριήλ.) Son of Jeroham, and viceroy over the tribe of Dan under David and Solomon (<1722>1 Chronicles 27:22). B.C. 1014.

4. (Sept. Ἐζριήλ) An Israelite, one of the descendants of Bani, who renounced the Gentile wife whom he had married on the return from Babylon (<1541>Ezra 10:41). B.C. 459.

5. (Sept. Ἐσριήλ v. r. Ἐσδριήλ, Οζιήλ) Son of Ahasai and father of Amashai, which last was one of the chiefs of the 128 mighty men of the priests who served at the Temple under the supervision of Zabdiel, on the restoration from Babylon (<1613>Nehemiah 11:13). B.C. cir. 440. He is probably the same with one of the first company of priests who were appointed with Ezra to make the circuit of the newly completed walls with trumpets in their hands (<1636>Nehemiah 12:36, where the name is Anglicized “Azarael”). B.C. 446.

Azari’ah

(Hebrews *Azaryah’.* hy;r]z[} *helped by Jehovah,* answering to the German name *Gottheef;* also in the prolonged form *Azarya’hu,* Why;r]z[} <1042>1 Kings 4:2, 5; <1256>2 Kings 15:6, 8; <1450>2 Chronicles 15:1; 21:2; 22:6; 23:1; 26:17, 20; 28:12; 29:12; 31:10, 13; Sept. Ἀζαρίας and Ἀζαρία*),* a very common name among the Hebrews, and hence borne by a considerable number of persons mentioned in Scripture, especially in the families of the priests of the line of *Eleazar,* whose name has precisely the same meaning as *Azariah.* It is nearly identical and is often confounded with Ezra, as well as with Zerahiah and Seraiah. *SEE AZARIAS.*

1. Apparently the only son of Ethan, the grandson of Judah (<1008>1 Chronicles 2:8). B.C. 1856.

2. A son of Jehu and father of Helez, of the tribe of Judah (<1038>1 Chronicles 2:38, 39). B.C. post 1046.

3. A person named as son of the high-priest Zadok, and an officer in the cabinet of Solomon (<1042>1 Kings 4:2). B.C. cir. 1000. He is perhaps the same, however, with No. 6 below.

4. A son of Nathan and captain of King Solomon's guards (1 Kings 4:5). B.C. cir. 1000.

5. A prophet who met King Asa on his return from a great victory over the Cushite king Zerah (2 Chronicles 15:1, where he is called the son of Oded, but Oded simply in ver. 8). See AsA. B.C. 939. He powerfully stirred up the spirit of Asa, and of the people of Judah and Benjamin, in a brief but pithy prophecy, which has been preserved, to put away all idolatrous worship, and to restore the altar of the one true God before the porch of the Temple. Great numbers of Israelites from Ephraim, and Manasseh, and Simeon, and all Israel, joined in the national reformation, to the great strengthening of the kingdom; and a season of rest and great prosperity ensued.

6. A high-priest, son of Ahimaaz and father (grandfather) of Johanan (1 Chronicles 6:9), perhaps the father of Amariah, who lived under Jehoshaphat, king of Judah (2 Chronicles 19:11). B.C. ante 912. *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*.

7. One of the sons of king Jehoshaphat (2 Chronicles 21:2, where the name is repeated, as if he had two sons of this name). B.C. post 912.

8. Otherwise called AHAZIAH *SEE AHAZIAH* (q.v.), king of Judah (2 Chronicles 22:6).

9. A son of Jeroham, who joined Jehoiada in his pious efforts to restore the worship of the Temple, and put down the usurpation of Athaliah (2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C.877.

10. A son of Obed, another "captain of a hundred," who joined Jehoiada in the same enterprise (2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. 877.

11. A person named as son of Johanan and father of another Amariah, a high-priest (1 Chronicles 6:10, 11), whom some suppose the same as ZECHARIAH, son of Jehoiada, who was killed in the reign of Joash of Judah (2 Chronicles 24:20-22). In Ezra 7:3, either his or a former person's father is called Mesaroth. B C. cir. 809. *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*. From the date he appears to be the same with the high-priest who opposed King Uzziah (q.v.) in offering incense to Jehovah (2 Chronicles 26:17, 20). B.C. 781.

12. Otherwise called UZZIAH *SEE UZZIAH* (q.v.), king of Judah, (<12421>2 Kings 14:21; 15:1, 6, 7, 8,17, 23, 27; <13312>1 Chronicles 3:12, etc.).

13. A son of Johanan and chief of the tribe of Ephraim, one of those that protested against enslaving their captive brethren of Jerusalem during the reign of Ahaz (<14812>2 Chronicles 28:12). B.C. 739.

14. A Levite, son of Zephaniah and father of Joel (<13636>1 Chronicles 6:36). In ver. 24 he is called UZZIAH, the son of Uriel and father of Shaul. It appears from <14292>2 Chronicles 29:12, that his son Joel lived under Hezekiah. B.C. ante 726.

15. A high-priest in the time of Hezekiah (<14310>2 Chronicles 31:10, 13). B.C. 726. He seems to be the same incorrectly called AHITUB in <13611>1 Chronicles 6:11, 12. He appears to have co-operated zealously with the king in that throrough purification of the Temple and restoration of the Temple services which was so conspicuous an event in Hezekiah's reign. He especially interested himself in providing chambers in the house of the Lord in which to stow the tithes, and offerings, and consecrated things for the use of the priests and Levites, and in appointing overseers to have the charge of them. As the attendance of priests and Levites and the maintenance of the Temple services depended entirely upon the supply of such offerings, whenever the people neglected them the priests and Levites were forced to disperse themselves to their villages, and so the house of God was deserted (comp. <16105>Nehemiah 10:35-39; 12:27-30, 44-47).

16. The son of Hilkiah and father of Seraiah, which latter was the last high-priest before the captivity (<13613>1 Chronicles 6:13, 14; 9:11; <15701>Ezra 7:1, 3). B.C. cir. 600.

17. One of the "'proud men" who rebuked Jeremiah for advising the people that remained in Palestine after the expatriation to Babylon not to retire into Egypt, and who took the prophet himself and Baruch along with them to that country (<24402>Jeremiah 43:2-7). B.C. 587.

18. The Hebrew name of ABEDNEGO *SEE ABEDNEGO* (q.v.), one of Daniel's three friends who were cast into the fiery furnace (<27107>Daniel 1:7; 3:9). He appears to have been of the royal lineage of Judah, and for this reason selected, with Daniel and his two other companions, for Nebuchadnezzar's especial service. The three children, as they were called, were remarkable for their beauty, and wisdom, and knowledge, and

intelligence. They were no less remarkable for their piety, their strict adherence to the law of Moses, and the steadfast ness of their faith, even in the face of death, and their wonderful deliverance. B.C. 603. *SEE DANIEL*.

19 One of the nobles who returned from Babylon (Nehemiah 7:7; 12:33), and joined in the oath of fidelity to the law (Nehemiah 10:2), and assisted in interpreting it to the people (Nehemiah 8:7). His father's name was Maaseiah, and he repaired that part of the wall of Jerusalem opposite his house (Nehemiah 3:23, 24). In Ezra 2:2, he is called SERAIAH. B.C. 446-410.

Azari'as

*(*Ἀζαρίας*,* the Greek form of *Azarfah),* the name of several men in the Apocrypha.

1. The last named of the "sons" of Emmett (rather Harim) among the priests who promised to renounce their Gentile wives after the captivity (1 Esdras 9:21) evidently the UZZIAH *SEE UZZIAH* (q.v.) of the true text (Ezra 10:21).

2. One of the nobles stated to have supported Ezra on the right while reading the law to the people (1 Esdras 9:43); but the genuine list (Nehemiah 8:4) does not contain this name.

3. One of the priests who expounded the law on the same occasion (1 Esdras 9:48); the AZARIAH *SEE AZARIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Nehemiah 8:7).

4. The son of Helchias and father of Seraias in the genealogy of Ezra (2 [Vulg. 4] Esdras 1:1); the AZARIAH *SEE AZARIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrews lineage (Ezra 7:1).

5. A name assumed by the angel Raphael (Tobit 5:12; 6:6,13; 7:8; 9:2).

6. The name (Song of 3 Children, ver. 2, 26, 66) of Abednego, Daniel's companion in trial, i.e. AZARIAH *SEE AZARIAH* (q.v.) of Daniel 1:7. He is mentioned by this Greek appellation also in 1 Maccabees 2:59, and by Josephus *(Ant. 10:*10,1). *SEE DANIEL, ADDITIONS TO*.

7. One of the generals under Judas Maccabaeus (1 Maccabees 5:18); he was defeated by Gorgias near Jamnia (1 Maccabees 5:56, 60; Josephus, *Ant.* 12, 8, 2 and 6).

A'zaz

(Hebrews *Azaz'*, zz;[; *strong;* Sept. Ἀζούζ v. r. Ὀζούζ), the son of Shema and father of Bela, a Reubenite (1 Chronicles 5:8). B.C. apparently ante 747.

Azazel

[so Milton] (Hebrews *Azazel'*, lzaz;[}, a word of doubtful interpretation, occurring only in the ordinance of the festival of expiation (Leviticus 16:8, 10, 26).

1. Some contend that it is the name itself of the *goat sent* into the desert. So Symmachus τράγος ἀπερχόμενος Aquila τράγος ἀπολελυμένος, Vulgate *hircus emissarius;* but not the Septuagint (for τῷ Ἀποπομπαίῳ in ver. 8, is by no means to be explained, with Theodoret and Cyril, by τῷ ἀποπεμπομένῳ, nor the Mishna (for the expression jLeWhiry[ice *hircus emissus*, of *Yoma*, 4, 2; 6:1, 2, is only added as a gloss on account of the occurrence of jLiin the Hebrews text). It should also be observed that in the latter clause of Leviticus 16:10, the Sept. renders the Hebrew term as if it was an abstract noun, translating lzaz;[}iby εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπήν. Buxtorf *(Heb. Lex.)* and Fagius *(Critici Sacri* in loc.), in accordance with this view of its meaning, derived the word from z[e*a goat*, and lza; *to depart.* To this derivation it has been objected by Bochart, Winer, and others, that z[edenotes a *she-goat.* It is, however, alleged that the word appears to be epicene in Genesis 30:33, Leviticus 3:12, etc.

But the application of lzaz;[}to the goat itself involves the Hebrew text in insuperable difficulties. In ver. 10, 26, the *azazel* clearly seems to be distinguished as that *for* or *to* which the goat is let loose. It can hardly be supposed that the prefix which is common to the designation of the two lots should be used in two different meanings, if both objects were beings.

2. Some have taken Azazel for the name of the place to which the goat was sent.

(1) Aben-Ezra quotes the words of an anonymous writer referring it to a hill near Mount Sinai. Vatablus adopts this opinion *(Critici Sacri,* in <BIBLE>Leviticus 16).

(2) Some of the Jewish writers, with Le Clerc, consider that it denotes the cliff to which the goat was taken to be thrown down. So Pseudo-Jonathan, Saadias, Arabs Erpenii and Jarchi, interpret a *hard* or *diffcult place* (comp. Mishna, *Yoma,* 6, 6).

(3) Bochart *(Hieroz.* 1, 749 sq.) regarded the word as a "pluralis fractus" signifying *desert places,* and understood it as a general name for any fit place to which the goat might be sent. This has the approbation of Hackmann *(Praecid. Sacr.* 1, 232-275). But Gesenius remarks that the "pluralis fractus," which exists in Arabic, is not found in Hebrew. Moreover, on this interpretation the context (ver. 10) would contain a palpable tautology, for the goat was to be sent to Azazel in the wilderness. Moreover, no such place as Azazel is elsewhere mentioned; and had it been a mountain, rhiwould not have been omitted.

3. Many of those who have studied the subject very closely take Azazel for a personal being to whom the goat was sent.

(1) Gesenius gives to lzaz;[}the same meaning as the Sept. has assigned to it, if ἀποπομπαῖος is to be taken in its usual sense; but the being so designated he supposes to be some false deity who was to be appeased by such a sacrifice as that of the goat. He derives the word from a root unused in Hebrew, but found in Arabic, lzi[; *to remove* or *take away (Hebrews Lex.* s.v.). Ewald agrees with Gesenius, and speaks of Azazel as a daemon belonging to the preMosaic religion.

(2) But others, with scarcely less superstition, have regarded him as an evil spirit, or the devil himself. So, among the rabbins, Menahem, who mentions the four arch-daemons Sammael, Azazel, Azae1, and Machazeel. In *Pirke Elieser,* c. 46, it is stated that Azazel, for the propitiation of which the goat was let loose, is the same daemon with Sammael (compare Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenth.* 2, 157; Zohar, *ad Genesis 2,* in Castell, *Opp. Posth.* p. 309). In the apocryphal book of Enoch, Azazel (not Azazyel) is among the chief of the spirits by whose doctrine and influence the. earth was corrupted (8:1; 10:12; 13:1 sq.;

15:9), and among the Greek writers the same name *(Azalzel,* Ἀζαλζήλ*)* occurs (Fabric. *Cod. pseudepigr.* 1, 18, 183; sometimes *Azaol,* Ἀζαήλ, but this by confusion for another daemon, Asael); and in Syrian authors *(Cod. Nasar.* 1, 240) it is the name of an evil spirit otherwise called *Barbag.* The same title (Ἀζαζήλ) among the Gnostics signified either Satan or some other daemon (Epiphan. *Haer.* 34); on which account Origen *(contra Cels.* vi, p. 305, ed. Spenc.) did not hesitate, in the passage of Leviticus in question, to understand the *devil* as meant. From the Jews and Christians, the word passed over to the Arabians (see Reland, *De Rel. Mo. hammed.* p. 189); and so, in later magical treatises, Azazel and Azael are reckoned among the genii that preside over the elements. Among moderns this view has been copiously illustrated by Spencer *(De legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus, 3,* diss. 8, p. 1039-1085), and has been assented to by Rosenmüller *(ad Leviticus* in loc.), Ammon *(Bibl. Theol.* 1, 360), Von Coln *(Bibl. Theol.* 1, 199), Hengstenberg *(Christol.* I, 1, 36). The following are the arguments used in its support:

(a) The contrast of terms ("to the Lord," "to Azazel") in the text naturally presumes a person to be intended, in opposition to and contradistinction from Jehovah.

(b) The desert, whither the consecrated goat of Azazel was sent away, was accounted the peculiar abode of daemons (see <231321>Isaiah 13:21; 34:13,14; Baruch 4:35; Tobit 8:3; <401243>Matthew 12:43; <661802>Revelation 18:2; Maimonid. *Nevoch.* 3, 30).

(c) This interpretation may be confirmed by the early derivation of the word, i. q. laAzz[, signifying either *strength of God* (comp. Gabriel), if referred to a once good but now fallen angel, *or powerful against God,* as applied to a malignant daemon. Spencer derives the word from z[i, *fortis,* and lzia; explaining it as *cito recedens,* which he affirms to be a most suitable name for the evil spirit. He supposes that the goat was given up to the devil, and committed to his disposal. Hengstenberg affirms with great confidence that Azazel cannot possibly be any thing but another name for Satan. He repudiates the conclusion that the goat was in any sense a sacrifice to Satan, and does not doubt that it was sent away laden with the sins of God's people, now forgiven, in order to mock their spiritual enemy in the desert, his proper abode, and to symbolize by its free gambols their exulting triumph. He considers that

the origin of the rite was Egyptian, and that the Jews substituted Satan for Typhon, whose dwelling was the desert.

On the other hand, this explanation is forbidden by the total absence in the O. Test. of any reference to evil genii; and it would be especially abhorrent to the spirit of the Mosaic economy to suppose a solemn offering of this kind to have been made out of deference to any of those daemons the propitiation of which the law so explicitly condemns (<18707>Leviticus 17:7; <15217>Deuteronomy 22:17; comp. <14115>2 Chronicles 11:15; <19637>Psalm 106:37). The obvious objection to Spencer's view is that the goat formed part of a sin-offering to the Lord. Few, perhaps, will be satisfied with Hengstenberg's mode of meeting this difficulty.

4. A better explanation of the word renders the designation of the lot לַעֲזָאזֵל; "for *complete* sending *away*" = *solitude, desert,* by reduplication from לזא (the root adopted by Gesenius), being the Pealpal form, which indicates intensity (see Ewald, *Kr. Gr.* p. 242; .comp. *Lehrgeb.* p. 869), so as to signify total *separation*. (Tholuck, *Hebr.* p. 80; Bahr, *Symbolik d. Mos. Cultus,* 2, 668), i.e. from sin, q. d. a bearer away of guilt; a sense agreeable to the rendering of the Sept. (ἀποπομπαῖος, as explained by Suidas, and as used by Pollux, v. 26), the solution of Josephus *(Ant. 3,* 10, 3), and the explanation of other ancient writers (Cyrill, *contra Julian.* 9; comp. Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccles.* 1, 468). The only objection that has been offered to this interpretation is that it destroys the exact antithesis between Jehovah and Azazel, by making the latter a thing and not a person, like the former. But this assumes that it was the design of Moses, in expressing himself thus, to preserve an exact antithesis, which is by no means evident. If we render "the one for Jehovah and the other for an utter removal," a meaning sufficiently clear and good is obtained. *SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF*.

For a farther discussion of the import and application of this word, see Prof. Bush, *Azazel, or the Levitical Scape-goat,* in the *Am. Bib. Repos.* July, 1842, p. 116-136; Hermansen, *Obs. de nomine Azazel* (Havn. 1833; comp. *Theoleg. Literaturbl.* 1835); Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1012 sq.; Schaffshausen, *De hirco emissario ejusque ritibus* (Lips. 1736); Shroder, *De Azazelis hirco ejisque rit.* (Marb. 1725); Von Slooten, *De hirco qui expiationis die cessit Azazeli* (Franec. 1726); Frischmuth, *De hirco emissario* (Jen. 1664-1668); Zeitmann, *Dehirci emissarii ductore* (Jen. 1701). *SEE SCAPE-GOAT*.

Azazi'ah

(Hebrews in the prolonged form *Azazyathu,* Whyzzi[} *strengthened* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Ὀζίας, but v. r. in 2 Chronicles Ὀζαζάς), the name of three men.

1. One of the Levitical harpers in the Temple under David (1 Chronicles 15:21). B.C. cir. 1043.

2. The father of Hoshea, which latter was the viceroy over the Ephraimites under David and Solomon (1 Chronicles 27:20). B.C. ante 1014.

3. One of the inferior overseers of the Temple offerings under Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 31:13). B.C. 726.

Azbaz'areth

(Ἀσβασαρέθ v.r. Ἀσβακαφάς,Vulg. *Asbazareth),* given (1 Esdras 5:69) as the name of the Assyrian king who planted the Samaritan colonies in Palestine; evidently a corruption for ESARHADDON *SEE ESARHADDON* (q.v.) in the true text (Ezra 4:2).

Az'buk

(Hebrews *Azbuk',* qWBz][*strong devastation;* Sept. Ἀζβούχ v. *r.* Ἀζαβούκ*),* the father of Nehemiah, which latter was ruler of the half of Beth-zur, and repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Nehemiah 3:16). B.C. ante 446.

Aze'kah

(Hebrews *Azekah',* hqzq} *dug over;* Sept. in Joshua 15:35, Ἰαζηκά Jeremiah 34:7, Ἀζηκα*;* elsewhere Ἀζηκά*),* a town in the plain of Judah (Joshua 15:35; 1 Samuel 17:1). It had suburban villages (Nehemiah 11:30), and was a place of considerable strength (Jeremiah 34:7). The confederated Amoritish kings of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon, were here defeated and slain by Joshua, and their army totally destroyed by an extraordinary shower of hailstones from heaven (Joshua 10:10, 11). It is named with Adullam, Shaaraim, and other places known to have been in that locality (Joshua 15:35; 2 Chronicles 11:9; Nehemiah 11:30), but is most clearly defined as being near Shochoh (that is, the northern one) [see SHOCHOHM

(<09701>1 Samuel 17:1). Joshua's pursuit of the Canaanites after the battle of Beth-horon extended to Azekah (<06010>Joshua 10:10, 11). Between Azekah and Shochoh, an easy step out of their own territory, the Philistines encamped before the battle in which Goliath was killed (<09701>1 Samuel 17:1). It was among the cities fortified by Rehoboam (<14109>2 Chronicles 11:9), was still standing at the time of the invasion of the kings of Babylon (<24407>Jeremiah 34:7), and is mentioned as one of the places reoccupied by the Jews after their return from captivity (<16130>Nehemiah 11:30). Eusebius and Jerome state *(Onomast.* s.v.) that there was in their time a town in this quarter called *Ezeca,* situated between Jerusalem and Eleutheropolis, which was probably the same as that mentioned by Joshua (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 603). According to Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 102), it is represented by the modern village Tell *Ezakaria,* three miles east of Saphia or Alba Specula; but this appears rather to be from the name Zechariah (Tell *Zachariya,* Robinson's *Researches,* 2, 343). The notices would correspond better to the present *Zaakuka,* marked on Zimmermann's *Map* a little to the north-east of Beit-Jibrin (Eleutheropolis); but that is in the hill country, beyond the Jerusalem road, which was the boundary of the group in <06556>Joshua 15:35. See TRIBE. Van de Velde *(Memoir,* p. 291) seems to have fixed its site as that of a village on a high hill-top called *Ahbek,* about 1.5 miles N. of Daman, and between 4 and 5 miles E.N.E. of Shuweikeh (Robinson, *Researches,* 2, 342 note).

A'zel

(Hebrews *Afsel',* לאזל; *noble;* Sept. Ἐσήλ), the son of Eleasah, of the descendants of king Saul, and father of six sons (<13837>1 Chronicles 8:37, 38; 9:43, 44). B.C. considerably post 1037. *SEE AZAL.*

A'zem

(Hebrews *E'tsem,* עצם, a *bone,* in pause *A'tsem,* עצם; Sept. Ἀσέμ v. r. Ἀσόμ, Ἰασόν), a city in the tribe of Simeon, originally included within the southern territory of Judah, in the neighborhood of Balah (or Bilhah) and Eltolad (or Tolad) (<06529>Joshua 15:29; 19:3; <13029>1 Chronicles 4:29, in which last passage it is Anglicized "Ezem," Sept. Βοασόμ v. r. Ἀϊσέμ). These notices afford only a slight ground for a conjectural location, perhaps in the great plain at the south-west extremity of the tribe, possibly at the ruins on *Tell Akhmar* (Van de Velde, *Map).*

Azephu’rith

(Ἀρσιφουρίθ, Vulg. omits), given (1 Esdras 5:16) as the name of a man whose descendants (or a place whose inhabitants), to the number of 102, returned from the captivity; but the original lists have the name JORAH (<15218>Ezra 2:18) or HARIPH (<16724>Nehemiah 7:24), and the number 112.

Aze’tas

(Ἀζητάς v. r. Ἀζηνάν), given (1 Esdras 5:15), in connection with Ceilan, as the name of another man whose descendants (or place whose inhabitants), to the number of 67, returned from the captivity; but the genuine lists (<15216>Ezra 2:16; <16721>Nehemiah 7:21) have no corresponding names.

Az’gad

(Hebrews *Azgad’*, דַּגְזַז *strong* in *fortune;* Sept. Ἀσγάδ, Ἀζγάδ), the head of one of the families of the Israelites whose descendants, to the number of 1222 persons, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (<15212>Ezra 2:12; <16717>Nehemiah 7:17), and 111 males afterward with Ezra (<15812>Ezra 8:12; <16015>Nehemiah 10:15). B.C. ante 536.

Azi’a

(Ἀζίας), one of the “temple servants” whose sons returned from the captivity (1 Esdras 5:31); evidently the UZZA *SEE UZZA* (q.v.) of the genuine texts (<15249>Ezra 2:49; <16751>Nehemiah 7:51).

Azi’ei

(Lat. *id.*, for the Greek text is lost), the son of Marimoth and father of Amarias, in the genealogy of Ezra (2 [Vulg. 4] Esdras 1:1); evidently the AZARIAH *SEE AZARIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrews list (<15703>Ezra 7:3).

A’ziel

(Hebrews *Az’el’*, אֲזַרְאֵל; Sept. Ὀζιήλ), prob. a contracted form (<13520>1 Chronicles 15:20) of the name JAAZIEL *SEE JAAZIEL* (q.v.) in the same chapter (ver. 18).

Azi'za

(Hebrews *Aziza',* azyzæ[} *strong;* Sept. Ὀζιζά*),* an Israelite, one of the descendants of Zattu, who divorced the foreign wife that he had married on the return from Babylon (<15027>Ezra 10:27). B.C. 459.

Azlzus

(῎Αζιζος), a king of Emesa, who embraced Judaism in order to marry Drusilla; but she afterward deserted him for Felix (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:7, 1, 2). He died in the first year of Nero (A.D. 54), and was succeeded by his brother Soaemus (Joseph. *ib.* 8, 4).

Az'maveth

(Hebrews *Azma'veth,* tymz][i perhaps *strong* as *death;* Sept. Ἀσμώθ and Ἀζμώθ), the name of three men, and also of a place.

1. A Barhumite (or Baharumite), one of David's thirty warriors (<102331>2 Samuel 23:31; <131133>1 Chronicles 11:33), and father of two of his famous slingers (<131203>1 Chronicles 12:3). B.C. 1061.

2. The second named of the three sons of Jehoadah (<130836>1 Chronicles 8:36) or Jarah (<130942>1 Chronicles 9:42), a descendant of Jonathan. B.C. post 1037.

3. A son of Adiel, and overseer of the royal treasury under David and Solomon (<132725>1 Chronicles 27:25). B.C. 1014.

4. A villae of Judah or Benjamin, and mentioned in connection with Geba (<161229>Nehemiah 12:29). Forty-two persons residents of this place were enrolled in the list of those that returned from the captivity at Babylon (<150224>Ezra 2:24; <160728>Nehemiah 7:28; in which latter passage the place is called BETH-AZMAVETH). The corresponding Arabic name Azment is still found in Palestine, but not in a location corresponding to the one in question (Robinson's *Researches,* 3, 102; De Saulcy's *Narrative,* 1, 91). Schwarz *(Palest.* p. 129) conjectures that the name of this place may have been derived from that of the Benjamite preceding; but he confounds it with Alemeth, Almon, and even Bahurim. The notices seem to point to some locality in the northern environs of Jerusalem; hence Ritter *(Erdk.* 16, 519) identifies it with *Hizmeh,* a village north of the site of Anathoth (Van de Velde, *Memoir,* p. 291).

Az’mon

(Hebrews *Atsmon’*, ˆ/mx][ǐ, *strong;* Sept. Ἀσεμωνᾶ, Ελμωνάν*),* a place on the southern border of Palestine, between Hazar-adar (beyond a bend at Karkaa) and “the river of Egypt” (<0304>Numbers 34:4, 5; <0650>Joshua 15:4). The site is perhaps marked by the ruins on a hill near *Wady es-Shutin* (Robinson, *Researches,* 1, 296), near the junction of Wady Futeis with Wady Ruhaibeh, *SEE TRIBE*, about half way between Elusa and Rehoboth (Van de Velde’s *Jiap). SEE HESHMON*.

Az’noth-ta’bor

(Hebrews *Aznoth’ Tabor’*, T/nzÞai r/bT; *ears* [i.e. *summits] of Tabor* [comp. Uzzen-Sherah, “Chisloth-Tabor”]; Sept. Ἀζνωθθαβώρ), a town on the western border of Naphtali, between the Jordan and Hukkok (<0694>Joshua 19:34). It is placed by Eusebius *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἀσανώθ*)* in a plain not far from Diocesarea. Neither of these notices, however, would allow a position near Tabor, as the name implies; for the territory of Zebulon, at least, intervened. *SEE TRIBE*. They may, however, be somewhat combined in a conjectural locality at the eastern edge of the plain el-Buttauf, in the vicinity of *Kurn Hattin.*

A’zor

(Ἀζώρ, from rz[; *to help),* one of the paternal ancestors of Christ (<4013>Matthew 1:13, 14); perhaps the same with AZRIKAM (<1323>1 Chronicles 3:23). *SEE AZZUR*.

Azor, Or Azorius John

a Spanish theologian, born in 1533 at Zamora, in Spain, died in 1603. Having entered the order of the Jesuits, he became professor of theology, first at Alcala, and subsequently in the Jesuit College at Rome. He published his lectures on moral theology under the title *Institutiones Morales.* Some of the opinions advanced in this work produced a considerable sensation. He, for instance, finds it “probable” that it is allowable for a man who is threatened by another with a box on the ear to kill the aggressor. The Dominicans violently attacked this proposition, but Pope Clement VIII authorized a new edition of the work. Subsequently Pascal resumed the attack in his *Lettres Provinciales,* in which the “probabilism,” or the doctrine of probable opinions, of which Azorius is

one of the authors, is severely censured. Notwithstanding these attacks, the work of Azorius had a large circulation in Italy, in Spain, and even in France, and was recommended by Bossuet to his priests. The *Institutiones* have frequently been published at Venice, Cologne, Rome, Lyons, and other places. — Hoefer, *Biographie Generale,* 3, 935.

Azo'tus

(Ἄζωτος), the Graecized form (4180Acts 8:40; so 1 Maccabees 4:15; 5:68; 10:77, 78, 83; 11:4; 13:34; 16:10) of the name of the city ASHDOD *SEE ASHDOD* (q.v.).

Azo'tus, Mount

*(*Ἀζώτου ὄρος or Ἄζωτος ὄρος*;* Vulg. *mons Azoti),* a spot to which, in the battle in which Judas Maccabeus fell, he pursued the broken right wing of Bacchides' army (1 Maccabees 9:15). Josephus *(Ant.* 12, 11, 1) calls it *Aza* (Ἀζά, or *Azara,* Ἄζαρα, according to many MSS.), which Ewald finds in a mountain west of Birzeit, under the form *Atara,* the Philistine *Ashdod* being, in his opinion, out of the question. But it is possible that the last-named encampment, *Eleasa,* was at some distance.

Az'riel

(Hebrews *Azriel',* לאזרי, *help of God),* the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Ὀζιήλ) The father of Jerimoth, which latter was phylarch of the tribe of Naphtali under David (13791 Chronicles 27:19). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Ἰεζριήλ.*)* One of the valiant heads of families of the tribe of Manasseh east who were taken into captivity by the Assyrians as a punishment of their national idolatry (15241 Chronicles 5:24). B.C. cir. 741.

3. (Sept. Ἐσριὴλ.) The father of Seraiah, which latter was one of the persons ordered by King Jehoiakim to seize Baruch and Jeremiah, and imprison them for sending him the roll of threatening prophecy (2626Jeremiah 36:26). B.C. 605.

Az'rikam

(Hebrews *Azrikam',* מקרי *help* against the *enemy;* Sept. Ἐζρικάμ or Ἐζρίκαμ*;*, once [14872 Chronicles 28:7] Ἐζρίκάν), the name of four men.

1. The first of the six sons of Azel, of the tribe of Benjamin (<1388>1 Chronicles 8:38; 9:44). B.C. post 1037.

2. (Josephus, Ἐρικάν, *Ant.* 9, 12, 1.) The governor of the king's house in the time of Ahaz, slain by Zichri an Ephraimite (<1487>2 Chronicles 28:7). B.C. cir. 738.

3. A Levite, son of Hashabiah and father of Hasshub (<1394>1 Chronicles 9:14; <1615>Nehemiah 11:15). B.C. ante 536.

4. The last named of the three sons of Neariah, a descendant of Zerubbabel (1 Chronicles in,.23). B.C. cir. 404. He is perhaps the same as AZOR (q.v.), the son of Eliakim and father of Sadoc in <4013>Matthew 1:13, 14 (see *Strong's Harmn. and Epeos. of Gospels,* p. 16, 17).

Azu'bah

(Hebrews *Azubah',* hbWz[} *deserted),* the name of two women.

1. (Sept. Ἀζουβά v. r. Γαζουβά.*)* The first wife of Caleb, Judah's grandson, by whom he had three sons (<1318>1 Chronicles 2:18, 19). B.C. ante 1658.

2. (Sept. Ἀζουβά.*)* The daughter of Shilhi and mother of King Jehoshaphat (<1242>1 Kings 22:42; <1420>2 Chronicles 20:31). B.C. 947-913.

A'zur

a less correct mode of Anglicizing (<2801>Jeremiah 28:1; <2610>Ezekiel 11:1) the name AZZUR *SEE AZZUR* (q.v.).

Az'uran

*(*Ἄζαρός v. *r.* Ἄζουρός*),* the name of a man whose descendants (or a place whose inhabitants), to the number of 432, are stated (1 Esdras 5:15) to have returned from the captivity; but the true lists (<1516>Ezra 2:16; <1672>Nehemiah 7:21) have no corresponding name.

Azymites

(from ἀ *negative* and ζύμη *leaven),* a title applied by the Greeks to the Western Church, because it uses unleavened bread in the Eucharist. The Greek Church has always maintained the use of leavened bread *(Conf. Ecc. Orient.* c. 9). The practice in the Latin Church of consecrating with

unleavened bread was one of the charges brought against that Church by the Greeks in the middle of the eleventh century, and there does not appear to have been any dispute on the subject between the two churches much before that period. Indeed Sirmondus maintains that the use of unleavened bread in the holy Eucharist was unknown to the Latin Church before the tenth century, and his opinion has the support of Cardinal Bona *(Per. Litur.* 1, 23), Schelstrat, and Pagi. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 15, ch. 2, § 5.

Az'zah

an unusual (but more correct) mode of Anglicizing (<05123>Deuteronomy 2:23; <11044>1 Kings 4:24; <24520>Jeremiah 25:20) the name GAZA (q.v.).

Az'zan

(Hebrews *Azzan',* ˆZ;[¡ perhaps a *thorn;* Sept. Ὀζάν v. r. Ὀζάν) the father of Paltiel, which latter was the commissioner from the tribe of Issachar for dividing the land of Canaan (<04626>Numbers 34:26). B.C. ante 1618.

Az'zur

(Hebrews *Azzur',* rZ][i and rWZ[¡ *helper),* the name of three men. *SEE AZOR.*

1. (Sept. Ἀζώρ.) The father of Hananiah of Gibeon, which latter was the prophet who falsely encouraged King Zedekiah against the Babylonians (<24801>Jeremiah 28:1, where the name is Anglicized "Azur"). B.C. ante 595.

2. (Sept. Ἰάζερ v. r. Ἔζερ) The father of Jaazaniah, which latter was one of the leaders of the people whom the prophet in vision saw devising false schemes of safety for Jerusalem against the Babylonians (<26101>Ezekiel 11:1, where the name is Anglicized "Azur"). B.C. ante 593.

3. (Sept. Ἀζούρ.) One of the chief Israelites who signed the covenant of faith with Jehovah on the return from Babylon (<16017>Nehemiah 10:17). B.C. cir. 410.