

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**E - Elamite**

*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**

# E

## Eachard John, D.D.,

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

## Eachard Lawrence.

SEE ECHARD.

## Eadfrith

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

## Eider

or Elmer, a monk of Canterbury (12th century), was elected bishop of St. Andrew's, in Scotland, 1120, which office he did not accept for the following reason: "The question of lay investiture of ecclesiastical benefices was then in its crisis; there was a controversy between Canterbury and York for jurisdiction over the see of St. Andrew's; that see, again, asserted its independence of either of the English metropolitans; and Eider seems to have added to all these perplexities a difficulty as to his monastic allegiance. 'Not for all Scotland,' he said to the Scottish king, 'will I renounce being a monk of Canterbury.' The king, on his side, was equally unyielding; and the issue was the return of Eadmer to his English monastery, unconsecrated indeed, but still claiming to be bishop of St. Andrew's. He was made precentor of Canterbury, and died, it is supposed, in January, 1124" (Chambers, *Encyclopedia*, s.v.). Eadmer is one of the

most important of the early English historians. He wrote a history of the affairs of England of his own time, from 1077 to 1122 (*Historia Novorum sive sui saeculi*), in which many original papers are inserted, and many important facts, nowhere else to be found, are preserved. This work has been highly commended, both by old and modern writers, as well for its correctness as for regularity of composition and purity of style. The best edition is that by Selden in 1623. Eadmer wrote the life of Anselm (generally found printed with his works), and the lives of Wilfred, Oswald, Dunstan and others, given in the *Acta Sanctorum*, and in Warton, *Anglia Sacra* (volume 2). The *Vita Anselmi* is prefixed to Anselm's works (Benedictine edition; also in Migne's *Patrologia*). The *Historia Novorum* and Eadmer's minor writings are given also in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, volume 159-347 sq. — Hook, *Eccl. Biographical* 4:52; Cave, *History Literature* (Geneva, 1720) 1:574; Collier, *Eccl. History of Great Britain* (Barham's edit.), 2:183 sq.; Wright, *Biographical Brit. Lit., Anglo-Norman Period*, p. 82 sq.

## Eagle

occurs in Scripture as the translation of the Hebrews **רִשְׁפָּי**, (*ne'sher*, so called from *tearing* its prey with its beak; occurs <sup><1994></sup>Exodus 19:4; <sup><8113></sup>Leviticus 11:13; <sup><5142></sup>Deuteronomy 14:12; 28:49; 32:11; <sup><10123></sup>2 Samuel 1:23; <sup><8025></sup>Job 9:26; 39:27; <sup><94375></sup>Psalms 103:5; <sup><12375></sup>Proverbs 23:5; 30:17, 19; <sup><24131></sup>Isaiah 40:31; <sup><24143></sup>Jeremiah 4:13; 48:40; 49:16, 22; <sup><20419></sup>Lamentations 4:19; <sup><30110></sup>Ezekiel 1:10; 10:14; 17:3, 7; <sup><3001></sup>Hosea 8:1; Obadiah 4; <sup><3001></sup>Micah 1:16; <sup><3008></sup>Habakkuk 1:8), with which all the designations of the kindred dialects agree, Chald. **רִשְׁפָּי** (*neshar'*, <sup><2063></sup>Daniel 4:33; 7:4), Sept. and N.T. **ἀετός** (<sup><1228></sup>Matthew 24:28; <sup><1757></sup>Luke 17:37; <sup><6047></sup>Revelation 4:7; 12:14). As there are many species of eagles, the *neshar*, when distinguished from others, seems to have denoted the chief species, the *golden eagle*, **χρυσάϊετος**, as in <sup><8113></sup>Leviticus 11:13; <sup><5142></sup>Deuteronomy 14:12. The word, however, seems to have had a broader acceptance, and, like the Greek **ἀετός** and Arabic *nesr* (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:312 sq.), sometimes comprehends also a species of *vulture*, especially in those passages where the *neshar* is said to be bald (<sup><3001></sup>Micah 1:16), and to feed on carcasses (<sup><8241></sup>Job 29:27; <sup><1207></sup>Proverbs 30:17; <sup><1228></sup>Matthew 24:28), which, however the true eagle will occasionally do. **SEE GIER-EAGLE; SEE HAWK; SEE OSPREY; SEE OSSIFRAGE; SEE VULTURE.**

**1.** The characteristics of the eagle referred to in the Scriptures are its swiftness of flight (<sup><658D></sup>Deuteronomy 28:49; <sup><10123></sup>2 Samuel 1:23; <sup><24413></sup>Jeremiah 4:13; 49:22; <sup><25019></sup>Lamentations 4:19, etc.); its mounting high into the air (<sup><18327></sup>Job 39:27; <sup><10116></sup>Proverbs 23:5; 30:19; <sup><23178></sup>Isaiah 40:31; <sup><24016></sup>Jeremiah 49:16); its strength and vigor (in <sup><94316></sup>Psalms 103:5); its predaceous habits (<sup><18016></sup>Job 9:26; <sup><10117></sup>Proverbs 30:17; compare Aelian, *Anim.* 10:14); its setting its nest in high places (in <sup><24016></sup>Jeremiah 49:16; comp. Aristotle, *Anim.* 9:22; Pliny, 10:4); the care in training its young to fly (in <sup><02194></sup>Exodus 19:4; <sup><65211></sup>Deuteronomy 32:11); its powers of vision (in <sup><18329></sup>Job 39:29; comp. Homer, *Il.* 17:674; Aelian, *Anim.* 1:42; Isidore, *Orig.* 12:1; Pliny, 12:88); and its molting (<sup><94316></sup>Psalms 103:5). As king of birds, the eagle naturally became an emblem of powerful empires (<sup><23178></sup>Ezekiel 17:3, 7), especially in the symbolical figures of Babylon (<sup><27004></sup>Daniel 7:4), and the cherubim (<sup><18010></sup>Ezekiel 1:10; 10:14; <sup><66017></sup>Revelation 4:7), like the *griffin* of classical antiquity. *SEE CREATURE, LIVING.* Eaglets are referred to in <sup><18017></sup>Proverbs 30:17 as first picking out the eyes of their prey.

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

*By thy understanding will [the] hawk tower,  
Spread his wings southward?  
Perchance on thy bidding [the] eagle will soar,  
Or [it is then] that he will make lofty his nest?*

*A rock will he inhabit, and [there] roost,  
Upon the peak of a rock, even [the] citadel:  
Thence he has spied food,  
From afar his eyes will look:  
Then his brood will sip blood;  
Ay, wherever [are the] slain, there [is] he!*

To the last line in this quotation our Savior seems to allude in <sup><11248></sup>Matthew 24:28. "Whosoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" that is, wherever the Jewish people, who were morally and judicially dead, might be, there would the Roman armies, whose standard was an eagle, and whose strength and fierceness resembled that of the king of birds, in comparison with his fellows, pursue and devour them. The *ἀετοί* of <sup><11248></sup>Matthew 24:28; <sup><02757></sup>Luke 17:37, may include the *fultur Jalvus* and *Neophraon percnopterus*; though, as some eagles prey upon dead bodies, there is no necessity to restrict the Greek word to the *Vulturide* (see Lucian, *Navig.* p. 1; comp. Seneca, *Ep.* 95; Martial, 6:62). The figure

of an eagle is now, and has long been, a favorite military ensign. The Persians so employed it, which fact illustrates the passage in <sup><2361></sup>Isaiah 46:11, where Cyrus is alluded to under the symbol of an " eagle" (fye) or "ravenous bird" (compare Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 7:4). The same bird was similarly employed by the Assyrians and the Romans. Eagles are frequently represented in Assyrian sculptures attending the soldiers in their battles, and some have hence supposed that they were trained birds. Considering, however, the wild and intractable nature of eagles, it is very improbable that this was the case. The representation of these birds was doubtless intended to portray the common feature in Eastern battlefield scenery, of birds of prey awaiting to satisfy their hunger on the bodies of the slain. These passages have been by some commentators referred to the vulture, on the assumed ground that the eagle never feeds on carrion, but confines itself to that prey which it has killed by its own prowess. This, however, is a mistake (see Forakal, *Descript. Anim.* page 12; compare Michaelis, *Orient. Bibl.* 9:37 sq., and new *Orient. Bibl.* 9:43 sq.); no such chivalrous feeling exists in either eagle or lion; both will feed ignominiously on a body found dead. Any visitor of the British zoological gardens may see that the habit imputed is at least not invariable. (See also Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:491.) *Aquila bisfasciata*, of India, was shot by Colossians Sykes at the carcass of a tiger; and *Arapax*, of South Africa is "frequently one of the first birds that approaches a dead animal."

Of all known birds, the eagle flies not only the highest, but also with the greatest rapidity (comp. Homer, *Il.* 22:308). To this circumstance there are several striking allusions in the sacred volume. Among the evils threatened to the Israelites in case of their disobedience, the prophet names one, in the following terms: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth" (<sup><1534></sup>Deuteronomy 28:49). The march of Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem is predicted in the same terms: "Behold, he shall come up as clouds, and his chariots as a whirlwind: his horses are swifter than eagles" (<sup><2043></sup>Jeremiah 4:13); as is his invasion of Moab also: "For thus saith the Lord, Behold he shall fly as an eagle, and shall spread his wings over Moab" (<sup><2480></sup>Jeremiah 48:40); i.e., he shall settle down on the devoted country as an eagle over its prey. (See also <sup><2049></sup>Lamentations 4:19; <sup><3002></sup>Hosea 8:2; <sup><3008></sup>Habakkuk 1:8.)

The eagle, it is said, lives to a great age, and, like other birds of prey, sheds his feathers in the beginning of spring. After this season he appears with fresh strength and vigor, and his old age assumes the appearance of youth.

To this David alludes when gratefully reviewing the mercies of Jehovah, "Who satisfieth thy mouth with good things, so that thy youth is renewed like the eagle's" (<sup><39A3B></sup>Psalm 103:5); as does the prophet, also, when describing the renovating and quickening influences of the Spirit of God: "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint" (<sup><234B></sup>Isaiah 40:31). Some Jewish interpreters have illustrated the former passage by a reference to the old fables about the eagle being able to renew his strength when very old (*SEE BOCHART, HIEROZ.* 2:747). But modern commentators for the most part are inclined to think that these words refer to the eagle after the molting season, when the bird is more full of activity than before. Others prefer Hengstenberg's explanation on <sup><39A3B></sup>Psalm 103:5, "Thy youth is renewed, so that in point of strength thou art like the eagle."

The passage in <sup><330B></sup>Micah 1:16, "Enlarge thy baldness as the eagle," has been understood by Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2:744) and others to refer to the eagle at the time of its molting in the spring. Oedman (*Vermischte Samml.* 1:64) erroneously refers the baldness spoken of by the prophet to point to the *Vultur barbatus* (*Gypaetus*), the bearded "vulture or lammergeeyer, which he supposed was bald. It appears to us to be extremely improbable that there is any reference in the passage under consideration to eagles molting. Allusion is here made to the custom of shaving the head as a token of mourning; but there would be little or no appropriateness in the comparison of a shaved head with an eagle at the time of molting. But if the *nesser* is supposed to denote the griffon vulture (*Vultur fulvus*), the simile is peculiarly appropriate; it may be remarked that the Hebrew verb *karach* (j r̄q̄) signifies "to make bald on the back part of the head;" the notion here conveyed is very applicable to the whole head and neck of this bird, which is destitute of true feathers. The direction of the prophet is to a token of mourning, which was usually assumed by making bald the *crown* of the head; here, however, it was to be enlarged, extended, as the baldness of the eagle. Exactly answering to this idea is Mr. Bruce's description of the head of the "golden eagle:" the crown of his head was bare; so was the front where the bill and skull joined. The meaning of the prophet, therefore, seems to be that the people were not to content themselves with shaving the crown of the head merely, as on ordinary occasions, but, under this special visitation of retributive justice, were to extend the baldness over the entire head.

With reference to the texts referred to above, which compare the watchful and sustaining care of his people by the Almighty with that exhibited by the eagle in training its younger ones to fly, especially the spirited one in <sup><1521></sup>Deuteronomy 32:11,12 —

*As an eagle will rouse his nest;  
Over his fledglings will hover;  
Will spread his wings,  
Will take it [i.e. his brood, or each of the young];  
Will bear it upon his pinions:  
[So] Jehovah, he alone would guide him [i.e. Israel];  
And there was not with him a strange god" —*

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

### **Picture for Eagle 1**

Finally, the eagle was an Assyrian emblem, and hence probably the reference in <sup><3108></sup>Habakkuk 1:8. The eagle-headed deity of the Assyrian sculptures is that of the god Nisroch (q.v.); and in the representations of

battles certain birds of this order are frequently shown accompanying the Assyrian warriors in their attacks, and in one case bearing off the entrails of the slain. From the Assyrians the use of the eagle as a standard (q.v.) descended to the Persians, and from them probably to the Romans. In all ages, and in most countries, as the proverbial "king of birds," it has been the symbol of majesty among the feathered tribes, like the lion among beasts.

## Picture for Eagle 2

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



tailed eagle, the imperial eagle, or mogilnick (*A. heliaca*), and the booted eagle (*A. pinnata*), is found in Syria; and at least one species of the sea-eagles (the *Hal. ossifragus*, *albicilla*, or *albicaudus*) frequents the coasts, and is even of stronger wing than the others. These build usually in the cliffs of Phoenicia, while the others are more commonly domiciliated within the mountains. According to their strength and habits, the former subsist on antelopes, hares, hyrax, bustard, stork, tortoises, and serpents; and the latter usually live on fish; both pursue the catta (*pteroles*), partridge, and lizard. The osprey alone being migratory, retires to Southern Arabia in winter. None, excepting the last mentioned, are so exclusively averse to carrion as is commonly asserted: from choice or necessity they all, but in particular the sea-eagles, occasionally feed upon carcasses of horses, etc.; and it is well known in the East that they follow armies for that purpose. Hence the allusions in Job and <sup><40></sup>Matthew 24:28, though vultures may be included, are perfectly correct. So again are those which refer to the eagle's eyrie, fixed in the most elevated cliffs. The swiftness of this bird, stooping among a flock of wild geese with the rushing sound of a whirlwind, is very remarkable; and all know its towering flight, suspended on its broad wings among the clouds with little motion or effort. Thus the predictions, in which terrible nations coming from afar are assimilated to eagles, have a poetical and absolute truth, since there are species, like the golden, which really inhabit the whole circumference of the earth, and the nations alluded to bore eagles' wings for standards, and for ornaments on their shields, helmets, and shoulders. In the northern half of Asia, and among all the Turkish races, this practice is not entirely abandoned at this day, and eagle ensigns were constantly the companions of the dragons. China, India, Bactria, Persia, Egypt, the successors of Alexandria, the Etruscans, the Romans, the Celtae, and the Arabs had eagle signa of carved work, of metal, or the skins of birds stuffed, and set up as if they were living. These, named <sup><341></sup>fyāi (*ayit*, a "ravenous bird," <sup><341></sup>Isaiah 46:1, whence <sup><341></sup>ἀετός), *aquila*, *eryx*, *simurg*, *humma* or *humaion*, *karakush* (the birds of victory of different nations and periods of antiquity), were always symbolical of rapid, irresistible conquest. A black eagle was the ensign of Kalid, general of Mohammed, at the battle of Aisnadin, and the carved eagle still, seen on the walls of the citadel of Cairo, set up by Karakufsh, the vizier of Salah-ed-din, to commemorate his own name and administration, indicates a species not here enumerated. At least for distinct kinds of eagles have been observed in Palestine, viz. the golden eagle (*Aquila Chrysaetos*), the spotted eagle (*A. naevia*), the common species in the rocky districts (see

*Ibis*, 1:23), the imperial eagle (*Aquila Heliaca*), and the very common *Circaetos gallicus*, which preys on the numerous *reptilia* of Palestine (see the vernacular Arabic names of different species of Vulturidae and Falconidae in Loche's *Catalogue des Oiseaux observ. en Algerie*; and in *Ibis*, volumes 1, 2, Tristram's papers on the ornithology of North Africa). The Hebrews *nesher* may stand for any of these different species. though perhaps more particular reference to the golden and imperial eagles and the griffon vulture may be intended. The *Aq. heliaca*, here figured, is the species most common in Syria, and is distinguished from the others by a spot of white feathers on each shoulder. (See the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. Falconidae; Hebenstreit, *Aquilae naturae S.S. Historia, e historia naturali et e Monumentt. vett. illustrata*, Lips. 1747.) **SEE BIRD.**

## Eagle

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

## E'anes

(**Μάνης**, Vulg. *Esses*, Syr. *Mani*), a name given (1 Esdr. 9:21) as that of a third son of Emmer (Immer); apparently in place of Harim, and his first two sons Maaseiah and Elijah of the Hebrews list (<sup><512></sup>Ezra 10:21). Fritzsche suggests (*Exeg. Handb.* in loc.) that **καὶ Μάνης** is a mistranslation of the **ynBjn**"and of the sons of," of the Hebrews text, the three names following having been omitted by the Greek translator.

## Ear

### Picture for Ear

(properly **זַאֵן** (*Zen*, **אָזְן**), the organ of hearing. In Scripture the term is frequently employed figuratively. To signify the regard of Jehovah to the prayers of his people, the Psalmist says, "His ears are open to their cry" (<sup><5345></sup>Psalm 34:15). To "uncover the ear" is a Hebraism, and signifies to show or reveal something to a person (<sup><5312></sup>1 Samuel 20:2). The Psalmist, speaking in the person of the Messiah, says, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened" (<sup><5416></sup>Psalm 40:6). Ainsworth

reads, " Mine ears hast thou digged open." The Sept., which Paul follows (<sup><3105></sup>Hebrews 10:5), reads the passage thus: "A body hast thou prepared me." "Make the ears of this people heavy," occurs in <sup><2360></sup>Isaiah 6:10, that is, render their minds inattentive and disobedient; with a similar meaning, the prophet Jeremiah speaks of " ears uncircumcised" (<sup><2360></sup>Isaiah 6:10). Among the Jews, the slave who renounced the privilege of being made free from servitude in the sabbatical year submitted to have his ear bored through with an awl, which was done in the presence of some judge or magistrate, that it might appear a voluntary act. The ceremony took place at his master's door, and was the mark of perpetual servitude (<sup><0206></sup>Exodus 21:6).  
**SEE EARRING.**

### Ears, Touching the

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

### Ears of Corn

(hl yl æ) *melilah'*, so called from being *cut of*, <sup><0525></sup>Deuteronomy 23:25; **tl Bva** *shibbo'leth*, from its *growth*, <sup><0405></sup>Genesis 41:5 sq.; <sup><0802></sup>Ruth 2:2; <sup><3224></sup>Job 24:24; <sup><2375></sup>Isaiah 17:5; **l m r k i** *karsuel'*, prop. a cultivated field, as often; hence produce or ears therefrom, i.e., *grits*, <sup><0804></sup>Leviticus 2:14; 23:14; <sup><1042></sup>2 Kings 4:42; **bybæ** *abib'*, *green ears*, <sup><0808></sup>Exodus 9:31; <sup><0804></sup>Leviticus 2:14; **στόχυς**, <sup><0101></sup>Matthew 12:1; <sup><0123></sup>Mark 2:23; 4:28; <sup><0101></sup>Luke 6:1). The remarkable productiveness of the cereals in Egypt has been proverbial from the days of Joseph (<sup><0447></sup>Genesis 41:47) to the present time. Jowett states, in his *Christian Researches*, that when in Egypt he plucked up at random a few stalks out of the thick grain-fields. " We counted the number of stalks which sprouted from single grains of seed, carefully pulling to pieces each root in order to see that it was one plant. The first had seven stalks, the next three, then eighteen, then fourteen. Each stalk would bear an ear." Even greater numbers than these are mentioned by Dr. Shaw, and still more by Pliny. It also often happens that one of the stalks will bear two ears, while each of these ears will shoot out

into a number of lesser ears, affording a most plentiful increase. *SEE CORN.*

## Ear

EARRING, an old English agricultural term for *ploughing*, occurs in <sup><04516></sup>Genesis 45:6; <sup><03421></sup>Exodus 34:21; <sup><00812></sup>1 Samuel 8:12, as a translation of the term *vyrjæ* (*charish'*, *ploughing*, as it is elsewhere rendered). (See *Critica Biblica*, in, 210.) The same now obsolete word is used by our translators in <sup><02104></sup>Deuteronomy 21:4; <sup><23124></sup>Isaiah 30:24, to represent the Hebrews word *dbī* (*abad'*, to *till*, as it is often elsewhere rendered). *SEE AGRICULTURE; SEE EGYPT.* So Shakspeare says "to ear the land that has some hopes to grow" (*Richard II*, 3, 2). It is etymologically connected with the Latin *aro*, to plough. It is directly derived from the Anglo-Saxon *erian*, "to plough," and is radically the same with *harrow*. What we call *arable* land was originally written *ear: able* land. The root *ar* is one of wide use in all the Indo-European languages (see Miller, *Science of Language*, p. 239). *SEE PLOUGH.*

## Eardley, Sir Culling

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

## Early, William

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in New Jersey, October 17, 1770; was converted at about nineteen; entered the itinerancy in 1791; was superannuated in 1821, and died in June of the same year, having preached

for thirty years. His first two years in the ministry were spent as missionary to New Brunswick, where he endured much hardship in zealously laboring for his Master's cause. His after ministry in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland was very useful to the Church. — *Min. of Conferences*, 1:380.

## Early English

### Picture for Early English 1

### Picture for Early English 2

### Picture for Early English 3

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

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

## Earnest

Ἄρραβών is evidently the Hebrew *ʿarabon*, a pledge) in Greek characters. It is a mercantile term which the Greeks and Romans appear to have adopted from the Phoenicians (kindred in dialect with the Hebrews) as the founders of commerce. With a slight alteration in the letters, but with none whatever in the sense, it becomes the Latin *arrhabo*, contrast *arrha*; French *arres*; English *earles* (in the old English expression *Earl's* or *Arle's* money) and *earnest*. These three words occur in the Hebrew, Sept.,

and Vulgate in <sup><013817></sup>Genesis 38:17, 18, and in verse 20, with the exception that the Vulgate there changes it to *pignus*. The use of these words in this passage clearly illustrates their general import, which is that of an earnest or pledge, given and received, to assure the fulfillment of an engagement. Hesychius explains ἀρράβων by πρόδομα, something given beforehand. The Hebrew word was used generally for *pledge* (<sup><013817></sup>Genesis 38:17), and in its cognate forms for *surety* (<sup><01718></sup>Proverbs 17:18) and *hostage* (<sup><12444></sup>2 Kings 14:14). The Greek derivative, however, acquired a more technical sense, as signifying the *deposit* paid by the purchaser on entering into an agreement for the purchase of anything (Suid. *Lex.* s.v.) This idea attaches to all the *particular* applications of the word, as anything given by way of warrant or security for the performance of a promise, part of a debt paid as an assurance of paying the remainder; part of the price of anything paid beforehand to confirm the bargain between buyer and seller; part of a servant's wages paid at the time of hiring, for the purpose of ratifying the engagement on both sides. The idea that the earnest is either to be returned upon the fulfillment of the engagement, or to be considered as part of the stipulation, is also included. A similar, legal and technical sense attaches to *earnest*, the payment of which places both the vendor and purchaser in a position to enforce the carrying out of the contract (Blackstone, 2:30). The payment of earnest-money under the name of *arrabon* is still one of the common occurrences of Arab life. Similar customs of paying down at the time of a contract "something to bind the bargain" have prevailed among all nations. (See Smith's *Dictionary of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Aarha.) **SEE BARGAIN.**

The word is used three times in the New Testament, but always in a figurative sense: in the first (<sup><40122></sup>2 Corinthians 1:22) it is applied to the *gifts* of the Holy Spirit which God bestowed upon the *apostles*, and by which he might be said to have hired them to be the servants of his Son; and which were the earnest, assurance, and commencement of those far superior blessings which he would bestow on them in the life to come as the wages, of *their faithful* services: in the two latter (<sup><40135></sup>2 Corinthians 5:5; <sup><40113></sup>Ephesians 1:13, 14) it is applied to the gifts bestowed on *Christians generally* upon whom, after baptism, the apostles laid their hands, and which were to them an *earnest* of obtaining a heavenly habitation and inheritance, upon the supposition of their fidelity. This use of the term finely illustrates the augmented powers and additional capacities promised in a future state. Jerome, in his comment on the second passage, exclaims,

"Si arrhabo tantus, quanta erit possessione the earnest was so great, how great must be the possession!" (See Kype, Macknight, and Middleton on these passages; Le Moyne, *Not. ad Var. Sacr.* p. 460-480.) In a spiritual sense, it denotes those gifts and graces which the Christian receives as the earnest and assurance of perfect happiness in a future world. (See Clauswitz, *De Arrhabosse*, Halle, 1747; Winzer, *Comment. in loc.* Lips. 1836; Schulthess, in Keil and Tschirner's *Analekten*, II, 1:215 sq.) There is a marked distinction between *pledge* and *earnest* in this respect, that the latter is a *past-payment* and therefore implies the *identity* in kind of the deposit with the future full payment; whereas a pledge may be something of a totally different nature, as in <sup><0330></sup>Genesis 38, to be resumed by the depositor when he has completed his contract. Thus the expression "*earnest of the Spirit*" implies, beyond the idea of security the *identity* in kind, though not in degree, and the *continuity* of the Christian's privileges in this world and in the next. Moreover, a pledge is taken back when the promise which it guaranteed is fulfilled; but whatever is given as earnest, being a part in advance of the whole, is of course retained. **SEE PLEDGE.**

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

1. **יָגַע** (*agil'*, from its *roundness*), properly a *ring*, specially an *ear-ring* (<sup><0319></sup>Numbers 31:50; <sup><0362></sup>Ezekiel 16:12), nearly all the ancient ear-rings exhibited in the sculptures of Egypt and Persepolis being of a circular shape. These are the **ἐνώτια** spoken of in Judith 10:4.

2. **מִזְנֵה** (*ne'zem*, either from its *perforating*, or from its use to *muzzle* in the case of animals), a *ring*, specially a *nose-ring*, but also an *earring*, which two do not seem, therefore, to have materially differed in form. It most certainly denotes an earring in <sup><0334></sup>Genesis 35:4; but in <sup><0247></sup>Genesis 24:47; <sup><0122></sup>Proverbs 11:22; <sup><0121></sup>Isaiah 3:21, it signifies a nose-jewel, and it is doubtful which of the two is intended in <sup><0124></sup>Judges 8:24, 25; <sup><0211></sup>Job 42:11. **SEE WOMAN.** Hence also we find **וַיִּלְלֵי** (*lach'ash*, properly a *whispering or incantation*), a *charm* or remedy against enchantment, i.e., a superstitious ornament, often a gem inlaid in a plate or ring of precious metal, on which certain magic formulas were inscribed, and which was worn suspended from the neck or in the ears of Oriental females (<sup><0121></sup>Isaiah 3:20). **SEE ENCHANTMENT.**



The "collars" or "chains" spoken of in <sup><0783></sup>Judges 8:26; <sup><2789></sup>Isaiah 3:19, may also have been a species of eardrop. See those terms.

## Picture for Ear-ring 1

## Picture for Ear-ring 2

No conclusion can be formed as to the shape of the Hebrew earrings except from the signification of the words employed, and from the analogy of similar ornaments in ancient sculpture. The word **מִזְנֵה**, by which these ornaments are usually described, is unfortunately ambiguous, originally referring to the nose-ring (as its root indicates), and thence transferred to the ear-ring. The full expression for the latter is **מִזְנֵה אֶבֶן רִבְוָה מִזְנֵה**, (<sup><0830></sup>Genesis 35:4), in contradistinction to **אַאֵל [מִזְנֵה]**, (<sup><0247></sup>Genesis 24:47). In the majority of cases, however, the kind is not specified, and the only clue to the meaning is the context. The term occurs in this undefined sense in <sup><0784></sup>Judges 8:24; <sup><0801></sup>Job 42:11; <sup><0152></sup>Proverbs 25:12; <sup><2023></sup>Hosea 2:13. The material of which the earring was made was generally gold (<sup><0232></sup>Exodus 32:2), and its form circular, as we may infer from the name **לְיָגֶזֶ**, by which it is described (<sup><0651></sup>Numbers 31:50; <sup><2162></sup>Ezekiel 16:12): such was the shape usual in Egypt (Wilkinson's *Egyptians*, 3:370). They were worn by women and by youth of both sexes (<sup><0110></sup>Exodus 1:100). It has been inferred from the passage quoted, and from <sup><0784></sup>Judges 8:24, that they were not worn by men: these passages are however, by no means conclusive. In the former an order is given to the men in such terms that they could not be mentioned, though they might have been implicitly, included; in the latter the *amount of the gold* is the peculiarity adverted to, and not the character of the ornament, a peculiarity which is still noticeable among the inhabitants of southern Arabia (Wellsted's *Travels*, 1:321). The mention of the *sons* in <sup><0232></sup>Exodus 32:2 (which, however, is omitted in the Septuagint), is in favor of their having been worn, and it appears unlikely that the Hebrews presented an exception to the almost universal practice of Asiatics, both in ancient and modern times. That they were not, however, usually worn by men is implied in <sup><0742></sup>Judges 14:24, where gold earrings are mentioned as distinctive of the Ishmaelitic tribes. The men of Egypt also abstained from the use of earrings; but how extensively they were worn by men in other nations is shown by the preceding group of heads of different foreigners, collected from the Egyptian monuments. By this also the usual forms of the most ancient ornaments of this description are sufficiently displayed. Those

worn by the Egyptian ladies were large, round, single hoops of gold, from one inch and a half to two inches and one third in diameter, and frequently of still greater size, or made of six single rings soldered together. Such probably was the round *agil* of the Hebrews. Among persons of high or royal rank the ornament was sometimes in the shape of an asp, whose body was of gold set with precious stones. Silver earrings have also been found at Thebes, either plain hoops like the earrings of gold, or simple studs. The ancient Assyrians, both men and women, wore earrings of exquisite shape and finish, especially the kings, and those on the later monuments are generally in the form of a cross (Layard, *Nineveh*, 2:234, 250).

### Picture for Ear-ring 3

### Picture for Ear-ring 4

Lane thus describes those now worn by Egyptian females: "Of earrings (*'halak'*) there is a great variety. Some of the more usual kinds are here represented. The first is of diamonds set in silver. It consists of a drop suspended within a wreath hanging from a sprig. The back of the silver is gilt, to prevent its being tarnished by perspiration. The specimen here given is that for the right ear; its fellow is similar, but with the sprig reversed. This pair of earrings is suited for a lady of wealth; so also is the second, which resembles the former, excepting that it has a large pearl in the place of the diamond drop and wreath, and that the diamonds of the sprig are set in gold. Number 3 is a side view of the same. The next consists of gold, and an emerald pierced through the middle, with a small diamond above the emerald. Emeralds are generally pierced in Egypt, and spoiled by this process as much as by not being cut with facets. The last is of gold, with a small ruby in the center. The ruby is set in fine filigree-work, which is surrounded by fifteen balls of gold. To the seven lower balls are suspended as many circular *bark*" (*Mod. Eg.* 2:404). The modern Oriental earrings are more usually jeweled drops or pendants than circlets of gold, but sometimes they consist of a small round plate of silver or gold suspended from a small ring inserted into the ear (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on <sup>(231)</sup>Exodus 32:2). This circular plate (about the size of a halfpenny) is either marked with fanciful figures or set with small stones. It is the same kind of thing which in that country (Mesopotamia) is worn as a nose-jewel, and in it we perhaps find the Hebrew earring, which is denoted by the same word that describes a nose-jewel. Jewels were sometimes attached to the rings: they were called *t/pyfak* (from *āfi*; *to drop*), a word rendered in

<sup><0785></sup>Judges 8:26, Sept. ὄρμισκοι, *Vulg. sonilia*, A.V. "collars;" and in <sup><2389></sup>Isaiah 3:19, καθεμα, *torques*, "chains." The size of the earrings still worn in Eastern countries far exceeds what is usual among ourselves (Harmer's *Observations*, 3, page 311, 314), hence they formed a handsome present (<sup><3821></sup>Job 42:11) or offering to the service of God (<sup><0815></sup>Numbers 31:50). *SEE JEWEL.*

The earring appears to have been regarded with superstitious reverence as an amulet: thus it is named in the Chaldee and Samaritan versions *avydæi* a holy thing; and in <sup><2389></sup>Isaiah 3:20 the word *μυνῖα* ] prop. *amulets*, is rendered in the A.V., after the Septuagint and Vulgate, *earrings*. On this account they were surrendered along with the idols by Jacob's household (<sup><0834></sup>Genesis 35:4). Chardin describes earrings, with talismanic figures and characters on them, as still existing in the East (Brown's *Antiquities*, 2:305). *SEE AMULET.*

## Ears

*SEE EAR.*

## Earth

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

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

**1.** *hmda*] *adamah'*, is the *earth* in the sense of soil or ground, particularly as being susceptible of cultivation; hence the expression *hmda*] *vyaadit*. "man of the ground," for an agriculturist (<sup><0022></sup>Genesis 9:20). The; *earth* supplied the elementary substance of which man's body was formed, and the terms *adam* and *adamah* are brought into juxtaposition, implying an etymological connection (<sup><0027></sup>Genesis 2:7). *SEE ADAM.* The opinion that man's body was formed of earth prevailed among the Greeks (Hesiod, *Op. et Di.* 61, 70; Plato, *Rep.* page 269), the Romans (Virgil, *Georg.* 2:341; Ovid, *Met.* 1:82), the Egyptians (Diod. Sic. 1:10), and other ancient nations. It is evidently based on the observation of the material into which the body is resolved after death (<sup><1819></sup>Job 10:9; <sup><2127></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:7). The law prescribed earth as the material out of which altars were to be raised (<sup><0228></sup>Exodus 20:24); Bahr (*Symb.* 1:488) sees in this a reference to the name

*adam*: others, with more reason, compare the *ara de cespite* of the Romans (Ovid, *Trist.* 5:5, 9; Horace, *Od.* 3:8, 4, 5), and view it as a precept of simplicity. Naaman's request for two mules' burden of earth (<sup><1357></sup>2 Kings 5:17) was based on the idea that Jehovah, like the heathen deities, was a local god, and could be worshipped acceptably only on his own soil. **SEE GROUND.**

2. More generally /*ra*, *e'rets*, which is explained by Von Bohlen (*Introduction to* <sup><0006></sup>*Genesis* 2:6) as meaning etymologically the *low* in opposition to the *high*, i.e., the heaven. It is applied in a more or less extended sense: 1, to the whole world (<sup><0006></sup>*Genesis* 1:1); 2, to land as opposed to sea (<sup><0010></sup>*Genesis* 1:10); 3, to a country (<sup><0213></sup>*Genesis* 21:32); 4, to a plot of ground (<sup><0235></sup>*Genesis* 23:15); and, 5, to the ground on which a man stands (<sup><0338></sup>*Genesis* 33:3); also, in a more general view, 6, to "*the inhabitants of the earth*" (<sup><0061></sup>*Genesis* 6:11; 11:1); 7, to *heathen countries*, as distinguished from the land of Israel, especially during the theocracy; i.e., all the rest of the world excepting Israel (<sup><0185></sup>2 Kings 18:25; <sup><4139></sup>2 Chronicles 13:9, etc.); particularly the empire of Chaldaea and Assyria (<sup><4503></sup>Ezra 1:2); 8, in the New Testament especially, "the earth" appears in our translation as applied to the land of Judea. As in many of these passages it might seem as if the habitable globe were intended, the use of so ambiguous a term as "the earth" should have been avoided, and the original rendered by "the land," as in <sup><0823></sup>Leviticus 25:23; <sup><2303></sup>Isaiah 10:23, and elsewhere. This is the sense which the original bears in <sup><0235></sup>Matthew 23:35; 27:45; <sup><4153></sup>Mark 15:33; <sup><0025></sup>Luke 4:25; 21:23; <sup><0028></sup>Romans 9:28; <sup><3057></sup>James 5:17. 9. Finally, in a spiritual sense, the word is employed (in the N.T.) in contrast with heaven, to denote things earthly and carnal (<sup><0031></sup>John 3:31; <sup><5000></sup>Colossians 3:1, 2). See Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s.v.; **SEE WORLD.**

To demand earth and water was a custom of the ancient Persians, by which they required a people to acknowledge their dominion; Nebuchodonosor, in the Greek of Judith (2:7), commands Holofernes to march against the people of the West, who had refused submission, and to declare to them that they were to prepare earth and water. Darius ordered his envoys to demand earth and water of the Scythians; and Megabysus required the same of Amyntas, king of Macedonia, in the name of Darius. Polybius and Plutarch notice this custom among the Persians. Some believe that these symbolical demands denoted dominion of the earth and sea; others, that the earth represented the food received from it, corn and fruits; the water,

drink, which is the second part of human nourishment. Ecclus. 15:16, in much the same sense, says, "The Lord hath set fire and water before thee; stretch forth thy hand unto whether thou wilt; and chapter 39:26, "Fire and water are the most necessary things to life." Fire and water were considered by the ancients as the first principles of the generation, birth; and preservation of man. Proscribed persons were debarred from their use; as, on the contrary, wives in their nuptial ceremonies were obliged to touch them. *SEE ELEMENT.*

**II.** The idea which the ancient Hebrews had of the figure of the earth can only be conjectured from incidental hints occasionally given in Scripture (<sup><2412></sup>Isaiah 40:22; <sup><1187></sup>Proverbs 8:27; <sup><1350></sup>Job 26:10; <sup><4214></sup>Psalms 24:2; 136:6). From these passages, taken together, says Rosenmüller (*Alterthumsk.* I, 1:133 sq.), we obtain the notion of the earth's disk as circular, rising out of the water, and surrounded with the ocean, the heaven being spread over it as a canopy. Though floating free in the boundless immensity of space, yet, through the Creator's might, it remains firmly fixed, without moving (<sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 17:30; <sup><4931></sup>Psalms 93:1; 104:5; 119:90). It is rather inconclusive, however, to infer the popular notions of the earth's figure from what may have been nothing more than the bold imagery of poets. Some have supposed that so long as the Hebrews were a nomadic race, they conceived of the earth as resembling a round tent, with the expanse as its covering; but that in later times, when domiciled in Palestine, they spoke of it as a splendid palace resting upon its many pillars (<sup><1218></sup>2 Samuel 22:8; <sup><4778></sup>Psalms 75:3; 104:5; <sup><1182></sup>Proverbs 5:25-29). The Greek and Roman writers (Hesiod, *Theogn.* 116 sq.; Ovid, *Metam.* 1:5 sq.; comp. Euseb. *Prasp. Ev.* 1:10 [Sanhoniathon, ed. Orelli, p. 9 sq.] *Zendavesta*, 1:170 sq.) also vary in their representations on this point, describing the earth sometimes as an oblong square, sometimes as a cube, sometimes as a pyramid, sometimes as a *chlamys*, or outspread mantle. (See Eichhorn, *Urgesch.* ed. Gabler, Nurnb. 1790; Doderlein *Rel. — Unterr.* 7:59 sq.; Beck, *Weltgesch.* 1:99 sq.; Bauer, *Hebr. Mythol.* 1:63 sq.; De Wette, *Bibl. Dogm.* page 76 sq.; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Bibl. Theolog.* p. 264 sq.; Colln, *Bibl. Theol.* 1:166; Mignot, in the *Memoires de l'Acad. des Inscr.* 34:352 sq.; Anquetil, *Oupnekhat*, 1:409 sq.; Johannsen, *Die kosmog., Ansichten d. Inder u. Hebr.* Altona, 1833, Dornedden, in Eichhorn's *Bibl.* 10:284 sq., 548 sq.; Gessner, in the *Comment. Soc. Goett.* volume 2; Corrodi, *Beitr. zum vern. Denken*, 18:15 sq.; Link, *Urwelt*, 1:268 sq.; Wagner, *Geschichte d. Urgesch.* p. 496 sq.; Umbreit, in the *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1839, p. 189 sq.;

Ballenstedt, *Die Urwelt*, 3d ed. Quedlinb. 1819; Von Schrank, *Physik. theolog. Erkldr. der 6 Schopfungstage*, Augsburg, 1829; Beke, *Researches in Primeval History*, London, 1834; Burton, *View of the Creation*, London, 1836; Tholuck, *Literar. Anzeig.* 1833, No. 67-78; Keil, *apologia Mos. traditionis*, Dorpat, 1839; Benner, *De censura Longini in verba ~~Genes~~ Genesis 1:3*, Giess. 1739; Burmeister, *Gesch. d. Schopfung*, Lips. 1843; Waterkeyn, *Kosmos Hieros* Grimma, 1846; Goguet, *Urspr. d. Gesetze*, 2:227.) **SEE COSMOGONY.**

## Earthen Vessel or Earthenware.

**SEE POTTERY.**

## Earthquake

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

vicinity of Hillah, the ancient Babylon. Syria and Palestine abound in volcanic appearances. Between the river Jordan and Damascus lies a volcanic tract. The entire country about the Dead Sea presents indubitable tokens of volcanic agency. Accordingly, these places come within one of the volcanic regions. The chief of these are,

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

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

That earthquakes were among the extraordinary phenomena of Palestine in ancient times is shown in their being an element in the poetical imagery of the Hebrews, and a source of religious admonition and devout emotion. An earthquake, when great, overturns and changes the surface of the earth, subverting mountains, hills, and rocks, sinking some parts, elevating others, altering the course of rivers, making ponds and lakes on dry lands, and drying up those that already existed; and is therefore a proper symbol of *great evolutions* or changes in the government or political world (<sup><3826></sup>Hebrews 12:26). See Wemyss, *Symbolical Dict.* s.v. In <sup><19807></sup>Psalm 18:7, we read, "Then the earth shook and trembled; the foundations also of the hills moved and were shaken, because he was wroth" (comp. <sup><3806></sup>Habakkuk 3:6; <sup><3006></sup>Nahum 1:5; <sup><21625></sup>Isaiah 5:25). It was not an unnatural transition that any signal display of the will, sovereignty, or goodness of Providence should be foretold in connection with, and accompanied as by other signs in the heavens above or on the earth below, so by earthquakes and their fearful concomitants (see <sup><2028></sup>Joel 2:28; <sup><12475></sup>Matthew 24:7, 29). Earthquakes are not unfrequently attended with fissures of the earth's surface; instances of this are recorded in connection with the destruction of Korah and his company (<sup><4462></sup>Numbers 16:32; compare Josephus, *Ant.* 4:3, 3), and at the time of our Lord's death (<sup><41251></sup>Matthew 27:51); the former may be paralleled by a similar occurrence at Oppido, in Calabria, A.D. 1783, where the earth opened to the extent of 500 and a depth of more than 200 feet, and again by the sinking of the bed of the Tagus at Lisbon,

in which the quay was swallowed up (Pfaff, *Schöpfungsgesch.* p. 115). These depressions are sometimes on a very large scale; the subsidence of the valley of Siddim, at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, may be attributed to an earthquake. Similar depressions have occurred in many districts, the most remarkable being the submersion and subsequent re-elevation of the temple of Serapis at Puteoli. The frequency of earthquakes about the Dead Sea is testified in the name Bela (<sup><1142></sup>Genesis 14:2; compare Jerome ad Isaiah 15). *SEE SODOM.* The awe which an earthquake never fails to inspire, "conveying the idea of some universal and unlimited danger" (Humboldt's *Kosmos*, 2:212), rendered it a fitting token of the presence of Jehovah (1 Kings, 19:11); hence it is frequently noticed in connection with his appearance (<sup><1106></sup>Judges 5:4; <sup><1128></sup>2 Samuel 22:8; <sup><1178></sup>Psalms 77:18; 97:4; 104:32; <sup><1188></sup>Amos 8:8; <sup><1190></sup>Habakkuk 3:10). Earthquakes, together with thunder, lightning, and other fearful phenomena of nature, form no small portion of the stock of materials which the interpreters of the German rationalistic school employ with no less liberality than confidence in order to explain after their manner events recorded in the Scriptures which have been commonly referred to the immediate agency of God. Hezel, Paulus, as other miracle exploders would, but for this resource, find their "occupation gone." But, if there is reason for 'the statement that truth is sometimes stranger than fiction, it may with equal propriety be observed that their "natural" causes are most unnatural, unlikely, and insufficient. *SEE MIRACLES.*

The first visitation of the kind recorded as having happened to Palestine was in the reign of Ahab (about B.C. 905), when Elijah (<sup><1191></sup>1 Kings 19:11, 12) was directed to go forth and stand upon the mountain before Jehovah: "And behold Jehovah passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks before Jehovah; but Jehovah was not in the wind: and after the wind an *earthquake*; but Jehovah was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but Jehovah was not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice." A terrible earthquake took place "in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah" (B.C. 781), which Josephus (*Ant.* 9, 10, 4) says "shook the ground, and a rent was made in the Temple, so that the rays of the sun shone through it, which, falling upon 'the king's face, struck him with the leprosy," a punishment which the historian ascribes to the wrath of God consequent on Uzziah's usurpation of the priest's office. That this earthquake was of an awful character may be learned from the fact that Zechariah (<sup><1145></sup>Zechariah 14:5) thus speaks respecting it: "Ye shall



flee as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah:" and it likewise appears from Amos (<sup><300B></sup>Amos 1:1) that the event was so striking, and left such deep impressions on men's minds, as to become a sort of epoch from which to date and reckon; the prophet's words are, "two years before the earthquake." *SEE UZZIAH*. From <sup><384D></sup>Zechariah 14:4 we are led to infer that a great convulsion took place at this time in the Mount of Olives, the mountain being split so as to leave a valley between its summits. Josephus records something of the sort, but his account is by no means clear, for his words (τοῦ ὄρους ἀπορράγηται τὸ ἡμῖσιν τοῦ κατὰ τὴν δύσιν) can hardly mean the *western half of the mountain*, as Whiston seems to think, but the *half of the western mountain*, i.e., of the Mount of Evil Counsel, though it is not clear why this height particularly should be termed the *western* mountain. We cannot but think that the two accounts have the same foundation, and that the Mount of Olives was really affected by the earthquake. Hitzig (*Comm. in Zechariah*) suggests that the name *tyj æhi* "*corruption*," may have originated at this time, the rolling down of the side of the hill, as described by Josephus, entitling it to be described as the *destroying mountain*, in the sense in which the term occurs in <sup><402S></sup>Jeremiah 2:25. *SEE AZAL*.

The only important or clear earthquake mentioned in the New Testament (except the doubtful one of <sup><418D></sup>Matthew 28:2) is that which happened at the crucifixion of the Savior of mankind (<sup><427S></sup>Matthew 27:50-1; compare <sup><4234></sup>Luke 23:44-5; <sup><4153S></sup>Mark 15:33). The concomitant darkness is most naturally held to have been an attendant on the earthquake. Earthquakes are not seldom attended by accompaniments which obscure the light of day during (as in this case from the sixth to the ninth hour, that is, from 12 o'clock at noon to 8 o'clock P.M.) several hours. If this is the fact, then the record is consistent with natural phenomena, and the darkness which skeptics have pleaded against speaks actually in favor of the credibility of the Gospel. Now it is well known to naturalists that such obscurations are by no means uncommon. It may be enough to give the following instances. A very remarkable volcanic eruption took place on the 19th of January, 1835, in the volcano of Coseguina, situated in the Bay of Fonseca (usually called the coast of Conchagua), in Central America. The eruption was preceded by a rumbling noise, accompanied by a column of smoke which issued from the mountain, increasing until it assumed the form and appearance of a large dense cloud, which, when viewed at the distance of thirty miles, appeared like an immense plume of feathers, rising with

considerable velocity, and expanding in every direction. In the course of the two following days several shocks of earthquakes were felt; the morning of the 22d rose fine and clear, but a dense cloud of a pyramidal form was observed in the direction of the volcano. This gradually ascended, and by 11 o'clock A.M. it had spread over the whole firmament, entirely obscuring the light of day, the darkness equaling in intensity that of the most clouded night: this darkness continued with little intermission for three days; during the whole time a fine black powder continued to fall. This darkness extended over half of Central America. The convulsion was such as to change the outline of the coast, turn the course of a river, and form two new islands. Precisely analogous phenomena were exhibited on occasions of earthquakes that took place at Cartago, in Central America, when there prevailed a dense black fog, which lasted for three days (*Recreations in Physical Geography*, page 382). In the case of the volcanic eruption which overwhelmed Herculaneum and Pompeii (A.D. 79), we learn from the younger Pliny that a dense column of vapor was first seen rising vertically from Vesuvius, and then spreading itself out laterally, so that its upper portion resembled the head, and its lower the trunk of a pine. This black cloud was pierced occasionally by flashes of fire as vivid as lightning, succeeded by darkness more profound than night, and ashes fell even at Misenum. These appearances agree perfectly with those witnessed in more recent eruptions, especially those of Monte Nuovo in 1538, and Vesuvius in 1822. Indeed earthquakes appear to exert a very marked influence on our atmosphere: among other effects, Lyell (*Principles of Geology*, 1:400) enumerates sudden gusts of wind, interrupted by dead calms; evolution of electric matter or of inflammable gas from the soil, with sulphurous and mephitic vapors; a reddening of the sun's disk, and a haziness in the air often continued for months (<sup><2020></sup>Joel 2:30, 31). Other interpreters, however, understand the earthquake in <sup><10754></sup>Matthew 27:54 to have been merely some special and supernatural operation of God, in attestation of the marvelous work that was in progress, producing a tremulous motion in the immediate locality, and in connection therewith a sensible consternation in the minds of the immediate actors; hence there is no other historical allusion to it. This view is confirmed by its being in the second case connected with the angel's descent (<sup><1080></sup>Matthew 28:2; compare <sup><09415></sup>1 Samuel 14:15). Like the one that occurred at Philippi (<sup><4166></sup>Acts 16:16), it is perhaps to be regarded as a somewhat exceptional phenomenon, wrought for a specific purpose, and consequently very limited as to its sphere of action. Nor does it appear from any notices of

Scripture that the phenomena of earthquakes in the ordinary and extensive sense of the term, played more than a very occasional and subordinate part in the scenes and transactions of sacred history. Treatises in Latin on the earthquake at our Savior's passion have been written by Berger (Viteb. 1710), Posner (Jen. 1672), Schmerbauch (Lubbeai. 1756), Schmid (Jen. 1683). *SEE DARKNESS.*

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

## East

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

**1. j rɪʒnæ** *mizrach'* properly denotes the *rising*, sc. of the sun, and strictly corresponds with the Greek, ἀνατολή, and the Latin, *oriens*. It is used tropically for the east indefinitely (<sup><19312></sup>Psalm 103:12; <sup><2789></sup>Daniel 8:9; <sup><3182></sup>Amos 8:12, etc.); also definitely for some place in relation to others, thus, "The land of the east," i.e., the country lying to the east of Syria, the Elymais (<sup><3872></sup>Zechariah 8:7); "the east of Jericho" (<sup><4049></sup>Joshua 4:19); "the east gate" (<sup><4689></sup>Nehemiah 3:29), and adverbially "eastward" (<sup><13728></sup>1 Chronicles 7:28; 9:24, etc.). Sometimes the full expression **vmv9j rɪʒnæ** *sunrise* is used (indefinitely <sup><23425></sup>Isaiah 41:25; definitely, <sup><07118></sup>Judges 11:18). See below.

2. **μdq**, *ke'dem* (with its modifications), properly means *what is in front of, before* (comp. <sup><1916></sup>Psalm 139:5; <sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 9:11 [12]). As the Hebrews, in pointing out the quarters, looked towards the east, **μdq**, *fore*, came to signify the east, as **r/ha**; *behind*, the west, and **ymg** *the right hand*, the south. In this sense *kedem* is used (a) indefinitely, <sup><0112></sup>Genesis 11:2; 13:11, etc.; (b) relatively, <sup><0611></sup>Numbers 34:11, etc.; (a) definitely, to denote the regions lying to the east of Palestine (<sup><0201></sup>Genesis 29:1; <sup><0207></sup>Numbers 23:7; <sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 9:11; sometimes in the full form, **μdq9/ra**, "*land of the east*" (<sup><0206></sup>Genesis 25:6), the inhabitants of which are denominated **μdq9ymB'** *children of the east.*" **SEE BENE-KEDEM.**

Sometimes *kedem* and *mizrach* are used together (e.g. <sup><02713></sup>Exodus 27:13; <sup><0692></sup>Joshua 19:12), which is, after all not so tautological as it appears to be in our translation "on the east side eastward." Bearing in mind this etymological distinction, it is natural that *kedem* should be used when the *four* quarters of the world are described (as in <sup><0134></sup>Genesis 13:14; 28:14; <sup><8238></sup>Job 23:8, 9; <sup><26718></sup>Ezekiel 47:18 sq.), and *mizrach* when the east is only distinguished from the *west* (<sup><0103></sup>Joshua 11:3; <sup><1900></sup>Psalm 1:1; 103:12; 113:3; <sup><3807></sup>Zechariah 8:7), or from some other one quarter (<sup><2709></sup>Daniel 8:9; 11:44; <sup><1082></sup>Amos 8:12); exceptions to this usage occur in <sup><19478></sup>Psalm 107:3 and <sup><2316></sup>Isaiah 43:5, each, however, admitting of explanation. Again, *kedem* is used in a strictly geographical sense to describe a spot or country immediately *before* another in an easterly direction; hence it occurs in such passages as <sup><0018></sup>Genesis 2:8; 3:24; 11:2; 13:11; 25:6; and hence the subsequent application of the term as a proper name (<sup><0206></sup>Genesis 25:6, *eastward, unto the land of Kedem*), to the lands lying immediately eastward of Palestine, viz. Arabia, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, etc.; on the other hand, *mizrach* is used of the far east with a less definite signification (<sup><2312></sup>Isaiah 41:2, 25; 43:5, 46:11). In describing *aspect or direction*, the terms are used indifferently (comp. *kedem* in <sup><0116></sup>Leviticus 1:16, and <sup><0692></sup>Joshua 7:2, with *mizrach* in <sup><4512></sup>2 Chronicles 5:12, and <sup><1350></sup>1 Chronicles 5:10). **SEE WEST**; etc.

"The East" is the name given by the ancient Hebrews to a certain region, without any regard to its relation to the eastern part of the heavens, comprehending not only Arabia Deserta and the lands of Moab and Ammon, which really lay to the east of Palestine but also Armenia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Chaldea, which were situated rather to the north than the east of Judaea. Its geographical boundaries include Syria,

the countries beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, and the shores of the Indian Ocean and of the Arabian Gulf. The name given to this entire region by the Hebrews was  $\mu\delta\alpha$ , / $\rho\alpha$ , ( $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}$ ), or the land of Kedem or East; by the Babylonians it was called  $br\{$  } or  $\acute{\Lambda}\rho\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha$  Arabia. Its miscellaneous population were called by the former "sons of the East," or *Orientalis*, and by the latter either *Arabians*, or the "people of the West." The Jews themselves also apply to them the Babylonian name in some of their books written after the Captivity (<sup><421></sup>2 Chronicles 22:1; <sup><411></sup>Nehemiah 2:9). The Arabs anciently denominated themselves, and do to this day, by either of these names. To this region belong the "kings of the East" (<sup><291></sup>Isaiah 19:11; <sup><459></sup>Jeremiah 25:19-25, Hebrew). The following passages may suffice as instances showing the arbitrary application of the term "east" to this region. Balaam says that Balak, king of Moab, had brought him from the mountains of the east (<sup><427></sup>Numbers 23:7), i.e., from Pethor on the Euphrates. Isaiah places Syria in the east (<sup><491></sup>Numbers 9:11), "the Syrians from the east" (bishop Lowth). The distinction seems evident in <sup><121></sup>Genesis 29:1, "Jacob came unto the land of the children of the East." It occurs again in <sup><113></sup>Judges 6:3, "Even the children of the East came against them" (Sept.  $\omicron\acute{\iota}\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu$ ; Vulg. *coeteri Orientalium nationum*). The preceding facts enable us to account for the prodigious numbers of persons sometimes assembled in war against the Israelites (<sup><115></sup>Judges 6:5; 7:12), "and the children of the East were like grasshoppers for multitude," and for the astonishing carnage recorded (<sup><130></sup>Judges 8:10), "there fell a hundred and twenty thousand men that drew the sword." It seems that the inhabitants of this region were distinguished for their proficiency in the arts and sciences (compare <sup><104></sup>1 Kings 1:4, 30), and were addicted in the time of Isaiah to superstition (<sup><201></sup>Isaiah 26). **SEE ARABIA.**

The east seems to have been regarded as symbolical of *distance* (<sup><241></sup>Isaiah 46:11), as the land stretched out in these directions without any known limit. In <sup><216></sup>Isaiah 2:6, the house of Jacob is said to be "replenished from the east" ( $\mu\delta\Omega\mu\alpha\lambda\ \acute{\jmath}\ m$ ), which some explain as referring to witchcraft, or the arts of divination practiced in the East while others, with greater probability, understand it of the men of the East, the diviners and soothsayers who came from the east (compare <sup><352></sup>Job 15:2); the correct text may, however, be  $\mu\varsigma\Omega\mu\alpha$  *with sorcery*, which gives a better sense (Gesen. *Thesaur.* page 1193). **SEE WITCHCRAFT.**

3. **Ἄνατολή**, sunrise. This word usually occurs in the plural, and without the article. When, therefore, we read, as in <sup><401></sup>Matthew 2:1, 2, that **μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν** came to Jerusalem saying we have seen his star **ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ**, we are led to suspect some special reason for such a variation. The former phrase is naturally rendered as equivalent to Oriental Magi, and the indefinite expression is to be explained by reference to the use of **μδϞ**, in the Old Test. The latter phrase offers greater difficulty. If it be taken "in the east," the questions arise why the singular and not the customary plural should be used? why the article should be added? and why the wise men should have seen the star in the *east* when the place where the child was lay to the *west* of their locality (unless, indeed, **ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ** relates to the star, and not the wise men themselves, to whom it seems to refer). Pressed by the difficulties thus suggested, the majority of recent interpreters take **ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ** literally *in its rise*, and trace a correspondence of this with the **τεχθεῖς** of the preceding clause: they inquired for the child, whom they knew to be born, because they had seen the *rising* of his star, the signal of his birth. Alford objects to this, that for such a meaning we should expect **αὐτοῦ**, if not in verse 2, certainly in verse 9; but the construction falls under the case where the article by indicating something closely associated with the subject, supersedes the use of the demonstrative pronoun. In the Sept. **ἀνατολαί** is used both for *kedem* and *mizrach*. It should be observed that the expression is, with but few exceptions (<sup><278></sup>Daniel 8:9; <sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:13; compare 7:2; 16:12, from which it would seem to have been John's usage to insert **ἡλίου**), **ἀνατολαί** (<sup><401></sup>Matthew 2:1; 8:11; 24:27; <sup><213></sup>Luke 13:29), and not **ἀνατολή**. It is hardly possible that Matthew would use the two terms indifferently in succeeding verses (<sup><401></sup>Matthew 2:1, 2), particularly as he adds the article to **ἀνατολή**, which is invariably absent in other cases (compare <sup><621></sup>Revelation 21:13). He seems to imply a definiteness in the locality—that it was the country called **μδϞ**, or **ἀσατολή** (comp. the modern *Anatolia*), as distinct from the quarter or point of the compass (**ἀνατολαί**) in which it lay. In confirmation of this, it may be noticed that in the only passage where the article is prefixed to *kedem* (<sup><100></sup>Genesis 10:30), the term is used for a definite and restricted locality, namely, Southern Arabia. **SEE STAR IN THE EAST.**

The only other terms rendered "east" in the Scriptures are the following: **תְּשׁוּרְיָא** (*charsuth'*, pottery), applied to a gate of Jerusalem, improperly called "east gate" (<sup><249></sup>Jeremiah 19:2), but meaning the potters' gate (s.v.),

i.e., one which led to the "potters' field" in the valley of Hinnom (see Strong's *Harmony and Exposition*, Appendix 2, page 11). *SEE JERUSALEM. ax/m* (*motsa'*, a going forth, as it is elsewhere usually rendered), applied poetically to sunrise (<sup>1976</sup>Psalm 75:6) For "east-wind," "east-sea," see below.

## EAST, TURNING TOWARDS THE.

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

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

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

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

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

(4.) Christ made his appearance on earth in the east, and thence ascended into heaven, and there will appear again as the last day. The authority of many of the fathers has been adduced by ecclesiastical writers in support of these views. The author of the *Questions to Antiochus*, under the name of Athanasius, gives this account of the practice: 'We do not,' says he, 'worship towards the east, as if we thought God any way shut up in those parts of the world, but because God is in himself the true Light. In turning, therefore, towards the created light, we do not worship it, but the great Creator of it; taking occasion from that most excellent element to adore the God who was

before all elements and ages in the world.' A little attention to geography shows that these are nothing but fancies. That part of the heavens, for example, which is east at six o'clock in the morning, is west at six o'clock in the evening, so that we cannot at both these periods pray towards 'that quarter of the heavens where (according to Wheatly) God is supposed to have his peculiar residence of glory,' unless, if we turn to the east at morning prayer, we turn to west at even song. Not only so, but two individuals on opposite sides of the globe, though both suppose that they are praying with their faces to the east, are, so far as it respects each other, or any particular 'quarter of the heavens,' praying in opposite directions, one east and the other west, one looking towards that 'quarter,' the other away from it. So that all such reasons are rendered futile by the geographical fact that, owing to the rotation of the earth on its axis, every degree of longitude becomes during the twenty-four hours both east and west."

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



— Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 11, chapter 7, § 4; Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Diet. s.v.*

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

### Eastburn James Wallis, A.M.,

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

### East, Christianity in the

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

### East Gate

**SEE EAST.**

### East Sea

(with the art. **ἡ ἀνατολική θάλασσα** *ha-yam hak-kadmoni'*, *the forward sea*; Sept. **ἡ θάλασσα ἡ πρώτη**) is an epithet used in two passages (<sup>3121</sup> Joel 2:20; <sup>3478</sup> Ezekiel 47:18) of the DEAD SEA **SEE DEAD SEA** (q.v.), because it lay on the eastern side of the Holy Land. The Mediterranean Sea, because lying in the opposite direction, was on a like account called the West Sea,

or the sea on the western border (<sup><0806></sup>Numbers 34:6; <sup><6512></sup>Joshua 15:12, etc.). *SEE SEA.*

## East Wind

(*pydæj* prop. the *east* [*as* often rendered], i.e., eastern quarter; hence elliptically for the wind from that direction, <sup><8271></sup>Job 27:21; <sup><3278></sup>Isaiah 27:8; <sup><4887></sup>Jeremiah 18:17; <sup><3302></sup>Ezekiel 29:26; the full expression *pydæj Wlr*. It also occurs, <sup><2103></sup>Exodus 10:13, 14, 21; <sup><9888></sup>Psalms 48:8; <sup><3170></sup>Ezekiel 17:10). This is in Scripture frequently referred to as a wind of considerable strength, and also of a peculiarly dry, parching, and blighting nature. In Pharaoh's dream the thin ears of corn are represented as being blasted by an east wind, as, in a later age, Jonah's gourd was withered and himself scorched by "a vehement east wind" (<sup><0406></sup>Genesis 41:6; <sup><3018></sup>Jonah 4:8); and often in the prophets, when a blighting desolation is spoken of, it is associated with the east wind, either as the instrumental cause or as a lively image of the evil (<sup><2670></sup>Ezekiel 17:10; 19:12; <sup><2835></sup>Hosea 13:15; <sup><3009></sup>Habakkuk 1:9, etc.). This arose from the fact that in Egypt, Palestine, and the lands of the Bible generally, the east wind, or a wind more or less from an eastern direction, blows over burning deserts, and consequently is destitute of the moisture which is necessary to promote vegetation. In Egypt it is rather a south-east than an east wind, which is commonly found most injurious to health and fruitfulness; but this also is familiarly called an east wind, and it often increases to great violence. Ukert thus sums up the accounts of modern travelers on the subject: "In the spring the south wind oftentimes springs up towards the south-east, increasing to a whirlwind. The heat then seems insupportable, although the thermometer does not always rise very high. As long as the south-east wind continues, doors and windows are closed, but the fine dust penetrates everywhere; everything dries up; wooden vessels warp and crack. The thermometer rises suddenly from 16-20° up to 30-36 degrees, and even 38 degrees of Reaumur. This wind works destruction upon everything. The grass withers, so that it entirely perishes if this wind blows long" (*Geogr.* page 111). It is stated by another traveler, Wansleb, with special reference to the strong east wind employed on the occasion of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea which took place shortly after Easter: "From Easter to Pentecost is the most stormy part of the year, for the wind commonly blows during this time from the Red Sea, from the east" (see in Hengstenberg's *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, page 9 sq). There is nothing therefore, in the scriptural

allusions to this wind which is not fully borne out by the reports of modern travelers; alike by sea and by land it is now, as it has ever been, an unwelcome visitant, and carries along with it many disagreeable effects.  
*SEE WIND.*

## Easter

(*πάσχα*, a Greek form of the Hebrews *j sPε* and so Latinized by the Vulgate *pascha*), i.e., *Passover*. *Easter* is a word of Saxon origin, and imports a goddess of the Saxons, or, rather, of the East, *Ester*, in honor of whom sacrifices being annually offered about the Passover time of the year (spring), the name became attached by association of ideas to the Christian festival of the resurrection, which happened at the time of the Passover: hence we say *Easter-day*, *Easter Sunday*,, but very improperly; as we by no means refer the festival then kept to the goddess of the ancient Saxons. So the present German word for Easter *Ostern*, is referred to the same goddess, *Ester* or *Oster*. — Calmet, s.v. The occurrence of this word in the A.V. of <sup><4120></sup>Acts 12:4 — "Intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people" — is chiefly noticeable as an example of the want of consistency in the translators. *SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION*. In the earlier English versions *Easter* had been frequently used as the translation of *πάσχα*. At the last revision *Passover* was substituted in all passages but this. It would seem from this, and from the use of such words as "robbers of churches" (<sup><4187></sup>Acts 19:37), "town-clerk" (<sup><4185></sup>Acts 19:35), "sergeants" (<sup><4165></sup>Acts 16:35), "deputy" (<sup><4137></sup>Acts 13:7, etc.), as if the Acts of the Apostles had fallen into the hands of a translator who acted on the principle of choosing, not the most correct, but the most familiar equivalents (comp. Trench, *On the Authorized Version of the N.T.* p. 21). — Smith, s.v. For all that regards the nature and celebration of the feast referred to in <sup><4120></sup>Acts 12:4, *SEE PASSOVER*.

## Easter Celebration of.

In the ancient Church the seventh day of Passion-week (q.v.), the great Sabbath, as it was called, was observed with rigorous precision as a day of fasting. Religious worship was celebrated by night; and the vigils continued till cock-crowing, the hour at which it is supposed our Lord arose. At this hour the stillness of these midnight vigils was broken by the joyful acclamation, "The Lord is risen! The Lord is risen! The Lord is risen indeed!" The day of Easter was celebrated with every demonstration of joy

as a second jubilee. There was a solemn celebration of the Lord's Supper; the baptism of catechumens; appropriate salutations, and demonstrations of joy; the liberation of prisoners, and the manumission of slaves. Charities were dispensed to the needy. Courts of justice were closed. The heathen were forbidden to celebrate public spectacles in order that the devotions of Christians might not be interrupted. The week following was considered as a continuation of the festival. During this time, those who had been baptized at Easter continued arrayed in white, in token of that purity of life to which they were bound by baptism. On the Sunday following they laid aside their garments of white, and were welcomed as members of the Church. — Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 20, chapter 5.

### Easter Controversies

There was much controversy in the early Church as to the days on which our Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated. The churches of Asia Minor celebrated the death of the Lord on the day corresponding to the 14th of the month Nisan, on which day, according to the opinion of the whole ancient Church, the crucifixion took place. The Western churches, on the other hand, were of opinion that the crucifixion should be annually commemorated on the particular day of the week on which it occurred, that is, Friday. The resurrection was accordingly commemorated by the former party on the day corresponding to the 16th of Nisan, and by the other party on the Sunday following Good Friday. The two parties also differed with regard to the fasting preceding Easter. The Western churches viewed the death-day of Christ exclusively as a day of mourning, and they did not terminate the time of fasting until the day of resurrection. The churches of Asia Minor, on the other hand, looking upon the death of Christ wholly as the redemption of mankind, terminated fasting at the hour of Christ's death (5 o'clock in the afternoon), and immediately after celebrated the Agape and the Lord's Supper. In addition to these two parties, both of which were within the old catholic Church, there was another, repudiated by the Church as heretical. This third party, an Ebionitic sect, agreed with the churches of Asia Minor in adhering to the commemoration of the day of the month (14th and 16th of Nisan), but differed from them in insisting upon the continuance of the obligatory character of the ancient law, and the consequent duty of Christians to celebrate the *Jewish* Passover. Both were called *Quartodecimani*, from the *fourteenth* (Latin *quartodecimus*) day of the month on which they commemorated the death of Christ. Eusebius mentions (*Hist.*

~~2102~~ *Ecclesiastes* 5:23; *Vita Constant.* 3:19) Palestine, Pontus, Gallia, Rome, Osroene, Corinth, Phoenicia, Alexandria, as churches following the Western practice. To these the emperor Constantine, in a circular enjoining the observance of a decree of the Nicene Council on the subject, adds all Italy, Africa, Spain, Britain, Greece. Thus the Western practice appears to have largely prevailed. Its adherents traced its origin to the apostles Peter and Paul, while the churches of Asia Minor rested their differing practice upon the authority of the apostle John. Both parties adhered to the name of *Pascha* (*Passover*), by which they understood sometimes the whole week commemorating the Passion, sometimes the specially festive days of this week. In the course of time (it is not known when) the death-day was distinguished as *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*, and the day of resurrection as *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*. Irenaeus explicitly bears testimony that the bishops of Rome up to Xystus (at the beginning of the 2d century) kept pace with the adherents of the other practice. The first effort to come to an agreement on the controversy was made by bishop Polycarp, of Smyrna, about the middle of the 2d century, when on a visit to bishop Anicet, of Rome. The two bishops received each other with the kiss of peace, but neither of them was willing to sacrifice the practice of his predecessors. Nevertheless they parted in kindness, and peace continued to reign between the two parties. A few years later, the Ebionitish Quartodecimani caused great trouble at Laodicea (about 170), at Rome (about 180), where a certain Blastus was at their head, and in other places. Books against them were written by Melito of Sardis and Apollinaris of Hierapolis, both of whom were adherents of the practice of Asia Minor; by Clement of Alexandria and Hippolytus (about the middle of the 3d century). Of all these books only fragments are left. That of Hippolytus shows that at this time the Jewish Quartodecimani were regarded by the Church as heretics. The first serious dispute between the parties within the old Catholic Church broke out about 196, when bishop Victor, of Rome, issued a circular to the leading bishops of the Church, requesting them to hold synods in their provinces, and to introduce the Western practice. Some complied with this request; but the synod held by bishop Polycrates, of Ephesus, emphatically refused, and approved the letter of bishop Polycrates, who, in defense of the Asiatic practice, referred Victor to the authority of the apostles Philip and John, to Polycarp, and to seven of his relations, who before him had been bishops of Ephesus. Victor at first intended to excommunicate the Asiatic churches, and therefore issued an encyclical to the Christians of those regions, but whether he really carried out his threat is not certain; the

words of Eusebius (*Hist. Ecclesiastes* 5:24) on the movements of Victor are by some understood as implying a real execution of the excommunication, while the more common opinion is, that, in consequence of the indignant remonstrances against such a usurpation of power by the Western bishops, especially by Irenaeus, the threat was never executed.

Thus far the controversy between the Asiatic and the Western churches had only concerned two points, namely, (1) whether the day of the week or the day of the month on which the death of Christ occurred should be commemorated; (2) when the fasting ought to be terminated. Now a third point of dispute arose, as to the time when the 14th day of Nisan really occurred. Many of the Church fathers are of opinion that, according to the original calculation of the Jews up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the 14th of Nisan had always been after the spring equinox, and that it was only in consequence of a miscalculation of the later Jews that the 14th of Nisan occasionally fell before the equinox. They therefore insisted that the 14th of Nisan, which for both parties within the Church determined the time of Easter, should always be after the equinox. As the year of the Jews is a lunar year, and the 14th of Nisan always a full-moon day, the Christians who adopted the above astronomical view, whenever the 14th of Nisan fell before the equinox, would celebrate the death of Christ one month later than the Jewish Passover. As the Christians could now no longer rely on the Jewish calendar, they had to make their own calculations of the time of Easter. These calculations frequently differed, partly from reasons already set forth, and partly because the date of the equinox was fixed by some at the 18th of March, by others at the 19th, by others at the 21st of March. The Council of Aries in 314 endeavored to establish uniformity, but its decrees do not appear to have had great effect. The subject was therefore again discussed and acted upon by the OEcumenical Council of Nice, which decreed that Easter should be celebrated throughout the Church after the equinox, on the Friday following the 14th of Nisan. It was also provided that the Church of Alexandria, as being distinguished in astronomical science, should annually inform the Church of Rome on what day of the calends or ides Easter should be celebrated, and the Church of Rome should notify all the churches of the world. But even these decrees of the Council of Nice did not put a stop to all differences, and it was reserved to the calculation of Dionysius Exiguus (q.v.) to gradually introduce uniformity of practice into the whole Church. Some countries, like Great Britain, did not abandon

their ancient practice until after a long resistance. At the time of Charlemagne uniformity seems to have been established, and no trace is to be found of the Quartodecimani. The revision of the calendar by Pope Gregory XIII, on the whole, retained the Dionysian era, but determined more accurately the Easter full moon, and made careful provision for avoiding any future deviation of the calendar from the astronomical time. By these minute calculations, however, the Christian Easter sometimes, contrary to the decrees of the Nicene Council, coincides with the Jewish Passover. This, for instance, was the case in 1825. — Mosheim, *Church Hist.* 1:68; Neander, *Church Hist.* 1:298; 2:301, 302 Mosheim, *Comm.* 1:523; Weitzel, *Die christliche Paschafeier der ersten Jahrhunderte* (1848); Rettberg, in *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1832, volume 2; Hefele, in Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:871; Steitz, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 11:140; Steitz, *Die Differenz der Occidentalen u. der Kleinasiaten* (in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1856). (A.J.S.)

### Easter, John

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

### Easter, John

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

### Eastern Church

a designation given,

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

## Eating

(properly ἡ κῆ; *akal'*, ἐσθίω). The ancient Hebrews did not eat indifferently with all persons; they would have esteemed themselves polluted and dishonored by eating with those of another religion or of an odious profession. In Joseph's time they neither ate with the Egyptians nor the Egyptians with them (<sup><443></sup>Genesis 43:32), nor in our Savior's time with the Samaritans (<sup><404></sup>John 4:9). The Jews were scandalized at his eating with publicans and sinners (<sup><401></sup>Matthew 9:11). As there were several sorts, of meats the use of which was prohibited, they could not conveniently eat with those who partook of them, fearing to contract pollution by touching such food, or if by accident any particles of it should fall on them. *SEE FOOD.* At their meals some suppose they had each his separate table; and that Joseph, entertaining his brethren in Egypt, seated them separately,

each at his particular table, while he himself sat down separately from the Egyptians, who ate with him; but he sent to his brethren portions out of the provisions which were before him (~~(431)~~Genesis 43:31 sq.). Elkanah, Samuel's father, who had two wives, distributed their portions to them separately (~~(1000)~~1 Samuel 1:4, 5). In Homer, each guest is supposed to have had his little table apart and the master of the feast distributed meat to each (*Odys.* 14:446 sq.). We are assured that this is still practiced in China, and that many in India never eat out of the same dish, nor on the same table with another person, believing they cannot do so without sin, and this not only in their own country, but when traveling and in foreign lands. This is also the case with the Brahmins and various castes in India, who will not even use a vessel after a European, though he may only have drank from it water recently drawn out of a well. The same strictness is observed by the more scrupulous among the Mohammedans, and instances have been known of every plate, and dish, and cup that had been used by Christian guests being broken immediately after their departure. The ancient manners which we see in Homer we see likewise in Scripture, with regard to eating, drinking, and entertainments. There was great plenty, but little delicacy; great respect and honor paid to the guests by serving them plentifully. Joseph sent his brother Benjamin a portion five times larger than those of his ether brethren. Samuel set a whole quarter of a calf before Saul (~~(1002)~~1 Samuel 9:24). The women did not appear at table in entertainments with the men; this would have been an indecency, as it is at this day throughout the East. —*SEE BANQUET.*

## Picture for Eating 1

The Hebrews anciently sat at table, but afterwards imitated the Persians and Chaldaeans, who reclined on table-beds or divans while eating. (See Gier, *De vett. Ebr. ratione caenandi*, Lips. 1639). This mode of reclining at meals was common in the East, and also among the Greeks and Romans. Under the Roman emperors the couches were sometimes made semicircular. *SEE ACCUBATION.* At the present day, in the East, the custom is to sit or recline upon the floor at meat, and at other times on cushions. Many of the Arabs use no knife, fork, spoon, or plate in eating their victuals (these being used only by foreigners, and that as a special privilege); they dip their hands into the milk which is placed before them in a wooden bowl, and lift it to their mouth in their palm. Dr. Russell states, "The Arabs, in eating, do not thrust their whole hand into the dish, but only their thumb and two first fingers, with which they take up the morsel, and

that in a moderate quantity at a time." The present mode of eating in Syria and Palestine is thus described by Dr. Jowett: "To witness the daily family habits, in the house in which I lived at Deir el Kamr (not far from Beyrout), forcibly reminded me of Scripture scenes. The absence of the females at our meals has already been noticed. There is another custom, by no means agreeable to a European, to which, however, I would willingly have endeavored to submit, but it was impossible to learn it in the short compass of twenty days' visit. There are set on the table, in the evening, two or three messes of stewed meat, vegetables, and sour milk. To me the privilege of a knife, and spoon, and plate was granted; but the rest all helped themselves immediately from the dish, in which it was no uncommon thing to see more than five Arab fingers at one time. Their bread, which is extremely thin, tearing and folding up like a sheet of paper, is used for the purpose of rolling together a large mouthful, or sopping up the fluid and vegetables. But the practice which was most revolting to me was this: when the master of the house found in the dish any dainty morsel, he took it out with his fingers and applied it to my mouth. This was true Syrian courtesy and hospitality, and had I been sufficiently well-bred, my mouth would have opened to receive it. On my pointing to my plate, however, he had the goodness to deposit the choice morsel there" (*Researches*, p. 210). Niebuhr's account is as follows (*Description of Arabia*, page 52). "The table of the Orientals is arranged according to their mode of living. As they always sit upon the floor, a large cloth is spread out in the middle of the room upon the floor, in order that the bits and crumbs may not be lost, or the carpets soiled. (On journeys, especially in the deserts, the place of this cloth is supplied by a round piece of leather, which the traveler carries with him, *Travels*, 2:372.) Upon this cloth is placed a small stool, which serves as a support for a large round tray of tinned copper; on this the food is served up in various small dishes of copper, well tinned within and without. Among the better class of Arabs, one finds, instead of napkins, a long cloth, which extends to all who sit at table, and which they lay upon their laps. Where this is wanting, each one takes, instead of a napkin, his own handkerchief, or rather small towel, which he always carries with him to wipe himself with after washing. Knives and forks are not used. The Turks sometimes have spoons of wood or horn. The Arabs are so accustomed to use the hand instead of a spoon, that they can do without a spoon even when eating bread and milk prepared in the usual manner. Other kinds of food, such as we commonly eat with a spoon, I do not remember to have seen. It is, indeed, at first,

very unpleasant to a European, just arrived in the East, to eat with people who help themselves to the food out of the common dish with their fingers; but this is easily got over, after one has become acquainted with their mode of life. As the Mohammedans are required, by their religion, very often to wash themselves, it is therefore even on this account probable that their cooks prepare their food with as much cleanliness as those of Europe. The Mohammedans are even obliged to keep their nails cut so short that no impurity can collect under thereon; for they believe their prayers would be without any effect if there should be the least impurity upon any, part of the body. And since, now, before eating, they always wash themselves carefully, and generally too with soap, it comes at length to seem of less consequence whether they help themselves from the dish with clean fingers or with a fork. Among the sheiks of the desert, who require at a meal nothing more than *pillau*, i.e., boiled rice, a very large wooden dish is brought on full, and around this one party after another set themselves till the dish is emptied, or they are satisfied. In Merdin, where I once ate with sixteen officers of the Waiwode, a servant placed himself between the guests, and had nothing to do but to take away the empty dishes, and set down the full ones which other servants brought in. As soon as ever the dish was set down, all the sixteen hands were immediately thrust into it, and that to so much purpose, that rarely could any one help himself three times. They eat, in the East, with very great rapidity; and at this meal in Merdin, in the time of about twenty minutes, we sent out more than fourteen empty dishes." *SEE DINE.*

## Picture for Eating 2

The Hebrews, like the modern Orientals, rose early, about the dawn of the day, when they breakfasted. They were accustomed to take a slight repast about noon; and this to husbandmen and mechanics was probably the principal meal (<sup><11206></sup>1 Kings 20:16; <sup><8024></sup>Ruth 2:14; <sup><0442></sup>Luke 14:12).

Wilkinson says, "That dinner was served up at midday among the ancient Egyptians may be inferred from the invitation given by Joseph to his brethren: 'Bring these men home, and slay and make ready, for these men shall dine with me at noon' (<sup><04516></sup>Genesis 43:16); but it is probable that, like the Romans, they also ate supper in the evening, as is still the custom in the East." Supper appears to have been the principal meal among the Hebrews, as it was among the Greeks and Romans. Among the Romans it anciently took place about three o'clock; but in the East, as at the present day in Persia, about six or seven in the evening, in order to avoid the enfeebling

heat of the afternoon (<sup><162></sup>Mark 6:21; <sup><246></sup>Luke 14:16, 24; <sup><312></sup>John 12:2). In <sup><993></sup>1 Samuel 9:13, we read that the people would not eat of the feast until Samuel had arrived and consecrated the sacrifice. But this circumstance affords no evidence of the custom of asking a blessing on food. In the time of Christ, however, it was common before every meal to give thanks (<sup><449></sup>Matthew 14:19; 15:36). *SEE MEAL-TIME.*

In closing this subject, we may properly notice the obligations which are considered by Eastern people to be contracted by eating together. Niebuhr says, "When a Bedouin sheik eats bread with strangers, they may trust his fidelity and depend on his protection. A traveler will always do well, therefore, to take an early opportunity of securing the friendship of his guide by a meal." The reader will recollect the complaint of the Psalmist (<sup><349></sup>Psalm 41:9), penetrated with the deep ingratitude of one whom he describes as having been his own familiar friend, in whom he trusted "*who did eat of my bread, even he hath lifted up his heel against me!*" Hence, in part, no doubt, the corviviality that always followed the making of a covenant. Hence, also, the severity of some of the feelings acknowledged by the indignant man of patience, Job, as appears in several passages of his pathetic ex-postulations. It is well known that Arabs, who have: given food to a stranger, have afterwards thought themselves bound to protect him against the vengeance, demanded by consanguinity, for even blood itself. (See Layard's *Nineveh*, 2d series, p. 217.) *SEE HOSPITALITY.*

To "eat" is frequently spoken metaphorically in Scripture of the enjoyment or partaking of temporal or spiritual blessings (<sup><2456></sup>Jeremiah 15:16; <sup><381></sup>Ezekiel 3:1; <sup><600></sup>Revelation 10:9). Wemyss's *Symbol. Dict.* s.v. *SEE DRINK; SEE TASTE.*

### Eaton, John

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

## Eaton, Samuel

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

## E'bal

(Hebrews **יבאל** [*estone*]), the name of one or two persons, and also of a hill.

1. (Sept. **Γεμίών** [Vat. MS. omits], Vulg. *Hebal.*), A various reading for OBAL **SEE OBAL** (q.v.), the son of Joktan (<sup><3102></sup>1 Chronicles 1:22; compare <sup><0108></sup>Genesis 10:28).
  2. (**Γαιβήλ** v. r. **Ταιβήλ** [1 Alex MS. **Γαιοβήλ**], Vulg. *Ebal.*) The fourth son of Shobal, son of Seir, the Horite of Idumaea (<sup><0323></sup>Genesis 36:23; <sup><3040></sup>1 Chronicles 1:40). B.C. ante 1694.
  3. (Sept. **Γαιβάλ**, Josephus **Γίβαλος**, Vulg. *Hebal.*) A mountain on the northern part of the tribe of Ephraim, on the north-eastern side of the valley in which was situated the city of Shechem (now Nablous), in Samaria (q.v.). See Mills, *Three Months at Nablus* (London, 1864).
1. It was here that the Israelites were enjoined to erect an altar, setting up plastered stones, and respond to the imprecations uttered in the valley, according to the divinely prescribed formula, upon those who should prove faithless to the Sinaitic law (<sup><0512></sup>Deuteronomy 11:29; 27:4, 13), while the responses to the blessings were to be uttered by the other division of the tribal representatives stationed upon the opposite mountain, Gerizim. Both

the benediction and the anathema were pronounced by the Levites, who remained with the ark in the center of the interval (compare <sup><B71></sup>Deuteronomy 27:11-26, with <sup><B83></sup>Joshua 8:30-35, with Joseph. *Ant.* 4, 8, 44, and with the comments of the Talmud, *Sota*, 36, quoted in Herxheimer's Pentateuch). But, notwithstanding the ban thus apparently laid on Ebal, it was further appointed to be the site of the first great altar to be erected to Jehovah: an altar of large unhewn stone, plastered with lime, and inscribed with the words of the law (<sup><B72></sup>Deuteronomy 27:2-8). On this altar peace-offerings were to be offered, and round it a sacrificial feast was to take place, with other rejoicings (verses 6, 7). Scholars disagree as to whether there were to be two erections — a kind of cromlech and an altar; or an altar only, with the law inscribed on its stones. The latter was the view of Josephus (*Ant.* 4:8, 44; 5:1, 19), the former is unhesitatingly adopted by the latest commentator (Keil, *Comment.* on <sup><B83></sup>Joshua 8:32). The terms of Moses' injunction seem to infer that no delay was to take place in carrying out this symbolical transaction. It was to be "on the day" that Jordan was crossed (Joshua 27:2), before they "went in unto the land flowing with milk and honey" (verse 3). Accordingly Joshua appears to have seized the earliest practicable moment, after the pressing affairs of the siege of Jericho, the execution of Achan, and the destruction of Ai had been dispatched, to carry out the command (<sup><B83></sup>Joshua 8:30-35). After this Ebal appears no more in the sacred story. By a corruption of the above-cited texts, the Samaritans transferred the site of the appointed altar to the opposite mountain, which has hence attained the greater notoriety. *SEE GERIZIM.*

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

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

**(2.)** Gerizim was very near Shechem (<sup><B70></sup>Judges 9:7), and in Josephus' time their names appear to have been attached to the mounts, which were then, as now, Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south. Since that they have been mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela (Asher, 1:66) and Sir John Maundeville, and among modern travelers by Maundrell (*Mod. Trav.* page 432).

The main impediment to our entire reception of this view rests in the terms of the first mention of the place by Moses in <sup><B13></sup>Deuteronomy 11:30: A.V. "Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh?" Here the mention of Gilgal, which was in the valley of the Jordan near Jericho, of the valley itself (*Arabah*, mistranslated here only, "champaign"), and of the Canaanites who dwelt there, and also the other terms of the injunction of Moses, as already noticed seem to imply that Ebal and Gerizim were in the immediate neighborhood of Jericho. This is strengthened by the narrative of Joshua, who appears to have carried out the prescribed ceremonial on the mounts while his camp was at Gilgal (compare <sup><B12></sup>Joshua 7:2; 9:6), and before he had (at least before any account of his having) made his way so far into the interior of the country as Shechem.

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

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

1. Moses is represented as speaking from the east side of Jordan, before anything was known of the country on the west, beyond the exaggerated reports of the spies, and when everything there was wrapped in mystery, and localities and distances had not assumed their due proportions.
2. A closer rendering of the verse is as follows: "Are they not on the other side the Jordan, beyond (μυρῆαι the word rendered 'the *backside* of the desert' in <sup><B12></sup>Exodus 3:1) the way of the sunset, in the land of the Canaanite who dwells in the Arabak, over against Gilgal, near the



terebinths of Moreb?" If this rendering is correct, a great part of the difficulty has disappeared. Gilgal no longer marks the site of Ebal and Gerizim, but of the dwelling of the Canaanites, who were, it is true, the first to encounter the Israelites on the other side of the river, in their native lowlands, but who, we have it actually on record, were both in the time of Abraham (<sup><0116></sup>Genesis 12:6) and of the conquest (<sup><0178></sup>Joshua 17:18) located about Shechem. The word now rendered "beyond" is not represented at all in the A.V., and it certainly throws the locality much further back; and, lastly, there is the striking landmark of the trees of Moreh, which were standing by Shechem when Abraham first entered the land, and whose name probably survived in Morthia, or Mamortha, a name of Shechem found on coins of the Roman period (Reland, *Miscell.* page 137 sq.). *SEE GILGAL.*

In accordance with this is the addition in the Samaritan Pentateuch, after the words "the terebinths of Moreh," at the end of <sup><0513></sup>Deuteronomy 11:30 of the words "over against Shechem." This addition is the more credible because there is not, as in the case noticed afterwards, any apparent motive for it. If this interpretation be accepted, the next verse (31) gains a fresh force: "For ye shall pass over Jordan [not only to meet the Canaanites immediately on the other side, but] to go in to possess the land [the whole of the country, even the heart of it, where these mounts are situated (glancing back to verse 29)], the land which; Jehovah your God giveth you; and ye shall possess it, and dwell therein." It may also be asked whether the significance of the whole solemn ceremonial of the blessing and cursing is not missed if we understand it as taking place directly a footing had been obtained on the outskirts of the country, and not as acted in, the heart of the conquered land, in its most prominent natural position, and close to its oldest city — Shechem.

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

The narrative of Joshua is more puzzling. But even with regard to this something may be said. It will at once be perceived that the book contains no account of the conquest of the center of the country, of those portions which were afterwards the mountain of Ephraim, Esdraelon, or Galilee. We

lose Joshua at Gilgal, after the conquest of the south, to find him again suddenly at the waters of Merom in the extreme north (~~600B~~Joshua 10:43; 11:7). Of his intermediate proceedings the only record that seems to have escaped is the fragment contained in ~~600B~~Joshua 8:30-35. Nor should it be overlooked that some doubt is thrown on this in ~~600B~~Joshua 8:30-35, by its omission in both the Vat. and Alex. MSS. of the Sept.

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

It is well known that one of the most serious variations between the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch and the Samaritan text is in reference to Ebal and Gerizim. In ~~620A~~Deuteronomy 27:4, the Samaritan has Gerizim, while the Hebrew (as in A.V.) has Ebal, as the mount on which the altar to Jehovah and the inscription of the law were to be erected. Upon this basis the Samaritans ground the sanctity of Gerizim and the authenticity of the Temple and holy place, which have existed there. The arguments upon this difficult question will be found in Kennicott (*Dissert.* 2), and in the reply of Verschuir (Leovard. 1775; quoted by Gesenius, *De Pesst. Sam.* page 61). Two points may merely be glanced at here which have apparently escaped notice.

- 1.** Both agree that Ebal was the mount on which the cursings were to rest, Gerizim that for blessings. It appears inconsistent that Ebal, the mount of cursing, should be the site of the altar and the record of the law, while Gerizim, the mount of blessing, should remain unoccupied by sanctuary of any kind.
- 2.** Taking into account the known predilection of Orientals for ancient sites on which to fix their sanctuaries, it is more easy to believe (in the absence of any evidence to the contrary) that in building their temple on Gerizim, the Samaritans were making use of a spot already enjoying a reputation for sanctity, than that they built on a place upon which the curse was laid in the records which they received equally with the Jews. Thus the very fact of the occupation of Gerizim by the Samaritans would seem an argument for

its original sanctity. On the other hand, all critics of eminence, with the exception of Kennicott, regard this as a corruption of the sacred text; and when it is considered that the invariable reading in Hebrew MSS. and ancient versions, both in this passage and the corresponding one in ~~(688)~~Joshua 8:30, is "Ebal," it seems strange that any scholar would for a moment doubt its correctness. Kennicott takes an opposite view, maintaining the integrity of the Samaritan reading, and arguing the point at great length; hut his arguments ,are neither' sound nor pertinent (*Dissertations on the Hebrew Text*, 2:20 sq.). The Samaritans had a strong reason for corrupting the text, seeing that Gerizim was their sanctuary; and they desired to make it not merely the mountain of blessing, but the place of the altar and the inscribed law. *SEE SAMARITANS.*

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

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

poppies-spring up among the rocks and stones. Ebal is "occupied from bottom to top by beautiful gardens" (Mills; see also Porter, *Handbook*, page 332). The slopes of Ebal towards the valley appear to be steeper than those of Gerizim (Wilson, pages 45, 71). It is also the higher mountain of the two. There is some uncertainty about the measurements, but the following are the results of the latest observations (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, page 178):

Nablus,	above sea,	1672 ft.
Gerizim	do.	2600 " ... above Nablus, 928 ft.
Ebal	do.	about 2700" ... do. 1028

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

### Ebbo

archbishop of Rheims, was the son of a Saxon serf, and was born about 775, or, according to other accounts, about 786. While a boy he became known to the young king Louis, the son of Charlemagne, who sent him to a convent school, and had him educated for the ministry. As he belonged to a serf family, and could not receive orders, Louis set him free, after which he was ordained. After the accession of Louis to the throne, Ebbo's influence rapidly rose, and in 817 the king secured his election as archbishop of Rheims. Soon after, in 822, he placed himself at the head of a mission to the Danes. His plan highly pleased both the king and the Pope.

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

## E'bed

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

**1.** (Many MSS., and the Syr. and Arab. Versions, have **rb**[, *Eber*; Sept. **Ἰωβήλ**; Alexand. MS. **Αβέδ**; Vulg. *Ebed* and *Obed*.) The father of Gaal

(q.v.), who headed the insurgents at Shechem against Abimelech, tyrant judge of the Israelites (<sup><0026></sup>Judges 9:26-35). B.C. ante 1321.

2. (Sept. Ωβίθ v. r. Ωβήν, Vulgate Abed.) Son of Jonathan, and family-head of the lineage of Adin; he returned with 50 males from the captivity (<sup><1886></sup>Ezra 8:6). B.C. 459.

## Ebed-jesu

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

## Ebed-Jesu

a Chaldaean patriarch and Syrian writer, lived about the middle of the 16th century. He received his education at Gozarta, and was afterwards bishop of that place. In 1554 he was elected as the successor of Sulaka, first patriarch of the Nestorians, and confirmed by the Pope in 1562. Ebed-Jesu was a man of great erudition; he was familiar with the writings of all the

Greek and Latin fathers, and was also master of the Arabic, Chaldee, and the Syriac. Many of the Nestorians were converted by him, and the numbers of the Chaldees were augmented under his administration. He died a few Years after his visit to Rome (1562), in a monastery at the village of Seert in Mesopotamia. We have from him a poem in three parts: *Sur le voyage a Rome, le retour et la mort de Sulaka*; *Poeme a la louange de Pie IV*; *a Confession of Faith*, read at the 22d session of the Council of Trent. — Assemani, *Bibi. Orient.* 1:538; 3, page 3, 325; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biographie Generale*, 15:595. (J.H.W.)

### E'bed-me'lech

(Hebrews *E'bed-Me'lek*, **Ēl m9db[**, *servant of the king*, i.e., Arabic *Abd el-Malek*, Sept. **Ἀβδεμέλεχ**, Vulgate *Abdemelech*), an Ethiopian at the court of Zedekiah, king of Judah, who was instrumental in saving the prophet Jeremiah from death by famine (<sup>-2487-</sup>Jeremiah 38:7-13), and who, for his humanity in this circumstance, was promised deliverance when the city should fall into the enemy's hands (<sup>-2495-</sup>Jeremiah 39:15-18). B.C. 589. **SEE JEREMIAH**. He is there styled a eunuch (**syraevyaan**) and he probably had charge of the king's harem (compare <sup>-2482-</sup>Jeremiah 38:22, 23), an office which would give him the privilege of free private access to the king; but his name seems to be an official title = *King's slave*, i.e., *minister*. **SEE EUNUCH**.

### Ebeh

**SEE REED**.

### Ebel

**SEE TALMUD**.

### Ebel Johann Wilhelm,

a Protestant mystic and theosophist, was born in 1784 at Passenheim, in the province of Eastern Prussia. In 1809, while a preacher in the Established Church of Prussia, he attracted the attention of his ecclesiastical superiors on account of his connection with the theosophist Schonherr (q.v.). Subsequently he was appointed preacher at Koenigsberg, where he gathered around him a circle of enthusiastic followers, among them a few noble men and a larger number of noble women. Foremost

among the latter were the countess of Kanitz and the countess von der Groben. In 1837, at the request of the Consistory of that city, a suit was instituted against him and his friend Diestel, which belongs among the most remarkable trials of the kind in modern times. He was in 1842 acquitted from the chief charge of the establishment of a new sect, but deposed from office for violating his official duties by communicating to others theosophic and philosophical views differing from the doctrines of the Church. He died in 1861, at the villa of his friend the countess von der Groben. Ebel wrote a number of works, chiefly of a mystic nature, among which are the following: *Die Weisheit von Obsen* (1822): — *Der Tayesanbruch* (1824): *Die gedeihliche Erziehung* (1825) : — *Bibelworte u. Winke* (1827): — *Die Philosophie der heil. Urkunde* (1854-56). A full account of Ebel, his doctrines and followers, is given in Dixon, *Spiritual Wives* (London and Philadelphia, 1868), where is also printed for the first time a paper by professor Sachs, which was the chief evidence used against Ebel. See also Diestel, *Das Zengenverhdr in d. Processe wider d. Prediger Ebel u. Diestel* (Leipz. 1838), and Ernst count von Kanitz (follower of Ebel), *Aufkldrung nach Actenquellen*, etc. (Basel, 1862). (A.J.S.)

## Eben

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

## Eben-bohan

*SEE BOHAN*.

## Eben-ezel

*SEE EZEL*.

## Ebenezer

(Hebrew with the art. *E'ben ha-E'ezzer*, *rz[ˆb; ˆba*, *stone of the help*; Sept. *Ἄβενέζερ*; Josephus translates *λίθος ἰσχυρός*), the name given to a place marked by a monumental stone which Samuel set up as a memorial of the divine assistance in battle obtained against the Philistines (*1 Samuel* 7:12). — *SEE PILLAR*. 'Twenty years before this, the same spot



(mentioned in the history under the same name by anticipation of its subsequent designation) witnessed the discomfiture of the Hebrew hosts, the death of the high-priest's sons, and the capture of the sacred ark by the Philistines (<sup><0001></sup>1 Samuel 4:1; 5:1). Its position is carefully defined (<sup><0072></sup>1 Samuel 7:12) as between Mizpeh "the watch-tower," one of the conspicuous eminences a few miles north of Jerusalem and Shen, "the tooth" or "crag," apparently some isolated landmark. Neither of these points, however, has been identified with certainty—at least not the latter. According to Josephus's record of the transaction (Ant. 6:2, 2), the stone was erected to mark the limit of the victory, a spot which he calls *Corrhaea*, but in the Hebrew BETH-CAR *SEE BETH-CAR* (q.v.). Eusebius and Jerome affirm (*Onomast.* a.v. Ἀβενετέρ, *Abenezes*) that it lay between Jerusalem and Ashkelon, near (πλησίον, juxta) Bethshemesh. Now Bethshemesh stands on a low ridge on the south side of the rich valley of Sorar. On the opposite side of this valley, on a rising ground, about three miles north-west of Bethshemesh, are the ruins of an old village called *Beit-far*. The situation answers in every respect to that assigned to Beth-car; and the name may possibly be an Arab corruption of the latter. It lies in the direct route from Mizpeh to the plain of Philistia, and is just on the borders of the latter province, where a pursuing army would halt (Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* page 283). But, as this is very far from the probable site of Mizpeh (Neby-Samwil), it is hardly possible to fix the position of Ebenezer at that of Beth-car. The monumental stone in question may rather have been set up at the point where the enemy began to flee, and we may therefore seek its locality nearer the Israelitish metropolis, possibly at the modern village Biddu, a short distance west of Neby-Samwil (Robinson, *Researches*, 2:133, note). *SEE SHEN.*

## Eben-zoheleth

*SEE ZOHELETH.*

## Eeber

(Hab. *id.* רב[ ], country *beyond*), the name of five men.

**1.** (Sept. Ἑβερ and Ἑβερ, Vulg. *Heber*.) Eber (as the name should be Anglicized) was the son of Salah, and father of Peleg, being the third post-diluvian patriarch after Shem (<sup><0104></sup>Genesis 10:24; 11:14; <sup><13018></sup>1 Chronicles 1:18, 25). B.C. 2448-1984. He is claimed as the founder of the Hebrew

race (<sup><0112></sup>Genesis 10:21; <sup><0024></sup>Numbers 24:24). *SEE HEBER*. In <sup><0135></sup>Luke 3:35, his name (Ἐβέρ) is Anglicized *Heber*.

2. (Sept. **Ιωβήδ**, Vulg. *Heber*.) The youngest of the seven heads of families of the Gadites in Bashan (<sup><1313></sup>1 Chronicles 5:13; A.V. "Heber"). B.C. 782.

3. (Sept. **Ωβήδ**, Vulg. *Heber*.) The oldest of the three sons of Elpaal the Benjamite, and one of those who rebuilt Ono and Lod, with their suburbs (<sup><1382></sup>1 Chronicles 8:12). B.C. 535.

4. (Sept. **Ωβήδ**, Vulg. *Heber*.) One of the heads of the families of Benjamites resident at Jerusalem (<sup><1382></sup>1 Chronicles 8:22; A.V. "Heber"). B.C. 535.

5. (Sept. **Αβέδ**, Vulg. *Heber*.) The head of the priestly family of Amok, in the time of the return from exile under Zerubbabel (<sup><1621></sup>Nehemiah 12:20). B.C. 535.

### Eber Paul,

a companion of Luther and Melancthon and an eminent Hebrew scholar and theologian, was born at Kissingen, November 8, 1511. He received his first instruction from his father, and continued his studies at Anspach. The sudden death of his mother caused his father to recall Paul from Anspach, and while on his way home he was thrown from his horse and became humpbacked. In 1526 he had so far recovered that he could resume his studies at Nuremberg, and in 1532 he entered the university at Wittenberg. Here he was employed as amanuensis to Melancthon, with whom he became so intimate that he consulted him on all important matters, and hence Eber received the name of Philip's Repository (*Repertorium Philippi*). He was also a faithful disciple of Luther. In 1536 he began to lecture on grammar and philosophy, and in 1541 he accompanied Melancthon to the Diet at Worms. In 1544 he was appointed professor of Latin grammar, in 1550 dean of the philosophical faculty, and in 1551 rector of the university. After the death of Forster (1556) he was appointed professor of Hebrew and chaplain to the royal chapel at Wittenberg. These positions he soon changed for others, and in 1559 he was made general superintendent of the electorate and, as doctor of theology, a member of the theological faculty of the university. From this time to the day of his death, December 16, 1569, he devoted himself entirely to theology and to the faithful discharge of his duties as general superintendent of the

electorate. After the death of Melancthon he was regarded as the head of the university. He took large part in the Adiaphoristic and Crypto-Calvinistic controversies but always showed himself moderate and learned. His principal works are: *Expositio Evangeliorum* (Francof. 1576): — *Calendarium historicum* (1551, 4to): — *Historia populi judaici a reditu ex Babylónico exilio usque ad ultimum excidium Jerosolymae* (Witeb. 1458; new ed. 1562, and translated into German, French, and Dutch): — *Unterricht u. Bekenntn. vom h. Sacrament des Leibs u. Bluts unseres Hermr* (Wittb. 1562): — *Biblia Latina* (Vitemb. 1565): — *Expositio Evangelicorum Dominicaliunz* (Frankf. 1576). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 15:599 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3:618 sq.; Plank, *Gesch. der protest. Theol.* 4, Theil 1 (Lpz. 1798), 448-525; Sixt, Paul Eber (Heidelb. 1843, and another book by the same author, Anspach, 1857); Pressel, *Paul Eber nach gleichzeitigen Quellen* (1862); *Bibl. Sacra*, 20 page 644 sq.

### Eberhard Johann August,

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

### Eberlin Anton,

one of the German reformers was born in Swabia towards the end of the 15th century. He entered the Franciscan order, and was chosen preacher of the Franciscan convent at Tübingen, from which, in consequence of some difficulties, he was, in 1519, transferred to Ulm. Here he became acquainted with Luther's writings, and having adopted his doctrines, had to leave Ulm in 1521. Repairing to Basle, he became very popular, but was driven away by the bishop of Basle. He found an asylum with Ulrich von Hutten and Francis of Sickingen, and wrote with them several works on

ecclesiastical and monastical abuses. In 1522 he came to Wittenberg, where he became personally acquainted with Luther and with Melancthon, under the influence of whose teaching he wrote in the same year his *Vom Missbrauche christlicher Freiheit*, breathing a charitable spirit. In 1524 he went to Erfurt, where he preached for some time and thence to Wertheim on the Main (1526). He died soon after. His works, to the number of 34, were mostly of local interest; among the others, the most important one, entitled *Wie sick eyn Diener Gottes worts ym all seynem thun halten soll* (Wittenberg, 1525, 4to), has seen several editions, and can be found in A. H. Franke, *Monita pastoralia*. See Dollinger, *d. Reformation*, etc. 1:205; Strobel, *Liter. Museum*, 1:365; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:620.

### Ebert, Jacob

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

### Ebert, Theodor

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

## Ebi'asaph

(Hebrews *Ebyasaph'*, *āsybā*, prob. a contraction for *āsaybā*) *Abiasaph*; Sept. Ἀβιασάφ and Ἀβισάφ, Vulg. *Abiasaph*), the son of Elkanah and father of Assir, in the genealogy of the Kohathite Levites (<sup><1362></sup>1 Chronicles 6:23). B.C. cir. 1660. In verse 37 he is called the son of Korah, from a comparison of which circumstance with <sup><1761></sup>Exodus 6:24, most interpreters have identified him with the *Abiasaph* (q.v.) of the latter passage; but (unless we there understand not three sons of Korah to be meant, but only three in regular descent), the pedigrees of the two cannot be made to tally without violence. *SEE ASSIR*. From <sup><1399></sup>1 Chronicles 9:19, it appears that he had a son named Kore. In <sup><1301></sup>1 Chronicles 26:1, his name is abbreviated to ASAPH *SEE ASAPH*.

## Ebionites

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

**1. The Name.** — The name is derived from the Hebrew *ʿ/ybā*, *poor*. This term was anciently applied in derision to Christians in general (Epiphanius, *adv. Haer.* 29:1), and came later to designate Jewish Christians (Origen, *cont. Celsum*, 2:1). First (Lexicon, s.v.) makes the derivation refer to <sup><1118></sup>Matthew 5:3 making "Ebionites" equivalent to "oppressed pious exiles" (<sup><2204></sup>Isaiah 25:4). Eusebius (*Hist. Ecclesiastes* in, 27) fancifully derives the name from "the poverty and meanness of the Elbionite doctrine concerning Christ." Tertullian (*De Praescrip. Haeret.* c. 33) derives it from a founder, Edion, who maintained the authority of the Jewish law, and rejected the miraculous conception and divine nature of spirit. The derivation first above given is now generally adopted.

**2. History.** — Dorner (*Person of Christ*, Edinb. translated 1:189 sq.) traces the Ebionitish tendency as far back as the Epistle to the Hebrews. "From that zeal for the law with which Paul had to contend, the Judaizing spirit was led not at first to impeach the Christology, but rather the Soteriology, or the work of Christ. But the consequence of the legal stand-point soon showed itself. The party which the Epistle to the Hebrews had in view must have over-estimated the law of the O.T. regarding holy times, places,

acts, and persons alike, and have been wanting in the Christian knowledge which knows how to secure to the O.T. its abiding significancy, which it has as a divine institute without imperiling the newness and conclusive completeness of Christianity." Epiphanius traces the origin of Ebionitism to the Christians who fled to Pella after the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 66 (*adv. Hoer.* 29:1). According to Hegesippus (*Hist.* <sup>21012</sup>*Ecclesiastes* 4:22), one Thebutis, at Jerusalem, about the beginning of the second century, "began to corrupt the Church secretly on account of his not being made a bishop." "We find the sect of the Ebionites in Palestine and the surrounding regions, on the island of Cyprus, in Asia Minor, and even in Rome. Though it consisted mostly of Jews, Gentile Christians also sometimes attached themselves to it. It continued into the fourth century, but at the time of Theodoret was entirely extinct. It used a Hebrew Gospel, now lost, which was probably a corruption of the Gospel of Matthew" (Schaff, *Church History*, 1, § 68, page 214).

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

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

(a.) Jesus is, indeed, the promised Messiah, the son of David, and the supreme lawgiver, yet a mere man, like Moses and David, sprung by natural generation from Joseph and Mary. The sense of his Messianic calling first arose in him at his baptism by John, when a higher spirit

joined itself to him. Hence Origen compared this sect to the blind man in the Gospel who called to the Lord without seeing him, "Thou son of David, have mercy on me!"

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

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

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

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

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

**4.** Ebionism has reappeared, since the Reformation, in Socinianism (q.v.), and in the other forms of what is called Unitarianism (q.v.). Some Unitarian writers have undertaken to show that Ebionism was the original form of Christian doctrine, and that the Church doctrine as to the person of Christ was a later development; so Priestley, in his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (Birmingham, 1782). Bishop Horsley replied to Priestley in his *Charge to the Clergy of St. Albans* (1783), and in other tracts, collected in *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley* (Dundee, 1812, 3d ed.). Horsley, in this controversy, made use of Bull's learned treatment of the subject in his reply to Zwicker (see Bull, *On the Trinity*, Oxford, 1855, 3 vols.: 1:116; 2:376; 3:175 et al. See also Waterland, *Works*, Oxf. 1843, 6 vols.: 3:554 sq.). A far abler advocate of the Socinian view is Baur, in his *Christenthum d. drei erstess Jahrhunderte; Lehre v.d. Dreieinigkeit Gottes; Dogmengeschichte*, etc. Baur's position is clearly stated, and refuted by professor Fisher (*Am. Presb. and Theolog. Rev.* October 1864, art. 1). "Baur agrees with the old Socinians in the statement that the Jewish Christianity of the apostolic age was Ebionite. But, unlike them, he holds

that we find within the canon a great departure from, and advance upon, this humanitarian doctrine of Christ's person. He professes to discover in the New Testament the consecutive stages of a progress which, beginning with the Unitarian creed terminates in the doctrine of Christ's proper divinity. There occurred at the end, or before the end, of the apostolic age, a reaction of the Jewish Christianity, which with Baur is identical with the Judaizing or Ebionite element; and this type of Christianity prevailed through the larger part of the second century." (See Fisher, 1. c., for a criticism of this view, and for a brief but luminous sketch of Ebionism. On the other side, see *N. Amer. Rev.* April, 1864, page 569 sq.).

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

### Ebnerian Manuscript

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

### Eboda

(**Ἐβόδα**), a city mentioned only by Ptolemy (17, 18) as situated in the seaboard quarter of Arabia Petraea (see Reland, *Palast.* p. 463), in 65.25 and 30.5, and marked on the *Peutinger Table* as lying on the Roman road 23 Roman miles south of Elusa (q.v.). Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 1:287) discovered the site in the modern *el-Abdeh* (otherwise *Aujeh*, *ib.* page 560), eight hours from the site of Elusa, at the junction of Wady es-Seram with Wadi el-Birein (*ib.* page 284). It contains extensive ruins, situated on a rocky ridge from sixty to one hundred feet high; especially the remains of an acropolis, of a capacious castle, and of a large Greek church, with



numerous walls, columns etc., still standing, and several wells or reservoirs, but no inhabitants (*ib.* pages 285, 286).

## Ebony

### Picture for Ebony

(**יִנְבֵּחַ**; *hobni'*, *stony*, q.d. stone-wood [comp. the Germ. *Steinholz*, "fossil-wood"], only in the plum. **מִינְבֵּחַ**; *hobnim'* [text **מִינְבֵּחַ/ח**; for **מִרְנֵבֶחַ/ח**, *hobenim'*], Sept. [by some confusion or misinterpretation, see Rosenmuller, *Schol.* in loc.] **τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις**, Symmachus **ἔβενους**, Vulg. Edentes] *hebeninos*) occurs only in one passage of Scripture, where the prophet Ezekiel (Ezekiel 10-17:15), referring to the commerce of Tyre, says, "The men of Dedan were thy merchants; many isles were the merchandise of thine hand: they brought thee for a present horns of ivory and *ebony*." **SEE DEDAN**. The Hebrew word is translated "ebony" in all the European versions; but, as Bochart states (*Hiero.* 1:20, part 2), the Chaldee version, followed by B. Selomo and other Jews, as well as the Greek and Arabic versions, render it by *pea-fowl* (*pavonses*). Some of the Hebrew critics, however, as Kimchi, also acknowledge that Arabian *ebony* is meant. Of the correctness of this opinion there can now be no doubt. In the first place, we may allude to Dedan being considered one of the ports of Arabia on the Persian Gulf, or at least to the south of the Red Sea; and, secondly, as observed by Bochart, the terms *hobnim* and *ebony* are very similar, the latter word being variously written by ancient authors, as **ἔβενη**, **ἔβενοϛ**, **ἔβενον**, *ebenus* and *hebenus*. The last form is used by Jerome in his Latin, and **ἔβενοϛ** by Symmachus in his Greek version. The Arabs have *abnus*, which they apply to ebony, and by that name it is known in Northern India at the present day. Forskal mentions *abnus* as one of the kinds of wood imported in his time from India into Arabia. Whether the Arabic name be a corruption of the Greek, or the Greek a modification, as is most likely, of some Eastern name, we require some other evidence besides the occurrence of the word in Arabic works on materia medica to determine, since in these Greek words are sometimes employed as the principal terms for substances with which they are not well acquainted. *Bardust* is, however, given by some as the Arabic name, *abnus* as the Persian. Naturalists have found the latter applied to ebony in north-west India, as did Forskil on the Red Sea.

Ebony wood was highly esteemed by the ancients, and employed by them for a variety of purposes (Theophr. *Hist. Pl.* 4:5; *Plin. H.N.* 6:30, § 35; 12:4, § 8, 9; Strabo, 15:703; Pausan. 1:42, 5; 8:17, 2; Ovid, *Met.* 11:610; compare Barhebr. *Chron.* page 181). It is very appropriately placed in juxtaposition with ivory, on account of the beautiful contrast in color. Ivory and ebony are probably, however, also mentioned together because both were obtained from the same countries, Ethiopia and India; and, among the comparatively few articles of ancient commerce, must from this cause, always have been associated together, while their contrast of color and joint employment in inlaid work would contribute as additional reasons for their being adduced as articles characteristic of a distinct commerce. But it is not in Ezekiel only that ebony and ivory are mentioned together, for Diodorus, as quoted by Bochart, tells us that an ancient king of Egypt imposed on the Ethiopians the payment of a tribute of ebony, gold, and elephants' teeth. So Herodotus (3, 97), as translated by Bochart, says, "Athiopes Persis pro triennali tributo vehunt duos choenices auri apyri (*id est, ignem nondum experti*), et ducentas *ebeni* phalangas, et magnos elephanti dentes viginti." Pliny, referring to this passage, remarks, "But Herodotus assigneth it rather to Ethiopia, and saith that every three years the Ethiopians were wont to pay, by way of tribute, unto the kings of Persia, 100 billets of the timber of that tree (that is, ebene), together with gold and ivorie;" and again, "From Syene (which confineth and boundeth the lands of our empire and dominion) as farre as to the island Meroe, for the space of 996 miles, there is little ebene found: and that in all those parts betweene there be few other trees to be found but date-trees; which peradventure may be a cause that ebene was counted a rich tribute, and deserved the third place, after gold and ivorie" (Holland's *Pliny*, 12:4). It is sometimes stated that the ancients supposed ebony to come only from India. This arose probably from the passage of Virgil (*Georg.* 2:117): "Sola India nigrum fert ebum." But the term "India" had often a very wide signification, and included even Ethiopia. Several of the ancients, however, mention both Indian and Ethiopian ebony, as Dioscorides and Pliny; while some mention the Indian, and others the Ethiopian only, as Lucan (*Phars.* 10:304): "Nigris Meroe fecunda colonis, laeta comis ebeni."

The only objection to the above conclusion of any weight is, that *hobnim* is in the plural form. To this Bochart and others have replied, that there were two kinds of ebony, as mentioned by Theophrastus, Dioscorides, etc., one Ethiopian, the other Indian. Fuller and others maintain that the plural form

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

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

- 1.** One from the Mauritius, in round sticks like scaffold poles, seldom exceeding fourteen inches in diameter, the blackest and finest in the grain, the hardest and most beautiful.
- 2.** The East Indian, which is grown in Ceylon and the Peninsula of India, and exported from Madras and Bombay in logs from six to twenty, and sometimes even twenty-eight inches in diameter, and also in planks. This is less wasteful, but of an inferior grain and color to the above.
- 3.** The African, shipped from the Cape of Good Hope in billets, the general size of which is from three to six feet long, three to six inches broad, and two to four inches thick. This is the least wasteful, as all the refuse is left

behind; but it is the most porous, and the worst in point of color. No Abyssinian ebony is at present imported: this, however, is more likely to be owing to the different routes which commerce has taken, although it is again returning to its ancient channels, than to the want of ebony in the ancient Ethiopia. From the nature of the climate, and the existence of forests in which the elephant abounds, there can be no doubt of its being well suited to the group of plants which have been found to yield the ebony of Mauritius, Ceylon, and India, the genus *Diospyrus* of botanists. Of this several species yield varieties of ebony as their *heartwood*, as *D. ebenum* in the Mauritius, and also in Ceylon, where it is called *kaluwara*. It is described by Retz "folis ovato-lanceolatis, acuminatis, gemmia hirtis;" and he quotes as identical *D. glaberrima* (Fr. Rottb. *Nov. Act. Havn.* 2:540, tab. 5). *D. ebenaster* yields the bastard ebony of Ceylon, and *D. hirsuta* the Calamander wood of the same island, described by Mr. Holtzappel as of a chocolate-brown color, with black stripes and marks, and stated by him to be considered a variety of ebony. *D. melanoxylon* of Dr. Roxburgh is the ebony-tree of Coromandel, and is figured among Coromandel plants (1, No. 46); it grows to be a large tree in the mountainous parts of Ceylon, and in the Peninsula of India — in Malabar, Coromandel, and Orissa. The black part of the wood of this tree alone forms ebony, and is found only in the center of large trees, and varies in quantity according to the size and age of the tree. The outside wood is white and soft, and is soon destroyed by time and insects, leaving the black untouched (Roxb. *Fl. Ind.* 2:530). Besides these, there is in the Peninsula of India a wood called: *blackwood* by the English, and *sit-sal* by the natives: it grows to an immense size, is heavy, close-grained, of a greenish-black color, with lighter-colored veins running in various directions. It is yielded by the *Dalberya latifolia*. To the same genus belongs the Sissu, one of the most valued woods of India, and of which the tree has been called *Dalberya sissu*. The wood is remarkably strong, of a light grayish hue, with darker-colored veins. It is called *sissu* and *shishum* by the natives of India. This is the name which we believe is referred to by Arab authors, and which also appears to have been the original of the *sesamina* of Dioscorides and of the Periplus. The name may be applied to other nearly allied woods, and therefore, perhaps, to that of the above *D. latafolia*. It is a curious confirmation of this that Forskall mentions that in his time *shishum*, with teak and ebony, was among the woods imported from India and Arabia. It is satisfactory to have apparently such competent confirmation of the general accuracy of ancient authors, when we fully understand the subjects and the products of the countries to

which they allude (Kitto, s.v.). According to Sir E. Tennent. (*Ceylon*, 1:116) the following trees yield ebony: *Diospyros ebenum*, *D. reticulata*, *D. ebenaster*, and *D. hirsuta*. The wood of the first-named tree, which is abundant throughout all the flat country to the west of Trincomali, "excels all others in the evenness and intensity of its color. The center of the trunk is the only portion which furnishes the extremely black part which is the ebony of commerce; but the trees are of such magnitude that reduced logs of two feet in diameter, and varying from ten to twelve feet in length, can readily be procured from the forests at Trincomali" (*Ceylon*, l.c.) It bears a berry that is eaten by the natives when ripe. The leaves are elliptical, having numerous veins. The corolla or colored part is shaped like an antique vase, and bears eight stamens (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, in loc. Ezekiel). There is every reason for believing that the ebony afforded by the *Diospyros ebenum* was imported from India or Ceylon by Phoenician traders, though it is equally probable that the Tyrian merchants were supplied with ebony from trees which grew in Ethiopia (Smith, s.v.). **SEE TYRE**. (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Ebenus; *Penny Cyclop.* s.v. Ebony; Geiger, *Pharmaceut. Botanik*, 1:697). **SEE BOTANY**.

### Ebraldines Order Of The.

**SEE FONTEVRAULD.**

### Ebrardus

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

### Ebemar or Evermer

the third Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, was born at Cickes, near Terouanne, towards the close of the 11th century. Admitted by Lambert, bishop of Arras, to the priesthood, he joined the first Crusaders, and was of the number appointed by Godfrey de Bouillon canon at the holy sepulcher. In

1103, on the deposition of Daimbert (q.v.), he was elevated to the patriarchate, in which, after much contention on the part of Daimbert, he was solemnly confirmed by the decree of a council. He was a member of the Council of Nablous (1120), and in 1123 signed the treaty between the crusading princes and the Vemetians. A letter of this prelate, with the response by Lambert of Arras, is contained in the 5th volume of the *Miscellanea* of Baluze. — *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 15, 618.

## Ebro'nah

(Hebrews *A bronah'*, *hn/rb* passage, i.e., — of the sea; Sept. *Ἐβρενάι*), the thirtieth station of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to Canaan (~~OR334~~ Numbers 33:34, 35). Since it lay near Ezion-Gaber on the west, as they left Jotbathah, it was probably in the plain now known as the *Ka'a en-Nikk*, immediately opposite the pass of the same name at the head of the Elanitic branch of the Red Sea (see Robinson's Map in *Researches*, volume 1). Rommel (in the *Hall. Encyklop.* 1:167) compares the *Avara* of Ptolemy (verse 17), in Arabia Petraea (66 degrees 10 feet and 29 degrees 40 feet), with the *Havarra* of the *Peutinger Table*; a very improbable supposition. Knobel thinks (*Exeg. Handb.* in loc.) that the Ezion-Gaber in question cannot be the port of that name at the head of the Elanitic Gulf; for, as the next station mentioned is Kadesh, this was too far from the north end of the gulf to be reached in one march; but this objection is of little force, as there is no uniformity in the 'intervals between the stations. Schwarz (*Palest.* page 219) rightly regards Ebronah as merely the name of a "ferry," by which the people perhaps crossed this arm of the sea (!), or where travelers usually crossed it.

## Ebutius

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

## Eca'nus

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

## Ecbat'ana

### Picture for Ecbat'ana

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

Two cities of the name of Ecbatana seem to have existed in ancient times, one the capital of Northern Media, the Media Atropatene of Strabo; the other the metropolis of the larger and more important province known as Media Magna (see Sir H. Rawlinson's paper on the Atropatenian Ecbatana, in the 10th volume of the *Journal of the Geographical Society*, art. 2). The site of the former appears to be marked by the very curious ruins at *Takht i-Suleiman* (lat. 36 degrees 28 feet long. 47 degrees 9 feet); while that of the latter is occupied by *hamadan*, which is one of the most important cities of modern Persia. There is generally some difficulty in determining,

when Ecbatana is mentioned, whether the northern or the southern metropolis is intended. Few writers are aware of the existence of the two cities, and they lie sufficiently near to one another for geographical notices in most cases to suit either site. The northern city was the "seven-walled town" described by Herodotus, and declared by him to have been the capital of Cyrus (Herod. 1:98-99, 153; compare Mos. Choren. 2:84); and it was thus most probably there that the roll was found which proved to Darius that Cyrus had really made a decree allowing the Jews to rebuild their Temple.

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

The peculiar feature of the site of *Takht i-Suleman*, which it is proposed to identify with the northern Ecbatana, is a conical hill rising to the height of



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

at first sight highly improbable — is found to have prevailed. Silver roofs were met with by the Greeks at the southern Ecbatana (Polybius, 10:27, 10-12); and there is reason to believe that at Borsippa the gold and silver stages of the temple were actually coated with those metals. (See Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1:185.)

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

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

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

Eccard.

SEE ECKHARD.

Ecce Homo

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

Ecchellensis or Echellensis Abraham;

a Maronite scholar, was born at Eckel, Syria, and was educated in Rome, where he afterwards taught the Syriac and Arabic languages. In 1630 he was called to Paris to assist in the preparation of the great Polyglot Bible of Le Jay. For this work Ecchellensis furnished *Ruth* in Syriac and Arabic, with a Latin translation, and the 3d book of *Maccabees* in Arabic. He undertook also the revision of the Syriac and Arabic texts, and the Latin versions contributed by Gabriel Sionita. He returned again to Rome to fill the chair of Oriental languages offered him in that city, and died there in 1664. Ecchellensis' writings are numerous; among the most important are: *Lingua Syriacae sive Chaldaicae perbrevis. Institutio* (Rome, 1628, 4to): — *Synopsis propositorum sapientiae Arabum, inscripta speculum mundum representans, ex arabico sermone latini juris facta* (Par. 1641, 4to). — *Sancti Antonii Magni Epistolae viginti* (Par. 1641, 8vo): — *Concilii Niceni Praefatio*, etc. (Par. 1645, 8vo): — *Sancti Antonii Magni Regulae, sermones, documenta, admonitiones, responsiones, at vita duplex* (Paris, 1646, 8vo): — *Semita Sapiestia, sive ad scientias comparandas methodus* (Paris, 1646): — *De Proprietatibus et virtutibus medicis animalium, plantarum ac gemmarum, tractatus triplex Habdarrahman* (Paris, 1647, 8vo): — *Chronicon orientale nunc primum latinitate donatum cui accessit supplementum Historiae orientalis* (Par. 1653, fol.): — *Catalogus librorum Chaldaeorum, tam ecclesiasticorum quam profanorum, auctore Hated-Jesu* (Rome, 1653, 8vo), with notes: —

*Concordantia nationum christianarum orientalium in fidei catholicae dogmate* (Mayence, 1655, 8vo). In this book he seeks to harmonize the sentiments of the Orientals with those of the Roman Church. Leo Allatius assisted him in his work. *De Origine nominis Papa, ... adeo de ejus primatu*, etc. (Rome, 1660), and *Euty chius vindicatus sive Responsio ad Seldeni Origines* (Rome, 1661, 4to), were works written in the controversy against the Protestants. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 5:621.

## Ecclesia

*SEE CHURCH.*

## Ecclesiae Domus

*SEE DOMUS.*

## Ecclesiae Seniores.

*SEE SENIORES.*

## Ecclesiastes

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

**I. Title.** — The Hebrew name is **תִּלְהַקֹּה** *Kohe'leth*, and is evidently taken from the designation which the writer himself assumes (<sup>2002</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:2, 2; 7:27; 12:8, 9, 10; Sept. **ἐκκλησιαστής**, Vulg. *ecclesiastes*, Auth. Vers. "preacher"). It is the participle of **לְהַקֵּי**; *kahal'* (cognate with **לְקַו**, *voice*, Greek **καλέω**, Eng. call), which properly signifies to *call together* a religious assembly (hence **לְהַקֵּי**; **לְהַקֵּי** a *congregation*). The apparent anomaly of the feminine termination **ת** indicates that the abstract noun has been transferred from the office to the person holding it (so the Arab. *caliph*, etc.; see Gesenius, *Thes. Hebrews* page 1199, 1200), and has thus become capable of use as a masculine proper name, a change of meaning of which we find other instances in *Sophereth* (<sup>1075</sup>Nehemiah 7:57), *Pochereth* (<sup>157</sup>Ezra 2:57); and hence, with the single exception of <sup>2077</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:27, the noun, notwithstanding its form, is used throughout in the masculine. Ewald, however (*Poet. Buch.* 4:189), connects the feminine termination with the noun **חֵכְמָה**; (wisdom), understood, and supposes a poetic license in the use of the word as a kind of symbolic proper name appealing to <sup>100</sup>Proverbs 30:1; 31:1, as examples of a like usage. As connected with the root **לְהַקֵּי** the word has been applied to one who speaks in an assembly, and there is, to say the least, a tolerable agreement in favor of this interpretation. Thus we have the comment of the Midrash, stating that the writer thus designates himself "because his words were spoken in the assembly (quoted in Preston's *Ecclesiastes*, note on 1:1); the rendering **ἐκκλησιαστής** by the Sept.; the adoption of this title by Jerome (*Præf. in Eccl.*), as meaning "*qui catum, i.e., ecclesiam congregat, quem nos nuncupare possumus Concionatorem*;" the use of "Prediger" by Luther; of "Preacher" in the A.V. On the other hand, taking **לְהַקֵּי** in the sense of collecting things, not of summoning persons, and led perhaps by his inability to see in the book itself any greater unity of design than in the chapters of Proverbs, Grotius (in <sup>2000</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:1) has suggested **Συναθροιστής** (*compiler*) as a better equivalent. In this he has been followed by Herder and Jahn, and Mendelssohn has adopted the same rendering (notes on <sup>2000</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:1, and <sup>2077</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:27, in Preston), seeing in it the statement partly that the writer had compiled the sayings of wise men who had gone before him, partly that he was, by an inductive process, gathering truths from the facts of a wide experience. The title of the book, however, indicates that the author did not write only for a literary public, but that he had in view the whole congregation of the Lord;

and that his doctrine was not confined within the narrow bounds of a school, but belonged to the Church in its whole extent (comp. <sup><1941></sup>Psalm 49:2-4). Solomon, who in <sup><1000></sup>1 Kings 8 is described *as gathering* ( **l hqj**) the people to hold communion with the Most High in the place which he erected for this purpose, is here again represented as *the gatherer* ( **tl hqj**) of the people to the assembly of God. It must, however, be borne in mind that, though Solomon is animated by and represents Wisdom he does not lose his individuality. Hence he sometimes describes his own experience (compare <sup><2006></sup>Ecclesiastes 1:16, 17; 2:9, 12; 7:23, etc.), and sometimes utters the words of Wisdom, whose organ he is, just as the apostles are sometimes the organs of the Holy Ghost (compare <sup><4153></sup>Acts 15:28).

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

1. The verb **l hqj** does not properly include the idea of *preaching*: such, however, would naturally be its derived import, inasmuch as popular assemblies are usually convened for the purpose of being addressed.
2. It ascribes to Solomon the office of *preacher*, which is nowhere mentioned in the Bible; it is too modern a title, and is inconsistent with his character, if not with the contents of the book: this, however, only applies to the title in its modern sense, and not to the above generic view.
3. It destroys the connection between the design of the book and the import of this symbolic name: this again depends upon the preconception as to the design of the book; the import, as above explained, is not unsuitable. Moreover,
  - a. Coheleth is neither a name of *rank* nor of *office*, but simply describes the act of gathering the people together, and can, therefore, not come within the rule which the advocates of the rendering *preacher* or *Ecclesiastes* are obliged to urge.
  - b. The construction of the feminine verb with it in <sup><2077></sup>Ecclesiastes 7:27, is incompatible with this view.
  - c. Abstracts are never formed from *the active participle*; and, d. There is not a single instance to be found *where a concrete is first made an abstract, and then again taken in a personal sense*. These objections are too minute

to be of much force, and are overruled by the peculiar use and application of this word, which occurs nowhere else.

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

inappropriateness. (See Dindorf, *Quomodo nomen Cohelet Salomoni tribuatur*, Lpz. 1791.)

**II. Author and Date.** — These have usually been regarded as determined by the account that the writer gives of himself in chapter 1 and 2, that it was written by the only "son of David" (<sup>2000</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:1), who was "king over Israel in Jerusalem" (<sup>2012</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:12). According to this, we have in it what may well be called the Confessions of king Solomon, the utterance of a repentance which some have even ventured to compare with that of the 51st psalm. This authorship is corroborated by the unquestionable allusions made throughout the book to particular circumstances connected with the life of the great monarch (compare Ecclesiastes chapter 1:16, etc., with <sup>1082</sup>1 Kings 3:12; chapter 2:4-10, with <sup>1082</sup>1 Kings 5:27-32; 7:1-8; 9:7-19; 10:14-29; chapter 7:20, with <sup>1086</sup>1 Kings 8:46; chapter 12:9, with <sup>1042</sup>1 Kings 4:32). Additional internal evidence has been found for this belief in the language of <sup>2073</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:26-28, as harmonizing with the history of <sup>1103</sup>1 Kings 11:3, and in an interpretation (somewhat forced perhaps) which refers <sup>2043</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:13-15 to the murmurs of the people against Solomon, and the popularity of Jeroboam as the leader of the people, already recognized as their future king (Mendelssohn and Preston in loc.). The belief that Solomon was actually the author was, it need hardly be said, received generally by the Rabbinic commentators, and the whole series of Patristic writers. The apparent exceptions to this in the passages by Talmudic writers, which ascribe it to Hezekiah (*Baba Bathra*, c. 1, fol. 15) or Isaiah (*Shalsh. Hakkab.* fol. 66 b, quoted by Michaelis), can hardly be understood as implying more than a share in the work of editing, like that claimed for the "men of Hezekiah" in <sup>2131</sup>Proverbs 25:1. Grotius (*Praef. in Eccles.*) was indeed almost the first writer who called it in question, and started a different hypothesis.

It may seem as if the whole question were settled for all who recognize the inspiration of Scripture by the statement, in a canonical and inspired book, as to its own authorship. The book purports, it is said (Preston, *Proleg. in Ecclesiastes* page 5), to be written by Solomon, and to doubt the literal accuracy of this statement is to call in question the truth and authority of Scripture. To many it has appeared questionable, however, whether we can admit an *a priori* argument of this character to be decisive. The hypothesis that every such statement in a canonical book must be received as literally true, is, in fact, an assumption that inspired writers were debarred from



forms of composition which were open without blame to others. In the literature of every other nation the form of personated authorship, where there is no *animus decipiendi*, has been recognized as a legitimate channel for the expression of opinions or the quasi-dramatic representation of character. Hence it has been asked, Why should we venture on the assertion that, if adopted by the writers of the Old Testament, it would have made them guilty of a falsehood, and been inconsistent with their inspiration? The question of authorship does not involve that of canonical authority. A book written by Solomon would not necessarily be inspired and canonical. It is said that there is nothing that need startle us in the thought that an inspired writer might use a liberty which has been granted without hesitation to the teachers of mankind in every age and country. Accordingly, the advocates of a different authorship for the book in question than that of Solomon feel themselves at liberty to discard these statements of the text as mere literary devices.

They argue that in like manner the book which bears the title of the "Wisdom of Solomon" asserts, both by its title and its language (<sup><2000></sup>Ecclesiastes 7:1-21), a claim to the same authorship, and, though the absence of a Hebrew original led to its exclusion from the Jewish canon, the authorship of Solomon was taken for granted by all the early Christian writers who quote it or refer to it, till Jerome had asserted the authority of the Hebrew text as the standard of canonicity, and by not a few afterwards. But in reply to this it may justly be said that the traditional character of the two books is so different as to debar any comparison of this kind. *SEE WISDOM, BOOK OF.*

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

**1.** All the other reputed writings of Solomon have his name in the inscription (compare <sup><2000></sup>Proverbs 1:1; Song of Songs 1:1; <sup><1900></sup>Psalms 78), whereas in this book the name of Solomon is studiously avoided, thus showing that it does not claim him as its actual author. Yet he gives other equally decisive intimations of his identity, and the peculiar character of the work sufficiently accounts for this partial concealment. Moreover, in some of his other undoubted writings he employs similar *noms de plume* (<sup><2000></sup>Proverbs 30:1; 31:1).

**2.** The symbolic and impersonal name *Koheleth* shows that Solomon is simply introduced in an ideal sense as the representative of wisdom. On the

other hand, it appears to have an equally tangible application to him historically.

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

**4.** This is moreover corroborated by various statements in the book, which would otherwise be irreconcilable, e.g. Koheleth comparing himself with a long succession of kings who reigned over Israel in Jerusalem (<sup>-2016</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:16; 2:7): the term king in Jerusalem (*ibid.*) showing that at the time when this was written there was a royal residence in Samaria; the recommendation *to individuals* not to attempt to resent the oppression of a tyrannical ruler, but to wait for a *general revolt* (<sup>-2012</sup>Ecclesiastes 8:2-9) a doctrine which a monarch like Solomon is not likely to propound; the description of a royal spendthrift, and of the misery he inflicts upon the land (<sup>-2106</sup>Ecclesiastes 10:16-19), which Solomon would not give unless he intended to write a satire upon himself. These historical allusions are too vague to be thus pressed into service. As to the political references, we know (<sup>-1114</sup>1 Kings 11:14, 23) that insurrectionary manifestations did exist in Solomon's reign, and were aggravated by his rigid and exacting government (<sup>-1124</sup>1 Kings 12:4). It has been asked whether Solomon would have been likely to speak of himself as in <sup>-2012</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:12, or to describe with bitterness the misery and wrong of which his own misgovernment had been the cause, as in <sup>-2016</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:16; 4:1 (Jahn, *Einl.* 2:840). On the hypothesis that he was the writer, the whole book is in acknowledgment of evils which he had occasioned, while yet there is no distinct confession and repentance. There are forms of satiety and self-reproach, of which this half sad, half scornful retrospect of a man's own life — this utterance of bitter words by which he is condemned out of his own mouth — is the most natural expression. Any individual judgment on this

point cannot, from the nature of the case, be otherwise than subjective, and ought therefore to bias our estimate of other evidence as little as possible.

**5.** The state of oppression, sufferings, and misery depicted in this book (<sup>(210B)</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:1-4, 5:7; 8:1-4, 10, 11; 10:5-7, 20, etc.) cannot be reconciled with the age of Solomon, and unquestionably shows that the Jews were then groaning under the grinding tyranny of Persia. There are sudden and violent changes, the servant of today becoming the ruler of tomorrow (<sup>(210B)</sup>Ecclesiastes 10:5-7). All this, it is said, agrees with the glimpses into the condition of the Jews under the Persian empire in Ezra and Nehemiah, and with what we know as to the general condition of the provinces under its satraps. But we cannot suppose that these evils, which have been prevalent in all times, were alluded to as specially characteristic of the writer's day.

**6.** The fact that Koheleth is represented as indulging in sensual enjoyments, and acquiring riches and fame *in order to ascertain what is good for the children of men* (<sup>(210B)</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:3-9; 3:12, 22, etc.), making philosophical experiments to discover *the summum bonum* held to be at variance with the conduct of the historical Solomon, and to be an idea of a much later period. In like manner, the admonition not to seek divine things in the profane books of the philosophers (<sup>(210D)</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:12) are thought to show that this book was written when the speculation of Greece and Alexandria had found their way into Palestine. In short, the doctrine of a future bar of judgment, whereby Koheleth solves the grand problem of this book, when compared with the vague and dim intimations respecting a future state in the pre-exilian portions of the O.T., is regarded as proving that it is apost-exilian production. But the untrustworthy character of these arguments is evinced by the parallel case of the book of Job (q.v.). It is also urged that the indications of the religious condition of the people, their formalism and much speaking (<sup>(210B)</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:1, 2), their readiness to evade the performance of their Vows by casuistic excuses (<sup>(210B)</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:5), represent in like manner the growth of evils, the germs of which appeared soon after the captivity, and which we find in a fully-developed form in the prophecy of Malachi. In addition to this general resemblance, there is the agreement between the use of **Ēa| Mhi** for the "angel" or priest of God (<sup>(210B)</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:6, Ewald, *in loc.*), and the recurrence in Malachi of the terms **Ēa| Mhih2a|by|** the "angel" or messenger of the Lord, as a synonym for the priest (<sup>(310D)</sup>Malachi 2:7), the true priest being the great

agent in accomplishing God's purposes. Significant, though not conclusive in either direction, is the absence of all reference to any contemporaneous prophetic activity or to any Messianic hopes. This might indicate a time before such hopes had become prevalent, or after they were for a time extinguished. It might, on the other hand, be the natural result of the experience through which the son of David had passed, or fitly take its place in the dramatic personation of such a character. The use throughout the book of Elohim instead of Jehovah as the divine name, though characteristic of the book as dealing with the problems of the universe rather than with the relations between the Lord God of Israel and his people, and therefore striking as an idiosyncrasy, leaves the question as to date nearly where it was. The indications of rising questions as to the end of man's life and the constitution of his nature, of doubts like those which afterwards developed into Sadduceeism (<sup><2189></sup>Ecclesiastes 3:19-21), of a copious literature connected with those questions, confirm, it is urged (Ewald), the hypothesis of the later date. It may be added, too, that the absence of any reference to such a work as this in the enumeration of Solomon's writings in <sup><1042></sup>1 Kings 4:32, tends, at least, to the same conclusion. But such considerations drawn *a silentio* are highly inconclusive.

**7.** The strongest argument, however, against the Solomonic authorship of this book is its vitiated language and style. It is written throughout with peculiarities of phraseology which developed themselves about the time of the Babylonian captivity. So convincing is this fact, that not only have Grotius, J.D. Michaelis, Eichhorn, Doderlein, Spohn, Jahn, J.E.C. Schmidt, Nachtigal, Kaiser, Rosenmuller, Ewald, Knobel, Gesenius, De Wette, Noyes, Hitzig, Heiligstedt, Davidson, Meier, etc., relinquished the Solomonic authorship, but even such unquestionably orthodox writers as Umbreit, Hengstenberg, Gerlach, Vaihinger, Stuart, Keil, Elster, etc., declare most emphatically that the book was written after the Babylonian captivity; and there is hardly a chief rabbi or a literary Jew to be found who would have the courage to maintain that Solomon wrote Koheleth. Dr. Herzfeld, chief rabbi of Brunswick; Dr. Philippson, chief rabbi of Magdeburg; Dr. Geiger, rabbi of Breslau; Dar. Zunz, Professor Luzzatto, Dr. Krochmal, Steinschneider, Jost, Gratz, Furst, and a host of others, affirm that this book is one of the latest productions in the O.T. canon. We are moreover reminded that these are men to whom the Hebrew is almost vernacular, and that some of them write better Hebrew, and in a purer

style, than that of Koheleth. With most readers, however, a single intimation of the text itself will weigh more than the opinion of these or all other learned men. On the other hand, the Rabbinical scholars, who certainly were not inferior in a knowledge of Hebrew, appear to have found no difficulty in attributing this book to Solomon. Most of those above enumerated are of very questionable sentiments on a point like this, and it must be borne in mind that a very large, if not equal, amount of learning has been arrayed on the opposite side. The last of the above objections, however, deserves a more minute consideration.

Many opponents of the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes have certainly gone much too far in their assertions respecting the impurity of its language. The Graecisms which Zirkle thought that he had found have now generally been given up. The Rabbinisms likewise could not stand the proof. The words, significations, and forms which seem to appertain to a later period of Hebrew literature, and the Chaldaisms, an abundance of which Knobel gathered, require, as Herzfeld has shown (in his *Commentary*, published at Braunschweig, 1838, page 13 sq.), to be much sifted. According to Herzfeld, there are in Ecclesiastes not more than between eleven and fifteen "young Hebrew" expressions and constructions, and between eight and ten Chaldaisms. Nevertheless, it is certain that the book does not belong to the productions of the first, but rather to the second period of the Hebrew language. This alone would not fully disprove the authorship of Solomon, for it would not necessarily throw the production into the latest period of Hebrew literature. We could suppose that Solomon, in a philosophical work, found the pure Hebrew language to be insufficient, and had, therefore, recourse to the Chaldaizing popular dialect, by which, at a later period, the book-language was entirely displaced. This supposition could not be rejected *a priori*, since almost every one of the Hebrew authors before the exile did the same, although in a less degree. It has been thought, however, that the striking difference between the language of Ecclesiastes and the language of the Proverbs renders that explanation quite inadmissible. This difference would prove little if the two books belonged to two entirely different classes of literature — that is, if Ecclesiastes bore the same relation to the Proverbs as the Song of Solomon does; but since Ecclesiastes and the Proverbs belong essentially to the same class, the argument taken from the difference of style, can only be avoided by attributing it to the effect of greater age in the writer. The occurrence of Chaldee words and forms in any Hebrew

document is by no means a certain and invariable indication of lateness of composition. We must be careful to distinguish archaisms, and words and forms peculiar to the poetic style, from Chaldaisms of the later period. Moreover, the Hebrew writings which have been transmitted to us being so few in number, it is of course much more difficult decisively to determine the period to which any of these writings belongs by the peculiar form of language which it presents, than it would have been had there been preserved to us a larger number of documents of different ages to assist us in forming our decision. Still, from the materials within our reach, scanty though they are, we would naturally draw a conclusion as to the age of the book of Ecclesiastes, not altogether certain, indeed, but decidedly unfavorable to an early date; for it needs but a cursory survey of the book to convince us that in language and style it not only differs widely from the other writings of the age of Solomon, but bears a very marked resemblance to the latest books of the Old Testament.

**1.** One class of words employed by the writer of Ecclesiastes we find rarely employed in the earlier books of Scripture, frequently in the later, i.e., in those written during or after the Babylonish captivity. Thus *shalat'*, **ִּלְיָ**; *he ruled* (<sup><2129></sup>Ecclesiastes 2:19; 5:18; 6:2; 8:9), is found elsewhere only in Nehemiah and Esther. The derived noun **ִּלְיָ** *Yashilton'*, *rule* (<sup><2128></sup>Ecclesiastes 8:4, 8), is found only in the Chaldee of Daniel; but **לְיָ** *shallit'*, *ruler*, appears once in the earlier Scriptures (<sup><1476></sup>Genesis 42:6). Under this head may also be mentioned **מְלֻכָּה** *malkuth'*, *kingdom* (<sup><2044></sup>Ecclesiastes 4:14), rare in the earlier Scriptures, but found above forty times in Esther and Daniel; and **מְדִינָה** *medinah'*, *province* (<sup><2128></sup>Ecclesiastes 2:8; 5:7), which appears also in Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, and likewise in <sup><1104></sup>1 Kings 20:14-19, where "princes of the provinces" are mentioned among the officers of king Ahab, but in none of the earlier Scriptures.

**2.** A second class includes those words which are *never* found in any Hebrew writing of earlier date than the Babylonian captivity, but are found in the later books: as **זְמַן** *zesnan'*, *set time* (<sup><2101></sup>Ecclesiastes 3:1) = **זְמַן** which we meet with in Hebrew only in <sup><1476></sup>Nehemiah 2:6 and <sup><1727></sup>Esther 9:27, 31, but in the biblical Chaldee and in the Targums frequently; **פִּתְיָמָה** *pithyam'*, *sentence* (<sup><2121></sup>Ecclesiastes 8:11), which appears in Hebrew only in <sup><1702></sup>Esther 1:20, but in Chaldee frequently. (If this word be,

as is commonly supposed, of Persian origin, its appearance only in the later Jewish writings is at once accounted for. See Rediger's *Additions to Gesenius' Thesaurus.*) [*Dmimadda'* (chapter 10:20), a derivative of [*dj*; *to know*, found only in 2 Chronicles and Daniel, and also in Chaldee; and the particles *WLaalu'*, *if* (<sup>2016</sup>Ecclesiastes 6:6), and *^kE]beken'*, *then, so* (<sup>2080</sup>Ecclesiastes 8:10), found in no earlier Hebrew book than Esther. From this enumeration it appears that the book of Ecclesiastes resembles the book of Esther in some of the most distinctive peculiarities of its language.

**3.** A third class embraces those words which are not found even in the Hebrew writings of the latest period, but only in the Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra, or in the Targums, as *^/rtjæithron'*, *profit*, which is used nine times in Ecclesiastes, never in any other scriptural writing, but frequently in the Targums, under the slightly modified form *yuthran*; so also *rb2]K kebar'*, *already, long ago*, which recurs eight times in this book; *^qI] takan'* (<sup>2015</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:15; 7:13; 12:9), found also in Chaldee (<sup>2043</sup>Daniel 4:33, etc.); *tW[r]reuth'*, *desire*, recurring five times, and also in the Chaldee portions of Ezra; *^wp]ri* (<sup>2017</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:17, etc.), *^ynI æ* (<sup>2013</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:13, etc.), */mWG* (<sup>2008</sup>Ecclesiastes 10:8).

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

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

(b) that so far as they are foreign to the Hebrew of the time of Solomon, he may have learned them from his "strange wives," or from

the men who came as ambassadors from other countries. (See Davidson, Horne's *Introd.* new ed. 2:787).

As to the date of Ecclesiastes, these arguments of recent criticism are stronger against the traditional belief than in support of any rival theory, and the advocates of that belief might almost be content to rest their case upon the discordant hypotheses of their opponents. On the assumption that the book belongs, not to the time of Solomon, but to the period subsequent to the captivity, the dates which have been assigned to it occupy a range of more than 300 years. Grotius supposes Zerubbabel to be referred to in <sup>2121</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:11, as the "One Shepherd" (*Comm. in Ecclesiastes in loc.*), and so far agrees with Keil (*Einleitung in das A.T.*) who fixes it in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Ewald and De Wette conjecture the close of the period of Persian or the commencement of that of Macedonian rule; Bertholdt, the period between Alexander the Great and Antiochus Epiphanes; Hitzig, circ. B.C. 204; Hartmann, the time of the Maccabees, etc. The following table will show the different periods to which it has been assigned:

(B.C.)

Nachtigal, between Solomon and Jeremiah — 975-588

Schmidt, Jahn, etc., between Manasseh and Zedekiah — 699-588

Grotius, Kaiser, Eichhorn, etc., shortly after the exile — 536-500

Umbreit, the Persian period — 538-333

Van der Hardt, in the reign of Xerxes II and Darius — 464-404

Rosenmuller, between Nehemiah and Alexander the Great — 450-333

Hengstenberg, Stuart, Keil — 433

Ewald, a century before Alexander the Great — 430

Gerlach, about the year — 400

De Wette, Nobel, etc., at the end of the Persian and the beginning of the Macedonian period — 350-300

Bergst, during Alexander's sojourn in Palestine — 333

Bertholdt, between Alexander and Ant. Epiphanes — 333-164

Zirkel, the Syrian period — 312-164

Hitzig, about the year — 204



Supposing it were proved that Solomon is only introduced as the speaker, the question arises why the another adopted this form. The usual reply is, that Solomon, among the Israelites, had, as it were, the prerogative of wisdom, and hence the author was induced to put into Solomon's mouth that wisdom which he intended to proclaim, without the slightest intention of forging a supposititious volume. This reply contains some truth, but it does not exhaust the matter. The chief object of the author was to communicate wisdom in general; but next to this, as appears from ~~20012~~ Ecclesiastes 1:12 sq., he intended to inculcate the vanity of human pursuits. Now, from the mouth of no one could more aptly proceed the proclamation of the nothingness of all earthly things than from the mouth of Solomon, who had possessed them in all their fullness; at whose command were wisdom, riches, and pleasures in abundance, and who had therefore full opportunity to experience the nothingness of all that is earthly. On the other hand, if we adopt the traditional view that Solomon was the author, we avoid all these doubtful expedients and pious frauds; and, as no other candidate appears, we shall be safest in coinciding with that ancient opinion. The peculiarities of diction may be explained (as in the book of Job) by supposing that the work was written by Solomon during a season of penitence at the close of his life, and edited in its present form, at a later period, perhaps by Ezra.

**III. Canonicity.** — The earliest catalogues which the Jews have transmitted to us of their sacred writings give this book as forming part of the canon (Mishna, *Yadaim*, 3:5; Talmud, *Baba Bathra*, 14). All the ancient versions, therefore — viz. the Septuagint, which was made before the Christian aera; the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which belong to the second century of Christianity, as well as the catalogue of Melito, bishop of Sardis (fl. A.D. 170) — include Ecclesiastes. Some singular passages in the Talmud indicate, however, that the recognition was not altogether unhesitating, and that it was at least questioned how far the book was one which it was expedient to place among the Scriptures that were read publicly. Thus we find the statements (Mishna, *Shabbath*, c.x, quoted by Mendelssohn in Preston, page 74; Midrash, fol. 114 a; Preston, page 13) that "the wise men sought to secrete the book Koheleth, because they found in it words tending to heresy," and " words contradictory to each other;" that the reason they did not secrete it was "because its beginning and end were consistent with the law;" that when they examined it more carefully they came to the conclusion, "We have

looked closely into the book *Koheleth*, and discovered a meaning in it." The chief interest of such passages is of course connected with the inquiry into the plan and teaching of the book, but they ate of some importance also as indicating that it must have commended itself to the teachers of an earlier generation either on account of the external authority by which it was sanctioned, or because they had a clearer insight into its meaning, and were less startled by its apparent difficulties. (See *Bab. Megilla*, 7, a; *Bab. Talm. Sabbath*, 30, a; Midrash, *Vayikra Rabba*, 28; Mishna, *Edayoth*, verse 3; Jerome, Comment. 12:13.) Traces of this controversy are to be found in a singular discussion between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, turning on the question whether the book *Koheleth* were inspired, and in the comments on that question by R. Ob. de Bartenora and Maimonides (Surenhus. 4:349).

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

**1.** The author is said to incline towards a moral epicurism. All his ethical admonitions and doctrines tend to promote the comforts and enjoyments' of life. But let us consider above all what tendency and disposition it is to which the author addresses his admonition, serenely and contentedly to enjoy God's gifts. He addresses this admonition to that speculation which will not rest before it has penetrated the: whole depth of the inscrutable councils of God; to that murmuring which bewails the badness of times, and quarrels with God about the sufferings of our terrene existence; to that gloomy piety which wearies itself in imaginary good works and external strictness, with a view to wrest salvation from God; to that avarice which gathers, not knowing for whom; making the means of existence our highest aim; building upon an uncertain futurity which is in the hand of God alone. When the author addresses levity he speaks: quite otherwise. For instance, in <sup>200</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:2, 4, " It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men; and the living will lay it to his heart. Sorrow is better than laughter, for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better. The heart of the wise man is in the house of mourning, but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth." The nature of the joy recommended by the author is also misunderstood. Unrestrained merriment and giddy sensuality belong to those vanities which

our author enumerates. He says to laughter, Thou art mad, and to joy, What art thou doing? He says, <sup><21075></sup>Ecclesiastes 7:5, 6, "It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise than for a man to hear the song of fools.' For as the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of a fool; this also is vanity." That joy which he recommends is joy in God. It is not the opposite, but the fruit of the fear of God. How inseparable these are is shown in passages like <sup><21076></sup>Ecclesiastes 5:6; 7:18; 3:12: "I know that there is no good in them, but for a man to rejoice, and to do good in his life ," and in many similar passages, but especially <sup><21109></sup>Ecclesiastes 11:9, 10, and 12:1, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth," etc. In reference to these passages Ewald says (page 186), "Finally, in order to remove every doubt, and to speak with perfect clearness, he directs us to the eternal judgment of God, concerning all the doings of man, and inculcates that man, in the midst of momentary enjoyment, should never forget the whole futurity, the account and the consequences of his doings, the Creator and the Judge." Ewald adds (page 227), in reference to the conclusion, " In order to obviate every possible misunderstanding of this writing, there is, verse 13, once more briefly indicated that its tendency is not, by the condemnation of murmuring, to recommend an unbridled life, but rather to teach, in harmony with the best old books, the fear of God, in which the whole man consists, or that true singleness of life, satisfying the whole man, and which comprehends everything else that is truly human. It is very necessary to limit the principle of joy which this book recommends again and again in various ways and in the most impressive manner, and to refer this joy to a still higher truth, since it is so liable to be misunderstood.

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

**3.** misled into a moral skepticism, having attained on his dogmatical basis the conviction of the inability of man, notwithstanding all his efforts, to reach his aim. However, this so-called fatalism of our author is nothing else but what our Lord teaches (<sup><41625></sup>Matthew 6:25): 'Take no thought,' etc. And as to the moral skepticism, our author certainly inculcates that man with all his endeavors can do nothing; but at the same time he recommends the fear of God as the never-failing means of salvation. Man in himself can do nothing, but in God he can do all. It is quite clear from <sup><21076></sup>Ecclesiastes 7:16, 18, where both self-righteousness and wisdom, when separated from

God, are described as equally destructive, and opposite to them is placed the fear of God, as being their common antithesis, that our author, by pointing to the sovereignty of God, did not mean to undermine morality: 'He that feareth God comes out from them all.' If our author were given to moral skepticism, it would be impossible for him to teach retribution, which he inculcates in numerous passages, and which are not contradicted by others, in which he says that the retribution in individual circumstances is frequently obscure and enigmatical. Where is that advocate for retribution who is not compelled to confess this as well as our author?

4. This book has given offense also, by <sup><2021></sup>Ecclesiastes 3:21, and similar passages, concerning immortality. But the assertion that there is expressed here some doubt concerning the immortality of the soul is based on a wrong grammatical perception. The **h** cannot, according to its punctuation, be the interrogative, but must be the article, and our author elsewhere asserts positively his belief in the doctrine of immortality (<sup><2127></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:7). How it happens that he did not give to this doctrine a prevailing influence upon his mode of treating his subject has lately been investigated by Heyder, in his essay entitled *Ecclesiastae de immortalitate Animi Sententia* (Erlangen, 1838)." (See Dr. Nordheimer, on *The Philosophy of Ecclesiastes*, in the *Amer. Bib. Repos.* July, 1838.)

**IV. Plan and Contents.** — The book of Ecclesiastes comes before us as being conspicuously, among the writings of the O.T., the great stumbling-block of commentators. Elsewhere there are different opinions as to the meaning of different passages. Here there is the widest possible divergence as to the plan and purpose of the whole book. The passages already quoted from the Mishna show that some, at least, of the Rabbinical writers were perplexed by its teaching — did not know what to make of it — but gave way to the authority of men more discerning than themselves. The traditional statement, however, that this was among the Scriptures which were not read by any one under the age of thirty (*Crit. Sac.* Amama in *Eccles.*, but with a "nescio ubi" as to his authority), indicates the continuance of the old difficulty, and the remarks of Jerome (*Praef. in Eccles.*, *Comm. in* <sup><2123></sup>*Ecclesiastes 12:13*) show that it was not forgotten. Little can be gathered from the series of Patristic interpreters. The book is comparatively seldom quoted by them. No attempt is made to master its plan and to enter into the spirit of its writer. The charge brought by Philastrius of Brescia (circ. A.D. 380) against some heretics who rejected it

as teaching a false morality, shows that the, obscurity which had been a stumbling-block to Jewish teachers was not removed for Christians. The fact that Theodore of Mopsuestia was accused at the fifth general council of calling in question the authority and inspiration of this book, as well as of the Canticles, indicates that in this respect, as in others, he was the precursor of the spirit of modern criticism. But, with these exceptions, there are no traces that men's minds were drawn to examine the teachings of this book. When, however, we descend to the more recent developments of criticism, we meet with an almost incredible divergence of opinion. Luther, with his broad, clear insight into the workings of a man's heart sees in it (*Praef. in Eccle.*) a noble "Politica vel OEconomica," leading men in the midst of all the troubles' and disorders of human society to a true endurance and reasonable enjoyment. Grotius (*Praef. in Eccles.*) gives up the attempt to trace in it a plan or order of thought, and finds in it only a collection of many maxims, connected more or less closely with the great problems of human life, analogous to the discussion of the different definitions of happiness at the opening of the Nicomachean Ethics. Some (of whom Warburton may be taken as the type, *Works*, 4:154) have seen in the language of <sup>2128</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:18-21, a proof that the belief in the immortality of the soul was no part of the transmitted creed of Israel. Others (Patrick, Des Voeux, Davidson, Mendelssohn) contend that the special purpose of the book was to assert that truth against the denial of a sensual skepticism. Others, the later Germans critics, of whom Ewald may be taken as the highest and best type, reject these views as partial and one-sided; and, while admitting that the book contains the germs of later systems, both Pharisaic and Sadducean, assert that the object of the writer was to point out the secret of a true blessedness, in the midst of all the distractions and sorrows of the world, as consisting in a tranquil, calm enjoyment of the good that comes from God (*Poet. Buch.* 4:180).

The variety of these opinions indicates sufficiently that the book is as far removed as possible from the character of a formal treatise. It is simply what it professes to be — the confession of a man of wide experience looking back upon his past life, and looking out upon the disorders and calamities which surround him. Such a man does not set forth his premises and conclusions with a logical completeness. While it may be true that the absence of a formal arrangement is characteristic of the Hebrew mind in all stages of its development (Lowth, *De Sac. Poet. Heb.* Proel. 24), or that it was the special mark of the declining literature of the period that followed

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

Leaving it an open question whether it is possible to arrange the contents of this book (as Koster and Vaihinger have done) in a carefully balanced series of strophes and antistrophes, it is tolerably clear that the recurring burden of "Vanity of vanities" and the teaching which recommends a life of calm enjoyment, mark, whenever they occur, a kind of halting-place in the succession of thoughts. It is the summing up of one cycle of experience; the sentence passed upon one phase of life. Taking this, accordingly, as our guide, we may look upon the whole book as falling into four divisions,

each, to a certain extent, running parallel with the others in its order and results, and closing with that which, in its position no less than its substance, is "the conclusion of the whole matter."

**1.** Ecclesiastes 1, 2. This portion of the book, more than any other, has the character of a personal confession; The Preacher starts with reproducing the phase of despair and weariness into which his experience had led him (<sup>-2000</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:2, 3). To the man who is thus satiated with life, the order and regularity of nature are oppressive (<sup>-2004</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:4-7); nor is he led, as in the 90th Psalm, from the things that are transitory to the thought of One whose years are from eternity. In the midst of the ever-recurring changes he finds no progress. That which seems to be new is but the repetition of the old (<sup>-2008</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:8-11). Then, having laid bare the depth to which he had fallen, he retraces the path by which he had traveled thitherward. First he had sought after wisdom as that to which God seemed to call him (<sup>-2013</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:13) but the pursuit of it was a sore travail, and there was no satisfaction in its possession. It could not remedy the least real evil, nor make the crooked straight (<sup>-2015</sup>Ecclesiastes 1:15). The first experiment in the search after happiness had failed, and he tried another. It was one to which men of great intellectual gifts and high fortunes ere continually tempted to surround himself with all the appliances of sensual enjoyment, and yet in thought to hold himself above it (<sup>-2018</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:1-9), making his very voluptuousness part of the experience which was to enlarge his store of wisdom. This which one may perhaps call the Goethean idea of life was what now possessed him. But this also failed to give him peace (<sup>-2021</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:11). Had he not then exhausted all human experience and found it profitless? (<sup>-2022</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:12). If for a moment he found comfort in the thought that wisdom excelleth folly, and that he was wise (<sup>-2023</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:13, 14), it was soon darkened again by the thought of death (<sup>-2025</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:15). The wise man dies as the fool (<sup>-2026</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:16). This is enough to make even him who has wisdom hate all his labor and sink into the outer darkness of despair (<sup>-2027</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:20). Yet this very despair leads to the remedy. The first section closes with that which, in different forms, is the main lesson of the book to make the best of what is actually around one (<sup>-2028</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:24) to substitute for the reckless, feverish pursuit of pleasure the calm enjoyment which men may yet find both for the senses and the intellect. This, so far as it goes, is the secret of a true life; this is

from the hand of God. On everything else there is written, as before, the sentence that it is vanity and vexation of spirit.

2. <sup>(2001)</sup>Ecclesiastes 2:1-6, 9. The order of thought in this section has a different starting-point. One who looked out upon the infinitely varied phenomena of man's life might yet discern, in the midst of that variety, traces of an order. There are times, and seasons for each of them, in their turn even as there are for the vicissitudes of the world of nature (<sup>(2003)</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:1-8). The heart of man, with its changes, is the mirror of the universe (<sup>(2001)</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:11), and is, like that, inscrutable. And from this there comes the same conclusion as from the personal experience. Calmly to accept the changes and chances of life, entering into whatever joy they bring, as one accepts the order of nature, this is the way of peace (<sup>(2003)</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:13). The thought of the ever-recurring cycle of nature, which before had been irritating and disturbing, now whispers the same lesson. If we suffer, others have suffered before us (<sup>(2005)</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:15). God is seeking out the past and reproducing it. If men repeat injustice and oppression, God also in the appointed season repeats his judgments (<sup>(2006)</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:16, 17). It is true that this thought has a dark as well as a bright side, and this cannot be ignored. If men come and pass away, subject to laws and changes like those of the natural world, then, it would seem, man has no pre-eminence above the beast (<sup>(2009)</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:19). One end happens to all. All are of the dust and return to dust again (<sup>(2010)</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:20). There is no immediate denial of this conclusion. It was to this that the Preacher's experience and reflection had led him. But even on the hypothesis that the personal being of man terminates with his death, he has still the same counsel to give. Admit that all is darkness beyond the grave, and still there is nothing better on this side of it than the temper of a tranquil enjoyment (<sup>(2002)</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:22).

The transition from this result to the opening thoughts of Ecclesiastes 4 seems at first somewhat abrupt. But the Preacher is retracing the paths by which he had been actually led to a higher truth than that in which he had then rested, and he will not, for the sake of a formal continuity, smooth over its ruggedness. The new track on which he was entering might have seemed less promising than the old. Instead of the self-centered search after happiness he looks out upon the miseries and disorders of the world, and learns to sympathize with suffering (<sup>(2001)</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:1). At first this does but multiply his perplexities. The world is out of joint. Men are so full of misery that death is better than life (<sup>(2002)</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:2). Successful



energy exposes men to envy (<sup>2004</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:4). Indolence leads to poverty (<sup>2005</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:5). Here, too; he who steers clear of both extremes has the best portion (<sup>2006</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:6). The man who heaps up riches stands alone without kindred to share or inherit them, and loses all the blessings and advantages of human fellowship (<sup>2008</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:8-12). Moreover, in this survey of life on a large scale, as in that of a personal experience, there is a cycle which is ever repeated. The old and foolish king yields to the young man, poor and wise, who steps from his prison to a throne (<sup>2003</sup>Ecclesiastes 4:13, 14). But he too has his successor. There are generations without limit before him, and shall be after him (<sup>2005</sup>Ecclesiastes 3:15, 16). All human greatness is swallowed up in the great stream of time.

The opening thought of Ecclesiastes 5 again presents the appearance of abruptness, but it is because the survey of human life takes a yet wider range. The eye of the Preacher passes from the dwellers in palaces to the worshippers in the Temple, the devout and religious men. Have they found out the secret of life, the path to wisdom and happiness? The answer to that question is that there the blindness and folly of mankind show themselves in their worst forms. Hypocrisy, unseemly prayers, idle dreams, broken vows, God's messenger, the Priest, mocked with excuses — that was what the religion which the Preacher witnessed presented to him (<sup>2003</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:1-6). The command "Fear thou God," meant that a man was to take no part in a religion such as this. But that command also suggested the solution of another problem, of that prevalence of injustice and oppression which had before weighed down the spirit of the inquirer. Above all tyranny of petty governors, above the might of the king himself, there was the power of the Highest (<sup>2008</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:8); and his judgment was manifest even upon earth. Was there, after all, so great an inequality? Was God's purpose, that the earth should be for all, really counteracted? (<sup>2009</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:9). Was the rich man with his cares and fears happier than the laboring man whose sleep was sweet without riches? (<sup>2010</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:10-12). Was there anything permanent in that wealth of his? Did he not leave the world naked as he entered it? And if so, did not all this bring the inquirer round to the same conclusion as before? Moderation, self-control, freedom from all disturbing passions, these are the conditions of the maximum of happiness which is possible for man on earth. Let this be received as from God. Not the outward means only, but the very capacity of enjoyment is his gift (<sup>2018</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:18,19). Short

as life may be, if a man thus enjoys, he makes the most of it. God approves and answers his cheerfulness. Is not this better than the riches or length of days on which men set their hearts? (<sup>2000</sup>Ecclesiastes 6:1-5). All are equal in death; all are nearly equal in life (<sup>2006</sup>Ecclesiastes 6:6). To feed the eyes with what is actually before them is better than the ceaseless wanderings of the spirit (<sup>2009</sup>Ecclesiastes 6:9).

**3.** <sup>2060</sup>Ecclesiastes 6:10–8:15. So far the lines of thought all seemed to converge to one result. The ethical teaching that grew out of the wise man's experience had in it something akin to the higher forms of Epicureanism. But the seeker could not rest in this, and found himself beset with thoughts at once more troubling and leading to a higher truth. The spirit of man looks before and after, and the uncertainties of the future vex it (<sup>2062</sup>Ecclesiastes 6:12). A good name is better, as being more permanent, than riches (<sup>2070</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:1); death is better than life, the house of mourning than the house of feasting (<sup>2072</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:2). Self-command and the spirit of calm endurance are a better safeguard against vain speculations than any form of enjoyment (<sup>2078</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:8, 9, 10). This wisdom is not only a defense, as lower things in their measure may be, but it gives life to them that have it (<sup>2072</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:12). So far there are signs of a clearer insight into the end of life. Then comes an oscillation which carries him back to the old problems (<sup>2075</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:15). Wisdom suggests a half-solution of them (<sup>2078</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:18), suggests also calmness, caution, humility in dealing with them (<sup>2072</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:22); but this is again followed by a relapse into the bitterness of the sated pleasure seeker. The search after wisdom, such as it had been in his experience, had led only to the discovery that, though men were wicked, women were more wicked still (<sup>2075</sup>Ecclesiastes 7:26-29). The repetition of thoughts that had appeared before is perhaps the natural consequence of such an oscillation, and accordingly in <sup>2080</sup>Ecclesiastes 8 we find the seeker moving in the same round as before. There are the old reflections on the misery of man (<sup>2086</sup>Ecclesiastes 8:6), and the confusions in the moral order of the universe (<sup>2080</sup>Ecclesiastes 8:10, 11), the old conclusion that enjoyment (such enjoyment as is compatible with the fear of God) is the only wisdom (<sup>2085</sup>Ecclesiastes 8:15).

**4.** <sup>2086</sup>Ecclesiastes 8:16–12:8. After the pause implied in his again arriving at the lesson of <sup>2065</sup>Ecclesiastes 5:15, the Preacher retraces the last of his many wanderings. This time the thought with which he starts is a profound conviction of the inability of man to unravel the mysteries by which he is

surrounded (<sup>2087</sup>Ecclesiastes 8:17), of the nothingness of man when death is thought of as ending all things (<sup>2093</sup>Ecclesiastes 9:3-6), of the wisdom of enjoying life while we may (<sup>2097</sup>Ecclesiastes 9:7-10), of the evils which affect nations or individual man (<sup>2091</sup>Ecclesiastes 9:11, 12). The wide experience of the Preacher suggests sharp and pointed sayings as to these evils (<sup>2105</sup>Ecclesiastes 10:1-20), each true and weighty in itself, but not leading him on to any firmer standing-ground or clearer solution of the problems which oppress him. It is here that the traces of plan and method in the book seem most to fail us. Consciously or unconsciously the writer teaches us how clear an insight into the follies and sins of mankind may coexist with doubt and uncertainty as to the great ends of life, and give him no help in his pursuit after truth. In <sup>2101</sup>Ecclesiastes 11, however, the progress is more rapid. The tone of the Preacher becomes more that of direct exhortation and he speaks in clearer and higher notes. The conclusions of previous trains of thought are not contradicted, but are placed under a new law and brought into a more harmonious whole. The end of man's life is not to seek enjoyment for him self only, but to do good to others, regardless of the uncertainties or disappointments that may attend his efforts (<sup>2108</sup>Ecclesiastes 11:1-4). His wisdom is to remember that there are things which he cannot know, problems which he cannot solve (<sup>2105</sup>Ecclesiastes 11:5), and to enjoy, in the brightness of his youth, whatever blessings God bestows on him (<sup>2109</sup>Ecclesiastes 11:9). But beyond all these there lie the days of darkness, of failing powers and incapacity for enjoyment; and the joy of youth, though it is not to be crushed, is yet to be tempered by the thought that it cannot last forever, and that it too is subject to God's law of retribution (<sup>2109</sup>Ecclesiastes 11:9, 10). The secret of a true life is that a man should consecrate the vigor of his youth to God (<sup>2109</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:1). It is well to do this before the night comes, before the slow decay of age benumbs all the faculties of sense (<sup>2112</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:2, 6), before the spirit returns to God who gave it. The thought of that end rings out, once more the knell of the nothingness of all things earthly (<sup>2128</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:8); but it leads also to "the conclusion of the whole matter," to that to which all trains of thought and all the experiences of life had been leading the seeker after wisdom, that "to fear God and keep his commandments" was the highest good attainable; that the righteous judgment of God would in the end fulfill itself and set right all the seeming disorders of the world (<sup>2123</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:13,14). (See two articles on *the plan and structure of the book of Ecclesiastes*, in the *Method. Quart. Rev.* for April and July, 1849, modified

by Dr. M'Clintock from Vaihinger, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* for July, 1848; also an article by Gurlitt in the *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1864, 2).

If one were to indulge conjecture, there would perhaps be some plausibility in the hypothesis that <sup>2113</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:8 had been the original conclusion, and that the epilogue of <sup>2113</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:9-14 had been added, either by another writer, or by the same writer on a subsequent revision. The verses (<sup>2113</sup>Ecclesiastes 12:9-12) have the character of a panegyric designed to give weight to the authority of the teacher. The two that now stand as the conclusion may naturally have originated in the desire to furnish a clue to the perplexities of the book, by stating in a broad intelligible form, not easy to be mistaken, the truth which had before been latent.

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

**V. Commentaries.** — The following is a full list of separate exegetical works on Ecclesiastes (the most important are indicated by an asterisk prefixed): Olympiodorus, *Enarratio* (in the *Bibl. Max.* 18:490; Grynaeus, page 953); Origen, *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gall. page 14); Dionysius Alex. *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 1:14; *Append. to Bibl. Patr.* Gall.), Gregory Thaum. *Metaphrasis* (in *Opp.* page 77); Gregory Nyssen. *Conciones* (in *Opp.* 1:373); Gregory Nazianzen, *Metaphrasis* (in *Opp. Spur.* 1:874), OEcumenius, *Catena* (in Gr., Verona, 1532); Jerome, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 3:383); Salonius, *Explicatio* (in *Bibl. fax. Patr.* page 8); Alcuin, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* 1, 2:410); Rupert, In *Ecclesiastes* (in *Opp.* 1:1118); Hugo, *Homilia* (in *Opp.* 1:53); Honorius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 1); Bonaventura, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 1:309) Latif, **vWlrPæ**(Constpl. n.d. 12mo); Schirwood, *Nota* (Antw. 1523, 4to); Guidacer, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1531, 1540, 4to); Arboreus, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1531, 1537, fol.); Bucer, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1532, 4to); Moring, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1533, 8vo); \*Luther, *Adnotationes* (Wittemb. 1533, 8vo); Borrhauus, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1539, 1564, fol.); Titelmann, *Commentarius* (8vo, Par. 1545, 1549, 1577, 1581; Antw. 1552; Lugd. 1555, 1575); Melancthon, *Enarratio* (Wittemb. 1550, 8vo); Zuingle, *Complanatio* (in *Opp.* 3), Brent, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 8); Cajetanus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1552, fol.); Striegel, *Schoia* (Lpz. 1565, 8vo); Sforno, **vWlrPæ**Ven. 1567, 4to); Galante, **bqčjy tLhæj**(4to, Safet, 1570; Freft. 1681); Sidonius, *Commentaria* (in Germ., Mogunt. 1571, fol.) De Pomis, *Discorso* (Ven. 1572, 8vo); Mercer, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1573, fol.); Taitazak, **āsčy tr/P** (Ven. 1576, 4to); Jaisch, **tl hqd [irwqm;** etc. (Constpl. 1576, fol.); Id., *Commentarius* (Antw. 1589, 4to); Jansen, *Paraphrasis* (Leyd. 1578, fol.); Galicho, **l [irWaKæ l hqç**(Ven. 1578, 4to); Corranus, *Paraphrasis* (Lond. 1579, 1581, 8vo; ed. Scultet, Frankft. 1618, Heidelb; 1619, 8vo); Senan, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1580. 8vo in Engl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1585, 8vo); Manse, *Explicatio* (Flor. 1580, 8Svo; Colon. 1580, 12mo); Lavater, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1584, 8vo); Beza, *Paraphrasis* (Genev. 1588, 1598, 8vo; in Germ., ib. 1599, 8vo); Gifford, *Commentarius* (Land. 1589, 8vo); Strack, *Predigten* (4to, Cassel, 1590; Freft. 1618; Goth. 1663); Slangendorp, *Commentarius* (Hafn. 1590, 8vo); Greenham, *Brief Sum* (in *Works*, page 628); Arepol, **µkj ;bl æ**(Constpl. 1591, 4to); Arvivo, **tl dçd yhæjñi**(Salonia 1597, 4to); Baruch ben-Baruch, **µda; t/dl ]t hLæ**(Vaen. 1599, fol.); Alscheich, **µybæf**

pyræD](Ven. 1601, 4to); Leuchter, Erklrdung (Frkft. 1603, 1611, 4to); Broughton, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1605, 4to); Lorinus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1606, 4to); Bardin, with various titles (in French, Par. 1609, 12mo; 1632, 8vo; in Germ., Guelf. 1662, 8vo); Fay, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1607, 8vo); Osorius, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1611, 8vo); Amama, *Notae* (in the *Crit. Sacri*); Sanchez, *Commentarius* (Barcin. 1619, 4to); \*De Pineda, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1620, fol.); Ferdinand, *Commentarius* (Romans 1621, fol.); Granger, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1621, 4to); Egard, *Expositio* (Hamb. 1622, 4to); Pemble, *Exposition* (Lond. 1628, 4to); Dieterich, Predigen (fol., Ulm., 1632, 1655; Nurnb. 1665); Drusius, *Annotationes* (Amsterd. 1635, 4to); Guillebert, *Paraphrasis* (Paris, 16351, 1642, 8vo); A Lapide, *In Ecclesiastes* (Antw. 1638, fol.); Jermin, *Commentary* (Lond. 1638, fol.); Cartwright, *Metaphrasis* (4to, Amsterd. 1.647; 4th edit. ib. 1663), Trapp, *Commentary* (Lond. 1650, 4to); \*Geier, *Commentarius* (4to, Lpz. 1653; 5th edit. 1730); Mercado, vW r Pæ Amst. 1653, 4to); Cotton, *Exposition* (London, 1654, 8vo); Gorse, *Explication* (in French, Par. 1655, 3 vols. 12mo); Lusitano, j ñ Ē Pi tñ p x; (Ven. 1656, 4to); Leigh, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1657, fol.); Varenius, *Gemma Salomonis* (Rost. 1659, 4to); Werenfels, *Homiliae* (Basle, 1666, 4to); \*Reynolds, *Annotations* (Lond. 1669, 8vo; in "Assembly's Annot. Works," 4:33; also edit. by Washburn, Lond. 1811); De Sacy, *L'Ecclesiaste* (in his *Sainte Bible*, 14); Anon. *Exposition* (Lond. 1680, 4to); Bossuet, *Libri Salomonis* (Par. 1693, 8vo); Nisbet, *Ex. position* (Edinb. 1694, 4to); \*Smith, *Explicatio* (Amst. 2 vols. 4to, 1699, 1704); Leenhost, *Verklaaring* (Zwolle, 1700, 8vo); Yeard, *Paraphrasis* (Lond. 1701, 8vo); Martianay, *Commentaire* (Par. 1705, 12mo); Seebach, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1705, 8vo); Tietzmann, *Erklärung* (Nurnb. 1705, 4to); David ben-Ahron, vW r Pet I h q o (Prague, 1708, 4to); \*Schmid, *Commentarius* (Strasb. 1709, 4to); Mel, *Predigten* (Frkft. 1711, 4to); Zierold, *Bedeutung*, etc. (Lpz. 1715, 4to); Rambach, *Adnotationes* (Hal. 1720, 8vo); Wachter, *Uebers. m. Anm.* (Memmingen, 1723, 4to); Francke, *Commentarius* (Brandenb. 1724, 4to); Wolle, *Auslegung* (Lpz, 1729, 8vo); Hardouin, *Paraphrase* (Par. 1729, 12mo); Bauer, *Erlauterung* (Lpz. 1732, 4to); Hanssen, *Betrachtungen* (Lub. 1737, 1744, 4to); Lampe, *Adnotationes* (in his *Medit. Exg.* Gronig. 1741, 4to); Michaelis, *Entwickelung* (8vo, Gott. 1751; Brem. 1762); Anon. *Uebers. m. Anm.* (Halle, 1760, 8vo); Peters, *Append. to Crit. Diss.* (Lond. 1760, 8vo); \*Des Voeux, *Essay, Analytical Paraphrase*, etc. (Lond. 1760, 4to; in Germ., Halle, 17 64, 4to); Carmeli, *Spiegamento* (Ven. 1765, 8vo3;

Judetnes, **μϣΥj itwov**](Amst. 1765, 4to); Anon. *Cuheleth, a Poem* (Lond. 1768, 4to); \*Mendelssohn, *D. Buch Koheleth*, etc. (Berlin, 1770, 8vo; 1789, 4to; tr. with notes by Preston, Cambr. 1845, 8vo); De Poix, D'Arras, and De Paris, *L'Ecclesiaste*, etc. (Par. 1771, 12mo); Anon. *Traduct. et Notes* (Par. 1771, 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Uebers. u. Erlaut.* (Lpz. 1772, 8vo); Grotius, *Adnotationes* (Halle, 1777, 4to); Kleuker, *Salomo's Schriften* (Lpz. 1777, 8vo); Zinck, *Commentarius* (Augsb. 1780, 4to); Struensee, *Uebersetzung* (Halberst. 1780, 8vo); Greenway, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1781, 8va); Van der Palm, *Eccl. illustratus* (Leyd. 1784, 8vo); Doderlein, *Uebersetzung* (8vo, Jen. 1784, 1792); Levison, **tl gma]tj kiw** (Hamb. 1784, 8vo); Schiananer, *Auctarium* (Gotting. 1785, 4to); Spohn, *Uebers. m. Anm.* (Lpz. 1785, 8vo); Neunhofer, *Versuch* (Weissenb. 1787, 8vo); Anon. *Paraphrase*, etc. (London, 1787, 8vo); Friedlander, *Abhandlung* (Berl. 1788, 8vo); Bode, *Erklärende Umschreibung* (Quedlinb. 1788, 8vo); Lowe, **tl hqa**(Berl. 1788, 8vo); Gregory II, *Explanatio* (Gr. and Lat., Ven. 1791, fol.); Pacchi, *Parafrassi* (Modena, 1791, 8vo); Zirkel, *Uebers. a. Erklar.* (Wurzb. 1792, 8vo); Boaretti, *Valgarizz.* (Ven. 1792, 8vo); Hodgson, *Translation* (Lond. 1792, 8vo); Schmidt, *Versuch* (Giess. 1794, 8vo); Loanz, **yppe wbkina**(4to, Amst. 1695; Berl. 1775); Goab, *Beyrage*, etc. (Tubing. 1795, 8vo); Nachtigal, *Koheleth* (Halle, 1798, 8vo); Bergst, *Bearbeitung* (1799, 8vo); Jacobi, *Predigerbuch* (Celle, 1799, 8vo); Frankel, **tl hqgrēdē]uyrēba**(Dessau, 1800, 8vo); Middeldorpf, *Symbolae* (Fr. ad V. 1811, 4to); Kelle, *D. Salomon Schriften* (Freib. 1815, 8vo); Katzenelubogen, **phrbaitkrēa**(Wars. 1815, 4to); \*Umbreit, *Uebers. u. Darstell.* (Gotha, 1818, 8vo; also his *Koheleth scepticus de summo bono*, Gott; 1820, 8vo); Wardlaw, *Lectures* (Lond. 1821, 2 vols. 8vo; new ed. Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 12mo); Holden, *Illustration* (Lond. 1822, 8vo); Kaiser, *Uebers. u. Erlaut.* (Erlang. 1823, 8vo); Henz, *Adumbratio* (Dorpat. 1827, 4to); Anon. *Uebers. u. Erlaut.* (Stuttg. 1827, 8vo); Rosenmuller, *Scholia* (pt. 9, Lips. 1830, 8vo); Heinemann, *Commentar* (Bera. 1831, 8vo); Koster, *Stroph. Uebers.* (Schlesw. 1831, 8vo); Ewald, *Koheleth* (in his *Poet. Bilcher*, 4); \*Knobel, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1836, 8vo); Auerbach, **tl hqarpse**etc. (Bresl. 1837, 8vo); \*Herzfeld, *Uebers. a. Erlaut.* (Braunsch. 1838, 8vo); Noyes, *Notes* (Bost. 1846 [3d ed. 1867], 12mo); Barham, *Ecclesiastes* (in his *Bible revised*, 1); \*Hitzig, *Erklärung* (in the *Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb.*, Lpz. 1847, 8vo); Hamilton, *Lectures* (Lond. 1851, 12mo); \*Stuart, *Commentary* (N.Y. 1851; Andover, 1862, 12mo); Elster, *Commentar* (Gotting. 1855, 8vo); Morgan, *Metrical Paraphrase*

(Lond. 1856, 4to); Macdonald, *Explanation* (N.Y. 1856, 8vo); Weiss, *Exposition* (Lond. 1856, 12mo); Plungian, *hmbσ] apK*, (Wilna, 1857, 8vo); Wangenheim, *Auslegung* (Berlin, 1858, 8vo); \*Vaihinger, *Uebersetz. u. Erklar.* (Stuttg. 1858, 8vo; his art. on the subject in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1848, was translated in the *Meth. Quart. Review*, April and July, 1849); Rosenthal, *tl hqot L6æ* etc. (Prague, 1858, 8vo); Buchanan, *Commentary* (Glasg. 1859, 8vo); Bridges, *Exposition* (London, 1859, 8vo); \*Hengstenberg, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1859, 8vo; tr. in Clarke's Library, Edinb. 1860, 8vo; also Phila. 1860, 8vo)\* Hahn, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1860, 8vo); Bohl, *De Araismis Koheleth* (Erlang. 1860, 8vo); \*Ginsburg, *Cohleth translated with a Commentary* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Diedrich, *Erlauterung* (Neu-Rup. 1865, 8vo); Castelli, *Tradotto e note* (Pisa, 1866, 8vo); Young, *Commentary* (Phila. 1866, 8vo). Others are embraced in the Rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Moses Frankfurter (q.v.). For those in general commentaries, *SEE COMMENTARY*.

## Ecclesiastic, Ecclesiastical

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

## Ecclesiastical History

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

**I.** *Idea and Scope of Ecclesiastical History*, — The title *Ecclesiastical History* (*Historic Ecclesiastica*) was used by all the older writers on this branch of science. German writers began the use, in its stead, of the title *Church History* (*Kirchengeschichte*), which has of late been adopted also by most English writers. Its idea and limits depend on the idea which is formed of the Church (*ecclesia*). *SEE CHURCH*.



**1.** If the Church be regarded as a divine institution, existing in all the ages before Christ as well as since, then the field of Church history reaches from the beginnings of the history of the first divine covenant with man down to the present time. It would then be divided into *Biblical Church History* and *Ecclesiastical History*, or simply *Church History*. Biblical Church history, again, could be divided into O.T. and N.T. The entire field of Church history, in its widest sense, would thus be, I. Old Testament Church history. II. New Testament Church History, including (1) the life of Christ; (2) the planting of Christianity by the apostles. (3). Ecclesiastical history, beginning at the close of the canon, and extending to the present time (see Alexander, *Notes on N.T. Literature and Ecclesiastical History*, N.Y. 1867, page 156 sq.; Stanley, *Eastern Church*, Introduction).

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

and Training of Christianity by the Apostles;" while his great *Church History* continues the development after the apostolic age. Nevertheless, in treating of "Church Discipline and Constitution," he is compelled to go back to the apostolic age. Dr. Schaff makes "the Church under the Apostles" the first division of his *History of the Christian Church*, and gives the relations of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism in chapter 1, as "Preparations for Christianity." Hinds (*History of the Christian Church, 1st Division, Encycl. Metropolitana*) treats in an Introduction of the religion of Jews, Gentiles, and Samaritans, and then makes part 1 the Ministry of Christ; part 2, the Apostolic Age; part 3, Age of the Apostolical Fathers.

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

**II. Method of Church History.** — The order and arrangement of the material have varied greatly at different periods. The earliest writers (e.g. Eusebius) wrote generally without scientific method, and their arrangement was arbitrary and fortuitous. In the Church of the Middle Ages history was little studied, and what little was written was put in the form of simple chronicles. The first application of method was really made in the Magdeburg Centuries, projected by Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1559-1574).

**SEE CENTURIES.** The history is divided into centuries, with a topical arrangement under each century of sixteen heads as rubrics, viz.:

1. General view;
2. Extent of the Church;
3. Its external condition;
4. Doctrines;
5. Heresies;
6. Rites;
7. Polity;
8. Schisms;
9. Councils;
10. Bishops and doctors;
11. Heretics;
12. Martyrs;
13. Miracles;
14. Jews;
15. Other religions;
16. Political changes affecting the condition of the Church.

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

1. State of literature and science;
2. Government of the Church;
3. Theology;
4. Rites and ceremonies;
5. Heresies and schisms.

The later historians divide the whole history into periods, determined by great events, and then arrange the material under each period by topics or rubrics. Each writer, of course, frames his periods according to his own views of the great epochal events of history, but most of them make three great periods-ancient, mediaeval, and modern, the first beginning with the day of Pentecost; the second with Gregory the Great, A.D. 590 (acc. to others, with Constantine, 306 or 311, or the fall of the West Roman

empire, 476, or Charlemagne, 800); the third with the Reformation, 1517. Perhaps the best modern division is that of Schaff, who proposes nine periods, viz., three ancient, three mediaeval, three modern, viz.:

- I.** The Apostolic Church, A.D. 1-100.
- II.** The Church persecuted as a sect, to Constantine, the first Christian emperor, A.D. 100-311.
- III.** The Church in union with the Graeco-Roman empire, and amid the storms of the great migration, to pope Gregory I, A.D. 311-590.
- IV.** The Church planted' among the Germanic nations, to Hildebrand, A.D. 590-1049.
- V.** The Church under the papal hierarchy and the scholastic theology, to Boniface VIII, A.D. 1049-1294.
- VI.** The decay of mediaeval Catholicism, and the preparatory movements of Protestantism, A.D. 1294-1517.
- VII.** The evangelical reformation and the Roman Catholic reaction, A.D. 1517-1600.
- VIII.** The age of polemic orthodoxy and exclusive confessionism, A.D. 1600-1750.
- IX.** The spread of infidelity and the revival of Christianity in Europe and America, from 1750 to the present time (*Ch. Hist.* 1:14).

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

theoretical consistency and of its practical efficiency and usefulness, and, at the same time, a convenient means of keeping this and other parts of universal history in mutual connection and agreement with each other." See also Baur, *Epochen d. kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung* (Tubingen, 1852).

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

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

Middle Ages, and of the Reformers and their opponents for the 16th century, are the richest mines for the historian. They give history in its birth and actual movement; but they must be carefully sifted and weighed: especially the controversial writings, where fact is generally more or less adulterated with party spirit, heretical and orthodox" (Schaff, *Church History*, volume 1, § 3).

## V. Literature. —

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

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

**3. The Latin Church before the Reformation** was long content with translations and extracts from Eusebius and his continuators, and but one work of consequence was produced during the Middle Ages. (4.) *The Roman Church after the Reformation.* At the head of Roman writers in Church history stands cardinal Baronius (1607), whose *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Rome, 1588 sq., 12 vols. fol.) come down to the year 1188. They were continued, though with less ability, by Raynaldus, Bzovius, Spondanus, and very recently, from the year 1572, by Theiner (Rome, 1853 sq., fol.). The *Annales* were designed as a refutation of the Magdeburg Centuries ( *SEE CENTURIES* ), and were refuted in part not only by several Protestant writers, but also by Roman scholars, e.g. by Pagi. The work of Natalis Alexander (1724), *Historia Ecclesiastica V. et*

*N.T.* (Par. 1699 sq., 8 vols. fol.; Bingii. 1785-91, 20 vols.), is Gallican, learned, and, on the whole, a very valuable work. Fleury (*Histoire Ecclesiastique*, Par. 1691-1720, 20C vols. 4to) commends himself by mildness of spirit, fluency of style, and copiousness of material. Bossuet (1704) wrote in a very elegant style a history of the world: *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle depuis le commencement du monde jusque l'empire de Charlemagne* (Paris, 1681). Tillemont (1698) compiled, almost entirely in the words of the original authorities, his *Memoires pour servir a l'histoire ecclesiastique des six premiers siecles* (Paris, 1693 sq., 4to), which is the most thorough of all the French Church histories. The first comprehensive work in Roman Catholic Germany was commenced by count Stolberg, *Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi* (Hamburg, 1806-1818, 8vo). The 15 volumes which he completed bring the history down to the year 430. The work is very copious, and written with the enthusiasm of a poet, but is not critical. The continuation, by Kerz (volumes 16-38, 8vo, Mentz, 1824-51, to A.D. 1300) and Brischar (volume 39 sq., 8vo), are still inferior. The work of Katerkamp (*Kirchenqeschichte*) (1819-30 to 1073, 4 parts, 8vo) is by far more thorough. Rohrbacher's *Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise* (Par. 1842-48, volume 29, 8vo; a continuation containing the Church history from 1860-1866, by J. Chantrel, Corbeil, 1867) is written from an ultramontane standpoint, and has not made sufficient use of the recent investigations. The best Roman Catholic manuals of Church history are those of Dollinger (*Gesch. d. christl. Kirche*, volume 1, parts 1 and 2, Landshut, 1833-35; *Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch.* volume 1, and part 1 of volume 2, up to the Reformation, Ratisbon, 1836 sq.; 2d edit. 1843; *Kirchengeschichte*, volume 1, part 1, *Heidenthum a. Judenthum*, Ratisbon, 1857; part 2, *Christenthum a. Kirche in der Zeit Ainer Grundlegung*, 1860), Ritter (*Handbuch d. Kirchengesch. Bonn*, 1826-35, 3 vols.; 6th edit., 1856, 2 vols.), and especially Alzog (*Universal geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, Mainz, 1843, 8vo; 8th edit. 2 volumes, 1867-68). Posthumous lectures on Church history by Dr. Mober (died 1838), the greatest Roman Catholic theologian of Germany in the 19th century, were published thirty years after his death by Dr. Gams (*Kirchenyeschichte*, 3 volumes, Ratisbon, 1868). (5.) *Protestant Writers*. The first comprehensive Church history from the Protestant standpoint was compiled by Mathias Flacius (1575), surnamed Illyricus (*Ecclesiastica Historia Novi Testamenti*, usually called *Centuriae Magdeburgenses*, Basil, 1559-74, fol.), assisted by ten other theologians. It followed the centurial arrangement, and treated of 13 centuries in as many folio volumes. It

remained long the standard work of the Lutheran Church, though it is to a certain extent partial and often uncritical ( *SEE CENTURIES* ). Hottinger (1667) published a similar work (from the standpoint of the Swiss Reformed Church), *Historia Ecclesiastica N. Testamenti* (Zurich, 1655-67, 9 volumes) extending to the 16th century, but it is inferior to that of Flacius. A thorough refutation of Baronius was furnished by Spanheim (*Summa Historia Ecclesiasticae*, Lugd. Bat. 1689, 4to). An attempt to free Church history from the fetters of confessionalism was made by J.G. Arnold (in his *Unparteiische Kirch.-und Ketzerhistorie*, 1698-1700, 4 volumes, to 1688), which, however, was often unjust towards the predominant churches through partiality towards the sects. Objective Church history was greatly advanced by Mosheim (1755), a moderate and impartial Lutheran. His *Institutiones historia ecclesiastica antiqua et recentioris* (Helmstadt, 1755, 4to) is, in the English translation of Murdock (N.Y., 1841, 3 volumes, 3d edit.) and McLaine, a favorite textbook in England and America to the present day. Of the two, Murdock's is far the best. The work of Schrockh, *Christliche Kirchengeschichte* (45 volumes, to the end of the 18th century, Leipzig, 1768-1812; the last 2 volumes are by Tzschirner), though leaning towards Rationalism, is very valuable for reference. The principal representative of *Rationalism* among Church historians is Henke, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (Braunschweig, 1788-1823, 9 volumes, 8vo, continued by Vater). The work of Gieseler (1854), *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Bonn, 1824-1857) gives the history as much as possible in the very words of the sources. It is profoundly learned and impartial, but cold and dry. The best English translation of it is by Professor H.B. Smith (New York, 1857 sq.). Neander (1850) is generally considered as the father of *modern* Church history. His aim was to represent Church history as a continuous proof of the divine power of Christianity, and it is therefore prominently the inner side of ecclesiastical events and their religious signification which he unfolds. His *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche* (Hamburg, 1825-52, 11 volumes, 8vo, extending to the council of Basle) has been translated into English by Torrey (Boston, 1847-51, 5 volumes, 8vo). Besides these larger works, Germany has produced a great number of excellent manuals. The most important of these are those of Niedner (1846, new ed. 1866), distinguished for fullness and thought; of Hase (9th edit. 1867, translated by Blumenthal and Wing, New York, 1855, 8vo), distinguished for copiousness combined with conciseness; and Guericke (9th edit. 1867, translated by Shedd, volume 1:1857), who wrote the best



historical work from the old Lutheran standpoint. More a sketch than a manual of Church history is the *Kirchengeschichte* of Schleiermacher, published after his death by Bonnell (Berlin, 1840, 8vo). The manual of Engelhardt, of Erlangen (*Hasdb. d. Kirchengeschichte*, Erlangen, 1832-34, 4 volumes), is an unpretending but valuable arrangement of the subject, as derived from the sources. The manual of Fricke, left incomplete (*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Leipz. 1850, 1 volume), learned but stiff, is a production of the school of Schleiermacher. In Gfrorer's work on ecclesiastical history (*Allgemeine Kirchengeschichte*, 4 volumes, Stuttgart, 1841-46 to 1305, Christianity is treated as the natural product of the time in which it originated. Clerical selfishness, political calculations and intrigues, appear the sole principles of ecclesiastical movements which this author can appreciate or discover. Still, the work is of importance; and those volumes especially which detail the history of the Middle Ages give evidence of original study, and contain much fresh information. The manual of Jacobi, a pupil of Neander (*Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte*, Berlin, 1850, 1 Volume, not completed), breathes the same spirit as that of his teacher. Its tone is elevated; nor is the author content merely to imitate Neander. The prelections of Hagenbach (*Die christl. Kirche der 3 ersten Jahrhunderte*, 2 volumes, Leipz. 1853-55; *D. christl. K. vom 7<sup>ten</sup> bis zum 15<sup>ten</sup> Jahrhunderte*, Leipz. 1860-61), originally delivered to an educated audience, are somewhat diffuse, but clear and attractive. They breathe throughout a warm Christian spirit, nor is the judgment of the lecturer warped by narrow sectarian prejudices. The works by J.A. Kurtz (*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Mitau, 1842, 5th ed. 1863; Engl. transl. in 2 Volumes, Philadelphia, 1860; *Handbuch der allgem. Kirchengesch.* — volume 1, in 3 parts, Mitau, 1853-54, volume 2, part 1, 1856) belong among the best productions of the Lutheran school. To the same school belong the manuals of W.B. Lindner (*Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte*, Leipz. 1847-54) and H. Schmid (*Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte*, Nordlingen, 1851). The manual of Ebrard (*Handbuch der christl. K.-u. Dogmengesch.* Erlangen, 1865-66, 4 volumes) is written from the standpoint of the United Evangelical Church, as is also, the work of Prof. F.A. Hasse (*Kirchengesch.* Leipz. 1864-65, 3 volumes), published after the author's death by A. K6obler. The works published by F.C. Baur, the founder of the Tubingen school on the Church history of the first six centuries (*Das Christenthum u.d. christl. K. der drei ersten Jahrh.* Tub. 1853, 3d ed. 1863, and *Die christl. K. des 4-6 Jahrh.* Tub. 1859, 2d ed. 1863), were after his death completed, so as to form a continuous and

complete Church history, by the publication of three volumes, treating severally of the Church history of the Middle Ages, of the time from the Reformation to the end of the 18th century, and of the 19th century. The five volumes appeared together, under the title *Geschichte d. christ. Kirche* (Tubingen, 1863-64, 5 volumes). A Church history in biographies was published by F. Bohringer (*Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen*, Zurich, 1842-58).

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

*Universelle de l'Eglise (Chretienne)*, Strasburg, 1829, 2 volumes, 2d edit. Paris, 1838, 4 vols.).

In addition to the above works, which (unless the contrary is specially mentioned) embrace the whole history of the Christian Church, there is a very copious literature on special periods. The works treating of the primitive Church have been given in the article on the APOSTOLIC AGE *SEE APOSTOLIC AGE*. An able work on the history of the first three centuries has been published by Ed. de Pressense (*Histoire des trois premiers siecles*, Paris, 1858, 2 volumes); also handbooks of modern Church history, by Dr. Nippold (Elberfeld, 1867) and Hagenbach (1865). For the ample literature on the period of the Reformation, see the article REFORMATION *SEE REFORMATION*. The literature on branches of ecclesiastical history, such as history of heresies, councils, particular religious denominations, popes, saints, countries, monasticism, crusades, etc., and that on prominent men of Church history, is given in the special articles treating of those subjects. *Tables of Church history*, presenting in parallel columns the various departments of history, have been compiled in Germany by Vater (Halle, 6th ed. 1833), Danz (Jena, 1838), Lange (Jena, 1841), Douay (Leipzig, 1841), Uhlemann (to the Reformation, 2d edit. Berlin, 1865); in England, by Riddle (*Ecclesiastical Chronology*, London, 1840); in America, by H.B. Smith (*Hist. of the Ch. of Christ in chronol. Tables*, New York, 1859), which work has considerably improved the plan of all its predecessors, and, in fact, is the most thorough and complete work of the kind extant. Special dictionaries of Church history were compiled by W.D. Fuhrmann (*Handwörterbuch der christl. Religions-u. Kirchengesch.* Halle, 1826-29, 3 volumes) and Neudecker (*Allgem. Lex. der Religions-u. christl. Kirchengesch.* Weimar, 1834-37, 5 volumes). Periodicals specially devoted to ecclesiastical history have been published by Stoudlin, Tzschirner, and Vater (*Magazin für Religions-u. Kirchengesch.*, by Staudlin, 4 volumes, Hanover, 1802-5; *Archiv für alte u. neue Kirchengesch.* by Staudlin u. Tzschirner, 1813-1822, 5 volumes; *Kirchenhist. Archiv*, by Staudlin, Tzschirner, u. Vater, 4 vols. Halle, 1823-26); by Ilgen, Niedner, and Kahnis (*Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie*, Leipzig, 1832-1868; established by Ilgen; since 1845, by Niedner; since 1867 by Kahnis); by Kist and Royaards (*Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis*, Leyden, 1829 sq.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 7:622; Hagenbach; *Theol. Encyklop.* page 212 sq.; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:130; *Christian Remembrancer*, 43:62; Jortin, *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*;

*Princeton Rev.* 26:300; 29:636; Stanley, *Eastern Church (Introduction on the Study of Church History)*; Dowling, *Introduction to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History attempted in an Account of the Progress, and a short Notice of the Sources, of the History of the Church* (Lond. 1838, 8vo).

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

*Is any form of Church polity divinely ordained?* Perhaps the conclusion on this point most generally adopted at the present day is that, while certain fundamental principles of Church government are laid down in the N.T., no specific form of polity is there enjoined. Compare ~~400~~ Matthew 20:20-28, with ~~405~~ Mark 10:35-45, and ~~420~~ Matthew 23:1-11. These passages clearly prohibit all arbitrary rule in the Church, and are utterly inconsistent with hierarchical assumptions; there is "but one Master, and all are brethren." The doctrine of these passages is that the members of the Church are on one level in presence of Christ the Head. We gather some elements of polity from the practice of the apostles as recorded in their acts and writings. This polity is not presented as legislative enactments, but simply as facts, showing how the apostles acted in given cases. In the first account we find the Church composed of the apostles and other disciples, and then of the apostles and "the multitudes of them that believed." Hence it appears that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole body, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them (Neander, *Planting and Training*, page 32). The Gospel is designed to extend to every climate, in every age, under every variety of race, of national life and character, and

of civil institutions; accordingly, its settled, fundamental, necessary rules are few and simple; it establishes principles rather than rules; the very regulations which the apostles made were in many instances of local, temporary use only.

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

us by the pure word of God" (Calvin, 4:1), and traces this form of government in the early Church until its subversion by the papal tyranny" (Calvin, chapter 5). In substance Calvin asserted the following principles:

- 1.** That it is unwarrantable and unlawful to introduce into the government and worship of the Church anything which has not the positive sanction of Scripture.
- 2.** That the Church, though it consists properly and primarily only of the elect or of believers, and though, therefore, visibility and organization are not *essential*, as Papists allege they are, to its existence, is under a positive obligation to be organized, if possible, as a visible society, and to be organized in all things, so far as possible — its office-bearers, ordinances, worship, and general administration and arrangements — in accordance with what is prescribed or indicated upon these points in the New Testament.
- 3.** That the fundamental principles, or leading features of what is usually called Presbyterian Church government, are indicated with sufficient clearness in the New Testament, as permanently binding upon the Church.
- 4.** That the Church should be altogether free and independent of civil control, and should conduct its own distinct and independent government by presbyters and synods, while the civil power is called upon to afford it protection and support.
- 5.** That human laws, whether about civil or ecclesiastical things, and whether proceeding from civil or ecclesiastical authorities, do not, *per se* — i.e., irrespective of their being sanctioned by the authority of God — impose an obligation upon the conscience. Calvin professed to find all these principles more or less clearly taught in Scripture (*B. and F. Ev. Rev.* April, 1860, page 464). On this principle Tulloch remarks (*Leaders of the Reformation*, page 179 sq.) that Calvin went too far in asserting that Presbyterianism "is the form of the divine kingdom presented in Scripture." "Presbyterianism became the peculiar Church order of a free Protestantism. It rested, beyond doubt, on a true divine order, else it never could have attained this historical success. But it not merely asserted itself to be wise and conformable to Scripture, and therefore divine, but it claimed the direct impress of a divine right for all its details and applications. This gave it strength and influence in a rude and uncritical age, but it planted in it from the first an element of corruption. The great conception which it

embodied was impaired at the root by being fixed in a stagnant and inflexible system, which became identified with the conception as not only equally but specially divine" (page 181). "But were not these 'elements,' some will say, really Biblical? Did not Calvin establish his Church polity and Church discipline upon Scripture? and is not this a warrantable course? Assuredly not, in the spirit in which he did it. The fundamental source of the mistake is here. The Christian Scriptures are a revelation of divine truth, and not a revelation of Church polity. They not only do not lay down the outline of such a polity, but they do not even give the adequate and conclusive hints of one; and for the best of all reasons, that it would have been entirely contrary to the spirit of Christianity to have done so; and because, in point of fact, the conditions of human progress do not admit of the imposition of any unvarying system of government, ecclesiastical or civil. The system adapts itself to the life, everywhere expands with it, or narrows with it, but is nowhere in any particular form the absolute condition of life. A definite outline of Church polity, therefore, or a definite code of social ethics, is nowhere given in the New Testament, and the spirit of it is entirely hostile to the absolute assertion of either the one or the other" (pages 182, 183). Dr. Tulloch, however, goes too far himself in saying that "Presbyterianism not merely asserted itself to be wise and conformable to Scripture, and therefore divine, but it claimed the direct impress of a divine right for all its details and applications.' This statement is untrue. There may be differences of opinion among Presbyterians as to the extent to which a divine right should be claimed for the subordinate features of the system, and some, no doubt, have gone to an extreme in the extent of their claims; but no Presbyterians of eminence have ever claimed 'the direct impress of a divine right for all the details and applications' of their system. They have claimed a divine right, or Scripture sanction, only for its fundamental principles, its leading features. It is these only which they allege are indicated in Scripture in such a way as to be binding upon the Church in all ages. And it is just the same ground that is taken by all the more intelligent and judicious among *jure divino* prelatists and Congregationalists" (*Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, April, 1860). Moreover, Calvin did not "unchurch" ecclesiastical bodies which should not choose to adopt the Presbyterian regimen. He introduced his scheme where he had influence to do so; and he employed all the vigor of his talents in pressing upon distant churches the propriety of regulating, in conformity with his sentiments, their ecclesiastical government. But, at the same time, he says, "Wherever the preaching of the Gospel is heard with reverence, and the

sacraments are not neglected, there at that time there is a church." Speaking of faithful pastors, he describes them to be "those who by the doctrine of Christ lead men to true piety, who properly administer the sacred mysteries, and who preserve and exercise right discipline."

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

- 1.** The Scripture, though the only standard and law of doctrine, is not a rule for discipline.
- 2.** The practice of the apostles, as they acted according to circumstances, is not an invariable rule for the Church.
- 3.** Many things are left indifferent, and may be done without sin, although not expressly directed in Scripture.
- 4.** The Church, like other societies, may make laws for her own government, provided they interfere not with Scripture.
- 5.** Human authority may interpose where the Scripture is silent.
- 6.** Hence the Church may appoint ceremonies within the limits of the Scriptures. Stillingfleet indicates the same view at large in his *Irenicum*: "Those things may be said to be *jure divino* which are not determined one



way or other by any positive law of God, but are left wholly as things lawful to the prudence of men, to determine them in a way agreeable to natural right and the general rules of the Word of God." His conclusion is that the reason or ground of Church government, the *ratio regiminis ecclesiastici*, is of divine right, but that the special mode or system of it is left to human discretion. In other words, it is a thing forever and immutably right that the Church should be under a definite form of government. This is undoubtedly *justum*. In no other way can the peace and unity of the Church be secured. But it is by no means equally indubitable what this form of government must be. The necessary end may be secured under diverse forms, as in the case of civil government. "Though the end of all be the same, yet monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy are in themselves lawful means for attaining the same common end... . So the same reason of Church government may call for an equality in the persons acting as governors of the Church in one place which may call for superiority and subordination in another" (*Irenicum*, page 40 sq., Phila. 1840).

In the modern Church the Romanists and High Episcopalians claim divine right for their system of government. The Roman Catholic doctrine is thus stated (*The Catechism of the Council of Trent*, published by command of pope Pius V, Donovan's translation, Baltimore, n.d., 8vo): "Sitting in that chair in which Peter the prince of the apostles sat to the close of life, the Catholic Church recognizes in his person the most exalted degree of dignity and the full amplitude of jurisdiction — a dignity and a jurisdiction not based on a synodal or other human constitutions, but emanating from no less an authority than God himself. As the successor of St. Peter, and the true and legitimate vicar of Jesus Christ, he therefore presides over the universal Church, the father and governor of all the faithful, of bishops also, and of all other prelates, be their station; rank, or power what they may" (page 222). And (page 82), speaking of the power of the keys, "it is a power not given to all; but to bishops and priests only." The following extracts from bishop Forbes' *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* (London and New York, 1867-8, 2 volumes, 8vo) present a High-Church, Episcopalian view of this subject: "Thus one department of the Church is to be called the *Ecclesia docens*. To the hierarchy, as distinguished from the great body of Christians, is committed the duty of handing down and communicating these truths" (Art. 19, page 268 of volume 1)... . "It having been shown in the preceding article that the *Ecclesia docens* hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and bath authority in controversies of faith,

we come to consider one great channel or organ of that power — the oecumenical council. Given that the Church has this power, by whom or how is it to be exercised? By whom but by the apostolical ministry, who are appointed for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; by those to whom was committed the power of the keys, who had, among: other duties connected with admission to communion, to test the orthodoxy of applicants; by those whose important office it was to hand on the form of sound words which they had received to their successors" (Art. 21 page 288-9 of volume 1)... . "Our Lord is the immediate founder of the hierarchy, because it was he who ordained the apostles bishops when he said to them, 'As my, Father sent me, so send I you; receive the Holy Ghost: go ye into all the world and make disciples of every creature; whatsoever ye shall bind or loose on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven.' These words denote a power without limit; its measure is the wants of humanity, its field of action the world. At the beginning of the Church there was one general episcopate" (Art. 36, page 699 of volume 2). "It is needless to add that the discipline as well as the doctrine of the Church was a purely internal matter, in which the state had no interest nor control... . The power of binding and loosing was the charter of all Church discipline, for it relegated the sanction of the visible Church into the unseen world. If salvation depended, *clave non errante*, upon Church membership, and Church membership, under certain laws, was in the hands of the hierarchy, it placed the control of the Church absolutely in their hands" (Art. 37, pages 728-9 of volume 2). The moderate Episcopalians (including Methodists and Moravians) generally hold that episcopacy is in harmony with Scripture, but is not divinely ordained as essential. For a temperate argument in favor of the conformity of the Episcopal Church organization to the Scriptures and the practice of the early Church, see Browne's *Exposition on the Thirty-nine Articles* (Amer. ed. N.Y. 1865, Art. 23, pages 549-576). Archbishop Whately (*The Kingdom of Christ*; 2d ed. N.Y. 1843, 12mo) says (page 93): "Thus a further confirmation is furnished of the view that has been taken, viz., that it was the plan of the sacred writers to lay down clearly the *principles* on which Christian churches were to be formed and governed, leaving the mode of application of those principles undetermined and discretionary." And again (page 213): "They," i.e., reformers compelled to separate, "have an undoubted right, according to the principles I have been endeavoring to establish, to appoint such orders of Christian ministers, and to allot to each such functions as they judge most conducive to the great ends of the

society; they may assign to the *whole*, or to a *portion* of these, the office of ordaining others as their successors; they may appoint one superintendent of the rest, or several, under the title of patriarch, archbishop, bishop, moderator, or any other that they may prefer; they may make the appointment of them for life or for a limited period by election or by rotation, with a greater or a less extensive jurisdiction." Mr. Wesley (*Works*, 7:284, N.Y. 1835) says: "As to my own judgment, I still believe the episcopal form of Church government to be scriptural and apostolical. 'I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is prescribed in Scripture I do not believe.'" Some Presbyterian writers claim that the Presbyterian polity is the only one divinely ordained. (See especially *The Divine Right of Church Government*, wherein it is proved that the Presbyterian government, by preaching and ruling elders, in sessional, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies, may lay the only lawful claim to a divine right according to the Holy Scriptures, by sundry ministers of Christ within the city of London. With an Appendix, containing extracts from some of the best authors who have written on Church government, N.Y. 1844, 12mo.) The same ground is taken by many of the advocates of the Congregational system (see especially Dexter, *On Congregationalism*, Boston, 1865, 8vo, chapter 2).

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

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

they were ecclesiastical synods that introduced the principle of representative government to mediaeval Europe" (Foulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, 1:11).

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

*Literature.* — Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (*Works*, volume 1); Potter, *Discourse of Church Government* (*Works*, volume 2); Stillingfleet, *Irenicum* (Philad. 1842, 8vo); Watson, *Institutes*, part 4; Litton, *Church of Christ* (Lond. 1851, 8vo); Barrett, *Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church* (Lond. 1854, 12mo); King, *Primitive Church* (N.Y. 12mo); Stevens, *Church Polity* (N.Y. 1852, 12mo); Coleman, *Primitive Church*, page 38-50; Wilson, *On Church Government*; Davidson (Congregational), *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament* (Lond. 1854, 12mo); Morris (Bishop), *On Church Polity* (18mo); Fillmore *Ecclesiastical Polity*, *its*

*Forms and Philosophy*; Ripley (Congregational), *Church Polity* (Boston, 1867, 18mo); Garratt, *Inquiry into the Scriptural View of the Constitution of a Christian Church* (Lond. 1848); *New Englander*, August, 1860, art. 6 (Congregational). Leicester A. Sawyer, *Organic Christianity, or the Church of God, saith its Officers and Government, and its Divisions and Variations, both in ancient, mediaeval, and modern Times* (Boston, 1854, 12mo; Congregational).

## Ecclesiasticus

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

**I.** Title. — The original Hebrew title of this book, according to the authority of the Jewish writings and St. Jerome (*Praef. in Libr. Sol.* 9:1242), was מִלְּפִי אֵם *Proverbs*, or, more fully, אַרְיָסָאֵב, [מִלְּפִי] יֵשׁוּעַ בְּנוֹ שִׁירָא *the Proverbs of Jesus, son of Sira*, which was abbreviated, according to a very common practice, into אַרְיָסָאֵב, *Ben-Sira*; קִרְיָסָאֵב *Siruk*, which we find in a few later writers, evidently originated from a desire to imitate the Greek Σιράχ. Hence all the quotations made from this book in the Talmud and Midrashim are under these titles. (Comp. Mishna, *Yadaim*, 3:15; *Chagiga*, page 15; *Midrash Rabba*, page 6, b.; *Tanchuma*, page 69, a, etc.) The Greek MSS. and fathers, however, as well as the prologue to this book, and the printed editions of the Sept., designate it Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιράχ (v.r. Σειράχ and even Σηράχ), *The wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach*, or, by way of abbreviation, Σοφία Ξιράχ, *The wisdom of Sirach*, or simply *Sirach*; also σοφία ἡπανάρετος, or simply ἡ πανάρετος, *The book of all virtues*, because of the excellency and diversity of the wisdom it propounds (Jerome, *l.c.*; comp. Routh, *Reli. Sacr.* 1:278). In the Syriac version the book is entitled *The book of Jesus, the son of Simeon Asiro* (i.e., the bound); and *the same book is called the wisdom of the Son of Asiro*. In many authors it is simply styled *Wisdom* (Orig. in Matthew 13, § 4; compare *Clam. Al. Pad.* 1:8, § 69, 72, etc.), and *Jesus Sirach* (August. ad *Simplic.* 1:20). The name *Ecclesiasticus*, by which it has been called in the Latin Church ever since the second half of the fourth century (Rufinus, *Vers.*; Orig. *Hom. in* <sup>ⲉⲓⲡⲏⲃ</sup> *Numbers* 17:3), and which has been retained in many versions of the Reformers (e.g. the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, and [together with the other title] the

Authorized Version) is derived from the *old Latin version*, adopted by Jerome in the Vulgate, and is explained to mean *church reading-book*. Calmet, however, is of opinion (*Preface*) that this name was given to it because of its resemblance to *Ecclesiastes*. But as this explanation of the title is very vague, it is rightly rejected by Luther, and almost all modern critics. The word, like many others of Greek origin, appears to have been adopted in the African dialect (e.g. Tertull. *De pudic.* c. 22, page 435), and thus it may have been applied naturally in the *Vetus Latina* to a *church reading-book*; and when that translation was adopted by Jerome (*Profe. in Libro Sal. juxta LXX.* 10:404, ed. Migne), the local title became current throughout the West, where the book was most used. The right explanation of the word is given by Rufinus, who remarks that "it does not designate the author of the book, but the character of the writing," as publicly used in the services of the Church (*Comm. in Symb.* § 38). The special application by Rufinus of the general name of the class (*ecclesiastici* as opposed to *canonici*) to the single book may be explained by its wide popularity. Athanasius, for instance, mentions the book (*Ep. Fest. s.f.*) as one of those "framed by the fathers to be read by those who wish to be instructed (*κατηχῆσθαι*) in the word of godliness."

**II. Design and Method.** — The object of this book is to propound the true nature of wisdom, and to set forth the religious and social duties which she teaches us to follow through all the varied stages and vicissitudes of this life, thus exhibiting the practical end of man's existence by reviewing life in all its different bearings and aspects. Wisdom is represented here, as in Proverbs, as the source of human happiness, and the same views of human life, founded on the belief of a recompense, pervade the instructions of this book also, wherein, however, a more matured reflection is perceptible (De Wette's *Einleitung*). It is, in fact, the composition of a philosopher who had deeply studied the fortunes and manners of mankind, and did not hesitate to avail himself of the philosophy of older moralists:

ⲚⲓⲔⲏⲥ Ecclesiastes 12:8–13:23; 15:11–20; 16:26–17:20; 19:6–17; 23:16–27; 26:1–18; 30:1–13; 37:27; 38:15, 24–39:11, etc. (*Ib.*). It abounds in grace, wisdom, and spirit, although sometimes more particular in inculcating principles of politeness than those of virtue (Cellerier, *Introd. a la Lecture des Liv. Saints*). It is not unfrequently marked by considerable beauty and elegance of expression, occasionally rising to the sublimest heights of human eloquence (*Christian Remembrancer*, volume 9). It has been observed of it by Addison (see Horne's *Introd.* volume 4) that "it would be

regarded by our modern wits as one of the most shining tracts of morality that are extant if it appeared under the name of a Confucius, or of any celebrated Grecian philosopher."

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

- 1.** Comprising chapters 1–16:21, describes the nature of wisdom, gives encouragements to submit to it, as well as directions for conducting ourselves in harmony with its teachings;
- 2.** 16:22–23:17, shows God in the creation, the position man occupies with regard to his Maker, gives directions how he is to conduct himself under different circumstances, and how to avoid sin;
- 3.** 24:1–30:24; 33:12–36:16a; 30:25–27, describes wisdom and the law, and the writer's position as to the former, gives proverbs, maxims, and admonitions about the conduct of men in a social point of view;
- 4.** 30:28–33:11; 36:16b–22, describes the wise and just conduct of men, the Lord and his people;

5. 36:23–39:11, instructions and admonitions about social matters;
6. 39:12–42:14, God's creation, and the position man occupies with regard to it;
7. 42:11-1, 26, the praise of the Lord, how he had glorified himself in the works of nature, and in the celebrated ancestors of the Jewish people. Thereupon follows an epilogue, chapter 1:27-29, in which the author gives his name, and declares those happy who will ponder over the contents of this book, and act according to it; as well as an appendix, chapter 51:1-30, praising the Lord for deliverance from danger, describing how the writer has successfully followed the paths of wisdom from his very youth, and calling upon the uneducated to get the precious treasures of wisdom. *SEE WISDOM PERSONIFIED.*

**III.** *Its Unity.* — The peculiar difficulties connected *both* with the plan of the book and the present deranged condition of its text will have prepared the reader for the assertions made by some that there is no unity at all in the composition of this book, and that it is, in fact, a compilation of divers national sayings, from various sources, belonging to different ages (see Davidson, in Horne's *Introd.* 2:1013 sq.). Encouragement is sought for these assertions from the statement in the spurious prologue of this book, οὐμόνον τὰ ἐτέρων τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συνετῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπαφθέγματα συνήγαγεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδιὰ τινα ἀπεφθέγγετο, as well as from the remark of St. Jerome: "Quorum priorem [πανάρητον Jesu filii Sirach librum] Hebraicum reperi, non *Ecclesiasticum* ut apud Latinos, sed *Parabolas* praenotatum, cui juncti erant *Ecclesiastes* et *Canticum Cantorum*, ut similitudinem Salomonis non solum librorum numero, sed etiam materiaram genere cosequaret" (*Praef. in Libr. Solom.*), which seems to imply that the book of Ben-Sira was intended to answer to all the three reputed works of Solomon. So also Luther. Eichhorn can see in it three different books: *the first* book consists of chapters 1–23, comprising desultory remarks upon life and morals, and is divisible into two sections, viz. (a) 1–9, and (b) 33; *the second* book comprises 24–42. 14, begins with a vivid description of wisdom whereupon follow remarks and maxims without any order; and *the third* book, comprising 42:15-1, 24, is the only portion of Sirach carefully worked out, and contains praise of God and the noble ancestors of the Hebrews (Einleitung in *d. Ap.* page 50, etc.). Ewald, again, assures us that Ben-Sira made two older works on Proverbs the basis of his book, so that his merit chiefly consists in arranging those works



and supplementing them. The first of these two books originated in the fourth century before Christ, extends from chapter 1 to 16:21, and contains the most simple proverbs, written with great calmness. The second book originated in the third century before Christ, extends from 16:22, to 36:22, and displays the excitement of passions as well as some penetrating observations, and has been greatly misplaced in its parts, which Ewald rearranges. The *third* book, which is the genuine work of Ben-Sira, extends from 36:23, to 51:30, with the exception of the song of praise contained in 39:12-35, which belongs to the author of the second work (*Geschichte d. V. Isr.* 4:300, etc.; *Jahrb.* 3:131, etc.). These must suffice as specimens of the opinions entertained by some respecting the unity of this book. Against this, however, is to be urged — 1. That the difference in form and contents of some of the constituent parts by no means precludes the unity of the whole, seeing that the writer brought to the illustration of his design the experience of a long life, spent both in study and traveling. 2. That this is evidently the work of the author's life, and was written by him at different periods. 3. That the same design and spirit pervade the whole, as shown in the foregoing section; and, 4. That the abruptness of some portions of it is to be traced to the Eastern style of composition, and more especially to the present deranged state of the Greek translation.

**IV. Author and Date.** — This is the only apocryphal book the author of which is known. The writer tells us himself that his name is Jesus (Ἰησοῦς, [Wvy] [Wvwy] i.e., *Jeshua*), the son (*Sirach*, and that he is of Jerusalem (1:27). Here, therefore, we have the production of a Palestinian Jew. The conjectures which have been made to fill up this short notice are either unwarranted (e.g. that he was a physician, from 38:1-15) or absolutely improbable. There is no evidence to show that he was of priestly descent; and the similarity of names is scarcely a plausible excuse for confounding him with the Hellenizing high-priest Jason (2 Macc. 4:7-11; Georg. Sync. *Chronogr.* page 276). In the Talmud, the name of Ben-Sira (arysÆB, for which qWrys is a late error, Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* page 311) occurs in several places as the author of proverbial sayings which in part are parallel to sentences in Ecclesiasticus, but nothing is said as to his date or person, and the tradition which ascribes the authorship of the book to Eliezer (B.C. 260) is without any adequate foundation (Jost, *ib.*; yet see note 1). The Palestinian origin of the author is, however, substantiated by internal evidence, e.g. 24:10 sq. For the various speculations advanced about the personal character, acquirements, and position of the author, we must refer

to the article JESUS, SON OF SIRACH *SEE JESUS, SON OF SIRACH*. That the book should have been ascribed by the Latin Church to Solomon, notwithstanding this plain declaration of the book itself, the discreditable terms in which Solomon is spoken of, the reference to Solomon's successors, to prophets and other great men who lived before and after the Babylonish captivity, the mention of the twelve minor prophets (49:10), the citation from the prophet Malachi (comp. 48:10, with ~~3006~~ Malachi 4:6), and the description of the high-priest Simon (chapter 1), only shows what the fathers can do.

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

description of the high-priest, would ever think, with his national traditions before him, of applying it to any one else but the Simon, unless he were *distinctly told* that it was intended for another Simon. These considerations, therefore, show that Ben-Sira's life-like description refers to Simon 1. Now as Simon 1 died B.C. cir. 300, Ben-Sira must have written his work not earlier than 290-280, as chapter 1 implies that this high-priest was dead. (See also *infra*, section 6).

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

<i>Ben-Sira.</i>	<i>Talmud and Midrashim.</i>
Chapter 3:20	Chagiga, 13; Bereshith Rab. 10.
Chapter 4	Sanhed. 10:100; Yebamoth, 63, b; Erub. 65, a.
Chapter 7:34	Derek Erets, 19, c. 4.
Chapter 9:8	Sanhed. 100, b; Yebamoth, 63.
Chapter 9:12 (Syriac)	Aboth, 1:5.
Chapter 11:27	Je. Berach. 29, a; Nazir, 18, a; Beresh. Rab. 78, b.
Chapter 11:27	Sanhed. 100.
Chapter 13:15	Baba Kama, 92, b.
Chapter 13:25	Bereshith Rabba, 82.
Chapter 13:31	Bereshith Rabba, 64, b.
Chapter 14:11	Erubin, 54, a.
Chapter 14:17	Erubin, 71.
Chapter 15:8	Pesachim, 66; Erubin, 55, a.
Chapter 18:23	Tanchuma Vayikra, 41, b.
Chapter 25:3, 4	Pesachim, 113.

Chapter 25:13	Sabbath, 11, <i>a</i> .
Chapter 26:1	Sanhed. 100; Yebamoth, 63, <i>b</i> .
Chapter 26:20	Nida, 70.
Chapter 27:9	Baba Kama, 92, <i>b</i> .
Chapter 28:14	Vayikra Rab. 153, <i>a</i> .
Chapter 30:21	Sanhed. 100, <i>b</i> .
Chapter 30:25	Yebamoth, 63, <i>b</i> .
Chapter 38:1	Sanhed. 41; Taanith, 9, <i>a</i> ; Shemoth. R, 106, <i>b</i> .
Chapter 38:4, 8	Beresh. Rab. S, <i>a</i> ; Yalkut Job, 148.
Chapter 38:16-23	Moed Katon, 27.
Chapter 40:28	Betza. 32, <i>b</i> ; Yalkut Job, 149.
Chapter 42:9, 10	Sanhedrin, 100, <i>b</i> .

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

Almost all of these quotations are in *Hebrew*, though the works in which they are found are in *Aramaean*, thus showing beyond doubt that the book of Ben-Sira was written in genuine Hebrew. Besides, some of the blunders in the Greek can only be accounted for from the fact that the original was Hebrew. Thus, for example, in 24:25 we read, "He maketh knowledge to come forth as light, as Gihon in the days of vintage," where the parallelism Γῆνῶν ῥῥῡγαῖ (Genesis 2:13), whereby the *Nile* was designated in later times, which the Sept. also understands by ῥῥῡνῶν (Jeremiah 2:18), shows that ὥς φῶς in the first hemistich originated from the translator's mistaking the Hebrew ῥwayk like a stream, for ryak, like light. Compare also 49:9, which is most unintelligible in the Greek through the translator's mistaking the Hebrew ῡyzb for ῡrzb Bishop Lowth, indeed, went so far as to assert that the translator "seems to have numbered the words, and

exactly to have preserved their order, so that, were it literally and accurately to be retranslated, I have very little doubt that, for the most part, the original diction would be recovered." The learned prelate has actually retranslated chapter 24 into Hebrew (*Hebrew Poet. Lecture 24*, Oxford ed. 1821, page 254). This retranslation is also printed by Fritzsche, who has added some corrections of his own, and who also gives a translation of chapter 1.

**VI.** *The Greek and other Translations of this Book.* — The Greek translation incorporated in the Sept. was made by the grandson of the author (ὁ πάππος μου Ἰησοῦς), who tells us that he came from Palestine into Egypt in his thirty-eighth year, "in the reign of Euergetes" (ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Ε εργέτου βασιλεως). But there were two kings who have borne this name — Euergetes I, son and successor of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, B.C. 247-222, and Euergetes II, i.e., Ptolemy VII, known by the nickname Physcon, the brother of Ptolemy VI, B.C. 145-116, and the question is, which of these two is meant? Now, if Ben-Sira wrote B.C. cir. 290-280, when an old man, and if we take ὁ πάππος μου to mean *great-grandfather*, a sense which it frequently has, and that the translator was born after the death of his illustrious ancestor, his arrival in Egypt in his thirty-eighth year would be B.C. cir. 230, i.e., in the reign of Euergetes I. On the other hand, the manner in which the translator speaks of the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament, and the familiarity which he shows with its language (e.g. 44:16, Ἐνώχ μετετέθη, ~~ἠὲ~~ Genesis 5:24; comp. Linde, ap. Eichhorn, pages 41, 42), is scarcely consistent with a date so early as the middle of the third century. Winer (*Deutr. Sirac. atate*, Erlang. 1832) maintains that Simon the Just is the person referred to, but that it is not necessary to conclude that the author was his contemporary. He thinks that, although the grammatical construction rather requires ἔτει τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ε εργέτου to refer to the age of the monarch's reign, Euergetes the Second was the king in whose reign the translation was made, and that the canon could not have been yet closed under the reign of the first Euergetes, as implied in the preface — "the law, the prophets, and the other books." As there appears to be no special reason for the translator's reference to *his* own age, the date has been taken to allude to that of the reigning Ptolemy by many critics since Eichhorn, e.g. by Bruch, Palfrey, Davidson, Ewald, Fritzsche, etc. The "thirty-eighth year of his reign," although not applicable to the first Euergetes, may refer to the second, if his regency be included. According

to this, which De Wette conceives the most probable hypothesis, the translator would have lived B.C. 130, and the author B.C. 180. But if, with most interpreters, the chronological datum in question refers to the translator's own age, then the grandson of the author was already past middle-age when he came to Egypt; and if his visit took place early in the reign of Ptolemy Physcon, it is quite possible that the book itself was written while the name and person of the last of "the men of the great synagogue" was still familiar to his countrymen. Even if the date of the book be brought somewhat lower than the times of Simon the Just, the importance of the position which that functionary occupied in the history of the Jews would be a sufficient explanation of the distinctness of his portraiture; and the political and social troubles to which the book alludes (2:6, 12; 36, sq.) seem to point to the disorders which marked the transference of Jewish allegiance from Egypt to Syria rather than to the period of prosperous tranquility which was enjoyed during the supremacy of the earlier Ptolemies. On the whole, therefore, we may conclude that the book was probably written B.C. cir. 200, and translated B.C. cir. 140.

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

Complutensian editions is very different. The English version here follows the latter, which is supported by the Latin and Syriac versions against the authority of the Uncial MSS. The extent of the variation may be seen in the following table:

<i>Compl., Lat., Syr., A. V.</i>	<i>Vat., WSS. "A, B, C."</i>
Chapter 30:25	33:13, λαμπρὰ καρδία, κ.τ.λ.
Chapter 31, 32	34, 35.
Chapter 33:16, 17, ἠγγρύπνησα	36:1-16.
Chapter 33:10 sq. ὡς καλαμώμενος	30:25 sq.
Chapter 34, 35	31, 32.
Chapter 36:1-11, φυλάς Ἰακώβ	33:1-13.
Chapter 36:12 sq καὶ κατεκ-	36:17 sq.

### ληρονόμησαμησα

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

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

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

**VII.** Canonicity. — Though this book has been quoted in the Jewish Church as early as B.C. 150 and 100, by Jose ben-Jochanan (Aboth, 1:5) and Simon ben-Shetach (*Nazis*, verse 3), and references to it are dispersed through the Talmud and Midrashim (*aide sup.* section 5), yet these latter declare most distinctly that it is not canonical. Thus *Yadaim*, c. 2, says *the book of Ben-Sira*, and all *the books written from its time and afterwards*,

are not canonical. We also learn from this remark that Ben-Sira is *the oldest* of all apocryphal books, thus confirming the date assigned to it in section 4. Again, the declaration made by R. Akiba, that he who studies uncanonical books will have no portion in the world to come (Mishna, *Sanhed.* 10:1), is explained by the *Jeremiah* Talmud to mean *the books of Ben-Sira and Ben-Laanah* (comp. the Midrash on Coheleth 12:12). It was never included by the Jews among their Scriptures; for though it is quoted in the Talmud, and at times like the Kethubim, yet the study of it was forbidden, and it was classed among "*the outer books*" μὴν ἄγρων that is, probably, those which were not admitted into the Canon (Dukes, Rabb. Blumenlese, page 24 sq.).

Allusions to this book have been supposed to be not unfrequently discernible in the New Testament (compare, especially, Ecclus. 33:13; <B02>Romans 9:21; 11:19; <D29>Luke 12:19, 20; 5:11; <B19>James 1:19, etc.; 24:17, 18; <D18>Matthew 11:28, 29; <B13>John 4:13, 14; 6:35, etc.). The earliest clear coincidence with the contents of the book occurs in the epistle of Barnabas (c. 19 = Ecclus. 4:31; compare *Const. Apost.* 7:11), but in this case the parallelism consists in the thought and not in the words, and there is no mark of quotation. There is no sign of the use of the book in Justin Martyr, which is the more remarkable, as it offers several thoughts congenial to his style. The first distinct quotations occur in Clement of Alexandria; but from the end of the second century the book was much used and cited with respect, and in the same terms as the canonical Scriptures; and its authorship was often assigned to Solomon, from the similarity which it presented to his writings (August. *De Cura pro Mort.* 18). Clement speaks of it continually as *Scripture* (*Pad.* 1:8, § 62; 2:2, § 34; 5, § 46; 8, § 69, etc.), as the work of Solomon (*Strom.* 2:5, § 24), and as the voice of the great Master (παιδαγωγός, *Pad.* 2:10, § 98). Origen cites passages with the same formula as the canonical books (γέγραπται, in Johann. 32, § 14; in *Matthew* 16, § 8), as *Scripture* (*Comm. in Matthew* § 44; in *Ep. ad Romans* 9, § 17, etc.), and as the utterance of "*the divine word*" (c. *Cels.* 8:50). The other writers of the Alexandrine school follow the same practice. Dionysius calls its words "*divine oracles*" (*Frag. de Nat.* 3, page 1258, ed. Migne), and Peter Martyr quotes it as the work of "*the Preacher*" (*Frag.* 1, § 5, page 515, ed. Migne). The passage quoted from Tertullian (*De exhort. cast.* 2, "Sicut scriptum est: *Ecce posui ante te bonum et malum; gustati enim de arbore agnitionis,*" etc.; compare Ecclus. 15:17, Vulg.) is not absolutely conclusive; but Cyprian constantly brings



forward passages from the book as *Scripture* (*De bono pat.* 17; *De mortalitate*, 9, § 13), and as the work of Solomon (Ep. 65:2). The testimony of Augustine sums up briefly the result which follows from these isolated authorities. He quotes the book constantly himself as the work of a *prophet* (*Serm.* 39:1), the word of God (*Sermon* 87:11), "*Scripture*" (*Lib. de Nat.* 33), and that even in controversy (*c. Jul. Pelag.* 5:36); but he expressly notices that it was not in the Hebrew Canon (*De Cura pro Maort.* 18), "though the Church, especially of the West, had received it into authority" (*De Civit.* 17:20; compare *Speculum*, 3:1127, ed. Paris). Jerome, in like manner (*Praef. in Sap. Sir.* § 7), contrasts the book with "the canonical Scriptures" as "doubtful," while they are "sure," and in another place (*Prolog. Galeat.*) he says that it "is not in the Canon," and again (*Prolog. in Libr. Sol.*), that it should be read "for the instruction of the people (plebis), not to support the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines." The book is cited by Hippolytus (Opp. p. 192) and by Eusebius (Opp. 4:21, etc.), but is not quoted by Irenaeus; and it is not contained in the Canon of Melito, Origen, Cyril, Laodicea, Hilary, or Rufinus. **SEE CANON.**

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

conspicuous in the sayings of the later doctors. Life is already imprisoned in' rules: religion is degenerating into ritualism: knowledge has taken refuge in schools (compare Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.* 4:298 sq.). — Kitto, s.v.; Smith, s.v.

**VIII.** Commentaries, etc. — Special exegetical works which have appeared on the whole of this book are the following, of which the chief are designated by an asterisk prefixed: Rabanus Maurus, In *Ecclesiasticuna* (in his *Opp.*); Anon. *Beschreib. u. Uebers.* (in Lorschach's *Archiv*, 2:11 sq.); Alexander, *De libro Ecclus.* (in his *Hist.* <sup>203B</sup> *Ecclesiastes* 3:690); Bengel, *Muthmassliche Quelle*, etc. (in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek*, 7:852-64); De Sacy, *L'Ecclesiastique* (in his *Sainte Bible*, 16); Bossuet, *Liber Ecclus.* (in his *OEuvres*, 22:1 sq.); Couz, *Bemerkungen* (in Henke's *Hus.* 2:177-243); \*Camerarius, *Sententiae J.S.* (Lips. 1570, 8vo); *Sapientia J.S.* (Lips. 1570, 8vo); Striegel, in his *Libri Sapientiae* (Lpz. 15,5, 12mo), page 277 sq.; Drusius, *Ecclus. interpretatus* (Franecker, 1596, 4to); Hoschel, *Sap. Sirachi* (Augsb. 1604, 4to; also in the *Crit. Sacri*, 5); \*a Lapide, *Commentarius* (Antwerp, 1634, 1687, fol.); Stiffer, *Homiliae* (Lips. 1676, 4to); Calmet, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1707, fol.; in Latin, ed. Manse, Wirceb. 1792; 8:351 sq.); \*Arnald, *Crit. Commentary* (Lond. 1748, fol., and often since); Koken, *Das. B. Sirach* (Hildesheim, 1756, 12mo); Teleus, *Disquisitiones* (Hafn. 1779, 8vo); Bauer, *Erlaut. m. Anmerk.* (Bamberg, 1781, 1793, 8vo); Onymus, *Weisheit J.S.* (Wirtzburg, 1788, 8vo); Sonntag, *De Jes. Siracide* (Riga, 1792, 4to); \*Linde, *Sententiae Jes. Sir.* (Danz. 1795, 4to); also *Glaubens a. Sittenlehre Jes. Sir.* (Lpz. 1782, 1795, 8vo); Zange, *Denkspruche Jes. Sir.* (Amst. 1797, 8vo); Feddersen, *Jes. Sir. ubers.* (Anst. 1797, 1827, 8vo); BenSeeb, [*vthy*]tmk]; etc. (8vo, Breslau, 1798; Vienna, 1807, 1818, 1828); <sup>5</sup>Bretschneider, *Lib. Jesu Sirae* (Ratisbon, 1806, 8vo); Gaab, *Diss. exegetica* (Tubing. 1809, 4to); Luther, *Das Buch J.S.* (Lpz. 1815, 1816, 12mo); Anon. *Jes. S. bearbeit.* (Lpz. 1826, 8vo); Howard, *Ecclus. tr. from the Vulg.* (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Anon. *Sirach, ein Spiegel* (Kreuznach, 1829, 8vo); Van Gilse, *Commentatio* (Gran. 1832, 4to); Grimm, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1837, 8vo); Gutmann, *Weisheits-Spruch J.S.* (Altona, 1841, 8vo); Dulk, *arysÆB, rpse* (Warsaw, 1843, 8vo); Stern, *Weisheitsspruche J.S.* (Wien, 1844, 8vo); Hill, *Translation* (in the *Monthly Religious Mag.* Bost. 185253); \*Fritzsche, *Weish. J.S. erklaut u. ubers.* (as part of the *Kurtzge. Exag. Handb. z.d. Apokr.* Lpz. 1860, 8vo); Cassel, *Uebers.* (Berl. 1866, 8vo). See also Rabiger, *Ethice Apoc. V.T.* (Vratislaw, 1838); Bruch, *Weisheits-*

*Lehre der Hebraer* (Strasb. 1851); Geiger, in the *Zeitschr. d. Morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1858, page 536 sq.; Horowitz, *Das Buch Sirach* (Bresl. 1865).  
**SEE APOCRYPHA.**

## Ecclesiology

"a word, of recent use, is the name which has been given in the British Islands to the study of Church architecture and decoration. Besides discriminating the various styles of ecclesiastical architecture, ecclesiology takes account of the ground plan and dimensions of a church; of its orientation, or the deviation of its line from the true east; of its apse, or circular or polygonal east end; of its altar or communion-table, whether fixed or movable, stone or wood; of its reredos, dossel, or altar-screen; of its piscina, or basin and drain for pouring away the water in which the chalice was rinsed, or the priest washed his hands; of the sedilia, or seats for the priest, deacon, and subdeacon, during the celebration of the Eucharist; of the aumbrye, or locker, for the preservation of the communion vessels and elements; of the 'Easter sepulcher,' or recess for the reception of the host from Good Friday till Easter day; of the altar-candlesticks; of the altar-steps; of the altar-rails; of the credence table, or shelf on which to place the communion elements before they were put upon the altar; of the 'misereres,' or elbowed stalls; of seats within and without the chancel walls; of the height of the chancel as compared with the nave; of the chancel arch; of the rood-screen, rood-staircase, rood-door, and roodloft; of the piers or columns; of the triforium or blindstory; of the clerestory; of the windows; of the parvise-turret, or outside turret leading to the parvise; of the roof or groining; of the eagle-desks and lecturns; of the pulpit; of the hour-glass stand, by which the preacher was warned not to weary the patience of the flock; of the reading pew; of the benches, pews, and galleries; of the aisles; of the shrine, fertour, or reliquary; of the benatura, or holy-water stoup; of the corbels, with special reference to the head-dress figured on them; of the pavement; of the belfry; of the baptismal font, with its accessories, the baptistery, the steps, the kneeling-stone, the chrismatory, the cover, and the desk; of the tower, with its lantern, parapet, pinnacles, louvres, windows, buttresses, and bells; of the porch and doors, with their niches and seats; of the parvise, or priest's chamber, above the porch; of the mouldings; of the pinnacle crosses; of the gurgoyles, or rain-spouts; of the church-yard or village cross; of the church-yard yew; of the lych-gate, or corpse-gate, where the corpse was met by the priest; of the crypt; of the confessional; of the hagnioscope, or

opening in the chancel arch through which the elevation of the host might be seen; of the lynchnoscope, or low window in the side wall of the chancel, the use of which is uncertain; of the chest for alms; of the table of the ten commandments; of the church plate; of the faldstool, or litany stool; of the embroidered work; of the images of saints; of the church well; of the sepulchral monuments and brasses, with their inscriptions; of the chapels or sacristies; of the vestry; of the dedication crosses. Ecclesiology has a literature of its own, including a monthly journal, called *The Ecclesiologist*. There are societies for promoting its study, one of which, 'The Ecclesiological, late Cambridge Camden, Society,' has published *A Handbook of English Ecclesiology* (Lond, 1847)."

### Ecdippa

SEE ACHZIB.

### Echard

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

### Echard, Lawrence A.M.,

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

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

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

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

### Eck or Eckius Johannes

(*Johann Mayr von Eck*), one of the most capable and violent of Luther's opponents, was born in Suabia, November 13, 1486, the son of a peasant. He was educated at Heidelberg and Tubingen, and in 1516 was made professor and vicechancellor at Ingolstadt. His intense ambition for literary fame stimulated him to unwearied activity and industry. In 1512 he was made vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt. In 1514 he published *Centuriae vi de Praedestinatione*; and lectured and wrote; on all sorts of subjects from 1514 to 1518. Ranke describes him as follows: "Eck was one of the most eminent scholars of his time, a reputation which he had spared no pains to acquire. He had visited the most celebrated professors in various universities: the Thomist Sustern at Cologne, the Scotists Sumenhard and Scriptoris at Tubingen; he had attended the law lectures of Zasius in Freiburg, those on Greek of Reuchlin, on Latin of Bebel, on cosmography of Reusch. In his twentieth year he began to write and to lecture at Ingolstadt upon Occam and Biel's canon law, on Aristotle's dialectics and physics, the most difficult doctrines of dogmatic theology, and the subtleties of nominalistic morality; he then proceeded to the study of the mystics, whose most curious works had just fallen into his hands: he set himself; as he says, to establish the connection between their doctrines and the Orphicoplatic philosophy, the sources of which are to be sought in Egypt and Arabia, and to discuss the whole in five parts (*Eckii Epistola de rationae studiorum suorum*, in Strobel, *Miscellanea*, 3:97). He was one of those learned men who held that the great questions which had occupied men's minds were essentially settled; who worked exclusively with the analytical faculty and the memory; who were always on the watch to appropriate to themselves a new subject with which to excite attention, to get advancement, and to secure a life of ease and enjoyment. His strongest taste was for disputation, in which he had made a brilliant figure in all the universities we have mentioned, as well as in Heidelberg, Mainz, and Basle: at Freiburg he had early presided over a class (the Bursa zum Pfauen)

where the chief business was practice in disputation; he then took long journeys — for example, to Vienna and Bologna — expressly to dispute there. It is most amusing to see in his letters the satisfaction with which he speaks of his Italian journey: how he was encouraged to undertake it by a papal nuncio; how, before his departure, he was visited by the young markgrave of Brandenburg; the very honorable reception he experienced on his way, in Italy as well as in Germany, from both spiritual and temporal lords, who invited him to their tables; how, when certain young men had ventured to contradict him at one of these dinners, he had confuted them with the utmost ease, and left them filled with astonishment and admiration; and lastly, how, in spite of manifold opposition, he had at last brought the most learned of the learned in Bologna to subscribe to his maxims" (Riederer, *Nachrichten*, 3:47).

With such antecedents, Eck was prepared to take up arms against Luther (as, indeed, he was ready to take up arms against any man). They had been good friends, and Luther sent him his *Theses*. *SEE LUTHER*. Against these, in 1518, Eck wrote animadversions under the title *Obelisci* (given in Loscher, *Vollst. Ref. Act.* 2:333 sq.), which were freely circulated, though the writer declared they were not meant to be published. Eck was at that time inquisitor for Bavaria, and what he said and wrote had great weight in fixing upon a man the reputation of heresy. Carlstadt (q.v.), at Luther's request, replied in 406 theses, in which he assailed both the learning and the orthodoxy of Eck, and very satirically. The controversy ended in a public *Disputation*, to which Carlstadt challenged Eck. According to a letter of Luther, written to Eck November 15, 1518, Luther seems to have cherished the hope of a friendly settlement of the difficulty; but Eck was only puffed up by this tenderness of Luther, and in February, 1519, he printed an outline for the expected disputation, in which he endeavored again to impeach the University of Wittenberg, but more especially Carlstadt and Luther, particularly the latter, as holding heretical doctrines on penitence and on the papal power. Malice only could have inspired Eck here, as Luther had at that very time promised to Miltitz to discontinue the dispute. Luther was, of course, relieved from his promise, and he so declared to the elector Frederick on the 13th of March. He wrote at once a reply to Eck, so unanswerable in all its points, and so full of severity, that Eck could no longer remain in doubt as to the fate which awaited him at Leipzig. Eck's aim was undoubtedly not so much to gain the mastery over Carlstadt as over Luther. He published (February, 1519) thirteen theses,

which he professed himself willing to defend against Luther. They referred chiefly to the doctrine of penitence and absolution, and the thirteenth especially sought to provoke an answer from Luther which should make him liable to the Inquisition for heresy. It read: "*Romanam Ecclesiam non fuisse superiorem aliis Ecclesiis ante tempora Sylvestri, negamus. Sed eum, qui sedem beatissimi Petri habuit et fidem, successorem Petri et Vicarium Christi generalem semper agnovimus.*" Eck here really gained his object.

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

The session opened at Leipsic June 27, 1519, and from that date to July 3 Eck and Carlstadt were the disputants. Eck admitted that the Scriptures were the ultimate rule of doctrine, and maintained a synergistic doctrine as to grace and free-will. Carlstadt supported the doctrine of the impotency of the will, and that good works are from grace alone. The controversy led to no result. "On Monday, the 4th of July, at seven in the morning, Luther

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



Would Gregory of Nazianzen, would the great Basil, not be saved? or would the pope and his satellites drive them out of heaven?' These expressions prove how greatly the omnipotence and exclusive validity of the forms of the Latin Church, and the identity with Christianity which she claimed, were shaken by the fact that, beyond her pale, the ancient Greek Church, which she had herself acknowledged, stood in all the venerable authority of her great teachers. It was now Eck's turn to be hard pressed: he repeated that there had been many heretics in the Greek Church, and that he alluded to them, not to the fathers — a miserable evasion, which did not in the least touch the assertion of his adversary. Eck felt this, and hastened back to the domain of the Latin Church. He particularly insisted that Luther's opinion — that the primacy of Rome was of human institution, and not of divine right was an error of the poor brethren of Lyons, of Wickliffe and Huss; but had been condemned by the popes, and especially by the general councils wherein dwelt the spirit of God, and recently at that of Constance. This new fact was as indisputable as the former. Eck was not satisfied with Luther's declaration that he had nothing to do with the Bohemians, nay, that he condemned their schism; and that he would not be answered out of the collectanea of inquisitors, but out of the Scriptures. The question had now arrived at its most critical and important moment. Did Luther acknowledge the direct influence of the divine Spirit over the Latin Church, and the binding force of the decrees of her councils, or did he not? Did he inwardly adhere to her, or did he not? We must recollect that we are here not far from the frontier of Bohemia; in a land which, in consequence of the aunathena pronounced in Constance, had experienced all the horrors of a long and desolating war, and had placed its glory in the resistance it had offered to the Hussites: at a university founded in opposition to the spirit and doctrine of John Huss: in the face of princes, lords, and commoners, whose fathers had fallen in this struggle; it was said that delegates from the Bohemians, who had anticipated the turn which this conflict must take, were also present. Luther saw the danger of his position. Should he really reject the prevailing notion of the exclusive power of the Roman Church to secure salvation? oppose a council by which John Huss had been condemned to the flames, and perhaps draw down a like fate upon himself? Or should he deny that higher and more comprehensive idea of a Christian church which he had conceived, and in which his whole soul lived and moved? Luther did not waver for a moment. He had the boldness to affirm that, among the articles on which the Council of Constance grounded its condemnation of John

Huss, some were fundamentally Christian and evangelical. The assertion was received with universal astonishment. Duke George, who was present, put his hands to his sides, and, shaking his head, uttered aloud his wonted curse, 'A plague upon it!' Eck now gathered fresh courage. It was hardly possible, he said, that Luther could censure a council, since his grace the elector had expressly forbidden any attack upon councils. Luther reminded him that the Council of Constance had not condemned all the articles of Huss as heretical, and specified some which were likewise to be found in St. Augustine. Eck replied that all were rejected; the sense in which these particular articles were understood was to be deemed heretical; for a council could not err. Luther answered that no council could create a new article of faith; how, then, could it be maintained that no council whatever was subject to error? 'Reverend father,' replied Eck, 'if you believe that a council regularly convoked can err, you are to me as a heathen and a publican' (*Disputatio Excellentissimorum Theologorum Johannis Eccii et D. Martini Lutheri Augustiniani qua Lipsiae caepta fuit iv die Julii ao 1519. Opera Lutheri*, Jena, 1:231). Such were the results of this disputation. It was continued for a time, and opinions more or less conflicting on purgatory, indulgences, and penance were uttered. Eck renewed the interrupted contest with Carlstadt; the reports were sent, after the solemn conclusion, to both universities; but all these measures could lead to nothing further. The main result of the meeting was, that Luther no longer acknowledged the authority of the Roman Church in matters of faith. At first he had only attacked the instructions given to the preachers of indulgences, and the rules of the later schoolmen, but had expressly retained the decretals of the popes; then he had rejected these, but with appeal to the decision of a council; he now emancipated himself from this last remaining human authority also; he recognised none but that of the Scriptures" (Ramake, *History of Reformation*, Austin's transl., book 2, chapter 3).

After the disputation, in which Eck's pride of intellect had been grievously wounded, he wrote (July 23) a letter to the elector of Saxony exhorting him to discourage the pernicious doctrines of his professor, and to cause his books to be burned. Frederick replied with some delay and great moderation, and Carlstadt with bitterness. A bitter controversy followed, in which Melancthon took part, and Eck got the worst of it. In February, 1520, Eck also completed a treatise on the primacy, in which he promises triumphantly and clearly to confute Luther's assertion that "it is not of

divine right." "Observe, reader," says he "and thou shalt see that I keep my word." Nor is his work by any means devoid of learning and, talent. After obtaining a condemnation of Luther from the universities of Louvain and Cologne, Eck went to Rome (1520) to present his book (*De Primatur*) to the pope, and to stir up feeling against Luther. His exhortations animated the enemies of Luther, and they at length prevailed upon the pope to summon a congregation on the subject, which passed sentence of condemnation upon Luther. Leo X indiscreetly appointed Eck as his nuncio for the promulgation of his bull in Germany. Elated by vanity, Eck set out with puerile exultation to inflict, as he thought, a fatal blow on his devoted adversary. In September he caused the bull to be fixed up in public places in Meistsen, Merseburg, and Brandenburg. "Everywhere he contended with force and energy, and on more than one occasion with success. Germany was his usual arena, where the brunt of controversy was almost invariably sustained by him. But in Switzerland his voice was likewise heard; and there, indeed, the papal interests were never upheld by any advocate of talent or distinction except himself and Faber. He was confronted in a long series of combats, during a space of twenty years, with all the chieftains of the Reformation; and, though he was defending what we are wont to consider the feebler cause, he never defended it feebly, or was overthrown with shame." He died Feb. 8, 1543. His works against Luther embrace five volumes (*Opera contra Lutherum*, Augsburg, 1530-35). Besides this, and the work *De Primatu* already mentioned, Eck published *Enchridion Controversiarum* (last edit. Cologne, 1600), *Apologia contra Bucerum* (Ingolstadt, 1543), and others. — Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 4:532; Ranke, *Hist. of Reformation*; D'Aubigne, *Hist. of Reformation*, volume 1; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* book 4, c. 16, section 1, chapter 2, § 9, and chapter 3, § 13; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:626 sq.

### Eckart or Eckhardt

(called *Master Eckart*), a Dominican monk, one of the most profound thinkers of the Middle Ages. Of the time or place of his birth we have no record. He is first mentioned as a teacher at the College of St. James, at Paris. Having gone to Rome, where he received the degree of D.D., he was appointed provincial of Saxony, the appointment being confirmed by a chapter of his order held at Toulouse in 1304. In 1307 he was appointed vicar-general of Bohemia, with power to reform the Dominican convents. We afterwards find him again in Strasburg, preaching in the nunneries, and making acquaintances among the "Brethren of the Free Spirit." Having

preached in Cologne, where archbishop Heinrich had already, in 1322, condemned the Beghards, Eckart, who inclined to them, brought upon himself the displeasure of the Church. Cited before the Inquisition in January, 1327, Eckart disclaimed heretical doctrines and professed his willingness to recant any such that could be found in his teachings. A total recantation, however, being demanded of him, he refused, and in consequence was condemned as a heretic. He appealed to the pope, who, out of 28 points acknowledged by Eckart, condemned 17 as heretical and the remainder as suspicious. Notwithstanding this condemnation, Henry Suso's autobiography, published in 1360, calls him "the holy Master Eckert," and praises his "sweet doctrine." He died in 1329. Copies of his sermons were preserved in numerous monasteries. Eckart has been claimed both by speculative philosophers and orthodox theologians; both by Protestants and Romanists. He is perhaps properly to be considered as the father of the modern mystical pantheism. He upheld the doctrines of the Brethren of the Free Spirit, but yet was free from their practical aberrations, as also from their opposition to the rites of the Church and to moral law. His writings have latterly been collected by Pfeiffer (*Deutsche Mystiker des 14<sup>ten</sup> Jahrh.* 1857, 2d volume); they consist of 110 sermons, 18 treatises, 70 theses, and the *Liber positionum*. Before this, some of his sermons and short treatises, appended to Tauler's collection, Basle, 1521, were the only ones of his writings which were generally accessible.

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

### Eckermann Jacob Christoph Rudolph,

was born September 6, 1754, at Wedendorf, in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. In 1782 he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Kiel, and Danish Church councillor. He died May 6, 1836. He is the author of *Erklärung aller dunklen Stellen des N.T.* (Kiel, 1806-1808, 3 volumes,

8vo): — *Joel metrisch ubersetzt mit einer neuen Erklarung* (Lub. and Leipz. 1786, 8vo): — *Compend. theol. theor. bibl. histor.* (Altona, 1792, 8vo); a German edition of the same work, *Handb. fur das systemat. Studium der Glaubenslehre*, in which he declares that the doctrines of Jesus are only a popular guide to a real adoration of the deity, and that whatever else the New Testament may contain is to be considered true only from an historical point of view (Altona, 1801-2, 4 volumes, 8vo): — *Erinnerung an den unvergagl. u. unschatzb. grossen Werth den Reformat. Luthers* (Altona, 1817, 8vo), besides a number of other works, which have been collected in 6 volumes, 8vo, under the title of *Theologische Beitrage* (Altona, 1790-99), and in two additional vols., *Vermischte Schriften* (ibid. 1799, 1800). — Winer, *Theologische Literatur*; Kitto, *Cyclopaedies*, 1:725; Griasse, *Allgem. Literargeschichte*, 7:872.

## Eclectics

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

Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* 1:228) said: "By philosophy I mean neither the Stoic, nor the Platonic, nor the Epicurean, nor the Aristotelian, but Whatever things have been properly said by each of these sects inculcating justice and devout knowledge — this *whole selection I call philosophy.*" "The sense in which this term is used by Clemens" (of Alexandria), says Mr. Maurice (*Mor. and Metaphys.* <sup>504B</sup> *Philippians* 2:53), "is obvious enough. He did not care for Plato, Aristotle, Pythagoras, as such; far less did he care for the opinions and conflicts of the schools which bore their

names; he found in each hints of precious truths of which he desired to avail himself; he would gather the flowers without asking in what garden they grew, the prickles he would leave for those who had a fancy for them. *Eclecticism*, in this sense, seemed only like another name for catholic wisdom. A man, conscious that everything in nature and art was given for his learning, had a right to suck honey wherever it was to be found; he would find sweetness in it if it was hanging wild on trees and shrubs; he could admire the elaborate architecture of the cells in which it was stored. The Author of all good to man had scattered the gifts, had imparted the skill; to receive them thankfully was an act of homage to him. But once lose the feeling of devotion and gratitude, which belonged so remarkably to Clemens — once let it be fancied that the philosopher was not a mere receiver of treasures which had been provided for him, but an ingenious chemist and compounder of various naturally unsociable ingredients, and the eclectic doctrine would lead to more self-conceit, would be more unreal and heartless than any one of the sectarian elements out of which it was fashioned. It would want the belief and conviction which dwell, with whatever unsuitable companions, even in the narrowest theory. Many of the most vital characteristics of the original dogmas would be effaced under pretense of taking off their rough edges and fitting them into each other. In general the superficialities and formality of each creed would be preserved in the new system; its original and essential characteristics sacrificed" (Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s.v.).

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

## Eclipse

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

No historical notice of an eclipse occurs in the Bible, but there are passages in the prophets which contain manifest allusion to this phenomenon. (Compare Lucan, 1:540 sq.; Virgil, *Georg.* 1:466; Curt. 4:3; *Evang. Nicod.* c. 11.) They describe it in the following terms: "The sun goes down at noon, the earth is darkened in the clear day" (<sup><380B></sup>Amos 8:9), "the day shall be dark" (<sup><380B></sup>Micah 3:6), "the light shall not be clear nor dark" (<sup><384B></sup>Zechariah 14:6), "the sun shall be dark" (<sup><380B></sup>Joel 2:10, 31; 3:15). Some of these notices have been thought to refer to eclipses that occurred about the time of the respective compositions: thus the date of Amos nearly coincides with a total eclipse which occurred February 9, B.C. 784, and was visible at Jerusalem shortly after noon (Hitzig, *Comm. in Proph.*); that of Micah with the eclipse of June 5, B.C. 716, referred to by Dionys. Hal. 2:56, to which same period the latter part of the book of Zechariah has been assigned by some. A passing notice in <sup><385B></sup>Jeremiah 15:9 nearly coincides in date with the eclipse of September 30, B.C. 610, so well known from Herodotus's account (1:74, 103). The Hebrews seem not to have philosophized much on eclipses, which they considered as sensible marks of God's anger (see <sup><380B></sup>Joel 2:10, 31; 3:15; <sup><380B></sup>Job 9:7). Ezekiel (32:7) and Job (36:32) speak more particularly, that God covers the sun with clouds when he deprives the earth of its light by eclipses. These passages, however, are highly figurative, and the language they present may simply be borrowed from the lurid look of the heavenly orbs as seen through a hazy atmosphere. Yet, when we read that "the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood," we can hardly avoid discerning an acquaintance with the appearance of those luminaries while under eclipse. The interruption of the sun's light causes him to appear

black; and the moon, during a total eclipse, exhibits a copper color, or what Scripture intends by a blood color. *SEE ASTRONOMY*. The awe which is naturally inspired by an eclipse in the minds of those who are unacquainted with the cause of it rendered it a token of impending judgment in the prophetic books. *SEE EARTHQUAKE*.

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

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

The darkness ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν of <sup><4275></sup>Matthew 27:45, attending the crucifixion has been similarly attributed to an eclipse. *SEE CRUCIFIXION (OF CHRIST)*. Phlegon of Tralles, indeed, mentions an eclipse of intense darkness, and, beginning at noon, combined, he says, in Bithynia, with an earthquake, which, in the uncertain state of our chronology (see Clinton's *Fasti Romani*, Olymp. 202), more or less nearly synchronizes with the event. Nor was the account without reception in the early Church. See the testimonies to that effect collected by Whiston (*Testimony of Phlegon vindicated*; London, 1732). Origen, however, ad loc. (Latin commentary on Matthew), denied the possibility of such a cause, arguing that by the fixed Paschal reckoning the moon must have been about full, and denying that <sup><4235></sup>Luke 23:45, by the words ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος, means to allege that fact as the cause. The genuineness of this commentary has been impeached, nor is its tenor consistent with Origen *adv. Cels.* page 80; but the argument, unless on such an assumption as that mentioned below, seems decisive, and has ever since been adhered to. He limits πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν to Judaea. Dean Alford (ad loc.), though without stating his reason, prefers the wider interpretation of all the earth's surface on which it would naturally have been day. That Phlegon's darkness, perceived so intense in Tralles and Bithynia, was felt in Judaea, is highly probable; and the evangelist's testimony to similar phenomena of a coincident darkness and earthquake, taken in connection with the near agreement of time, gives a



probability to the supposition that the former speaks of the same circumstances as the latter. Wieseler (*Chron. Synop.* page 388), however, and De Wette (*Comment.* on Matthew) consider the year of Phlegon's eclipse an impossible one for the crucifixion, and reject that explanation of the darkness. The argument from the duration (three hours) is also of great force, for an eclipse seldom lasts in great intensity more than six minutes. The darkness in this instance, moreover, cannot with reason be attributed to an eclipse, as the moon was at the full at the time of the Passover (q.v.). On the other hand, Seyffarth (*Chronolog. Sacs.* pages 58, 9) maintains that the Jewish calendar, owing to their following the sun, had become so far out that the moon might possibly have been at new, and thus, admitting the year as a possible epoch, revives the argument for the eclipse as the cause. He, however, views this rather as a natural basis than as a full account of the darkness, which in its degree at Jerusalem was still preternatural (ib. page 138). The pamphlet of Whiston above quoted, and two by Dr. Sykes, *Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by Phlegon*, and *Defense of the same* (London, 1733 and 1734), may be consulted as regards the statement of Phlegon. Treatises on the phenomenon in question have been written in Latin by Baier (Regiom. 1718), Engestrom (London, 1730), Fleischer (Viteb. 1692), Frick (Lips. 1692), Lauth (Argent. 1743), Pasch (Viteb. 1683), Posner (Jena, 1661), Schmid (Jena, 1683), Sommel (London, 1774), Topfer (Jen. 1678), Wiedeburg (Helmst. 1687), Ziebich (Viteb. 1741), and in German by Grausbeck (Tubing. 1835). **SEE DARKNESS.**

## Economy

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

## Ecthesis

a proclamation or formula of faith, in the form of an edict, written by Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, published A.D. 639 by the emperor Heraclius, to put an end to the troubles occasioned by the Eutychian heresy. It prohibited all controversies on the question, Whether in Christ

there were one or two operations? though in the same edict the doctrine of one will was plainly inculcated. A considerable number of the Eastern bishops declared their assent to this law, which was also submissively received by Pyrrhus, the new patriarch of Constantinople. In the West the case was quite different. The Roman pontiff, John IV, assembled a council at Rome, A.D. 629, in which the ecthesis was rejected, and the Monothelites were condemned (Mosheim's *Ecclesiastes Hist.* N.Y. ed. 1:453). A copy of it is given in Harduin, *Concilia*, 3:791. See also Gieseler, *Church History*, 1, § 126; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 3:154 sq. *SEE EUTYCHIANS.*

## Ecuador

(the Spanish term for *Equator*), a republic in South America. In lat. it extends from 1° 23' N. to 40 45' S., while in W. long it stretches from 790 to 81° 20'. It measures, therefore, from north to south fully 400 miles, and from east to west nearly 850, presenting an area of about 100,000 square miles. It is bounded by the United States of Colombia, Brazil, Peru, and the Pacific. The population in 1885 was given at 1,004,651, in which the savage and heathen Indians of the eastern province were not included, although estimated at from 100,000 to 150,000. Six cities have a population of more than 10,000. The majority of the population is of the aboriginal race, speaking the Quichua or some cognate language. Ecuador, until the beginning of the present century, belonged to the Spanish viceroyalty of New Granada. After the establishment of the independence of the Spanish colonies, Ecuador formed part, until 1830, of the federal republic of Colombia. Since 1830 it has been an independent republic. The chief cities are Quito, the capital, and Guayaquil, the emporium of foreign trade. The government appears to have been constituted on the model of the United States of North America, having a president and vice-president, with a Senate and a House of Representatives. All the inhabitants belong to the Roman Catholic Church, which contains the following dioceses: 1. The archbishopric of Quito, established as an episcopal see in 1545, erected into an archbishopric in 1861; 2. the bishopric of Guayaquil, established in 1838; 3. the bishopric of Nueva Cuenga. The public exercise of no other religion is allowed by the Constitution of the state. There were, in 1855, 277 parochial and 106 vice-parochial churches, 534 secular priests, 262 monks in 36 and 202 nuns in 11 convents. The University of Quito, established in 1586 by the Jesuits, has 4 colleges and several seminaries. There were 11 high schools, called colleges or seminaries, and 290 primary

schools, of which 30 were for girls. Nearly all the scholars were the children of the whites and mulattoes; the Indian population grows up almost without education. — *Allgemeine Real-Encycl.* 4:1018; Vilavencio, *Geographia de la Republica del Ecuador* (N.Y. 1858). (A.J.S.)

## Ed

i.e., "witness" (for Hebrews *id.* **ד[ע]** supplied (apparently on the authority of a few MSS. and also of the Syr. and the Arab. versions) in the A.V. as the name of the altar erected by the three tribes east of Jordan in commemoration of their adhesion to the others (<sup><16234></sup>Joshua 22:34). The commonly received Hebrews text is literally as follows: "And the sons of Reuben and the sons of Gad called the altar [**י בַּמִּבְּרָא** Sept. **ἔπωνόμασαν καὶ εἶπαν**, Vulg. *vocaverunt*]; for a witness is this [**אֵלֶּה ד[ע]בָּרָא** Sept. **ὅτι μαρτύριόν**, Vulg. *testimonium*]," etc., or as it may be rendered (**אָרָב**; being sometimes used absolutely thus), "gave a name to the altar, [saying]," etc. The gloss is unnecessary (see Maurer, *Comment.* in loc.), for the latter clause furnishes both the name and the explanation (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.), i.e., "they named the altar (as follows), that 'This is a witness,'" etc. **SEE OREB.**

## E'dar

(Hebrews *E'der*, **רד[ע]** *flock*, as often rendered), the name of a tower (**י דגמָרָא** beyond (**הַלְהַמָּה**) which Jacob first halted between Bethlehem and Hebron (<sup><16321></sup>Genesis 35:21, Sept. **Γαδέρ**, Vat. omits, Vulg. *Eder*). In <sup><3048></sup>Micah 4:8 (Sept., Vulg., and A.V. translate **ποιμνίον**, *grex*, "flock") it is put for the neighboring village Bethlehem itself, and hence tropically for the royal line of David as sprung thence. It perhaps derived its name from the fact of having been erected to guard, **SEE MIGDOL.**, flocks, or else from some individual of the name of Eder (q.v.). Jerome (who calls it *turris Ader*) says it lay 1000 paces from Bethlehem (*Onomast.* s.v. Bethlehem), and intimates that it contained a prophetic anticipation (compare *Targum* of Pseudo-Jon. in loc.) of the birth of the Messiah on the same spot (<sup><4017></sup>Luke 2:7, 8). (See Albert, *De turri Eder*, Lips. 1689.) **SEE BETHLEHEM.**

## Edayoth

SEE TALMUD.

## Eddy John Reynolds,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, son of Reverend Augustus Eddy, was born in Xenia, Ohio, October 10, 1829, obtained a liberal English education, and made some proficiency in the classics. He commenced the study of law, but determined to devote himself to the ministry, and was admitted on trial in the Northwest Indiana Conference in 1856. After filling various appointments acceptably, he accepted in 1862 the chaplaincy of the 72d Indiana Regiment. He immediately joined his regiment at Murfreesborough, Tennessee, and commenced his labors among the soldiers. Sunday, June 21, he preached from ~~2162~~ Proverbs 16:32; Wednesday, June 24, during a fight between colonel Wilder's cavalry brigade and a rebel force he was instantly killed by a shell. — *Min. of Conference*, 1863.

## Edelmann Johann Christian,

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

"What Edelmann wished was nothing new; after the manner of all adherents of Illuminism, he wished to reduce all positive religions to natural religion. The positive heathenish religions stand, to him, on a level

with Judaism and Christianity. He is more just towards heathenism than towards Judaism, and more just towards Judaism than towards Christianity. Everything positive in religion is, as such, superstition. Christ was a mere man, whose chief merit consists in the struggle against superstition. What he taught, and what he was anxious for, no one, however, may attempt to learn from the New Testament writings, inasmuch as these were forged as late as the time of Constantine. All which the Church teaches of his divinity, of his merits, of the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit, is absurd. There is no rule of truth but reason, and it manifests its truths directly by a peculiar sense. Whatever this sense says is true. It is this sense which perceives the world. The reality of everything which exists is God. In the proper sense there can, therefore, not exist any atheist, because every one who admits the reality of the world admits also the reality of God. God is not a person, least of all are there three persons in God. If God be the substance in all the phenomena, then it follows of itself that God cannot be thought of without the world, and hence that the world has no more had an origin than it will have an end. One may call the world the body of God, the shadow of God, the son of God. The spirit of God is in all that exists. It is ridiculous to, ascribe inspiration to special persons only; every one ought to be a Christ, a prophet, an inspired man. The human spirit, being a breath of God, does not perish; our spirit, separated from its body by death, enters into a connection with some other body. Thus Edelmann taught a kind of metempsychosis. What he taught had been thoroughly and ingeniously said in France and England; but from a German theologian, and that with such eloquent coarseness, with such a mastery in expatiating in blasphemy, such things were unheard of. But as yet the faith of the Church was a power in Germany!" (Kahnis, *German Protestantism*, book 1, chapter 2, § 2). An autobiography of Edelmann was published by Klose (Berlin, 1849). See Pratje, *Histor. Nachrichten* (Hamb. 1755, 8vo); Elster, *Erinnerungen an Edelmann* (Clausthal, 1839); Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, chapter 5.

## E'den

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

**I.** "The garden of EDEN" (עֵדֶן *edelight*, and so Sept. ἡδονή, *Vulg. voluptas*) is the most ancient and venerable name in geography, the name of the first district of the earth's surface of which human beings could have any knowledge.

**1. The Name.** — The word is found in the Arabic as well as in the Hebrew language. It is explained by Firuzabadi, in his celebrated Arabic lexicon (*Kamus*), as signifying *delight, tenderness, loveliness* (see Morren, in *Edinb. Biblical Cabinet*, 11:2, 48, 49). Major Wilford and professor Wilson find its elements in the Sanscrit. The Greek ἡδονῆ is next to identical with it in both sound and sense. It occurs in three places (<sup>237D</sup>Isaiah 37:12; <sup>272B</sup>Ezekiel 27:23; Amos 1:5) as the name of some eminently pleasant districts, but not the Eden of this article. Of them we have no certain knowledge, except that the latter instance points to the neighborhood of Damascus. In these cases it is pointed, in the Hebrew text, with both syllables short  $\hat{d}$  ], but when it is applied to the primitive seat of man, the first syllable is long. The passages in which it occurs in the latter sense are, in addition to <sup>000P</sup>Genesis 2:2, 4:16, the few following, of which we transcribe the chief, because they cast light upon the primeval term: "He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of Jehovah." "Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God." "All the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him." "This land which was desolate is become like the garden of Eden" (<sup>250B</sup>Isaiah 51:3; <sup>250B</sup>Ezekiel 28:13; 31:9, 16, 18; 36:35; <sup>200B</sup>Joel 2:3). All this evidence goes to show that Eden was a tract of country, and that in the most eligible part of it was the *Paradise*, the garden of all delights, in which the Creator was pleased to place his new and pre-eminent creature, with the inferior beings for his sustenance and solace. *SEE GARDEN.*

The old translators appear to have halted between a mystical and literal interpretation. The word  $\hat{d}$  ] is rendered by the Sept. as a proper name in three passages only, <sup>000B</sup>Genesis 2:8, 10; 4:16, where it is represented by Ἐδέμ. In all others, with the exception of <sup>230B</sup>Isaiah 2:3, it is translated τρυφή. In the Vulgate it never occurs as a proper name, but is rendered "*voluptas*," "*locus voluptatis*," or "*deliciae*." The *Targum* of Onkelos gives it uniformly  $\hat{d}$  ], and in the Peshito Syriac it is the same, with a slight variation in two passages. *SEE PARADISE.*

**2. Biblical Description.** — The following is a simple translation of the Mosaic account of the situation of the Adamic Paradise (<sup>000B</sup>Genesis 2:8-17). *SEE GENESIS.*

Now Jehovah God had planted a garden in Eden eastward, and he placed there the man whom he formed: for Jehovah God had caused to spring from the ground every tree pleasant for sight or good for food; also the

tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Now a river issued from Eden to water the garden, and thence it was parted, and became four head-[streams]: the name of the first is Pishon; this [is the one] that surrounds all the land of the Chavilah, where [is] the [metal] gold (the gold too of that land [is] good); there [also is] the [substance called *bedolach*, and a stone [called] the *shoham*); and the name of the second river [is] Gichon; this [is the one] that surrounds all the land of Cush: and the name of the third river [is] Chiddekel; this [is the one] that flows east of Ashshur: and the name of the fourth river, that [is] Perath.

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

The garden of Paradise is here said to be to the east, i.e., in the eastern part of the tract of Eden (see Gesenius, *Heb. Lex. s.v.*). The river which flowed through Eden watered the garden, and thence branched out into four distinct streams. The first problem to be solved, then, is this: To find a river which, at some stage of its course, is divided into four streams, two of which are the Tigris and Euphrates. The identity of these rivers with the Hiddekel and Perath has never been disputed, and no hypothesis which omits them is worthy of consideration. Setting aside minor differences of detail, the theories which have been framed with regard to the explanation of the above description of the terrestrial paradise naturally divide themselves into two classes. The first class includes all those which place the main river of the garden of Eden below the junction of the Euphrates and Tigris, and interpret the names Pison and Gihon of certain portions of these rivers; the second, those which seek for it in the high table-land of Armenia, the fruitful parent of many noble streams. These theories have been supported by most learned men of all nations, of all ages, and representing every shade of theological belief; but there is scarcely one which is not based in some degree upon a forced interpretation of the words of the narrative. Those who contend that the united stream of the Euphrates and Tigris is the "river" which "goeth forth from Eden to water the garden," have committed a fatal error in neglecting the true meaning of *axy*; which is only used of the course of a river from its source *downwards* (compare <sup>אֲשַׁרְיָהוּ</sup> Ezekiel 47:1). Following the guidance which this word

supplies, the description in verse 10 must be explained in this manner: the river takes its rise in Eden, flows into the garden, and from thence is divided into four branches, the separation taking place either in the garden or after leaving it. If this be the case, the Tigris and Euphrates before junction cannot, in this position of the garden, be two of the four branches in question. But, though they have avoided this error, the theorists of the second class have generally been driven into another but little less destructive. Looking for the true site of Eden in the highlands of Armenia, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates, and applying the names Pison and Gihon to some one or other of the rivers which spring from the same region, they have been compelled to modify the meaning of **רְחֵם**; the "river," and to give to **מַיִם**; a sense which is scarcely supported by a single passage. In no instance is **בֵּית** (lit. "head") applied to the *source* of a river. On several occasions (compare **בְּמַדְבָּר**; Judges 7:16; **בְּמַדְבָּר**; Job 1:17, etc.) it is used of the detachments into which the main body of an army is divided, and analogy therefore leads to the conclusion that **מַיִם**; denotes the "branches" of the parent stream. There are other difficulties in the details of the several theories which may be obstacles to their entire reception, but it is manifest that no theory which fails to satisfy the above-mentioned conditions can be allowed to take its place among things that are probable. What, then, is the river which goes forth from Eden to water the garden? is a question which has often been asked, and still waits for a fully satisfactory answer. That the ocean stream which surrounded the earth was the source from which the four rivers flowed was the opinion of Josephus (*Ant.* 1, 1, 53) and Johannes Damascenus (*De Orthod. Fid.* 2:9). It was the *Shat el-Arab*, according to those who place the garden of Eden below the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, and their conjecture would deserve consideration were it not that this stream cannot, with any degree of propriety, be said to rise in Eden. By those who refer the position of Eden to the highlands of Armenia, the "river" from which the four streams diverge is conceived to mean "a collection of springs," or a well-watered district. It is scarcely necessary to say that this signification of **רְחֵם**; (*nahar'*) is without a parallel; and even if it could, under certain circumstances, be made to adopt it, such a signification is, in the present instance, precluded by the fact that, whatever meaning we may assign to the word in verse 10, it must be essentially the same as that which it has in the following verses, in which it is sufficiently definite. Sickler (*Augusti, Theol. Monatschrift*, 1:1), supposing the whole narrative to be a myth,



solves the difficulty by attributing to its author a large measure of ignorance. The "river" was the Caspian Sea, which in his apprehension was an immense stream from the east. Bertheau, applying the geographical knowledge of the ancients as a test of that of the Hebrews, arrived at the same conclusion, on the ground that all the people south of the Armenian and Persian highlands place the dwelling of the gods in the extreme north, and the regions of the Caspian were the northern limit of the horizon of the Israelites (Knobel, *Genesis*). But he allows the four rivers of Eden to have been real rivers, and not, as Sickler imagined, oceans which bounded the earth east and west of the Nile. The modern Lake *Van*, or perhaps the ancient stream of which this is now the representative, appears to be the only body of water in this vicinity answering to the Mosaic description. Nor will it do to suppose that in former ages great changes had taken place, which have so disguised the rivers in question that their course connection, and identity are not now traceable; for two of the rivers, at least, remain to this day essentially the same as in all historic times, and the whole narrative of Moses is evidently adapted to the geography as it existed in his own day, being constantly couched in the *present tense*, and in terms of well-known reference as landmarks. *SEE RIVER.*

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

flood in changing the face of countries, and altering the relations of land and water, are too little known at present to allow any inferences to be drawn from them. (See below.)

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

## Picture for E'den 1

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

**a.** The opinion which fixes Eden in *Armenia* we have placed first, because it is that which has obtained most general support, and seems nearest the truth. (See Number 6) For if we may suppose that, while Cain moved to the East (<sup>GEN 4:16</sup>Genesis 4:16), the posterity of Seth remained in the neighborhood of the primeval seat of mankind, and that Noah's ark rested not very far from the place of his former abode, then Mount Ararat in

Armenia becomes a connecting point between the antediluvian and post-diluvian words (<sup><0084></sup>Genesis 8:4), and the names of the Phrat, Hiddekel, etc., would readily be given to rivers, which, after the great deluge, seemed to flow in channels somewhat corresponding to the Paradisiacal streams. The opinion in question was first systematically propounded by Reland, and is held by Calmnet, and by his American editor, Professor Robinson, who, however, understands by Cush, Chusistan. Professor Stuart takes the Pishon for the Kur, and Cush for Cushi-Capcoch, i.e., the northern part of the region between the Caspian Lake and the Persian Gulf (*Heb. Chrest on* <sup><0080></sup>Genesis 2:10-14). The Cossaei, whom Reland finds in Cush, lived near Media, in the tract now called Dilem, southwest of the Caspian Sea. Link takes the Gihon for the Cur or Cyrus, and Cush for the Caucasus. Verbrugge coincides with Reland, except that he takes the Gihon to be the Gyndes, which flowed between Armenia and Matiana.

**b.** This opinion was most elaborately defended by Huet, bishop of Avranches; but it is also maintained by Calvin, Bochart, Wells, Steph. Morinus, Vorst, etc. Hales was of this sentiment in the first edition of his *Chronology*, but in the second he follows the opinion of Reland. The Shat el-Arab is the name of the united streams of the Euphrates and Tigris. Ainsworth says, "It is probable that the united rivers emptied themselves into the gulf at this period (in ancient times) by several distinct mouths, of which the first or greatest was at Teredon, the Ostium Tigris Occidentale of Ptolemy, and the mouth of the Euphrates, according to Nearchus; the second was the Pasitigris of Pliny, probably the Shat el-Arab, and the Ostium Tigris Orientale of the Alexandrian geographer." Cush they compare with the Cutha of <sup><1724></sup>2 Kings 17:24; and Havilah with the Chaulataioi of Eratosthenes in Strabo, 16:767. Grotius thinks the Pishon is the Pasitigris, and the Gihon, the Nahr Malikah, or the Chaboras. Hottinger agrees with Grotius as to the Pishon, but takes the Gihon for the Nahr Sura. Hopkinson makes the Pishon and Gihon to be the two canals of the Euphrates, the Nahl Malikah, and the Nahr Sares or Sura.

**c.** The celebrated Gottingen professor, J.D. Michaelis, originated this hypothesis, though he is doubtful as to some of the points. Gatterer, in the main, agrees with him, only he understands the Hiddekel to be the Indus, and takes the Pishon for the Phasis. Cush is found by Michaelis in the name of the city Cath or Caths, the ancient capital of Chowrasmia, on the Oxus or Jihun, near the site of Balkh. He refers to Quint. Curtius as speaking of the Cusaei or Cusitani being in Bactria upon the Oxus. Wahl sees Cush in

the Khousti of Moses of Chorene, meaning the large province between the Caspian and Persian Seas, as far as the Indus and Oxus. The land of Havilah Michaelis connects with the tribe of Chwaliski or Chwalisses, from whom the Russians call the Caspian Sea the Chwalinskoie More.

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

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

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

**g.** Captain Wilford, well known for his profound acquaintance with Hindu antiquities, advanced the present view, as being founded upon the Indian Puranas (*Asiatic Researches*, 6:455, Lond. edit.). It was partly adopted by a late ingenious but fanciful writer, Mr. C. Taylor, editor of *Calmet's Dictionary*, who, in however, makes the Pishon the Nilab; the Gihon, the western branch of the Oxus; the Hiddekel, the eastern; and the Phrat, the Hirmend.

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

## Picture for E'den 2

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

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

These, indeed, are but a few of the opinions that have been propounded; yet, though many more might be added, it is to be observed that most of them have much in common, and differ only in some of the details. To enumerate the vagaries of German and other writers on this subject would be endless. (See Kittos *Scripture Lands*, page 1-8.) The fact is that not one of them answers to all the conditions of the problem. It has been remarked that this difficulty might have been expected, and is obviously probable, from the geological changes that may have taken place, and especially in connection with the Deluge. This remark would not be applicable, to the extent that is necessary for the argument, except upon the supposition before mentioned, that the earlier parts of the book of Genesis consist of primeval documents, even antediluvian, and that this is one of them. There

is reason to think, however, that *since the Deluge* the face of the country cannot have undergone any change approaching to what the hypothesis of a post-diluvian composition would require. But we think it highly probable that the principal of the immediate causes of the Deluge, the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep," was a subsidence of a large part or parts of the land between the inhabited tract (which we venture to place in E. long. from Greenwich, 300 to 500, and N. lat. 250 to 400) and the sea which lay to the south, or an elevation of the bed of that sea. *SEE DELUGE.*

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

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

That the Hiddekel (this name is said to be still in use among the tribes who live upon its banks — Col. Chesney, *Expedition. to Tigris and Euphrates*, 1:13) is the Tigris, and the Phrath the Euphrates, has never been denied, except by those who assume that the whole narrative is a myth which originated elsewhere and was adapted by the Hebrews to their own geographical notions. As the former is the name of the great river by which Daniel sat (<sup><2704></sup>Daniel 10:4), and the latter is the term uniformly applied to the Euphrates in the Old Testament, there seems no reason to suppose that the appellations in <sup><0024></sup>Genesis 2:14 are to be understood in any other than the ordinary sense. One circumstance in the description is worthy of observation. Of the four rivers, one, the Euphrates, is mentioned by name

only, as if that were sufficient to identify it. The other three are defined according to their geographical positions, and it is fair to conclude that they were therefore rivers with which the Hebrews were less intimately acquainted. If this be the case, it is scarcely possible to imagine that the Gihon, or, as some say, the Pison, is the Nile, for that must have been even more familiar to the Israelites than the Euphrates, and have stood as little in need of a definition.

But the stringent difficulty is to find any two rivers that will reasonably answer to the predicates of the Pishon and the Gihon, and any countries which can be collocated as Havilah and Cush. The latter name, indeed, was given by the Hebrews and other Orientals to several extensive countries, and those very distant both from Armenia and from each other. As for Havilah, we have the name again in the account of the dispersion of the descendants of Noah (chapter 10:29); but whether that was the same as this Havilah, and in what part of Asia it was, we despair of ascertaining. Reland and others, the best writers upon this question, have felt themselves compelled to give to these names a comprehension which destroys all preciseness. So, likewise, the meaning of the two names of natural products can be little more than matter of conjecture the *bedolach* and the stone *shoham*. The former word occurs only here and in <sup><01107></sup>Numbers 11:7. The Septuagint, our oldest and best authority with regard to terms of natural history, renders it, in our passage, by *anthrax*, meaning probably the ruby, or possibly the topaz; and in Numbers by *crystallos*, which the Greeks applied not merely to rock-crystal, but to any finely transparent mineral. Any of the several kinds of odoriferous gum, which many ancient and modern authorities have maintained, is not, likely, for it could not be in value comparable to gold. The pearl is possible, but not quite probable, for it is an animal product, and the connection seems rather to confine us to minerals; and pearls, though translucent, are not transparent as good crystal is. Would not the diamond be an admissible conjecture? The *shoham* occurs in ten other places, chiefly in the book of Exodus, and in all those instances our version says onyx; but the Septuagint varies, taking onyx, sardius, sardonyx, beryl, prase-stone, sapphire, and smaragdus, which is a green-tinctured rock-crystal. The preponderance seems to be in favor of onyx, one of the many varieties of banded agate; but the idea of value leads us to think that the emerald is the most probable. There are two remarkable inventories of precious stones in <sup><02910></sup>Exodus 39:10-13, and <sup><02813></sup>Ezekiel 28:13, which may be profitably studied, comparing the

Septuagint with the Hebrew. *SEE HAVILAR*. For attempted identifications of the Pison and Gihon, see those names respectively.

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

**II.** (ⲉⲃⲉⲙ, Sept. Ἐδὲμ, but omits in <sup><23712></sup>Isaiah 37:12, and <sup><23723></sup>Ezekiel 27:23; Vulg. Eden), one of the marts which supplied the luxury of Tyre with richly embroidered stuffs. It is associated with Haran, Sheba, and Asshur; and in Amos 1:5, Beth-Eden, or "the house of Eden," is rendered in the Sept. by Charran (Χαῤῥᾶν). In <sup><12912></sup>2 Kings 19:12, and <sup><23712></sup>Isaiah 37:12, "the sons of Eden" are mentioned with Gozan, Haran, and Rezep, as victims of the Assyrian greed of conquest. Telassar appears to have been the headquarters of the tribe; and Knobel's (*Comm. on Isaiah*) etymology of this name would point to the highlands of Assyria as their whereabouts. But this has no sound foundation, although the view which it supports receives confirmation from the version of Jonathan, who gives *bydj* (*Chadib*) as the equivalent of Eden. Bochart proved (*Phaleg*. part 1, p. 274) that this term was applied by the Talmudic writers to the mountainous district of Assyria; which bordered on Media, and was known as *Adiabene*. But if Gozan be Gausanitis in Mesopotamia, and Haran be Carrhe, it seems more natural to look for Eden somewhere in the same locality. Keil (*Comm. on Kings*, 2:97) thinks it may be *Ma'don*, which Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* 2:224) places in Mesopotamia, in the modern province of Diarbekr. Bochart, considering the Eden of Genesis and Isaiah as identical, argues that Gozan, Haran, Rezep, and Eden are mentioned in order of geographical position, from north to south; and, identifying Gozan with Gausanitis, Haran with Carrhae, a little below Gausanitis on the Chabor, and Rezep with Resepha, he gives to Eden a still more southerly situation at the confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris, or even lower. According to him, it may be *Addan* or *Addana*, which geographers place on the Euphrates. . Michaelis (*Suppl.* No. 1826) is in favor of the modern *Aden*, a port of Arabia (called by Ptolemy Ἀραβίας ἑμπόριον), as the Eden of Ezekiel. *SEE VEDAN*.

**III.** (ⲉⲃⲉⲙ, Amos 1:5, "house of Eden"). *SEE BETH-EDEN*.

**IV.** (Sept. Ἰωδᾶν v. r. Ἰωαδάμ.) Son of Joah, and one of the Gershonite Levites who assisted in the reformation of public worship under Hezekiah (<sup><12912></sup>2 Chronicles 29:12). B.C. 726. He is probably the same with the Levite appointed in the same connection one of the superintendents of the



distribution of the free-will offerings (<sup><4315></sup>2 Chronicles 31:15, Sept. Ὀδόμ, v.r. -δόμων).

### Edenius Jordan Nicolas,

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

### E'der

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

**1.** (Sept. Ἐδραίν, *Vat.* MS. omits; *Vulg.* *Eder.*) A city in the extreme south of Judah, on the Idumaeon border, mentioned between Kabzeel and Jagur (<sup><4652></sup>Joshua 15:21); therefore, doubtless, one of those afterwards assigned to Simeon. Schwa z suggests (*Palest.* page 99) that it may be the same with ARAD *SEE ARAD* (q.v.), by a transposition of letters; but this is doubtful. Possibly it was situated on the eminence north of the fountain marked as "water" on Van de Velde's *Map*, in wady el-Ernez, S.W. of the Dead Sea.

**2.** (Sept. Ἐδέρ *Vulg.* *Eder.*) The second named of the three "sons" (i.e. descendants) of Mushi appointed to the Levitical offices in the time of David (<sup><1323></sup>1 Chronicles 23:23; 24:30). B.C. 1013.

### E'des

(rather *Edais*; Ἡδαίς, *Vulg.* *Esmi*), one of the "sons of Ethma," who had married foreign wives after the captivity (1 Esdr. 9:35); evidently the *Jadau* (q.v.) of the Hebrews list (<sup><4504></sup>Ezra 10:43).

### Edessa

(modern name *Urfah* or *Orfa*; Armenian name *Edessia*; Arab. *Er-Roha*; — Syrian, *Urhoi*), an ancient city of Mesopotamia, 78 miles S.W. from Diarbekir. An old legend attributes its origin to Nimrod, or to Khabiba, a female contemporary of Abraham. The Targums (followed by Jerome and Ephrem Syrus) make it the *Erech* of <sup><4110></sup>Genesis 10:10. Another tradition

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

The report of the introduction of Christianity by king Abgar (q.v.), a contemporary of Christ, is probably an unfounded legend; but it is certain that Christianity became firmly rooted in Edessa at a very early period. The twenty-sixth Osroenian king (152-187) was, if not a Christian himself, a patron of Christianity, and the Gnostic Bardesanes is said to have been

highly esteemed by him. Edessa was an early episcopal see, and in the 4th century became the chief seat of Syrian ecclesiastical learning. The emperor Julian threatened to distribute the large treasure of the churches of Edessa among his soldiers, but his death saved the churches from the execution of this threat. In 363, Ephrem (q.v.), the Syrian, came from Nisibis to Edessa, and by his preaching, teaching, and prolific writings, greatly distinguished himself in the defense of the orthodox doctrines of the Church. After the death of Ephrem, the Arians took possession of all the churches of Edessa, but after five years the ascendancy of the orthodox school was restored. Different from the Edessene school established by Ephrem was the Persian school at Edessa, which was intended to be a seminary for the Christian subjects of the Persian king. It attained its highest prosperity in the time of Ephrem, became subsequently a stronghold of Nestorianism, and was on that account dissolved in 489. — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3:645; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:391; *Chronicon Edessenum*, in Assemani, *Biblioth. Oriental.* 1:387-428; Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents relative to Edessa, etc.* (London, 1866); Etheridge, *The Syrian Churches* (London, 1846), page 35 sq. **SEE NESTORIANS.**

### Edgar John, D.D.,

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

## Edgar John Todd, D.D.,

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

## Edge

with reference to the sword, is the rendering ,of **hP**, *peh*, mouth (like **στόμα**, <sup><2724></sup>Luke 21:24; <sup><3813></sup>Hebrews 11:34), or fem. **hyP***peyah'* (<sup><2816></sup>Judges 3:16); also **μyn***panim'*, *face* (<sup><2100></sup>Ecclesiastes 10:10); poet. **rWx**, *tsur*, a rock, hence *sharpness* (<sup><1943></sup>Psalms 89:43): elsewhere, in the sense of brink or *margin*; it corresponds to **hpn**; *saphah'*, *ip*; and to **hxq**; *atsah'*, **hxq**; *kastek'*, or **hwxf** *kitsveh'*, *extremity* (<sup><1287></sup>Exodus 28:7; 39:4; 13:20; 21:5; 36:12; <sup><2816></sup>Numbers 33:6, 37; <sup><1637></sup>Joshua 13:27; <sup><1943></sup>Psalms 39:4). To "set on edge" is an inaccurate rendering (<sup><2412></sup>Jeremiah 31:29, 30; <sup><3812></sup>Ezekiel 18:2) of **hhq**; *kahah*, to be blunt (as in <sup><2100></sup>Ecclesiastes 10:10).  
**SEE SWORD.**

## Edi'as or Eddi'as,

(Ἰεζίας, Alex. MS. Ἰεδδίας, Vulg. *Geddias*), the second named of the "sons of Phoros," who took foreign wives after the captivity (1 Esdr.

9:26); the JEZIAH *SEE JEZIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrews list (<sup>15025</sup>Ezra 10:25).

## Edict

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

## Edict of Nantes

*SEE NANTES; SEE FRANCE, SEE REFORMED CHURCH OF.*

## Edicts, Imperial

*SEE PERSECUTIONS.*

## Edification

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

**1.** The 'sacred writers perpetually employ this figure as their favorite illustration of the condition of Christians, as forming collectively the temple, succeeding that literal one on Mount Sion; the temple in which the Lord dwells by his holy Spirit; and as being, individually, "living stones,

builded up into an habitation for the Lord.” “The words “edify” and “edification” have so completely lost their literal signification in our tongue, that it would be reckoned even an impropriety to use them in speaking of the building of a literal edifice, and thus the reader loses the force and significance of the language of the sacred writers.’ The word ‘edify,’ especially when applied to individual Christians, has often the sense of *instruct*; though in the ‘Preface’ to the ‘Order of Confirmation’ in the English Prayer-book. ‘To the end ... to the more edifying,’ the word is probably used in the sense already explained, not in the especial sense of ‘instruct’” (Eden).

2. "To perceive the full force and propriety of the term as used by the apostles, it is quite necessary to keep in mind the similitudes by which they generally describe a Christian church. All those spiritual gifts, which were bestowed on the Christians were for the building and edifying of the members of the Church. The apostolical power in Church censures was for edification, not for destruction (<sup><470B></sup>2 Corinthians 10:8); to build, and not to pull down; that is, to preserve the unity of the Church entire, and its communion pure. And we may observe that this edification is primarily applied to the Church: that the Church may receive edifying; that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church; for the edifying of the body of Christ (<sup><434F></sup>1 Corinthians 14:5, 12; <sup><40H2></sup>Ephesians 4:12). And it is very observable wherein the apostle places the edification of the body of Christ, viz., in unity and love: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ (<sup><40H2></sup>Ephesians 4:12, 13). Till we are united by one faith unto one body, and perfect man. And speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual 'working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love' (<sup><40H5></sup>Ephesians 4:15, 16). This is an admirable description of the unity of the Church, in which all the parts are closely united and compacted together, as stones and timber are to make one house; and thus they grow into one body and increase in mutual love and charity, which is the very building and edification of the Church, which is edified and built up in love, as the apostle adds, that knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth (<sup><40K1></sup>1 Corinthians 8:1). This builds up the Church of Christ; and that not such a common charity as we have for all mankind but such a love

and sympathy as is peculiar to the members of the same body, and which none but members can have for each other" (Hook, *Ch. Dict.* s.v.).

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

## Edifice

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

## Edilthryda or Etheldrida St.,

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

Edinburgh, the capital of Scotland, and seat of a bishop of the Scotch Episcopal Church. The diocese of Edinburgh had in 1867 24 churches, 2 missions, 33 clergymen, and 20 schools. The population of the city was, in 1861, 168,098. Edinburgh is also the seat of a Roman Catholic vicar apostolic, whose district had in 1860 about 60 parishes and 70,000 Roman

Catholics. See *Churchman's Calendar for 1868*; Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr.* 1:103. (A.J.S.)

### Editions Printed, Of The Original Texts Fof The Bible.

*SEE SCRIPTURES, HOLY; SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.*

### Edmund I

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

### Edmund St., Edmund Rich,

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

### Ed'na

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



## E'dom

(Hebrews *Edom'*,  $\mu\delta\bar{\alpha}$  or  $\mu\omega\delta\bar{\alpha}$  so called from his red hair, <sup><0255></sup>Genesis 25:25, or from the red pottage for which he bartered his birthright, verse 30; Sept.  $\text{\textcircled{E}}\delta\acute{\omega}\mu$ ), the later name of Isaac's son, elder twin-brother of Jacob; more frequently called ESAU *SEE ESAU* (q.v.). *SEE OBED-EDOM*.

**EDOM** (Sept.  $\text{\textcircled{I}}\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ) stands also collectively for the *Edomites*, the posterity of Edom or Esau; and likewise for their country. *SEE EDMITE*.

## E'domite

(Hebrews Adomi',  $\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ ) Sept.  $\text{\textcircled{I}}\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ , fem. plur.  $\tau\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  <sup><1110></sup>1 Kings 11:1, Sept.  $\text{\textcircled{I}}\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ; but usually  $\mu\delta\bar{\alpha}$ , Edom, put collectively for the Edomites). The name Edom (fully written  $\mu/\delta\bar{\alpha}$ , red; see Gesenius, *Hebrews Thesaur.* 1:26) was originally the secondary name of Esau (<sup><0250></sup>Genesis 25:30, compare verses 25; 36:8), but is used ethnographically in the O.T., his descendants ("children of Edom,"  $\mu/\delta\bar{\alpha}\ \gamma\eta\beta$ ) being the race who had settled in the south of Palestine, and who at a later period came into conflict with the kindred nation of the Israelites (<sup><0620></sup>Deuteronomy 23:7; <sup><0014></sup>Numbers 20:14). Comparatively seldom are the appellations *children of Esau* (<sup><0604></sup>Deuteronomy 2:4, 8; 1 Macc. 5:3), *house of Esau* (Obadiah 18), *mount Esau* (Obadiah 8, 9, 19, 21), or simply *Esau* (<sup><2408></sup>Jeremiah 49:8, 10; Obadiah 6), used in Scripture for the Edomites or Idumaea; the people and country are oftener called merely *Edom* (<sup><0248></sup>Numbers 24:18; <sup><0650></sup>Joshua 15:1; <sup><0084></sup>2 Samuel 8:14; <sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:14; and especially by the prophets), hence, more fully, *land of Edom*, (<sup><0356></sup>Genesis 36:16, 21; <sup><0357></sup>Numbers 33:37), or *field of Edom* (<sup><0338></sup>Genesis 32:3; <sup><0004></sup>Judges 5:4). The territory of the Edomites was mountainous (Obadiah 8, 9, 19, 21), situated at the southern (<sup><0617></sup>Joshua 11:17; 12:7), i.e., southeastern border of Palestine (<sup><0648></sup>Numbers 34:3), or more particularly of the tribe of Judah (<sup><0650></sup>Joshua 15:1, 21), in the neighborhood of the Moabites (<sup><0718></sup>Judges 11:18; <sup><2114></sup>Isaiah 11:14; <sup><0301></sup>2 Kings 3:8), and was properly called the land or mountain of *Seir* ( $\text{\textcircled{r}}\gamma$   $\text{\textcircled{e}}$  <sup><0253></sup>Genesis 26:20; 32:4; <sup><0242></sup>Joshua 24:2; <sup><2583></sup>Ezekiel 35:3, 7, 15; compare <sup><0604></sup>Deuteronomy 2:4, 29). See SEIR. Lofty and intersected by chasms in the rocks, it formed a natural fastness (<sup><2496></sup>Jeremiah 49:16 sq.; Obadiah 3 sq.), yet it was by no means unfruitful (<sup><0279></sup>Genesis 27:39). It contained, among other cities, the famous rock-hewn Sela (<sup><1247></sup>2 Kings 14:7), and extended from the

AElanitic Gulf to the Red Sea (<sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 9:26; <sup><487></sup>2 Chronicles 8:17). Hence it admits of no doubt that the cleft and craggy region traversed by fruitful valleys, now called *el-Shira*, which stretches from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea to the eastern arm of the Red Sea, and is separated on the west by the long sandy plain el-Ghor from the desert et-Tib (Seetzen, 18:390, 434; Burckhardt, Trav. 2:683), and bounded on the north by the wady el-Ahsa, which separates it from the land of Moab, near Kerak, in the district of Jebal, is the ancient land of Edom, as Saadias has long ago perceived, for he renders Seir in <sup><038></sup>Genesis 36:8 by the same Arabic name Shera (compare Raumer in Berghaus's *Annal. d. Erd. u. Volskerkunde*, 1:562 sq.). **SEE SELA; SEE TEMAN; SEE UZ; SEE BOZRAH.** According to the division in Greek authors, the territory of Edom, *Idumaea* (Ἰδουμαία, a name evidently derived from the Heb.), was reckoned as a part of Arabia Petriæ (see Anthon's *Class. Diet. s.v.*). The early inhabitants of Mount Seir, who were called *Horites*, were destroyed by the Edomites (<sup><82></sup>Deuteronomy 2:12, 22), or rather supplanted and absorbed by them. **SEE HORITE.** Already, in the time of Moses, the Edomites showed a hostile feeling towards the Israelites by forbidding them to pass through their territories, and thus subjecting them to the hardship of journeying around it (<sup><015></sup>Numbers 20:15-21; 21:4; compare <sup><717></sup>Judges 11:17 sq.; see Hengstenberg, *Pent.* 2:283); at act which Saul successfully avenged (<sup><947></sup>1 Samuel 14:47), while David subjugated them (<sup><184></sup>2 Samuel 8:14; compare <sup><115></sup>1 Kings 11:15 sq.; <sup><912></sup>Psalms 60:2, 10), and his successor Solomon fitted out a merchant fleet in the Edomitish harbors (<sup><125></sup>1 Kings 9:26), although under his reign a partially successful revolt took place (<sup><1114></sup>1 Kings 11:14 sq.). In the division of the Hebrew commonwealth the Edomites continued under the sway of Judah (probably by means of viceroys, <sup><131></sup>2 Kings 3:9, 12, 26; but compare <sup><1228></sup>1 Kings 22:48; <sup><130></sup>2 Kings 8:20), so that their ports were at the disposal of Jewish commerce to the time of Joram (<sup><1229></sup>1 Kings 22:49), under whose reign (B.C. 885) they threw off their allegiance (<sup><130></sup>2 Kings 8:20), and maintained their independence by force of arms against several succeeding princes of the weak kingdom of Judah (<sup><131></sup>2 Kings 8:21). Amaziah (<sup><1247></sup>2 Kings 14:7; <sup><451></sup>2 Chronicles 25:11), in B.C. cir. 836, and also Uzziah (<sup><1242></sup>2 Kings 14:22; <sup><451></sup>2 Chronicles 25:11), in B.C. cir. 802, again reduced the Edomites to subjection; but under Ahaz (B.C. cir. 738) they invaded Judæa (<sup><487></sup>2 Chronicles 28:17), while, at the same time, the harbor of Elath was wrested from the Jewish dominions by the Syrians (<sup><1216></sup>2 Kings 16:6). From this time forward, the Edomites, favored by the increasingly

formidable attitude of Assyria, and later of Chaldaea, remained in merely nominal connection with the kingdom of Judah, enjoying real independence, until they too at last were forced to succumb to the Chaldaean power (<sup><277B></sup>Jeremiah 27:3, 6). The early prophets, nearly contemporary with these events, had already announced Judah's future triumph over these rebellious subjects and persistent enemies (<sup><28114></sup>Isaiah 11:14; <sup><28189></sup>Joel 3:19; <sup><3000E></sup>Amos 1:11); but, after they had made common cause with the foes of Israel at the capture of Jerusalem (<sup><28515></sup>Ezekiel 35:15; 36:5; <sup><3010D></sup>Obadiah 1:10, 13 sq.), the denunciations of the prophets became still more decisive (<sup><2440B></sup>Jeremiah 49:8, 20; <sup><2502I></sup>Lamentations 4:21 sq.; <sup><2552E></sup>Ezekiel 25:12 sq. — compare 35; Obadiah pass.; <sup><24707E></sup>Psalms 137:7; compare <sup><2345E></sup>Isaiah 34:5 sq.; 63:1 sq.). The Edomites, it is true, likewise felt the ravages of the Chaldaean march (<sup><3000B></sup>Malachi 1:3 sq.), but they were left in their own land (in opposition to the view of Eichhorn, *Hebr. Proph.* 2:618, 624; Bertholdt, *Einleit.* 4:1440, 1626, who maintain that the Idumaeans were politically annihilated by Nebuchadnezzar; see Gesenius, *Comm. on* <sup><2000B></sup>Isaiah 1:906: nor are the predictions of the utter desolation of Edom, e.g. <sup><24417E></sup>Jeremiah 49:17 sq., to be pressed to their extreme fulfillment; see Heinrich, *De Idumaea ejusque vastatione*, Lips. 1782), and they even rent away a portion of southern Palestine (comp. <sup><28510></sup>Ezekiel 35:10), including the town of Hebron (1 Macc. 5:65). During the Syrian rule they continued to evince their old ill will against the Jews (1 Macc. 5:3, 65; 2 Macc. 10:15; 12:32 sq.), until they were wholly subdued by John Hyrcanus (B.C. cir. 129), and, by a compulsory circumcision, were merged in the Jewish state (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:9, 1; 15:7, 9; comp. *War*, 4:5, 5; yet they were invidiously termed *half-Jews*, *Ant.* 14:15, 2). From that time Idumaea continued under a Jewish praefect (στρατηγός, Joseph. *Ant.* 14:1, 3). One of these, Antipater, managed so to ingratiate himself with the Jewish court, and, during the disputes concerning the Maccabean succession, wielded the procuratorship of all Judaea, with which the friendship of the emperor had invested him, with such efficiency (B.C. 47), that he eventually secured the supreme power instead of Hyrcanus II (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:8, 5). His son Herod became the acknowledged king of the Jews, and founded an Idumaeian dynasty in Palestine. Idumaea formed a province of his dominions, and was under the administration of a special governor (ἄρχων, Joseph. *Ant.* 15:7, 9). Concerning the farther history of this people, we can here only remark, that the Idumaeans in the last Jewish contest acted the same ruinous part with the Jews themselves (Joseph. *War*, 4:4, 1 and 5; 7:8, 1). The name of Edom or Edomite is to this day

hateful to the Jews (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* page 196; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebrews* page 693). From the time of the overthrow of the Jewish nation, the name of Idumaea no longer occurs, but passes away in the wider denomination Arabia (comp. Steph. Byz. pages 334, 341; Strabo 16:760, 749); since already for a long period the southern part of the ancient land of the Edomites was reckoned, together with its metropolis Petra, to Arabia, and entitled separately from (the Jewish province) Idumaea (Joseph. *Ant.* 14:1, 3; 17:3, 2; *War.* 1:13, 8); so that Idumaea, while on the north it included in addition a Jewish district (compare the term Idumaeon for Jew, especially among the Roman poets, Celsii *Hierob.* 2:469 sq.), at the same time was contracted in its southern boundary (comp. Ptol. 5:16, 10; 5:17; Strabo, 16:760; Jerome in *Obadiah* 1); but this does not affect Biblical geography, and it would be difficult to reduce the point to full historical and topographical clearness (see Reland, *Palaest.* page 69 sq.), **SEE ARABIA; SEE PETRA.**

The form of government among the Edomitish people was, like that of surrounding nations, tribal (compare <sup><0135></sup>Genesis 36:15 sq.), yet they originally (or at least earlier than the Israelites) had kings (<sup><0132></sup>Genesis 36:32 sq.; <sup><0014></sup>Numbers 20:14; see Tuch on <sup><0139></sup>Genesis 36:9 sq.; Bertheau, *Israel. Gesch.* page 207), who appear to have been freely chosen from among the clan-chieftains (princes, <sup><0130></sup>Genesis 36:40; <sup><0129></sup>Ezekiel 32:29; compare <sup><0124></sup>Isaiah 34:12, and Gesenius, in loc.; Hengstenberg, *Pent.* 2:299 sq.), until (in the time of Solomon) a hereditary dynasty had established itself (<sup><0114></sup>1 Kings 11:14 sq.). While the country remained under Israelitish sway, the native royal government was nearly superseded (<sup><0124></sup>1 Kings 22:48); although under Jehoshaphat mention is made (<sup><0101></sup>2 Kings 3:9, 26) of a king (viceroy) of the Edomites (in alliance with him), and from this time they seem to have had an uninterrupted line of kings (<sup><0101></sup>Amos 2:1; <sup><0101></sup>Jeremiah 27:3; <sup><0129></sup>Ezekiel 32:29). The principal mode of livelihood and employment of the Edomites were commerce by land by means of caravans (Heeren, *Ideen*, 1:1, page 107; Lengerke, *Ken.* 1:298; compare <sup><0116></sup>Ezekiel 28:16, where, however, the true reading is *Aram*; see Havernick in loc.), probably to Elath and Ezion-geber, on the Red Sea; the raising of cattle, agriculture, and the cultivation of vines (<sup><0017></sup>Numbers 20:17; <sup><0123></sup>Ezekiel 25:13); according to Jerome (*Onom.* s.v. Fenon), also mining (see C.G. Flade, *De re metall. Midianit., Edomit., et Phoenic.*, Lips. n.d.). Respecting their religion the Old Test. is entirely silent, except that it was some form of polytheism (<sup><0120></sup>2 Chronicles 25:20); Josephus (*Ant.* 15:7, 9)

mentions one of their gods by the name of *Coze* (Κοζέ,? ἡχαρθε *destroyer* or *ender*; see Hitzig, *Philist.* page 265; and compare Epiphan. *Haer.* 55; Lengerke, *Ken.* 1:298). From the earliest times the wisdom of the Edomites, namely, of the Temanite branch, was celebrated (Obadiah 8; ~~2407~~Jeremiah 49:7). See Uz. (On the subject generally, see Van Iperen, *Hist. crit. Edomaeor. et Amalek.* Leonard. 1768; Hoffmann, in the *Hall. Encyklop.* II, 15:146). **SEE IDUMAEA.**

## Ed'rei

(Hebrews *Edre'i*,  $\gamma[\text{אדרא}]$ , *mighty*; Sept. Ἐδράειν and Ἐδραίν), the name of two cities.

**1.** One of the metropolitan towns (Ashtaroth being the other) of the kingdom of Bashan, beyond the Jordan (~~6123~~Joshua 12:4, 5; 13:12; ~~6180~~Deuteronomy 3:10). It was here that Og, the gigantic king of Bashan, was defeated by the Israelites, and lost his kingdom (~~6023~~Numbers 21:33-35; ~~6104~~Deuteronomy 1:4; 3:1-3). Edrei afterwards belonged to eastern Manasseh (~~6133~~Joshua 13:31; ~~6123~~Numbers 32:33). It is probable that Edrei did not remain long in possession of the Israelites. May it not be that they abandoned it in consequence of its position within the borders of a wild region infested by numerous robber bands? The Lejah is the ancient Argob, and appears to have been the stronghold of the Geshurites; and they perhaps subsequently occupied Edrei (~~6124~~Joshua 12:4, 5). It was the seat of a bishop in the early ages of Christianity (Reland, *Palaest.* page 547), and a bishop of *Adraa* sat in the Council of Seleucia (A.D. 381) and of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). In A.D. 1142 the Crusaders under Baldwin III made a sudden attack upon *Adraa*, or *Adratum*, then popularly called also *Civitas Berardi de Stampis*, but they encountered such obstacles in the difficult nature of the ground, the scarcity of water, and the valor of the inhabitants, that they were compelled to retreat (Will. Tyr. pages 895, 896, 1031). Abulfeda calls it *Adsraat* (*Tab. Syr.* 79).

There are two ancient towns in Bashan which now claim the honor of being the representatives of Edrei. The one is called *Edhra*, and is situated on the southwest angle of the rocky district of Lejah, the Argob of the Hebrews, and the Trachonitis of the Greeks. The ruins of Edhra are among the most extensive in Hauran. The site is a strange one. It is a rocky promontory projecting from the Lejah, **SEE TRACHONITIS**, having an elevation of some thirty feet above the plain, which spreads out beyond it

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

The other place with which Edrei has been identified is called *Dera*, and stands in a shallow wady in the open plain of Hauran, about fourteen miles south of Edhra. The following reasons have been assigned in favor of the other site. 1. The name *Edrei*, which signifies "strength," and the fact that it was the capital of an ancient and warlike nation, naturally lead to the belief that it was a very strong city. Ancient cities were always, when possible, built on the tops of hills, or in rocky fastnesses, so as to be easily defended. Edhra stands on a ridge of jagged rocks, and is so encompassed with cliffs and defiles as to be almost inaccessible. *Dera*, on the contrary, is in the open plain, and has no traces of old fortifications (G. Robinson, *Travels in Palestine*, 2:168). It is difficult to believe that the warlike Rephaim would have erected a royal city in such a position. 2. *Dera* has neither well nor fountain to attract ancient colonists to an un-defended site. Its supply of water was brought by an aqueduct from a great distance

(Ritter, *Palest. and Syr.* 2:834). 3. The ruins of Edhra are more ancient, more important, and much more extensive than those of Dera. The dwellings of Edhra possess all the characteristics of remote antiquity — massive walls, stone roofs, stone doors. The monuments now existing seem to show that it must have been an important town from the time the Romans took possession of Bashan; and that it, and not Dera, was the episcopal city of Adraa, which ranked next to Bostra (Reland, *Pal.* page 219, 223, 548). None of the buildings in the latter seem older than the Roman period (Dr. Smith, in Robinson's *Bib. Res.* 3, App. page 155, 1st ed.). On the other hand, the identification of Dera and Edrei can be traced back to Eusebius and Jerome, who say that Edrei was then called *Adara* (Ἄδαρά), and was a noted city of Arabia, twenty-four miles from Bostra (*Onomast.* s.v. Ἐσδραεΐ, Esdrai). In another place they give the distance at twenty-five miles from Bostra and six from Ashtaroth (ib. s.v. Ἀσταρώθ, Astaroth, where the place in question is called Ἄδράα, Ader). *Adara* is laid down in the Peutinger Tables as here indicated (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 547; comp. Ptolemy, 5:17, 7). There can be no doubt that the city thus inferred to is the modern Dera; and the statement of Eusebius is too explicit to be set aside on the supposition that he has confounded the two sites in dispute. Moreover, it is improbable that the boundaries of Manasseh East extended so far as the locality of Edhra. Most modern geographers have therefore concluded that Dera marks the real site of Edrei (Reland, *Palaest.* page 547; Ritter, *Palest. and Syr.* 2:834; Burckhardt, *Syria*, page 241; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, page 168; Schwarz, however, declares for the other position, *Palest.* page 222).

**2.** A fortified town of northern Palestine, allotted to the tribe of Naphtali, and situated near Kedesh and Hazor (<sup><del>10937</del></sup>Joshua 19:37). About two miles south of Kedesh is a conical rocky hill called *Tell Khuraibeh*, the "Tell of the ruin," with some remains of ancient buildings on the summit and a rock-hewn tomb in its side. It is evidently an old site, and it may be that of the long-lost Edrei. The strength of the position, and its nearness to Kedesh, give probability to the supposition. Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 3:365) suggests the identity of Tell Khurmaibeh with Hazor (q.v.). For the objections to this theory, see Porter's *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, page 442.

## Education Hebrew.

Although nothing is more carefully inculcated in the Law than the duty of parents to teach their children its precepts and principles (<sup><1226></sup>Exodus 12:26; 13:8, 14; <sup><6046></sup>Deuteronomy 4:5, 9, 10; 6:2, 7, 20; 11:19, 21; <sup><4218></sup>Acts 22:3; <sup><5815></sup>2 Timothy 3:15; Susanna 3; Josephus, Ap. 2:16, 17, 25), yet there is little trace among the Hebrews in earlier times of education in any other subjects. The wisdom, therefore, and instruction, of which so much is said in the book of Proverbs, is to be understood chiefly of moral and religious discipline, imparted, according to the direction of the Law, by the teaching and under the example of parents (<sup><2102></sup>Proverbs 1:2, 8; 2:2, 10; 4:1, 7, 20; 8:1; 9:1, 10; 12:1; 16:22; 17:24; 31). Implicit exceptions to this statement may perhaps be found in the instances of Moses himself, who was brought up in all Egyptian learning (<sup><4372></sup>Acts 7:22); of the writer of the book of Job, who was evidently well versed in natural history and in the astronomy of the day (<sup><8881></sup>Job 38:31; 39, 40, 41); of Daniel and his companions in captivity (<sup><2004></sup>Daniel 1:4, 17; and, above all, in the intellectual gifts and acquirements of Solomon, which were even more renowned than his political greatness (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 4:29, 34; 10:1-9; <sup><4301></sup>2 Chronicles 9:1-8), and the memory of which has, with much exaggeration, been widely preserved in Oriental tradition. The statement made above may, however, in all probability, be taken as representing the chief aim of ordinary Hebrew education, both at the time when the Law was best observed, and also when, after periods of national decline from the Mosaic standard, attempts were made by monarchs, as Jehoshaphat or Josiah, or by prophets, as Elijah or Isaiah, to enforce, or at least to inculcate reform in the moral condition of the people on the basis of that standard (<sup><2713></sup>2 Kings 17:13; 22:8-20; <sup><4470></sup>2 Chronicles 17:7, 9; <sup><1194></sup>1 Kings 19:14; Isaiah 1 sq.).

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

The sect of the Essenes, though themselves abhorring marriage, were anxious to undertake, and careful in carrying out the education of children,



but confined its subject matter chiefly to morals and the divine law (Josephus, War, 2:8, 12; Philo, Quod *omnis probus* liber, 2:458, ed. Mangey; § 12, Tauchn.).

Previous to the captivity, the chief depositaries of learning were the schools or colleges, from which, in most cases (see <sup><3074></sup>Amos 7:14), proceeded that succession of public teachers who, at various times, endeavored to reform the moral and religious conduct of both rulers and people. (See Werkmeister, *De prima scholarus ap. Hebr. origine*, Jesuit. 1735; Hegewisch, *Ob bei den Alten offentl. Erziehung war*, Altona, 1811.) In these schools the Law was probably the chief subject of instruction; the study of languages was little followed by any Jews till after the Captivity, but from that time the number of Jews residing in foreign countries must have made the knowledge of foreign languages more common than before (see <sup><4215></sup>Acts 21:37). From the time of the outbreak of the last war with the Romans, parents were forbidden to instruct their children in Greek literature (Mishna, *Sotah*, c. 9:15, volume 3, page 307, 308, Surenhus). Nor had it ever been generally pursued by the Jews (Origen, *contra Celsum*, 2:34).

Besides the prophetic schools, instruction was given by the priests in the Temple and elsewhere, but their subjects were doubtless exclusively concerned with religion and worship (<sup><8001></sup>Leviticus 10:11; <sup><3423></sup>Ezekiel 44:23, 24; <sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 25:7, 8; <sup><3007></sup>Malachi 2:7). Those sovereigns who exhibited any anxiety for the maintenance of the religious element in the Jewish polity were conspicuous in enforcing the religious education of the people (<sup><4470></sup>2 Chronicles 17:7, 8, 9, 19:5, 8, 11; <sup><1230></sup>2 Kings 23:2).

From the time of the settlement in Canaan there must have been among the Jews persons skilled in writing and in accounts. Perhaps the neighborhood of the tribe of Zebulun to the commercial district of Phoenicia may have been the occasion of their reputation in this respect. The "writers" of that tribe are represented (<sup><0054></sup>Judges 5:14) by the same word, *ῥῥσῥσopher*, used in that passage of the levying of an army, or, perhaps, of a military officer (Gesenius, s.v.) as is applied to Ezra in reference to the Law (<sup><15006></sup>Ezra 7:6); to Seraiah, David's scribe or secretary (<sup><10087></sup>2 Samuel 8:17); to Shebna, scribe to Hezekiah (<sup><12087></sup>2 Kings 18:37); Shemaiah (<sup><13406></sup>1 Chronicles 24:6); Baruch, scribe to Jeremiah (<sup><2052></sup>Jeremiah 36:32), and others filling like offices at various times. The municipal officers of the kingdom, especially in the time of Solomon, must have required a staff of

well-educated persons in their various departments under the recorder, *ryKzñi mazkir'*, or historiographer, whose business was to compile memorials of the reign (<sup><1086></sup>2 Samuel 8:16; 20:24; <sup><1288></sup>2 Kings 18:18; <sup><1618></sup>2 Chronicles 34:8). Learning, in the sense above mentioned, was at all times highly esteemed, and educated persons were treated with great respect, and, according to Rabbinical tradition, were called "sons of the noble," and allowed to take precedence of others at table (Lightfoot, *Chr. Temp.* Acts 17, volume 2:79, fol.; *Hor. Hebr.* <sup><2148></sup>Luke 14:8-24; 2:540). The same authority deplores the degeneracy of later times in this respect (Mishna, *Sotah*, 9:15, volume 3, 308, Surenhus).

To the schools of the prophets succeeded, after the Captivity, the synagogues, which were either themselves used as schools, or had places near them for that purpose. In most places there was at least one, and in Jerusalem, according to some, 394, according to others, 460 (Calmet, *Dict. s.v. Eccles*). It was from these schools, and the doctrines of the various teachers presiding over them, of whom Gamaliel, Sammai, and Hillel were among the most famous, that many of those traditions and refinements proceeded by which the Law was in our Lord's time encumbered and obscured, and which may be considered as represented, though in a highly exaggerated degree, by the Talmud. After the destruction of Jerusalem, colleges, inheriting and probably enlarging the traditions of their predecessors, were maintained for a long time at Japhne in Galilee, at Lydda, at Tiberias, the most famous of all, and at Sepphoris. These schools, in process of time, were dispersed into other countries, and by degrees destroyed. According to the principles laid down in the Mishna, boys at five years of age were to begin the Scriptures, at ten the Mishna, at thirteen they became subject to the whole Law (see <sup><1086></sup>Luke 2:46), at fifteen they entered the Gemara (Mishna, *Pirk. Ab.* 4:20; 5:21, volume 4, page 460, 482, 486, Surenhus.). Teachers were treated with great respect, and both pupils and teachers were exhorted to respect each other. Physical science formed part of the course of instruction (*ib. in*, 18). Unmarried men and women were not allowed to be teachers of boys (Mishna, *Kiddush.* 4:13, volume 3, page 383). In the schools the Rabbins sat on raised seats, and the scholars, according to their age, sat on benches below or on the ground (Lightfoot on *Lake* 2:46; Philo, *at sup.* 12, 2:458, Mangey).

Of female education we have little account in Scripture, but it is clear that the prophetic schools included within their scope the instruction of females, who were occasionally invested with authority similar to that of

the prophets themselves (~~17004~~Judges 4:4; ~~12214~~2 Kings 22:14). Needlework formed a large, but by no means the only subject of instruction imparted to females, whose position in society and in the household must by no means be considered as represented in modern Oriental including Mohammedan-usage (see ~~12116~~Proverbs 21:16, 26; Hist. of Sus. 3; ~~4180~~Luke 8:2, 3; 10:39; ~~4135~~Acts 13:50; ~~5005~~2 Timothy 1:5).

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

## Education For The Ministry.

*SEE MINISTRY; SEE THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.*

## Edumia

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

## E'duth

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

## Edward III Confessor,

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

## Edward VI

king of England, son of Henry VIII by his wife Jane Seymour, was born at Hampton Court, October 12, 1537. He is mentioned here rather for the great events of his reign than for his personal qualities, though these were

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

### Edwards Bela Bates, D.D.,

was born in Southampton, Massachusetts, July 4, 1802, and graduated at Amherst College in 1824, and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1830. He served as a tutor in Amherst College during the years 1827-28, and as assistant secretary of the American Education Society during the years 1828-33. In 1837 he was ordained as a minister of the Gospel, and was also appointed professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary; and in 1848 he was elected associate professor of sacred literature, as successor of Professor Moses Stuart, in the same institution. From 1828 to 1842 he edited the *American Quarterly Register*. He established in 1833 the *American Quarterly Observer*. After publishing two volumes of it, he united it with the *Biblical Repository*, and was sole editor of the combined periodicals from January 1835, to January 1838. From 1844 to 1852 he was the senior editor of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. For twenty-three years he was employed in superintending periodical literature, and, with the assistance of several associates, has left thirty-one octavo volumes as the monuments of his enterprise and industry in this department of labor. He also edited several duodecimo volumes, among which are the *Eclectic Reader*, the *Biography of Self-taught Men*, the *Memoir of Henry Martyn*, to which he prefixed an Introductory Essay. He published many articles in the religious newspapers, various pamphlets, and important parts of several volumes, such as the *German Selections*, by professors Edwards and Park; *Classical Studies*, by professors Edwards, Sears, and Felton. He injured his

constitution by his unremitting toils, and was compelled to make the tour of Europe for his health, and to spend two winters in the South. He died at Athens, Georgia, April 20, 1852, in the fiftieth year of his age. He was distinguished not only for his poetic sentiment, large erudition, soundness of judgment, skill as an instructor, and eloquence as a preacher, but also for his delicacy of taste, his tender sensibilities, and, above all, his deep, earnest, and uniform piety. Some of his discourses and essays, with a memoir of his life by E.A. Park, were published in Boston in 1853 in two duodecimo volumes. (E.A.P.)

### Edwards John, D.D.,

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

## Edwards, Jonathan,

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

The history of President Edwards cannot be fully understood without considering that both on the paternal end maternal side he was allied with families belonging to the ecclesiastical aristocracy of New England. He was an only son, and had ten sisters, some of whom became the wives of eminent men. He was trained by his father and his four eldest sisters (all of whom were proficient in learning) for Yale College, which he entered in 1716, just before he was thirteen years of age. During the next year his favorite study was Locke on the Human Understanding. "Taking that book into his hand upon some occasion not long before his death, he said to some of his select friends who were then with him, that he was beyond expression entertained and pleased with it when he read it in his youth at

college; that he was as much engaged, and had more satisfaction and pleasure in studying it, than the most greedy miser in gathering up handfuls of silver and gold from some new-discovered treasure." When about twelve years of age he wrote a paper which indicates that he had been thoroughly interested in the question of Materialism. At about the same age he composed some remarkable papers on questions in natural philosophy. Having distinguished himself at college as an acute thinker, and also as an impassioned writer, he took his Bachelor's degree in 1720, and delivered the "salutatory, which was also the valedictory oration."

When he was a boy, probably about the age of seven or eight years, he began to develop his religious character. He writes: "I was then very much affected for many months, and concerned about the things of religion and my soul's salvation, and was abundant in religious duties. I used to pray five times a day in secret, and to spend much time in religious conversation with other boys, and used to meet with them to pray together. I experienced I know not what kind of delight in religion. I, with some of my schoolmates, joined together and built a booth in a swamp, in a very retired spot, for a place of prayer; and, besides, I had particular secret places of my own in the woods where I used to retire by myself, and was from time to time much affected. My affections seemed to be lively and easily moved, and I seemed to be in my element when engaged in religious duties."

Reflecting on these fervid emotions, Edwards afterward regarded them as no signs of genuine piety. He was keen in his analysis of character, and was wont to encourage, not only in others, but also in himself, the habit of severe self-examination, and of jealous watchfulness against the influence of self-love. Although from his earliest childhood he had been dutiful, docile, and exemplary in his outward demeanor, yet he writes concerning his boyhood and youth: "I was at times very uneasy, especially towards the latter part of my time at college, when it pleased God to seize me with a pleurisy, in which he brought me nigh to the grave, and shook me over the pit of hell. And yet it was not long after my recovery before I fell again into my old ways of sin. But God would not suffer me to go on with any quietness. I had great and violent inward struggles, till, after many conflicts with wicked inclinations, repeated resolutions, and bonds that I laid myself under by a kind of vows to God, I was brought wholly to break off all former wicked ways, and all ways of known outward sin, and to apply myself to seek salvation, and practice many religious duties, but without that kind of affection and delight which I had formerly experienced." With



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

which oftentimes was exceedingly entertaining, leading me to sweet contemplations of my great and glorious God. While thus engaged it always seemed natural for me to sing or chant forth my meditations, or to speak my thoughts in soliloquies with a singing voice."

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

In September, 1723, he was called to a tutorship in Yale College. Having passed the preceding winter and spring in severe study at the college, he entered on his tutorship in June 1724, and left it in September 1726. After having declined various invitations to take the oversight of churches, he was ordained February 15, 1727, as pastor of the church in Northampton, a colleague with his celebrated grandfather, Solomon Stoddard. He rose at once into eminence as a preacher, especially as a preacher of the divine law, of the divine sovereignty, of man's entire sinfulness by nature, of

justification by faith, and of eternal punishment. He often spoke *extempore*; he seldom made a gesture; his voice was not commanding; his power was that of deep thought and strong feeling. Dr. Trumbull says that when Mr. Edwards was preaching at Enfield, Connecticut, "there was such a breathing of distress and weeping that the preacher was obliged to speak to the people and desire silence that he might be heard." A gentleman remarked to President Dwight that when, in his youth, he heard Mr. Edwards describe the day of judgment, he fully supposed that immediately at the close of the sermon "the Judge would descend, and the final separation take place." During the delivery of one of his most overwhelming discourses in the pulpit of a minister unused to such power, this minister is said to have forgotten himself so far as to pull the preacher by the coat, and try to stay the torrent of such appalling eloquence by the question, "Mr. Edwards! Mr. Edwards! is not God a merciful Being?"

In February, 1729, in consequence of the death of Mr. Stoddard, the entire charge of the congregation at Northampton was devolved on Mr. Edwards. In 1734 and 1735 occurred a remarkable "awakening" of religious feeling in his parish; another occurred in 1740, at which period he became a bosom friend of George Whitefield. During both these developments of religious activity he preached with a force which overawed his hearers. While his parochial labors were multifarious and earnest, he studied the phenomena of the revival with the keenness of a philosopher, and they prompted him to write some of his most acute disquisitions. Indeed, nearly all the works which he published during his ministry at Northampton indicate the degree in which he labored for the promotion or the regulation of those religious "awakenings" for which his ministry was distinguished. Some of these works are merely sermons, others are larger treatises. They bear the following titles: *God glorified in Man's Dependence* (1731): — *A divine and supernatural Light imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God* (1734; a sermon noted for its spiritual philosophy): — *Curse ye Meroz* (1735): — *A faithful Narrative of the surprising Work of God in the Conversion of many hundred Souls in Northampton, etc.* (London, 1736): — *Five Discourses prefixed to the American Edition of this Narrative* (1738): — *Sinners in the Hands of an angry God* (1741; one of his most terrific sermons): — *Sorrows of the bereaved spread before Jesus* (1741): — *Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the true Spirit* (1741): — *Thoughts on the Revival in New, England, etc.* (1742): — *The Watchman's Duty and Account* (1743): — *The true Excellency of a Gospel Minister* (1744): — A

*Treatise concerning religious Affections* (1745; one of his most spiritual and analytical works): — *An humble Attempt to promote explicit Agreement and visible Union among God's People in extraordinary Prayer* (1746): — *True Saints, when absent from the Body, present with the Lord* (1747): — *God's awful Judgments in breaking the strong Rods of the Community* (1748): — *Life and Diary of the Reverend David Brainerd* (1749; a volume which exerted a decisive influence on Henry Martyn, and has affected the missionary spirit of the English as well as American churches): — *Christ the Example of Gospel Ministers* (1749): — *Qualifications for full Communion in the visible Church* (1749; a treatise of historical as well as theological importance): — *Farewell Sermon to the People of Northampton* (1750; called "the best farewell sermon ever written").

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

At the present day, when the dismissal of pastors is so frequent, we cannot easily imagine the mortification and injury which Edwards suffered

in consequence of his difficulties with his parish. He was in his forty-seventh year, and had accumulated no property for the support of his large and expensive family. He was compelled to receive pecuniary aid from his friends in remote parts of this country and in Great Britain. His wife was a descendant from the earls of Kingston, and was a lady of rare accomplishments. The description which he wrote of her in her girlhood was pronounced by Dr. Chalmers to be one of the most beautiful compositions in the language. He was married to her on the 27th of July, 1727, and at the time of his dismissal, his eldest son, afterwards judge Timothy Edwards, was about twelve years of age; his second son, afterwards Dr. Jonathan Edwards, was about five years of age; and his youngest son, afterwards judge Pierpont Edwards, was an infant of two or three months; his third daughter, afterwards the mother of Aaron Burr, was in her eighteenth year; and his fourth daughter, afterwards the mother of president Timothy Dwight, was in her sixteenth year. He had a family of three sons and seven daughters, another daughter, Jerusha, having died three years before his dismissal. She was betrothed to David Brainerd, who had been a cherished inmate of her father's family.

In July, 1751, about a year after his dismissal, Edwards was installed pastor of the small Congregational church in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, and missionary of the Housatonic tribe of Indians at that place. He preached extemporaneously to the Indians through an interpreter. In this uncultivated wilderness he was sadly afflicted with the fever and ague, and other disorders incident to the new settlements. He published a characteristic sermon in 1752, entitled *True Grace distinguished from the Experience of Devils*. In 1754 he published the most celebrated of his works — his *Essay on the Freedom of the Will*. Of this essay there are conflicting interpretations. One school of interpreters contend that he believed in a *literal* inability of the soul to act otherwise than it does act; another school contend that he did not believe in an inability which is *natural* and *literal*, but only in one which is *moral*, *figurative*, "an inability improperly so called." One school contend that he believed liberty to consist in the mere power of doing what the soul has previously willed, of outwardly executing what the soul has antecedently chosen; another school contend that he believed liberty to consist in the power of electing either of two or more objects — such a power that men are not "at all hindered by any fatal necessity from doing, and even willing and choosing as they please, with full freedom; yea, with the highest kind of liberty that ever was

thought of, or that ever could possibly enter into the heart of any man to conceive" (Letter to a Scotch theologian). One school regard Edwards as agreeing with those Calvinists who suppose that "man, in his state of innocency, had freedom and power to do that which is good and well-pleasing to God, but yet mutably so that he might fall from it," and that "man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation;" another school regard Edwards as denying this proposition in its *literal*, and affirming it only in its *figurative* sense, and believing that since the Fall man has all the freedom or liberty which he ever had, or can be imagined to have. One class of critics suppose him to believe that motives are the efficient or the necessitating causes of volitions; another class suppose him to believe that the volition is the *result* of motive as an *occasion*, rather than the necessary *effect* of motive as a *cause*. The latter class interpret his whole theory of the will in the light of the following remark of Edwards to the Scotch divine: "On the contrary, I have largely declared that the connection between antecedent things and consequent ones, which takes place with regard to the acts of men's wills, which is called moral necessity, is called by the name of *necessity* improperly, and that all such terms as *must*, *cannot*, *impossible*, *unable*, *irresistible*, *unavoidable*, *invincible*, etc., when applied here, are not applied in their proper signification, and are either used nonsensically and with perfect insignificance, or in a sense quite diverse from their original and proper meaning, and their use in common speech, and that such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills is more properly called certainty than necessity, it being no other than the certain connection between the subject and predicate of the proposition which affirms their existence." It is asserted by many that Edwards makes no distinction between the will and the sensibilities; it is thought by some that he does make a distinction; the acts of the will being acts of moral *choice*, the processes of the sensibilities being what he elsewhere terms "*natural or animal feelings or affections*."

During his virtual banishment to the Stockbridge wilderness he wrote another of his more noted works, entitled *The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin defended*, etc. The work was finished May 26, 1757, but was not published until 1758, several months after his death. Perhaps the distinctive peculiarity of this treatise is his defense of the doctrine that there was a constituted *oneness* or *identity* of Adam and his posterity;" that they constituted, "as it were, *one* complex person, or *one* moral whole;" that as a tree, when a century old, is *one* plant with the little sprout from which it

grew — as the body of a man, when forty years old, is *one* with the infant body from which it grew — as the body and soul are *one* with each other, so there is a divine "constitution" according to which Adam and his posterity are "*looked upon as one*, and dealt with accordingly;" that in his descendants "the *first existing* of a corrupt disposition is not to be looked upon as sin belonging to them, *distinct* from their participation in Adam's first sin;" that "the *guilt* a man has upon his soul at his first existence is one and simple, viz., the guilt of the original apostasy, the guilt of the sin by which the species first rebelled against God. This, and the guilt arising from the first corruption or depraved disposition of the heart, are not to be looked upon as *two* things distinctly imputed and charged upon men in the sight of God," but are one and the same thing, according to an arbitrary constitution, like that which causes the continued identity of a river which is constantly flowing, or of an animal body which is constantly fluctuating. "When I call this an *arbitrary constitution*, I mean that it is a constitution which depends on nothing but the *divine will*, which divine will depends on nothing but the *divine wisdom*." During his retirement at Stockbridge, Edwards wrote his *Dissertation concerning the End for which God created the World*, and also his *Dissertation concerning the Nature of true Virtue*. On the former of these treatises he had expended much, and on the latter a life-long study. One class of his interpreters suppose that he wrote the first of these treatises with the design, and that the treatise has been followed with the result, of modifying the popular aspect of Calvinism, and of thereby removing some of the popular objections to the system as formerly held. They suppose that he designed to make the sovereignty of God appear the more amiable by showing that it is intent on the highest interests of his creatures; that the glory of God and the well-being of the universe are one and the same thing, and therefore, when God is said to govern the universe for his own glory, he is also said to govern it for its own well-being. In the second of the two last-named treatises, a treatise which, like the first, and like many of his other essays, was designed to reconcile reason with faith — a treatise the rudiments of which were written in his boyhood, and are found scattered through many of his published works — he reduces all moral goodness to 'the love of being in general,' and this love he considers an act of the will as distinct from "animal or natural feeling." Those Calvinistic divines who believe that all the virtues, such as faith, justice, etc., are in their nature active, and are mere forms of benevolence, and that all sin is equally active, and is the elective preference of an inferior above a superior good, appeal to

Edwards's *Dissertation on Virtue* as having given a marked impulse to what has been called by various names, such as the new, or the New England, or the Hopkinsian divinity. The two last-named dissertations were not published until 1788, thirty years after his death. In 1764 eighteen of Edwards's sermons were published in a volume, to which was prefixed his memoir by Dr. Samuel Hopkins. In 1777 his celebrated *History of Redemption*, in 1788, a new volume of his sermons, in 1789 another new volume of his sermons, in 1793 his *Miscellaneous Observations on important Theological Subjects*, in 1796 his *Remarks on important Theological Controversies*, were all published at Edinburgh, Scotland. His published works were collected and printed in eight volumes at Worcester, Mass., under the editorship of Dr. Samuel Austin, in 1809, and have been republished repeatedly in England and America. A larger edition of his writings, in ten volumes, including a new memoir, and much new material, especially his *Notes on the Bible*, was published at New York in 1829, under the editorial care of Rev. Dr. Sereno Edwards Dwight. Parts of this edition have been republished in England. In 1852, his work entitled *Charity and its Fruits* was published for the first time, and more recently a volume of his writings has been printed in England, which has never been reprinted in America.

One of most interesting aspects in which president Edwards may be viewed is that of his influence over Whitefield, Brainerd, and two of his theological pupils, Bellamy and Hopkins. Another is that of his influence over European scholars and divines. Several of his treatises were published in Great Britain before they were published in America, and the estimate formed of him by Dr. Erskine, Dr. Chalmers, Robert Hall, Dugald Stewart, Sir Henry Moncrief, Sir James Mackintosh, Dr. Priestley, Dr. George Hill, Isaac Taylor, and others, is higher than that expressed by men of the same relative position in this country. It is a remarkable fact that, while living in a kind of exile as a missionary among the Indians at Stockbridge, he was invited to the presidency of the college at Princeton, New Jersey. He was elected to the office on the 26th of September, 1757. In his first response to the trustees he expressed his great surprise at their appointment, and, among other reasons for declining it, he said, with his characteristic simplicity, "I have a constitution in many respects peculiarly unhappy, attended with flaccid solids, vapid, sily, and scarce fluids, and a low tide of spirits, often occasioning a kind of childish weakness and contemptibleness of speech, presence, and demeanor, with a disagreeable dullness and



stiffness much unfitting me for conversation, but more especially for the government of a college." He was dismissed from his Stockbridge pastorate January 4, 1758, after having labored in it six years and a half. He spent a part of January and all of February at Princeton, performing some duties at the college, but was not inaugurated until the 16th of February, 1758. He was inoculated for the small-pox on the 23d of the same month; and after the ordinary effects of the inoculation had nearly subsided, a secondary fever supervened, and he died on the 22d of March, 1758. He had then resided at Princeton about nine weeks, and had been the inaugurated president of the college just five weeks. His age was 54 years, 5 months, and 17 days. His father died in his 89th year, only two months before him; his son-in-law, president Burr, died in his 42d year, only six months before him; his daughter, Mrs. President Burr, died in her 27th year, only sixteen days after him; his wife died in her 49th year, only six months and ten days after him. The three last named are interred in the same burial ground at Princeton. (E.A.P.)

### Edwards, Jonathan D.D.,

the second son and ninth child of the President whose history has been sketched in the preceding article, was born at Northampton, Massachusetts, May 26th, 1745. Although each was the president of a college, yet, as the father was not a doctor of divinity, he is familiarly termed the President, and the son is distinguished from him as the Doctor. In his early childhood young Edwards was afflicted with an ocular disease, and therefore did not learn to read at so early an age as his powers and instincts would have inclined him. In consequence also of his father's ecclesiastical troubles at Northampton, he was deprived of some important facilities for his education. "When I was but six years of age," he writes in 1788, "my father removed with his family to Stockbridge, which at that time was inhabited by Indians almost solely, as there were in the town but twelve families of whites, or Anglo-Americans, and perhaps one hundred and fifty families of Indians. The Indians being the nearest neighbors, I constantly associated with them; -their boys were my daily schoolmates and play-fellows. Out of my father's house I seldom heard any language spoken but the Indian. By these means I acquired the knowledge of that language, and a great facility in speaking it. It became more familiar to me than my mother-tongue. I knew the names of some things in Indian that I did not know in English. Even all my thoughts ran in Indian; and, though the true pronunciation of the language is extremely difficult to all but

themselves, they acknowledged that I had acquired it perfectly, which, as they said, had never been done before by any Anglo-American. On account of my skill in their language in general, I received from them many compliments applauding my superior wisdom. This skill in their language I have in a good measure retained to this day."

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

accept, the professorship of languages and logic in the same institution. He had distinguished himself as a linguist and as a logician at Nassau Hall, and at a later day he received the doctorate of divinity from that college. Thus in his earlier years he was honored by his Alma Mater as a man of uncommon promise, and in his mature years as a man of uncommon attainments. His contemporaries speak of him as indefatigably diligent while at college, and as ever afterwards an eager aspirant for knowledge in its various branches.

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

He had already acquired a great reputation as a philosopher and as a philanthropist. He was well known and much beloved by divines in Great Britain, with some of whom he maintained an active correspondence. Such a man could not long remain without some official relations. In January 1796, he was installed pastor of the church in Colebrook, Connecticut. Here, in the bosom of an intelligent, affectionate, and confiding parish, he persevered in his rigorous system of study, and prepared himself for works which he did not live to execute. Having enjoyed his busy retreat a little

more than three years, he was surprised by being called in May 1799, to the presidency of Union College, Schenectady, N.Y. After a prolonged examination of his duty, he applied to an ecclesiastical council for their advice, and in accordance with their counsel he accepted the new office. He entered on its duties in the summer of 1799, and was welcomed with unusual demonstrations of joy. Reverend Dr. Andrew Yates, who was associated with Dr. Edwards in the government of the college, says of him: "His discipline was mild and affectionately parental, and his requirements reasonable. Such a character for government in president Edwards was unexpected to some who professed to know his disposition, and had formed their opinions of him in this respect. It was therefore the more noticed. There was an apparent austerity and reserve in his manner, which no doubt arose from the retirement of study and from habits of close thought, and would leave such an impression after a slight acquaintance; but in his domestic intercourse, and with his intimate friends, while conscientiously strict and prompt in his duties, and while he acted with decision, he was mild and affectionate. The same spirit characterized his government of the college. It was probably conducted with greater mildness and affection than would have been exercised had not the prevailing expectations of some intimated the danger of his erring on the side of severity. His pupils, like a well-regulated family under faithful discipline, were respectfully attached to him."

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

The influence of Dr. Edwards in the pulpit, although not equal to that of his father, was yet greater than might have been expected from his analytic habits. His eye was piercing, his whole manner was impressive, his thoughts were clear and weighty, and his general character was itself a sermon. He was known to be honest, and a hearty lover of the truth as it is in Jesus. Although not a talker, in the superficial meaning of that phrase, yet he was powerful in conversation with men of letters, and was a prince among disputants; therefore his influence over his theological pupils was

perhaps as important as his power in molding the character of his parishioners. He instructed many young men for the Christian ministry, and his influence is yet apparent in the writings of some of them. One of these pupils was his nephew, president Dwight, of Yale College, who was wont to speak of him with filial reverence; another was Dr. Griffin, president of Williams College, who bore frequent testimony to the power of his teacher. A large part of Dr. Edwards's influence arose from his interpretations of his father's writings. He often said that he had spent his life on those writings, although, in fact, he had more various learning than belonged to his father. He studied the published and the unpublished works of the elder president with peculiar care. He was an early and confidential friend of Dr. Bellamy, one of the most intimate associates of the elder president, and he learned from Bellamy the exact shadings of the father's system. He was also a lifelong friend of Dr. Samuel Hopkins, another of president Edwards's bosom companions, and he obtained from Hopkins many nice discriminations in regard to the president's theories as expounded in his conversations. He was thus well fitted to be an editor of his father's works, and he did prepare for the press the *History of the Work of Redemption*, two volumes of sermons, and two volumes of *Miscellaneous Observations on important Theological Subjects*. He was also well fitted to write a commentary on his father's doctrinal system, as that system was originally published by the President, or afterwards modified by Hopkins, Bellamy, Smalley, and others. In this aspect there is great value belonging to Dr. Edwards's treatise entitled *Improvements in Theology made by President Edwards and those who have followed his Course of Thought*. In 1797, while he was at Colebrook, he published *A Dissertation concerning Liberty and Necessity, in reply to the Reverend Dr. Samuel West*. This volume may be regarded as perhaps the fairest exponent of the elder president's theory of the will. It led Dr. Emmons to say that, of the two, the father had more reason than the son, yet the son was a better reasoner than the father. It is accordingly in his published works that the influence of Dr. Edwards has been most conspicuous. He printed numerous articles in the *New York Theological Magazine*; various sermons, one in 1783, at the ordination of Reverend Timothy Dwight, at Greenfield, Connecticut; one in 1791, on the Injustice and Impolicy of the Slave-trade; one in 1791, on Human Depravity; one in 1792, at the ordination of Reverend Dan Bradley, at Hamden; one in 1792, at the ordination of Reverend William Brown, at Glastenbury; one in 1792, the *Concio ad Clerom*, preached in the chapel of Yale College on the marriage of a deceased wife's sister; one in 1793, on

the death of Roger Sherman; an election sermon in 1794; in 1797, a sermon on the Future State: of Existence and the Immortality of the Soul; in 1799, a Farewell Sermon to the people of Colebrook. The most celebrated of his discourses are the three *On the Necessity of the Atonement and its Consistency with Free Grace in Forgiveness*. They were "preached before his excellency the governor and a large number of both houses of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, during their sessions at New Haven, in October, 1785, and published by request." They have been frequently republished, and they form the basis of that theory of the atonement which is sometimes called the "Edwardean theory," and is now commonly adopted by what is termed the "New England school of divines." These discourses have great historical as well as theological importance, and they serve to illustrate the fact that some of the most profound treatises in the science of divinity have been originally preached in sermons. One ultimate design of his volume on the Atonement was to refute the argument which some were deriving from that doctrine in favor of universal salvation. Intimately connected with this volume was another larger work, originally published in 1789, but frequently republished, and entitled, *The Salvation of all Men strictly examined, and the endless Punishment of those who die impenitent argued and defended against the Reasonings of Dr. Chauncy in his book entitled "The Salvation of all Men."* This work alone would have established the fame of Dr. Edwards as a divine of singular acuteness, deep penetration, accuracy and precision of thought and style. At the present day it is more suggestive of the true and the decisive modes of reasoning on this subject than is perhaps any other volume. The preceding works illustrate the metaphysical acumen and the profound judgment of Dr. Edwards; he published one essay which indicates his tact as a philologist, and which elicited the enthusiastic praises of Humboldt. This is his *Observations on the Language of the Muhhekaneew Indians, in which the Extent of that Language in North America is shown, its Genius grammatically traced, and some of its Peculiarities, and some Instances of Analogy between that and the Hebrew are pointed out*. These observations were "communicated to the Connecticut Society of Arts and Sciences, and published at the request of the society." One of the most accomplished of American linguists, Honorable John Pickering, who edited one edition of this paper, says of it: "The work has been for some time well known in Europe, where it has undoubtedly contributed to the diffusion of more just ideas than once prevailed respecting the structure of the Indian languages, and has served to correct some of the errors into which learned

men had been led by placing too implicit confidence in the accounts of hasty travelers and blundering interpreters. In the *Mithridates*, that immortal monument of philological research, professor Vater refers to it for the information he has given upon the Mohegan language, and he has published large extracts from it. To a perfect familiarity with the Muhhekaneew dialect, Dr. Edwards united a stock of grammatical and other learning 'which well qualified him for the task of reducing an unwritten language to the rules of grammar.'" Nearly all of Dr. Edwards's published writings were collected and reprinted in two octavo volumes, each of above 500 pages, in 1842. They were edited, and a memoir was prefixed to them, by his grandson, Reverend Tryon Edwards, D.D.

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

### Edwards, Justin, D.D.

an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Westhampton, Massachusetts, April 25, 1787. He graduated at Williams College 1810; entered the Theological Seminary in Andover March 1811, and was installed pastor of the South Church in the same place December 2, 1812. In 1825 he was one of the sixteen who founded the "American Society for the Promotion of Temperance." He was installed pastor of the Salem-Street Church, Boston, January 1, 1828, but resigned August 20, 1829, and entered the service of the American Temperance Society as secretary. His zeal, wisdom, and activity contributed, perhaps more than any other agency, to diffuse the principles of the Temperance reform in the United States. He was elected Professor of Theology in the Seminary in New York in February 1836, and President of the Seminary at Andover, 1837. He accepted the latter appointment. In 1842 he was chosen secretary of the

newly — formed American and Foreign Sabbath Union, and in this service he spent several laborious and eminently useful years. He died July 24, 1853. He published *An Address before the Rhetorical Society in the Theological Seminary at Andover* (1824): — *An Address at the laying of the corner-stone of the new meeting-house in Andover* (1826): — *A Letter to the friends of Temperance in Massachusetts* (1836): — *Permanent Temperance Documents*, a series of papers (1830-36): — *Permanent Documents*, a series of papers on *The Sabbath*; and numerous tracts for the American Tract Society, and a compendious Commentary (N.T. and part of O.T.; Amer. Tract Society). His life was full of varied but always consecrated labor, and few men have contributed more largely to promote Christian ethics in America by laying their foundation wisely in true religion. See Halleek, *Life of Justin Edwards* (Amer. Tract Society); and Sprague, *Annals*, 2:572.

### Edwards, Morgan

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

### Edwards, Thomas

an English divine, was born about 1579, passed A.B. at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1605, and A.M. in 1609. He did not become a Nonconformist, but yet was always a Puritan in theology. "I never," says he, "had a canonical coat, declined subscription for many years before the Parliament, though I practiced the old conformity; much less did I bow to the altar and at the name of Jesus," etc. He was lecturer at Hertford, and afterwards in London. When the Long Parliament declared against Charles



He sided with them, but when the Independents came into power he opposed them with great virulence both by writing and acting. He published *Reasons against the Independent Government of particular Congregations* (1641, 4to): — *Antapologia, or a full answer to the apologetical Narration of Mr. Goodwyn, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Bridge, Members of the Assembly of Divines, wherein are handled many of the Controversies of these Times* (1644, 4to: the chief design of this work we learn from himself, in the preface to it: "This *Antapologia*," says he, "I here recommend to you for a true glass to behold the faces of Presbytery and Independency in, with the beauty, order, and strength of the one, and the deformity, disorder, and weakness of the other"): — *Gangraena, or a Catalogue and discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this Time* (1645, 4to): — *Gangraena*, part 2 (1646, 4to): — *Gangraena*, part 3: — *The casting down of the last and strongest hold of Satan, or a Treatise against Toleration* (part 1:1647): — *Of the particular Visibility of the Church: — A Treatise of the Civil Power in Ecclesiastica's, and of Suspension from the Lord's Supper*. He died August 24, 1647. He professed himself "a plain, open-hearted man, who hated tricks, reserves, and designs; zealous for the Assembly of Divines, the Directory, the use of the Lord's Prayer, singing of psalms, etc., and so earnest for what he took to be the truth that he was usually called in Cambridge young Luther." — Kippis, *Biog. Brit.* volume 5.

### Edwards, Thomas, D.D.

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

- (1.) *The Doctrine of irresistible Grace proved to have no Foundation in the Writings of the New Testament* (Camb. 1759, 8vo): —
- (2.) *Prolegomena in libros veteris Testamenti poeticos* (Cantab. 1762, 8vo).

## Edwards, Timothy

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

## Edwy

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

*Brit. Lit.* (A.S.P.) 430 sq.; Collier, *Ecclesiastes History*, 1:430 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* 25 and 42.

### Edzardi, Esra

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

### Edzardi, Esra Heinrich

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

### Edzardi, Georg Elieser

son of Esra Edzardi, known, like his father, as a great Hebrew scholar, was born at Hamburg January 22, 1661. He studied at the universities of Giessen, Frankfort on the Oder, and Heidelberg, and resided for some time at Worms, where he held many disputations with the Rabbis. After a journey through Germany, he was appointed professor of Greek and history at the gymnasium in Hamburg. In 1717 he was appointed professor of Hebrew, and in this department became the worthy successor of his father, and, like him, was zealous in the conversion of the Jews. He died

July 23, 1727. Besides treatises on the Talmud, we have from him *Excerpta Gemarae Babyloniae*. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 15:693; Grasse, *Literargeschichte*, 6:886. (J.H.W.)

### Edzardi, Johann Esra

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

### Edzardi, Sebastian

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

*Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 15:694; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* 1:672; Aschblach, *Allgem. Kirchen-Lexikon*, 2:495; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte s.d. Reform.* 8:231, 232; Grasse, *Allgem. Literargeschichte*, 6:886. (J.H.W.)

## Effectual Calling

SEE CALL.

## Effectual Prayer

is the rendering of an expression which occurs <sup><3956></sup>James 5:16: "The *effectual fervent* (ἐνεργουμένη) prayer of a righteous man availeth much." The verb ἐνεργέω (the root of the English *energy*), thus translated, signifies to *work in*, produce, effect (intransitively, <sup><4042></sup>Matthew 14:2; <sup><4065></sup>Mark 6:15; or transitively, <sup><6176></sup>1 Corinthians 12:6; <sup><8085></sup>Galatians 3:5; <sup><8011></sup>Ephesians 1:11; <sup><1883></sup>Philippians 2:13; or in the "middle voice," <sup><8085></sup>Romans 7:5; <sup><5006></sup>2 Corinthians 1:6; 4:12; <sup><8085></sup>Galatians 5:6; <sup><4081></sup>Ephesians 3:20; <sup><5102></sup>Colossians 1:29; <sup><5123></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:13; <sup><5107></sup>2 Thessalonians 2:7). The participle here, if regarded as used in a neuter sense, adjectively, would signify *operative, effective*, and such is the interpretation of most commentators (see Wolff *Curei*, in loc., for the views and discussions of the older writers); but this produces a tautology with the context (πολὸν ἰσχύει, *availeth much*"), which all efforts have failed to remove (such as that of Meyer, who renders adverbially, "The prayer of a righteous man avails much, *in that it works* [indem es wirkt]," i.e., in its efficiency (so Alford, in loc.). It is better (with Vatablus, Hammond, Whitby, Macknight, Doddridge, and Clarke, to regard it as *passive*, in its literal sense, *inwrought*, implying both earnest unction and divine influence, not full inspiration (although the example of Elijah adduced in the following verse would almost warrant that), but such an afflatus as accompanies the supplications of the believing suppliant. SEE PRAYER.

## Efficacious Grace

SEE GRACE; SEE JANSENISM.

## Effrontes

an obscure Transylvanian sect of the sixteenth century, who not only denied the Holy Ghost, but, among other fooleries, cut their foreheads and

anointed them with oil as a mode of initiation. Hence their name "*exfrons*" — out of the brow (Eadie, *Eccl. Cyclop.* s.v.).

## Effusion Of The Holy Spirit.

*SEE PENTECOST.*

## Egbert or Ecbert

archbishop of York, was a brother of Eadbert, king of Northumberland, and a pupil, and later a friend, of Beda. As teacher at the cathedral school of York, he became celebrated for extensive knowledge and for his Christian character. Among those who were educated at this school were Alcuin and Aelbert. He became bishop of York in 731, and soon after, in 735, York was made an archbishopric, with metropolitan power over all bishoprics north of the river Humber. Even as bishop and archbishop he continued to give instruction at the cathedral school. He founded a library at York which gained great reputation, but was destroyed by fire in the reign of Stephen. He died in 767, leaving a *Dialogus de Ecclesiastica Institutione* (Dublin, 1664; Lond. 1693; also in Galland's *Bibl. Patr.* 13:266), and a collection of canonical prescriptions, *De jure sacerdotali*, of which only a few fragments are extant (Mansi, 12, fol. 411-431). The treatise *De Remediis peccatorum* (Mansi, 12:489) is probably an extract from the work just named by some other writers. Some penitential books have also been ascribed to Egbert, but falsely. — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 2:15; Collier, *Eccl. Hist. of England*, volume 1; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* Anglo-Saxon Period, page 297; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3:658; Hoefler, *Biographie Generale*, 15:700.

## Egbert, Saint

was born in the 7th century. He was a monk in the convent of Rathmelsing, and in 644, when seized with the plague, he made a vow that, in case of recovery, he would leave his country and preach the Gospel among the pagans. He accordingly set out as a missionary for Germany, but was by a tempest compelled to return. He then took up his abode among the monks of the island of Hy, from where he sent as missionaries to Friesland, first, the learned monk Wictbert, and, when this one returned after two years of fruitless labor, twelve Anglo-Saxons. Egbert had a prominent share in kindling that remarkable missionary zeal which distinguished the Anglo-Saxons in the 8th century. He introduced, in 716, into the monastery of Hy

the Roman manner of celebrating Easter, and the Roman tonsure. He died in 729. — Beda, *Hist. Eccl. Angl.* 3:27; 5:10, 11, 23; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3:658. (A.J.S.)

## Egede, Hans

an eminent Danish missionary, called the "apostle of Greenland," was born at Harstadt, Norway (which at that time belonged to Denmark), January 31, 1686, and became pastor at Drontheim in 1707. Here he conceived the project of a mission to Greenland, having derived from a history of Norway the impression that formerly there had been Christians in Greenland, where now there were only heathens. "Egede, after receiving some suggestions to this effect from a friend in Bergen, became so enthusiastic on the subject that he wrote to the bishops of Bergen and Drontheim in 1710, proposing an expedition to convert the Greenlanders; and on its striking him that such a recommendation would come with an ill grace from one who did not offer to undertake it himself, he made the offer, supposing, however, as he himself tells us, that as it was war-time, and the expedition would require some money, the proposal would not be accepted. He received in reply a strange letter from the bishop of Drontheim, Krog, in which the prelate suggested that 'Greenland was undoubtedly a part of America, and could not be very far from Cuba and Hispaniola, where there was found such abundance of gold;' concluding that it was very likely that those who went to Greenland would bring home 'incredible riches.' Egede had made this offer, very oddly, without acquainting his wife; and as soon as she became aware of it, by the receipt of the bishop's letters, she, with her mother and his mother, assailed Egede with such strong remonstrances, that he says in his own account, he was quite conquered, and repulsed his folly with a promise to remain in the land which 'God had placed him in'" (*Eng. Cyclop.*). Soon after, his wife, however, gave her consent. In 1717 he threw up his benefice at Vaagen, and went with his family to Bergen, endeavoring to found a company to trade with Greenland. The merchants did not receive this project favorably, and Egede determined to lay his plans before the king at Copenhagen. "Frederick IV of Denmark, who had already, in 1714, founded a college for the propagation of the Gospel, sent Egede back to Bergen with his approbation; a company was formed, to which Egede put down his name for the first subscription of 300 dollars, and finally, on May 3, 1721, a ship called 'Haabet,' or 'The Hope,' set sail for Greenland, with forty-six souls on board, including Egede and his family. On the 3d of July, after a dangerous voyage, they set foot on shore

at Baalsrevier, on the western coast, and were, on the whole, hospitably received by the natives. The very appearance of the Greenlanders at once put a negative on the supposition that they were descended from the Northmen, and their language, which it was now the missionary's business to learn, was found to be entirely of a different kind, being, in fact, nearly related to that spoken by the Esquimaux of Labrador. The climate and the soil were both harsher and ruder than the Norwegians had expected, and the only circumstance that was in their favor was the character of the inhabitants, which, though at first excessively phlegmatic, so as to give the idea that their feelings had been frozen, was neither cruel, nor, as was found by further experience, unadapted to receive religious impressions. For some years the mission had a hard battle for life. The settlers, unable to obtain sufficient food by fishing and the chase, were entirely dependent on the supply of provisions sent them by annual store-ships from Denmark, and when this supply was delayed, were reduced to short rations and the dread of starvation. On one occasion even Egede's courage gave way, and he had made up his mind to abandon the mission and return to Europe unless the provisions arrived within fourteen days. His wife alone opposed the resolution, and refused to pack up, persisting in predicting that the store-ship would arrive in time; and, ere the time had elapsed, the ships, which had missed the coast, found their way, and brought tidings that, rather than give up the attempt to Christianize Greenland, the king had ordered a lottery in favor of it, and, on the lottery's failing, had imposed a special tax on Denmark and Norway under the name of the Greenland Assessment. In 1727 the Blergen company for trading with Greenland was dissolved, from the losses it had sustained, and the Danish government then resolved on founding a colony in Greenland, and sent in 1728 a ship of war, with a body of soldiers under the command of a Major Paars. The soldiers grew mutinous when they saw to what a country they had been sent, and Egede found his life in more danger from his countrymen than it had ever been from the natives. The death of king, Frederick IV, in 1731, occasioned a change of affairs. The new king, Christian IV, determined to break up the colony and recall all his subjects from Greenland, with the exception of such as chose to remain of their own free-will, to whom he gave directions that provisions were to be allowed for one year, but that they were to be led to expect no further supply. Egede had then been ten years in Greenland, and his labors were beginning to bear fruit. His eldest son Paul, who was a boy of twelve when they landed, had been of much assistance in learning the language and in other ways; his wife and the



younger children had aided greatly in producing a favorable effect on the natives, who had seen no Europeans before except the crews of the Dutch trading vessels. The angekoks, or conjurors, who might almost be called the priests of the native religion, had been awed, some into respect and others into silence by the mildness and active benevolence of the foreign angekok; the natives had seen with wonder the interest he took in their welfare, and, if they refused to believe the new doctrines themselves, had not forbidden them to their children, of whom Egede had a hundred and fifty baptized. The elder Greenlanders, when Egede told them of the efficacy of prayer, asked him to pray that there should be no winter; and when he spoke of the torment of fire, said they should prefer it to frost. Egede, confirmed by his wife, resolved to remain, and this resolution greatly increased his influence over the Greenlanders, who knew that it could only proceed from zeal in their behalf. The king of Denmark, unable to resist his constancy, sent another year's provision beyond what he had promised, and finally, in 1733, announced that he had changed his mind, and determined to devote a yearly sum to the Greenland mission. A dreadful trial was approaching. The Greenland children, of whom some had occasionally been sent to Denmark, almost all died of the small-pox. Two of them were returning home from Copenhagen in the vessel which came in 1733 one of them died on the voyage, the other brought the disorder to Greenland, and the mortality was dreadful.

From September 1733, to June 1734, the contagion raged to a degree that threatened to depopulate Greenland. When the trading-agents afterwards went oven the country, they found every dwelling-house empty for thirty leagues to the north of the Danish colony, and the same devastation was said to have extended still farther south: the number of the dead was computed at 3000. That winter in Greenland offered a combination of horrors which could seldom be equaled, but they were met with admirable constancy by Egede and his indefatigable wife. The same ship that brought the small-pox had brought the assistance of some Moravian missionaries. In the year 1734 his son Paul Egede returned from Copenhagen, whither he had been sent to study, and the elder Egede, finding his health begin to fail, applied for leave to return home. The permission reached him in 1735, but his return was delayed from the illness of his wife, who longed to see her native land again, but was denied that gratification, dying finally in Greenland on the 21st of December, 1735, at the age of 62. Egede carried her coffin with him to Denmark, and she was buried in Copenhagen, where

she was followed to the grave by the whole of the clergy of the city. A seminary for the Greenland mission was established there in 1740, and Egede was appointed superintendent, with the title of bishop. In the same year he preferred a memorial for an expedition to be sent out to discover the lost 'eastern colony' of the old Norwegians, and offered to accompany it in person, but the proposal was not adopted. In 1747 Egede retired from his office at Copenhagen, and spent most of the remainder of his life at the house of his daughter Christine, who was married to a clergyman of the island of Falster. While he was at Copenhagen he had married a second wife, who accompanied him to Falster, but before his last illness he expressed his wish that he should be buried by the side of his first wife at Copenhagen, and said that if they would not promise to carry this wish into effect, he would go to Copenhagen to die there. He died at Falster on the 5th of November, 1758" (*Eng. Cyclop.*). He wrote two books on the history of his life's labors. The first was, *Relation angaaende den Gronlandske Missions Begyndelse og forsattelse* (Copenh. 1738; German, Hamb. 1748). It is rich in materials, but dry in style. Its chief recommendation is its sincerity. The reader is disposed to give entire confidence to the missionary, who not only tells him that on one occasion he labored earnestly in his vocation, but that on another he occupied himself for days in the study of alchemy; who not only speaks of the ardor of his faith at times, but tells us that at others he was seized with a hatred of his task and of religion altogether. *Den gamle Gronlands nye Perlustration* (Copenh. 1741-4) was translated into French (1763), and into English in 1745, under the title of *A Description of Greenland*. The translation was reprinted in 1818. It comprises his observations on the geography and natural history of Greenland, and the manners of its inhabitants. See *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3:659; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 15:702; Brauer, *Beitrag zur Gesch. den Heidenbekehrung* (part 3:1839); Rudelbach, *Christl. Biogr.* (part 6).

### Egede, Paul

son of Hans, was born at Waagen, Norway; went to Greenland in 1720, in his twelfth year; afterwards studied at Copenhagen; returned to Greenland in 1704; finally left it in 1740, and was, in reward for his labors, appointed chaplain of the hospital of the Holy Ghost, member of the College of Missions, director of the Hospital of Orphans, and finally (1776) bishop of Greenland. Having retired to the house of his son-in-law, pastor Saabye, he did not cease to urge the Danish government to send new expeditions to

that colony, and had the joy of seeing his wishes finally complied with. He died June 3, 1789. He wrote and published a Greenland grammar (*Grammatica Graenlandico-Lat.-Dan.*, Copenh. 1760) and dictionary (*Dictionarium Graenlandicum-Dano-Latinum*, Copenh. 1754), which have since been improved by Fabricius; translated the New Testament into the language, and was the author of a work, *Efterretninger om Gronland* (*Information on Greenland*, Copenh. 1789), which is one of the most interesting in Danish literature. It gives a history of the mission from 1720 to 1788 in a more interesting style than his father was master of. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 15:705.

## Egel

*SEE HEIFER.*

## Egg

(*hxyBebeytsah'* so called from its *whiteness*, *ὄόν*) occurs, in the plur., of eggs deserted (<sup><2304></sup>Isaiah 10:14), of the eggs of a bird (<sup><6216></sup>Deuteronomy 22:6), of the ostrich (<sup><1894></sup>Job 39:14), or the cockatrice (<sup><2305></sup>Isaiah 59:5).

*SEE FOWL; SEE OSTRICH; SEE COCKATRICE.* It is apparently in this last sense that an egg is contrasted with a scorpion in <sup><2112></sup>Luke 11:12, as a desirable article of food. The body of the scorpion is said to be very like an egg; the head can scarcely be distinguished, as it appears to be joined and continued to the breast. Bochart adduces authorities to prove that scorpions in Judea were about the size of an egg (<sup><1894></sup>Job 39:14; <sup><2304></sup>Isaiah 10:14; 59:5). The passage in <sup><6216></sup>Deuteronomy 22:6, humanely prohibits the taking away of a brooding bird from a nest, and is similar in its nature to the provision respecting other animals and their young (<sup><1828></sup>Leviticus 22:28).

Eggs are usually considered a great delicacy in the East, and are served up with fish and honey at their entertainments. Among the ancient Egyptians poultry seems to have been bred in abundance, and the most remarkable thing connected with it is the manner in which the eggs were hatched by artificial means, and which, from the monuments, we have reason to infer, was known and practiced there at a very early period. At the present time there are as many as four hundred and fifty of these establishments, which, being heavily taxed, produce a large revenue to the government. The proprietors of these egg-ovens make the round of the villages in their vicinity, and collect eggs from the peasants, which are given in charge to

the rearers, who, without any previous examination, place all they receive on mats strewed with bran, in a room eleven feet square, with a flat roof, and about four feet high, over which is a chamber of the same size, but with a vaulted roof, about nine feet high; a small aperture in the center of the vaulted roof admitting light during the warm weather, and another of larger diameter immediately below, communicating with the oven, through whose ceiling it is pierced. By this the man descends to observe the eggs; but in the cold season both openings are closed, and a lamp is kept burning instead, another entrance at the front part of the oven being then used for the same purpose, and shut immediately on his quitting it. In the upper room, the fire is disposed along the length of two troughs, based with earthen slabs, reaching from one side to the other against the front and back walls. In the oven the eggs are placed in a line corresponding to and immediately below the fire, where they remain half a day. They are then removed to a warmer place, and replaced by others, and so on, till all have taken their share of the warmest positions, to which each set returns, again and again, in regular succession, till the expiration of six days. They are then held up one by one towards a strong light, and if the egg appears clear, and of a uniform color, it is evident it has not succeeded; but if it shows an opaque substance within, or the appearance of different shades, the chicken is already formed; and these last are all returned to the oven for four days more, their positions being changed as before. At the expiration of the fourth day they are removed to another oven, over which, however, there are no fires, where they remain for five days in one heap, the aperture in the roof being closed with tow to exclude air; after which they are placed separately about one, two, or three inches apart, over the whole surface of the mats, which are sprinkled with a little bran. They are now continually turned and shifted from one part of the mats to another for six or seven days, all air being carefully excluded, and are constantly examined by one of the rearers, who applies each singly to his upper eyelid. Those which are cold prove the chickens to be dead; but warmth greater than that of the human skin is the favorable sign that the eggs have succeeded. The average temperature maintained is from 1000 to 1050. The manager, having been accustomed to his art from his youth, knows from experience the exact temperature required for the success of the operation, without having any instrument like our thermometer to guide him. Each *ma'amal*, or set of ovens, receives about one hundred and fifty thousand eggs during the annual period of its being brought into use, which is only during about two or three months in the spring. Of this number, generally one quarter,

or a third, fail to be productive; so that when the peasants bring their eggs to be hatched, the proprietor of the *ma'amal* returns one chicken for every two eggs. The fowls produced in this way are inferior both in size and flavor to those of Europe (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, 2:170, Am. ed.; Lane's *Mod. Egyptians*, 2:5).

The word **tWmLj** 'ichallamuth', in ~~Job~~ Job 6:6, which our translators have rendered "the white of an egg," is so rendered by the Hebrew interpreters, and the Targum, or rather, "the slime of the yolk of an egg." The Syriac interpretation gives "a tasteless herb," which is there proverbially used for something unsavory or insipid. *SEE PURSLAIN.*

### Egidio Antoniini

surnamed of Viterbo, Latin patriarch of Constantinople, was born at Viterbo in the second half of the 15th century. He was received into the order of the hermits of St. Augustine at the early age of ten years; was professor of philosophy and theology in several towns of Italy, and became one of the most eloquent preachers of his epoch. Having become general of his order in 1507, he was appointed patriarch of Constantinople, and bishop of Viterbo, Nepi, Castro, and Sutri. In 1512 he opened, by order of pope Julius II, the Council of Lateran, and on this occasion severely censured the corruption prevailing in the Church, and, in particular, among the clergy. In 1517 pope Leo X sent him to Germany, and appointed him cardinal; in the following year he was sent as papal legate to Spain. Egidio was well versed in the Oriental languages, and a good Latin poet. He wrote a commentary to the first three chapters of Genesis and to several psalms, Latin dialogues, epistles, and poems, and a treatise *De ecclesia incremento*. Some of these works are given in Martene et Durand, *Amplissima Collectio veterans monumentorum*, tom. 3. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 15:718.

### Egidius.

*SEE AEGIDIUS.*

### Egidius

*SEE GIL JUAN.*

## Eginhard or Einhard

(sometimes also called Agenhard or Ainhard), the biographer of Charlemagne, was born about 770. The place of his birth is entirely unknown. At an early age he repaired to the court of Charlemagne, and became a pupil of Alcuin. Eginhard gained the favor of the emperor to a high degree, and an intimate friendship sprang up between him and the emperor's children, especially the emperor's oldest son and successor, Louis le Debonnaire. The emperor appointed him his private secretary, and superintendent of public buildings at Aix-la-Chapelle. Eginhard accompanied the emperor in all his marches and journeys, never separating from him excepting on one occasion (806), when he was dispatched by Charlemagne on a mission to pope Leo, in order to obtain the signature of the pope for the document which divided the empire among the sons of Charlemagne. The emperor departed in his case, as in that of Alcuin, Angilbert, and some other friends, from his habit not to cumulate ecclesiastical benefices in one hand, and gave to him the abbeys of St. Bavo and Blandenberg in Ghent, St. Lerontius in Maestricht, Fritslar in Germany, St. Wandregisil in France, and others. On the death of Charlemagne, he was appointed preceptor of Lothaire, son of Louis le Debonnaire. The latter presented him with a large tract of land in the Odenwald, the center of which was Michelstadt. Here Eginhard spent the last years of his life in retirement. He was in 826 ordained presbyter, and in 827 assumed as abbot the direction of a monastery at Seligenstadt, which he had erected upon his estates. As his wife Emma was still alive at this time, he appears to have agreed with her to consider her only as a sister. The report that his wife was a daughter of Charlemagne is probably untrue. The year of his death is unknown. He was still alive in 848. He probably had no children, and the claim of the counts of Erbach, who trace their descent from him, and in whose castle the coffins of Eginhard and his wife are still shown, is probably unfounded. The reputation of Eginhard rests chiefly upon his life of Charlemagne (*Vita et Conversatio Gloriosissimi Imperatoris Karoli Regis Magni*, completed about 820), which is generally regarded as the most important historical work of a biographical nature that has come down to us from the Middle Ages. It frequently served as a model for other biographies, and was extensively used as a school-book. The best edition is that of Pertz (1829), in volume 2 of the *Monumenta Germaniae historica*; another edition, with valuable notes and documents, was published by Ideler, *Leben u. Wandel Karl's des Grossen* (Gotha, 1839, 2 volumes)

Another work, the *Annales Regum Francorum, Pippini, Caroli Magni, Hludowici Imperatoris*, embraces the period from 741 to 829 (published in Pertz, *Monumenta*, volume 1). The first part (741-788) is based on the Annals of Lorsch; the second part is original. He also wrote an account of the transfer of the relics of St. Marcellin and St. Peter from Rome to his monastery in Seligenstadt (*Historia translationis St. Marcellini et Petri*, in *Acta Sanctorum*, June 2). His *Epistolae*, 62 in number, are also of considerable value in a historical point of view. They are published in Weinkens, *Eginhardus vindicatus* (Francof. 1714). Another work, *Libellus de adoranda cruce*, is lost. The French consider the edition of Eginhard's works by M. Teulot, with a translation and life of Eginhard (Paris, 1840-43, 2 vols.), to be the best and most complete. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, anno 814; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 8, chapter 2, note 43; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3:725; Dahl, *Ueber Eginhard und Emma* (Darmstadt, 1817). (A.J.S.)

## Eg'lah

(Hebrews *Eglah'*, **הַלְגָּה**, a heifer, as often; Sept. **Αἰγάλα** and **Αγλά**), one of David's wives during his reign in Hebron, and the mother of his son Ithream (<sup><1085></sup>2 Samuel 3:5; <sup><1085></sup>1 Chronicles 3:3). B.C. 1045. In both lists the same order is preserved, Eglah being the sixth and last, and in both is she distinguished by the special title of David's "wife." According to the ancient Hebrew tradition preserved by Jerome (*Quest. Hebr.* on <sup><1085></sup>2 Samuel 3:5; 6:23), she was MICHAL **SEE MICHAL** (q.v.), — the wife of his youth, and she died in giving birth to Ithream. A name of this signification is common among the Arabs at the present day. **SEE EGLATH.**

## Eg'laim

(Hebrews *Egla'yim*, **מַגְלַיִם**, two ponds; Sept. **Αγαλείμ**, *Vulg. Gallim*), a place named in <sup><2358></sup>Isaiah 15:8, apparently as one of the most remote points on the boundary of Moab. It is probably the same as the EN-EGLAIM **SEE EN-EGLAIM** (q.v.) of <sup><3470></sup>Ezekiel 47:10. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. **Αγαλλείμ**, *Agalleim*) say that it still existed in their day as a village (**Αἰγαλλαίμ**), eight miles south of Areopolis, i.e., Ar-Moab. Exactly in that position, however, stands Kerak, the ancient Kir-Moab. A town named *Agalla* (**Ἀγαλλὰ**) is mentioned, by Josephus with Zoar and other places as in the country of the Arabians (*Ant.* 14:1, 4). Some have also confounded it with GALLIM **SEE GALLIM** (q.v.). De Saulcy

conceives Eglaim to be the same with a place which he names Wady *Ajerrah*, not far north of the ruins of Rabbah, but on slender grounds (*Dead Sea*, 1:262, 270). *SEE EGLATH*; *SEE EGLON* 3.

### Eglath or Eglah

(q.v.), in the phrase תִּלְגַּיְהִי־עֵגְלָה *eglath' shelishiyah'*, <sup>2315</sup>Isaiah 15:5; <sup>2483</sup>Jeremiah 48:34, which literally signifies *a heifer of the third year*; Sept. δάμαλις τριέτης (but v.r. ἀγγελία Σαλισία in Jer.); Vulg. *vitula conternans*; A.V. "a heifer three years old;" and so the Targum, and most modern interpreters (Hitzig, Umbreit, etc.). Others (as Knobel, Winer, etc.) understand the term to be the proper name of a place on the border of Moab, mentioned in connection with Zoar, Luhith, and Horonaim (q.v. respectively), and so compare it with the *Agalla* of Josephus (*Ant.* 14:1, 4) and the *Necla* (or *Jecla*, Νέκλα or Ίέκλα) of Ptolemy (5:17, 5), which lay in this region (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* page 931), and with the modern region *Ajlun* north of Jabbok (Abulfeda, *Syr.* 13, 93; Robinson, *Research.* in, App. page 162), as the last name has in Arab the same signification as the Hebrews *SEE EGLAIM*.

### Eglinus, RAPHAEL

also called Iconius, a minister of the Reformed Church, was born at Riissicon, in the Swiss canton of Zurich, December 28, 1559. After studying theology at Zurich, Geneva, and Basel, he for some time taught school at Sonders, in the Veltlin (now part of Lombardy,); but, with the Protestants generally, he had to leave this place in 1586. After working for some time as teacher and "diaconus" in Winterscheid, and as "paedagogus" at the college of the alumni at Zurich, he was, in 1592, appointed professor of the New Testament in the latter city. Becoming absorbed in the study of theosophy and alchemy, he spent his whole property in experiments, and in 1601 had to flee on account of debts which he had contracted. Through the intercession of his friends he obtained, however, permission to return, and an honorable dismissal. He went to Cassel, where landgrave Moritz, himself a great friend of alchemy, appointed him teacher at the court school, and later, June 13, 1606, professor of theology at Marburg. From the theological faculty of this university he received, in 1607, the title of D.D. Subsequently Moritz also appointed him court preacher at Marburg. He died May 20, 1622. Eglinus was one of the first Reformed theologians in Hesse where landgrave Moritz and his successors endeavored to



supplant Lutheranism by the Reformed Church. He wrote in defense of his creed a number of small essays, the most important of which relate to the doctrine of predestination. He is one of those writers in whom the German reformed theology became more scholastic in its character, and was merged in the stricter Calvinistic tendency. In 1618 Eglinus wrote an apology of the Rosicrucians, of which association he had become an active member. He also wrote several books on alchemy and on the Apocalypse. A complete list of his works is given by Strieder, *Grundlage zu einer hess. Gelehrten-Gesch.* — Heppe, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 19:456; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines* (edited by Smith), 2:175. (A.J.S.)

## Eg'lon

(Hebrews *Eglon'*, עִגְלוֹן place of *heifers*, q.d. *vituline*), the name of a man, and also of two places.

**1.** (Sept. *Ἐγλώμ*, Josephus *Ἐγλών*, Vulgate *Eglon*.) An early king of the Moabites (<sup><00812></sup>Judges 3:12 sq.), who, aided by the Ammonites and the Amalekites, crossed the Jordan and took "the city of palm-trees," or Jericho (Josephus). B.C. 1527. Here he built himself a palace (Josephus, *Ant.* 5:4, 1 sq.), and continued for eighteen years to oppress the children of Israel, who paid him tribute (Josephus). Whether he resided at Jericho permanently, or only during the summer months (<sup><00812></sup>Judges 3:20; Josephus), he seems to have formed a familiar intimacy (*συνήθης*, Josephus, not Judg.) with Ehud, a young Israelite (*νεανίας*, Josephus) who lived in Jericho (Josephus, not Judg.), and who, by means of repeated presents, became a favorite courtier of the monarch. Eglon subdued the Israelites beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side the river, and made Jericho the seat, or one of the seats, of his government. This subjection to a power always present must have been more galling to the Israelites than any they had previously suffered. At length (B.C. 1509) they were delivered, through the instrumentality of Ehud, who slew the Moabitish king (<sup><00812></sup>Judges 3:12-33). *SEE EHUD.*

**2.** (Sept. *Ἐγλώμ* v.r. *Αἰλάμ*, but in Joshua 10, *Ὀδολλάμ*; Vulgate *Eglon*, *Aglon*.) A city in the maritime plain of Judah, near Lachish (<sup><0659></sup>Joshua 15:39), formerly one of the royal cities of the Canaanites (<sup><0622></sup>Joshua 12:12). Its Almoritish king Debir (q.v.) formed a confederacy with the neighboring princes to assist Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, in attacking Gibeon, because that city had made peace with Joshua and the Israelites

(<sup>-600B</sup>Joshua 10:3, 4). Joshua met the confederated kings near Gibeon and routed them (<sup>-600B</sup>Joshua 10:11). Eglon was soon after visited by Joshua and destroyed (<sup>-600B</sup>Joshua 10:34, 35). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. **Ἐγλώμ**, Eglon) erroneously identify it with *Odollam* or ADULLAM **SEE ADULLAM** (q.v.), and say it was still "a large village," ten R. miles (Jerome, twelve) east of Eleutheropolis, being misled by the unaccountable reading of the Sept. as above. On the road from Eleutheropolis to Gaza, nine miles from the former and twelve from the latter, are the ruins of *Ajlan*, which mark the site of the ancient Eglon (Robinson, *Researches*, 2:392). The site is now completely desolate. The ruins are mere shapeless heaps of rubbish, strewn over a low, white mound (Porter, *Handb. for Syria*, page 262). The absence of more imposing remains is easily accounted for. The private houses, like those of Damascus, were built of sun-dried bricks; and the temples and fortifications of the soft calcareous stone of the district, which soon crumbles away. A large mound of rubbish, strewn with stones and pieces of pottery, is all we can now expect to mark the site of an ancient city in this plain (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, 2:188; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:356).

**3.** Another important place of this name (<sup>wl g</sup>), according to Schwarz (*Palest*; p. 235), is mentioned in Talmudical authorities as situated within the bounds of Gad. He identifies it with the present village *Ajlun*, one mile east of Kulat er-Rubud, or Wady Rejib, which runs parallel with Jebel Ajlun on the south (see Robinson's *Map*, and comp. *Researches*, 2:121). The village is built on both sides of the narrow rivulet Jenne, and contains nothing remarkable except a few ancient mosques (Burckhardt, *Syria*, page 266).

## Egoism

**SEE SELFISHNESS.**

## E'gypt

(or, more strictly, *AEgypt*, since the word is but anglicized from the Gr. and Lat. **Αἴγυπτος**, *AEgyptus*), a region important from the earliest times, and more closely identified with Bible incidents than any other, except the Holy Land itself. For a vindication of the harmony between Scripture history and the latest results of Egyptological research (Brugsch, *Aus dem Orient*, Berl. 1864), see Volck in the *Dorpater Zeitschrift*, 1867, 2, art. 2.

**I. Names.** — The common name of Egypt in the Hebrews Bible is *Mizraim*, מִצְרַיִם *Mitsra'yim* (or, more fully; "the land of Mizraim"). In form *Mizraim* is a dual, and accordingly it is generally joined with a plural verb. When, therefore, in <sup><0116></sup>Genesis 10:6, *Mizraim* is mentioned as a son of Ham, some conclude that nothing more is meant than that Egypt was colonized by descendants of Ham. **SEE MIZRAIM.** The dual number doubtless indicates the natural division of the country into an upper and a lower region, the plain of the Delta and the narrow valley above, as it has been commonly divided at all times. The singular *Mazor*, מָצוֹר; *Matsor'*, also occurs (<sup><1294></sup>2 Kings 19:24; <sup><2375></sup>Isaiah 37:25; perhaps as a proper name in <sup><2396></sup>Isaiah 19:6; <sup><3372></sup>Micah 7:12; A.V. always as an appellative, "besieged city," etc.), and some suppose that it indicates Lower Egypt, the dual only properly meaning the whole country; but there is no sure ground for this assertion. **SEE MAZOR.** The mention of *Mizraim* and *Pathros* together (<sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 11:11; <sup><3441></sup>Jeremiah 44:1, 15), even if we adopt the explanation which supposes *Mizraim* to be in these places by a late usage put for *Mazor*, by no means proves that, since *Pathros* is a part of Egypt, *Mizraim*, or rather *Mazor*, is here a part also. The mention of a part of a country by the same term as the whole is very usual in Hebrew phraseology. This designation, at all events, is sometimes used for Egypt indiscriminately, and was by the later Arabs extended to the entire country. Josephus (*Ant.* 1:6, 2) says that all those who inhabit the country call it *Mestre* (Μέστρη), and the Egyptians *Mestraeans* (Μέστραιοι). The natives of Modern Egypt invariably designate it by the name *Misr*, evidently cognate with its ancient Hebrews appellation (Hackett's *Illustra. of Scripture*, page 120).

Egypt is also called in the Bible מִצְרַיִם; *ra*, "the land of Ham" (<sup><1952></sup>Psalms 105:23, 27; compare <sup><1781></sup>Psalms 78:51), referring to the son of Noah. **SEE HAM.** Occasionally (<sup><1354></sup>Psalms 87:4; 89:10; <sup><2509></sup>Isaiah 51:9) it is poetically styled *Rahab*, בְּהִרְיָ, i.e., "the proud" or "insolent." **SEE RAHAB.** The common ancient Egyptian name of the country is written in hieroglyphics. **SEE KEM**

## Picture for E'gypt 1

which was probably pronounced *Chem*; the demotic form is *KEMI* (Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften*, 1:73, Number 362); and the Coptic forms are *Chame* or *Chemi* (Memphitic), *Keme* or *Keme* (Sahidic), and *Knemi* (Bashmuric). This name signifies, alike in the ancient language and

in Coptic, "black," and may be supposed to have been given to the land on account of the blackness of its alluvial soil (comp. Plutarch, *De Isaiah et Osir.* c. 33). It would seem, however, to be rather a representative of the original Hebrews name Ham (i.e. Cham), which likewise in the Shemitic languages denotes *sun-burnt*, as a characteristic of African tribes. The other hieroglyphic names of Egypt appear to be of a poetical character.

The Greek and European name ( $\eta\text{Αἴγυπτος}$ , *Egyptus*), Egypt, is of uncertain origin and signification (Champollion, *L'Egypte*, 1:77). It appears, however, to have some etymological connection with the modern name *Copt*, and is perhaps nothing more than "land of the Copts" (the prefix  $\alpha\acute{\iota}$  — being perhaps for  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha$  or  $\gamma\eta$ ). In Homer the Nile is sometimes (*Odys.* 4:351, 355; 14:257, 258) called Egypt ( $\text{Αἴγυπτος}$ ).

## Picture for E'gypt 2

## Picture for E'gypt 3

**II. Extent and Population.** — Egypt occupies the northeastern angle of Africa, between N. lat.  $31^{\circ} 37'$  and  $24^{\circ} 1'$ , and E. long.  $27^{\circ} 13'$  and  $34^{\circ} 12'$ . On the E. it is bounded by Palestine, Idumaea, Arabia Petraea, and the Arabian Gulf. On the W., the moving sands of the wide Libyan desert obliterate the traces of all political or physical limits. Inhabited Egypt, however, is restricted to the valley of the Nile, which, having a breadth of from two to three miles, is enclosed on both sides by a range of hills: the chain on the 'eastern side disappears at Mokattam, that on the west extends to the sea. Its limits appear to have always been very nearly the same. In <sup>(3910)</sup>Ezekiel 29:10; 30:6, according to the obviously correct rendering, **SEE MIGDOL**, the whole country is spoken of as extending from Migdol to Syene, which indicates the same limits to the east and the south as at present. Egypt seems, however, to have always been held, except by the modern geographers, to include no more than the tract irrigated by the Nile lying within the limits we have specified. The deserts were at all times wholly different from the valley, and their tribes more or less independent of the rulers of Egypt. Syene, now Aswan, is also assigned by Greek and Arabian writers as the southern limit of Egypt. Here the Nile issues from the granite rocks of the cataracts, and enters Egypt proper. The length of the country, therefore, in a direct line, is 456 geographical miles. The breadth of the valley between Aswan and the Delta is very unequal; in some places the inundations of the river extend to the foot of the

mountains; in other parts there remains a strip of a mile or two in breadth, which the water never covers, and which is therefore always dry and barren. Originally the name *Egypt* designated only this valley and the Delta; but at a later period it came to include also the region between this and the Red Sea from Berenice to Suez, a strong and mountainous tract, with only a few spots fit for tillage, but better adapted to pasturage. It included also, at this time, the adjacent desert on the west, as far as to the oases, those fertile and inhabited islands in the ocean of sand. The name *Delta*, also, was extended so as to cover the districts between Pelusium and the border of Palestine, and Arabia Petraea; and on the west it included the adjacent tract as far as to the great deserts of Libya and Barca, a region of sand of three days' journey east and west, and as many north and south.

Egypt, in the extensive sense, contains 115,200 square geographical miles, yet it has only a superficies of about 9582 square geographical miles of soil, which the Nile either does or can water and fertilize. This computation includes the river and lakes as well as sandy tracts which can be inundated, and the whole space either cultivated or fit for cultivation is no more than about 5626 square miles. Anciently 2735 square miles more may have been cultivated, and now it would be possible at once to reclaim about 1295 square miles. These computations are those of Colonel Jacotin and M. Esteve, given in the Memoir of the former in the great French work (*Description de l'Egypte*, 2d edition 18, part 2, page 101 sq.). They must be very nearly true of the actual state of the country at the present time. Mr. Lane calculated the extent of the cultivated land in A.D. 1375-6 to be 5500 square geographical miles, from a list of the cultivated lands of towns and villages appended to De Sacy's *Abd-Ahatif*. He thinks this list may be underrated. M. Mengin made the cultivated land much less in 1821, but since then much waste territory has been reclaimed (Mrs. Poole, *Englishwoman in Egypt*, 1:85). The chief differences in the character of the surface in the times before the Christian era were that the long valley through which flowed the canal between the Nile and the Red Sea was then cultivated, and that the Gulf of Suez perhaps extended further north than at present.

As to the number of its inhabitants, nothing very definite is known. Its fertility would doubtless give birth to and support a teeming population. In very remote times as many as 8,000,000 souls are said to have lived on its soil. In the days of Diodorus Siculus they were estimated at 3,000,000. Volney made the number 2,300,000. A late government estimate is

3,200,000, which seems to have been somewhat below the fact (Bowring's *Report on Egypt and Candia*, page 4). According to the census taken in 1882, the inhabitants number 6,817,265 in Egypt proper. The Copts are estimated at 300,000, the Bedouins being the most in number. Seven eighths of the entire population are native Mohammedans. In Alexandria, at the close of the last century, scarcely 40,000 inhabitants were counted, whereas at present that city contains 300,000, about half of whom are Arabs and half Europeans. The nationality of the latter has been ascertained to be as follows (the figures represent thousands): Greeks, 25; Italians, 18; French, 16; Anglo-Maltese, 13; Syrians and natives of the Levant, 12; Germans and Swiss, 10; various, 6. Cairo, the capital, contains upwards of 400,000 inhabitants; within its walls are 140 schools, more than 400 mosques, 1166 cafes, 65 public baths, and 11 bazaars. The other towns of importance, from their population, are, in Lower Egypt, Damietta, 45,000; Rosetta, 20,000; and in Upper Egypt, Syout, on the left bank of the Nile, numbering 20,000 souls.

**III. Geographical Divisions.** — Under the Pharaohs Egypt was divided into Upper and Lower, "the two regions" TA-TI? called respectively "the Southern Region" TA-RES, and "the Northern Region" TAMEHIT. There were different crowns for the two regions, that of Upper Egypt being white, and that of Lower Egypt red, the two together composing the *pschent*. The sovereign had a special title as ruler of each region: of Upper Egypt he was SUTEN, "king," and of Lower Egypt SHEBT, "bee," the two combined forming the common title SUTEN-SHEBT. The initial sign of the former name is a bent reed, which illustrates what seems to have been a proverbial expression in Palestine as to the danger of trusting to the Pharaohs and Egypt (<sup><1182></sup>1 Kings 18:21; <sup><2316></sup>Isaiah 36:6; <sup><2316></sup>Ezekiel 29:6): the latter name may throw light upon the comparison of the king of Egypt to a fly, and the king of Assyria to a bee (<sup><2378></sup>Isaiah 7:18). It must be remarked that Upper Egypt is always mentioned before Lower Egypt, and that the crown of the former in the *pschent* rises above that of the latter. In subsequent times the same division continued. Manetho speaks of it (ap. Josephus, c. *Apion*. 1:14), and under the Ptolemies it still prevailed. In the time of the Greeks and Romans, Upper Egypt was divided into the Heptanomis and the Thebais, making altogether three provinces, but the division of the whole country into two was even then the most usual. The Thebais extended from the first cataract at Philae to Hermopolis, the Heptanomis from Hermopolis to the point where the Delta begins to form

itself. About A.D. 400 Egypt was divided into four provinces, Augustamnica Prima and Secunda, and AEgyptus Prima and Secunda. The Heptanomis was called Arcadia, from the emperor Arcadius, and Upper Egypt was divided into Upper and Lower Thebais.

From a remote period Egypt was subdivided into *nomes* (HESPU, sing. HESP), each one of which had its special objects of worship. The monuments show that this division was as old as the earlier part of the twelfth dynasty, which began cir. B.C. 1900. They are said to have been first 36 in number (*Diod. Sic.* 1:54; Strabo, 17:1). Ptolemy enumerates 44, and Pliny 46; afterwards they were further increased. There is no distinct reference to them in the Bible. In the Sept. version, indeed, חַקְל מַמְלִיכָה (<sup>-239D</sup>Isaiah 19:2) is rendered by νόμος, but we have no warrant for translating it otherwise than "kingdom." It is probable that at that time there were two, if not three kingdoms in the country. Two provinces or districts of Egypt are mentioned in the Bible, Pathros (q.v.) and Capthor (q.v.); the former appears to have been part of Upper Egypt; the latter was evidently so, and must be represented by the Coptite nome, although no doubt of greater extent. The division into nomes was more or less maintained till the invasion of the Saracens. Egypt is now composed of 24 departments, which, according to the French system of geographical arrangement, are subdivided into arrondissements and cantons (*Bowring's Report*).

**IV. Surface, Climate, etc.** — The general appearance of the country cannot have greatly changed since the days of Moses. The Delta was always a vast level plain, although of old more perfectly watered than now by the branches of the Nile and numerous canals, while the narrow valley of Upper Egypt must have suffered still less alteration. Anciently, however, the rushes must have been abundant; whereas now they have almost disappeared except in the lakes. The whole country is remarkable for its extreme fertility, which especially strikes the beholder when the rich green of the fields is contrasted with the utterly bare yellow mountains or the sand-strewn rocky desert on either side. Thus the plain of Jordan, before the cities were destroyed, was, we read, "well watered everywhere" ... "[even] like a garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt" (<sup>-0130</sup>Genesis 13:10). The aspect of Egypt is remarkably uniform. The Delta is a richly cultivated plain, varied only by the mounds of ancient cities and occasional groves of palms. Other trees are seldom met with. The valley in Upper

Egypt is also richly cultivated. It is, however, very narrow, and shut in by low hills, rarely higher than 300 feet, which have the appearance of cliffs from the river, and are not often steep. They, in fact, form the border of the desert on either side, and the valley seems to have been, as it were, cut out of a table-land of rock. The valley is rarely more than twelve miles across. The bright green of the fields, the reddish-brown or dull green color of the great river, the tints of the bare yellow rocks, and the deep blue of the sky, always form a pleasant view, and often one of great beauty. The soil consists of the mud of the river, resting upon desert sands; hence this country owes its existence, fertility, and beauty to the Nile, whose annual overflow is indispensable for the purposes of agriculture. The country around Syene and the cataracts is highly picturesque; the other parts of Egypt, and especially the Delta, are exceedingly uniform and monotonous. The prospect, however, is extremely different, according to the season of the year. From the middle of the spring season, when the harvest is over, one sees nothing but a gray and dusty soil, so full of cracks and chasms that he can hardly pass along. At the time of the autumnal equinox, the whole country presents nothing but an immeasurable surface of reddish or yellowish water, out of which rise date-trees, villages, and narrow dams, which serve as a means of communication. After the waters have retreated, which usually remain only a short time at this height, you see, till the end of autumn, only a black and slimy mud. But in winter nature puts on all her splendor. In this season, the freshness and power of the new vegetation, the variety and abundance of vegetable productions, exceed everything that is known in the most celebrated parts of the European continent; and Egypt is then, from one end of the country to the other, nothing but a beautiful garden, a verdant meadow, a field sown with flowers, or a waving ocean of grain in the ear.

The climate is very equable, and, to those who can bear great heat, also healthy; indeed, in the opinion of some, the climate of Egypt is one of the finest in the world. There are, however, unwholesome tracts of salt marsh which are to be avoided. Rain seldom falls except on the coast of the Mediterranean. At Thebes a storm will occur, perhaps, not oftener than once in four years. Cultivation nowhere depends upon rain or showers. This absence of rain is mentioned in <sup><6110></sup>Deuteronomy 11:10, 11) as rendering artificial irrigation necessary, unlike the case of Palestine, and in <sup><3148></sup>Zechariah 14:18 as peculiar to the country. The atmosphere is clear and shining; a shade is not easily found. Though rain falls even in the winter



months very rarely, it is not altogether wanting, as was once believed. Thunder and lightning are still more infrequent, and are so completely divested of their terrific qualities that the Egyptians never associate with them the idea of destructive force. Showers of hail descending from the hills of Syria are sometimes known to reach the confines of Egypt. The formation of ice is very uncommon. Dew is produced in great abundance. The wind blows from the north from May to September, when it veers round to the east, assumes a southerly direction, and fluctuates till the close of April. The southerly vernal winds, traversing the arid sands of Africa, are most changeable as well as most unhealthy. They form the simoom or samiel, and have proved fatal to caravans and even to armies (*View of Ancient and Modern Egypt*, Edin. Cab. Library).

Egypt has been visited at all ages by severe pestilences, but it cannot be determined that any of those of ancient times were of the character of the modern plague. The plague with which the Egyptians are threatened in Zechariah (l.c.) is described by a word, ἡρῶμαι which is not specially applicable to a pestilence of their country (see verse 12). *SEE BOTCH*. Cutaneous disorders, which have always been very prevalent in Egypt, are distinctly mentioned as peculiar to the country (<sup>(R715)</sup>Deuteronomy 7:15; 28:27, 35, 60, and perhaps <sup>(D50)</sup>Exodus 15:20, though here the reference may be to the plague of boils), and as punishments to the Israelites in case of disobedience, whereas if they obeyed they were to be preserved from them. The Egyptian calumny that made the Israelites a body of lepers and unclean (Joseph. *c. Apion.*) is thus refuted, and the traditional tale as to the Exodus given by Manetho shown to be altogether wrong in its main facts, which depend upon the truth of this assertion. Famines are frequent, and one in the Middle Ages, in the time of the Fatimite caliphate El-Mustansir-billah, seems to have been even more severe than that of Joseph. Mosquitoes, locusts, frogs, together with the small-pox and leprosy, are the great evils of the country. Ophthalmia is also very prevalent. *SEE DISEASE*.

**V.** *The Nile*. — Egypt is the land of the Nile, the country through which that river flows from the island of Philas, situated just above the Cataracts of Syene, in lat. 24° 1' 36", to Damietta, in 31° 35' N., where its principal stream pours itself into the Mediterranean Sea. In lat. 30° 15' the Nile divides into two principal streams, which, in conjunction with a third that springs somewhat higher up, forms the Delta, so called from its

resemblance to the Greek letter Δ. At Khartum, 160 miles north of Sennar, the Nile forks into two rivers, called Bahr el-Abiad and Bahr el-Azrak, or the white and blue river, the former flowing from the west, the latter from the east. The blue river is the smaller of these, but it possesses the same fertilizing qualities as the Nile, and is of the same color. The sources of this river were discovered by Bruce; those of the white river were, until quite recently, undiscovered. They are now known to flow from lakes situated among the mountains south of the equator (Beke, *Sources of the Nile*, Lond. 1860). Most ancient writers mention seven mouths of the Nile, beginning from the east: 1, Pelusiatic or Bubastic; 2, Saitic or Tanitic; 3, Mendesian; 4, Bucolic or Phatmetic (now of Damietta); 5, Sebennytic; 6, Bolbitine (now of Rosetta); 7, Canopic or Heracleotic.

The Nile is called in the Bible *Shichor'*, *ר/י yvæor* "the black (river)"; also *eor'*, *ר/אי] ray*, "the river." As to the phrases *מַיַם אֲרָצוֹת מִצְרָיִם*, "the river of Egypt," and *מַיַם אֲרָצוֹת מִצְרָיִם*, "the brook of Egypt," it seems unlikely that the Nile should be so specified; and *ל/י n* or *רhn* here more probably denotes a mountain stream, usually dry, on the borders of Egypt and Palestine, near the modern El-Arish (<sup><061E></sup>Numbers 34:5; <sup><061B></sup>Joshua 13:3, etc.). **SEE EGYPT, RIVER OF.** Some have thought that *ל/י n* is the origin of the word Nile; others have been anxious to find it in the Sanscrit *Nila*, which means dark blue. The Indus is called Nil-ab, or "the blue river;" the Sutlej also is known as "the blue river." It is to be observed that the Low Nile was painted blue by the ancient Egyptians. The river is turbid and reddish throughout the year, and turns *green* about the time when the signs of rising commence, but not long after becomes red and very turbid. The Coptic word is *iom*, "sea," which corresponds to the Arab name for it, *bahr*, properly sea; thus <sup><34BB></sup>Nahum 3:3, "Populous No (Thebes), whose rampart was the *sea*." In Egyptian the Nile bore the sacred appellation HAPI, or HAPI-MU, "the abyss," or "the abyss of waters." As Egypt was divided into two regions, we find two Niles, HAPI-RES, "the Southern Nile," and HAPI-MEHIT, "the Northern Nile," the former name being given to the river in Upper Egypt and in Nubia. The common appellation is ATUR, or AUR, "the river," which may be compared with the Hebrews *Yeor*.

The inundation, HAPI-UR, "great Nile," or "high Nile," fertilizes and sustains the country, and makes the river its chief blessing, a very low inundation or failure of rising being the cause of famine. The Nile was on

this account anciently worshipped, and the plague in which its waters were turned into blood, while injurious to the river itself and its fish (<sup><1072></sup>Exodus 7:21; <sup><10529></sup>Psalm 105:29), was a reproof to the superstition of the Egyptians. The rise begins in Egypt about the summer solstice, and the inundation commences about two months later. The greatest height is attained about or somewhat after the autumnal equinox. The inundation lasts about three months. During this time, and especially when near the highest, the river rapidly pours along its red turbid waters, and spreads through openings in its banks over the whole valley and plain. The prophet Amos, speaking of the ruin of Israel, metaphorically says that "the land ... shall be drowned, as [by] the flood [river] of Egypt" (<sup><1088></sup>Amos 8:8; 9:5). Owing to the yearly deposit of alluvial matter, both the bed of the Nile and the land of Egypt are gradually raised. The river proceeds in its current uniformly and quietly at the rate of two and a half or three miles an hour, always deep enough for navigation. Its water is usually blue, but it becomes of a deep brick-red during the period of its overflow. It is salubrious for drinking, meriting the encomiums which it has so abundantly received. On the river the land is wholly dependent. If the Nile does not rise a sufficient height, sterility and dearth, if not famine, ensue. An elevation of sixteen cubits is essential to secure the prosperity of the country. Such, however, is the regularity of nature, and such the faithfulness of God, that for thousands of years, with but few and partial exceptions, these inundations have in essential particulars been the same. The waters of the stream are conveyed over the surface of the country by canals when natural channels fail. During the overflow the land is literally inundated, and has the appearance of a sea dotted with islands. Wherever the waters reach abundance springs forth. The cultivator has scarcely more to do than to scatter the seed. No wonder that a river whose waters are so grateful, salubrious, and beneficial should in days of ignorance have been regarded as an object of worship, and that it is still revered and beloved. *SEE NILE.*

**VI. Geology.** — The fertile plain of the Delta and the valley of Upper Egypt are bounded by rocky deserts covered or strewn with sand. On either side of the plain they are low, but they overlook the valley, above which they rise so steeply as from the river to present the aspect of cliffs. The formation is limestone as far as a little above Thebes, where sandstone begins. The First Cataract, the southern limit of Egypt, is caused by granite and other primitive rocks, which rise through the sandstone and obstruct the river's bed. In Upper Egypt the mountains near the Nile rarely exceed

300 feet in height, but far in the eastern desert they often attain a much greater elevation. The highest is Jebel Gharib, which rises about 6000 feet above the sea. Limestone, sandstone, and granite were obtained from quarries near the river; basalt, breccia, and porphyry from others in the eastern desert between the Thebais and the Red Sea. A geological change has, it is thought, in the course of centuries raised the country near the head of the Gulf of Suez, and depressed that on the northern side of the isthmus. The Delta is of a triangular form, its eastern and western limits being nearly marked by the courses of the ancient Pelusiatic and Canopic branches of the Nile: Upper Egypt is a narrow winding valley, varying in breadth; but seldom more than twelve miles across, and generally broadest on the western side. Anciently there was a fertile valley on the course of the Canal of the Red Sea, the Land of Goshen (q.v.), now called Wady Tumeilat: this is covered with the sands of the desert. To the south, on the opposite side, is the oasis now called the Feyum, the old Arsinoite Nome, connected with the valley by a neck of cultivated land.

**VII. Agriculture, etc.** — The ancient prosperity of Egypt is attested by the Bible, as well as by the numerous monuments of the country. As early as the age of the Great Pyramid it must have been densely populated and well able to support its inhabitants, for it cannot be supposed that there was then much external traffic. In such a climate the wants of man are few, and nature is liberal in necessary food. Even the Israelites in their hard bondage did "eat freely" the fish, and the vegetables, and fruits of the country, and ever afterwards they longed to return to the idle plenty of a land where even now starvation is unknown. The contrast of the present state of Egypt with its former prosperity is more to be ascribed to political than to physical causes. It is true that the branches of the Nile have failed, the canals and the artificial lakes and ponds for fish are dried up; that the reeds and other water-plants which were of value in commerce, and a shelter for wild-fowl, have in most parts perished; that the Land of Goshen, once, at least for pasture, "the best of the land" (<sup>4047B</sup>Genesis 47:6, 11), is now sand-strewn and unwatered, so as scarcely to be distinguished from the desert around, and that the predictions of the prophets have thus received a literal fulfillment (see especially <sup>2341B</sup>Isaiah 19:5-10), yet this has not been by any irresistible aggression of nature, but because Egypt, smitten and accursed, has lost all strength and energy. The population is not large enough for the cultivation of the land now fit for culture, and long oppression has taken from it the power and the will to advance.

Egypt is naturally an agricultural country. As far back as the days of Abraham, we find that when the produce failed in Palestine, Egypt was the natural resource. In the time of Joseph it was evidently the granary — at least during famines — of the nations around (<sup>(-0120)</sup>Genesis 12:10; compare <sup>(-0248)</sup>Exodus 16:3; Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 2). The inundation, as taking the place of rain, has always rendered the system of agriculture peculiar; and the artificial irrigation during the time of low Nile is necessarily on the same principle. We read of the Land of Promise that it is "not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst [it] with thy foot, as a garden of herbs: but the land whither thou goest in to possess it, [is] a land of hills and valleys, [and] drinketh water of the rain of heaven" (<sup>(-0510)</sup>Deuteronomy 11:10, 11). Watering with the foot may refer to, some mode of irrigation by a machine, but we are inclined to thinly that it is an idiomatic expression implying a laborious work. The monuments do not afford a representation of the supposed machine. That now called the shaduf, which is a pole having a weight at one end and a bucket at the other, so hung that the laborer is aided by the weight in raising the full bucket, is depicted, and seems to have been the common means of artificial irrigation (q.v.). There are detailed pictures of breaking up the earth, or ploughing, sowing, harvest, threshing, and storing the wheat in granaries. *SEE AGRICULTURE*. The threshing was simply treading out by oxen or cows, unmuzzled (compare <sup>(-0524)</sup>Deuteronomy 25:4). The processes of agriculture began as soon as the water of the inundation had sunk into the soil, about a month after the autumnal equinox (<sup>(-0088)</sup>Exodus 9:31, 32) Vines were extensively cultivated, and there were several different kinds of wine, one of which, the Mareotic, was famous among the Romans. Of other fruit-trees, the date-palm was the most common and valuable. The gardens resembled the fields, being watered in the same manner by irrigation. *SEE GARDEN; SEE VINEYARD*. On the tenure of land much light is thrown by the history of Joseph. Before the famine each city and large village — for *ry[an]* must be held to have a wider signification than our city" — had its field (<sup>(-0448)</sup>Genesis 41:48); but Joseph gained for Pharaoh all the land, except that of the priests, in exchange for food, and required for the right thus obtained a fifth of the produce, which became a law (<sup>(-0472)</sup>Genesis 47:20-26). The evidence of the monuments, though not very explicit, seems to show that this law was ever afterwards in force under the Pharaohs. There does not seem to have been any hereditary aristocracy, except perhaps at an earlier time, and it is not impossible that these lands may have been held during

tenure of office or for life. The temples had lands which of course were inalienable. Diodorus Siculus states that all the lands belonged to the crown except those of the priests and the soldiers (1:73). It is probable that the latter, when not employed on active service, received no pay, but were supported by the crown lands, and occupied them for the time as their own. *SEE LAND.*

The great lakes in the north of Egypt were anciently of high importance, especially for their fisheries and the growth of the papyrus. Lake Menzeleh, the most eastern of the existing lakes, has still large fisheries, which support the people who live on its islands and shore, the rude successors of the independent Egyptians of the Bucolia. Lake Moeris, anciently so celebrated, was an artificial lake between Beni-Suweif and Medinet el-Feyum. It was of use to irrigate the neighboring country, and its fisheries yielded a great revenue. *SEE ANGLING.* It is now entirely dried up. The canals are now far less numerous than of old, and many of them are choked and comparatively useless. The Bahr Yusuf, or "river of Joseph" — not the patriarch, but the famous sultan Yusuf Salah-ed-deen, who repaired it is a long series of canals, near the desert on the west side of the river, extending northward from Farshut for about 350 miles to a little below Memphis. This was probably a work of very ancient times. There can be no doubt of the high antiquity of the canal of the Red Sea, upon which the Land of Goshen mainly depended for its fertility. It does not follow, however, that it originally connected the Nile and the Red Sea.

**VIII.** *Botany.* — The cultivable land of Egypt consists almost wholly of fields, in which are very few trees. There are no forests and few groves, except of date-palms, and in Lower Egypt a few of orange and lemon trees. There are also sycamores, mulberry trees, and acacias, either planted on the sides of roads or standing singly in the fields. The Theban palm grows in the Thebais, generally in clumps. All these, except, perhaps, the mulberry-tree, were anciently common in the country. The two kinds of palm are represented on the monuments, and sycamore and acacia-wood are the materials of various objects made by the ancient inhabitants. The chief fruits are the date, grape, fig, sycamore-fig, pomegranate, banana, many kinds of melons, and the olive; and there are many others less common or important. These were also of old produced in the country. Anciently gardens seem to have received great attention, to have been elaborately planned, and well filled with trees and shrubs. Now horticulture is neglected, although the modern inhabitants are as fond of flowers as

were their predecessors. The vegetables are of many kinds and excellent, and form the chief food of the common people. Anciently cattle seem to have been more numerous, and their meat, therefore, more usually eaten, but never as much so as in colder climates. The Israelites in the desert, though they looked back to the time when they "sat by the flesh-pots" (~~(1214B)~~ Exodus 16:3), seem as much to have regretted the vegetables and fruits, as the flesh and fish of Egypt. "Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely, the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic" (~~(04104)~~ Numbers 11:4, 5). The chief vegetables now are beans, peas, lentils, of which an excellent thick pottage is made (~~(02534)~~ Genesis 25:34), leeks, onions, garlic, radishes, carrots, cabbages, gourds, cucumbers, the tomato, and the eggfruit. There are many besides these. The most important field-produce in ancient times was wheat; after it must be placed barley, millet, flax, and, among the vegetables, lentils, peas, and beans. At the present day the same is the case; but maize, rice, oats, clover, the sugar-cane, roses, the tobacco-plant, hemp, and cotton, must be added, some of which are not indigenous. In the account of the plague of hail four kinds of field-produce are mentioned — flax, barley, wheat, and **tmsku** (~~(10081)~~ Exodus 9:31, 32), which is variously rendered in the A. V. "rye" (l.c.), "spelt" (~~(23085)~~ Isaiah 28:25), and "fitches" (~~(23077)~~ Isaiah 28:27). It is doubted whether the last be a cereal or a leguminous product: we incline to the former opinion. *SEE RYE.*

It is clear from the evidence of the monuments and of ancient writers that, of old, reeds were far more common in Egypt than now. The byblus or papyrus is almost or quite unknown. Anciently it was a common and most important plant: boats were made of its stalks, and of their thin leaves the famous paper was manufactured. It appears to be mentioned under two names in the Bible, neither of which, however, can be proved to be a peculiar designation for it.

- (1.) The mother of Moses made **amṣot biṭe** "an ark" or "skiff" "of papyrus," in which to put her child (~~(10018)~~ Exodus 2:3), and Isaiah tells of messengers sent apparently from farthest Ethiopia in **amḡṯyl Ḳ**, "vessels of papyrus" (~~(23082)~~ Isaiah 18:2), in both which cases **amḡ** must mean papyrus, although it would seem in other places to signify "reeds" generically.

(2.) Isaiah prophesies, "The papyrus-reeds ( $t/r$  [ ] in the river ( $r/ay$ ], on the edge of the river, and everything growing [lit. sown] in the river shall be dried up, driven away [by the wind], and [shall] not be" (<sup><2307></sup>Isaiah 19:7). Gesenius renders  $hr$ [ ]: a naked or bare place, here grassy places on the banks of the Nile. Apart from the fact that little grass grows on the banks of the Nile, in Egypt, and that little only during the cooler part of the year, instead of those sloping meadows that must have been in the European scholar's mind, this word must mean some product of the river which with the other water plants should be dried up, and blown away, and utterly disappear. Like the fisheries and the flax mentioned with it, it ought to hold an important place in the commerce of ancient Egypt. It can therefore scarcely be reasonably held to intend anything but the papyrus. *SEE PAPER REED.*

The marine and fluvial product  $\tilde{a}ws$ , from which the Red Sea was called  $\tilde{a}wsApyj$  will be noticed under RED SEA. The lotus was anciently the favorite flower, and at feasts it took the place of the rose among the Greek and Arabs: it is now very rare.

**IX. Zoology.** — Anciently Egypt was far more a pastoral country than at present. The neat cattle are still excellent, but lean kine are more common among them than they seem to have been in the days of Joseph's Pharaoh (<sup><0419></sup>Genesis 41:19). Sheep and goats have always been numerous. Anciently swine were kept, but not in great numbers; now there are none, or scarcely any, except a few in the houses of Copts and Franks. The Egyptian oxen were celebrated in the ancient world (Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* 8:28). — Horses abounded (<sup><1108></sup>1 Kings 10:28); hence the use of war-chariots in fight (<sup><2300></sup>Isaiah 31:1; Diod. Sic. 1:45), and the celebrity of Egyptian charioteers (<sup><2409></sup>Jeremiah 46:4; <sup><2375></sup>Ezekiel 17:15). Under the Pharaohs the horses of the country were in repute among the neighboring nations who purchased them as well as chariots out of Egypt. Thus it is commanded respecting a king of Israel: "He shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way" (<sup><0576></sup>Deuteronomy 17:16), which shows that the trade in horses was with Egypt, and would necessitate a close alliance. "Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt; and linen yarn: the king's merchants received the linen yarn at a price. And a chariot came



up and went out of Egypt for six hundred [shekels] of silver, and a horse for a hundred and fifty; and so for all the kings of the Hittites and for the kings of Syria did they bring [them] out by their hand" (<sup><1103></sup>1 Kings 10:28, 29). The number of horses kept by this king for chariots and cavalry was large (<sup><1103></sup>1 Kings 4:26; 10:26; <sup><4014></sup>2 Chronicles 1:14; 9:25). Some of these horses came as yearly tribute from his vassals (<sup><1103></sup>1 Kings 10:25). In later times the prophets reprov'd the people for trusting in the help of Egypt, and relying on the aid of her horses and chariots and horsemen, that is, probably, men in chariots, as we shall show in speaking of the Egyptian armies. The kings of the Hittites, mentioned in the passage quoted above, and in the account of the close of the siege of Samaria by Benhadad, where we read, "The Lord had made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, [even] the noise of a great host: and they said one to another, Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites and the kings of the Egyptians to come upon us" (<sup><1206></sup>2 Kings 7:6)-these kings ruled the Hittites of the valley of the Orontes, who were called by the Egyptians SHETA or KHETA. The Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties waged fierce wars with these Hittites, who were then ruled by a great king and many chiefs, and whose principal arm was a force of chariots, resembling those of the Egyptian army. —Asses were anciently numerous: the breed at the present time is excellent. —Buffaloes are common, and not wild. —Dogs were formerly more prized than now; for, being held by most of the Moslems to be extremely unclean, they are only used to watch the houses in the villages. —Cats are as numerous, but less favored. —The camel has nowhere been found mentioned in the inscriptions of Egypt, or represented on the monuments. In the Bible Abraham is spoken of as having camels when in Egypt, apparently as a gift from Pharaoh (<sup><0126></sup>Genesis 12:16), and before the Exodus the camels of Pharaoh or his subjects were to be smitten by the murrain (<sup><0903></sup>Exodus 9:3; compare verse 6). Both these Pharaohs may have been shepherds. The Ishmaelites or Midianites who took Joseph into Egypt carried their merchandise on camels (<sup><0375></sup>Genesis 37:25, 28, 36), and the land traffic of the Arabs must always have been by caravans of camels; but it is probable that camels were not kept in Egypt, but only on the frontier. On the black obelisk from Nimrud, now in the British Museum, which is of Shalmanubar, king of Assyria, contemporary with Jehu and Hazael, camels are represented among objects sent as tribute by Egypt. They are of the two-humped sort, which, though perhaps then common in Assyria, has never, so far as is known, been kept in Egypt. —The deserts have always

abounded in wild animals, especially of the canine and antelope kinds. The wolf, fox, jackal, hyena, wild cat, weasel, ichneumon, jerboa, and hare are also met with. — Anciently the hippopotamus was found in the Egyptian Nile, and hunted. This is a fact of importance for those who suppose it to be the behemoth (q.v.) of the book of Job, especially as that book shows evidence of a knowledge of Egypt. Now this animal is rarely seen even in Lower Nubia. — The elephant may have been, in the remotest historical period, an inhabitant of Egypt, and, as a land animal, have been driven further south than his brother pachyderm, for the name of the island of Elephantine, just below the First Cataract, in hieroglyphics, AB. "Elephant-land," seems to show that he was anciently found there. — Bats abound in the temples and tombs, filling the dark and desecrated chambers and passages with the unearthly whirr of their wings. Such desolation is represented by Isaiah when he says that a man shall cast his idols "to the moles and to the bats" (<sup><2122></sup>Isaiah 2:20). See each animal in its place.

The birds of Egypt are not remarkable for beauty of plumage: in so open a country this is natural. The *Rapaces* are numerous, but the most common are scavengers, as vultures and the kite. Eagles and falcons also are plentiful. Quails migrate to Egypt in great numbers. The *Grallitores* and *Anseres* abound on the islands and sandbanks of the river, and in the sides of the mountains which approach or touch the stream.

Among the reptiles, the crocodile (q.v.) must be especially mentioned. In the Bible it is usually called <sup>ʿ</sup>ynāḫ <sup>ḥ</sup>pnāḫ "dragon," a generic word of almost as wide a signification as "reptile," and is used as a symbol of the king of Egypt. Thus, in Ezekiel, "Behold, I am against thee, Pharaoh, king of Egypt, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers, which hath said, My river [is] mine own, and I have made [it] for myself. But I will put hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause the fish of thy rivers to stick unto thy scales, and I will bring thee up out of the midst of thy rivers, and all the fish of thy rivers shall stick unto thy scales. And I will leave thee [thrown] into the wilderness, thee and all the fish of thy rivers ... I have given thee for meat to the beasts of the field and to the fowls of the heaven" (<sup><2519></sup>Ezekiel 29:3, 4, 5). Here there seems to be a retrospect of the Exodus (which is thus described in <sup><2519></sup>Isaiah 51:9, 10, and 15), and with a more close resemblance in <sup><2519></sup>Psalm 74:13, 14, "Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the dragons (<sup>ḥ</sup>pnāḫ) in the waters. Thou brakest the heads of leviathan (<sup>ʿ</sup>tyw) in pieces, [and] gavest him [to

be] meat to the dwellers in the wilderness" ( $\mu\gamma\lambda\alpha\epsilon\iota$ , i.e., to the wild beasts; comp. <sup><2332></sup>Isaiah 13:21). The last passage is important as indicating that whereas  $\hat{y}nt$  is the Hebrew generic name of reptiles, and therefore used for the greatest of them, the crocodile,  $\hat{t}ywl$  is the special name of that animal. The description of leviathan in Job (Job 41) fully bears out this opinion, and it is doubtful if any passage can be adduced in which a wider signification of the latter word is required. In <sup><1332></sup>Job 26:12 also there is an apparent allusion to the Exodus in words similar to those in <sup><2500></sup>Isaiah 51:9, 10, and 15?), but without mention of the dragon. In this case the division of the sea and the smiting of Rahab,  $bhr$ ; the proud or insolent, are mentioned in connection with the wonders of creation (verses 7-11, 13): so, too, in Isaiah (verses 13, 15). The crossing of the Red Sea could be thus spoken of as a signal exercise of the divine power. — Frogs are very numerous in Egypt, and their loud and constant croaking in the autumn in "the streams,"  $trbnj$  "the rivers,"  $\mu\gamma\rho\alpha\epsilon\eta$  and "the ponds" or "marshes,"  $\mu\gamma M\epsilon\alpha$  (<sup><0001></sup>Exodus 8:1, A.V. 5), makes it not difficult to picture the Plague of Frogs. — Serpents and snakes are also common, including the deadly cerastes and the cobra di capello; but the more venomous have their home in the desert (comp. <sup><0005></sup>Deuteronomy 8:15).

The Nile and lakes have an abundance of fishes; and although the fisheries of Egypt have very greatly fallen away, their produce is still a common article of food.

Among the insects the locusts must be mentioned, which sometimes come upon the cultivated land in a cloud, and, as in the plague, eat every herb, and fruit, and leaf where they alight; but they never, as then, overspread the whole land (<sup><0003></sup>Exodus 10:3-6, 1219). They disappear as suddenly as they come, and are carried away by the wind (verse 19). As to the lice and flies, they are now plagues of Egypt, but it is not certain that the words  $\mu\kappa\alpha$  and  $br\phi$ ; designate them (<sup><0006></sup>Exodus 8:16-31). The dangerous scorpion is frequently met with. Beetles of various kinds are found, including the sacred scarabaeus. Bees and silkworms are kept, but the honey is not very good, and the silk is inferior to that of Syria.

## Picture for E'gypt 4

**X. Ancient Inhabitants.** — The old inhabitants of Egypt appear from their monuments and the testimony of ancient writers to have occupied in race a

place between the Nigritians and the Caucasians. The constant immigrations of Arab settlers have greatly diminished the Nigritian characteristics in the generality of the modern Egyptians. The most recent inquiries have shown that the extreme limit at Philae was only of a political nature, for the natives of the country below it were of the same race as those who lived above that spot — a tribe which passed down into the fertile valley of the Nile from its original abode in the south. These Ethiopians and the Egyptians were not negroes, but a branch of the great Caucasian family. Their frame was slender, but of great strength. Their faces appear to have been oval in shape, and narrower in the men than in the women. The forehead was well-shaped, but small and retiring; the eyes were almond-shaped and mostly black; the hair was long, crisp, and generally black; the skin of the men was dark brown, chiefly from exposure; that of the women was olive-colored or even lighter. The women were very fruitful (Strabo, 15, page 695; Heeren, *Ideen*, 11:2, 10). The ancient dress was far more scanty than the modern, and in this matter, as in manners and character, the influence of the Arab race is also very apparent. The ancient Egyptians in character were very religious and contemplative, but given to base superstition, patriotic, respectful to women, hospitable, generally frugal, but at times luxurious, very sensual, lying, thieving, treacherous, and cringing, and intensely prejudiced, through pride of race, against strangers, although kind to them. This is very much the character of the modern inhabitants, except that Mohammedanism has taken away the respect for women. The ancient Egyptians are indeed the only early Eastern nation that we know to have resembled the modern Westerns in this particular; but we find the same virtue markedly to characterize the Nigritians of our day. That the Egyptians in general treated the Israelites with kindness while they were in their country, even during the oppression, seems almost certain from the privilege of admission into the congregation in the third generation, granted to them in the Law, with the Edomites, while the Ammonites and Moabites were absolutely excluded, the reference in three out of the four cases being to the stay in Egypt, and the entrance into Palestine (<sup>(1213)</sup>Deuteronomy 23:3-8). This supposition is important in its bearing on the history of the oppression.

**XI. Language.** — The ancient Egyptian language, from the earliest period at which it is known to us, is an agglutinate monosyllabic form of speech. It is expressed by the signs which we call hieroglyphics. The character of the language is compound: it consists of elements resembling those of the

Nigritian languages and the Chinese language on the one hand, and those of the Shemitic languages on the other. All those who have studied the African languages make a distinct family of several of those languages, spoken in the north-east quarter of the continent, in which family they include the ancient Egyptian; while every Shemitic scholar easily recognizes in Egyptian, Shemitic pronouns and other elements, and a predominantly Shemitic grammar. As in person, character, and religion, so in language we find two distinct elements, mixed but not fused, and here the Nigritian element seems unquestionably the earlier, Bunsen asserts that this language is "ante-historical Shemitism:" we think it enough to say that no Shemitic scholar has accepted his theory. For a full discussion of the question, see Poole, *The Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, chapter 6. As early as the age of the 26th dynasty, a vulgar dialect was expressed in the demotic or enchorial writing. This dialect forms the link connecting the old language with the Coptic or Christian Egyptian, the latest phase. The Coptic does not very greatly differ from the monumental language, distinguished in the time of the demotic as the sacred dialect, except in the presence of many Greek words. *SEE COPTIC LANGUAGE.*

The language of the ancient Egyptians was entirely unknown until the discoveries made by Dr. Young from the celebrated Rosetta stone, now preserved in the British Museum. This stone is a slab of black marble, which was found by the French in August 1799, among the ruins of Fort St. Julien, on the western bank, and near the mouth of the Rosetta branch of the Nile. It contains a decree in three different kinds of writing, referring to the coronation of Ptolemy V (Epiphanes), and is supposed to have been sculptured B.C. cir. 195. As part of the inscription is in Greek, it was easily deciphered, and was found to state that the decree was ordered to be written in sacred, enchorial, and Greek characters. Thence, by carefully comparing the three inscriptions, a key was obtained to the interpretation of the mysterious hieroglyphics. The language which they express closely resembles that which was afterwards called Coptic when the people had become Christians. It is monosyllabic in its roots, and abounds in vowels. There were at least two dialects of it, spoken respectively in Upper and Lower Egypt. *SEE ROSETTA STONE.*

"The wisdom of Egypt" was a phrase which, at an early period, passed into a proverb, so high was the opinion entertained by antiquity of the knowledge and skill of the ancient Egyptians (<sup><1063></sup>1 Kings 4:30; Herod. 2:160; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:25; <sup><4172></sup>Acts 7:22). Nor, as the sequel of this article

will show, were there wanting substantial reasons for the current estimate. If, however, antiquity did not on this point exceed the bounds of moderation, very certain is it that men of later ages are chargeable with the utmost extravagance in the terms which they employed when speaking on the subject. It was long thought that the hieroglyphical inscriptions on the monumental remains of Egypt contained treasures of wisdom no less boundless than hidden; and, indeed, hieroglyphics were, in the opinion of some, invented by the priests of the land, if not expressly to conceal their knowledge from the profane vulgar, yet as a safe receptacle and convenient storehouse for their mysterious but invaluable doctrines. Great, consequently, was the expectation of the public when it was announced that a key had been discovered which opened the portal to these long-concealed treasures. The result has not been altogether correspondent, especially with regard to the presumed secrets of ancient lore. Men of profound learning, great acuteness of mind, and distinguished reputation have engaged and persevered in the inquiry: it is impossible to study without advantage the writings of such persons as Zoega, Akerblad, Young, Champollion, Spohn, Seyffarth, Kosegarten, Ruhle; and equally ungrateful would it be to affirm that no progress has been made in the undertaking; but, after all, the novel conclusions and positions which have been drawn and set forth are only in a few cases (comparatively) definite and unimpeachable (Heeren, *Ideen*. 2:2,4; Quatremere, *Recherches sur la langue et la litterature de l'Egypte*). **SEE HIEROGLYPHICS**. The results in point of history and archaeology, as detailed by Lepsius, Brugsch, and other late Egyptologists, are far more important than in a purely scientific view. See below.

**XII. Religion.** — The basis of the religion was Nigritian fetichism, the lowest kind of nature-worship, differing in different parts of the country, and hence obviously indigenous. Upon this were engrafted, first, cosmic worship, mixed up with traces of primeval revelation, as in Babylonia; and then a system of personifications of moral and intellectual abstractions. The incongruous character of the religion necessitates this supposition, and the ease with which it admitted extraneous additions in the historical period confirms it. There were, according to Herodotus, three orders of gods — the eight great gods, who were the most ancient, the twelve lesser, and the Osirian group. They were represented in human forms, sometimes having the heads of animals sacred to them, or bearing on their heads cosmic or other objects of worship. The fetichism included, besides the worship of

animals, that of trees, rivers, and hills. Each of these creatures or objects was appropriated to a divinity. There was no prominent hero-worship, although deceased kings and other individuals often received divine honors — in one case, that of Osirtasen II, of the 12th dynasty, the old Sesostris, of a very special character. The great doctrines of the immortality of the soul, man's responsibility, and future rewards and punishments, were taught. Among the rites, circumcision is the most remarkable: it is as old as the time of the 4th dynasty.

Wilkinson gives us the following classification of the Egyptian deities (*Materia Hieroglyphica*, page 58, modified by himself in Rawlinson's *Herod.* 2:241 sq.):

### I. FIRST ORDER.

1. Amen, or Amun-ra, "the king of all the gods."
2. Maut, or Mut (Sanchon. *mot*), the material principle, sometimes as Buto (=Latona).
3. Noum, Nu, Nef, or Kneph=Mercury.
4. Site=Juno.
5. Pthah, or Ptah, the creative power [a function assigned by others to Kneph]=Vulcan.
6. Neith, self-born and of masculine character=Minerva.
7. Khem, the generative principle (*phallus*).
8. Pasht=Diana.

### II. SECOND ORDER.

1. Re, Ra, or Phrah, the Sun, father of many deities, often combined with those of the others.
2. Seb, the Earth=Saturn, father of the inferior gods.
3. Netpe, wife of Seb, the Sky, mother of gods=Rhea.
4. Khous, son of Amun and Maut, the Moon=Hercules.
5. Anouke [Fire]=Vesta.

6. Atmu [? or Mat], Darkness, or Twilight.
- 7 Mui, or Shu, son of Re, Light [=Phoebus].
8. Taphne (Daphne), or Tafnet, a lion-headed goddess.
9. Thoth, the Intellect=Hermes and the Moon.
10. Sanak-re, or Sebak.
11. Eilithyia=Lucina.
12. Mandu, or Munt=Mars.

### III. THIRD ORDER.

1. Osiris
2. Isis, son and daughter of Seb and Netpe.
3. Aroeris, the elder Horus, son of Netpe.
4. Seth, or Typhon, the destructive principle [Death].
5. Nephtys (Nebtei), "lady of the house"=Vesta.
6. Horus the younger, god of Victory=Apollo.
7. Harpocrates, son of Osiris and Isis, emblem of Youth.
8. Anubis, son of Osiris.

### IV. MISCELANEOUS.

1. Thmei, or Ma (θέμις), goddess of Truth and Justice, headless.
2. Athor (eit-Hor)=Venus, another daughter of Ra.
3. Nophr-Atmu, perhaps a variation of Atmu above.
4. Hor-Hat, a winged globe, as ἀγαθοδαίμων.
5. Hakte (Hecate), a lion-headed goddess.
6. Selk, a scorpion-headed goddess.
7. Tore, a god connected with Ptah.



8. Amunta, perhaps a female Amun.
9. The, "the heavens."
10. Hapi, or the god of the Nile.
11. Ranno, an asp-headed goddess, as ἀγαθοδαίμων.
12. Hermes Trismegistus, a form of Thoth.
13. Asclepius, Moth, or Imoph, "son of Ptah."
14. Soph, the goddess of Speech.

Together with about 50 more, some of them local divinities, and personifications of cities, besides deified animals, etc

*Num, Au, or Kneph*, was one of the most important of the gods, corresponding to the "soul" of the universe, to whom was ascribed the creation of gods, men, and the natural world. He is represented as a man with the head of ram and curved horns. The chief god of Thebes was *Amen*, or *Amen-Ra*, or *Amen-Ra Khem*, also worshipped in the great oasis, and sometimes portrayed under the form of *Kneph*. He was the Jupiter Ammon of the classics. The goddess *Mut*, or "the mother," is the companion of Amen, and is represented as a female wearing the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt, and the vulture headdress of a queen. *Khem* was the god by whom the productiveness of nature was symbolized. His name reminds us of the patriarch Ham. The Greeks identified him with Pan, and called Chemmis, a city in the Thebais, where he was worshipped, Panopolis. He is accompanied by a tree or a flower on the sculptures, which may have been, as supposed by Mr. Poole, the *asherak* or sacred grove spoken of in the Bible. *Ptah* was the god of Memphis, and worshipped there under the form of a pigmy or child; but, as his temples have been destroyed, little is known of his worship. The goddess *Neit* or *Neith* is often associated with Ptah. She was the patron deity of Sais, in the Delta; and the Greeks say that Cecrops, leading a colony from thence to Athens, introduced her worship into Greece, where she was called Athene. This name may be derived from the Egyptian, if we suppose the latter to have been sometimes called Thenei, with the article prefixed like the name of Thebes. She is represented as a female with the crown of Lower Egypt on her head. *Ra*, or the sun, was worshipped at Heliopolis. His common figure is that of a man with a hawk's head, on which is placed the solar disk

and the royal asp. *Thoth* was the god of science and letters, and was worshipped at Hermopolis Magna. His usual form is that of a man with the head of an ibis surmounted by a crescent. *Bast* was called Bubastis by the Greeks, who identified her with Artemis. She is represented as a lion or cat-headed female, with the globe of the sun on her head. There is a similar goddess called Pasht. *Athor* was the daughter of Ra, and corresponded to the Aphrodite of the Greeks; the town of Tentyra or Denderah was under her protection. *Shu* represented solar or physical light, and *Ma-t* or Thma (Themis) moral light, truth, or justice. *Sebak* was a son of Ra. He has a crocodile's head. *Osiris* is the most remarkable personage in the Egyptian Pantheon. His form is that of a mummied figure holding the crook and flail, and wearing the crown of Upper Egypt, generally with an ostrich feather on each side. He was regarded as the personification of moral good. He is related to have been on earth instructing mankind in useful arts; to have been slain by his adversary Typhon (Set or Seth), by whom he was cut in pieces; to have been bewailed by his wife and sister Isis; to have been embalmed; to have risen again, and to have become the judge of the dead, among whom the righteous were called by his name, and received his form—a wonderful fore-feeling of the Gospel narrative, and most likely symbolizing the strife between good and evil. *Isis* was the sister and spouse of Osiris, worshipped at Abydos and the island of Philae. *Horus* was their son. *Apep*, Apophis of the Greeks, an enormous serpent, was the only representative of moral evil. The worship of animals is said to have been introduced by the second king of the second dynasty, when the bull Apis, at Memphis, and Mnevis, at Heliopolis, and the Mendesian goat, were called gods. The cat was sacred to Pasht, the ibis to Thoth, the crocodile to Sebak, the scarabaeus to Ptah and a solar god Atum. In their worship of the gods, sacrifices of animals, fruit, and vegetables were used, as well as libations of wine and incense. No decided instance of a human sacrifice has been found. After death a man was brought before Osiris: his heart weighed against the feather of truth. He was questioned by forty-two assessors as to whether he had committed forty-two sins about which they inquired. If guiltless, he took the form of Osiris, apparently after long series of transformations and many ordeals, and entered into bliss, dwelling among the gods in perpetual day on the banks of the celestial Nile. If guilty he was often changed into the form of some base animal, and consigned to a fiery place of punishment and perpetual night. From this abstract it may be seen that the Egyptian religion is to be referred to various sources. There is a trace of some primeval revelation in it; also a strong Sabaeen

element. (See a full discussion of the subject, with figures of the leading deities, in Kitto's *Pictorial Bible*, note on <sup><רמב></sup>Deuteronomy 4:16). A more favorable view of the ancient Egyptian theology is taken by Wilkinson in his *Ancient Egyptians* (see his summary in the abridged ed. 2:327 sq.); and it is probably true, as was the case with the polytheism of the Greeks and Romans likewise, that the more learned and philosophical classes were able to spiritualize to some extent a religion which could have been to the populace nothing but a gross idolatry.

The Israelites in Egypt appear, during the oppression, to have adopted to some extent the Egyptian idolatry (<sup><רמב></sup>Joshua 24:14; <sup><רמב></sup>Ezekiel 20:7, 8). The golden calf, or rather steer, **l g l e** was probably taken from the bull Apis, certainly from one of the sacred bulls. Remphan and Chiun were foreign divinities adopted into the Egyptian Pantheon, and called in the hieroglyphics RENPU (probably pronounced *Remphu*) and KEN. It can hardly be doubted that they were worshipped by the shepherds; but there is no satisfactory evidence that there was any' separate foreign system of idolatry. **SEE REMPHAN**. Ashtoreth was worshipped at Memphis, as is shown by a tablet of Amenoph II, B.C. cir. 1415, at the quarries of Tura, opposite that city (Vyse's *Pyramids*, in, "Tourah tablet 2"), in which she is represented as an Egyptian goddess. The temple of "the Foreign Venus," in "the Tyrian camp" in Memphis (Herod. 2:112), must have been sacred to her. Doubtless this worship was introduced by the Phoenician shepherds.

As there are prominent traces of primeval revelation in the ancient Egyptian religion, we cannot be surprised at finding certain resemblances to the Mosaic law, apart from the probability that whatever was unobjectionable in common belief and usages would be retained. The points in which the Egyptian religion shows strong traces of truth are, however, doctrines of the very kind that the Law does not expressly teach. The Egyptian religion, in its reference to man, was a system of responsibility mainly depending on future rewards and punishments. The Law, in its reference to man, was a system of responsibility mainly depending on temporal rewards and punishments. All we learn, but this is of: the utmost importance, is that every Israelite who came out of Egypt must have been fully acquainted with the universally recognised doctrines of the immortality of the 'soul, man's responsibility, and future rewards and punishments, truths which the law does not, and of course could not, contradict. The idea that the Mosaic law was an Egyptian invention is one of the worst examples of modern reckless criticism.

**XIII. Laws.** — We have no complete account of the laws of the ancient Egyptians either in their own records or in works of ancient writers. The passages in the Bible which throw light upon the laws in force during the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt most probably do not relate to purely native law, nor to law administered to natives, for during that whole period they may perhaps have been under shepherd rulers, and in any case it cannot be doubted that they would not be subject to absolutely the same system as the Egyptians. The paintings and sculptures of the monuments indicate a very high degree of personal safety, showing us that the people of all ranks commonly went unarmed, and without military protection. We must therefore infer that the laws relating to the maintenance of order were sufficient and strictly enforced. The punishments seem to have been lighter than those of the Mosaic law, and very different in their relation to crime and in their nature. Capital punishment appears to have been almost restricted, in practice, to murder. Crimes of violence were more severely treated than offenses against religion and morals. Popular feeling seems to have taken the duties of the judge upon itself in the case of impiety alone. That in early times the Egyptian populace acted with reference to any offense against its religion as it did under the Greeks and Romans, is evident from the answer of Moses when Pharaoh proposed that the Hebrews should sacrifice in the land. "It is not meet so to do; for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God: lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone, us?" (<sup>1835</sup>Exodus 8:26.)

**XIV. Government.** — The rule was monarchical, but not of an absolute character. The sovereign was not superior to the laws, and the priests had the power to check the undue exercise of his authority. The kings under whom the Israelites lived seem to have been absolute, but even Joseph's Pharaoh did not venture to touch the independence of the priests. Nomes and districts were governed by officers whom the Greeks called nomarchs and toparchs. There seems to have been no hereditary aristocracy, except perhaps at the earliest period, for indications of something of the kind occur in the inscriptions of the 4th and 12th dynasties.

**XV. Foreign Policy.** — This must be regarded in its relation to the admission of foreigners into Egypt and to the treatment of tributary and allied nations. In the former aspect it was characterized by an exclusiveness which sprang from a national hatred of the yellow and white races, and was

maintained by the wisdom of preserving the institutions of the country from the influence of the pirates of the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, and the robbers of the deserts. Hence the jealous exclusion of the Greeks from the northern ports until Naucratis was opened to them, and hence, too, the restriction of Shemitic settlers in earlier times to the land of Goshen, scarcely regarded as part of Egypt. It may be remarked as a proof of the strictness of this policy that during the whole of the sojourn of the Israelites they appear to have been kept in Goshen. The key to the policy towards foreign nations, after making allowance for the hatred of the yellow and white races balanced by the regard for the red and black, is found in the position of the great Oriental rivals of Egypt. The supremacy or influence of the Pharaohs over the nations lying between the Nile and the Euphrates depended as much on wisdom in policy as prowess in arms. The kings of the 4th, 6th, and 15th dynasties appear to have uninterruptedly held the peninsula of Sinai, where tablets record their conquest of Asiatic nomads. But with the 18th dynasty commences the period of Egyptian supremacy. Very soon after the accession of this powerful line most of the countries between the Egyptian border and the Tigris were reduced to the condition of tributaries. The empire seems to have lasted for nearly three centuries, from about B.C. 1500 to about 1200. The chief opponents of the Egyptians were the Hittites of the valley of the Orontes, with whom the Pharaohs waged long and fierce wars. After this time the influence of Egypt declined; and until the reign of Shishak (B.C. cir. 990-967), it appears to have been confined to the western borders of Palestine. No doubt the rising greatness of Assyria caused the decline. Thenceforward to the days of Pharaoh Necho there was a constant struggle for the tracts lying between Egypt, and Assyria, and Babylonia, until the disastrous battle at Carchemish finally destroyed the supremacy of the Pharaohs. It is probable that during the period of the empire an Assyrian or Babylonian king generally supported the opponents of the rulers of Egypt. Great aid from a powerful ally can indeed alone explain the strong resistance offered by the Hittites. The general policy of the Egyptians towards their eastern tributaries seems to have been marked by great moderation. The Pharaohs intermarried with them, and neither forced upon them Egyptian garrisons, except in some important positions, nor attempted those deportations that are so marked a feature of Asiatic policy. In the case of those nations which never attacked them they do not appear to have even exacted tribute. So long as their general supremacy was uncontested they would not be unwise enough to make favorable or neutral

powers their enemies. Of their relation to the Israelites we have for the earlier part of this period no direct information. The explicit account of the later part is fully consistent with what we have said of the general policy of the Pharaohs. Shishak and Zerah, if the latter were, as we believe, a king of Egypt or a commander of Egyptian forces, are the only exceptions in a series of friendly kings, and they were almost certainly of Assyrian or Babylonian extraction. One Pharaoh gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon, another appears to have been the ally of Jehoram, king of Israel (~~1206~~2 Kings 7:6), So made a treaty with Hoshea, Tirhakah aided Hezekiah, Pharaoh Necho fought Josiah against his will, and did not treat Judah with the severity of the Oriental kings, and his second successor, Pharaoh Hophra, maintained the alliance, notwithstanding this break, as firmly as before, and, although foiled in his endeavor to save Jerusalem from the Chaldaeans, received the fugitives of Judah, who, like the fugitives of Israel at the capture of Samaria, took refuge in Egypt. It is probable that during the earlier period the same friendly relations existed. The Hebrew records of that time afford no distinct indication of hostility with Egypt, nor have the Egyptian lists of conquered regions and towns of the same age been found to contain any Israelitish name, whereas in Shishak's list the kingdom of Judah and some of its towns occur. The route of the earlier Pharaohs to the east seems always to have been along the Palestinian coast, then mainly held by the Philistines and Phoenicians, both of whom they subdued, and across Syria northward of the territories occupied by the Hebrews. With respect to the African nations a different policy appears to have been pursued. The Rebu (Lebu) or Lubim, to the west of Egypt, on the north coast, were reduced to subjection, and probably employed, like the Shayretana or Cherethim, as mercenaries. Ethiopia was made a purely Egyptian province, ruled by a viceroy, "the prince of Kesh (Cush)," and the assimilation was so complete that Ethiopian sovereigns seem to have been received by the Egyptians as native rulers. Further south the negroes were subject to predatory attacks like the slave-hunts of modern times, conducted not so much from motives of hostility as to obtain a supply of slaves. In the Bible we find African peoples, Lubim, Phut, Sukkiim, Cush, as mercenaries or supporters of Egypt, but not a single name that can be positively placed to the eastward of that country.

**XVI.** *Army.* — There are some notices of the Egyptian army in the O.T. They show, like the monuments, that its most important branch was the chariot force. The Pharaoh of the Exodus led 600 chosen chariots, besides

his whole chariot-force, in pursuit of the Israelites. The warriors fighting in chariots are probably the "horsemen" mentioned in the relation of this event and elsewhere, for in Egyptian they are called the "horse" or "cavalry." We have no subsequent indication in the Bible of the constitution of an Egyptian army until the time of the 22d dynasty, when we find that Shishak's invading force was partly composed of foreigners; whether mercenaries or allies cannot as yet be positively determined, although the monuments make it most probable that they were of the former character. The army of Necho, defeated at Carchemish, seems to have been similarly composed, although it probably contained Greek mercenaries, who soon afterwards became the most important foreign element in the Egyptian forces.

**XVII.** *Customs, Science, and Art.* — The sculptures and paintings of the tombs give us a very full insight into the domestic life of the ancient Egyptians, as may be seen in Sir G. Wilkinson's work. What most strikes us in their manners is the high position occupied by women, and the entire absence of the harem system of seclusion. The wife is called "the lady of the house." Marriage appears to have been universal, at least with the richer class; and if polygamy were tolerated it was rarely practiced. Of marriage ceremonies no distinct account has been discovered, but there is evidence that something of the kind was usual in the case of a queen (De Rouge, *Essai sur une Stele Egyptienne*, pages 53, 54). Concubinage was allowed, the concubines taking the place of inferior wives. There were no castes, although great classes were very distinct, especially the priests, soldiers, artisans, and herdsmen, with laborers. A man of the upper classes might, however, both hold a command in the army and be a priest; and therefore the caste system cannot have strictly applied in the case of the subordinates. The general manner of life does not much illustrate that of the Israelites from its great essential difference. The Egyptians from the days of Abraham were a settled people, occupying a land which they had held for centuries without question except through the aggression of foreign invaders. The occupations of the higher class were the superintendence of their fields and gardens, their diversions, the pursuit of game in the deserts or on the river, and fishing. The tending of cattle was left to the most despised of the lower class. The Israelites, on the contrary, were from the very first a pastoral people: in time of war they lived within walls; when there was peace they "dwelt in their tents" (<sup><2236></sup>2 Kings 13:5).

The Egyptian feasts, and the dances, music, and feats which accompanied them for the diversion of the guests, as well as the common games, were probably introduced among the Hebrews in the most luxurious days of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. The account of the noontide dinner of Joseph (<sup><04316></sup>Genesis 43:16, 31-34) agrees with the representations of the monuments, although it evidently describes a far simpler repast than would be usual with an Egyptian minister. The attention to precedence, which seems to have surprised Joseph's brethren (verse 33), is perfectly characteristic of Egyptian customs.

The Egyptians were in the habit of eating much bread at table, and fancy rolls or seed-cakes were in abundance at every feast. Those who could afford it ate wheaten bread, the poor alone being content with a coarser kind, made of *dura* flour or millet. They ate with their fingers, though they occasionally used spoons. The table was sometimes covered with a cloth; and in great entertainments among the rich, each guest was furnished with a napkin. They sat on a carpet or mat upon the ground, or else on stools or chairs round the table, and did not recline at meat like the Greeks and Romans. They were particularly fond of music and dancing. The most austere and scrupulous priest could not give a feast without a good band of musicians and dancers, as well as plenty of wine, costly perfumes and ointments, and a profusion of lotus and other flowers. Tumblers, jugglers, and various persons skilled in feats of agility, were hired for the occasion, and the guests played at games of chance, at *mora*, and the game of *latrunculi*, resembling draughts. The latter was the favorite game of all ranks, and Rameses III is more than once represented playing it in the palace at Thebes. The number of pieces for playing the game is not exactly known. They were of different colors on the opposite sides of the board, and were not flat as with us, but about an inch and a half or two inches high, and were moved like chessmen, with the thumb and finger.

The religious festivals were numerous, and some of them were, in the days of Herodotus, kept with great merry-making and license. His description of that of the goddess Bubastis, kept at the city of Bubastis, in the eastern part of the Delta, would well apply to some of the great Mohammedan festivals now held in the country (2:59, 60). The feast which the Israelites celebrated when Aaron had made the golden calf seems to have been very much of the same character: first offerings were presented, and then the people ate; and danced, and sang (<sup><02316></sup>Exodus 32:5, 6, 17, 18, 19), and



even, it seems, stripped themselves (verse 25), as appears to have been not unusual at the popular ancient Egyptian festivals.

The funeral ceremonies were far more important than any events of the Egyptian life, as the tomb was regarded as the only true home. The body of the deceased was embalmed in the form of Osiris, the judge of the dead, and conducted to the burial-place with great pomp and much display of lamentation. The mourning lasted seventy-two days or less. Both Jacob and Joseph were embalmed, and the mourning for the former lasted seventy days.

The Egyptians, for the most part, were accustomed to shave their heads; indeed, except among the soldiers, the practice was probably almost universal. They generally wore skull-caps. Otherwise they wore their own hair, or wigs falling to the shoulders in numerous curls, or done up in the form of a bag. They also shaved their faces; kings, however, and other great personages had beards about three inches long and one inch broad, which were plaited. The crown of Upper Egypt was a short cap, with a tall point behind, which was worn over the other. The king often had the figure of an asp, the emblem of royalty, tied just above his forehead. The common royal dress was a kilt which reached to the ankles; over it was worn a shirt, coming down to the knees, with wide sleeves as far as the elbows: both these were generally of fine white linen. Sandals were worn on the feet, and on the person, armllets, bracelets, and necklaces. The upper and middle classes usually went barefoot; in other respects their dress was much the same as that of the king's, but of course inferior, in costliness. The priests sometimes wore a leopard's skin tied over the shoulders, or like a shirt, with the fore legs for the sleeves. The queen had a particular headdress, which was in the form of a vulture with expanded wings. The beak projected over the forehead, the wings fell on either side, and the tail hung down behind. She sometimes wore the uraeus or asp. The royal princes were distinguished by a side-lock of hair elaborately plaited. The women wore their hair curled or plaited, reaching about half way from the shoulders to the waist.

The Egyptians were a very literary people, and time has preserved to us, besides the inscriptions on their tombs and temples, many papyri of a religious or historical character, and one tale. They bear no resemblance to the books of the O.T., except such as arises from their sometimes enforcing moral truths in a manner not wholly different from that of the book of

Proverbs. The moral and religious system is, however, essentially different in its principles and their application. Some have imagined a great similarity between the O.T. and Egyptian literature, and have given a show of reason to their idea by dressing up Egyptian documents in a garb of Hebrew phraseology, in which, however, they have gone so awkwardly that no one who had not prejudged the question could for a moment be deceived. We find frequent reference in the Bible to the magicians of Egypt. The Pharaoh of Joseph laid his dream before the magicians, who could not interpret it (~~CHIB~~Genesis 41:8); the Pharaoh of the Exodus used them as opponents of Moses and Aaron, when, after what appears to have been a seeming success, they failed as before (~~CHBI~~Exodus 7:11, 12, 22; 8:18, 19; 9:11; ~~CHBS~~2 Timothy 3:8, 9). The monuments do not recognize any such art, and we must conclude that magic was secretly practiced, not because it was thought to be unlawful, but in order to give it importance. *SEE MAGIC; SEE JAMBRES; SEE JANNES.*

In science, Egyptian influence may be distinctly traced in the Pentateuch. Moses was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (~~CHID~~Acts 7:22), and probably derived from them the astronomical knowledge which was necessary for the calendar. His acquaintance with chemistry is shown in the manner of the destruction of the golden calf. The Egyptians excelled in geometry and mechanics: the earlier books of the Bible, however, throw no light upon the degree in which Moses may have made use of this part of his knowledge. In medicine and surgery, the high proficiency of the Egyptians was probably of but little use to the Hebrews after the Exodus: anatomy, practiced by the former from the earliest ages; was repugnant to the feelings of Shemites, and the simples of Egypt and of Palestine would be as different as the ordinary diseases of the country. In the arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting, the former of which was the chief, there seems to have been but a very slight and material influence. This was natural, for with the Egyptians architecture was a religious art, embodying in its principles their highest religious convictions, and mainly devoted to the service of religion. Durable construction, massive and grand form, and rich, though sober color, characterize their temples and tombs, the abodes of gods, and "homes" of men. To adopt such an architecture would have been to adopt the religion of Egypt, and the pastoral Israelites had no need of buildings. When they came into the Promised Land they found cities ready for their occupation, and it was not until the days of Solomon that a temple took the place of the tent, which was the sanctuary of the pastoral people.

Details of ornament were of course borrowed from Egypt; but, separated from the vast system in which they were found, they lost their significance, and became harmless until modern sciolists made them prominent in support of a theory which no mind capable of broad views can for a moment tolerate.

It is hardly needful to observe that the ancient Egyptians had attained to high degrees of civilization and mental culture. This is evidenced by many facts. For instance, the variation of the compass may even now be ascertained by observing the lateral direction of the pyramids, on account of their being placed so accurately north and south. This argues considerable acquaintance with astronomy. Again, we know that they were familiar with the duodecimal as well as the decimal scale of notation, and must therefore have made some progress in the study of mathematics. There is proof that the art of painting upon plaster and panel was practiced by them more than 2000 years before Christ; and the sculptures furnish representations of inkstands that contained two colors, black and red; the latter being introduced at the beginning of a subject, and for the division of certain sentences, showing, this custom to be as old as that of holding the pen behind the ear, which is often portrayed in the paintings of the tombs. Alabaster was a material much used for vases, and as ointment was generally kept in an alabaster box, the Greeks and Romans applied the name *alabastron* to all vases made for that purpose; and one of them found at Thebes, and now in the museum at Alnwick Castle, contains some ointment perfectly preserved, though from the queen's name in the hieroglyphics it must be more than 3000 years old. In architecture they were very successful, as the magnificent temples yet remaining bear evident witness, though in ruins. The Doric order is supposed to have been derived from columns found at Beni-Hassan, and the arch is at least as old as the 16th century B.C. In medical science, we know from the evidence furnished by mummies found at Thebes that the art of stopping teeth with gold, and probably cement, was known to the ancient Egyptians, and Cuvier found incontestible proof that the fractured bone of an ibis had been set by them while the bird was alive.

Sacred music was much used in Egypt, and the harp, lyre, flute, tambourine, cymbals, etc., were admitted in divers religious services, of which music constituted an important element. Sacred dancing was also common in religious ceremonies, as it seems to have been among the Jews (<sup>49B</sup>Psalm 149:3). Moses found the children of Israel dancing before the

golden calf (<sup><1229></sup>Exodus 32:19), in imitation probably of rites they had often witnessed in Egypt.

The industrial arts held an important place in the occupations of the Egyptians. The workers in fine flax and the weavers of white linen are mentioned in a manner that shows they were among the chief contributors to the riches of the country (<sup><2300></sup>Isaiah 19:9). The fine linen of Egypt found its way to Palestine (<sup><3076></sup>Proverbs 7:16). That its celebrity was not without cause is proved by a piece found near Memphis, and by the paintings (compare <sup><1442></sup>Genesis 41:42; <sup><4016></sup>2 Chronicles 1:16, etc.). The looms of Egypt were also famed for their fine cotton and woolen fabrics, and many of these were worked with patterns in brilliant colors, sometimes being wrought with the needle, sometimes woven in the piece. Some of the stripes were of gold thread, alternating with red ones as a border. Specimens of their embroidery are to be seen in the Louvre, and the many dresses painted on the monuments of the 18th dynasty show that the most varied patterns were used by the Egyptians more than 3000 years ago, as they were subsequently by the Babylonians, who became noted for their needle-work. Sir G. Wilkinson states that the secret of dyeing cloths of various colors by means of mordants was known to the Egyptians, as proved by the manner in which Pliny has described the process, though he does not seem to have understood it. They were equally fond of variety of patterns on the walls and ceilings of their houses and tombs, and some of the oldest ceilings show that the chevron, the checker, the scroll, and the guilloche, though ascribed to the Greeks, were adopted in Egypt more than 2000 years before our aera.

A gradual progress may be observed in their choice of fancy ornament. Beginning with simple imitations of real objects, as the lotus and other flowers, they adopted, by degrees, conventional representations of them, or purely imaginary devices; and it is remarkable that the oldest Greek and Etruscan vases have a similarly close imitation of the lotus and other real objects. The same patterns common on Greek vases had long before been introduced on those in Egypt; whole ceilings are covered with them; and the vases themselves had often the same elegant forms we admire in the cilix and others afterwards made in Greece. They were of gold and silver, engraved and embossed; those made of porcelain were rich in color, and some of the former were inlaid or studded with precious stones, or enameled in brilliant colors. Their knowledge of glass-blowing is shown by a glass bead inscribed with the name of a queen of the 18th dynasty which

proves it to be as old as 3200 years ago. Among their most beautiful achievements in this art were their richly-colored bottles with waving lines and their small inlaid mosaics. In these last, the fineness of the work is so great that it must have required a strong magnifying power to put the parts together, especially the more minute details, such as feathers, the hair, etc. "They were composed," says Sir G. Wilkinson, "of the finest threads or rods of glass (attenuated by drawing them when heated to a great length), which, having been selected according to their color, were placed upright side by side, as in an ordinary mosaic, in sufficient number to form a portion of the intended picture. Others were then added until the whole had been composed; and when they had all been cemented together by a proper heat, the work was completed. Slices were then sawn off transversely, as in our Tunbridge ware, and each section presented the same picture on its upper and under side."

The more wealthy Egyptians had their large townhouses and spacious villas, in which the flower-garden and pleasure-grounds were not the least prominent features. Avenues of trees shaded the walks, and a great abundance of violets, roses, and other flowers was always to be had, even in winter, owing to the nature of their climate and the skill of their gardeners. A part also was assigned to vines and fruit-trees; the former were trained on trellis-work, the latter were standards. It is a curious fact that they were in the habit of employing monkeys, trained for the purpose, to climb the upper branches of the sycamore-trees, and to gather the figs from them. The houses generally consisted of a ground floor and one upper story; few were higher. They were often placed round an open court, in the center of which was a fountain or small garden. Large houses had sometimes a porch with a flight of steps before the street door, over which latter was painted the name of the owner. The wealthy landed proprietors were grandees of the priestly and military classes (Mr. Birch and M. Ampere may be said to have proved the non-existence of castes, in the *Indian sense*, in Egypt); but those who tended cattle were looked down upon by the rest of the community. This contempt is often shown in the paintings, by their being drawn unshaven, and squalid, and dressed in the same covering of mats that were thrown over the beasts they tended. None would intermarry with swineherds. It was the custom for the men to milk, as it is still among some Arab tribes, who think it disgraceful for a woman to milk any animal.

Potters were very numerous, and the wheel, the baking of cups, and the other processes of their art were prominent on the monuments. It is singular, as affording illustration of Scripture language, that the same idea of fashioning the clay was also applied to man's formation; and the gods Ptah and Num, the creative agencies, are represented sitting at the potter's wheel turning the clay for the human creation. Pottery appears to have furnished employment to the Hebrews during the bondage (<sup><B806></sup>Psalm 81:6; 68:13; compare <sup><B114></sup>Exodus 1:14).

The Egyptians were familiar with the use of iron from a very remote period, and their skill in the manufacture of bronze was celebrated. They were acquainted also with the use of the forceps, the blowpipe, the bellows, the syringe, and the siphon. Gold mines were wrought in Upper Egypt (Diod. Sic. 3:12).

Leather was sometimes used for writing purposes, but more frequently paper made from the papyrus, which grew in the marsh-lands of the Delta. The mode of making it was by cutting the pith into thin slices lengthwise, which being laid on a table were covered with similar layers at right angles, and the two sets, being glued together and kept under pressure a proper time, formed a sheet. The dried flower-heads of the papyrus have been found in the tombs.

As illustrating Scripture, it may be mentioned that the gods are sometimes represented in the tombs holding the *Tau* or sign of life, which was adopted by some of the early Christians in lieu of the cross, and is mentioned by <sup><B104></sup>Ezekiel 9:4,6, as the "mark (Tau) set upon the foreheads of the men" who were to be preserved alive. Christian inscriptions at the great oasis are headed by this symbol; it has been found on Christian monuments at Rome.

Egyptian edicts seem to have been issued in the form of a *firman* or written order; and from the word used by Pharaoh in granting power to Joseph ("According to thy word shall all my people be ruled;" Hebrew *kiss*, <sup><B440></sup>Genesis 41:40, alluding evidently to the custom of kissing a *firman*), we may infer that the people who received that order adopted the usual Eastern mode of acknowledging their obedience to the sovereign. Besides the custom of kissing the signature attached to these documents, the people were doubtless expected to "bow the knee" (<sup><B443></sup>Genesis 41:43) in the presence of the monarch and chiefs of the nation, or even to prostrate themselves before them. The sculptures represent them thus bowing with the hand stretched out towards the knee.

The account of brick-making in <sup><01817></sup>Exodus 5:7-19 is illustrated in a remarkable degree by a painting in a tomb at Thebes, in which the hardness of the work, the tale of bricks, the straw, and the native taskmasters set over foreign workmen, are vividly portrayed. The making of bricks was a monopoly of the crown, which accounts for the Jews and other captives being employed in such numbers to make bricks for the Pharaohs. *SEE BRICK.*

Certain injunctions of the Mosaic law appear to be framed with particular reference to Egyptian practices, e.g. the fact of false witness being forbidden by a distinct and separate commandment, becomes the more significant when we bear in mind the number of witnesses required by the Egyptian law for the execution of the most trifling contract. As many as sixteen names are appended to one for the sale of a part of certain properties, amounting only to 400 pieces of brass. It appears that bulls only, and not heifers, were killed by the Egyptians in sacrifice. Compare with this the law of the Israelites (<sup><0492></sup>Numbers 19:2), commanding them to "bring a red heifer, without spot, wherein was no blemish." It was on this account that Moses proposed to go "three days' journey into the desert," lest the Egyptians should be enraged at seeing the Israelites sacrifice a heifer (<sup><0186></sup>Exodus 8:26); and by this very opposite choice of a victim they were made unequivocally to denounce and separate themselves from the rites of Egypt. The Egyptian common name for Heliopolis was AN, from which was derived the Hebrew On or Aon, pointed in <sup><3507></sup>Ezekiel 30:17, Aven, and translated by Bethshemesh (<sup><2463></sup>Jeremiah 43:13). So also the Pi-beseth of the same place in Ezekiel is from the Egyptian article *Pi*, prefixed to *Bast*, the name of the goddess there worshipped, and is equivalent to Bubastis, a city named after her, supposed to correspond to the Grecian Artemis. The Tahpanhes of Scripture (<sup><2438></sup>Jeremiah 43:8; <sup><3508></sup>Ezekiel 30:18) was perhaps a place called Daphnae, sixteen miles from Pelusium.

**XVIII.** *Comparison with the Manners of the modern Inhabitants.* — The mode of life of the Egyptians has in all ages necessarily been more or less influenced by their locality: those who dwelt on high lands on the east, as well as those who dwelt on the marshy flat country in the Delta, have become shepherds, as their land does not admit of cultivation. The people who live along the Nile become fishermen and sailors. The cultivated part of the natives who live on the plains and over the surface of the country diligently and most successfully practice all the arts of life, and in former ages have left ever-during memorials of their proficiency and skill.

On this natural diversity of pursuits, as well as on a diversity of blood — for besides the master and ruling race of Ethiopians there were anciently others who were of nomad origin — was early founded the institution of so-called castes, which Egypt had, although less marked than India, and which pervaded the entire life of the nation. These, according to Herodotus (11:164), were seven in number (compare Diod. Sic. 1:73). The priestly caste was the most honored and influential. It had in every large city a temple dedicated to the deity of the place, together with a high-priest, who stood next to the king and restricted his power. The priesthood possessed the finest portions of the country. They were the judges, physicians, astrologers, architects — in a word, they united in themselves all the highest culture and most distinguished offices of the land, while with them alone lay tradition, literature, and the sacred writings. This class exerted the most decided and extensive influence on the culture not only of their own country, but of the world; for during the brightest periods of Grecian history the love of knowledge carried into Egypt men who have done much to form the character of after ages, such as Solon, Pythagoras, Archytas, Thales, Herodotus, Plato, and others (compare <sup><OHOB></sup>Genesis 41:8; <sup><OBT></sup>Exodus 7:11; 8:11; 13:7; Josephus, *Ant.* 2:9, 2).

The peculiarities of the ancient Egyptians of the lower castes seem to have survived best, and to be represented, at least in some particulars, by the Fellahs of the present day. These Fellahs discharge all the duties of tilling the country and gathering its rich abundance. They are a quiet, contented, and submissive race, always living, through an unjust government, on the edge of starvation, yet always happy, with no thought for the morrow, no care for, no interest in, political changes. "Of the Fellahs it may be said, as was said by Amrou of the ancient Egyptians, 'they are bees always toiling, always toiling for others, not themselves.' The love of the Fellah for his country and his Nile is an all-absorbing love. Remove him, and he perishes. He cannot live a year away from his village; his grave must be where his cradle was. But he is of all men most submissive: he will rather die than revolt; resignation is his primary virtue; impatience under any yoke is unknown to him; his life, his faith, his law is submission. 'Allah Kerim!' is his hourly consolation, his perpetual benediction. He was made for peace, not for war; and, though his patriotism is intense, there is no mingling in it of the love of glory or the passion for conquest. His nationality is in his local affections, and they are most intense. Upon this race, the race of bright eyes and beautiful forms, it is impossible to look without deep



interest: of all the gay, the gayest; of all the beings made for happiness, the most excitable. If days of peace and prosperity could be theirs, what songs, what music, what joys!" (Bowring's *Report*, page 7).

The ruling class consists of Arabs intermingled with Turks, who have been in succession the conquerors of the land, and may be regarded as representing the priestly and military castes.

The only other tribe we have room to notice is that of the Copts; equally with the preceding indigenous. They are Christians by hereditary transmission, and have suffered centuries of cruel persecutions and humiliations, though now they seem to be rising in importance, and promise to fill an important page in the future history of Egypt. In character they are amiable, pacific, and intelligent, having, of course, the faults and vices of dissimulation, falsehood, and meanness, which slavery never fails to engender. In office they are the scribes, the arithmeticians, the measurers, the clerks — in a word, the learned men of the country. The language which they use in their religious services is the ancient Egyptian, or Coptic, which, however, is translated into Arabic for the benefit of temerity (Bowring's *Report*). *SEE EGYPT, CHRISTIAN*; and *SEE COPTS*.

**XIX.** *Technical Chronology.* — That the Egyptians used various periods of time, and made astronomical observations from a remote age, is equally attested by ancient writers and by their monuments. It is, however, very difficult to connect periods mentioned by the former with the indications of the same kind offered by the latter; and what we may term the recorded observations of the monuments cannot be used for the determination of chronology without a previous knowledge of Egyptian astronomy that we have not wholly attained. The testimony of ancient writers must, however, be carefully sifted, and we must not take their statements as a positive basis without the strongest evidence of correctness. Without that testimony, however, we could not at present prosecute the inquiry. The Egyptians do not appear to have had any common era. Every document that bears the date of a year gives the year of the reigning sovereign, counted from that current year in which he came to the throne, which was called his first year. There is, therefore, no general means of testing deductions from the chronological indications of the monuments.

There appear to have been at least three years in use with the Egyptians before the Roman domination, the Vague Year, the Tropical Year, and the Sothic Year; but it is not probable that more than two of these were

employed at the same time. The Vague Year contained 365 days without any additional fraction, and therefore passed through all the seasons in about 1500 years. It was used both for civil and for religious purposes. Probably the Israelites adopted this year during the sojourn in Egypt, and that instituted at the Exodus appears to have been the current Vague Year fixed by the adoption of a method of intercalation. *SEE YEAR*. The Vague Year was divided into twelve months, each of thirty days, with five *epagomenae*, or additional days, after the twelfth. The months were assigned to three seasons, each comprising four months, called respectively the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th of those seasons. The names by which the Egyptian months are commonly known, Thoth, Paophi, etc., are taken from the divinities to which they were sacred. The seasons are called, according to our rendering, those of Vegetation, Manifestation, and the Waters, or the Inundation: the exact meaning of their names has, however, been much disputed. They evidently refer to the phenomena of a tropical year, and such a year we must therefore conclude the Egyptians had, at least in a remote period of their history. If, as we believe, the third season represents the period of the inundation, its beginning must be dated about one month before the autumnal equinox, which would place the beginning of the year at the winter solstice, an especially fit time in Egypt for the commencement of a tropical year. The Sothic Year was a supposed sidereal year of 365+ days, commencing with the so-called heliacal rising of Sothis. The Vague Year, having no intercalation, constantly retreated through the Sothic Year, until a period of 1461 years of the former kind, and 1460 of the latter had elapsed, from one coincidence of commencements to another.

The Egyptians are known to have used two great cycles, the Sothic Cycle and the Tropical Cycle. The former was a cycle of the coincidence of the Sothic and Vague years, and therefore consisted of 1460 years of the former kind. This cycle is mentioned by ancient writers, and two of its commencements recorded, the one, called the Aera of Menophres, July 20, B.C. 1322, and the other on the same day, A.D. 139. Menophres is supposed to be the name of an Egyptian king, and this is most probable. The nearest name is Mern-ptah, or Menephthah, which is part of that of Sethi Menptah, a title that seems to have been in one form or another common to several of the first kings of the 19th dynasty. Chronological indications seem to be conclusive in favor of Sethos I. The Tropical Cycle was a cycle of the coincidence of the Tropical and Vague years. We do not know the exact length of the former year with the Egyptians, nor, indeed,

that it was used in the monumental age; but from the mention of a period of 500 years, the third of the cycle, and the time during which the Vague Year would retrograde through one season, we cannot doubt that there was such a cycle, not to speak of its analogy with the Sothic Cycle. It has been supposed by M. Biot to have had a duration of 1505 years; but the length of 1500 Vague Years is preferable, since it contains a number of complete lunations, besides that the Egyptians could scarcely have been more exact, and that the period of 500 years is a subdivision of 1500. Ancient writers do not fix any commencements of this cycle. If the characteristics of the Tropical Year are what we suppose, the cycle would have begun B.C. 2005 and 507: two hieroglyphic inscriptions are thought to record the former of these epochs (Poole, *Horae Aegyptiacae*, page 12 sq., pl. 1, Numbers 5, 6). The return of the Phoenix has undoubtedly a chronological meaning. It has been supposed to refer to the period last mentioned, but Poole is of opinion that the Phoenix Cycle was of exactly the same character, and therefore length, as the Sothic, its commencement being marked by the so-called heliacal rising of a star of the constellation BENNU HESAR, "the Phoenix of Osiris," which is placed in the astronomical ceiling of the Rameseum of El-Kurneh six months distant from Sothis. The monuments make mention of Panegyric Months, which can only, it is supposed, be periods of thirty years each, and divisions of a year of the same kind. Poole has computed the following as dates of commencements of these Panegyric Years, in accordance with which he has adjusted his chronology: 1st, B.C. 2717, 1st dynasty, aera of Menes (not on monuments); 2d, B.C. 2352, 4th dynasty, Suphis I and II; 3d, B.C. 1986 (12th dynasty, Osirtasen III? not on monuments); the last-mentioned date being also, according to him, the beginning of a Phoenix Cycle, which he thinks comprised four of these Panegyric Years. The other important dates of the system of panegyrics which occur on the monuments are, in his scheme: B.C. 1442, 18th dynasty, queen Amen-nemt; and B.C. 1412, 18th dynasty, Thothmes III.

Certain phenomena recorded on the monuments have been calculated by M. Biot, who has obtained the following dates: Rising of Sothis in reign of Thothmes III, 18th dynasty, B.C. 1445; supposed vernal equinox, Thothmes III, B.C. cir. 1441; rising of Sothis, Rameses II, 19th dynasty, B.C. 1301; star-risings, Rameses VI and IX (? Meneptah I and II), 20th dynasty, B.C. cir. 1241. Some causes of uncertainty affect the exactness of these dates, and that of Rameses II is irreconcilable with the two of

Thothmes III, unless we hold the calendar in which the inscription supposed to record it occurs to be a Sothic one, in which case no date could be obtained.

Egyptian technical chronology gives us no direct evidence in favor of the high antiquity which some assign to the foundation of the first kingdom. The earliest record which all Egyptologers are agreed to regard as affording a date is of the fifteenth century B.C., and no one has alleged any such record to be of an earlier time than the twenty-fourth century B.C. The Egyptians themselves seem to have placed the beginning of the 1st dynasty in the twenty-eighth century B.C., but for determining this epoch there is no direct monumental evidence, and a comparison with Scripture does not favor quite so early a date. *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

**XX.** *Historical Chronology.* — The materials for this are the monuments and the remains of the historical work of Manetho. Since the interpretation of hieroglyphics has been discovered the evidence of the monuments has been brought to bear on this subject, but as yet it has not been sufficiently full and explicit to enable us to set aside other aid. We have still to look elsewhere for a general framework, the details of which the monuments may fill up. The remains of Manetho are now generally held to supply this want. A comparison with the monuments has shown that he drew his information from original sources, the general authenticity of which is vindicated by minute points of agreement. The information Manetho gives us, in the present form of his work, is, however, by no means explicit, and it is only by a theoretical arrangement of the materials that they take a definite form. The remains of Manetho's historical work consist of a list of the Egyptian dynasties and two considerable fragments, one relating to the Shepherds, the other to a tale of the Exodus. The list is only known to us in the epitome given by Africanus, preserved by Syncellus, and that given by Eusebius. These present such great differences that it is not reasonable to hope that we can restore a correct text. The series of dynasties is given as if they were successive, in which case the commencement of the first would be placed full 5000 years B.C., and the reign of the king who built the Great Pyramid, 4000. The monuments do not warrant so extreme an antiquity, and the great majority of Egyptologers have therefore held that the dynasties were partly contemporary. A passage in the fragment of Manetho respecting the Shepherds, where he speaks of the kings of the Thebais and of the rest of Egypt rising against these foreign rulers, makes it almost certain that he admitted at least three contemporary lines at that

period (Josephus, *Apion*, 1:14). The naming of dynasties anterior to the time of a single kingdom, and then of later ones, which we know generally held sway over all Egypt — in other words, the first seventeen, distinct from the 18th and following dynasties — lends support to this opinion. The former are named in groups: first a group of Thinites, then one of Memphites, broken by a dynasty of Elephantinites, next a Heracleopolite line, etc., the dynasties of a particular city being grouped together; whereas the latter generally present but one or two together of the same name, and the dynasties of different cities recur. The earlier portion seems therefore to represent parallel lines, the later a succession. The evidence of the monuments leads to the same conclusion. Kings who unquestionably belong to different dynasties are shown by them to be contemporary (see, for example, in Rawlinson's *Herod.* 2:289). In the present state of Egyptology this evidence has led to various results as to the number of contemporary dynasties, and the consequent duration of the whole history. One great difficulty is that the character of the inscriptions makes it impossible to ascertain, without the explicit mention of two sovereigns, that any one king was not a sole ruler. For example, it has lately been discovered that the 12th dynasty was for the greatest part of its rule a double line; yet its numerous monuments in general give no hint of more than one king, although there was almost always a recognised colleague. Therefore, *a fortiori*, no notice would be taken, if possible, on any monument of a ruler of another house than that of the king in whose territory it was made. We can therefore scarcely expect very full evidence on this subject. Mr. Lane, as long ago as 1830, proposed an arrangement of the first seventeen dynasties based upon their numbers and names. The subjoined table, after Poole, contains the dynasties thus arranged, with the approximative dates B.C. which he assigns to their commencements.

### Picture for E'gypt 4a

The monuments will not justify any great extension of the period assigned in the table to the first seventeen dynasties. The last date, that of the commencement of the 18th dynasty, cannot be changed more than a few years. Some Egyptologists, indeed, place it much earlier (Bunsen, B.C. 1625; Bockh, 1655; Lepsius, 1684; Brugsch, 1706), but they do so in opposition to positive monumental evidence. The date of the beginning of the 1st dynasty, which Poole is disposed to place a little before B.C. 2700, is more doubtful, but a concurrence of ethnological evidence points to the twenty-fifth century. The interval between the two dates cannot therefore

be greatly more or less than nine hundred years, a period quite in accordance with the lengths of the dynasties according to the better text, if the arrangement here given be correct. Some have supposed a much greater antiquity for the commencement of Egyptian history (Bunsen, B.C. 3623; Lepsius, 3892; Brugsch, 4455; Bockh, 5702). Their system is founded upon a passage in the chronological work of Syncellus, which assigns a duration of 3555 years to the thirty dynasties (*Chron.* page 51 B). It is by no means certain that this number is given on the authority of Manetho, but apart from this, the whole statement is unmistakably not from the true Manetho, but from some one of the fabricators of chronology, among whom pseudo-Manetho held a prominent place (*Encyc. Brit.* 8th edit., "Egypt," page 452; *Quarterly Review*, Number 210, page 395-7). If this number be discarded as doubtful or spurious, there is nothing definite to support the extended system so confidently put forth by those who adopt it.

The importance of this ancient list of Egyptian kings — it being, in fact, the only completely connected line extant — requires a fuller exhibit than we usually give, and especially a somewhat minute examination of the monumental records compared with ancient historical documents. The dates given by us are essentially those assigned by Wilkinson in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, volume 2, chapter 8. The identifications are in part made by Kenrick (*Egypt under the Pharaohs*, volume 2). The names of Manetho exhibit many striking coincidences with the elements afforded by the latest researches and discoveries, especially Mariette's "Apis list" on the tablet of Sakkarah, Diimichen's "Sethos list" on that of Abydos, and the "Turin papyrus," as these are given in detail by Unger (*Chronologie des Manetho*, Berlin, 1867), although we have not been able to adopt all the conclusions of this author, whose work is the most elaborate on the subject. The fact that the names in all these lists are in continuous order does not prove an unbroken succession of reigns, for such is the case in Manetho's list, although he expressly states that the several dynasties were of different localities. That the dynasties of the monumental lists likewise are not all consecutive is further proved by at least two conclusive circumstances: 1. The sum of the years of those 74 reigns, to which an explicit length is assigned in the Turin roll, is 1060; now if to this we add a corresponding number for the other 160 reigns whose duration is not specified in the same document, and also for the 10 subsequent names in the parallel lists down to Sethi I (B.C. 1322), we obtain a total of 3484

years for the first eighteen dynasties, or a date for Menes of B.C. 4806; but this would be 2144 years *before the Flood*, even according to the longest computation of the Biblical text. *SEE AGES OF THE WORLD.*

2. Several dynasties are wholly and designedly omitted in one of these monumental lists, which are given at length in the others (e.g. the 7th, 8th, 9th, 13th, 14th, and 15th), and at least one of them (the 11th) is absent in all of them, not to speak of numerous gaps and discrepancies: they must therefore, if at all trustworthy, be intended as contemporaneous lines in different sections of the empire, precisely as were those of Manetho, who frequently dispatches an entire dynasty without any details whatever, as being of local importance only. *SEE MANETHO.*

## Picture for E'gypt 4b

### XXI. History. —

1. *Traditionary Period.* — We have first to notice the indications in the Bible which relate to the earliest period. In Genesis 10 we find the colonization of Egypt traced up to the immediate children of Noah, for it is there stated that Mizraim was the second son of Ham, who was himself the second son of Noah. That Egypt was colonized by the descendants of Noah in a very remote age is further shown by the mention of the migration of the Philistines from Caphtor, which had taken place before the arrival of Abraham in Palestine (<sup><1104></sup>Genesis 10:14; compare <sup><8123></sup>Deuteronomy 2:23; <sup><3192></sup>Amos 9:27). Before this migration could occur the Caphtorim and other Mizraites must have occupied Egypt for some time. Immediately after these genealogical statements, the sacred narrative (Genesis 12) informs us that the patriarch Abraham, pressed by famine, went down (B.C. 2087) into Egypt, where it appears he found a monarch, a court, princes, and servants, and where he found also those supplies of food which the well-known fertility of the country had led him to seek there; for it is expressly stated that the favor which his wife had won in the reigning Pharaoh's eyes procured him sheep and oxen, as well as he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels. A remarkable passage points to a knowledge of the date at which an ancient city of Egypt was founded: "Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt" (<sup><0432></sup>Numbers 13:22). We find that Hebron was originally called Kirjath-arba, and was a city of the Anakim (<sup><0645></sup>Joshua 14:15), and it is mentioned under that appellation in the history of Abraham (<sup><0232></sup>Genesis 23:2): it had therefore been founded

by the giant race before the days of that patriarch. In ~~(120)~~Genesis 21:9, mention is made in the case of Ishmael, the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whose mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt (B.C. cir. 2055), of a mixed race between the Egyptians and the Chaldaeans, a race which in after times became a great nation. From this mixture of races it has been supposed the Arabs (*br* [ *e* "mixed people") had their name (Sharpe's *Early Hist. of Egypt*, 1:11).

The evidence of the Egyptians as to the primeval history of their race and country is extremely indefinite. They seem to have separated mankind into two great stocks, and each of these again into two branches, for they appear to have represented themselves and the negroes, the red and black races, as the children of the god Horus, and the Shemites and Europeans, the yellow and white races, as the children of the goddess Pesht (comp. Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* 2:90, 91). They seem, therefore, to have held a double origin of the species. The absence of any important traditional period is very remarkable in the fragments of Egyptian history. These commence with the divine dynasties, and pass abruptly to the human dynasties. The latest portion of the first may indeed be traditional not mythical, and the earliest part of the second may be traditional and not historical, though this last conjecture we are hardly disposed to admit. In any case, however, there is a very short and extremely obscure time of tradition, and at no great distance from the earliest date at which it can be held to end we come upon the clear light of history in the days of the pyramids. The indications are of a sudden change of seat, and the settlement in Egypt of a civilized race, which, either wishing to be believed autochthonous, or having lost all ties that could keep up the traditions of its first dwelling-place, filled up the commencement of its history with materials drawn from mythology. There is no trace of the tradition of the Deluge which is found in almost every other country of the world. The priests are indeed reported to have told Solon, when he spoke of one deluge, that, many had occurred (Plat. *Tim.* 23), but the reference is more likely to have been to great floods of the Nile than to any extraordinary catastrophes. *SEE DELUGE.*

**2. Uncertain Period.** — The history of the dynasties preceding the 18th is not told by any continuous series of monuments. Except the bare lists indicated in the above table, there are scarcely any records of the age left to the present day, and thence in a great measure arises the difficulty of determining the chronology. From the time of Menes, the first king, until



the Shepherd invasion, Egypt seems to have enjoyed perfect tranquility. During this age the Memphite line was the most powerful, and by it, under the 4th dynasty, were the most famous pyramids raised. The Shepherds were foreigners who came from the east, and, in some manner unknown to Manetho, gained the rule of Egypt. Those whose kings composed the 15th dynasty were the first and most important. They appear to have been Phoenicians, and it is probable that their migration into Egypt, and thence at last into Palestine, was part of the great movement to which the coming of the Phoenicians from the Erythraean Sea, and the Philistines from Caphtor, belong. It is not impossible that the war of the four kings — Chedorlaomer and his allies — was directed against the power of the kings of the 15th dynasty. Most probably the Pharaoh of Abraham was of this line, which lived at Memphis, and at the great fort or camp of Avaris on the eastern frontier. The period of Egyptian history to which the Shepherd invasion should be assigned is a point of dispute. It is generally placed after the 12th dynasty, for it is argued that this powerful line could not have reigned at the same time as one or more Shepherd dynasties. Poole is of the opinion that this objection is not valid, and that the Shepherd invasion was anterior to the 12th dynasty. It is not certain that the foreigners were at the outset hostile to the Egyptians, for they may have come in by marriage, and it is by no means unlikely that they may have long been in a position of secondary importance. The rule of the 12th dynasty, which was of Thebans, lasting about 160 years, was a period of prosperity to Egypt, but after its close those calamities appear to have occurred which made the Shepherds hated by the Egyptians. During the interval to the 18th dynasty there seems to have been no native line of any importance but that of the Thebans, and more than one Shepherd dynasty exercised a severe rule over the Egyptians. The paucity of the monuments proves the troubled nature of this period. *SEE HYKSOS.*

Of these first seventeen dynasties, Menes, the first mortal king of Egypt, according to Manetho, Herodotus, Eratosthenes, and Diodorus, and preceded, according to the first, by gods, heroes, and Manes (?), *Ἰνέριος*, is accepted on all hands as a historical personage. His hieroglyphic name reads MENI or MENA, and is the first on the list of the Rameseium of el-Kurneh. It is also met with in the hieratic of the Turin Papyrus of Kings. Strong reasons are given by Mr. Stuart Poole for fixing the date of his accession at B.C. 2717 (*Horae Aegyptiacae*, pages 94-98); but even this date must be somewhat lowered, as it would precede that of the Flood

(B.C. 2515); on the other hand, Unger (*ut sup.*) raises it to June 27, B.C. 5613. As one step in Poole's argument involves a very ingenious elucidation of a well-known statement of Herodotus, we cannot forbear to mention it. Herodotus says that, in the interval from the first king to Sethon, the priest of Hephaestus, the priests told him that "the sun had four times moved from his wonted course, twice rising where he now sets, and twice setting where he now rises." Upon this Mr. Poole remarks: "It is evident that the priests told Herodotus that great periods had elapsed since the time of Menes, the first king, and that, in the interval from his reign to that of Sethon, the solar risings of stars — that is to say, their manifestations — had twice fallen on those days of the Vague Year on which their settings fell in their time, and *vice versa*; and that the historian, by a natural mistake, supposed they spoke of the sun itself." Menes appears to have been a Thinite king, of the city of This, near Abydus, in Upper Egypt. Herodotus ascribes the building of the city of Memphis to him, while Manetho says that he made a foreign expedition and acquired renown, and that eventually he was killed by a hippopotamus. Menes, after a long reign, was succeeded by his son Athothis, who was the second king of the first dynasty. Manetho says that he built the palace at Memphis, that he was a physician, and left anatomical books; all of these statements implying that even at this early period the Egyptians were in a high state of civilization. About the time of Athothis, the 3d dynasty is supposed, according to the scheme which seems most reasonable, to have commenced, and Memphis to have become independent, giving its name to five dynasties of kings — 3d, 4th, 6th, 7th, and 8th. The 1st Thinite dynasty probably lasted about two centuries and a half. Of the 2d very little has reached us; under one of the kings it was determined that women could hold the sovereign power; in the time of another it was fabled, says Manetho, that the Nile flowed mixed with honey for the space of eleven days. The duration of this dynasty was probably between 300 and 400 years, and it seems to have come to a close at the time of the Shepherd invasion. The 3d (Memphite) dynasty, after having lasted about 200 years, was succeeded by the 4th, one of the most famous of the lines which ruled in Egypt; while the 5th dynasty of Elephantinite kings arose at the same time. This was emphatically the period of the pyramids, the earliest of which was probably the northern pyramid of Abu Sir, supposed to have been the tomb of Soris or Shurai, the head of the 4th dynasty. He was succeeded by two kings of the name of Suphis, the first of whom, the Cheops of Herodotus, the Shilphu of the monuments, was probably the

builder of the great pyramid. On these wondrous monuments we find traces at that remote period of the advanced state of civilization of later ages. The cursive character scrawled on the stones by the masons proves that writing had been long in common use. Many of the blocks brought from Syene are built together in the pyramids of Ghizeh in a manner unrivalled at any period. The same manners and customs are portrayed on them as on the later monuments. The same boats are used, the same costume of the priests, the same trades, such as glassblowing and cabinet-making. At the beginning of the 4th dynasty, moreover, the peninsula of Sinai was in the possession of the Egyptians, and its copper mines were worked by them. The duration of this dynasty probably exceeded two centuries, and it was followed by the 6th. The 5th dynasty of Elephantinites, as just remarked, began the same time as the 4th. The names of several of its kings occur in the Necropolis of Memphis. The most important of them is Sefhres, the Shuphra of the monuments, the Chephren of Herodotus, and Chephren of Diodorus. This dynasty lasted nearly 600 years. Of the 6th dynasty, which lasted about 150 years, the two most famous sovereigns are Phiops or Pepi and queen Nitoeris. The former is said to have ruled for a hundred years. With the latter the dynasty closed; for at this period Lower Egypt was invaded by the Shepherds, who entered the country from the north-east, about 700 years after Menes, and eventually drove the Memphites from the throne. Of the 7th and 8th dynasties nothing is known with certainty; they probably followed the 15th. To the former of them, one version of Manetho assigns a duration of 70 days, and 150 years to the latter. The 9th dynasty of Heracleopolites, or, more properly, of Hermonthites, as Sir G. Wilkinson has suggested (Rawlinson's *Herod.* 2:293), arose while the 6th was in power. Little is known of either the 9th or 10th dynasties, which together may have lasted nearly 600 years, ending at the time of the great Shepherd war of expulsion, which resulted in the overthrow of all the royal lines except the Diospolite or Theban. With the 11th dynasty commenced the Diospolite kingdom, which subsequently attained to greater power than any other. Amenemhet I was the last and most famous king of this dynasty, and during part of his reign he was co-regent of Osirtasen or Sesertesen I, head of the 12th. An epoch is marked in Egyptian history by the commencement of this dynasty, since the Shepherd rule, which lasted for 500 years, is coeval with it. The three Osirtasens flourished in this dynasty, the second of whom is probably the Sesostris of Manetho. It began about Abraham's time, or somewhat later. In ancient sculptures in Nubia we find kings of the 18th dynasty worshipping Osirtasen III as a god, and this is the

only case of the kind. The third Osirtasen was succeeded by Amenemhet III, supposed to be the Moeris of Herodotus, who built the labyrinth. After the reigns of two other sovereigns, this dynasty came to a close, having lasted about 160 years. The 13th dynasty, which lasted some 400 years, probably began before the close of the 12th. The kings of this dynasty were of little power, and probably tributary to the Shepherds. The Diospolites, indeed, did not recover their prosperity till the beginning of the 18th dynasty. The 14th, or Xoite dynasty, seems to have risen with the 12th. It was named from Xoïs, a town of Lower Egypt, in the northern part of the Delta. It may have lasted for nearly 500 years, and probably terminated during the great Shepherd war. The 15th, 16th, and 17th dynasties are those of the Shepherds. Who these foreigners were who are said to have subdued Egypt without a battle is a question of great uncertainty. Their name is called Hyksos by Manetho, which is variously interpreted to mean shepherd kings, or foreign shepherds. They have been pronounced to have been Assyrians, Scythians, Aethiopians, Phoenicians, and Arabs. The kings of the 15th dynasty were the greatest of the foreign rulers. The kings of the 16th and 17th dynasties are very obscure. Mr. Poole says there are strong reasons for supposing that the kings of the 16th were of a different race from those of the 15th, and that they may have been Assyrians. Having held possession of Egypt 511, or, according to the longest date, 625 years, the Shepherds were driven out by Ames, or Amosis, the first king of the 18th dynasty; and the whole country was then united under one king, who rightly claimed the title of lord of the two regions, or of Upper and Lower Egypt.

**3. *Period of the Hebrew Sojourn.*** — In Genesis 39 begins the interesting story of Joseph's being carried down to Egypt, with all its important consequences for the great-grandchildren of Abraham. The productiveness of the country is the allurements, famine the impulse. Attendant circumstances show that Egypt was then famous also for its commercial pursuits; and the entire narrative gives the idea of a complex system of society (about B.C. 1890), and a well-constituted yet arbitrary form of government. As in Eastern courts at later periods of history, elevation to high offices was marked and sudden. The slave Joseph is taken from prison and from impending death, and raised to the dignity of prime vizier, and is intrusted with making provision for an approaching dearth of food, which he had himself foretold, during which he effects in favor of the ruling sovereign one of the greatest revolutions of property which history has

recorded. The high consideration in which the priestly order was held is apparent. Joseph himself marries a daughter of the priest of On. Out of respect towards, as well as -by the direct influence of Joseph, the Hebrews were well treated. The scriptural record, however, distinctly states (<sup><OR6></sup>Genesis 46:34) that before the descent of Israel and his sons "every shepherd" was "an abomination unto the Egyptians." The Hebrews, whose "trade had been about cattle," must have been odious in the eyes of the Egyptians, yet they are expressly permitted to dwell "in the best of the land" (<sup><OR6></sup>Genesis 43:6), which is identified with the land of Goshen, the place which the Israelites had prayed might be assigned to them, and which they obviously desired on account of the adaptation of its soil to their way of life as herdsmen. Having settled his father and family satisfactorily in the land, Joseph proceeded to supply the urgent wants of a hungry nation, and at the same time converted the tenure of all property from freehold into tenancy-at-will, with a rent-charge of one fifth of the produce, leaving the priests' lands, however, in their own hands; and thus he gave another evidence of the greatness of their power.

The richness of Goshen was favorable, and the Israelites "grew and multiplied exceedingly," so that the land was filled with them. But Joseph was now dead; time had passed on, and there rose up a new king (probably one of a new dynasty) "which *knew*" (<sup><OR8></sup>Exodus 1:8) not Joseph," having no personal knowledge, and, it may be, no definite information of his services; who, becoming jealous of the increase of the Hebrews, set about persecuting them with the avowed intention of diminishing their numbers and crippling their power. Severe task-masters are therefore set over them; heavy tasks are imposed; the Hebrews are compelled to build "treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses." It is found, however, that they only increase the more. In consequence, their burdens are doubled and their lives made bitter with hard bondage (<sup><OR14></sup>Exodus 1:14), "in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field." *SEE BRICK*. Their firstborn males, moreover, are doomed to destruction the moment they come into being. The deepest heartburnings ensue; hatred arises between the oppressor and the oppressed; the Israelites seek revenge in private and by stealth (<sup><OR12></sup>Exodus 2:12). At last a higher power interferes, and the afflicted race is permitted to quit Egypt (B.C. 1658). At this time Egypt appears to have been a well-peopled and well-cultivated country, with numerous cities, under a despotic monarch, surrounded by officers of his court and a life-guard. There was a ceremonial at audience, a distinction of ranks, a state-

prison, and a prime minister. Great buildings were carried on. There was set apart from the rest of the people an order of priests who probably filled offices in the civil government; the priest of Midian and the priest of On seem to have ruled over the cities so named. There was in the general class of priests an order — wise men, sorcerers, and magicians — who had charge of a certain secret knowledge; there were physicians or embalmers of the dead; the royal army contained chosen captains, and horsemen, and chariots. The attention which the people at large paid to agriculture, and the fixed notions of property which they in consequence had, made them hold the shepherd or nomad tribes in abhorrence, as freebooters only less dangerous than hunting-tribes. *SEE PHARAOH.*

According to the scheme of Biblical chronology, which we have adopted as the most probable, the whole sojourn in Egypt would belong to the period before the 18th dynasty. The Israelites would have come in and gone forth during that obscure age, for the history of which we have little or no monumental evidence. This would explain the absence of any positive mention of them on the Egyptian monuments. Some assert that they were an unimportant Arab tribe, and therefore would not be mentioned, and that the calamities attending their departure could not be commemorated. These two propositions are contradictory, and the difficulties are unsolved. If, as Lepsius supposes, the Israelites came in under the 18th dynasty, and went out under the 19th, or if, as Bunsen holds, they came in under the 12th, and (after a sojourn of 1434 years!) went out under the 19th, the oppression in both cases falling in a period of which we have abundant contemporary monuments, sometimes the records of every year, it is impossible that the monuments should be wholly silent if the Biblical narrative is true. Let us examine the details of that narrative. At the time to which we should assign Joseph's rule, Egypt was under Shepherds, and Egyptian kings of no great strength. Since the Pharaoh of Joseph must have been a powerful ruler and held Lower Egypt, there can be no question that he was, if the dates be correct, a Shepherd of the 15th dynasty. How does the Biblical evidence affect this inference? Nothing is more striking throughout the ancient Egyptian inscriptions and writings than the bitter dislike of most foreigners, especially Easterns. They are constantly spoken of in the same terms as the inhabitants of the infernal regions, not alone when at war with the Pharaohs, but in time of peace and in the case of friendly nations. It is a feeling paralleled in our days by that of the Chinese alone. The accounts of the Greek writers, and the whole history of the later period, abundantly

confirm this estimate of the prejudice of the Egyptians against foreigners. It seems to us perfectly incredible that Joseph should be the minister of an Egyptian king. In lesser particulars the evidence is not less strong. The Pharaoh of Joseph is a despot, whose will is law, who kills and pardons at his pleasure; who not only raises a foreign slave to the head of his administration, but through his means makes all the Egyptians, except the priests, serfs of the crown. The Egyptian kings, on the contrary, were restrained by the laws, shared the public dislike of foreigners, and would have avoided the very policy Joseph followed, which would have weakened the attachment of their fellow-countrymen by the loosening of local ties and complete reducing to bondage of the population, although it would have greatly strengthened the power of an alien sovereign. Pharaoh's conduct towards Joseph's family points to the same conclusion. He gladly invites the strangers, and gives them leave to dwell, not among the Egyptians, hut in Goshen, where his own cattle seem to have been (~~(Gen)~~ Genesis 46:34; 47:6). His acts indicate a fellow-feeling, and a desire to strengthen himself against the national party. *SEE JOSEPH.*

The "new king," "which knew not Joseph," is generally thought by those who hold with us as to the previous history, to have been an Egyptian, and head of the 18th dynasty. It seems at first sight extremely probable that the king who crushed, if he did not expel the Shepherds, would be the first oppressor of the nation which they protected. Plausible as this theory appears, a close examination of the Biblical narrative seems to us to overthrow it. We read of the new king that he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel [are] more and mightier than we: come on, let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and [so] get them up out of the land" (~~(Exod)~~ Exodus 1:9,10). The Israelites are therefore more and stronger than the people of the oppressor; the oppressor fears war in Egypt, and that the Israelites would join his enemies; he is not able at once to adopt open violence, and he therefore uses a subtle system to reduce them by making them perform forced labor, and soon after takes the stronger measure of killing their male children. These conditions point to a divided country and a weak kingdom, and cannot, we think, apply to the time of the 18th and 19th dynasties. The whole narrative of subsequent events to the Exodus is consistent with this conclusion, to which the use of universal terms does not offer any real objection. When all Egypt is spoken of, it is not

necessary either in Hebrew or in Egyptian that we should suppose the entire country to be strictly intended. If we conclude, therefore, that the Exodus most probably occurred before the 18th dynasty, we have to ascertain, if possible, whether the Pharaohs of the oppression appear to have been Egyptians or Shepherds. The change of policy is in favor of their having been Egyptians, but is by no means conclusive, for there is no reason that all the foreigners should have had the same feeling towards the Israelites, and we have already seen that the Egyptian Pharaohs and their subjects seem in general to have been friendly to them throughout their history, and that the Egyptians were privileged by the law, apparently on this account. It may be questioned whether the friendship of the two nations, even if merely a matter of policy, would have been as enduring as we know it to have been, had the Egyptians looked back on their conduct towards the Israelites as productive of great national calamities, or had the Israelites looked back upon the persecution as the work of the Egyptians. If the chronology be correct, we can only decide in favor of the Shepherds. During the time to which the events are assigned there were no important lines but the Theban, and one or more of Shepherds. Lower Egypt, and especially its eastern part, must have been in the hands of the latter. The land of Goshen was in the eastern part of Lower Egypt: it was wholly under the control of the oppressors, whose capital or royal residence, at least in the case of the Pharaoh of the Exodus, lay very near to it. Manetho, according to the transcript of Africanus, speaks of three Shepherd dynasties, the 15th, 16th, and 17th, the last of which, according to the present text, was of Shepherds and Thebans, but this is probably incorrect, and the dynasty should rather be considered as of Shepherds alone. It is difficult to choose between these three: a passage in Isaiah, however, which has been strangely overlooked, seems to afford an indication which narrows the choice. "My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there, and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause" (Genesis 52:4). This indicates that the oppressor was an Assyrian, and therefore not of the 15th dynasty, which, according to Manetho, in the epitomes, was of Phoenicians, and opposed to the Assyrians (Josephus, *Apion*, 1:14). Among the names of kings of this period in the royal Turin papyrus (ed. Wilkinson) are two which appear to be Assyrian, so that we may reasonably suppose that some of the foreign rulers were of that race. Their exact date, however, is undecided. It cannot be objected to the explanation we have offered that the title Pharaoh is applied to the kings connected with the Israelites, and that they must therefore have been natives, for it is



almost certain that at least some of the Shepherd kings were Egyptianized, like Joseph, who received an Egyptian name, and Moses, who was supposed by the daughters of Jethro to be an Egyptian (<sup><1019></sup>Exodus 2:19). It has been urged by the opponents of the chronological schemes that place the Exodus before the later part of the fourteenth century B.C., that the conquests of the Pharaohs of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties would have involved collisions with the Israelites had they been in those times already established in Palestine, whereas neither the Bible nor the monuments of Egypt indicate any such event. It has been overlooked by the advocates of the Rabbinical date of the Exodus that the absence of any positive Palestinian names, except that of the Philistines, in the lists of peoples and places subject to these Pharaohs, and in the records of their wars, entirely destroys their argument; for while it shows that they did not conquer Palestine, it makes it impossible for us to decide on Egyptian evidence whether the Hebrews were then in that country or not. Shishak's list, on the contrary, presents several well-known names of towns in Palestine, besides that of the kingdom of Judah. The policy of the Pharaohs, as previously explained, is the key to their conduct towards the Israelites. At the same time, the character of the portions of the Bible relating to this period prevents our being sure that the Egyptians may not have passed through the country, and even put the Israelites to tribute. It is illustrative of the whole question under consideration that, in the most flourishing days of the sole kingdom of Israel, a Pharaoh should have marched unopposed into Palestine and captured the Canaanitish city Gezer, at no great distance from Jerusalem, and that this should be merely incidentally mentioned at a later time instead of being noticed in the regular course of the narrative (<sup><1015></sup>1 Kings 9:15, 16). *SEE EXODE.*

**4. Definite Period.** — With the 18th dynasty, about B.C. 1520, a new and clearer epoch of Egyptian history begins, both as regards the numerous materials for reconstructing it, and also its great importance. In fact, the history of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties is that of the Egyptian empire. Amosis, or Ahmes, the head of the first of these, overthrew the power of the Shepherds, and probably expelled them. No great monuments remain of the first king, but from various inscriptions we are warranted in supposing that he was a powerful king. During his reign we first find mention of the horse, and, as it is often called by the Shemitic name *sus*, it seems probable that it was introduced from Asia, and possibly by the Shepherd kings. If so, they may have been indebted to the strength of their cavalry for their easy

conquest of Egypt. It is certain that, while other animals are frequently depicted on the monuments, neither in the tombs near the pyramids, nor at Beni-Hassan, is there any appearance of the horse, and yet, subsequently, Egypt became the great depot for these animals, insomuch that in the time of Solomon they were regularly imported for him, and for "all the kings of the Hittites, and for the kings of Syria;" and when Israel was invaded by Sennacherib, it was on Egypt that they were said to put their trust for chariots and for horsemen. Amenoph I, the next king (B.C. cir. 1498), was sufficiently powerful to make conquests in Ethiopia and in Asia. In his time we find that the Egyptians had adopted the five intercalary days, as well as the twelve hours of day and night. True arches, not "arches of approaching stones," also are found at Thebes, bearing his name on the bricks, and were in common use in his time. See ARCH. Some of the more ancient chambers in the temple of Amen-ra, or El-Karnak, at Thebes, were built by him. In the reign of his successor, Thothmes I (B.C. cir. 1478), the arms of Egypt were carried into Mesopotamia, or the land of "Naharayn:" by some Naharayn is identified with the Nairi, a people south-west of Armenia. Libya also was subject to his sway. A monument of his reign is still remaining in one of the two obelisks of red granite which he set up at El-Karnak, or Thebes. The name of Thothmes II (B.C. cir. 1470) is found as far south as Napata, or Gebel Berkel, in Ethiopia. With him and his successor was associated a queen, Amense or Amen-numt, who seems to have received more honor than either. She is thought to have been a Semiramis, that name, like Sesostris, probably designating more than one individual. Queen Amen-nemt and Thothmes II and III are the earliest sovereigns of whom great monuments remain in the temple of El-Karnak, the chief sanctuary of Thebes. Thothmes III (B.C. cir. 1463) was one of the most remarkable of the Pharaohs. He carried his arms as far as Nineveh, and reduced perhaps Babylon also to his sway, receiving a large tribute from Asiatic nations over whom he had triumphed. This was a common mode of acknowledging the supremacy of a conqueror, and by no means implied that the territory was surrendered to him; on the contrary, he may only have defeated the *army* of the nation, and that beyond its own frontier. The *Punt*, a people of Arabia, the *Shupha*, supposed to be of Cyprus, and the *Ruten*, a people of the Euphrates or Tigris, thus confessed the power of Thothmes; and the monuments at Thebes are rich in delineations of the elephants and bears, camelopards and asses, the ebony, ivory, gold, and silver which they brought for tribute. Very beautiful specimens of ancient Egyptian painting belong to the time of this king;

indeed his reign, with that of Thothmes II preceding it, and those of Amenoph II (B.C. cir. 1416), Thothmes IV (whose name is borne by the sphinx at the pyramids), and Amenoph III following it, may be considered as comprising the best period of Egyptian art; all the earlier time showing a gradual improvement, and all the later a gradual declension. In the reign of Thothmes IV (B.C. cir. 1410), according to Manetho, the Shepherds took their final departure. The conquests of Amenoph III (B.C. cir. 1403) were also very extensive; traces of his power are found in various parts of Ethiopia; he states on scarabaei, struck apparently to commemorate his marriage, that his northern boundary was in Mesopotamia, his southern in Kara (Choloe?). From his features, he seems to have been partly of Ethiopian origin. His long reign of nearly forty years was marked by the construction of magnificent temples. Of these, the greatest were two at Thebes; one on the west bank, of which little remains but the two great colossi that stood on each side of the approach to it, and one of which is known as the vocal Memnon. He likewise built, on the opposite bank, the great temple, now called that of El-Uksor, which Rameses II afterwards much enlarged. The tomb of this king yet remains at Thebes. For a period of about thirty years after the reign of Amenoph III, Egypt was disturbed by the rule of stranger kings, who abandoned the national religion, and introduced a pure sun-worship. It is not known from whence they came, but they were regarded by the Egyptians as usurpers, and the monuments of them are defaced or ruined by those who overthrew them. Sir G. Wilkinson supposes that Amenoph III may have belonged to their race; but, if so, we must date the commencement of their rule from the end of his reign, as then began that change of the state religion which was the great peculiarity of the foreign domination. How or when the sun-worshippers were destroyed or expelled from Egypt does not appear. Horus, or Haremheb, who succeeded them (B.C. cir. 1367), was probably the prince by whom they were overthrown. He was a son of Amenoph III, and continued the line of Diospolite sovereigns. The records of his reign are not important; but the sculptures at Silsilis commemorate a successful expedition against the negroes. Horus was indirectly succeeded by Rameses I, with whom substantially commences the 19th dynasty, about B.C. 1324. His tomb at Thebes marks the new dynasty, by being in a different locality from that of Amenoph III, and being the first in the valley thenceforward set apart as the cemetery of the Theban kings. After a short and unimportant reign, he was succeeded by his son Sethi I, or Sethos (B.C. 1322). He is known by the magnificent hypostyle hall in the great

temple of El-Karnak, which he built, and on the outside of the north wall of which are sculptured the achievements of his arms. His tomb, cruelly defaced by travelers, is the most beautiful in the Valley of the Kings, and shows that his reign must have been a long one, as the sepulcher of an Egyptian king was commenced about the time of his accession, and thus indicated the length of his reign. He conquered the *Kheta*, or Hittites, and took their stronghold Ketesh, variously held to be at or near Emesa, on or near the Orontes, or Kadesh, or even Ashtaroth. His son Rameses II, who was probably for some time associated with him in the throne, became the most illustrious of the ancient kings of Egypt (B.C. cir. 1307). If he did not exceed all others in foreign conquests, he far outshone them in the grandeur and beauty of the temples with which he adorned Egypt and Nubia. His chief campaign, as recorded on his numerous monuments, was against the *Kheta* or Hittites, and a great confederacy they had formed. He defeated their army, captured Ketesh, and forced them to conclude a treaty with him, though this last object does not seem to have been immediately attained. It is he who is generally intended by the Sesostris of classic writers. He built the temple which is erroneously called the Memnonium, but properly the Rameseum of El-Kurneh, on the western bank of the Nile, one of the most beautiful of Egyptian monuments, and a great part of that of El-Uksor, on the opposite bank, as well as additions to that of El-Karnak. Throughout Egypt and Nubia are similar memorials of the power of Rameses II, one of the most remarkable of which is the great rock-temple of Abu-Simbel, not far north of the second cataract. The temple of Ptah, at Memphis, was also adorned by this Pharaoh, and its site is chiefly marked by a very beautiful colossal statue of him, fallen on its face and partly mutilated through modern vandalism. He was succeeded by his son Meneptah, who is supposed by the advocates of the Rabbinical date of the Exodus to have been the Pharaoh in whose time the Israelites went out. The monuments tell us little of him or of his successor, which latter was followed by his son Rameses III, perhaps the head of the 20th dynasty (B.C. cir. 1200). With this sovereign the glories of the Theban line revived, and a series of great victories by land and sea raised Egypt to the place which it had held under Rameses II. He built the temple of Medinet-Habu, on the western bank at Thebes, the walls of which are covered with scenes representing his exploits. The most remarkable of the sculptures commemorating them represents a naval victory in the Mediterranean, gained by the Egyptian fleet over that of the *Tokkari*, probably the Carians, and *Shairetana* (Khairretana), or Cretans. Other Shairetana, whom Mr.

Poole takes to correspond to the Cherethim of Scripture, served in the Egyptian forces. This king also subdued the *Pelesatu*, or Philistines, and the *Rebu* (Lebu), or Lubim, to the west of Egypt. Several kings hearing the name of Rameses succeeded Rameses II, but their tombs alone remain. Under them the power of Egypt evidently declined, and towards the close of the dynasty the country seems to have fallen into anarchy, the high-priests of Amen having usurped regal power at Thebes, and a Lower Egyptian dynasty, the 21st, arisen at Tanis. Of these, however, but few records remain.

With the succeeding dynasty occurs the first definite point of connection between the monumental and the scriptural history of Egypt. The ill feelings which the peculiar circumstances connected with the exode from Egypt had occasioned served to keep the Israelites and the Egyptians strangers, if not enemies, one to another during the lapse of centuries, till the days of David and Solomon, when (1 Kings 3, 7, 9, 11) friendly relations again spring up between the two countries. Solomon marries the daughter of Pharaoh, who burns the city of Gezer, and who, in consequence, must have been master of Lower Egypt (B.C. cir. 1010). "And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and linen yarn:" six hundred shekels was the price of a chariot, and one hundred and fifty the price of a horse. Probably the Egyptian princess who became Solomon's wife was a daughter of a king of the Tanite dynasty. It was during the reign of a king of this age that "Hadad, being yet a little child," fled from the slaughter of the Edomites by David, and took refuge, together with "certain Edomites of his father's servants," at the court of Pharaoh, who "gave him to wife the sister of his own wife, the sister of Tahpenes the queen" (<sup><III></sup>1 Kings 11:17-19), B.C. cir. 1040-1000. The 22d dynasty was of Bubastite kings; the name of one of them has been found among the sculptured remains of the temples of Bubastis; they were probably not of unmixed Egyptian origin, and may have been partly of Assyrian or Babylonian race. The first king was Sheshonk I (B.C. cir. 990), the contemporary of Solomon, and in his reign it was that "Jeroboam arose and fled into Egypt unto Shishak, king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon" (<sup><IIII></sup>1 Kings 11:40), B.C. 973. In the 5th year of Rehoboam, B.C. 969, Sheshonk invaded Judaea with an army of which it is said "the people were without number that came with him out of Egypt, the Lubims, the Sukkiims, and the Ethiopians;" and that, having taken the "fenced cities" of Judah, he "came up against Jerusalem, and took away the

treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house," and "the shields of gold which Solomon had made" (2 Chronicles 12). "The record of this campaign," says Sir G. Wilkinson, "which still remains on the outside of the south wall of the great temple of Karnak, bears an additional interest from the name of *Yuda-Melchi* (kingdom of Judah), first discovered by Champollion in the long list of captured districts and towns put up by Sheshonk to commemorate his success." Perhaps it was by Jeroboam's advice that he thus attacked Judah. It is doubtful, however, whether Jeroboam did not suffer by the invasion as well as Rehoboam. **SEE SHISHAK.** The next king, Osorkon I, is supposed by some to have been the Zerah whom Asa defeated (<sup>444B</sup>2 Chronicles 14:9); and in that view, as the army that Zerah led can only have been that of Egypt, his overthrow will explain the decline of the house of Sheshonk. According to others, Zerah was a king of Asiatic Ethiopia. **SEE ZERAH.** Of the other kings of this dynasty we know scarcely more than the names. It was followed by the 23d dynasty of Tanite kings, so called from Tanis, the Zoan of Scripture. They appear to have been of the same race as their predecessors. Bocchoris the Wise, a Saite, celebrated as a lawgiver, was the only king of the 24th dynasty (B.C. cir. 734). He is said to have been burned alive by Sabaco the Ethiopian, the first king of the 25th or Ethiopian dynasty. Egypt therefore makes no figure in Asiatic history during the 23d and 24th dynasties; under the 25th it regained, in part at least, its ancient importance. This was a foreign line, the warlike sovereigns of which strove to the utmost to repel the onward stride of Assyria. It is not certain which of the Sabacos — Shebake, or his successor Shebateke — corresponded to the So or Seva of the Bible, who made a treaty with Hoshea, which, as it involved a refusal of his tribute to Shalmaneser, caused the taking of Samaria, and the captivity of the ten tribes. **SEE SO.** The last king of this dynasty was Tirhakah, or Tehrak (B.C. 690), who, probably while yet ruling over Ethiopia or Upper Egypt only, advanced against Sennacherib to support Hezekiah, king of Judah, B.C. 713. It does not appear whether he met the Assyrian army, but it seems certain that its miraculous destruction occurred before any engagement had been fought between the rival forces. Perhaps Tirhakah availed himself of this opportunity to restore the supremacy of Egypt west of the Euphrates. **SEE TIRHAKAH.** With him the 25th dynasty closed. It was succeeded by the 26th, of Saite or native kings. The first sovereign of importance was Psammetichus, or Psametik I (B.C. 664), who, according to Herodotus, had previously been one of a dodecarchy which had ruled Egypt.

Rawlinson finds in Assyrian history traces of a dodecarchy before Psammetichus. This portion of the history is obscure. Psammetichus carried on a war in Palestine, and is said to have taken Ashdod, or Azotus, i.e., according to Wilkinson, *Shedid*, "the strong," after a siege of twenty-nine years (Herod. 2:157; see Rawlinson in loc. 2:204). It was probably held by an Assyrian garrison, for a Tartan, or general of the Assyrian king, had captured it apparently when garrisoned by Egyptians and Ethiopians in the preceding century (Isaiah 20). Psammetichus was succeeded by his son Neku, the Pharaoh-Necho of Scripture, B.C. 610. In his first year he advanced to Palestine, marching along the sea-coast on his way to Carchemish on the Euphrates, and was met by Josiah, king of Judah, whom he slew at Megiddo, B.C. 609. The remonstrance of the Egyptian king on this occasion is very illustrative of the policy of the Pharaohs in the East (<sup><437></sup>2 Chronicles 35:21), no less than in his lenient conduct after the defeat and death of the king of Judah. Neku was probably successful in his enterprise, and on his return deposed Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, and set up Jehoiakim in his stead. He apparently wished by this expedition to strike a blow at the falling power of the Assyrians, whose capital was shortly after taken by the combined forces of the Babylonians and Medes. The army, however, which was stationed on the Euphrates by Neku met with a signal disaster three years afterwards, being routed by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish (<sup><241></sup>Jeremiah 46:2). The king of Babylon seems to have followed up his success, as we are told (<sup><1247></sup>2 Kings 24:7) that "the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt." Neku either commenced a canal to connect the Nile and the Red Sea, or else attempted to clear one previously cut by Rameses II; in either case the work was not completed. **SEE NECHO**. The second successor of Neku was the next sovereign of note, Ruahprah, or Vaphrah, called Pharaoh-Hophra in the Bible, and by Herodotus Aprics. He took Gaza and Sidon, and defeated the king of Tyre in a sea-fight. He also worsted the Cyprians. Having thus restored the power of Egypt, he succored Zedekiah, king of Judah, and when Jerusalem was besieged, obliged the Chaldaeans to retire (<sup><267></sup>Jeremiah 37:5, 7, 11). He was so elated by these successes that he thought "not even a god could overthrow him." In <sup><337></sup>Ezekiel 29:3, he is thought to be called "the great dragon (i.e. crocodile?) that lieth in the midst of his rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself." At last, however, Amosis, or Ahmes II, who had been crowned in a military revolt, took him prisoner

and strangled him (B.C. 569), so that the words of Jeremiah were fulfilled: "I will give Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt, into the hand of his enemies, and into the hand of them that seek his life" (<sup>(2440)</sup>Jeremiah 44:30). There seems little doubt that at the time of this rebellion, and probably in conjunction with the advance of Amosis, Egypt was invaded and desolated by Nebuchadnezzar. *SEE HOPHRA*. The remarkable prophecies, however, in Ezekiel 29-31 may refer for the most part to the invasion of Cambyses, and also to the revolt of Inarus under Artaxerxes. Amosis, the successor of Apries, reigned nearly fifty years, and, taking advantage of the weakness and fall of Babylon, he somewhat restored the weight of Egypt in the East. But the new power of Persia was to prove even more terrible to his house than Babylon had been to the house of Psammetichus. He was succeeded by his son Psammenitus, held to be the Psametik III of the monuments, B.C. 525. Shortly after his accession this king was attacked by Cambyses, who took Pelusium, or "Sin, the strength of Egypt," and Memphis, and subsequently put Psammenitus to death. With Cambyses (B.C. 525) began the 27th dynasty of Persians, and Egypt became a Persian province, governed by a satrap. The conduct of Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 521) to the Egyptians was favorable, and he caused the temples to be adorned with additional sculptures. The large temple in the Great Oasis was principally built by him, and in it is found his name, with the same honorary titles as the ancient kings. Before the death of Darius, however, the Egyptians rebelled, but were again subdued by Xerxes (B.C. 485), who made his brother Achaemenes governor of the country. Under Artaxerxes Longimanus they again revolted, as above referred to, and in the 10th year of Darius Nothus contrived to throw off the Persian yoke, when Amyrtaeus the Saite became the sole king of the 28th dynasty (B.C. 414). After having ruled six years, he was succeeded by the first king of the 29th or Mendesian dynasty. Of the four kings comprising it little is known, and the dates are uncertain. It was followed by the last, or 30th dynasty of Sebennyte kings. The first of these was Nectanebo, or Nekt-har-heb (B.C. 387), who successfully defended his country against the Persians, had leisure to adorn the temples, and was probably the last Pharaoh who erected an obelisk. His son Teos, or Tachos, was the victim of a revolt, from which he took refuge in the Persian court, where he died, while his nephew Nectanebo II, or Nekt-neb, ascended the throne as the last native king of Egypt (B.C. 361). For some time he successfully opposed the Persians, but eventually succumbed to Artaxerxes Ochus, about B.C. 343, when Egypt once more became a Persian province. "From that time till our



own day," says Mr. Poole, "a period of twenty-two centuries, no native ruler has sat on the throne of Egypt, in striking fulfillment of the prophecy, 'There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt' (<sup><2613></sup>Ezekiel 30:13)."

Egypt was governed by a Persian satrap till Persia itself was conquered by Alexander the Great, B.C. 332. When Alexander's army occupied Memphis, the numerous Greeks who had settled in Lower Egypt found themselves the ruling class. Egypt became at once a Greek kingdom, and Alexander showed his wisdom in the regulations by which he guarded the prejudices and religion of the Egyptians, who were henceforth to be treated as inferiors, and forbidden to carry arms. He founded Alexandria as the Greek capital. On his death, his lieutenant Ptolemy made himself king of Egypt, being the first of a race of monarchs who governed for 300 years, and made it the second chief kingdom in the world, till it sunk under its own luxuries and vices and the rising power of Rome. The Ptolemies founded a large public library and a museum of learned men. *SEE ALEXANDRIA.*

After the time of the exile the Egyptian Ptolemies were for a long while (from B.C. 301 to about 180) masters of Palestine, and during this period Egypt became as of old a place of refuge to the Jews, to whom many favors and privileges were conceded; This shelter seems not to have been for ages withdrawn (<sup><4123></sup>Matthew 2:13). Yet it cannot be said that the Jews were held in esteem by the Egyptians (Philo, *c. Apion*, 2, page 521). Indeed, it was from an Egyptian, Manetho (B.C. 300), that the most defamatory misrepresentations of Jewish history were given to the world; and, in the days of Augustus, Chaeremon took special pains to make the Jewish people appear despicable (Josephus, *Apion*, 1:32; comp. Creuzer, *Com. Herod.* 1:270). *SEE PTOLEMY.*

In the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, Onias, whose father, the third high-priest of that name, had been murdered, fled into Egypt, and rose into high favor with the king and Cleopatra his queen. The high priesthood of the Temple of Jerusalem, which belonged of right to his family, having passed from it to the family of the Maccabees, by the nomination of Jonathan to this office (B.C. 153), Onias used his influence with the court to procure the establishment of a temple and ritual in Egypt which should detach the Jews who lived there from their connection with the Temple at Jerusalem. The king complied with the request. To reconcile the Egyptian Jews to a second temple, Onias alleged <sup><2318></sup>Isaiah 19:18, 19. He close for the purpose

a ruined temple of Bubastis, at Leontopolis, in the Heliopolitan nome, one hundred and fifty stadia from Memphis, which place he converted into a sort of miniature Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, 1:1), erecting an altar in imitation of that in the Temple, and constituting himself high-priest. The king granted a tract of land around the temple for the maintenance of the worship, and it remained in existence till destroyed by Vespasian (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:3; 20:9; *War*, 7:11). The district in which this temple stood appears to have been, after Alexandria, the chief seat of the Jews in Egypt, and which, from the name of its founder, was called *Ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ* (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:8; Helon's *Pilgrim.* page 328). *SEE ONIAS, CITY OF.*

Under these Alexandrian kings the native Egyptians still continued building their grand and massive temples, nearly in the style of those built by the kings of Thebes and Sais. The temples in the island of Philae, in the Great Oasis, at Latopolis, at Ombos, at Dendera, and at Thebes, prove that the Ptolemies had not wholly crushed the zeal and energy of the Egyptians. An Egyptian phalanx had been formed, armed and disciplined like the Greeks. These soldiers rebelled unsuccessfully against Epiphanes, and then Thebes rebelled against Soter II, but was so crushed that it never again held rank among cities. But while the Alexandrians were keeping down the Egyptians, they were themselves sinking under the Romans. Epiphanes asked for Roman help; his two sons appealed to the senate to settle their quarrels and guard the kingdom from Syrian invasion. Alexander II was placed on the throne by the Romans, and Auletes went to Rome: to ask for help against his subjects. Lastly, the beautiful Cleopatra, the disgrace of her country and the firebrand of the republic, maintained her power by surrendering her person, first to Julius Caesar, and then to Mark Antony. On the defeat of Mark Antony by Augustus, B.C. 30, Egypt became a province of Rome, and was governed by the emperors with jealous suspicion. It was still a Greek state, and Alexandria was the chief seat of Greek learning and science. Its library, which had been burned by Caesar's soldiers, had been replaced by that from Pergamus. The Egyptians yet continued building temples and covering them with hieroglyphics as of old; but on the spread of Christianity the old superstitions lost their sway, the animals were no longer worshipped, and we find few hieroglyphical inscriptions after the reign of Commodus. On the division of the Roman empire, A.D. 337, Egypt fell to the lot of Constantinople. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v. AEGYPTUS.

Ever since its first occupancy by the Romans Egypt has ceased to be an independent state, and its history is incorporated with that of its different conquerors and possessors. In A.D. 618 it fell under the power of the Persians, but in 640 it was transferred to the Saracens by the victorious Amru, general of the caliph Omar, under whose successors it continued till about 1171, when the Turcomans expelled the caliphs; these again were in their turn expelled in 1250 by the Mamelukes. The latter raised to the throne one of their own chiefs with the title of sultan, and this new dynasty reigned over Egypt till 1517, when the Mamelukes were totally defeated, and the last of their sultans put to death by the Turkish sultan Selim. This prince established the government of Egypt in twenty-four beys, whose authority he subjected to a council of regency, supported by an immense standing army. The conqueror did not, however, entirely suppress the Mameluke government, who continued to be "the power behind the throne" until their massacre in 1811, which made the pacha virtually independent of the Sublime Porte. Great and rapid changes have taken place in this interesting country within the last fifty years. The campaign of the French army in 1800, undertaken with a view to subdue Egypt, and so secure to the French an important share of the East India trade, though it resulted unsuccessfully, was attended with important consequences to the interests of science and learning. Mohammed Ali, the late viceroy, though a perfect despot, did much to elevate his dominions to a rank with civilized nations in arts, commerce, and industry. The works of internal improvement which he undertook, the extensive manufactories he established, and the encouragement he gave to literary institutions, have done much to change the political, if not the moral aspect of Egypt. His successors have carried out his enlightened views by establishing railroads and opening out canals, which, while they increase the commerce of the country, greatly facilitate communication with India by what is called the overland route by the Mediterranean, Egypt, and the Red Sea, to Bombay. See M'Culloch's *Gazetteer*, s.v. For the history of Christianity in Egypt, *SEE EGYPT, CHRISTIAN.*

**XXII.** *Monumental Localities.* — Of the towns on the northern coast the most western is Alexandria or El-Iskenderiyeh, founded B.C. 332 by Alexander the Great, who gave it the form of a Macedonian chlamys or mantle. Proceeding eastward, the first place of importance is Er-Rashid, or Rosetta, on the west bank of the branch of the Nile named after this town. In ascending the Rosetta branch the first spot of interest is the site of the

ancient Sais, on the eastern bank, marked by lofty mounds and the remains of massive walls of crude brick. It was one of the oldest cities of Egypt, and gave its name to the kings of the 26th dynasty. The goddess Neith, supposed to be the origin of Athene, was the local divinity, and in her honor an annual festival was held at Sais, to which pilgrims resorted from all parts of Egypt. On the eastern side of the other branch of the Nile, to which it gives its name, stands the town Dimyat, or Damietta, a strong place in the time of the Crusades, and then regarded as the key of Egypt. It has now about 28,000 inhabitants. To the eastward of Damietta is the site of Pelusium, the Sin of Scripture, and the ancient key of Egypt, towards Palestine. No important remains have been found here. Between this site and the Damietta branch are the mounds of Tanis, or Zoan, the famous Avaris of the Shepherds, with considerable remains of the great temple, of which the most remarkable are several fallen obelisks, some of them broken. This temple was as ancient as the time of the 12th dynasty, and was beautified by Rameses II. Tanis was on the eastern bank of the Tanitic branch of the Nile, now called the canal of El-Moiz. A little south of the modern point of the Delta, on the eastern bank of the river, is the site of the ancient Heliopolis, or On, marked by a solitary obelisk, and the ruins of a massive brick wall. The obelisk bears the name of Osirtasen I, the head of the 12th dynasty. At a short distance south of Heliopolis stands the modern capital, Cairo, or El-Kahireh. The ancient city of Memphis, founded by Menes, stood on the western bank of the Nile, about ten miles above Cairo. The kings and people who dwelt there chose the nearest part of the desert as their burial-place, and built tombs on its rocky edge or excavated them in its sides. The kings raised pyramids, round which their subjects were buried in smaller sepulchers. The site of Memphis is marked by mounds in the cultivated tract. A few blocks of stone and a fine colossus of Rameses II are all that remains of the great temple of Ptah, the local deity.

*SEE MEMPHIS.*

There is not space here for a detailed account of the pyramids; suffice it to say that the present perpendicular height of the great pyramid is 450 feet, 9 inches and its present base 746 feet. It is about 30 feet lower than it was originally, much of the exterior having been worn off by age and man's violence. Like all the other pyramids, it faces the cardinal points. The surface presents a series of great steps, though when first built it was cased, and smooth, and polished. The platform on the summit is about 32 feet square. The pyramid is almost entirely solid, containing only a few

chambers, so small as not to be worthy of consideration in calculating its contents. It was built by Rhufa (Cheops), or Shufu (Suphis). The second pyramid stands at a short distance south-west of the great pyramid, and is not of much smaller dimensions. It is chiefly remarkable for a great part of its casing having been preserved. It was built by Khafra or Shafra (Chephren), a king of the same period. The third pyramid is much smaller than either of the other two, though it is constructed in a more costly manner. It was built by Mycerinus or Mencheres, the fourth ruler of the 4th dynasty. Near the three pyramids are six smaller ones; three of them are near the east side of the great pyramid, and three on the south side of the third pyramid. They are supposed to be the tombs of near relatives of the kings who founded the great pyramid. To the east of the second pyramid is the great sphinx. 188 feet in length, hewn out of a natural eminence in the solid rock, some defects of which are supplied by a partial stone casing, the legs being likewise added. *SEE PYRAMIDS.*

In the tract between the pyramids of Sakkarah and Abu-Sir are the remains of the Serapeum, and the burial place of the bulls Apis, both discovered by M. Mariette. They are enclosed by a great wall, having been connected, for the Serapeum was the temple of Apis. The tomb is a great subterranean gallery, whence smaller passages branch off, and contains many sarcophagi in which the bulls were entombed. Serapis was a form of Osiris, his name being Osir-hapi, or Osiris Apis. In ascending the river we arrive at the ancient Ahnas, supposed by some to be the Hanes of Isaiah, and about sixty miles above Cairo, at Beni-Suweif, the port of the province of the Feyum. In this province are supposed to be the remains of the famous Labyrinth of Moeris, probably Amen-em-ha III, and not far off, also, may be traced the site of the Lake Moeris, near the ancient Arsinoe, or Crocodilopolis, now represented by Medinet el-Feylum. The next objects of peculiar interest are the grottoes of Beni-Hassan, which are monuments of the 12th dynasty, dating about B.C. 2000. Here are found two columns of an order which is believed to be the prototype of the Doric. On the walls of the tombs are depicted scenes of hunting, fishing, agriculture, etc. There is also an interesting representation of the arrival of certain foreigners, supposed to be Joseph's brethren — at least illustrative of their arrival. In the town of Asyrt, higher up the river, is seen the representative of the ancient Lycopolis. It was an important place 3500 years ago, and has thus outlived Thebes and Memphis, Tanis and Pelusium.

Further on, a few miles south-west of Girga, on the border of the Libyan desert, is the site of the sacred city of Abydus, a reputed burial-place of Osiris, near which, also, must have been situated the very ancient city of This, which gave its name to the 1st and 2nd dynasties. About forty miles from Abydus, though nearly in the same latitude, is the village of Denderah, famous for the remains of the temple of Athor, the Egyptian Venus, who presided over the town of Tentyra. the capital of the Tentyrite nome. This temple dates from the time of the earlier Caesars, and the names of the last Cleopatra, and Caesarion her son, are found in it. *SEE DENDERAH.*

### Picture for E'gypt 5

About twenty miles still higher up the Nile than Denderah, and on the western bank, are the ruins of Thebes, the No-Amon of the Bible. In the hieroglyphic inscriptions the name of this place is written AP-T, or with the article prefixed T-AP, and AMENHA, the abode of Amen. The Copts write the former name *Tape*, which becomes in the Memphitic dialect *Thaba*, and thus explains the origin of the Greek  $\Theta\eta\beta\alpha\iota$ . The time of its foundation is unknown, but remains have been found which are ascribed to the close of the 11th dynasty, and it probably dates from the commencement of that first Diospolite line of kings. Under the 18th and two following dynasties it attained its highest prosperity, and to this period its greatest monuments belong. The following is a description of this celebrated locality by Mr. Poole: "The monuments of Thebes, exclusive of its sepulchral grottoes, occupy a space on both sides of the river, of which the extreme length from north to south is about two miles, and the extreme breadth from east to west about four. The city was on the eastern bank, where is the great temple, or, rather, collection of temples, called after El-Karnak, a modern village near by. The temple of El-Karnak is about half a mile from the river, in a cultivated tract. More than a mile to the south-west is the temple of El-Uksur, on the bank of the Nile. On the western bank was the suburb bearing the name Memnonia. The desert near the northernmost of the temples on this side almost reaches the river, but soon recedes, leaving a fertile plain generally more than a mile in breadth. Along the edge of the desert, besides the small temple just mentioned as the northernmost, are the Rameseum of El-Kurneh, and that of Medinet-Habu less than a mile farther to the south-west, and between them, but within the cultivated land, the remains of the Amenophium, with its two gigantic seated colossi. Behind these edifices rises the mountain, which here attains

a height of about 1200 feet. It gradually recedes in a southwesterly direction, and is separated from the cultivated tract by a strip of desert in which are numerous tombs, partly excavated in two isolated hills, and two small temples. A tortuous valley, which commences not far from the northernmost of the temples on this bank, leads to those valleys in which are excavated the wonderful tombs of the kings, near the highest part of the mountain, which towers above them in bold and picturesque forms" (*Encyclop. Britannica*, art. Egypt, page 506). At the entrance to the temple of El-Uksur stood two very fine obelisks of red granite, one of which is now in the center of the Place de la Concorde, at Paris. There is also a portal with wings 200 feet in width, covered with sculptures of the highest interest, illustrating the time of Rameses II. Within is a magnificent avenue of 14 columns, having capitals of the bell-shaped flowers of the papyrus. They are 60 feet high, and elegantly sculptured. These are of the time of Amenoph III. — On a south portal of the great temple of El-Karnak is a list of countries subdued by Sheshonk I, or Shishak, the head of the 22d dynasty. Among the names is that of the kingdom of Judah, as before mentioned. The great hypostyle hall in this temple is the most magnificent work of this class in Egypt. Its length is 170 feet, its width 329; it is supported by 134 columns, the loftiest of which are nearly 70 feet in height and about 12 in diameter, and the rest more than 40 feet in height and about 9 in diameter. The great columns, 12 in number, form an avenue through the midst of the court from the entrance, and the others are arranged in rows very near together on each side. There is a transverse avenue made by two rows of the smaller columns being placed further apart than the rest. This great hall is therefore crowded with columns, and the effect is surpassingly grand. The forest of pillars seems interminable in whatever direction one looks, producing a result unequalled in any other Egyptian temple. This great hall was the work of Sethi I, the head of the 19th dynasty, who came to the throne B.C. cir. 1340, and it was sculptured partly in his reign and partly in that of his son and successor Rameses II. — The Rameseum remains to be briefly noticed. This temple on the edge of the desert is perhaps the most beautiful ruin in Egypt, as Karnak is the grandest. It also records the glories of Rameses II, of whom there is in one of its courts a colossal statue hewn out of a single block of red granite, supposed to weigh nearly 900 tons, and transported thither from the quarries of Syene. This temple is also noted for containing the celebrated astronomical ceiling, one of the most precious records of ancient Egyptian science. Not the least interesting among the monuments of Thebes are the

tombs of the kings. The sepulchers are 20 or 21 in number. Nineteen are sculptured, and are the mausolea of kings, of a queen with her consort, and of a prince, all of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties. The paintings and sculptures are almost wholly of a religious character, referring chiefly to a future state. Standing on the resting places of kings and warriors who figured in the history of Egypt while the world was yet young, and long before the age of others whom we are accustomed to consider heroes of antiquity, it seems as though death itself were immortalized; and proudly indeed may those ancient Pharaohs, who labored so earnestly to preserve their memory on earth, look down upon the paltry efforts of later aspirants, and their slender claims to be regarded as either ancient or immortal. *SEE THEBES.*

About twenty miles further south of the site of Thebes is the village of Edfu, representing the town called by the Greeks Apollinopolis Magna, where is still found in a comparatively perfect state a temple of the Ptolemaic period. *SEE TEMPLE.* Above Edfu, at Jebel es-Silsileh, the mountains on either side, which have for some time confined the valley to a narrow space, reach the river, and contract its course and higher still, about thirty miles, is the town of Aswan, which represents the ancient Syene, and stands among the palm-trees on the eastern bank, opposite to the island of Elephantine. The bed of the river above this place is obstructed by numerous rocks and islands of granite, which form the rapids called the first cataract. During the inundation boats are enabled by a strong northerly wind to pass this cataract without aid, and, in fact, at other times the principal rapid has only a fall of five or six feet, and that not perpendicular. The roaring of the troubled stream, and the red granite islands and rocks which stud its surface, give the approach a wild picturesqueness till we reach the open stream, less than two miles further, and the beautiful island of Philae suddenly rises before our eyes, completely realizing one's highest idea of a sacred place of ancient Egypt. It is very small, only a quarter of a mile long and 500 feet broad, and contains monuments of the time of the Ptolemies. In the desert west of the Nile are situate the great and little *wahs* (oases), and the valley of the Natron lakes, containing four Coptic monasteries, the remains of the famous anchorite settlement of Nitria, recently noted for the discovery of various Syrian MSS. In the eastern desert the chief town of importance is Es-Suweis, or Suez, the ancient Arsinoe, which gives its name to the western gulf of the Red Sea.



**XXIII. Prophecies.** — It would not be within the province of this article to enter upon a general consideration of the prophecies relating to Egypt; we must, however, draw the reader's attention to their remarkable fulfillment. The visitor to the country needs not to be reminded of them; everywhere he is struck by the precision with which they have come to pass. We have already spoken of the physical changes which have verified to the letter the words of Isaiah. In like manner we recognize, for instance, in the singular disappearance of the city of Memphis and its temples in a country where several primeval towns yet stand, and scarce any ancient site is unmarked by temples, the fulfillment of the words of Jeremiah: 'Noph shall be waste and desolate without an inhabitant' (<sup>2469</sup>Jeremiah 46:19), and those of Ezekiel, "Thus saith the Lord God, I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause [their] images to cease out of Noph" (<sup>2703</sup>Ezekiel 30:13).

The principal passages relating to Egypt are as follows: Isaiah 19; <sup>2468</sup>Jeremiah 43:8-13; 44:30; 46; Ezekiel 29-32, inclusive. In the course of what has been said, several allusions have been made to portions of these prophecies; and it may here be observed that the main reference in them seems to be to the period extending from the times of Nebuchadnezzar to those of the Persians, though it is not easy to elucidate them to any great extent from the history furnished by the monuments. Nebuchadnezzar appears to have invaded Egypt during the reign of Apries, and Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that the story of Amasis' rebellion was invented or used to conceal the fact that Pharaoh-Hophla was deposed by the Babylonians. It is not improbable that Amasis came to the throne by their intervention. The forty years' desolation of Egypt (<sup>2520</sup>Ezekiel 29:10) is a point of great difficulty, owing chiefly to the statements of Herodotus (2:161, 177) as to the unexampled prosperity of the reigns of Apries and Amasis (B.C. 588-25), during which the period in question must have fallen. That the Greek historian was misled by the accounts of the Egyptian priests, who wished to conceal the extent of the national humiliation by Nebuchadnezzar and Cambyses, is made evident by Browne (*Ordo Saeclorum?* page 191 sq.), who thus arranges the events: "Soon after B.C. 572, Nebuchadnezzar invades Egypt, conquers Apries, and puts him to death, and carries off the spoil of Egypt, together with its chief men, to some other part of his dominions: Amasis is appointed his viceroy. Cyrus, about B.C. 532, 'turns the captivity of Egypt,' as he had before done that of the Jews. On his

death Amasis revolts, and Cambyses invades and fully subjugates all Egypt, B.C. 525." *SEE EZEKIEL.*

**XXIV. Literature.** — For a very full classified list of works on Egypt, see Jolowicz's *Bibliotheca -Egyptiaca* (Lpz. 1858, 8vo), with the *Supplement* thereto (ib. 1861). The following are the most useful, excepting such as relate to the modern history. On Egypt generally: *Description de l'E'gypte* (2d ed. Par. 1821-9); *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (8th edit. art. Egypt). Description, Productions, and Topography: Abd-Allatif, *Relation de l'E'gypte* (ed. Silvestre de Sacy, Par. 1810); D'Anville, *Memoires sur l'Egypte* (Par. 1766); Belzoni, *Narrative of Operations* (London, 1820); Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften d. alt-Egyptischen Denkmaler* (Lpz. 1857); Id. *Reiseberichte aus Aegypten* (ib. 1855); Champollion le Jeune, *L'E'gypte sous les Pharaons* (Par. 1814); Id. *Lettres ecrites pendant son Voyage en Egypte* (2d edit. Par. 1833); Ehrenberg and Hemprich, *Naturgeschichtliche Reiser — Reisen in Aegypten*, etc. (Lpz. 1828); *Symbolae Physicae* (ib. 1829-1845); Forskal, *Descriptiones animalium*, etc. (Hafn. 1775-6); Id. *Flora Aegyptiaco-arabica* (ib. 1775); Harris, *Hieroglyphical Standards* (London, 1852); Linant de Bellefonds, *Memoire sur le lac de Moeris* (Paris, 1843); Quatremere, *Memoires Geographiques et Historiques* (Paris, 1811); Russegger, *Reisen* (Lpz. 1841-8); Vyse and Perring, *Pyramids of Gizeh* (Lond. 1839-42); Perring, *58 Large Views, etc., of the Pyramids of Gizeh* (Lond. 1841); Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes* (Lond. 1843); Id. *Hand-book for Egypt* (2d edit. Lond. 1858); Id. *Survey of Thebes* (plan); Id. *on the Eastern Desert* (in the *Jour. Geogr. Soc.* 2:1832, p. 28 sq.); Hartmann, *Naturgesch. der Nillander* (Lpz. 1865); Kremer, *Egypten* (modern, Lpz. 1863); Parthey, *Erdk. des alten Aegyptens* (ib. 1859); Pethorick, *Egypt*, etc. (Lond. 1861). Monuments and Inscriptions: Champollion le Jeune, *Monuments* (Paris, 1829-47); Id. *Notices descriptives* (ib. 1844); Gliddon, *Lectures* (N.Y. 1843); Lepsius, *Denkmaler* (Lpz. 1849 sq.); Letronne, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines d'E'gypte* (Par. 1842); Rosellini, *Monumenti* (Pisa, 1832-44); Dumichen, *Altgypt. Inschriften* (in three series, Lpz. 1865 -8); Brugsch, *Recueil de Monuments Egyptiens* (Par. 1862-63); Leemans, *Monuments Egyptiens* (ib. 1866); Rhind, *Thebes*, etc. (Lond. 1862). Language: Brugsch, *Grammaire Demotique* (Berl. 1855); Id. *Hierog.-Demot. Worterb.* (Berl. 1867); Id. *Zwei bilingue Papyri* (ib. 1865); Birch, *Dictionary of Hieroglyphics* (in Bunsen, volume 5); Champollion le Jeune, *Grammaire Egyptienne* (Paris, 1836-41); *Dictionnaire E'gyptien* (ib.

1841); *Encyclop. Brit.* (8th edit. art. Hieroglyphics); Parthey, *Vocabularium Coptico-Latinum*, etc. (Berl. 1844); Peyron, *Grammatica linguae Copticae* (Turin, 1841); Id. *Lexicon* (ib. 1835); Schwartz, *Das Alte Aegypten* (Lpz. 1843). Ancient Chronology, History, and Manners: Bunsen, *Egypt's Place* (London, 1850-59); Cory, *Ancient Fragments* (2d edit. Lond. 1832); *Herodotus* (ed. Rawlinson, volumes 1-4, Lond. and N.Y. 1861); Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses* (Lond. 1843); Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie* (Lpz. 1825); Lepsius, *Chronologie der Aegypter* (volume 1, Lpz. 1849); Id. *Konigsbuch der alten Aegypter* (ib. 1858); Poole, *Horae Egyptiacae*. (Lond. 1851); Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (ib. 1837, 1841); Id. *Popular Account of the Ancient Egyptians* (Lond. and N.Y. 1855); Kenrick, *Egypt under the Pharaohs* (Lond. and N.Y. 1852); Osburn, *Monumental History* (Lond. 1854); Sharpe, *Hist. of Egypt* (Lond. 1846); Brugsch, *Histoire de l'Egypte* (Paris, 1859 sq.); Hincks, *Years of the Egyptians* (London, 1865); Lauth, *Der Dynast. Manetho's* (Leipzig, 1865); Unger, *Chronologie des Manetho* (Berlin, 1867). Ancient Religion: Herodotus; Diodorus of Sicily; Plutarch; Porphyry; Iamblichus, etc.; Jablonski, *Pantheon Aegypt.* (Frankf. 1750-52, 3 volumes); Schmidt, *De sacerdot. et sacrificiis Aegyptiorum* (Tub. 1786); Hirt, *U. d. Bildung d. aegyptischen Gottheiten* (1821); Champollion, *Pantheon egyptied* (Paris, 1832); Haymann, *Darstellung d. A.-nr. M.* (Bonn, 1837); Roth, *Die ag. u. Zoroastrische Glaubenslehre* (Manh. 1846); Beauregard, *Les divinites E'gyptiennes* (Paris, 1866); Sharpe, *Egyptian Mythology* (Lond. 1863); Lepsius, *D. Todtenbuch* (Lpz. 1867); Rouge, *Ritual des E'gyptiens* (Paris, 1866); Birch, *The Funeral Ritual* (in Bunsen, volume 5); Pleyte, *La Religion des Pre-Israelites* (Par. 1862). Modern Inhabitants: Lane, *Modern Egyptians* (3d ed. 1860); Id. *Thousand and One Nights* (2d edit., by Poole, Lond. 1859); Mrs. Poole, *Englishwoman in Egypt* (Lond. and N.Y. 1844). The periodicals of Great Britain, France, and Germany contain many valuable papers on Egyptian history and antiquities, by Dr. Hincks, Mr. Birch, M. de Rouge, and others. There is a monthly Egyptological *Zeitschrift*, edited by M. Brugsch, published at Berlin; and a society called the "Eg. Explor. Fund" of London, has published several *Memoirs* of new researches.

### Egypt Brook Or River Of.

This is frequently mentioned as the southern limit of the Land of Promise (◀0158Genesis 15:18; ◀40082 Chronicles 7:8; ◀0245Numbers 24:5; ◀0150Joshua

15:4). **SEE BROOK**. Calmet is of opinion that this was the Nile, remarking that <sup><633B></sup>Joshua 13:3 describes it by the name of Sihor, which is the true name of the Nile (<sup><242B></sup>Jeremiah 2:18), "the muddy river ;" and that <sup><3064></sup>Amos 6:14 calls it the river of the wilderness, because the eastern arm of the Nile adjoined Arabia, or the wilderness, in Hebrew *Arabah*, and watered the district by the Egyptians called Arabian. In answer to this, it is said that this stream was the limit of Judaea toward Egypt, and that the Sept. (<sup><237D></sup>Isaiah 27:12), "unto the river of Egypt," render "to *Rhinocorura*," an interpretation which is adopted by Cellarius, Bochart, Wells, and others, although that is the name of a town certainly not adjacent to the Nile. **SEE NILE**. Besides, it is extremely dubious whether the power of the Hebrew nation extended at any time to the Nile, and, if it did, it was over a mere sandy desert. But, as this desert is unquestionably the natural boundary of the Syrian dominions, no reason can be given why the political boundary should exceed it. Most geographers, therefore, understand by "the River of Egypt" the modern *Wady el-Arish*, which drains the middle of the Sinaitic desert; a few, however, take it to be the *brook Besor*, between Gaza and Rhinocorura. (See <sup><6157></sup>Joshua 15:47.) **SEE EGYPT**.

## Egypt, Christian

**1. Church History.** The first seeds of Christianity were undoubtedly scattered in Egypt at the time of the apostles. According to some ancient historians, Peter founded the Church of Alexandria and several other Egyptian churches. Mark the Evangelist is said by an old tradition, preserved by Eusebius (*Ecclesiastes Hist.* 2:16), to have been "the first that was sent to Egypt, and first established churches at the city of Alexandria." **SEE ALEXANDRIA**. The testimony of Eusebius, that the first Christians of Egypt followed a rigidly ascetic school, is very doubtful, because Philo, to whom he refers, does not speak of Christians, but of a Jewish sect, the Therapeutae, and expressly mentions that they lived, not in Alexandria, but on Lake Moeris. From Lower Egypt Christianity soon spread to Cyrene, Pentapolis, Libya, Central and Upper Egypt. There were at least twenty bishoprics in Egypt about the middle of the third century, for that number of bishops were assembled at a council in 235. Five councils of Egyptian bishops were held before 311; a great many in the fourth and following centuries. As Egypt had been in the times before Christ the seat of philosophy and mysticism, so it now became one of the chief seats of Christian literature. The Alexandrian school was the oldest of the higher class of institutions for Christian education. Jerome and others hold Mark

the Evangelist to have been its founder, but the succession of catechists is differently stated. *SEE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL*. Among the scientific men whom it gave to the Church were *Clement, Athanasius, Origen, Cyril*. Gnosticism found numerous adherents. Basilides, Valentinus, Heracleon, Ptolemaeus, Carpocrates, were Egyptians. The Ophites and Doketism sprang up there; Sabellianism and Arianism were also products of Egypt. The influence of Egypt in the history of Monachism is equally marked; Pachomius, Anthony, and many other celebrated hermits, greatly contributed to the spreading of Monachism in the Christian Church. Monachism (q.v.), in fact, cannot be fully understood without a due appreciation of the Egyptian element. In the history of the constitution of the Christian Church Egypt has also had a considerable influence. In no other country of the East were hierarchical tendencies so early developed, for the patriarch of Alexandria soon sought to obtain privileges which no other of the superior bishops enjoyed. The Monophysites, who subsequently received the name of Copts, became in Egypt the predominant Church, and gradually wrested nearly all the churches from the orthodox Christians, who, as early as the end of the sixth century, were reduced to a very insignificant number. The patriarchal seat at Alexandria was occupied almost exclusively by Monophysite (Jacobite) patriarchs, with the exception of Cosmas (elected about 726) and Eutychus (elected in 934). The orthodox (Greek) Christians received from their opponents the nickname Melchites (q.v.). In 615 Egypt was invaded by Chosroes, king of Persia, when few bishoprics were spared. The dominion of the Persians lasted only a few years, when the whole country, with the capital city of Alexandria, passed into the power of the Mohammedans in 635 (according to others in 640). Under them Christianity suffered incalculable injuries, and gradually declined so as to become a despised and oppressed sect. *SEE COPTS*. Better prospects for Christianity did not open till the beginning of the 19th century, when Egypt, under the reign of the enlightened Mehemet Ali, was brought under the influence of European civilization. Since then the educated Egyptians have learned to appreciate the superiority of European nations, especially of England and France; many young men of talent have been sent to European schools; the native Christian population begins to rise from its degradation and despised condition; the large cities, especially Alexandria and Cairo, are filling up with an intelligent and influential population of foreign-born Christians; Christian schools, and other religious and charitable institutions, are multiplying; and the signs of

the times seem to indicate that the prospects of Christianity are at present very bright.

An attempt to establish a Protestant mission in Egypt was made by the Moravians in 1769. A missionary, Hocker, who previously had sought to open communication with the Abyssinian Church, but had been compelled to return to Europe in 1761, was in 1768 commissioned, together with a young man named Danke, a carpenter by trade, to return to Egypt, and await any opening that might present itself to penetrate into Abyssinia. "On March 5, 1769, they reached Cairo, Hocker earning a livelihood by practicing as a physician and Danke by working at his trade. The latter soon learned to converse tolerably in Arabic, and when an assistant arrived for Hocker in the person of John Antes, a watchmaker, he set out on his first journey to the Copts, landing at Gizeh, in Upper Egypt. The state of the country at this time was exceedingly disturbed, the Mameluke beys having revolted against the Turkish government, and many of them being also at war with one another. Hocker had been summoned to attend members of the household of Ali Bey (for a time the first chief in Egypt), and Danke's connection with the 'English physician,' as Hocker was called, brought him into favor with the officers and soldiers at Gizeh, who treated him with the greatest kindness. He met a number of Copts in this city, with whom he formed a very intimate friendship. At first several of them invited him to visit their native city, Behnesse, the population of which was exclusively Coptic, but afterwards they endeavored to deter him by describing the danger to which he would expose himself. Danke, however, refused to listen to them, and, after bidding the Copts at Girzeh farewell, he set out September 13th. Danke made in all three visits to the Copts at Behnesse. His labors were by many eagerly accepted, by others they were viewed with suspicion or openly opposed. His testimony for Jesus was not without encouraging effect, and many of the priests even became his firm supporters, and begged him to remain amongst them. On his third visit he caught a severe cold, upon which followed an attack of malignant fever. Notwithstanding the most careful nursing on the part of the other brethren, the disease increased upon him, and on October 6th, 1772, he died, aged only 38 years. By permission of the Greek patriarch, his body was interred in a vault of St. George's church, in the Old City of Cairo. In May 1775, George Winiger arrived as Danke's successor. He proceeded to Behnesse, and labored faithfully in preaching the Gospel and instructing the people privately. Michael Baschara (the magistrate referred to above) remained

faithful to his profession, and was an active and influential assistant. In 1780, three other brethren were sent from Herrrlhut to reinforce the mission, but it had become evident before their arrival that in the present state of the country it would be impossible to continue the work amongst the Copts, and that an effort to penetrate into Abyssinia would be useless. The brethren remained at their post until the Synod of 1782 resolved to discontinue the mission. Hocker, who had labored for its establishment ever since the year 1752, died at Cairo in August, 1781" (*Moravian* [newspaper], May 7, 1868).

In 1826, the "Church Missionary Society" of London sent out some German missionaries to labor among the Copts. After spending some time in studying the Arabic language, and distributing the Bible and religious tracts, the missionaries fixed the location of the mission at Cairo, where they had two schools, attended by Greek, Coptic, Armenian, Roman Catholic, and even pure Mohammedan children. In 1833 a boarding-school was commenced, designed for training teachers and catechists. In 1834, a chapel was constructed by subscriptions obtained on the spot. In 1835, the mission was interrupted by a terrible visitation of the plague. In 1840, it was reported by the missionaries that in the different quarters of the town no less than six religious meetings had been established by the native Copts for the purpose of reading the Scriptures; that the patriarch had sanctioned both these meetings and a plan for the establishment of an institution in Egypt for the education of the Coptic clergy. In 1841, a pupil of the missionary school of Cairo was appointed by the patriarch Abuna, or head of the Abyssinian Church. Bishop Gobat, who visited Egypt in 1849, expressed in a letter dated January 9, 1850, opinion that the plan on which this mission had been established, to seek the friendship of the higher clergy of the Eastern churches, and to induce them to reform their churches, had failed. The mission was subsequently abandoned.

A mission established by the American Missionary Association has also been again abandoned. The most successful of any of the Protestant missions has been that undertaken by the United Presbyterian Church. It organized a number of congregations and schools, and, through the liberality of the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh, who married a pupil of the mission school, it obtained a press, through which a large amount of useful reading has been scattered throughout the land. The growth of the Church was sufficiently encouraging to organize the churches into the Presbytery of Egypt, in connection with the General Assembly of the Church in the

United States. A flourishing theological school has been established at Assifut, for which the Rev. Mr. Hogg, in 1866, raised in Great Britain about \$2500. In 1867 the patriarch of the Coptic Church manifested the fiercest hostility to the mission; and obtaining, it is believed, at least the tacit consent and authority of the civil government, he instituted proceedings that at one time threatened the mission churches with great disaster. Finally, however, the Egyptian government, chiefly in consequence of the remonstrances of the English and American consuls, stopped the persecution. The last annual report on this mission, made to the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in May, 1868, states that in nearly all the churches gratifying accessions have been made to the membership during the past year, and that during the persecution only four shrunk back, all of whom subsequently returned. The Presbytery have taken the proper steps for each native church to have a native pastor duly called, ordained, and installed. The churches of Ghifs and Cairo already have called native pastors, and taken steps for providing the necessary salaries. The Presbytery of Egypt, in 1867, also adopted strong resolutions against the slave-trade, which is still carried on in Egypt with the connivance of the government.

**2. Statistics.** — The large majority of the inhabitants are Mohammedans. The theological school connected with the mosque of Cairo is one of the most frequented schools of the Islam. All the elementary schools and higher institutions for the Mohammedan population are of a strictly religious character. Mehemet Ali established several schools after the European model, in which young Egyptians were to be educated, partly by European teachers, for civil and military offices. Such schools were the medical school at Abu-Zahel, the cadet school at Gizeh, the marine school at Alexandria, the school of engineers at Chanka, the medical college of Casr-el-Ayin, the artillery school of Turrah, and the musical institute in the Citadel of Cairo. A special college for young Egyptians was also established in Paris. Several of these schools were, however, suppressed under the reign of Abbas Pasha. The most numerous body of Christians are the Copts, who have a patriarch, four metropolitans, and seven other bishops, and a population estimated from 150,000 to 250,000 souls. *SEE COPTS*. The number of United Copts, who recognize the authority of the Pope, is about 10,000. They have a vicar apostolic at Cairo. For the Latin Roman Catholics there is another vicar apostolic at Alexandria, who is at the same time delegate for the United Orientals of other rites than the



Coptic. According to letters of Roman Catholic missionaries, Alexandria had, in 1853, 7020 Latins, 600 United Copts, 240 Maronites, 350 Melchites (United Greeks), 50 Syrians, 60 Armenians — together 8320. The Roman Catholic population of Cairo at the same time consisted of 4148 Latins, 200 Melchites, 800 Copts, 300 Maronites, 300 Armenians, 200 Syrians, 100 Chaldees. Since then the Roman Catholic population of these two cities has undoubtedly largely increased in consequence of the rapid growth of the total population of the two cities; but no later trustworthy statistics are known. There are Franciscan monasteries at Alexandria, Damietta, Cairo, and two in Upper Egypt. The orthodox Greek Church has in Egypt a population of about 8000 souls. They are under the patriarch of Alexandria, who resides at Alexandria or Cairo, and whose official title is "The most Blessed and Holy Patriarch of the great City of Alexandria, and of all Egypt, Pentapolis, Libya, and Ethiopia, Pope, and (Ecumenical Judge." Four metropolical sees belong to the Greek patriarchate of Alexandria, viz.: 1. Libya; 2. Memphis; 3. Pelusium; 4. Metelis; but the last three appear to have been vacant for some time.

The mission of the American United Presbyterian Church reported at the General Assembly for 1888 the following statistics: missionaries, 12, including one medical missionary; congregations, 24; organized outstations, 85; communicants, 2307. The mission occupies seven central stations, the chief ones being at Alexandria, Cairo, Assifut, Feyum, and Ghifs. The theological school at Assifut had in 1888, 20 theological students. Schools for boys and girls are organized in connection with each of the five churches and at each of the out-stations. The distribution of the Bible is prosecuted by the agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by the American missionaries, by the Crischona mission, and by others. There were, in 1889, three depots in Cairo for the sale of the Bible, and the yearly sale of the Scriptures averaged from 7000 to 12,000 copies. The Crischona, or Pilgrim mission, at Basel, Switzerland, intended to establish a so-called "Apostles' Street," or series of twelve stations, from Alexandria far into the heart of Abyssinia. Of these, the following stations were, in 1866, in active operation in Egypt: St. Matthew's in Alexandria; St. Mark's in Cairo; St. Peter's at Assouan, at the falls of the Nile; St. Thomas at Khartoum, at the junction of the White and Blue Niles; and St. Paul's at Matammah, on the borders of Abyssinia. The deaconesses of Kaiserswerth have a hospital in Alexandria, and the first German Protestant church of Egypt was opened in 1866. — *Princeton Review*, 1850, page 260; 1856,

page 715; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, s.v.; Hardwick. *Christ and other Masters*, volume 2; *Journal of Sac. Lit.* 8, 9; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 6:707; *Christian Yearbook for 1867*, page 289; the Annual Reports of the U.P. Foreign Mission Board, in July number of *Evangel. Repository* (1860-1868). (A.J.S.)

## Egypt'ian

(properly *yræhæ Mitsri'*, Αἰγύπτιος; but often in the plur. as a rendering in the A.V. of *μυραϊνᾶε Egypt*), a native of the land of Egypt (q.v.); found in the sing. masc. (<sup><0301></sup>Genesis 39:1, etc.; <sup><4218></sup>Acts 21:38, etc.), fem. *tyræhæ* (<sup><0161></sup>Genesis 16:1), plur. masc. *myræhæ* (<sup><0122></sup>Genesis 12:12, 14; <sup><4022></sup>Acts 7:22, etc.), fem. *t/Yræhæ* (<sup><0119></sup>Exodus 1:19). The Egyptian insurrectionist of <sup><4218></sup>Acts 21:38, seems to have been a mountebank (γόης, Josephus, War, 2:13, 5), or pretended prophet (*Ant.* 20:7, 6). See PAUL. That country was proverbial for such characters.

## Egyptian Plagues

SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.,

## Egyptian Versions Of The Holy Scriptures.

After the death of Alexander the Great the Greeks multiplied in Egypt, and obtained important places of trust near the throne of the Ptolemies. The Greek language accordingly began to diffuse itself from the court among the people, so that the proper language of the country was either forced to adapt itself to the Greek both in construction and in the adoption of new words, or was entirely suspended. In this way originated the Coptic, compounded of the old Egyptian and the Greek. (See Tattam, *Egyptian Grammar of the Coptic, Sahidic, and Bashmuric Versions*, 2d edit. Lond. 1863.) SEE COPTIC LANGUAGE. There is a version in the dialect of Lower Egypt, usually called the *Coptic*, or, better, the *hemphitic* version; and there is another in the dialect of Upper Egypt, termed the *Sahidic*, and sometimes the *Thebaic*. See Davidson, *Bibl. Criticism*, 2:206 sq.; Scrivener, *Introd. to N.T.* page 270 sq.; Westcott, *N.T. Canon*, page 322 sq.

**1.** The *Memphitic* version of the Bible. — The O.T. in this version was made from the Septuagint and not from the original Hebrew. It would appear from Munter (*Specim. verss. Daniel Copt.* Romæ, 1786) that the

original was the Hesychian recension of the Sept. then current in the county. There is little doubt that all the O.T. books were translated, though many of them have not yet been discovered. Although this version (*not* the Thebaic) seems to be that exclusively used in the public services of the Copts, it was not known in Europe till Dr. Marshall, of Lincoln College, contributed some readings from it to bishop Fell's New Testament (Oxford, 1675). The Pentateuch has been published by Wilkins (London, 1731, 4to), by Fallet (Paris, 1854 sq.), and by De Lagarde (Leipz. 1867, 8vo); the Psalms at Rome (1744 and 1749) by the Propaganda Society. In 1837 Ideler published the Psalter more correctly; and in 1844 the best critical edition, by Schwartz, appeared. The twelve minor prophets were published by Tattam (Oxon. 1836, 8vo), and the major prophets by the same (1852). Bardelli published Daniel (Pisa, 1849). A few pieces of other books were printed at different times by Mingarelli, Quatrembre, and Munter. The N.T., made from the original Greek, was published by Wilkins, with a Latin translation (Oxford, 1716). In 1846 a new and more correct edition was begun by Schwartz, and continued, but in a different manner, after his death, by Botticher (1852, etc.). In 1848-52, the "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge" published the N.T. in Memphitic and Arabic (Lond. 2 volumes, fol.). The text was revised by Lieder. The readings of this version, as may be inferred from the place where it was made, coincide with the Alexandrine family, and deserve the attention of the critic. Unfortunately, the version has not yet been adequately edited. It belongs perhaps to the 3d century. See Davidson, in Home's *Introd.* 2:66.

**2.** The *Thebaic*. — This version was also made from the Greek, both in the O. and N.T., and probably in the 2d century. Only some fragments of the O.T. part have been printed by Munter, Mingarelli, and Zoega. In the N.T. it agrees generally, though not uniformly, with the Alexandrine family. Not a few readings, however, are peculiar; and some harmonize with the Latin versions. Fragments of it have been published by Mingarelli, Giorgi, Munter, and Ford.

**3.** The *Bashmuric*, or *Ammonian*. — Only some fragments of such a version in the O. and N.T. have been published, and very little is known concerning it. Scholars are not agreed as to the nature of the dialect in which it is written, some thinking that it does not deserve the name of a dialect, while others regard the Bashmuric as a kind of intermediate dialect between those spoken in Upper and Lower Egypt. Hug and De Wette are inclined to believe that it is merely the version of Upper Egypt transferred

to the idiom of the particular place where the Bashmuric was spoken. The origin of this version belongs to the 3d or 4th century. See Tregelles, in Home's *Introduct.* 4:287299. *SEE VERSIONS (OF THE BIBLE).*

## E'hi

(Hebrews *Echi'*, **yj æ**prob. a modified form of the name AHI; Sept. **Ἀγγίς**; Vulg. *Echi*), one of the "sons" of Benjamin (<sup><1421></sup>Genesis 46:21), apparently the grandson called AHIRAM *SEE AHIRAM* (q.v.) in <sup><1038></sup>Numbers 26:38 (from which the name is perhaps contracted). In the parallel passage (<sup><1386></sup>1 Chronicles 8:6) he seems to be called EHUD *SEE EHUD* (q.v.).

## E'hud

(Hebrews *Ehud'*, **dWħæ**union), the name of two or three Benjamites, and apparently hereditary in that tribe, like Gera (q.v.).

**1.** (Sept. **ᾠδ** v.r. **Ἄωδ**; Vulg. *Ahod.*) A descendant of Benjamin, progenitor of one of the clans of Geba that removed to Manahath (<sup><1330></sup>1 Chronicles 13:10). The name is there written **dWħæ***Echud'*, either for **dWħæ**as above, or altogether erroneously for **yj æ***Echi*. i.e. EHI *SEE EHI* (q.v.), the grandson of Benjamin, which appears in the parallel list of <sup><1421></sup>Genesis 46:21, and as a son of Belah according to the Sept. version of that passage. He seems to be the same as AHI-RAM, **μρυj æ** in the list in <sup><1038></sup>Numbers 26:38, and, if so; *Ahiram* is probably the right name, as the family were called *Ahiramites*. In <sup><1381></sup>1 Chronicles 8:1, the same person seems to be called **j rj æ**AHARAH, and perhaps also **j 'j a}**AHOAH, in verse 4 (Sept. **Ἀχιά**, and in Cod. Vatic. **Ἀχιράν**), **hYj æ**(**Ἀχιά**), *Ahiah*, verse 7, and **rj ei**(**Ἀφρ**), *Aher*, <sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 7:12. *SEE SHAHARAIM*. These fluctuations in the orthography seem to indicate that the original copies were partly effaced by time or injury. *SEE BECHER;SEE CHRONICLES*.

**2.** (Sept. **Ἀμείδ** v. r. **Ἄωθ**; Vulg. *Aod.*) The third named of the seven sons of Bilhan, the son of Jediael, and grandson of the patriarch Jacob (<sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 7:10). B.C. post 1856.

**3.** (Sept. **Ἄωδ**; Vulg. *Aod*; Josephus' **Ἡούδης**.) The son of Gera (there were three others of this name, <sup><1421></sup>Genesis 46:21; <sup><1065></sup>2 Samuel 16:5; <sup><1383></sup>1

Chronicles 8:3), of the tribe of Benjamin (<sup><OR16></sup>Judges 3:16, marg. "son of Jemini," but vid. Gesenius, *Lex.* sub v. <sup><OR16></sup>יִמְנֵאֵל the second judge of the Israelites, or, rather, of that part of Israel which he delivered from the dominion of the Moabites by the assassination of their king Eglon. These were the tribes beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side the river. In the Bible he is not called a judge, but a *deliverer* (i.e.); so Othniel (<sup><OR19></sup>Judges 3:9), and all the judges (<sup><OR27></sup>Nehemiah 9:27). As a Benjamite he was specially chosen to destroy Eglon, who had established himself in Jericho, which was included in the boundaries of that tribe. **SEE EGLON.** In Josephus he appears as a young man (<sup><OR16></sup>νεανίας). He was very strong, and left-handed. So A.V.; but the more literal rendering is, as in the margin, "shut of his right hand." The words are differently rendered: 1. left-handed, and unable to use his right; 2. using his left hand as readily as his right. For 1. Targum, Josephus, Syr. (*impotem*), Arab. (*aridum*), and Jewish writers generally; Cajet., Buxtorf, Parkh., Gesen. (*impeditus*): derivation of <sup><OR16></sup>rfa from <sup><OR16></sup>rfa; the latter only in <sup><OR16></sup>Psalm 69:16, where it = to shut. For 2. Sept. (<sup><OR16></sup>ἀμφιδέξιος), Vulg. (*qui utraque manu pro dextran utebatur*), Corn. a Lap., Bonfrer., Patrick (comp. <sup><OR16></sup>περιδέξιος, Hom. II. 21:163; Hipp. *Aph.* 7, 43); <sup><OR16></sup>Judges 20:16, sole recurrence of the phrase, applied to 700 Benjamites, the picked men of the army, who were not likely to be chosen for a physical defect. As regards <sup><OR16></sup>Psalm 69:16, it is urged that <sup><OR16></sup>rfa; may = *corono* = *aperio*; hence <sup><OR16></sup>rfae = *apertus* = *expeditus*, q.d. *expedita dextra*; or if "*clausus*," *clausus dextr* = *cinctus dextra* = <sup><OR16></sup>περιδέξιος, *ambidexter* (vid. Poli *Syn.*). The feint of drawing the dagger from the right thigh (<sup><OR16></sup>Judges 3:21) is consistent with either opinion. **SEE AMBIDEXTER.**

Ehud obtained access to Eglon as the bearer of tribute from the subjugated tribes, and being left-handed, or, rather, ambidextrous, he was enabled to use with a sure and fatal aim a dagger concealed under a part of his dress, where it was unsuspected, because it would there have been useless to a person employing his right hand. The circumstances attending this tragical event are somewhat differently given in Judges and in Josephus (see Winkler, *Unters. Schurer Schriftst.* 1:45 sq.; Redslob, in the *Studien v. Krit.* 9:912 sq.; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 2:375 sq.). That Ehud had the entree of the palace is implied in <sup><OR16></sup>Judges 3:19), but more distinctly stated in Josephus. In Judges the Israelites send a present by Ehud (<sup><OR16></sup>Judges 3:15); in Josephus. Ehud wins his favor by repeated presents of his own. Josephus represents this intimacy as having been of long continuance; but in Judges

we find no mention of intimacy, and only one occasion of a present being made, viz., that which immediately preceded the death of Eglon. In Judges we have two scenes, the offering of the present and the death scene, which are separated by the temporary withdrawal of Ehud (verses 18, 19); in Josephus there is but one scene. The present is offered, the attendants are dismissed, and the king enters into friendly conversation (*ὁμιλίαν*) with Ehud. In Judges the place seems to change from the reception-room into the "summer-parlor," where Ehud found him upon his return (comp. verses 18, 20). In Josephus the entire action takes place in the summer-parlor (*δωμάτιον*). In Judges the king exposes himself to the dagger by rising apparently in respect for the divine message which Ehud professed to communicate (Patrick, ad loc.); in Josephus it is a *dream* which Ehud pretends to reveal, and the king, in delighted anticipation, springs up from his throne. The obesity of Eglon, and the consequent impossibility of recovering the dagger, are not mentioned by Josephus (vid. <sup><ORIS></sup>Judges 3:17, *fat*, *ἄστειος*, Sept.; but "crassus," Vulg., and so Gesenius, *Lex.*). The "quarries that were by Gilgal," to which Ehud retired in the interval between the two interviews (<sup><ORIS></sup>Judges 3:19), are rendered in the margin better, as in <sup><ORIS></sup>Deuteronomy 7:25, "graven images" (Patrick, ad loc.; comp. Gesen. *Heb. Lex.* s.v. *μῦλ ὄστῃ*). *SEE EGLON.*

After this desperate achievement Ehud repaired to Seirah (improp. Seirath; see Gesen. *Lex.* s.v.), in the mountains of Ephraim (3:26, 27), or Mount Ephraim (<sup><ORIS></sup>Joshua 19:50). To this wild central region, commanding, as it did, the plains east and west, he summoned the Israelites by sound of horn (a national custom according to Josephus; A.V. "a trumpet"). Descending from the hills they fell upon the Moabites, dismayed and demoralized by the death of their king (Josephus, not Judges). The greater number were killed at once, but 10,000 men made for the Jordan with the view of crossing into their own country. The Israelites, however, had already seized the *fords*, and not one of the unhappy fugitives escaped. As a reward for his conduct Ehud was appointed judge (Josephus, not Judges). The Israelites continued to enjoy for eighty years (B.C. 1509-1430) the independence obtained through this deed of Ehud (<sup><ORIS></sup>Judges 3:15-30). *SEE JUDGES.*

## Ekdach

*SEE CARBUNCLE.*

## Eichhorn

Johann Gottfried, a celebrated German Orientalist and theologian, was born October 16, 1752, at Dorenzimmern, in the principality of Hohenlohe-Oehringen. He received his education at the gymnasium of Heilbronn and at the University of Gottingen, under Michaelis and Heyne. He became professor of Oriental literature at Jena in 1775, and was named court-councillor by the duke of Saxe-Weimar in 1783. In 1788 he succeeded Michaelis as professor of philosophy at the University of Gottingen, and in 1811 he was made professor of theology there, which post he retained until his death, June 25, 1827. Eichhorn was a thoroughly industrious student and a very voluminous writer. His first proof of Oriental knowledge was given in his *Geschichte des Ostindischen Handels vor Mohammed* (Gotha, 1775, 8vo). This was followed by *Monumenta antiquissima historiae Arabum., post Alb. Schultens, arabiae edidit, latine vertit, et animadvers. adjecit J. G. Eichhorn* (Gotha, 1775, 8vo): *De rei numemarie apud Arabos initiis* (Jena, 1776, 4to). At Jena he devoted himself to Biblical literature, and established, as a sort of organ, a magazine entitled *Repertorium fur biblische und morgenliindische Literatur*, which lasted from 1777 to 1786 (Leipzig), and was followed by the *Allgemeine Bibliothek d. biblischen Literatur* (Leipz. 1787-1803, 10 volumes, 8vo). His professorship at Gottingen opened to him a wider field (1788) after the death of J.D. Michaelis. He lectured not only on Oriental literature, and on the exegesis of the O. and N.T., but also in the field of general history, in which he soon appeared as an author. In 1790-93 appeared his *Urgeschichte* (Primitive History), edited by Gabler from the *Repertorium* (Nuremb. 8vo). His more important works, in addition, are *Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis* (Gotting. 1791, 2 volumes, 8vo): *Einteitung ins A.T.: Einleitung ins N.T.* (also published under the general title of *Kritische Schrifften*, Leips. 1804-1814, 8vo, 7 volumes). He also published a number of historical writings, besides many essays, reviews, etc.; and all this time his lectures were kept up in the university. The zealous and continued industry of Eichhorn is one of the marvels of modern literature.

As an interpreter of the Bible, Eichhorn, following Michaelis, transcended him in the boldness of his criticism and in his far-reaching Rationalism. The results of his criticism were that the Bible, *as we have it*, has only a moral and literary superiority over other, books. The primeval history attributed to Moses was made up of ancient *sagas*, and gathered up, partly, by Moses into the Pentateuch. His system of interpretation multiplies paradoxes, and

tends to uproot the Christian revelation, as such, entirely. In his view the Apocalypse is a prophetic drama, and he comments on it as he would on a play of Aristophanes or Terence. But his vast labors in Biblical literature retain great part of their reputation, while his method of interpretation is fast passing into oblivion, even in Germany. Saintes, *History of Rationalism*, chapter 11; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:710.

### Eichhorn, Karl Friedrich

son of Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (q.v.), was born at Jena in 1781. After completing his studies at the University of Gottingen, he became *privat-docent* of law at the University of Jena. In 1805 he was appointed professor at the University of Frankfort on the Oder, and in 1811 was transferred, with the university, to Berlin, where he edited, with Savigny, Goschen, and, later, with Rudorff, *the Zeitschrift firgeschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft*. From 1817 to 1828 he was professor of Church law, and other branches, at Gottingen; from 1831 to 1833 professor at the University of Berlin. In 1833 he was appointed a member of the supreme state court, and subsequently filled some other high offices in the civil administration. He was regarded as the head of the historical school of German jurists. He died at Berlin July 4, 1854. Besides a number of law books, which still occupy a high rank in that literature, he wrote a work on Church law (*Grundsitze des Kirchen; rechts der kathol. u. evangel. Religionsparteien*, Getting. 1831-1833). — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 11:470.

### Einhard

*SEE EGINHARD.*

### Einsiedeln

(*Maria-Einsiedeln, Deiparae Virginis Eremus, Notre Dame des Ermites*), a Benedictine monastery in Switzerland, founded in the 9th century by Meinrad of Soleure, who was murdered by robbers A.D. 861. In 934, Eberhard, provost of the cathedral of Strasburg, built a monastery and church here, which the emperor Otto, in 946, endowed with the free right of election. The convent was to be consecrated September 14, 948, by the bishop of Constanz, but the latter claimed to have heard the preceding night the song of angels, and to have seen Christ himself, attended by angels, saying mass and consecrating the chapel; and when, the next morning, he prepared to perform the act of consecration, he was



admonished by a voice saying, "Hold on, brother, God himself has dedicated the chapel." The story was believed, and on the sole strength of it the annual pilgrimage to Einsiedeln on September 14, to commemorate the "Angelic Consecration" (*Engel-Weihe*), "became, and still is, one of the most famous pilgrimages in the Church of Rome. The popes granted full absolution to all who went in pilgrimage to the church. The congregation consisted mostly of scions of noble families, and the convent steadily increased in power and riches. A new church was built in the beginning of the last century on the model of the Lateran Church, and contains Meinrad's cell and the image of the Virgin. In the time of the Reformation most of the monks left the convent, but it was subsequently reorganized by Ludwig Blarer, a Benedictine monk of St. Gall. In 1710, 260,000 are said to have visited Einsiedeln, and in 1851 the number was over 200,000. The vendors of blessed images, medals, etc., do a thriving business there, and at a large profit. There are at Einsiedeln confessionals for the people of different nations and languages, each bearing an inscription by which it is recognised. In 1867 the convent had 75 priests, and 6 clerical and 17 lay brothers. The "Stiftsschule" ("Gymnasium" and Lyceum) numbered about 200 pupils. Until 1852 the convent had a second "gymnasium" in Bellizona, in the canton of Tessin, but in that year it was suppressed by the Liberal government of the canton. See Placidus, *Documenta archivii Eiusidlensis* (3 volumes, folio); *Annales Heremi Deipares matris* (Frib. Brig. 1612, fol.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:742; Landolt, *Ursprung u. erste Gestaltung des Klosters Einsiedela* (Einsied. 1845); Brandes, *Der heil. Meinrad u. die Wallfahrt von Einsiedeln* (Einsiedeln, 1861).

### Eisenmenger, Johann Andreas

a German Orientalist, was born at Mannheim in 1654, and studied at the University of Heidelberg, in which, after a journey to England and Holland, he became in 1700 professor of Oriental languages. He died in 1704. His principal work is entitled *Entdecktes Judenthum* (Frankf. 1700). The Jews opposed its publication by all means in their power, and even obtained an imperial edict against it. At the time of his death nearly the whole edition of the work still lay under arrest. The Jews shortly before offered him 12,000 florins for the surrender of all the copies, but he asked 30,000. Friedrich I of Prussia appealed, in behalf of the heirs of Eisenmenger, to the emperors Leopold and Joseph for permission to publish the book, and, when this led to no result, had the book reprinted and published at his own expense (Konigsberg, 1711). Subsequently the Frankfort edition was also permitted

to see the light. Eisenmenger also compiled a *Lexicon Orientale harmonicum*, which has never been printed, and he published, conjointly with Leusden (q.v.), in 1694, an edition (without points) of the Hebrews Bible.—Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3:744; Hoefler, *Biog.* <sup><1157></sup>*Genesis* 15:776; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12:311; Jost, *Gesch. der Juden.* volume 8. (J.H.W.)

## E'ker

(Hebrews *id.* re'qoi, a plant *rooted up* and transplanted, e.g. metaph. a resident *foreigner*, <sup><1257></sup>*Leviticus* 25:47), the youngest of the three sons of Ram, the grandson of Hezron (<sup><127></sup>1 *Chronicles* 2:27; Sept. 'ΑΚχοπ, Vulg. Achar). B.C. post 1856.

## Ekkehard

the name of several learned monks of St. Gall. The first of the name, about the middle of the 10th century, was the director of the convent school, and subsequently dean of the convent. He laid the foundation of the literary celebrity of St. Gall, wrote several ecclesiastical hymns, and is honorably mentioned in the history of German literature. Another *Ekkehard*, a nephew of the former, was also a director of the convent school, and subsequently a chaplain of emperor Otto II. He also composed ecclesiastical hymns, and is supposed to have been familiar with stenography. He died April 23, 990. A third *Ekkehard*, born about 980, was a pupil of Notker Labeo, and became distinguished for his knowledge of Latin, Greek, German, mathematics, astronomy, and music. Aribo, archbishop of Mentz, appointed him superior of the cathedral school of that city. He continued the *Annals of St. Gall*, which a monk by the name of Ratpertus had begun and carried to the year 883. This work, *Casus Monasterii Sancti Galli* (printed in *Monumenta Germaniae histor. Scriptor.* 2:74-163) is of great importance for the Church history of the 10th century. Ekkehard also compiled a collection of ecclesiastical hymns, under the title *Liber Benedictionum*. He wrote a poem, *De ornatu dictionis*, and translated a life of St. Gall, in German verses by Ratpertus, into Latin. He died in 1036. A fourth *Ekkehard*, who lived at the beginning of the 12th century, wrote a *Vita Sancti Notkeri*. — *Herzog, Real-Encyklop.* 3:745. (A.J.S.)

## Ek'rebel

(Ἐκρεβήλ; Pesh. *Ecrabat*; Vulg. omits), a place named in Jud. 7:18 only, as "near to Chusi, which is on the brook Mochmur," apparently somewhere in the hill country to the south-east of the Plain of Esdraelon and of Dothain. The Syriac reading of the word points to the place *Acrabbein*, mentioned by Eusebius in the *Onomasticon* as the capital of a district called *Acrabatine*, and still standing as *Akrabah*, about six miles south-east of Nablus (Shechem), in the Wady Makfuriyeh, on the road to the Jordan valley (Van de Velde, 2:304, and Map). Though frequently mentioned by Josephus (*War*, 2:20, 4; 3:3, 5, etc.), neither the place nor the district are named in the Bible, and they must not be confounded with those of the same name in the south of Judah. *SEE AKRABBIM*; *SEE ARABATTINE*; *SEE MAALEH-ACRABBIM*.

## Ek'ron

(Hebrews *Ekron*, עֲקֹרֹן, *eradication*, comp. <sup><0304></sup>Zephaniah 2:4, which apparently contains a play upon the word; Sept. [usually] and Josephus Ἀκκαρόν, *Vulg. Accaron*), one of the five towns belonging to the lords of the Philistines, and the most northerly of the five (<sup><0638></sup>Joshua 13:3). Like the other Philistine cities, its situation was in the maritime plain. In the general distribution of territory (unconquered as well as conquered) Ekron was assigned to Judah, as being upon its border (<sup><0638></sup>Joshua 13:3), between Bethshemesh and Jabneel (<sup><0651></sup>Joshua 15:11, 45), but apparently was afterwards given to Dan, although conquered by Judah (<sup><0651></sup>Joshua 15:11, 45; 19:43; <sup><0618></sup>Judges 1:18; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 5:1, 22; 5:2, 4). But it mattered little to which tribe it nominally belonged, for before the monarchy it was again in full possession of the Philistines (<sup><0650></sup>1 Samuel 5:10). In Scripture Ekron is chiefly remarkable from the ark having been sent home from thence, upon a new cart drawn by two much kine (<sup><0650></sup>1 Samuel 5:10; 6:1-8). Ekron was the last place to which the ark was carried before its return to Israel, and the mortality there in consequence seems to have been greater than at either Ashdod or Gath. (The Sept. in both MSS., and Josephus [*Ant.* 6:1, 1], substitute Ascalon for Ekron throughout this passage [<sup><0650></sup>1 Samuel 5:10-12]. In support of this it should be remarked that, according to the Hebrew text, the golden trespass-offerings were given for Ashkelon, though it is omitted from the detailed narrative of the journeyings of the ark. There are other important differences between the Sept. and Hebrew texts of this transaction. See especially verse 60) From

Ekron to Bethshemesh (q.v.) was a straight highway (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:309). After David's victory over Goliath, the Philistines were pursued as far as this place (<sup><0175></sup>1 Samuel 17:52). Henceforward Ekron appears to have remained uninterruptedly in the hands of the Philistines (<sup><0175></sup>1 Samuel 17:52; <sup><1002></sup>2 Kings 1:2,16; <sup><2253></sup>Jeremiah 25:20). Except the casual mention of a noted sanctuary of Baalzebul (q.v.) existing there (<sup><1002></sup>2 Kings 1:2, 3, 6, 16), there is nothing to distinguish Ekron from any other town of this district. In later days it is merely named with the other cities of the Philistines in the denunciations of the prophets against that people (<sup><2253></sup>Jeremiah 25:20; Amos 1:8; <sup><3104></sup>Zephaniah 2:4; <sup><3005></sup>Zechariah 9:5). The name occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.) of the Assyrian monuments. In the Apocropha it appears as *Accaron* (Ἀκκαρόν, 1 Macc. 10:89, only), bestowed with its borders (τὰ ὄρια αὐτῆς) by Alexander Balas on Jonathan Maccabaeus as a reward for his services. Eusebius and Jerome describe it (*Onomast.* s.v. ] Ἀκκαρόν, *Accaron*) as a large village of the Jews, between Azotus and Jamnia towards the east, or eastward of a line drawn between these two places., The same name *Accaron* occurs incidentally in the histories of the Crusades (*Gesta Dei per Francos*, page 404). The site of Ekron has lately been recognized by Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Researcher*, 3:24) in that of 'Akir, in a situation corresponding to all that we know of Ekron. The radical letters of the Arabic name are the same as those of the Hebrew, and both the Christians and Moslems of the neighborhood regard the site as that of the ancient Ekron. It is a considerable Moslem village, about five miles southwest of Ramleh, and three due east of Yebna, on the northern side of the important valley Wady Surar. It is built of unburnt bricks, and, as there are no apparent ruins, the ancient town was probably of the same materials. It is alleged, however, that cisterns and the stones of hand-mills are often found at Akir and in the adjacent fields. The plain south is rich, but immediately round the village it has a dreary, forsaken appearance (hence perhaps the name = "wasteness"), only relieved by a few scattered stunted trees (Porter, *Handb.* page 275; and see Van de Velde, 2:169).

### Ek'ronite

(Hebrews *Ekroni'*, <sup><0175></sup>יֶקְרוֹנִי, <sup><0638></sup>Joshua 13:3, Sept. Ἀκκαρωνίτης, *Vulg.* *Accaronite*; plur. <sup><0175></sup>יֶקְרוֹנִי, <sup><0650></sup>1 Samuel 5:10, Ἀσκαλωνίται, *Accaronitae*), a native of the Philistine town *EIRON* (q.v.).

## El-

(*l aem*ighty, hence *God*, either Jehovah or a false deity; sometimes a *hero* or *magistrate*, *SEE GOD*, ) occurs as a prefix (and also as a suffix) to several Hebrews names, e.g. EL-BETH-EL; EL-EL-OHI-ISRA-EL, all of which see in their place. *SEE ELI*-.

## E'la

(*Ἠλά*, Vulg. *Jolaman*), one of the heads of clans (or places) whose "sons" had taken foreign wives after the Babylonian exile (1 Esdr. 9:27); evidently the ELAM *SEE ELAM* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<sup><1307></sup>Ezra 10:26). *SEE ELAH*.

## El'adah

(Hebrews *Eladah'*, *hd[ ] æ* whom *God has put on*, i.e., fills with himself; Sept. *Ἐλαδά* v.r. *Ἐλεαδά*, Vulg. *Elada*), one of the sons (rather than grandson or later descendant, as the text seems to state) of Ephraim (<sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 7:20), perhaps the same as ELEAD *SEE ELEAD* (q.v.) of verse 21, since several of the names [*SEE TAHATH*] in the list appear to be repeated (compare <sup><0935></sup>Numbers 26:36, where the only corresponding name is ERAN). *SEE BERIAH*.

## E'lah

(Hebrews *Elah'*, *hl aeterebinth* or oak [q.v.]), the name of a place, and also of five men.

**1.** The VALLEY OF ELAH- (*hl aeterebinth* or oak; Sept. *ἡ κοιλάς Ἠλά*, but translates *ἡ κοιλάς τῆς δρυός* in <sup><0972></sup>1 Samuel 17:2, 19; Vulg. likewise *vallis terebinthi*), a valley in (not "by," as the A.V. has it) which the Israelites were encamped against the Philistines when David killed Goliath (<sup><0972></sup>1 Samuel 17:2, 19; 21:9). It lay somewhere near Shocoh of Judah, and Azekah, and was nearer Ekron than any other Philistine town (1 Samuel 17). Shocoh has been with great probability identified with Shuweikeh, near Beit Netif, some 14 miles S.W. of Jerusalem, on the road to Beit Jibrin and Gaza, among the more western of the hills of Judah, not far from where they begin to descend into the great Philistine plain. The village stands on the south slopes of the *wady es-Sumt*, or *valley of the acacia*, which runs off in a N.W. direction across the plain

to the sea just above Ashdod. Above Shuweikeh it branches into two other wadys. Large, though inferior in size to itself, and the junction of the three forms a considerable open space of not less than a mile wide cultivated in fields of grain. In the center is a wide torrent bed thickly strewn with round pebbles, and bordered by the acacia bushes from which the valley derives its present name. There seems to be no reason to doubt that this is the Valley of the Terebinth. It has changed its name, and is now called after another kind of tree (the *sumt*, or acacia), but the terebinth (*butm*) appears to be plentiful in the neighborhood, and one of the largest specimens in Palestine still stands in the immediate neighborhood of the spot, in wady Sur, the southernmost of the branch wadys. Four miles E. of Shuweikeh, along wady Musur, the other branch, is the khan and ruined site Akbeh, which van de Velde proposes to identify with Azekah. These identifications are confirmed by that of Ephesdammim (q.v.), the site of the Philistine camp. Ekron is 17 miles, and Bethlehem 12 miles distant from Shochoh. (For the valley, see Robinson, *Researches*, 2:350; Van de Velde, *Narrative*, 2:191; Porter, *Handbook*, pages 249, 250, 280; Schwarz, *Palest.* page 77.)

There is a point in the topographical indications of 1 Samuel 17 which it is very desirable should be carefully examined on the spot. The Philistines were between Shochoh and Azekah, at Ephesdammim, or Pasdammim, on the mountain on the S. side of the wady, while the Israelites were in the "valley" (qemoi) of the terebinth, or, rather, on the mountain on the N. side, and "the ravine" or "the glen" (ayjsh) was between the two armies (verses 2, 3). Again (verse 52), the Israelites pursued the Philistines "till you come to 'the ravine'" (the same word). There is evidently a marked difference between the "valley" and the "ravine," and a little attention on the spot might do much towards elucidating this, and settling the identification of the place. In the above location, the distance between the armies was about a mile, and the vale beneath is flat and rich. The ridges rise on each side to the height of about 500 feet, and have a uniform slope, so that the armies ranged along them could see the combat in the vale. The Philistines, when defeated, fled down the valley towards Gath and Ekron.

The traditional "Valley of the Terebinth" is the *wady Beit-Hanina*, which lies about 4 miles to the N.W. of Jerusalem, and is crossed by the road to Nebi Samwil. The scene of David's conflict is pointed out a little N. of the "Tombs of the Judges," and close to the traces of the old paved road. In this valley olive trees and carob-trees now prevail, and terebinth-trees are

few; but the brook is still indicated whence the youthful champion selected the "smooth stones" wherewith he smote the Philistine. The brook is dry in summer, but in winter it becomes a mighty torrent, which inundates the vale (Kitto, *Pictorial Palestine*, page 121). But this spot is in the tribe of Benjamin, and otherwise does not correspond with the narrative of the text (see Thenius, *Sachs exeg. Stud.* 2:151).

2. (Sept. Ἡλάς, but Ἡλάς in Chron.; Vulg. *Ella*.) One of the Edomitish "dukes" or chieftains in Mount Seir (<sup><1341></sup>Genesis 36:41; <sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 1:52), B.C. post 1963. By Knobel (*Comment. zu Genesis* in loc.) he is connected with Elath (q.v.) on the Red Sea.
3. (Sept. Ἀδά v.r. Ἀλά.) The middle one of the three sons of Caleb the son of Jephunneh (<sup><1345></sup>1 Chronicles 4:15), B.C. 1618. In that passage his sons are called Kenaz or Uknaz, but the words may be taken as if Kenaz was, with Elah, a son of Caleb. It is a singular coincidence that the names of both Elah and Kenaz also appear among the Edomitish "dukes."
4. (Properly ELA, Hebrews *Ela'*, al æSept. Ἡλά.) The father of Shimei ben-Ela, Solomon's commissariat officer in Benjamin (<sup><1048></sup>1 Kings 4:18), B.C. 1013.
5. (Sept. Ἡλά, Josephus Ἡλανος, Vulg. *Ela*.) The son and successor of Baasha, king of Israel (<sup><1168></sup>1 Kings 16:8-10); his reign lasted for little more than a year (compare verse 8 with 10), B.C. 928-7. He was killed while drunk by Zimri, in the house of his steward Arza, who was probably a confederate in the plot. This occurred, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 8:12, 4), while his army and officers were absent at the siege of Gibbethon. He was the last king of Baasha's line, and by this catastrophe the predictions of the prophet Jehu were accomplished (<sup><1166></sup>1 Kings 16:6, 7, 11-14).
6. (Sept. Ἡλά.) The father of Hoshea, last king of Israel (<sup><1250></sup>2 Kings 15:30; 17:1), B.C. 729, or ante.
7. (Sept. Ἡλά v.r. Ἡλό, Vulg. *Ela*.) The son of Uzzi, and one of the Benjamite heads of families who were taken into captivity (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 9:8), or rather, perhaps, returned from it. B.C. 516.

## Elah

SEE OAK; SEE TEREBINTH.

## Elais

(Ἐλαΐς), a Phoenician city mentioned by Dionysius (*Perieg.* 910) and other ancient authors as lying between Joppa and Gaza, but apparently merely an appellative (see Reland, *Palaest.* page 747) for some place noted for olives (ἐλαία), which abound in that entire region.

## E'lam

(Hebrews *Eylam'*, מל י[ע corresponding to the Pehlvi *Airjama* [see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* page 1016]), the name of a man and of the region settled by his posterity, also of several Hebrews, especially about the time of the Babylonian captivity.

**1.** (Sept. Ἐλάμ; Josephus Ἐλαμος, *Ant.* 1:6, 4; Vulg. *AElam.*) Originally, like Aram, the name of a man — the son of Shem (<sup><0102></sup>Genesis 10:22; <sup><0307></sup>1 Chronicles 1:17). B.C. post 2514. Commonly, however, it is used as the appellation of a country (<sup><0140></sup>Genesis 14:1, 9; <sup><0311></sup>Isaiah 11:11; 21:2; <sup><0225></sup>Jeremiah 25:25; 49:34-39; <sup><0524></sup>Ezekiel 32:24; <sup><0702></sup>Daniel 8:2). In <sup><0140></sup>Genesis 14:1, it is introduced along with the kingdom of Shinar in Babylon, and in <sup><0202></sup>Isaiah 21:2, and <sup><0225></sup>Jeremiah 25:25, it is connected with Media. In <sup><0500></sup>Ezra 4:9, the Elamites are described among the nations of the Persian empire; and in <sup><0702></sup>Daniel 8:2, Susa is said to lie on the river Ulai (Eulaeus or Choaspes), in the province of Elam. This river was the modern Karun (Layard, *Nineveh and Bab.* page 146), and the capital of Elam was Shushan (q.v.), one of the most powerful and magnificent cities of the primeval world. The name Elam occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.) found on the bulls in Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh. The country was also called *Nuvaki*, as we learn from the monuments of Khorsabad and Besutun (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* page 452).

The Elam of Scripture appears to be the province lying south of Assyria and east of Persia Proper, to which Herodotus gives the name of *Cissia* (3:91; verse 49, etc.), and which is in part termed *Susis* or *Susiana* by the geographers (Strab. 15:3, § 12; Ptolem. 6:3, etc.). It includes a portion of the mountainous country separating between the Mesopotamian plain and the high table-land of *Iran*, together with a fertile and valuable low tract at the foot of the range, between it and the Tigris. The passage of Daniel (8:2) which places Shushan (Susa) in "the province of Elam," may be regarded as decisive of this identification, which is further confirmed by the frequent mention of Elymseans in this district (Strab. 11:13, § 6; 16:1, §



17; Ptolem. 6:3; Plin. *H.N.* 6:26, etc.), as well as by the combinations in which Elam is found in Scripture (see <sup><0140></sup>Genesis 14:1; <sup><2302></sup>Isaiah 21:2; <sup><5214></sup>Ezekiel 32:24). It appears from <sup><0102></sup>Genesis 10:22, that this country was originally peopled by descendants of Shem, closely allied to the Aramaeans (Syrians) and the Assyrians; and from <sup><0140></sup>Genesis 14:1-12, it is evident that by the time of Abraham a very important power had been built up in the same region. Not only is "Chedorlaomer, king of Elam," at the head of a settled government, and able to make war at a distance of two thousand miles from his own country, but he manifestly exercises a supremacy over a number of other kings, among whom we even find Amraphel, king of Shinar, or Babylonia. It is plain, then, that at this early time the predominant power in Lower Mesopotamia was Elam, which for a while held the place possessed earlier by Babylon (<sup><0100></sup>Genesis 10:10), and later by either Babylon or Assyria. Discoveries made in the country itself confirm this view. They exhibit to us Susa, the Elamitic capital, as one of the most ancient cities of the East, and show that its monarchs maintained, throughout almost the whole period of Babylonian and Assyrian greatness, a quasi-independent position. Traces are even thought to have been found of Chedorlaomer himself, whom some are inclined to identify with an early Babylonian monarch, who is called the "Ravager of the West," and whose name reads as Kudur-mapula. The Elamitic empire established at this time was, however, but of short duration. Babylon and Assyria proved, on the whole, stronger powers, and Elam during the period of their greatness can only be regarded as the foremost of their feudatories. Like the other subject nations she retained her own monarchs, and from time to time, for a longer or a shorter space, asserted and maintained her independence. But generally she was content to acknowledge one or other of the two leading powers as her suzerain. Towards the close of the Assyrian period she is found allied with Babylon, and engaged in hostilities with Assyria; but she seems to have declined in strength after the Assyrian empire was destroyed, and the Median and Macedonian arose upon its ruins. Elam is clearly a "province" of Babylonia in Belshazzar's time (<sup><2702></sup>Daniel 8:2), and we may presume that it had been subject to Babylon at least from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. The desolation which <sup><3400></sup>Jeremiah 49:30-34 and <sup><5214></sup>Ezekiel 32:24, 25 foresaw was probably this conquest, which destroyed the last semblance of Elamitic independence. It is uncertain at what time the Persians added Elam to their empire. Possibly it only fell under their dominion together with Babylon; but there is some reason to think that it may have revolted and joined the Persians before the city was besieged.

The prophet Isaiah in two places (~~22:2~~ Isaiah 21:2; 22:6) seems to speak of Elam as taking part in the destruction of Babylon; and, unless we are to regard him with our translators as using the word loosely for Persia, we must suppose that, on the advance of Cyrus and his investment of the Chaldaean capital, Elam made common cause with the assailants. She now became merged in the Persian empire, forming a distinct satrapy (Herod. 3:91), and furnishing to the crown an annual tribute of 300 talents. Susa, her capital, was made the ordinary residence of the court, and the metropolis of the whole empire. This mark of favor did not, however, prevent revolts. Not only was the Magian revolution organized and carried out at Susa, but there seem to have been at least two Elamitic revolts in the early part of the reign of Darius Hystaspis (*Behistun Inscr.* col. 1, part 16, and col. 2, part 3). After these futile efforts, Elam acquiesced in her subjection, and, as a Persian province, followed the fortunes of the empire. These historic facts illustrate the prophecy of ~~44:5~~ Jeremiah 49:35-39, "And upon Elam will I bring the four winds from the four quarters of heaven, and I will scatter them towards all these winds." The situation of the country exposed it to the invasions of Assyrians, Medes, and Babylonians; and it suffered from each in succession before it was finally embodied in the Persian empire. Then another part of the prophecy was also singularly fulfilled: "I will set my throne in Elam, and I will destroy from thence the king and princes." The present state of the Persian empire, in which Elam is included, may be a fulfillment of the concluding words of the passage: "But it shall come to pass in the latter days that I will bring again the captivity of Elam" (Vaux, *Nineveh and Persepolis*, page 85 sq.). **SEE PERSIA.**

Herodotus gives the name Cissia to the province of; which Susa was the capital (3:91); Strabo distinguishes between Susiana and the country of the Elymians. The latter he extends northwards among the Zagros mountains (11:361; 15:503; 16:507). Pliny says Susiana is separated from Elymais by the River Eulaeus, and that the latter province extends from that river to the confines of Persia (*Hist. Nat.* 6:27). Ptolemy locates Elymais on the coast of the Persian Gulf, and regards it as part only of Susiana (*Geogr.* 6:3). According, to Josephus, the Elymaeans were the progenitors of the Persians (*Ant.* 1:6, 4); and Strabo refers to some of their scattered tribes as far north as the Caspian Sea. From these various notices, and from the incidental allusions in Scripture, we may conclude that there was a little province on the east of the Lower Tigris called Elymais; but that the Elymaeans, as a people, were anciently spread over and ruled a much wider

district, to which their name was often attached. They were a warlike people, trained to arms, and especially skilled in the use of the bow (<sup><220D></sup>Isaiah 21:2; <sup><244B></sup>Jeremiah 49:35); they roamed abroad like the Bedawin, and like them, too, were addicted to plunder (Strabo, 11:361). Josephus mentions a town called Elymais, which contained a famous temple dedicated to Diana, and rich in gifts and votive offerings (*Ant.* 22:9, 1); Appian says it was dedicated to Venus (Bochart, *Opp.* 1:70 sq.). Antiochus Epiphanes attempted to plunder it, but was repulsed (1 Macc. 6). It is a remarkable fact that little images of the goddess, whose Assyrian name was Anaitis, were discovered by Loftus in the mounds of Susa (*Chaldea*, page 379). The Elamites who were in Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost were probably descendants of the captive tribes who had settled in Elam (<sup><411D></sup>Acts 2:9).

It has been repeatedly observed above that Elam is called Cissia by Herodotus, and Susiana by the Greek and Roman geographers. The latter is a term formed artificially from the capital city, but the former is a genuine territorial title, and probably marks an important fact in the history of the country. The Elamites, a Shemitic people, who were the primitive inhabitants (<sup><011D></sup>Genesis 10:22), appear to have been invaded and conquered at a very early time by a Hamitic or Cushite race from Babylon, which was the ruling element in the territory from a date anterior to Chedorlaomer. These *Cushites* were called by the Greeks *Cissians* (Κίσσηοι) or *Cossaeans* (Κοσσαῖοι), and formed the dominant race, while the Elamites or Elymseans were in a depressed condition. In Scripture the country is called by its primitive title without reference to subsequent changes; in the Greek writers it takes its name from the conquerors. The Greek traditions of Memnon and his *Ethiopians* are based upon this Cushite conquest, and rightly connect the Cissians or Cossaeans of Susiana with the Cushite inhabitants of the upper valley of the Nile.

The fullest account of Elam, its physical geography, ruins, and history, is given in Loftus's *Chaldaeae and Susiana* (London 1856; N.Y. 1857). The southern part of the country is flat, and towards the shore of the gulf marshy and desolate. In the north the mountain ranges of Backhtiari and Luristan rise gradually from the plain in a series of calcareous terraces, intersected by ravines of singular wildness and grandeur. Among these mountains are the sources of the Ulai (Loftus, page 308, 347 sq.). The chief towns of Elymais are now Shuster ("little Shush") and Dizful; but the greater part of the country is overrun by nomad Arabs. *SEE ELAMIT.*

2. (Sept. Ἰενουηλωλάμ v.r. Ἰωλάμ, also Ὠλλάμ and Αἰλάμ; Vulg. *Elnam*.) A Korhite Levite, fifth son of Meshelemiah, one of the Bene-Asaph, and superintendent of the fifth division of Temple wardens in the time of king David (<sup><1318></sup>1 Chronicles 26:3), B.C. 1014.
3. (Sept. Ἀηλάμ v.r. Αἰλαμ, Vulg. *AElam*.) A chief man of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the sons of Shashak, resident at Jerusalem at the captivity or on the return (<sup><1328></sup>1 Chronicles 8:24), B.C. 536 or ante.
4. (Sept. Αἰλάμ, Ἡλάμ, Vulg. *AElam*.) "Children of Elam," *Bene-Elam*, to the number of 1254, returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (<sup><1507></sup>Ezra 2:7; <sup><1472></sup>Nehemiah 7:12; 1 Esdr. 5:12), and a further detachment of 71 men with Ezra in the second caravan (<sup><1507></sup>Ezra 8:7; 1 Esdr. 8:33). It was one of this family, Shechaniah, son of Jehiel, who encouraged Ezra in his efforts against the indiscriminate marriages of the people (<sup><1507></sup>Ezra 10:2, text μί / [ei.e., μί / [ , Olam), and six of the Bene-Elam accordingly put away their foreign wives (<sup><1506></sup>Ezra 10:26). The lists of Ezra ii and Nehemiah vii contain apparently an irregular mixture of the names of places and of persons. In the former, verses 21-34, with one or two exceptions, are names of places; 3419, on the other hand, are not known as names of places, and are probably of persons. No such place as Elam is mentioned as in Palestine, either in the Bible or in the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius, nor has since been discovered as existing in the country, although Schwarz endeavors (*Palest.* page 143) to give the word a local reference to the grave of a Samaritan priest Eli, at a village named by him as *Charim ben-Elim*, on the bay, 8 miles N.N.E. of Jaffa. *SEE HARIM*. Most interpreters have therefore concluded that it was a person. B.C. ante 536. It is possible, however, that this and the following name have been borrowed from number 1, perhaps as designating Jews who resided in that region of the Babylonian dominions during the captivity.
5. In the same lists is a second Elam, whose sons, to the same number as in the former case, returned with Zerubbabel (<sup><1523></sup>Ezra 2:31; <sup><14734></sup>Nehemiah 7:34), and which, for the sake of distinction, is called "the other Elam" (rj αιμιλ γ[; Sept. Ἡλαμάρ, Ἡλαμαάρ, Vulg. *AElam alter*). The coincidence of the numbers is curious, and also suspicious, as arguing an accidental repetition of the foregoing name. B.C. ante 536.

6. (Sept. **Αἰλάμ**, Vulg. *AElam*.) One of the sacerdotal or Levitical singers who accompanied Nehemiah at the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem (<sup><162D></sup>Nehemiah 12:42). B.C. 446.
7. (Sept. **Ἡλάμ**, Vulg. *AElam*.) One of the chiefs of the people who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (<sup><160H></sup>Nehemiah 10:14), B.C. 410.

## E'lamite

(Chald. *Elamay'*, **ymī** [ **ē** in the plural **aymā**] [ **e** Gr. **Ἐλυναῖοι**, Strabo, Ptolemy; or **Ἐλαμίται**, <sup><41D></sup>Acts 2:9; Vulg. *AElamitae*). This word is found in the O.T. only in <sup><150D></sup>Ezra 4:9, and is omitted in that place by the Sept. translators, who probably regarded it as a gloss upon "Susanchites," which had occurred only a little before. The Elamites were the original inhabitants of the country called Elam; they were descendants of Shem, and drew their name from an actual man, Elam (<sup><111D></sup>Genesis 10:22). It has been observed in the preceding article that the Elamites yielded before a Cossaeon or Cushite invasion. **SEE ELAM**. They appear to have been driven in part to the mountains, where Strabo places them (11:13, § 6; 16:1, § 17), in part to the coast, where they are located by Ptolemy (6:3). Little is known of their manners and customs, or of their ethnic character. (See Muller, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1839, 7:299; Wahl, *Asien*, page 603; Mannert, *Geogr.* 5:2:158; comp. Plutarch, *Vit. Pomp.* 36; Justin. 36:1; Tacit. *Annul.* 6:44). Strabo says they were skillful archers (15:3, § 10; comp. Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 2:1, 16; Livy, 35:48; Appian, *Syr.* 32), and with this agree the notices both of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the latter of whom speaks of "the bow of Elam" (<sup><230B></sup>Isaiah 49:35), while the former says that "Elam bare the quiver" (<sup><221B></sup>Jeremiah 22:6). Isaiah also adds in this place that they fought both on horseback and from chariots. They appear to have retained their nationality with peculiar tenacity, for it is plain from the mention of them on the day of Pentecost (<sup><41D></sup>Acts 2:9) that they still at that time kept their own language, and the distinct notice of them by Ptolemy more than a century later seems to show that they were not even then merged in the Cossaeans. — (See Hassel, *Erdbeschr. v. Asien*, 2:769 sq.; Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* III, 2:419, 744; comp. Herod. 1:102; Arrian, *Ind.* 42; Pliny, 6:31; Strabo, 15:728.) In Judith 1:6, the name is given in the Greek form as Elymaeans, and in 1 Macc. 6:1, mention is made of a city ELYMAYS **SEE ELYMAYS** (q.v.).