THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Elasah - Engine

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

El'asah

[some *Ela'sah*] (Hebrews *Elasah',* hv;[;l][, whom *God made;* Vulg. *Elasa),* the name of four men (variously Anglicized in the A.V.). *SEE ELEASA*.

1. (Sept. Ἐλεασά.*)* The son of Helez, and father of Sisamai; one of the descendants of Judah, of the family of Hezron (<130239>1 Chronicles 2:39, A.V. "Eleasah"). B.C. post 1046.

2. (Sept. Ἐλεασά v.r. Ἐλασά, A.V. "Eleasah.") A son of Rapha or Repharah, and father of Azel; descendant of king Saul through Jonathan and Meribbaal or Mephibosheth (<130837>1 Chronicles 8:37; 9:43). B.C. considerably ante 588.

3. (Sept. Ἐλεασάρ v.r. Ἐλεασάν, A.V. "Elasah.") The son of Shaphan; one of the two men who were sent on a mission by king Zedekiah to Nebuchadnezzar at Babylon after the first deportation from Jerusalem, and who at the same time took charge of the letter of Jeremiah the prophet to the captives in Babylon (<242903>Jeremiah 29:3). B.C. 594.

4. (Sept. Ἠλασά, A.V. "Elasah.") One of the Bene-Pashur, a priest, who renounced the Gentile wife whom he had married after the return from Babylon (<150222>Ezra 10:22). B.C. 458.

E'lath

(Hebrews *Eylath',* tl;yae *grove,* perhaps of TEREBINTH-trees; occurs in this form <050208>Deuteronomy 2:8; <121422>2 Kings 14:22; 16:6; also in the plur. form tl/yae ELATH *SEE ELATH* [q.v.], <110926>1 Kings 9:26; <141817>2 Chronicles 8:17; 26:2; "Elath," <121606>2 Kings 16:6; in the Sept. Αἰλάθ and Αἰλών; in Joseph. [*Ant.* 8:6,4] Αἰλανή; in Jerome, *Ailath* [who says that in his day it was called *Ailah,* to which its appellation in Arabic writers corresponds]; by the Greeks and Romans, *Elana* or *AElana,* Ἐλάνα [Ptol. 5:17, [Αἴλανα [Strabo, 16:768; comp. Pliny, 5:12; 6:32]; in Arabic authors *Ailah*), a city of Idumaea, having a port on the eastern arm or gulf of the Red Sea, which thence received the name of Sinus Elaniticus (Gulf of Akabah). According to Eusebius *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἡλάθ), it was ten miles east from Petra. It must have been situated at the extremity of the valley of El-Ghor, which runs at the bottom of two parallel ranges of hills, north and south, through Arabia Petraea, from the Dead Sea to the

northern parts of the Elanitic Gulf; but on which side of the valley it lay has been matter of dispute (see M'Culloch's *Geog. Dict.* s.v. Akabah). In the geography of Arabia it forms the extreme northern limit of the province of the Hijoz (El-Makrizi, *Khitat;* and *Maraisid*, s.v.; *SEE ARABIA*), and is connected with some points of the history of the country. According to several native writers the district of Ailah was in very ancient times peopled by the Sameyda, said to be a tribe of the Amalekites (the first Amalek). The town itself, however, is stated to have received its name from Eyleh, daughter of Midian (El-Makrizi's *Khitat,* s.v.; Caussin's *Essai sur l'Histoire des Arabes*, 1:23). The Amalekites, if we may credit the writings of Arabic historians, passed in the earliest times from the neighborhood of the Persian Gulf through the peninsula (spreading over the greater part of it), and thence finally passed into Arabia Petraea. Future researches may trace in these fragments of primeval tradition the origin of the Phoenicians. Herodotus seems to strengthen such a supposition when he says that the latter people came from the Erythrean Sea. Were the Phoenicians a mixed Cushite settlement from the Persian Gulf, who carried with them the known maritime characteristics of the peoples of that stock, developed in the great commerce of Tyre, and in that of the Persian Gulf, and, as a link between their extreme eastern and western settlements, in the fleets that sailed from Ezion-geber and Elath, and from the southern ports of the Yemen? *SEE ARABIA; SEE CAPHTOR; SEE MIZRAIM*. It should be observed, however, that Tyrian sailors manned the fleets of Solomon and of Jehoshaphat (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* October 1851, page 153, n.).

The first time that Elath is mentioned in Scripture is in <5208>Deuteronomy 2:8, in speaking of the journey of the Israelites towards the Promised Land: "When we passed by from our brethren the children of Esau, which dwelt in Seir, through the way of the plain from Elath, and from Ezion-geber." These two places are mentioned together again in <1026>1 Kings 9:26 (compare <1487>2 Chronicles 8:17), in such a manner as to show that Elath was more ancient than Ezion-geber, and was of so much repute as to be used for indicating the locality of other places: the passage also fixes the spot where Elath itself was to be found: "and king Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion-geber, which is beside Elath, on the shore (<4335>Numbers 33:35) of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom." *SEE EZION-GEBER*. The use which David made of the vicinity of Elath shows that the country was at that time in his possession. Accordingly, in <1014>2 Samuel 8:14, we learn that he had previously made himself master of Idumaea, and garrisoned its

strong-holds with his own troops. Under Joram, however (121802 Kings 8:20), the Idumaeans revolted from Judah, and elected a king over themselves. Joram thereupon assembled his forces, "and all the *chariots* with him," and, falling on the Idumaeans by night, succeeded in defeating and scattering their army. The Hebrews, nevertheless, could not prevail, but "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day;" thus exemplifying the striking language employed (01274Genesis 27:40) by Isaac: "By thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." From 121422 Kings 14:22, however, it appears that Uzziah recovered Elath, and, having so repaired and adorned the city as to be said to have built, that is, rebuilt, it, he made it a part of his dominions. This connection was not of long continuance; for in chapter 16, verse 6 of the same book, we find the Syrian king Rezin interposing, who captured Elath, drove out the Jews, and annexed the place to his Syrian kingdom, and “the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there unto this day." At a later period it fell under the power of the Romans, and was for a time guarded by the tenth legion, forming part of Palaestina Tertia (Jerome, *Onomast.* s.v. Ailath; Strabo, 21:4, 4; Reland, *Palaest.* page 556). It subsequently became the residence of a Christian bishop. Bishops of Elath were at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and at that of Constantinople (A.D. 536). At the Council of Chalcedon, Beryllus thus wrote his designation as "bishop of Ela of Third Palestine" (Ἀϊλᾶ τῆς Παλαιστίνης τρίτης). In the days of its prosperity it was much distinguished for commerce, which continued to flourish under the auspices of Christianity (Cellarii *Notit.* 2:686 sq.). In the 6th century it is spoken of by Piocopius as being inhabited by Jews subject to the Roman dominion *(De Bell. Pers.* 1:19). In A.D. 630 the Christian communities of Arabia Petraea found it expedient to submit to Mohammed, when John, the Christian governor of Ailah, became bound to pay an annual tribute of 300 gold pieces (Abulfeda, *Ann.* 1:171). Henceforward, till the present century, Ailah lay in the darkness of Islamism. It is merely mentioned by the supposed Ibn-Haukal (Engl. translation of D'Arvieux, Append. page 353), perhaps in the 11th century; and, after the middle of the 12th, Edrisi describes it as a small town frequented by the Aral s, who were now its masters, and forming an important point in the route between Cairo and Medina. In A.D. 1116, king Baldwin of Jerusalem took possession of it. Again it was wrested from the hands of the Christians by Saladin I, A.D. 1157, and never again fully recovered by them, although the reckless Rainald of Chatillon, in A.D.

1182, seized, and for a time held, the town. In Abulfeda's day, and before A.D. 1300, it was already deserted. He says, "In our day it is a fortress, to which a governor is sent from Egypt. It had a small castle in the sea, but this is now abandoned, and the governor removed to the fortress on the shore." Such as Ailah was in the days of Abulfeda, is *Akabah* now. Mounds of rubbish alone mark the site of the town, while a fortress, occupied by a governor and a small garrison under the pasha of Egypt, serves to keep the neighboring tribes of the desert in awe, and to minister to the wants and protection of the annual Egyptian Haj, or pilgrim caravan. Under the Roman rule it lost its former importance with the transference of its trade to other ports, such as Berenice, Myos Hormos, and Arsinoe; but in Mohammedan times it again became a place of some note. It is now quite insignificant. It lies on the route of the Egyptian pilgrim-caravan, and the mountain-road or Akabah named after it was improved or reconstructed by Ahmad Ibn-Tulun, who ruled Egypt from A.D. cir. 840 to 848. This place has always been an important station upon the route of the Egyptian Haj. Such is the importance of this caravan of pilgrims from Cairo to Mecca, both in a religious and political point of view, that the rulers of Egypt from the earliest period have given it convoy and protection. For this purpose a line of fortresses similar to that of Akabah has been established at intervals along the route, with wells of water and supplies of provisions (Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, 1:250). The first Frank who visited this place in modern times was Ruppell, in 1822 *(Reise,* page 248 sq.). Laborde *(Journey through Arabia Petraea,* London, 1836) was well received by the garrison and inhabitants of the castle of Akabah, of which he has given a view (1:116). The fortress, he states, is built on a regular plan, and is in a pretty good condition, though within several good habitations have been suffered to fall to decay. It has only two guns fit for service (Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert,* page 99 sq.). The ancient name of the place is indicative of groves in the vicinity, and Strabo speaks of its palm-woods (16:776), which appear still to subsist (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* Page 400; Schubert, 2:379)

El-Beth'el

(Hebrews *El Beyth-El,* לאֵל בֵּית *God of Bethel;* Sept. simply Βαιθήλ, Vulg. *Domus Dei),* the name given by Jacob to the altar erected by him as a sanctuary (comp. Genesis 35:7), on the spot where he had formerly

experienced the vision of the mystic ladder (chap. 31:13; 28:18). *SEE BETHEL*.

Elcesaites

SEE ELKISAITES.

El'cia

(Ἐλκία), one of the forefathers of Judith, and therefore belonging to the tribe of Simeon (Jud. 8:1); what Hebrew name the word represents is doubtful. Hilkiah is probably Chelkias, two steps back in the genealogy. The Syriac version has *Elkana.* In the Vulgate the names are hopelessly altered.

El'daah

[some *Elda'ah]* (Hebrews *Eldaah',* הַלְדָּעָה whom *God called;* Sept. Ἐδαάφ, Ἐδάδ, Josephus Ἐδάχ, *Ant.* 1:15, 1), the last-named of the five sons of Midian, Abraham's son by Keturah (Genesis 25:4; 1 Chronicles 1:33). B.C. post 2063.

El'dad

(Heb. *Eldad',* דַּלְדָּד whom *God has loved;* comp. *Theophilus;* Sept. Ἐλδάδ), one of the seventy elders who had been appointed under Moses to assist in the administration of justice among the people. B.C. 1658. He is mentioned along with Medad, another elder, as having on a particular occasion received the gift of prophecy, which came upon them in the camp, while Moses and the rest of the elders were assembled around the door of the tabernacle. The spirit of prophecy was upon them all; and the simple peculiarity in the case of Eldad and Medad was that they did not lose their share in the gift, though they abode in the camp, but they prophesied there. It appeared, however, an irregularity to Joshua, the son of Nun, and seems to have suggested the idea that they were using the gift with a view to their own aggrandizement. He therefore entreated Moses to forbid them. But Moses, with characteristic magnanimity, replied, "Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!" (Numbers 11:2429). — Fairbairn, s.v. The great fact of the passage is the more general distribution of the spirit of prophecy, which had hitherto been concentrated in Moses;

and the implied sanction of a tendency to separate the exercise of this gift from the service of the tabernacle, and to make it more generally available for the enlightenment and instruction of the Israelites, a tendency which afterwards led to the establishment of "schools of the prophets." The circumstance is in strict accordance with the Jewish tradition that all prophetic inspiration emanated originally from Moses, and was transmitted from him by a legitimate succession down to the time of the captivity. The *mode* of prophecy in the case of Eldad and Medad was probably the extempore production of hymns, chanted forth to the people (Hammond); comp. the case of Saul, <09101>1 Samuel 10:11. From <04125>Numbers 11:25, it appears that the gift was not merely intermittent, but a continuous energy, though only occasionally developed in action. *SEE PROPHECY*.

Elder

(properly ˆqæ; *zaken'; πρεσβύτερος*, a term which is plainly the origin of our word *"priest;"* Saxon *preoster and presfe, then priest,* High and Low Dutch *priester*, French *prestre* and *pretre,* Ital. *prete,* Span. *presbytero),* literally, one of the older men; and because, in ancient times, older persons would naturally be selected to 'hold public offices, out of regard to their presumed superiority in knowledge and experience, the term came to be used as the designation for the office itself, borne by an individual of whatever age. (See Gesenius, *Hebrews Lex.* s.v.) Such is the origin of the words γερουσία (a council of elders), senatus, alderman, etc.

I. In the O.T. — The term elder was one of extensive use, as an official title, among the Hebrews and the surrounding nations. It applied to various offices; Eliezer, for instance, is described as the "old man of the house," i.e., the *major-domo* (<01242>Genesis 24:2); the officers of Pharaoh's household (Genesis 1, 7), and, at a later period, David's head servants (<10217>2 Samuel 12:17) were so termed; while in <26709>Ezekiel 27:9 the "old men of Gebal" are the *master-workmen.* But the term "elder" appears to be also expressive of respect and reverence in general, as *signore, seigneur, seseor,* etc. The word occurs in this sense in <01007>Genesis 1:7, "Joseph went up to bury his father, and with him went up all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt" (Sept. πρεσβύτεροι, Vulg. *senes).* These elders of Egypt were probably the various state officers. As betokening a political office, it applied not only to the Hebrews and Egyptians, but also to the Moabites and Midianites (<04207>Numbers 22:7). The elders of Israel, of whom such frequent mention is made, may have

been, in early times, the lineal descendants of the patriarchs (<scripRef passage="Exodus 12:21" />). To the elders Moses was directed to open his commission (<scripRef passage="Exodus 3:16" />. They accompanied Moses in his first interview with Pharaoh, as the representatives of the Hebrew nation (verse 18); through them Moses issued his communications and commands to the whole people (<scripRef passage="Exodus 19:7" />; <scripRef passage="Deuteronomy 31:9" />); they were his immediate attendants in all great transactions in the wilderness (<scripRef passage="Exodus 17:5" />); seventy of their number were selected to attend Moses, Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, at the giving of the law (<scripRef passage="Exodus 24:1" />), on which occasion they are called the *nobles* (μyl yxa, lit. *deep-rooted.* i.e., of high-born stock; Sept. ἐπίλεκτοι) of the children of Israel, who did eat and drink before God, in ratification of the covenant, as representatives of the nation (verse 11). In <scripRef passage="Numbers 11:16" />, 17, we meet with the appointment of seventy elders to bear the burden of the people along with Moses; these were selected by Moses out of the whole number of the elders, and are described as being already officers over the children of Israel. It is the opinion of Michaelis that this council chosen to assist Moses should not be confounded with the Sanhedrim, which, he thinks, was not instituted till after the return from the Babylonish captivity. *SEE SANHEDRIM.* He observes that these seventy elders were not chosen to be *judges* of the people, who had already more than 60,000 judges. He also argues that the election of seventy additional *judges* would have done but little towards suppressing the rebellion which led Moses to adopt this proceeding; but that it seems more likely to have been his intention to form a supreme senate to take a share in the government, consisting of the most respectable persons, either for family or merit, which would materially support his power and influence among the people in general; would unite large and powerful families, and give an air of aristocracy to his government, which had hitherto been deemed too monarchical. He further infers that this council was not permanent, not being once alluded to from the death of Moses till the Babylonish captivity; that Moses did not fill up the vacancies occasioned by deaths, and that it ceased altogether in the wilderness. Wherever a patriarchal system is in force, the office of the *elder* will be found as the keystone of the social and political fabric; it is so at the present day among the Arabs, where the sheik (=the *old man)* is the highest authority in the tribe. That the title originally had reference to age is obvious; and age was naturally a concomitant of the office at all periods (<scripRef passage="Joshua 24:31" />; <scripRef passage="1 Kings 12:6" />), even when the term had acquired its secondary sense. At what period the transition occurred, in other words,

when the word *elder* acquired an official signification, it is impossible to say. The earliest notice of the *elders* acting in concert as a political body is at the time of the Exodus. We need not assume that the order was then called into existence, but rather that Moses availed himself of an institution already existing and recognised by his countrymen, and that, in short, "the elders of Israel" (<02B316>Exodus 3:16; 4:29) had been the *senate* (Sept. γερουσία) of the people ever since they had become a people. The position which the elders held in the Mosaic constitution, and more particularly in relation to the people, is described under CONGREGATION *SEE CONGREGATION* ; they were the representatives of the people, so much so that *elders* and *people* are occasionally used as equivalent terms (comp. <062401>Joshua 24:1 with 2, 19, 21; <090804>1 Samuel 8:4 with 7, 10, 19). Their authority was undefined, and extended to all matters concerning the public weal; nor did the people question the validity of their acts, even when they disapproved of them (<061918>Joshua 9:18). When the tribes became settled the elders were distinguished by different titles, according as they were acting as national representatives ("elders of Israel," <090403>1 Samuel 4:3; <110801>1 Kings 8:1, 3; "of the land," <111207>1 Kings 20:7; "of Judah," <122301>2 Kings 23:1; <260801>Ezekiel 8:1), as district governors over the several tribes (<053128>Deuteronomy 31:28; <100911>2 Samuel 19:11), or as local magistrates in the provincial towns, appointed in conformity with <051618>Deuteronomy 16:18, whose duty it was to sit in the gate and administer justice (<051912>Deuteronomy 19:12; 21:3 sq.; 22:15; <080409>Ruth 4:9, 11; <111208>1 Kings 21:8; <070806>Judges 10:6); their number and influence may be inferred from <093026>1 Samuel 30:26 sq. They retained their position under all the political changes which the Jews underwent: under the judges (<070207>Judges 2:7; 8:14; 11:5; <090403>1 Samuel 4:3; 8:4); in the time of Samuel (<091604>1 Samuel 16:4); under Saul (<093026>1 Samuel 30:26), David (<132116>1 Chronicles 21:16), and the later kings (<101704>2 Samuel 17:4; <111206>1 Kings 12:6; 20:8; 21:11); during the captivity (<242901>Jeremiah 29:1; <260801>Ezekiel 8:1; 14:1; 20:1); subsequently to the return (<150505>Ezra 5:5; 6:7, 14; 10:8, 14); under the Maccabees, when they were described sometimes as the senate (γερουσία; 1 Macc. 12:6; 2 Macc. 1:10; 4:44; 11:27; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 3), sometimes by their ordinary title (1 Macc. 7:33; 11:23; 12:35); and, lastly, at the commencement of the Christian aera, when they are noticed as a distinct body from the Sanhedrim, but connected with it as one of the classes whence its members were selected, and always acting in conjunction with it and the other dominant classes. *SEE COUNCIL*. Thus they are associated sometimes with the chief priests (<402123>Matthew 21:23),

sometimes with the chief priests and the scribes (Matthew 16:21), or the council (Matthew 26:59), always taking an active part in the management of public affairs. Luke describes the whole order by the collective term πρεσβυτηριον, i.e. eldership (Luke 22:66; Acts 22:5).. Like the scribes, they obtained their seat in the Sanhedrim by election, or nomination from the executive authority. *SEE AGE.*

II. *In the New Testament and in the Apostolical Church.* — In the article BISHOP *SEE BISHOP* (1:818 sq.), the origin and functions of the eldership in the N.T. and in the early Church are treated at some length, especially with regard to the question of the original identity of *bishops and presbyters* (or elders). Referring our readers to that discussion, we add here the following points.

1. *Origin of the office.* — No specific account of the origin of the eldership in the Christian Church is given in the N.T. "The demand for it arose, no doubt, very early; as, notwithstanding the wider diffusion of gifts not restricted to office, provision was to be made plainly for the regular and fixed instruction and conduct of the rapidly multiplying churches. The historical pattern for it was presented in the Jewish synagogue, namely, in the college or bench of elders (πρεσβύτεροι, Luke 7:3; ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, Mark 5:22; Acts 13:15), who conducted the functions of public worship, prayer, reading, and exposition of the Scriptures. We meet Christian presbyters for the first time (Acts 11:30) at Jerusalem, on the occasion of the collection sent from the Christians of Antioch for the relief of their brethren in Judaea. From thence the institution passed over not only to all the Jewish Christian churches, but to those also which were planted among the Gentiles. From the example of the household of Stephanas at Corinth (1 Corinthians 16:15) we see that the first converts (the ἀπαρχαί) ordinarily were chosen to this office, a fact expressly confirmed also by Clemens Romanus" (1 Corinthians c. 13). Schaff, in *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1851; *Apostolic Church*, § 132. "The creation of the office of elder is nowhere recorded in the N.T., as in the case of deacons and apostles, because the latter offices were created to meet new and special emergencies, while the former was transmitted from the earliest times. In other words, *the office of elder was the only permanent essential office of the Church under either dispensation" (Princeton Review*, 19:61). The Jewish eldership, according to this view, was tacitly transferred from the Old Dispensation to the New, without

express or formal institution, except in Gentile churches, where no such office had a previous existence (comp. Acts 11:30; 14:23).

2. *Functions of the Elders.* — The "elders" of the N.T. Church were plainly the "pastors" (Ephesians 4:11), "bishops, or overseers" (Acts 20:28, etc.); "leaders" and rulers" (Hebrews 13:7; 1 Thessalonians 5:12, etc.) of the flock. But they were not only leaders and rulers, but also the " regular *teachers* of the congregation, to whom pertained officially the exposition of the Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. That this function was closely connected with the other is apparent, even from the conjunction of 'pastors and teachers,' Ephesians 4:11, where the terms, as we have already seen, denote the same persons. The same association of ruling and teaching occurs Hebrews 13:7: 'Remember them which have the rule over you (ἡγούμενοι), who have spoken unto you the word of God (οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ), whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation' (comp. verse 17). Especially decisive, however, are the instructions of the pastoral epistles, where Paul, among the requirements for the presbyterate, in addition to a blameless character and a talent for business and government, expressly mentions also *ability to teach* (1 Timothy 3:2): 'A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, *apt to teach'* (διδακτικόν), etc.; so also Titus 1:9, where it is required of a bishop that he shall hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught (ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου), that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers'" (Schaff, *1*.c.). It is not improbable (indeed, several passages in the New Testament seem clearly to favor the notion) that many persons were ordained elders in the apostolical age who were not, and could not be, separated from their temporal occupations. "At first, those who held office in the Church continued, in all probability, to exercise their former trades for a livelihood. The churches would scarcely be able (as they were mostly poor) to provide stipends at first for their pastors" (Neander). Nevertheless, men specially called and fitted for the work, and devoted to it, were *entitled* by the Christian law, as set forth by the apostles, to be supported by the people; but there was no distinction of rank, honor, or authority between those elders who had stipends and those who had none, unless, indeed, the latter, who, following Paul's example, "worked with their own hands" that they might not be chargeable to the churches, were

held in greater honor for the time. The principle that full ministerial title may stand apart from stipend is fully recognised in modern times in the system of *local preachers* (q.v.) in the Methodist Episcopal Church (see Steward, *On Church Government*, Lond. 1853, page 128).

"After the pattern of the synagogues, as well as of the political administration of cities, which from of old was vested in the hands of a senate or college *of decuriones*, every church had a *number* of presbyters. We meet them everywhere in the plural and as a corporation: at Jerusalem, <44130>Acts 11:30; 15:4, 6, 23; 21:18; at Ephesus, 20:17, 28; at Philippi, <50101>Philippians 1:1; at the ordination of Timothy, <540414>1 Timothy 4:14, where mention is made of the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery;* and in the churches to which James wrote, <590514>James 5:14: 'Is any sick among you? let him call for the *presbyters of the congregation*, and let them pray over him,' etc. This is implied also by the notice (<441423>Acts 14:23) that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders for *every* church, several of them of course; and still more clearly by the direction given to Titus (<560105>Titus 1:5) to ordain elders, that is, a presbytery of such officers, in every city of Crete. Some learned men, indeed, have imagined that the arrangement in the larger cities included several congregations, while, however, each of these had but one elder or bishop; that the principle of congregational polity thus from the beginning was neither democratic nor aristocratic, but monarchical. But this view is contradicted by the passages just quoted, in which the presbyters appear as a college, as well as by the associative tendency which entered into the very life of Christians from the beginning. The *household congregations* (ἐκκλησίαι κατ᾽ οἶκον), which are often mentioned and greeted (<451604>Romans 16:4, 5, 14, 15; <461619>1 Corinthians 16:19; <510415>Colossians 4:15; Philemon 2), indicate merely the fact that where the Christians had become very numerous they were accustomed to meet for edification at different places, and by no means exclude the idea of their organized union as a whole, or of their being governed by a common body of presbyters. Hence, accordingly, the apostolical epistles also are never addressed to a separate part, an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, a conventicle, but always to the whole body of Christians at Rome, at Corinth, at Ephesus, at Philippi, at Thessalonica, etc., treating them in such case as a moral unity (comp. <520101>1 Thessalonians 1:1; <530101>2 Thessalonians 1:1; <460102>1 Corinthians 1:2; 5:1 sq.; <470101>2 Corinthians 1:1, 23; 2:1 sq.; <510416>Colossians 4:16; <500101>Philippians 1:1, etc.). Whether a full parity reigned among these collegiate presbyters, or whether one, say the eldest, constantly presided

over the rest, or whether, finally, one followed another in such presidency as *primes inter pares* by some certain rotation, cannot be decisively determined from the N.T. The analogy of the Jewish synagogue leads here to no entirely sure result, since it is questionable whether a particular presidency belonged to its eldership as early 'as the time of Christ. Some sort of presidency, indeed, would seem to be almost indispensable for any well-ordered government and the regular transaction of business, and is thus beforehand probable in the case of these primitive Christian presbyteries, only the particular form of it we have no means to determine" (Schaff, *1*.c.).

III. *In the early Church (post-apostolic).* — Very soon after the apostolic age the episcopacy arose, first in the congregational form, afterwards in the diocesan episcopacy. *SEE EPISCOPACY*. Until the full development of the latter, elders or presbyters were the highest order of ministers. No trace of ruling elders, in the modern sense, is to be found in the early Church. There was a class of *seniores ecclesie* in the African Church, whom some writers have supposed to correspond to the ruling elder; but Bingham clearly shows the contrary. The name occurs in the writings of Augustine and Optatus. In the Diocletian persecution, when Mensurius was compelled to leave his church, he committed the ornaments and utensils to such of the elders as he could trust, *fidelibus senioribus commendabit* (Optatus, lib. I, page 41) In the works of Optatus there is a tract called "the Purgation of Felix and Caecilian," where is mention of these *seniores.* Augustine inscribes one of his epistles, *Clero, senioribus, et universae plebi:* "To the clergy, the elders, and all the people" *(Epist.* 137). According to Bingham, some of these *seniores* were the civil *optimates* (magistrates, aldermen); the Council of Carthage (A.D. 403) speaks of *magistratus vel seniores locorum.* Others were called *seniores ecclesiastici,* and had care of the utensils, treasures, etc., of the church, and correspond to modern churchwardens or trustees (Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 2, chapter 19, § 19; Hitchcock, in *Amer. Presb. Review,* April 1868).

IV. *In the modern Church.* — 1. In the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the word "priest" is generally used instead of "presbyter" or "elder" to designate the second order of ministers (the three orders being bishops, priests, and deacons). *SEE PRESBYTER;SEE PRIEST.*

2. In the Methodist Episcopal Church but two orders of ministers are recognised, viz. elders and deacons, the bishop being chosen as *primus inter pares*, or superintendent. *SEE EPISCOPACY*. For the election, ordination, duties, etc., of elders, see the *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, part 2, chapter 2, § 15, and part 4, chapter 6, § 2. The *presiding elder* is appointed by the bishop, once in four years, to superintend a district. For the nature and functions of this office, *SEE PRESIDING ELDER.*

3. Among Congregationalists, the only Church officers now known are elders (or ministers) and deacons. Ruling elders were recognised in the Cambridge platform (q.v.), and their duties particularly pointed out; but neither the office itself nor the reasons by which it was supported were long approved. Ruling elders never were universal in Congregationalism, and the office was soon everywhere rejected (Upham, *Ratio Disciplinae*, 1844, § 38, 39; Dexter, *On Congregationalism).*

4. Among Presbyterian churches (i.e. all which adopt the Presbyterian form of government, whether designated by that name or not) there are generally two classes of elders, teaching and ruling elders. The teaching elders constitute the body of pastors; the ruling elders are laymen, who are set apart as assistants to the minister in the oversight and ruling of the flock. Together with the minister, they constitute "the Session," the lowest judicatory in the Church. *SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH*. They cannot administer the sacraments, but aid at the Lord's Supper by distributing the elements to the communicants.

1. In Scotland, ruling elders constitute, with the ministers, the "Kirk Session." The *Form of Government* annexed to the *Confession of Faith* asserts that 'as there were in the Jewish Church elders of the people, joined with the priests and Levites in the government of the Church, so Christ, who hath instituted government and governors ecclesiastical in the Church, besides the ministers of the Word, with gifts for government, and with commission to execute the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the minister in the government of the Church, which officers reformed churches commonly call *elders*." "These elders are chosen from among the members, and are usually persons of tried character. After their acceptance of office, the minister, in the presence of the congregation, sets them apart to their office by prayer, and sometimes by imposition of hands, and concludes the ceremony of *ordination* with exhorting both elders and

people to discharge their respective duties. They have no right to teach or to dispense the sacraments. 'They generally discharge the office, which originally belonged to the deacons, of attending to the interests of the poor; but their peculiar function is expressed by the name "ruling elders;" for in every question of jurisdiction they are the spiritual court of which the minister is officially moderator, and in the presbytery of which the pastors within the bounds are officially members — the elders sit as the representatives of the several sessions or consistories' (Hill's *Theolog. Instit.* part 2, section 2, part 171). In the Established Church of Scotland elders are nominated by the Session, but in unestablished bodies they are freely chosen by the people" (Eadie, *Eccl. Cyclop.* s.v.). The *United Presbyterian Church* has the following rules on the subject:

"**1.** The right of electing elders is vested solely in the members of the congregation who are in full communion.

2. No fixed number of elders is required, but two, along with the minister, are required to constitute a Session. 3. When the Session judge it expedient that an addition should be made to their number, the first step is to call a meeting of the congregation for the purpose of electing the required number....

6. At the meeting for election a discourse is generally delivered suitable to the occasion. Full opportunity is first of all given to the members to propose candidates. The names are then read over, and, after prayer, the votes are taken, and the individuals having the greatest number of votes are declared to be duly elected.

7. After the election the call of the congregation is intimated to the elders elect, and on their acceptance the Session examines into their qualifications, and, if satisfied, orders an edict to be read in the church.

8. At the time mentioned in the edict, which must be read on two Sabbath days, the Session meets, the elders elect being present. After the Session is constituted, if no objections are brought forward, the day of ordination is fixed. If objections are made, the Session proceeds to inquire into and decide on them.

9. On the day of ordination, the moderator calls on the elders elect to stand forward, and puts to them the questions of the formula. Satisfactory answers being given, the minister proceeds to ordain or set

them apart by prayer to the office of ruling elder. Immediately afterwards the right hand of fellowship is given to the persons thus ordained by the minister and by the other elders present, and the whole is followed by suitable exhortations."

2. The *Form of Government* of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (book 1, chapter 5) contains the following: "Ruling elders are properly the representatives of the people, chosen by them for the purpose of exercising government and discipline, in conjunction with pastors or ministers. This office has been understood, by a great part of the Protestant reformed churches, to be designated in the holy Scriptures by the title of governments, and of those who rule well, but do not labor in the word and doctrine" (<46128>1 Corinthians 12:28). Chapter 13 gives the rules for the election and ordination of ruling elders. Each congregation elects "according to the mode most approved and in use in that congregation;" and the whole procedure is very similar to that of the U.P. Church recited above. The ordination is "by prayer" and the "right hand of fellowship," not by imposition of hands. The office is perpetual. The elders, with the pastor, constitute the *Session;* one elder from each church is a member of *Presbytery* and *Synod;* and one for every twenty-four ministers in each presbytery is sent to the *General Assembly.*

In the Reformed Church the elders are chosen for two years only, by the congregation or by the Consistory *(Constitution of the Ref. Dutch Church,* chapter 1, art. 3). They are entitled to membership in Classis and Synod as delegates *(Constitution,* chapter 2, art. 3). There is a form given in the book for their ordination, without imposition of hands. So also in the new liturgy prepared for the German Reformed Church.

3. *Ruling Elders.* — The distinction between teaching and ruling elders originated with Calvin, and has diffused itself very widely among the churches which adopt the Presbyterian form of government; and the authority of the N.T. is claimed for it (see above, 2) in the Presbyterian "Form of Government" (book 1, chapter 5); in the Reformed Church *Form of Ordination* (Constit. page 118); in the Lutheran Church *Formula of Government* (chapter 3, § 6). The Congregationalists of New England admitted this distinction for a while (see above), but soon abandoned it.

Calvin *(Institutes,* book 4, chapter 3, § 8) seeks a scriptural basis for lay eldership as follows: "Governors (<46122>1 Corinthians 12:2) I apprehend to have been persons of advanced years, selected from the people to unite

with the bishops in giving admonition, and exercising discipline. No other interpretation can be given of 'He that ruleth, let him do it with diligence' (Romans 12:8)... . Now that this was not the regulation of a single age experience itself demonstrates." This passage, however, occurs first in the 3d edition of the *Institutes,* 1543; it is not found in the editions of 1536 or 1539. The office of lay elders had existed before among the *Unitas Fratrum,* who were supposed to have borrowed it from the Waldenses; but these lay elders were only trustees or churchwardens. Calvin himself organized a lay eldership in Geneva, to be elected yearly, and seems afterwards to have sought a scriptural warrant for it. In so doing he formed a novel theory, viz. that of a *two-fold* eldership. "This cardinal assumption of a *dual presbyterate* was controverted by Blondel, himself a Presbyterian, in 1648, and again in 1696 by Vitringa, who, as Rothe says in his *Anfange,* 'routed from the field this phantom of apostolic lay elders.' Even the Westminster Assembly, when, in 1643, it debated the question of Church government, as it did for nearly four weeks, was careful not to commit itself to Calvin's theory of lay presbyters, refused to call them ruling elders, and in its final report in 1644 spoke of them as 'other Church governors,' 'which reformed churches *commonly call elders.'* Calvin's theory has also been controverted by James P. Wilson in his *Primitive Government of Christian Churches* (1833), and by Thomas Smyth in his *Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders* (1845). The drift of critical opinion is now decidedly in this direction. It is beginning to be conceded, even among Presbyterians of the staunchest sort, that Calvin was mistaken in his interpretation of 1 Timothy 5:17; that two orders of presbyters are not there brought to view, but only one order, the difference referred to being simply that of service, and not of rank. And if this famous passage fails to justify the *dual presbyterate,* much less may we rely upon the ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ, 'he that ruleth with diligence,' of Romans 12:8, or the κυβερνήσεις, 'governments,' of 1 Corinthians 12:28. In short, the *jure divino* theory of the lay eldership is steadily losing ground. A better support is sought for it in the New-Testament recognition throughout of the right and propriety of lay participation in Church government; in the general right of the Church, as set forth by Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity,* to govern itself by whatsoever forms it pleases, provided the great end of government be answered; and in the proved fitness and efficiency of our present Presbyterian polity, as compared either with prelacy on the one side, or Congregationalism on the other" (Hitchcock, in *Am. Presb. Rev.* 1868, page 255). Dr. Thornwell *(Southern*

Presb. Review, 1859; *Spirit of the XIXth Century,* December 1843; reprinted in *Southern Presb. Rev.* July, 1867) sets forth a peculiar theory of the divine right of the ruling eldership, viz. that the ruling elder is the presbyter of the N.T., whose *only* function was to rule, while the *preachers* were generally selected from the class of elders. This view is also maintained by Breckinridge *(Knowledge of God, subjectively considered,* page 629); and is refuted by Dr. Smyth, *Princeton Review,* volume 33 (see also *Princeton Review,* 15:313 sq.). Principal Campbell *(Theory of Ruling Elderships,* Edinb. and Lond. 1866) aims to show that "elder" in the N.T. always means pastor, and never means the modern "ruling elder" (see *Brit. and For. Elvan. Review,* January 1868, page 222). He shows that the Westminster Assembly, after a long discussion, refused to sanction Calvin's view; but he seeks to find lay elders, under another name, in <451208>Romans 12:8; <461228>1 Corinthians 12:28, etc., and also in early Church History. For a criticism of his view, and a luminous statement of the whole subject of lay eldership, with a conclusive proof that there is no trace of it in the N.T., see Dr. Hitchcock's article in the *Amer. Presb. Review,* April 1868, page 253 sq. See also an able critical and historical discussion of the subject in Dexter, *Congregationalism* (Boston, 1865), page 120 sq. The scriptural right of lay elders is maintained in *The divine Right of Church Government, with Dr. Owen's Argument in favor of Ruling Elders* (New York, 1844, 12mo); in Miller, *On Ruling Elders* (Presb. Board, 18mo). See also King, *Eldership in the Christian Church* (N.Y. 1851); Muhlenberg, *On the Office of Ruling Elders;* M'Kerrow, *Office of Ruling Elders* (London, 1846); Engles, *Duties of Ruling Elders* (Presb. Board); Smyth, *Name, Nature, and Functions of Ruling Elders* (N.Y. 1845, 12mo); Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 2, chapter 20, § 19; Gieseler, *Church History,* volume 1, § 29; Neander, *Planting and Training,* book 1, chapter 2; Davidson, *Eccl. Polity of N.T.;* Watson, *Theol. Institutes,* part. 4, chapter 1; Schaff, *Apostolic Church,* § 132, 113; Rothe, *Anfange d. christlichen Kirche, §* 28, 29; Bilson, *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church;* Owen, *Works* (Edinb. 1851), 15:504.

E'lead

(Hebrews *Eled* , דלעא, whom *God has applauded;* Sept., Ἐλεάδ Vulg. *Elad),* a descendant of Ephraim (<130721>1 Chronicles 7:21), but whether through Shuthelah (q.v.), or a son of the patriarch (the second Shuthelah being taken as a repetition of the first, and Ezer and Elead as his brothers),

is not determined (see Bertheau, *Comment. zu Chronik*, page 82). B.C. ante 1856. Perhaps he is the same with ELADAH *SEE ELADAH* (q.v.) in the preceding verse, who appears to have survived, if identical with ERAN (<0026>Numbers 26:36).

Elei'leh

(Hebrews *Elaleh'*, הֲלֶעָלֵה, whither *God has ascended*, once *Elale'*, אֲלֶעָלֵה, <0327>Numbers 32:37; Sept. Ἐλεαλή), a place on the east of Jordan, in the pastoral country, taken possession of and rebuilt by the tribe of Reuben (<0303>Numbers 32:3, 37). We lose sight of it till the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah, by both of whom it is mentioned as a Moabitish town, and, as before, in close connection with Heshbon (<2304>Isaiah 15:4; 16:9; <2434>Jeremiah 48:34). It apparently lay close to the border of Reuben and Gad (<0626>Joshua 13:26). On the decline of Jewish power, Elealeh, with the whole Mishor, fell into the hands of the Moabites, and is thus included in the woes pronounced by Isaiah on Moab (<2309>Isaiah 16:9): "I will water thee with my tears, O Heshbon and Elealeh; for the alarm is fallen upon thy summer fruits, and thy harvest." Elealeh was still a large village in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, one mile from Heshbon *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἐλεάλε, Eleale). The extensive ruins of the place are still to be seen, bearing very nearly their ancient name, *El-A'al*, though with a modern signification, "the high," a little more than a mile north of Heshbon (Robinson, *Researches*, 2:278). It stands on the summit of a rounded hill commanding a very extended view of the plain, and the whole of the southern Belka (Burckhardt, *Syria*, page 365; Seetzen, 1854, page 407). The whole surrounding plain is now desolate. The statements of all travelers who have visited it show how fully the prophetic curses have been executed (Irby and Mangles, 1st ed. page 471; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* 2:1172.; G. Robinson's *Palest. and Syr.* 2:180 sq.).

Ele'isa

(Ἐλεασά, Alex. MS. Ἀλασά; Vulg. *Laisa)*, a place at which Judas Maccabeus encamped before the fatal battle with Bacchides, in which he lost his life (1 Macc. 9:5). It was apparently not far from Azotus (comp. verse 15). Josephus *(Ant.* 12:11, 1) has *Bethzetho* (Βηθζηθώ), by which he elsewhere renders Bezeth. But this may be but a corrupt reading of Berzetha or Bethzetha, which is found in some MSS. for Berea in 1 Mace. 9:4. Elsewhere *(War* 1:1, 6), however, Josephus states that Judas lost his

life in a battle with the generals of Antiochus Eupator at *Adasa* (q.v.), which is probably the correct reading here, since Adasa was where Judas had encamped on a former memorable occasion (1 Macc. 7:40). It is singular that Bezeth should be mentioned in this connection also (see verse 19).

Ele'isah

[many Elea 'sah], the name (in the A.V.) of two men (1 Chronicles 2:39; 8:37; 9:43), identical (in the Hebrew) with that of two others (Jeremiah 29:3; Ezra 10:22), more properly Anglicized ELASAH *SEE ELASAH* (q.v.).

Eleatic School

the designation given to an early and brilliant sect of Greek philosophers. The name was bestowed in consequence of the residence or birth of the chiefs of the school at Elea or Velia, a town on the western coast of Italy, founded in 544 by the Phocaeans, who abandoned their Ionian home rather than submit to the arms of Cyrus. The general characteristic of this type of speculation is the maintenance of a broad and irreconcilable distinction between the apparent and the intellectual universe — between transitory phenomena and eternal truth. It is thus contrasted with the earlier Ionic School, which assumed material principles as the origin of the world, and with the Pythagorean School, which assigned a mathematical basis for the creation. But it exhibited several points of contact with these more ancient doctrines, and hence both Empedocles and Democritus are sometimes enumerated among the Eleatics. In its wider acceptation, the Eleatic philosophy includes the pantheistic idealism of Xenophanes and Parmenides, and the skeptical materialism of Leucippus and Epicurus, embracing both extremes of metaphysical thought. It may thus be distributed into two main divisions:

I. The Eleatic School proper, which asserted a divine unity to be the origin and essence of all things, regarded multiplicity as only the manifestation of the incessant activity of this divine unity, considered all change as merely phenomenal, and all temporal facts as only the transitory and deceitful shows of things, believing that the only true existence was the one indiscrete divine Essence, which underlay, determined, animated, and enclosed the whole sensible and intelligible order of the universe.

II. The Atomistic or Epicurean School, which confined attention to the earthly and material side of the problem, not denying the immaterial and spiritual, but renouncing it as unattainable. Its position may be appreciated by comparing it with the modern schemes of Moleschott, Herbert Spencer, and Comte. It took note only of the temporal and perishable side of the universe, and established a foundation for its reasonings by supposing the eternity and indestructibility of the elementary constituents of matter.

Esse immortali primordia corpore debent,
Dissolvi quo quae que supremo tempore possint,
Materies ut suppeditet rebus reparandeis.

Thus the two branches of the school, or the two schools, starting from the same point, but pursuing divergent courses, arrived at exactly opposite conclusions. The Eleatics disregarded the sensible, the Epicureans the divine element; the former contemplated the imperishable, the latter the perishable aspects of the universe. But neither denied what they renounced. In the present article, the Eleatic School proper will alone be considered; for a notice of the other branch, reference is made to the title EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY *SEE EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY* .

History of the Eleatic Philosophy. — The shadowy and impalpable character of the Eleatic doctrine renders it peculiarly difficult of determination, because it admits of many modifications, and of a great variety of expositions and limitations. Another difficulty arises from the fact that the sources of our knowledge are confined to a few metrical fragments of Xenophanes and Parmenides, to the statements of their adversaries, Plato and Aristotle, to Diogenes Laertius, who is by no means a reliable witness, and to a few other relics of antiquity. There is, consequently, more uncertainty in regard to the tenets of this school, and to the interpretation given to them by their advocates, than in regard to any other of the Greek sects except the Pythagorean. After all the diligence of Fulleborn, Brandis, Karsten, Cousin, and other inquirers, there is much doubt whether we are ascribing to the Eleatic leaders positions which they deliberately held, or are imposing our own conjectural interpretations upon their doctrines. The general complexion of the school is, however, readily recognized.

The Eleatic School is rather united by a common principle than by agreement in the application of the principle (v. Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, 1:5). Each distinguished philosopher of the sect creates his own scheme,

and differs in procedure and in doctrine from the rest: hence it is impracticable to give any general exposition which will be true for its whole development, and it therefore becomes necessary to consider the peculiar modifications which it assumed in the hands of its successive teachers. The principal expounders of the Eleatic philosophy were Xenophanes, Parmenides, Zeno, and Melipus: the first of these was its founder. The period during which they flourished may be considered to extend over the century preceding the Peloponnesian War. But the chronological data are confused and uncertain.

Xenophanes. — Xenophanes of Colophon, in Asia Minor, an exile from his native land, migrated to Sicily, and may have resided in Elea, whose foundation he celebrated in verse. The dates are uncertain; but Cousin, in an elaborate essay, fixes his birth in the 40th Olympiad (B.C. 620-616), and he lived nearly a century. His philosophy was presented in a metrical form in his poem *On Nature,* of which fragments remain, though they are too broken and obscure to give any clear revelation of his tenets. His leading doctrines, as far as they can now be ascertained, appear to have constituted an indistinct, confused, and undeveloped idealism, remarkable at the period of their introduction, but requiring expansion and rectification before they could be arranged in any harmonious system. They are rather germs of thought than precise principles. They needed the acute logical intellect of Parmenides to give them consistency, as the Socratic speculations received definite form from Plato. Parmenides probably deviated as far from the simple, reveries of Xenophanes as Plato did from the practical maxims of Socrates. Xenophanes apparently adopted from Pythagoras, either directly or indirectly, the conviction that there must be an ultimate term of being, which was not the sensible universe, but the divine intelligence. But Pythagoras distinguished between God and nature; while Xenophanes, by exaggerating, confused this distinction, and resolved everything into a single divine essence. He denied all beginning, and therefore denied that anything could become what it had not always been. The doctrine *ex nihilo nihil fit* had with him a broader and deeper significance than it received from Epicurus, and his Roman expositor, Lucretius. If nothing commences and nothing becomes, then all things are eternal, and all things are one. The unity of the God-head is thus asserted against polytheism; the individuality of the Deity against the dualism of conflicting forces. This antagonism to the current creed and prevalent speculations is developed in his attacks on Homer, Hesiod, and the whole Hellenic mythology, and by his earnest

repudiation of all anthropomorphism. The substantial reality of the sensible world is necessarily rejected: God and the universe are identified, and a close approximation is made to Spinozism, though not without essential differences. The only reality is the divine intelligence, σύμπαντά to εἶναι νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν (Diogenes Laert. 9, 19). Everything cognizable by the human senses represents merely the accidents and shows of things. The sensible world is in an unceasing flux, but the divine essence is unchanging, unchangeable, unmoving, incapable of being moved, impassive, eternal, infinite, though possessing spherical dimensions, uncompounded, one (αἴδιον-ἄπειρον-πᾶν- ν- ν-μέτριον-ἀκίνητον-ἀνώδυνον-ἀνάλγητον-ἄνοσον-οὔτεἑτεροιούμενον εἴδει, οὔτε μιγνύμενον ἄλλῳ, Aristot. *De Xenoph.* 1: "unum esse omnia, neque id esse mutabile, et id esse Deum, neque natum umquam, et sempiternum, conglobata figura," Cicero, *Acad. Pr.* 2, 37.). All change is but apparent — the restless play of colors on the surface of the immutable Existence — the incessant agitation of the waves on the bosom of the boundless and unalterable deep. There is no denial of the actuality of sensible facts and changes; there is a denial of their reality; they are shadows of the eternal, the mists and vapors that disguise and conceal the infinite One.

Unquestionably there are contradictions involved in this scheme, but the acceptance of antinomies is one of the most striking characteristics of the doctrines of Xenophanes. Naturally and necessarily he is brought to declare all things incomprehensible. Certain knowledge is thus impossible; all truth evaporates into opinion; skepticism is introduced — the skepticism which disregards the sensible as a delusion — the skepticism which excludes the eternal and the divine as unintelligible, or the skepticism which regards truth as unattainable. Thus the fundamental positions of the Eleatics prognosticate the age of the Sophists, and the; theories of the Epicureans the Pyrrhonists and the Neo-Platonists.

It is not easy to discover the exact mode in which Xenophanes interpreted the order of the sensible creation. The remarkable feature in his cosmogony is that he anticipated geology, and made it the basis of some of his deductions. He thus contributed to science the commencements of that marvelous investigation, as Pythagoras contributed the theory of the geometrical harmonies of the universe, and divined the Copernican system. It may appear a remarkable incongruity that, after identifying God and the universe, and asserting the infinity, immutability, and eternity of the divine existence, Xenophanes and Parmenides should both have held the

periodicity of the destruction of the world — the former by water, the latter by fire. This conclusion may have been suggested to the earlier philosopher by the fossil remains which he recognised as aqueous deposits; but it also results from the dogma that all things are in a perpetual flux except the one eternal existence. The phenomena change recurrently, the One remains unchanged.

The Eleatic philosophy, in its first enunciation, was a crude idealism, extravagant in expression, if moderate in design. It was an anxious attempt to unite the operation of the omnipotence, omnipresence, and unity of the divine Intelligence with the recognition of his continual support and government of the creation. It was a protest alike against the vain abstractions, the materialistic tendencies, and the polytheistic creed of the Hellenic world; but in the endeavor to avoid popular and philosophical errors, it fell into the opposite extreme, and became in tendency, though not in purpose, distinctly pantheistic. It is impossible to explain the connection between the Creator and the creation — the distinction and the union of the intelligible and the sensible universe. To these heights the mind of man cannot soar. There is a truth of things sensible and a truth of things spiritual. Neither can be safely disregarded or misapprehended. The world of matter, with all its changes — the world of mind, with all its intuitions and reasonings, are as essentially real as the divine Being on whom they depend. But what the degree and mode of the dependence — when the dependence is interrupted and the laws imposed upon creation come into action — what is the hidden spring of natural forces, who shall define? If Xenophanes ran into errors as hazardous as those which he resisted, he is entitled to indulgent censure when it is considered that he was the first, or among the first, to introduce into Greek speculation worthy, if inadequate, conceptions of the grandeur, and glory, and ineffable sovereignty of the divine Intelligence.

Parmenides. — The most illustrious name produced by the Eleatic School is that of Parmenides, the disciple, probably, of the founder of the sect. He was, by all accounts, a native of Elea (about 536 B.C.), and may have furnished, by his birthplace, the chief cause for the designation habitually bestowed upon this type of philosophy. He is frequently represented as the founder of dialectics, though this distinction is given by Aristotle to his pupil Zeno. He is, however, entitled to the credit of having given a more logical development to the views of his supposed teacher. So far as any authoritative exposition of his doctrines is concerned, we are in nearly as

unfortunate a position as in the case of his predecessor. Insufficient fragments of his philosophical poem are preserved, but the rest of our knowledge must be obtained from the polemics of his adversaries, and from the statements of late compilers. He is commended by Aristotle for his perspicacity, and certainly gave greater coherence to the system espoused by him. In doing so he may have improved its form at the expense of its elevation. The divinity of the universal Existence disappears; for his point of departure is not the all-embracing Intelligence, but the abstract conception of being. In the main he agrees with Xenophanes, though he presents his tenets in a different order and connection. He states precisely the antagonism between the judgments of the senses and the conclusions of the reason, but he leaves it undeveloped. This has been regarded as his most important addition to the Eleatic metaphysics, though the principle is latent and presupposed in the whole speculations of the earlier philosopher. The fundamental position of his scheme is the contradiction of entity and nonentity. What is cannot be non-existent; what is non-existent is not. But everything that is, exists. Hence the universality and unity of existence must be admitted; and as nothing can spring from nothing, or proceed from non-existence to existence, all existence is eternal and unchangeable. There is nothing but being; therefore there is *aplenum* without any *vacuum,* and all being is thought. Being is limited, but limited only by itself, and embodied in a perfect sphere. It is independent of time, space, and motion, all of which are denied to have any absolute existence. It is a state of everlasting repose. All changes and motions are apparent only; they are mere semblances. On this system being is indestructible-a dogma which has returned upon us unexpectedly in the philosophy of Herbert Spencer, and those with whom he coincides. There is no loss or cessation of existence, only variation of species, or change of apparent condition. Everything is determined by an indwelling necessity — a law which is involved in the existence by which it is revealed.

There is a singular accordance in the procedure of Parmenides and that of Des Cartes. The highest speculations of man roll, like the world on which he dwells, in one self-repeating orbit around the center of attraction, deviating by slight deflections from the precisely-described track, but never departing so far as to destroy the uniformity of the course. Contrasted but connected schemes of thought succeed each other in each revolution like the seasons, and all "lead up the golden year."

In the physical application of his principles Parmenides recurred, like Xenophanes, to the procedure of the Ionic and Pythagorean schools, admitting antagonistic elements and forces, whose collisions and conjunctions produced the phenomena of the universe.

In all these speculations, one main cause of bewilderment and exaggeration is the oscitancy and impalpability of abstract terms. We are at the mercy of the abracadabra with which the enchantments are attempted. The perplexity and hallucination resulting from loose and elastic phrases was of course most perilous and least suspected before logical science arose, and before metaphysicians distinguished between rigorous thought and current expression.

Such defects exposed the doctrines of Parmenides to the attacks of acute contemporaries, and led to the recognition of the necessity of precision in statement, and to the consequent examination of the strict import of terms and of the Validity of arguments. Hence they furnished to his disciple the occasion of inaugurating logic.

Zeno. — The relation of Zeno to Parmenides is the most certain fact connected with the filiation of the Eleatic School. He was pupil, friend, companion, and apologist. He was the only prominent member of the sect who was unquestionably a native of Elea. He defended and explained the dogmas of his preceptor; but the mode of his exposition led to notable changes in the career of philosophy, and prepared the way for the Socratic irony, the Platonic dialectics, the Organon of Aristotle, and other developments scarcely less important. He became the inventor of regular dialectic procedure but his claims in this respect are limited by the remarkable declaration of the Stagyrite in regard to his own labors, that his predecessors had only furnished examples of the forms of reasoning, while he had created the art *(Sophist. Elench.* sub fin.).

Increase of logical precision may give greater consistency and intelligibility to a philosophical system, but it renders its errors and dangers more prominent. This was the case with Zeno's presentation of the views of Parmenides. In urging the unreliability of the senses, and of inferences from observation, he arrayed experience against reason, and denied the validity of the former. He acknowledged, at the same time, the impossibility of recognizing in things sensible the unity which was alone real existence, and thus invited skepticism and provoked the age of the Sophists.

Melissus. — There is no reason for believing that Melissus of Samos was directly or consciously connected with the Eleatic family, but he is habitually included in their number in consequence of substantial identity of doctrine. He confined his attention almost exclusively to the negative aspects of the system, endeavoring to demonstrate the unreality of the phenomenal world, and the inconsistency of ascribing time, motion, change, divisibility or limitation to the solitary Existence. In representing being as infinite, he recoiled from the position of Parmenides and Zeno, and in some degree also from Xenophanes. He differed from them also in asserting that we can have no knowledge of the gods; and, according to Aristotle, inclined to materialism in his conception of the universal One. The Eleatic idealism was thus verging towards the form of doctrine propounded by Epicurus. It had completed its course, and had swung round nearly to the opposite extreme from the point where it started.

Whatever extravagances may be justly charged upon this celebrated school, its services to speculation and to the cause of truth should be neither denied nor underrated. It was surely a splendid and meritorious office, in the dawn of systematic philosophy, to awaken the minds of men to the recognition of the vain and evanescent character of all temporal things; to protest against the delusions of Polytheism; to direct attention to a supreme and omnipresent Intelligence, perfect in all attributes; to unveil the everlasting truth which was latent, but active, beneath all material and transitory forms; and to bring the reason of man into direct communion with the sovereign Power of the universe, in which he and all things else "lived, and moved, and had their being." In discharging this high function, the Eleatics promoted physical speculation, laid the foundations of logic, and perhaps of rhetoric, and introduced the argumentative dialogue which was employed with such consummate genius by Plato.

There is a most profound significance in the observation made by Aristotle in regard to Parmenides, that, "looking up to the whole heavens, he declared the one only Being to be God." This seems to have been the distinctive purport of the Eleatic School, though it was soon obscured, and ultimately discarded; but it propagated itself by a secret growth, and allied itself with other forms of speculation.

Literature. — Plato, *Sophista*, *Parmsenides*; Aristotle, *De Xenophane, Zenone et Gorgia; Metaphysica*, lib. 1, cap. 5; Diogenes Laertius; Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et Crit.* s.v. *Xenophane;* Roschmann, *Diss. Hist. Philosoph. de*

Xenophane (Altona, 1729); Fulleborn, *Liber de Xenophane, Zenone, Gorgia, Aristoteli vulgo tributus, partim illustratus commentario* (Hal. 1789); *Fragments of Xenophanes and Parmenides* (Zullichau, 1795); Van der Kemp, *Parmenides* (Edmee, 1781); Gundling, *Observations on the Philosophy of Parmenides;* Brandis, *Comm. Eleaticarum* pars i (Altona, 1813); *V. Cousin, Nouveaux Essais Philosophiques* (Paris, 1828); Rosenberg, *De Eleaticae philos. primordiis* (Berl. 1829); Karsten, *Philosophorum Graec. veterum Reliquiae* (Bruxelles, 1830); Mullach, *Aristotelis de Melisso lib. Disputationes* (Berol. 1846); Lewes, *Hist. of Philosophy* (Lond. 1867, 1:67 sq.); Ueberweg, *Gesch. d. Philosophie,* 1:47; and the various historians of Greek philosophy. (G.F.H.)

Elea'zar

(Hebrews *Elazar',* רזעלא, whom *God has helped;* Sept. and N.T. Ἐλεάζαρ*;* from the Graecized form Ἐλεάζαρος found in Maccabees and Josephus], came by contraction the later name Λάζαρος, *Lazarus),* a common name among the Hebrews, being borne by at least six persons mentioned in Scripture, besides several in the Apocrypha and Josephus. *SEE ELIEZER*.

1. The third son of Aaron, by Elisheba, daughter of Amminadab, who was descended from Judah, through Pharez (<0623>Exodus 6:23; 28:1; for his descent, see <0129>Genesis 38:29; 46:12; <0048>Ruth 4:18, 20). He married a daughter of Putiel, who bore him Phinehas (<0625>Exodus 6:25). After the death of Nadab and Abihu without children (<0301>Leviticus 10:1; <0404>Numbers 3:4), Eleazar was appointed chief over the principal Levites, to have the oversight of those who had charge of the sanctuary (<0432>Numbers 3:32). With his brother Ithamar he ministered as a priest during their father's lifetime, and immediately before the death of their father he was invested on Mount Hor with the sacred garments, as the successor of Aaron in the office of high-priest (<0428>Numbers 20:28). B.C. 1619. One of his first duties was, in conjunction with Moses, to superintend the census of the people (<0403>Numbers 26:3). He also assisted at the inauguration of Joshua, and at the division of spoil taken from the Midianites (<0422>Numbers 27:22; 31:21). After the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, he took part in the distribution of the land (<0601>Joshua 14:1). The time of his death is not mentioned in Scripture; Josephus says it took place about the same time as Joshua's, 25 years after the death of Moses. He is said to have been buried in "the hill of Phinehas" his son (<0624>Joshua 24:33),

where Josephus says his tomb existed *(Ant.* 5:1, 29), or possibly a town called Gibeath-Phinehas (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* pages 260, 261,). The high-priesthood is said to have remained in the family of Eleazar until the time of Eli, a descendant of Ithmar, into whose family, for some reason unknown, it passed until it was restored *to* the family of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (0910271 Samuel 2:27; 1306081 Chronicles 6:8; 24:3; 1102271 Kings 2:27; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:1, 3). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*

2. An inhabitant of Kirjath-jearim, on the "hill" (h [b ¢ e who was set apart by his fellow-townsmen to attend upon the ark, while it remained under the roof of his father Abinadab, after it had been returned to the Hebrews by the Philistines (0907011 Samuel 7:1, 2). B.C. 1124. His service in this capacity was doubtless somewhat irregular, but justifiable under the circumstances; for there is no evidence that he belonged to the priestly order, although it is probable that he was of a Levitical family (who were not allowed to *touch* the ark, but had only the general charge of it, 040331Numbers 3:31; 4:15). He seems to have continued to exercise this sole care of the sacred deposit for the twenty years that intervened till the judgeship of Samuel (0907011 Samuel 7:1), although the ark remained in the same place much longer (1303071 Chronicles 13:7).

3. A Levite, son of Mahli, and grandson of Merari. B.C. cir. 1618. He is mentioned as having had only daughters, who were married by their "brethren" (i.e., their cousins) (1323211 Chronicles 23:21, 22; 24:28).

4. The son of Dodo the Ahohite (y j ja ea ^ B, i.e., possibly a descendant of Ahoah, of the tribe of Benjamin (1308041 Chronicles 8:4); one of the three most eminent of David's thirty-seven distinguished heroes (1311121 Chronicles 11:12), who "fought till his hand was weary" in maintaining with David and the other two a daring stand against the Philistines after "the men of Israel had gone away." He was also one of the same three when they broke through the Philistine host to gratify David's longing for a drink of water from the well of his native Bethlehem (1023092 Samuel 23:9, 10, 13). B.C. cir. 1046. *SEE DAVID.*

5. Son of Phinehas, and associated with the priests and Levites in taking charge of the sacred vessels restored to Jerusalem after the Exile (150838Ezra 8:38). B.C. 459. He is probably the same with one of those who encompassed the walls of Jerusalem on their completion (161242Nehemiah

12:42). B.C. 446. It does not appear from these passages, however, that he was necessarily a priest or even a Levite.

6. One of the descendants (or citizens) of Parosh, an Israelite (i.e., layman) who renounced the Gentile wife whom he had married on returning from Babylon (<15025>Ezra 10:25). B.C. 410. Possibly he is the same with Number 5.

7. The first-named of the "principal men and learned" sent for by Ezra to accompany him to Jerusalem (1 Esd. 8:43); evidently the ELIEZER *SEE ELIEZER* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<15816>Ezra 8:16).

8. According to Josephus, the Jewish high-priest, brother, and successor of Simon the Just, and son of Onias I, whose correspondence with Ptolemy Philadelphus resulted in the Septuagint (q.v.) translation being made *(Ant.* 12:2, 5 sq.; 4, 4). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*

9. Surnamed AVARAN (1 Macc. 2:5, Αὐαράν, or Αὐράν, and so Josephus, *Ant.* 12:6, 1; 9:4. In 1 Macc. 6:43, the common reading ὁ Σαυαράν arises either from the insertion of C by mistake after O, or from a false division of Ἐλεάζαρος Αὐαράν), the fourth son of Mattathias, who fell by a noble act of self-devotion in an engagement with Antiochus Eupator, being crushed to death by the fall of an elephant which he stabbed under the belly in the belief that it bore the king, B.C. 164 (1 Macc. 6:43 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:19, 4; *War,* 1:1, 5; Ambrose, *De offic. min.* 40). In a former battle with Nicanor, Eleazar was appointed by Judas to read "the holy book" before the attack, and the watchword in the fight — "the help of God" — was his own name (2 Macc. 8:23).

The surname "Avaran" is probably connected with Arab. *havar,* "to pierce an animal behind" (Michaelis, s.v.). This derivation seems far better than that of Rediger (Ersch u. Gruber, s.v.) from Arab. *khavaran,* "an elephant-hide." In either case the title is derived from his exploit.

10. A distinguished scribe (Ἐλεάζαρος ... τῶν πρωτευόντων γραμματέων, 2 Macc. 6:18) of great age, who suffered martyrdom during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc. 6:18-31). B.C. cir. 167. His death was marked by singular constancy and heroism, and seems to have produced considerable effect. Later traditions embellished the narrative by representing Eleazar as a priest *(De Macc.* 5), or even high-priest (Grimm, *ad; Macc.* 1.c.). He was also distinguished by the nobler

title of "the proto-martyr of the old covenant," "the foundation of martyrdom" (Chrysost. *Hom.* 3 *in 1 Macc.* init. Comp. Ambrose, *De Jacob.* 2:10). For the general credibility of the history comp. Grimm, *Excurs. uler* 2 *Macc.* 6:18-8, in *Exeg. Handb.;* also Ewald, *Gesch.* 4:341, 532. *SEE MACCABEES.*

The name Eleazar in 3 Macc. 6 appears to have been borrowed from this Antiochian martyr, as belonging to one weighed down by age and suffering, and yet "helped by God." — Smith, s.v.

11. The father of Jason, ambassador from Judas Maccabeaus to Rome (1 Macc. 8:18). B.C. 161.

12. Son of Eliud and father of Matthan, which last was the grandfather of Joseph, Christ's reputed father (<40115>Matthew 1:15). B.C. cir. 150.

13. A priest mentioned by Josephus as having charge of the Temple treasures, who sought to divert Crassus from pillaging the sanctuary by the largess of a beam of gold *(Ant.* 14:7, 1).

14. A son of Boethus, whom Archelaus put into the high-priesthood in place of his brother Joazar, but soon displaced by Jesus the son of Sie (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:13, 1).

15. Son of Ananus (or Ananias), made high-priest in the room of Ishmael (son of Phabi) by Gratus, who deposed him after one year in favor of Simon son of Camithus (Josephus, *Ant.* 18:2, 2). While a youth, his boldness led him, as prefect of the Temple, to advise the Jews to refuse all foreign presents (Josephus, *War,* 2:17, 2). He had been seized by the Sicarii as a hostage for ten prisoners of their own number *(Ant.* 20:9, 3). He was one of the generals chosen by the Jews for Idumaea during the revolt under Cestius *(War,* 2:20, 4).

16. Son of Dinseus, a robber who for many years infested the mountains of Samaria, whose troop was at length broken up by Cumanus (Josephus, *Ant. 20:*6, 1). He was himself captured by stratagem and sent to Rome by Felix *(ib.* 8, 5). He seems to be the same with the notorious rebel commander of Massada, at whose instigation the desperate garrison committed suicide *(War,* 7:8-9; comp. *Ant.* 20:1, 1; *War,* 2:13, 2).

17. A companion of Simoni of Gerasa; sent by the latter to endeavor to persuade the garrison of Herodium to capitulate, but indignantly put to death by them (Josephus, *War,* 4:9, 5).

18. A young Jew of great valor in the siege of Machaerus by Bassus; captured by Rufus, but released by the Romans on condition of the surrender of the fortress (Josephus, *War,* 7:6, 4).

19. A Jewish conjuror whom Josephus speaks of having seen exorcise daemons in the presence of Vespasian and his officers by means of a magical ring *(Ant.* 8:2, 5).

20. A son of Sameas, and born in Saab in Galilee, who performed a heroic act of valor and self-devotion during the final siege of Jerusalem (Josephus, *War,* 3:7, 21).

21. Son of Simon, and ringleader of the Zealots in the final convulsions of the Jewish nation (Josephus, *War,* 4:4, 1). He first appears as possessor of a large amount of plunder from the Romans under Cestius, which gave him control of public affairs *(ib.* 2:20, 3). During the siege by Titus he held the Temple against the other factions *(ib.* 5:1, 2), being supplied by the sacred stores of provisions *(ib.* 3); but at length he formed a coalition with one of these opponents, John of Gischala, who occupied the remainder of the eastern part of the city *(ib.* 5:6, 1), having lost his vantage by a stratagem of the latter *(ib.* 3, 1). See the full account under JERUSALEM *SEE JERUSALEM* .

Eleazar

(in Armenian *Eghiazar),* an Armenian patriarch, was born at Anthab, in Syria. In 1650, David, the patriarch of Constantinople, was ejected from his seat, and Eleazar elected in his place. He held this position only for two years, for in 1652 Philip, the patriarch of Etchmiadzin, and supreme head of the Church, arrived at Constantinople, expelled Eleazar, and consecrated John of Meghin, who, in turn, was soon ejected by the intrigues of Eleazar. The see then remained vacant for some time. Eleazar went to Jerusalem, in compliance with an invitation of the patriarch of that city, Azduadzadur, who wished his assistance in a quarrel with the Greeks, and promised to make him his successor. While residing in the convent of St. James, Eleazar discovered a treasure of 100,000 pieces of gold and 100,000 pieces of silver. After many troubles with Turkish officials and several

imprisonments, he succeeded in obtaining possession of the convent. He built a church, called after the residence of the chief patriarch of the Armenians, Etchmiadzin, and caused himself to be elected independent patriarch of Jerusalem. He was expelled in 1664, and again, after having regained possession of the dignity, in 1668, when he was succeeded by a personal enemy, Martyr. The people, dissatisfied with this change, replaced Azduadzadur, after whose death Eleazar took forcible possession of the patriarchal see. He maintained himself in this position until 1680, when, after the death of James IV, the patriarch of Etchmiadzin, he assumed the title of patriarch of all the Armenians. A subsequent election confirmed him in this position, and in 1682 he took up his residence in Etchmiadzin. His chief aim as head of the Armenian Church was to put an end to internal dissensions. He died at Etchmiadzin in 1691. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 15:791.

Eleazu'rus

(a strange rendering for Ἐλιάσεβος, Alex. MS. Ἐλιάσιβος, Vulg. *Eliasib),* one of the Levitical musicians who married a Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (1 Esdr. 9:24); evidently the ELIASHIB *SEE ELIASHIB* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezra 10:24).

Elect

a term sometimes applied in the ancient Church

(1) to the whole body of baptized Christians, who were called ἅγιοι, ἐκλεκτοί, *saints, elect;*

(2) to the highest class of catechumens *elected* to baptism;

(3) at other times to the newly baptized, as especially admitted to the full privileges of their profession, and sometimes called the perfect.

Ascetics, who at one time were considered the most eminent of Christian professors, were called the *elect of the elect. — Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 10, chapter 2, § 5. *SEE CATECHUMENS.*

Electa Or Eclecta

(Ἐκλεκτή, Auth. Vers. *"elect"* lady). According to Grotius, Wetstein, and some other critics, this word is used as a proper name in the address of John's second epistle, ὁ Πρεσβύτερος Ἐκλεκτῇ κυριᾷ — *"The*

Presbyter to the Lady Eclecta." This meaning is advocated by bishop Middleton, in his treatise on the *Doctrine of the Greek Article* (2d edit. Cambridge, 1828, pages 626-629). He adduces in support of it several epistolary inscriptions from Basil, in which the name precedes, and the rank or condition in life is subjoined, such as Εὐσταθίῳ ἰατρῷ-Λεοντίῳ σοφιστῇ -Βοσπορίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ-Μαγνημιανῷ κόμητι: none of these, however, are purely honorary titles. To meet the objection that the sister of the person addressed is also called Eclecta in verse 13, he suggests that the words τῆς Ἐκλεκτῆς are a gloss, explanatory of σοῦ. But this is mere conjecture, unsupported by a single manuscript; and such a gloss, if occasioned (as bishop Middleton supposes) by the return to the singular number, would more naturally have been inserted after se, in which position, however unnecessary, it would at least produce no ambiguity. Some writers, both ancient and modern, have adopted a mystical interpretation, though contrary to the *usus loquendi,* and ,to all apostolic usage, and suppose with Jerome that the term ἐκλεκτή referred to the Church in general, or with Cassiodorus, to some particular congregation. The last-named writer (born A.D. 470, died 562), in his *Complexiones in Epistolas,* etc. (London, 1722, page 136), says, "Johannes — electae dominae scribit ecclesiae, filiisque ejus, quas sacro fonte genuerat." Clemens Alexandrinus, in a fragment of his *Adumbrationes,* attempts to combine the literal and the mystical meanings — "Scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine, significat autem electionem ecclesiae sancta" *(Opera,* ed. Klotz, 4, page 66). The Auth. Version translates the words in question *"the elect lady,"* an interpretation approved by Castalio, Beza, Mill, Wolf, Le Clerc, and Macknight. Most modern critics, however — Schleusner and Breitschneider, in their lexicons; Bourger (1763),Vater (1824), Goschen, and Tischendorf (1841), in their editions of the New Testament; Neander *(Planting of the Church,* 2:71), De Wette *(Lehrbuch,* page 339), and Lucke *(Commentary on the Epistles of St. John,* pages 314-320, Eng. transl.) — agree with the Syriac and Arabic versions in making Καϸta a proper name, and render the words *"to the elect Cyria."* (See Gruteri *Inscript.* page 1127.) Lardner has given a curious account of critical opinions in his *History of The Apostles and Evangelists,* c. 20 *(Works,* 6:284-288). See also Heumann, *De Cyria* (Gotting. 1726); Rittmeier, De ἐκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾳ (Helmst. 1706); Knauer, Ueber ἐκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾳ (in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 6:452 sq.); *Amer. Presb. Rev.,* January 1867. *SEE JOHN (THIRD EPISTLE OF).*

Election of Clergy. How far the people had a right in the election of ministers in the early Church is a question that has been much disputed.

1. The account in <40115>Acts 1:15 of the choice of an apostle in place of Judas is cited as proof that even the apostles would not elect without the voice of the Church at Jerusalem. So in the choice of the deacons (Acts 6), the people "chose Stephen and set him before the apostles." On the other hand, the apostles themselves appointed elders, and St. Paul empowered Titus and Timothy to do the same (<44423>Acts 14:23; <550201>2 Timothy 2:1; <560105>Titus 1:5); though some interpret the word χειροτονεῖν, in these passages, as implying ordination only and not excluding a previous election by the people. Compare also <44501>Acts 15:1; <461612>1 Corinthians 5:2; <470819>2 Corinthians 8:19.

2. Clemens Romanus (t 100) *(Epist. ad Corinth.* 1, § 44) asserts that the apostles appointed bishops and deacons with the concurrence of the whole Church. It is clear, from Clement's statement, that in his time the Church had a share in the appointment of its ministers. Cyprian (t 258) testifies to the share of the people in the election of bishops and elders, calling it matter of divine authority that "sacerdos *plebe presente sub omnium oculis* deligatur, et dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur" *(Epist.* 68). Bingham cites Lampridius *(Vit. Alex. Severi, c.* 45) as stating that the emperor (A.D. 222-235) gave the people a negative vote in the appointment of procurator, on the express ground that "what the Christians did in the election of their priests and ministers, should certainly be allowed the people in the appointment of governors of provinces."

3. Even after the establishment of the hierarchy, it seems to have been usual for the clergy or presbytery, or the sitting bishop or presbyter, to nominate a person to fill the vacant office, and then for the suffrages of the people — not merely testimonial, but really elective suffrages — to be taken. Bingham sums up the facts *(Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 4, chapter 2) in substance as follows:

> **1.** No bishop could be obtruded upon an orthodox people against their consent (in case a majority were heretics or schismatics, the case was otherwise provided for): when they agreed upon a deserving bishop, they were usually gratified in their choice. The emperor Valentinian III held it to be a crime in Hilary of Aries that the ordained bishops against the consent and will of the people."

2. In many cases the voices of the people prevailed against the nominations of the bishops.

3. The modes of voting illustrate the power of the people in the elections; if they were unanimous for or against a man, they cried out "worthy" or "unworthy" (ἄξιος, ἀνάξιος*; dignus, indignus).*

If they were divided, they expressed their dissent in accusations, or even in tumults. There are instances in which persons were brought by force to the bishop to be ordained, or were elected to the office by acclamation. It was decided by the fourth Council of Carthage, that as the bishop might not elect clerks without the advice of his clergy, so likewise he should secure the consent, cooperation, and testimony of the people. The popular elections, however, became scenes of great disorder and abuse. A remarkable passage from Chrysostom *(De Sacerd.)* has been frequently quoted, and applies more or less to such elections, not only in Constantinople, but also in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and other large cities. He says: "Go and witness the proceedings at our public festivals, in which, more especially, according to established rule, the election of ecclesiastical officers take place. You will find there complaints raised against the minister as numerous and as various in their character as the multitude of those who are the subject of Church government. For all those in whom the right of election is vested split into factions. It is evident that there is no good understanding, either among themselves, or with the appointed president, or with the presbytery; One supports one man, and one another and the reason of this is, that they all neglect to look at that point which they ought to consider, namely, the intellectual and moral qualifications of the person to be elected. There are other points by which their choice is determined. One, for instance, says, 'It is necessary to elect a person who is of a good family.' Another would choose a wealthy person, because he would not require to be supported out of the revenues of the Church. A third votes for a person who has come over from some opposite party. A fourth uses his influence in favor of a relative or friend; while another lends his influence to one who has won upon him by fair speeches and plausible pretensions." In order to set aside these abuses, some bishops claimed an exclusive right of appointing to spiritual offices. In this way they gave offense to the people. In the Latin and African churches an attempt was made to secure greater simplicity in elections by introducing *interventors* or "visitors." This did not, however, long continue. Another plan was to vest the election in members of the lay aristocracy. But the

determining who these should be was left to caprice or accident; and the result was, that the right of election was taken out of the hands of the people, and vested partly in the hands of the ruling powers, and partly with the clergy, who exercised their right, either by the bishops, their suffragans and vicars, or by collegiate meetings, and this very often without paying any regard to the Church or diocese immediately concerned. Sometimes the extraordinary mode of a bishop's designating his successor was adopted; or some one unconnected with the diocese, to whom a doubtful case had been referred for decision, was allowed to nominate. But in these cases the consent of the people was presupposed. Patronage has prevailed since the fifth century; but the complete development of this system was a work of the 8th and 9th centuries. —Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticae,* book 4, chapter 2; Farrar, *Ecclesiastical Dict.* s.v.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* book 3, chapter 15; Coleman, *Christian Antiquities,* chapter 5. *SEE PATRONAGE*.

Election of Grace. On the history of the doctrine of Election, *SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE PREDESTINATION*. We present here,

I. A statement of the doctrine from the Augustinian or Calvinistic point of view, by the Reverend C. Hodge, D.D., of Princeton;

II. A statement of the doctrine from the Methodist point of view;

III. Some other conceptions of the doctrine.

I. *Election from the Calvinistic Point of View.* — The Scriptures speak, first, of the election of individuals to office, or to positions of honor and privilege. Thus Abraham was chosen to be the father of the faithful, and the depositary of the promise of redemption. Thus Jacob was chosen, in preference to Esau, to be the progenitor of the chosen people. In like manner, Saul was chosen by God to be king over Israel, and subsequently David, and after him Solomon, were selected for the same high dignity. Thus also the prophets, and, under the new dispensation, the apostles, were chosen by God for the work assigned them. 2d. The Bible speaks of the election of nations to special privileges. The Hebrews were chosen from all the nations of the earth to be God's peculiar people. To them were committed the oracles of God. They were his inheritance. They received from him their laws and their religion, and were under his special guidance and protection, In ⁽DDD⁾Deuteronomy 7:6, it is said, "Thou art an holy people

unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth;" (5219)Deuteronomy 32:9, "The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance;" (4504)Romans 9:4, "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving to the law, and the service of God, and the promises." 3d. Besides this election of individuals and of nations to external advantages, the Scriptures speak of an election to salvation: (5213)2 Thessalonians 2:13, "We are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

Of this election to eternal life all Augustinians teach, *first*, that its objects are not nations, nor communities, nor classes of persons, but individuals.

1. Because neither the nations nor communities, as such, are saved. God did not choose all the nation of the Jews to salvation. Neither does he choose the nations of Christendom to eternal life; nor any organized Church, whether Papal or Protestant. The heirs of salvation are individual men.

2. Because those chosen to salvation are chosen to “sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.” They are chosen "to be holy and without blame before him in love" (4004)Ephesians 1:4). They are elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (6002)1 Peter 1:2). But nations and communities are not sanctified, or obedient, or unblameable before God in love.

3. We accordingly find that the elect are always addressed as individuals. Paul, when writing to a number of persons residing in Thessalonica, says, "God hath chosen you to salvation." Writing to the Ephesians, he says, "God hath chosen us," "having predestinated us." Our Lord (4308)John 13:18) says, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen;" and again (4065)John 6:37), "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." (4702)John 17:2, " Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." Verse 9, "I pray not for the world, but for those which thou hast given me." The Scriptures, therefore, clearly teach that the elect are certain individuals chosen out of the world to be the heirs of salvation.

Secondly. Augustinians hold that the ground of this election is the good pleasure of God. That is, that the reason why one person and not another is chosen to eternal life is to be found, not in what he is or does, distinguishing him favorably from his fellow-men, but simply because so it seems good in the sight of God. All being equally guilty and unworthy, God, for the manifestation of his glory, and for the attainment of the highest ends, chooses some, and not others, to be vessels of mercy prepared beforehand unto glory.

That such is the doctrine of the Scriptures on this subject is argued,

1. Because the Bible expressly says that election is of grace and not of works. It is not of works means that it is not what a man does that determines whether he is to be one of the elect or not. The apostle, in Romans 9:11, teaches that the choice of Jacob instead of Esau was made and announced before their birth, "that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth." It matters not whether the election here spoken of be to eternal life or to temporal advantages. The apostle refers to this incident in proof of God's sovereignty, and therefore he infers from it, " It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (verse 16). In like manner, in chapter 11 of the same epistle, he refers to the declaration made in the Old Testament to Elias! "I have reserved unto myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal;" and adds, "Even so, then, at this present time there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace" (verses 4-6). The mass of the Jews were cast off. A remnant was saved. That remnant consisted of those whom God chose. His choice was a sovereign one. It was of grace, and not of works. It was determined by the good pleasure of God, and not by what the objects of that choice had done. Paul himself belonged to that remnant. He was an illustrious example of the sovereignty of God in election. He had done nothing to secure the favor of God. He Was chosen to eternal life not because he repented and believed. He was converted not because he had faithfully used the means of securing a knowledge of Christ. On the contrary, he was converted in the midst of his wicked career of persecution. He was brought to faith and repentance because, as our Lord says, "He was a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts 9:15). Paul's experience, as well as the teaching of the Holy Spirit, impressed upon his mind a deep conviction of the sovereignty

of God in the salvation of men. He knew he had been chosen not for, but notwithstanding, his previous character and conduct. And he knew that, had he not been thus chosen, he would have perished forever. It is not surprising, therefore, that he valued this doctrine, or that he so often refers to himself as a monument of the grace of God in the election and salvation of sinners. In his epistle to the Galatians, after referring to the fact that he had beyond measure persecuted the Church of God," he adds, "It pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me" (<480115>Galatians 1:15). See also <442214>Acts 22:14; <461509>1 Corinthians 15:9; <540115>1 Timothy 1:15, 16: "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe in him to life everlasting." Nothing could have pained the apostle more than that any one should attribute his conversion in any form or in any measure to himself. His constant and grateful acknowledgment was; "By the grace of God I am what I am." The negative statement that election is "not of works," is often, as in the passages above cited, connected with the positive assertion that it is of grace, or due to the sovereign pleasure of God.

2. It is not, however, merely in isolated passages that this doctrine is taught; it is elaborately proved and vindicated. Thus, in <461017>1 Corinthians 1:17-31, the opponents of Paul in Corinth had urged against him that he was neither a philosopher nor a rhetorician; he came neither with "the wisdom of men" nor with enticing words." Paul's answer to this objection is twofold. First, he shows that philosophy, or the wisdom of men, had never led to the saving knowledge of God (1Corinthians 1:18-21); secondly, that when the true method of salvation was revealed, it was rejected by the wise. “Look at your calling, brethren," he says; see whom it is that God hath chosen. It is not the wise, the noble, or the great; but God hath chosen the foolish, the weak, and the base. This was done with the design that no flesh should glory in his presence; no man was to be allowed to refer his conversion to himself. It is of God ye are in Christ Jesus, that he that glorieth may glory in the Lord (<461226>1 Corinthians 1:26-31).

Thus, also, in <490103>Ephesians 1:3-6, the apostle reminds his readers that God had blessed them with every spiritual blessing (verse 3). This he had done because he had chosen them in Christ before the foundation of the world, to be holy and without blame before him in love (verse 4). He had thus chosen them to holiness, because he had, according to the good pleasure of

his will, predestined them to the high dignity of sonship (verse 5). He had thus predestined them to be his sons, in order to glorify his grace or unmerited love (verse 6). In these few verses the whole Augustinian doctrine on this subject is stated with the utmost clearness and precision.

In the 8th chapter of the epistle to the Romans, the design of the apostle is to show the security of believers. Those who are in Christ shall never be condemned; because they are justified; because they have the principle of spiritual life through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; because they are the children of God; because the Spirit makes intercession for them; because those whom God foreknows, he predestinates: whom he predestinates, he calls: whom he calls, he justifies: whom he justifies, he glorifies. This is a chain which cannot be broken. Those in whom he fixes his choice, he predestines, as said in the Ephesians, to be his sons and daughters; and those whom he thus predestinates, he effectually calls or regenerates; and those whom he regenerates, he will certainly save. All this the apostle confirms by a reference to the infinite and immutable love of God. "If God se loved us," he argues, "that he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for "is, how shall he not with him freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justified. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for US."

It was a natural objection to the apostle's doctrine that God had rejected the Jews and called the Gentiles; that it involved a violation of his promise to the patriarch Abraham. To this objection he gives, in the ninth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, a twofold answer. The one is, that the promise of salvation pertained not to the natural, but to the spiritual children of Abraham; not to the Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα, but to the Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα. The other is, that God acts as a sovereign in the dispensation both of temporal and of spiritual blessings. This he illustrates in the choice of Isaac instead of Ishmael, and of Jacob instead of Esau. Besides, he expressly claims this prerogative, saying to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion."

To the objection that it is unjust thus to dispense or withhold mercy at his own good pleasure, Paul's answer is, that any attribute which the Scriptures ascribe to God, and any prerogative which he actually exercises, we must admit rightfully to belong to him. If God, in his Word, claims this

prerogative of having mercy on whom he will have mercy, and if he actually exercises it in his providence, and in the dispensation of his grace, it is vain for us to deny or to protest. The judge of all the earth must do right.

Besides, as the inspired writer continues his argument, if the potter has the right of the same mass of clay to make one vessel to honor and another to dishonor, has not the infinite God the same right over his fallen creatures? Can any one complain if, to manifest his mercy, he saves some of the guilty children of men, and to manifest his justice he allows others to bear the just recompense of their sins? This is only doing what every good and wise human sovereign is expected and required to do.

It cannot fail to be noticed that the character of the apostle's doctrine is determined by the objections to it. Had he taught that God chooses as vessels of mercy those who he foresees will believe, and leaves to perish those who he foresees will reject the Gospel, there had been no pretext for the charge of injustice. It was because he taught that God gave repentance and faith to some and not to others that his opponents charged him with teaching what was inconsistent with impartial justice on the part of God.

3. That God is sovereign in the election of the heirs of salvation is plain, because men are chosen to holiness; faith and repentance are gifts of God, and fruits of his Spirit. If it is election to salvation which secures repentance and faith, repentance and faith cannot be the ground of election. The passages of Scripture already quoted distinctly assert that election precedes and secures the exercise of faith. In <490104>Ephesians 1:4, it is said, We were chosen, before the foundation of the world, to be holy. In <490208>Ephesians 2:8, of the same epistle, it is said, "Faith is the gift of God;" and in verse 10, that we were foreordained unto good works. In Colossians, faith is said to be " of the operation of God" (<510212>Colossians 2:12). In <490119>Ephesians 1:19, it is referred to "the mighty power of God," which wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. In <600102>1 Peter 1:2, it is said, we are elected "unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Vocation, that is, regeneration, the fruits of which are faith and holy living, follows election, as taught in <450830>Romans 8:30, "whom he did predestinate, them he also called." In a preceding verse of that chapter, it is said, we are predestinated " to be conformed to the image of his Son." But conformity to the image of Christ includes all that is good in us. Christ was exalted "to give repentance and forgiveness of sin"

(<4405>Acts 5:31). "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth" (<5525>2 Timothy 2:25). "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world to be rich in faith" (<5905>James 2:5). "It is of him ye are in Christ Jesus" (<4601>1 Corinthians 1:30). It is, however, unnecessary to multiply quotations. The Bible is full of the doctrine that regeneration is the gift of God; that all holy exercises are due to the working of his Spirit. All Christians recognize this truth in their prayers. They pray earnestly for the conversion of those dear to them. This takes for granted that God can and does change the heart; that all that pertains to salvation, the means as well as the end, are his gifts. If he gives us repentance — if the fact be due to him that we, and not others, turn from our sins to the living God, then surely he does not choose us and not others because of such repentance.

4. Salvation is by grace. Grace is not mere benevolence, nor is it love in the form in which God loves the holy angels. It is love to the unholy, the guilty, to enemies. It is mysterious love. It is compared to the instinctive love of a mother for her child, which is independent of its attractions. This is the most wonderful, and, perhaps, the most glorious of all the known attributes of God. We are distinctly told that the special object of the redemption of man was the revelation of this divine perfection; it was for the manifestation "of the glory of the riches of his grace" (<4906>Ephesians 1:6). He hath quickened us, raised us up, made us sit in heavenly places, "that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness to us through Christ Jesus" (<4907>Ephesians 2:5-7). Such being the design of redemption, it must, in all its stages, be a work of grace. It was a matter of grace that redemption was provided for man and not for angels; it was a matter of grace that God gave his Son for our salvation. To make the mission of Christ a matter of justice, something to which our fallen race had a righteous claim, would alter the whole character of the Bible. The incarnation, sufferings, and death of the Son of God are everywhere set forth as manifestations of the unmerited and infinite love of God. But if a matter of grace that salvation was provided for the children of men, it was a matter of grace that the knowledge of the plan of salvation was communicated to some and not to others — to the Jews and not to the Gentiles. It is of grace that any sinner is justified, that he is sanctified and saved. From first to last salvation is of grace. To introduce the element of works or merit into any part of the plan vitiates its character. It is expressly taught that regeneration or conversion, the fact

that one man is converted and not another, is a matter of grace. This is what the apostle specially insists upon in the first chapter to the Corinthians, already referred to. He calls upon his readers to look at their calling, to see who among them were called. It was not the wise or the great, but the foolish and the insignificant, whom God chose, for the very purpose that no flesh should glory in his presence. — It was necessary that the subjects of salvation should feel and acknowledge that they were saved by grace; that it was not for any merit of their own, not for anything favorably distinguishing them from others, but simply that God, and the riches and sovereignty of his grace, should be magnified in them. Such is the form of apostolic Christianity, and such is the form in which it reveals itself in the heart of the believer. His theory may be one thing, but his inward and, it may be added, his delightful consciousness is that he owes his salvation to the grace of God alone.

5. The doctrines of the Bible are so related that one of necessity implies others. If the Scriptures teach that men, since the Fall, are born in a state of sin and condemnation, and are spiritually dead until renewed by the Holy Ghost; if this death in sin involves entire helplessness, or inability to any spiritually good; if regeneration, or effectual calling, is effected, not by the moral influence of the truth, or by those divine influences common to all who hear the Gospel, but "by the mighty power of God," then of necessity the calling and consequently the election of those who are sated is a matter of sovereignty. If Christ, when on earth, raised some from the dead and not others, it was not anything in the state of one dead body as distinguished from others which determined which should rise and which should remain in their graves. As this connection between doctrines exists, all the evidence which the Bible contains of one of the truths just mentioned is so much evidence in favor of the others.

6. The system of doctrine with which these views are connected is frequently designated as Pauline. But this is a misnomer. Although clearly taught by the apostle Paul, these views are far from being peculiar to his writings. They not only pervade the Scriptures, but were inculcated with greater solemnity, clearness, and frequency by our blessed Lord himself than by any other of the messengers of God. He constantly addressed men as in a hopeless and helpless state of sin and misery, from which nothing but the almighty power of God could deliver them. Of the mass of mankind thus lying under the just displeasure of God, he speaks of those whom the Father had given him, who should certainly come to him, and whom he

would without fail bring into his heavenly kingdom. He constantly refers to the good pleasure of God as the only assignable reason why one is saved and not another. "Many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias... . but unto none of them was Elias sent save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman, and she was a widow. And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet, and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman the Syrian" (<4025>Luke 4:25-27). "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight" (<4011>Matthew 11:25, 26). "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand" (<4010>Luke 8:10). "All that the Father hath given me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out... . And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that if all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but raise it up again at the last day" (<4006>John 6:37, 39). "No man can come to me except the Father draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day" (verse 44). "No man can come to me except it were given unto him of my Father" (verse 65). "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world" (<4015>John 15:19). "Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one" (<4010>John 10:26-28). "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he might give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him" (<4017>John 17:2). "Thine they were, and thou gavest them me" (verse 6). " I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine" (verse 9). ' Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me" (verse 11). "Father, I will that they also, whom thon hast given me, be with me where I am." Our Lord thus teaches that those who are saved are certain persons chosen out of the world and given to him by the Father; that those thus given to him certainly come to him; that this certainty is secured by the drawing of the Father; and that those thus given to him are certainly saved.

7. There is an intimate relation between truth and Christian experience. The one accords with the other. What the Bible teaches of the sinfulness of

man, the believer feels to be true concerning himself. What it teaches of the helplessness and dependence of the sinner, his own experience teaches him to be true; what is said of the nature and effects of faith answers to what he finds in his own heart. If, therefore, the Bible teaches that it is of God, and not of himself, that the believer is in Christ Jesus; that he, and not others, repent and believe; that he has been made to hear the divine voice, while others remain deaf — this will find a response in the bosom of the experienced Christian. We consequently find all these truths impressed upon the common consciousness of the Church, as it finds expression in its liturgies, its prayers, praises, and confessions. "Not unto us, not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be the glory," is the spontaneous language of the believer's heart. It is not in experimental religion, in the theology of the heart, that the children of God differ, but in the form in which the understanding undertakes to reduce these facts of Scripture experience to logical consistency.

8. As there is this correspondence between the truths of the Bible and religious experience, there is a like analogy between the providence of God and the dispensations of his grace. He is not more sovereign in the one than in the other. It is of him that we were born in a Christian land and not heathendom; among Protestants instead of in Spain or Italy; of Christian parents and in the bosom of the Church instead of being the children of the irreligious and immoral. It is the "Lord that maketh poor and maketh rich; he bringeth low and lifteth up" (<09207>1 Samuel 2:7). "God putteth down one and setteth up another" (<19507>Psalm 75:7). " It is he giveth power to get wealth" (<05818>Deuteronomy 8:18). "He giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them who know understanding" (<27212>Daniel 2:12). "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he wills" (<27047>Daniel 4:17). The Bible is full of this doctrine. God governs all his creatures and all their actions. "He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (<49011>Ephesians 1:11). This is a truth of even natural religion; at least it is recognised by all Christians. They pray for favorable seasons, for protection from disease and accident, and from the malice of their enemies. When the pestilence sweeps over the land, and one is taken and another left, we all say, " It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth right in his sight." All that Augustinians teach concerning election is, that God acts in the dispensation of grace as he does in his providential government of the world. If sovereignty be consistent with justice and goodness in the one case, it must be in the other.

The difficulty which is usually felt on this subject arises from looking at only one aspect of the case. It is true that God gives health, wisdom, riches, power, the knowledge of the truth, saving grace, and life everlasting, according to his good pleasure. He exercises the prerogative of having mercy upon whom he will have mercy. It is true that what in fact occurs God intended to permit. Although he can, as all Christians admit, control the acts of free agents, he permitted the fall of man. He permits the present amount of sin and misery in the world. If so be that multitudes perish in their sins, it is undeniable that God intended, for wise reasons, to permit them to perish. While all this is true, it is no less true that he never interferes with the free agency of his rational creatures. If a man of the world determines to make the acquisition of wealth the end of his life, he is perfectly free in forming that determination. If he determines by diligence and honesty to accomplish his object, or if he chooses to resort to deceit and fraud, he is in both cases free and responsible. On the other hand, if a man determines to make the salvation of his soul and the service of Christ the great end of his being, he also is perfectly free in the choice he makes. If God makes him willing, he does not act unwillingly. Paul was never more free in his life than when he made a complete surrender of himself to Christ, saying, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" No man, we may well believe, ever sought Christ with the diligence and constancy, under the guidance of the Gospel, which the men of the world exhibit who failed of being saved. All who perish under the knowledge of the truth perish because they deliberately prefer the world to God.

The importance of the doctrine in question arises from the fact that, in the present state of human nature, if God by his almighty power did not convert some from the error of their way, no man would be saved. If he left all to themselves, and to those influences of the Spirit common to all who hear the Gospel, all would continue in their sins. Had not Christ by his omnipotence healed some lepers, none would have been healed; had he not opened some sightless eyes, all the blind would have continued in darkness.

The practical effect of the doctrine that we are entirely helpless in our sin and guilt, lying at the mercy of God, is to lead us to cast ourselves at his feet, saying, God be merciful to us sinners! As the deaf, and blind, and leprous, under a sense of helplessness and misery, crowded to Christ for healing, so souls burdened with the leprosy of sin are constrained to look to him for help, and those who come to him he will in no wise cast out. (C.H.)

II. *The Doctrine of Election from the Arminian Point of View. —*

1. John Wesley sums up his view of election as follows: "I believe it commonly means one of these two things:

(1.) A divine appointment of some particular men to do some particular work in the world. And this election I believe to be not only personal, but absolute and uncondition: 2. Thus Cyrus was *elected* to rebuild the Temple, and St. Paul, with the twelve, to preach the Gospel. But I do not find this to have any necessary connection with eternal happiness. Nay, it is plain it has not; for one who is *elected* in this sense may yet be lost eternally. 'Have I not chosen *(elected)* you twelve,' saith our Lord, 'yet one of you hath a devil?' Judas, you see, was *elected* as well as the rest; yet is his lot with the devil and his angels.

(2.) I believe election means, *secondly*, a divine appointment of some men to eternal happiness. But I believe this election to be conditional, as well as the reprobation opposite thereto. I believe the eternal decree concerning both is expressed in these words: 'He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.' And this decree, without doubt, God will not change, and man cannot resist. According to this, all true *believers* are in Scripture termed *elect;* as all who continue *in unbelief* are so long properly *reprobates*, that is, *unapproved* of God, and *without discernment* touching the things of the Spirit. Now God, to whom all things are present at once, who sees all eternity at one view, 'calleth the things that are not as though they were,' the things that are not as yet as though they were now subsisting. Thus he calls Abraham 'the father of many nations' before even Isaac was born. And thus Christ is called 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' though he was not slain, in fact, till some thousands of years after. In like manner God calleth true believers 'elect from the foundation of the world,' although they were not actually elect or believers till many ages after, in their several generations. Then only it was that they were actually elected when they were made 'the sons of God by faith.' Then were they in fact chosen and taken out of the world; 'elect,' saith St. Paul, 'through belief of the truth;' or, as St. Peter expresses it, 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God, through sanctification of the Spirit.' This election I as firmly believe as I believe the Scripture to be of God. But unconditional election I cannot believe; not only because I cannot find it in Scripture, but also (to waive all other considerations)

because it necessarily implies unconditional reprobation. Find out any election which does not imply reprobation, and I will gladly agree to it. But reprobation I can never agree to while I believe the Scriptures to be of God, as being utterly irreconcilable to the whole scope of the Old and New Testaments" *(Works,* N.Y. edition, 6:28, 29).

2. The following summary statement is from the Reverend Dr. Whedon: "All God's choices are elections. Some of these elections are unconditional, viz. those which relate to material objects, the absolute disposing of which violates no flee agency. But there is also a class of conditional elections or predeterminations by God, which are so far contingent as that they are conditioned upon the actual performance of certain free acts by the finite agent as foreseen. Those free acts, required by God as conditions to this election, are by divine grace placed in the power of every responsible agent, so that the primary reason why any are not elected is that they do not exercise their power of meeting those conditions. And since every responsible agent has the power to make his own calling and election sure, and every elect person has full power to reject the conditions, so it is not true that the number of the elect can be neither increased nor diminished. Every man has gracious powers to be elected according to the eternal purpose of God. All men may be saved. Every individual, by grace divine, may place himself in the number of those who are chosen from before the foundation of the world. The reprobates are those who, abusing the conferred grace of God, resisting the Holy Spirit, reject the conditions of salvation, and so fail to present the necessary tests to their election. The elect are chosen *unto* good works, to holy faith, to persevering love, to a full manifestation of the power of the Gospel during their probationary life, and upon their full performance of this their work and mission, they attain, through grace divine, to a rich, unmerited salvation" *(Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1862, page 268).

3. The following statement and argument is chiefly abridged from Watson, *Theological Institutes,* part 2, chapter 26: Three kinds of election are mentioned in Scripture, viz.:

i. *The election of individuals to perform some particular service,* which has no necessary connection with their salvation. Cyrus was God's chosen servant to promote the rebuilding of his Temple. The apostles of our Lord were elected to their office: "Have I not chosen you twelve?" This was an act of sovereign choice for which Christ gave no reason. He made no

apologies to those disciples who were not chosen, and he never allowed any one who had the call to refer to anything meritorious in himself as the cause. He is the Lord of his Church. Great mischief has been done by confounding this election to office, which in its nature must be unconditional, with personal election to salvation, dependent upon faith and perseverance. St. Paul had an unconditional election to the same office from which Judas fell. He was a "chosen" vessel to be the apostle of the Gentiles.

ii. The second kind of election is that *of communities or bodies of people to eminent religious privileges* to accomplish, through their means, the merciful purposes of God in benefiting other nations. This was once applicable to the Jews, as it is now to the Christians. "You only have I chosen of all the families of the earth." "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." This fact may in part account for the frequent and familiar use of the terms *elect, chosen,* and *peculiar* in the New Testament, when the apostles are writing to the churches. This, however, does not explain fully the reason for the use of these terms. The abrogation of the *church-state* of the Jews, and the admission of Gentiles to an equality with Jews as the people of God, will account for the adoption of this phraseology. The reason of their peculiar existence as a nation ceased with the coming of Christ, for he was a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the glory of his people Israel. There was a new election of a new people of God, to be composed of Jews, not by virtue of their natural descent, but by faith in Christ; and of Gentiles of all nations, also believers, and placed on an equal ground with the believing Jews (see Romans 11). It is easy therefore, to see what is the import of the 'calling' and 'election' of the Christian Church, as spoken of in the New Testament. It was not the calling and the electing of one nation in particular to succeed the Jews, but it was the calling and the electing of believers in all nations, wherever the Gospel should be preached, to be in reality what the Jews typically, and therefore in an inferior degree, had been the visible Church of God, 'his people,' under Christ 'the head;' with an authenticated revelation; with an appointed ministry, never to be lost; with authorized worship; with holy days and festivals; with instituted forms of initiation; and with special protection and favor.

Now what were the effects of this election?

(1.) Plainly the ancient election of the Jews to be God's peculiar people did not secure the salvation of every Jew individually, nor did it exclude the non-elect Gentiles from adequate means of salvation; nay, the election of the Jews was intended for the benefit of the Gentiles — to restrain idolatry and diffuse spiritual truth.

(2.) As to the election of the Christian Church, it does not infallibly secure the salvation of every member of the Church, nor does it conclude anything against the saving mercy of God being still exercised as to those who are out of the Church; nay, the very election of Christians (who are the "salt" of the earth) is intended to bring those who are still in "the world" to Christ.

This collective election is often confounded by Calvinists with personal election. This is especially done in the interpretation of Paul's argument in Romans 9-11. But a just exegesis of these chapters shows that they can be interpreted only of collective election, not of personal election (see the full examination of this in Watson, *Institutes*, 2:312-325). The apostle does, indeed, treat of unconditional election in this discourse, but it is of unconditional *collective* election.

iii. The third kind *is personal election of individuals to be the children of God.* Our Lord says, "I have chosen you out of the world." St. Peter says, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." Then election must take place in time, and must be subsequent to the administration of the means of salvation. The " calling" goes before the “election," and the "sprinkling of the blood of Christ" before that "sanctification" through which they become "the elect" of God. In a word, "the elect" are the body of true believers; and personal election into the family of God is through personal faith. All who truly believe are elected; and all to whom the Gospel is sent have, through the grace that accompanies it, the power to believe placed within their reach; and all such might, therefore, attain to the grace of personal election. The doctrine of personal election is therefore brought down to its true meaning. *Actual* election cannot be eternal; for from eternity the elect were not actually chosen out of the world, and from eternity they could not be "sanctified unto obedience." The phrases "eternal election' and "eternal decree of election" can therefore mean only "an eternal purpose" to elect, a purpose formed in eternity to choose and sanctify *in time* “by the Spirit and the

blood of Jesus." But when Calvinists graft on this the doctrine that God hath from eternity chosen in Christ unto salvation a set number of men *(certam quorundam hominum multitudinem)* unto holiness and eternal life, without cause or condition except his arbitrary will, they assert a doctrine not to be found in the Word of God. It has two parts:

(1) the choosing of a determinate number of men, which cannot be increased or diminished;

(2) this choice is unconditional. Let us consider these two points.

a. As to the choosing of a *determinate number of men,* it is allowed by Calvinists that they have no express scriptural evidence for this tenet. And,

(1.) As to God's *eternal* purpose to elect, we know nothing except from revelation, and that declares

(a) that he willeth *all* men to be saved;

(b) that Christ died for *all* men, in order to the salvation of all; and

(c) the decree of God is, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned:" and if God be unchangeable, this must have been his decree from all eternity:

(d) if the fault of men's destruction lies in *themselves,* then the number of the elect is capable of *increase* and *diminution.*

(2.) This doctrine *necessarily* carries with it that of the *unconditional reprobation* of all mankind, except the elect, which cannot be reconciled with the moral attributes of God, i.e., with his love, wisdom, grace, compassion, justice, or sincerity; nor with the scriptural doctrine that *God is no respecter of persons;* nor with the scriptural doctrine of the *eternal salvation of infants;* nor, finally, with the proper end of *punitive justice,* which is, to deter men from sin, and to add strength to the law of God.

b. As to the second branch of this doctrine, viz. that personal election is *unconditional.*

(1.) According to this doctrine, the Church of God is constituted on the sole principle of the divine purpose, not upon the basis of faith and obedience, which manifestly contradicts the Word of God, according to which Christ's Church is composed not merely of men, as Peter, James,

and John, but of Peter, James, and John believing and obeying; while all who “believe not," and obey not, are of "the world," not of "the chosen."

(2.) This doctrine of *election without respect to faith* contradicts the history of the commencement and first constitution of the Church of Christ. The first disciples became such by believing; and before baptism men were required to believe, so that their actual election had respect to faith.

(3.) There is no such doctrine in Scripture as the election of individuals *unto* faith, and it is Inconsistent with several passages which speak expressly of personal election, e.g. <43159>John 15:19; <60102>1 Peter 1:2; <53213>2 Thessalonians 2:13,14.

(4.) There is another class of texts in which the term election occurs, referring to believers, not personally, but as a body forming the Church of Christ, which texts, containing the *word* election, are ingeniously applied to the support of the doctrine of unconditional personal election, when in fact they do not contain it. Such is <49104>Ephesians 1:4, 5, 6. Now in regard to this text, it might be shown

(a) that if personal election *were* contained in it, the choice spoken of is not of men merely, but of *believing* men; but

(b) it does not contain the doctrine of personal election, but that of the eternal purpose of God to constitute his visible Church no longer upon the ground of descent from Abraham, but on that *of faith in Christ*,

(5.) Finally, the Calvinistic doctrine has no stronger passage to lean upon. We conclude by asking if this doctrine be true,

(a) Why are we commanded "to make our *election* sure?"

(b) Where does Scripture tell us of *elect unbelievers?*

(c) and how can the Spirit of truth convince such of sin and danger, when they are, *in fact*, in no danger?

The fundamental objection made by Calvinists to the Arminian doctrine is that it "subverts grace!” How? Because "it is not an act of grace for the Most High to do justice!" Does this mean that God cannot be at once gracious and just? Grace, in this discussion, is not opposed to God's

justice, but to man's desert. If, indeed, human merit alone had entered into the question, the race would have ended with Adam; and it was only in virtue of the covenant of grace that descendants were born to him. Under that covenant God *is* bound, not, indeed, by any desert of man (for that would preclude grace), but by his own faithfulness, to offer salvation in Christ to all who fell in Adam. This is the doctrine of Arminians; this, too, is the doctrine of Scripture. The Gospel system is called by St. Paul the " grace of God, given to us in Christ Jesus." And he tells us that "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men (ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*)* hath appeared" (Titus 2:11); that "the living God is the Savior of all men, especially those that believe" (1 Timothy 4:10); that he "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (1 Timothy 2:4). According to the Gospel scheme, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." This θέλημα Θεοῦ is his determinate counsel — a decree "of his good pleasure." "Not, however, that it would have been consistent for God to desert the human race, and leave it to perish; the divine goodness forbids such a supposition. The simple meaning is that no external necessity compelled him to it, and that it was his free grace, without desert or worthiness on the part of man" (Knapp, *Theol. §* 88). Were God bound, *by any merit in man,* to restore freedom of will and moral power to man, there would be no grace in the act. But God may be bound by the perfections of his own character, and, in accordance with the scheme of human salvation which he in his infinite goodness has devised and announced, to do many things for man, which, so far as the recipient is concerned, are pure acts of grace. The Augustinian doctrine holds, in effect, that God displays his mercy in saving a portion of mankind by irresistible grace, and in "destroying the rest by the simple rule of his own sovereignty." The Methodist doctrine is that God, of his boundless philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία, Titus 3:4), provides means for the salvation of the whole human race, gives grace to enable each man to appropriate that salvation to himself, and destroys none but those who willfully refuse that grace. The former, in its fatalistic elements, is as much the doctrine of Mohammed as of Christ; the latter is the very grace of the Gospel." *SEE GRACE*.

III. *Other Views on Election.* — It is undeniable that the Augustinian doctrine has been held by many of the greatest and subtlest intellects from Augustine's time until now. It has a sort of fascination, especially for masculine and vigorous natures. Is not the explanation probably to be

found in the fact that such natures find "a deep peace in the belief that their own greatest efforts are not really efforts at all, but the natural fruits of a divine necessity; that *they* can neither fail nor succeed so long as they obey implicitly, but only transmit the energies and register the decrees of a diviner might and wisdom? No doubt there is A great fascination in a mode of thought which almost obliterates the human instrument in the grandeur of the inevitable purpose. Calvinism is a personal and Christian way of merging the individual in the grandeur of a universal destiny" *(Spectator,* July 2, 1864), Perhaps the greatest danger in the tendencies of modern thought is that of the subversion of the mora) freedom of man by the general acceptance of the doctrine that physical law is just as valid in the moral world as in the material. That the Calvinistic doctrine *tends in this direction* cannot be denied. And this tendency is doubtless one of the grounds, if not the chief ground, of the modern reaction against Augustinianism among spiritual thinkers (as distinguished from materialists) on the one hand, and of the various schemes of modified Augustinianism which have been proposed within the theological sphere as substitutes for extreme Calvinism, as Baxterianism, the so-called moderate Calvinism (q.v.) and the New-England Theology (q.v.).

1. Dr. Nevin *(Mercersburgh Review,* April, 1857, *not* writing from the Arminian point of view) compares the New Testament idea of election with the Calvinistic as follows: "Are the references to the idea of election in the New Testament such, as a general thing, that they may be fairly construed in the known and established sense of the Calvinistic dogma; or are they so circumstanced and conditioned as to require plainly a different interpretation? On this point there is no room for any serious doubt. The New Testament doctrine of election, as it meets us, for instance, in the epistles of St. Peter, and rules continually the thinking and writing of St. Paul, is something essentially different from the doctrine of election which is presented to our view in Calvin's Institutes. The proof of this is found sufficiently in one single consideration. The Calvinistic election involves, beyond the possibility of failure, the full salvation at last of all those who are its subjects; there is no room to conceive of their coming short of this result in any single instance, made certain as it is in the form of a specific purpose and predetermination in the divine mind from all eternity. Election and glorification, the beginning and the end of redemption, are so indissolubly bound together that they may be considered different sides only of one and the same fact. The 'elect' in Calvin's sense have no power

really to fall from grace, or come short of everlasting life: But, plainly, the 'elect' of whom the New Testament speaks, the 'chosen and called of God' in the sense of St. Peter and St. Paul, are not supposed to possess any such advantage; on the contrary, it is assumed in all sorts of ways that their condition carries with it, in the present world, no prerogative of certain ultimate salvation whatever. They may forget that they were purged from their old sins, lose the benefit of their illumination, make shipwreck of their faith, and draw back to everlasting perdition. They have it in their power to throw away the opportunities of grace, just as much as it lies in the power of men continually to waste in like manner the opportunities of mere nature. Their salvation is, after all, hypothetical, and suspended upon conditions in themselves which are really liable to fail in every case, and which with many do eventually fail in fact. Hence occasion is supposed to exist, in the sphere of this election itself, for all sorts of exhortation and warning to those who are the subjects of it, having the object of engaging them to 'make their calling and election *sure.'* The tenor of all is, Walk worthy of your vocation. Only such as endure unto the end shall be saved. So run that ye may obtain.' Plainly, we repeat, the two conceptions are not the same. The difference here brought into view is such as to show unanswerably that the Calvinistic dogma is one thing, and the common New Testament idea of election altogether another. The Calvinistic election terminates on the absolute salvation of its subjects; that forms the precise end and scope of it, in such so that there is no room to conceive of its failing to reach this issue in any single case. The New Testament election, as it enters into the thinking of St. Peter and St. Paul, terminates manifestly on a state or condition short of absolute salvation. Whatever the distinction may involve, for those who are its subjects, in the way of saving grace, it does not reach out at once to the full issue of eternal life. The fact it serves to establish and make certain for them is of quite another character and kind; it sets them in the way of salvation, but it does not make their salvation sure."

2. Martensen *(Christian Dogmatics,* Edinb. 1866), a modern Lutheran divine, remarks — that Calvin "confounds predestination with the election of grace. The separation which is only temporal he made eternal, be. cause he laid its foundations in the eternal counsel of God. God, according to him, made from eternity a twofold election, because he hath foreappointed certain persons to faith and to blessedness, and certain others to unbelief and everlasting damnation. This awful election he further maintained to be

purely unconditional, and thus he mistook the true relations between the divine and the human... . From Calvin's point of view man has no *history* — at least so far as history includes the idea of a temporal and free life in which what is as yet undecided will be decided; all is decided beforehand — existence, life, destiny... . The true basis of the doctrine of election is given in the Lutheran doctrine of universal grace and conditional decrees" (§ 206-210).

3. Browne, bishop of Ely, in his *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles* (N.Y. 1865, 8vo), gives a pretty full history of the doctrine of election, and maintains, in substance, the theory of "ecclesiastical election," viz. that, as the "Jews of old were God's chosen people, so now is the Christian Church; that any baptized member of the Church is one of God's elect, and that this election is from God's irrespective and unsearchable decree. Here, therefore, election is to baptismal privileges, not to final glory; and the elect are identical with the baptized; and the 'election' constitutes the Church" (page 402). His conclusion, from an examination of the passages of Scripture bearing on the question, is, "that the revelation which God has given us concerns his will and purpose to gather together in Christ a Church chosen out of the world, and that to this Church, and to every individual member of it, he gives the means of salvation. That salvation, if attained, will be wholly due to the favor of God, which first chooses the elect soul to the blessings of the baptismal covenant, and afterwards endues it with power to live the life of faith. If, on the other hand, the proffered salvation be forfeited, it will be in consequence of the faults and wickedness of him that rejects it. Much is said in Scripture of God's will that all shall be saved. and of Christ's death as sufficient for all men; and we hear of none shut out from salvation but for their own faults and demerits. More than this cannot with certainty be inferred from Scripture, for it appears most probable that what we learn there concerns only predestination to grace, there being no revelation concerning predestination to glory" (page 442). See also, for views somewhat similar, Faber, *Primitive Doctrine of Election* (New York, 1840, 8vo); Fry, *Essay on Election* (London 1864). For the further literature, *SEE ARMINIANISM*; *SEE PREDESTINATION*.

Election of Pope

SEE CARDINALS; *SEE CONCLAVE; SEE POPE*.

El-elo'he-Is'rael

(Hebrew *El Elohey' Yisral'*, לאֵ יהֹלֱא לאֵרָשׂיִ *Mighty One, God of Israel;* Sept. ὁ θεὸς Ισραήλ*;* Vulg. *Fortissimus Deus Israel),* the name bestowed by Jacob on the altar which he erected facing the city of Shechem, in the piece of cultivated land upon which he had pitched his tent, and which he afterwards purchased from the Bene-Hamor (<01330>Genesis 33:20). This compound term designates God as the being who can do whatever seems good to him, and who, in the recent experience of Jacob, had peculiarly manifested his power in overcoming the deep-rooted enmity of Esau, and thereby averting the most alarming evil which Jacob had ever been called to encounter. *SEE JACOB.*

Elements

(στοιχεῖα). The etymon both of the English and Greek word conveys their primary meaning: thus, elements, from "elementa," *the alimenta* from which things are m de, and στοιχεῖα, from στείχω, "to go up by steps" — *the first principles* whence the subsequent parts of things (στοιχοῦσι) proceed in order. It seems to have been believed, from a very early period, that all bodies consist of certain first, specific ingredients (στοιχεῖα), into which they are all resolvable, although different opinions prevailed respecting the number and nature of these primary constituents of things. Hesychius explains στοιχεῖα βψ πῦρ, ὕδωρ, γῆ, καὶ ἀήρ, ἀφ᾽ ων τὰ σώματα — fire, water, earth, and air, of which bodies are formed. This, which is the simplest, may be called the primary sense of the word. A secondary use of the word relates to the *organized* parts of which anything is framed, as the letters of the alphabet (Hesychius gives also γράμματα*),* these being the elements of words; also the elements, rudiments, or first principles of any art or science.

The word occurs in its *primary* sense, Wis. 7:17, σύστασιν κόσμου καὶ εὐέργειαν στοιχείων, "the constitution of the world and the operation of the elements;" also 19:18. It is used in the *same sense*, <61310>2 Peter 3:10, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσονται, and verse 12, τήκεται, " the elements burning will be dissolved and melted." The Jews, in Peter's time, spoke *of four* elements (Josephus, *Ant.* 3:7, 7).

The word occurs in a *secondary* sense in <48403>Galatians 4:3-9, τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, "the elements or rudiments of the world," which the apostle

calls ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, "weak and poor elements." He introduces the word to preserve the unity of his comparison of the law to a *pedagogue* (3:24), and of persons under it to children under tutors; and by the elements or *rudiments* of the world he evidently means that state of religious knowledge which had subsisted in the world, among Jews and Gentiles, before Christ; the weakness of which, among the Jews, may be seen in <580718>Hebrews 7:18, 19; 10:1; and among the Gentiles, in the epistle to the Romans, *passim*. "The elements of the world" occurs again, <510208>Colossians 2:8-20, in the same sense, as appears from the various allusions both to the terms used in Grecian philosophy, and the dogmas of the Judaizers in the subsequent verses; the phrase being possibly suggested to the apostle by his previous use of it to the Galatians. The word στοιχεῖα, in <580512>Hebrews 5:12, is restricted, by the addition τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, to the rudiments of Christianity (see Rosenmuller and Benson on the passages).

II. *In the Sacraments.* — The materials used in the sacraments are called the *elements*. Water is the element of baptism, bread and wine are the elements of the Eucharist. "This use of the word 'elements' (στοιχεῖα) sprung from the philosophy of the school divines, and evidently had reference to the change supposed to take place after consecration. The Church of England has discarded the term in her services, and has introduced instead the word 'creatures' ('These thy creatures of bread and wine') in the communion-service, though the word 'elements' is found in one of the rubrics of that office" (Eden). "In all the Jewish sacrifices of which the people were partakers, the viands or materials of the feast were first made God's by a pious oblation, and then afterwards eaten by the communicants, not as man's, but as God's provisions, who, by thus entertaining them at his own table, declared himself reconciled, and again in covenant with them. And therefore our blessed Savior, when he instituted the new sacrament of his own body and blood, first gave thanks and blessed the elements — that is, offered them up to God as Lord of the creatures, as the most ancient fathers expound that passage; who for that reason, whenever they celebrated the holy Eucharist, always offered the bread and wine for the communion to God upon the altar by this or some short ejaculation: 'Lord, we offer thee thine own out of what thou hast bountifully given us' " (Bishop Patrick, cited by Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.).

Elem-Recho'kim

SEE JONATH-ELEM-RECHO KIM.

E'leph

(Hebrews with the art. *ha-Eleph,* ãlah; Vulg. *Eleph),* one of the second group of towns allotted to Benjamin, and named between Zelah and Jerusalem (<061828>Joshua 18:28). It is possibly the ruined site marked as *Katamon* on Van de Velde's "Map of the environs of Jerusalem," about one mile S.W. of Jerusalem. The Sept. unites the preceding name with this, under the compound form Σηλαλέφ (Vat. MS. Σελεκάν), and accordingly assigns only *thirteen* (δεκατρεῖς) cities to this group. Eusebius and Jerome (in their *Onomasticon,* s.v.) mention Sela (Σελά, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν) as distinct from Eleph. The Peshito strangely renders the name as *Gebira.* From the occasional use of ãla in the *bucolic* sense of "ox," it has been conjectured that "Eleph and its villages" was a pastoral district. The extremely frequent *numerical* sense, however, of ãla, *a thousand,* points rather to *the populousness* of these towns, which lay in the neighborhood of Jebus or Jerusalem. Schultens *(Proverbs Solom.* 2:17) refers to the Arabic *alaph,* "union," in illustration of both the *numerical* and the *domestic* sense of the Hebrews root. (See further Meier, *Hebrews W. w. b.* page 379.) Simonis (in his *Oonomasticon,* page 141) refers to the name of the Cilician town Μυρίανδρος in illustration, and to <050111>Deuteronomy 1:11; <199107>Psalm 91:7, etc., for an indefinite use of ãla, to designate *a great multitude.* Furst, in his *Hebraisches Worterb.* (1:91, 98), finds in <380907>Zechariah 9:7 another mention of our town Eleph, under the form ãWLaior ãLai, *Alluph;* which, like *Jebusi,* he makes a frontier city belonging to Benjamin and Judah. He quotes from Jephet (or Jefet ben-Ali), a Jewish commentator who lived at Jerusalem in the 10th century, a statement that the words of <061828>Joshua 18:28, [lxeysWbyJhiãlßah; are, in fact, the designation of but a single city — or still less, apparently, than even that, for he further quotes Jefet as saying that in his time a *ward* of Jerusalem bore that aggregate name, in which was the sepulcher of Zechariah. We reject this view as not only doing violence to the distinct enumeration of the group of cities given in <061828>Joshua 18:28, but as disturbing the sense of the passage in <380907>Zechariah 9:7 (see Hengstenberg, *Christology,* 3:392-394). The phrase hdWhyBãLai *(tribe-prince in Judah),* used by the prophet in this passage, is by him repeated twice (see

(Zechariah 12:5, 6). In the Pentateuch and 1 Chronicles the same noun, ãLa¡ in the plural, designates the chieftains or "dukes" of Edom. For some valuable remarks on the phrase, as indicating the *genuineness* of the passages in Zechariah, see also Hengstenberg, 4:67, note.

Elephant

Picture for Elephant

(ἐλέφας) does not occur in the text of the canonical Scriptures of the A. V., except in the adj. ἐλεφάντινος, "of ivory," (Revelation 18:12). But the animal is believed to be referred to in the Hebrew µyBhæ]v, *elephant's tooth*, i.e., "ivory," (1 Kings 10:22); (2 Chronicles 9:21). *SEE IVORY*. Some have also regarded it as identical with the BEHEMOTH *SEE BEHEMOTH* (q.v.), as in the margin of (Job 40:15). Elephants, however, are repeatedly mentioned in the 1st and 2d books of Maccabees as being used in warfare. The way in which they were used in battle, and the method of exciting them to fight, is described in 1 Macc. 6. The essential syllable of the Greek (and modern) name seems to be derived from that which all the nations of the south and west of Asia have for many ages generally used, name*ly, fil, feel, pheel, phil,* lyp; for we find it in the Chaldee alyPæ *pila'*, Buxtorf, *Lex. Talin.* col. 1722), Syriac, Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, extending to the east far beyond the Ganges, where, nevertheless, in the indigenous tongues, *anei, waranam,* and *hatti* are existing names. See Cassel, *De variis eleph. denomi. natt.* in the *Symbol. lit. Brem.* I, 1:136 sq.; *Zeitschr. f. Kunde des Morgenl.* IV, 1:12 sq.

It is well known that these animals were anciently employed in battles, originally in India (Aristotle, *Anim.* 9:1; Pliny, 6:22; AElian, *Anim.* 13:8, 22; comp. Ritter, *Erdk.* verse 903 sq.), where they are commonly stronger and more sagacious than in Africa (Diod. Sic. 2:16; Pliny, 6:22; Philostr. Apol. 2:12; Curtius, 8:9, 17; AElian, *Anim.* 16:15; yet see Herod. 4:191; comp. Burmeister, in the *Hall. Encycl.* 33:265 sq.); next in Persia (although only indirectly before the times of Alexander, Arrian, *Alex.* in, 11, 6); later also in Asia Minor and even in the West (Flor. 1:18; Livy, 31:36; 37:40; 38:39; Hirtius, *Bell. Afr.* 48:86; Pliny, 8:5; Veget. *Mil.* 3:24; comp. Pausanias, 1:12, 4); and the Maccabees had to contend with such trained elephants in the Syrian armies of the Seleucidae (compare Plutarch, *Demetr.* 28 sq.; Appian, *Syr.* 46; Polybius, 11:32) in immense numbers (comp. Livy, 37:39; Pliny, 6:22; Polybius, 5:53). Military elephants were

accustomed to carry on their backs a wooden tower (Pliny, 8:7; Philostr. Apoll. 2:6; Juvenal, 12:110; Livy, 37:40), in which were a number of soldiers (four in the Syrian army of Antiochus the Great, according to Livy, l.c.; according to Philostr. Apoll. 2:12, about ten to fifteen; in India only three, Elian, *Anim.* 13:19; comp. Pliny, l.c.; certainly not thirty-two, as is stated in 1 Macc. 6:37: in modern India only four or five persons are placed in the elephant-tower, Munro, *Hist. of War* in *East India*, page 91 [comp. Schlegel, *Ind. Bibl.* I, 2:176; Bochart, 1:262; and see Wernsdorf, *De fide Macc.* page 119 sq.], although an elephant can easily travel with 4000 pounds on his back); and their courage was artificially stimulated by wine (,Elian, *Anim.* 13:8; on the fondness of these animals for spirituous drinks, see Thevenot, *Voyage*, 3:89). This illustrates 3 Macc. 5:2; also 1 Macc. 6:34. Each equipped elephant was surrounded in battle by more than a hundred soldiers, to protect him on the side (1 Macc. 6:35 sq.), and thus were these animals conveniently distributed along the whole line (1 Macc. 6:35; comp. Livy, 37:40; Curtius, 8:12, 7). Occasionally, however, the elephant, becoming frightened, did his master more harm than the enemy (Curtius, 3:13, 15; 8:14, 16; 9:2, 20). The driver of a single armed elephant was called Ἰνδός, i.e., an Indian (1 Macc. 6:37), while the commander of a battalion of such was styled ἐλεφαντάρχης, an elephantarch (2 Macc. 14:12; 3 Macc. 5:4). See generally Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:233 sq.; Schlegel, *Indische Bibliothek*, I, 2:129 sq.; Armandi, *Histoire militaire des ilephants* (Par. 1844); Oken, *Lehrb. der Naturgesch.* III, 2:783 sq.; Tavernier, *Voyage*, 2:72 sq.; Philippians a. S. Trinitate, *Reisebeschr.* page 386 sq.; fig. in Schreber's *Saugethiere*, 6, pl. 317.

The elephant's tusks, growing from the upper jaw (Aristotle, *Anim.* 2:4; AElian, *Anim.* 11:37), which the ancients sometimes mistook for horns (AElian, *Anim.* 4:31; 7:2; 11:37; Pausan. 5:12, 1; Pliny, 8:4; 18:1; Philostr. Apoll, 2:13; perhaps the ˆvet/nrÞi of <26275>Ezekiel 27:15; comp. Ludolf, *Hist. AEthiop.* 1:10, 29; but see Havernick, in loc.) or ivory (µybæ[]v, or simply low; comp. Pott, in the *Zeitschro f. Morgenl.* IV, 1:13 sq.), much earlier known in Asia Minor and Europe than the animal itself, were used by the Hebrews from the time of Solomon for ornamenting (overlaying, Pliny, 16:84) furniture (especially the divan, <30604>Amos 6:4; Philo, *Opp.* 2:478; <11018>1 Kings 10:18; Apulej. *Metam.* 2, page 37, ed. Bip.) and chambers (<12209>1 Kings 20:39; <30315>Amos 3:15; <19409>Psalm 45:9; comp. Homer, *Odyss.* 4:73; Diod. Sic. 3:47; Pausan. 1:12, 4; Petron. 135; Horace, *Od.* 2:18, 1; Lucan, 10:119; Herodian, 4:2, 3; Elian, *Var. Hist.*

12:39; Avien. 1200), also weapons (Curtius, 8:5, 1). Likewise vessels and images of the gods (Pausan. 5:12, 1; 2:17, 4; Virgil, *Georg.* 1:480; Pliny, 36:4; comp. Hermann, *Ad Lucian. conscrib. hist.* Page 303) were constructed of it (Revelation 18:12); while the Tyrians, who disposed of ivory *as* an article of commerce (Ezekiel 27:15), carried luxury so far as to make the rowers' benches of their ships of boxwood inlaid with ivory. For the estimation in which ivory was anciently held, and its various uses among the Greeks and Romans, see Heyne, *Antiquar. Aufs.* 2:149 sq. (also in the *Nov. commentatt. Soc. Goetting.* I, 2:96 sq.); Schlegel, *ut sup.* page 137 sq.; Kype, *Observv.* 2:461 sq.; Muller, *Archdol.* page 418 sq.; Bottiger, *Archaol. Andeut.* 1:108 sq. Solomon brought it by sea from Ophir (1 Kings 10:22; comp. verse 11).

The animals of this genus consist at present of two very distinct species, one a native of Southern Asia, once spread considerably to the westward of the Upper Indus, and the other occupying southern and middle Africa to the edge of the great Sahara. In a fossil state, however, there are six more species clearly distinguished. The elephant is the largest of all terrestrial animals, sometimes attaining above eleven feet of vertical height at the shoulders, and weighing from five to seven thousand pounds: he is of a black or slaty-ash color, and almost destitute of hair. The head, which is proportionably large, is provided with two broad pendulous ears, particularly in those of the African species, which are occasionally six feet in length. This species has also two molar teeth on each side of the jaw, both above and below, and only three toenails on each of the hind feet, whereas the Asiatic species is provided with only one tooth on each side above and below, and, though both have tusks or defences, the last mentioned has them confined solely to the males: they are never of more than 70 pounds in weight, often much less, and in some breeds even totally wanting; while in the African both sexes are armed with tusks, and in the males they have been known seven feet in length, and weighing above 150 pounds each. The forehead of the African is low, that of the Asiatic high; in both the eyes are comparatively small, with a malevolent expression, and on the temples are pores which exude a viscous humor; the tail is long, hanging nearly to the heels, and distichous at the end. But the most remarkable organ of the elephant, that which equally enables the animal to reach the ground and to grasp branches of trees at a considerable height, is the proboscis or trunk — a cylindrical elastic instrument, in ordinary condition reaching nearly down to the ground, but contractile to two thirds

of its usual length, and extensile to one third beyond it; provided with nearly 4000 muscles crossing each other in such a manner that the proboscis is flexible in every direction, and so abundantly supplied with nerves as to render the organ one of the most delicate in nature. Within is the double canal of the nostrils, and at the terminal opening a finger. like process, with which the animal can take up very minute objects and grasp others, even to a writing pen, and mark paper with it. By means of the proboscis the elephant has a power of suction capable of raising nearly 200 pounds; and with this instrument he gathers food from trees and from the earth, draws up drink to squirt it down his throat, draws corks, unties small knots, and performs numberless other minute operations; and, if necessary, tears down branches of trees more than five inches in diameter with no less dexterity than strength. The gait of an elephant is an enormous slide, performed with his high and ponderous legs, and sufficiently rapid to require brisk galloping on horseback to outstrip him. Elephants are peaceable towards all inoffensive animals; sociable among themselves, and ready to help each other; gregarious in grassy plains, but more inclined to frequent densely-wooded mountain glens; at times not unwilling to visit the more and wastes, but fond of rivers and pools, where they wallow in mud and water among reeds and under the shade of trees. They are most assuredly more sagacious than observers, who, from a few visits to menageries, compare them with dogs, are able to appreciate, for on this question we must take into account, on the one hand, the physical advantages of the proboscis added to the individual experience gained by an animal slow in growth, and of a longevity exceeding a century, but still placed in contact with man after a birth free in every sense, where his powers expand without human education; while, on the other hand, dogs are the offspring of an immense number of generations, all fashioned to the will of a master, and consequently with innate dispositions to acquire a certain education. In Griffith's *Cuvier* are found several anecdotes illustrating the sagacity of these animals, to which we shall add only a single one, related by the late Captain Hobson, R.N., as observed by himself at Travancore, where several of these animals were employed in stacking teak-timber balk. They had scarcely any human aid or direction, but each beam being successively noosed and slung, they dragged it to the stack, raised one end up, contrived to shove it forward, nicely watching when, being poised by its own weight, the lower end would rise, and then, placing their foreheads against the butt end, they pushed it even on the stack; the sling they unfastened and carried back to have it fitted again. In a

wild state no other animal has the sagacity to break off a leafy branch, hold it as a fan, and use it as a brush to drive away flies.

The Asiatic species, carrying the head higher, has more dignity of appearance, and is believed to have more sagacity and courage than the African, which, however, is not inferior in weight or bulk, and has never been in the hands of such experienced managers as the Indian mohauts are, who have acquired such deep knowledge of the character of these beasts that they make them submit to almost incredible operations; such, for example, as suffering patiently the extraction of a decayed part of a tooth, a kind of chisel and mallet being the instruments used for the purpose. Elephants walk under water as long as the end of the proboscis can remain above the surface, but when in greater depth they float with the head and back only about a foot beneath it. In this manner they swim across the broadest streams, and guide themselves by the sense of smelling till they reach footing to look about them and land. They are steady, assiduous workmen in many laborious tasks, often using discretion when they require some dexterity and attention in the performance. Good will is all man can trust to in directing them, for correction cannot be enforced beyond their patience; but flattery, good treatment, kind words, promises, and rewards, even to the wear of finery, have the desired effect. In history they appear most conspicuous as formidable elements of battle. From the remotest ages they were trained for war by the nations of India, and by their aid they no doubt acquired and long held possession of several regions of High Asia westward of the Indus. They are noticed in the ancient Mahabarata. According to Sauti, the relative force of elephants in an *akshaushini*, or great army corps, was one to each chariot of war, three horsemen, and five foot soldiers, or, rather, archers mounted on the animal's back within a defensible *howdah*-*in* the West denominated a castle. Thus one armed elephant, one chariot, and three horsemen, formed a *patti* or squad of at most eleven men, and, if there were other bodies of infantry in the army, they are unnoticed. This enumeration is sufficient to show that in India, which furnished the elephants and the model of arming them, there were only four or five archers, with or without the mohaut or driver, and that, consequently, when the successors of Alexander introduced them in their wars in Syria, Greece, and even Italy, they could not be encumbered more than perhaps momentarily with one or two additional persons before a charge; for the weight carried by a war-elephant is less than that of one used for burden, which seldom equals 2000 pounds. In order to ascend his

back when suddenly required, the animal will hold out one of his hind legs horizontally, allowing a person to step upon it until he has grasped the crupper and crept up. In the West, where they were considered for a time of great importance, no doubt the squad or escort was more considerable than in the East, and may have amounted to thirty-two foot-soldiers, the number given, by some mistake, as if actually mounted, in 1 Macc. 6:37. Although red colors are offensive to many animals, it may be observed that the use of mulberry-juice or grapes must have been intended as an excitement to their taste, for they are all fond of fruit. Wine, so as to cause an approach to intoxication, would render them ungovernable, and more dangerous than when in a state of fear. They do not require stimulants to urge them on in a modern battle, with all its flashes of fire, smoke, and explosion; and red colors usually employed for their trappings produce more of a satisfactory feeling than rage. Judicious and long-continued training is the only good remedy against sudden surprises caused by objects not yet examined by their acutely-judging senses, or connected with former scenes of danger, which are alone apt to make them turn. It is likely that the disciplined steadiness of well-armed ranks frightened them by their novelty more than the shouts of Macedonian thousands, which must have been feeble in the ears of elephants accustomed to the roar of hundreds of thousands of Indians. It is probable that the Carthaginians made the experiment of training African elephants in imitation of Ptolemy Philadelphus: they are noticed in their army only in the first Punic war; and, from what appears of the mode of managing them, there is reason to believe, as already noticed, that they were never so thoroughly subdued as the Indian elephants (see *Penny Cyclopcedia,* s.v.).

Eleusinian Mysteries

the sacred rites with which the annual festival of Ceres was celebrated at Eleusis, a town in Attica, situated to the northwest of Athens, and opposite the island of Salamis. They were the most ancient and most venerated mysteries of Greece, and were probably at first a national and harvest festival instituted to thank Demeter for the gift of fruit, to remember the barbaric times preceding the introduction of agriculture, and to rejoice at the progress made since. Both the founder of the mysteries and the time of their foundation are unknown. It is probable that the first foundation of them was laid by Thracians, who from Boeotia, spread over Western Attica; and that they were farther developed by the Athenians themselves, especially at the tinge of the Pisistratidae. The place in which they were

celebrated was the temple of Demeter at Eleusis, a spacious, almost quadratic structure, which had been erected by the architect Iktinos, and was surrounded with a double vestibule *(peribolos).* At the time when Heracles came to Athens to be initiated into the mysteries it was not yet permitted to admit any foreign Greek. In order not to violate the traditional laws, and at the same time not to offend the great hero, who was not less feared than venerated, the lesser mysteries were transferred to Agrae, a suburb of Athens, and with them Heracles had to be content. From this time the lesser mysteries served as a preparation for the greater. The initiation into the mysteries was preceded by some devotional exercises, sacred rites, and symbolic actions, the object of which was to divert the candidates for initiation for a time from the world, its pleasures and occupations, and to bring about in them a change of mind, and a longing for the disclosures to be made to them. Between initiation into the lesser and initiation into the greater one year had to elapse. The lesser were celebrated from the 19th to the 21st of the month Anthesterion (beginning of April); the greater one, the Eleusinian mysteries, were celebrated from the 16th to the 25th of Boedromion (beginning of October). "On the first day (called *agurmos,* the assembling), the neophytes, already initiated at the preparatory festival, met, and were instructed in their sacred duties. On the second day (called Halade, mystae, *To the sea, ye initiated!),* they purified themselves by washing in the sea. On the third day, sacrifices, comprising, among other things, the mulletfish, and cakes made of barley from the Rharian plain, were offered with special rites. The fourth day was devoted to the procession of the sacred basket of Ceres (the Kalathion). This basket-containing pomegranates, salt, poppy seeds, etc., and followed by bands of women carrying smaller baskets similarly filled-was drawn in a consecrated cart through the streets, amid shouts of 'Hail, Ceres!' from the onlookers. The fifth day was known as the 'day of the torches,' and was thought to symbolize the wanderings of Ceres in quest of her daughter. On it the mystae, led by the 'daduchus,' the *torch-bearer,* walked two by two to the temple of the goddess, and seem to have spent the night there. The sixth day, called Iacchus, in honor of the son of Ceres, was the great day of the feast. On that day the statue of Iacchus was borne in pomp along the sacred way from the Ceramnicus at Athens to Eleusis, where the votaries spent the night, and were initiated in the last mysteries. Till this stage of the proceedings they had been only *mystae;* but on the night of the sixth day they were admitted into the innermost sanctuary of the temple, and, from being allowed to behold the sacred things, became entitled to be called

'epoptse,' or 'ephori,' i.e., *spectators,* or *contemplators.* They were once more purified, and repeated their original oath of secrecy with an imposing and awful ceremonial, somewhat resembling, it is believed, the forms of modern free-masonry. On the seventh day the votaries returned to Athens with mirth and music, halting for a while on the bridge over the Cephisus, and exercising their wit and satire against the spectators. The eighth day was called Epidauria, and was believed to have been added to the original number of the days for the convenience of those who had been unable to attend the grand ceremonial of the sixth day. It was named in honor of AEsculapius, who arrived on one occasion from his native city of Epidaurus too late for the solemn rites, and the Athenians, unwilling to disappoint so distinguished a benefactor of mankind, added a supplementary day. On the ninth day took place the ceremony of the 'Plemochose,' in which two earthen vessels filled with wine were turned one towards the east and the other towards the west. The attendant priests, uttering some mystic words, then upset both vessels, and the wine so spilt was offered as a libation. Slaves, prostitutes, and persons who had forfeited their citizenship were excluded from the rites. During the period of the festival, none of those taking part in it could be arrested for any offense. Lycurgus, with a view to destroying distinctions of class, forbade any woman to ride to the Eleusinia in a chariot, under a penalty of 6000 drachmae. The mysteries were celebrated with the most scrupulous secrecy. No initiated person might reveal what he had seen under pain of death, and no uninitiated person could take part in the ceremonies under the same penalty. The priests were chosen from the sacred family of the Eumolpidae, whose ancestor, Eumolpus, had been the special favorite of Ceres. The chief-priest was called the 'Hierophant,' or 'Mystagogue;' next in rank to him was the Daduchus, or Torch-bearer; after whom came the 'Hiero-Ceryx,' or Sacred Herald, and the priest at the altar. Besides these leading ministers, there was a multitude of inferior priests and servants" (Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.). It was undoubtedly one chief aim of these mysteries to spread among the educated classes of the people more elevated religious ideas than were held by the mass of the people, especially with regard to the immortality of the soul, the punishment of the wicked, and the rewards of the good. The initiated were supposed to be especially protected by the gods, and to be sure of the joys of the future life. — See Ouwaroff, *Essai sur les Mysteres d'Eleusis* (3d edit. Paris, 1816; Preller, *Demeter und Persephone* (Hamb. 1837); Mommsen,

Heortoloqie. Antiquar. Untersuchungen iuber die stfdtischez Feste der Athener (Leipz. 1864). (A.J.S.)

Eleutheropolis

(Ἐλευθερόπολις, *free city),* a place not named in Scripture, but which was an episcopal city of such importance in the time of Eusebius and Jerome that they assumed it as the point whence to estimate the distances and positions of other cities in southern Palestine *(Onomast.* s.v. Estherne, Sephela, Jermus, etc.; see Reland, *Palaest.* page 410, 411). It appears from these and many other notices that Eleutheropolis was the capital of a large province during the fourth and fifth centuries of our era. It was also an episcopal city of Palaestina Prima (St. Paulo, *Geogr. Sac.* page 306; *Notitive Ecclesiasticae,* page 6). Its site remained unknown for many centuries, though defined by several ancient writers with much minuteness. Eusebius states that the plain of Shepheleh extends from Eleutheropolis westward and southward *(Onomast.* s.v. Sephela), and hence it must have stood at the southwestern base of the mountains of Judah. He also states that Bethshemesh was ten miles distant from it, on the road to Nicopolis; and Jedna, six miles on the road to Hebron; and Sochoh, nine miles on the road to Jerusalem. All these places are now known, and the lines of road being traced and the distances measured, we find that the site indicated is *Beit Jibrin* (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2:348, 359, 398, 404 420, 642-646). In the *Acta Sanctorum Martyrum,* published by Assemani in Syriac, Greek, and Latin, Peter Abselama the martyr is said to have been born at Anea, which lay, according to the Syriac version, in the district of *Beth Gubrin,* while both the Greek and Latin read in the district of *Eleutheropolis (ib.* page 66). This establishes the identity of Beth Gubrin and Eleutheropolis. Josephus mentions a town in this neighborhood called Betaris, which some copies read Βήγαβρις, and it appears to be the same place *(War,* 4:8, 1). Under its ancient name *Baetogabra (*Βαιτογάβρα, i.e., *house of Gabra* or *Gabriel?),* it is enumerated by Ptolemy among the cities of Palestine (verse 16), and it is also laid down as *Betogabri* in the Peutinger tables (Reland, *Palaest.* page 421). The name *Eleutheropolis* first appears on coins of this city inscribed to Julia Donna, the wife of Septimius Severns, in A.D. 202-3 (Eckhel, 3:488). The emperor had been in Syria about that time, and had conferred important privileges on various cities among which was Betogabris, which appears to have been then called *Eleutheropolis,* as being made a free city. Epiphanius, the well-known writer, was born in a village three miles from the city in the beginning of the 4th century, and is

often called an Eleutheropolitan (Reland, page 751,752). In the year A.D. 796, little more than a century and a half after the Saracenic conquest, Eleutheropolis was razed to the ground, and left completely desolate. The Greek language now gave place to the Arabic, and this city lost its proud name and its prouder rank together (Reland, page 987). Like so many other cities, the old Aramaic name, which had probably never been lost to the peasantry, was revived among writers, and we thus find *Beigeberin,* or some form like it, constantly in use after the 8th century (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 222, 227; *Gesta Dei per Francos,* page 1044). In the 12th century the Crusaders found it in ruins, and called by the Arabs *Bethgebrim* (doubtless a Frank corruption of *Beit Jibrin).* They built a strong fortress on the old foundations to guard against the incursions of the Moslems, the remains of which, and the chapel connected with it, still exist. After the battle of Hattin it fell into the hands of Saladin, but was retaken by Richard of England. It was finally captured by Bibars (see Will. Tyr. 14:22; Jac. de Vit. in *Gesta Dei,* pages 1070, 1071; Bohaeddin, *Vit. Salad.* page 229). It has since crumbled to ruin under the blight of Mohammedan rule.

The modern village of Belt Jibrin is about twenty-five miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Gaza. It contains between two and three hundred inhabitants, and is situated in a little nook or glen in the side of a long green valley, which is shut in by low ridges of limestone partially covered with dark copse. The ancient ruins are scattered around it, and are of considerable extent. The principal one is a large irregular enclosure, formerly surrounded by a massive wall, still in part standing, and containing the remains of the Crusaders' castle. A great part of this outer wall is completely ruinous; but the north side, which skirts the bank of the valley, is still several feet high. The enclosure is about 600 feet in diameter. The fortress is about 200 feet square, and is of a much later date than the outer wall. In the castle, along the south side, are portions of the walls and the groined roof and clustered columns of a fine old chapel — the same, doubtless, which was built by the Crusaders. An Arabic inscription over the castle-gate bears the date A.D. 958 A.D. 1551 — probably the time when it was last repaired. A short distance eastward are other massive ruins and a deep well; while about a mile up the valley are the picturesque remains of the church of St. Anne (Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* page 256 sq.). Several curious traditions have found a "local habitation" at Beit Jibrin. One places here the miraculous fountain which sprang from the jaw-bone

Samson wielded with such success against the Philistines (Anton. Mant. *Itin.* pages 30, 32).

The valley, on the side of which the ruins of Eleutheropolis lie, runs up among the hills for two miles or more south-by-east. On each side of it are low ridges of soft limestone, which rises here and there in white bare crowns over the dark shrubs. In these ridges are some of the most remarkable caverns and excavations in Palestine, rivaling in extent and interest the catacombs of Rome and Malta. They are altogether different in character from the rock-tombs of Jerusalem and the grottos of Petra. They were examined and described by Dr. Robinson, and they have since been more fully explored by Mr. Porter. They are found together in clusters, and form subterranean villages. Some are rectangular, 100 feet and more in length, with smooth walls and lofty arched roofs. Others are bell-shaped-from 40 to 70 feet in diameter, by nearly 60 feet in height-all connected together by arched doorways and winding subterranean passages. A few are entirely dark, but most of them are lighted by a circular aperture at the top. They occur at short intervals along both sides of the whole valley, and may also be seen at several other neighboring villages. The origin and object of these singular excavations are easily ascertained. During the Babylonian captivity the Edomites overran and occupied the whole of southern Palestine, which is hence called by Josephus Idumaea. Jerome calls the Idumaeans Horites, and says they inhabited the whole country extending from Eleutheropolis to Petra and Elah, and that *they dwelt in caves* — preferring them both on account of their security and their coolness during the heat of summer *(Comm. in Obad.* 1). The original inhabitants of Edom were *Horites,* that is, *Troglodytes,* "dwellers in caves." The descendants of Esau adopted the habits of their predecessors, and when they took possession of southern Palestine excavated rock dwellings wherever practicable (see Robinson's *Biblical Researches,* 2d ed. 2:23, 57 sq.; Van de Velde, *Narrative,* 2:147 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:358 sq.).

Eleu'therus

(Ἐλεύθερος, *free;* see Simonis, *Onom.* page 58), a river of Syria mentioned in 1 Macc. 11:7; 12:30. In early ages it was a noted border stream (Pliny, 5:17; 9:12; Ptolemy, 5:15, 4). According to Strabo, it separated Syria from Phoenicia (16:753), and formed the northern limit of Coele-Syria. Josephus informs us that Antony gave Cleopatra "the cities

that were within the river Eleutherus, as far as Egypt, except Tyre and Sidon" *(Ant.* 15:4, 1; *War,* 1:18, 5). A careful examination of the passages in ⁰⁶⁰⁴Numbers 34:8-10, and ²⁶⁷⁵Ezekiel 47:15-17, and a comparison of them with the features of the country, lead Mr. Porter to the conclusion that this river also formed in part the northern border of the " Promised Land" *(Five Years in Damascus,* 2:354 sq.). Pliny says that at a certain season of the year it swarmed with tortoise (9:10). Of the identity of the Eleutherus with the modern *aihr el-Kebir,* "Great River," there cannot be a doubt. Its highest source is at the northeastern base of Lebanon; it sweeps round the northern end of the range, through the opening called in Scripture "the entrance of Hamath" (⁰⁶⁰⁴Numbers 34:8), and, after receiving several small tributaries from the heights of Lebanon, it falls into the Mediterranean about eighteen miles north of Tripolis. It still forms the boundary between the provinces of Akkar and elHusn. During summer and autumn it is but a small stream, easily forded, but in winter it swells into a large and rapid river (Maundrell, p. 33; Burckhardt, page 270; Paulus, *Samml.* 1:35, 303).

Eleutherus

or Eleutherius, a native of Nicopolis, elected bishop of Rome after the death of Soter, May 3, 177. He is previously (168) mentioned as a deacon of bishop Anicetus of Rome. He opposed with much zeal the errors of the Valentinians during his tenure of office. Two events are reported to have rendered his pontificate memorable: the glorious death of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 5:4), and an embassy from Lucius, king of Great Britain, to demand a missionary to teach the Britons the Christian religion (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* 3:25; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* 1:35). The churches of Lyons and Vienne sent to him the acts of those of their members who had Just suffered martyrdom. Their messenger was the; presbyter Irenaeus, subsequently celebrated as one of the pillars of the Church in Gaul. As the letter of these churches to Eleutheo us warns against the Montanists, some have inferred, though without being supported by any other proof, that Eleutherus was an adherent of the Montanist sect. The legend about the embassy of king Lucius, and the subsequent mission of two Roman missionaries to England, is doubted by many historians. Eleutherus died A.D. 192. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome as a saint on the 26th of May. See Mosheim, *Comment.* 1:273; Neander, *Planting and Training,* 2:518; Smith. *Religion of Ancient Britain,* pages 121, 122; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* in, 753. (A.J.S.)

Elha'nan

(Hebrews *Elchanan',* ˆn;j ;l ÞÀ, whom *God has* graciously *bestowed* [compare *Hananeel, Hanananiah, Johanan,* Phoen. *Hannibal;* also *Baal-hanan,* etc.]; Sept. Ἐλεανάν*;* Vulg. *Adeodatus,* but *Chanan, Elchanan,* in Chron.), a distinguished warrior in the time of king David, who performed a memorable exploit against the Philistines, though in what that exploit exactly consisted, and who the hero himself was, it is not easy to determine. B.C. cir. 1020.

1. <0210>1 Samuel 21:19, says that he was the "son of Jaare Oregim the Bethlehemite," and that he "slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam." Here, in the A.V., the words "the brother of" are inserted, to bring the passage into agreement with,

2. <1305>1 Chronicles 20:5, which states that "Elhanan, son of Jair (or Jaor), slew Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear," etc.

Of these two statements the latter is probably the more correct, the differences between them being much smaller in the original than in English (see Kennicott, *Dissertation,* page 78). *SEE LAHMI.*

(a.) The word *Oregim* (q.v.) exists twice in the verse in Samuel, first as a proper name, and again at the end — "weavers." The former has probably been taken in by an early transcriber from the latter, i.e., from the next line of the MS. To the end of the verse it certainly belongs, since it is found in the parallel passage of Chronicles, and also forms part of what seems to have been a proverbial description of Goliath (compare <0907>1 Samuel 17:7).

(b.) The statement in Samuel is in contradiction to the narrative of 1 Samuel 17, according to which Goliath the Gittite was killed by David. True, Ewald *(Gesch.* 3:91 sq.) — from the fact that David's antagonist is, with only three exceptions (one of them in the doubtful verses, 17:12-32), called "the Philistine," and for other linguistic reasons has suggested that Elhanan was the real victor of Goliath, and that after David became king the name of Goliath was attached to the nameless champion whom he killed in his youth. But against this is the fact that Goliath *is* named thrice in 1 Samuel 17 and 21 — thrice only though it be; and also that Elhanan's exploit, from its position both in Samuel and in Chronicles, and from other indications, took place late in David's reign, and when he had been so long

king, and so long renowned, that all the brilliant feats of his youth must have been brought to light, and well known to his people. It is recorded as the last but one in the series of encounters of what seems to have been the closing struggle with the Philistines. It was so late that David had acquired among his warriors the fond title of "the light of Israel" (<10217>2 Samuel 21:17), and that his nephew Jonathan was old enough to perform a feat rivaling that of his illustrious uncle years before. It was certainly after David was made king, for he goes down to the fight, not with his "young men," as when he was leading his band during Saul's life, but with his " servants," literally his "slaves," a term almost strictly reserved for the subjects of a king. The vow of his guard, on one of these occasions, that it should be his last appearance in the field, shows that it must have been after the great Ammonitish war, in which David himself had led the host to the storming of Rabbah (<10229>2 Samuel 12:29). It may have been between this last event and the battle with Absalom beyond Jordan, though there are other obvious reasons why David staid within the walls of Mahanaim on that occasion. *SEE DAVID*.

Jerome, in his *Quaest. Hebr.* on both passages — he does not state whether from ancient tradition or not translates Elhanan into *A ‘do-datus,* and adds *filius saltus Polymitarius Bethlehemites* — the son of a wood, a weaver, a Bethlehemite." Adeodatus, he says, is David, which he argues not only by considerations drawn from the meaning of each of the above words, but also from the statement in the concluding verse of the record that all these giants "fell by the hand of David and by the hand of his servants," and as Elhanan slew Goliath, Elhanan must be David.

3. Elhanan is elsewhere called the son of Dodo of Bethlehem, one of "the thirty" of David's guard, and named first on the list (<10234>2 Samuel 23:24; <131126>1 Chronicles 11:26). See Kennicott's *Dissertation,* page 179. Perhaps his father had both names. *SEE JAIR.*

Elevation of the Host

SEE HOST AND MASS.

Elfege

SEE ALPHAGE.

Elfric

SEE AJLFRIC.

E'li

(Hebrews *Eli',* יְעֵלִי i.e., יְעֶלִי *ascent;* Sept. Ἡλι [so N.T. *SEE HELI*], Josephus Ἡλεί,Vulg. *Heli),* the high-priest of the Jews when the ark was in Shiloh (<09103>1 Samuel 1:3, 9). He was descended from Aaron through Ithamar, the youngest of his two surviving sons (<03101>Leviticus 10:1, 2, 12), as appears from the fact that Abiathar, who was certainly a lineal descendant of Eli (<11027>1 Kings 2:27), had a son Ahimelech, who is expressly stated to have been "of the sons of Ithamar" (<13243>1 Chronicles 24:3; compare <10817>2 Samuel 8:17). With this accords the circumstance that the names of Eli and his successors in the high-priesthood up to and including Abiathar are not found in the genealogy of Eleazar (<13604>1 Chronicles 6:4-15; compare <15701>Ezra 7:1-5). As the history makes no mention of any high-priest of the line of 4thamar before Eli, he is generally supposed to have been the first of that line who held the office (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:1, 3). From him, his sons having died before him, it appears to have passed to his grandson Ahitub (<09403>1 Samuel 14:3; compare however Josephus, *Ant.* 5:11, 2), and it certainly remained in his family till Abiathar, the grandson of Ahitub, was "thrust out from being priest unto the Lord" by Solomon for his share in Adonijah's rebellion (<11026>1 Kings 2:26, 2-7; 1:7), and the high-priesthood passed back again to the family of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (<11025>1 Kings 2:35). How the office ever came into the younger branch of the house of Aaron we are not informed; perhaps it was through the incapacity or minority of the then sole representative of the elder line, for it is very evident that it was no unauthorized usurpation on the part of Eli (<09227>1 Samuel 2:27, 28, 30). *SEE ITHAMAR.* Eli also acted as regent or civil judge of Israel after the death of Samson, being the immediate predecessor of his pupil Samuel (<09706>1 Samuel 7:6, 15-17), the last of the judges. This function, indeed, seems to have been intended, by the theocratical constitution, to devolve upon the high-priest, by virtue of his office, in the absence of any person specially appointed by the divine King to deliver and govern Israel. He is said to have judged Israel 40 years (<09418>1 Samuel 4:18): the Septuagint makes it 20. It has been suggested, in explanation of the discrepancy, that he was *sole* judge for 20 years, after having been co-judge with Samson for 20 years (<07631>Judges 16:31). But the probability is that the number 40 is correct, but that it comprehends only

the period of his administration as *judge;* for not only does the whole tenor of the narrative imply that this immediately succeeded the judgeship of Samson (as indeed Josephus evidently understood it; a fact apparent not only from his history, but also from the summing up of his numbers as computed by himself, *Ant.* 5:9; 10:3; title to book 5), but this view is evidently taken by Paul in his assignment of the period of 450 years to the judges (<44130>Acts 13:20), a number that immediately results from simply adding together the items as given in the O.T. history, including Samson and Eli as continuous to the others. *SEE JUDGES.* As Eli died at the age of ninety-eight (<090415>1 Samuel 4:15), the forty years (B.C. 1165-1125) must have commenced when he was fifty-eight years old. (See Lightfoot's *Works,* 1:53, 907, fol. Lond. 1684; Selden, *De Success. in Pontif. Hebr.* lib. 1, cap. 4). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*

Eli seems to have been a religious man, and the only fault recorded of him was an excessive easiness of temper, most unbefitting the high responsibilities of his official character. His sons Hophni and Phinehas, whom he invested with authority, misconducted themselves so outrageously as to excite deep disgust among the people, and render the services of the tabernacle odious in their eyes (<090227>1 Samuel 2:27-36; <111027>1 Kings 2:27). Of this misconduct Eli was aware, but contented himself with mild and ineffectual remonstrances (<090122>1 Samuel 2:22-25), where his station required severe and vigorous action (<090313>1 Samuel 3:13). For this neglect the judgment of God was at length denounced upon his house, through the young Samuel (q.v.), who, under peculiar circumstances, had been attached from childhood to his person (<090229>1 Samuel 2:29; 3:18). Some years passed without any apparent fulfillment of this denunciation, but it came at length in one terrible crash, by which the old man's heart was broken. The Philistines had gained the upper hand over Israel, and the ark of God was taken to the field, in the confidence of victory and safety from its presence. But in the battle which followed the ark itself was taken by the Philistines, and the two sons of Eli, who were in attendance upon it, were slain. The high-priest, then blind with age, sat by the wayside at Shiloh, awaiting tidings from the war, "for his heart trembled for the ark of God." A man of Benjamin, with his clothes rent, and with earth upon his head, brought the fatal news: and Eli heard that Israel was defeated-that his sons were slain-that the ark of God was taken — at which last word he fell heavily from his seat, and died (1 Samuel 4). According to Schwarz *(Palest.* page 142), an erroneous tradition locates his grave in an elegant

building at the village Charim ben-Elim, eight miles N.N.E. of Jaffa, on the shore. The ultimate doom upon Eli's house was accomplished when Solomon removed Abiathar (the last high-priest of this line) from his office, and restored the line of Eleazar, in the person of Zadok (1 Kings 2:27). *SEE ABIATHAR.* Another part of the same sentence (1 Samuel 2:31-33) appears to have been taking effect in the reign of David, when we read that "there were more chief men found of the sons of Eleazar than of the sons of Ithamar" — sixteen of the former, and only eight of the latter (1 Chronicles 24:4).

E'li

(ἠλί, for Hebrews יִלאֵ[Psalm 22:2], *eli', my God,* as it is immediately rendered), an exclamation used by our Savior on the cross, in appeal to his heavenly Father (Matthew 27:46). *SEE AGONY*. In the parallel passage (Mark 15:34) it is written Ἐλωΐ, ELOI *SEE ELOI* (q.v.).

Eli-

(יִלֵא, an old form of the "construct state" of לַא, the *Mighty*, i.e., Almighty, the union vowel *i* being used as in ABI-, AHI-, etc.) often occurs as the first element of proper names (comp. *Elihu, Elijah,* and many others here following), as referring to the highest notion of the Deity among the Shemitic races. As such epithet it is sometimes interchangeable with BAAL *SEE BAAL* - (q.v.) (see 2 Samuel 5:16; 1 Chronicles 14:7), or even JEHO *SEE JEHO* - (q.v.) (see 2 Kings 23:34). This constructive form is also sometimes interchanged with the abbreviation of the simple לא into אלא (1 Chronicles 3:6; 14:5; compare Exodus 6:22; Numbers 3:30), or it even exchanges places with the other element of the name, e.g. *Eliam* (2 Samuel 11:3) becomes *Ammiel* (1 Chronicles 3:5). As in the words beginning with *Abi-, Ahi-*, etc., this element often melts into the other member, not strictly in a genitive sense, but as a sort of liturgical invocation or eulogium of the Deity, as is found to be the case with similar names used as religious formulae, especially among the ancient Phoenicians (*SEE ELHANAN).*

E'liab

[usually *Eli'ab*] (Heb). *Eliab',* בַיאֵלִא; to whom *God* is *father;* Sept. Ἐλιάβ, Vulg. *Eliab),* the name of seven men.

1. A Reubenite, son of Pallu or Phallu, whose family was one of the principal in the tribe, and father or progenitor of Dathan and Abiram, the leaders in the revolt against Moses (Numbers 26:8, 9; 16:1, 12; Deuteronomy 11:6). B.C. post. 1856. Eliab had another son named Nemuel; and the record of Numbers 26 is interrupted expressly to admit a statement regarding his sons.

2. A son of Helen, and phylarch of the tribe of Zebulun at the time of the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Numbers 1:9; 2:7; 7:24, 29; 10:16). B.C. 1657.

3. An ancestor of Samuel (q.v.) the prophet, being a Kohathite Levite, son of Nahath and father of Jeroham (1 Chronicles 6:27 [12]). B.C. cir. 1250. In the other statements of the genealogy this name appears to be given as ELIHU *SEE ELIHU* (1 Samuel 1:1) and ELIEL *SEE ELIEL* (1 Chronicles 6:34 [19]).

4. The eldest son of Jesse and brother of David (1 Samuel 16:6; 17:13; 1 Chronicles 2:13). It was he that made the contemptuous inquiry, by which he sought to screen his own cowardice, when David proposed to fight Goliath, "With whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness?" (1 Samuel 17:28.) B.C. 1063. His daughter Abihail married her second cousin Rehoboam, and bore him three children (2 Chronicles 11:18); although, taking into account the length of the reigns of David and Solomon, it is difficult not to suspect that the word "daughter" is here used in the less strict sense of granddaughter or descendant. In 1 Chronicles 27:18, we find mention of "ELIHU, of the brethren of David," as "ruler" (dygn) or "prince" (rc) of the tribe of Judah. According to the ancient Hebrew tradition preserved by Jerome *(Quaest. Hebr.* ad loc.), this Elihu was identical with Eliab. "Brethren" is, however, often used in the sense of kinsman, e.g. 1 Chronicles 12:2.

5. The third of the Gadite heroes who joined David in his stronghold in the wilderness (1 Chronicles 12:9). B.C. 1061;

6. A Levite in the time pf David, who was both a "porter" (r [ev, *shoer*, i.e. a door-keeper) and a musician on the "psaltery" (1 Chronicles 15:18, 20; 16:5). B.C. 1013.

7. Son of Nathanael, one of the forefathers of Judith, and therefore belonging to the tribe of Simeon (Judith 8:1).

Eli'ada

(Hebrews *Elyada',* [dy;l]a, whom *God has known),* the name of three men.

1. (Sept., in Kings, Ἐλιδαέ, and repeated, Βααλιμάθ*;* in Chron. Ἐλιαδά, v.r. Ελιέδα*;* Vulg. *Elioda, E`iada.)* One of David's sons; according to the list, the youngest but one of the family born to him after his establishment in Jerusalem (2 Samuel 5:16; 1 Chronicles 3:8). B.C. post 1033. From the latter passage it appears that he was the son of a wife and not of a concubine. In 1 Chronicles 14:7, the name appears in the form of [dy;l][B; BEELIADA *SEE BEELIADA* (q.d. whom the *Master has known;* see Simonis, *Onomast.* page 460; l [B]being the Syriac form of l [B; *Lord).* This curious reading of the Masoretic text is not, however, indisputable; De Rossi's *Cod.* 186 *(prima manu)* reads idyla, the Sept. Ἐλιαδέ, and the Peshito *Elidaa.:* On the strength of these authorities, De Rossi (after Dathius, *Lib. Hist. V.T.* page 654) pronounces in favor of assimilating this passage to the other two, and refers to the improbability of David's using the names l a and l [B promiscuously (see De Rossi's *Var. Lect. V.T. Hebraicae,* 4). We must not, however, in the interest of careful criticism, too hastily succumb to arguments of this kind. As to MSS., the four or five which Kennicott adduces *all* support the text of 1 Chronicles 14:7; the authority of the Sept. is neutralized by *Codd. Alex. and Frid. August.,* the former of which has Βαλλιαδά, and the latter Βαλεγδαέ, evidently corroborating the Masoretic text, as does the Vulg. *Baaliada.* As to the difficulty of David's using a name which contained lib for one of its elements, it is at least very doubtful whether that word, which literally means *master, proprietor, husband,* and is often used in the earlier Scriptures inoffensively (see Gesenius, *Thes.* page 224), in David's time had acquired the bad sense which Baal-worship in Israel afterwards imparted to it. It is much to the present point that in this very chapter (verse 11) David does not object to employ the word lib in the name *Baal-perazim,* in commemoration of a victory vouchsafed to him by the Lord (see 2 Samuel 5:20, where the naming of the place is ascribed to David himself). It is possible that this appellation of his son might itself have had reference to that signal victory. The name appears to be omitted by Josephus in his list of David's family *(Ant.* 7:3, 3), unless he be there called *Elien* (Ἐλιήν).

2. (Sept. Ἐ[adf;v.r. Ἐλιαδαὲ; Vulg. *Eliada.)* Apparently an Aramite of Zobah, the father of Rezon, which latter was captain of a marauding band that annoyed Solomon (<111123>1 Kings 11:23, where the name is Anglicized "Eliadah"). B.C. ante 975.

3. (Sept. Ἐλιαδά, Vulg. *Eliada.)* A mighty man of war (lyaeir/BG;æa Benjamite, who led 200,000 (?) archers of his tribe to the army of Jehoshaphat (<141717>2 Chronicles 17:17). B.C. 945. *SEE JEHOSHAPHAT.*

Eli'adah

(<111123>1 Kings 11:23), a less correct mode of Anglicizing the name *Eliada* (q.v.).

Eli'adas

(Ἐλιαδάς, Vulg. *Eliadas),* one of "the sons of Zamoth" who divorced his Gentile wife after the restoration from Babylon (1 Esdr. 9:28); evidently the ELIOENAI *SEE ELIOENAI* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<150127>Ezra 10:27).

Eli'adun

(Ἠλιαδούς v.r. Ἠλιαδούν, Vulg. omits), a name given as that of the father of Joda, whose sons and brethren assisted in rebuilding the Temple after the return from Babylon (1 Esdr. 5:58); apparently a corruption for the HENADAD *SEE HENADAD* (q.v.) of the Hebrew narrative (<150301>Ezra 3:19).

Eli'ah

(<130827>1 Chronicles 8:27; <150126>Ezra 10:26), a less correct mode of Anglicizing the name of ELIJAH *SEE ELIJAH* (q.v.), but referring to others than the prophet.

Eli'ahba

(Hebrews *Eliyachba',* aB;j ÿyil æ, but in Chron. *Elyachba',* aB;j ÿ;l Þa, whom *God will hide;* Sept. Ἐλιαβά, Vulg. *Eliaba),* a Shaalbonite; one of David's' thirty chief warriors (<102332>2 Samuel 23:32; <131133>1 Chronicles 11:33). B.C. 1046.

Eli'akim

(Hebrews *Elyakim',* μyqyl;a,whom *God will raise up;* Sept. Ἐλιακίμ and Ἐλιακείμ*;* N.T. Ἐλιακείμ; Josephus, Ἐλιάκιμος, *Ant.* 10:1, 2; Vulg. *Eliacim*), the name of five men.

1. The son of Melea and father of Jonan, in the genealogy (q.v.) of Christ (Luke in, 30); probably the grandson of Nathan, of the private line of David's descent (Strong's *Harm. and Expos.* page 16). B.C. considerably post 1013.

2. Son of Hilkiah, and praefect of the palace under king Hezekiah, who sent him to receive the message of the invading Assyrians, and report it to Isaiah (<121818>2 Kings 18:18; 19:2; <233603>Isaiah 36:3, 11, 22; 37:2). B.C. 713. He succeeded Shebna in this office after the latter had been ejected from it (Grotius thinks by reason of his leprosy) as a punishment for his pride (<232215>Isaiah 22:15-20). Eliakim was a good man, as appears by the title emphatically applied to him by God, "my servant Eliakim" (<232220>Isaiah 22:20), and as was evinced by his conduct on the occasion of Sennacherib's invasion (<121837>2 Kings 18:37; 19:1-5), and also in the discharge of the duties of his high station, in which he acted as a "father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah" (<232221>Isaiah 22:21). It was as a special mark of the divine approbation of his character and conduct, of which, however, no further details have been preserved to us, that he was raised to the post of authority and dignity which he held at the time of the Assyrian invasion. What this office was has been a subject of some perplexity to commentators. The ancients, including the Sept. and Jerome, understood it of the priestly office, as appears by the rendering of ˆkæsæ(<232215>Isaiah 22:15; A.V. "treasurer") by παστοφόριον, the "priest's chamber," by the former, and of tyBah;l[i("over the house," as <233603>Isaiah 36:3) by *"praepositus templi,"* by the latter. Hence Nicephorus, as well as the author of the Alexandrian Chronicle, includes in the list of high priests Somnas or Sobnas (i.e., Shebna), and Eliakim, identifying the latter with Shallum or Meshullam. But it is certain from the description of the office in Isaiah 22, and especially from the expression in verse 22, "The key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder," that it was the king's house, and not the house of God, of which Eliakim was praefect, as Ahishar had been in the reign of Solomon (<110406>1 Kings 4:6), and Azrikam in that of Ahaz (<142807>2 Chronicles 28:7). With this agrees both all that is said, and all that is not

said, of Eliakim's functions. The office seems to have been the highest under the king, as was the case in Egypt, when Pharaoh said to Joseph, "Thou shalt be over my house (ytyBe l[;) ... only in the throne will I Le greater than thou" (<0144>Genesis 41:40; compare 39:4). In <1487>2 Chronicles 28:7, the officer is called "governor (dgn) of the house." It is clear that the "scribe" was inferior to him, for Shebna, when degraded from the prefecture of the house, acted as scribe under Eliakim (<1237>2 Kings 18:37). The whole description of it too by Isaiah implies a place of great eminence and power. This description is transferred in a mystical or spiritual sense to Christ the son of David in <6607>Revelation 3:7, thus making Eliakim in some sense typical of Christ. The true meaning of ^ksn, *soken'*, is very doubtful. "Friend," i.e., of the king, and "steward of the provisions," are the two most probable significations. *SEE TREASURER*. Eliakim's career was a most honorable and splendid one. Most commentators agree that <2225>Isaiah 22:25 does not apply to him, but to Shebna.

3. The original name of Jehoiakim (q.v.), king of Judah (<1234>2 Kings 23:34; <1604>2 Chronicles 36:4).

4. Son of Abiud and father of Azor, of the posterity of Zerubbabel (<4013>Matthew 1:13). He is probably identical with the SHECHANIAH *SEE SHECHANIAH* (q.v.) of 1 Chronicles in, 21 (Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels*, page 11). *SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).*

5. A priest in the days of Nehemiah, who assisted at the dedication of the new wall of Jerusalem (<1624>Nehemiah 12:41). B.C. 446.

Eli'ali

(Ἐλιαλι v.r. Ἐλιαλεί, Vulg. *Dielus),* one of "the sons of Maani" who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdr. 9:34); apparently a corruption for the BINNUI *SEE BINNUI* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<1508>Ezra 10:38).

E'liam

[usually *El'am*] (Hebrews *Eliam',* µ[;lae, *God* is [his] *people,* i.e., *friend;* Sept. Ἐλιάβ, Vulg. *Eliam),* the father of Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah and afterwards of David (<1103>2 Samuel 11:3). In the list of <1305>1 Chronicles 3:5, the names of both father and daughter are altered, the former to the equivalent AMMIEL *SEE AMMIEL* (q.v.), and the latter to Bathshua, both

the latter names being also those of non-Israelite persons, while Uriah was a Hittite (comp. <01B82>Genesis 38:12; <130103>1 Chronicles 2:3; also <101727>2 Samuel 17:27). 'The same name Eliam also occurs as that of a Gilonite, the son of Ahithophel, and one of David's "thirty" warriors (<102334>2 Samuel 23:34). It is omitted in the list of 1 Chronicles 11, but is now probably discernible as "AHIJAH the Pelonite" (verse 36) (see Kennicott, *Dissertation*, p. 207). The ancient Jewish tradition preserved by Jerome *(Qu. Hebr.* on <101103>2 Samuel 11:3, and <130305>1 Chronicles 3:5) is that the two Eliams are the same person. An argument has been founded on this to account for the hostility of Ahithophel to king David, as having dishonored his house and caused the death of his son-in-law (Blunt, *Coincidences*, part 2, 10). But he would perhaps have rather been proud of this alliance with royalty. B.C. 1046.

Eliao'nias

[many *Eliaoni'as*] *(*Ἐλιαωνίας, Vulg. *Moabilionis*, including the preceding name), a son of Zaraias of Pahath-Moab, leader of two hundred exiles from Babylon (1 Esdr. 8:31); evidently the ELIHOENAI *SEE ELIHOENAI* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<150804>Ezra 8:4).

Eli'as

᾽Ηλίας, in Maccabees, elsewhere and in N.T. ᾽Ηλίας, Vulg. *Elias*, but in Cod. Amiat. *Helias)*, the Graecized form in which the name of ELIJAH *SEE ELIJAH* (q.v.) is given in the A.V. of the Apocrypha and N.T. (Ecclus. 48:1, 4, 12; 1 Macc. 2:58; <401114>Matthew 11:14; 16:14; 17:3, 4, 10, 11, 12; 27:47, 49; <410615>Mark 6:15; 8:28; 9:4, 5, 11, 12, 13; 15:35, 36; <420117>Luke 1:17; 4:25, 26; 9:8, 19, 30, 33, 54; <430121>John 1:21, 25; <451102>Romans 11:2; James v. 17). In <451102>Romans 11:2, the reference is not to the prophet, but to the portion of Scripture designated by his name, the words being ἐν ᾽Ηλιᾷ*;* "in Elias," not as in A.V. "of Elias." — Smith, s.v.

Elias Levita

(properly ELIJAH *the Levite, son of Asher)*, one of the greatest Jewish scholars of modern times, was born in the latter half of the fifteenth century. Both the year and the place of his birth have been the subject of literary controversy. The former point seems to have been settled by the learned Rossi (see below), who showed that Elias was born in 1471 or 1472, not, as Hirt maintains, in 1469, or, as Nagel undertook to prove, in 1477. The second point is still a point of dispute, both Italians and

Germans being desirous to claim this great writer for their country. The chief argument of the former is that Elias, in one of his works, speaks of Italy as "my country" and Venice as "my city;" the chief arguments of the Germans are that Elias, on the title pages of several of his books, calls himself *Ashkenazi* (yzaKvha), or "the German," and that, according to the express testimony of his friend and pupil, Sebastian Minster (q.v.), he was born at Neustadt, on the Aich, not far from Nuremberg. The margrave of Neustadt expelled Elias, together with several other Jews, from that town. He then went to Italy, lived in several places as teacher of the Hebrew language, especially (from 1504) at Padua, where he lectured on the Hebrew grammar of Moses Kimchi, and wrote a commentary on it. When Padua, in 1509, was captured and plundered, Elias lost all his property and went to Venice, which city, in 1512, he again left for Rome. There he met with a very friendly reception from cardinal Egidio of Viterbo, who even received him and his family into his own house. For many years Elias instructed the cardinal in the Hebrew language, who, in turn, made him better acquainted with the classical languages. Through Egidio, Elias entered into intimate relations with a number of other cardinals and bishops, who so warmly recommended him that he received an honorable call from king Francois I of France, which he, however, declined. When Rome, in 1527, was plundered by the troops of Karl V, Elias again lost his whole property. He again went to Venice, where he remained until 1540, when he accepted a call from Paul Fagius to assist him in the establishment of a new Hebrew printing office, and in the publication of several Hebrew books, at Isny, in Suabia. He remained in Isny until 1547, when he returned to Venice, where he died in 1549. Elias rejected many of the Jewish traditions, and always spoke favorably of the Christians; but he expressly denied that he had secretly become a Christian, and averred that, "thanks to God, he was still a Jew." He was universally esteemed both for his character and his extraordinary scholarship; only some fanatical Jews hated him, as they suspected his fidelity to Judaism. His celebrated works on Hebrew grammar procured him the surname of "the Grammarian" (qDeqDMh). His first work was a commentary on the Ëlhm; *(Mahalak)*, or grammar of the rabbi Moses Kimchi, first published by a certain Benjamin who had stolen the MS. (at Pesaro, 1508; frequently reprinted, with a Latin translation by Sebastian Munster, Basel, 1527, 1531; and another by L'Empereur, Leyd. 1631). This is a different work from his scholia on Kimchi's yrbDj tPe *(Pethach Debaray)*, or brief grammatical

introduction, the text of which had appeared at Naples in 1492, and Levita's scholia on it at Pesara in 1507, and later editions. At Rome he composed a grammar entitled rWjBÞi*(hab-Bachur,* Rome, 1518), and a work on "*Composition"* hbÞK;rÞhi, Rome, 1519), in which he treats of the irregular words of the Bible. Both works were translated by Minster (the former first at Basel in 1518, and the latter in 1536). He also wrote a more extensive grammatical treatise in four parts, entitled. WhY;lÞœeyqœÞPæ *"Elijah's Sections"* (Soncino, 1520, and later elsewhere; trans. by Munster, Basel, 1527, and later). After his return to Venice he wrote a book on the accents (µ[ifibWf) *Tezb Taam* (Ven. 1538, and other eds.; likewise translated by Minster, Basel, 1539), and, the most celebrated of all his works, a critical book on the Biblical text and its authors (tr/sMÞi tr/sm*),Masoreth ham-Masoreth* (Venice, 1538, 1546; Basel, 1539 [with a Latin summary of the work by Munster; Sulzbach, 1769 and 1771]). This work, remarkable alike for literary merit, although it anticipated the judgments of the highest modern criticism on the questions of which it treats, and although it was, in fact, the father of the great Buxtorf and Cappel controversy, which raged round the Hebrew Scriptures for more than a hundred years after Levita's death, had, until recently, never been actually translated either into Latin or any modern language. Nagel translated into Latin the three introductions (Altdorf, 1757-1771); and there is a so-called German translation of Levita's book, published at Halle in 1772, and commonly known as Semler's. But Semler was not really, as indeed he did not profess to be, the translator of Levita. The translation, such as it was, was executed by a young Jewish convert to Christianity of the name of Meyer, and all that Semler did was to supervise and annotate the German rendering. After all, the work was full of errors, and many valuable passages of the original are altogether omitted. A complete and very carefully executed translation into English, together with a critical edition of the original, was in 1867 published by Dr. Ginsburg *(The Masoreth ha-Masoreth of Elias Levita, in Hebrew, with an English Translation and Explanatory Notes,* London, 1867). Among the works compiled by him at Isny is a Chaldaic-Rabbinical Dictionary (]fm2g2rVt2m, *Methurgeman,* Isny, 1541; Ven. 1560). Elias also prepared a German translation of the Psalms (Ven. 1545), and was, according to Sabtai, the author of a Hebrew-German novel, *Baba.* A full list of these and other works of Elias, with their editions, translations, etc., also bibliographical treatises on them and their author, may be found in Furst's

Bibliotheca Judaica, 2:239 sq. A valuable biography of Elias is found in Dr. Ginsburg's edition of *Masoreth ham-Masoreth,* cited above; see also Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* 3:758; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gin.* 15:810; Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei* (German transl. *[Hist. Handworterbuch der juid. Schriftsteller*] by Dr. Hamberger, Leipz. 1839); Hirt, *Oriental. und Exeget. Bibliothek,* part 7, Jena, 1755; Wolffi *Bibliotheca Hebrea,* Hamburg, 1715, 1:153. (A.J.S.)

Eli'asaph

(Hebrew *Elyasaph',* [sy;lyaE, whom *God has added;* Sept. Ἐλισάφ), the name of two Israelites at the time of the Exode.

1. Son of Reuel or Deuel, and phylarch of the tribe of Dan (<04014>Numbers 1:14; 2:14; 7:42, 47; 10:20). B.C. 1657.

2. Son of Lael, and chief of the family of the Gershomite Levites (<04024>Numbers 3:24). B.C. 1657.

Eli'ashib

(Hebrew *Elyashib',* byvyaE, whom *God will restore;* Sept. Ἐλιασεβών, Ἐλιαβί, Ἐλιασείβ, Ελιασούβ, etc.; Josephus Ἐλιάσιβος; (Vulg. *Eliasub, Eliasib*), a common name of Israelites, especially at the later period of the O.T. history.

1. A priest in the time of king David; head of the eleventh "course" in the order of the "governors" (sydic) of the sanctuary (<13242>1 Chronicles 24:12). B.C. 1013.

2. A Levitical singer who repudiated his Gentile wife after the exile (<15024>Ezra 10:24). B.C. 458.

3. An Israelite of the lineage of Zattu, who did the same (<15027>Ezra 10:27). B.C. 458.

4. An Israelite of the lineage of Bani, who did the same (<15036>Ezra 10:36). B.C. 458.

5. The high-priest of the Jews in the time of Nehemiah (<16228>Nehemiah 12:28). B.C. 446. With the assistance of his fellow-priests, he rebuilt the eastern city wall adjoining the Temple (<16301>Nehemiah 3:1). His own extensive mansion was doubtless situated in the same vicinity, probably on

the ridge Ophel (Nehemiah in, 20,21). *SEE JERUSALEM*. Eliashib was in some way allied (bYqi=near) to Tobiah the Ammonite, for whom he had prepared an ante-room in the Temple, a desecration which excited the pious indignation of Nehemiah (16134Nehemiah 13:4, 7). One of the grandsons of Eliashib had also married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite (16328Nehemiah 13:28). There seems no reason to doubt that the same Eliashib is referred to in 15106Ezra 10:6, as the father of Johanan, who occupied an apartment in the Temple (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 11:5, 4). He is evidently the same with the son of Joiakim and father of Joiada (Josephus, "Judas," *Ant.* 11:7, 1), in the succession of high-priests (16210Nehemiah 12:10, 22). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST*.

6. A son of Elioenai, and member of the latest family of the lineage of Zerubbabel, mentioned in the Old Test. (13024 1 Chronicles 3:24). B.C. 406.

Eli'asib

(Ἐλιάσιβος), the Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:1) of the name of the high-priest ELIASHIB *SEE ELIASHIB* (q.v.).

Eli'asis

(Ἐλιάσις v.r. Ἐλιάσεις), a name given (1 Esdr. 9:34) as that of one of the " sons of Maani" who divorced their Gentile wives after the captivity, and corresponding in position to MATTENAI *SEE MATTENAI* (q.v.) of the Hebrews list (15103Ezra 10:33); but probably a merely erroneous repetition of ENASIBOS *SEE ENASIBOS* (q.v.) preceding in the same verse.

Eli'athah

(Hebrew *Elia'thah*, ht;* ayliêa, 13204 1 Chronicles 25:4, or *Eliya'thah*, ht;* Yliêa; verse 27, to whom *God will come;* Sept. Ἐλιαθά v.r. Ἐλιάθ, Vulg. *Eliatha),* the eighth named of the fourteen sons of the Levite Heman, and a musician in the Temple in the time of king David (13204 1 Chronicles 25:4), who, with twelve of his sons and brethren, had the twentieth division of the Temple-service (25:27). B.C. 1013. In Jerome's *Quaest. Hebr.* on verse 27, the name is given as *Eliaba,* and explained accordingly; but not so in the Vulgate.

Eliberis

SEE ELVIRA.

Eli'dad

(Hebrew *Elidad',* ddyl'a, whom *God has loved;* Sept. Ἐλδάδ, Vulg. *Eldad),* the son of Chislon, and phylarch of the tribe of Benjamin, one of the commissioners appointed, to portion out the promised land among the tribes (<04817>Numbers 31:7, 21). B.C. 1619.

E'liel

(Hebrew *Eliel',* la'yli, to whom *God* is *might),* the name of some nine Israelites.

1. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) A valiant phylarch of the tribe of Manasseh east (1 Chronicles v. 24). B.C. post 1612.

2. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) Son of Toah and father of Jerohan, ancestors of Heman the singer and Levite (<130634>1 Chronicles 6:34); probably identical with the ELIAB of <130634>1 Chronicles 6:34, and the ELIHU of <090101>1 Samuel 1:1. B.C. cir 1250. *SEE SAMUEL.*

3. (Sept. Ἐλιηλί.) One of the descendants of Shimhi, and head of a Benjamite family in Jerusalem (<130820>1 Chronicles 8:20). B.C. between 1612 and 588.

4. (Sept. Ἐλεήλ.) One of the descendants of Shashak, and likewise head of a Benjamite family at Jerusalem (<130822>1 Chronicles 8:22). B.C. eod.

5. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ v.r. Ἐλιάβ.) The seventh of the Gadite heroes who joined David in his stronghold in the wilderness (<131211>1 Chronicles 12:11), possibly the same with No. 6 or 7. B.C. 1061.

6. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ v.r. Ἰελιήλ.) A Mahanite (q.v), and one of David's distinguished warriors (<131146>1 Chronicles 11:46). B.C. 1046.

7. (Sept. Ἀλιήλ v.r. Δαλιήλ.) Another of David's distinguished warriors (<131147>1 Chronicles 11:47). B.C. eod.

8. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) Chief of the 80 Hebronite Levites assembled by David to assist in bringing the ark to Jerusalem (<131509>1 Chronicles 15:9, 11). B.C. 1043.

9. (Sept. Ἐλιήλ.) One of the Levites appointed by Hezekiah to have charge of the offerings for the Temple services (2 Chronicles 31:13). B.C. 726.

Elie'nai

(Hebrew *Elieynay'*, ynyÙ[ylea; perh. contracted for ELIOENAI *SEE ELIOENAI* [q.v.]; Sept. Ελιωηναΐ v.r. Ἐλιωναΐ, Vulg. *Elioenai)*, one of the Bene-Shimhi Benjamite heads of families resident at Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 8:20). B.C. between 1618 and 588.

Elie'zer

(Hebrew *id.* rz,[yl ea; *God* is his *help*, a modification of the name *Eleazar* [see LAZARUS]; Sept, Ἐλιέζερ and Ἐλιέζερ, N.T. Ἐλιέζερ), the name of eleven men.

1. "ELIEZER OF DAMASCUS," mentioned in Genesis 15:2, 3, apparently as a house-born domestic, *SEE SLAVE* and steward of Abraham, and hence likely, in the absence of direct issue, to become the patriarch's heir. B.C. 2088. The Sept. interprets the terms thus: "But the son of Masek, my house-born maid, is this Heliezer of Damascus." It appeared even thus early that the passage of Scripture in which the name of Eliezer occurs is one of some difficulty. Abraham, being promised a son, says, "I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus (aWh rz,[yl ea qc,MiD; *he of Damascus, Eliezer)* ... Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in mine house is mine heir" (Genesis 15:2, 3). The common notion is that Eliezer was Abraham's house-born slave, adopted as his heir, and meanwhile his chief and confidential servant, and the same who was afterwards sent into Mesopotamia to seek a wife for Isaac (q.v.). This last point we may dismiss with the remark that there is not the least evidence that 'the elder servant of his house" (Genesis 24:2), whom Abraham charged with this mission, was the same as Eliezer. The obvious meaning is that Eliezer was born in Damascus, and how is this compatible with the notion of his being Abraham's house-born slave, seeing that Abraham's household never was at Damascus? It is true that there is a tradition, quoted by Josephus from Nicolaus of Damascus *(Ant.* 1:7, 4), that Abraham "reigned in Damascus;" but the tradition was probably founded on this very passage, and has no claim on our belief. The Mohammedans call him *Dameshak*, or Damascennis, and believe him to

have been a black slave given to Abraham by Nimrod, at the time when he saw him, by virtue of the name of God, walking out of the midst of the flames (Ur), into which he had been cast by his orders. *SEE ABRAHAM.* The expression, "the steward of mine house," in verse 2, yTæBe qvm, ^B, (note the alliteration between the obscure term *meshek* and *Dammesek),* literally translated, is "the son of possession of my house," i.e., one who shall possess my house, my property, after my death, and is therefore exactly the same as the phrase in the next verse, "the son of my house (ytæBe ^B, paraphrased by "one born in mine house") is mine heir." This removes every objection to Eliezer's being of Damascus, and enables us to dispense with the tradition; for it is no longer necessary to suppose that Eliezer was a house-born slave, or a servant at all, and leaves it more probable that he was some near relative whom Abraham regarded as his heir-at-law. It is by no means certain that "this Eliezer" was present in Abraham's camp at all; and we, of course, cannot know in what degree he stood related *to* Abraham, or under what circumstances he was born at, or belonged to Damascus. It is possible that he lived there at the very time when Abraham thus spoke of him, and that he is hence called "Eliezer of Damascus." This view removes another difficulty, which arises from the fact that, while Abraham speaks of Eliezer as his heir, his nephew Lot was in his neighborhood, and had until lately been the companion of his wanderings. If Eliezer was Abraham's servant, it might well occasion surprise that he should speak of him and not of Lot as his heir; but this surprise ceases when we regard Eliezer as also a relative, and if so, a nearer relative than Lot, although not, like Lot, the companion of his journeys. Some have supposed that Lot and Eliezer were, in fact, the same person; and this would be an excellent explanation if the Scriptures afforded sufficient grounds for it. (See Gesenius, *Thes. Hebrew* s.v. qvm; Rosenmuller, on Genesis 15; Knobel, *Comment.* in loc.)

2. A son of Becher, and grandson of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 7:8). B.C. post 1856.

3. (Josephus Ἐλεάζαρος, *Ant.* 2:13, 1.) The second of the two sons of Moses and Zipporah, born during the exile in Midian, to whom his father gave this name, "because, said he, the God of my fathers was my help, that delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh" (Exodus 18:4; 1 Chronicles 23:15, 17). B.C. cir. 1690. He remained with his mother and brother Gershom, in the care of Jethro his grandfather, when Moses

returned to Egypt (<2Ex4:18>Exodus 4:18), she having been sent back to her father by Moses (<2Ex18:2>Exodus 18:2), though she set off to accompany him, and went part of the way with him. Jethro brought back Zipporah and her two sons to Moses in the wilderness, after he heard of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt (18). Eliezer had one son, Rehabiah, from whom sprang a numerous posterity (<132317>1 Chronicles 23:17; 26:25, 26). Shelomith, in the reigns of Saul and David (verse 28), who had the care of all the treasures of things dedicated to God, was descended from Eliezer in the 6th generation, if the genealogy in <132625>1 Chronicles 26:25, is complete.

4. One of the priests who blew with trumpets before the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem (<131524>1 Chronicles 15:24). B.C. 1043.

5. Son of Zichri, and chief of the Reubenites under David (<132716>1 Chronicles 27:16). B.C. ante 1013.

6. A prophet (son of Dodavah of Mareshah), who foretold to Jehoshaphat (q.v.) that the merchant fleet which he fitted out in partnership with Ahaziah should be wrecked, and thus prevented from sailing to Tarshish (<142037>2 Chronicles 20:37). B.C. 895.

7. Son of Jorim, and father of Joseh, of the private lineage of David prior to Salathiel (<420329>Luke 3:29). B.C. ante 588.

8. One of the chiefs of the Jews during the exile, sent by Ezra, with others from Ahava, to Casiphia, to induce some Levites and Nethinim to join the party returning to Jerusalem (<150816>Ezra 8:16). B.C. 459.

9. One of the priests (of the kindred of Jeshua) who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (<151018>Ezra 10:18). B.C. 458.

10. A Levite who did the same (<151023>Ezra 10:23). B.C. 458.

11. An Israelite of the lineage of Harim, who did the same (<151031>Ezra 10:31). B.C. 458.

Eliezer ben-Elias Aschenazi

(i.e. *son of Elijah, the German),* a distinguished Rabbi, was born about the opening of the 16th century, and practiced medicine at Cremona. Obliged to leave that town, he went to Constantinople, and was intrusted with the care of the synagogue at Naxos, in the Archipelago. Finally he went to Poland, and was made chief Rabbi of the synagogue at Posen. His

coreligionists regard him as one of the most learned men of the 16th century. He died at Cracow in 1586. He "published jqil,ãsæ (Cremona, 1576, and often), a commentary on Esther:— 8y8y hcçj}mi *(Work of Jehovah),* in which he describes the historical events of the Pentateuch (Venice, 1583; Cracow, 1584, and later), and one or two less important works. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 15:827.

Eliezer ben-Hyrkanos

surnamed the Great, was born about the middle of the 1st century. He was of a good family, but his early education was very much neglected, and at the age of 28, urged by an awakened impulse after knowledge, he left his father's house and became a disciple of Jochanan ben-Zachai. Eliezer soon repaired his deficiencies, and became one of the distinguished Rabbins of his age. Profound in the *Cabala* (q.v.), he made many practical acquisitions in magical science, and became the thaumaturgist of the school. During the controversies between Gamaliel (q.v.) and the rival doctors at Jamnia, he founded a school at Lydda, where his teaching appears to have assumed so mystical a character as to involve him in difficulties with the rabbinical authorities. The Karaites regarded Eliezer as one of the defenders of their doctrines. He died about 73 A.D., at Caesarea, in Palestine. His principal work is *Pirke R. Eliezeris* (edit. Princ. Hebraice. Venet. 1544, 4to), translated into Latin with notes by Vorstius (Leyd. 1644, 4to), ed. by Abr. Aaron Broda, with a Heel. commentary (Wilna, 1838, 4to), and often republished. See *Boraitha der R. Elieser,* by Leop. Zunz (Berlin, 1832), a critical account of the work and its author. He is regarded also as the author of *Orcothchaiim (The Way of Life),* which has been often reprinted. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 15:825-6; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrews Literature,* page 60 sq.; Grasse, *Allgem. Iterirgesch.* 1:1108 sq. (J.H.W.)

Eliezer ben-Judah

(sometimes called ELEAZAR GARMIZA, but apparently without good reason), of Worms, the son of Kalonymos of Mentz, was one of the most distinguished Rabbins of the 13th century. He was a pupil of Judah the Saint, and died in 1238; He wrote thirty works, of which only a few have been printed. The principal ones are: *Yoreh Chatcinz* hr/y µyaæj} "he will instruct sinners") a liturgical and ascetic formulary (Venice, 1589, 8vo, and often):*Yeyn ha-Rekach* (jqirh;ˆyy "wine of spicery"), a cabalistic commentary on Canticles and Ruth (Lublin, 1608, 4to): — *Sepher*

Rokeach (jqeorpse, "spiced book"), on the fear of God and repentance (Fano, 1505, fol., and often since): — vWrPe, etc., a commentary on the cabalistic book *Jezirah* (Mantua, 1562, 4to, and since): — µyfaWMlae, etc., a cabalistic exposition of the Pentateuch (extracts in Azulai's µymWdqlj ji, Leghorn, 1800): — aYzir;ydqes, on angelology (in pait, Amst. 1701, 4to). Several of his works in MS. are at the *Bibliotheque de l'Oratoire* at Paris. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 15:826-7; Grasse, *Allgem. Literargesch.* 3:521; Furst, *Bibliotheca Judaica,* 1:228. (J.H.W.)

Eliezer ben-Nathan

sometimes also surnamed Metz, from his native place, was a contemporary of Rashi, and eminent in the cabalistic science. His renown is greatly due to a work on Talmudical law which he composed in 1152, under the title rz,[h;^ba, *(stone of help)*, printed at Prague in 1610. The Rabbins Jachia and Wolf ascribe to him also the authorship of *Tsophnath Paaneach*, but Rossi asserts that Eliezer of Spain was the real author of that work. It appears to be only another title of the preceding work. He wrote also µymdaqsBae (Constantinople, 1520, and later) and lKehirmiaj (Cremona, 1554, and later); both relating to the Jewish ritual. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 15:826; Grasse, *Allgem. Literargesch.* 3:502.

Eligius, Eloi, or Eloysius

(ST.), bishop of Novon, one of the most eminent names in the ecclesiastical history of France, was born at Cadillac, near Limoges, in or shortly before the year 588. He learned the trade of a goldsmith, and became the most skillful artist of the day, especially in ornaments for churches and tombs. He gained the confidence of Clotaire II, and stood high at his court. While working at his art, he always had an open Bible before him. He devoted his gains to works of piety, especially to the redemption of slaves from captivity, sometimes emancipating a hundred at one time. As a layman, he instructed the common people constantly. Dagobert, the son and successor of Clotaire, made him his treasurer, and employed him for important missions, in which he was always successful. Thus he brought about a treaty of peace between Dagobert and Judicahill, duke of Brittany. Eligius availed himself of his influence with the weak and licentious Dagobert to obtain large donations, which he used for the establishment of churches, monasteries, and hospitals. In 640, two years

after the death of Dagobert, the majordomo Herchenoald, who was regent during the minority of Clodvig II, in order to get rid of the influence of Eligius, appointed him bishop of Noyon. In this office he was in labors abundant for eighteen years, preaching, taking missionary tours, and founding churches and monasteries. Eligius seems to have been a thoroughly converted man, and his life is indeed a light in a dark place. Eligius, together with his friend Audoenus (St. Ouen), archbishop of Rheims, had a predominating influence upon the churches of Gaul; and although most of the bishops disliked the rigor and severity of Eligius, they yielded to his zeal and authority. Thus, in 644, at a synod of Chalons sur Saone, very strict rules were given for the appointment of bishops and abbots; and the metropolitan Theodosius of Aries, who had violated many Church laws, was suspended from his office. When bishop Martin of Rome, in the Monothelitic controversy, was imprisoned and exiled by the emperor, the majority of the Gallic bishops, at a council held in Orleans, under the leadership of Eligius and Audoenus, declared for the pope and against the Monothelites, who were cruelly persecuted. After the death of Clodvig II and Herchenoald, Eligius was recalled by the queen dowager Bathilde to the court, where he remained until shortly before his death. He died at Noyon Nov. 30, 658 (or 659), and the people soon after began to venerate him as a saint. His life *(Vita S. Eligii),* written by his disciple Audoenus (St. Ouen), will be found in D'Achery, *Spicilegium,* 2:76-123, and in Migne, *Patrol. Latin.* 89:474. The extracts from sermons of Eligius which are included in this biography are almost verbally taken from the sermons of Caesarius of Aries. In its present form this work is undoubtedly of a later origin. Sixteen homilies are given to him in *Bib. Max. Patr.* 12:300; also in Migne, *Patrol. Latin.* 97:595; but their genuineness is questioned. A letter from Eligius to bishop Desiderius of Cahors is given in Canisii *Antiquit. Lection.* ed. Basnage, tom. 1, and in Migne, 87:657. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:760; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 15:904; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:41, 42; Neander, *Light in Dark Places;* Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* book 2, chapter 7, part 2, chapter 2, n. 24.

Elihoi'nai

(Hebrew *Elyehoeynay',* ynyh[,ehyalea, *toward Jehovah* are *my eyes),* the name of two men. *SEE ELIOENAI* and *SEE ELIENAI*.

1. (Sept. Ἐλιωηναΐ v.r. Ἐλιωναΐ, Vulg. *Elioenai.)* The seventh and youngest son of Meshelemiah (q.v.) the Levite, of the time of David (1Ch 26:3 1

Chronicles 26:3, where the name is improperly Anglicized "Elioenai"). B.C. 1043-13.

2. (Sept. Ἐλιαανά v.r. Ἐλιανά', Vulg. *Elioenai.)* Son of Zerahiah of the "sons of Pahath-Moab," who returned with 200 males from the exile (<15804>Ezra 8:4). B.C. 459.

Eliho'reph

(Hebrew *Elicho'reph*, ãrjpwlae, *God* is his *recompense;* Sept. Ἐλιχόρεφ v.r. Ἐλάφ and Ἐναρέφ), son of Shisha, and appointed, with his brother Ahiah, royal scribe (rpes) by Solomon (<11043>1 Kings 4:3). B.C. 1012.

Eli'hu

(Hebrew *Elihu'*, awhylae. [but abbreviated WTylae in <18324>Job 32:4; 35:1; <13907>1 Chronicles 26:7; 27:18], whose *God* is *He*, i.e., Jehovah), the name of five men.

1. (Sept. Ἐλιούς.) One of Job's friends, described as "the son of Barachel, a Buzite, of the kindred of Ram" (<18302>Job 32:2). This is usually understood to imply that he was descended from Buz, the son of Abraham's brother Nahor, from whose family the city called Buz (<24523>Jeremiah 25:23) also took its name. The Chaldee paraphrase asserts that Elihu was a relation of Abraham. Elihu's name does not appear among those of the friends who came in the first instance to condole with Job, nor is his presence indicated till the debate between the afflicted man and his three friends had been brought to a conclusion. Then, finding there was no answer to Job's last speech, he comes forward with considerable modesty, which he loses as he proceeds, to remark on the debate, and to deliver his own opinion on the points at issue (Job 32, 37). B.C. cir. 2200. It appears, from the manner in which Elihu introduces himself (<18303>Job 32:3-7), that he was much the youngest of the party; and it is evident that he had been present from the commencement of the discussion, to which he had paid very close attention.* This would suggest that the debate between Job and his friends was carried on in the presence of a deeply-interested auditory, among which was this Elihu, who could not forbear from interfering when the controversy appeared to have reached an unsatisfactory conclusion (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* in loc.). He expresses his desire to moderate between the disputants; and his words alone touch upon, although they do not thoroughly handle, that idea of the disciplinary nature of suffering,

which is the key to Job's perplexity and doubt; but, as in the whole book, the greater stress is laid on God's unsearchable wisdom, and the implicit faith which he demands (see Velthuysen, *De Elice carmine*, Rotterdam, 1789-90). He does not enlarge on any supposable wickedness in Job as having brought his present distresses upon him, but controverts his replies, his inferences, and his arguments. He observes on the mysterious dispensations of Providence, which he insists, however they may appear to mortals, are full of wisdom and mercy; that the righteous have their share of prosperity in this life no less than the wicked;. that God is supreme, and that it becomes us to acknowledge and submit to that supremacy, since "the Creator wisely rules the world he made;" and he draws instances of benignity from the constant wonders of creation, of the seasons, etc. His language is copious, glowing, and sublime; and it deserves notice that Elihu does not appear to have offended God by his sentiments; nor is any sacrifice of atonement commanded for him as for the other speakers in the poem. It is almost pardonable that the character of Elihu has been thought figurative of a personage interposed between God and man — a mediator — one speaking "without terrors," and not disposed to overcharge mankind. This sentiment may have had its influence on the acceptability and preservation of the book of Job (see Hodges's *Elihu*, Oxford, 1750). *SEE JOB (BOOK OF).*

2. (Sept. Ἠλιού.) Son of Tohu, and grandfather of Elkanah, Samuel's father (1 Samuel 1:1). In the statements of the genealogy of Samuel in 1 Chronicles vi the name ELIEL *SEE ELIEL* (q.v.) occurs in the same position — son of Toah, and father of Jeroham (6:34 [Hebrews 19]); and also ELIAB *SEE ELIAB* (6:27 [Hebrews 12]), father of Jeroham, and grandson of Zophai. The general opinion is that Elihu is the original name, and the two latter forms but copyists' variations of it.

3. (Sept. Ἐλιούδ v.r. Ἐλιμούθ.) One of the chiliarchs of Manasseh who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chronicles 12:20), after he had left the Philistine army on the eve of the battle of Gilboa, and who assisted him against the marauding band **(**dWdG**)** of the Amalekites (comp. 1 Samuel 30). B.C. 1053.

4. (Sept. Ἐλιού.) One of the eminently able-bodied members of the family of Obed-edom (apparently a grandson by Shemaiah), who were appointed porters of the Temple under David (1 Chronicles 26:7). B.C. 1043. Terms are applied to all these doorkeepers which appear to indicate that

they were not only "strong men," as in A.V., but also fighting men. (See verse 6, 7, 8, 12, in which occur the words lyjæ = army, and µyrbGæ warriors or heroes.)

5. (Sept. Ἐλιάβ.) A chief of the tribe of Judah, said to be "of the brethren of David" (1 Chronicles 27:18), and hence supposed by some to have been his oldest brother ELIAB *SEE ELIAB* (1 Samuel 16:6). B.C. 1013 or ante.

Eli'jah

(Hebrews *Eliyah'*, hY;læ whose *God is Jehovah*, 2 Kings 1:3, 4, 8, 12; 1 Chronicles 8:27; Ezra 10:21, 26; Malachi 4:5; elsewhere in the prolonged form *Eliya'hu*, WhY;læ Sept. Ἠλιού v.r. Ἠλίας; N.T. Ἠλίας; Josephus, Ἠλίας, *Ant.* 8:13, 4; Vulg. *Elias)*, the name of several men in the O.T., but the later ones apparently all namesakes of the famous prophet.

I. "ELIJAH THE TISHBITE," the Elias" of the N.T., a character whose rare, sudden, and brief appearances, undaunted courage and fiery zeal — the brilliancy of whose triumphs — the pathos of whose despondency-the glory of whose departure, and the calm beauty of whose reappearance on the Mount of Transfiguration — throw such a halo of brightness around him as is equalled by none of his compeers in the sacred story.

1. *Origin.* — This wonder-working prophet is introduced to our notice like another Melchizedek (Genesis 10:4, 18; Hebrews 7:3), without any mention of his father or mother, or of the beginning of his days — as if he had dropped out of that cloudy chariot which, after his work was done on earth, conveyed him back to heaven. "Elijah the Tishbite, of the inhabitants of Gilead," is literally all that is given us to know of his parentage and locality (1 Kings 17:1). The Hebrew text is d[;lgæb]vTmæBæ]Tæi WhY;læ The third word may be pointed (1), as in the present Masoretic text, to mean "from the inhabitants of Gilead," or (2) "from Tishbi of Gilead," which, with a slight change in form, is what the Sept. has (ὁ ἐκ θεσσεβῶν). The latter is followed by Ewald *(Isr. Gesch.* 3:486, note). Lightfoot assumes, but without giving his authority, that Elijah was from Jabesh-Gilead. By Josephus he is said to have come from Thesbon — ἐκ πολεως θεσβώνης τῆς Γαλααδίτιδος χώρας *(Ant.* 8:13, 2). Perhaps this may have been read as Heshbon, a city of the priests, and given rise to

the statement of Epiphanius that he was "of the tribe of Aaron," and grandson of Zadok. (See also the *Chron. Pasch.* in Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep. V.T.* p. 1070, etc.; and Quaresmius, *Elucid.* 2:605.) According to Jewish tradition — grounded on a certain similarity between the fiery zeal of the two-Elijah was identical with Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the priest. He was also the angel of Jehovah who appeared in fire to Gideon (Lightfoot on <4B0121>John 1:21; Eisenmenger, 1:686). Arab tradition places his birthplace at Gilhad (Jalud), a few miles north of es-Salt (Irby, page 98), and his *tomb* near Damascus (Mislin, 1:490). The common assumption — perhaps originating with Hiller *(Onom.* page 947) or Reland *(Pal.* page 1035) — is that he was born in the town of Thisbe (q.v.), mentioned in Tob. 1:2. But, not to insist on the fact that this Thisbe was not in Gilead, but in Naphtali, it is nearly certain that the name has no real existence in that passage, but arises from a mistaken translation of the same Hebrew word which is rendered "inhabitants" in <111701>1 Kings 17:1. *SEE TISHBITE.*

2. *Personal Appearance.* — The mention of Gilead, however, is the key-note to much that is most characteristic in the story of the prophet. Gilead was the country on the further side of the Jordan — a country of chase and pasture, of tent-villages and mountain castles, inhabited by a people not settled and civilized like those who formed the communities of Ephraim and Judah, but of wandering, irregular habits, exposed to the attacks of the nomad tribes of the desert, and gradually conforming more and more to the habits of those tribes; making war with the Hagarites, and taking the countless thousands of their cattle, and then dwelling in their stead (<130510>1 Chronicles 5:10, 19-22). *SEE GILEAD*. With Elijah this is seen at every turn. Of his appearance as he "stood before" Ahab — with the suddenness of motion to this day characteristic of the Bedouins from his native hills — we can perhaps realize something from the touches, few, but strong, of the narrative. Of his height little is to be inferred — that little is in favor of its being beyond the ordinary size. His chief characteristic was his hair, long and thick, and hanging down his back, and which, if not betokening the immense strength of Samson, yet accompanied powers of endurance no less remarkable. *SEE HAIR.* His ordinary clothing consisted of a girdle of skin round his loins, which he tightened when about to move quickly (<111846>1 Kings 18:46). But in addition to this he occasionally wore the "mantle" (q.v.), or cape, of sheep-skin, which has supplied us with one of our most familiar figures of speech. In this mantle, in moments of emotion, he would hide his face (<111913>1 Kings 19:13), or when excited would roll it up as into a

kind of staff. On one occasion we find him bending himself down upon the ground with his face between his knees. Such, so far as the scanty notices of the record will allow us to conceive it, was the general appearance of the great prophet — an appearance which there is no reason to think was other than uncommon even at that time. The solitary life in which these external peculiarities had been assumed had also nurtured that fierceness of zeal and that directness of address which so distinguished him. It was in the wild loneliness of the hills and ravines of Gilead that the knowledge of Jehovah, the living God of Israel, had been impressed on his mind, which was to form the subject of his mission to the idolatrous court and country of Israel.

3. *History*. — The northern kingdom had at this time forsaken almost entirely the faith in Jehovah. The worship of the calves had been a departure from him, it was a violation of his command against material resemblances; but still it would appear that even in the presence of the calves Jehovah was acknowledged, and they were at any rate a national institution, not directly imported from the idolatries of any of the surrounding countries. *SEE CALF*. They were announced by Jeroboam as the preservers of the nation during the great crisis of its existence: "Behold thy gods, O Israel, that brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kings 12:28). But the case was quite different when Ahab, not content with the calf-worship — "as if it had been a light thing to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat" — married the daughter of the king of Sidon, and introduced on the most extensive scale (Josephus, *Ant.* 9:6, 6) the foreign religion of his wife's family, the worship of the Phoenician Baal. What this worship consisted of we are ignorant — doubtless it was *of* a gay, splendid, and festal character, and therefore very opposite to the grave, severe service of the Mosaic ritual. Attached to it and to the worship of Asherah (A.V. "Ashtaroth," and "the groves") were licentious and impure sites, which in earlier times had brought the heaviest judgments on the nation (Numbers 15; Judges 2:13, 14; 3:7, 8). But the most obnoxious and evil characteristic of the Baal religion was that it was the worship of power, of mere strength, as opposed to that of a God of righteousness and goodness — a foreign religion, imported from nations the hatred of whom was inculcated in every page of the law, as opposed to the religion of that God who had delivered the nation from the bondage of Egypt, had "driven out the heathen with his hand, and planted them in," and through whom their forefathers had "trodden down their enemies, and

destroyed those that rose up against them." It is as a witness against these two evils that Elijah comes forward. (B.C. cir. 907.)

(1.) What we may call the first act in his life embraces between three and four years — three years and six months for the duration of the drought, according to the statements of the New Testament (<4Luke 4:25; <5James 5:17), and three or four months more for the journey to Horeb and the return to Gilead (<111 Kings 17:50–19:21). His introduction is of the most startling description: he suddenly appears before Ahab, as with the unrestrained freedom of Eastern manners he would have no difficulty in doing, and proclaims the vengeance of Jehovah for the apostasy of the king. This he does in the remarkable formula evidently characteristic of himself, and adopted after his departure by his follower Elisha — a formula which includes everything at issue between himself and the king — the name of Jehovah — his being the God of Israel — the Living God — Elijah being his messenger, and then — the special lesson of the event — that the god of power and of nature should be beaten at his own weapons. "As Jehovah, God of Israel, liveth, before whom I stand," whose constant servant I am, "there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word." Before, however, he spoke thus, it would seem that he had been warning this most wicked king as to the fatal consequences which must result both to himself and his people from the iniquitous course he was then pursuing, and this may account for the apparent abruptness with which he opens his commission. What immediate action followed on this we are not told; but it is plain that Elijah had to fly before some threatened vengeance, either of the king, or more probably of the queen (compare 19:2). Perhaps it was at this juncture that Jezebel "cut off the prophets of Jehovah" (<111 Kings 18:4). We can imagine Ahab and Jezebel being greatly incensed against Elijah for having foretold and prayed that such calamities might befall them. For some time they might attribute the drought under which the nation suffered to natural causes, and not to the interposition of the prophet; and, therefore, however they might despise him as a vain enthusiast, they would not proceed immediately to punish him. When, however, they saw the denunciation of Elijah taking effect far more extensively than had been anticipated, they would naturally seek to wreak their vengeance upon him as the cause of their sufferings. But we do not find him taking one step for his own preservation till the God whom he served interposed. He was directed to the brook Cherith, either one of the torrents which cleave the high table-lands of his native hills, or on the west

of Jordan, more in the neighborhood of Samaria, perhaps the present wady Kelt. *SEE CHERITH*. There, in the hollow of the torrent-bed, he remained, supported in the miraculous manner with which we are all familiar, till the failing of the brook obliged him to forsake it. How long he remained in the Chelith is uncertain. The Hebrew expression is simply "at the end of days;" nor does Josephus afford us any more information. A vast deal of ingenuity has been devoted to explaining away Elijah's "ravens." The Hebrew word, µybir][*orebim'*, has been interpreted as "Arabians," as "merchants," as inhabitants of some neighboring town of *Orbo* or *Orbi*. By others Elijah has been held to have plundered a raven's nest, and this twice a day regularly for several months! *SEE RAVEN.*

His next refuge, under the divine guidance (<1170>1 Kings 17:9), was at Zarephath, a Phoenician town lying between Tyre and Sidon, certainly the last place at which the enemy of Baal would be looked for. The widow woman in whose house he lived is thought, however, to have been an Israelite, and no Baal-worshipper, by some who take her adjuration by "Jehovah thy God" as an indication. But the obvious circumstances of the case, and her mention by our Savior (<4026>Luke 4:26), imply her heathen character. Here Elijah performed the miracles of prolonging the oil and the meal, and restored the son of the widow to life after his sudden death. The traditional scene of his meeting with the widow was in a wood to the south of the town (Mislin, 1:532, who, however, does not give his authority). In the time of Jerome the spot was marked by a tower (Jerome, *Ep. Paulk).* At a later period a church dedicated to the prophet was erected over the house of the widow, in which his chamber and her kneading-trough were shown (Anton. Martyr and Phocas, in Reland, p. 985). This church was called τὸ χηρεῖον *(Acta Sanctorum).* The Jewish tradition, quoted by Jerome, was that the resuscitated boy was the servant who afterwards accompanied Elijah, and finally became the prophet Jonah (Jerome, *Pref. to Jonah;* and see the citations from the Talmuds in Eisenmenger, 2:725).

The drought continued, and at last the full horrors of famine, caused by the failure of the crops, descended on Samaria. During this time the prophet was called upon passively to suffer God's will; now he must once again resume the more active duties of life; he must make one great public effort more to reclaim his country from apostasy and ruin. According to the word of the Lord, he returned to Israel; Ahab was yet alive, and unreformed; Jezebel, his impious consort, was still mad upon her idols; in a word, the prophets of Baal *were prophesying lies, the priests were bearing rule by*

their means, and the people loved to have it so. The king and his chief domestic officer had divided between them the mournful duty of ascertaining that neither round the springs, which are so frequent a feature of central Palestine, nor in the nooks and crannies of the most shaded torrent-beds, was there any of the herbage left, which in those countries is so certain an indication of the presence of moisture. No one short of the two chief persons of the realm could be trusted with this quest for life or death — "Ahab went one way by himself, and Obadiah went another way by himself." It is the moment for the reappearance of the prophet. Wishing not to tempt God by going unnecessarily into danger, he first presented himself to good Obadiah (<11807>1 Kings 18:7). There, suddenly planted in his path, is the man whom he and his master have been seeking for more than three years. Before the sudden apparition of that wild figure, and that stern, unbroken countenance, Obadiah could not but fall on his face. Elijah requested him to announce to Ahab that he had returned. Obadiah, apparently stung by the unkindness of this request, replied, "What have I sinned, that thou shouldest thus expose me to Ahab's rage, who will certainly slay me for not apprehending thee, for whom he has so long and so anxiously sought in all lands and in confederate countries, that they should not harbor a traitor whom he looks upon as the author of the famine," etc. Moreover, he would delicately intimate to Elijah how he had actually jeopardied his own life in securing that of one hundred of the Lord's prophets, and whom he had fed at his own expense. Satisfied with Elijah's reply to this touching appeal, wherein he removed all his fears about the Spirit's carrying him away (as <12211>2 Kings 2:11-16; <26304>Ezekiel 3:4; <44839>Acts 8:39), he resolves to be the prophet's messenger to Ahab. Intending to' be revenged on him, or to inquire when rain might be expected, Ahab now came forth to meet Elijah. He at once charged him with troubling Israel, i.e., with being the main cause of all the calamities which he and the nation had suffered. But Elijah flung back the charge upon himself, assigning the real cause to be his own sin of idolatry. Regarding, however, his magisterial position, while he reproved his sin, he requests him to exercise his authority in summoning an assembly to Mount Carmel, that the controversy between them might be decided by a direct miracle from heaven (compare <40160>Matthew 16:1). Whatever were his secret motives, Ahab accepted this proposal. As fire was the element over which Baal was supposed to preside, the prophet proposes (wishing to give them every advantage), that, two bullocks being slain, and laid each upon a distinct altar, the one for Baal, the other for Jehovah, whichever should be

consumed by fire must proclaim whose the people of Israel were, and whom it was their duty to serve. The people consent to this proposal, because, it may be, they were not altogether ignorant how God had formerly answered by fire (<01004>Genesis 4:4; <03924>Leviticus 9:24; <07621>Judges 6:21; 13:20; <13026>1 Chronicles 21:26; <14701>2 Chronicles 7:1). Elijah will have summoned not only all the elders of Israel, but also the four hundred priests of Baal belonging to Jezebel's court, and the four hundred and fifty who were dispersed over the kingdom. The former, however, did not attend, being, perhaps, glad to shelter themselves under the plea that Jezebel would not allow them to do so. Why Mount Carmel, which we do not hear of until now, was chosen in preference to the nearer Ebal or Gerizim, is not evident. Possibly Elijah thought it wise to remove the place of the meeting to a distance from Samaria. Possibly in the existence of the altar of Jehovah (18:30) — in ruins, and therefore of earlier erection — we have an indication of an ancient sanctity attaching to the spot. On the question of the particular part of the ridge of Carmel which formed the site of the meeting, there cannot be much doubt. *SEE CARMEL.*

There are few more sublime stories in history than this. On the one hand the solitary servant of Jehovah, accompanied by his one attendant, with his wild shaggy hair, his scanty garb, and sheepskin cloak, but with calm dignity of demeanor, and the minutest regularity of procedure; on the other hand, the prophets of Baal and Ashtaroth, doubtless in all the splendor of their vestments (<12022>2 Kings 10:22), with the wild din of their "vain repetitions" and the maddened fury of their disappointed hopes, and the silent people surrounding all — these things form a picture which brightens into fresh distinctness every time we consider it. Having reconstructed an altar which had once belonged to God, with twelve stones — as if to declare that the twelve tribes of Israel should again be united in the service of Jehovah — and having laid thereon his bullock, and filled the trench by which it was surrounded with large quantities of water, lest any suspicion of deceit might occur to any mind, the prophet gives place to the Baalites-allows them to make trial first. In vain did these deceived and deceiving men call, from morning till evening, upon Baals — in vain did they now mingle their own blood with that of the sacrifice: no answer was given — no fire descended. Elijah having rebuked their folly and wickedness with the sharpest irony, and it being at last evident to all that their efforts to obtain the wished-for fire were vain, now, at the time of the evening sacrifice, offered up his prayer. The Baalites' prayer was long, that of the

prophet is short — charging God with the care of his covenant, of his truth, and of his glory — when, "behold, the fire came down, licked up the water, and consumed not only the bullock, but the very stones of the altar also." The effect of this on the mind of the people was what the prophet desired: acknowledging the awful presence of the Godhead, they exclaim, as with one voice, " The Lord, he is God; the Lord, he is God!" Seizing the opportunity while the people's hearts were warm with the fresh conviction of this miracle, he bade them take those juggling priests and kill them at Kishon, that their blood might help to fill that river which their idolatry had provoked God to empty by drought. All this Elijah might lawfully do at God's direction, and under the sanction of his law (Deuteronomy 13:5; 18:20). Ahab having now publicly vindicated God's violated law by giving his royal sanction to the execution of Baal's priests, Elijah informed him that he may go up to his tent on Carmel to take refreshment, for God will send the desired rain. In the mean time he prayed earnestly (James 5:17, 18) for this blessing: God hears and answers: a little cloud arises out of the Mediterranean Sea, in sight of which the prophet now was, diffuses itself gradually over the entire face of the heavens, and now empties its refreshing waters upon the whole land of Israel! Here was another proof of the divine mission of the prophet, from which, we should imagine, the whole nation must have profited; but subsequent events would seem to prove that the impression produced by these dealings of God was of a very partial and temporary character. Impressed with the hope that the report of God's miraculous actings at Carmel might not only reach the ear, but also penetrate and soften the hard heart of Jezebel, and anxious that the reformation of his country should spread in and about Jezreel also, Elijah, strengthened, as we are told, from on high, now accompanies Ahab thither on foot. The ride across the plain to Jezreel was a distance of at least 16 miles; the prophet, with true Arab endurance, running before the chariot, but also, with true Arab instinct, stopping short of the city, and going no further than the "entrance of Jezreel."

So far the triumph had been complete; but the spirit of Jezebel was not to be so easily overcome, and her first act is a vow of vengeance against the author of this destruction. "God do so to me, and more also," so ran her exclamation, "if I make not thy life as the life of one of them by tomorrow about this time." It was no duty of Elijah to expose himself to unnecessary dangers, and, as at his first introduction, so now, he takes refuge in flight. The danger was great, and the refuge must be distant. The first stage on

the journey was Beersheba — "Beersheba which belongeth to Judah," says the narrative, with a touch betraying its Israelitish origin. Here, at the ancient haunt of those fathers of his nation whose memory was so dear to him, and on the very confines of cultivated country, Elijah halted. His servant — according to Jewish tradition, the boy of Zarephath — he left in the town, while he himself set out alone into the wilderness — the waste uninhabited region which surrounds the south of Palestine. The labors, anxieties, and excitement of the last few days had proved too much even for that iron frame and that stern resolution. His spirit is quite broken, and he wanders forth over the dreary sweeps of those rocky hills wishing for death — "It is enough! Lord, let me die, for I am not better than my fathers." The man whose prayer had raised the dead, had shut and opened heaven, he who had been so wonderfully preserved by God at Cherith and Zarephath, and who dared to tax Ahab to his face with being Israel's troubler, is now terrified and disconsolate, thus affording a practical evidence of what the apostle James says of him, that he was a man of like passions with us. His now altered state of mind would seem to have arisen out of an exaggerated expectation of what God designed to effect through the miracles exhibited to, and the judgments poured upon this guilty nation. He seems to have thought that, as complete success did not crown the last great effort he had made to reform Israel, there could not be the slightest use in laboring for this end any longer. It is almost impossible not to conclude from the terms of the story that he was entirely without provisions for this or any journey. But God, who had brought his servant into this difficulty, provided him with the means of escaping from it. He now, alone in the wilderness and at Mount Horeb, will at once touch his heart and correct his petulancy by the ministration of his angel, and by a fearful exhibition of his divine power. The prophet, in a fit of despair, laid himself down beneath a lone "juniper-tree" (Hebrew dj ̈a,µt,rø*one Rothem-tree)*. *SEE JUNIPER*. The indented rock opposite the gate of the Greek convent Deir Mar-Elyas, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, which is now shown to travelers as the spot on which the prophet rested on this occasion, appears at an earlier date not to have been so restricted, but was believed to be the place on which he was "accustomed to sleep" (Sandys, lib. 3, page 176; Maundrell, *Ear. Trav.* page 456), and the site of the convent as that where he was born (Gaysforde, 1506, in Bonar, page 117). Neither the older nor the later story can be believed; but it is possible that they may have originated in some more trustworthy tradition of his having rested here on his southward journey, in all probability taken along this

very route. (See a curious statement by Quaresmius of the extent to which the rock had been defaced in his own time "by the piety or impiety" of the Christian pilgrims, *Elucidatio,* 2:605; comp. Doubdan, *Voyage,* etc. page 144.) In this position the prophet was wakened from his despondent dream beneath the solitary bush of the wilderness, was fed with the bread and the water which to this day are all a Bedouin's requirements, and went forward, "in the strength of that food," a journey of forty days, "to the mount of God, even to Horeb." Here, in "the cave" (הַמְּעָרָה), one of the numerous caverns in those awful mountains — perhaps some traditional sanctuary of that hallowed region, at any rate well known — he remained for certainly one night (שָׁם). In the morning came the "word of Jehovah" — the question, "What doest thou here, Elijah? Driven by what hard necessity dost thou seek this spot, on which the glory of Jehovah has in former times been so signally shown?" In answer to this invitation the prophet opens his griefs. He has been very zealous for Jehovah; but force has been vain; one cannot stand against a multitude; none follow him, and he is left alone, flying for his life from the sword which has slain his brethren. The reply comes in that ambiguous and indirect form in which it seems necessary that the deepest communications with the human mind should be couched to be effectual. He is directed to leave the cavern and stand on the mountain in the open air, face to face with Jehovah. Then, as before with Moses (Exodus 34:6), "the Lord passed by;" passed in all the terror of his most appalling manifestations. The fierce wind tore the solid mountains and shivered the granite cliffs of Sinai; the earthquake crash reverberated through the defiles of those naked valleys; the fire burnt in the incessant blaze of Eastern lightning. Like these, in their degree, had been Elijah's own modes of procedure, but the conviction is now forced upon him that in none of these is Jehovah to be known. Then, penetrating the dead silence which followed these manifestations, came the fourth mysterious symbol — "the still small voice." What sound this was — whether articulate voice or not, we cannot determine; but low and still as it was, it spoke in louder accents to the wounded heart of Elijah than the roar and blaze which had preceded it. To him, no less unmistakably than to Moses centuries before, it was proclaimed that Jehovah was “merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth." Elijah knew the call, and at once stepping forward and hiding his face in his mantle, stood waiting for the divine communication. It is in the same words as before, and so is his answer; but with what different force must the question have fallen on his ears, and the answer left his lips! "Before his

entrance to the cave he was comparatively a novice; when he left it he was an initiated man. He had thought that the earthquake, the fire, the wind, must be the great witnesses of the Lord. But He was not in *them;* not they, but the still small voice had that awe in it which forced the prophet to cover his face with his mantle. What a conclusion of all the past history! What an interpretation of its meaning!" (Maurice, *Prophets and Kings,* page 136). Not in the persecutions of Ahab and Jezebel, nor in the slaughter of the prophets of Baal, but in the 7000 unknown worshippers who had not bowed the knee to Baal, was the assurance that Elijah was not alone as he had seemed to be.

Three commands were laid on him — three changes were to be made. Instead of Ben-hadad, Hazael was to be king of Syria; instead of Ahab, Jehu the son of Nimshi was to be king of Israel; and Elisha the son of Shaphat was to be his own successor. These per. sons shall revenge God's quarrels: one shall begin, another shall prosecute, and the third shall perfect the vengeance on Israel. Of these three commands, the first two were reserved for Elisha to accomplish; the last only was executed by Elijah himself. It would' almost seem as if his late trials had awakened in him a yearning for that affection and companionship which had hitherto been denied him. His first search was for Elisha. Apparently he soon found him; we must conclude at his native place, Abel-meholah, probably somewhere about the center of the Jordan valley. *SEE ABEL-MEHOLAH*. Elisha was ploughing at the time, and Elijah "passed over to him" — possibly crossed the river — and, without uttering a sword, cast his mantle, the well-known sheepskin cloak, upon him, as if, by that familiar action (which was also a symbol of official investiture), claiming him for his son. A moment of hesitation — but the call was quickly accepted; and then commenced that long period of service and intercourse which continued till Elijah's removal, and which after that time procured for Elisha one of his best titles to esteem and reverence — "Elisha the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah." *SEE ELISHA*.

(2.) For about six years from this calling of Elisha we find no notice in the sacred history of Elijah, till God sent him once again to pronounce sore judgments upon Ahab and Jezebel for the murder of unoffending Naboth (<1Ki 21:17>1 Kings 21:17, etc.). How he and his associate in the prophetic office employed themselves during this time we are not told. We may conceive, however, that they *were* much engaged in prayer for their country, and in imparting knowledge in the schools of the prophets, which were at Jericho

and Beth-el. Ahab and Jezebel now probably believed that their threats had been effectual, and that they had seen the last of their tormentor. At any rate, this may be inferred from the events of chapter 21. *SEE AHAB*. Foiled in his wish to acquire the ancestral plot of ground of Naboth by the refusal of that sturdy peasant to alienate the inheritance of his fathers, Ahab and Jezebel proceed to possess themselves of it by main force, and by a degree of monstrous injustice which shows clearly enough how far the elders of Jezreel had forgotten the laws of Jehovah, how perfect was their submission to the will of their mistress. At her orders Naboth is falsely accused of blaspheming God and the king, is with his sons (<12026>2 Kings 9:26; romp. <06724>Joshua 7:24) stoned and killed, and his vineyard then — as having belonged to a criminal-becomes at once the property of the king. *SEE NABOTH.*

Ahab loses no time in entering on his new acquisition. Apparently the very next day after the execution he proceeds in his chariot to take possession of the coveted vineyard. Behind him — probably in the back part of the chariot — ride his two pages Jehu and Bidkar (<12026>2 Kings 9:26). But the triumph was a short one. Elijah had received an intimation from Jehovah of what was taking place, and rapidly as the accusation and death of Naboth had been hurried over, he was there to meet his ancient enemy, and as an enemy he does meet him — as David went out to meet Goliath — on the very scene of his crime; suddenly, when least expected and least wished for, he confronts the miserable king. Then follows the curse, in terms fearful to any Oriental — peculiarly terrible to a Jew, and most of all significant to a successor of the apostate princes of the northern kingdom — "I will take away thy posterity; I will cut off from thee even thy very dogs; I will make thy house like that of Jeroboam and Baasha; thy blood shall be shed in the same spot where the blood of thy victims was shed last night; thy wife and thy children shall be torn in this very garden by the wild dogs of the city, or as common carrion devoured by the birds of the sky" — the large vultures which in Eastern climes are always wheeling aloft under the clear blue sky, and doubtless suggested the expression to the prophet. How tremendous was this Scene we may gather from the fact that after the lapse of at least twenty years Jehu was able to recall the very words of the prophet's burden, to which he ,and his companion had listened as they stood behind their master in the chariot. The whole of Elijah's denunciation may possibly be recovered by putting together the words recalled by Jehu, <12026>2 Kings 9:26, 36, 7, and those given in <12119>1 Kings

21:19-25. Fearing that these predictions would prove true, as those about the rain and fire had done, Ahab now assumed the manner of a penitent; and, though subsequent acts proved the insincerity of his repentance, yet God rewarded his temporary abasement by a temporary arrest of judgment. We see, however, in after parts of this sacred history, how the judgments denounced against him, his abandoned consort, and children took effect to the very letter. *SEE JEZEBEL*.

(3.) A space of three or four years now elapses (compare 12201 Kings 22:1; 22:51; 12172 Kings 1:17) before we again catch a glimpse of Elijah. The denunciations uttered in the vineyard of Naboth have been ,partly fulfilled. Ahab is dead, and his son and successor, Ahaziah, has met with a serious accident, after a troubled reign of less than two years (12012 Kings 1:1, 2; 12251 Kings 22:51). Fearing a fatal result, as if to prove himself a worthy son of an idolatrous parentage, he sends to an oracle or shrine of Baal at the Philistine town of Ekron to ascertain the issue of his illness. But the oracle is nearer at hand than the distant Ekron. An intimation is conveyed to the prophet, probably at that time inhabiting one of the recesses of Carmel, and, as on the former occasions, he suddenly appears on the path of the messengers, without preface or inquiry utters his message of death, and as rapidly disappears. The tone of his words is as national on this as on any former occasion, and, as before, they are authenticated by the name of Jehovah — "Thus saith Jehovah, Is it because there is no God in Israel that ye go to inquire of Baalzebub, god of Ekron?" The messengers returned to the king too soon to have accomplished their mission. They were possibly strangers; at any rate they were ignorant of the name of the man who had thus interrupted their journey. But his appearance had fixed itself in their minds, and their description at once told Ahaziah, who must have seen the prophet about his father's court or have heard him described in the harem, who it was that had thus reversed the favorable oracle which he was hoping for from Ekron. The "hairy man" (cr [; l [B ivyaa, *a man, a lord of hair),* with a belt of rough skin round his loins, who came and went in this secret manner, and uttered his fierce words in the name of the God of Israel, could be no other than the old enemy of his father and mother; Elijah the Tishbite. But, ill as he was, this check only roused the wrath of Ahaziah, and, with the spirit of his mother, he at once seized the opportunity of possessing himself of the person of the man who had been for so long the evil genius of his house. A captain was dispatched, with a party of fifty, to take Elijah prisoner. He was sitting on the top of "the

mount" (rhh), i.e., probably of Carmel. The officer approached and addressed the prophet by the title which, as before noticed, is most frequently applied to him and Elisha — "O man of God, the king hath spoken: come down." "And Elijah answered and said, If I be a man of God, then let fire come down from heaven, and consume thee and thy fifty! And there came down fire from heaven, and consumed him and his fifty." A second party was sent, only to meet the same fate. The altered tone of the leader of a third party, and the assurance of God that his servant need not fear, brought Elijah down. But the king gained nothing. The message was delivered to his face in the same words as it had been to the messengers, and Elijah, so we must conclude, was allowed to go harmless. This was his last interview with the house of Ahab. It was also his last recorded appearance in person against the Baal-worshippers. It was this occasion to which the fiery sons of Zebedee alluded (<4905105>Luke 9:51-56) in a proposal that brought out from the lips of the Savior the contrast with his own benign mission (Trench, *Miracles,* chapter 4).

(4.) It must have been shortly after the death of Ahaziah that Elijah made a communication with the southern kingdom. It is the only one of which any record remains, and its mention is the first and last time that the name of the prophet appears in the Books of Chronicles. Mainly devoted, as these books are, to the affairs of Judah, this is not surprising. The alliance between his enemy Ahab and Jehoshaphat cannot have been unknown to the prophet, and it must have made him regard the proceedings of the kings of Judah with more than ordinary interest. When, therefore, Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, who had married the daughter of Ahab, began "to walk in the ways of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab, and to do that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah," Elijah sent him a letter (bTkmæ, *a writing,* different from the ordinary word for an epistle, rps, *a book),* denouncing his evil doings, and predicting his death (<14212>2 Chronicles 21:12-15). This letter has been considered as a great difficulty, on the ground that Elijah's removal must have taken place before the death of Jehoshaphat (from the terms of the mention of Elisha in <12301>2 Kings 3:11), and therefore before the accession of Joram to the throne of Judah. But, admitting that Elijah had been translated before the expedition of Jehoshaphat against Moab, it does not follow that Joram was not at that time, and before his father's death, king of Judah, Jehoshaphat occupying himself during the last eight or ten years of his life in going about the kingdom (<14190>2 Chronicles 19:4-11), and in conducting some important

wars, amongst others that in question against Moab, while Joram was concerned with the more central affairs of the government (2 Kings 3:7, etc.). That Joram began to reign during the lifetime of his father Jehoshaphat is stated in 2 Kings 8:16. According to one record (2 Kings 1:17), which immediately precedes the account of Elijah's last acts on earth, Joram was actually on the throne of Judah at the time of Elijah's interview with Ahaziah; and though this is modified by the statements of other places (2 Kings 3:1; 8:16), yet it is not invalidated, and the conclusion is almost inevitable that Joram ascended the throne as viceroy or associate some years before the death of his father. *SEE JORAM; SEE JEHOSHAPHAT*; *SEE JUDAH*. The ancient Jewish commentators get over the apparent difficulty by saying that the letter was written and sent after Elijah's translation. Others believed that it was the production of Elisha, for whose name that of Elijah had been substituted by copyists. The first of these requires no answer. To the second, the severity of its tone, as above noticed, is a sufficient reply. Josephus *(Ant.* 9:5, 2) says that the letter was sent while Elijah was still on earth. (See Lightfoot, *Chronicle*, etc., "Jehoram." Other theories will be found in Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepig.* page 1075, and Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* page 167). In its contents the letter bears a strong resemblance to the speeches of Elijah, while in the details of style it is very peculiar, and quite different from the narrative in which it is imbedded (Bertheau, *Chronik*, ad loc.).

(5.) The prophet's warfare being now accomplished on earth, God, whom he had so long and so faithfully served, will translate him in a special manner to heaven. Conscious of this, he determines to spend his last moments in imparting divine instruction to, and pronouncing his last benediction upon, the students in the colleges of Bethel and Jericho; accordingly, he made a circuit in this region (2 Kings 2:1, etc.). It was at Gilgal (q.v.) — probably not the ancient place of Joshua and Samuel, but another of the same name still surviving on the western edge of the hills of Ephraim — that the prophet received the divine intimation that his departure was at hand. He was at the time with Elisha, who seems now to have become his constant companion. Perhaps his old love of solitude returned upon him, perhaps he wished to spare his friend the pain of a too sudden parting, or perhaps he desired to test the affection of the latter; in either case he endeavors to persuade Elisha to remain behind while he goes on an errand of Jehovah. "Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jehovah hath sent me to Bethel." But Elisha will not so easily give up his master — "As Jehovah

liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee." They went together to Bethel. The event which was about to happen had apparently been communicated to the sons of the prophets at Bethel, and they inquire if Elisha knew of his impending loss. His answer shows how fully he was aware of it. "Yea," says he, with emphasis, "indeed *I do* know it (ynaæ¤µGi yTaæ¤[dy): hold ye your peace." But, though impending, it was not to happen that day. Again Elijah attempts to escape to Jericho, and again Elisha protests that he will not be separated from him. Again, also, the sons of the prophets at Jericho make the same unnecessary inquiries, and again he replies as emphatically as before. Elijah makes a final effort to avoid what they both so much dread. "Tarry here, I pray thee, for Jehovah hath sent me to the Jordan." But Elisha is not to be conquered, and the two set off across the undulating plain of burning sand to the distant river-Elijah in his mantle or cape of sheep-skin, Elisha in ordinary clothes (dgB, verse 12). Fifty men of the sons of the prophets ascend the abrupt heights behind the town — the same to which a late tradition would attach the scene of our Lord's temptation — and which command the plain below, to watch with the clearness of Eastern vision what happens in the distance. Talking as they go, the two reach the river, and stand on the shelving bank beside its swift brown current. But they are not to stop even here. It is as if the aged Gileadite cannot rest till he again sets foot on his own side of the river. He rolls up (s+N) his mantle as into a staff, and with his old energy strikes the waters as Moses had done before him — strikes them as if they were an enemy (hkn); and they are divided hither and thither, and they two go over on dry ground. What follows is best told in the simple words of the narrative. "And it came to pass when they were gone over, that Elijah said to Elisha, 'Ask what I shall do for thee before I be taken away from thee.' And Elisha said, 'I pray thee let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me.' And he said, 'Thou hast asked a hard thing: if thou see me taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so.' And it came to pass as they still went on and talked, that, behold, a chariot of fire and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up by the whirlwind into the skies." The tempest (hr;[s), which was an earthly substratum for the theophany, was accompanied by a fiery phenomenon, symbolizing the translation, which appeared to the eyes of Elisha as a chariot of fire with horses of fire, in which Elijah rode to heaven (Keil). Well might Elisha cry with bitterness (q[ix), "My father, my father." He had gone who, to the discerning eye and loving heart of his disciple, had been "the chariot of

Israel and the horsemen thereof" for so many years; and Elisha was at last left alone to carry on a task to which he must often have looked forward, but to which in this moment of grief he may well have felt unequal. He saw him no more; but his mantle had fallen, and this he took up — at once a personal relic and a symbol of the double portion of the spirit of Elijah with which he was to be clothed. Little could he have realized, had it been then presented to him, that he whose greatest claim to notice was that he had "poured water on the hands of Elijah" should hereafter possess an influence which had been denied to his master — should, instead of the terror of kings and people, be their benefactor, adviser, and friend, and that over his death-bed a king of Israel should be found to lament with the same words that had just burst from him on the departure of his stern and silent master, "My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" (<12134>2 Kings 13:14).

4. *Traditionary Views and Character.* — Elijah and Moses are the only men whose history does not terminate with their departure out of this world. Elijah appeared with Moses on Mount Hermon at the time of our Lord's transfiguration, and conversed with him respecting the great work of redemption which he was about to accomplish (<401701>Matthew 17:1-3). The author of the book of Ecclesiasticus (chapter 48) justly describes him as a prophet "who stood up as a fire, and whose word burned as a lamp." But, with the exception of the eulogiums contained in that catalogue of worthies, and 1 Macc. 2:58, and the passing allusion in <420954>Luke 9:54, none of the later references allude to his works of destruction or of portent. They all set forth a different side of his character from that brought out in the historical narrative. They speak of his being a man of like passions with ourselves (<590517>James 5:17); of his kindness to the widow of Sarepta (<420425>Luke 4:25); of his "restoring all things" (<401711>Matthew 17:11); “turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just" (<390405>Malachi 4:5, 6; <420117>Luke 1:17). In the sternness and power of his reproofs, however, he was a striking type of John the Baptist, and the latter is therefore prophesied of under his name: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (<390405>Malachi 4:5, 6). Our Savior also declares that Elijah had already come in spirit, in the person of John the Baptist. Many of the Jews in our Lord's time believed him to be Elijah, or that the soul of Elijah had passed into his body (<420908>Luke 9:8). *SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST*. How deep was the impression which he made on the mind of the nation may be

judged from the fixed belief which many centuries after prevailed that Elijah would again appear for the relief and restoration of his country. The prophecy of Malachi was possibly at once a cause and an illustration of the strength of this belief. Each remarkable person, as he arrives on the scene, be his habits and characteristics what they may — the stern John, equally with his gentle Successor — is proclaimed to be Elijah (<40164>Matthew 16:14; <41065>Mark 6:15; <43012>John 1:21). His appearance in glory on the Mount of Transfiguration does not seem to have startled the disciples. They were "sore afraid," but not apparently surprised. On the contrary, Peter immediately proposes to erect a tent for the prophet whose arrival they had so long been expecting. 'Even the cry of our Lord from the cross, containing as it did but a slight resemblance to the name of Elijah, immediately suggested him to the bystanders. "He calleth for Elijah." "Let be, let us see if Elijah will come to save him."

In the Talmud (see the passages cited by Hamburger, *Real-Encykl.* s.v. Eliahu) he is recorded as having often appeared to the wise and good rabbis — at prayer in the wilderness, or on their journeys — generally in the form of an Arabian merchant (Eisenmenger, 1:11; 2:402-7). At the circumcision of a child a seat was always placed for him, that, as the zealous champion and messenger of the "covenant" of circumcision (<111914>1 Kings 19:14; <390301>Malachi 3:1), he might watch over the due performance of the rite. During certain prayers ,the door of the house was set open that Elijah might enter and announce the Messiah (Eisenmenger, 1:685). His coming will be three days before that of the Messiah, and on each of the three he will proclaim, in a voice which shall be heard all over the earth, peace, happiness, salvation, respectively (Eisenmenger, 2:696). So firm was the conviction of his speedy arrival, that when goods were found and no owner appeared to claim them, the common saying was, "Put them by till Elijah comes" (Lightfoot, *Exercit.* <40170>Matthew 17:10; <43012>John 1:21). The same customs and expressions are even still in use among the stricter Jews of this and other countries (see *Revue des deux Mondes,* 24:131, etc.).

Elijah has been canonized in both the Greek and Latin churches. Among the Greeks *Mar Elygis* is the patron of elevated spots, and many a conspicuous summit in Greece is called by his name (Clark, *Peloponnessus,* p. 190). The service for his day — Ἠλίας μεγαλώνυμος — will be found in the *Menaion* on July 20, a date recognized by the Latin Church also. (See the *Acta Sanctorum,* July 20). By Cornelius h Lapide it is maintained

that his ascent happened on that day, in the 19th year of Jehoshaphat (Keil, *On Kings*, page 331). The convent bearing his name, Deir Mar Elyas, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, is well known to travelers in the Holy Land. It purports to be situated on the spot of his birth, as already observed. Other convents bearing his name once existed in Palestine: in Jebel Ajlun, the ancient Gilead (Ritter, *Syrien*, page 1029, 1066, etc.); at Ezra, in the Hauran (Burckhardt, *Syria*, page 59), and the more famous establishment on Carmel.

It is as connected with the great Order of the barefooted Carmelites that Elijah is celebrated in the Latin Church. According to the statements of the Breviary *(Off. B. Marim Virginis de Monte Carmelo*, Julii 16), the connection arose from the dedication to the Virgin of a chapel on the spot from which Elijah saw the cloud (an accepted type of the Virgin Mary) rise out of the sea. But other legends trace the origin of, the order to the great prophet himself, as the head of a society of anchorites inhabiting Carmel; and even as himself dedicating the chapel in which he worshipped to the Virgin! (St. John of Jerusalem, as quoted by Mislin, *Lieux Saints*, 2:49; and the bulls of various popes enumerated by Quaresmius, volume 2) These things are matters of controversy in the Roman Church, Baronius and others having proved that the order was founded in 1181, a date which is repudiated by the Carmelites (see extracts in Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepig.* page 1077).

In the Mohammedan traditions *Ilyas* is said to have drank of the Fountain of Life, "by virtue of which he still lives, and will live to the day of judgment." He is by some confounded with St. George, and with the mysterious *el-Khidr*, one of the most remarkable of the Moslem saints (see Lane's *Arabian Nights*, Introd. note 2; also *Selections from the Kuran;* page 221, 222). The Persian *Sojis* are said to trace themselves back to Eli. jah (Fabricius, page 1077); and he is even held to have been the teacher of Zoroaster (D'Herbelot, *Bib. Or.* s.v.).

Among other traditions, it must not be omitted that the words "Eye hath not seen," etc., <4619>1 Corinthians 2:9, which are without doubt quoted by the apostle from <2604>Isaiah 64:4, were, according to an ancient belief, from " the Apocalypse, or mysteries of Elijah," τὰ῾ Ηλία ἀπόκρυφα. The first mention of this appeal to Le Origen *(Hon. on* <4709>Matthew 27:9), and it is noticed with disapproval by Jerome, *ad Pammachium* (see Fabricius, page 1072).

By Epiphanius, the words "Awake, thou that sleepest," etc., <4B514>Ephesians 5:14, are inaccurately alleged to he quoted "from Elijah," 1:e. the portion of the O.T. containing his history — παρὰ τῷ Ηλίᾳ (comp. <45102>Romans 11:2).

5. *Literature.* — On the general subject, Anon. *Lectures on Elijah* (Lond. 1865); Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations,* Solomon and Kings, 45-47th week. Ephraem Syrus, *In Eliam (Opp.* 3:240); Basil, *In Eliam (Opp.* page 61); Ambrose, *De Elia (Opp.* 1:535); Chrysostom, *In Heliam (Opp. Spuria,* 6:708); Alexander, *De Elia (Hist. Eccl.* 3:335); Zouch, *Life of Elijah (Works,* 2:219); Robinson, *Elijah (Script. Char.* 2); Krummacher, *Elijah the Tishbite* (from the Germ., Lond. 1840; N.Y. 1847); Anderson, *Discourses on Elijah* (Lond. 1835); Evans, *Elijah (Script. Biog.* 1); Williams, *Elijah (Char. of O.T.* page 222); Frischmuth, *De Elia (Critici Sacri,* 2); Camartus, *Elias Thesbites* (Par. 1631); Simpson, *Lectures on Elijah* (Lond. 1836); Berr, *Notice sur E lie* (Nancy, 1839); Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 5:350; Schreiber, *Allgem. Religionslehre,* 1:194; Knobel, *Prophet.* 2:73; Rodiger, in the *Hall. Enycl.* 1:33, page 320; Menken, *Gesch. des Elias* (in his *Schriften, 2:*17 sq.); Hall, *Contemplations,* book 18, 19; Stanley, *Jewish Church,* 2:321 sq. On the "ravens," Schulen, *De Elia corvorum alumno* (Wittenb. 1717); id. *ib.* (Altorf, 1718); Mayer, *Elias corvorum convictor* (Viteb. 1685); Van Hardt, *Corbeaux d'Elie* (Helmst. 1709); Heumann, *Dissertt. syllog.* 1:896; Beykert, *Dee* μyb r [*Eliam alentib.* (Argent. 1774); Berg, in the *Duisb. Wochenbl.* 1768, No. 52; 1769, No. 1; Gumpach, *Alttestam. Stud.* page 200 sq.; Deyling, *Obs. Sacra,* part 1, No. 25. On his "mantle," Brockmann, *Comment. philol.* (Gryph. 1750). On Elijah's "coming," Hartung, *De El. adventu* (Jen. 1659); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1852, page 420 sq. On his proceedings at Carmel, Klausing, *De sacrificio Eite* (Lips. 1726); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1867. On his vision at Horeb, Verschuir, *De apparitione Elice (Dissertt. phil.* p. 85 sq.). On his stay at Cherith, at Zarephath, *Jour. Sac. Literature,* 1860, p. 1; *Unters. eiiger Verstorbzene* (Lips. 1793). On his ascension, Hergott, *De curru. Eliae* (Wittenb. 1676); Muller, *Eliae ascensio* (Lpz. 17—); Pfaff, *De raptu Eliae* (Tib. 1739). On his letter to Joram, Pfaff, *De litteris El. ad. Jor.* (Tib. 1755); Berg, in the *Duisb. Wochenbl.* 1774, No. 5, 6.

II. (Sept. Ηλία v.r. Ἐρία.) One of the "sons of Jeroham," and heads of Benjamite families resident at Jerusalem (<130827>1 Chronicles 8:27, where the name is inaccurately Anglicized " Eliah"). B.C. post 1612.

III. (Sept. Ἠλία.) One of the "sons of Elim" (q.v.), who divorced his Gentile wife on returning from the exile (<15102>Ezra 10:21, where the name is likewise wrongly Anglicized "Eliah"), B.C. 458.

Eli'ka

[some *El'ika*] (Hebrews *Elika'*, אֵלִיקָא, *God* is his *rejecter;* Sept. Ἐλικά v.r. Ἐνακά (Vulg. *Eica*), a Harodite (q.v.), one of David's thirty-seven distinguished warriors (<10235>2 Samuel 23:25). B.C. 1046. His name is omitted in the parallel list of <13127>1 Chronicles 11:27 (see Kennicott's conjecture, *Dissertatioz,* page 182). *SEE SHAMMOTH*.

Elilim

SEE TALMUD.

E'lim

(Hebrews *Eylim'*, אֵילִם, *trees* [so called from their *strength; SEE OAK*]; perh. here *palm-trees;* Sept. Αἰλείμ), a place mentioned in <021527>Exodus 15:27; <043309>Numbers 33:9, as the second station where the Israelites encamped after crossing the Red Sea. (See Huldrich or Ulrich, *De fontibus in Elim repertis,* Brem. 1728). *SEE BEER-ELIM*. It is distinguished as having had "twelve wells (rather "fountains," עֲיָנֹת) of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees." Laborde *(Geographical Commentary on* <021527>*Exodus* 15:27) supposed *wady Useit* to be Elim, the second of four wadys lying between 29° 7' and 29° 20', which descend from the range of et-Tih (here nearly parallel with the shore) towards the sea. The route of the Israelites, however, cannot well be mistaken at this part. It evidently lay along the desert plain on the eastern shore of the Red Sea. Elim must consequently have been in this plain, and not more than about fifty miles from the place of passage. With these data, and in a country where fountains are of such rare occurrence, it is not difficult to identify Elim. Near the south-eastern end of this plain, and not far from the base of Jebel Hummam, the outpost of the great Sinai mountain-group, a charming vale, called *wady Ghurundel,* intersects the line of route. It is the first of the four wadys noticed above, and is, in fact, the most noted valley of that region, and the only one in the vicinity containing water (Robinson, *Researches,* 1:100, 105). In the dry season it contains no stream, but in the rainy season it becomes the channel of a broad and powerful mountain current, being

bounded by high ridges, and extending far into the interior. It has no soil, but drifting sand, which has left but one of the "wells" remaining, the others anciently existing being doubtless filled up. This principal fountain springs out at the foot of a sandstone rock, forming a pool of sparkling water, and sending out a tiny but perennial stream. This, in fact, is one of the chief watering places in the peninsula of Sinai (Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert,* page 33 sq.). There are no palm-trees at present here, but the place is fringed with trees and shrubbery, stunted palms, with their hairy trunks and dishevelled branches; tamarisks, their feathery leaves dripping with what the Arabs call manna; and the acacia, with its gray foliage and white blossoms (Stanley, *Palestine,* page 68). These supply the only verdure, which, however, in contrast with the naked desert, is quite refreshing (Olin's *Travels,* 1:362). Well might such a wady, in the midst of a bare and treeless waste, be called emphatically *Elim,* "the trees." Lepsius takes another view, that Ghurundel is Mara, by others identified with Howara (2 hours N.W. from Ghurundel, and reached by the Israelites, therefore, before it), and that Elim is to be found in the last of the four above named, *wady Shubeikeh (Travels,* Berlin, 1845, page 27 sq.). *SEE EXODE.*

Elim'elech

(Hebrews *Elime'lek,* Ëlˆmyl{a; *God* is his *king;* Sept. Ἐλιμέλεκ; Josephus, Ἐλιμέλεχος, *Ant.* 5:9, 1), a man of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of the Hezronites and kinsman of Boaz, who dwelt in Bethlehem-Ephratah in the days of the judges. B.C. cir. 1368. In consequence of a great dearth in the land he went with his wife Naomi, and his two sons, Mahlon and Chilion, to dwell in Moab, where he and his sons died without posterity (<0802>Ruth 1:2, 3; 2:1, 3; 4:3, 9). *SEE RUTH.*

Elio'nai

(Hebrews *Elyoenay',* ynfe/ykla, a contracted form of the name *Elihoenai,* the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ἐλιωναΐ v.r. Ἐλιθενάν, Vulg. *Elioenai.)* Fourth son of Becher, son of Benjamin (<1708>1 Chronicles 7:8). B.C. post 1856.

2. (Sept. Ἐλιωναΐ v.r. Ἐλιωνηί, Vulg. *Elioenai.)* A chief of the posterity of Simeon (<1436>1 Chronicles 4:36) B.C. post 1618.

3. (1Ch 26:3 1 Chronicles 26:3.) *SEE ELIHOENAI*. 4. (Sept. Ἐλιωηναΐ v.r. Ἐλιωναΐ, Vulg. *Elioenai.)* A priest of the sons of Pashur, who had married a foreign wife after the return from Babylon, but who, at Ezra's instigation, put her away with the children born of her, and offered a ram for a trespass offering (Ezr 10:22 Ezra 10:22). B.C. 458. He is perhaps the same mentioned in Neh 12:41 Nehemiah 12:41, as one of the priests who accompanied Nehemiah with trumpets at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem. B.C. 446.

5. (Sept. Ἐλιωηναΐ v.r. Ἐλιωαΐ, Vulg. *Elioenai.)* An Israelite of the sons of Zattu, who likewise divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:27 Ezra 10:27). B.C. 458.

6. (Sept. Ἐλιωηναΐ v.r. Ἐλιωνναΐ and Ἐλιθενάν, Vulg. *Elioenai.)* Eldest son of Meariah, son of Shemaiah, of the descendants of Zerubbabel; his family are the latest mentioned in the Old Test. (1Ch 3:23 1 Chronicles 3:23, 24). B.C. ante 280. He appears to be the same with ESLI *SEE ESLI* , of the maternal ancestry of Christ (Luk 3:25 Luke 3:25). (See Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp.* page 16.) According to the present Hebrews text he is in the seventh generation from Zerubbabel, or about contemporary with Alexander the Great; but lord Hervey thinks that Shemaiah is identical with Shimei (verse 19), Zerubbabel's brother *(Geneal. of our Lord,* pages 107-109, and chapter 7).

Elionse'us

(Ἐλιωναῖος, doubtless a Graecized form of *Elioenai),* a high-priest of the Jews, who succeeded Matthias, son of Ananus (A.D. 42), and was the next year succeeded by Simon Cantheras (Josephus, *Ant.* 19:8, 1). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*

Elio'nas

the name of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. (Ἐλιωνάς v.r. Ἐλιωναΐς, Vulg. omits.) One of the sons of "Phaisur," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdras 9:22); evidently the ELIOENAI *SEE ELIOENAI* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:22 Ezra 10:22).

2. (Ἐλιωνάς, Vulg. *Noneas.)* One of the sons of "Annas," who did the same (1 Esd. 9:32); doubtless the ELIEZER *SEE ELIEZER* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezr 10:31 Ezra 10:31).

Eliot, Andrew, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born in Boston December 25, 1719 (O.S.), and graduated at Harvard College in 1737. In 1742 he was ordained pastor (as colleague with Mr. Webb) of the New North Church in Boston, in which service he remained until his death. In 1757 he was made D.D. by the University of Edinburgh. In 1773 he was elected president of Harvard College, but declined to leave his pastoral work. He died September 13, 1778. Besides occasional sermons, he published a volume of *Discourses* (1774). — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:417.

Eliot, John

styled "the apostle of the Indians," was born in the county of Essex, England, in 1604, and studied at the University of Cambridge. Emigrating to New England in 1631, he joined the Church in Boston. He was settled over the Church in Roxbury November 5, 1632. Here he studied the Indian language, with the view of converting the natives to Christianity. "The first Indian Church, established by the labors of Protestants in America, was formed at Natick in 1660, after the manner of the Congregational churches in New England. Those who wished to be organized into a Christian body were strictly examined as to their faith and experience by a number of the neighboring ministers, and Mr. Eliot afterwards administered to them baptism and the Lord's Supper. Other Indian churches were planted in various parts of Massachusetts, and he frequently visited them; but his pastoral care was more particularly over that which he first established. He made every exertion to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes; he stimulated many servants of Jesus to engage in the missionary work; and, although he mourned over the stupidity of many who preferred darkness to light, yet he lived to see twenty-four of the copper-colored aborigines fellow-preachers of the precious Gospel of Christ. In 1661 he published the New Testament in the Indian language, and in a few years the whole Bible, and several other books best adapted for the instruction of the natives. When he reached the age of fourscore years he offered to give up his salary, and desired to be liberated from the labors of his office as a teacher of the Church at Roxbury. It was with joy that he received Mr. Walter as his colleague in 1688. When he was bending under his infirmities, and could no longer visit the Indians, he persuaded a number of families to send their negro servants to him once a week, that he might instruct them in the truths of God. He died May 20, 1690, saying that all his labors were poor

and small, and exhorting those who surrounded his bed to pray. His last words were, 'Welcome joy'" (Allen). In 1649 Mr. Eliot published *The glorious Progress of the Gospel among the Indians;* in 1653, *Tears of Repentance;* in 1655, *A further Manifestation of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians;* and in 1670, *A brief Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel.* Baxter says, in one of his letters, "There was no man on earth whom I honored above him." A handsome memorial to the "Apostle of the Indians, and the pastor for fifty-eight years of the first Church in Roxbury," has been erected in the Forest Hills Cemetery, Roxbury. — *Life and Death of John Eliot,* by Cotton Mather (1691); Mather's *Magnalia,* 3:270; Francis, *Life of John Eliot* (Edinb. 1828); Sprague, *Annals,* 1:18; Allen, *American Biography.*

Elipandus

archbishop of Toledo in the 8th century. He shared the opinions of Felix, bishop of Urgel, with regard to the person of Christ, viz. that, with respect to his human nature, he was only the *adoptive* Son of God, thus giving rise to the sect of *Adoptianists.* Elipandus disseminated his views in Spain, France, and Germany. Adosinde, queen of Gallicia, induced bishop Etherius of Osma and the priest Beatus to write against him. They published against him two books, the originals of which are said to be still extant in Toledo. Elipandus replied by several letters, but he was condemned at the council which Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileja, convened at Ciudad de Friuli in 791. In the following year the doctrines of Elipandus and Felix were again condemned at a synod which Charlemagne held at Ratisbon. Pope Adrian confirmed the sentence, to which Felix submitted; but Elipandus, and several other bishops of Spain, persisted in their views, and wrote against Felix. This letter was refuted, and condemned by Adrian in a council held in Italy, and in the Council of Frankfort in 794. Charlemagne himself wrote a letter (still extant) to Elipandus urging him to submit; but the letter seems to have had little effect, for shortly before his death (in 799) Elipandus wrote a reply maintaining his views. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 15:832; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:156-158; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* book 3, c. 8, part 2, chapter 5, § 3. *SEE ADOPTIANISM.*

El'iphal

(Hebrews *Eliphal',* לִפְלָה, *God is his judge;* Sept. Ἐλιφαάλ v.r. Ἐλφάτ, Vulg. *Eliphal),* son of Ur (q.v.), and one of David's famous guard (1 Chr 11:35; 1

Chronicles 11:35). B.C. 1046. In the parallel passage (2 Samuel 23:34) he seems to be called "ELIPHELET *SEE ELIPHELET* , the son of Ahasbai (q.v.), the son of the Maachathite ;" but the names are here greatly confused. *SEE DAVID.*

Eliph'alat

(Ἐλιφαλάτ, Vulg. *Eliphalach),* one of the sons of "Asom," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esd. 9:33); evidently the ELIPHELET *SEE ELIPHELET* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (Ezra 10:33).

Eliph'alet

a less correct mode of Anglicizing (2 Samuel 5:16; 1 Chronicles 14:7) the name ELIPHELET *SEE ELIPHELET* (q.v.). It also occurs in the Apocrypha (Ἐλιφαλέτ) as the name of one of the sons of Adonicam, who returned from the exile (1 Esdr. 8:39); the ELIPHELET *SEE ELIPHELET* of the Hebrews text (Ezra 8:13).

El'iphaz

(Hebrew *Eliphaz',* זPÿ l ē, *God* is his *strength;* Sept. Ἐλιφάξ, but in Genesis Ἐλιφάς, Vulg. *Eliphaz),* the name of two men.

1. The leading one of the "three friends" who came to condole with Job in his affliction (Job 4:1), and who took part in that remarkable discussion which occupies the book of Job. B.C. cir. 2200. He is called "the Temanite;" hence it is naturally inferred that he was of the region substantially known as Teman (q.v.), in Idumaea; and as Eliphaz, the son of Esau, had a son called Teman, from whom the place took its; name, many have concluded that this Eliphaz was a descendant of the other Eliphaz. Some, indeed, even go so far as to suppose that the Eliphaz of Job was no other than the son of Esau. This view is of course confined to those who refer the age of Job to the time of these patriarchs. But it is doubtful whether even this gives a date sufficiently early. *SEE JOB.*

Eliphaz is the first of the friends to take up the debate, in reply to Job's passionate complaints. He appears to have been the oldest of the speakers, from which circumstance, or from natural disposition, his language is more mild and sedate than that of the others (see Eichler, *De visione E'iphazi* [4:12-31], Lpz. 1781). He begins his orations with delicacy, and conducts his part of the controversy with considerable address (chapter 4, 5, 15, 22).

On him falls the main burden of the argument, that God's retribution in this world is perfect and certain, and that consequently suffering must be a proof of previous sin. His words are distinguished from those of Bildad and Zophar by greater calmness and elaboration, and, in the first instance, by greater gentleness towards Job, although he ventures afterwards, apparently from conjecture, to impute to him special sins. The great truth brought out by him is the unapproachable majesty and purity of God (4:12-21; 15:12-16). But still, with the other two friends, he is condemned for having, in defense of God's providence, spoken of him "the thing that was not right," i.e., by refusing to recognize the facts of human life, and by contenting himself with an imperfect retribution as worthy to set forth the righteousness of God. On sacrifice and the intercession of Job all three are pardoned. *SEE JOB, BOOK OF.*

2. The son of Esau by one of his first wives, Adah, and father of several Edomitish tribes (<0364>Genesis 36:4, 10, 11, 16; <1365>1 Chronicles 1:35, 36). B.C. post 1963.

Eliph'eleh

(Hebrews in the prolonged form *Eliphele'hu*, Whlypla, *God will distinguish him;* Sept. Ἐλιφαλά and Ἐλιφαλού v.r. Ἐλιφενά and Ἐλιφαλαίας*;* Vulg. *Eliphalu),* a Merarite Levite; one of the gatekeepers (μyrip/v, A.V, porters") appointed by David to play on the harp "on the Sheminith," on the occasion of bringing up the ark to the city of David (<1358>1 Chronicles 15:18, 21). B.C. 1043.

Eliph'elet

(Hebrew *Eliphe'let,* tlypla, in pause *Elipha'let,* tlypla, *God* is his *deliverance);* the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ἐλιφαλάτ v.r. Ἀλιφαλέθ and Ἀλιφαλετ, Vulg. *Elipheleth.)* One of David's distinguished warriors, styled "the son of Ahasbai, the son of the Maachathite" (<1234>2 Samuel 23:34); but, by some error and abbreviation, ELIPHAT *SEE ELIPHAT* (q.v.), the son of Ur, [and] Hepher, the Mecherathite," in the parallel passage (<1365>1 Chronicles 11:35, 36.)

2. (Sept. Ἐλιφαλέτ v.r. Ἐλιφαλέθ, Vulg. *Eliphaleth.)* The third of the nine sons of David, born at Jerusalem, exclusive of those by Bathsheba

(1 Chronicles 3:6; 14:5, in which latter passage the name is written *Elpalet).* B.C. post 1044.

3. (Sept. Ἐλιφαλέτ v.r. Ἐλιφαλά, Vulg. *Eliphelet.)* The ninth of the same (1 Chronicles 3:8; 14:7; 2 Samuel 5:16, in which two latter passages the name is Anglicized "Eliphalet"). It is believed that there were not two sons of this name, but that, like Nogah, one is merely a transcriber's repetition. The two are certainly omitted in Samuel, but, on the other hand, they are inserted in two separate lists in Chronicles, and in both cases the number of sons is summed up at the close of the list. Josephus mentions but one *Eliphale* (Ἐλιφαλέ), as the last of David's eleven sons, and states that the last two were born of concubines *(Ant.* 7:3, 3). *SEE DAVID*.

4. (Sept. Ἐλιφαλέτ, Vulg. *Eliphalet.)* The third of the three sons of Eshek, of the posterity of Benjamin, and a descendant of king Saul through Jonathan (1 Chronicles 8:39). B.C. ante 536.

5. (Sept. Ἐλιφαλάθ v.r. Ἐλιφαλάτ, Vulg. *Eliphelet.)* One of the sons of Adonikam, who returned from Babylon with his two brothers and 60 males (Ezra 8:13). B.C. 459.

6. (Sept. Ἐλιφαλέτ,Vulg. *Elipheleth.)* An Israelite of the lineage of Hashum, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra 10:33). B.C. 458.

Elis'abeth

(Ἐλισάβετ), wife of Zacharias or Zachariah, and mother of John the Baptist (Luke 1:5). She was a descendant of Aaron, or of the race of the priests; and of her and her husband this exalted character is given by the evangelist: "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Luke 1:7, 13). They had remained childless till the decline of life, when an angel foretold to her husband Zachariah the birth of John, and Zachariah returning home, Elisabeth conceived. During five months she concealed the favor God had granted her; but the angel Gabriel discovered to the Virgin Mary this miraculous conception, as an assurance of the birth of the Messiah by herself. *SEE ANNUNCIATION*. Mary visited Elisabeth, and when she saluted her, Elisabeth felt the quickening of her unborn babe. When her child was circumcised she named him John, according to previous

instructions from her husband (<40103>Luke 1:39-63). B.C. 7. *SEE ZACHARIAS*.

The name in this precise shape does not occur in the Old Testament, where the names of few females are given. But it is a Hebrew name, the same in fact as ELISHEBA *SEE ELISHEBA* (q.v.). It is perhaps etymologically connected with *Elissa* or *Elisa*, the Phoenician name of queen Dido (Virgil, *AEn.* 4:335), whence the modern *Eliza, Elizabeth.*

Elisae'us

(Ἐλισαῖος or Ἐλισσαῖος), the Graecized form of the name of ELISHA *SEE ELISHA* (q.v.) in the N.T. (<42427>Luke 4:27) and Apocrypha (Ἐλισαιέ, Ecclus. 48:12), as well as Josephus *(Ant.* 8:13, 7 etc.).

Eli'sha

(Hebrews *Elisha'*, (עַיְשֶׁלֱא, for יָעַיְשֶׁלֱא, *God* is his *salvation;* Sept. Ἐλισαιέ or Ἐλισσαιέ, Josephus and N.T. Ἐλισσαῖος, Vulg. *Elisaeus*, A.V. in N.T. and Apocr. "Elisaeus"), the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah (<111916>1 Kings 19:16-19), who became the attendant and disciple of Elijah (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:13, 7), and his successor as prophet in the kingdom of Israel. *SEE ELIJAH.*

I. *History*. — The earliest mention of Elisha's name is in the command to Elijah in the cave at Horeb (<111916>1 Kings 19:16, 17). But our first introduction to the future prophet is in the fields of his native place (B.C. cir. 900). Abel-meholah-the "meadow of the dance" — as probably in the valley of the Jordan, and, as its name would seem to indicate, in a moist or watered situation. *SEE ABEL*. Elijah, on his way from Sinai to Damascus by the Jordan valley, lights on his successor engaged in the labors of the field, twelve yoke before him, i.e., probably eleven other ploughs preceding him along the same line (see Thomson, *Land and Book,* 1:108). To cross to him, to throw over his shoulders the rough mantle — a token at once of investiture with the prophet's office, and of adoption as a son — was to Elijah but the work of an instant, and the prophet strode on as if what he had done were nothing — "Go back again, for what have I done unto thee?" So sudden and weighty a call, involving the relinquishment of a position so substantial, and family ties so dear, might well have caused hesitation. But the parley was only momentary. To use a figure which we may almost believe to have been suggested by this very occurrence, Elisha

was not a man who, having put his hand to the plough, was likely to look back; he delayed merely to give the farewell kiss to his father and mother, and preside at a parting feast with his people, and then followed the great prophet on his northward road to become to him what in the earlier times of his nation Joshua had been to Moses. Of the nature of this connection we know hardly anything. "Elisha the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah," is all that is told us. The characters of the two men were thoroughly dissimilar, but how far the lion like daring and courage of the one had infused itself into the other, we can judge from the few occasions on which it blazed forth, while every line of the narrative of Elijah's last hours on earth bears evidence how deep was the personal affection which the stern, rough, reserved master had engendered in his gentle and pliant disciple.

Seven or eight years must have passed between the call of Elisha and the removal of his master, and during the whole of that time we hear nothing of him. But when that period had elapsed he reappears, to become the most prominent figure in the history of his country during the rest of his long life.

Being anxious, after his remarkable appointment to receiving the robe as a symbol of inheriting the prophetic spirit of his ascended master, to enter at once upon the duties of his sacred office, Elisha determined to visit the schools of the prophets which were on the other side of the Jordan. Accordingly, returning to that river, and wishing that sensible evidence should be afforded, both to himself and others, of the spirit and power of his departed master resting upon him, he struck its waters with Elijah's mantle, when they parted asunder and opened a way for him to pass over on dry land. Witnessing this miraculous transaction, the fifty sons of the prophets, who had seen from the opposite side Elijah's ascension, and who were awaiting Elisha's return, now, with becoming reverence, acknowledged him their spiritual head. These young prophets are not more full of reverence for Elisha than of zeal for Elijah: they saw the latter carried up in the air — they knew that this was not the first time of his miraculous removal. Imagining it therefore possible that the Spirit of God had cast him on some remote mountain or valley, they ask permission to go and seek him. Elisha, though fully aware that he was received up into glory, but yet fearful lest it should be conceived that he, from any unworthy motives, was not anxious to have him brought back, yielded to their request. The unavailing search confirmed Elisha's fame. (B.C. cir. 892.)

There are several considerations from which the incompleteness of the records of Elisha's life may be inferred:

(a.) The absence of marks by which to determine the dates of the various occurrences. — The "king of Israel" is continually mentioned, but we are left to infer what king is intended (2 Kings 5:5, 6, 7, etc.; 6:8, 9, 21, 26; 7:2; 8:3, 5, 6, etc.). This is the case even in the story of the important events of Naaman's cure, and the capture of the Syrian host at Dothan. The only exceptions are 2 Kings 3:12 (compare 6), and the narrative of the visit of Jehoash (2 Kings 13:14, etc.), but this latter story is itself a proof of the disarrangement of these records, occurring as it does after the mention of the death of Jehoash (verse 13), and being followed by an account of occurrences in the reign of Jehoahaz his father (verses 22, 23).

(b.) The absence of chronological sequence in the narratives. The story of the Shunammite embraces a lengthened period, from before the birth of the child till he was some years old. Gehazi's familiar communication with the king, and therefore the story which precedes it (2 Kings 8:1, 2), must have occurred before he was struck with leprosy, though placed long after the relation of that event (2 Kings 5:27)

(c). The different stories are not connected by the form of words usually employed in the consecutive narrative of these books. (See Keil, *Comment. on Kings*, page 348, where other indications will be found.) The call of Elisha seems to have taken place about four years before the death of Ahab. He died in the reign of Joash, the grandson of Jehu, B.C. cir. 835. Hence his public career embraces a period of not less than 65 years, for certainly 55 of which he held the office of "prophet in Israel" (2 Kings 5:8).

1. After the departure of his master, Elisha returned to dwell (בּוֹשֵׁב) at Jericho (2 Kings 2:18). The town had lately been rebuilt (1 Kings 16:34), and was the residence of a body of the "sons of the prophets" (2 Kings 2:5, 15). Among the most prominent features of that place are still the two perennial springs which, rising at the base of the steep hills of Quarantania behind the town, send their streams across the plain towards the Jordan, scattering, even at the hottest season, the richest and most grateful vegetation over what would otherwise be a bare tract of sandy soil. At the time in question, part, at least, of this charm was wanting. One

of the springs was noxious — had some properties which rendered it unfit for drinking, and also prejudicial to the land (2:19, µd (d; *bad,* A.V. "naught"). At the request of the men of Jericho, Elisha remedied this evil. He took salt in a new vessel, and cast it into the water at its source in the name of Jehovah. From the time of Josephus *(War,* 4:8, 3) to the present (Saewulf, *Mod. Trav.* page 17), the tradition of the cure has been attached to the large spring N.W. of the present town, and which now bears, probably in reference to some later event, the name of *Ain es-Sultan* (Robinson, *Researches,* 2:383 sq.). *SEE JERICHO.*

2. We next meet with Elisha at Bethel, in the heart of the country, on his way from Jericho to Mount Carmel (<2K 2:23>2 Kings 2:23). His last visit had been made in company with Elijah on their road down to the Jordan (<2K 2:2>2 Kings 2:2). Sons of the prophets resided there, but still it was the seat of the calf-worship, and therefore a prophet of Jehovah might expect to meet with insult, especially if not so well known and so formidable as Elijah. The road to the town winds up the defile of the wady Suweinit, under the hill which still bears what in all probability are the ruins of Ai, and which, even now retaining some trees, was at that date shaded by a forest, thick, and the haunt of savage animals (comp. <Am 5:19>Amos 5:19). *SEE BETHEL.* Here the boys of the town were clustered, waiting, as they still wait at the entrance of the villages of Palestine, for the chance passer-by. In the scanty locks of Elisha, how were they to recognize the successor of the prophet, with whose shaggy hair streaming over his shoulders they were all familiar? So, with the license of the Eastern children, they scoff at the newcomer as he walks by — "Go up (hl[, hardly *ascend,* as if alluding to Elijah, *but pass on* out of the way), bald-head (hir qe devoid of hair on the *back* of the head, as opposed to 2a j Bq bald on the *forehead)!"* For once Elisha assumed the sternness of his master. He turned upon them and cursed them in the name of Jehovah. There was in their expressions an admixture of rudeness, infidelity, and impiety. But the inhabitants of Bethel were to know, from bitter experience, that to dishonor God's prophets was to dishonor himself, for Elisha was at the moment inspired to pronounce the judgment which at once took effect. God, who never wants for instruments to accomplish his purposes, caused two she-bears to emerge from the neighboring wood and punish the young delinquents. It is not said that they were actually killed (the expression is (qN; to *rend,* which is peculiarly applicable to the claws of the bear). This fate may indeed have befallen

some of the party, but it is by no means probable in regard to the greater number.

Ehlenberg says that the bear is seen only on one part of the summit of Lebanon, called Mackmel, the other peak, Jebel Sanin, being, strangely enough, free from these animals. The Syrian bear is more of a frugiverous habit than the brown bear *(Ursus arctos),* but when pressed with hunger it is known to attack men and animals; it is very fond of a kind of chick-pea *(Cicer arietinus),* fields of which are often laid waste by its devastations. Most recent writers are silent respecting any species of bear in Syria, such as Shaw, Volney, Hasselquist, Burckhardt, and Schulz. Seetzen, however, notices a report of the existence of a bear in the province of Hasbeiya, on Mount Hermon. Klaeder supposed this bear must be the *Ursus arctos,* for which opinion, however, he seems to have had no authority; and a recent writer, Dr. Thomson *(Land and Book,* 2:373), says that the Syrian bear is still found on the higher mountains of this country, and that the inhabitants of Hermon stand in great fear of him. Hemprich and Ehrenberg *(Symbole Phys.* part 1) inform us that during the summer months these bears keep to the snowy parts of Lebanon, but descend in winter to the villages and gardens; it is probable, also, that at this period in former days they extended their visits to other parts of Palestine; for, though this species was in ancient times far more numerous than it is now, yet the snowy summits of Lebanon were probably always the summer home of these animals. It is not improbable, therefore, that the attack upon the forty-two children who mocked Elisha took place some time in the winter, when these animals inhabited the low lands of Palestine. *SEE BEAR.*

3. Elisha extricates Jehoram, king of Israel, and the kings of Judah and Edom, from their difficulty in the campaign against Moab, arising from want of water (2 Kings 3:4-27). The revolt of Moab occurred very shortly after the death of Ahab (2 Kings 3:5; comp. 1:1), and the campaign followed immediately —"the same day" (2 Kings 3:6; A.V. "time"). The prophet was with the army; according to Josephus *(Ant.* 9:3, 1) he "happened to be in a tent outside the camp of Israel." Joram he refuses to hear, except out of respect for Jehoshaphat, the servant of the true God; but a minstrel is brought, and at the sound of music the hand of Jehovah comes upon him, and he predicts a fall of rain, and advises a mode of procedure in connection therewith which results in the complete discomfiture of Moab. This incident probably tool place at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea. *SEE JEHORAM.*

4. The widow of one of the sons of the prophets according to Josephus, of Obadiah, the steward of Ahab — is in debt, and her two sons are about to be taken from her and sold as slaves by her creditors, as by an extension of the law (<2207>Exodus 21:7, and <3259>Leviticus 25:39), and by virtue of another (<2203>Exodus 22:3), they had the power to do; and against this hard-hearted act she implores the prophet's assistance. God will not, *without a cause*, depart from the general laws of his administration: Elisha therefore inquires how far she herself had the power to avert the threatened calamity. She replies that the only thing of which she was possessed was one pot of oil. This Elisha causes (in his absence, 4:5) to multiply (after the example of Elijah at Zarephath), until the widow has filled with it all the vessels which she could borrow, and thus procured the means of payment (<1201>2 Kings 4:1-7). No place or date of the miracle is mentioned.

5. The next occurrence is at Shunem and Mount Carmel (<1208>2 Kings 4:8-37). The account consists of two parts,

[a.] Elisha, probably on his way between Carmel and the Jordan valley, calls accidentally at Shunem, now Solam, a village on the southern slopes of Jebel ed-Duhy, the little Hermon of modern travelers. Here he is hospitably entertained by a woman of substance, apparently at first ignorant of the character of her guest. Wishing that he should take up, more than occasionally, his abode under her roof, she proposed to her husband to construct for him a chamber which he might have for his own accommodation. The husband at once consented, and, the apartment being fitted up in a way that showed their proper conception of his feeling, the prophet becomes its occupant. Grateful for such disinterested kindness, Elisha delicately inquired of her if he could prefer her interest before the king or the captain of his host; for he must have had considerable influence at court, from the part he had taken in the late war. But the good woman declined the prophet's offer by declaring that she would rather "dwell among her own people," and in the condition of life to which she had been accustomed. Still, to crown her domestic happiness, she lacked one thing — she had no child; and now, by reason of the age of her husband, she could not expect such a blessing. In answer, however, to the prayer of the prophet, and as a recompense for her care of him, she was saved from that childless condition which was esteemed so great a calamity by every Jewish wife, and permitted to "embrace a son" (<1208>2 Kings 4:8-17).

[b.] After an interval of several years, the boy is old enough to accompany his father to the corn-field, where the harvest is proceeding. The fierce rays of the morning sun are too powerful for him, and (affected apparently by a *sun-stroke)* he is carried home to his mother only to die at noon. She says nothing of their loss to her husband, but depositing her child on the bed of the man of God, at once starts in quest of him to Mount Carmel. The distance is fifteen or sixteen miles-at least four hours' ride; but she is mounted on the best ass (ˆ/taḥ; *the she-ass,* such being noted for excellence), and she does not slacken rein. Elisha is on one of the heights of Carmel commanding the road to Shunem, and from his position opposite to her (rgnmi) he recognizes in the distance the figure of the regular attendant at the services which he holds here at "new moon and sabbath" (comp. verse 23). He sends Gehazi down to meet her, and inquire the reason of her unexpected visit. But her distress is for the ear of the master, and not of the servant, and she presses on till she comes up to the place where Elisha himself is stationed (rhḥ; *the mount,* verse 27, i.e., Carmel, verse 25); then throwing herself down in her emotion, she clasps him by the feet. Misinterpreting this action, or perhaps with an ascetic feeling of the unholiness of a woman, Gehazi attempts to thrust her away. But the prophet is too profound a student of human nature to allow this — "Let her alone, for her soul is vexed within her, and Jehovah hath hid it from me, and bath not told me." "And she said" — with the enigmatical form of Oriental speech — "did I desire a son of my lord? Did I not say, do not deceive me?" No explanation is needed to tell Elisha the exact state of the case. The heat of the season will allow of no delay in taking the necessary steps, and Gehazi is at once dispatched to run back to Shunem with the utmost speed. He takes the prophet's walking-staff in his hand which he is to lay on the face of the child. The mother and Elisha follow in haste. Before they reach the village the sun of that long, anxious summer afternoon must have set. Gehazi meets them on the road, but he has no reassuring report to give; the placing of the staff on the face of the dead boy had called forth no sign of life. Then Elisha enters the house, goes up to his own chamber, "and he shut the door on them twain, and prayed unto Jehovah." It was what Elijah had done on a similar occasion, and in this and his subsequent proceedings Elisha was probably following a method which he had heard of from his master. The child is restored to life, the mother is called in, and again falls at the feet of the prophet, though with what different emotions — "and she took up her son and went out" (<12048>2

Kings 4:18-37). There is nothing in the narrative to fix its date with reference to other events.

We here first encounter Gehazi, the "servant" (r (nj lad) of the man of God. It must of course have occurred before the events of 2 Kings 8:1-6, and therefore before the cure of Naaman, when Gehazi became a leper.

6. The scene now changes to Gilgal, apparently at a time when Elisha was residing there (2 Kings 4:38-41). The sons of the prophets are sitting round him. It is a time of famine, possibly the same seven years' scarcity which is mentioned in 2 Kings 8:1, 2, and during which the Shunammite woman of the preceding story migrated to the Philistine country. The food of the party must consist of any herbs that can be found. The great caldron is put on at the command of Elisha, and one of the company brings his blanket (dgB; not "lap" as in A.V.) full of such wild vegetables as he has collected, and empties it into the pottage. But no sooner have they begun their meal than the taste betrays the presence of some noxious herb, *SEE GOURD*, and they cry out, "There is death in the pot, oh man of God!" In this case the cure was effected by meal which Elisha cast into the stew in the caldron (1 Kings 4:38-41).

7. The next miracle in all probability belongs to the same time, and also to the same place as the preceding. A man from Baal-shalisha (q.v.) brings the man of God a present of the first-fruits, which under the law (Numbers 18:8, 12; Deuteronomy 18:3, 4) were the perquisite of the ministers of the sanctuary — 20 loaves of the new barley, and some delicacy, the exact nature of which is disputed, but which seems most likely to have been roasted ear of corn not fully ripe (lm,rK; perhaps elliptically for lm,rKi vrG; comp. Leviticus 23:4), brought with care in a sack or bag (^/lqK; Sept. πήρα). This moderate provision is by the word of Jehovah rendered more than sufficient for a hundred men (2 Kings 4:42-44). This is one of the instances in which Elisha is the first to anticipate in some measure the miracles of Christ.

8. The simple records of these domestic incidents amongst the sons of the prophets are now interrupted by an occurrence of a more important character (2 Kings 5:1-27). The chief captain of the army of Syria, to whom his country was indebted for some signal success (the tradition of the Jews is that it was Naaman who killed Ahab, *Midrash Tehillim,* page 29 *b*, on Psalm 78), was afflicted with leprosy, and that in its most

malignant form, the white variety (verse 27). In Israel this would have disqualified him from all employment and all intercourse (<12505>2 Kings 15:5; <14650>2 Chronicles 26:20, 21). But in Syria no such practice appears to have prevailed; Naaman was still a "great man with his master," "a man of countenance." One of the members of his establishment is an Israelitish girl, kidnapped by the marauders (µydWdG) of Syria in one of their forays over the border, and she brings into that Syrian household the fame of the name and skill of Elisha. "The prophet in Samaria," who had raised the dead, would, if brought into the presence of (ynpl) the patient, have no difficulty in curing even this dreadful leprosy. The news is communicated by Naaman himself (abYWy; not "*one* told") to the king. Benhadad had yet to learn the position and character of Elisha. He writes to the king of Israel a letter very characteristic of a military prince, and curiously recalling words uttered by another military man in reference to the cure of his sick servant many centuries later — "I say to this one, go, and he goeth. and to my servant. do this, and he doeth it." "And now" — so ran Benhadad's letter after the usual complimentary introduction had probably opened the communication — "and now, when this letter is come unto thee, behold, I have sent Naaman, my slave, to thee, that thou mayest recover him of his leprosy." With this letter, and with a present, in which the rich fabrics (vWbl] i.e., a dress of ceremony) for which Damascus has always been in modern times so famous form a conspicuous feature, and with a full retinue of attendants (13, 15, 23), Naaman proceeds to Samaria. The king of Israel — his name is not given, but it was probably Joram — is dismayed at the communication. He has but one idea, doubtless the result of too frequent experience — "Consider how this man seeketh a quarrel against me!" The occurrence soon reaches the ears of the prophet, and with a certain dignity he "sends" to the king "Let him come to me, and he shall know that there is a prophet in Israel." To the house of Elisha Naaman goes with his whole cavalcade, the "horses and chariot" of the Syrian general fixing themselves particularly in the mind of the chronicler. Elisha still keeps in the background, and while Naaman stands at the doorway, contents himself with sending out a messenger with the simple direction to bathe seven times in the Jordan. The independent behavior of the prophet, and the simplicity of the prescription — not only devoid of any ceremonial, but absolutely insulting to the native of a city which boasted, as it still boasts, of the finest water-supply of any city of the East, all combined to enrage Naaman. His slaves, however, knew how to deal with the quick but not

ungenerous temper of their master; and the result is that he goes down to the Jordan and dips himself seven times, "and his flesh came again like the flesh of a little child, and he was clean." His first business after his cure is to thank his benefactor. He returns with his whole train (hn,j }mi, i.e., "host" or "camp"), and this time he will not be denied the presence of Elisha, but, making his way in, and standing before him, he gratefully acknowledges the power of the God of Israel, and entreats him to accept the present which he had brought from Damascus. But Elisha is firm, and refuses the offer, though repeated with the strongest adjuration. Naaman, having adopted Jehovah as his God, begs, to be allowed to take away some of the earth of his favored country, of which to make an altar. He then consults Elisha on a difficulty which he foresees. How is he, a servant of Jehovah, to act when he accompanies the king to the temple of the Syrian god Rimmon? He must bow before the god; will Jehovah pardon this disloyalty? Elisha's answer is “Go in peace," and with this farewell the caravan moves off. But Gehazi, the attendant of Elisha, cannot allow such treasures thus to escape him. "As Jehovah liveth" — an expression, in the lips of this vulgar Israelite, exactly equivalent to the oft-repeated *Wallah* — " by God" — of the modern Arabs, "I will run after this Syrian and take somewhat of him." So he frames a story by which the generous Naaman if made to send back with him to Elisha's house a considerable present in money and clothes. He then went in and stood before his master as if nothing had happened. But the prophet was not to be so deceived. His heart had gone after his servant through the whole transaction, even to its minutest details, and he visits Gehazi with the tremendous punishment of the leprosy, from which he has just relieved Naaman. The date of the transaction must have been 'at least seven years after the raising of the Shunammite's son. This is evident from a comparison of 2 Kings 8:4 with 1, 2, 3. Gehazi's familiar conversation with the king must have taken place before he was a leper. *SEE NAAMAN.*

9. We now return to the sons of the prophets, but this time the scene appears to be changed, and is probably at Jericho, and during the residence of Elisha there. Whether from the increase of the scholars consequent on the estimation in which the master was held, or from some other cause, their habitation had become too small — "The place in which we sit before thee is too narrow for us." They will therefore move to the close neighborhood of the Jordan, and cutting down beams — each man one, as with curious minute ness the text relates — make there a new dwelling place. Why Jordan was selected is not apparent.. Possibly for its distance

from the distractions of Jericho — possibly the spot was once sanctified by the crossing of Israel with the ark, or of Elijah, only a few years before. Urged by his disciples, the man of God consents to accompany them. When they reach the Jordan, descending to the level of the stream, they commence felling the trees (µyxi(h) of the dense belt of wood in immediate contact with the water. *SEE JORDAN.* As one of them was cutting at a tree overhanging the stream, the iron of his axe (a borrowed tool) flew off and sank into the water. His cry soon brought the man of God to his aid. The stream of the Jordan is deep up to the very bank, especially when the water is so low as to leave the wood dry, and is, moreover, so turbid that search would be useless. But the place at which the lost axe entered the water is shown to Elisha; he lops off (bxq) a stick and casts it into the stream, and the iron appears on the surface, and is recovered by its possessor (2 Kings 6:1-7).

10. Elisha is now residing at Dothan, half way on the road between Samaria and Jezreel. The incursions of the Syrian marauding bands (comp. verse 2) still continue, but apparently with greater boldness, and pushed even into places which the king of Israel is accustomed to frequent (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 9:4, 3). But their maneuvers are not hid from the man of God, and by his warnings he saves the king "not once nor twice." So baffled were the Syrians by these repeated failures as to make their king suspect treachery in his own camp. But the true explanation is given by one of his own people — possibly one of those who had witnessed the cure wrought on Naaman, and could conceive no power too great to ascribe to so gifted a person: "Elisha, the prophet in Israel, telleth the king of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bedchamber." So powerful a magician must be seized without delay, and a strong party with chariots is dispatched to effect his capture. . They march by night, and before morning take up their station round the base of the eminence on which the ruins of Dothan still stand. Elisha's servant — not Gehazi, but apparently a newcomer, unacquainted with the powers of his master — is the first to discover the danger. But Elisha remains unmoved by his fears; and at his request the eyes of the youth are opened to behold the spiritual guards which are protecting them, horses and chariots of fire filling the whole of the mountain. But this is not enough. Elisha again prays to Jehovah, and the whole of the Syrian warriors are struck blind. He then descends, and offers to lead them to the person and the place which they seek. He conducts them to Samaria. There, at the prayer of the prophet, their sight is restored,

and they find themselves, not in a retired country village, but in the midst of the capital of" Israel, and in the presence of the king and his troops. His enemies thus completely in his grasp, the king of Israel is eager to destroy them. "Shall I slay? shall I slay, my father?" But the end of Elisha has been answered when he has shown the Syrians how futile are all their attempts against his superior power. "Thou shalt not slay. Thou mayest slay those whom thou hast taken captive in lawful fight, but not these [literally, "Are these what thou hast captured with thy sword and bow, that *thou* art for smiting them?": feed them, and send them away to their master." After such a repulse it is not surprising that the marauding forays of the Syrian troops ceased (2 Kings 6:8, 23). *SEE BENHADAD.*

11. But the king of Syria could not rest under such dishonor. He abandons his marauding system, and gathers a regular army, with which he lays siege to Samaria. The awful extremities to which the inhabitants of the place were driven need not here be recalled. Roused by an encounter with an incident more ghastly than all, and which remained without parallel in Jewish records till the unspeakable horrors of the last days of Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, 5:10, 3; 13, 7, etc.), the king vents his wrath on the prophet, probably as having, by his share in the last transaction (so Josephus, *Ant.* 9:4, 4), or in some other way not recorded, provoked the invasion; possibly actuated by the spite with which a weak bad man in difficulty often regards one better and stronger than himself. The king's name is not stated in the Bible, but there can be no doubt that Josephus is correct in giving it as Joram; and in keeping with this is his employment of the same oath which his mother Jezebel used on an occasion not dissimilar (1 Kings 19:2), "God do so to me and more also, if the head of Elisha, the son of Shaphat, shall stand on him this day." No sooner is the word out of the king's mouth than his emissary starts to execute the sentence. Elisha is in his house, and round him are seated the elders of Samaria, doubtless receiving some word of comfort or guidance in their sore calamity. He receives a miraculous intimation of the danger. Ere the messenger could reach the house, he said to his companions, “See how this son of a murderer (alluding to Ahab in the case of Naboth) hath sent to take away my head! Shut the door, and keep him from entering: even now I hear the sound of his master's feet behind him (hastening to stay the result of his rash exclamation!" interprets Josephus, *Ant.* 9:4, 4). As he says the words the messenger arrives at the door, followed immediately, as the prophet had predicted, by the king and by one of his officers, the lord on whose

hand he leaned. What follows is very graphic. The king's hereditary love of Baal burst forth, and he cries, "This evil is from Jehovah," the ancient enemy of my house: "why should I wait for Jehovah any longer?" To this Elisha answers: "Hear the word of Jehovah" — he who has sent famine can also send plenty — "tomorrow at this time shall a measure of fine flour be sold for a shekel, and two measures of barley for a shekel, in the gate of this very city." "This is folly," says the officer; "even if Jehovah were to make windows in heaven and pour down the provisions, it could not be." "It can, it shall," replies Elisha; "and you, you shall see it all, but shall not live even to taste it" (<12624>2 Kings 6:24-7:2). The next night God caused the Syrians to hear the noise of chariots and horses; and conceiving that Jehoram had hired against them the kings of the Hittites and the king of Egypt, they fled from before the walls of Samaria — leaving their tents filled with gold and provisions — in the utmost panic and confusion. In this way did God, according to the word of Elisha, miraculously deliver the inhabitants of Samaria from a deadly enemy without, and from sore famine within, its walls: another prediction moreover was accomplished; for the distrustful lord was trampled to death by the famished people in rushing through the gate of the city to the forsaken tents of the Syrians (2 Kings 7). *SEE SAMARIA.*

12. We now go back several years to an incident connected with the lady of Shunem, at a period antecedent to the cure of Naaman and the transfer of his leprosy to Gehazi (<12501>2 Kings 5:1, 27). Elisha had been made aware of a famine which Jehovah was about to bring upon the land for seven years; and he had warned his friend the Shunammite of it that she might provide for her safety. Accordingly she had left Shunem with her family, and had taken refuge in the land of the Philistines, that is, in the rich corn-growing plain on the sea-coast of Judah, where, secure from want, she remained during the dearth. At the end of the seven years she returned to her native place, to find that during her absence her house with the field-land attached to it — the corn-fields of the former story — had been appropriated by some other person. In Eastern countries kings are (or were) accessible to the complaints of the meanest of their subjects to a degree inconceivable to the inhabitants of the Western world. To the king, therefore, the Shunammite had recourse, as the widow of Tekoah on a former occasion to king David (<10404>2 Samuel 14:4). Thus occurred one of those rare coincidences which it is impossible not to ascribe to something more than mere chance. At the very moment of the entrance of the woman

and her son-clamoring, as Oriental suppliants alone clamor (קָרָא), for her home and her land — the king was listening to a recital by Gehazi of "all the great things which Elisha had done," the crowning feat of all being that which he was then actually relating — the restoration to life of the boy of Shunem. The woman was instantly recognised by Gehazi. — "My lord, O king, this is the woman and this is her son whom Elisha restored to life." From her own mouth the king hears the repetition of the wonderful tale, and, whether from regard to Elisha, or struck by the extraordinary coincidence, orders her land to be restored, with the value of all its produce during her absence (2 Kings 8:1-6).

13. Hitherto we have met with the prophet only in his own country. We now find him at Damascus. (The traditional spot of his residence on this occasion is shown in the synagogue at *Jobar* [? Hobah], a village about two miles E. of Damascus. The same village, if not the same building, also contains the cave in which Elijah was fed by ravens and the tomb of Gehazi [Stanley, *Palest.* page 412; Quaresmius, 2:881— "*vana et mendacia Hebraeorum"*].) He is there to carry out the command given to Elijah on Horeb to "anoint Hazael to be king over Syria." At the time of his arrival Benhadad was prostrate with his last illness. This marks the time of the visit as after the siege of Samaria, which was conducted by Benhadad in person (compare 2 Kings 6:24). The memory of the cure of Naaman, and of the subsequent disinterestedness of the prophet, were no doubt still fresh in Damascus; and no sooner does he enter the city than the intelligence is carried to the king — "The man of God is come hither." The king's first desire is naturally to ascertain his own fate; and Hazael, "he appears to have succeeded Naaman, is commissioned to be the bearer of a present to the prophet, and to ask the question on the part of his master, "Shall I recover of this disease?" The present is one of royal dimensions — a caravan (of 40 camels, according to Josephus, *Ant.* 9:4, 6) laden with the riches and luxuries which that wealthy city alone could furnish. The terms of Hazael's address show the respect in which the prophet was held even in this foreign and hostile country. They are identical with those in which Nasman was addressed Ly his slaves, and in which the king of Israel in a moment of the deepest gratitude and reverence had addressed Elisha himself. "Thy son Benhadad hath sent me to thee, saying, 'Shall I recover of this disease?'" The reply, probably originally ambiguous, is doubly uncertain in the present doubtful state of the Hebrew text, but the general conclusion was unmistakable: "Jehovah hath showed me that he shall

surely die." But this was not all that had been revealed to the prophet. If Benhadad died, who would be king in his stead but the man who now stood before him? The prospect was one which drew forth the tears of the man of God. This man was no rash and imprudent leader, who could be baffled and deceived as Benhadad had so often been. Behind that "steadfast," impenetrable countenance was a steady courage and a persistent resolution, in which Elisha could not but foresee the greatest danger to his country. Here was a man who, give him but the power, would "oppress" and "cut Israel short," would "thresh Gilead with threshing instruments of iron," and "make them like the dust by threshing" as no former king of Syria had done, and that at a time when the prophet would be no longer alive to warn and to advise. At Hazael's request Elisha confesses the reason of his tears. But the prospect is one which has no sorrow for Hazael. How such a career presented itself to him may be inferred from his answer. His only doubt is the possibility of such good fortune for one so mean. "But what is thy slave, dog that he is (bl Ḳhi ÚDþ][¡ *thy servant*, THE *dog*, i.e., insignificant object), that he should do this great thing?" To this Elisha replies, "Jehovah hath showed me that thou wilt be king over Syria." Returning to the king, Hazael tells him only half the dark saying of the man of God — "He told me that thou shouldest surely recover." But that was the last day of Benhadad's life. What were the circumstances attending his death, whether in the bath as has recently been suggested (Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 3:523 note), is not clear, except that he seems to have been smothered. The general inference, in accordance with the account of Josephus, is that Hazael himself was the murderer, but the statement in the text does not necessarily bear that interpretation (j QÝ¥ge r Bk¡Mhi may well be rendered "*one* took the [not a] hair-cloth," i.e., perhaps divan-mattress); and, indeed, from the mention of Hazael's name at the end of the passage, the conclusion is rather the reverse (2 Kings 8:7-15). *SEE HAZAEL.*

14. Two of the injunctions laid on Elijah had now been carried out, but the third still remained. Hazael had begun his attacks on Israel by an attempt to recover the stronghold of Ramoth-Gilead (2 Kings 8:28), or Ramah, among the mountains on the east of Jordan. But the fortress was held by the kings of Israel and Judah in alliance, and, though the Syrians had wounded the king of Israel, they had not succeeded in capturing the place (2 Kings 8:28; 9:15). One of the captains of the Israelitish army in the garrison was Jehu, the son of Jehoshaphat, the son of Nimshi. At the time

his name was mentioned to Elijah on Horeb he must have been but a youth; now he is one of the boldest and best known of all the warriors of Israel. He had seen the great prophet — once, when with his companion Bidkar he attended Ahab to take possession of the field of Naboth, and the scene of that day, and the words of the curse then pronounced, no subsequent adventure had been able to efface (2 Kings 9:25, 36). The time had now come far the fulfillment of that curse by his being anointed king over Israel. Elisha's personal share in the transaction was confined to giving directions to one of the sons of the prophets, and the detailed narrative may be found in 2 Kings 9 (see Maurice, *Prophets and Kings,* sermon 9). *SEE JEHU.*

15. Beyond this we have no record of Elisha's having taken any part in the revolution of Jehu, or the events which followed it. He does not again appear till we find him on his death-bed in his own house (2 Kings 13:14-19). Joash, the grandson of Jehu, is now king, and he has come to weep over the approaching departure of the great and good prophet. His words are the same as those of Elisha when Elijah was taken away — "My father! my father! the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" But it is not a time for weeping. One thought fills the mind of both king and prophet. Syria is the fierce enemy who is gradually destroying the country, and against Syria one final effort must be made before the aid of Elisha becomes unobtainable. What was the exact significance of the ceremonial employed, our ignorance of Jewish customs does not permit us to know, but it was evidently symbolic. The window is opened towards the hated country, the bow is pointed in the same direction, and the prophet laying his hands on the string as if to convey force to the shot, "the arrow of Jehovah's deliverance, the arrow of deliverance from Syria" is discharged. This done, the king takes up the bundle of arrows, and, at the command of Elisha, beats them on the ground. But he does it with no energy, and the successes of Israel, which might have been so prolonged as completely to destroy the foe, are limited to three victories. *SEE JEHOASH.*

16. The power of the prophet, however, does not terminate with his death. Even in the tomb (Josephus embellishes the account by stating that he had a magnificent funeral, *Ant.* 9:8, 6) he restores the dead to life. Moab had recovered from the tremendous reverse inflicted on her by the three kings at the opening of Elisha's career (2 Kings 3), and her marauding bands had again begun the work of depredation which Syria so long pursued (2 Kings 5:2; 6:23). The text perhaps infers that the spring — that is, when the early crops were ripening — was the usual period for these attacks;

but, be this as it may, on the present occasion they invaded the land "at the coming in of the year." A funeral was going on in the cemetery which contained the sepulcher of Elisha. Seeing the Moabitish spoilers in the distance, the friends of the dead man hastened to conceal his corpse in the nearest hiding-place. They chose — whether by design or by accident is not said — the tomb of the prophet, and, as the body was pushed (Ë l ý) into the cell which formed the receptacle for the corpse in Jewish tombs, it came in contact with his bones. The mere touch of those hallowed remains was enough to effect that which in his lifetime had cost Elisha both prayers and exertions — the man "revived and stood up on his feet." Other miracles of the prophet foreshadow, as we have remarked, the acts of power and goodness of our Savior, but this may rather be said to recall the marvels of a later period — of the early ages of the Christian Church. It is in the story of Gervasius and Protasius (Augustine's *Confessions,* 9, § 16), and not in any occurrence in the life of our Lord or of the apostles, that we must look for a parallel to the last recorded miracle of Elisha (<12130>2 Kings 13:20-22).

II. *Characteristics and Traditional Views.* — In almost every respect Elisha presents the most complete contrast to Elijah. The copious collection of his sayings and doings which are preserved in the 3d to the 9th chapter of the 2d book of Kings, though in many respects deficient in that remarkable vividness which we have noted in the records of Elijah, is yet full of testimonies to this contrast. Elijah was a true Bedouin child of the desert. The clefts of the Cherith, the wild shrubs of the desert, the cave at Horeb, the top of Carmel, were his haunts and his resting-places. If he enters a city, it is only to deliver his message and be gone. Elisha, on the other hand, is a civilized man, an inhabitant of cities. He passed from the translation of his master to dwell at Jericho (<12218>2 Kings 2:18); from thence he "returned" to Samaria (verse 25). At Samaria (<12503>2 Kings 5:3; 6:32; comp. verse 24) and at Dothan (<12614>2 Kings 6:14) he seems regularly to have resided in a house (<12509>2 Kings 5:9, 24; 6:32; 13:17) with "doors" and "windows," in familiar intercourse with the sons of the prophets, with the elders (<12632>2 Kings 6:32), with the lady of Shunem, the general of Damascus, the king of Israel Over the king and the "captain of the host he seems to have possessed some special influence, capable of being turned to material advantage if desired (<12413>2 Kings 4:13). The touches of the narrative are very slight, but we can gather that his dress was the ordinary garment of an Israelite, the *beged,* probably similar in form to the long

abbeyeh of the modern Syrians (<12212>2 Kings 2:12), that his hair was worn short (if not naturally deficient) behind, in contrast with the long locks of Elijah (<12223>2 Kings 2:23), and that he used a walking-staff (<12429>2 Kings 4:29) of the kind ordinarily carried by grave or aged citizens (<380804>Zechariah 8:4). What use he made of the rough mantle of Elijah, which came into his possession at their parting, does not anywhere appear, but there is no hint of his ever having worn it. Elijah was emphatically a destroyer. His mission was to slay and to demolish whatever opposed or interfered with the rights of Jehovah, the Lord of Hosts. The nation had adopted a god of power and force, and they were shown that he was feebleness itself compared with the God whom they had forsaken. But after Elijah the destroyer comes Elisha the healer. "There shall not be dew nor rain these years" is the earliest proclamation of the one. "There shall not be from thence any dearth or barren land" is the first miracle of the other. What may have been the disposition of Elijah when not engaged in the actual service of his mission we have unhappily no means of knowing. Like most men of strong, stern character, he probably had affections not less strong. But it is impossible to conceive that he was accustomed to the practice of that beneficence which is so strikingly characteristic of Elisha, and which comes out at almost every step of his career. Still more impossible is it to conceive him exercising the tolerance towards the person and the religion of foreigners for which Elisha is remarkable in communication, for example, with Naaman or Hazael; in the one case calming with a word of peace the scruples of the new proselyte, anxious to reconcile the due homage to Rimmon with his allegiance to Jehovah; in the other case contemplating with tears, but still with tears only, the evil which the future king of Syria was to bring upon his country. That Baal-worship was prevalent in Israel even after the efforts of Elijah, and that Samaria was its chief seat, we have the evidence of the narrative of Jehu to assure us (<12018>2 Kings 10:18-27), but his mission is not so directly to rebuke and punish it. In the eulogium of Elisha contained in the catalogue of worthies of Ecclus. 48:12-14 — the only later mention of him save the passing allusion of <420427>Luke 4:27 — his special character is more strongly brought out than in the earlier narrative: "Whilst he lived he was not moved by the presence of any prince, neither could any bring him into subjection. No word could overcome him, and after his death his body prophesied. He did wonders in his life, and at his death were his works marvelous."

This thaumaturgic view of Elisha is indeed the true key to his Biblical history, for he evidently appears in these records chiefly as a worker of prodigies, a predictor of future events, a revealer of secrets, and things happening out of sight or at a distance. The working of wonders seems to be a natural accompaniment of false religions, and we may be sure that the Baal-worship of Samaria and Jezreel was not free from such arts. The story of 1 Kings 22 shows that even before Elisha's time the prophets had come to be looked upon as diviners, and were consulted, not on questions of truth and justice, nor even as depositaries of the purposes and will of the Deity, but as able to foretell how an adventure or a project was likely to turn out, whether it might be embarked in without personal danger or loss. But if this degradation is inherent in false worship, it is no less a principle in true religion to adjust itself to a state of things already existing, and out of the forms of the alien or the false to produce the power of the true. Thus Elisha appears to have met the habits of his fellow-countrymen. He wrought, without reward and without ceremonial, the cures and restorations for which the soothsayers of Baalzebub at Ekron were consulted in vain: he warned his sovereign of dangers from the Syrians which the whole four hundred of his prophets had not succeeded in predicting to Ahab, and thus in one sense we may say that no less signally than Elijah he vanquished the false gods on their own field.

The frequency and unparalleled nature of his miracles also furnish perhaps the best explanation of Elijah's behest of "a double portion of his own spirit" upon Elisha (2 Kings 2:9), The ordinary meaning put upon this phrase (see, for example, J.H. Newman, *Subj. of the Day*, page 191) is that Elisha possessed double the power of Elijah. This, though sanctioned by the renderings of the Vulgate and Luther, and adopted by a long series of commentators from Ephraem Syrus to Krummnacher, would appear not to be the real force of the words. The expression is µyinv]yPa, literally "a mouth of two" — a double mouthful — the same phrase employed in Deuteronomy 21:17 to denote the amount of *a* father's goods which were the right and token of a first-born son. Thus the gift of the "double portion" of Elijah's spirit was but the legitimate conclusion of the act of adoption which began with the casting of the mantle at Abel-meholah years before. It was this which Elisha sought — not a gift of the spirit of prophecy twice as large as Elijah himself possessed. This carries improbability on the very face of it; for with what propriety could a man be asked to leave as an inheritance to another double of what he himself

possessed? Nor did Elisha get any such superlative endowment; his position as a prophet was altogether of a dependent and secondary nature as compared with Elijah's; and the attempts that have been made to invert the relation of the one to the other, proceed upon arbitrary and superficial considerations. Not less arbitrary is the view of Ewald, that the request of Elisha must be understood as indicating a wish for two thirds only of Elijah's spirit *(Gesch.* 3:507) — a view that requires no refutation. The proper explanation is, that Elisha here regarded Elijah as the head of a great spiritual household, which included himself as the first-born and all who had since been added to the fraternity under the name of "the sons of the prophets;" and what he now sought was, that he might be constituted Elijah's heir in the spiritual vineyard, by getting the first-born's double portion, and therewith authority to continue the work. For a curious calculation by Peter Damianus that Elijah performed twelve miracles and Elisha twenty-four, see the *Acta Sanctorum,* July 20.

Elisha is canonized in the Greek Church; his day is the 14th of June. Under that date, his life, and a collection of the few traditions concerning him-few indeed when compared with those of Elijah — may be found in the *Acta Sanctorum.* In the time of Jerome a "mausoleum" containing his remains were shown at Samaria (Reland, *Palaest.* page 980). Under Julian the bones of Elisha were taken from their receptacle and burned. But, notwithstanding this, his relics are heard of subsequently, and the church of St. Apollinaris at Ravenna still boasts of possessing his head. The Carmelites have a special service in honor of Elisha.

III. *Literature.* — On the subject generally, Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations,* "Solomon and Kings," 47th to 49th week; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 5:364 sq.; Blunt, *History of Elisha* (new ed. Lond. 1862); Krummacher, *Elisha* (from the German, Lond. 1838); Anon. *Short Meditations on Elisha* (Lond. 1848); Cassel, *Der Prophet Elisa* (Berlin, 1860); Stanley, *Jewish Church,* 2:353 sq. On the fate of the Bethelite youths, Michaelis, *De Elisaso vindicato* (Fref. A.D. 1734). On the miracle of the axe-helve, Freise, *Ferrum natans* (Jen. 1689). On the Shunammitess, Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:177 sq.

Elisha (in Armenian *Eghische),* one of the most celebrated Armenian historians, was born at the beginning of the 5th century. He was a pupil of the patriarch St. Sahag (Isaac) and of St. Mesrob, by whom he was sent to the schools of Athens, Alexandria, and Constantinople. Subsequently he

became almoner and secretary of prince Vartan, who, in the religious war of the Armenians against the Persians, was chief commander of the Armenian army. He died in 480. Probably he is the same person with bishop Elisha of Amathunik, who in 449 was present at the Synod of Artishat, at which the bishops of Armenia replied to the summons of the Persian ruler Yesdegerd II to adopt the faith of Zoroaster. This reply, to which was added a brief apology of the Christian religion, led to the religious war which is described by Elisha. So great was the reputation of this work that its author received the surname of the Armenian Xenophon. It begins with the accession to the throne of Yesdegerd in 439, describes in full the schemes of persecution devised by the Persian king against the Armenians, the resistance of the Armenian bishops and princes, the "holy alliance" concluded by the latter, and its operation and fate until the unfortunate battle at the river Techrnut, in the province of Artas, in 451, in consequence of which the leaders of the holy alliance and most of the bishops were captured and taken to Persia. The first, edition of this work was printed at Constantinople in 1764 (new ed. 1833); other editions appeared at Nakhidchevan (1764), Calcutta (1816), and Venice (1823 and 1838). The last Venice edition, which is the best, contains also commentaries to the books of Joshua and Judges, a recommendation of monastic life, an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, several homilies, and a work on the ecclesiastical canons. An English translation of the work was published by Fr. Neumann *(The History of Vartan and of the Battle of the Armenians, containing an Account of the religious Wars between the Persians and Armenians,* by Elisaeus, bishop of the Amadunians, etc., Lond. 1830). It has also been translated into French by abbe G.K. Garabed *(Soulevement national de l'Armenie chretienne,* Par. 1844, 8vo), and into Italian by G. Cappelletti (Ven. 1841). Elisha is also the author of a history of Armenia, which, however, appears to be lost. — Wretzer u. Welte, *Kirchten-Lex.* 3:540; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 15:884; Neumann, *Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Litter.* page 69, 70. (A.J.S.)

Eli'shah

(Hebrew *Elishah',* hvyl;a; deriv. unknown; Sept. Ἐλισά and Ἐλισαί; Josephus, Ἐλισᾶς, Vulg. *Elisa),* the oldest of the four sons of Javan (<01004>Genesis 10:4; <130107>1 Chronicles 1:7). B.C. cir. 2450. He seems to have given name to a region on the Mediterranean, "the isles (syYai; *shores)* of Elishah," which are described as exporting fabrics of purple and scarlet to

the markets of Tyre (<27707>Ezekiel 27:7). If the descendants of Javan peopled Greece, we may expect to find Elishah in some province of that country. The circumstance of the purple suits the Peloponnesus, for the fish affording the purple dye was caught at the mouth of the Eurotas, and the purple of Laconia was very celebrated. *SEE PURPLE*. The name seems kindred to *Elis* (Bochart, *Phaleg,* 3:4), which, in a wider sense, was applied to the whole Peloponnesus; and some identify *Elishah* with *Hellas* (Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 1:79). — Kitto, s.v. Josephus, however, identified the race of Elishah with the *AEolians (Ant.* 1:6, 1). His view is adopted by Knobel *(Volkertrfel,* page 81 sq.). It appears correct to treat it as the designation of a *race* rather than of a locality; and if Javan represents the Ionians, then Elishah the AEolians, whose name presents considerable similarity (Αἰολεῖς having possibly been Αἰλεῖς), and whose predilection for maritime situations quite accords with the expression in Ezekiel. In early times the AEolians were settled in various parts of Greece, Thessaly, Boeotia, AEtolia, Locris, Elis, and Messenia: from Greece they emigrated to Asia Minor, and in Ezekiel's age occupied the maritime district in the N.W. of that country, named after them AEolis, together with the islands Lesbos and Tenedos. The purple shell-fish was found on this coast, especially at Abydus (Virgil, *Georg.* 1:207), Phocaea (Ovid, *Metam.* 6:9), Sigeum and Lectum (Athenaeus, 3:88). Not much, however, can be deduced from this as to the position of the "isles of Elishah," as that shell-fish was found in many parts of the Mediterranean, especially on the coast of Laconia (Pausan. 3:21, § 6). Schulthess *(Paradies,* page 264), without the slightest probability, argues in favor of a position on the western coast of Africa, on the ground of the resemblance to *Elisa* as the Phoenician name of Carthage. *SEE ETHNOLOGY.*

Elish'ama

(Hebrew *Elishama',* (מְיַלִשֱא, whom *God has heard),* the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ἐλισαμά v.r. in Chron. Ἐλισαμαΐ.) Son of Ammihud, and "prince" or "captain" (both אישׂ; i.e., phylarch) of the tribe of Ephraim at the Exode (<040110>Numbers 1:10; 2:18; 7:48, 53; 10:22). B.C. 1658. From the genealogy in <130726>1 Chronicles 7:26, we find that he was the grandfather of Joshua.

2. (Sept. Ἐλισαμά v.r. Ἐλισά.) The second of the nine sons of David born at Jerusalem, exclusive of those by Bathsheba (<13306>1 Chronicles 3:6); called in the parallel passages (<10515>2 Samuel 5:15; <13405>1 Chronicles 14:5) by apparently the more correct name ELISHUA *SEE ELISHUA* (q.v.).

3. (Sept. Ἐλισαμά.) The seventh of the same series of sons (<10516>2 Samuel 5:16; <13308>1 Chronicles 3:8; 14:7); being one of the thirteen, or, according to the record of Samuel, the eleven, sons born to David of his wives after his establishment in Jerusalem. B.C. post 1044. The list in Josephus *(Ant.* 7:3, 3) has no similar name. *SEE DAVID.*

4. (Sept. Ἐλισαμά.) One of the two priests sent by Jehoshaphat with the Levites to teach the Law through the cities of Judah (<14708>2 Chronicles 17:8). B.C. 912.

5. (Sept. Ἐλισαμά.) Son of Jekamiah, a descendant of Judah (<13241>1 Chronicles 2:41). In the Jewish traditions preserved by Jerome *(Qu. Hebr.* on <13241>1 Chronicles 2:41) he appears to be identified with

6. (Sept. Ελισαμά v.r. in Jeremiah Ἐλασά and Ἐλεασά.) A member of the royal line of Judah; father of Nethaniah, and grandfather of Ishmael who slew Gedaliah, provisional governor of Jerusalem after its capture by the Babylonians (<12525>2 Kings 25:25; <244101>Jeremiah 41:1). B.C. considerably ante 588.

7. (Sept. Ἐλισαμά.) A royal scribe in whose chamber the roll of Jeremiah was read to him and other assembled magnates, and afterwards deposited for a time (<243612>Jeremiah 36:12, 20, 21). B.C. 605.

Elish'aphat

(Hebrews *Elishaphat',* FPyvyl, whom *God has judged;* Sept. Ἐλισαφάτ v.r. Ἐλισαφάν), son of Zichri, and one of the "captains of hundreds" whom Jehoiada associated with himself in the league to overthrow the usurpation of Athaliah (<142301>2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. 877.

Elish'eba

(Hebrew *Elishe'ba,* (kvyl, *God* is her *oath,* or she *swears* by *God,* i.e., worshipper of God, comp. <231908>Isaiah 19:8; Sept. Ἐλισάβετ, Vulg. *Elisabeth;* as in <420107>Luke 1:7), the daughter of Amminadab, phylarch of the tribe of Judah, and sister of Nahshon, the captain of the Hebrew host

(<04013>Numbers 2:3); she became the wife of Aaron (q.v.), and hence the mother of the priestly family (<02823>Exodus 6:23). B.C. 1658.

Elishu'a

(Hebrew *id.* (WvyIa, *God* is his *salvations,* Sept. Ἐλισουέ v.r. Ἐλισαύ and Ἐλισά, Vulg. *Elisua),* one of the sons of David, born at Jerusalem (<10515>2 Samuel 5:15; <13405>1 Chronicles 14:5); called ELISHAMA *SEE ELISHAMA* (q.v.) in the parallel passage (<13306>1 Chronicles 3:6). B.C. post 1044.

Elis'imus

(Ἐλιάσιμος; Vulg. *Liasumus),* an Israelite of the "sons of Zamoth," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esdr. 9:28); evidently the ELIASHIB *SEE ELIASHIB* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<15027>Ezra 10:27).

Eli'u

(Ἠλιού, i.e., *Elihi),* one of the forefathers of Judith (Jud. 8:1), and therefore of the tribe of Simeon. *SEE JUDITH.*

Eli'ud

(Ἐλιούδ, prob. for Hebrews dRhyIa, *God* is his *praise,* but not found in O.T.), son of Achim, and father of Eleazar, being the fifth in ascent in Christ's paternal genealogy (<40114>Matthew 1:14, 15). B.C. cir. 200. *SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.*

Elizabeth

queen of England, ascended the throne on the death of her sister, the bloody Mary, November 17, 1558, and died March 24 (April 3, New Style), 1603. She was the daughter and only living child of Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII. She was born September 7,1533, and was therefore "full five-and-twenty years old when she came to the crown." Before she was three years of age her mother was beheaded by her father, who, according to his own declaration, "never spared man in his anger, nor woman in his lust." On the 8th of June of the same year, 1536, the Parliament declared the divorces of Catharine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn legal, and bastardized the issue of both marriages. The same decision had been previously pronounced by archbishop Cranmer in the Star-Chamber, and

confirmed by the Convocation. The Parliament also empowered Henry to settle the succession by testamentary disposition. In January, 1544, Elizabeth was restored to the line of royal inheritance.

During the lifetime of her father her education was carefully encouraged, especially by queen Catharine Parr; and it was continued after his death. She was instructed in Latin and Greek by William Grindal and Roger Ascham. The latter commends her masculine power of application, quick apprehension, and retentive memory. "She spoke French and Italian with fluency, was elegant in her penmanship, and was skillful in music, though she did not delight in it." She seems also to have had some acquaintance with German. Her position was at all times exceedingly dubious, and rarely free from peril.

On the accession of her brother Edward VI she encountered other risks than those she had been previously exposed to. In her infancy her hand had been designed for the duke of Orleans, third son of Francis I; it was offered to the earl of Arran, and declined by him; it was then proposed for Philip of Spain. Under Edward VI, admiral Seymour, the brother of the lord protector, hesitated between seeking the hand of Mary, Elizabeth, or the lady Jane Grey. He finally accepted that of the queen dowager, but did not discontinue his amorous attentions, and renewed his addresses to the princess Elizabeth on his wife's death. Her fair fame was impeached by her encouragement of his devotions; and this furnished one of the charges against him which resulted in his execution.

New dangers encompassed her on the death of her brother. Dudley, earl of Northumberland, father of the earl of Leicester, the subsequent favorite, had persuaded the boy-king, in his last illness, to set aside both his sisters on the ground of their illegitimacy, and to bequeath the crown to the lady Jane Grey (great-niece of Henry VIII), who had recently been married to his fourth son, lord Guilford Dudley. Ridley, bishop of London, preached vehemently in favor of lady Jane, and against any supposed title of Mary and Elizabeth, both of whom were regarded as Roman Catholic, and favorable to the restoration of the old religion. Northumberland offered lands and money to Elizabeth to induce her to renounce her claims, but she adroitly evaded his proposals.

The legitimacy of Mary was declared by Parliament, which thus stigmatized anew the birth of Elizabeth. She conformed to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church with some reluctance, but was viewed with

suspicion. In 1554 she was implicated, in connection with her dissolute suitor, Courtenay, earl of Devonshire, in Wyats conspiracy, and was confined to the Tower for two months. Her death was demanded; but Philip II, now the husband of Mary, interposed, and she was put under surveillance at Woodstock. Philip proposed to bestow her upon Emanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, who afterwards married, according to the provisions of the treaty of Cateau-Cambresis, Margaret of France.

These points may appear trivial in a rapid notice of the life and reign of Elizabeth, but they affected both the development of her character and the policy of her government. The death of queen Mary exposed her to untried difficulties, requiring discernment, resolution, and singular good fortune. Her accession to the throne was unchallenged in Parliament, and was heard with demonstrations of joy by the populace of London. She herself, however, in her retirement at Hatfield, recognized the gravity of the occasion. She had been declared illegitimate and incapable of the crown by her father, by her brother, by the Star-Chamber, by the Convocation, and twice by act of Parliament. For the last twenty years the religion of England had been determined by royal edicts and parliamentary enactments. The majority of the people were Roman Catholic in consequence of the measures of the late reign. Elizabeth, in the presence of her dying sister, had "prayed God that the earth might open and swallow her alive if she were not a true Roman Catholic." But, if Roman Catholicism remained the national creed, her tenure of the crown would the wholly precarious, as the illegitimacy of her birth would be inevitably and irrefragably maintained. The superior title of Mary, queen of Scots, would prevail, perhaps, with the aid of French arms, while the Brandon or Suffolk line might seek Spanish support. Roman Catholic her government could not be; but, if she renounced Rome, she united the religious with the political enthusiasm of France, under the instigation of the Guises, against her reign, and alienated or provoked Philip II, then aspiring to universal dominion, and having in his own person some claims to the English throne, which he afterwards advanced. He had hastened to tender his widowed heart and hand to the new queen immediately on the death of her sister. Could she venture to reject it at once, while his party was still strong, and in possession of all places of influence in England — while her own throne was still uncertain? She temporized, she coquetted, she entertained his proposals till she could reject them. She did not fully renounce the old and lately restored religion. She retained the crucifix and lights in her private

chapel, and throughout her life addressed prayers to the Virgin. But she gradually abolished the most distinctive practices of the Papal Church, and established by act of Parliament her ecclesiastical supremacy. Her own Protestantism was always political rather than religious; the creed was less important to her than the political submission of the people. Her first measures were very cautious, and were adroitly introduced by her great minister, Sir William Cecil, who guided her councils till his death, forty years after. So insecure was her hold upon the scepter, that in the year of her coronation her title was denied by pope Paul IV, and also by John Knox, who had written a diatribe against *the intolerable regimen of women,* and who at this time addressed a letter to the queen to persuade her to surrender her crown.

Nearly all omens were adverse. The state was divided into factions — all opposed to her. Foreign states were hostile or indifferent in interest and in sentiment. Her title was most questionable, if not utterly invalid. She had no support but her own brave heart, the patriotic antipathy of her people to foreign rule, the civil wars and discords prevailing or in prospect in the kingdoms around her, and the sagacity of the advisers whom she might choose. She had to knit together her own people into a nation, to win popular support by suppressing all factions at home, to avert foreign dangers by creating a party for herself, and provoking occupation for her enemies in the realms by which she was menaced. The character and conduct of Elizabeth present a most interesting, but most difficult moral and historical study. No hasty and sweeping censures, whether of praise or blame, can exhibit the complicated intertexture of threads of various material and hue in that strange fabric. All was not virtue, all was not vice. The virtues were obscured, soiled, or dwarfed by supposed state necessities; the vices were darkened or deepened by ceaseless provocations and harassing perplexities. Never, perhaps, was an illustrious character composed of a more undistinguishable admixture of fine gold, and dross, and clay, and never was there one better calculated to invite and reward curious examination.

In the earlier years of her reign she could trust only to those political friends whose fortunes were indissolubly connected with her own, and to her relatives, principally by her mother's line — the descendants of Mary Boleyn. As her throne became more assured, she attracted to her court the young men of ancient gentry, of adventurous spirit, of chivalrous bearing, of great but restricted ambition, and of high physical and intellectual

advantages. Gentle birth, great talents, and good looks were the passports to the favor of the court. She thus created supporters and officers for her crown. The old nobility she did not and could not trust. They were powers in the land which despised, envied, and menaced her own. She accumulated favors on Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, from compassion for the fate of his father and brother, from regard for his courtly manners, perhaps for a tenderer feeling, which she deemed it unregal and unsafe to gratify. Leicester, like his father, was ever scheming for a crown. Essex she petted, indulged, spoiled, as a bright, petulant, promising youth, who was one of her nearest male relatives, and the chief hope of her lonely old age.

Her crown was at first held merely by the acquiescence of the nation; it was not confirmed by any parliamentary sanction till the fourteenth year of her reign. Civil and religious disorder desolated Scotland, France, and the Netherlands: she prevented such commotions in her own realm. She promptly suppressed the commencements of revolt; she arrested the numerous conspiracies against her life and throne before they had time to explode; and she left her people a united, if not a harmonious nation — prosperous, intelligent, powerful, independent, and free.

Menaced by the claims of Mary, and by their prospective advocacy by France or Spain, she placed herself at the head of the Protestant movement, and aided, openly or secretly, the Protestant lords in Scotland, the Huguenots in France, William of Orange, and the Gueux in the Netherlands. She assisted all; she gave no decisive aid to any.

In the midst of perils and successes at home and abroad, she made head against the incessant revolts of Ireland, which has been a thorn in the side of Britain from the fabulous days of king Arthur to the current year of queen Victoria. Throughout her reign she was harassed by its state of chronic though intermittent rebellion, but in the year preceding her death she received its submission through lord Mountjoy.

The important results achieved in the long reign of Elizabeth were mainly due to the impulses communicated by herself and the policy pursued by her ministers. All portentous stars were in conjunction in her horoscope. Internal and external hazards envisoned her. Industry was disorganized, agriculture disordered, trade inactive, enterprise stagnant, fortunes were shattered, ranks confused, beggars and vagabonds multiplied by the confiscation and private appropriation of Church lands, by the enclosure of commons, and the extension of pasturage. These social evils were

aggravated by the growth of colossal fortunes alongside of increasing destitution among the masses, as commerce rapidly advanced under her rule. They were augmented also by the progressive depreciation of the precious metals, which grievously affected the public revenue, and the condition of families with fixed and moderate means.

All these circumstances must be considered in order to appreciate justly the otherwise suspicious and unintelligible policy of Elizabeth. They explain the meaning, if they do not evince the propriety of her ecclesiastical measures; they illustrate the spirit of her internal government; they interpret her severity to the beautiful and unfortunate queen who sought as a kinswoman an asylum and protection in her realm. They enable us to see how she fostered the high emprise and the transcendent genius of the Elizabethan Age; and how, in the midst of all the clouds and mists which obscured her career, she remained a right royal woman, created the national spirit of England, established the English Church, maintained the Protestant cause, and spread such blessings over the land that to this day the popular imagination still fondly looks back to "the merry days of good queen Bess."

Her religious policy was hostile alike to Roman Catholics and Puritans; yet Howard of Effingham, who commanded the navies of England against the Spanish Armada, belonged to the Roman communion; and nearly all her chief ministers were supporters of the Puritan doctrine. There seems to be substantial truth in the declaration of lord Bacon, who had ample opportunities of forming a correct judgment, who was Puritan by family and political connections, but tolerant by disposition. He says, with an affirmation of "certain knowledge," "Most certain it is that it was the firm resolution of this princess not to offer any violence to consciences; but then, on the other side, not to suffer the state of her kingdom to be ruined under pretense of conscience and religion." Her aim was to maintain her ascendency in Church and State, in order to prevent internal divisions which would invite external aggressions. It was impossible, in the turmoil and religious acrimony of the period, to draw precisely the line of discrimination between religious belief and political intrigue. There is reason to believe that the persecutions which darkened her reign did not contemplate capital penalties till her crown and life had both been endangered by papal excommunications, by Papist plots, and by Spanish or domestic schemes of assassination.

These principles also controlled in large measure her harsh, unsympathizing treatment of her beautiful and accomplished cousin, Mary of Scotland, whose graces have been employed, like the charms of Aspasia and Phryne in an Athenian court, to secure acquittal when the evidence compels a condemnation. If Mary was innocent of the murder of her husband; if she was not involved in the Northern rebellion; if she did not beguile the duke of Norfolk; if she did not connive at Babington's conspiracy and other similar transactions; if she did not instigate Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh to murder her royal jailor; if she practiced no collusion with Philip of Spain — all these things might have been readily credited by the English queen and her council, and such belief would remove the atrocity, if not the formal illegality, of their procedure. But if all, or most of these suspicions were well founded; if they have been confirmed by the most dispassionate historians, and by the most recent and diligent investigations, the action of Elizabeth may still be illegal, but it ceases to be iniquitous. It should be remembered, too, that Elizabeth did not consent to the trial of Mary till after repeated and urgent demands from the lords and commons of England in Parliament assembled; that her signature of the death warrant is by no means certain; that it was issued and carried into effect without her consent, and contrary to her orders; and that the execution caused her bitter agony and horror. This plea is, indeed, counterbalanced by the suspicion that she sought the removal of her royal captive by secret murder. Such a design is, of course, infamous, though in accordance with the spirit and practices of the age.

To these habits of indirect procedure may be referred much of that matrimonial coquetting which furnished occasion for the malignant censures of hostile contemporaries. There was much female vanity in the frequent and not always coy reception of tender addresses. The Tudor blood displayed its licentious warmth in Margaret and Mary, the sisters of Henry VIII, and in their female descendants, as well as in "bluff king Harry." But there was much also of policy in Elizabeth's demeanor. It introduced a courtly language which has often been misconstrued. It cannot have been entirely unworthy, degrading, or vicious, when it inspired the compliments of Sidney, and Raleigh, and Spenser, and Shakespeare, and Bacon. There is a fashion in language and manners as well as in dress, and the fashion must be regarded if we would interpret their significance.

The supposition of a warmer attachment to Essex than the natural attachment of an aged relative for the hopeful representative of an almost

extinct line has neither foundation nor probability. Just as little truth is there in the fancy that her life was overcast and her death hastened by the execution of Essex. The misguided earl had been guilty of the grossest breach of trust and treachery at the head of the government and armies of Ireland; he had repeated his treason, and menaced her existence and crown, in the midst of her capital. He had a solemn trial, and was inevitably condemned. He confessed the enormity of his guilt, and the queen shortly after assured the ambassador of Henry IV that she felt no scruples in regard to his punishment.

Whatever may be thought on these points, which will always be disputed, the spirit, the conduct, and the measures of Elizabeth encouraged and produced the most splendid outburst of national prowess and of varied abilities that any age has ever witnessed. Strong men surrounded her from the first — men of marked capacity as statesmen, of eminent qualities as precursors of the approaching splendor — Sir William Cecil, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Ralph Sadler, the earl of Sussex, and lord Sackville. But she had been a quarter of a century on the throne, more than half her reign was passed, and she was verging to old age before the great names which immortalized her times commenced those achievements which have immortalized themselves. It was under the inspiration of her rule, and of the results attained by her rule, that the brilliant generation grew up which has left to all future admiration the names of Sidney, and Spenser, and Shakespeare, and Bacon — of Raleigh, and Vere, and Essex, and Grenville — of Hooker and Gilbert — the generation which confirmed the independence of England and of Europe, which invented new arts, extended and applied the principles of law and government, secured the Protestant ascendency, founded colonies, extended commerce, glorified letters, discovered new sciences, and established the political eminence, the industrial wealth, and the intellectual empire of England.

The first twenty years of Elizabeth's reign were occupied in consolidating her throne, by averting foreign aggression through the encouragement given by her to the insurgents in each neighboring state, by suppressing disorder and divisions at home, and by promoting Protestant interests at home and abroad. The next twenty years, which terminated with the peace of Vervins, was a period of secret or open contention with Philip of Spain. The execution of Mary, queen of Scots, 1587, and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, 1588, marked the culmination of this perilous struggle. It was closed by the death of the great minister, lord Burleigh. The last five

years of her reign were free from serious apprehensions of foreign dangers, but they were distracted by the disturbances in Ireland, by the treacherous intrigues of the court, and by the ambitious designs of the reckless and ungrateful Essex. Her whole life was one long succession of hazards, and after all her glories she died lonely, unloved, and without friends.

Few sovereigns have ever impressed themselves more strongly than Elizabeth upon the imaginations and hearts of their people; few ever bestowed greater or more permanent benefits upon them; yet few have met with blinder admiration or more undistinguishing vituperation. The presumptions are all adverse to this great queen. Contemporary slanders, designed for political objects, have crystallized themselves into commonly accepted facts. But with each addition to our knowledge of the period, the perception of her heroism, and even of her virtues, becomes clearer, and the exaggeration or false coloring of her frailties diminishes. It was an age of great crimes and of multitudinous vices, and Elizabeth did not escape the contamination; but a minute study of the fearful difficulties of her position from infancy to old age will produce profound commiseration rather than bitter censure.

It is only in the diaries and journals of Parliament; in the state papers of the time; in the records of the religious and political intrigues of the period; in the reports of Venetian, French, and Spanish ambassadors; in contemporaneous memoirs, and in the numerous miscellaneous letters and papers of the age, that the true characteristics of Elizabeth and her reign can be discovered. Perhaps a definite conclusion cannot be reached until the voluminous calendars and other records, now in process of publication under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls, have been given to the world. Certainly the portrait offered by the latest historian of her reign, Mr. Froude, cannot be accepted with any confidence, for it is as strangely distorted and miscolored as his picture of Henry VIII. The commendation of her earliest eulogist, lord Bacon, who knew her well, is still appropriate: "To say the truth, the only commender of this lady's virtues is time, which, for as many ages as it hath run, hath not yet showed us one of the female sex equal to her in the administration of a kingdom."

The literature of this subject is so extensive that it is scarcely necessary to enumerate particular works. Any or all of the historians of England may be consulted; but further researches may be aided by examining Camden, *Annals of Queen Elizabeth;* Strype's *Annals of the Reformation in*

England; Harrison's *Description of England* in Hall's *Chronicle;* Sir Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia;* Symonds d'Ewes's *Diary;* Rushworth's *Collections; Harleian Miscellany; Felicities of Queen Elizabeth,* in the works of Lord Bacon; Egerton, Sidney, and Burleigh *Papers;* Miss Strickland's *Life of Queen Elizabeth;* Miss Aiken's *Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth;* Wright's *Elizabeth;* Mignet, *Hist. Mary, Queen of Scots;* Caird, *Mary Stuart;* Froude's *Hist. England,* and the *Calendars of State Papers* for the period published by the British government. A very able essay on queen Elizabeth and queen Mary appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1866. (G.F.H.)

Elizabeth, Albertine

countess of the Palatinate, was born at Heidelberg December 26, 1618. She was the eldest daughter of the unfortunate Friedrich V,: king of Bohemia, and of Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of James I. The misfortunes of her family led to her becoming abbess of the institution of Herford, in Westphalia, where she died February 11, 1680. She was no less distinguished for her high attainments in literature and science than for her sincere and active piety. All true Christians in need of help were sure to receive it from her. She was the intimate friend of Fox, Keith, Barclay, Malebranche, Leibnitz, Des Cartes, Gichtel, etc. Penn, in a passage of his *"No Cross, no Crown,"* pays a fitting tribute to her piety and virtue. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:769. See Guhrauer, *Pfalzgrafin Elisabeth* (Raumner's *Historisches Taschenbuch,* 1851); Goebel. *Gesch. d. christlichen Lebens in d. rhein.-westphal. evang. Kirche* (Coblentz, 1852).

Elizabeth, Saint

of Thuringia, was a daughter of king Andrew II, of Hungary, and was born at Pressburg in 1207. When only four years old she was destined by her father to become the wife of Ludwig, oldest son of landgrave Hermann of Thuringia. She was immediately sent to the court of the landgrave, at the Wartburg; for her education, and on her arrival was betrothed to Ludwig. She early showed a remarkable inclination for ascetic exercises. Several efforts were on that account made to have her sent back to her father, but Ludwig, who in 1215 succeeded his father as landgrave, refused to dismiss her, and in 1221 married her. As landgravine she continued her ascetic manners, and refused all the comforts of life. At the same time, she was indefatigable in all works of charity. She spun and sowed garments for the

poor, and, at the time of a famine, fed as many as 900 people daily. Her confessor, Konrad von Marburg, not only encouraged her asceticism, but made her vow absolute obedience, and that, in the case of her husband's death, she would not marry again. Ludwig died in 1227, at Otranto, while taking part in the crusade of emperor Friedrich II. In consequence of the opposition of her mother-in-law Sophia, and most of the members of the family, as well as the courtiers generally, Elizabeth was deprived of the regency during the minority of her oldest son, and her brother-in-law, Heinrich Raspe, assumed the administration of the landgravate. Soon Elizabeth, with her son Hermann, and her two daughters, was expelled from the Wartburg, and for a time had to beg in the streets of Eisenach for the necessaries of life. At length she found a refuge at one of the castles of her maternal uncle, the bishop of Bamberg. Repeated offers of a second marriage (even, it is said, from the emperor Friedrich), which were made to her she refused. When the knights who had accompanied her husband returned from the crusade, they compelled Heinrich Raspe to restore to Elizabeth the Wartburg, and the revenue to which she could lay claim as the widow of the landgrave. Subsequently Heinrich gave her the town of Marburg, with a number of adjoining villages, and an annual income of 500 marks in silver. Elizabeth took up her residence at Marburg in 1229, and again devoted her whole time to asceticism and benevolence. Her confessor Konrad not only continued to be very severe, but several times was even guilty of acts of great cruelty with regard to her. Nevertheless, she declined an invitation from her father to return to him. Exhausted by her ascetic life, she died in a hospital which had been erected by her, November 19, 1231. The fame of her ascetic life had already pervaded all Europe, and, as was usual in such cases, the people soon ascribed to her relics a number of miracles, about the details of which there is, however, the greatest discrepancy, among the contemporaneous writers, showing how little they rested on careful investigation. No longer than four years after her death, in 1235, she was canonized by pope Gregory IX. In 1236 her relics were transferred with great solemnity to a new church (St. Elizabeth's) which landgrave Konrad erected at Marburg. The emperor Friedrich II placed a golden crown on the head of the saint, and an immense crowd ,of people, estimated at 200,000, came to see the relics while exhibited to public view. After the Reformation, landgrave Philip, in order not to countenance the veneration of relics, had them removed from the church; subsequently the Teutonic knights obtained permission to send them to various Roman Catholic churches and convents. Her head is

preserved in the church of St. Elizabeth at Breslau. — See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:767; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 3:531; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 15:875; Justi, *Elisabeth die Heilige* (Zurich, 1797, 2d ed. Marb. 1835); Schmerbauch, *Elisabeth die Heilige* (Erfurt, 1828); Montalembert, *Vie de St. Elisabeth* (Par. 1835); Simon, *Ludwig IV und s. Gemahlin, die heil. Elisab.* (Frankf. 1854); Kahnis, *Die heil. Elis.* in *Zeitschriftfur histor. Theol.* 1868. *SEE KONRAD VON MARBURG*. (A.J.S.) Elizabethines.

(1.) Associations of women whose object it was to imitate the ascetic life and the benevolent zeal of Elizabeth (q.v.) of Thuringia. They did not retire from the world, and only met for prayer and some ascetic exercises.

(2.) A branch of nuns of the third order of St. Francis, so called after Elizabeth of Hungary, who, after the death of her husband, is said to have joined of the third order of St. Francis. Modern writers on monastic orders generally doubt or deny the report that Elizabeth ever was a member of the third order of Franciscans, but the name Elizabethines is still in use to designate Franciscan nuns of the third order. In France they have also been designated by the name of *Scaurs* or *Filles de la Misisericorde* (Sisters of Charity). The real foundress of the monastic community is said to have been Angelina di Corbaro, daughter of the count of Corbaro and Tisigniano. She was born in 1377, married the count de Civitelle, with whom she lived as a sister, and immediately after the death of her husband (1393) joined the third order of Franciscans. She founded the first monastery of Franciscan Tertiarians in 1395 at Foligno. In 1428 the monasteries of this order were organized into a congregation, which was authorized to elect at the triennial conventions ("Chapters General") a general. In 1459 the congregation was placed under the general of the Franciscan Observants. In the middle of the 16th century the Elizabethines had 135 monasteries and 3872 nuns. In 1843 the number of members was estimated at 1000. — Helyot, *Dict. des Ordres Relig.* (ed. Migne), 2:144; Fehr, *Geschichte der Monchsorden*, 1:275. (A.J.S.)

Eliz'aphan

(Hebrew *Elitsaphan'*, ˆP‚‚xy|ê, whom *God has protected;* Sept. Ἐλισαφάυ), the name of two men.

1. Second son of Uzziel, and chief of the Kohathite Levites at the Exode (Numbers in, 30; Exodus 6:22). B.C. 1657. He, with his elder brother, was directed by Moses to carry away the corpses of their sacrilegious cousins Nadab and Abihu (Leviticus 10:4). In these two last-cited passages the name is written contracted into ELZAPHAN *SEE ELZAPHAN* . — His family was known and represented in the days of king David (1 Chronicles 15:8), and took part in the revival of Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 29:13).

2. Son of Parnoch, and phylarch (aycn; "prince") of the tribe of Zebulon at the Exode, being one of the men appointed to assist Moses in apportioning the land of Canaan.

Eli'zur

(Hebrew *Elitsur'*, rWxyl, *God* is his *rock;* Sept. Ἐλισούς), son of Shedeur, and phylarch (aycg;"prince") of the tribe of Reuben at the Exode (Numbers 1:5; 2:10; 7:30, 35; 10:18). B.C. 1657.

Elka'nah

[some *El'kanah*] (Hebrew, *Elkanah'*, hnqyl, whom *God has gotten;* Sept. Ἐλκανά but Ἐλκανά in Exod., and Ηλκανά v.r. Ἐλκανά in 1 Chronicles 12:6; 15:23; Josephus, Ἐλκάνης and Ἐλκάν*;* Vulg. *Elcana),* the name of several men, all apparently Levites.

1. Second son of Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi, according to Exodus 6:24,where his brothers are represented as being Assir and Abiasaph. But in 1 Chronicles 6:22, 23 (Hebrews 7, 8) Assir, Elkanah, and Ebiasaph are mentioned in the same order, not as the three sons of Korah, but as son, grandson, and great-grandson respectively; and this seems to be correct. If so, the passage in Exodus must he understood as merely giving the families of the Korhites existing at the time the passage was penned, which must in this case have been long subsequent to Moses. In Numbers 26:58, "the family of the Korhites" (A.V. "Korathites") is mentioned as one family. As regards the fact of Korah's descendants continuing, it may be noticed that we are expressly told in Numbers 26:11, that when Korah and his company died, "the children of Korah died not." *SEE KORAH*. On the above view, this Elkanah becomes the son of Assir (q.v.). grandson of Korah, and father of

Ebiasaph (q.v.). B.C. cir. 1700. *SEE SAMUEL*. A writer in the *Journal of Sacred Lit.* (April, 1852, page 200), however, proposes to reject both Assir and this first Elkanah from the list in Chronicles.

2. Son of Shaul or Joel, being father of Amasai, and sixth in descent from Ebiasaph, son of the foregoing (1 Chronicles 6:25, 36). B.C. cir. 1445.

3. Son of Ahimoth or Mahuth, being father of Zuph or Zophai, and great grandson of the one immediately preceding (1 Chronicles 6:26, 35), B.C. cir. 1340. (See Hervey, *Genealogies*, page 210, 214, note.)

4. Another Kohathite Levite, in the line of Heman the singer. B.C. cir. 1190. He was the fifth in descent from the foregoing, being son of Jeroham, and father of Samuel, the illustrious judge and prophet (1 Chronicles 6:27, 28, 33, 34). Josephus *(Ant.* 5:10, 2) calls him a man "of middle condition among his fellow-citizens" (τῶν ἐν μέσῳ πολιτῶν). All that is known of him is contained in the above notices and in 1 Samuel 1:1, 4, 8, 19, 21, 23, and 2:2, 20, where we learn that he was of a Bethlehemite stock (an "Ephrathite;" the Levites not being confined to their cities), but lived at Ramathaim-Zophim in Mount Ephraim, otherwise called Ramah; that he had two wives, Hannah and Peninnah, but had no children by the former, till the birth of Samuel in answer to Hannah's prayer. We learn also that he lived in the time of Eli the high priest, and of his sons Hophni and Phinehas; that he was a pious man, who went up yearly from Ramathaim-Zophim to Shiloh, in the tribe of Ephraim, to worship and sacrifice at the tabernacle there; but it does not appear that he performed any sacred functions as a Levite; a circumstance quite in accordance with the account which ascribes to David the establishment of the priestly and Levitical courses for the Temple service. He seems to have been a man of some wealth from the nature of his yearly sacrifice, which enabled him to give portions out of it to all his family, and from the costly offering of three bullocks when Samuel was brought to the house of the Lord at Shiloh. After the birth of Samuel, Elkanah and Hannah continued to live at Ramah (where Samuel afterwards had his house, 1 Samuel 7:7), and had three sons and two daughters. *SEE SAMUEL*.

5. Another man of the family of the Korhites who joined David while he was at Ziklag (1 Chronicles 12:6). B.C. 1054. From the terms of verse 2, some have thought it doubtful whether this can be the well-known Levitical family of Korhites; but the distinction there seems merely to refer to residents within the tribe of Benjamin, which included the Levitical

cities. Perhaps he was the same who was one of the two doorkeepers for the ark when it was brought to Jerusalem (1 Chronicles 15:23). B.C. 1043.

6. An officer in the household of Ahaz, king of Judah, and slain by Zichri the Ephraimite, when Pekah invaded Judah; apparently the second in command under the praefect of the palace (2 Chronicles 28:7). B.C. 739. Josephus says that he was the general of the troops of Judah, and that he was merely carried into captivity by "Amaziah," the Israelitish general *(Ant.* 9:12, 1). *SEE AHAZ.*

7. Father of one Asa, and head of a Levitical family resident in the "villages of the Netophathites" (1 Chronicles 9:16). B.C. long ante 536.

Elkesaites

a sect of Jewish Christians, which sprang up in the 2d century. The origin of the name is uncertain. Delitzsch (in Rudelbach u. Guericke, *Zeitschrift,* 1841) derives it from a hamlet, Elkesi, in Galilee. The Church fathers derived it from the name of a pretended founder, Elxai, which name, according to Epiphanius, denotes "a hidden power" (ysKelyh). Elxai is probably not the name of a person, but the name *of* a book which was the chief authority for this sect. Gieseler thinks that the name signifies the Holy Ghost, which in *Hom. Clem.* 17:16, is called δὐναμις ἄσαρκος, "the incorporeal power." At all events, the sect held as highest doctrinal authority a book which is brought into connection with Elxai. This book, which appears to have been the chief authority of all the Gnostic sects of Jewish Christians, was known to Origen (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6:38), and the Syrian Alcibioades of Apamea brought it with him to Rome. Epiphanius shows its influence among all sects of Jewish Christians. As Origen reports, this book was believed to have fallen from heaven; according to an account in the *Philosophoumena,* it was revealed by an angel, who was the Son of God. Elxai is said to have received it from the Seri, in Parthia, in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 101), and its contents were communicated to no one except upon an oath of secrecy. Ritschl puts the origin of the book in the last third of the second century, while Uhlhorn thinks that it must have originated soon after the beginning of the second century, as it served as the basis of the doctrinal system of the Clementine Homilies, which were nearly completed about A.D. 150.

The best account of the standard book of the Elkesaites is to be found in the *Philosophoumena,* and its main points are confirmed by the statements of Origen. Epiphanius, as usual, is somewhat confused in his exposition of the sect, and his report seems in many points to refer to a modified, and not the original system. According to the *Philosophoumesa,* there was in the Elkesaite system a pagan element of naturalism, mixed with Jewish and Christian elements. The pagan element shows itself in particular in the ablutions. A remission of sins is proclaimed upon the ground of a new baptism, consisting without doubt in oft-repeated ablutions, which were also used against sickness, and were made in the name of the Father and the Son. In connection with these ablutions appear seven witnesses — the five elements, and oil and salt (also bread), the latter two denoting baptism and the Lord's Supper. The same pagan element appears in the use made by the Elkesaites of astronomy and magic; even baptismal days were fixed in accordance with the position of the stars. The Jewish element appears in the obligatory character of the law, and in circumcision. They rejected, however, sacrifices, and also several parts of the Old and New Testaments (of the latter, the Pauline epistles). Their views of Christ seem not to have been settled. On the one hand, their Christ is described as an angel; on the other, they taught a repeated, continuous incarnation of Christ, although his birth of a virgin seems to have been retained. The Lord's Supper was celebrated with bread and salt; the eating of meat was forbidden; marriage was highly esteemed; renunciation of the faith in time of persecution was allowed. A prayer, which is preserved by Epiphanius (19:4), is entirely unintelligible.

The Elkesaite doctrine probably arose among the Jewish Christians, who, in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, coalesced with the Essenes, and were to some extent influenced by Oriental paganism. Under bishop Callistus of Rome, a certain Alcibiades of Apaemea went to that city as an Elkesaite teacher, and in 274 Origen met a missionary of the sect at Caesarea. These efforts appear, however, to have met with but little success. The Clementine Homilies contain a further development of Elkesaite doctrines, with a stronger predominance of the Christian element. At the time of the emperor Constantius, Epiphanius found Elkesaites to the east of the Dead Sea, in Nabathaea, Ituraea, and Moabitis. He calls them Σαμψαῖοι, which name he explains as ἡλιακοί, and therefore seems to have derived from vm,v, "sun." From the circumstance that in Epiphanius Elxai appears among nearly all parties of Jewish Christians, Uhlhorn infers that the

Elkesaites were not so much a separate sect as a school among all sects of Jewish Christians. Rilschl regards them as antipodes of the Montanists, and, as their chief peculiarity, the setting forth of a new theory of remission of sins by a new baptism. Hefele, in Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* art. *Ebioniten,* 3:359, takes the Elkesaites for the highest of four classes of Jewish Essenes, from whom, or, rather, from a member of whom (the Elxai of Epiphanius), a party of Ebionites received about the middle of the second century a gnosis or theosophic secret system, which was fully developed in the Clementine Homilies. See Uhlhorn, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:771 (which article is the basis of our account); Ritschl, *Ueber d. Sekte. der Elkesaiten,* in *Zeitschriftfur histor. Theologie,* 1853; Hefele, in Wetzer u. Welte, *KirchenLex.* [art. *Ebioniten*], 3: 358; and [art. Clement 1] 2:590; Schaff, *Hist. of the Christ. Church, §* 69; Lipsius, *Zur Quellen-Kritik des Epiphanius* (Vien. 1865); Mosheim, *Ch. list.* Luke 1, c. 2, part 2, chapter 5:3, 5-7. (A.J.S.)

El'kosh

(vqlh, i.e., *God* is its *bow,* see Furst, *Hebr. Handw.* s.v.), the birthplace of the prophet Nahum, hence called "the Elkoshite" (Nahum 1:1). Two widely differing Jewish traditions assign as widely different localities to this place. In the time of Jerome it was believed to exist in a small village of Galilee. The ruins of some old buildings were pointed out by his guide as the remains of the ancient Elkosh (Jerome, *on Nahum* 1:1). Cyril of Alexandria *(Comm. on Nahum)* says that the village of Elkosh was somewhere or other in the country of the Jews. Pseudo-Epiphanius *(De Vitis prophetarum,* in his *Opp.* 2:247) places Elkosh on the east of the Jordan, at Bethabara (εἰς Βηγαβάρ, *Chron. Pasch.* page 150, Cod. B, has εἰς βηταβαρήν), where he says the prophet died in peace. According to Schwartz *(Palestine,* page 188), the grave of Nahum is shown at *Kefr Tanchum,* a village 2½ English miles north of Tiberias. A village of the name *El-Kauzah* is found about 2 hours S.W. of Tibnin, which seems to correspond with Jerome's notice. Another village of that name, also an ancient site, lies on a high hill rather more than 2 hours S. of Nablous (Van de Velde, *Memoir,* page 309). But medieval tradition, perhaps for the convenience of the Babylonian Jews, attached the fame of the prophet's burial place to *El-Kush,* or *Alkosh,* a village on the east bank of the Tigris, near the monastery of Rabban Hormuzd, and about two miles north of Mosul. It is situated on a stony declivity, has a few gardens, and contains

about 30 papal Nestorian families (Perkins, in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, July, 1852, page 643). Benjamin of Tudela (page 53, ed. Asher) speaks of the synagogues of Nahum, Obadiah, and Jonah at Asshur, the modern Mosul. R. Petachia (page 35, ed. Benisch) was shown the prophet's grave, at a distance of four parasangs from that of Baruch, the son of Neriah, which was itself distant a mile from the tomb of Ezekiel. It is mentioned in a letter of Masius, quoted by Assemani *(Bibl. Orient.* 1:525). Jews from the surrounding districts make a pilgrimage to it at certain seasons. The synagogue which is built over the tomb is described by Colonel Shiel, who visited it in his journey through Kurdistan *(Journ. Geog. Soc.* 8:93). Rich evidently believed in the correctness of the tradition, considering the pilgrimage of the Jews as almost sufficient test *(Kurdistan,* 1:101). Layard, however, speaks less confidently *(Nineveh,* 1:197). Gesenius doubts the genuineness of either locality *(Thes. Hebrews* page 1211 b). The. tradition which assigns Elkosh to Galilee is more in accordance with the internal evidence afforded by the prophecy, which gives no sign of having been written in Assyria (Knobel, *Prophet. 2:*208; Hitzig, *Kl. Prorh.* page 212; Edwards, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* August 1848, page 557 sq.). *SEE NAHUM.*

El'koshite

(Hebrews *Elkoshi',* יְקֹשִׁי, the regular patrial form; Sept. Ἐλκεσαῖος, Vulg. *Elcesaeus),* an epithet (<340101>Nahum 1:1) of the prophet Nahum (q.v.), apparently as an inhabitant of ELKOSH *SEE ELKOSH* (q.v.).

El'lasar

(Hebrews *Ellasar',* אֶלָּסָר Furst suggests *[Hebrews Handwb. s.*v.] that it may be compounder of אֵל and אָסָר, and אַרְיוֹךְ; Sept. Ἐλλασάρ), a territory in Asia, whose king, Arioch, was one of the four who invaded Canaan in the time of Abraham (<011401>Genesis 14:1, 9). The association of this king with those of Elam and Shinar indicates the vicinity of Babylonia and Elymais as the region in which the kingdom should be sought; but nothing further is known of it, unless it be the same as THELASAR mentioned in <121912>2 Kings 19:12, the TELASSAR of <233712>Isaiah 37:12. Symmachus and the Vulg. understand *Pontus.* The Jerusalem Targum renders the name by *Telasar.* The Assyro-Babylonish name of the king Arioch (q.v.) would seem to point to some province of Persia or Assyria (compare <270214>Daniel 2:14). Colossians Rawlinson thinks (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.*

October 1851, page 152 note) that Ellasar is the Hebrew representative of the old Chaldaean town called in the native dialect *Larsa or Larancha,* and known to the Greeks as *Larissa* (Λάρισσα) or *Larachon* (Λαράχων). This suits the connection with Elam and Shinar (Genesis 14:1), and the identification is orthographically defensible. Larsa was a town of Lower Babylonia or Chaldaea, situated nearly half way between Ur (now Mugheir) and Erech (Warka), on the left bank of the Euphrates. It is now *Senkereh.* The inscriptions show it to have been one of the primitive capitals, of earlier date, probably, than Babylon itself; and we may gather from the narrative in Genesis 14, that in the time of Abraham it was the metropolis of a kingdom distinct from that of Shinar, but owning allegiance to the superior monarchy of Elam. That we hear no more of it after this time is owing to its absorption into Babylon, which took place soon afterwards. *SEE ABRAHAM*.

Eller, Elias

chief of a fanatical sect known under the name of the Ellerians, or *"Communion of Ronsdorf."* He was born in 1690 (according to others, in the beginning of the 18th century). He was the son of a poor peasant in the village of Ronsdorf, in the duchy of Berg, where at that time not only Pietism, but Millenarianism and "Philadelphian" mysticism had numerous adherents. He early went to Elberfeld to find employment in a manufactory, and while there he won the confidence of a rich widow, Bolckhaus, to so high a degree that she married him. Eller at this time had already gained a great influence among the Separatists in Elberfeld, as he was thoroughly acquainted with the writings of all the leading Mystics. Having become rich by his marriage, he soon (1726) organized, together with a Reformed pastor, Schleiermacher, a society of Apocalyptic Millenariars who regularly met in his house, and on meeting and separating greeted each other with a "seraphic" kiss. Among the regular attendants at these meetings was Anna von Buchel, the beautiful daughter of a baker in Elberfeld, who soon astonished the whole society by her ecstasies and visions, and by the wonderful prophecies which she proclaimed while in this condition. She claimed to hold frequent conversations with the Lord, and announced the beginning of the millennium to take place in 1730. The new doctrine found many adherents, and numbered upwards of 50 families; but the relations of Anna with Eller became at the same time so intimate that Eller's wife openly accused the two of illicit intercourse, and declared the prophecies of Anna to be a deliberate fraud. Eller declared his wife to be insane, and had

her locked up, while Anna claimed to have received a revelation that Eller's wife was possessed by an evil spirit, and would soon be carried off by Satan. The whole society, even the sons of Eller's wife from her first marriage, believed this announcement, and the unfortunate woman was consequently subjected to the utmost indignities and tribulations for about six months, when death put an end to her sufferings. Almost immediately after her burial Eller married Anna von Buchel. His society was now deemed sufficiently strong to appear in public. Eller maintained, in union with the prophecies of Professor Horch in Marburg, that in accordance with Revelation 3:1, 7, the Church of Sardis would cease in 1729, and the Church of Philadelphia begin in 1730. The revelations and visions of his wife increased rapidly. What she announced as a new revelation was laid down in a writing, which was subsequently communicated to the initiated under the name of the *"Hirtentasche"* ("The Shepherd's Bag"). The chief points of the new doctrines were, The Bible is the Word of God, but a new revelation has become necessary, and this is laid down in the *Hirtentasche*. Not only the ancient saints, but the Savior himself, will reappear upon earth. The person of the Father dwelt in Abraham, the person of the Son in Isaac, the person of the Holy Ghost in Sarah, but the fullness of the Deity in Eller. Moses, Elias, David, and Solomon were prototypes both of Christ and of Eller. The children of Anna were not the natural children of Eller, but begotten by God himself. The faithful, whose number had largely increased, were divided into three classes. To the first class belonged those who expressed belief, but were not yet made acquainted with all doctrines and secrets; to the second those who, being initiated, were called in the congregations "Persons of Rank" ("Standespersonen") to the third, the most trustworthy among the initiated, who had reached the temple, and were called "gifts" (Geschenke). The society believed that from Anna the Savior would be born a second time, and there was therefore some dissatisfaction when her first child was a daughter. Her second child, born 1733, was a son, Benjamin, and he was believed by the sect to be the Savior, manifested a second time in the flesh, but he died when only a year old. Eller, in the mean while, had sent out missionaries throughout Germany, Switzerland, and Scandinavia, but the investigations which in 1735 were made in Elberfeld concerning the meetings held by him induced him to depart in 1737, with his family, for Ronsdorf, his native place. Many of his adherents followed him immediately, and fifty new houses arose in Ronsdorf in a short time. The missionaries sent out by Eller collected large amounts of money for the new church to be built in Ronsdorf, and in 1741

Schleiermacher was called as pastor. Eller himself was elected burgomaster, and soon established a theocratic despotism. His wife Anna died in 1744, in a mysterious manner, and Eller proclaimed that all the supernatural gifts which had been possessed by Anna had been transferred to him. But now Schleiermacher began to lose his faith and even to oppose Eller, who, however, to neutralize the sermons of Schleiermacher, caused one of his most fanatical adherents, Pastor Wulffing, of Solingen, to be called as second pastor. In 1749 Eller married the widow of a rich merchant at Ronsdorf, Bosselmann, who had died under suspicious circumstances; and in the same year he procured the removal of Schleiermacher from his position of first pastor, and the election of Pastor Rudenhaus, of Rattingen, who, since 1738, had been a fanatical adherent of the sect, as his successor. Schleiermacher was, even after his departure from Ronsdorf, persecuted by Eller, who lodged with the government a formal charge of sorcery against him; and so great was still Eller's influence, that Schleiermacher deemed it best to flee to Holland. Eller died on May 16, 1750, and soon after him died also Wulffing. After the death of these two men the sect seems to have soon become extinct. Schleiermacher's innocence was, chiefly owing to the efforts of his friend J.W. Knevel, fully established by the declarations of the theological faculties of Marburg and Herborn, and the Synod of Berg. This fanaticism singularly resembles that of the Buchanites (q.v.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 20:606; Knevel, *Grauel d. Verwustung an heil. Statte od. d. Geheimnisse der Bosheit d. Ronsdorfer Sekte* (Frankf. 1750); Wulffing, *Ronsdoffischer Catechismus* (Dusseldorf, 1756); Joh. Bolckhaus (step-son of Eller), *Ronsdorf's gerechte Sache* (Dusseldorf, 1757); *Das jubelirende Ronsdorf* (compiled by Wulffing, but edited by Bolckhaus, Muhlheim, 1761); Wulffing, *Ronsdorf's silberne Trompete* (Muhlheim, 1761); Engels, *Versuch einer Gesch. d. relig, Schwarmerei im ehemal. Herzogthum Berg* (Schwelm, 1826); Hase, *Ch. Hist. §* 421. The *Hirtentasche* may be found in the *Histoire des Sectes Religieuses.* (A.J.S.)

Ellerians

SEE ELLER.

Elliott, Arthur W

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland in 1784; emigrated to Butler County, Ohio, in 1805, and was converted in 1806. In 1818 he

entered the itinerancy, and rapidly rose to eminence and usefulness. He filled many important charges in his Conference until his health failed. He was supernumerary eight years, and superannuated seventeen during his ministry. In 1854 he removed to Paris, Illinois, where he died in January, 1858. Mr. Elliott had a "wonderful power over the multitude, and thousands of souls will call him blessed in eternity." — *Minutes of Conferences,* 1858, page 296.

Elliott, John, D.D

a Congregational minister, was born at Killingworth, Connecticut, August 24, 1768, graduated at Yale College 1786, entered the ministry 1791, and was installed pastor in East Guilford November 2, 1791, in which place he remained until the close of his life, December 17, 1824. Dr. Elliott was made fellow of Yale College 1812, and one of the prudential committee 1816. He published *An Oration on the Death of Thomas Lewis* (1804), and a few sermons. — Sprague, *Annals,* 2:321.

Elliott, Stephen

D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Georgia, was born in Beaufort, South Carolina, August 31, 1806. At sixteen he entered the sophomore class at Harvard University, but returned during the junior year to South Carolina College, Columbia, where he graduated A.B. in 1825. In 1827 he engaged in the practice of law. "In 1832, under the pressure of a newly-awakened devotion to the cause of Christ, he abandoned his profession, and became a candidate for holy orders. He was ordained by bishop Bowen in 1835, served as deacon one month in the church at Wilton, and was then elected professor of sacred literature and the evidences of Christianity in the South Carolina College. Five years later he was chosen first bishop of Georgia. He was consecrated in February 1841, removed to Savannah, and became rector of St. John's Church. In 1844 he became provisional bishop of Florida. In 1845 he removed to Montpellier, to direct in person the work of female education. Here he spent about seven years of his life, and, like many other bishops, expended his whole fortune in the noble effort. In 1853 he removed to Savannah, and took charge of Christ Church in that city as rector. This office he continued to hold, with the exception of one brief interval, till his death. His numerous home duties did not hinder his visitation of his diocese at least once each year, often much more frequently. But two hours before his decease he had

returned, in cheerfulness and apparent health, from one of those long episcopal journeys. Instantly, not to him 'suddenly,' in the midst of his labors, and at the height of his power," he died at his home in Savannah December 21, 1866. — *Amer. Quart. Church Review,* April 1867, and April 1868.

Ellis, Reuben

an early Methodist Episcopal minister. The dates of his early life are wanting. He was a native of North Carolina, entered the itinerancy in 1777, and died in Baltimore, February 1796. "He was a man of very sure and solid parts, weighty and powerful in preaching, and full of simplicity and godly *sincerity." — Minutes of Conferences,* 1:67; Stevens, *History of Methodist Episcopal Church,* page 39 et al.

Ellis, Robert Fulton

a Baptist minister, was born at Topsham, Maine, October 16, 1809; studied at Bowdoin College, and at Newton Theological Institution, where he graduated in 1838. He was pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Springfield, Mass., from 1838 to 1845. He then spent two and a half years in the State of Missouri, preaching, establishing Sunday-schools, and furnishing them with libraries. In 1847 he became pastor of the First Baptist Church of Alton, Illinois, but, becoming associate editor of the *Western Watchman,* published at St. Louis, Missouri, he again took an itinerant agency in that state, and, while thus employed, he died, July 24, 1854. — Sprague, *Annals,* 6:827.

Ellora

Picture for Ellora

a decayed town in the dominions of the Nizam, not far from the city of Dowlatabad, in lat. 200 2 degrees N., and long. 750 13 degrees E., which are in this respect the most noted even in India. It is celebrated for its wonderful rock-cut temples. Their number has not been precisely ascertained, but Erskine reckoned 19 large ones, partly of Hindu and partly of Buddhist origin. Some are cave-temples proper — i.e., chambers cult out in the interior of the rock — but others are vast buildings hewn out of the solid granite of the hills, having an exterior as well as an interior architecture, and being, in fact, magnificent monoliths. In executing the

latter, the process was first to sink a great quadrangular trench or pit, leaving the central mass standing, and then to hew and excavate this mass into a temple. The most beautiful of these objects is the Hindu temple Kailasa. At its entrance the traveler passes into an antechamber 138 feet wide by 88 deep, adorned by numerous rows of pillars. Thence he proceeds along a colonnade over a bridge into a great rectangular court, which is 247 feet in length and 150 broad, in the center of which stands the temple itself, a vast mass of rock richly hewn and carved. It is supported by four rows of pilasters, with colossal elephants beneath, and seems suspended in the air. The interior is about 103 feet long, 56 broad, and 17 feet high, but the entire exterior forms a pyramid 100 feet high, and is overlaid with sculpture. In the great court are numerous ponds, obelisks, colonnades, sphinxes, and on the walls thousands of mythological figures of all kinds, from ten to twelve feet in height. Of the other temples, those of Indra and Dumarheyna are little inferior to that of Kailasa. Regarding their antiquity and religious significance, authorities are not agreed; but at all events they must be subsequent to the epic poems *Ramoyama* or *Mahabharata,* because they contain representations taken from these poems, and also to the cave-temples at Elephanta, because they exhibit a richer and more advanced style of architecture.

Ellys Anthony,

bishop of St. David's, was born in 1693. He was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he took his master's degree in 1716. In 1724 he was presented to the vicarage of St. Olave, Jewry, and to the rectory of St. Martin's, Ironmonger's Lane. In 1725 he obtained a prebend of Gloucester, and in 1728 was created D.D. at Cambridge. He was next promoted to the bishopric of St. David's, and died at Gloucester in 1761. His writings are as follows: 1. *A Plea for the Sacramental Text:* — 2. *Remarks on Hume's Essay concerning Miracles*, and sermons preached on public occasions (4to): — 3. *Tracts on the Liberty, Spiritual and Temporal, of Protestants in England* (1767, 4to): — 4. *Tracts on the Liberty, Spiritual and Temporal, of Subjects in England:* the two last-mentioned are collections of tracts, and form one great and elaborate work, which was the principal object of the bishop's life. They were published posthumously. — Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biography*, volume 4; Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, 5:581.

Elm

stands in the Authorized Version as the translation of הֵלָה *'elah'*, in Hosea 4:13; elsewhere rendered " OAK" *SEE OAK* (q.v.).

Elmo'dam

(Ἐλμωδάμ; perhaps for דּוֹדְמִלְאִי *Almodad)*, son of Er and father of Cosam; one of the ancestors of Christ, in the private line of David. and great-grandfather of Maamfiah, the great-grandfather of Salathiel (Luke 3:28). B.C. cir. 700. He is not mentioned in the Old Test.

Elna'am

[many *El'naan*] (Hebrews *Elna'am*, עַלְנָעַם — [in pause עַלְנָעָם; *God* is his *delight;* Sept. Ἐλναάμ v.r. Ἐλλαάμ, Vulgate *Elnaem)* father of Jeribai and Joshaviah, two of David's distinguished warriors (1 Chronicles 11:46). B.C. 1044. In the Sept. the second warrior is said to be the son of the first, and Elnaam is given as himself a member of the guard.

Elna'than

[some *El'nathan]* (Hebrews *Enlzathan'*, יְהוֹנָתָן, whom *God has given;* compare *John, Theodore, Diodati)*, the name of four leading men.

1. An inhabitant of Jerusalem, father of Nehushta, the mother of king Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:8. Sept. Ἐλνασθάν v.r. Ἐλλανασθάν). B.C. ante 598. He was perhaps the same with the son of Achbor, sent by Jehoiakim to bring the prophet Urijah out of Egypt (Jer 26:22, Sept. Ἐλδαθάν), and in whose presence the roll of Jeremiah was read, for the preservation of which he interceded with the king (Jer 36:12, 25, Sept. Ναθάν v.r. Ἰωναθάν). B.C. 605.

2, 3, 4, (Sept. Ἐλναθάμ, Ναθάν, and Ἐλναθάν respectively). Three of the Israelites, of established prudence and integrity, sent by Ezra to invite the priests and Levites to accompany him to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16). B.C. 459.

Elohim

is the Hebrews plural *(Elohim',* µyhil{a}, of which the sing. form, Hl{a}, *Elo'dh,* is also employed to designate in general any deity, but likewise the true God. The word is derived, according to Gesenius *(Thes. Hebrews* page 94), from an obsolete root, hla; *alah',* to *revere;* but is better referred by First *(Hebrews Handw.* page 90) to the kindred la{e} [see EL-], the name of God as *mighty* (from the extensive root hla; or lwa, to *be firm);* and has its equivalent in the Arabic *Allah,* i.e., God. The plur. *Elohim* is sometimes used in its ordinary sense of *gods,* whether true or false (e.g. of the Egyptians, Ex 12:12; Exodus 12:12; 35:2, 4; De 5:8; Deuteronomy 20:18; 32:17; including Jehovah, Ps 86:8; Ex 18:11; Exodus 22:19; or distinctively of actual deity, Isa 44:6; 45:5, 14, 21; 46:9; 1Ch 13:9; 1 Chronicles 13:9); once of *kings* (Ps 82:1, 6); but Gesenius thinks not of *angels* (Ps 8:6; Psalm 91:7; 138:1), *nor judges* (Ex 21:6; Exodus 21:6; 22:7, 8). But it is especially spoken of one true God, i.e., Jehovah, and in this sense it is always *construed as a sing.,* especially when it has the article prefixed (µyhil{a}h;). *SEE SACK, Commentatt. theol. hist.* (Bonn, 1821), 1; Reinhard, *De notione Dei,* etc. (Vitemb. 1792); Edzard, *Utrum "Elohim" a Canaanaeis orig. ducet* (ib. 1696); Michaelis, *Num Deus dicatur* µyhil{a} *inito faedere* (ib. 1723); Sennert, *Exercitt. philol.* (ib. 1678). *SEE GOD*.

Elohist

the name technically given in theology and sacred criticism to the assumed authors of those parts of the Pentateuch (q.v.) in which the Deity is styled ELOHIM *SEE ELOHIM* rather than JEHOVAH *SEE JEHOVAH* (q.v.).

Elo'i'

(ἐλωΐ for Aramoean yhil{a, *my God),* an exclamation quoted thus by our Savior (<411534>Mark 15:34) on the cross from <192202>Psalm 22:2 (where the Sept. has ὁθεός μου*),* for the Heb. yl{ae, which is more literally Graecized ἠλί, ELI, by <401646>Matthew 26:46.

E'lon

a name occurring in two forms in the Hebrews (but both having the primitive sense of *oak* [q.v.]), as that of a place, and also of three men.

1. (Hebrews *Eylon',* ^wl{ae, Sept. Ἠλών.*)* A city of Dan, mentioned between Jethlah and Timnath (<061943>Joshua 19:43); probably the same elsewhere (<110409>1 Kings 4:9) more fully called ELON-BETH-HANAN *SEE ELON-BETH-HANAN* (q.v.).

2. (Hebrews *Eylon',* ^dyae and ^/l{ae, Sept. Ἐλών and Αἰλὸμ v.r. Ἠλώμ.) A Hittite, father of Bashemath (<012634>Genesis 26:34) or Adah (<013603>Genesis 36:3), the first wife of Esau (q.v.). B.C. ante 1963.

3. (Hebrews *Elon',* ^/l{ae, Sept. Ἀλλών and Ἀλλῶν v.r. Ἀορών.) The second of the three sons of Zebulon (<014614>Genesis 46:14), and father of the family of the Elonites (<042626>Numbers 26:26). B.C. 1856.

4. (Hebrews *Eylon',* ^/l{ae, Sept. Ἠλών, Josephus Ἡλών, Vulg. *Ahialon.)* A native of the tribe of Zebulon (perhaps a descendant of the preceding), and the 11th of the Hebrew judges for ten years (<071211>Judges 12:11, 12), B.C. 1243-34; which are simply noted as a period of tranquility (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 5:7, 14). *SEE JUDGES.*

Elon

SEE OAK.

E'lon -beth -ha'nan

[some *E'lon-beth'hanan]* (Hebrews *Eylon' beyth-Chanan',* ^n;t,a,tyKe ^/l{ae *oak of Beth-hanan,* i.e., *of* the *house of Hanan;* Sept. Ἠλών [v.r.] Αἰαλὼμ] ἕως Βηθανάν, Vulg. *Elon et in Bethhanan),* one of the Danite cities in the commissary district of Ben-Dekar, the third of Solomon's purveyors (<110409>1 Kings 4:9). It is simply called ELON *SEE ELON* in

(Joshua 19:43, being probably a site marked from early times by a particular *tree* [*SEE OAK*] of traditional fame. For "Beth-hanan" some Hebrew MSS. have "Benhanan," and some "and Beth-hanan;" the latter is followed by the Vulgate. To judge from the order of the list in Joshua, its situation must have been on the border of Dan, between Ajalon and Ekron. Thenius suggests *(Exeg. Handb.* in loc.) that Beth-hanan can be no other than the village *Beit-Hunun,* in the rich plain near Gaza (Robinson, *Researches,* 2:371); but this is entirely out of the region in question. Possibly it may be the modern *Beit-Susin,* a “small village, looking old and miserable," on a ridge near an ancient well, about half way between the sites of Nicopolis and Zorah (Robinson, *Later Researches,* page 152).

E'lonite

(Hebrews with the art. and collectively, ηαΕλονι', ψΙνλοαφη; Sept. ὸ Ἀλλωνί*ι*), the patronymic designation (Numbers 26:26) of the descendants of ELON *SEE ELON* (q.v.), the son of Zebulon.

Eloquence Of The Pulpit.

SEE HOMILETICS.

E'loth

(Hebrews *Eyloth',* t/lyae*trees;* Sept. Αἰλάθ v.r. in Chron. Ἀἰλάμ), another (plur.) form (1 Kings 9:26; 2 Chronicles 8:17; 26:2) of the name of the city ELATH *SEE ELATH* (q.v.).

Elpa'al

[many *El'paal]* (Hebrews *Elpa'al,* l(Pilæ, in pause l(P;læ, *God* is his *wages;* Sept. Ἀλφαάλ and Ἐλφαάλ), the second named of the two sons of Shaharaim (a descendant of Benjamin residing in the region of Moab) by his wife Hushim, and progenitor of a numerous posterity (1 Chronicles 8:11, 12, 18). B.C. cir. 1618. The Bene-Elpaal appear to have lived in the neighborhood of Lydda (Lod), and on the outposts of the Benjamite hills as far as Ajalon (8:12-18), near the Danite frontier.

Elpa'let

[many *El'palet]* (Heb. *Elpe'let,* ֶלְפַעְלָה, in pause *Elpa'let,* ֶלְפַעְלָה; Sept.]Ελιφαλέτ v.r. Ἐλιφαλήθ, Vulg. *Eliphalet),* a contracted form (1 Chronicles 8:18) of the name ELIPHALET *SEE ELIPHALET* (q.v.).

Ellpa'ran

[many *Ellpa'ran]* (Hebrew *Eyl Paran,* אֵילפָארָן *oak of Paran;* Sept. ἡ τερέβινθός [v.r. τερέμιμθος] τῆς Φαράν, Vulg. *campestria Pharan),* a spot (hounding on the south the territory of the Rephaimn smitten by Chedorlaomer) on the edge of the wilderness bordering the territory of the Horites or Idumaea, probably marked by a noted *tree* (Genesis 14:6). *SEE OAK*; *SEE PARAN*. An ingenious writer in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* (October 1851, page 153 note) argues, from the rendering of the Sept., for the identity of El-paran with *Elath,* but inconclusively.

Elphegus

SEE ALPHAGE.

Elphinston, William

was born at Glasgow in 1431, studied in the university of that city, and obtained the rectory of Kirkmichael. He subsequently was professor of civil and canon law at Paris and Orleans for nine years, and on his return (1471) was appointed rector of the University of Glasgow. He afterwards became successively member of Parliament and of the Privy Council, ambassador of James III to France, and bishop of Ross, from whence he was transferred to Aberdeen in 1484. As bishop of Aberdeen he was twice sent on a diplomatic mission to England. In 1488 he was for several months lord chancellor of the kingdom, and subsequently, on returning from an embassy to Germany, he was appointed to the office of lord privy seal. He secured the foundation of the University at Aberdeen, for which pope Alexander VI gave a bull dated February 10, 1494. King's College was in consequence erected in 1506, and Elphinston contributed 10,000 pounds Scots towards it, and the building of a bridge over the Dee. He died October 25th, 1514, while negotiations were pending with the court of Rome for his elevation to the primacy of St. Andrew's. He wrote a book of canons, the lives of some Scottish saints, and a history of Scotland, which is preserved among Fairfax's MSS. in the Bodleian Library. — Hook,

Ecclesiastes Biography, volume 4; Oudin, *De Script.* 2002*Ecclesiastes* 3:2670.

Elpis

(Ἐλπίς, *hope*); one of the wives of Herod the Great, who had by her and another wife Phedra two daughters, Roxana and Salome (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:1, 3; *War,* 1:28, 4).

Elrington The Right Rev. Thomas,

lord bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, obtained a scholarship in the University of Dublin in 1778, and in 1781 was elected fellow. In 1794 he was appointed Donellan lecturer all his alma mater; in 1795, professor of mathematics, and in 1806, rector of Ardtree, in the county of Tyrone. In 1811 he was raised to the highest literary rank in Ireland by appointment as provost of Trinity College. This position he held with high credit to himself until 1820, when he was consecrated bishop of Limerick. In 1822 he was transferred to the see of Leighlin and Ferns, He died in 1835. Besides editing several of the classics, he published his lectures delivered while Donellan lecturer: "The proof of Christianity derived from the miracles recorded in the New Testament," under the title, *Sermons preached in the Chapel of Trinity College,* etc. (Dublin, 1796, *8vo): — Reflections on the Appointment of Dr. Milner as the Political Agent of the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland* (1809, 8vo): — *The Clergy of the Church of England truly ordained* (1809, 8vo), and a number of other polemical writings. — A*nnual Biography and Obituary*, 20 (1836); Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, pages 1084-5.

Elsner Jacob, D.D.,

was born at Saalfeld, Prussia, in March, 1692. He studied at the University of Konigsberg, and in 1715 became "corrector" of the Reformed school in that city. Two years later he visited Utrecht and Leyden. In 1720 he was appointed professor of theology and philology at Bingen; in 1722, rector and first professor of the Joachimsthal Gymnasium at Berlin. Subsequently he became pastor at one of the Berlin churches. From 1742 to 1744 he was director of the class of belles-lettres at the Royal Society. He died Oct. 8,1750. His principal works are: *Observationes sacrce in novi foederis libros* (Traj. 17201728, 2 volumes 8vo): — *Comm. sacro-philologicus in evang. Matthei* (Zwollse, 1767-69, 2 volumes 4to): — *Commentarius in*

evang. Marci (Traj. 1733, 4to). —Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica;* Doering, *die gelehrten Theolog. Dcutschlands,* 1:366; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 15:919.

El'tekeh

[some *Elte'keh]* (Hebrews *Eltekeh',* הקתא, *God is its fear,* i.e., object of awe; but *Elteke',* אקתא, in (Joshua 21:23) Sept. Ἐλθεκώ v.r. Ἀλθακά and ἡ Ἐλκωθαίυ, Vulg. *Elthece* and *Eltheco),* a city in the tribe of Dan, apparently near the border, and mentioned between Ekron and Gibbethon ((Joshua 19:44) With its "suburbs" it was assigned as a city of refuge and Levitical city to the Kohathites ((Joshua 21:23); but it is omitted in the parallel list (1 Chronicles 6). The site is possibly now represented by *El-Mansurah* (“the victorious"), "a miserable little village" near a copious spring, in the plain between Ramleh and Akir (Robinson, *Researches,* 3:21). Schwarz *(Palest.* page 141) confounds Eltekeh with Eltekon, and locates both at a village which he calls *"Althini,* not far from Beilin (Baalath)."

El'tekon

[some *Elte'kon]* (Hebrews *Eltekon'* ׳קתא, *God* is its *foundation;* Sept. Ἐλθεκούν v.r. Ἐλθεκεν and Θέκουμ, Vulg. *Eltecon),* a city of Judah, in the mountain-district, mentioned last in order after Maarath and Beth-Anoth ((Joshua 15:59), being in the group north of Hebron *(Keil, Comment.* in loc.). *SEE JUDAH.* It is perhaps identical in site with the present *Deit Sahur el-Atikah,* a little S.E. of Jerusalem. *SEE ELTEKEH.* It is perhaps the *Altaqu* mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions. *SEE HEZEKIAH.*

Elto'lad

[many *Et'tolad]* (Hebrews *Eltolad',* דלתא, perhaps meaning *God* is its *race* or posterity; but, according to Furst *[Hebr. Handw.* s.v.], whose *God* is *Mylitta,* the Phoenician deity, *SEE MOLADAH;* Sept. Ἐλθωδάδ and Ἐλθωλάθ v.r. Ἐρβωυδάδ and Ἐρθουλά; Vulg. *Eltholad),* a city in the south of Judah, mentioned between Azem and Chesil ((Joshua 15:29), but afterwards assigned to Simeon, and mentioned between Azem and Bethul ((Joshua 19:4). It remained in possession of the latter tribe in the time of David ((1 Chronicles 4:29, where it is called simply TOLAD). It

is possibly the ruined site *Tell-Melaha,* observed by Van de Velde *(Memoir,* page 113) along the N. branch of wady Sheriah, which empties into the Mediterranean a little S. of Gaza.

E'lul

(Hebrews *Elui',* לוּאֱ, <16065>Nehemiah 6:15; Sept. Ἐλούλ, also in 1 Macc. 14:27; the Macedonian Γορπιαῖυς*)* is the name of that month which was the sixth of the ecclesiastical, and the twelfth of the civil year of the Jews, and in which began with the new moon of our August or September, and consisted of 29 days. Several unsatisfactory attempts have been made to find a Syro-Arabian etymology for the word, as it occurs in a similar form in both these languages (see Gesenius, *Thes. Hebr.* page 1036). The most recent derivation, that of Benfey, deduces it, through many commutations and mutilations, from an original Zend form *haurvatat (Monutsnamen,* p. 126). According to the Talmud, the following are the days devoted to religious services. *SEE CALENDAR.*

1. The new moon The propitiatory prayers are commenced in the evening service after the new moon

7. The festival of the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem by Nehemiah.

17. A fast because of the death of the spies who brought up the evil report of the Land of Promise (<04146>Numbers 14:36, 37).

21. The festival of wood offering (*Xy'ophoio1o*). According to others, this occurred during the previous month.

22. A fast in memory of the punishment of the wicked and incorrigible Israelites.

29. This is the last day of the month, on which the Jews reckoned up the beasts that had been born, the tenths of which belonged to God. They chose to do it on this day because the first day of the month Tisri was a festival, and therefore they could not tithe a flock on that day.

Elusa

(Ἔλοσα, apparently for the Aramaean אלוסא; see Jerome, *Comment. in Esa.* 15:4), an ancient city of Idumaea, frequently mentioned by writers of the fourth to the sixth centuries (see the citations in Reland, *Palaest.* page 755-7) as an episcopal city of the Third Palestine *(Concil. Gen.* 3:448); the

E'lysa of the Peutinger Table, 71 Roman miles S. of Jerusalem (Ritter, *Erdk.* 14:120); recognized by D. Robinson *(Bib. Res.* 1:296 sq.) as the present ruins *el-Khulaseh,* 5 hours S.S.W. of Hebron on the way to Egypt, ant consisting of walls, a fine well, and enclosures sufficient to have contained a population of 15,000 or 20,000 persons (see also Stewart, *Tent and Khan,* page 205). *SEE CHELLUS.*

Elu'zai

(Hebrews *Eluzay',* yzWl (la, *God* is *my praises,* i.e., object of praise; Sept. Ἐλιωζί v.r. Ἀζαΐ, Vulg. *Eluzai),* one of the Benjamite warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chronicles 12:5). B.C. 1054.

Elvira Council Of

(Concilium Eliberitanum or *Illiberitanum),* held in the town of Elvira (or Illiberis, Iliberi, or Liberini), in the Spanish province of Baetica. The town, which no longer exists, was situated not far from the modern Granada. That it was not Illiberis, in Gallia Narbonensis, is shown by the fact that all the signers were Spanish bishops. The council was most probably held at the beginning of the fourth century, but the year (303, 305, 309) is uncertain. Some of the early Protestant writers (as the authors of the Magdeburg *Centuries)* inferred, from the resolutions concerning pictures and the lighting of candles, that the synod took place as late as the year 700; but this opinion has now been abandoned. The Synod of Elvira is the most ancient among those of which all the canons (eighty-one) are extant. It was attended by nineteen bishops, among them Hosius of Cordova, and twenty-six priests. Some of the canons show that the Church of Spain was at that time strongly under the influence of Novatian and Montanist principles. The most important of the resolutions were, 1, depriving of communion, i.e., of absolution, even in death, those who, after baptism, have voluntarily sacrificed to idols; 3, relaxing the penalty in canon 1 in favor of those who have not gone beyond offering a present to the idol. It allows of admitting such to communion at the point of death, if they have undergone a course of penance; canons 6 and 7 forbid communion even at the point of death to those who have caused the death of another maliciously, and to adulterers who have relapsed after entering upon the course of penance; 12 and 13 forbid communion even in death to mothers who prostitute their own daughters, and to women who, after consecrating themselves in virginity to God, forsake that state; 33 prohibits the clergy

from the use of marriages; 34 prohibits the lighting of candles during daytime in cemeteries, "for the spirits of the saints must not be disturbed;" 36 declares that pictures ought not to be in a church, lest the object of veneration and worship be depicted upon walls; 63 and 64 forbid communion even in death to adulteresses who have willfully destroyed their children, or who abide in a state of adultery up to the time of their last illness; 65 forbids communion even in death to one who has falsely accused of a crime a bishop, priest, or deacon. The canons may be found in Mansi, 2:2 sq., and in Routh, *Reliquiae*, volume 4. Special treatises on the canons were written by the bishop Ferdinand de Mendoza *(De Confirmando concil. Illiberitano,* in Mansi. l.c.), and bishop Aubespine of Orleans (Mansi. l.c.). The canons, together with some explanatory remarks, may also be found in the Tibingen *Theolog. Quartalschriff,* 1821, page 144. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:775; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:543; Gams, *Kirchengesch. von Spanien ;* Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* 1:122 sq. (A.J.S.)

Elxai, Elxaites

SEE ELKESAITES.

Ely Ezra Stiles, D.D.,

a Presbyterian (O.S.) minister, was born in Lebanon, Conn., June 13, 1786. At twelve years of age he made a profession of religion. He graduated at Yale College in 1803. His theological studies were pursued under his father, the Reverend Z. Ely. In 1806 he was ordained, and installed as pastor of the church in Colchester, Connecticut, which he left some time after to become chaplain to the New York City Hospital. In 1811 the Old Pine Street Church, Philadelphia, became vacant. Its pulpit had been filled by the most eloquent ministers of the day, and it was necessary to choose a man of commanding intellect and power. The choice fell most wisely upon Dr. Ely. He entered upon his field of labor with earnestness and zeal. He was the principal founder of the Jefferson Medical College. He was stated clerk and moderator of the General Assembly in 1825 and 1828, and was constantly engaged in works of charity and schemes of benevolence. In 1834 he conceived the plan of establishing a college and theological seminary in Missouri. He entered into this with great zeal, and for a while with success, but the crisis of 1837 made it a failure. In this enterprise he lost his large fortune; and returned to Philadelphia a poor man — his

intellect and oratorical powers unimpaired — but failed to receive that degree of attention he commanded when in affluence. In 1844 he became pastor of the church in Northern Liberties, Philadelphia, where he labored until prostrated by paralysis in 1851. He lingered ten years, his intellect being so impaired as to preclude activity of any kind. He died June 18, 1861. He published *Memoirs of the Rev. Z. Ely* (his father):*Collateral Bible, or Key to the Holy Scriptures* (in connection with Bedell and M'Corkle): — Ely's *Journal: — Sermons on Faith: —Visits of Mercy.* He was also editor of *The Philadelphian. — Wilson, Presb. Historical Almanac,* 1862.

Ely

so called from a Saxon word, *elig,* an eel, or *helig,* a willow, a cathedral town in that part of the fen country of Cambridgeshire called the *Isle of Ely.* Pop. about 6000.

Ely Cathedral. — About the year 673, Etheldreda, daughter of the king of East Anglia, and wife of Oswy, king of Northumberland, founded a monastery here, and took on herself the government of it. A new church was begun in 1081, which was converted into a cathedral, and the abbey erected into a see in 1109. The possessions of the abbey were divided between the bishop and the community. Among the celebrated names connected with Ely are abbot Thurstan, who defended the isle against William the Conqueror for seven years, and bishop Andrews. The bishops of Ely, like the bishops of Durham, formerly enjoyed a palatine jurisdiction, and appointed their own chief justice, etc., but this privilege was taken from them by the 6th and 7th William IV. The bishop of Ely is visitor to St. Peter's, St. John's, and Jesus colleges, Cambridge, of which last he also appoints the master. There is a grammar-school attached to the cathedral, founded by Henry VIII. The diocese of Ely belongs to the province of Canterbury, and embraces Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, Huntingdonshire, and the archdeaconry of Sudbury. in Suffolk. The income of the bishop is £5500. The present (1890) incumbent is Alwyne Compton. The diocese has 26 deaneries and 172,263 church sittings. The total population within the territory of the diocese was, in 1861, 480,716. — Chambers, *Encyclop.* s.v.; *Churchman's Calendar for* 1868.

Elymae'an

(Ἐλυμαῖος), the Graecized form (Judith 1:6) of the designation usually Anglicized ELAMITE *SEE ELAMITE* (q.v.).

Elyma'is

(Ἐλυμαΐς), a general designation (Tobit 2:10) of that province of the Persian empire. See Smith, *Diet. of Class. Geog.* s.v.) termed ELAM *SEE ELAM* (q.v.) in the Bible. In 1 Macc. 6:1, however, the word is used (incorrectly) in a more specific or local sense of some Persian city, as we are there informed that Antiochus Epiphanes, understanding there were very great treasures in the temple at Elymais, determined to plunder it; but the citizens resisted him successfully. 2 Macc. 9:2 calls this city *Persepolis*, probably because it formerly had been the capital of Persia; for Persepolis and Elymais were very different cities; the former situated on the Araxes, the latter on the Eulaeus. The temple which Antiochus designed to pillage was that of the goddess Nannaea, according to 2 Macc. 1:13; Appian says *(Syr.* page 66) a temple of Venus (i.e., probably the goddess Anubis); Polybius (31:11), Diodorus, Josephus *(Ant.* 12:9, 1), and Jerome say a temple of Diana. *SEE ANTIOCHUS (EPIPHANES).*

El'ymas

(Ἐλύμας), an appellative commonly derived from the Arabic *Aliman ("a wise man,"* see Pfeiffer, *Dubia vex.* page 941; like the Turkish title *Ulema*, see Lakemacher, *De Elyma Mago*, in his *Observatt.* 2:162), which Luke interprets by ὁ μάγος, the *Magian* or "sorcerer:" it is applied to a Jew named BAR-JESUS, who had attached himself to the proconsul of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus, when Paul visited the island (<44B13 6>Acts 13:6 sq.). A.D. 44. On his attempting to dissuade the proconsul from embracing the Christian faith, he was struck with miraculous blindness by the apostle (see Neander's *History of first Planting of the Christian Church*, 1:125). A very different but less probable derivation of the word is given by Lightfoot in his *Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations* on the Acts *(Works*, 8:461), and in his *Sermon on Elymas the Sorcerer (Works*, 7:104). Chrysostom observes, in reference to the blindness inflicted by the apostle on Bar-Jesus, that the limiting clause, for a season, "shows that it was not intended so much for the punishment of the sorcerer as for the conversion of the deputy (Chrysost. *in Acta Apost. Homeil.* 28; *Opera*, 9:241). On the practice generally then prevailing, in the decay of faith, of consulting

Oriental impostors of this kind, see Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul,* 1:177-180, 2d ed. *SEE MAGIC.*

El'zabad

[some *Elza'bad] (Heb. Elzabad',* דַבְזֶלְא, whom *God has bestowed,* i.e., *Theodore;* Sept. Ἐλεζαβάδ and Ἐλζαβάδ, v.r. Ἐλιεζέρ and Ἐλζαβάθ), the name of two men.

1. The ninth of the eleven Gadite heroes who joined David in his fastness in the wilderness of Judah (1 Chronicles 12:12) B.C. 1061.

2. One of the able-bodied sons of Shemaiah, the son of Obed-edom the Levite; he served as a porter to the "house of Jehovah" under David (1 Chronicles 26:7). B.C. 1014.

El'zaphan

[some *Elzaphan]* (Hebrews *Eltsaphan',* פָצְלֵא), a contracted form (Exodus 6:22; Leviticus 10:4) of the name ELIZAPHAN *SEE ELIZAPHAN* (q.v.).

Emanation

(Latin *emanatio,* a flowing forth), a religious theory concerning the relation of the universe to the Deity, which lies at the basis of some of the Oriental religions, and from them found its way into several philosophical systems. Emanation denotes a development, descending by degrees, of all things from the Supreme Being, the universe constituting in general, as well as in particular, a chain of revelations, the individual rings of which lose the divine character the more the farther they are remote from the primary source, the Deity. A system of emanation is different from a system of evolution, because in the latter the revelation of the Deity in the universe has for the Deity itself the signification of a process of self-cognition which grows in a progressive ratio. Emanation was the basis of the religions of India, in the northern provinces of which country it developed from the original religion of nature even before the compilation of the Vedas. The cause of all things was found in a universal world-soul. *SEE ANIMA MUNDI.* The world-soul was identified with Brahma, and, viewed as the eternal spiritual unit, the mysterious source of all life. The ancient gods were explained as the first rays of Brahma, whom he had constituted the guardians of the world. The creation was an emanation from Brahma,

which became the more gross, dense, materialized, the farther it removed from the primitive source. Those who give themselves up to the corporeal world sink deeper and deeper, and only rise again upward when purified by the fire of hell; but those who renounce all sensuality, and direct all their thoughts to the one divine substance, are gradually absorbed by it. The religion of the Parsees is also based upon emanation. From the *Zeruane akherene* (the uncreated one), Ormuzd and Ahriman proceed as the highest revelation. From Ormuzd and Ahriman all other substances emanate, from the ministering angels down to the beings of the material world. But the Persians did not teach, like the Indians, a self-destruction of personality for the purpose of obtaining a reunion with the original unit; in the Parsee system the good is perfected and completed by overcoming the bad, and the series of the imperfect emanations is closed by a reunion of Ahriman with Ormuzd. In the Western countries, Plato is the first in whose writings we find, though not yet distinctly, traces of the doctrine of emanation. More developed, it appears in the writings of Philo. It is a prominent feature of the Neoplatonic school, and through Valentinus (q.v.) it was introduced into the Gnostic schools. Finally, it is to be found in the philosophy of the Arabs, which was more or less an Aristotelism mixed with Neoplatonic views.-Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:548; Muller, *Gesch. der Kosmologie in der griech. Kirche bis auf Origenes* (Halle, 1860); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* volume 1. (A.J.S.)

Emancipation.

1. In the Roman Church, *Emancipatio canonicarum* is the raising of some member of a convent to an ecclesiastical dignity, by virtue of which he is no longer subject to his former superior. The *Emancipatio canonica* is the release of a young canon from the obligation of visiting the foundation school when about to receive a prebend.

2. The term is also used to denote the act whereby a government or Legislature *delivers from a state of slavery*, or sets at *political liberty*, any classes of persons who have previously been declared ineligible for certain offices or privileges, on account of their religious peculiarities, e.g. emancipation of Jews in Christian countries, *SEE JEWS*; Roman Catholic emancipation in 1829 in England, *SEE TESTS*.

3. The freeing of slaves from bondage, *SEE SLAVERY*.

Embalm

(חנט; *chanat',* to *spice;* hence spoken of the *ripening* of fruit, on account of its *aromatic* juice, improperly rendered "putteth forth" in Song of Solomon 2:13), the process of preserving a corpse by means of aromatics (Genesis 1, 2, 3, 26; Sept. ἐνταφάζω). This art was practiced among the Egyptians from the earliest times, and arrived at great perfection in that country, where, however, it has now become lost, the practice apparently having gradually fallen into disuse in consequence of the change of customs affected by the introduction of Christianity in that part of the Roman empire. It is in connection with that country that the above instances occur, and later examples (2 Chronicles 16:14; John 9:39, 40) seem to have been in imitation of the Egyptian custom. The modern method of embalming is in essential points similar.

I. *Egyptian. —*

1. The feeling which led the Egyptians to embalm the dead probably sprang from their, belief in the future reunion of the soul with the body. Such a reunion is distinctly spoken of in the Book of the Dead (Lepsius, *Todtenbuch,* chapter 89 and *passing),* and Herodotus expressly mentions the Egyptian belief in the transmigration of souls (2:123). This latter idea may have led to the embalming of lower animals also, especially those deemed sacred, as the ox, the ibis, and the cat, mummies of which are frequent. The actual process is said to have been derived from "their first merely burying in the sand, impregnated with natron and other salts, which dried and preserved the body" (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2:122). Drugs and bitumen were of later introduction, the latter not being generally employed before the 18th dynasty. When the practice ceased entirely is uncertain.

2. Herodotus (2:86-89) describes three modes, varying in completeness and expense, and practiced by persons regularly trained to the profession, who were initiated into the mysteries of the art by their ancestors. The most costly mode, which is estimated by Diodorus Siculus (1:91) at a talent of silver (over $1000), was said by the Egyptian priests to belong to him whose name in such a matter it was not lawful to mention, viz. Osiris. The embalmers first removed part of the brain through the nostrils by means of a crooked iron, and destroyed the rest by injecting caustic drugs. An incision was then made along the flank with a sharp Ethiopian stone, and the whole of the intestines removed. The cavity was rinsed out with

palm-wine, and afterwards scoured with pounded perfumes. It was then filled with pure myrrh pounded, cassia, and other aromatics, except frankincense. This done, the body was sewn up and steeped in natron for seventy days. When the seventy days were accomplished, the embalmers washed the corpse and swathed it in bandages of linen, cut in strips and smeared with gum. They then gave it up to the relatives of the deceased, who provided for it a wooden case, made in the shape of a man, in which the dead was placed, and deposited in an erect position against the wall of the sepulchral chamber. Diodorus Siculus gives some particulars of the process which are omitted by Herodotus. When the body was laid out on the ground for the purpose of embalming, one of the operators, called the scribe (γραμματεύς), marked out the part of the left flank where the incision was to be made. The dissector (παρασχίστης) then, with a sharp Ethiopian stone (black flint, or Ethiopian agate, Rawlinson, *Herod.* 2:121), hastily cut through as much flesh as the law enjoined, and fled, pursued by curses and volleys of stones from the spectators. When all the embalmers (ταριχευταί) were assembled, one of them extracted the intestines, with the exception of the heart and kidneys; another cleansed them one by one, and rinsed them in palm-wine and perfumes. The body was then washed with oil of cedar, and other things worthy of notice, for more than thirty days (according to some MSS. forty), and afterwards sprinkled with myrrh, cinnamon, and other substances, which possess the property not only of preserving the body for a long period, but also of communicating to it an agreeable shell. This process was so effectual that the features of the dead could be recognized. It is remarkable that Diodorus omits all mention of the steeping in natron. Porphyry(De *Abst.* 4:10) supplies an omission of Herodotus, who neglects to mention what was done with the intestines after they were removed from the body. In the case of a person of respectable rank they were placed in a separate vessel and thrown into the river. This account is confirmed by Plutarch *(Sept. Sap. Conv.* c. 16).

The second mode of embalming cost about 20 minae. In this case no incision was made in the body, nor were the intestines removed, but cedar-oil was injected into the stomach by the rectum. The oil was prevented from escaping, and the body was then steeped in natron for the appointed number of days. On the last day the oil was withdrawn, and carried off with it the stomach and intestines in a state of solution, while the flesh was consumed by the natron, and nothing was left but the skin and bones. The body in this state was returned to the relatives of the deceased.

The third mode, which was adopted by the poorer classes, and cost but little, consisted in rinsing out the intestines with syrmaea, an infusion of senna and cassia (Pettigrew, *Hist. of Mummies*, page 69), and steeping the body for the usual number of days in natron.

Although the three modes of embalming are so precisely described by Herodotus, it has been found impossible to classify the mummies which have been discovered and examined under one or other of these three heads. Pettigrew, from his own observations, confirms the truth of Herodotus's statement that the brain was removed through the nostrils. But in many instances, in which the body was carefully preserved and elaborately ornamented, the brain had not been removed at all, while in some mummies the cavity was found to be filled with resinous and bituminous matter. M. Rouyer, in his *Notice sur los Embaumements d.s Anciens Egyptiens (Description de l'Egypte,* page 471), endeavored to class the mummies which he examined under two principal divisions, which were again subdivided into others. These were,

I. Mummies with the ventral incision, preserved, 1, by balsamic matter, and, 2, by natron. The first of these are filled with a mixture of resin and aromatics, and are of an olive color — the skin dry, flexible, and adhering to the bones. Others are filled with. bitumen or asphaltum, and are black, the skin hard and shining. Those prepared with natron are also filled with resinous substances and bitumen.

II. Mummies without the ventral incision. This class is again subdivided, according as the bodies were, 1, salted and filled with pisasphaltum, a compound of asphaltum and common pitch; or, 2, salted only. The former are supposed to have been immersed in the pitch when in a liquid state. The medicaments employed in embalming were various. From a chemical analysis of the substances found in mummies, M. Rouelle detected three modes of embalming: 1, with *asphaltum,* or Jew's pitch, called also *funeral gum,* or *gum of mummies;* 2, with a mixture of asphaltum and cedria, the liquor distilled from the cedar; 3, with this mixture, together with some resinous and aromatic ingredients. The powdered aromatics mentioned by Herodotus were not mixed with the bituminous matter, but sprinkled into the cavities of the body. Pettigrew supposes that after the spicing "the body must have been subjected to a very considerable degree of heat; for the resinous and aromatic substances have penetrated even into the innermost structure of the bones, an effect which could not have been produced

without the aid of a high temperature, and which was absolutely necessary for the entire preservation of the body" (page 62). M. Rouyer is of the same opinion (page 471). The surface of the body was in one example covered with "a coating of the dust of woods and barks, nowhere less than one inch in thickness," which "'had the smell of cinnamon or cassia" (Pettigrew, pages 62, 63). At this same stage plates of gold were sometimes applied to portions of the body, or even its whole surface. Before enwrapping, the body was always placed at full length, with no variety save in the position of the arms.

The principal embalming material in the more costly mummies appears to have been asphalt, either alone or mixed with a vegetable liquor, or so mixed with the addition of resinous and aromatic ingredients. Pettigrew supposes resinous matters were used as a kind of varnish for the body, and that pounded aromatics were sprinkled in the cavities within. The natron, in a solution of which the mummies were placed in every method, appears to have been a fixed alkali. It might be obtained from the Natron Lakes and like places in, the Libyan desert. Wax has also been discovered (Pettigrew's *History*, page 75 sq.).

Picture for Embalm 1

Picture for Embalm 2

3. The embalming having been completed, the body was wrapped in bandages. There has been much difficulty as to the material; but it seems certain that linen was invariably used. Though always long, they vary in this respect; and we know no authenticated instance of their exceeding 700 yards, though much greater measures are mentioned. The width is also very various, but it is generally not more than seven or eight inches. The quantity of cloth used is best ascertained from the weight. The texture varies, in the cases of single mummies, the coarser material being always nearer to the body. The bandages are found to have been saturated with asphalt, resin, gum, or natron; but the asphalt has only been traced in those nearest the body: probably the saturation is due to the preparation of the mummies, and does not indicate any special preparation of the clothes. The beauty of the bandaging has been the subject of great admiration. The strips were very closely bound, and all directions were adopted that could carry out this object. Pettigrew is of opinion that they were certainly applied wet. Various amulets and personal ornaments are found upon

mummies and in their wrappings; the former were thought to be of use to the soul in its wanderings, and they were placed with the body from the belief in the relation between the two after death. With these matters, and the other particulars of Egyptian mummies, we have little to do, as our object is to show how far the Jewish burial-usages may have been derived from Egypt. The body in the cases of most of the richer mummies, when bandaged, has been covered with what has been termed by the French a *cartonage,* formed of layers of cloth, plastered with lime on the inside. The shape is that of a body of which the arms and legs are not distinguishable. In this shape every dead person who had, if we may believe Diodorus, been judged by a particular court to be worthy of the honor of burial, was considered to have the form of Osiris, and was called by his name. It seems more probable, however, that the tribunal spoken of was that of Amenti, "the hidden," the Egyptian Hades, and that the practice of embalming was universal. The *cartonage* of the more costly mummies is generally beautifully painted with subjects connected with Amenti. Mummies of this class are enclosed in one or even two wooden cases, either of sycamore, or, rarely, of cedar. The mummies of royal and very wealthy persons were placed in an outer stone case, within which there was a wooden case, and, probably, sometimes two such cases. *SEE MUMMY*. It would seem that the features of the face, as well as the other parts of the body, were covered over with the bandage, and that it was only through this, and latterly through the coffin, which commonly took the form of the features, that these could be recognized.

Picture for Embalm 3

II. *Hebraeo-Egyptian.* — The records of the embalming of Jacob and Joseph are very brief. In the former case we read, "And Joseph commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father: and the physicians embalmed Israel. And forty days were fulfilled for him; for so are fulfilled the days of embalming: and the Egyptians mourned for him threescore and ten days" (Genesis 1, 2, 3). Of Joseph we are only told that "they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt" (verse 26). It should be remarked, that in Joseph's case the embalming must have been thorough, as Moses at the Exodus carried his body into Canaan. The motive of embalming in these instances was evidently that the strong desire of these patriarchs to be buried in the Land of Promise might be complied with, although, had this not been so, respect would probably have led to

the same result. That the physicians were employed by Joseph to embalm his father may mean no more than the usual embalmers, who must have had medical and surgical knowledge, but it is not unlikely that the kings and high officers were embalmed by household physicians. The periods of forty days for embalming, and seventy for mourning, are not easily reconciled with the statement of Herodotus, who specifies seventy days as the time that the body remained in natron. Hengstenberg *(Egypt and the Books of Moses,* page 69) attempts to reconcile this discrepancy by supposing that the seventy days of Herodotus include the whole time of embalming, and not that of steeping in natron only. But the differences in detail which characterize the descriptions of Herodotus and Diodorus, and the impossibility of reconciling these descriptions in all points with the results of scientific observation, lead to the natural conclusion that, if these descriptions are correct in themselves, they do not include every method of embalming which was practiced, and that, consequently; any discrepancies between them and the Bible narrative cannot fairly be attributed to a want of accuracy in the latter. Perhaps the periods varied in different ages, or the forty days may not include the time of steeping in natron. Diodorus Siculus, who, having visited Egypt, is scarcely likely to have been in error in a matter necessarily well known, speaks of the anointing of the body at first with oil of cedar and other things for above thirty or forty days (ἐφ ἡμέρας πλείους τῶν τριάκοντα ; some MSS. τεσσαράκοντα. This period would correspond very well with the forty days mentioned in Genesis, which are literally "the days of spicing," and indicate that the latter denoted the most essential period of embalming. Or, if the same period as the seventy days of Herodotus be meant by Diodorus, then there would appear to have been a change. It may be worth noticing, that Herodotus, when first mentioning the steeping in natron, speaks of seventy days as the extreme time to which it might be lawfully prolonged (ἡμέρας ἑβδομήκοντα: πλεῦνας δὲ τουτέων οὐκ ἔξεστι ταριχεύειν), that (according to Pettigrew, page 61) "appearing to be precisely the time necessary for the operation of the alkali on the animal fiber." This would seem to render it possible that the seventy days in the time of Herodotus was the period of mourning, as it was not to be exceeded in what appears to have been the longest operation of embalming. The division of the seventy days mentioned in Genesis into forty and thirty may be suggested if we compare the thirty days' mourning for Moses and for Aaron, in which case the seventy days in this instance might mean until the end of seventy days. It is also to be remarked that Diodorus speaks of the time of

mourning for a king being seventy- two days, apparently ending with the day of burial (1:72). Joseph's coffin was perhaps a stone case, as his mummy was to be long kept ready for removal. *SEE COFFIN.*

III. *Jewish.* — It is not until long after the Exodus that we find any record of Jewish embalming, and then we have, in the O.T., but one distinct mention of the practice. This is in the case of king Asa, whose burial is thus related: "And they buried him in his own sepulchers, which he had digged for himself in the city of David, and laid him in the bed [or rather "coffin," not "bier"] which he had filled [or "which was filled"] with perfumes and spices compounded by the apothecaries' art; and they made for him an exceeding great burning" (<14614>2 Chronicles 16:14). The burning is mentioned of other kings of Judah. From this passage it seems that Asa had prepared a bed, probably a sarcophagus, filled with spices, and that spices were also burnt at his burial. In the accounts of our Savior's burial the same or similar customs appear to be indicated, but fuller particulars are given. We read that Nicodemus "brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred, pound [weight]." The body they wound "in linen clothes with the sweet spices, as the manner of the Jews is to prepare for burial" (<43939>John 19:39, 40). Mark specifies that fine clothes were used (<41546>Mark 15:46), and mentions that the women who came to the sepulcher on the morning of the resurrection “had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him" (<41601>Mark 16:1). Luke relates that the women went to see the sepulcher. "And they returned, and prepared sweet spices and ointments" (Mark 23:56). Immediately afterwards he speaks of their "bringing the sweet spices which they had prepared" (Mark 24:1) on the second day after. Our Lord himself referred to the use of ointment in burial-ceremonies (πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάζειν) "for the preparation for burial," when he commended the piety of the woman who had anointed his head with "very precious ointment" (<40206>Matthew 26:6-13), and spoke in like manner in the similar case of Mary, the sister of Lazarus (<43203>John 12:3-8). The customs at this time would seem to have been to anoint the body and wrap it in fine linen, with spices and ointments in the folds, and afterwards to pour more ointment upon it, and perhaps also to burn spices. In the case of our Savior, the hurried burial and the following of the Sabbath may have caused an unusual delay. Ordinarily everything was probably completed at once.

Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus speak of the use of myrrh in Egyptian embalming, but we do not find any mention of aloes. The wrapping in fine

linen is rather contrary to the Egyptian practice than like it, when we remember that the coarser mummy-bandages are those which immediately enfold the body, and would best correspond to the clothes used by the Jews.

The Jewish custom has therefore little in common with the Egyptian. It was, however, probably intended as a kind of embalming, although it is evident from what is mentioned in the case of Lazarus, who was regularly swathed (⁴³¹⁴⁴John 11:44), that its effect was not preservation (verse 39). The use of aromatics may naturally have been a harmless relic of the Egyptian custom, which, however, was very different in all else that relates to the disposal of the corpse. *SEE BURIAL.*

Picture for Embalm 4

Among the later Jews a sort of embalming by means of *honey* occurs (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:7, 4; see Strabo, 16:746; compare Pliny, 22:50). *Wax* is said to have been employed for a similar purpose by the ancient Persians (Herodotus, 1:140; comp. Cicero, *Tusc. Quest.* 1:45; Xenophon, *Hellen.* 5:3, 19).

IV. *Literature.* — See Pettigrew, *History of Egyptian Mummies* (Lond. 1840, 4to); Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians,* 2d series, 2:451 sq.; Rosellini, *Monumenti dell' Egitto,* II, 3:334 sq., and pl. 121; Jablonski, *Opusc.* ed. Water, 1:472; Caylus, *Abhand. zur Gesch. u. Kunst.* 1:334 sq.; Heyne, in the *Commentt. Soc. Goett.* 1780, 3:89 sq.; Winekler, *Animadverss.* 1:105 sq.; Creuzer, *Comment. in Herod.* 1:14 sq., 361 sq.; Sethus, *De alimentor. facultatibus* (Par. 1658), 10, page 74; Ritter, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* 7:374 sq.; Brande's *Encyclopedia,* and the *Penny Cyclopcedia,* s.v. Mummy.

Embalming the Dead

in the Christian Church. It was the custom of the early Church to bestow the honor of embalming upon the bodies of martyrs at least. According to an intimation of Tertullian *(Apol.* cap. 42), the usage appears to have been even generally adopted by Christians in burying their dead. One of the chief ingredients used was myrrh; in imitation of the Jewish custom, which was followed by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, who "brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight, and took the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury" (⁴³⁰³⁹John 19:39). There was supposed to be some mystic

meaning in the presents made by the wise men to our Savior at his birth when they offered to him gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh: gold as to a king, frankincense as to a God, and myrrh as to a man that must die and be buried. In addition to the Jewish custom and the mode of our Savior's burial, another reason which rendered the use of myrrh important was that the ancient Christians were often compelled to bury their dead in the places in which they assembled for divine worship, and the embalming would tend to preserve them from corruption, and render the burial-places less offensive.-Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 23, chapter 2, § 5.

Ember Weeks

The weeks in which the ember days fall. These are certain days set apart in the Roman and Anglican churches for imploring God's blessing upon the ordinations which are appointed to be held in the church on the Sundays next following these weeks. The ember days are the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday-in Lent; after Whit-Sunday; after the 14th of September; and after the 13th of December. These days were settled by the Council of Placentia, A.D. 1095. The name is derived by some from a German word signifying "abstinence;" by others it is supposed to signify "ashes;" the most probable derivation, however, is from a Saxon word *(ymbren* or *embren)* signifying "a circuit or course," because these fast-days return at certain periods (Eden, s.v.). The ember weeks in the Roman Church are called the *quatuor tempora,* the fast so called being observed at the beginnings of the four seasons. In the French Church it is called the fast of *quatre-temps.* It is observed at the same dates, nearly, as in the English Church. It was first distinctly fixed in the Church year by Gregory VII. — Thomassin, *Traite des Jeunes,* part 1, chapter 21; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 21, chapter 2; Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary,* s.v.; Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* 1:305; Procter, *On Common Prayer,* page 261.

Emblem

"a device or figure employed to represent some moral notion. There are various opinions as to the lawfulness and expediency of emblems in religious matters, some considering it to be both allowable and useful thus to represent spiritual ideas to the bodily eye; others, again, holding it to be both presumptuous and dangerous, if not superstitious, to use any emblems of sacred things not warranted and enjoined by Scripture. This, at least, is certain, that it is quite as likely to lead to idolatry (answering to that of the

Hindoos, Egyptians, etc.) as pictures or images giving a simple resemblance. The golden calf was meant for an emblem, but it was the occasion of gross idolatry."

Emblems are to be distinguished from symbols. Symbols are generally intended to represent revealed doctrines; emblems are "arbitrary representations of an idea of human invention" (Walcott). Thus a sword is the emblem of St. Paul. A lion, as indicating solitude, was chosen as the emblem of Jerome as a recluse. *SEE IDOLATRY*;*SEE IMAGE*.

Embroider

Picture for Embroider

(µqir; *rakam'*, to *variegate*, 2Exodus 35:35; 38:23; elsewhere “needle-work," etc.; /bv; *shabats'*, to *interweave*, 2Exodus 28:39; "set," 2Exodus 38:20). *SEE BROIDERED*. If these passages are correctly rendered, the Israelites must have known the art of embroidery. In several passages, also, an equivalent expression is used — *needle-work* — and used so as to imply that not plain sewing, but ornamental work, was evidently meant (2Exodus 26:36; 7Judges 5:30; 19Psalm 45:14, etc.). The Hebrew women were undoubtedly indebted to their residence in Egypt for that perfectness of finish in embroidery which was displayed in the service of the tabernacle, and in the preparation of the sacerdotal robes directed to be worn by the high-priest (2Exodus 28:29). The colored figures in the cloth of the Hebrews are thought by most authors to have been partly the product of the weaver in colors, whose art appears the superior, and partly that of the embroiderer in colors. The notices of Egyptian history, confirmed by the monumental remains, give reason for believing that at a comparatively early period they had made wonderful attainments in this line. For example, a corslet is mentioned by Herodotus as having been presented by Amasis, king of Egypt, to the Lacedaemonians, which was of linen, each thread composed of 360 finer threads, and ornamented with numerous figures of animals, worked in gold and cotton (Herod. 3:47). This was many centuries indeed after the Exodus; but its testimony reaches back to a much earlier time, as such a beautiful and elaborate piece of workmanship could not have been produced without ages of study and application to the art. Wilkinson says, "Many of the Egyptian stuffs presented various patterns worked in colors by the loom, independent of those produced by the dyeing or printing

process; and so richly composed that they vied with cloths embroidered by the needle. The art of embroidery," he adds, "was commonly practiced in Egypt" (3:128) referring in proof, however, simply to passages in Scripture, and taking them in the sense put upon them in the authorized version, sanctioned by Gesenius and the rabbins. The Egyptian sails, says the same author, were some of them embroidered with fanciful devices, representing the phoenix, flowers, and other emblems. This, however, was confined to the pleasure-boats of the nobles and king. That this was done even in the early ages is evident from the paintings at Thebes, which show sails ornamented with various colors, of the time of Rameses III. The devices are various; the most common is the phoenix (<26707>Ezekiel 27:7). The Egyptian ladies of rank wore splendid dresses of needle-work (<19513>Psalm 45:13, 14). (See Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians,* abridgm. 2:81; Gesenius, *Hebrews Thesaur.*, s.v., ut sup.)

The art of embroidery became hereditary in certain families of the Israelites, but finally fell into desuetude (<130421>1 Chronicles 4:21).

Picture for Embroider 2

In later times, the Babylonians were the most noted of all the Asiatic nations for the weaving of cloth of different colors, with gold threads introduced into the woof. These Assyrian dresses are mentioned as an article of commerce by <26724>Ezekiel 27:24, and occur even as early as the time of <060721>Joshua 7:21. They formed, perhaps, the “dyed attire and broidered work" so often mentioned in Scripture as the garments of princes and the costly gifts of kings. The ornaments upon them may either have been dyed, worked in the loom, or embroidered with the needle (<070530>Judges 5:30) (See Layard's *Nineveh,* 1st series, 2:313.) *SEE WOMAN*; *SEE WEAVING*. (See further in Adam's *Roman Antiquities,* page 372; Miss Lambert's *Hand-book of Needlework,* London and New York, 1846.) *SEE NEEDLEWORK.*

Picture for Embroider 3

Embury, PHILIP

the first Methodist minister in America, was born in Ballygaran, Ireland, September 21, 1728 or 1729. His parents were Germans of the Palatinate, and he was educated at a school near Ballygaran. In 1752 he was converted, and in 1758 he was entered upon the roll of the Irish

Conference as a preacher. In 1760 he emigrated to America, but it is not known whether he preached or not during the first few years of his life in New York. In 1766, stimulated by the advice of Barbara Heck, a pious Methodist, he organized a class, and commenced preaching, first in his own house, then in a hired room, and soon after (1767) in the "Rigging Loft," famous as the birth-place of Methodism in New York. A chapel became necessary, and in 1768 the pioneer Methodist church was erected on the site of the present Johnstreet Church. New York at this time had a population of twenty thousand. Embury continued to serve the Church in this chapel gratuitously until the arrival of the first missionaries sent out by John Wesley in 1769, when he surrendered the charge, and, with a party of fellow-Methodists, emigrated to Washington County. He there continued his labors as a "local preacher, and formed a society, chiefly of his own countrymen, at Ashgrove, the first Methodist organization within the bounds of the present Troy Conference, now numbering twenty-five thousand communicants, and more than two hundred traveling preachers. Embury died suddenly in August 1775, in consequence of an accident in mowing. He was buried on a neighbor's farm, but in 1832 his remains were taken up and deposited in Ashgrove church-yard, with funeral ceremonies, and an address by John N. Maffitt. In 1866, the centenary year of American Methodism, his remains were transferred, by order of the Troy Conference, to the Woodland Cemetery, Cambridge, Washington County, N.Y., with impressive services, conducted by bishop Janes and the Reverend S.D. Brown. See a good sketch of his life by Saxe, *Ladies' Repository,* May, 1859; also Bangs, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church,* volume 1; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism,* volume 2; Wakeley, *Heroes of Methodism;* Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church,* volume 1; Wakeley, *Lost Chapters.*

Emek

SEE BETH-EMEK;*SEE KEZIZ.*

Emerald

(Ëρῃ, *nophek,* of uncertain signif.; Sept. ἄνθραξ, N.T. and Apocr. σμάραγδος), a precious stone, named first in the second row on the breast-plate of the high-priest (28:18Exodus 28:18; 39:11), imported to Tyre from Syria (27:16Ezekiel 27:16), used as a seal or signet (Ecclus. 32:6), as an ornament of clothing and bedding (28:13Ezekiel 28:13; 10:21Judges 10:21),

and spoken of as one of the foundations of Jerusalem (Revelation 21:19; Tob. 13:16). The rainbow round the throne is compared to emerald in Revelation 4:9 (ὅμοιος ὁράσει σμαραγδίνῳ). The Sept., Josephus, and Jerus. Targum understand by it the *carbuncle.* This name (in Greek denoting a *live coal)* the ancients gave to several glowing red stones resembling live coals (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 32:20; comp. Theophrast. *De Lapid.* 18), particularly rubies and garnets. *SEE CARBUNCLE*. The most valued of the carbuncles seems, however, to have been the Oriental garnet, a transparent red stone, with a violet shade, and strong vitreous luster. It was engraved upon (Theophrast. 31), and was probably not so hard as the ruby, which, indeed, is the most beautiful and costly of the precious stones of a red color, but is so hard that it cannot easily be subjected to the graving-tool. The Hebrew *nophek,* in the breast-plate of the high-priest, was certainly an engraved stone; and there is no evidence that the ancients could engrave the ruby, although this has in modern times been accomplished (Rosenmuller, *Biblical Mineralogy,* pages 32, 33; Braunius, *De Vest. Sacerdot.* page 523; Bellermann, *Ueber die Urim u. Thummim,* page 43). *SEE BERYL.*

The *smaragdus* of the New Testament was the generic name of twelve varieties of gems, some of which were probably true emeralds, while others seem to have been rather stones of the prasius or jasper kind, and still others no more than colored crystals and spars from copper mines. The statues, etc., of emerald mentioned by several ancient authors appear to have been noth*ing* more than rock crystals, or even colored glass (Hill on *Theophrast. de Lapid.* 44; Moore's *Anc. Mineral.* page 150). *SEE GEM.*

The modern emerald is a species of *beryl,* of a beautiful green color, which occurs in primitive crystals, and is much valued for ornamental jewelry. The finest are obtained from Peru. The mines from which the ancients obtained emeralds are said to have existed in Egypt, near Mount Zabarah. (See the *Penny Cyclopadia,* s.v. Beryl.)

Em'erods

SEE HEIEMORRHOIDS.

Emerson, John S

a Congregational minister and missionary, was born at Chester, N.H., in 1802; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1826, and studied theology at

Andover. He had studied with special reference to the missionary work, and went, under the auspices of the American Board, to the Sandwich Islands, and was appointed to Waialua, Oahu, where he spent nearly the whole of his missionary life, laboring with zeal and success. For four years he was professor in the Lahainaluna seminary, and while there he prepared (with other writers) an *English-Hawaiian Dictionary.* He died at Waialua March 28, 1867. — *American Annual Cyclopcedia,* 7:559.

Emerson, Ralph, D.D

a Congregational divine and scholar, was born at Hollis, N.H., August 18, 1787, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1811 with the highest honors of his class. After studying theology at Andover until 1814, he was tutor at Yale for a short time, and in 1816 became pastor at Norfolk, Conn. In 1827 he was chosen professor of Church history and pastoral theology at Andover, which office he held until 1854. He lived for five years at Newburyport, and then removed to Rockford, Illinois, where some of his children resided, and where he died, May 26, 1863. As a teacher, he maintained a high character during his long service at Andover. —*Congregational Quarterly,* July 1863.

Emery, Jacques Andri

an eminent French Roman Catholic divine, was born at Gex, August 27, 1732, and studied in the Jesuits' College at Macon, and also at St. Sulpice, Paris. He was ordained in 1756; became professor of theology at Orleans 1759; and afterwards he held the chair of philosophy at Lyons; in 1776, superior of the seminary at Angers; 1784, head of the abbey of Boisgroland, and also head of the congregation of St. Sulpice. In 1789 he founded a seminary of his congregation at Baltimore, Maryland.

During the French Revolution he was imprisoned both at St. Pelagie and at the Conciergerie. In 1802 he resumed his place among the clergy of Paris, and devoted himself to the restoration of the scattered and broken congregation of St. Sulpice. He died April 18, 1811. Among his numerous writings are *L'Esprit de Leibnitz* (Lyons, 1772, 2 volumes, 12mo; Paris, 1804, 2 volumes, 8vo): — *Esprit de St. Therese* (3d edit. Avignon, 1825, 2 volumes, 12mo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale,* 15:943; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 12:315.

E'mim

(Hebrews *Eynim',* µymyae *terrors;* Sept. Ὀμμαῖοι and Ὀμμείν; Auth. Vers. "Emims"), a numerous and warlike tribe of the ancient Canaanites, of gigantic stature, defeated by Chedorlaomer and his allies in the plain of Kiriathaim; they occupied, in the time of Abraham, the country east of the Jordan, afterwards possessed by the Moabites (<01145>Genesis 14:5; <05210>Deuteronomy 2:10, 11). *SEE CANAAN.* An ingenious writer in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* (April, 1852, page 55 sq.; January 1853, page 296) argues, but upon rather slender grounds, that their original title was *Shittim,* and identifies them with the *Chetta* so often referred to in the Egyptian inscriptions. It would appear, from a comparison of <01145>Genesis 14:5-7 with <05210>Deuteronomy 2:10-12, 20-23, that the whole country east of Jordan was, in primitive times, held by a race of giants, all probably of the same stock, comprehending the Rephaim on the north, next the Zuzim, after them the Emim, and then the Horim on the south; and that afterwards the kingdom of Bashan embraced the territories of the first; the country of the Ammonites, the second; that of the Moabites, the third; while Edom took in the mountains of the Horim. The whole of them. were attacked and pillaged by the Eastern kings who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. *SEE REPHAIM.* The Emim were related to the Anakim, and were generally called by the same name; but their conquerors, the Moabites, termed them Emimthat is, "Terrible men" (<05211>Deuteronomy 2:11) — most probably on account of their fierce aspect. *SEE ANAKIM*.

Eminence

a title of the Romish cardinals, first given to them by Urban VIII, to endow them with a rank equal to that of the spiritual princes of Europe, and of the grand masters of the knights of St. John and of Malta. *SEE CARDINALS.*

Emlyn, Thomas

an English Nonconformist theologian, was born May 27, 1663, at Stamford, in Lincolnshire; made chaplain 1683 by the countess of Donegal. In 1691 he became assistant to Mr. Boyce in the congregation of Nonconformists in Wood Street, Dublin. Having imbibed and preached Arian doctrines, he was deprived of his functions, and fined and imprisoned for two years. Restored to liberty, he continued to preach and to write in favor of Arianism until his death, July 30, 1743. His *Works* were collected

and published in London, 1746 (3 volumes, 8vo). Waterland notices Emlyn's writings frequently (see the Index to his works, 6 volumes, 8vo). See also Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Edinb. transl.), div. 2, volume 3, 357.

Emman'uel (Ἐμμανουήλ), a Graecized form (Matthew 1:23) of the name IMMANUEL *SEE IMMANUEL* (q.v.).

Em'maiis

(Ἐμμαούς, prob. from μymj;x; *hot baths,* see Genesis 36:24), the name of three places in Palestine.

1. A village (κώμη) 60 stadia (A.V. "furlongs") or 7 miles from Jerusalem, noted for our Lord's interview with two disciples on the day of his resurrection (Luke 24:13). The same place is mentioned by Josephus *(War,* 7:6, 6), and placed at the same distance from Jerusalem, in stating that Vespasian left 800 soldiers in Judaea, to whom he gave the village of *Ammaiis* (Ἀμμαοῦς). The direction, however, is not given in either passage. Eusebius and Jerome *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἐμμαοῦς, Emmaus) hold that it is identical with *Nicopolis* [see Number 2, below]; and they were followed by all geographers down to the commencement of the 14th century (Reland, *Palaest.* page 758). Then, for some reason, it began to be supposed that the site of Emmaus was at the little village of *Kubeibeh,* about 3 miles W. of Neby Samwil, the eminence N.W. of Jerusalem (Maundeville, in *Early Travels in Palestine,* page 175; Ludolph. de Suchem, *Itiner.;* Quaresmius, 2:719; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3:66, note). Mr. Williams regards *Kuriet el-Enab* as the true location *(Journal of Philology,* 4:26), and Thomson inclines to the same position *(Land and Book,* 2:308); but this view has little to recommend it, and the locality is otherwise appropriated. *SEE KIRJATH-JEARIM*. Schwarz thinks it different from Nicopolis, and that it is mentioned in the Talmud as *Barur Chayil* (lyjæi rWrB;, i.e., *chosen of the army)* or *Gibbor Chayil* (lyjir/BG;, i.e., *heroes of the army,* as being occupied by Roman veterans), a name that he finds in "some ruins which the Arabs call *Barburaia,* S. of Saris, 7½ Eng. miles from Jerusalem" *(Palest.* pages 117, 118); but no such name appears on Van de Velde's *Map* (which lays down Saris at 7 miles N. of W. from Jerusalem). In this uncertainty, the monkish identification with el-KubeiLeh ("the little dome") may for the present be acquiesced in. This corresponds sufficiently in distance from Jerusalem (Raumer, *Paldat.* page 169), being 7500 paces (Cotovicus, page 315), or 21 hours to the N.W. (Van de

Velde, *Memoir,* page 309); and containing the ruins of a convent and church (Tobler, *Topooroph. von. Jerus.* 2:540), although Dr. Robinson describes it *(Bib. Res.* 2:394) as “a village built up by the government of Gaza on a stony, barren hill, without anything to mark it particularly as an ancient site." On the evangelical incident at this place there are treatises in Latin by Harenberg (in his *Otia Gandersh.* page 41-60); Walch (Jen. 1754). Zschokke *(Das neutest. Emmaus beleuchtet,* Schaffh. 1865) argues at length in favor of the modern traditionary site; and the chief building on the spot, known as the "castrum Arnoldi," has lately been bought by some zealous Catholics as a "holy place" *(Bibliotheca Sacra.* July, 1866, page 517).

2. EMMAUS (Ἐμμαούς, 1 Macc. 3:40, etc; Ἀμμαούς, Josephus, *War,* 2:20, 4) or NICOPOLIS, a town in the plain of Philistia, at the foot of the mountains of Judah (Jerome, in Daniel 8), 22 Roman miles from Jerusalem, and 10 from Lydda *(Itin. Hieros.* ed. Hessel, page 600; Reland, *Palest.* page 309). The name does not occur in the O.T.; but the town rose to importance during the later history of the Jews, and was a place of note in the wars of the Asmonaeans. It was fortified by Bacchides, the general of Antiochus Epiphanes, when he was engaged in the war with Jonathan Maccabaeus (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:1, 3; 1 Macc. 9:50). It was in the plain beside this city that Judas Maccabaeus so signally defeated the Syrians with a mere handful of men, as related in 1 Macc. 3:57; 4:3; 9:50. Under the Romans, Emmaus became the capital of a toparchy (Josephus, *War,* 3:3, 5; Pliny, 5:14). It was burned by the Roman general Varus about A.D. 4. In the 3d century (about A.D. 220) it was rebuilt through the exertions of Julius Africanus, the well-known Christian writer, and then received the name *Nicopolis.* Eusebius and Jerome frequently refer to it in defining the positions of neighboring towns and villages *(Chron. Pas.* ad A.C. 223; Reland, page 759). Early writers mention a fountain at Emmaus, famous far and wide for its healing virtues (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 5:21); the cause of this Theophanes ascribes to the fact that our Lord on one occasion washed his feet in it *(Chron.* page 41). The Crusaders still called it Nicopolis, but confounded it with a small fortress farther south, on the Jerusalem road, now called Latron (Will. Tyr. *Hist.* 7:24). A small, miserable village called *'Amwas* still occupies the site of the ancient city. It stands on the western declivity of a low, rocky hill commanding the plain, and contains the ruins of an old church a little south of the village, also two copious fountains, one of which is doubtless the ancient medicinal spring

(Robinson, *Researches, 2:*363; *Later Res.* page 146, 147; Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:290).

Dr. Robinson has recently revived the old theory that the Emmaus of Luke is identical with Nicopolis, and has supported it with his wonted learning, but not with his wonted conclusiveness *(Bib. Res.* 3:65, 66; *Later Res.* page 148). He endeavors to cast doubts on the accuracy of the reading ἑξήκοντα in Luke 24:13, because several uncial MSS. and a few unimportant cursive MSS. insert ἑκατόν, thus making the distance 160 stadia, which would nearly correspond to the distance of Nicopolis. But the best MSS. have not this word, and the best critics regard it as an interpolation. There is a strong probability that some copyist who was acquainted with the city, but not the village of Emmaus, tried thus to reconcile Scripture with his ideas of geography. The opinions of Eusebius, Jerome, and their followers, on a point such as this, are not of very great authority. When the *name* of any noted place agreed with one in the Bible they were not always careful to see whether the *position* corresponded in like manner. Emmaus-Nicopolis being a noted city in their day, they were led somewhat rashly to confound it with the Emmaus of the Gospel. The circumstances of the narrative are plainly opposed to the identity. The two disciples, having journeyed from Jerusalem, to Emmaus in part of a day (Luke 24:28, 29), left the latter again after the evening meal, and reached Jerusalem before it was very late (verses 33, 42, 43). Now, if we take into account the distance, and the nature of the road, leading up a steep and difficult mountain, we must admit that such a journey could not be accomplished in less than from six to seven hours, so that they could not have arrived in Jerusalem till long past midnight. This fact seems conclusive against the identity of Nicopolis and the Emmaus of Luke (Reland, *Palest.* page 427 sq.; Van de Velde, *Memoir,* page 309).

3. The name Emmaus, or Ammaus (Ἀμμαούς), was also borne by a village of Galilee close to Tiberias; probably the ancient HAMMATH *SEE HAMMATH* (q.v.), i.e., hot springs of which name Emmaus was but a corruption. The hot springs still remained in the time of Josephus, and are mentioned by him as giving name to the place *(War,* 4:1, 3; *Ant.* 18:2, 3).

Em'mer

(Ἐμμήρ), given (1 Esdr. 9:21) as the name of one of the priests whose "sons" had married foreign wives after the exile, in place of the IMMER *SEE IMMER* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (15100Ezra 10:20).

Emmeran or Emmeram

a bishop of Poitiers in the 7th century. He left his see for the purpose of missionary labors in Hungary, but is said to have stopped in Bavaria three years, at the request of duke Theodo, to purify the Christianity of that duchy, where it was sadly mixed with paganism. After this he continued his journey to Rome, and was waylaid and murdered by a son of the duke (September 22, 652), because the daughter of the latter, Uta, claimed to have been dishonored by Emmeran. After his death, a clergyman, Wulflaich by name, maintained the innocence of Emmeran, saying that the latter, shortly before his death, had told him that, in order to help Uta, he had allowed her to name him as seducer, though the real culprit was Sieghart, the son of a judge. This statement of Wulflaich is said to have induced Theodo to bury him with great honors, and to exile his son to Hungary. Emmeran was soon venerated as a saint, and became one of the patron saints of the city and diocese of Ratisbon. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome on the 22d of September. On pictures he is represented as a bishop with a ladder. The accounts of Emmeran are very confused and conflicting; the best one is given by Canisius, *Lectiones Antique,* 3:1. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:39; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 3:779; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:558.

Emmons, Nathanael, D.D

one of the founders of a new school in Calvinistic theology, was born April 20 (O.S.), 1745, at East Haddam, Connecticut, a town which was also the birthplace of the missionary brothers David and John Brainerd, of President Edward Dorr Griffin and his brother George D. Griffin, Esq., of the jurist Jeremiah Gates Brainard and the poet James Brainard Taylor. He was the sixth son, and the twelfth and youngest child of his parents. He entered Yale College in 1763, and was graduated with honor in 1767. Among his classmates were Governor John Treadwell, the poet John Trumbull, Professor Samuel Wales, and Dr. Joseph Lyman, who, as long as they lived, exhibited a high degree of reverence for Dr. Emmons. He studied theology first with Reverend Nathan Strong, of Coventry, Connecticut, and

afterwards with Reverend Dr. John Smalley, of Berlin, Connecticut, a divine who had been a pupil of Dr. Joseph Bellamy, and who exerted more influence than perhaps any other man in shaping the theological opinions of young Emmons. — In 1769 Emmons was approbated as a preacher, and on the 20th of April, 1773, was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Franklin, Mass. He remained sole pastor of this church fifty-four years, and an active member of it sixty-seven years and five months. Among the members of the council which ordained him were his two special friends, Rev. Dr. Hopkins, of Newport, Rhode Island, and Reverend Dr. Hart, of Preston, Connecticut, a son-in-law of Dr. Bellamy. During his active pastorate at Franklin he was favored with three revivals of religion, one in 1784, one in 1794, and one in 1808-9. In the first of these revivals about seventy persons, in the second about thirty, and in the third about forty were thought to have consecrated themselves to Christ. One of his aphorisms was, "The seed which a faithful laborer sows is apt to come up when he retires from the field;" and as soon as Dr. Emmons was relieved of his sole pastorate at Franklin, he was gladdened by a fourth revival, in which thirty-six persons were added to his church, and after nine or ten years he rejoiced in a fifth ingathering of the fruits which he had planted. He lived to see nearly four hundred of his parishioners profess their faith in Christ. One of them, Reverend Dr. Blake, has recorded: "Hardly a case of defection from the truth has ever occurred among those who were turned unto God under Dr. Emmons's ministry." His examinations of candidates for church membership were very rigid. — A large part of his influence on the churches has been exerted through his theological pupils. Between eighty-six and a hundred young men were guided by him in their studies preparatory to the Christian ministry. Of these pupils several became useful as professors in our colleges and theological seminaries; many, as sound and strong preachers. Forty-six of them are noticed in the biographical dictionaries of eminent men. His impress upon them was decided and permanent. They were often called Emmonites. — Although he was an adept in metaphysical abstractions; yet he aimed to be a practical man, not only in his influence on his pupils, but also in the general affairs of the Church and the. State. He was the first president, and *a* father, if not *the* father of the Massachusetts Missionary Society; which was the parent of many philanthropic institutions. He was also one of the original editors of the *Massachusetts Missionary Magazine,* which was the germ of the present *Missionary herald.* He was among the foremost in starting various trains of influence which have now become

parts of our history. When the masonic fraternity was most popular, he was a zealous and mason. When anti-slavery was most generally denounced, he was an active abolitionist. It was often his lot to be an advocate of the weaker party. He was a decided Federalist in politics, and produced a great excitement by some of his political writings. He seldom visited his parishioners, still he was remarkable for his knowledge of their secular as well as religious affairs. He was a man of authority in his parish, faithful, often stern, yet beloved. — It is as an author, however, that he has exerted his greatest influence on the churches. He published during his life more than seven thousand copies of nearly two hundred sermons, besides four elaborate dissertations and more than a hundred essays for the magazines of his day. He must have preached nearly or quite six thousand times, and at his death a part only of his discourses were collected and published in six octavo volumes; to these a seventh volume was afterwards added. At a still subsequent period a new and enlarged edition of his sermons was published in six volumes. The first edition of his works was introduced with a memoir by his son-in-law, Reverend Jacob Ide, D.D., of Medway, Massachusetts; the second edition with a memoir by E.A. Park, of Andover, Massachusetts. — He began to study in 1762; he ceased to preach in 1827: during these sixty-five years he was an earnest, patient, and singularly methodical applicant to books. During ten of the years which followed his resignation of his active pastorate he continued to be an assiduous *reader*, although he relaxed his habits of intense energetic *study*. It may be safely affirmed, then, that he devoted seventy-five years to the perusal of books, the meditation on their contents, and the writing on themes suggested by them. He was accustomed to spend ten, twelve, or fourteen hours daily in his room with his book or pen in hand. He had a place for everything, and kept everything in its place. He was temperate in his diet, regular in all his habits, and, although he took no physical exercise, he enjoyed uninterrupted health during his long and laborious life. He was distinguished for his punctuality, precision, definiteness, and sharpness of mind, keen analysis, self-consistency, wit, frankness, honesty, profound reverence for the truth. He was tenacious of old usages, and went so far as to continue to wear the antique dress, even the three-cornered hat, as long as he appeared in public. He was an original thinker, and formed his theological system with rare independence of mind. He coincided in opinion with Dr. Samuel Hopkins, of Newport, more nearly than with any preceding divine. A sketch of his theological system will be given in the subsequent notice of Dr. Hopkins. It may be here remarked, however, that

he considered himself not a *high*, nor a *low*, but a *consistent* Calvinist; and, so far as his speculations were novel, they were mainly designed to make the Genevan scheme consistent with itself. On one Sabbath, for instance, he would use so bold language in advocating the doctrine of decrees as might induce some to call him a Fatalist; and on a following Sabbath he would use so bold language in advocating the doctrine of free-will as might induce some to call him a Pelagian; and on a third Sabbath he would employ his ingenuity in reconciling his statements on the agency of God with his statements on the free agency of man. This ingenuity in harmonizing such views as are often pronounced irreconcilable, was a main source of the interest excited in him. — Dr. Emmons died on the 23d of September, 1840 at the age of ninety-five years and five months. He retained his faculties to a surprising degree until his death, and few men have ever left the world with a more unfaltering and solid faith in Christ. — In 1775 he was married to his first wife, who, with her two children, died in 1778. In 1779 he was married to his second wife, by whom he had five children, two of whom survived him. She was the step-daughter of Reverend Dr. Samuel Hopkins, of Hadley, Mass., and thus he became the brother-in-law of Reverend Dr. Spring, of Newburyport, Mass., Reverend Dr. Austin, president of Burlington College, Reverend Leonard Worcester, and Reverend Mr. Riddel, four strong Hopkinsian divines. In 1831, when he was eighty-six years of age, he was married to his third wife, the widow of his former friend, Reverend Mr. Mills, of Sutton, Mass. (E.A.P.)

Em'mor

(Ἐμμόρ v.r. Ἐμμώρ), a Graecized form (<44716>Acts 7:16) of the name of HAMOR *SEE HAMOR* (q.v.), the father of Shechem (<10342>Genesis 34:2).

Emperor

(Lat. *imperator, general),* a title common (in its Latin form) to all governors who had paramount jurisdiction within a given province (Smith, *Diet. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Imperium), but technically assumed as a praenomen first by Julius Caesar (Sueton. *Jul.* 76), as affecting supreme power, and historically attributed to his successors, the heads of the so-styled ROMAN EMPIRE *SEE ROMAN EMPIRE* (q.v.). They were also designated as CAESAR *SEE CAESAR* (q.v.). We are here chiefly concerned with them as they came in contact with the Christian religion in the character of persecutors or patrons. *SEE PERSECUTION*. (See

Baldwin, *Edicta vett. principum Roman. de Christianis,* Hal. 1727 [also in Heineccii *Jurispr. Romans* 1:1374 sq.]; Crause, *De Romanorum imperatoribus haereticis,* viz. 1674; Hebenstreit, *De primis Christianis imperatoribus,* Jen. 1702; Heineccius, *De ministris Caesarun Christianis,* Hal. 1712; also Hirt, *De imperatorun ante Constant. erga Christianos favore,* Jen. 1758; Koepke, *De statu Christianorum sub impp.* Berol. 1828).

The following is a complete list of the Roman emperors, with their respective dates of accession. See each name of ecclesiastical interest in its alphabetical place.

B.C.

31. Augustus.
A.D).

14. Tiberius.

37. Caligula.

41. Claudius I.

54. Nero.

68. Galba.

69. Otho.

69. Vitellius.

69. Vespasian.

76. Titus.

81. Domitian.

96. Nerva.

98. Trajan.

117. Hadrian.

138. Antoninus.
(**161. 161.** M. Aurelius.

161. Lucius Verus.

A. D.

363. Jovian.

Western Empire.

364. Valentinian I.

367. Gratian.

375. Valentinian II.

392. Theodosius 1.

395. Honorius.

423. Theodosius II.

425. Valentinian
III.

455. Petronius.

455. Avitus.

457. Majorian.

461. Libius.

467. Anthemius.

472. Olybrius.

473. Glycerius.

A.D.

842. Michael III
867. Basil 1.

886 Leo VI.

911. Constantine
VII.

911. Alexander.

919. Romanus I.

944. Constantine
VIII.

944. Stephanus.

959. Romanus II.

963. Nicephorus
II

969. John I.

969. Basil II.

976. Constantine
IX.

1028. Romanus IV

180. Commodus.
193. Pertinax.

193. Julian.
191. Niger.

193. Severus.

211. Caracalla.

211. Geta.

217. Macrinus.
218. Elagabalus.

222. Alexander.

235. Maximin I.

237. Gordian.
237. Maximus.
237. Balbinus.

238. Gordianian.

244. Philip.

249. Decius.

251. Gallun.

252. Volusian.

253. AEmilian.

253. Valerian.

260. Gallienus.

268. Claudius II.

270. Quintillus.

270. Aurelian.

275. Tacitus.

474. Julius.
475. Romulus.

Eastern Empire.

364. Valens.

378 Theodosius.

395. Arcadius.

408. Theodosius II.
450. Marcian.

457. Leo I.

474. Leo II.

474. Zeno.
491. Anastasia.
518 Justin I.

527. Justinian I.

565. Justin II.

578. Tiberius II.

582. Mauricius.

602. Phocas.

610. Heraclius I.

641. Constantine or Heraclius II.

641. Heracleonas.

641. Constans II.

668. Constantine IV.

1034. Michael IV.
1041. Michael V.

1042. Zoe and Theodora.

1042. Constantine X.

1054. Theodora.

1056. Michael VI.
1057. Isaac I.

1053. Constantine XI.

1067. Romanus IV.
1071. Michael VII.
1078. Nicephorus III.

1081. Alexis I.

1118. John II.

1143. Manuel I.

1181. Alexis II.

1183. Andronicus I.

1185. Isaac II.

1195. Alexis III.

1203. Alexis IV.

1204. Alexis V.

Latin Emperor of

276. Florianus.

277. Probus.

282. Carus.

282. Carinus.

283. Numerianus.

284. Diocletian.

286. Maximian.

292. Constantius.

292. Galerius.

{**305.** Valerius.

{**305.** Maximin II.

{**306.** Constantine.

307. Licinius.

(**337.** Constantine, jun IV.

337. Constantius.

(**337.** Constans.

361. Julian, apos.

A.D.

1283. Andronicus II.

1294. Michael IX.

685. Justinian II.

695. Leontius.

698. Absimarus.

704. Justinian III.

711. Philippicus.

713. Anastasius II.

716. Theodosius III.

717. Leo III.

741. Constantine V

[Artavasdes].

775. Leo IV.

780. Constantine VI.

797. Irene.

802. Nicephorus.

811. Stauracius.

811. Michael I.

813. Leo V.

820. Michael II.

829. Theophilus.

A.D

1332. Andronicus III.

{**1341.** John V.

{**1347.** John VI.

Constantinople.

1204. Baldwin I.

1206. Henry.

1217. Peter.

1221. Robert.

1228. Baldwin II.

Greek Emperors of Niccea.

1206. Theodorus I.

1222. John III.

1255. Theodorus II

1259. John

1260. Michael VIII.

Greek Emperors of Constantinople.

1261. Michael VIII.

A.D.

1384. Manuel II.

1425. John VII.

1445. Constantine XIII.

Emory, John, D.D

a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Queen Anne County, Maryland, April 11, 1789. After completing his academical education at Washington College, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar at nineteen years of age. His great ability was soon manifest; he came rapidly into practice, and had every prospect of early success. But he had passed through a decided religious experience before his admission to the bar, and soon after decided, in opposition to the will of his father, to enter the ministry. In 1810 he was received on trial in the Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He soon established a reputation for pre-eminence in all the qualities of a true Christian minister. From 1813 to 1824 he filled the most important pastoral stations in the Methodist Connection in America, his appointments being as follows: 1811, Cambridge Circuit; 1812, Talbot Circuit; 1813-14, Philadelphia; 1815, Wilmington; 1816-17, Union Church, Philadelphia; 1818-19, Washington; 182021, Annapolis; 1822, Hagerstown; 1823, Baltimore. In 1816 he was elected to the General Conference, and he was a member of every subsequent General Conference until his death, except that of 1824. In 1820 he was sent as a delegate from the American to the British Conference, and discharged the delicate duties of his mission to the entire satisfaction of the churches. From 1824 to 1832 he was book-agent and editor for the Methodist Episcopal Church at New York. In this post his rare combination of intellectual power and culture with business habits was pre-eminently displayed. To none of the eminent men who have held this office is the Methodist Book Concern more indebted for its present greatness than to Dr. Emory. In the language of Bishop Waugh, "The two great objects which Dr. Emory aimed to accomplish were, first, the extinguishment of the debts due from the concern, and, second, the actual sale of the stock on hand, and especially that pait of it which was daily depreciating, because of the injuries which were constantly being sustained by it, in the scattered and exposed state in which most of it was found. The ability, skill, diligence, and perseverance which he displayed in the measures devised by him for the accomplishment of these objects have seldom been equaled, and perhaps never surpassed by the most practiced business man. His success was complete. Before the meeting of the General Conference he had canceled all the obligations of the institution which had been so opportunely intrusted to his supervision. He had greatly enlarged the annual dividends to an increased number of conferences. He

had purchased several lots of ground for a more enlarged and eligible location of the establishment, and had erected a large four story brick building as a part of the improvements intended to be put on them, for the whole of which he had paid. It was his high honor, and also his enviable satisfaction, to report to the General Conference, for the first time, that its Book Concern was no longer in debt." He originated the "Publishing Fund" and "The Methodist Quarterly Review," and abolished entirely the sale of books on commission. In 1832 he was elected a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and entered upon his duties at once, not only by attending the annual Conferences, but also by general attention to the interests of the Church. He was especially active with regard to education, and had a large share in the organization of Dickinson College. In addition to this, he drew up the outline of a plan for an education society in the Methodist Episcopal Church, which he designed to aid ministers and others in educating their sons. Soon after his election to the episcopacy Dr. Emory devised a course of study for candidates for deacons' and elders' orders, in which, with his usual discretion, he did not hazard everything by attempting too much. The Troy Conference of 1835 was the last which he attended. On the 16th of December in that year he was thrown from his carriage, about two miles from his own house (Reisterstown, Maryland.), at seven o'clock A.M., and at half past seven in the evening he died.

Bishop Emory was a man of great talent and large cultivation. As a scholar, he was accurate and profound; as a preacher, he was clear and convincing: as an administrative officer, he hardly had a superior in any church. As a controversial writer, he was distinguished for logical directness and for fairness to his adversaries. In 1817 he published two pamphlets in reply to bishop White's *Objections against Personal Assurance by the Holy Spirit;* and in 1818, another, entitled *The Divinity of Christ vindicated against the Cavils of Mr. John Wright.* The period from 1818 to 1830 was one of great excitement in the Methodist Episcopal Church on various points of Church polity, and in all the controversy Dr. Emory bore a distinguished part. A large party wished to have the office of presiding elder made elective; he fell into the ranks of that party, and, at the General Conference of 1820, he opposed vigorously a theory which gave the bishops a right to veto the acts of the General Conference. In the later conferences as to lay representation he was the principal writer, publishing, in 1824, *The Defence of our Fathers,* in reply to A. M'Caine, a very vigorous and powerfully written work. After his death there appeared from

his pen *The Episcopal Controversy Reviewed* (New York, 1838, 8vo), edited by his son, Robert Emory, from an unpublished manuscript; it is a luminous sketch, in reply to bishop Onderdonk's *Episcopacy tested by Scripture*. Most of the original articles in the first two volumes of the *Methodist Quarterly Review* were written by him. — *Life of Bishop Emory*, by his eldest son (N.Y. 1840, 8vo); M'Clintock, in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1842, page 62 sq.; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:486; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, volume 4.

Emory, Robert, D.D

son of the preceding, an eminent Methodist minister and scholar, was born in Philadelphia, July 29, 1814. His early education was superintended by his father. In 1827 he entered Columbia College, New York, where he graduated in 1831 with the highest honors and medals of his class. He then entered upon the study of law, first in the law school of Yale College, and afterwards in the office of the Hon. Reverdy Johnson, of Baltimore. In 1834 he was elected professor of ancient languages at Dickinson College, Carlisle, and entered upon his duties there with great zeal. In 1839 he was admitted on trial in the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; in 1841 he was appointed to the Baltimore city station; and in 1842 he was appointed acting president of Dickinson College, during the absence of the president (Dr. Durbin). In 1844 he was appointed presiding elder of the Carlisle District; and in 1845 he was made president of Dickinson College. In the same year the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Columbia College. In 1847 he attended the session of the Evangelical Alliance held at London, and few of the delegates made a greater impression upon the body. His health showed signs of failure during this year, and he spent the winter following in the West Indies. But he continued to decline, and on his return homeward he died in Baltimore, May 18, 1848 Dr. Emory was one of those rare men in whom the human faculties, both moral and intellectual, seem to approach perfection, and to reach almost complete harmony of action. His classical scholarship was thorough and accurate; his mind was at once logical and comprehensive, and his general culture was wide and generous. His religious experience was, in many respects, similar to that of President Edwards, and ripened into similar fullness and serenity. As a preacher he was luminous, earnest, and successful. As a college officer he was seldom rivaled. "His power of government was unsurpassed: he seemed born to command. In him prudence and independence met to form that rare combination so essential

to one who rules. This remark finds its illustration and proof in his government of the college, to whose interests he devoted so much of his brief earthly life. While he shrunk from no responsibility of his position, he was still careful to maintain that position by devising the best means to meet responsibility. Though many felt the weight of the scepter in his hand, yet the conviction that it was wielded by a strong man, and in the fear of the Lord, conciliated esteem. As president of the college, as in every other position, he rose rapidly, both before the public and in the college; and the last year in which his name appeared in connection with that office was the most prosperous in the history of the institution. The students honored him even to reverence, and regarded him as standing on a moral and intellectual eminence toward which the indolent and unworthy must not even look, and to which the noblest and best among them ought eagerly to aspire." In 1841 he published *A Life of the Rev. John Emory, D.D.* (N.Y. 8vo); in 1843, an elaborate *History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (N.Y. 12mo). He left unfinished an *Analysis of Butler's Analogy*, which was completed by the Rev. G. R. Crooks, D.D. (N.Y. Harpers, 1856, 8vo), and which is the best analysis of the *Analogy* that has ever appeared. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1849; Sprague, *Annals*, 7:828.

Emotion

(emoveo, to move out) "is often used as synonymous with feeling. Strictly taken, it means a 'state of feeling which, while it does not spring directly from an affection of body, manifests its existence and character by some sensible effect upon the body.' An emotion differs from a *sensation* by its not originating in a state of body; and from a cognition, *by* its being pleasurable or painful. Emotions, like other states of feeling, imply knowledge. Something beautiful or deformed, sublime or ridiculous, is known and contemplated; and on the contemplation springs up the appropriate feeling, followed by the characteristic expression of countenance, or attitude, or manner. In themselves considered, emotions can scarcely be called springs of action. 'The feelings of beauty, grandeur, and whatever else is comprehended under the name of taste, *do not lead to action,* but terminate in delightful contemplation, which constitutes the essential distinction between them and the moral sentiments, to which, in some points of view, they may doubtless be likened' (Mackintosh, *Dissert.* page 238). Emotions tend rather, while they last, to fix attention on the objects or occurrences which have excited them. In many instances, however, emotions are succeeded by desires to obtain possession of the

objects which awaken them, or to remove ourselves from the presence of such objects. When an emotion is thus succeeded by some degree of desire, it forms, according to Lord Kames, a *passion,* and becomes, according to its nature, a powerful and permanent spring of action. Emotions, then, are awakened through the medium of the intellect, and are varied and modified by the conception we form of the objects to which they refer. Emotions manifest their existence and character by sensible effects upon the body. Emotions, in themselves and by themselves, lead to quiescence and contemplation rather than acaccity; but they combine with springs of action, and give to them a character and a coloring. What is said to be done from surprise or shame has its proper spring — the surprise or shame being concomitant" (Dr. Chalmers, *Sketches of Mental and Moral Philosophy,* page 88. — Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy,* s.v.

Empedocles

an ancient philosopher of Agrigentum, "distinguished himself by his knowledge of natural history and medicine, and his talents for philosophical poetry. It is generally believed that he perished in the crater of Atna. Some suppose him to have been a disciple of Pythagoras or Aichytas (Diog. Laert. 8:54 sq.); others, of Parmenides. He cannot have been an immediate scholar of the first, inasmuch as Aristotle *(Met.* 1:3) represents him as contemporary with, but younger than Anaxagorar, and because he appears to have been the master of Corgias. His philosophy, which he described in a didactic poem, of which only fragments have come down to us, combined the elements of various systems, most nearly approaching that of Pythagoras and Heraclitus, but differing from the latter, principally,

1. Inasmuch as Empedocles more expressly recognizes four elements, earth, water, air, and fire: these elements (compare his system, in this respect, with that of Anaxagoras) he affirmed not to be *simple* in their nature, and assigned the most important place to fire.

2. Besides the principle of concord (φιλία), opposed to that of discord (νεῖκος) (the one being the source of union and good, the other of their opposites), he admitted into his system *necessity* also, to explain existing phenomena. To the first of these principles he attributed the original composition of the elements. The material world (σφαῖρος, μῖγμα) he believed, as a whole, to be divine, but in the *sub lunar* portion of it he detected a considerable admixture of evil and imperfection. He taught that

at some future day all things must again sink into chaos. He advanced a subtle and scarcely intelligible theory of the active and passive affections of things (comp. Plato, Menon. ed. Steph. page 76, C. D.; Arist. De *Gener. et Corr.* 1:8; *Fraym. ap. Sturz.* 5:117), and drew a distinction between the world as presented to our senses (κὀσμος αἰσθητός), and that which he presumed to Le the type of it, the intellectual world (κόσμος νοητός). He looked for the principle of life in fire, admitting, at the same time, the existence of a Divine Being pervading the universe. From this superior intelligence he believed the *daemones* to emanate, to whose nature the human soul is allied. Man is a fallen *daemon.* There will be a return to unity, a transmigration of souls, and a chancre of forms. The soul he defined to consist in a combination of the four elements (because cognition depends upon the similarity of the subject and object), and its seat he pronounced to be principally the blood" (Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Philippians §* 106). Lewes differs from all other historians respecting the place occupied by Empedocles, making his system to include elements from the Pythagorean, Eleatic, Heraclitic, and Anaxagorean systems *(History of Philosophy,* Lond. 1867, 2 volumes, 8vo, 1:89 sq.). See Sturz, *Empedocles Agrigentinus, De Vita et Philo: ophia ejus exposuit, Carminum Reliquias er Antiquis Scriptoribus collegit, recensuit, illustraiit Fr. Guil. Sturz* (Lips. 1805, 8vo); J.G. Neumanni *Pror. de Empedocle Philosopho* (Viteb. 1790, fol.); Lommatzsch, *Die Weisheit des Emped.* (Berlin, 1830); Stein, *Emped. Agrigent. fragmnenta* (Bonn, 1852); Winnefeld, *Die Philosophie des Emped.* (Rastadt, 1862); Steinhart, in Ersch und Gruber, *Alygem. Encyklop.* s.v. Empedocles.

Empiricism, Empirism, Empiric

Empiricism, in its primary meaning, signifies the method or habit of judging from observation or trial; and an empiric is one who forms his conclusions in this manner. Empiricism may thus be employed to denote either inductive reasoning, in which observation and experiment furnish the data for the conclusions drawn by the reason, or that unscientific mode of procedure which accepts the phenomena as they are observed, without analysis or accurate determination. In the former case the term is used in a good sense, and is equivalent to experimental science; in the latter it is used in a bad sense, and this is its ordinary employment.

The relation of experience to science, and to art or practice, is precisely exhibited by Aristotle in the opening chapter of his Metaphysics; but the

peculiar terseness of the Aristotelian phraseology renders expansion and restatement of his positions necessary, in order to adapt them to modern views.

Art, or systematic action, is founded upon observation, but upon observation reduced to theory, or to consonance with theory. That is to say, observation furnishes the facts, but they must be coordinated and interpreted in order to constitute valid knowledge (science), or a reliable rule of action (art). If the observations be indistinct or perplexed, or if they be not sufficiently numerous to establish a general conclusion, or if a general conclusion be drawn prematurely, the induction is deceptive, and obnoxious to the censures passed by Lord Bacon upon the simple enumeration of examples *(Nov. Org.* 1, aph. 69, cv; *Instaur. Sei.* tom. 9, page 146; *Distr. Op.* page 167, ed. Montagu). The true nature of the induction required is briefly stated by Campanella: "Inductio est argumentatio a partibus sufficienter enumeratis ad suum totum universale." What is a sufficient exposition of the particulars may be learned from the *Second Book of the Novum Organon,* or more satisfactorily from Whewell's *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences,* Comte's *Political Philosophy,* and Mill's *Logic.*

When the observations are sufficiently multiplied and varied, and when they have been analyzed and sifted so as to eliminate all illusions, and everything which does not bear distinctly upon the point under consideration, then they justify a definite conclusion. This is the *"nul implicatio et vindemiatio instantiarum"* so strenuously urged by Lord Bacon. But, even in this case, the general experience authorizes a universal conclusion only by assuming a law latent under each of the concordant instances by which all are governed. In establishing or accepting the conclusion there is need for the introduction of a purely rational element — if none other, at least the principle that nature acts uniformly, and that what is true of all observed instances is true of all similar phenomena. Thus theory is needed to permit and to complete induction, or inference from observation.

This accumulation, collation, and appreciation of instances is disregarded by undisciplined and impatient minds. A few recurrences loosely noted, or a single undigested observation, is made the foundation for a universal conclusion, without reference to any rational principle. The designation derived from experience and inquiry is still retained, but, in consequence of

want of validity in the process, and of method, reliability, and rationality in the corresponding practice, it receives an unfavorable import, and empiricism commonly denotes that mode of reasoning which is based upon hasty and inadequate observation, and which neglects scientific principle and scientific precision.

This exposition of the derivation and deflection of the meaning is illustrated and confirmed by the history of the term. In the middle of the 3d century before Christ a revolution in medical practice was inaugurated by Philinus of Cos and Serapion of Alexandria. They revolted against the maxims of the Dogmatists, and repudiated the course pursued by the Methodists of treating all cases of disease according to fixed theoretical rules. They observed the symptoms of disorders, and the specific effects of remedial agents; they considered the idiosyncrasies of their patients as affected by climates and localities; and they employed the therapeutics which hidden found effectual in analogous instances. They recognized three kinds of experience: chance, experiment, and imitation, but relied principally upon the last, which is a sort of blind observation. They thus introduced into medical practice the whole train of inductive reasoning, and were in consequence designated Empirics. The school flourished for nearly five centuries, and its duration attests its merit and success. It had started, however, with sundry hazardous hypotheses, such as the doctrine of Homoeopathy, and in its best period had trusted mainly to disguised analogies, which were usually obscure, and too often delusive. The Empirics rejected formal science; they contemned theoretical views and rational deductions, and thus drifted into close approximation to the Skeptics. Their original doctrine was an extravagance in the manner of its assertion, but it was a wholesome reaction against a more perilous excess. With the succession of generations, however, their cardinal principle of depending exclusively on observation was pushed so far as to engender the wildest fantasies. Hence no confidence could be placed in their treatment of diseases. It was thus that the term Empiricism received the opprobrious signification which is habitually attached to it. The meaning of a word is perpetuated in the last perversion which it has received from popular use.

The name originating in this way in the schools of medicine was readily transferred to the corresponding procedure in other departments of knowledge. Empiricism is opposed to science in the same way that a paralogism is opposed to a syllogism: it is the abuse, or the imperfect use of a procedure which is valid when correctly pursued. It is confused

observation developed into unreliable induction. But the distortion of the process, and the consequent degradation of the word denoting the process, evince the partial agreement between empiricism and scientific reasoning. It becomes, therefore, expedient to point out more explicitly the relation which observation and experience bear to theory, or philosophical reasoning.

Science is the systematic coordination of observed facts, and the exhibition of their dependence upon general principles. Observation collects particulars, which should be compared and tested, so as to eliminate all discrepancies and all accidental agreements, and to disentangle from the complex phenomena the single point of positive and habitual concordance. When this is adequately achieved, the regular association of the facts under consideration is established. This, however, provides only what Bacon designates *axiomata media* — those inductions which ascertain the character and direct connections of the phenomena. A further generalization is required; these intermediate axioms must be traced to precise laws. Such is the nature and procedure of strict inductive science, with which empiricism is more immediately contrasted, though it arose originally out of the antagonism to dogmatic deduction. The empiric disregards these careful comparisons and gradual approximations, and leaps at once from loosely-observed data, from casual coincidences, or from a few disconnected instances to a general conclusion. He has no principle to restrain him, no recognised law for his guidance. From the absence of all certainty, and the consequent liability to error, empiricism has come to denote rash and ignorant generalization leading to hazardous and unreasoning applications.

Another important point demands attention. Certain phenomena are so complex and so inapprehensible by the processes of rigid observation, comparison, and experiment, that they scarcely admit of rigorously scientific treatment. Moreover, from the want of opportunity for applying the methods of science, and from the multiplicity of concurrent, interacting, and irregularly varying influences involved in the production of the result, scientific induction and philosophical deduction fail to include or to exclude everything which should be embraced or rejected. The subject either does not yet admit of scientific treatment, but must be governed by the suggestions of unanalyzed experience, or there is a large discordance between the scientific conclusions and the observed facts. In these cases the indications of experience cannot be disregarded, and the procedure, to

be adopted, must be in greater or less measure empirical. History, politics, social organization, agriculture, and many of the applications of physical science to human requirements demand, in a greater or less degree, this subordination of scientific results to observed facts. But the insufficiency of the procedure should be recognised; for empiricism, even in its most favorable form, is tentative and problematical, because it is the renunciation of the guidance of the reason, and the acceptance of imperfect or imperfectly-digested observation for the prescriptions of ascertained and immutable law. Empiricism is available only *in consimili casu;* and, as this exact similitude can never be assured, but is always precarious, it is necessarily attended with insecurity. If the conditions or concomitances vary so as to modify the result, it is a blind leader of the blind. The only protection in changed circumstances, or under novel conditions, is a knowledge of the general principles which govern the facts, and this knowledge is obtained only from science, inductive or deductive. Theory and experience have distinct but associated functions: theory is the abstract rationale of the phenomena; experience is their undiscriminating representation: theory degenerates into rash inexperience when not checked by careful observation; experience runs into wild and pernicious fantasies when not illuminated by speculative discernment. The two must be combined and conciliated in order to afford any absolute confidence in the rectitude of our conclusions, and the procedure founded thereon. If they be separated, and to the extent to which they are separated, experience is valid only in matters of mere routine; theory or science is always required under novel combinations. Theory, unregulated by experience, is as arbitrary and capricious as experience unenlightened by reason, and misleads hopelessly, because it never awakens any suspicion of the possibility of error. But theory, which systematizes the conclusions drawn from an adequate range and degree of observation, furnishes guidance under all changes of circumstance; while empiricism only misleads and betrays in every case when it is necessary to deviate in any respect from a procedure already adopted and approved.

Empiricism is thus at all times an irrational procedure, though it may furnish a practical rule within a very limited sphere. Theory may beguile, in consequence of its imperfect constitution or rash application, but is always requisite to insure the recognition of established law, and obedience to the immutable prescriptions of reason in the individual or in the order of creation. An empirical procedure may often be indispensable, but, when

most necessary, it is provisional only. A theoretical procedure may be demanded before adequate experience has been acquired, but this must be confirmed or reformed by the observation of facts. It is only when theory is sustained by facts, and facts are explained by theory, that knowledge becomes entirely trustworthy. Many departments of practical knowledge are not yet, and may never be, capable of thorough scientific organization. In these we must continue to. be guided by empirical conclusions; but they are received, not because they are sufficient, but because nothing better is attainable. Empiricism is, therefore, always inadequate, and usually deceptive. (G.F.H.)

Ems Congress

a meeting of plenipotentiaries of the archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, Treves, and Salzburg, held in the watering-place of Ems, in August 1786, for the purpose of defining the rights belonging to bishops and archbishops, and of opposing the exorbitant demands of the papal nuncio. The agreement which was arrived at, and which consists of 23 articles, is called the Ems Punctation. The archbishops of Germany, as well as the emperors, had long been dissatisfied with the endeavors made by the popes, under the pretext of securing the execution of the decrees of the Council of Trent, to steadily enlarge the rights of papal nuncios and legates in Germany at the expense of the bishops. A serious conflict was brought on by the elector Karl Theodor of Bavaria, who, in order to supersede as much as possible the episcopal jurisdiction of other princes of the empire, such as the archbishops of Salzburg and Cologne, over his subjects, induced the Pope to appoint a papal nuncio at the court of Munich. The archbishop of Salzburg in 1785 requested the archbishop of Mentz, as primate of the German Catholic Church, to avert the new danger threatening the authority of the archbishops. The primate remonstrated in Rome, and his example was soon followed by the bishops of Eichstidt and Freising. But Pope Pius VI declared that the new nuncio in Munich, Zoglio, would be clothed with the same authority which had heretofore been exercised by the nuncio in Cologne. The archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg appealed to the emperor Joseph II for aid against this encroachment of the Pope upon their rights. The emperor replied, October 12, 1785, that the Pope would at once be notified that the emperor would never allow an infringement upon the diocesan rights of the German bishops. Nevertheless, the new nuncio Zoglio made his appearance in Munich in March 1786; informed all archbishops and bishops whose dioceses embraced part of Bavaria of his

arrival; exercised all the prerogatives which the Pope claimed for his nuncios; and even appointed a subnuncio at Dusseldorf. The archbishop of Cologne remonstrated against these proceedings to the emperor, and the latter ordered the elector Karl Theodor to forbid the nuncio the further exercise of functions which did not belong to him. At the same time, the archbishops of Cologne, Treves, Mentz, and Salzburg forbade their subjects to receive any orders from the nuncios of Munich and Cologne. In order to organize a combined resistance to the papal encroachments, the archbishop of Mentz invited the archbishops of Cologne, Treves, and Salzburg to send deputies to a congress to be held at Ems. The invitation was accepted, and accordingly the Ems congress met in August 1786. It was composed of the assistant bishop Heimes, of Mentz, the official Beckt of Treves, the official Von Tautphaeus, of Cologne, and the consistorial councillor Bonike, of Salzburg. These deputies, on the 25th of August, agreed upon the Ems Punctation, the most important points of which are the following:

1. All those papal prerogatives and reservations which were unknown in the first centuries, but derived from the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, must now be abandoned.

2. The bishops, having, received from Christ the power to bind and to loose, the persons living within their dioceses must not pass over their immediate ecclesiastical superiors in order to have recourse to Rome. No exemptions must any more be allowed except such as have been confirmed by the emperors. The members of monastic orders are forbidden to receive any orders from their generals, or any superiors living outside of Germany.

3. As the bishops have the power to grant dispensations, the so-called *facultates quinquennales* shall no longer be asked from the papal court; and the bulls, briefs, and rescripts of the popes, as well as all the declarations, rescripts, and orders of the Roman congregations, shall not be received in Germany without their express recognition by the bishops.

4. The nuncios shall have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but shall be merely ambassadors of the Pope.

The Punctation, signed by the four archbishops, was sent to the emperor Joseph, who assured the archbishops of his assistance, but also declared, perhaps influenced by the nuncio Caprara at Vienna, that the execution would depend upon an agreement between the archbishop on the one hand,

and the exempts, the suffragan bishops, and the government on the other. The papal party, in the mean while, endeavored to excite the jealousy of the bishops against the four archbishops, charging the latter with an intention of extending their rights at the expense of those of the bishops. The archbishop of Mentz was in particular charged with a desire to establish a primatical authority over all archbishops and bishops of Germany. Among the bishops who came forward to attack the Punctation, those of Spires, Hildesheim, and Wurzburg were prominent. Soon particular interests caused disagreement among the signers of the Punctation. The archbishop of Mentz approached the Pope with a request to have baron von Dalberg appointed his coadjutor; the archbishop of Treves (1787) appealed to Rome for a renewal of *the facultates quinquennales;* and finally, in 1789, all the four archbishops declared that they desired a settlement of the controversy, and that they recognized the right of the Pope to send nuncios and to grant dispensations. The literature on the Congress and the Punctation of Ems is very copious. The results of the congress were at once published in the work *Resultate des Emser Congresses* (Francf. 1787) [also in *Die neuesten Grundlagen der deutsch-kath. Kirchen-Vefassung,* Stuttgardt, 1821]. The official reply of Rome is entitled *Responsio ad Metropolitanos Mogunt. Trevir. Colon. et Salisb. super Nuntiaturis* (Rome, 1789). See also Neudecker, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:784; Munich, *Gesch. des Emser Congresses;* Pacca (papal nuncio at Cologne), *Histor. Denkuiirdigkeiten* (Augsburg, 1832); Stigloher, *Die Errichtung der pabstl. Nuntiatur in, Munchen und der Emser Congress* (Ratisbon, 1866). (A.J.S.)

Emser, Hieronymus

a Roman Catholic divine, and one of the most Violent of Luther's opponents in the Reformation, was born at Ulm March 26, 1477. After having begun his studies at Tubingen, he went to continue them at Basle, where he applied himself to jurisprudence, theology, and Hebrew. He accompanied cardinal Raymond de Gurk, who had appointed him his chaplain and secretary, through Germany and Italy in 1500-1502. Some time after he became lecturer at Erfurt, which he quitted (1504) to reside at the University of Leipzic, where he taught canonical law. About the same time, George, duke of Saxony, took him as his private secretary. The duke, who had a desire to procure the canonization of bishop Benno, of Meissen, employed Emser to visit a number of convents, especially in Bohemia, to collect information concerning Benno; and in 1510 sent him to Rome. On

his return from Rome he received from the duke two prebends, at Dresden and Meissen. About this time he' also appears to have been consecrated a priest. His recovery from a severe sickness he ascribed to the intercession of bishop Benno, and was thereby induced to write a eulogy of him *(Divi Bennonis Vita,* Lips. 1512). With Luther, whose reformatory zeal had already begun to attract attention, Emser remained on good terms until the time of the Leipzig disputation (1519). Luther called him *Emser noster* (our Emser), and was kindly received by Eraser when he had to preach before duke George at Dresden. The literary controversy between Emser and Luther commenced soon after the Leipzic disputation with a letter from Emser to Dr. Zack, provost at Leitmneritz, in which the opinion was expressed that Luther had nothing in common with the Bohemian Hussites, and an intimation was given that Luther was ready to abandon his reformatory views. As Emser, who was descended from a noble family, used in this letter his escutcheon, the forepart of a he-goat, Luther addressed his very bitter reply to the "Wild-goat Emser" *(ad AEgocerotem Emseranum,* Wittenberg, 1519), and in his subsequent writings generally called him "the he-goat of Leipzic," or "He-goat Emser." In his reply, Emser called Luther's theology "novel and cynic," and represented Luther's reformatory labors as merely the result of the jealousy of the Augustinian monks against the Dominicans. Emser also attacked Carlstadt, Zwingle, Pirkheimer, and other reformers; was soon joined by Eck, and thus helped to kindle a violent controversy all through Germany. In 1520 Luther burned Emser's writings along with the papal bull and the decretals. As Emser's works were almost wholly personal invectives, the interest in them soon ceased, and in the history of the Reformation they are of little significance. As duke George forbade Luther's translation of the Bible, Emser, in 1527, published another German translation made from the Vulgate. Emser branded Luther's version as a horrible corruption; but at present even the Roman Catholic writers of Germany acknowledge that Emser's version is of no value, and, in a literary point of view, greatly inferior to that of Luther. Emser died November 8, 1527, where and how is not known. The titles of the numerous works of Emser may be found in Waldau, *Nachrichten von Emser's Leben und Schriften* (Anspach, 1783). See Neudecker, in Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3:782; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 16:17. (A.J.S.)

En-

(Hebrews *Eyn-*, ˆy[e constr. of ˆy[i a *fountain*), a prefix to many names of places in Hebrews (e.g. En-gedi, En-gammin, En-dor, En-haddah, En-hazor, En-harod, En-mishpah; En-eglaim, En-shemesh, En-rogel, Entannim [<16213>Nehemiah 2:13], En-tappuah); all so called from a living spring in the vicinity; and corresponding to the Arabic prefix *Ain-* (Robinson, *Researches,* 3:225), in which language, as also in the Syriac and Ethiopic, it has the same signification; in two instances (<061516>Joshua 21:16; <043411>Numbers 34:11) it stands alone as the name of a place (q.d. "the spring"); also in the dual, ENAM *SEE ENAM* (q.v.), and plural ANIM *SEE ANIM* (q.v.), the latter likewise in the Aramaic form *Enon* (q.v.). *SEE AIN.*

Enaim

SEE ENAM.

E'nam

(Hebrews with the art. *ha-Eynam',* µyn[h; doubtless a contraction for µyaeyr[h; *the two springs;* Sept. Ἡνάϊμ v.r. Ἡναείμ and Μαιανί, Vulg. *Enaim),* a city in the lowlands of Judah, mentioned between Tappuah and Jarmuth (<061534>Joshua 15:34). From its mention with towns (Jarmuth and Eshtaol for instance) which are known to have been near Timnath, this is very probably the place in the "entrance" of which (perhaps at a fork of the road) Tamar sat to intercept her father-in-law on his way to Timnath (<013814>Genesis 38:14), (µyaeyr[ej tP, *pe'thach Eyna'yim,* i.e., *doorway of Enaim,* or the *double spring;* Sept. αἱ πύλαι Αἰνάν, Vulg. *bivium itineris,* A.V. "an open place;" comp. Reland, *Palest,* page 761). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Ἡναίμ, Enaim) state that it was "still a village *Betheninm* (Βεθενίμ) near the terebinth;" meaning probably "Abraham's oak," 22 miles S. of Jerusalem *(ib.* s.v. Ἀρκώ, Arboch), near Hebron (Robinson, *Res.* 2:443). Schwarz in like manner identifies Enam with "the village *Beth-Ani,* distant 21 English miles from Saafir" *(Palest.* page 102); meaning apparently *Beit-Anur,* which is laid down on Van de Velde's *Map* at that distance S.W. of Bir es-Zafaraneh, in the region N.E. of Hebron. But this site is appropriated to Beth-anoth (q.v.), with which the similarity of names has doubtless caused these authors to confuse Enam. The place in question lay in the group of cities situated N.W. of Hebron, on the border of the tribe of Dan (Keil, *Comment. on Joshua* in loc.). It is perhaps the

present *Deir el-Butm,* with a well adjoining, laid down by Van de Velde *(Map)* a little beyond Deir Dubibai, N. of Eleutheropolis.

E'nan

(Hebrews *Eynan',* ˆ[ey born at a *fountain,* q.d. *fontanus;* Sept. Αἰνάν), the father of Ahira, which latter was phylarch of the tribe of Naphtali at the Exode (<04015>Numbers 1:15; 2:29; 7:78, 83; 10:27). B.C. ante 1657. *SEE HAZAR-ENAN*.

Enas'ibus

(Ἐνάσιβος, Vulgate *Eliasib),* given (1 Esdr. 9:34) as the name of one of "the sons of Moani" who had married a Gentile wife after the exile, in place of the ELIASHIS *SEE ELIASHIS* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<15106>Ezra 10:36).

Encaenia

(ἐγκαίνια).

1. When heathen temples were converted to Christian use, they were purified by a solemn dedication, called *Encaenia,* and by the sign of the cross; they also received new and appropriate names (Riddle, *Antiq.* 6:2).

2. At a later period *encaenia* denoted festivals kept in memory of the dedication of churches. In the church of Jerusalem, built by Constantine to the honor of our Savior, it was customary to observe an anniversary festival which lasted eight days, during which divine service was performed. The practice was soon adopted by other churches. In England the first Saxon bishops allowed the people liberty on the annual feasts of the dedication of their churches, to build themselves booths round the church, and to entertain themselves with eating and drinking. In German such a feast is called *Kirchzweiho,* church-consecration, whence the English name CHURCHWAKE. The ceremonies and solemnities instituted at Oxford in honor of founders and benefactors of colleges are called *encaenia*. — *Bingham, Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 20, chapter 8, § 1. *SEE DEDICATION.*

Encamp

Picture for Encamp

(Hn;j ; *chanah'*, to *decline*, e.g. of the day, <070919>Judges 19:9, i.e., evening; hence to "pitch" a tent, <012617>Genesis 26:17, especially to "*camp"* down at night, as often rendered), among the Hebrews, primarily denoted the resting of an army or company of travelers at night (<021320>Exodus 13:20; <041550>Numbers 1:50; comp. <021613>Exodus 16:13; <013221>Genesis 32:21), and hence the derivative noun (hn,j,m; *michaneh'*, *camp*, once t/n j m; *mackanoth'*, <121808>2 Kings 6:8) is applied to the army or caravan when on its march (<021419>Exodus 14:19; <060510>Joshua 10:5; 11:4; <013307>Genesis 32:7, 8). *SEE MAHANAIM*. Sometimes the verb refers to the casual arrangement of a siege (<192903>Psalm 29:3) or campaign (<090401>1 Samuel 4:1), and occasionally it is extended to the signification of a permanent abode (<232901>Isaiah 29:1). Among nomadic tribes war never attained the dignity of a science, and their encampments were consequently devoid of all the appliances of more systematic warfare. *SEE WAR*.

1. The description of the camp of the Israelites, on their march from Egypt (<040203>Numbers 2:3), supplies the greatest amount of information on the subject: whatever else may be gleaned is from scattered hints. The tabernacle, corresponding to the chieftain's tent of an ordinary encampment, was placed in the center; and around and facing it (<040201>Numbers 2:1), arranged in four grand divisions, corresponding to the four points of the compass (but not necessarily in the strict quadrangular form usually represented, since modern Arab caravans are ranged at night in a nearly circular manner), lay the host of Israel, according to their standards (<040152>Numbers 1:52; 2:2). On the east the post of honor was assigned to the tribe of Judah, and round its standard rallied the tribes of Issachar and Zebulon, descendants of the sons of Leah. On the south lay Reuben and Simeon, the representatives of Leah, and the children of Gad, the son of her handmaid. Rachel's descendants were encamped on the western side of the tabernacle, the chief place being assigned to the tribe of Ephraim. To this position of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin, allusions are made in <070514>Judges 5:14, and <198002>Psalm 80:2. On the north were the tribes of Dan and Napthali, the children of Bilhah, and the tribe of Asher, Gad's younger brother. All these were encamped around their standards, each according to the ensign of the house of his fathers. In the center, round the tabernacle, and with no standard but the cloudy or fiery pillar

which rested over it, were the tents of the priests and Levites. The former, with Moses and Aaron at their head, were encamped on the eastern side. On the south were the Kohathites, who had charge of the ark, the table of shew bread, the altars and vessels of the sanctuary. The Gershonites were on the west, and when on the march carried the tabernacle and its lighter furniture; while the Merarites, who were encamped on the north, had charge of its heavier appurtenances. The order of encampment was preserved on the march (<04027>Numbers 2:17), the signal for which was given by a blast of the two silver trumpets (<04105>Numbers 10:5). The details of this account supply Prof. Blunt with some striking illustrations of the undesigned coincidences of the books of Moses *(Undes. Coincid.* pages 75-86).

In this description of the order of the encampment no mention is made of sentinels, who, it is reasonable to suppose, were placed at the gates (<02226>Exodus 32:26, 27) in the four quarters of the camp. This was evidently the case in the camp of the Levites (comp. <13918>1 Chronicles 9:18, 24; <14302>2 Chronicles 31:2).

The sanitary regulations of the camp of the Israelites were enacted for the twofold purpose of preserving the health of the vast multitude, and the purity of the camp as the dwelling-place of God (<04503>Numbers 5:3; <05234>Deuteronomy 23:14). With this object the dead were buried without the camp (<03004>Leviticus 10:4, 5); lepers were excluded till their leprosy departed from them (<03346>Leviticus 13:46; 14:3; <04124>Numbers 12:14, 15), as were all who were visited with loathsome diseases (<03403>Leviticus 14:3). All who were defiled by contact with the dead, whether these were slain in battle or not, were kept without the camp for seven days (<04319>Numbers 31:19). Captives taken in war were compelled to remain for a while outside (<04319>Numbers 31:19; <06623>Joshua 6:23). The ashes from the sacrifices were poured out without the camp at an appointed place, whither all uncleanness was removed (<05310>Deuteronomy 23:10, 12), and where the entrails, skins, horns, etc., and all that was not offered in sacrifice, were burnt (<03411>Leviticus 4:11, 12; 6:11; 8:17).

The execution of criminals took place without the camp (<03444>Leviticus 24:14; <04535>Numbers 15:35, 36; <06724>Joshua 7:24), as did the burning of the young bullock for the sin offering (<03412>Leviticus 4:12). These circumstances combined explain <58132>Hebrews 13:12, and <43917>John 19:17, 20.

2. The encampment of the Israelites in the desert left its traces in their subsequent history. The temple, so late as the time of Hezekiah, was still "the camp of Jehovah" (<14302>2 Chronicles 31:2; comp. <19878>Psalm 78:28); and the multitudes who flocked to David were " a great camp, like the camp of God" (<13122>1 Chronicles 12:22).

High ground appears to have been uniformly selected for the position of a camp, whether it were on a hill or mountain side, or in an inaccessible pass (<07018>Judges 7:18). So, in <07017>Judges 10:17, the Ammonites encamped in Gilead, while Israel pitched in Alizpeh. The very names are significant. I he camps of Saul and the Philistines were alternately in Gibeah, the "height" of Benjamin, and the pass of Michmash (<09302>1 Samuel 13:2, 3, 16, 23). When Goliath defied the host of Israel, the contending armies were encamped on hills on either side of the valley of Elah (<09703>1 Samuel 17:3); and in the fatal battle of Gilboa Saul's position on the mountain was stormed by the Philistines he had pitched in Shunem (<09204>1 Samuel 28:4), on the other side of the valley of Jezreel. The carelessness of the Midianites in encamping in the plain exposed them to the night surprise by Gideon, and resulted in their consequent discomfiture (<07033>Judges 6:33; 7:8, 12). But another important consideration in fixing upon a position for a camp was the propinquity of water; hence it is found that in most instances camps, were pitched near a spring or well (<07003>Judges 7:3; 1 Macc. 9:33). The Israelites at Mount Gilboa pitched by the fountain in Jezreel (<09201>1 Samuel 29:1), while the Philistines encamped at Aphek, the name of which indicates the existence of a stream of water in the neighborhood, which rendered it a favorite place of encampment (1 Samuel 4, <12002>2 Kings 20:26; <12317>2 Kings 13:17). In his pursuit of the Amalekites David halted his men by the brook Besor, and there left a detachment with the camp furniture (<09309>1 Samuel 30:9). One of Joshua's decisive engagements with the nations of Canaan was fought at the waters of Merom, where he surprised the confederate camp (<06105>Joshua 11:5, 7; comp. <07059>Judges 5:19, 21). Gideon, before attacking the Midianites, encamped beside the well of Harod (<07001>Judges 7:1), and it was to draw water from the well at Bethlehem that David's three mighty men cut their way through the host of the Philistines (<10216>2 Samuel 23:16).

The camp was surrounded by the hl;[]mi *magalah'* (<09720>1 Samuel 17:20) or lG2P[mi *magal'* (<09265>1 Samuel 26:5, 7) which some, and Thenius among them, explain as an earthwork thrown up round the encampment,

others as the barrier formed by the baggage-wagons. The etymology of the word points merely to the circular shape of the enclosure formed by the tents of the soldiers pitched around their chief, whose spear marked his resting-place (1 Samuel 26:5, 7; see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:20 sq.), and it might with propriety be used in either of the above senses, according as the camp was fixed or temporary. We know that, in the case of a siege, the attacking army, if possible, surrounded the place attacked (1 Macc. 13:43), and drew about it a line of circumvallation (qyD; *dayek'*, 2 Kings 25:1), which was marked by a breastwork of earth (hL,saem; *Mesillah'*, Isaiah 62:10; hl;l=s, *solelah'*, Ezekiel 21:27 [22]; comp. Job 19:12), for the double purpose of preventing the escape of the besieged and of protecting the besiegers from their sallies. But there was not so much need of a formal entrenchment, as but few instances occur in which engagements were fought in the camps themselves, and these only when the attack was made at night. Gideon's expedition against the Midianites took place in the early morning (Judges 7:19), the time selected by Saul for his attack upon Nahash (1 Samuel 11:1l), and by David for surprising the Amalekites (1 Samuel 30:17; comp. Judges 9:33). To guard against these night attacks, sentinels (µyrem]v, *shomerhim'*) were posted (Judges 7:20; 1 Macc. 12:27) round the camp, and the neglect of this precaution by Zebah and Zalmunna probably led to their capture by Gideon and the ultimate defeat of their army (Judges 7:19).

The valley which separated the hostile camps was generally selected as the fighting ground (hdc; "the battle-field," 1 Samuel 4:2; 14:15; 2 Samuel 18:6), upon which the contest was decided, and hence the valleys of Palestine have played so conspicuous a part in its history (Joshua 8:13; Judges 6:33; 2 Samuel 5:22; 8:13, etc.). When the fighting men went forth to the place of marshaling hk;r;[]mi *maarakah'*, 1 Samuel 17:20), a detachment was left to protect the camp and baggage (1 Samuel 17:22; 30:24). The beasts of burden were probably tethered to the tent pegs (2 Kings 7:10; Zechariah 14:15).

The hn,j}mi *machaneh'*, or movable encampment, is distinguished from the bXem; *matstsab'*, or byxae]nt,c,[b'(2 Samuel 23:14; 1 Chronicles 11:16), which appears to have been a standing camp, like those which Jehoshaphat established throughout Judah (2 Chronicles 17:2), or an

advanced post in an enemy's country (<09137>1 Samuel 13:17; <10806>2 Samuel 8:6), from which skirmishing parties made theor predatory excursions and ravaged the crops. It was in resisting one of these expeditions that Shammah won himself a name among David's heroes (<10232>2 Samuel 23:12). *Vachaneh* is still farther distinguished from rx;bi *mibtsar'*, "a fortress" or "walled town" (<04339>Numbers 13:19).

Camps left behind them a memorial in the name of the place where they were situated, as among ourselves (comp. *Chester*, etc., from the Lat. *castsra).* Mahaneh-Dan (<07325>Judges 13:25) was so called from the encampment of the Danites mentioned in <07812>Judges 18:12. The more important camps at Gilgal (<06510>Joshua 5:10; 9:6) and Shiloh (<06889>Joshua 18:9; <07212>Judges 21:12, 19) left no such impress; the military traditions of these places were eclipsed by the greater splendor of the religious associations which surrounded them. (See Ker Porter, *Travels in Persia,* 2:147 sq., 300 sq.; Rhodes, *Tent life and Encampment of Armies in ancient and modern Times,* Lond. 1858.)

Among the Ancient Egyptians, "the field encampment was either a square or a parallelogram, with a principal entrance in one of the faces, and near the center was the general's tent and those of the principal officers. The general's tent was sometimes surrounded by a double rampart or fosse inclosing two distinct areas, the outer one containing three tents, probably of the next in command, or of the officers on the staff; and the guards slept or watched in the open air. Other tents were pitched outside these enclosures; and near the external circuit a space was set apart for feeding horses and beasts of burden, and another for ranging the chariots and baggage. It was near the general's tent, and within the same area, that the altars of the gods, or whatever related to religious matters, the standards, and the military chest, were kept; and the sacred emblems were deposited beneath a canopy within an enclosure similar to that of the general's tent" (Wilkinson, 1:409, abridgm.).

Enchantment

stands in the Authorized Version as the representative of several Hebrews words: usually some form of vjn; *nachash'* (<12717>2 Kings 17:17; 21:6; <14306>2 Chronicles 33:6; <03926>Leviticus 19:26; <05172>Deuteronomy 18:10; <04213>Numbers 23:23; 24:1), literally to *whisper* a spell, hence to *practice divination* in general; vjil; *lachash'* (<21101>Ecclesiastes 10:11), of cognate form and

signification, especially *incantation;* fWl, *lut,* literally to *muffle* up, hence to use *magic arts* (Exodus 7:13, 22; 8:7, 18); ˆni[; *anan',* literally to *cover* with a cloud, hence to practice *sorcery* (Jeremiah 27:9); and rbij; *chabar',* to *bind,* i.e., with a spell, to *charm* (Isaiah 47:9, 12). The following are the specific forms which the black art assumed among the Hebrews. *SEE AMULET*; *SEE DIVINATION*.

1. µyfæl; *latim',* or µyfælh] *lehatim',* Exodus 7:11, 22; 8:7; Sept. φαρμακίαι (Grotius compares the word with the Greek λιται); secret arts, from fWl, *to coves;* though others incorrectly connect it with fhili *flame,* or the glittering blade of a sword, as though it implied a sort of dazzling cheironomy which deceives spectators. Several versions render the word by "whisperings," *insusurrationes,* but it seems to be a more general word, and hence is used of the various means (some of them no doubt of a quasi-scientific character) by which the Egyptian *chartummim* imposed on the credulity of Pharaoh. *SEE MAGICIAN*.

2. µypæP], *keshaphim';* Sept. φαρμακείαι, φάρμακα (2 Kings 9:22; Micah 5:12; Nahum 3:4); Vulg. *veneficia, maleficia;* "maleficae artes," "praestigiae," "muttered spells." Hence it is sometimes rendered by ἐπαοιδαί, *incantations,* as in Isaiah 47:9, 12. The belief in the power of certain formulae was universal in the ancient world. Thus there were *carmina* to evoke the tutelary gods out of a city (Macrob. *Saturnal,* 3:9), others to devote hostile armies (Id.), others to raise the dead (Maimon. *De Idol.* 11:15; Senec. (*Edip*. 547), or bind the gods (δεσμοὶ θεῶν*)* and men (AEsch. *Fur.* 331), and even influence the heavenly bodies (Ovid, *Met.* 7:207 sq.; 12:263; "Te quoque Luna traho," Virg. *Ecl.* 8; *AEn.* 4:489 Hor. *Epod.* 5:45). They were a recognized part of ancient medicine, even among the Jews, who regarded certain sentences of the law as efficacious in healing. The Greeks used them as one of the five chief resources of pharmacy (Pind. *Pyth.* 3:8, 9; Soph. *Aj.* 582), especially in obstetrics (Plat. *Theaet.* page 145) and mental diseases (Galen, *De Sanitattuenda,* 1:8). Homer mentions them as used to check the flow of blood *(Od.* 19:456), and Cato even gives a charm to cure a disjointed limb *(De Re Rust.* 160; comp. Plin. *H. N.* 28:2). The belief in charms is still all but universal in uncivilized nations; see Lane's *Modern AEgypt.* 1:300, 306, etc.; 2:177, etc.; Beeckman's *Voyage to Borneo,* chapter 2; Meroller's *Congo* (in Pinkerton's *Voyages,* 16, pages 221, 273); Huc's *China,* 1:223; 2:326; Taylor's *New Zealand,* and Livingstone's *Africa,* passim, etc.; and hundreds

of such remedies still exist, and are considered efficacious among the uneducated. *SEE INCANTATION*.

3. µyvæ[l] *lechashim'* (<21101>Ecclesiastes 10:11), Sept. ψιθυρισμός, is especially used of the charming of serpents, <24817>Jeremiah 8:17 (comp. <19805>Psalm 58:5; Ecclus. 12:13; <21101>Ecclesiastes 10:11; Lucan, 9:891 — a parallel to "cantando rumpituranguis," and "Vipereas rumpo verbis et carmine fauces," Ov. *Metam.* l.c.). Maimonides *(De Idol.* 11:2) expressly defines an enchanter as one "who uses strange and meaningless words, by which he imposes on the folly of the credulous. They say, for instance, that if one utter the words before a serpent or scorpion it will do no harm" (Carpzov, *Alnot. in Godwynumn,* 4:11). An account of the Marsi, who excelled in this art, is given by Augustine *(ad* <01938>*Genesis* 9:28), and of the Psylli by Arnobius *(ad Nat.* 2:32); and they are alluded to by a host of other authorities (Pliny, 7:2; 28:6; AElian, *H.A.* 1:5; Virg, *AEn.* 7:750; Sil. Ital. 8:495. They were called Ὀφιοδιώκται). The secret is still understood in the East (Lane, 2:106). *SEE CHARM*.

4. The word µyvæ[n] *nechashim',* is used of the enchantments sought by Balaam (<04241>Numbers 24:1). It properly alludes toophiomancy, but in this place has a *general* meaning of, endeavoring to gain omens (Sept. εἰς συνάντησιν τοῖς οἰωνοῖς). *SEE SOOTHSAYER*.

5. rbj, *che'ber,* is used for magic (<23709>Isaiah 47:9, 12). It means generally the process of acquiring power over some distant object or person; but this word seems also to have been sometimes used expressly of serpent charmers, for R. Sol. Jarchi, on <05711>Deuteronomy 17:11, defines the rbj, rb/j to be one "who congregates serpents and scorpions into one place." *SEE MAGIC.*

Any resort to these methods of imposture was strictly forbidden in Scripture (<03926>Leviticus 19:26; <23709>Isaiah 47:9, etc.), but to eradicate the tendency is almost impossible (<12717>2 Kings 17:17; <14306>2 Chronicles 33:6), and we find it still flourishing at the Christian aera (<44106>Acts 13:6, 8; 8:9, 11, γοητεία; <48520>Galatians 5:20; <66021>Revelation 9:21). *SEE WITCHCRAFT*.

The chief "sacramenta daemoniaca" were a rod, a magic circle, dragon's eggs, certain herbs, or "insane roots," like the henbane, etc. The fancy of poets, both ancient and modern, has been exerted in giving lists of them

(Ovid and Hor. *l.c*); Shakspeare's *Macbeth,* Act 4:1; Kirke White's *Gondoline;* Southey's *Curse of Kehama,* cant. 4, etc.). *SEE SORCERY*.

Encinas

SEE ENZINAS.

Encolpium

SEE RELIQUARY.

Encratites

(Ἐγκρατεῖς Ἐγκρατίαι, *Contanentes),* a name given by several Church fathers (Irenaeus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret) to a particular Gnostic sect, but which, in the opinion of most of the modern Church historians (Neander, Hase), either designates collectively several Gnostic sects, or, in general, the tendency of Gnostic asceticism in the ancient Church. The Encratites condemned marriage, forbade the eating of flesh or drinking of wine, and used even at the celebration of the Lord's Supper water instead of wine, on which account they were called ὑδροπαραστάται, *aquarii.* They were, in general, representatives of the Gnostic asceticism lased upon the principle of Dualism, in opposition to the asceticism of the Ebionites, Montanists, and others which kept within the limits of the Church. The Church fathers who regarded the Encratites as one sect of Gnostics, called Tatian (q.v.) its founder; but it is certain that there were Encratites before Tatian, and that subsequently there were Encratites who in some points differed from Tatian. Prominent men among the Encratites were, besides Tatian, Saturninus, Marcion, Julianus, Cassianus, and Severus, who is called the founder of a particular sect, the Severians, and made himself known as a violent opponent of the apostle Paul and of the Pauline epistles. In the 12th century the name of the Encratites was used. together with the names of several other ancient heresies, to designate and condemn the Bogomiles. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:29; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* (N.Y. 3 volumes) 1:149, 282; Mosheim, *Comment.* 1:482; Hase, *Chz. Hist.* pages 64, 83; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy,* page 42; Lardner, *Works* (10 volumes, 8vo), 2:148 sq.; Schaff. *Ch. Hist.* 1:245; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 4:67; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 3:575. *SEE SACCOPHORI*; *SEE TATIAN*.

Encyclica, Encyclical Letters

(from the Gr. ἐγκύκλιος, letters which have to go the rounds of a certain number of *men — literae encyclicae*, *literae circulares),* in the ancient Church, letters sent by bishops to all the churches of a particular circuit. At present the name is exclusively used for letters addressed by the Pope to all the bishops of the Roman Catholic world. In the encyclicals the Pope lays down his views of the general wants of the Church, or of some prevailing demands and sentiments; he warns against dangerous movements within the Church, as well as against dangers threatening the Church from abroad. He urges the bishops to be watchful, and points to the proper antidotes for existing evils. Among modern encyclicals, none attracted greater attention than that issued by Pope Pius IX, in December 1864, against modern civilization. — Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 6:540. *SEE LITERAE ENCYCLICAE.*

Encyclopedia of Theology

a branch of theological science of comparatively recent origin. Its aims are to furnish

(1) a sketch of the different branches of theology in their organic connection and relations with each other; showing the fitness of the various branches to theological science as a whole, and the relative importance of these branches; and

(2) a plan of theological study, showing the order in which the topics should be taken up, and indicating the best methods of study and necessary books and helps of all kinds. This second branch, including the practical application of encyclopedia, is generally called Methodology, and the whole science taken together is called by the double name *Encyclopedia and Methodology*. Of these, Encyclopedia is the objective side, the outline of the science itself; Methodology is the subjective side, having reference to the work of the student of the science.

I. *History of the Science.* — In form, this branch of science is modern. When theology as a science was in its infancy, theological encyclopedia as science was impossible. But at an early period helps for students were prepared. Such were the treatise by Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio*, the *De officiis ministrorum* of Ambrosius, *De doctrina christiana* of Augustine,

and a work of the same kind as the latter, De *disciplina scholarium,* attributed to Boethius (t 525), but probably written after his time. Cassiodorus (t 562) wrote *De Institutione Divinacrum Literarum,* an introduction to the profitable study of Scripture, for the use of monks. In the 7th century Isidor of Seville wrote a larger work, a kind of general encyclopedia, wherein he also treats of theology, *Originum sive Etymologiarum Libr. xx,* but it is more in the shape of pastoral theology, as is the *De institutione clericorum* of Rabanus Maurus in the 9th century. The latter contains, however (volume 3), a sketch of the different branches of information necessary to a minister. The *Didascalion (eruditio didascalica)* of Hugo of St. Victor (t 1141) comes nearer to the character of a theological encyclopedia — its 1st, 2d, and 3d books treating on the preparatory studies, and the others, 4th to 6th, on the exposition of Scripture and the study of the fathers (Liebner, Hugo *v. St. Victor,* page 96). In the 13th century, Vincent of Beauvais (t 1264), in his *Speculuon doctrinale,* gave a scientific exposition of several subjects, including theology. After these we find the writings of Nicolas of Clemanges *(De stud o theologico,* d'Achery, 1:473), and Jean Charlier Gerson *(De reformatione theologaie,* and *Epistolae duce ad studentes Collegii Navarrae Parisiensis, quid et qualiter studere debeat novus theologies auditor).*

But the real origin of theological encyclopedia is to be found in the time when the Reformation, in the 16th century, breaking through the bonds of scholastic divinity, brought in a new era for science, particularly for theology. Erasmus first led the way in the new direction by his *Ratio s. methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam* (1519-1522), giving to theological studies a solid philosophical foundation, promoting the study of the Scriptures, and requiring from the theologian a knowledge of natural sciences. In the *Lutheran Church* we first find Melancthon giving a short guide to theological studies in his *Brevis ratio discendae Theologie* (Opp., Bas. 7541, 2:287), This was followed by a work of his pupil, Theobald Thamer, *Adhortatio ad theologies studium in aademia Marburgensi.* 1543. After these we find the *Oratio de studio theol. recte inchoando,* 1577, and *Regulae studiorum seu de ratione discendi in praecipuis artibus recte instituenda* (Lips. 1565), both by David Chytrius; the *Consilium de theologiae studio recte constituendo* (Nuremb, 1565), by Hieronymus Weller, the pupil and friend of Luther; the systematic *Methodus studii theologi publicis praelectionibus in academia Jenensi a.*

1617 *exposita,* (1620, 1622, 1654), by John Gerhard; as also the works of Jacob Andreoe, *De Stud. Sacr. Litt.* (Lips. 1567); Nicholas Selnecker *(Notatio de Stud. Theologiae (Lips.* 1579); and Abr. Calov *(Isagoge ad Theoilogicam).* First in the list of encyclopedic works of the *Reformed Church* stands Bullinger's *Ratio stadii theologici,* and the latter part of Conrad Gessner's *Pandectarum universalium liber ultimus.* But more important than either of those is the work of Andreas Gerhard of Ypern (Hyperius), professor at Marburg (t 1564), *Theologus, seu de ratione studii theologici* (Basal, 1572, 1582), in which we find a first attempt to arrange the matter of the *Encyclopedia,* dividing it into different departments, exegetical, dogmatical, historical, and practical, though the exact limits of each were not yet well defined. The writers on dogmatics often prefixed an encyclopedic essay to their works, as did J.H. Alsted in his *Methodus sacrossanctae Theologies* (Hanov. 1623) which contains two prefatory books on the study of theology. From the school of Saumur came Steph. Gaussin's *Dissertationes de studii theologici ratione,* etc. (1678, 6th ed., by Rambach, Hal. 1726). Calixtus (t 1656) wrote a copious *Appaeratus Theologicus* (Helmst., edited by his son, 1661); and Spener (t 1705) gave acute advice and discriminations in several of his writings.

The term encyclopedia, in its present meaning, we find for the first time in the title of a work by the Reformed theologian S. Mursinna, *Primae lineae* ENCYCLOPAEDAE, THEOLOGICAE, (Hal. Magd. 1764; 2d ed. 1794). But this, like all the works heretofore mentioned, has now only a historical interest. Herder's *Briefe u. d. Stadium d. Theologie* (1785, 4 volumes) is, on the other hand, even now of value in this field. A new era in the history of theological encyclopedia was inaugurated by Schleiermacher in his *Darstellung d. theologischen Stadiums z. Behufe einleitender Vorlesungen* (Berlin, 1811); but the full effect of the book was not felt until its 2d edition appeared in 1830, although Bertholdt *(Theol. Wissenschaftskunde,* Erlangen, 1821, 2 volumes), Francke *(Theol. Encyclopaedie,* 1819), and Danz *(Encyclopaedie and Methodologie,* Wein. 1832) had been stimulated and guided by Schleiermacher's remarkable sketch. The powerful grasp of the whole science, and the luminous statement of the relations of all the parts, given by Schleiermacher, give his *Darstellung* the foremost place in this branch of science. (There is an English translation by Farrar, not very well done, under the title *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology,* Edinb. 1850, 12mo). Its practical fault lies in the divisions, made of the whole science (see below). It was followed by Hagenbach's *Encyclopaedie au.*

Methodologie d. Theol. Wissenschaften (Leips. 1833, 8vo), a work of great practical value, which has maintained its position as the most useful manual on the subject (7th edition, Leips. 1864, 8vo). The *Encyclopaedie d. theol. Wissenschaften* of K. Rosenkranz (Halle, 1845) is thoroughly speculative and Hegelian. Harless's *Enryclopadie u. Methodologie* (Nurnb. 18371) is a Lutheran work, and is really valuable for its historical sketch of the development of theology and for its copious literature. The *Anleitung z. Studium d. christl. Theologie* of Lobegott Lange (Jena, 1841) advocates Biblical rationalism. Pelt's *Theologische Encyklopadie* (Hamb. 1843, 8vo) follows Schleiermacher's method closely, but is a thorough and scholarly work, careful in statement, broad in range, and accurate in literature. Holland has produced a valuable compendium in Clarisse, *Encyclopedice Theologicae Epitome* (2d edit. Lugd. Bat. 1835, 8vo), which has a copious literature, especially full in reference to English books, a matter in which the German writers on the subject are all signally deficient.

Among Roman Catholic books in this field are to be mentioned Possevinus, *Bibliotheca selecta de ratione studiorum* (Colon. 1607); Ellies du Pin, *Methode pour etudier la theologiae* (1716), translated into several languages. In the 18th century, Denina (1758), Gerbert (1764), Braun (1777), Brandmeier (1783), and specially Oberthur, labored in this field. The influence of the later Protestant writers is manifest in such works as Drey, *Kurze Einl. in das Stud. d. Theologie* (Tubing. 1819); Klee, *Encyklopaedie* (Mainz, 1832); Staudenmaier, *Encyclopadie der theol. Wissenschaften als System d. gesammfen Theologie* (Mentz, 1834-1840); Gengler, *D. Ideale d. Wissenschaft. o. d. Encyclopadie d. Theologie* (Bamb. 1834); Buchner, *Enc. u. Method.* (Sulzb. 1837); A. von Sieger, *De natura fidei et methodo theologiae ad ecclesiae catholicae Theologos* (Monast. 1839).

No book properly to be called *Encyclopedia of Theology* has appeared in English, and no book is more needed, as the English theological literature is almost wholly neglected by the Germans. (We are glad to see, as this article goes to press, 1868, an *Encyclopedia and Methodology* announced as in preparation by Dr. H.B. Smith.) But there are *many* excellent remarks in English books of pastoral theology on the best methods of study, and some special treatises which deserve notice. Among them are Dodwell, *Advice on Theological Studies* (Lond. 1691); Bennet, *Directions for Studying* (Lond. 1727, 3d edit. 8vo); Cotton Mather, *Manuductio in Ministerium* (Boston, 1726, 12mo; republished, with additions, as Mather's

Student and Preacher, by Ryland (Lond. 1781); Mason, *Student and Pastor* (Lond. 1755); Marsh, *Course of Lectures on Divinity* (Cambridge, 1809, 8vo), which gives good practical hints, and also attempts an encyclopaedic outline; Doddridge, *Lectures* (Works, Lond. 1830, 215 sq.); Bickersteth, *Christian Student* (Lond. 4th edit. 1844), contains much information and good advice, but is destitute of scientific form or spirit. There are many compends, such as Preston's *Theological Manual* (1850), Smith's *Compendium* (1836), etc., which are superficial sketches of theology, designed to aid students in cramming rather than in thorough work. Many good hints are given in books of pastoral theology, for which *SEE PRACTICAL THEOLOGY*. There is a good list of books in Lowndes's *British Librarian*, page 813 sq.

II. *Method of Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology.* —

1. Some writers hold that encyclopedia should be treated entirely apart from methodology: so Kienlen, *Encyclopadie* (Strasb. 1842), confines the former to the exposition of the relation of the several branches of theology to the science as a whole; making methodology a separate work, aiming not to set forth the science at all, but to show how it should be studied. This view is correct, if encyclopedia be taken in its broadest sense, as not merely an introductory science, taking the beginner by the hand at the portals of theology, and showing, him the way to enter, and the plan of the edifice, but also as forming the *conclusion* of the course of study, in which all the branches are exhibited in their natural relations to the central trunk. But in view of practical use, most of the recent writers blend methodology with encyclopedia in one connected whole.

2. We give here the methods of the chief writers on the subject:

(1.) Schleiermacher (§ 31) divides theology as science into three branches, Philosophical, Historical, and Practical. *Philosophical* theology includes, 1. Apologetics; 2. Polemics. *Historical* theology includes, 1. Exegetics, or the knowledge, of primitive Christianity; 2. Church history, or the knowledge of the earthly career of Christianity; 3. the knowledge or the present condition of Christianity *(a)* as to doctrine (Dogmatic theology), *(b)* as to social condition and extension (Ecclesiastical statistics). *Practical* theology includes, 1. Church service (Liturgy, Worship, Homiletics, Pastoral care); 2. Church government.

(2.) Hagenbach adopts the old and useful division of theology into four parts, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical. *Exegetical* theology includes a knowledge of the sacred books, as the primary source of Christian doctrine, and the record of the original facts of Christianity. This knowledge presumes a knowledge of the languages of the sacred books, and requires also an apparatus (1) of criticism; (2) of history, viz. archaeology, geography, etc.; (3) of interpretation (Hermeneutics).

Historical theology includes Bible history of Old and New Testament, Biblical theology, Church history, Doctrine history, Patristics, Symbolics, Archaeology, Statistics. *Systematic* theology includes Dogmatics, Apologetics, Polemics, and Ethics. *Practical* theology embraces Catechetics, Worship, Homiletics, Pastoral care, Church government. — Pelt gives a very complete outline (founded on Schleiermacher's) in his *Encyclopaedie* (1843, 8vo), which he modifies somewhat in his article *Theologie,* in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopadie,* 15:748 (compare also his article in *Studien u. Kritiken,* 1849, page 27). — Godet *(Bulletin Theologique,* Paris, 1863, art. 1) divides theology into,

1. Speculative, or the knowledge of salvation;

2. Practical, or the art of saving men. Under the first he classes Exegetical, Systematic, and Historical theology; under the second, Ecclesiastical economy, Missions, Apologetics (compare a criticism on this outline by Pronier, in the same journal, May, 1863, page 76 sq.).

Thomas *(Bullet. Theol.* September 1865) proposes to arrange as follows:

1. Apologetics (historical and philosophical);

2. Historical theology (Biblical sciences, Church history, Statistics);

3. Systematic theology (Dogmatics, Polemics, Speculative theology);

4. Practical theology (the individual, the family, the nation, civilization, the Church, (a) as to its base, (b) as to its organization, (c) as to its active working. — Dr. W.F. Warren, of the Boston Theological Seminary, gives a philosophical but luminous outline in *Jahrbicherf. Deutsche Theologie,* 1867, page 318, as follows:

1. The Church, in its origin in time (History of the sacred writings; Biblical doctrines: Mosaic, Jewish, and New Test.; Biblical Church history; auxiliary sciences: philology, archeology, geography, chronology, etc.).

2. The Church in its development in time (Literature, History of doctrines, System of Christian doctrines, Church history, Church economy, auxiliary sciences, with Polemics as a concluding discipline).

3. The Church in its consummation (the scientific exposition of what the Word of God tells us concerning the future development and final consummation of the Church). In a note to Dr. Warren's article (page 321), Dr. Wagenmann gives another outline, to which we refer the reader.

Literature. — Besides the authors already cited, see Tholuck's *Lectures on Encyclopedia,* translated in the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* volume 1; *Biblical Repository,* edited by Dr. Robinson, 1:613; 4:127; Zyro, in *Studien u.Kritiken,* 1837, page 689 sq.; Shedd, *Essays,* Essays on *Method and Influence of Theological Studies;* Vincent, *Du Protestantisme en France,* 1:314 sq. (Paris, 1860,12mo); Credner, *Preface to Kitto's Cyclopcedia.*

Encyclopedia French,

and the ENCYCLOPEDISTS. The *Dictionnaire Encyclopedique* was a publication of the 18th century, which exerted a great influence not merely on general science and literature but also on theology and religion. Its full title is *Encyclopadie ou Dictionnaire raisonne des Sciences, des Arts, et des Metiers, par une societe de gens de Lettres; mis en ordre et public par* DIDEROT; *et quant a la parie Mathematique par* D'ALEMBERT *SEE D'ALEMBERT* (Par. and Amst. 1751-80, 35 volumes, fol.). This great work was projected by Diderot (q.v.), and carried through, in the midst of difficulties, chiefly by his indomitable industry and perseverance. The name of D'Alembert (q.v.) added luster to the publication; and these two called to their aid all the skeptical and free-thinking talent of France. A great aim of the Encyclopedists was to establish what they called philosophy instead of religion; and the higher intellect of France seemed to become thoroughly imbued with their views, social, moral, and political. The *Encyclopedia* was a product of the same causes which generated the Revolution, but the publication itself doubtless greatly hastened the catastrophe. It was only one stage in the development of that one-sided realism which commenced with Locke; expanded into the deism of England; and, crossing over to France, found a powerful advocate in Condillac. The progress of this

development was very rapid. Among the Encyclopedists a single lifetime produced startling changes. Diderot, the editor and leading philosophical spirit of the *Encyclopedia,* "was at first only a doubter, next he became a deist, lastly an atheist. In the first stage he only translated English works, and even condemned some of the English deists. His views seem gradually to have altered, probably under the influence of Voltaire's writings and of the infidel books smuggled into France, and he thenceforth assumed a tone bolder and marked by positive disbelief. Diderot's atheism is a still farther development of his unbelief. It is expressed in few of his writings, and presents no subject of interest to us, save that it seeks to invalidate the arguments for the being of God drawn from final causes" (Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought,* page 179). D'Alembert, the scientific editor of the *Encyclopedia,* was "the author of the celebrated *Discours Preliminaire des Editeurs,* which was issued in separate form, and became a text-book of infidelity not only in France, but also in England. D'Alembert's reputation in the department of science was very great over the entire continent of Europe, and he gave to the *Encyclopedia* its high scientific character and value. *SEE ALEMBERT, D'*. There has been much discussion as to whether the *Encyclopedia* proper really was issued in the interests of atheism. Many of the articles are entirely Christian in their tone and spirit. Others are as decidedly atheistic, while the *Discours Preliminaire* can hardly be called doubtful as to its character and aims. The true view seems to be that the Encyclopedists endeavored clandestinely to accomplish what more honest infidels had long attempted openly. They endeavored to undermine both religion and the state, while seeming to be in favor of them. Voltaire doubtless stands at the head of the coterie which furnished the articles for the *Encyclopedia,* although he wrote little for it himself. More than any other man he was the educator of the Encyclopedists. His principles are too well known to need statement. Helvetius derived his philosophy from Locke. "He was the moralist of the sensational philosophy, one who applied the philosophy of Condillac to morals. His philosophy is expressed in two works: the one on the spirit, the other on man; the former a theoretical view of human nature, the latter a practical view of education and society. His primary position is, that man owes all his superiority over animals to the superior organization of his body. Pleasure is the only good, and self-interest the true ground of morals, and the frame-work of individual and political right" (Farrar, *History of Free Thought,* page 180). Next come the authors of the *Systeme de la Nature,* a work issued by the encyclopedists. It has been attributed to

baron d'Holbach, his tutor Lagrange, Diderot, Grimm, Helvetius, and Robinet. It was doubtless a joint work, and expressed the views of all these men, or was a compromise creed to which they could all subscribe, for they held widely different opinions in other respects. The great object of the *System of Nature* was to banish God from the universe. It is devoted to the boldest materialism. "There is, in fact, nothing but matter and motion, says this book. Both are inseparably connected. If matter is at rest, it is only because hindered in motion, for in its essence it is not a dead mass" (Schwegler, *History of Philosophy).* The first part of this work undertakes to disprove the existence of mind; the second part is directed against religion. This *System of Nature* was the boldest achievement of infidelity, a work which even Voltaire pronounced "illogical in its deductions, absurd in its physics, and abominable in its morality." To those already named we may add Rousseau, whose *Political Essays* became the text-book of the French Revolution. He did for the state what the others had done for the Church. Such, then, were the views of those who projected and carried forward the *Encyclopedia.* If in the *Encyclopedia* itself we find those views covered up, or at least offset by thoroughly Christian ones, we are justified in believing that they were concealed and balanced by contrary opinions only to make the *Encyclopedia* acceptable to the unthinking masses of the French nation. The fact, as some hold, that the French nation was ripening for a revolution both in Church and State, and would have rushed into such a catastrophe at all hazards, proves nothing respecting the motives of the encyclopedists; and the terrible quickening which their great popular work gave to infidelity is perhaps the best test by which to judge the purposes of its authors.

Let us now look at the *Encyclopedia* itself, and its spirit can perhaps be best read from the *Discours Preliminaire.* D'Alembert was its author, although he probably secured both the approval and assistance of Diderot in its form and contents. The object of this *Discours* is to set forth the philosophy underlying the *Encyclopedia,* and this is nothing more than the sensationalism of Locke. D'Alembert declares that "all our abstract knowledge may be reduced to what we receive through our senses," Showing that this may be the case, he thence argues that it is so. Sensations are the only things about which he cannot raise a doubt. With regard to ethics, the following is his underlying principle. Our ideas of good and evil "arise from the oppression which, by nature, the stronger practices upon the weaker, and the latter bears the more reluctantly the

more violent it is, because he feels that there is no reason why he should submit to it; the evils which befall us through the vices of our fellow-men lead to the indirect knowledge of antagonistic virtues." These are the grounds upon which his philosophy is based. And yet this *Discours* made infidelity more popular to the unthinking masses than the writings of Locke, Condillac, Helvetius, De la Mettrie, or Holbach had done.

Such is the sensualistic materialism contained in the *Discours Preliminaire*, containing the ethical principle that we feel a sense of oppression only because we can see no *reason* why we should submit to it. And yet, by the side of this, in the same *Discours*, we find the following statement: "Nothing, therefore, is more necessary than a revealed religion, which instructs us concerning so many things. Designed for the completion of our natural knowledge, it shows us a portion of what was concealed from us; but confines itself to that which is most needful, while all the rest remains forever hidden. A few points of faith, and a small number of practical precepts, is all to which the revealed religion refers; yet, thanks to the light which it communicates to the world, since then the people are more firm and decided concerning a great number of interesting questions than the philosophers of any school ever were." In this way infidelity and religion were woven into the same system, religion being always held subordinate, a something to accomplish an end which science and philosophy could not quite reach. This being once admitted, it was not difficult to persuade the French people that, when philosophy could accomplish all that is necessary, religion might be set aside.

In the body of the *Encyclopedia* itself, many of the articles upon religious subjects are apparently in full sympathy with catholicity, and even orthodoxy. For instance, the article "Trinite" defends the orthodox dogma from attacks of Socinians, Jews, and infidels of all kinds. In the article "Dieu" the arguments for the existence of God are ably summed up, and objections are refuted. Quotations are made from Christian authorities, and the writer of the article seems to have been in full sympathy with the Christian view of the subject. The existence of angels and devils is recognised. The article "Christianisme" pronounces Christianity the only true revealed religion, and the Old and New Testaments are recognised as divine. It declares that the severest criticism has not been able to invalidate their authenticity. Reason and philosophy must accord to them the honor of setting forth facts beyond their reach. The hand of God is seen in the style of the sacred writings. Articles on Protestantism condemn severely

every innovation in doctrine, every departure from the established creeds of the various denominations. The errors of the Romish Church are pointed out and severely castigated. It is not necessary to suppose these articles written in a spirit of hypocrisy. Their authors doubtless held the views expressed. The fact that they did does not invalidate the opinion that the *Encyclopedia* was secretly issued in the interests of atheism. Its authors could well afford to give Christian men a voice within its pages, when there was so much to counteract all they might say. It was not that Christianity had no advocates in the *Encyclopedia,* but that it was allowed only a feeble defense, and was often defended on principles which directly tended to its overthrow. Its very defenders, in many cases, were its worst enemies, and only erected fortifications on the side of religion to show how easily they could be carried by infidelity. The defense is made chiefly to rest on eudaemonism. Christianity should be upheld because it brings us more good than any other system of religion. Whatever system is most advantageous for man in his worldly relations is the system to which he should adhere. Whenever men can be made to believe that Christianity fails to do this, then it must be set aside. For example, in the article "Christianisme," Christ is placed side by side with the other lawgivers, his only superiority being that, while they kept the useful in view, he aimed at the true as well as the useful. "Though he set forth, as its first object, the happiness of another life, he also meant it to make us happy in this world." In other places morality is preferred to faith, "because he who does good and makes himself useful to the world is in a better condition through morality without faith than through faith without morality." Theism is better than atheism, because it is more advantageous for nations to admit the existence of God than to reject it.

The work began to appear in 1751, and was concluded in 1765, in 17 volumes, fol., besides 11 volumes of plates. A supplement, in 5 volumes, appeared at Amsterdam, 1776-1777, and a *Table analytique et raisonne des matieres,* in 2 volumes, at Paris, in 1780. The publication was stopped two or three times by the government, and the last volumes were distributed privately, though the king himself was one of the purchasers. Diderot himself said of the *Encyclopedia* that he had had "neither time nor means of being particular in the choice of his contributors, among whom some were excellent, but most of the rest were very inferior; moreover the contributors, being badly paid, worked carelessly; in short, it was a patch-work composed of very ill-sorted materials, some masterpieces by the side

of school-boys' performances; and there was also considerable neglect in the arrangement of the articles, and especially in the references." In spite of all its defects, the *Encyclopedia* was the pride of France, and is in many respects a very able production. See La Porte, *Esprit de l'Encyclopedie* (Paris, 1768); Voltaire, *Questions sur l'Encyclopedie* (Paris, 1770); Van Mildert, *Boyle Lecture,* 1:378; Kurtz, *Church History,* 2:236; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought,* pages 166-178; Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Philosophy,* page 378; Schwegler, *Hist. Philosophy,* translated by Seelye, page 206; Chambers, *Encyclopaedia;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:1; Morell, *Hist. Philippians* page 111. (H.G.)

End of the World

SEE ESCHATOLOGY.

En'-dor

(Heb. *Eyn-Dor',* r/D ˆ[e *fountain of Dor,* i.e., of the *age,* <091807>1 Samuel 28:7, Sept. Ἐνδώρ v.r. Ἀενδώρ; but defectively rDoˆ[e in <061711>Joshua 17:11, Sept. Δώρ, v.r. Ἐνδώρ; and ρ0αΔ9οι in <198310>Psalm 83:10 [11], Sept. Ἀενδώρ; Josephus Ἔνδωροὺ, *Ant.* 6:14, 2), a place which, with its "daughter-towns" (t/nB), was in the territory of Issachar, and yet possessed by Manasseh (<061711>Joshua 17:11). This was the case with five other places which lay partly in Asher, partly in Issachar, and seem to have formed a kind of district of their own, called "the three, or the triple *Nepheth*" (q.v.). The Israelites were unable to expel the Canaanites from it until a late period. Endor was long held in memory by the Jewish people as connected with the great victory of Deborah and Barak over Sisera and Jabins. Taanach, Megiddo, and the torrent Kishon all witnessed the discomfiture of the huge host, but it was emphatically to Endor that the tradition of the death of the two chiefs attached itself (<198309>Psalm 83:9, 10). Possibly it was some recollection of this, some fame of sanctity or good omen in Endor, which drew the unhappy Saul thither (see Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:161) on the eve of his last engagement with an enemy no less hateful and no less destructive than the Midianites (<091807>1 Samuel 28:7). Endor is not again mentioned in the Scriptures; but it was known to Eisebius and Jerome, who describe it (by the same name, Ἀενδώρ and Ἐνδώρ, *AEndor* and *Endor)* as a large village in the plain of Jezreel or Esdraelon, 4 miles S. of Tabor *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἀηνδώρ, AEndor), near Nain and Scythopolis *(ib.* s.v. Ἠνδώρ, Endor). It was recognized during

the Crusades (Brocardus, c. 6, page 176; Marin. Sanut. page 248), but was then partially lost sight of till the 17th century (Doubdan, page 580; Nau, page 632; Maundrell, Apr. 19). On the bleak northern slope of Jebel Duhy (the "Little Hermon" of travelers) the name still lingers, attached to a considerable but now deserted village (Burckhardt, *Trav.* page 342; Robinson, *Res.* 3:218; Schwarz, *Palest.* page 149). The rock of the mountain, on the slope of which *Endur* stands, is hollowed into caves, one of which, containing a little fountain, the entrance narrow, between rugged rocks, and partly covered with a fig-tree, may well have been the scene of the incantation of the witch (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, 2:383). The distance from the slopes of Gilboa to Endor is 7 or 8 miles, over difficult ground (Porter, *Handb.* 2:358).

E'neas

SEE AJEEAS.

En-eg'laim

[many *En-egla'imi*] (Hebrews *Eyn Egla'yim,* µyaeg][,ˆy[*fountain of two calves,* unless for µyaeg][,ˆy[*fountain of two pools;* Sept. Ἐναγαλείμ v.r. Εναγαλλείμ), a place named only by Ezekiel (47:10), apparently as on the Dead Sea, but whether near to or far from Engedi, on the west or east side of the sea, it is impossible to ascertain from the text: "The fishers shall stand upon it from En-gedi even to En-eglaim: they shall be a place to spread forth nets." In his comment on the passage, Jerome places it at the northern end of the Deed Sea, at the influx of the Jordan. M. de Saulcy thinks it identical with *AinAjlah,* situated towards the northern point of the Dead Sea, between Jericho and the Jordan *(Narrative,* 1:163). *SEE BETH-HOGLAH*. En-eglaim is probably another name for the EGLAIM *SEE EGLAIM* (q.v.) of <23B15B08>Isaiah 15:8.

Enemes'sar

(Ἐνεμέσσαρος and Ἐνεμεσσάρ) is the name under which SHATMIANESER *SEE SHATMIANESER* (q.v.) appears in the book of Tobit (1:2,13, 15, 16). The change of the name is a corruption, the first syllable *Shal* being dropped (compare the Bupalussor of Abydenus, which represents Nabopolassar), and the order of the liquids *m* and *n* being reversed. The author of Tobit makes Enemessar lead the children of Israel into captivity (<12010202>2 Kings 1:2), following the *apparent* narrative of the

book of Kings (2 Kings 17:3-6; 18:9-11). "He regards Sennacherib not only as his successor, but as his son (2 Kings 1:15), for which he has probably no authority beyond his own speculations upon the text of Scripture. *SEE TOBIT.*

Ene'nius

(Ἐνηνής v.r. Ἐνήνιος, Vulg. *Emmanius),* one of the leaders of the people who returned from captivity with Zorobabel (1 Esdr. 5:8); corresponding to the NAHAMANI *SEE NAHAMANI* (q.v.) of Nehemiah 7:7.

Energici

a sect in Germany in the 16th century, so called because — they held that the Eucharist was the *energy* of Jesus Christ — not his body, nor a representation thereof. — Buck, *Theol. Dictionary,* s.v.

Energumens

(ἐνεργούμενοι), persons *possessed*, and, in the narrower and more usual sense, persons possessed by an evil spirit. In the early Church such persons constituted a distinct class, bearing some relation to the catechumens and the faithful, but differing from them in this, that they were under the special care of exorcists, while they took part in some of the religious exercises of both classes. Catechumens who became disordered in mind during their term of probation were not baptized until thoroughly recovered, except in cases of sickness. Should any among the baptized become thus afflicted, they were excluded from the Christian assembly during the worst stages of their disease, being compelled to remain in the area of the church. From this circumstance they were called χειμαζόμενοι, *exposed to the weather.* When partially recovered they were permitted to join in public worship, but were not permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper till they were properly restored, except in the immediate prospect of death. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 3, chapter 4, § 6, 8.

Enfantin Barthelemy Prosper,

more commonly called father Enfantir, one of the founders of Saint Simonism (q.v.), was born at Paris February 8, 1796. He received his education at a lyceum, and subsequently (1813) at the Polytechnic School. After the fall of Napoleon he engaged in commercial and industrial pursuits. Towards the close of the year 1825 Enfantin became intimately

acquainted with Olinde Rodriguez, and through him with Saint Simon, who converted him to his theories of an industrial and religious reformation. He accepted from his dying master the mission to spread and develop his doctrines. The work was begun with the establishment of a journal called *Le Producteur* (1825-26, 5 volumes), which closed its career with the celebrated epitaph, The golden age, which a blind tradition has formerly placed in the past, is still before us. The Liberal party at first saw in this periodical the application of its own ideas to the material order, and supported it but the support was withdrawn when Benjamin Constant denounced it as theocratic. In 1828 Enfantin had about a dozen co laborers, among whom were Blanqui, Duveyrier, Buchez (in 1818 president of the Constituent Assembly), and Pereire. The revolution of 1830 filled Enfantin with enthusiastic hopes. He signed, on the 30th of July, a proclamation, in which he demanded community of goods, abolition of inheritage, and the emancipation of woman. He organized "centers of action" at Toulouse, Montpellier, Lyons, Metz, and Dijon; provided for regular preaching at Paris, and frequently addressed the learned, the artists, and the industrials. In 1830 he secured the support of the *Globe* newspaper. Soon he was made by acclamation (the sacred word was *acclame*) one of the supreme fathers, with Bazard. The two chiefs disagreed, however, on one important point: Bazard wished to pay prominent attention to political agitation, while Enfantin occupied himself only with ethics, art, religion, and social reform. He desired first of all to regulate individual relations, to emancipate woman and the pauper, and to sanctify the flesh by labor and pleasure. He expected to obtain control of society by dispossessing the Church, not the state. In November, 1831, he issued a manifesto to the forty thousand adherents of the new doctrine in France, that Bazard and Rodriguez had separated from him, and that the new dogma had become incarnate in him alone, as the living law and the messiah. But his attempt to establish communistic colonies failed, and the researches made for finding a female messiah, to share with him the leadership of the communion, made the whole movement ridiculous. The *Globe*, which was gratuitously distributed, had to be discontinued. In 1832 the government suppressed the association. Enfantin, followed by about forty of his disciples, among whom were Michael Chevalier (subsequently a member of the senate), Duveyrier, and Gustave d'Eichthal, retired to an estate which he possessed on the coast of Menilmontant, and there organized a model community. There the new brethren, divided into groups of laborers, wore a peculiar garb, and passed the day in work,

religious conferences, and symbolical ceremonies. The "father" (Enfantin) had this name conspicuously inscribed upon his breast, superintended, preached, encouraged; he wrote articles for *Les Feuilles Populaires,* and the *Livre Nouveau;* composed mystical hymns, and developed some mystical pantheism. It cost him great efforts to refute the attacks of Carnot, J. Reynaut, and others. He was then summoned before the assizes of the Seine, being charged with having held forbidden meetings, and outraged public morality, and was condemned to a year of imprisonment (August 28, 1832). The Saint Simonians now dispersed. Enfantin, who after a few months was set at liberty, left with about a dozen of his disciples for Egypt. Most of them, turning Mohammedans, received appointments from the pasha of Egypt; but Enfantin refused to profess Mohammedanism, and after remaining in Egypt for two years, returned to France. He was for a time postmaster, and in 1841, through the influence of his friends, some of whom had obtained high offices, was appointed member of a scientific commission sent to Algeria. In 1845 he received the chief direction of the Lyons railroad. In November, 1848, Enfantin, conjointly with Duveyrier, established a daily paper, *Le Credit,* which was continued until 1850. Subsequently Enfantin became connected with the administration of the railroad from Lyons to the Mediterranean. He died May 31, 1864. Shortly before his death he appointed Arles Dufour head of the sect. Enfantin developed the socialistic views of his master and his own in the works *E'conomie politique et St. Simonienne* (Paris 1831) and *Morale* (Paris 1832). The latter work was at once condemned by to *Courd'assises.* Another work of the same class, *Le Livre nouveau* (completed in 1832), has never been printed. His philosophical and theological views were set forth at length in the *Correspondance philosophique et religieuse* (Paris 1847), of which the *Correspondance politique* (Paris, 1849) is a supplement, and in a pamphlet against the Jesuit orator, father Felix *(Reponse au Pere Felix,* Paris, 1856). His last work was *La Vie Eternelle passee, presente, future* (Paris, 1861: also republished in the *Bibliothique utile,* Paris, 1864). In 1865 a collective edition of his socialistic works was published. Vapereau, *Dictionnaire des Contemporains,* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 16:37. (A.J.S.)

Enfield William, LL.D.,

an English Dissenter and voluminous writer, was born at Sudbury March 29, 1741, and was educated at Daventry under Dr. Ashworth. On leaving the seminary he became pastor to a congregation at Liverpool. He

afterwards became resident tutor and lecturer on belles-lettres at Warrington Academy. In 1785 he became minister of the Unitarian Church at Norwich, where he died November 3, 1797. Among his numerous publications were

(1) *A History of Philosophy,* drawn up from Brucker (London 1819, 2 volumes, 8vo): —

(2) *The Preachers' Directory* (London, 1771, 4to): —

(3) *Sermons for Families* (London 1778, 2 volumes, 12mo): —

(4) *The English Preaches* (London 9 volumes, 12mo). He was a frequent contributor to periodicals, and shared with Dr. Aikin in the preparation of the *General Biographical Dictionary.*

Engad'di

(ἐν αἰγιαλοῖς v r. Ἐνγάδδι and ἐν Γάδδι or ἐν Γάδοις, Vulg. *in Cades),* Ecclus. 24:14. *SEE ENGEDI.*

En-gan'nim

(Hebrews *Eyn Gannim'*µ µyNÞæ ˆy[,e *fountain of gardens),* the name of several places in Palestine, for, besides those mentioned below, there was said, according to Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Ἡγαννί, Engannim), then to be a third village called Engannim (Ἡγαννά, *Eganna)* near Gerasa, beyond the Jordan.

1. (Sept. Ἡνγονείμ v.r. unrecognizable; Vulg. *AEngannim.)* A town in the plains of Judah, mentioned between Zanoah and Tappuah (<06534>Joshua 15:34). Eusebius and Jerome state *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἡγανίμ, Engannim) that it was still extant in their day near Bethel; but there must have been some mistake in this, as the place in question lay in the group N.W. of Jerusalem (Keil, *Comment. on Joshua* in loc.), possibly at the site of the present agricultural village *Rana,* north of Eleutheropolis (Robinson, *Researches,* 2:354). Schwarz, however, thinks *(Palest.* page 102) that "En-gannim is certainly identical with the village *Jenin,* 3 Eng. miles S.E. of Ashkelon;" but this is not in the quarter indicated by the associated names, and is, moreover. with greater probability appropriated to another ancient locality. *SEE ZENAN.*

2. A city on the border of Issachar (Joshua 19:21; Sept. Ἰεών καὶ Τομμάν, Alex. ην Γαννίμ; Vulg, *En(annimni);* allotted with its "suburbs" to the Gershonite Levites (21:29; Sept. ρλσψσ) Πηγὴ γραμμάτων*;* Vulg. *En-Gannim*); probably the same (see Reland, *Palest.* page 812) as the *Ginaea* (Γιναία) or *Geman* (Γημάν) of Josephus, of the borders of the great plain toward Samaria *(Ant.* 20:6, 1; *War*, 3:3, 4; comp. 2:12, 3), which Biddulph (in *Purchas,* 2:135) identifies with the present *Jenin,* a town 15 miles south of Mount Tabor, and which he and others describe as still a place of gardens and abundant water (Wilson, *Lands of Bible,* 2:84; Van de Velde, *Narrative,* 2:359; Schwarz, *Palest.* page 167). In the lists of Levitical cities in 1 Chronicles 6, ANEM is substituted for Engannim, apparently by contraction. The position of Jenin is in striking agreement with the requirements of BETHHAG-GAN (A.V. "the garden-house;" Sept. Βαιθγάν) in the direction of which Ahaziah fled from Jehu (2 Kings 9:27). The rough road of the ascent was probably too much for his chariot, and, keeping the more level ground, he made for Megiddo, where he died (Stanley, *Palest.* page 942). The place is several times noticed by Arabian writers in connection with thee march of Saladin, and has been visited by many modern travelers (Robinson, *Researches,* 3:156). The only remains of Ginea are a few foundations of walls close to the mosque of the present town (De Saulcy, *Narrative,* 1:78, 79). The town is high enough to overlook the broad plain, and low enough to have its houses encircled by its verdure. The hills rise steeply behind, dotted with bushes, and here and there clothed with the somber foliage of the olive. Rich gardens, hedged with prickly pear, extend along their base, and a few palm-trees give variety to the scene. The "fountain," front which the town took the first part of its Scripture name (En), is in the hills a few hundred yards distant; and' its abundant waters flow over and fertilize the "gardens" *(Gannim)* from which the second and chief part of the name is derived. The leading road from Jezreel and the north to Samaria and Jerusalem passes Jenin. It contains about 2000 inhabitants, and is the capital of a large district (Porter, *Handbook,* page 351; Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:189).

En-ge'di

[many *En'-gedi,* some *En-ged'i*] (Hebrews *Eyn Gedi,',* ydeGi[; *fountain of* the *kid;* Sept. in Joshua Ηνγαδδί v.r. Ἀγκαδής, in Sam. Ἐνγαδδί, in Chron. and Cant. Ἐνγαδδεί v.r. Ἰγγαδδί and ἐν Γαδδί, in Ezekiel Ἐνγαδδείν v.r. Ἰνγαδείν, Apocr. ENGADDI; Josephus Ἔγγαδδί;

Ptolemy Ἐγγαδαί, 5:16, 8; Stephanus Byz. Ἔγγαδά, page 333; Eusebius Ἠγγαδδί, *Onomast.* s.v.; Pliny, *Engadd, Hist. Nat.* 5:17), a town in the wilderness of Judah (<06162>Joshua 15:62), on the western shore of the Dead Sea (<263470>Ezekiel 47:10), which gave its name to a part of the desert whither David withdrew for fear of Saul (<06162>Joshua 15:62; <092401>1 Samuel 24:1-4). Its more ancient name was HAZEZON-TAMAR *SEE HAZEZON-TAMAR* (q.v.), and by that name it is mentioned before the destruction of Sodom, as being inhabited by the Amorites, and near the cities of the plain (<011407>Genesis 14:7); a title ("the pruning of the palm") doubtless derived from the palm-groves that surrounded it (Ecclus. 24:14). It was immediately after an assault upon the "Amorites, that dwelt in Hazezon-tamar," that the five Mesopotamian kings were attacked by the rulers of the plain of Sodom (<011407>Genesis 14:7; comp. <142002>2 Chronicles 20:2). Saul was told that David was in the "wilderness of En-gedi;" and he took "3000 men, and went to seek David and his men upon the rocks of the *wild goats"* (<092401>1 Samuel 24:1-4). These animals still frequent the cliffs above and around the fountain; the Arabs call them *Beden.* At a later period En-gedi was the gathering-place of the Moabites and Ammonites who went up against Jerusalem, and fell in the valley of Berachah (<142002>2 Chronicles 20:2). It is remarkable that this is the usual route taken in the present day by such predatory bands from Moab as make incursions into Southern Palestine. They pass round the southern end of the Dead Sea, then up the road along its western shore to the pass at Ain-Jidy (“the ascent by the cliff Ziz," <142016>2 Chronicles 20:16), and thence toward Hebron, Tekoa, or Jerusalem, as the prospects of plunder seem most inviting. The vineyards of Engedi were celebrated by Solomon (Cant. 1:14); its balsam by Josephus *(Ant.* 9:1, 2). Stephanus of Byzantium places it near Sodom; Jerome at the south end of the Dead Sea *(Comm. in Ezekiel* 47); but Josephus more correctly upon the Lake Asphaltites, at the distance of 300 stadia from Jerusalem *(Ant.* 9:1, 2; comp. 16:13, 4; *War,* 3:3, 5). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome, En-gedi was still a large village on the shore of the Dead Sea, but it must have been abandoned very soon afterwards, for there is no subsequent reference to it in history, nor are there any traces of recent habitation (Porter's *Handbook,* page 242). There is a curious reference to it in Mandeville *(Early Trav.* page 179), who says that the district between Jericho and the Dead Sea is "the land of Dengadda" (Fr. *d'Engadda),* and that the balm-trees were "still called vines of Gady." En-gedi has always, until recently, been sought at the north end of the Dead Sea (Reland, *Palaest.* page 449); but in 1805 Seetzen recognised the

ancient name in the *Ain-Jidy* of the Arabs, and lays it down in his map at a point of the western shore nearly equidistant from both extremities of the lake. This spot was visited by Dr. Robinson, and he confirms the identification (*Researches,* 2:209-216). The site lies among the mountains, a considerable way down the descent to the shore. Here is a rich plain, half a mile square, sloping very gently from the base of the mountains to the water, and shut in on the north by a lofty promontory. About a mile up the western acclivity, and at an elevation of some 400 feet above the plain, is the fountain of Ain-Jidy, bursting forth at once in a fine stream upon a sort of narrow terrace or shelf of the mountain, having an abrupt margin towards the lake. The water is sweet, but warm, and strongly impregnated with lime. The stream rushes down the steep descent of the mountain below, and its course is hidden by a luxuriant thicket of trees and shrubs belonging to a more southern clime. Near this fountain are the remains of several buildings, apparently ancient, although the main site of the town seems to have been farther below. The whole of the descent below seems to have been once terraced for tillage and gardens, and near the foot are the ruins of a town, exhibiting nothing of particular interest, and built mostly of unhewn stones. This we may conclude was the town which took its name from the fountain. On reaching the plain, the brook crosses it in nearly a straight line to the sea. During a great part of the year it is absorbed in the thirsty soil. Its banks are now cultivated by a few families of Arabs, who generally pitch their tents near this spot. The soil is exceedingly fertile, and in such a climate it might be made to produce the rarest fruits of tropical climes; but vineyards no longer clothe the mountainside, and neither palm-tree nor balsam is seen on the plain.

THE WILDERNESS OF EN-GEDI is doubtless the immediately neighboring part of the wild region west of the Dead Sea, which must be traversed to reach its shores. It was here that David and his men lived among the "rocks of the wild goats," and where the former cut off the skirts of Saul's robe in a cave (1 Samuel 21:1-4). "On all sides," says Dr. Robinson, "the country is full of caverns, which might then serve as lurking-places for David and his men as they do for outlaws at the present day." He adds that, as he came in sight of the ravine of the Ghor; a mountain-goat started up and bounded along the face of the rocks on the opposite side *(Researches,* 2:203). M. de Saulcy imagines that he has identified the particular cave in question with one in that vicinity now called *Bir el-Makukieh (Narrative,* 1:162).

Engelbert

abbot of Admont, of the Benedictine order in Styria, was born of noble parents about 1250. He became abbot of Admont about 1297, and died 1331, leaving a great number of works, of which the principal are: *De ortu, progressu et fine imperii Romani,* published by Gaspard Brusch (Basle. 1553, 8vo; Mentz, 1603, 8vo): — *Tractatus super passionem secundum Maatthceum; de statu defunctorum; de Providentia*; *de causa longaevitatis hominum ante diluvium: — Speculum virtutum.* Several of his works were published by the learned Benedictine monk Pez, partly in the *Thesaurus Anecdotoraum Novissimus* (Augsb. 1721), partly in the *Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova* (Ratisbon, 1723-25). A biography of Engelbert, and a complete list of all his works, are given by Pez, both in an introductory essay in the 1st volume of the *Thesaurus* and in the preface to the 3d volume of the *Bibliotheca.* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 16:48; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:589. (A.J.S.)

Engelbert Saint,

archbishop of Cologne, was a son of count Engelbert I of Berg-Gelderi, and was born in 1185. When he was twenty-two years old the diocese of Munster was offered to him, but he declined it on the ground of youth and inexperience. In 1215 he was elected archbishop of Cologne. With great energy he reorganized the electorate, which, under the administration of his predecessors, had become quite disordered. He extinguished its debt, recovered those portions of its territory which had been lost, and acquired new ones. When the emperor Friedrich II was called to Italy, Engelbert was appointed head of the regency to which was intrusted the administration of the empire. As archbishop, Engelbert made the utmost endeavors to reform the corrupt habits of the clergy, and to repel the interference of the nobility in ecclesiastical affairs. The rigor with which he carried through his principles made him many enemies, and on November 7, 1225, he was surprised and assassinated at Gevelsberg by his nephew, count Friedrich von Isenburg. The murderer was captured and broken on the wheel; the bishops of Munster and Osnabruck, who were charged with complicity, were excommunicated; and Engelbert, on account of his zeal for enlarging the power of the Church, was enrolled in the number of saints. A life of Engelbert, by Caesar of Heisterbach (q.v.), was, in 1630, edited by Gelenius, with many learned remarks and additions *(Vindex libertatis ecclesiae et martyr St. Engelbertus,* Coloni; 1630); see also

Ficker, *Engelbert der Heilige,* Cologne, 1853; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:590. *SEE COLOGNE*. (A.J.S.)

Engelbrecht, Johann,

a visionary religionist, was born in Brunswick 1599. He was sickly from his youth, and suffered dreadfully from melancholy, caused by physical pain as well as by mental disturbance. He believed himself (after 1623) the subject of revelations and visions, and went from house to house preaching and narrating his supernaturally acquired knowledge of heaven and hell. Some preachers, like Paul Egard, in Holstein, gave very favorable testimonials of his character and his preaching; but the larger number took offense at his pretended revelations, and persecuted him. In Hamburg, where he spent several years, he was imprisoned. During the last years of his life he lived in great retirement in his native city. He died in 1644. Though unlettered, he wrote several books, especially a *View of Heaven* (Brunswick, 1625); and they were collected in 1640, and again in 1697, into editions of his *Werke und Offenbarungen* (Brunsw. and Alnsterd.). Some of his writings have been translate41 into French and English. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*. 4:32.

Engelhardt Johann Georg Veit,

a German theologian, was born at Neustadt on the Aich, November 12, 1791. After studying for three years at the University of Erlangen, and being for several years a tutor in two noble families, he was in 1817, appointed deacon at a church in Erllangen and professor at the gymnasium. In 1820 he became lecturer at the University of Erlangen, and obtained the degree of doctor of divinity; the next year he was advanced to an extraordinary, and in 1822 to an ordinary professorship at the university. The latter position lie retained until his death, September 13, 1855. For several years he held the office of university preacher, and five terms he was elected rector of the university. From 1846 to 1848 he was deputy of the university in the Bavarian diet. The king of Bavaria conferred upon him the title of ecclesiastical councillor and the order of St. Michael, and the city of Erlangen the right of honorary citizenship. In the history of theological literature, Engelhardt has secured a lasting place by his manuals of Church history and history of doctrines *(Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte,* 4 volumes, Erlangen, 1833-34; *Dogmengeschichte,* 2 volumes, Neustadt, 1839). He gave special attention to the study of the history of mystic theology. His intention to write a comprehensive history

of this theology he did not find time to carry out, but he wrote a number of separate articles on the subject. Among the most important of this class of his works are those on Dionysius Areopagita *(Dissertatio de Dionysio plotinizante,* Erlangen, 1820; *De origine scriptorum Areopagiticorum,* Erlang. 1823; *Die angebl. Schriften des Areopagiten Dionysius, ubersetzt u. mit Abhandlungen begleitet,* Erlang. 1823, 2 volumes); on Plotinus *(Plotin's Enneaden, ubersetzt u. mit Anmerkungen,* part 1, Erlangen, 1820, incomplete); on Richard of St. Victor and Ruysbroek *(Rich. von St. Victor u. Joh. Ruysbroek,* Erlang. 1838). Several other works on kindred topics are preserved in MS. in the library of the Erlangen University. Next to mystic theology, the study of the Church fathers was one of his favorite occupations, to which we owe a work on patristics *(Leitfaden zu Vorlesungen uber Patristik,* Erlang. 1823). He also left in MS. a complete translation of Irenaeus. A biographical sketch of Engelhardt is given in the funeral sermon by his colleague, professor Thomasius (Erlang. 1855). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:479.

Engine

(μηχανή, *machine,* 1 Macc. 5:30, etc.; 2 Macc. 12:15, etc.), a term exclusively applied in Scripture to military affairs. Such instruments were certainly known much earlier than the Greek writers appear to admit, since figures of them occur in Egyptian monuments, where two kinds of the *testudo,* or penthouse, used as shelters for the besiegers, are represented, and a colossal lance, worked by men who, under the cover of a *testudo,* drive the point between the stones of a city wall. *SEE FORT.*

Picture for Engine 1

Picture for Engine 2

Picture for Engine 3

The Hebrew ˆ/bV;j æ *chishshabon'* (<14665>2 Chronicles 26:15), lit. *invention* (as in <21729>Ecclesiastes 7:29), is its counterpart in etymological meaning, each referring to the *ingenuity* (engine, from *ingenium)* displayed in the contrivance. The engines to which the term is applied in 2 Chronicles were designed to propel various missiles from the walls of a besieged town; one, like the *balista,* was for stones, consisting probably of a strong spring and a tube to give the right direction to the stone; another, like the *catapulta,* for arrows, an enormous stationary bow. The invention of these is assigned

to Uzziah's time a statement which is supported both by the absence of such contrivances in the representations of Egyptian and Assyrian warfare, and by the traditional belief that the *balista* was invented in Syria (Pliny, 7:56). Of the balistae and catapultae it may be proper to add that they were of various powers. For battering walls there were some that threw stones of fifty, others of one hundred, and some of three hundredweight; in the field of battle they were of much inferior strength. Darts varied similarly from small beams to large arrows, and the range they had exceeded a quarter of a mile, or about 450 yards. All these engines were constructed upon the principle of the sling, the bow, or the spring, the last being an elastic bar, bent back by a screw or a cable of sinews, with a trigger to set it free, and contrived either to impel darts by its stroke, or to throw stones from a kind of spoon formed towards the summit of the spring. (See Smith's *Diet. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. *Tormentum.)* *SEE WAR.*

Picture for Engine 4

Picture for Engine 5

2. Another military engine with which the Hebrews were acquainted was the battering-ram, described in <26609>Ezekiel 26:9 as /Lbqy;jæ[*mechi' kobollo'* lit. a *beating of* that which is in *its front*, hence a ram for striking walls; and still more precisely in <26402>Ezekiel 4:2, 21:22 as rKi *kar*, a *ram*. The use of this instrument was well known both to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 1:359) and the Assyrians. The references in Ezekiel are to the one used by the latter people, consisting of a high and stoutly-built framework on four wheels, covered in at the sides in order to protect the men moving it, and armed with one or two pointed weapons. Their appearance was very different from that of the Roman *armies* with which the Jews afterwards became acquainted (Joseph. *War,* 3:7,19). No notice is taken of the *testudo* or the *vinea* (comp. <26609>Ezekiel 26:9, Vulg.), but it is not improbable that the Hebrews were acquainted with them (comp. Wilkinson, 1:361). The marginal rendering ' engines of shot" (<24606>Jeremiah 6:6; 32:24; <26608>Ezekiel 26:8) is incorrect. An engine for battering the wall is mentioned in the reign of king David (<10105>2 Samuel 20:15); but the instrument itself for throwing it down may have been that above noticed, and not the battering-ram. The ram was, however, a simple machine, and capable of demolishing the strongest walls, provided access to the foot was practicable, for the mass of cast metal which formed the head could be fixed to a beam lengthened sufficiently to require between one and two

hundred men to lift and impel it; and when it was still heavier and hung in the lower floor of a movable tower, or *helepolis*, it became a most formidable engine of war — one used in all great sieges from the time of Demetrius, about B.C. 306, till long after the invention of gunpowder. Towers of this kind were largely used at the destruction of Jerusalem (q.v.) by the Romans. *SEE BATTERING-RAM.*

Picture for Engine 6

Picture for Engine 7