THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

England, Church of - Esau

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

England, Church of

The proper designation of this church since the Act of Union in 1801 is "The United Church of England and Ireland." The Reformed Church of England dates from the 16th century; but it is convenient to treat in this article of the rise of Christianity in England, and of its growth under the protection of the State. (The free churches of England are given under their several titles in this work.)

I. HISTORY. —

(I.) *Early Period* (to the mission of Augustine, A.D. 596).

1. *To the Saxon Invasion,* A.D. 449. It is generally believed that Christianity was introduced into Britain before the end of the 2d century. Tertullian (t about 220) speaks of places in Britain not reached by the Romans, but yet subject to Christ (Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita). Eusebius, indeed, declares that some of the apostles preached in Britain *(Dem. Evang.* 3:7); Stillingfleet *(Origines Britannicae,* c. 1), Cave *(Lives of the Apostles),* and others, insist that St. Paul was the founder of British Christianity. Clemens Romanus (A.D. 101) says that Paul went to the limits of the West (το τέρμα τῆς δύσεως, *I Epist. ad Cor.);* and Theodoret (t 457) says that Paul brought salvation to the isles of the ocean (ταῖς ἐν τῷ πελάγει διακειμέναις νήσοις, *in Psalm* 116). But none of these hints amount to proof. Other traditions use the names of St. James, of Simon Zelotes, and of Joseph of Arimathea; asserting that the latter came over A.D. 35, or about the twenty-first year of Tiberius, and died in England. Of all this there is no proof (Fuller, *Ch. Hist. of Britain,* 1:13; Stillingfleet, *Orig.* c. 4; Short, *Ch. History of England,* 1, § 2). Another legend is that an English king, Lucius, sent messengers to Eleutherius (t 192), bishop of Rome, asking for Christian instruction; that the messengers were converted and ordained, one a bishop and the other a teacher; and that on their return king Lucius and his chief men were baptized, and a regular Church order established (Collier, *Eccl. History,* volume 1, chapter 1; Smith, *Religion of Ancient Britain,* chapter 5). But it is very doubtful whether there ever was a king Lucius, and the whole story is now generally discredited.

The Gospel having been introduced into Britain, a Christian Church subsisted there, though not always in an equal degree of vigor, till the persecution of Diocletian. It then acquired new strength from the fortitude

of its martyrs. Though the names of only three have been recorded (St. Alban, Aaron, and Julius), yet all historians agree that numbers suffered in Britain with the greatest constancy and courage (compare Gildas, § 8; Bede, 1:6, 7). The first martyr is said to have been St. Alban, who lived in the town of Verulam, which had a Roman colony; he had been converted from paganism by a teacher to whom he had afforded protection from the general persecution. Though Constantius, the Roman governor of Britain, had an inclination to favor the Christians, yet it was' not in his power to dispense with the edicts of the emperors, and he complied so far with them as to demolish the churches. Though he died a pagan, yet he granted to the Christians the free exercise of their religion, and protected them from injury or insult. This emperor died at York, and was succeeded by his son Constantine, A.D. 306 (Carwithen, *Hist. of Christian Church,* chapter 16). The best illustration of the early organization of Christianity in Britain is the fact that three British bishops attended the council at Arles, A.D. 314, the canons of which have among their signers *Eborius* episcopus, de civitate Eboracensi, provincia Britannia; *Restitutus* episcopus, de civitate Londinensi, provincia suprascripta; *Adelius* episcopus, de civitate colonia Londinensium (perhaps Colonia Lindi. i.e., *Lincoln);* compare Jac. Usserii *Brit. eccles. antiq.* (London 1687); Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* 3:557 sq. British bishops also attended the councils of Sardica (A.D 347) and of Ariminum (A.D. 359).

Little is accurately known of the real state of Christianity in this period. Pelagianism took root in Britain (the native country of Pelagius), and the British bishops called in Germanus and Lupus from Gaul, who refuted Pelagius at the conference of Verulam (A.D. 446). They also founded a cathedral at Llandaff, making Dubricius bishop, with extensive jurisdiction. The monastery of Banchor (Bangor), near Chester, was founded at about the same time.

2. *From the Saxon Invasion,*449, *to the Invasion of Augustine,* 596. — Hengist and Horsa, retained by Vortigern, A.D. 449, to aid him with 5000 men in expelling the Scots and Picts from Britain, remained in the island as conquerors. The greater part of Britain was again plunged into barbarism, and Christianity kept its ground only in Wales and Cornwall. (Its history in Ireland and Scotland is given in separate articles.) The patron saint of Wales, St. David (6th century), is said to have been consecrated a bishop at Jerusalem; he held a synod against Pelagianism at Brevy, and became archbishop of Caerleon *SEE DAVID, ST*. In Cornwall the British rites and

usages were preserved until near the end of the 7th century. Iona, where Columba (q.v.) established his foundations about 565, was a center of light not only for Scotland, but also for north Britain *SEE IONA*.

(II.) *Middle Age: Era of Submission to the Papacy* (6th to 16th century). Up to the 6th century British Christianity had been independent of Rome. But at that time Gregory the Great determined to seek the conversion of the English Saxons to Christianity. Ethelbert, king of Kent, had married. a Christian wife, Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of the Franks. She induced her husband to favor Christianity, and thus prepared the way for the mission of Augustine (sent by Gregory), who, with a number of monks, landed in 596. They converted Ethelbert, who was not only king of Kent, but Braetwalda, or chief of the Saxon monarchs. His example was soon followed by the kings of Essex and East Anglia, and gradually by the other chieftains of England. It is said that 10,000 English were baptized within the year of Augustine's arrival. In 597 Augustine went over to Aries, in France, where he was consecrated by bishop Virgilius, and on his return he became the first bishop of Canterbury. His see was immediately endowed by king Ethelbert, who likewise established the dioceses of Rochester and London. Another portion of the Anglo-Saxons were converted by Aidan and other Scottish missionaries. But the ecclesiastical system set up by the Roman missionaries was entirely of the Roman type, which differed from that of the Irish and of the old British Church in various points, e.g. the reckoning of Easter, the clerical tonsure, chrism, etc. More important were the questions of the marriage of the clergy and of the papal jurisdiction. Wherever the Romish influence prevailed, the Roman view, of course, was adopted. But Scottish and Irish missionaries were also at work in the kingdom, and up to the 7th century the converts of the latter were probably in the majority. In 664, king Oswy of Northumberland held a conference at Whitby, where Colman (q.v.) of Lindisfarne maintained the old British and Irish views, and Wilfrid (q.v.) took the Roman side. The king was persuaded by Wilfrid (or perhaps by his queen, who was a Romanist), and went over to the Roman party. Colman and all his clergy then went to Ireland. In 668 the pope sent over Theodore to be primate of England, and under his administration (668-689) the Roman and British Christians (what remained of them) were fused into one body. *SEE THEODORE*. But for many ages we hear little of any exercise of jurisdiction ,by the popes in England: the English bishops and kings did not permit appeals to Rome. When Wilfrid, bishop of York, appealed, A.D. 680, against an English

synod which had deposed him from his diocese, and obtained a decree in his favor from the pope, that decree was disregarded in England, even Theodore himself refusing to obey it. From this period England was in formal connection with the see of Rome up to the time of the Reformation. A few great names shine amid the general gloom, e.g. Bede (t 735), Alcuin (t 804), king Alfred (t 900). The Anglo-Saxon Church, from the time of Alfred, grew more and more Romish. "At length, from the time of Gregory VII (A.D. 1073), the papal jurisdiction was pushed into England, as it was into other countries; legates made frequent visits, held councils, exacted subsidies. Appeals, dispensations, mandates, reserves, annates, bulls, and all the other inconveniences of papal usurpation, followed each other in rapid succession; and for four centuries no country in Europe suffered more, and with greater reluctance, than England. But the popes and the kings of England had, after much disputation, made their agreement, and the Church was their prey" (Palmer, *Ch. History*, chapter 22).

The Norman Conquest took place A.D. 1066. From this period, for several centuries, the history of England is full of struggles between the ecclesiastical and royal power for supremacy. William the Conqueror refused to acknowledge the pope as his feudal superior, and declared his right to retain in his own hand the investiture of bishops and abbots which the early Saxon kings had possessed. He prohibited the publishing of papal bulls and letters of advice till they had been submitted to and approved of by him; and, further, he deprived the clergy of the right of excommunicating any of his nobles except with his express permission. On the other hand, "he confirmed by charter a law of Edward the Confessor, granting to the clergy tithe of cattle and profits, in addition to the ancient tithe of produce," and committed a still greater error in establishing ecclesiastical courts, to which alone clerical persons were thenceforth to be amenable. The "spiritual courts" became an enormous power in supporting the Roman domination. In 1076 celibacy was first made imperative on the English clergy. "Under Henry Beauclere a synod met at Westminster, 1102, which passed various reforming measures, the nature of which attests the existing depravity and degradation of the Church. This synod prohibited simony, and the pope ruled that lay investiture was simony, and on this question a rupture between the pope and the king soon occurred. After a struggle to maintain the rights of investiture, which he had received with the crown, Henry felt himself compelled to relinquish them to the pope, and only got permission from the pope for bishops to do homage to

him, if they chose, without being on that account removed from their sees. None of the proposed measures of reform accomplished any result. The morals of the clergy were thoroughly relaxed; murder by a person in holy orders was quite a usual occurrence; against such offenders there was no resort to common law, and ecclesiastical courts rarely interfered with them. A case of this kind gave rise to the protracted struggle between Thomas a Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, on the side of the pope, and Henry II for himself and people" (Eadie, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v. The "Constitutions of Clarendon" *SEE CLARENDON* were intended to secure the rights of the civil against the ecclesiasticl1 power; but the resistance of Becket (q.v.), his murder, and the repentant fears of the king, caused their speedy revocation in all the points to which the pope objected. "It was not, however, till the reign of John, when England was laid under an interdict, and the king resigned his crown to the pope, that the papal encroachments rose to their height; and the weak reign of Henry III, which followed, did nothing to abate them. Edward I gave a check to the power of the clergy, subjected them to taxation, and passed the statute of mort main (1279), which prohibited the transfer of land without the king's consent. There is little to be said as to innovations in doctrine during these three centuries; but it may be noted that about the middle of this period, viz. 1213, the Council of St. John Lateran declared transubstantiation, or the bodily presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, to be a tenet of the Church" (Chambers, s.v.). In 1350 the important statute of *Provisors* was passed. It was provoked by the fact that most of the valuable English benefices were reserved to the pope or to alien clergy, and it provided that the pope should confer no English benefice on any one without consent of the king. The statute of *Praemunire* (1389; enlarged 1393) forbade any interference of the Church with the statute of *Provisors*, and also all appeals from English civil courts to the pope. The statute of *Mort main* (in Magna Charta), and the various amendments and additions to it, all aimed to prevent the accumulation of property in the Church. *SEE MORTMAIN.*

In the reign of Henry II certain German Church reformers found their way to England — probably Waldensian Christians; and, though they were bitterly persecuted, all the good seed did not perish. In 1327 John Wycliffe was born. As rector of Lutterworth he preached until his death against the supremacy of the pope, the abuses of the hierarchy, and the Romish doctrine of the sacraments. In 1377 he was arrested for heresy, but no harm came to him. His translation of the Scriptures, and other writings,

made a great impression upon the more educated classes, but his labors had little effect upon the mass of the people. After his death more fruit appeared; and by 1400 his followers were numerous enough to form a party and to get the designation of *Lollards* (q.v.), and for a century persecution for Lollardism was common in England. "Henry IV thought it necessary to fortify his usurped position by assisting the bishops against the Lollards, and from this time to the Reformation there was an uninterrupted succession of confessors and martyrs. Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, was the most illustrious of these sufferers. Fox gives a detailed account of nearly twenty individuals burned for heresy between the death of lord Cobham and 1509, when Henry VIII ascended the throne. To some extent, the blood of these martyrs was the seed of the Reformed Church; but we must not overlook the 'hidden seed,' which was growing secretly from the time that Wycliffe gave to his countrymen a translation of the Scriptures in their own tongue. The progress of learning, and especially the study of Greek, led to a better understanding of the sacred books, whilst the invention of printing (1442) caused a wider circulation of them" (Chambers, s.v.). *SEE WYCLIFFE*; *SEE LOLLARDS*.

(III.) *From the Reformation to the present Time.* The Church of Rome, however, was to all outward appearance fairly established in England at the time of the accession of Henry VIII in 1509 *SEE HENRY VIII*, and his minister, cardinal Wolsey, maintained the splendor of the Church to a degree unexampled in England. Nevertheless, the great edifice was already undermined. In view of the facts cited in the last paragraph, it is absurd to say, as Roman writers do, that the source of the English Reformation is to be found in the vices of Henry VIII. However, it was not till the reign of that monarch that the Reformation in England in reality commenced. When Luther declared war against the pope, Henry wrote his treatise on the seven sacraments against Luther's book, *Of the Captivity of Babylon*, and was repaid by the pontiff with the title of "Defender of the Faith" (1521). The king had married his brother's widow, Catharine of Aragon, and was weary of her. Wolsey at first favored a divorce, "to revenge himself on Charles V for having disappointed him of the papacy; but after the king began to look with favor on Anne Boleyn, one of a house from whom Wolsey had everything to fear, he adopted a covert policy of opposition to the divorce he had suggested. When at last he was pressed on every side, with no open way before him, and his own ruin imminent, his course became tortuous, and was marked by a constant endeavor to protract the

proceedings, and delay any sentence being pronounced on this question by the pope. The issue was, in consequence of the advice of Cranmer, an appeal to the universities, and to the learned men of Christendom; for their opinion on this point, which was given in favor, for the most part, of Henry. The disgrace of Wolsey followed thereon. *SEE WOLSEY*. Henry's quarrel with the pope daily became more palpable Convocation was summoned in 1531, and charged with breaking the statutes of *provisors* and *praemnunire.* They humbly offered to pay a fine. The first step towards a schism was made by this Convocation, but it was under the pressure of the court. They proclaimed the king of England only and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ permits, even the supreme head of the Church of England." In 1533, on the elevation of Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, he pronounced sentence of divorce between Henry VIII and Catharine; and the marriage of Anne Boleyn to Henry was publicly notified. The pope declared this illegal, and threatened, unless these doings were undone, that he would pronounce excommunication on Henry. To prevent any such proceedings affecting the stability of his throne and his succession, in the following year Henry caused Parliament to abolish all papal authority in England, and to stop all payments to the Roman exchequer. After this came, under Thomas Cromwell, acting as vice-regent, a blow upon popish power in England from which it never recovered-namely, first a visitation, and then, as a consequence, the suppression of the monasteries, because 'they had long and notoriously been guilty of vicious and abominable living.' Among the bishops there were two parties; one whose sympathies were with the pope, the other with reform; to the former belonged Bonner and Gardiner, to the latter Cranmer and Latimer. But it was necessary to have some authoritative declaration of what the Church of England held since it had rejected the pope; and hence, in 15S6, the king, as head of the Church, issued a proclamation on this subject, and in 1539 Parliament passed an act for establishing the Creed, under the rather characteristic title, 'An act for abolishing diversity of opinions.' By this the doctrine of transubstantiation was taught, and the penalty of death by burning was attached to the denial of it. All who stood out for 'the necessity of the communion in both kinds, or for the marriage of priests, or against the observance of vows of chastity, or the propriety of private masses, or the fitness of auricular confession; all priests who shall marry after having advisedly made vows of chastity, shall suffer the pains of death as felons; and all those who maintain the same errors under any other manner may be imprisoned during the

king's pleasure'" (Mackintosh). Henry felt compelled to go on and increase the 'distance which separated him from Rome. There was in the Church a powerful party (Cranmer, Latimer, and many others of less note) that were of progressive tendencies, and to this party Thomas Cromwell, during his continuance in power, lent all his influence. His favor shown to the Protestant cause was one ground of his fall. About this time, too, several editions of the English Bible were printed and circulated with the permission of Henry. They were based upon Coverdale's translation. To Cranmer and Cromwell the permission to circulate them is due, and the command to place them in the cathedrals for public use, and for ministers to instruct their people in them. But the tide of political power now turned in favor of the Romanist party, and these permissions were withdrawn: the Bible became again for a time a prohibited book, and many who had received enlightened views of truth suffered bitter persecution. "In 1540 Cranmer persuaded Henry to appoint a commission, of which he was made a member, to draw up a formal confession. This appeared under the title, *The Erudition of a Christian Man.* It indicates some progress, since it only recommends prayers for the dead as 'good and charitable; and because it is not known what condition departed souls are in, we ought only to recommend them to the mercy of God.' It affirms justification by faith, though it modifies this declaration so far as to add, 'Yet man, prevented by grace, is by his free consent and obedience a worker toward the attaining of his own justification.' It forbids the worship of images, though it allows their use to excite devotional feeling. It altered some minor matters also in the service. Such was the character of the Church of England's first confession. The Reformers were gaining strength, and under Edward VI and the Protector Somerset their triumph was undoubted. Thirty commissioners were sent through the country to abolish superstitious practices. Cranmer drew up twelve homilies, which were appointed to be read in the churches where the ministers could, not preach. This was one of the provisions made for the diffusion of sound religious knowledge. This step, and the sermons themselves, elicited the unqualified approbation of the Continental Reformers. Cranmer wrote also a catechism, which was generally circulated. Such theologians as Bucer and Peter Martyr were invited to come and lecture in the English universities; and the most strenuous exertions were made to provide preaching; 'one sermon every quarter of the year at least' in every church being imperative. But such was the state of the Romish clergy that even this much they could hardly accomplish. In 1547 Parliament repealed the various persecuting acts of

Henry VIII and earlier reigns, leveled against the new opinions, as they are often called. As Convocation was inclined in favor of the Romish party, Parliament assumed to itself the task of reforming the Church. It passed that year acts 'concerning the sacrament,' ordaining 'the communion to be received in both kinds,' forbidding the priest to communicate alone, and requiring him to prepare the people for worthily communicating by an exhortation on the *day preceding* its celebration. In 1548 there was a commission appointed for the revision of the offices of public worship. One of its first fruits was a new communion service. Confession was no longer made imperative. At the same time a new liturgy was compiled. At the end of it occurs the petition — 'From the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, good Lord, deliver us.' *SEE COMMON PRAYER.* In 1551 a farther series of emendations was made in the Prayer-book: in it very few alterations have since been introduced. The same year the Articles, then forty-two in number, were published. *SEE ARTICLES, THIRTY-NINE*. The commission appointed in 1552 to prepare a canon law, in consequence of the death of Edward, was discontinued before its work was done. Under his reign the progress of reformation had been rapid, but it was to be sorely tried. Mary ascended the throne (1553) and re-established Romanism. Bonner and Gardiner were restored; the Book of Common Prayer and Catechism were declared heretical; the kingdom was reconciled to the see of Rome; a persecution of the chief reformers commenced — Rogers was burned at Smithfield, Hooper at Gloucester, Saunders at Coventry, Taylor at Hadley. The prisons were filled with 'heretics;' many fled beyond sea; some purchased safety by an outward conformity. Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley perished in the flames at Oxford. Cardinal Pole was made primate. One benefit was conferred on the Church by Mary — she surrendered all the Church lands, as well as the first-fruits and tenths, which had been seized by Henry. At last the death of Mary (1558), with which that of the cardinal was all but simultaneous, delivered the Church from its oppressors. Under Elizabeth (1558-1603) Protestantism was again in the ascendant; and by the various measures which were taken, the Reformation in England was completed. The Convocation of 1562, besides drawing up the Thirty-nine Articles, published two volumes of homilies by Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, and caused Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, to draw up a catechism for general use. *SEE NOWELL*.

"About this time the more extreme reforming party began to appear *SEE PURITANS*, and to exert their influence specially in all the questions which arose about the various ceremonies of the Church. Elizabeth's extreme jealousy of her supreme authority often obstructed the plans for reform which the more zealous clergy contrived — a jealousy which brought her into collision with the primate himself, as on the subject of 'the prophesyings.' The works of the great Continental divines, as Calvin and Bullinger, were studied in England; and the great standard work of Richard Hooker on *Ecclesiastical Polity* — which may be styled the apology of the Church of England — was published 1594-97.

"When James ascended the throne, both the Puritans and the Church party calculated on having his support. The Puritans hastened to present to him the famous Millenary Petition, which embodied a statement of those things in the Church which they desired to see amended. This elicited from the universities a counter-petition, and James held a conference with both parties at Hampton Court (q.v.), January 1604. It resulted in no good to the Puritans, for king James now thought Episcopacy was most conformable to monarchy, and the reply to their arguments he pithily put in the form 'No bishop, no king.' One advantage which ensued from this conference was the revision of the translation of the Bible, instituted at the suggestion of the leader of the Puritans, and the result was the present authorized version. During the, reign of James the famous Synod of Dort met, and four English divines were sent thither by James. *SEE DORT, SYNOD OF.* Henceforward the Calvinistic party in the Church of England began to decline, and king James himself turned against it. James first issued the *Book of Sports* in 1618, and offended very many, because he thereby legally sanctioned certain amusements on the Sabbath day. Under Charles it was republished in 1663, the declaration affirming that it was done 'out of a pious care for the service of God... . and the ease, comfort, and recreation of our well-deserving people.' It was received with manifest disgust, and many of the clergy refused to obey the ordinance requiring its publication in the churches. In 1644 the House of Commons caused it to be burnt by the hangman. *SEE SPORTS, BOOK OF*." Under Charles, the High-Church party, with Laud at their head, rose to the highest power. The court of High Commission and the Star Chamber never had more constant employment, and their hateful tyranny most thoroughly roused the people. The severity of Laud occasioned the greatest discontent; and the Puritan party, as they could not maintain themselves in the Church, began to found

special lectureships; but, on Laud's advice, the king issued instructions to the bishops to suppress all such. Forbearance at last came to an end. Then came the great rebellion and civil war, which led to the putting down of Episcopacy, and the establishment of Presbyterianism on the basis of the *Westminster Confession*, though afterwards Independency took the lead. Laud was condemned the day after the House of Commons established Presbyterianism, and executed January 10, 1645.

"With the restoration of Charles II occurred the restoration of Episcopacy in England. The Sunday after his return heard the liturgy read in almost every parish church. The Puritans, who are henceforward known as Presbyterians (q.v.), having greatly contributed to the restoration, were treated at first by Charles with kindness, and several of their number were offered high ecclesiastical preferments. In 1661 the famous Savoy Conference (q.v.) met, with Baxter as leader of the Presbyterian party, and Sheldon as that of the bishops, to try, if possible, to unite both sides. As might have been expected, the plan failed. In 1662 the Act of Uniformity was passed; and, rather than take the test it prescribed, 2000 Puritan clergy left the Church of England. Then, in quick succession, followed those persecuting acts, the Corporation, Conventicle, and Five-miles Acts. Still further grievances were inflicted by the Test Act of 1672. Next arose another school of divines — 'Christian philosophers rather than divines.' Their lives were moral, but they eviscerated the Gospel of all that was characteristic of it. When a plan for 'comprehension' was revived in 1668, the House of Commons prohibited such a measure being introduced. When James, duke of York, professed Roman Catholicism, Charles at once proclaimed complete toleration. This was in 1672; but the Commons the year following compelled him to withdraw his indulgence. Popery they were determined to resist. When James came into power he proclaimed similar indulgences, and forbade preaching against Romanist errors; nay, in defiance of the enactment of 1651, he re-created the court of High Commission. These measures the clergy resisted. In consequence of his resistance, the bishop of London was suspended for a time. The University of Cambridge came into collision with the king, and also Magdalen College, Oxford. Rather than do what might advantage Rome, the Nonconformists did not avail themselves of the royal indulgence. But James renewed his declaration, and commanded that it should be published in the churches. Eighteen out of twenty-five bishops refused to do so, and nearly all the clergy. The bishops were commanded to cite the recusants,

but they refused. Seven of them — Sancroft, Lloyd, Ken, Turner, Lake, White, and Trelawney — even drew up a remonstance, and, as a consequence, were sent to the Tower. Their committal to it had rather the appearance of a triumphal entry, from the enthusiasm displayed by the people on their behalf. They were tried at Westminster Hall, and the news of their acquittal was received with rapturous delight on all hands, for all felt that they were committed to a struggle against an insidious attempt to restore Popery. The royal career of James was now ending, and his further schemes were not developed, for that very year the Prince of Orange landed (5th of November, 1688). One of William's first acts was the passing of a toleration bill in 1689; but an act of comprehension was rejected in the Commons. In September of that year a commission was appointed to revise the liturgy and canons, and reform ecclesiastical abuses; but all their proposals were rejected by Convocation. Three of the seven bishops mentioned above refused the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. They headed the party known as the Nonjurors, which ceased to exist as an independent Episcopalian Church in 1780; but many of them became attached to the Scottish Episcopalians" (Chambers, s.v.). *SEE NONJURORS.*

During the period just described a school of divines was formed who, in seeking to avoid Puritanism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other, became Latitudinarians. "They became Christian philosophers rather than divines; and, except an occasional dissertation on the Trinity or a Whitsunday sermon, in which the work of the Holy Spirit was carefully guarded against fanatical abuses, they scarcely interfered with matters of Christian doctrine. Still they were men of blameless lives, and in a slothful age remarkable for pastoral diligence. Amongst the leaders were Whitchcote, Cudworth, Wilkins, and Worthington; some of these were known to be men of eminent piety, but it was more apparent in their lives (and, since their deaths, by their private diaries) than in their preaching. They were equally afraid of superstition on the one hand, and enthusiasm on the other. They loved the constitution of the Church, and were well satisfied. with the liturgy; but they did not think all other forms unlawful. They wished to see a spirit of greater moderation. They continued on good terms with Nonconformists, and allowed great freedoms, not only in philosophical speculations, but in religion; and the boldness of their inquiries into the reasonableness, rather than the scriptural warrant of the truths of religion, led them to be regarded as Socinians. They were all

zealous against Popery; and the Papists cried them down, in return, as Atheists, Deists, or, at best, Socinians, and men of no principles at all. In the society of these men, Tillotson, Patrick, Lloyd, and Stillingfleet were trained — the greatest divines of the next generation, but still with the faults of the school in which they had been educated. They received, and long bore, the title of the Latitudinarian divines; and, in the sense in which we have explained it, the charge was just. They attempted a divorce between evangelical doctrine and Christian practice. The former they at first neglected, and at length lost out of sight; the latter they displayed with admirable clearness, and, if any other principles than those of the Gospel could possibly have enforced it, they would not have so completely failed. But the founders of the school made no deep impression in the days of Charles II, and their still more gifted pupils saw religion in the Church of England almost expiring in spite of all their efforts" (Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, 1:286). "In 1698 the Church of England gave birth to two noble philanthropic schemes — the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which circulates Bibles, Prayer-books, and Tracts; and in 1701 the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was chartered." In 1747 Convocation was dissolved. *SEE CONVOCATION*.

"That the Church of England, after fighting for its very existence against Popery on the one hand, and against Puritanism on the other, should have subsided into inactivity during the dull reigns of the Georges, is less a matter of surprise than of regret. The peaceful enjoyment of her temporalities in a dull, irreligious, not to say infidel age, may easily account for, though it cannot excuse, her idleness. But that in the rise of John Wesley, 1730, she should have failed to see a grand opportunity for herself, is a matter of both surprise and regret; she, however, let it pass; nor can she hope that such another will ever again present itself. *SEE METHODISM*; *SEE WESLEY*. The utmost that can be hoped is that she has seen her error.

"The next important event in the history of the Church is the Act of Union, which came into effect on the 1st of January, 1801, and united the churches of England and Ireland in all matters of doctrine, worship, and discipline. The Reformation had made some progress in Ireland under Edward VI. Five Protestant bishops were appointed in 1560, and the English Bible and Liturgy were introduced in 1551; but, from a variety of causes, the Reformed doctrines have never found much acceptance with the native population, and, although a Protestant Church was established by law, it

was and is the Church of the minority. *SEE IRELAND*. In 1635 the English Articles were received. and in 1662 the English Book of Common Prayer was adopted by Convocation. Before the political union of the countries, the two churches were in full communion. By an act of the imperial Parliament in 1833, ten of the Irish bishoprics were suppressed, and the funds thus obtained were applied to the augmentation of small livings, and the building and repair of churches" (Chambers, *Cyclopcedia,* s.v.). It is now proposed (1868) to "disestablish" the Episcopal Church in Ireland, and the proposal will doubtless be carried into effect. '

In the progress of the 19th century great changes have passed over the Church of England. The formation of the Church Missionary Society *SEE MISSIONARY SOCIETIES*, of the Bible Society, etc., and especially the influence of Methodism, awakened the long dormant spirit of aggressive Christianity. Since 1800 more than 300C churches have been erected. About 1830 several earnest young men in the University of Oxford gave signs of profound theological study, and of deep interest in Church questions. In reaction, perhaps, from the latitudinarianism of the 18th century, their studies lay chiefly in the fathers and mediaeval writers, and in 1833 they began the publication of the Oxford tracts, calling for a revival of obsolete usages, and bringing up again Romanist or quasi-Romanist views in theology. A brief history of this movement is given under PUSEYISM *SEE PUSEYISM* ; it must suffice to say here that many young clergymen, as the result ofthe movement, went over to Rome; and those of the school who remained gave rise to the modern RITUALISM *SEE RITUALISM* (q.v.), which tends to import the spirit, doctrines, and practices of the Church of Rome into the Church of England. In the autumn of 1867 a conference of bishops of the Church of England, and of the churches in communion with the English, was held at Lambeth. The chief object of this synod was to promote a closer union between all branches of the Anglican Church. A resolution censuring bishop Colenso, of Natal, for his deviation from the doctrine of the Church, was adopted by all save three votes. The pastoral letter, signed by the bishops, warned the people against Romanizing tendencies, but made no reference to controversies within the Church. A Greek translation of the pastoral letter was officially transmitted by the archbishop of Canterbury to all the patriarchs and bishops of the Greek Church. *SEE PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD.* In order to promote the interest of intelligent laymen in the affairs of the Church, a "Church Congress" was called in 1860, which from that

time has held annual sessions. *SEE CHURCH CONGRESS.* Several attempts were made by the High-Church party to introduce monastic institutions. Thus the Reverend Mr. Lyne, assuming the name of father Ignatius, endeavored to establish an Anglican branch of the Benedictine order, but the first monastery of the order at Norwich had, after a trial of a few years, to be abandoned. At Bristol a community of the Third Order of St. Benedict was organized. The Reverend Mr. Mackonochie, in 1867, established a Society of the Holy Cross, of which he was the first master. But thus far (1868) all these attempts have met with but little success. *SEE MONASTICISM*. The High-Church party exhibited a great desire to bring on a closer union with the Eastern churches. A special society, the Eastern Church Association (see below, *Statistics),* was established to promote the cause, and the Convocations of Canterbury and York gave their official approval of the scheme. *SEE EASTERN CHURCHES, GREEK CHURCH, AND PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.* Official communications for the same purpose were also opened with the Church of Sweden, but this step was strenuously opposed by one portion of the High-Church party on the ground that the Swedish Church held some heretical doctrines.

II. CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT. —

1. *Church and State.* —The constitution of the Reformed Church of England is that "of an authorized and paid establishment, which is not allowed to persecute those who dissent from it" (Short). The union of Church and State was completely secured by the statutes that followed the Reformation up to the Revolution of 1688. The English Church constitution remained nearly unchanged by the Reformation, only that the crown took the place of the pope. The course of subsequent legislation brought in, however, many important modifications of detail. The old statutes, though rarely enforced, were still law, excepting when expressly abrogated. One of the most important of these was the *Prnmunire* (see above). The statute 25 of Henry VIII (1534), chapter 21, declares entire independence of Rome, and calls the king *supreme hede* of the Church of England, according to the recognition of its prelate: and clergy. This statute abolishes Peter's pence, and provides for the visitation of monasteries by royal commission.

During the reign of Mary Popery was restored, but all the statutes to that effect were repealed by stat. 1 of Elizabeth (1558-9), which transfers the headship of the Church from the pope to the English crown, and declares

the *royal supremacy* perpetual. Every form of spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction and prerogative is included in the declaration. The crown can exercise this authority through such officers as it may select, provided they be British subjects appointed by letters-patent. The act prescribes the oath of supremacy, to be taken by all civil and spiritual officers. *SEE OATH OF SUPREMACY.* The *Act of Uniformity* (1559) restored the Common Prayer, and required the clergy to conform strictly to it. The statute 13 Eliz. c. 11 (1571), incorporated the 39 articles which had been agreed upon by the Convocation of 1562 into the law of the land. This act, with the laws of supremacy and uniformity, and the articles, settled the government, the worship, and the doctrines of the Church. The queen, though subject to the Church order and doctrines, was invested with full power to govern the Church, and to fill the highest ecclesiastical offices. Church and State were fused together, for all citizens of the State were made members of the Church; the officers of the Church were officers of the State, and the head of the State was made head of the Church. The Revolution made several changes in the constitution of the Church. By stat. 1 William and Mary chapter 6 (April, 1689), the coronation oath was modified. In it the king swore not merely to govern according to the old laws and customs, but also to maintain the laws of God and the true confession of the Gospel, and of the Protestant Reformed religion as by law established; and to "present ye unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them." The 8th chapter substituted a new form of the oath of allegiance, in which the recognition of the king's ecclesiastical supremacy is left out, and in its place stands a promise to obey the king truly; with an anathema of the impious doctrine that princes excommunicated by the pope should be deposed and executed, and that a foreign potentate can have ecclesiastical authoril within the realm. The same statute (chapter 18) removed some penalties from Dissenters, and made them eligible to office, provided they took the oath of allegiance personally, or by proxy, in case of conscientious objection to taking the especial oaths of office. During the present century a number of acts have been passed annulling disabilities of Papists and Dissenters; and it is now the case that Dissenters and Romanists have religious freedom, are eligible to civil office, and are admitted to Parliament.

2. *Government.* —

(1.) The king is the supreme head of the Church on earth, at least in name and form. Formerly the clergy made the following subscription: "That the king's (queen's) majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other his highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal," etc.; but by an act of Parliament of July 5, 1865 (28th and 29th Vict. cap. 122), persons to be ordained deacons or priests are required (1) to make a "Declaration of Assent" to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; (2) to take the *Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy* (21st and 22d Vict. cap. 48), by which they swear to be faithful and bear true allegiance to the queen, and declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realmn. "The highest Church offices are filled by the ministry in the name of the crown. The Privy Council, in which only temporals vote, is the highest court of appeal."

(2.) The management of the Church is in the hands of a hierarchy of archbishops and bishops, subject to the authority of the king and Parliament. The United Church of England and Ireland is divided into four provinces: two English, Canterbury and Yolk; two Irish, Armagh and Dublin. These are under four mutually independent archbishops. The bishops, as well as the archbishops, are spiritual peers, excepting the bishop last consecrated, and the bishop of Sodor and Man, who does not sit in the House of Lords unless he happens to be a peer in his own right. Archbishops are chosen by the crown from among the bishops. The sovereign also nominates the bishops. The Church is governed, "under her majesty, by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same" (Can. 7). The archbishops and bishops alone have the power to ordain clergymen; and these ordinations take place, according to canon law, at "allotted certain times," and "only on the Sundays immediately following *jejunia quatuor temporum*, commonly called Ember weeks." Candidates for the ministry are usually graduates of Cambridge or Oxford, or Trinity College, Dublin, or else of Durham, Lampeter, or St. Bees; but the bishops are not bound to restrict ordination to members of any university or college. Approved candidates take "the oath of supremacy," sign a declaration that they will conform to the liturgy, and subscribe three articles: the first affirming the supremacy of the sovereign

in the Church; the second asserting that the Book of Commnon Prayer contains nothing contrary to the word of God, and that the ordained person will use the form of the said book; and the third, that they hold all "the Thirty-nine Articles." The candidate is first ordained a deacon, and so continues for one year. At the expiration of this term he undergoes an examination; and when this is satisfactory, he is admitted by the bishop to the order of priest, or presbyter. Several of the presbyters, as well as the bishop, lay their hands simultaneously on the head of every candidate, while the bishop repeats the form prescribed in the ordination service. When once ordained a presbyter, he is competent to take any duty or to hold any preferment in the Church.

(3.) The country is divided into parishes, and many of these have been of late years subdivided. *SEE PARISH*. The property of the Church of England is obtained through many different channels, and is very valuable: the total revenues are estimated as being not under seven millions a year; and yet so unequal is the distribution, that there are, out of 10,500 benefices, not less than 6800 with incomes under £300 a year; and of these there are 3460 livings whose annual value is under £150. The curates have a very inadequate compensation, the ordinary pay ranging, in large towns, from £70 to *£150*.

The total number of benefices in 1890 was 14,200. Of late some reforms have been effected by the Parliament. There is a special board of "ecclesiastical commissioners for England to administer the state patronage of ecclesiastical benefices. In their twentieth report, issued in 1868, they state that in the current year they expect to complete the scheme which, in their report of 1864, they proposed to accomplish within five years. Every living with less income than £300 a year which then existed, and contained, according to the census of 1861, a population of 4000 persons, will, on the 1st of March, 1869, have had its income raised to £300 a year, except those cases in private patronage where the one half of the augmentation which the patrons were required to provide from non-ecclesiastical sources has not been forthcoming. In their report of 1853 the commissioners referred to an arrangement which had been entered into with the dean and chapter of York, whereby the capitular estates (subject to subsisting leases) had become vested in the commissioners, and inlieu thereof the dean and chapter were to receive an annuity until the commissioners should restore to them real estates in possession calculated to produce an income equal to such annuity; and it was estimated that the arrangement would at a future

date yield a considerable surplus for the augmentation of small livings. At the close of 1852 the chapter of Carlisle effected a similar commutation. In 1855 the Cathedral Commission advised that all the improved revenue derived from the better management of capitular property should be appropriated to the augmentation of capitular incomes, and to the improvement of cathedral institutions. In 1856 a committee of the House of Commons sat to consider the proceedings of the ecclesiastical commissioners, and in their third report set out the details of the York chapter commutation, and observe, 'Such agreements tend to facilitate enfranchisement, and to provide funds for the endowment of poor livings, as well as to afford a ready means of providing estates in possession for the ecclesiastical corporations.' In the year 1854 the chapters of Peterborough and Chester; in 1855, the chapter of Gloucester; in 1856, St. Asuph; in 1857, Worcester; in 1860, Chichester; in 1861, Winchester and Salisbury; in 1862, Bristol, Canterbury, and Exeter; in 1866, Wells, Rochester, and St. David's; and in 1867, the chapters of Llandaff and Windsor, effected similar commutations of their capitular estates. All these arrangements have been successively sanctioned by orders in council. Commutations have thus been effected with no fewer than eighteen chapters. Under these commutations the chapters gave up their ancient estates in consideration of annual money payments to be received by them, pending their re-endowment with real estates in possession: and in 1862 the permanent estate of the chapter of York; in 1863, that of Peterborough; in 1865, those of Carlisle and Chichester; in 1866, those of Chester, Cloucester, and Canterbury; and in 1867, that of Winchester, were reassigned. As a consequence, the commissioners, in the period between 1864 and 1868, considered the local claims of the parochial cures upon the estates of the chapters of York, Peterborough, Carlisle, and Chichester, and, so far as the value of the property would permit, the requisite grants were made to such parochi;al cures." See below, *Patronage* and *Statistics.*

(4.) The only ecclesiastical assembly of the English Church is *Convocation* (q.v.), which is a convention of the clergy to discuss Church affairs in time of Parliament. As the Parliament consists of two distinct houses, so does this Convocation; the one called the upper house, where the archbishops and bishops sit severally by themselves; the other the lower house, where the rest of the clergy are represented by their deputies. The power of the Convocation is limited by a statute of Henry VIII. They are not to make any canons or ecclesiastical laws without the royal license; nor, when

permitted to make any, can they put them in execution lbut under severe restrictions. In the yeqar 1661 the English Convocation granted a subsidy to king Charles II, which was the last tax of this nature paid by the English clergy; for, by an arrangement made between archbishop Sheldon and lord chancellor Clarendon in 1664, the Convocation of the clergy thenceforward gave up the privilege of taxing themselves to the House of Commons, in consideration of being allowed to vote at the election of members of that house (Eden). Of late, the Convocations, both of Canterbury and York, have arain been permitted to meet, talk, vote addresses to the crown, etc., but they have no real power. *SEE CONVOCATION.*

(5.) *Canons.* — In the Convocation which met at the time of the Parliament of 1604, the canons by which the Church of England is still governed were passed. They are said to have been collected by Bancroft from the canons of the ancient Church, and the articles, injunctions, and acts of Convocation during the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. They received the royal sanction, but were not carried through the two houses of Parliament, and are not, therefore, laws of the realm. They bind the clergy only, and that by virtue of their promise of canonical obedience. Many of them have been virtually repealed by subsequent enactments, especially the Toleration Act. Many of those that remain are such that the best and wisest members of the Church would gladly see them repealed. *SEE CANONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

(6.) *Patronage.* — The theory of the Church of England is that whoever originally built a church is entitled to chooserits minister in pelpetuity — i.e., is the *patron* of the living. What follows on this point is from a Church of England writer (Marsden, *Churches and Sects*, 1:332): "In a few instances this right is still vested in the descendants of the original patron, but these must be rare. The right of patronage is now a salable commodity, transferred, or sold by auction, to the highest bidder, like any other real property, and the patronage of the Church "of England is consequently dispersed wherever wealth has found its way: 1144 benefices are in the gift of the crown; 1853 in that of the bishops; 938 in that of cathedral chapters and other dignitaries: 770 in that of the universities and collegiate bodies; 6092 in private persons; and 931 (vicarages or perpetual curacies) in the incumbent of the mother church. The good and evil of this system are so nearly balanced that thoughtful and wise men are to be met with every day who, as they look at the favorable or dark side of the question, are

disposed to cherish it as the nearest approach that is ever likely to be made in practice to a perfect theory; or, on the other hand, to reject it as unjust and full of danger. Its evils lie upon the surface, and they are by no means slight. It has a tendency to promote a subservient spirit, inconsistent with the courage and simplicity of the Christian minister, towards those in whose hands patronage is vested, for upon them advancement in the Church depends. It excludes many valuable men from livings of importance, and thrusts many incompetent men into stations for which they are but meanly qualified. It fills our choicest parishes with men rather well bred than deeply learned — men of courtesy and benevolence rather than a fervent zeal; and, consequently, the parish church wears to the poor man too frequently something of a cold and aristocratic air. He is spoken to by his superior in the presence of his superiors, and he retires to the dissenting chapel, not that he prefers dissent, but that he meets with sympathy and feels himself at home. Patronage is either held by individuals, or vested in corporations or in trustees; but the individual may have little sense of religion; he may give away his church on considerations of friendship, or he may look upon it merely as a provision for a younger son. Corporate bodies have less conscience than individuals. Previous to the act for reforming municipal corporations twenty years ago, most of the livings in our ancient towns and boroughs were in the gift of our municipal corporations. Their appointments, on an average, were certainly not better than those of private patrons; religion slumbered in our great towns not less profoundly than in our country villages. Several trusts have been formed of late years for the purchase of advowsons (an advowson is the right of presentation in perpetuity), and none can deny them at least the praise of pure disinterestedness. They have expended large sums to obtain in return the right of placing zealous ministers of evangelical principles in populous places. But all these various methods of patronage labor under the same defect — the congregation whose spiritual interests are to be committed to the new pastor, and the parishioners amongst whom, as their friend or their example, he is to live and die, have no voice whatever in the momentous choice. The party most interested looks on with indifference, or hope, or silent resignation. The English lay churchman, in the most important event that can effect his parish during his lifetime, finds everything done for him; it is only on trifling matters that he is consulted. He may help to build the school, he may discharge the duties of churchwarden, but with regard to the appointment of the minister he has no right to speak." A remarkable illustration of the way in which

ecclesiastical wealth is monopolized by certain families is afforded in the case of Richard and George Pretyman, sons of the bishop of Lincoln, which is stated in the *Methodist Quarterly*, 1853, page 157.

III. DOCTRINES. —

(1.) The doctrinal standards of the united Church of England and Ireland are, after the Scriptures, the Book of Homilies, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Prayer-book.

(a) The *Homilies* (q.v.) were composed by Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridlcy, men of unexceptionable learning and orthodoxy; or, according to others, the first book was written principally by Cranmer, and the second by Jewel. They were appointed to be read in churches at the beginning of the Reformation, when, by reason of the scarcity of learned divines, few ministers were found who could safely be trusted to preach their own compositions.

(b) The first draught of the *Articles* was composed by archbishop Cranmer, assisted by bishop Ridley, in the year 1551; and after being corrected by the other bishops, and approved by the Convocation, they were published in Latin and English in 1553, and amounted to forty-two in number. In 1562 they were revised and corrected. Being then reduced to thirty-nine, they were drawn up in Latin only; but in 1571 they were subscribed by the members of the two houses of Convocation, both in Latin and English, and therefore the Latin and Eng, lish copies are to be considered as equally authentic. *SEE ARTICLES, XXXIX*.

(c) During the last century disputes arose among the clergy respecting the propriety of subscribing to any human formulary of religious sentiments. Parliament, in 1772, was applied to for the abolition of the subscription by certain clergymen and others, whose petition received the most ample discussion, but was rejected by a large majority. It has been generally held by most, if not all Calvinists, both in and out of the Church, that the doctrinal parts of the articles are Calvinistic. This opinion, however, has been warmly controverted. It is no doubt nearer the truth to conclude that the articles are framed with comprehensive latitude, and that neither Calvinism nor Arminianism was intended to be exclusively established (Watson, s.v. *Church).* See Puller's *Moderation of the Church of England considered*, 1679 (new edit. Lond. 1843, 8vo); and also *SEE ARMINIANISM*, *SEE ARTICLES LAMBETH*,. The articles contain,

however, what the Church of England holds to be a fair scriptural account of the leading doctrines of Chuistianity, together with a condemnation of what she considers to be the principal errors of the Church of Rome and of certain Protestant sects. As far as they go (and there are many things unnoticed by them), they are a legal definition of the doctrines of the Church of England and Ireland; though the members of that communion look to the Prayer-book as well as to the articles for the genuine expression of her faith. The articles are far more thoroughly Protestant than the Prayer-book, taken as a whole. Although the articles expressly assert that the Church of Rome has erred, attempts have repeatedly been made by the High-Church party of the Church of England to show that there is no irreconcilable difference between the Thirty-nine Articles and the decrees of the Council of Trent, and that a construction can be put upon them fully harmonizing them. To show this was, in particular, the object of Dr. Newman's celebrated tract *(Tracts for the Times,* No. 90, Oxf. 1839), and more recently of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* (Lond. 1865; N.Y. 1866). See also *Christ. Remembrancer,* January 1866, art. 6.

(2.) For the preservation of doctrine and discipline in the Church of England, many provisions are made both by the civil and canon law. Whoever shall come to the possession of the crown of England shall join in communion with the Church of England, as by law established (12 and 13 Will. III, chapter 2, § 3). By the 1 Will. III, chapter 6, an oath shall be administered to every king or queen who shall succeed to the imperial crown of this realm, at their coronation; to be administered by one of the archbishops or bishops; to be thereunto approved by such king or queen, that they will do the utmost in their power to maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and Protestant Reformed religion established by law; and will preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them, or any of them. And by the 5 Anne, chapter 5, the king, at his coronation, shall take and subscribe an oath to maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by law established (§ 2).

(3.) In practice there is no definite creed or system of theology in the Church of England. Its members have always been divided into parties. There has always been a Sacramentarian party, approximating in doctrine to the teachings of Rome, though it has never bad great influence since

Laud's time until the recent rise of Puseyism (q.v.). And, on the other hand, there have never been wanting representatives of the Puritan or Evangelical school. The latter party finds its stronghold in the Articles, the former in the Liturgy. At present a division prevails into three great sections, which are styled High-Church, Low-Church (or Evangelical), and Broad-Church. The first party holds to apostolical succession, the divine right of episcopacy, and generally adheres to the sacramentarian view of the Church's life. The Puseyites have been drawn chiefly from this party. The Low-Church, or Evangelical party, holds, in general, that episcopacy is not *essential* to the being of the Church, though some evangelicals, so called, hold it in as high esteem as High-churchmen. The Low-churchmen recognize the claims of Presbyterians and dissenters as members of Christ's body. In doctrine they are chiefly Calvinists. The Broad-Church party, though of recent origin, embraces a large number of the most cultivated men in the Church, such as'Kingsley, Maurice, Stanley, and, in fact, most of Dr. Arnold's pupils and sympathizers. The tendency of this party is towards what is called liberal Christianity.

At the present time (1868) the Church of England is agitated by proposals of change on many sides. Archdeacon Wilberforce, who went over to Rome some years ago, issued an "explanation," in which he inquires how far the popular principle of subscription to the English formularies is compatible with the rule of Church authority. The system he believes to be altogether bad, while it has not even the merit of being able to settle the differences which exist among individual churchmen. He says: "The difficulty becomes greater when it is considered that the clergy are divided into various parties, who are widely opposed to one another in almost every particular. It may be allowable, perhaps, to employ the phraseology of a recent reviewer, who has distributed them into three classes, which he designates as High, Low, and Broad. The last may be expected to be comparatively inattentive to matters of doctrine, regarding the Church chiefly as a social institution, designed merely to raise the standard of morals and ameliorate the manners of men. But the High and Low agree in one point, if in nothing else, that to contend for the truth is the first duty of Christians. They differ, however, respecting almost every point of doctrine. One believes the Church to be the body of Christ, inhabited by his Spirit; the other supposes it to be little more than a religious club. One believes in baptismal regeneration and in the real presence; the other speaks of the sacraments as if they were only acted sermons. One affirms Christ to speak

by the voice of his priests, and that deadly sin requires absolution; the other affirms that the priest's words are no more effective than those of his parish clerk. Yet both parties, as well at the Broad, who lie between them, subscribe to the same formularies, which they interpret avowedly in contradictory senses, and from which they deduce the most opposite results. If all this does not arise from the laxity of those who subscribe, but from the ingenuity of those who devised our formularies, they must certainly have been the greatest masters of equivocal expression whom the world has known." Subscription to the English formularies, he says, was originally imposed, and is still rendered by High-churchmen, on the principle that the Church's judgment should guide her members; but the Gorham case showed that the Church of England has transferred the decision respecting doctrines to the civil power, and that the most opposite statements respecting matters of faith are taught under her sanction. *SEE GORHAM CASE*. There exists in England a "Liturgical Revision Society," from whose "Declaration of Principles and Objects" we extract the following: "The members of this society are moved by such 'weighty and important considerations' as arise from 'the exigencies' of *these present times*, to seek farther 'changes and alterations in the Prayer-book;' some of which, as the most necessary, they now proceed to specify:

1. The Rubric: the word priest to be changed.
2. The Ordination Service: words abused to the purposes of sacerdotal assumption to be altered.
3. The Visitation of the Sick: the absolution to be omitted or qualified.
4. The Baptismal Offices: words asserting the spiritual regeneration of each recipient to be altered.
5. The Catechism to be revised.
6. The Burial Service: general language to be employed in expressing hope for the departed.
7. The Athanasian Creed: the damnatory clauses to be omitted.
8. The Apocryphal Lessons to be replaced by Scripture."

The chief aim of this society is "to bring the Book of Common Prayer into closer conformity with the written word of God and the principles of the Reformation, by excluding all those expressions which have been assumed to countenance Romanizing doctrine or practice."

At present (1868) Romanizing tendencies gre plainly on the increase in the Church of England, and there is apparent danger of a total separation of

many ministers and members of this Church from the common faith of the reformed churches organized in the 16th century. The High-Church party has several schools, one of which (the Old School), while gladly concurring in all efforts for widening the breach between "the Church" and the "sects," yet continues in earnest opposition to the errors of Rome. Others, looking more at what is common to the Church of Rome and the Church of England than at what separates them, hope that the Church of Rome, by means of an "Episcopalian" movement, will gradually come over to the Anglican ground. This party builds great hopes especially upon the movements in Italy of such men as cardinal Andrea and Passaglia. There is, finally, an extreme party, which makes every other consideration subordinate to the desire to establish the union with Rome, and which has of late proceeded farther in this direction as a party than has ever been done before. It is this party which in 1867 sent a letter to cardinal Patrizi asking for some kind of recognition from Rome. It also aims at re-establishing monastic orders, and is specially conspicuous by "Ritualistic" innovations in divine worship, endeavoring to conform the service altogether to that of the Roman and Eastern churches. Until recently this party was more noted for zeal and fervor than for intelligence and ecclesiastical standing, but of late they have gained an immense advantage by the open declaration of Dr. Pusey in their favor. In his *Eirenicon* (1866, 12mo) he explains away the chief doctrinal differences between the Articles and the Catechism of Trent, though, at the same time, he treats severely the personal infallibility of the pope, and the increasing Mariolatry of the Roman Church. Dr. Pusey also advocates the confessional and monastic life. The latest development of this school is to be found in the series of volumes entitled *The Church and the World* (edited by the Reverend Orby Shipley).

On the other hand, there is a large party of Rationalists in the Church of England whose type of opinion is to be found in the *Essays and Reviews* (1860), and whose extreme representative is perhaps bishop Colenso, of Natal, who has published several volumes of so-called criticisms, in which the inspiration and amthenticity of the Old Testament are repudiated. No power has been discovered, either in the Church of England or in the laws of the land, to deal with the Romanizers on the one hand, or the Rationalists on the other.

IV. STATISTICS. — The Established Church of England is divided into two ecclesiastical provinces, Canterbury and York. Each province has a

Convocation (q.v.) consisting of two houses, the upper house embracing the archbishop and all the bishops of the provinces, and the lower house a number of deans, archdeacons, and proctors. The bishops of the Church in England, in 1868, were as follows :

I. *Province of Canterbury.* —

1. Canterbury (archbishop);
2. London;
3. Winchester;
4. Exeter;
5. St. David's;
6. Chichester; 7. Lichfield;
8. Oxford;
9. St. Asaph's;
10. Hereford;
11, Llandaff;
12. Lincoln;
13. Bath and Wells;
14. Salisbury;
15. Norwich;
16. Bangor;
17. Rochester;
18. Worcester;
19. Gloucester;
20. Ely;
21. Peterborough.

II. *Province of York.* —

1. York (archbishop);
2. Durham;
3. Manchester;
4. Ripon;
5. Carlisle;
6. Chester;
7. Sodor and Man (each diocese is treated of in a special article of the *Cyclopaedia*, where full statistics and the name of the present incumbents are given).

The 32 dioceses of Ireland, formerly divided into four provinces) were reduced to 12 by.the ChurchTemporality Act (passed 1833). — *Armagh* has 6 dioceses: Armagh, Derry, Down, Kilmore, Meath, Tuam. *Dublin,* 6: Dublin, Cashel, Cloyne, Killaloe, Limerick, Ossory. *SEE IRELAND*. In connection with the Church of England are also a number of colonial and missionary bishops. They were, in 1890, as follows:

I. Europe. — Gibraltar.

II. *Asia.* —

1. Calcutta (metropolitan);
2. Bombay;
3. Travacore and Cochin;
4. Madras;
5. Colombo;
6. Rangoon;
7. Lahore.

III. *Africa.* —

1. Capetown (metropolitan);
2. Mauritius;
3. Grahamstown;
4. St. Helena;
5. Orange River State;
6. Central Africa;
7. Natal;
8. Sierra Leone;
9. Niger region.

IV. *Australia.* —

1. Sydney (metropolitan);
2. Adelaide;
3. Melbourne;
4. Newcastle;
5. Perth ;
6. Brisbane;
7. Goulburn;
8. Tasmania;
9. New Zealand (metropolitan);

10. Christ Church;
11. Nelson;
12. Wellington;
13. Waiapu;
14. Dunedin;
15. Melanesia;
16. Honolulu:
17. Grafton and Armidale.

V. *America*. —

1. Montreal;
2. Toronto;
3. Newfoundland;
4. Frederickton (metropolitan);
5. Nova Scotia;
6. Huron;
7. Colombia;
8. Quebec;
9. Ontario;
10. Rupert's Land;
11. New Westminster;
12. Jamaica;
13. Barbadoes;
14. Antigua;
15. Nassau;
16. Guiana.

The following is a list of the principal Church Societies, with a brief account of their work:

1. *Society for promoting the Employment of additional Curates in populous Places* (established in 1837). This society, besides making annual grants towards the maintenance of additional clergymen, grants sums, not exceeding £500 in any single grant, in aid of endowments. Income for 1867-68, £32,4 64.

2. *The Church Pastoral Aid Society* (1836) aims at providing means for maintaining curates and lay agents in largely peopled districts. Total receipts in the year 1866-67, £47,829; in 1886-87, £54,226.

3. *The Incorporates Society for promoting the Enlargement, Building, and Repairing of Churches and Chapels in England and Wales* (1818) had, in 1867-68, an income of £8422. This society was incorporated by act of Parliament in 1828; until 1851 it was supported by a triennial royal letter, which produced about £30,000; since then it has been dependent on annual subscriptions, donations, church collect tions, and legacies.

4. *The London Diocesan Church Building Society and Metropolis Church Fund* (1854) had, in 1867-68, an income of £45,130.

5. *The Church of England Scripture Readers' Association* provides lay readers of the Scriptures to the poor, under the superintendence of the parochial clergy. Its income was, in 1867-68, £13,440.

6. *The National Association for promoting Freeom of Worship* (1858) has for its object "to promote the restoration of the ancient freedom of parish churches as the true basis of the parochial system, and the only means of relieving spiritual destitution; and the scriptural system of weekly offerings as the most excellent way, especially enjoined by the Church of England, of raising money for Church purposes, and as a substitute for pew-rents where endowments are not obtainable."

7. *Society for promoting Chsistian Knowledge.* This is the oldest society in the country. It supplies Bibles and Prayer-books either gratuitously or far below cost price, issues boks and tracts of a "sound Church tone," suitable for schools, lending libraries, workingmen's clubs and readingrooms, hospitals, workhouses, jails, etc.; also for the use of soldiers, sailors, and emigrants. The income (independent of sales) for 1866-67 was £28,547; for 1888-89, £40,290.

8. *National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church* (instituted 1811, incorporated 1817). The operations of this society embrace building schoolrooms and teachers' dwelling-houses, maintaining colleges for the training of teachers, granting money towards paying the sales of certificated teachers, etc. The National Society, during the time of its existence, has made rants to the amount of more than £400,000, and this amount has been supplemented by at least £1,200,000 of private contribution for the building cf schools, besides originating the expenditure of an immense annual sum for their sustentation. The total number of schools in connection with this society in 1865 was 12,421, in which there were 1,186,515 scholars. The total

number of scholars in the Sunday schools was 1,818,476. The numler of schoolmasters and mistresses trained in the colleges of the society is about 140 a year, and about 4750 have been sent out during the last twenty-two years. The income of the society for 1864-65 was £20,267.

9. *The Prayer-book and Homily Society* desires to promote the circulation of the "Book of Common Prayer and the Homilies" of the Church, which it has had translated into thirty-three languages. Its income for 1866-67 was £1163; for 1867-68, £1247.

10. *The Poor Clergy Relief Society* has, since its establishment in 1856, assisted 1165 poor clergymen, and widows and orphans of clergymen, with the sum of £8254. In 1864-65 the income was £2062, and grants were made to 101 applicants.

11. *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (incorporated in 1701) is the oldest of all the English, and one of the oldest of all the Protestant missionary societies of the world. The society aims as much as possible at establishing complete churches, with bishops at their head, and which shall ultimately become altogether independent of the society, wherever England has any territorial possessions. Its income in 1866-67 was £91,1816; in 1887-88, £105,712.

12. *The Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East* was founded in 1799. Its work is chiefly among the natives of the countries in which its missions are established. Its income in 1866-67 was £150,357, and in 1886-87, £234,639.

13. *The Colonial and Continental Church Society.* Its leading object is to send clergymen, catechists, and teachers of the Church of England to settlers in the English colonies, and to British subjects in other parts of the world. The income for 1866-67 was £31,079; for 1886-87, £16,501.

14. *The English Church Union* was formed in 1859 for the purpose of "watching over the interests of the Church of England; of resisting, by a combination of its members, the attempts of dissenters and others to alienate the rights and injure the position of the Church; and also for the purpose of developing its internal energies." It is intended to be the central organ of the High-Church party. The union is managed by a council of twenty-four elected and five ex-officio members, thirteen of these being clergymen and the remaining sixteen laymen.

15. *The Association for the promotion of the Unity of Christendom* was formed in 1857 for the purpose of uniting in a bond of intercessory prayer members both of the clergy and the laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican communions. The members promise to use daily a brief prayer for the peace and unity of the Church. In 1865 the association numbered 8827 members, divided as follows: Roman Catholics, 1271; Orientals, including Servians and Armenians, 360; uncertain or miscellaneous, 75; Anglicans, 7121.

16. *The Eastern Church Association* was founded in 1864. Its objects were stated to be to inform the English public as to the state and position of the Eastern Christians; to make known the principles and doctrines of the Anglican Church to the Christians of the East; to take advantage of all opportunities which the providence of God shall afford for intercommunion with the orthodox Church, and also for friendly intercourse with the other ancient churches of the Eist; to assist, as far as possible, the bishops of the orthodox Church in their efforts to promote the spiritual welfare and the education of their flocks. It counts among its members English, Scotch, American, colonial, and Greek bishops.

17. *The Anglo-Continental Society* has for its object to make the principles of the English Church known in the different countries of Europe and throughout the world, and to aid in the reformation of national churches and other religious communities.

18. *The English Church Association* was established in 1865 as the central organization of Low-Churchmen. Its chief object is to counteract and prevent the spreading of High-Church and Romanizing tendencies in the Church.

19. *The South American Mission Society*, established in 1852. Its object is to send out missionaries to the native tribes of South America, to Englishmen in spiritual destitution there, and to take advantage of any opening for evangelization. Its means was in 1866-67, £7431, and in 1886-87, £12,008. 20. *Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics.* According to the nineteenth annual report, published in May, 1868, the income was £25,577; the year before it was £22,507. 21. *The London Societyforpromoting Christianity among the Jews*, established in 1809. The officers must be members of the United Church of England and Ireland, or, if foreigners, of a Protestant Chlurch. Its income was in 1666-67, £33,327, and in 1887-88, £33,925.

At the last official census taken in Great Britain in 1881, in England and Scotland no inquiries were made as to the creed of the inhabitants. For Ireland, the population connected with the Established Church was, in 1861, according to the official census, 678,661. As in England the Church herself makes no attempt to find out her statistics, nothing but estimates can be given on this point. As regards places of worship, number of sittings, and estimates of Church attendants, the statistics of the Established Church compared as follows with the aggregate statistics of all other religious bodies:

Religious Bodies	Places of worship	Number of Sittings	Estimate of Attendants
Church of England	14,077	5,317,915	3,773,474
All other Religious Denominations	20,390	4,894,648	3,487558

According to this table, of all the church sittings, 51.9 percent belonged to the Church of England, and 48.1 percent to the other religious denominations; and of the Church attendants, likewise about 52 percent to the Church of England, and 48 to others. Other statistics, as, for instance, the annual marriage statistics, give to the population connected with the Church of England from 65 to 70 percent of the population. The two statements can may be reconciled by taking 52 percent as that portion of the total population which is practically and actively connected with the Church, while it is, on the other hand, probable that fully 65 percent sustain a nominal connection with the Church. Since the beginning of the present century, the progress of the Church of England in point of places of worship and Church attendants has been less rapid than that of the other religious denominations taken together. For detailed comparative statistics, *SEE GREAT BRITAIN*.

Besides the national universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Durham University and King's College, London, the Church of England has the following theological training institutions: St. Bees (Cumberland), with 80 students, and St. Aidan's (Birkenhead), with 63 students; also a training

department at Birmingham College, the London College of Divinity at St. John's Wood, and Lampeter College, Wales.

The following table gives the number of parishes and the number of clergy in each of the English dioceses; also the total population of the territory embraced in each diocese.

Picture for England, Church of

For farther accounts of the statistics of the Church of England, see the annual *Clergy List* (which also contains a complete list of all the benefices, with names of patrons, etc.); Rivington's *Ecclesiastical Year-book for* 1865; *Christian Year-book* (Lond. 1867 and 1868); Schem, *Amer. Ecclesiastes Year-book for* 1859 (N.Y. 1860), and *Amer. Ecclesiastes Almanac for* 1868 (N.Y. 1868).

V. *Literature.* — The early historians are Gildas (6th century), *De Britanniae excidio,* etc. (transl. by Gills, Lond. 1841, 8vo); Bede, *Hist. Ecclesiastes Anglorum (Opera,* ed. Giles 12 volumes, 1843, volume 2); Giraldus Camzbrensis, *Vitae Episcoporum,* in Wharton, *Anglia Sacra,* volume 2; Eadmer, *Vitae,* Wharton, *Anglia Sacra,* volume 2, and in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* volume 159; Ingulphus, and William of Malmesbury, in Fulman, *Rer. Anglicar. Script. Vet.* (Oxon, 1684); and in Gale, *Historiae Britannicae,* etc. (Oxon, 1691, 2 vols. fol.). The *History of Engulph,* the *History of Gaimar,* the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* and the *Chronicle of Florence of Worcester,* are reprinted in *The Church Historians of England* (Lond. 1853).

Historians: Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicae* (1710; mew edit. Oxford, 1842, 2 volumes, 8vo); Usher, *Brit. Ecclesiarum Antiquitates* (1638, 4to; *Works,* 16 volumes, Dublin, 1847, volumes 5, 6); Smith, *Religion of Ancient Britain* (Lond. 1846, 12mo); Churton, *Early English Church* (London, 1858, 3d edit. 18mo); Soames, *Anglo-Saxon Church* (Lond. 1828, 2d edit. 8vo); Ib. *Doctrines of Anglo-Saxon Church* (Bampton Lecture, 1830); Ib. *Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times* (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Ib. *Elizabethan Religious History* (London, 1839, 8vo); Ib. *Reformation* (London, 1826-8, 4 volumes, 8vo); Fuller, *Church History of Great Britain* (1655, fol.; new edit. Lond. 1837, 3 volumes, 8vo; Warner, *Ecclesiastical History of England* (1765, 2 volumes, fol.); Inett, *Origines Anglicanae,* History from 6th century to death of King John, 1216 (London, 1704-10, 2 volumes, fol.; new edit. Oxford, 1855, 3 volumes,

8vo); Carwithen, *History of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1849, 2d edit 2 volumes, 12mo); Grant, *Summary of the History of the English Church and of the Sects*, etc. (Lond. 1811-1826, 4 volumes, 8vo); Collier, *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (1708, fol.; new ed. by Barham, Lond. 1840, 9 volumes, 8vo); Brown, *Compendious History of the British Churches* (Edinb. 1820; 2d edit. 1823, 2 volumes, 8vo); Baxter, *Church History of England* (2d ed. Lond. 1849, 8vo); Short, *Sketch of the History of the Church of England to* 1688 (Lond. 1840, 3d edit. 8vo); Anderson, *History of the Church of England in the Colonies* (Lond. 1856, 2d edit. 3 vols. Svo); *Annual American Cyclopadie*, 1863, and all the following volumes, art. Anglican Church.

On the history of the English Reformation, *SEE REFORMATION*. For general statistics of Christianity in the British Islands, *SEE GREAT BRITAIN*; *SEE IRELAND: SCOTLAND*.

Engles, Joseph Patterson, D.D

was born in Philadelphia January 3, 1793. He was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, and graduated in July, 1811. In 1813 he was appointed co-master of the grammar-school in the same institution with Reverend Dr. S.B. How. In 1817, Reverend Dr. S.B. Wylie and Mr. Engles founded an academy, under the name of the Classical Institute, which Mr; Engles continued until February, 1845, when he was elected publishing agent of the Presbyterian Board of Publication. He continued in this position until his death. Mr. Engles was a member and elder of the Scots Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, having joined that church at the age of twenty, and very soon after having been chosen an elder of the same. Besides writinig everal smaller volumes for children and youth, he edited an edition of the Greek Testament, with various readings. He died suddenly on the night of April 14, 1861, of a disease of the heart from which he had been suffering for about a year.

Engles, William Morrison, D.D

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia October 12, 1797, and was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, where he graduated A.B. in 1815. After studying theology under the Reverend Dr. S.B. Wylie (q.v.), he was licensed to preach in 1818, and in 1820 became pastor of the Seventh Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, which office he filled faithfully until his health failed in 1834, when he became editor of *The*

Presbyterian. He edited that journal for over thirty years. In 1838 the Presbyterian Board of Publication made him their editor of books and tracts, and he continued in that work with great success till 1863. In one of their publications, it is stated that "the Board of Publication is probably more largely indebted to Dr. Engles than to any other one man for its existence and its usefulness, especially during the first twenty years of its history." Besides his constant editorial work, he wrote a number of small books on practical religion, many of which had a wide circulation. Of one of them, the *Soldier's Pocket-book,* in English and German, 300,000 were circulated among our soldiers during the civil war. He died in Philadelphia November 27, 1867. — *American Annual Cyclopeadia,* 7:296.

English Versions Of The Bible.

Passing over the lives of the individual translators, the long struggle with the indifference or opposition of men in power, the religious condition of the people as calling for, or affected by, the appearance of the translation, the time, and place, and form of the successive editions by which the demand, when once created, was supplied — all of which is given under more appropriate titles — we shall here aim to give an account of the several versions as they appeared; to ascertain the qualifications of the translators for the work which they undertook, and the principles on which they acted; to form an estimate of the final result of their labors in the received version, and, as consequent on this, of the necessity or desirableness of a new or revised translation; and, finally, to give such a survey of the literature of the subject as may help the reader to obtain a fuller knowledge for himself. In doing this we shall substantially adopt so much of Prof. Plumtre's art. in Smith's *Diet. of the Bible,* s.v. Versions, as relates to the subject. The present article has been carefully revised by the Reverend T.J. Conant, D.D., of Brooklyn.

I. *Early Translations.* — It was asserted by Sir Thomas More, in his anxiety to establish a point against Tyndal, that he had seen English translations of the Bible which had been made before Wycliffe, and that these were approved by the bishops, and were allowed by them to be read by laymen, and even by devout women *(Dialogues* chapter 8-14, col. 82). There seem good grounds, however, for doubting the accuracy of this statement. No such translations versions, i.e., of the entire Scriptures are now extant. No traces of them appear in any contemporary writer. Wycliffe's great complaint is that there is no translation (Forshall and

Madden, *Wycliffe's Bible,* Pref. page 21, Prol. page 59). The Constitutions of archbishop Arundel (A.D. 1408) mention two only, and these are Wycliffe's own, and the one based on his and completed after his death. More's statement must therefore be regarded either as a rhetorical exaggeration of the fact that parts of the Bible had been previously translated. or as arising out of a mistake as to the date of MSS. of the Wycliffe version. The history of the English Bible will therefore begin, as it has begun hitherto, with the work of the first great reformer. One glance, however, we may give, in passing, to the earlier history of the English Church, and connect some of its most honored names with the great work of making the truths of Scripture, or parts of the books themselves, if not the Bible as a whole, accessible to the people. We may think of Caedmon as embodyingthe whole history of the Bible in the alliterative metre of Anglo-Saxon poetry (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:24); of Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, in the 7th century, as rendering the Psalter; of Bede, as translating in the last hours of his life the Gospel of John *(Epist. Cuthberti);* of Alfred, setting forth in his mother tongue, as the great ground-work of his legislation, the four chapters of Exodus (20-23) that contained the first code of the laws of Israel (Pauli's *Life of Alfred,* chapter 5). The wishes of the great king extended further. le, desired that "all the free-born youth of his kingdom should be able to read the English Scriptures" ["Enslisc gewritt," which, however, may merely denote English literature in general] *(Ibid.).* Portions of the Bible, some of the Psalms, and extracts from other books, were translated by him for his own use and that of his children. The traditions of a later date, seeing in him the representative of all that was good in the old Saxon time, made him the translator of the whole Bible *(Ibid.,* supp. to chapter 5).

The work of translating was, however, carried on by others. One Anglo-Saxon version of the four gospels, interlinear with the Latin of the Vulgate, known as the Durham book, is found in the Cottonian MSS. of the British Museum, and is referred to the 9th or 10th century. Another, known as the Rushworth Gloss, and belonging to the same period, is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Another, of a somewhat later date, is in the same collection, and in the library of Corpus-Christi College, Cambridge. The name of Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, is connected with a version of the Psalms, that of Aelfric with an epitome of Scripture history, including a translation of many parts of the historical books of the Bible (Lewis, *Hist. of Transl.* chapter 1; Forshall and Madden, *Preface;* Bagster's *English*

Hexapla, Pref.). The influence of Norman ecclesiastics, in the reigns that preceded and followed the Conquest, was probably adverse to the continuance of this work. They were too far removed from sympathy with the subjugated race to care to educate them in their own tongue. The spoken dialects of the English of that period would naturally seem to them too rude and uncouth to be the channel of divine truth. Pictures, mysteries, miracle plays, rather than books, were the instruments of education for all but the few who, in monasteries under Norman or Italian superintendence, devoted themselves to the study of theology or law. In the remoter parts of England, however, where their influence was less felt, or the national feeling was stronger, there were those who carried on the succession, and three versions of the Gospels, inthe University Library at Cambridge, in the Bodleian, and in the British Museum, belonging to the 11th or 12th century, remain to attest their labors. The metrical paraphrase of the Gospel historyknown as the Ormulum, in alliterative English verse, ascribed to the latter half of the 12th century, is the next conspicuous monument, and may be looked upon as indicating a desire to place the facts of the Bible within reach of others than the clergy. The 13th century, a time in England, as throughout Europe, of religious revival, witnessed renewed attempts. A prose translation of the Bible into Norman-French, circ. A.D. 1260, indicates a demand for devotional reading within the circle of the court, or of the wealthier merchants, or of convents for women of high rank. Farther signs of the same desire are found in three English versions of the Psalms — one towards the close of the 13th century; another by Schorham, circ. A.D. 1320; another, with other canticles from the O.T. and N.T., by Richard Rolle, of Hampole, circ. 1349; the last being accompanied by a devotional exposition and in one of the Gospels of Mark and Luke, and of all Paul's epistles (the list includes the apocryphal epistle to the Laodiceans), in the library of CorpusChristi College, Cambridge. The fact stated by archbishop Arundel in his funeral sermon on Anne of Bohemia, wife of Richard II, that she habitually read the Gospels in the vulgar tongue, with divers expositions, was probably true of many others of high rank. It is interesting to note these facts, not as detracting from the glory of the great reformer of the 14th century, but as showing that for himself also there had been a preparation; that what he supplied met a demand which had for many years been gathering strength. It is almost needless to add that these versions started from nothing better than the copies of the Vulgate, more or less accurate, which each translator had before him (Lewis; chapter 1; Forshall and Madden, *Preface).*

II. WYCLIFFE (born 1324, died 1384). —

1. It is singular, and not without significance, that the first translation from the Bible connected with the name of Wycliffi should have been that of part of the Apocalypse. The *Last Age of the Church* (A.D. 1356) translates and expounds the vision in which the reformer read the signs of his own times, the sins and the destruction of "Antichrist and his meynee" (=multitude). Shortly after this he completed a version of the Gospels, accompanied by a commentary, "so that pore Cristen men may some dele know the text of the Gospel, with the comyn sentence of the olde holie doctores" (Preface). Wycliffe, however, though the chief, was not the only laborer in the cause. The circle of English readers was becoming wider, and they were not content to have the book which they honored above all others in a tongue not their own. Another translation and commentary appear to have been made about the same time, in ignorance of Wycliffe's work, and for the "manie lewid men that gladlie would kon the Gospelle, if it were draghen into the Englisch tung." The fact that many MSS. of this period are extant, containing in English a Monotessaron' or Harmony of the Gospels, accompanied by portions of the Epistles, or portions of the O.T., or an epitome of Scripture history, or the substance of Paul's epistles, or the Catholic Epistles at full length, with indications more or less distinct of Wycliffe's influence, shows how widespread was the feeling that the time had come for an English Bible (Forshall and Madden, *Pref.* pages 13-17). These preliminary labors were followed up by a complete translation of the N.T. by Wycliffe himself. The O.T. was undertaken by his coadjutor, Nicholas de Hereford, but was interrupted probably by a citation to appear before archbishop Arundel in 1382, and ends abruptly (following so far the order of the Vulgate) in the middle of Baruch. Many of the MSS. of'this version now extant present a different recension of the text, and it is probable that the work of Wycliffe and Hereford was revised by Richard Purvey, circ. A.D. 1388. To him also is ascribed the interesting Prologue, in which the translator gives an account both of his purpose and his method (Forshall and Madden, *Pref.* page 25).

2. The former was, as that of Wycliffe had been, to give an English Bible to the English people. He appeals to the authority of Bede, of Alfred, and of Grostete, to the examples of "Frenshe, and Beemers (Bohemians), and Britons." He answers the hypocritical objections that men were not holy enough for such a work; that it was wrong for "idiots" to do what the great

doctors of the Church had left undone. He hopes "to make the sentence as trewe and open in Englishe as it is in Latine, or more trewe and open."

It need hardly be said, as regards the method of the translator, that the version was based upon the Vulgate (comp. Genesis 3:15: “She shall trede thy head"). If, in the previous century, scholars like Grostete and Roger Bacon, seeking knowledge in other lands, and from men of other races, had acquired, as they seem to have done, some knowledge both of Greek and Hebrew, the succession had, at all events, not been perpetuated. The war to be waged at a later period with a different issue between scholastic philosophy and “humanity" ended, in the first struggle, in the triumph of the former, and there was probably no one at Oxford among Wycliffe's contemporaries who could have helped him or Purvey in a translation from the original. It is something to find at such a time the complaint that "learned doctoris taken littel heede to the lettre," the recognition that the Vulgate was not all sufficient, that "the texte of oure bokis" (he is speaking of the Psalter, and the difficulty of understanding it) "discordeth much from the Ebreu" (which knowledge is, however, at second hand, "bi witnesse of Jerom, of Lire, and other expositouris"). The difficulty which was thus felt was increased by the state of the Vulgate text. The translator complains that what the Church had in view was not Jerome's verslon, but a later and corrupt text; that "the comune Latyne Bibles ban more neede to be corrected as manie as I have seen in my life, than hath the Englishe Bible late translated." To remedy this he had recourse to collation. Many MSS. were compared, and out of this comparison the true reading ascertained as far as possible. The next step was to consult the *Glossa Ordinaria,* the commentaries of Nicholas de Lyra, and others, as to the meaning of any difficult passages. After this (we recognize here, perhaps, a departure from the right order) grammars were consulted. Then came the actual work of translating which he aimed at making idiomatic rather than literal. As he went on, he submitted his work to the judgment of others, and accepted their suggestions. It is interesting to trace these early strivings after the true excellence of a translator; yet more interesting to take note of the spirit, never surpassed, seldom equalled, in later translators, in which the work was done. Nowhere do we find the conditions of the work, intellectual and moral, more solemnly asserted. "A translator hath grete nede to studie well the sentence, both before and after," so that no equivocal words may mislead his readers or himself, and then also "he hath nede to lyve a clene life, and be ful devout

in preiers, and have not his wit occupied about worldli things, that the Holie Spiryt, author of all wisedom, and cunnynge, and truth, dresse (=train) him in his work, and suffer him not for to err" (Forshall and Madden, *Prol.* page 60).

3. The extent of the circulation gained by this version may be estimated from the fact that, in spite of all the chances of time, and all the systematic efforts for its destruction made by archbishop Arundel and others, not less than 150 copies are known to be extant, some of them obviously made for persons of wealth and rank, others apparently for humbler readers. It is significant as bearing, either on the date of the two works or on the position of the writers, that while the quotations from Scripture in Langton's *Vision of Piers Plowman* are uniformly given in Latin, those in the *Persone's Tale* of Chaucer are given in English, which for the most part agrees substantially with Wycliffe's translation.

4. The following characteristics may be noticed as distinguishing this version:

(1) The general homeliness of its style. The language of the court or of scholars is as far as possible avoided, and that of the people followed. In this respect the principle has been acted on by later translators. The style of Wycliffe is to that of Chaucer as Tyndale's is to Surrey's, or that of the A.V. to Ben Jonson's.

(2) The substitution,in many cases, of English equivalents for quasi-technical words. Thus we find "fy" or "fogh" instead of "Raca" (<4052>Matthew 5:22); "they were washed" in <4006>Matthew 3:6; "richesse" for "mammon" (<4209>Luke 16:9, 11, 13); "bishop" for "high-priest" *(passim).*

(3) The extreme literalness with which, in some instances, even at the cost of being unintelligible, the Vulgate text is followed, as in <4017>2 Corinthians 1:17-19.

III. TYNDALE. — The work of Wycliffe stands by itself. Whatever power it exercised in preparing the way for the Reformation of the 16th century, it had no perceptible influence on later translations. By the reign of Henry VIII its English was already obsolescent, and the revival of classical scholarship led men to feel dissatisfied with a version which had avowedly been made at second-hand, not from the original. With Tyndale, on the

other hand, we enter on a continuous succession. He is the patriarch, in no remote ancestry, of the Authorized Version. With a consistent, unswerving purpose, he devoted his whole life to this one work, and, through dangers and difficulties, amid enemies and treacherous friends, in exile and loneliness, accomplished it. More than Cranmer or lidley, he is the true hero of the English Reformation. While they were slowly moving onwards, halting between two opinions, watching how the courtwinds blew, or, at the best, making the most of oppor. tunities, he set himself to the task without which, he felt sure, reform would be impossible, which, once accomplished, would render it inevitable. "Ere many years," he said, at the age of thirty-six (A.D. 1520), he would cause "a boy that driveth the plough" to know more of Scripture than the great body of the clergy then knew (Foxe, in Anderson's *Annals of English Bible,* 1:36). We are able to form a fairly accurate estimate of his fitness for the work to which he thus gave himself. The change which had come over the universities of Continental Europe since the time of Wycliffe had affected those of England. Greek had been taught in Paris in 1458. The first Greek Grammar, that of Constantine Lascaris, had been printed in 1476. It was followed in 1480 by Craston's Lexicon. The more enterprising scholars of Oxford visited foreign universities for the sake of the new learning. Grocyn (d. 1519), Linacre (d. 1524), Colet (d. 1519), had, in this way, from the Greeks whom the fall of Constantinople had scattered over Europe, or from their Italian pupils, learned enough to enter, in their turn, upon the work of teaching. When Erasmus visited Oxford in 1497, he found in these masters a scholarship which even he could admire. Tyndale, who went to Oxford cir. 1500, must have been within the range of their teaching. His two great opponents, Sir Thomas More and bishop Tonstal, are known to have been among their pupils. It is significant enough that, after some years of study, Tyndale left Oxford and went to Cambridge. Such changes were, it is true, common enough. The fame of any great teacher would draw around him men from other universities, from many lands. In this instance, the reason of Tyndale's choice is probably not far to seek (Walter, *Biog. Notice* to Tyndale's *Doctrinal Treatises).* Erasmus was in Cambridge from 1509 to 1514. All that we knew of Tyndale's character and life, the fact especially that he had made translations of portions of the N.T. as early as 1502 (Offor, *Life of Tyndale,* page 9), leads to the conclusion that he resolved to make the most of the presence of one who was emphatically the scholar and philologist of Europe. It must be remembered, too, that the great scheme of cardinal Ximenes was just then beginning to interest the

minds of all scholars. The publication of the Complutensian Bible, it is true, did not take place till 1520; but the collection of MSS. and other preparations for it began as early as 1504. In the mean time Erasmus himself, in 1516, brought out the first published edition of the Greek Testament, and it was thus made accessible to all scholars. Of the use made by Tyndale of these opportunities we have evidence in his coming up to London (1522), in the vain hope of persuading Tonstal (known as a Greek scholar, an enlightened Humanist) to sanction his scheme of rendering the N.T. into English; and bringing a translation of one of the orations of Isocrates as a proof of his capacity for the work. The attempt was not successful. "At the last I understood not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the N.T., but also that there was no place to do it in all England"' *(Pref. to Five Books of Moses).*

It is not so easy to say how far at this time any knowledge of Hebrew was attainable at the English universities, or how far Tyndale had used any means of access that were open to him. It is probable that it may have been known, in some measure, to a few bolder than their fellows, at a time far earlier than the introduction of Greek. The large body of Jews settled in the cities of England must have possessed a knowledge, more or less extensive, of their Hebrew books. On their banishment, to the number of 16,000, by Edward I, these books fell into the hands of the monks, superstitiously reverenced or feared by most yet drawing some to examination, and then to study. Grostete, it is said, knew Hebrew as well as Greek.

Roger Bacon knew enough to pass judgment on the Vulgate as incorrect and misleading. Then, however, came a period in which linguistic studies were thrown into the background, and Hebrew became an unknown speech even to the best-read scholars. The first signs of a revival meet us towards the close of the 15th century. The remarkable fact that a, Hebrew Psalter was printed at Soncino in 1477 (forty years before Erasmus's Greek Testament), the Pentateuch in 1482, the Prophets in 1486, the whole of the O.T. in 1488, that by 1496 four editions had been published, and by 1596 not fewer than eleven (Whitaker, *Hist. and Crit. Inquiry*, page 22), indicates a demand on the part of the Christian students of Europe, not less than on that of the more learned Jews. Here also the progress of the Complutensian Bible would have attracted the notice of scholars. The cry raised by the "Trojans" of Oxford in 1519 (chiefly consisting of the friars, who from the time of Wycliffe had all but swamped the education of the

place) against the first Greek lectures — that to study that language would make men pagans, that to study Hebrew would make them Jews — shows that the latter study as well as the former was the object of their dislike and fear (Anderson, 1:24; Hallam, *Lit. of Eur.* 1:403).

Whether Tyndale had in this way gained any knowledge of Hebrew before he left England in 1524 may be uncertain. The fact that in 1530-31 he published a translation of Genesis, Deuteronomy, and Jonah (see a letter by the ven. lord Arthur Hervey to the *Bury Post* of February 3, 1862, transferred shortly afterwards to the *Athenaeum),* may be looked on as the firstfruits of his labors, the work of a man who was giving this proof of his power to translate from the original (Anderson, *Annals,* 1:209-288). We may perhaps trace, among other motives for the many wanderings of his exile, a desire to visit the cities Worms, Cologne, Hamburg, Antwerp (Anderson, pages 48-64), where the Jews lived in greatest numbers, and some of which were famous for their Hebrew learning. Of at least a fair acquaintance with that language we have, a few years later, abundant evidence in the table of Hebrew words prefixed to his translation of the five books of Moses, and in casual etymologies scattered through his other works, e.g. "Mammon" *(Parable of Wicked Mammoen,* page 68), "Cohen" *(Obedience,* page 255), "Abel Mizraim" (page 347), "Pesah" (page 353). A remark (Preface to *Obedience,* page 148) shows how well he had entered into the general spirit of the language. "The properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the Englishe than with the Latine. The manner of speaking is in both one, so that in a thousand places thou needest not but to translate it into Englishe word for word." When Spalatin describes him in 1534, it is as one well-skilled in seven languages, and one of these is Hebrew (Anderson, 1:397).

The N.T. was, however, the great object of his care. First the gospels of Matthew and.Mark were published tentatively, then in 1525 the whole of the N.T. was printed in 4to at Cologne, and in small 8vo at Worms (reproduced in facsimile in 1862 by Mr. Francis Fry, Bristol). The work was the fruit of a self-sacrificing zeal, and the zeal was its own reward. In England it was received with denunciations. Tonstal, bishop of London, preaching at Paul's Cross, asserted that there were at least 2000 errors in it, and ordered all copies of it to be bought up and burnt. An act of Parliament (35 Hen. VIII, cap. 1) forbade the use of all copies of Tyndale's "false translation." Sir T. More *(Dialogues, 1.c. Supplication of Souls, Confutation of Tindal's Answer)* entered the lists against it, and accused

the translator of heresy, bad scholarship, and dishonesty, of "corrupting Scripture after Luther's counsel." The treatment which it received from professed friends was hardly less annoying. Piratical editions were printed, often carelessly, by trading publishers at Antwerp. One of his own pupils, George Joye, undertook (in 1534) to improve the version by bringing it into closer conformity with the Vulgate, and made it the vehicle of peculiar opinions of his own, substituting "life after this life'" or "verie life," for "resurrection," as the translation of ἀνάστασις. (Comp. Tyndale's indignant protest in Pref. to edition of 1534.) Even the most zealous reformers in England seemed disposed to throw his translation overboard, and encouraged Coverdale (see below) in undertaking another. In the mean time the work went on. Editions were printed one after another, namely, at Halmburg, Cologne,Worms, in 1525; Antwerp in 1526, '27, '28; Marlborow (=Marburg) in 1529; Strasburg (Joye's edition) in 1531; Bergen-op-Zoom in 1533 (Joye's); John 6 at Nuremberg in 1533; Antwerp in 1534 (Cotton, *Printed Editions,* pages 4-6). The last appeared in 1535, just before his death, "diligently compared with the Greek," presenting for the first time systematic chapter-headings, and with some peculiarities in spelling specially intended for the pronunciation of the peasantry (Offor, *Life*, pages 82). His heroic life was brought to a close in 1536. We may cast one look on its sad end — the treacherous betrayal, the Judas-kiss of the false friend, the imprisonment at Vilvorden, the last prayer, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes." He was tied to the stake, then strangled to death, and finally burnt. (See Offor's memoir prefixed to his edition of Tyndale's New Testament.)

The work to which a life was thus nobly devoted was as nobly done. To Tyndale belongs the honor of having given the first example of a translation based on true principles, and the excellence of later versions has been almost in exact proportion as they followed his. Believing that every part of Scripture had one sense and one only, the sense in the mind of the writer *(Obedience*, page 30), he made it his work, using all philological helps that were accessible to attain that sense. Believing that the duty of a translator was to place his readers as nearly as possible on a level with those for whom the books were originally written, he looked on all the later theological associations that had gathered round the words of the N.T. as hindrances rather than helps, and sought, as far as possible, to get rid of them. Not "grace," but "favor," even in <4801>John 1:17 (in edition of 1525); not "charity," but "love;" not "confessing," but "acknowledging;"

not "penance," but "repentance;" not "priests," but "seniors" or "elders;" not "salvation," but "health;" not "church," but "congregation," are'instances of the changes which were then looked on as startling and heretical innovations (Sir T. More, *1.c.).* Some of them we are now familiar with. In others the later versions bear traces ofa reaction in favor of the older phraseology. In this, as .in other things, Tyndale was in advance, not only of his own age, but of the age that followed him. To him, however, it is owing that the versions of the English Church have throughout been popular, and not scholastic. All the exquisite grace and simplicity which have endeared the A.V. to men of the most opposite tempers and contrasted opinions — to J.H. Newman *(Dublin Review,* June, 1853) and J.A. Froude — is due mainly to his clear-sighted truthfulness. The testimony of a Roman Catholic scholar is worth quoting: 'In point of perspicacity and noble simplicity, propriety of idiom and purity of style, no English version has as yet surpassed it" (Geddes. *Prospectus for a new Translation,* page 89). The desire to make the Bible a people's book led Tyndale in one edition to something like a provincial rather than a national translation; but, on the whole, it kept him free from the besetting danger of the time, that of writing for scholars, not for the people; of a version full of "inkhorn" phrases, not in the spoken language of the English nation. And throughout there is the pervading stamp, so often wanting in other like works, of the most thorough truthfulness. No word has been altered to court a king's favor, or please bishops, or make out a case for or against a particular opinion. He is working freely, not in the fetters of prescribed rules. With the most entire sincerity he could say, 'I call God to record, against the day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus to give a reckoning of our doings, that I never altered one syllable of God's Word against my conscience, nor would this day, if all that is in the world, whether it be pleasure, honor, or riches, might be given me" (Anderson, 1:349).

IV. COVERDALE. —

1. A complete translation of the Bible, different from Tyndale's, bearing the name of Miles Coverdale, printed probably at Zurich, appeared in 1535. The undertaking itself, and the choice of Coverdale as the translator, were probably due to Cromwell. Tyndale's controversial treatises, and the polemical character of his prefaces and notes, had irritated the leading ecclesiastics, and embittered the mind of the king himself against him. All that he had written was publicly condemned. There was no hope of obtaining the king's sanction to anything that bore his name. But the idea of

an English translation began to find favor. The rupture with the see of Rome, the marriage with Anne Boleyn, made Henry willing to adopt what was urged upon him as the surest way of breaking forever the spell othehe pope's authority. The bishops even began to think of the thing as possible. It was talked of in Convocation. They would take it in hand themselves. The work did not, however, make much progress. The great preliminary question whether "venerable" words, such as hostia, penance, pascha, holocaust, and the like, should be retained, was still unsettled (Anderson, 1:414). Not till "the day after doomsday" (the words are Cranmer's) were the English people likely to get their English Bible from the bishbps *(ib.* 1:577). Cromwell, it is probable, thought it better to lose no further time, and to strike while the iron was hot. A divine whom he had patronized, though not, like Tyndale, feeling himself called to that special work *(Pref. to Coverdale's Bible),* was willing to undertake it. To him accordingly it was intrusted. There was no stigma attached to his name, and, though a sincere Reformer, neither at that time nor afterwards did he occupy a sufficiently prominent position to become an object of special persecution.

2. The work which was thus executed was done, as might be expected, in a very different fashion from Tyndale's. Of the two men, one had made this the great object of his life; the other, in his own language, "sought it not, neither desired it," but accepted it as a task assigned him. One prepared himself for the work by long years of labor in Greek and Hebrew; the other is content to make a translation at second hand "out of the Douche (Luther's German Version) and the Latine." The one aims at a rendering which shall be the truest and most exact possible; the other loses himself in weak commonplace as to the advantage of using many English words for one and the same word in the original, and in practice oscillates between "penance" and "repentance," "love" and "'charity," priests" and "elders," as though one set of words were as true and adequate as the other *(Preface,* page 19). In spite of these weaknesses, however, there is much to esteem in the spirit and temper of Coverdale. He is a second-rate man, laboring as such contentedly, not ambitious to appear other than he is. He thinks it a great gain that there should be a diversity of translations. He acknowledges, though he dare not name.it, the excellence of Tyndale's version, and regrets the misfortune which left it incomplete. He states frankly that he had done his work with the assistance of that and of five others. The five were probably:

(1.) The Vulgate;
(2.) Luther's;
(3.) The German Swiss version of Zurich;
(4.) The Latin of Pagninus;
(5.) Tyndale's.

Others, however, have conjectured a German translation of the Vulgate earlier than Luther's, and a Dutch version from Luther (Whit. aker, *Hist. and Crit. Inquiry*, page 49). If the language of his dedication to the king, whom he compares to Moses, David, and Josiah, seems to be somewhat fulsome in its flattery, it is, at least, hardly more offensive than that of the Dedication of the A.V., and there was more to palliate it.

3. An inspection of Coverdale's version serves to show the influence of the authorities he followed. The proper names of the O.T. appear for the most part in their Latin fotm, "Elias," "Eliseus," "Ochozias;" sometimes, as in "Esay" and "Jeremy," in that which was familiar in spoken English. Some points of correspondence with Luther's version are not without interest. Thus "Cush," which in Wycliffe, Tyndale, and the A.V. is uniformly rendered "Ethiopia," is in Coverdale "Morians' land" (<19B831>Psalm 68:31; <44827>Acts 8:27, etc.), after the "Mohrenlande" of Luther, and appears in this form accordingly in the P.B. version of the Psalms. The proper name Rabshakeh passes, as in Luther, into the "chief butler" (<121817>2 Kings 18:17; <23611>Isaiah 36:11). In making the sons of David "priests" (<10818>2 Samuel 8:18) he followed both his authorities. Ἐπίσκοποι are "bishops" in <44028>Acts 20:28 ("overseers" in A.V.). "Shiloh," in the prophecy of <01490>Genesis 49:10, becomes "the worthy," after Luther's "der Held." "They houghed oxen" takes the place of "they digged down a wall," in <01406>Genesis 49:6. The singular word "Lamia" is taken from the Vulg., as the English rendering of *Ziim* ("wild beasts," A.V.) in <23414>Isaiah 34:14. The "tabernacle of witness," where the A.V. has "congregation," shows the same influence. In spite of Tyndale, the Vulg. "plena gratia," in <42028>Luke 1:28, leads to "full of grace;" while we have, on the other hand, "congregation" throughout the N.T. for ἐκκλησία, and "love" instead of "charity" in 1 Corinthians 13. It was the result of the same indecision that his language as to the Apocrypha lacks the sharpness of that of the more zealous reformers. "Baruch" is placed with the canonical books, after "Lamentations." Of the rest he says that they are "placed apart," as "not held by ecclesiastical doctors in the same repute" as the other Scriptures, but this is only because there are "dark sayings" which seem to differ from the "open Scripture."

He has no wish that they should be "despised or little set by." "Patience and study would show that the two were agreed."

4. What has been stated practically disposes of the claim which has sometimes been made for this version of Coverdale's, as though it had been made from the original text (Anderson, 1:564; Whitaker, *Hist. and Crit. Inquiry,* page 58). It is not improbable, however, that as time went on he added to his knowledge. The letter addressed by him to Cromwell *(Renains,* page 492, Parker Soc.) obviously asserts, somewhat ostentatiously, an acquaintance "not only with the standing text of the Hebrew, with the interpretation of the Chaldee and the Greek," but also with "the diversity of reading of all sects." He, at any rate, continued his work as a pains-taking editor. Fresh editions of his Bible were published, keeping their ground in spite of rivals, in 1537, 1539, 1550, 1553. He was called in at a still later period to assist in the Geneva version. Among smaller facts connected with this edition may be mentioned the appearance of Hebrew letters-of the name Jehovah-in the title-page (hwhy), and again in the margin of the alphabetic poetry of Lamentations, though not of Psalm 119. The plural form "Biblia" is retained in the title-page, possibly, however, in its later use as a singular feminine, *SEE BIBLE*. There are no notes; no chapter-headings, no divisions into verses. The letters A, B, C,D in the margin, as in the early editions of Greek and Latin authors, are the only helps for finding places. Marginal references point to parallel passages. The O.T., especially in Genesis, has the attraction of wood-cuts. Each book has a table of contents prefixed to it. A careful reprint, though not a facsimile, of Coverdale's version has been published by Bagster (London 1838).

V. MATTHEW. —

1. In the year 1537, a large folio Bible appeared as edited and dedicated to the king, by Thomas Matthew. No one of that name appears at all prominently in the religious history of Henry VIII, and this suggests the inference that the name was pseudonymous, adopted to conceal the real translator. The tradition which connects this Matthew with John Rogers, the protomartyr of the Marian persecution, is all but undisputed. It rests

(1) on the language of the indictment and sentence which describe him (Foxe, *Acts and Monuments,* page 1029, 1563; Chester, *Life of*

Rogers, pages 418-423) as Joannes Rogers, alias Matthew, as if it were a matter of notoriety;

(2) the testimony of Foxe himself, as representing, if not personal knowledge, the current belief of his time;

(3) the occurrence, at the close of a short exhortation to the study of Scripture in the preface, of the initials J.R.; (4) internal evidence. This last subdivides itself.

(a.) Rogers, who had graduated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1525, and had sufficient fame to be invited to the new Cardinal's College at Oxford, accepted the office of chaplain to the merchant adventurers of Antwerp, and there became acquainted with Tyndale two years before the latter's death. Matthew's Bible, as might be expected, if this hypothesis were true, reproduces Tyndale's work, in the N.T. entirely, in the O.T. as far as 2 Chronicles, the rest being taken, with occasional modifications, from Coverdale.

(b.) The language of the Dedication is that of one who has mixed much, as Rogers mixed, with foreign reformers ("the godlie in strange countries").

2. The printing of the book was begun apparently abroad, and was carried on as far as the end of Isaiah., At that point a new pagination begins, and the names of the Lond6n printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, appear. The history of the book was probably something like this: Coverdale's translation had not given satisfaction — least of all were the more zealous and scholar-like reformers contented with it. As the only complete English Bible, it was, however, as yet, in possession of the field. Tyndale and Rogers, therefore, in the year preceding the imprisonment of the former, determined on another, to include O.T., N.T., and Apocrypha, but based throughout on the original. Left to himself, Rogers carried on the work, probably at the expense of the same Antwerp merchant who had assisted Tyndale (Poyntz), and thus got as far as Isaiah. The enterprising London printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, then came in (Chester, *Life of Rogers,* page 29). It would be a good speculation to enter the market with this, and so drive out Coverdale's, in which they had no interest. They accordingly embarked a considerable capital, £500, and then came a stroke of policy which may be described as a miracle of audacity. The name of Rogers, known as the friend of Tyndale, is suppressed, and the simulacrum of

Thomas Matthew disarms suspicion. The book is sent by Grafton to Cranmer. He reads, approves, rejoices. He would rather have the news of its being licensed than a thousand pounds (Chester, pages 425-427). Application is then made both by Grafton and Cranmer to Cromwell. The king's license is granted, but the publisher wants more. Nothing less than a monopoly for ave years will give him a fair margin of profit. Without this, he is sure to be undersold by piratical, inaccurate editions, badly printed on inferior paper. Failing this, he trusts that the king will order one copy to be bought by every incumbent, and six by every abbey. If this was too much, the king might, at least, impose that obligation on all the popishly-inclined clergy. That will bring in something, besides the good it may possibly do them (Chester, pages 430). The application was to some extent successful. A copy was ordered, by royal proclamation, to be set up in every church, the cost being divided between the clergy and the parishioners. This was, therefore, the first Authorized Version. It is scarcely conceivable, however, that Henry could have read the book which he thus sanctioned, or known that it was substantially identical with what had been publicly stigmatized in his Acts of Parliament *(ut supra).* What had before given most offense had been the polemical character of Tyndale's annotations, and here were notes bolder and more thorough still.. Even the significant "W.T." does not appear to have attracted notice.

3. What has been said of Tyndale's version applies, of course, to this. There are, however, signs of a more advanced knowledge of Hebrew. All the technical words connected with the Psalms, Neginoth, Shiggaion, Sheminith, etc., are elaborately explained. Psalm 2 is printed as a dialogue. The names of the Hebrew letters are prefixed to the verses of Lamentations. Reference is made to the,Chaldee Paraphrase (Job 6), to Rabbi Abraham (Job 19), to Kimchi (Psalm 3). A like range of knowledge is shown in the N.T. Strabo is quoted to show that the magi were not kings, Macrobius as testifying to Herod's ferocity (Matthew ii), Erasmus's Paraphrase on 40B13Matthew 13:15. The popular identification of Mary Magdalene with "the woman that was a sinner" is discussed, and rejected (Luke 10). More noticeable even than in Tyndale is the boldness and fullness of the exegetical notes scattered throughout the book. Strong and earnest in asserting what he looked upon as the central truths of the Gospel, there was in Rogers a Luther-like freedom in other things which has not appeared again in any authorized translation or popular commentary. He guards his readers against looking on the narrative of Job

1 as literally true. He recognises a definite historical starting-point for Psalm 41 ("The sons of Korah praise Solomon for the beauty, eloquence, power, and nobleness, both of himself and of his wife"), Psalm 22 ("David declareth Christ's dejection ... and all, under figure of himself"), and the Song of Solomon ("Solomon made this balade for himself and his wife, the daughter of Pharaoh, under the shadow of himself, figuring Christ," etc.). The chief duty of the Sabbath is "to minister the fodder of the Word to simple souls," to be "pitiful over the weariness of such neighbors as labored sore all the week long." "When such occasions come as turn our rest to occupation and labor, then ought we to remember that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Jeremiah 17). He sees in the prophets of the N.T. simply "expounders of Holy Scripture" (Acts 15). To the man living in faith, " Peter's fishing after the resurrection, and all deeds of matrimony are pure spiritual;" to those who are not, "learning, doctrine, contemplation of high things, preaching, study of Scripture, founding of churches and abbeys, are works of the flesh" *(Pref. to Romans).* "Neither is outward circumcision or outward baptism worth a pin of themselves, save that they put us in remembrance to keep the covenant" (1 Corinthians 7). "He that desireth honor gaspeth after lucre ... castles, parks, lordships... . desireth not a work, much less a good work, and nothing less than a bishop's" (1 Timothy 3). Ezekiel 34 is said to be "against bishops and curates that despise the flock of Christ." The ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας of Rev. ii and in appears (as in Tyndale) as "the messenger of the congregation." Strong protests against Purgatory are found in notes to Ezekiel 18 and 1 Corinthians 3, and in the "Table of Principal Matters" it is significantly stated under the word Purgatory that " it is not in the Bible, but the purgation and remission of our sins is made us by the abundant mercy of God." The Preface to the Apocrypha explains the name, and distinctly asserts the inferiority of these books. No notes are added to them, and the translation of them is taken from Coverdale, as if it had not been worth while to give much labor to it.

4. A few points of detail remain to be noticed. In the order of the books of the N.T. Rogers follows Tyndale, agreeing with the A.V. as far as the Epistle to Philemon. This is followed by the Epistles of John, then that to the Hebrews, then those of Peter, James, and Jude. Wood-cuts, not very freely introduced elsewhere, are prefixed to every chapter in the Revelation. The introduction of the "Table" mentioned above gives Rogers a claim to be the patriarch of Concordances, the "father" of all such as

write in Dictionaries of the Bible. Reverence for the Hebrew text is shown by his striking out the three verses which the Vulgate has added to Psalm 14. In a later edition, published at Paris, not by Rogers himself, but by Grafton, under Coverdale's superintendence, in 1539, the obnoxious prologue and prefaces were suppressed, and the notes systematically expurgated and toned down. The book was in advance of the age. Neither booksellers nor bishops were prepared to be responsible for it.

VI. TAVERNER (1539). —

1. The boldness of the pseudo-Matthew had, as has been said, frightened the ecclesiastical world from its propriety. Coverdale's version was, however, too inaccurate to keep its ground. It was necessary to find another editor, and the printers applied to Richard Taverner. But little is known of his life. The fact that, though a layman, he had been chosen as one of the canons of the Cardinal's College at Oxford indicates a reputation for scholarship, and this is confirmed by the character of his translation. It professes, in the title-page, to be "newly recognized, with great diligence, after the most faithful exemplars." The editor acknowledges the labors of others (i.e., Tyndale, Coverdale, and Matthew, though he does not name them) who have neither undiligently nor unlearnedly traveled," owns that the work is not one that can be done "absolutely" (i.e., completely) by one or two persons, but requires "a deeper conferring of many learned wittes together, and also a juster time and longer leisure;" but the thing had to be done; he had been asked to do it. He had "used his talent" as he could.

2. In most respects this may be described as an expurgated edition of Matthew's. There is a table of principal matters, and there are notes; but the notes are briefer and less polemical. The passages quoted above are, e.g. omitted wholly or in part. The epistles follow the same order as before.

VII. CRANMER. —

1. In the same year as Taverner's, and coming from the same press, appeared an English Bible, in a more stately folio, printed with a more costly type, bearing a higher name than any previous edition. The title-page is an elaborate engraving, the spirit and power of which indicate the hand of Holbein. The king, seated on his throne, is giving the *Verbum Dei* to the bishops and doctors, and they distribute it to the people, while doctors and people are all joining in cries of *"Vivat Rex."* It declares the book to be "truly translated after the verity of the Hebrew and Greek texts" by "divers

excellent learned men, expert in the foresaid tongues." A preface, in April 1540, with the initials "T.C." implies the archbishop's sanction. In a later edition (November 1540) his name appears on the title-page, and the names of his coadjutors are given, Cuthbert (Tonstal), bishop of Durham, and Nicholas (Heath), bishop of Rochester; but this does not exclude the possibility of others having been employed for the first edition.

2. Cranmer's version presents, as might be expected, many points of interest. The prologue gives a more complete ideal of what a translation ought to be than we have as yet seen. Words not in the original are to be printed in a different type. They are added, even when "not wanted by the sense," to satisfy those who have "missed them" in previous translations, 1:e. they represent the various readings of the Vulgate where it differs from the Hebrew. The sign * indicates diversity in the Chaldee and Hebrew. It had been intended to give all these, but it was found that this would have taken too much time and space, and the editors purposed therefore to print them in a little volume by themselves. The frequent hands in the margin, in like manner, show an intention to give notes at the end; but Matthew's Bible had made men cautious, and, as there had not been time for the "king's council to settle them," they were omitted, and no help given to the reader beyond the marginal references. In the absence of notes, the lay-reader is to submit himself to the "godly-learned in Christ Jesus." There is, as the title-page might lead us to expect, a greater display of Hebrew than in any previous version. The books of the Pentateuch have their Hebrew names given, *Bereschith* (Genesis), *Velle Schemoth* (Exodus), and so on. 1 and 2 Chronicles in like manner appear as *Dibre Haiamim.* In the edition of 1541, many proper names in the O.T. appear in the fuller Hebrew form, as e.g., Amaziahu, Jeremiahu. In spite of this parade of learning, however, the edition of 1539 contains, perhaps, the most startling blunder that ever appeared under the sanction of an archbishop's name. The editors adopted the preface which, in Matthew's Bible, had been prefixed to the Apocrypha. In that preface the common traditional explanation of the name was concisely given. They appear, however, to have shrunk from offending the conservative party in the Church by applying to the books in question so damnatory an epithet as Apocrypha. They looked out for a word more neutral and respectful, and found one that appeared in some MSS. of Jerome so applied, though in strictness it belonged to an entirely different set of books. They accordingly substituted that word, leaving the preface in all other respects as it was before, and the result is the somewhat ludicrous

statement that the "books were called *Hagiographa*," because "they were read in secret and apart!"

3. A later edition in 1541 presents a few modifications worth noticing. It appears as "authorized" to be "used and frequented" in every church in the kingdom. The introductionwith all its elaborate promise of a future perfection, disappears, and in its place there is a long preface by Cranmer, avoiding as much as possible all references to other translations, taking a safe *via media* tone, blaming those who "refuse to read" on the one hand, and "inordinate reading" on the other. This neutral character, so characteristic of Cranmer's policy, was doubtless that which enabled it to keep its ground during the changing moods of Henry's later years. It was reprinted again and again, and was the authorized version of the English Church till 1568 — the interval of Mary's reign excepted. From it, accordingly, were taken most, if not all, the portions of Scripture in the Prayer-books of 1549 and 1552. The Psalms as a whole, the quotations from Scripture in the Homilies, the sentences in the Communion services, and some phrases elsewhere (such as "worthy fruits of penance"), still preserve the remembrance of it. The oscillating character of the book is shown in the use of "love" instead of "charity" in 1 Corinthians 13; and "congregation" instead of "church" generally, after Tyndale; while in <54414>1 Timothy 4:14, we have the singular rendering, as if to gain the favor of his opponents, "with authority of priesthood." The plan of indicating doubtful texts by a smaller type was adhered to, and was applied, among other passages, to <19405>Psalm 14:5, 6, 7, and the more memorable text of <62507>1 John 5:7. The translation of <54316>1 Timothy 3:16, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable," etc., anticipated a construction of that text which has sometimes been boasted of, and some. times attacked as an innovation. In this, however, Tyndale had led the way.

VIII. GENEVA. —

1. The experimental translation of the Gospel of Matthew by Sir John Cheke into a purer English than before (Strype, *Life of Cheke*, 7:3) had so little influence on the versions that followed that it hardly calls for more than a passing notice, as showing that scholars were as yet unsatisfied. The reaction under Mary gave a check to the whole work, as far as England was concerned; but the exiles who fled to Geneva entered upon it with more vigor than ever. Cranmer's version did not come up to their ideal. Its size made it too costly. There were no explanatory or dogmatic notes. It

followed Coverdale too closely; and where it deviated, did so, in some instances, in a retrograde direction. The Genevan refugees — among them Whittingham, Goodman, Pullain, Sampson, and Coverdale himself — labored "for two years or more, day and night." They entered on their "great and wonderful work" with much "fear and trembling." Their translation of the N.T. was "diligently revised by the most approved Greek examples" (MSS. or editions?) *(Preface).* The N.T., translated by Whittingham, was printed by Conrad Badius in 1557, the whole Biule in 1560.

2. In point of general correctness in expressing the true sense of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, the Geneva version shows a very marked advance on all that preceded it, and for more than sixty years it was the most popular of all the English versions. Largely imported in the early years of Elizabeth, it was printed in England in 1561, and a patent of monopoly was given to James Bodleigh. This was transferred in 1576 to Barker, in whose family the right of printing Bibles remained for upwards of a century. Not less than eighty editions, some of the whole Bible, were printed between 1558 and 1611. It kept its ground for some time even against the later version of king James, and gave way, as it were, slowly and under protest. In the *Soldiers' Pocket Bible,* published in 1643 for the use of Cromwell's army, almost all the selections of Scripture were taken from the Geneva version. The causes of this general acceptance are not difficult to ascertain. The volume was, in most of its editions, cheaper and more portable — a small quarto, instead of the large folio of Cranmer's "Great Bible." It was the first Bible which laid aside the adolescent black letter, and appeared in Roman type. It was the first which, following the Hebrew example, recognised the division into verses, so dear to the preachers or hearers of sermons. It was accompanied, in most of the editions after 1578, by a Bible Dictionary of considerable merit. The notes were often really helpful in dealing with the difficulties of Scripture, and were looked upon as spiritual and evangelical. It was accordingly the version specially adopted by the great Puritan party through the whole reign of Elizabeth, and far into that of James. As might be expected, it was based on Tyndale's version, often returning to it where the intermediate renderings had had the character of a compromise.

3. Some peculiarities are worthy of special notice:

(1) It professes a desire to restore the "true writing" of many Hebrew names, and we meet accordingly with forms like Izhak (Isaac), Jaacob, and the like.

(2) It omits the name of Paul from the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and, in a short preface, leaves the authorship an open question.

(3) It avows the principle of putting all words not in the original in italics.

(4) It presents, in a Calendar prefixed to the Bible, something like a declaration of war against the established order of the Church's lessons, commemorating Scripture facts, and the deaths of the great reformers, but ignoring saints' days altogether.

(5) It was the first English Bible which entirely omitted the Apocrypha.

(6) The notes were characteristically Swiss, not only in their theology, but in their politics. They made allegiance to kings dependent upon the soundness of their faith, and in one instance (note on <14 15 16>2 Chronicles 15:16) at least seemed, to the easily startled James I, to favor tyrannicide.

4. The circumstances of the early introduction of the Geneva version are worth mentioning, if only as showing in how different a spirit the great fathers of the English Reformation, the most conservative of Anglican theologians, acted from that which has too often animated their successors. Men talk now of different translations and various readings as likely to undermine the faith of the people. When application was made to archbishop Parker, in 1565, to support Bodleigh's application for a license to reprint the Geneva version in 12mo, he wrote to Cecil in its favor. He was at the time looking forward to the work he afterwards accomplished, of one other special Bible for the churches, to be set forth as convenient time and leisure should permit" but in the mean time it would "nothing hinder, but rather doo much good, to have diversity of translations and readings" (Strype, *Life of Parker,* 3:6). Many of the later reprints, instead of the Geneva version from the Greek, have Tomson's translation of Beza's Latin version; and the notes are said to be taken from Joac. Camer, P. Leseler, Villerius, and Fr. Junius. The Geneva version, as published by

Barker, is that popularly known as the *Breeches* Bible, from its rendering of Genesis 3:7. It had, however, been preceded in this by Wycliffe's.

IX. THE BISHOPS' BIBLE. —

1. The facts just stated will account for the wish of archbishop Parker, in spite of his liberal tolerance, to bring out another version which might establish its claims against that of Geneva. Great preparations were made. The correspondence of Parker with his suffragans presents some points of interest, as showing how little agreement there was as to the true theory of a translation. Thus, while Sandys, bishop of Worcester, finds fault with the "common translation" (Geneva?), as "following Munster too much," and so "swerving much from the Hebrew," Guest, bishop of St. David's, who took the Psalms, acted on the principle of translating them so as to agree with the N.T. quotations, "for the avoiding of offense;" and Cox, bishop of Ely, while laying down the sensible rule that "inkhorn terms were to be avoided," also went on to add "that the usual terms were to be retained so far forth as the Hebrew will well bear" (Strype, *Parker,* 3:6). The principle of pious frauds, of distorting the truth for the sake of edification, has perhaps often been acted on by other translators. It has not often been so explicitly avowed as in the first of these suggestions.

2. The bishops thus consulted, eight in number, together with some deans and professors, brought out the fruit of their labors in a magnificent folio (1568 and 1572). Everything had been done to make it attractive. A long erudite preface vindicated the right of the people to read the Scriptures, and (quoting the authority of bishop Fisher) admitted the position which later divines have often been slow to admit, that "there be yet in the Gospel many dark places which, without all doubt, to the posterity shall be made much more open." Wood-engravings of a much higher character than those of the Geneva Bible were scattered profusely, especially in Genesis. Three portraits of the queen, the earl of Leicester, and lord Burleigh, beautiful specimens of copperplate engraving, appeared on the title-pages of the several parts. A map of Palestine was given, with degrees of latitude and longitude, in the edition of 1572. It also contained more numerous illustrated initials. Some of these caused very great dissatisfaction, being grossly offensive representations of heathen mythology; for which, however, the printer alone was responsible, who used such ornamental initials as he chose, following the taste of the age. From one of them, the initial letter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this version is popularly known

as the *Leda Bible.* A most elaborate series of genealogical tables, prepared by Hugh Broughton, the great rabbi of the age (of whom more hereafter), but ostensibly by Speed the antiquary (Broughton's name being in disfavor with the bishops), as prefixed (Strype, *Parker,* 4:20; Lightfoot, *Life of Broughton).* In some points it followed previous translations, and was avowedly based on Cranmer's. "A new edition was necessary." "This had led some well-disposed men to recognize it again, not as condemning the former translation, which has been followed mostly of any other translation, excepting the original text" (Pref. of 1572). Cranmer's Prologue was reprinted. The Geneva division into verses was adopted throughout.

3. Some peculiarities, however, appear for the first and last time.

(1.) The books of the Bible are classified as legal, historical, sapiential, and prophetic. This was easy enough for the O.T., but the application of the same idea to the N.T. produced some rather curious combinations. The Gospels, the catholic Epistles, and those to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, are grouped together as legal, St. Paul's other epistles as sapiential; the Acts appear as the one historical, the Revelation as the one prophetic book.

(2.) It is the only Bible in which many passages, sometimes nearly a whole chapter, have been marked for the express purpose of being omitted when the chapters were read in the public service of the Church.

(3.) In the edition of 1572, Cranmer's version of the Psalms, as being the one used in the Book of Common Prayer (which could not be changed without an act of Parliament), was printed along with the Bishops' version in parallel columns. In the editions subsequent to this date the Bishops' version is omitted altogether, and that of Cranmer is substituted in its place, in order that the Bible and the Prayer-book might have the same version. They are so far worthless, therefore, as editions of the Bishops' Bible.

(4.) The initials of the translators were attached to the books which they had severally undertaken. The work was done on the plan of limited, not joint liability.

(5.) Here, as in the Geneva, there is the attempt to give the Hebrew proper names more accurately, as e.g. in Heva, Isahac, Uziahu, etc.

4. Of all the English versions, the Bishops' Bible had probably the least success. It did not command the respect of scholars, and its size and cost were far from meeting the wants of the people. Its circulation appears to have been practically limited to the churches which were ordered to be supplied with it. It had, however, at any rate, the right to boast of some good Hebrew scholars among the translators, one of whom, bishop Alley, had written a Hebrew Grammar; and, though vehemently attacked by Broughton (Townley, *Literary History of the Bible*, 3:190), it was defended as vigorously by Fulke, and, together with the A.V., received from Selden the praise of being "the best translation in the world" *(Table Talk, Works*, 3:2009).

X. RHEIMS AND DOUAY. —

1. The successive changes in the Protestant versions of the Scriptures were, as might be expected, matter of triumph to the controversialists of the Latin Church. Some saw in it an argument against any translation of Scripture into the spoken language of the people. Others pointed derisively to the want of unity which these changes displayed. There were some, however, who took the line which Sir T. More and Gardiner had taken under Henry VIII. They did not object to the principle of an English translation. They only charged all the versions hitherto made with being false, corrupt, heretical. To this there was the ready retort that they had themselves done nothing; that their bishops in the reign of Henry had promised, but had not performed. It was felt to be necessary that they should take some steps which might enable them to turn the edge of this reproach. Accordingly, the English refugees who were settled at Rheims-Martin, Allen (afterwards cardinal), and Bristow —undertook the work. Gregory Martin, who had graduated at Cambridge, had signalized himself by an attack on the existing versions, and had been answered in an elaborate treatise by Fulke, master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge *(A Defience of the Sincere and True Translation,* etc.). The charges are mostly of the same kind as those brought by Sir T. More against Tyndale. " The old time-honored words were discarded. The authority of the Septuagint and Vulgate was set at naught when the translator's view of the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek differed from what he found in them." The new model translation was to avoid these faults. It was to command

the respect at once of priests and people. After an incubation of some years, it was published at Rheims in 1582. Though Martin was competent to translate from the Greek, it professed to be based on "the authentic text of the Vulgate." Notes were added, as strongly dogmatic as those of the Geneva Bible, and often keenly controversial. The work of translation was completed somewhat later by the publication of the O.T. at Douay in 1609. The language was precisely what might have been expected from men who adopted Gardiner's ideal of what a translation ought to be. At every page we stumble on "strange inkhorn words," which never had been English, and never could be, such, e.g. as "the Pasche and the Azymes" (<41401>Mark 16:1), "the arch-synagogue" (<41055>Mark 5:35), "in prepuce" (<45409>Romans 4:9), "obdurate with the fallacie of sin" (<58313>Hebrews 3:13), "a greater hoste" (<58104>Hebrews 11:4), "this is the annuntiation" (<62105>1 John 5:5), "pre-ordinate" (<44348>Acts 13:48), "the justifications of our Lord" (<42006>Luke 1:6), " what is to me and thee" (<43004>John 2:4), "longanimity" (<45204>Romans 2:4), "purge the old leaven that you may be a new paste, as you are azymes" (<46507>1 Corinthians 4:7), "you are evacuated from Christ" (<48504>Galatians 5:4), and so on.

2. A style such as this had, as might be expected, but few admirers. Among those few, however, we find one great name. Bacon, who leaves the great work of the reign of James unnoticed, and quotes almost uniformly from the Vulgate, goes out of his way to praise the Rhemish version for having restored "charity" to the place from which Tyndale had expelled it, in 1 Corinthians 13 *(Of the Pacification of the Church).* Even Roman Catholic divines have felt the superiority of the A.V., and Challoner, in his editions of the N.T. in 1748, and the Bible, 1763, often follows it in preference to the Rheims and Douay translations.

XI. KING JAMES'S VERSION. —

1. The position of the English Church in relation to the versions in use at the commencement of the reign of James was hardly satisfactory. The Bishops' Bible was sanctioned by authority. That of Geneva had the strongest hold on the affections of the people. Scholars, Hebrew scholars in particular, found grave fault with both. Hugh Broughton, who spoke Hebrew as if it had been his mother tongue, denounced the former as being full of "traps and pitfalls," "overthrowing all religion," and proposed a new revision to be effected by an English Septuagint (72), with power to consult gardeners, artists, and the like, about the words connected with

their several callings, and bound to submit their work to "one qualified for difficulties." This ultimate referee was, of course, to be himself (Strype, *Whitgft*, 4:19, 23). Unhappily, neither his temper nor his manners were such as to win favor for this suggestion. Whitgift disliked him, worried him, drove him into exile. Broughton's views were, however, shared by others; and among the demands of the Puritan representatives at the Hampton-Court Conference in 1604 (Dr. Reinolds being the spokesman), was one for a new, or, at least, a revised translation. The special objections which they urged were neither numerous (three passages only — <19A528>Psalm 105:28; 106:30; <4805>Galatians 4:25 — were referred to) nor important, and we must conclude either that this part of their case had not been carefully got up, or that the bullying to which they were exposed had had the desired effect of throwing them into some confusion. The bishops treated the difficulties which they did raise with supercilious scorn. They were "trivial, old, and often answered." Bancroft raised the cry of alarm which a timid conservatism has so often raised since. "If every man's humor were to be followed, there would be no end of translating" (Cardwell, *Conferences*, page 188). Cranmer's words seemed likely to be fulfilled again. Had it been left to the bishops, we might have waited for the A.V. "till the day after doomsday." Even when the work was done, and the translators acknowledged that the HamptonCourt Conference had been the starting-point of it, they could not resist the, temptation of a fling at their opponents. The objections to the Bishops' Bible had, they said, been nothing more than a shift to justify the refusal of the Puritans to subscribe to the Communionbook *(Preface* to A.V.). But the king disliked the politics of the Geneva Bible. Either repeating what he had heard from others, or exercising his own judgment, he declared that there was as yet no good translation, and that the Geneva was the worst of all., Nothing, however, was settled at the Conference beyond the hope thus held out.

2. But the king was not forgetful of what he thought likely to be the glory of his reign. The work of organizing and superintending the arrangements for a new translation was one specially congenial to him, and in 1606 the task was accordingly commenced. The selection of the fifty-four scholars to whom it was intrusted seems, on the whole, to have been a wise and fair one. Andrews, Saravia, Overal, Montague, and Barlow represented the "higher" party in the Church; Reinolds, Chaderton, and Lively that of the Puritans. Scholarship unconnected with party was represented by Henry Savile and John Boys. One name, that of Broughton, is indeed conspicuous

by its absence. The greatest Hebrew scholar of the age — the man who had, in a letter to Cecil (1595), urged this very plan of a joint translation — who had already translated several books of the O.T. (Job, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Lamentations), was ignominiously excluded. This may have been, in part, owing to the dislike with which Whitgift and Bancroft had all along regarded him. But in part, also, it was owing to Broughton's own character. An unmanageable temper, showing itself in violent language, and the habit of stigmatizing those who differed from him, even on such questions as those connected with names and dates, as heretical and atheistic, must have made him thoroughly impracticable; one of the men whose presence throws a committee or conference into chaos. Only forty-seven names appear in the king's list (Burnet, *Reform. Records).* Seven may have died or declined to act; or it may have been intended that there should be a final committee of revision. A full list is given by Fuller *(Ch. Hist.* 10); and is reproduced, ,with biographical particulars, by Todd and Anderson. The Puritan side was, however, weakened by the death of Reinolds and Lively during the progress of the work.

3. What reward other than that of their own consciences and the judgment of posterity were the men thus chosen to expect for their long and laborious task? The king was not disposed to pay them out of his state revenue. Gold and silver were not always plentiful in the household of the English Solomon, and from him they received nothing (Heywood, *State of Auth. Bibl. Revision).* There remained, however, an ingenious form of liberality, which had the merit of being inexpensive. A king's letter was sent to the archbishops and bishops, to be transmitted by them to their chapters, commending all the translators to their favorable notice. They were exhorted to contribute in all 1000 marks, and the king was to be informed of each man's liberality. If any livings in their gift, or in the gift of private persons, became vacant, the king was to be informed of it, that he might nominate some of the translators to the vacant preferment. Heads of colleges, in like manner, were enjoined to give free board and lodging to such divines as were summoned from the country to labor in the great work (Strype, *Whitgift,* 4). That the king might take his place as director of the whole, a copy of fifteen instructions, was sent to each translator, and apparently circulated freely in both universities.

4. The instructions thus given will be found in Fuller *(1.*c.), and with a more accurate text in Burnet *(Reform. Records).* It will not be necessary to

give them here in full; but it will be interesting to note the bearing of each clause upon the work in hand, and its relation to previous versions.

(1) The Bishops' Bible was to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit. This was probably intended to quiet the alarm of those who saw in the proposed new version a condemnation of that already existing.

(2) The names of prophets and others, were to be retained as nearly as may be in the form vulgarly used. This was to guard against forms like Izhak, Jeremiahu, etc., which had been introduced in some versions, and which some Hebrew scholars were willing to introduce more copiously. To it we owe probably the forms Jeremy, Elias, Osee, Core, in the N.T.

(3) The old ecclesiastical words were to be kept, as the word “church" not to be translated "congregation." The rule was apparently given for the sake of this special application. "Charity," in 1 Corinthians 13, was probably also due to it. The earlier versions, it will be remembered, had gone on the opposite principle.

(4) "When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith." This, like the former, tends to confound the functions of the preacher and the translator, and substitutes ecclesiastical tradition for philological accuracy.

(5) The division of the chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as possible. Here, again, convenience was more in view than truth and accuracy, and the result is that divisions are perpetuated which are manifestly arbitrary and misleading.

(6) No marginal notes to be affixed but only for the explanation of Hebrew and Greek words. This was obviously directed against the Geneva notes, as the special objects of the king's aversion. Practically, however, in whatever feeling it originated, we may be thankful that the A.V. came out as it did, without note or comment. The open Bible was placed in the hands of all readers. The work of interpretation was left free. Had an opposite course been adopted, we might have had the tremendous evil of a whole body of exegesis imposed upon the Church

by authority, reflecting the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort, the absolutism of James, the highflying prelacy of Bancroft.

(7) "Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as may serve for fit reference of one Scripture to another." The principle that Scripture is its own interpreter was thus recognised, but practically the marginal references of the A.V. of 1611 were somewhat scanty, most of those now printed having been added in later editions.

(8 and 9) State plan of translation. Each company of translators is to take its own books; each person to bring his own corrections. The company to discuss them, and, having finished their work, to send it on to another company, and so on.

(10) Provides for differences of opinion between two companies by referring them to a general meeting.

(11) Gives power, in cases of difficulty, to consult any scholars.

(12) Invites suggestions from any quarter.

(13) Names the directors of the work: Andrews, dean of West. minster; Barlow, dean of Chester; and the regius pro. fessors of Hebrew and Greek at both universities.

(14) Names translations to be followed when they agree more with the original than the Bishops' Bible, namely, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, Whitchurch's, (Cranmer's), and Geneva.

(15) Authorizes universities to appoint three or four overseers of the work.

5. It is not known that any of the correspondence connected with this work, or any minute of the meetings for conference, is still extant. Nothing is more striking than the silence with which the version that was to be the inheritance of the English people for at least two centuries and a half was ushered into the world. Here and there we get glimpses of scholars coming from their country livings to their old college haunts to work; diligently at the task assigned them (Peck. *Desiderata Curiosa,* 2:87). We see the meetings of translators, one man reading the chapter which he has been at work on, while the others listen, with the original, or Latin, or German, or Italian, or Spanish versions in their hands (Selden, *Table Talk).* We may represent to ourselves the differences of opinion, settled by the casting vote

of the "odd man," or by the strong overbearing temper of a man like Bancroft, the minority comforting themselves with the thought that it was no new thing for the truth to be outvoted (Gell, *Essay towards Amendment of last English transl. of Bible,* page 321). Dogmatic interests were in some cases allowed to bias the translation; and the Calvinism of one party, the prelatic views of another, were both represented at the expense of accuracy (Gell, 1.c.). The following passages are those commonly referred to in support of this charge:

(1.) The rendering "such as should be saved," in <4402 47>Acts 2:47.

(2.) The insertion of the words "any man" in <5810 38>Hebrews 10:38 ("the just shall live by faith, but if *any man* draw back," etc.), to avoid an inference unfavorable to the doctrine of Final Perseverance.

(3.) The use of "bishopric," in <4402 0>Acts 1:20, of "oversight," in <6010 2>1 Peter 5:2, of "bishop," in <5400 1>1 Timothy 3:1, etc., and "overseers," in <4402 8>Acts 20:28, in order to avoid the identification of bishops and elders.

(4.) The chapter-heading of Psalm 149 in 1611 (since altered), "The prophet exhorteth to praise God for that power which he hath given the Church to bind the consciences of men." Blunt *(Duties of a Parish Priest,* lect. 2) appears, in this question, on the side of the prosecution, Trench *(On the A.V. of the N.T.* chapter 10) on that of the defense. The charge of an undue bias against Rome in <4611 27>1 Corinthians 11:27; <4805 16>Galatians 5:6; <5810 4>Hebrews 13:4, is one on which an acquittal may be pronounced with little or no hesitation.

6. For three years the work went on, the separate companies comparing notes as directed. When the work drew towards its completion, it was necessary to place it under the care of a select few. Two from each of the three groups were accordingly selected, and the six met in London to superinted the publication. Now, for the first time, we find any more definite remuneration than the shadowy promise held out in the king's letter of a share in the 1000 marks which deans and chapters would *not* contribute. The matter ,had now reached its business stage, and the Company of Stationers thought it expedient to give the six editors thirty pounds each, in weekly payments, for their nine months' labor. The final correction, and the task of writing the arguments of the several books, was given to Bilson, bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Miles Smith, the latter of

whom also wrote the Dedication and the Preface. Of these two documents, the first is unfortunately familiar enmough to us, and is chiefly conspicuous for its servile adulation. James I is "that sanctified person," "enriched with singular and extraordinary graces," that had appeared "as the sun in his strength." To him they appeal against the judgment of those whom they describe, in somewhat peevish accents, as "popish persons or self-conceited brethren." The Preface to the Reader is more interesting, as throwing light upon the principles on which the translators acted. They "never thought that they should need: to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one." "Their endeavor was to make a good one better, or, out of many good ones, one principal good one." They claim credit for steering a middle course between the Puritans who "left the old ecclesiastical words," and the obscurity of the Papists "retaining foreign words of purpose to darken the sense." They vindicate the practice, in which they indulge very freely, of translating one word in the original by several English words, partly on the intelligible ground that it is not always possible to find one word that will express all the meanings of the Greek or Hebrew, partly on the somewhat childish plea that it would be unfair to choose some words for the high honor of being the channels of God's truth, and to pass over others as unworthy.

7. The version thus published did not all at once supersede those already in possession. The fact that five editions were published in three years' shows that there was a good demand. But the Bishops' Bible probably remained in many churches (Andrews takes his texts from it in preaching before the king as late as 1621), and the popularity of the Geneva version is shown by not less than thirteen reprints, in whole or in part, between 1611 and 1617. It is not easy to ascertain the impression which the A.V. made at the time of its appearance. Probably, as in most like cases, it was far less for good or evil than friends or foes expected. The Puritans, and the religious portion of the middle classes generally, missed the notes of the Geneva book (Fuller, *Church History,* 10:50, 51). The Romanists spoke, as usual, of the unsettling effect of these frequent changes, and of the marginal readings as leaving men in doubt what was the truth of Scripture. Whitaker's answer, by anticipation, to this charge is worth quoting: "No inconvenience will follow if interpretations or versions of Scripture, when they have become obsolete or ceased to be intelligible, may be afterwards changed or corrected" *(Dissert. on Script,* page 232, Parker Soc. ed.). The wiser divines of the English Church had not then learned to raise the cry of

finality. One frantic cry was heard from Hugh Broughton, the rejected *(Works,* page 661), who “would rather be torn in pieces by wild horses than impose such a version on the poor churches of England." Selden, a few years later, gives a calmer and more favorable judgment. It is "the best of all translations as giving the true sense of the original." This, however, is qualified by the remark that "no book in the world is translated as the Bible is, word for word, with no regard to the difference of idioms. This is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it. but when it comes among the common people, Lord, what gear do they make of it!" *(Table Talk).* The feeling of which this was the expression led, even in the midst of the agitations of the Commonwealth, to proposals for another revision, which, after being brought forward in the Grand Committee of Religion in the House of Commons in January, 1656, was referred to a sub-committee, acting under Whitelocke, with power to consult divines and report. Confeiences were accordingly held frequently at Whitelocke's house, at which we find, mingled with less illustrious names, those of Walton and Cudworth. Nothing, however, came of it (Whitelocke, *Memorials,* page 564; Collier, *Ch. Hist.* 2:9). No report was ever made; and with the Restoration the tide of conservative feeling, in this as in other things, checked all plans of further alteration. Many had ceased to care for the Bible at all. Those who did care were content with the Bible as it was. Only here and there was a voice raised, like R. Gell's *(ut sup.),* declaring that it had defects, that it bore in some things the stamp of the dogmatism of a party (page 321).

8. The highest testimony of this period is that of Walton. From the editor of the Polyglot, the few words "inter omnes eminet" meant a good deal *(Pref.).* With the reign of Anne the tide of glowing panegyric set in. It would be easy to put together a long *catena* of praises stretching from that time to the present. With many, of course, this has been only the routine repetition of a traditional boast. "Our unrivalled Translation" and "our incomparable Liturgy" have been equally phrases of course. But there have been witnesses of a far higher weight. In proportion as the English of the 18th century was infected with a Latinized or Gallicized style, did those who had a purer taste look with reverence to the strength and purity of a better time as represented in the A.V. Thus Addison dwells on its ennobling the coldness of modern languages with the glowing phrases of Hebrew *(Spectator,* No. 405), and Swift confesses that "the translators of the Bible were masters of an English style far fitter for that work than any

we see in our present writings" *(Letter to Lord Oxford).* Each half century has naturally added to the prestige of these merits. The language of the A.V. has intertwined itself with the controversies, the devotion, the literature of the English people. It has gone, wherever they have gone, over the face of the whole earth. The most solemn and tender of individual memories are, for the most part, associated with it. Men leaving the Church of England for the Church of Rome turn regretfully with a yearning look at that noble "well of English undefiled" which they are about to exchange for the uncouth monstrosities of Rheims and Douay. In this case, too, as in so many others, the position of the A.V. has been strengthened, less by the skill of its defenders than by the weakness of its assailants. While from time to time scholars and divines (Lowth, Newcome, Waterland, Trench, Ellicott) have admitted the necessity of a revision, those who have attacked the present version and produced new ones have been, for the most part, men of narrow knowledge and defective taste (Purver, Harwood, Bellamy, Conquest, Sawyer), just able to pick out a few obvious faults, and committing others equally glaring. There have also generally entered on the work of translating or revising the whole Bible single-handed. One memorable exception must not, however, be passed over. Hallam *(Lit. of Europe,* 3, chapter 2, ad fin.) records a brief but emphatic protest against the "enthusiastic praise" which has been lavished on this translation. "It may, in the eyes of many, be a better English, but it is not the English of Daniel, or Raleigh, or Bacon... . It abounds, in fact, especially in the O.T., with obsolete phraseology, and with single words long since abandoned, or retained only in provincial use." The statement may, however, in some sense be accepted as an encomium. If it had been altogether the English of the men of letters of James's reign, would it have retained, as it has done for two centuries and a half, its hold on the mind, the memory, the affections of the English people?

XII. *Schemes for a Recision. —*

1. A notice of the attempts which have been made at various times to bring about a revision of the A.V., though necessarily brief and imperfect, may not be without its use for future laborers. The first half of the 18th century was not favorable for such a work. An almost solitary *Essayfor a New Translation* by H.R. (Ross), 1702, attracted little or no notice (Todd, *Life of Walton,* 1:134). A Greek Testament, with an English translation, singularly vulgar and offensive, was published in 1729, of which extracts are given by Lewis *(Hist. of Transl.* chapter 5). With the slight revival of

learning among the scholars of the latter half of that period the subject was again mooted. Lowth in a visitation sermon (1758), and Secker in a Latin speech intended for Convocation (1761), recommended it. Matthew Pilkington, in his *Remarks* (1759), and Dr. Thomas Brett, in an *Essay on Ancient Versions of the Bible* (1760), dwelt on the importance of consulting them with reference to the O.T. as well as the N.T., with a view to a more accurate text than that of the Masoretic Hebrew, the former insisting also on the obsolete words which are scattered in the A.V., and giving a useful alphabetic list of them. A folio *new and literal translation* of the whole Bible by Anthony Purver, a Quaker (1764), was a more ambitious attempt. He dwells at some length on the "obsolete, uncouth, clownish" expressions which disfigure the A.V. He includes in his list such words as "joyous," "solace," "damsel," "day-spring," bereaved," "marvels," "bondmen." He substitutes "he hearkened to what he said" for "he hearkened to his voice;" "eat victuals" for "eat bread" (<01019>Genesis 3:19); "was in favor with" for "found grace in the eyes of;" "was angry" for "his wrath was kindled." In spite of this defective taste, however, the work has considerable merit, is based upon a careful study of the original and of many of the best commentators, and may be contrasted favorably with most of the single-handed translations that have followed. It was, at any rate, far above the depth of degradation and folly which was reached in Harwood's *Literal Translation of the N.T.* "with freedom, spirit, and elegance" (1768). Here, again, a few samples are enough to show the character of the whole. "The young lady is not dead" (<41039>Mark 5:39). "A gentleman of splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons" (<42151>Luke 15:11). "The clergyman said, You have given him the only right and proper answer" (<41232>Mark 12:32). "We shall not pay the common debt of nature, but by a soft transition," etc. (<46151>1 Corinthians 15:51).

2. Biblical revision was happily not left entirely in such hands as these. A translation by Worsley "according to the present idiom of the English tongue" (1770) was, at least, less offensive. Durell *(Preface to Job),* Lowth *(Pref. to Isaiah),* Blayney *(Pref. to Jeremiah,* 1784), were all strongly in favor of a new or revised translation. Durell dwells most on the arbitrary additions and omissions in the A.V. of Job, on the total absence in some cases of any intelligible meaning. Lowth speaks chiefly of the faulty state of the text of the O.T., and urges a correction of it, partly from various readings, partly from ancient versions, partly from conjecture. Each of the three contributed, in the best way, to the work which they had little

expectation of seeing accomplished, by laboring steadily at a single book, and committing it to the judgment of the Church. Kennicott's labors in collecting MSS of the O.T. issued in his *State of the present Hebrew Text* (1753-59), and excited expectations that there might before long be something like a basis for a new version in a restored original.

A more ambitious scheme was started by the Roman Catholic Dr. Geddes, in his *Prospectus for a New Translation* (1786). His remarks on the history of English translations, his candid acknowledgment of the excellences of the A.V., and especially of Tyndale's work as pervading it, his critical notes on the true principles of translation, on the A.V. as falling short of them, may still be read with interest. He too, like Lowth, finds fault with the superstitious adherence to the Masoretic text, with the undue reference to lexicons, and disregard of versions shown by our translators. The proposal was well received by many Biblical scholars, Lowth, Kennicott, and Barrington being foremost among its patrons. The work was issued in parts, according to the terms of the Prospectus, but did not get further than 2 Chronicles in 1792, when the death of the translator put a stop to it. Partly, perhaps, owing to its incompleteness, but still more from the extreme boldness of a Preface, anticipating the conclusions of a later criticism, Dr. Geddes's translation fell rapidly into disfavor. A sermon by White (famous for his Bampton Lectures) in 1779, and two pamphlets by J.A. Symonds, professor of modern history at Cambridge — the first on the Gospels and the Acts, in 1789; the second on the Epistles, in 1794 — though attacked in an *Apology for the Liturgy and Church of England* (1795), helped to keep the discussion from oblivion.

3. The revision of the A.V., like many other salutary reforms, was hindered by the French Revolution. In 1792, archbishop Newcome had published an elabe rate defense of such a scheme, citing host of authorities (Doddridge,Wesley, Campbell, in addition to those already mentioned), and taking the same line as Lowth, Revised translations of the N.T. were published by Wakefield in 1795, by Newcome himself in 1796, by Scarlett in 1798. Campbell's version of the Gospels appeared in 1788, that of the Epistles by Macknight in 1795. But in 1796 the note of alarm was sounded. A feeble pamphlet by George Burges *(Letter to the Lord Bishop of Ely)* took the ground that "the present period was unfit," and from that time conservatism, pure and simple, was in the ascendant. To suggest that the A.V. might be inaccurate was almost as bad as holding "French principles." There is a long interval before the question again comes into anything like

prominence, and then there is a new school of critics in the *Quarterly Review* and elsewhere, ready to do battle vigorously for things as they are. The opening of the next campaign was an article in the *Classical Journal* (No. 36), by Dr. John Bellamy, proposing a new translation, followed soon afterwards by its publi.cation under the patronage of the prince regent (1818). The work was poor and unsatisfactory enough, and a tremendous battery was opened upon it in the *Quarterly Review* (Nos. 37 and 38), as afterwards (No. 46) upon an unhappy critic, Sir J.B. Burges, who came forward with a pamphlet in its defense *(Reasons in favor of a new Translation,* 1819). The rash assertion of both Bellamy and Burges that the A.V. had been made almost entirely from the Septuagint and Vulgate, and a general deficiency in all accurate scholarship, made them easy victims. The personal element of this controversy may well be passed over, but three less ephemeral works issued from it, which any future laborer in the same field will find worth consulting. Whitaker's *Historical and Critical Inquiry* was chiefly an able exposure of the exaggerated statement just mentioned. H.J. Todd, in his *Vindication of the Authorized Translation* (1819), entered more fully than any previous writer had done into the history of the A.V., and gives many facts as to the lives and qualifications of the translators not easily to be met with elsewhere. The most masterly, however, of the manifestoes against all change was a pamphlet *(Remarks on the Critical Principles,* etc., Oxford, 1820), published anonymously, but known to have been written by archbishop Laurence. The strength of the argument lies chiefly in a skillful display of all the difficulties of the work, the impossibility of any satisfactory restoration of the Hebrew of the O.T., or any settlement of the Greek of the N.T.; the expediency, therefore, of adhering to a *Textus receptus* in both. *SEE VARIOUS READINGS*. The argument, if conclusive, would unsettle our confidence in the text of the Holy Scriptures. Happily, more thorough critical research has fully refuted the archbishop's positions. But the scholarship and acuteness with which the subject is treated make the book instructive, and any one entering on the work of a translator ought at least to read it, that he may know what difficulties he has to face. About this period, also (1819), a new edition of Newcome's version was published by Belsham and other Unitarian ministers, and, like Bellamy's attempt on the O.T., had the effect of stiffening the resistance of the great body of the clergy to all proposals for a revision.

4. A correspondence between Herbert Marsh, bishop of Peterborough, and the Reverend H. Walter, in 1828, is the next link in the chain. Marsh had spoken *(Lectures on Biblical Criticism,* page 295) with some contempt of the A.V. as based on Tyndale's, Tyndale's on Luther's, and Luther's on Miinster's lexicon, which was itself based on the Vulgate. There was, therefore, on this view, no real translation from the Hebrew in any one of these. But it is evident that the Christian Hebraists of the period of the Reformation depended quite as much on the traditional learning of their Jewish teachers, often erroneous indeed, as on the earlier tradition preserved in the Latin Vulgate, and that they followed, as far as they were able, the Masoretic punctuation, a much surer guide than the ancient versions, or the later rabbinic interpretation.

5. The last five-and-twenty years have seen the question of a revision from time to time gaining fresh prominence. If men of second-rate power have sometimes thrown it back by meddling with it in wrong ways, others, able scholars and sound theologians, have admitted its necessity and helped it forward by their work. Dr. Conquest's Bible, with "20,000 emendations" (1841), has not commanded the respect of critics, and is almost self-condemned by the silly ostentation of its title. The motions which have from time to time been made in the House of Commons by Mr. Heywood have borne little fruit beyond the display of feeble liberalism, and yet feebler conservatism, by which such debates are, for the most part, characterized; nor have the discussions in Convocation, though opened by a scholar of high repute (professor Selwyn), been muich more productive. Dr. Beard's essay, *A revised English Bible the Want of the Church* (1857), though tending to overstate the defects of the A.V., is yet valuable as containing much information, and representing the opinions of the more learned Nonconformists. Far more important, every way, both as virtually an authority in favor of revision and as contributing largely to it, are professor Scholefield's *Hints for an improved Translation of the N.T.* (1832). In his second edition, indeed, he disclaims any wish for a new translation, but the principle which he lays down clearly and truly in his preface, that if there is "any adventitious difficulty resulting from a defective translation, then it is at the same time an act of charity and of duty to clear away the difficulty as much as possible," leads legitimately to at least a revision; and this conclusion Mr. Selwyn, in the last edition of the *Hints* (1857), has deliberately adopted. To bishop Ellicott also belongs the credit of having spoken at once boldly and wisely on this matter. Putting

the question whether it would be right to join those who oppose all revision, his answer is. "God forbid... . It is in vain to cheat our own souls with the thought that these errors (in A.V.) are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there *are* misconceptions, there *are* obscurities ... and that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will ... have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable word of God" *(Pref. to Pastoral Epistles).* The translations appended by Dr. Ellicott to his editions of Paul's epistles proceed on the true principle of altering the A.V. "only where it appears to be incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obscure," uniting a profound reverence for the older translators with a bold truthfulness in judging of their work. The copious collation of all the earlier English versions makes this part of his book especially interesting and valuable. Dr. Trench *(On the A.V. of the N.T.,* 1858), in like manner, states his conviction that "a revision ought to come," though as yet, he thinks, "the Greek and theEnglish necessary to bring it to a successful issue are alike wanting" (page 3). The work itself, it need hardly be said, is the fullest contradiction possible of this somewhat despondent statement, and supplies a good store of materials for use when the revision actually comes. The *Revision of the A.V. by five Clergymen* (Dr. Barrow, Dr. Moberly, dean Alford, Mr. Humphry, and Dr. Ellicott) represents the same school of conservative progress, has the merit of adhering to the clear, pure English of the A.V., and does not deserve the censure which Dr. Beard passes on it as "promising little and performing less." As yet, this series includes only the Gospel of John, and the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. The publications of the American Bible Union are signs that there also the same want has been felt. The translations given respectively by Alford, Stanley, Jowett, and Conybeare and Howson, in their respective commentaries, are in like manner at once admissions of the necessity of the work and contributions towards it. Mr. Sharpe (1840) and Mr. Highton (1862) have ventured on the wider work of translations of the entire N.T. Mr. Sawyer (1858) has done the same, and proposes to continue the task over the whole Bible; but he lacks both the scholarship and the judgment necessary. Mr. Cookesiey has published the Gospel of Matthew as Part I of a like undertaking. It might almost seem as if at last there was something like a *consensus* of scholars and divines on this question. That assumption would,

however, be too hasty. Partly the *vis inertia,* which, in a large body like the clergy of the Church, is always great, partly the fear of ulterior consequences, partly also the indifference of the majority of the laity, would probably, at the present moment, give at least a numerical majority to the opponents of a revision. Writers on this side are naturally less numerous, but the feeling of conservatism, pure and simple, has found utterance in four men representing different Sections, and of different calibre-Mr. Scrivener *(Supp. to A. Eng. Ver. of N.T.),* Dr. M'Caul *(Reasons for holding fast the Authorized English Version),* Mr. C.S. Malan *(A Vindication,* etc.), and Dr. Cumming *(Revision and Translation).* A high American authority, Mr. Geo. P. Marsh, may also be referred to as throwing the weight of his judgment into the scale against any revision at the present moment *(Lectures on the English Language,* lect. 28).

XIII, *Present State of the Question.* —

1. To take an accurate estimate of the extent to which the A.V. requires revision would call for nothing less than an examination of each single book, and would therefore involve an amount of detail incompatible with our present limits. To give a few instances only would practically fix attention on a part only of the evidence, and so would lead to a false rather than a true estimate. No attempt, therefore, will be made to bring together individual passages as needing correction. A few remarks on the chief questions which must necessarily come before those who undertake a revision will not, perhaps, be out of place. Examples, classified under corresponding heads, will be found in the book by Dr. Trench already mentioned, and, scattered in the form of annotations, in that of professor Scholefield.

2. The translation of the N.T. is from a text confessedly imperfect. What editions were used i's a matter of conjecture; most probably one of those published with a Latin version by Beza between 1565 and 1598, and agreeing substantially with the *Textus receptus* of 1633. It is clear, on principle, that no revision ought to ignore the results of the textual criticism of the last hundred years. To shrink from noticing any variation, to go on printing as the inspired Word that which there is a preponderant reason for believing to be an interpolation or a mistake, is neither honest or reverential. To do so for the sake of greater edification is simply to offer to God the unclean sacrifice of a lie. The authority of the A.V. is, at any rate, in favor of the practice of not suppressing facts. In <40111>Matthew 1:11;

26:26; <42173>Luke 17:36; <43806>John 8:6; <44138>Acts 13:18; <49609>Ephesians 6:9; <58104>Hebrews 2:4; <59128>James 2:18; <62323>1 John 2:23; <60221>1 Peter 2:21; <61021>2 Peter 2:11, 18; 2 John, 8, different readings are given in the margin, or, as in <62323>1 John 2:23, indicated by a different type. In earlier versions, as has been mentioned, <62507>1 John 5:7 was printed in smaller letters. The degree to which this should be done will, of course, require discernment. An apparatus like that in Tischendorf or Alford would obviously be out of place. Probably the useful Greek Testament edited by Mr. Scrivener might serve as an example of a middle course.

3. Still less had been done at the commencement of the 17th century for the text of the O.T. The Jewish teachers, from whom Protestant divines derived their knowledge, had given currency to the belief that in the Masoretic text were contained the *ipsissima verba* of revelation, free from all risks of error, from all casualties of transcription. The conventional phrases, "the authentic Hebrew," "the Hebrew verity," were the expression of this undiscerning reverence. They refused to apply the same rules ofjudgment here which they applied to the text of the N.T. They assumed that the Masorites were infallible, and were reluctant to acknowledge that there had been any variations since. Even Walton did not escape being attacked as unsound by the great Puritan divine, Dr. John Owen, for having called attention to the fact of discrepancies *(Proleg.* chapter 6). The materials for a revised text are, of course, scantier than with the N.T.; but the labors of Kennicott, De Rossi, J.H. Michaelis, and Davidson have not been fruitless, afil here, as there, the older versions must be admitted as at least evidence of variations which once existed, but which were suppressed by the rigorous uniformity of the later rabbis. Conjectural emendations, such as Newcome, Lowth, and Ewald have so freely suggested, ought to be ventured on in such places only as are quite unintelligible without them. *SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL*.

4. All scholars worthy of the name are now agreed that as little change as possible should be made in the language of the A.V. Happily there is little risk of an emasculated elegance such as might have infected a new version in the last century. The very fact of the admiration felt for the A.V., and the general revival of a taste for the literature of the Elizabethan period, are safeguards against any like tampering now. Some words, however, absolutely need change, as be. ing altogether obsolete; others, more numerous, have been slowly passing into a different, often into a lower or a

narrower meaning, and are therefore no longer what they once were, adequate renderings of the original.

5. The self-imposed law of fairness, which led the A.V. translators to admit as many English words as possible to the honor of representing one in the Hebrew or Greek text, has, as might be expected, marred the perfection of their work. Sometimes the effect is simply the loss of the solemn emphasis of the repetition of the same word; sometimes it is more serious, and affects the meaning. While it would be simple pedantry to lay down unconditionally that but one and the same word should be used throughout for one in the original, there can be no doubt that such a limitation is the true principle to start with, and that instances to the contrary should be dealt with as exceptional necessities. Side by side with this fault there is another just the opposite of it. One English word appears for several Greek or Hebrew words, and thus shades of meaning, often of importance to the right understanding of a passage, are lost sight of. Taken together, the two forms of error, which meet us in Wvellnigh every chapter, make the use of an English Concordance absolutely misleading. Technical terms especially should be represented in as exact and uniform a manner as possible.

6. Grammatical inaccuracy must be noted as a defect pervading, more or less, the whole extent of the' present version of the N.T. Instances will be found in abundance in Trench and Scholefield *(passinm),* and in any of the better Commentaries. Such Gallicisms as "I *am* come," "Babylon *is* fallen," etc., to say nothing of outright French words, e.g. "bruit" for noise (3019Nahum 3:19), have often escaped detection. The true force of tenses, cases, prepositions, articles, is continually lost, sometimes at the cost of the finer' shades which give vividness and emphasis, but sometimes also entailing more serious errors. In justice to the translators of the N.T., it must be said that, situated as they were, such errors were almost inevitable. They learned Greek through the medium of Latin. Lexicons and grammars were alike in the universal language of scholars; and that language was poorer and less inflected than the Greek, and failed utterly to represent, e.g., the force of its article, or the difference of its aorist and perfect tenses. Such books of this nature as were used by the translators were necessarily based upon a far scantier induction, and were therefore more meager and inaccurate than those which have been the fruits of the labors of later scholars. Recent scholarship may in many things fall short of that of an earlier time, but the introduction of Greek lexicons and grammars in English has been beyond all doubt a change for the better.

7. The field of the O.T. has been far less adequately worked than that of the N.T., and Hebrew scholarship has made far less progress than Greek. Relatively, indeed, there seems good ground for believing that Hebrew was more studied in the early part of the 17th century than it is not. It was newer and more popular. The reverence which men felt for the perfection of the "Hebrew verity" made them willing to labor to learn a language which they looked upon as half-divine. But here, also, there was the same source of error. The early Hebrew lexicons represented partly, it is true, a Jewish tradition, but partly also were based upon the Vulgate (bishop Marsh, *Lectures,* 2, App. 61). The forms of cognate Shemitic languages had not been applied as a means for ascertaining the precise value of Hebrew words. The grammars, also in Latin, were defective. Little as Hebrew professors have, for the most part, done in the way of exegesis, any good commentary on the O.T. will show that here also there are errors as serious as in the N.T. In one memorable case, the inattention, real or apparent, of the translators to the force of the *Hiphil* form of the verb (Leviticus 4:12) has led to a serious attack on the truthfulness of the whole narrative of the Pentateuch (Colenso, *Pentateuch critically Examined,* part 1, chapter 7).

8. The poetical character of many portions of the O.T. is wholly obscured by the arrangement of the A.V., and, indeed, its authors and editors seem to have ignored the poetical element altogether. This is a defect of very great importance, and should be remedied by a proper distribution of the clauses according to the Heb, laws of parallelism (q.v.), as well as by a more careful observance of that system of transposition of the terms of each hemistich that is characteristic of all poetry.

9. The division into chapters and verses is a matter that ought not to be passed over in any future revision. The former, it must be remembered, does not go further back than the 13th century. The latter, though answering, as far as the O.T. is concerned, to a long-standing Jewish arrangement, depends, in the N.T., upon the work of Robert Stephens. Neither in the O.T. nor in the N.T. did the verse-division appear in any earlier edition than that of Geneva. The inconveniences of changing both are probably too great to be risked. The habit of referring to chapter and verse is too deeply rooted to be got rid of. Yet the division, as it is, is not seldom artificial, and sometimes is absolutely misleading. No one would think of printing any other book, in prose or poetry, in short clauses like the verses of our Bibles, and the tendency of such a division is to give a

broken and discontinuous knowledge, to make men good textuaries but bad divines: An arrangement like that of the paragraph Bibles of our own time, with the verse and chapter divisions relegated to the margin, ought to form part of any authoritative revision.

10. Other points of detail remain to be noticed briefly:

(1.) The chapter-headings of the A.V. often go beyond their proper province. If it is intended to give an autnoritative commentary to the lay reader, let it be done thoroughly. But if that attempt is abandoned, as it was deliberately in 1611, then for the chapter. headings to enter, as they do, upon the work of interpretation, giving, as in Canticles, Psalms, and Prophets, *passim*, mystical meanings, is simply an inconsistency. What should be a mere table of contents becomes a gloss upon the text.

(2.) The use of italics in printing the A.V., if of advantage in point of minute criticism, is at least open to some risks. At first they seem an honest confession on the part of the translators of what is or is not in the original. On the other hand, they tempt to a loose translation. Few writers would think it necessary to use them in translating other books. If the words do not do more than represent the sense of the original, then there is no reason for treating them as if they were added at the discretion of the translators. If they go beyond that, they are of the nature of a gloss, altering the force of the original, and have no right to be there at all, while the fact that they appear as additions frees the translator from the sense of responsibility.

(3.) Good as the principle of marginal references is, the margins of the A.V., as now printed, are somewhat inconveniently crowded, and the references, being often merely verbal, term to defeat their own purpose, and to make the reader weary of referring. They need, accordingly, a careful sifting; and though it would not be desirable to go back to the scanty number of the original edition of 1611, something intermediate between that and the present overabundance would be an improvement.

(4.) Marginal readings, on the other hand, indicating variations in the text, or differences in the judgment of translators, might be profitably increased in number. The results of the labors of scholars would thus be

placed within the reach of all intelligent readers, and so many difficulties and stumbling-blocks might be removed.

In all these points there has been, to a much larger extent than is commonly known, a work of unauthorized revision. Neither italics, nor references, nor readings, nor chapter-headings, nor, it may be added, punctuation, are the same now as they were in the A.V. of 1611. The chief alterations appear to have been made first in 1683, and.afterwards in 1769, by Dr. Blayney, under the sanction of the Oxford delegates of the press *(Gentleman's Magazine*, November 1789). A like work was done about the same time by Dr. Paris at Cambridge. There had, however, been some changes previously. The edition of 1638, in particular, shows considerable augmentations in the italics (Turton, *Text of the English Bible*, 1833, page 91, 126). To Blayney also we owe most of the notes on weights and measures, and coins, and the explanation, where the text seems to require it, of Hebrew proper names. The whole question of the use of italics is discussed elaborately by Turton in the work just mentioned. The late issues of the American Bible Union (q.v.) have, too uniformly perhaps, rejected this mode of distinction; discarding it on the ground that, if the italicized words are not necessary to the sense, they have no business there; if necessary, then the reader is misled by marking them as though they were not.

11. What has been said will serve to show at once to what extent a new revision is required, and what are the chief difficulties to be encountered. The work, it is believed, ought not to be delayed much longer. Names of men competent to undertake the work, as far as the N.T. is concerned, will occur to every one; and if such alterations only were to be introduced as commanded the assent of at least two thirds of a chosen body of twenty or thirty scholars, while a place in the margin was given to such renderings only as were adopted by at least one third, there would be, it is believed, at once a great change for the better, and without any shock to the feelings or even the prejudices of the great mass of readers. Men fit to undertake the work of revising the translation of the O.T. are confessedly fewer, and, for the most part, occupied in other things. The knowledge and the power, however, are there, though in less measure; and, even though the will be for the tine absent, a summons to enter on the task fron those whose authority they are bound to respect, would, we cannot doubt, be listened to. It might have tie result of directing to their proper task, and to a fruitful issue, energies which are too often withdrawn to ephemeral and

unprofitable controversies. As the revised Bible would be for the use of English-speaking people, the men appointed for the purpose ought not to be taken exclusively from any one Church, and the learning of all denominations should at least be fairly represented. The changes recommended by such a body of men, under conditions such as those suggested, might safely be allowed to circulate experimentally for two or three years. "When they had stood that trial, they might, without risk, be printed in the new Authorized Version. Such a work would unite reverence for the past with duty towards the future. In undertaking it we should be not slighting the translators on whose labors we have entered, but following in their footsteps. It is the wisdom of the Church to bring out of its treasures things new and old.

XIV. *Literature*. — In addition to the works cited above, see especially Johnson's *Account of the several English Trans. of the Bible* (Lond. 1730, 8vo; reprinted in Bp. Watson's *Theolog. Tracts);* Bp. Marsh's *Hist. of the Translations which have been made of the Scriptures, fromn the earliest to the present Age* (Lond. 1812, 8vo); Lewis' *History of the principal Translations of the Bible* (3d ed. London, 1818, 8vo); Newcome's *Historical View of the English Biblical Translations* (Dublin, 1792, 8vo); Cotton's *List of Editions of the Bible* (2d ed. Oxford, 1852, 8vo): Walter's *Letter on the Independence of the Authorized Version of the Bible* (Lond. 1823, 8vo); Todd's *Vindication of our Authorized Translation,* etc. (Lond. 1819, 8vo); and especially Anderson's *Annas of the English Bible* (Lond. 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo; in part reprinted, N.Y. 1856, 8vo); also Beard, *Revised English Bible the Want of the Church* (new ed. Lond. 1860, 8vo); Mrs. Conant, *History of the English Bible* (N.Y. 1856; Lond. 1859, 8vo); Bp. Hinds, *Scripture and the Authorized Version* (Lond. 1853, 12mo); Malan, *Vindication of the Authorized Versions of the Bible* (London, 1856, 8vo); Anon. *Renderings of the principal English Translations of the Bible* (Lond. 1849, 4to); Scholefield, *Hints for an improved Translation of the New Testament* (London, 1857, 12mo); Dewes, *Plea for translating the Scriptures* (Lond. 1866, 8vo); comp. *Bibliotheca Sacra,* April, 1858; *Ch. of Eng. Quarterly,* October 1856; *Christian Review,* April, 1857; *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July 1857. July, 1858; *South. Presb. Review,* January 1858; *Br. For. Evangelical Rev.* July 1857, January 1858, April 1858, October 1859, July 1863; *Prot. Episc. Quart. Rev.* January 1859; *North Am. Rev.* January 1859; *New Englander,* Februry 1859, May 1859; *United Presb. Quart. Rev.* January 1860; *Freewill Bapt. Quart. Rev.* July 1863; *Meth. Quart.*

Review, July 1864; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* April 1867. *SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION.*

Engrave

(jtP; *pathach',* to *open,* hence [in Piel] to *carve* or grave, whether on wood, gems, or stone; thrice vrj; *charash',* Exodus 28:11; 35:35; 38:23, elsewhere *artificer* in general; ἐντυπόω, 2 Corinthians 3:7). The latter term, vrj; so translated in the A.V., applies broadly to any *artficer,* whether in wood, stone, or metal: to restrict it to the *engraver* in Exodus 35:35; 38:23, is improper: a similar latitude must be given to the other term jtP, which expresses the operation of the artificer; in Zechariah 3:9, ordinary stone-cutting is evidently intended. The specific description of an *engraver* was ^ba,vrij;(Exodus 28:11), lit. a *stone-graver,* and his chief business was cutting names or devices on rings and seals; the only notices of engraving are in connection with the high-priest's dress, — the two onyx-stones, the twelve jewels, and the mitre-plate having inscriptions on them (Exodus 28:11, 21, 36). The previous notices of signets (Genesis 38:18; 41:42) imply engraving. The art was widely spread throfighout the nations of antiquity *(For. Quar. Rev.* 26:32, 27:40), particularly among the Egyptians (Diod. 1:78; Wilkinson, 3:373), the Ethiopians (Her. 7:69), and the Indians (Von Bohlen, *Indien,* 2:122). *SEE GRAVING.*

En-had'dah

(Hebrew *Eyn Chiaddah',* hDjiˆy(, *swift fountain;* Sept. Ηναδδά), a city on the border of the tribe of Issachar, mentioned between Engannim and Beth-pazzez (Joshua 19:21). Van de Velde *(Narrative,* 1:315) and Thomson *(Land and Book,* 2:248) would identify it with *Ain-Haud,* on the western brow of Carmel, and about two miles from the sea; but this is out of the limits of the tribe of Issachar. Its site is possibly to be sought in that of the modern village *Ain-Mahil,* not far N.E. of Nazareth (Robinson, *Researches,* 3:209).

En-hak'kore

(Hebrews *Eyn hak-kore',* arwQhˆy(, *fountain of to caller;* Sept. Πηγὴ τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου), a name given by Samson to the spring that burst forth in answer to his prayer in a dell of Lehi, when he was exhausted with

the slaughter of the Philistines (<071519>Judges 15:19). The word vTek]mi, *maktesh'*, which in the narrative denotes the "hollow place" (literally the "mortar") or *socket* in the jaw, and also that for the “jaw" itself, *lechi,* are both names of places. *SEE LEHI*. Van de Velde *(Memoir,* page 343) endeavors to identify Lehi with *Tell el-Lekiyeh,* 4 miles N. of Beersheba, and En-lakkore with the large spring between the tell and Khewelfeh. But Samson's adventures appear to have been confined to a narrow circle, and there is no ground for extending them to a distance of some 30 miles from Gaza, which Lekiyeh is, even in a straight line. It appears to have been the same place later known (<161129>Nehemiah 11:29) as EN-RIMMON *SEE EN-RIMMON* (q.v.).

En-ha'rod

(Hebrews *E4n Charod,* dwOrj}ˆy[e *fountain of Harod;* Sept. πηγὴ Ἀρώδ), a spring in the vicinity of the town of Harod (<070701>Judges 7:1, where the name is translated "well of Harod"). *SEE HAROD:*

En-ha'zor

(Hebrews *Eyn Chatsor',* r/xj;ˆy(, *focntain of Hazor,* i.e., *of the village;* Sept. πηγὴ Ἀσώρ), a fortified city of the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned between Edrei and Iron (<061937>Joshua 19:37), but apparently different from Hazor (verse 36). It has been identified by Schwarz *(Palest.* page 183) and Thomson *(Land and Book,* 1:515) with the *Ain-Hazur* not far N.W. of *TellHfazr* (between Rameh or Ramah and Yakuk or Hukkok), which latter (being marked as a ruined site by Van de Velde, although Dr. Robinson, who visited it, denies that there are any traces of structures on the summit; *Later Researches*, page 81), was probably the location of the city itself. *SEE HAZOR.*

Enlightenment

SEE ILLUMINATI.

En-mish'pat

(Hebrews *Eyn Mishpat',* fP;v]mi ˆy(, *fountain of judgment;* Sept. ἡ πηγὴ τῆς κρίσεως), the earlier name (<011407>Genesis 14:7) for KADESH *SEE KADESH* (q.v.), in the borders of Idumaea (comp. <042013>Numbers 20:13,14). According to Schwarz *(Palest.* page 214), there is found, about 10 miles

south of Petra, a large spring, still called by the Bedouins *Ain el-Sedaka,* or *spring of justice,* which he holds to be the same as the ancient En-mishpat; but this would be very far south for the required locality, *SEE EXODE*; and the spot he names is doubtless the *Ain el-Usdakah* markedon Robinson's *Map* as identical with the Zodocatha of the Roman post-routes (Reland, *Palest.* page 230).

Enmity

"opposition; very bitter, deep-rooted, irreconcilable hatred and variance. Such a constant enmity there is between the followers of Christ and Satan; nay, there is some such enmity between mankind and some serpents (<01003>Genesis 3:15). Friendship with this world, in its wicked members and lusts, is *enmity with God* — is opposed to the love of him, and amounts to an actual exerting of ourselves to dishonor and abuse him (<590404>James 4:4; <620215>1 John 2:15, 16). The carnal mind, or minding of fleshly and sinful things, is *enmnity against God* — is opposed to his nature and will in the highest degree, and, though it may be removed, cannot be reconciled to him, nor he to it (<450807>Romans 8:7, 8). The ceremonial law is called *enmity:* it marked God's enmity against sin by demanding atonement for it; it occasioned men's enmity against God by its burdensome services, and was an accidental source of standing variance between Jews and Gentiles: or perhaps the *enmity* here meant is the state of variance between God and men, whereby he justly loathed and hated them as sinful, and condemned them to punishment; and they wickedly hated him for his holy excellence, retributive justice, and sovereign goodness: both are slain and abolished by the death of Christ (<490215>Ephesians 2:15, 16)."

Ennodius Magnus Felix,

one of the Latin fathers, was born about A.D. 473, at Arles (according to others at Milan), of a noble Gallic family, having such names as Faustus and Boethius on its registers. His parents dying early, he was sent, on the invasion of the Visigoths, to an aunt in Milan, who took good care of his education. Soon after her death (A.D. 489) he married a rich wife, and lived very freely until a severe illness brought him to reflection; and on his restoration he was ordained deacon, and his wife became a nun. (One account says that he had been ordained deacon before, and lived a bad life as deacon.) In 494 he accompanied Epiphanius of Pavia on a mission to Burgundy to ransom some Italian prisoners. In 496 he went to Rome,

where he soon gained great reputation. In 502 he wrote in vindication of pope Symmachus against his rival, pope Laurentius. In this defense he first asserted that the bishop of Rome is subject to no earthly tribunal (Gieseler, 1, § 115); He was the first to give to the bishop of Rome exclusively the name of "Papa" (pope), and was, in general, very eager to enlarge the papal authority. After he had been chosen, about A.D. 511, to succeed Maximus as bishop of Pavia (Ticinum), he went, under direction of pope Hormisdas, on two missions (515 and 517) to the emperor Anastasius with reference to the union between the Eastern and Western churches. Both missions failed. Ennodius died at Pavia July 17, 521. Among his writings are, *Epistolarum ad Diversos lib. ix: — Libellus adv. eos, qui contra Synodum scribere praesumserunt,* containing the defense of Symmachus named above: — *Vita Epiphanii Episcopi: — Vita Antonii Monachi Lirinensis: — Eucharisticon de vita sua,* an autobiography: —*Paraenesis didascalica ad Ambrosium et Beatum: — Orationes: —Carmina.* His writings were published in Basle, 1569, fol.; Tournay, 1610; and by Sirmond (best ed.), Paris, 1611. They are also in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. 63:Ennodius wrote strongly in favor of free will, and has been therefore styled a Semipelagian. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Geneva, 1720), 1:322; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Paris, 1861), 10:473 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:68; Wetzer Welte, *Kirch. Lex.* 3:595.

E'noch

(Hebrews *Chanok',* Ë/nj} *initiated;* according to Philo, *De poet. Caini, §* 11, from ^jewith the suffix Ú=ËNęi[ἑρμηνευεται Ἐνὼχ χάρις σου], i.e., *thy favor;* Sept. and N.T. Ἐνώχ, Josephus ῎Ανωχος, Vulg. *Henoch),* the name of several men.

1. The eldest son of Cain (<01047>Genesis 4:17), who called the city which he built after his name (<01048>Genesis 4:18). B.C. post 4041. It is there described as being east of Eden, in the land of Nod, to which Cain retired after the murder of his brother. *SEE NOD*. Ewald *(Gesch.* 1:356, note) fancies that there is a reference to the Phrygian Iconium, in which city a legend *of "Annakov* was preserved, evidently derived from the biblical ac count of the father of Methuselah (Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἰκόνιον; Suid. s.v. Νάννακος). Other places have been identified with the site of Enoch with little probability; e.g. *Anuchta* (Ptolemy, 6:3, 5) in Susiana, the *Heniochi* (Ptolemy, 5:9, 25; Strabo, 11:492; Pliny, 6:10, 12) in the Caucasus, etc. (Huetius, *De Paradiso,* c. 17; Hasse, *Entdeckung,* 2:35; Gotter, *De*

Henochia urbe, Jen. 1705 [of little value]; Sticht, *De urbe Hanochia,* Jen. 1727).

2. Another antediluvian patriarch, the son of Jared and father of Methuselah (<010521>Genesis 5:21 sq.; <420328>Luke 3:28: in <130103>1 Chronicles 1:3, the name is Anglicized "Henoch"). — B.C. 3550-3185. He was born when Jared, was 162 years old, and after the birth of his eldest son in his 65th year he lived 300 years. From the period of 365 years assigned to his life, Ewald *(Isrl. desch.* 1:356), with very little probability, regards him as "the god of the new year," but the number may have been not without influence on the later traditions which assigned to Enoch the discovery of the science of astronomy (ἀστρολογία, Eupolemus ap. Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 9:17, where he is identified with Atlas). After the birth of Methuselah it is said (<010522>Genesis 5:22-24) that Enoch "walked with God 300 years ... and he was not; for God took him" (j qil). The phrase "walked with God" (µyhaeh;A t a,ËLeh'it]hæ) is elsewhere only used of Noah (<010609>Genesis 6:9; comp. <011701>Genesis 17:1, etc.), and is to be explained of a prophetic life spent in immediate converse with the spiritual world (Book of Enoch, 12:2, *"All his action was with the holy ones, and with the watchers during his life").* There is no farther mention of Enoch in the O.T., but in Ecclesiasticus (49:14) he is brought forward as one of the peculiar glories (οὐδὲ ε ς ἐκτίσθη ο ος Ε.) of the Jews, for he was taken up (ἀνελήφθη, Alex. μετετέθη) from the earth. "He pleased the Lord and was translated [Vulg. into Paradise], being a pattern of repentance" (Ecclus. 44:14). In the Epistle to the Hebrews the spring and issue of Enoch's life are clearly marked. "By faith Enoch was translated (μετετέθη), that he should not see death . . for before his translation (μετάθεσις) he had this testimony, that he pleased God." The contrast to this divine judgment is found in: the constrained words of Josephus: " Enoch departed to the Deity (ἀνεχώρησε πρὸς τὸ θεῖον), whence [the sacred writers] have not recorded his death" *(Ant.* 1:3, 4). In the Epistle of Jude 5:14; (comp. Enoch 60:8) he is described as " the *seventh* from Adam;" and the number is probably noticed as conveying the idea of divine completion and rest (comp. August. *c. Faust.* 12:14), while Enoch was himself a type of perfected humanity, "a man raised to heaven by pleasing God, while angels fell to earth by transgression" (Ireneus, 4:16, 2). Elijah was in like manner translated; and thus was the doctrine of *immortalitypalpably* taught under the ancient dispensation.

The biblical notices of Enoch were a fruitful source of speculation in later times. Some theologians disputed with subtilty as to the place to which he was removed, whether it was to Paradise or to the iimmedLate presence of God (comp. Feuardentius, *ad Iren.* 5:5), though others more wisely declined to discuss the question (Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* page 758). On other points there was greater unanimity. Both the Latin and Greek fathers commonly couple Enoch and Elijah as historic witnesses of the possibility of a resurrection of the body and of a true human existence in glory (Iren. 4:5, 1; Tertull. *de Resurr. Carn.* page 58; Jerome, *c. Joan. Hierosol. §* 29, 32, pages 437, 440); and the voice of early ecclesiastical tradition is almost unanimous in regarding them as "the two witnesses" (Revelation 11:3 sq.) who should fall before "the beast," and afterwards be raised to heaven before the great judgment (Hippol. *Fragm. in Daniel* 22; *de Antichr.* 43, Cosmas Indic. page 75, ap. Thilo, κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν; Tertull. *de Anima,* page 59; Amzbros. *in Psalm.* 45:4; *Evang. Nicod.* c. 25, on which 'Thilo has almost exhausted the question, *Cod. Apoc. N.T.* page 765 sq.). This belief removed a serious difficulty which was supposed to attach to their translation, for thus it was made clear that they would at last discharge the common debt of a sinful humanity, from which they were not exempted by their glorious removal from the earth (Tertull *de Anima,* 1.c.; August. *Op. imp. c. Jul.* 6:30). In later times Enoch was celebrated as the inventor of writing, arithmetic, and astronomy (Euseb. *Prcp. Ev.* 9:17). He is said to have filled 300 books with the revelations which he received, and is commonly identified with *Edris* (i.e., *the learned),* who is commemorated in the Koran (cap. 19) as one "exalted [by God] to a high place" (comp. Sale, ad loc.; Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* page 30 sq.). Visions sand prophecies were commonly ascribed to him, which he is said to have arranged in a book. This book was delivered to his son, and preserved by Noah in the ark. After the Flood it was made known to the world, and handed down from one generation to another (see *Yuchasin,* f. 134; Eusebius, *Hist.* *Ecclesiastes* 7:32; Cedren. *Hist.* page 9; Barhebr. *Chron.* page 5). But these traditions were probably due to the apocryphal book “which bears his name (comp. Fabric. *Cod. Pseudep. V.T.* 1:215 sq.). See below. Some (Buttm. *Mythol.* 1:176 sq.; Ewald, *1.c.)* have found a trace of the history of Enoch in the Phrygian legend of Annacus (Ἄννακος, Νάννακος), who was distinguished for his piety, lived 300 years, and predicted the deluge of Deucalion. See Heber, *De pietate et fatis Enochi* (Bamb. 1789); Bredenkamp, in Paulus, *Memor.* 2:152; Danz, in Meuschen's *N.T. Talm.* Page 722; Schmieder, *Comment. in*

Galatians 3:19 (Nurnbn, 1826), page 23; Buddei *Hist. Ecclesiastes V.T.* 1:162; Drusius, *De Henoch,* in the *Crit. Sacri.* 1, 2; Pfeiffer, *Decas select. exerc.* page 12; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.* 1:624; Robertson, *The Prophet Enoch* (Lond. 1860); Pfaff, *De raptu Henochi* (Tub. 1739); Hall, *Works,* 11:185; Alexander, *Hist.* Ecclesiastes 1:142; Calmet, *Commentary,* 8:10, 27; Hunter, *Sacred Biog.* page 24 sq.; Robinson, *Script. Char.* 1; Rudge, *Lect. on* Genesis 1:72; Evans, *Script. Biog.* 3:1; Kitto, *Bible Illust.* 1:123; Bell, *Enoch's Walk* (Lond. 1658); Heidegger, *Hist. Patriarcharum,* i; Saurin, *Disc.* 1:65; Boston, *Sermons,* 1:230; Doddridge, *Works,* 3:329; Slade, *Sermons,* 2:447; Williams, *Sermons,* 2:367.

3. The third son of Midian, and grandson of Abraham by Keturah (Genesis 25:4, A.V. "Hanoch;" 1 Chronicles 1:33, "Henoch"). B.C. post 1988.

4. The eldest son of Reuben (A.V. "Hanoch," Genesis 46:9; Exodus 6:14; 1 Chronicles 5:3), from whom came "the family of the Hanochites" (Numbers 26:5). B.C. 1873.

5. In 2 Esdr. 6:49, 51, "Enoch" stands in the Lat. (and Eng.) version for one of the two famous amphibious monsters, doubtless correctly *Behemoth* in the Ethiopic.

Enoch, Book Of

one of the most important remains of early apocalyptic literature. The interest that once attached to it has now partly subsided; yet a document quoted, as is generally believed, by an inspired apostle (Jude verses 14, 15), can never be wholly devoid of importance or utility in sacred literature. From its vigorous style and wide range of speculation, the book is well worthy of the attention which it' received in the first ages, and recent investigations have still left many points for further inquiry.

I. *History of the Book.* — The first trace of its existence is generally found in the epistle of Jude verses 14, 15; (comp. Enoch, 1:9), but the words of the apostle leave it uncertain whether he derived his quotation from tradition (Hoffmann, *Schriftbeweis,* 1:420) or from writing (ἐπροφήτευσεν ... . Ἐνὼχ λέγων), though the wide spread of the book in the 2d century seems almost decisive in favor of the latter supposition. In several of the fathers mention is made of Enoch as the author, not only of a

prophetic writing, but of various productions. Some such work appears to have been known to Justin *(Apol.* 2:5), Irenaeus *(adv. Haer.* 4:16, 2), and Anatolius (Eusel. *H.E.* 7:32). Clement of Alexandria *(Eclog.* page 801) and Origen (yet comp. c, *Cels.* 5, page 267, ed. Spenc.) both make. use of it, and nu. merous references occulr to the "writing," books, and "words" of Enoch in the *Testament of the XII Patriarchs* (q.v.) — a document which Nitzsch has shown to belong to the latter part of the 1st century or the beginning of the second, and which presents more or less resemblance to passages in the present book (Fabricii *Cod. Pseudep. V.T.* 1:161 sq.; Gfrorer, *Proph. Pseudep.* 273 sq.). Tertullian *(De cultu faem.* 1:3; compare *De Idol.* 4) expressly quotes the book as one which was "not received by some, nor admitted into the Jewish canon" (in armarium Judaicum), but defends it on account of its reference to Christ ("legimus omnem scripturam sedificationi habilem divinitus inspirari"). Augustine *(De Civ.* 15:23, 4) and an anonymous writer, whose work is printed with Jerome's *(Brev. in Psalm.* 132:2; compare Hil. *ad Psalm.* 1.c.), were both acquainted with it; but from their time till the revival of letters it was known in the Western Church only by the quotation in Jude (Dillmann, *Einl.* 46). In the Eastern Church it was known some centuries later. In the 8th century, Georgius Syncellus, in a work entitled *Chronographia,* that reaches from Adam to Diocletian, made various extracts from "the first book of Enoch." In the 9th century, Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, at the conclusion of his *Chronographice Compendium,* in his list of *canonical* and un*canonical* books, refers to the book of Enoch, and assigns 4800 στίχοι as the extent of it. After this time little or no mention appears to have been made of the production until Scaliger printed the fragments of Syncellus regarding it, which he inserted in his notes to the *Chronicus Canon* of Eusebius. In consequence of such extracts, the book of Enoch excited much attention and awakened great curiosity. At the beginning of the 17th century an idea prevailed that it existed in an Ethiopic translation. A Capuchin monk from Egypt assured Peiresc that he had seen the book in Ethiopic, a circumstance which excited the ardor of the scholar of Pisa so much that he never rested until he obtained the tract. But when Job Ludolph went afterwards to Paris to the Royal Library, he found it to be a fabulous and silly production. In consequence of this disappointment, the idea of recovering it in Ethiopic was abandoned. At length, in 1773, Bruce brought home three copies of the book of Enoch from Abyssinia in MSS., containing the Ethiopic translation complete. "Amongst the articles," he states, "I consigned to the library at Paris was a

very beautiful and magnificent copy of the prophecies of Enoch in large quarto. Another is amongst the books of Scripture which I brought home, standing immediately before the book of Job, which is its proper place in the Abyssinian Canon; and a third copy I have presented to the Bodleian Library at Oxford by the hands of Dr. Douglas, bishop of Carlisle." As soon as it was known in England that such a present had been made to the Royal Library at Paris, Dr.Woide, librarian of the British Museum, set out for France with letters from the secretary of state to the ambassador at that court, desiring him to assist the learned bearer in procuring access to the work. Dr. Woide accordingly transcribed it, and brought back with him the copy to England. The Parisian MS. was first publicly noticed by the eminent Orientalist De Sacy in 1800, who translated into Latin chapters 1, 2, 3, 4-15; also 22 and 31. These he also published in the *Magasin Encyclopedique* (VI, 1:382 sq.). Mr. Murray, editor of *Bruce's Travels,* gave some account of the book from the traveler's own MS. The Ethiopic text, however, was not published till the edition of archbishop Laurence from the Bodleian MS. in 1838 *(Libri Enoch versio Ethiopica* ... Oxon.). But in the interval Laurence published an English translation, with an introduction and notes, which passed through three editions *(The Book of Enoch,* etc., by R. Laurence; Oxford, 1821, 1833, 1838). The translation of Laurence formed the basis of the German edition of Hoffmann *(Das Buch Henoch* ... A. E. Hoffmann, Jena, 1833-38); and Gfrorer, in 1840, gave a Latin translation constructed from the translations of Laurence and Hoffmann *(Prophetae veteres Pseudepigraphi* ... ed. A. F. Gfrorer, Stuttgartiae, 1840). According to Angelo Mai, there is a MS. copy of the book of Enoch among the Ethiopic codices of the Vatican, which must have been brought into Europe earlier than Bruce's MSS. In 1834 Dr. Riippell procured another MS. of Enoch from Abyssinia, from which Hoffmann made the second part of his German version. All these editions were superseded by those of Dillmann, who edited the AEthiopic text from five MSS. *(Liber Henoch, LEthiopice,* Lipsiae, 1851), and afterwards gave a German translation of the book with a good introduction and commentary *(Das Buch Henoch* ... von Dr. A. Dillmann, Leipzig, 1853). The work of Dillmann gave a fresh impulse to the study of the book. Among the essays which were called out by it, the most important were those of Ewald *(Ueber des Ethiopischen Buches Henoch Entstehung,* etc., Gottingen, 1856) and Hilgenfeld *(D. Juidische Apokalyptik,* Jena, 1857). The older literature on the subject is reviewed by Fabricius *(Cod. Pseudep. V.T.* 1:199 sq.).

The Greek translation, in which it was known to the fathers, appears to be irrecoverably lost. There is no trace of it after the 8th century. The last remnant of it is preserved by Syncellus.

II. *Identity of the extant Forms.* — There can be no doubt that the Ethiopic translation exhibits the identical book which, as most believe, Jude quoted, and which is also mentioned or cited by many of the fathers. The fragment preserved by Syncellus (reprinted by Laurence and Hoffmann) is obviously the same as chapter 7, etc., the deviations being of little importance (though one considerable passage quoted by George Syncellus is wanting in the present book, Dillm. page 85), and probably accidental. It is manifest, also, to any one who will compare the quotations made by the fathers with the Ethiopic version, that both point to the same original. The extracts in question could not have been interpolations, as they are essential to the connections in which they are found. The mention of *books* of Enoch in the Testament of Judah, in the Testament of Benjamin, in Origen *(c. Cels.* and *Homil. in Num.),* and of the "first book" of Enoch in the fragments preserved by Syncellus, consist with the idea that the whole was then, as now, divided into different books. Tertullian leads us to believe that it was of the same extent in the Greek text then existing as it is in the present Ethiopic.

III. Canonicity. — Notwithstanding the quotation in Jude, and the wide circulation of the book itself, the apocalypse of Enoch was uniformly and distinctly separated from the canonical Scriptures. Tertullian alone maintained its authority, while he admitted that it was not received by the Jews: his arguments, however, are exceedingly puerile *(De cultu foeminarum,* 1:3). Origen, on the other hand (c. *Cels.* 5:267, ed. Spenc.), and Augustine *(De Civ.* 15:23, 4), definitively mark it as apocryphal, and it is reckoned among the apocryphal books in the Apostolic Constitutions (6:16), and in the catalogues of the *Synops. S. Scripturce,* Nicephorus (Credner, *Zur Gesch. d. Kan.* page 145), and Montfaucon *(Bibl. Coislin.* page 193).

IV. *Original Language.* — The book of Zohar, in which are various allusions to Enoch, seems to speak of it as an important Hebrew production which, have been handed down from generation to generation. The Cabbalists, whose opinions are embodied in Zobar, thought that Enoch was really the author, a sentiment quite at variance with any other hypothesis' than that of a Hebrew original. At all events, a Hebrew book of

Enoch was known and used by Jewish writers till the 13th century (Dillmann, *Einl.* 47). One of the earliest references to the book occurs in the Hebrew *Book of Jubilees* (Dillmann, in Ewald's *Jahrb.* 1850, page 90). The careful reader soon sees that the work was composed at first in Hebrew, or rather Hebrew-Aramaan. This was long ago perceived by Joseph Scaliger, though he had before him nothing but the Greek fragments preserved by Syncellus. Hottinger, however, observed, in opposition to Scaliger, that a Hebraizing style is no sure proof of a Hebrew original. Hoffmann adduces the Hebrew-Aramaean etymology of names, especially the names of angels, as an evidence of the Aramsean original — an argument which is more pertinent; and Laurence infers from the book of Zohar that Hebrew was its primitive language. The writer's thorough acquaintance with the canonical Scriptures of the Jews in the tongue in which they were composed; their use of them in the original, not the Greek translation of the Septuagint; their Hebrew etymologies of names, especially the appellations of angels and archangels; the fact that all words and phrases can easily be rendered back into Hebrew and Aramaean, and the many Hebrew idioms and terms that occur, prove that neither Greek nor Ethiopic was the original language, but the later Palestinian Hebrew. Thus Tamiel (8:7) is compounded of µt and la, *the upright of God;* Samyaza of µv and az[, *the name of the strong.* The same conclusion follows from the term Ophanin (60:13), which is evidently identical with the Hebrew ˆynpa. It is remarkable; also, that as Ophanin occurs in connection with, the Cherubim, so the Hebrew term ˆynpa is found in the same association (<1Ki 7:30> 1 Kings 7:30; <Eze 10:15> Ezekiel 1:15, 16, 19, 20, 21; 10:2, 6, 9, 1, etc.; Murray's *Enoch Restitutus,* page 33 sq.). The names of the sun are *Oryares:* and *Tomas* (77:1), from srj,r/a and hM;Ti In 77:1, 2, we read that "the first wind is called *the eastern,* because it is *the first,"* which can only be explained by the Hebrew µdq, ynwmdqh; "the second is called the south, because the Most High there descends," i.e., µ/rD; from µr; dr;(Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch,* pages 235, 236). The names of the conductors of the month are also Hebrew (82:13), as Murray (page 46) and Hoffmann (page 690) remark. See Joseph hal-Lewi, in the *Journal Asiatique,* 1867, page 352 sq.

At what time the Greek version was made from the original can only be conjectured. It could not have been long after the final redaction of the whole, probably about the time of Philo. Having appeared in Greek, it soon

became widely circulated. The Ethiopic version was made from the Greek probably about the same time as the Ethiopic translation of the other parts of the Bible with which it was afterwards conrnected, or, in other words, towards the middle or close of the 4th century. *SEE ETHIOPIC VERSIONS.*

V. *Contents*. — The book of Enoch is divided in the Ethiopic MSS. into twenty sections, which are subdivided into 108 chapters; but copies differ in their specification of chapters. Dillmann has properly departed from the MSS., and endeavored to make divisions of sections, chapters, and verses which may represent the text pretty nearly as it is preserved among the Abyssinians.

In its present shape the book consists of a series of revelations supposed to have been given to Enoch and Noah, which extend to the most varied aspects of nature and life, and are designed to offer a comprehensive vindication of the action of Providence. *SEE ENOCH*. It is divided into five parts. The *first part* (chapters 1-36, Dillm.), after a general introduction (characterizing the book to which it belongs as a revelation of Enoch the seer respecting the future judgment of the world, and its results both towards the righteous and rebellious sinners, written to console the pious in the times of final tribulation), contains an account of the fall of the angels (Genesis 6:1), and of the judgment to come upon them and upon the giants, their offspring (6-16); and this is followed by the description of the journey of Enoch through the earth and lower heaven in company with an angel, who showed to him many of the great mysteries of nature, the treasure-houses of the storms, and winds, and fires of heaven, the prison of the fallen, and the land of the blessed (17-26). The *second part* (37-71) is styled "a vision of wisdom," and consists of three "parables," in which Enoch relates the revelations of the higher secrets of heaven and of the spiritual world which were given to him. The first parable (38-44) gives chiefly a picture of the future blessings and manifestation of the righteous, with further details as to the heavenly bodies; the second (45-57) describes in splendid imagery the coming of Messiah, and the results which it should work among "the elect" and the gainsayers; the third (58-69) draws out at further length the blessedness of "the elect and holy," and the confusion and wretchedness of the sinful rulers of the world. The *third part* (72-82) is styled "the book of the course of the lights of heaven," and deals with the motions of the sun and moon, and the changes of the seasons; and with this the narrative of the journey of Enoch closes. The *fourth part* (83-91) is not

distinguished by any special name, but contains the record of a dream which was granted to Enoch in his youth, in which he saw the history of the kingdoms of God and of the world up to the final establishment of the throne of Messiah. *The fifth part* (92-110) contains the last addresses of Enoch to his children, in which the teaching of the former chapters is made the groundwork of earnest exhortation. 'The signs which attended the birth of Noah are next noticed (111-112); and another short "writing of Enoch" (113) forms the close to the whole book (comp. Dillmann, *Einl.* 1 sq.; Licke, *Versuch einer vollstand. Einl.* 1:93 sq.).

VI. *Design.* — The leading object of the writer, who was manifestly imbued with deep piety, was to comfort and strengthen his contemporaries. He lived in times of distress and persecution, when the enemies of religion oppressed the righteous. The outward circumstances of the godly were such as to excite doubts of the divine equity in their minds, or, at least, to prevent it from having that hold on their faith which was necessary to sustain them in the hour of trial. In accordance with this, the writer exhibits the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. To give greater authority to his affirmations, he puts them into the mouths of Enoch and Noah. Thus they have all the weight belonging to the character of an eminent prophet and saint. Various digressions are not without their bearing on the author's main purpose. The narrative of the fallen angels and their punishment, as also of the flood, exemplifies the retributive justice of Jehovah; while the Jewish history, continued down to a late period, exhibits the final triumph of His people, notwithstanding all their vicissitudes. Doubtless the author lived amid a season of fiery trial. and, looking abroad over the desolation, sought to cheer the sufferers by the consideration that they should be recompensed in the Messianic kingdom. As for their wicked oppressors, they were to experience terrible judgments. The writer occasionally delights in uttering dire anathemas against the wicked. It is plain that the book grew out of the times and circumstances by which he was surrounded. It gives us a glimpse not only of the religious opinions, but also of the general features which characterized the whole period. The book belongs to the apocalyptic literature of the period between the close of the O.T. canon and the advent of Messiah. It is therefore of the same class of composition as the fourth book of Esdras and the Jewish Sibyllines. The principal interest attaching to it arises from its contributing to our knowledge of the development of Jewish Messianic ideas subsequently to the writings of inspired prophets. In tracing the gradual

unfolding and growth of those ideas among the Jewish people, we are the better prepared for the revelation of the N.T.

VII. *Doctrines.* — In doctrine the Book of Enoch exhibits a great advance of thought within the limits of revelation in each of the great divisions of knowledge. The teaching on nature is a curious attempt to reduce the scattered images of the O.T. to a physical system. The view of society and man, of the temporary triumph and final discomfiture of the oppressors of God's people, carries out into elaborate detail the pregnant images of Daniel. The figure of the Messiah is invested with majestic dignity as "the Son of God" (105:2 only), "whose name was named before the sun was made" (48:3), and who existed "aforetime in the presence of God" (62:6; comp. Laurence, *Prel. Diss.* 51 sq.). At the same time, his human attributes as "the son of man," "the son of woman" (62:5 only), "the elect one," "the righteous one," "the anointed," are brought into conspicuous notice. The mysteries of the spiritual world, the connection of angels and men, the classes and ministries of the hosts of heaven, the power of Satan (40:7; 65:6), and the legions of darkness, the doctrines of resurrection, retribution, and eternal punishment (22; comp. Dillm. page 19), are dwelt upon with growing earnestness as the horizon of speculation was extended by intercourse with Greece. But the message of the book is emphatically one of "faith and truth" (comp. Dillm. page 32), and while the writer combines and repeats the thoughts of Scripture, he adds no new element to the teaching of the prophets. His errors spring from an undisciplined attempt to explain their words, and from a proud exultation in present success. For the great characteristic by which the book is distinguished from the later apocalypse of Ezra, *SEE ESDRAS, 2D BOOK*, is the tone of triumphant expectation by which it is pervaded. It seems to repeat in every form the great principle that the world, natural, moral, and spiritual, is under the immediate government of God. Hence it follows that there is a terrible retribution reserved for sinners, and a glorious kingdom prepared for the righteous, and Messiah is regarded as the divine mediator of this double issue (90, 91). Nor is it without a striking fitness that a patriarch translated from earth, and admitted to look upon the divine majesty, is chosen as "the herald of wisdom, righteousness, and judgment to a people who, even in suffering, saw in their tyrants only the victims of a coming vengeance."

As in the canonical prophecies of the O.T., so here, the final establishment of the Messianic kingdom is preceded by wars and desolations. In the

eighth ofthe ten weeks into which the world's history is divided, the sword executes judgment upon the wicked, at the end of which God's people have built a new temple, in which they are gathered together. The tenth week closes with the eternal judgment upon angels (90, 91).

With respect to the doctrine of a general resurrection, it is certainly implied in the work. But the mode of the resurrection of the wicked and the righteous is differently presented. The *spirits* of the former are taken out of Shed and thrown into the place of torment (98:3; 103:8; 108:2-5); whereas the spirits of the righteous raised again will be reunited to their *bodies,* and share the blessedness of Messiah's kingdom on earth (61:5; 91:10; 92:3; 100:5). The reunion of their *bodies* with their spirits appears a thing reserved for the righteous.

As various sects in Jerusalem were tolerably developed at the time of some of the writers, it has been a subject of inquiry whether the peculiar doctrines of any appear in the work. According to Jellinek *(Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenlind Gesellschaft,* 7:249), the work originated in the sphere of Essenism. We learn from Josephus that the Essenes preserved as sacred the names of the angels; and put up certain prayers before sunrise, as if they made supplication for that phenomenon *(War,* 2:8). Now there is a very developed angel-doctrine in the work before us, and we also find the following passage: "When I went out from below and saw the heaven, and the sun rise in the east, and the moon go down in the west, a few stars, and everything as he has known it from the beginning, I praised the Lord of judgment and magnified him, because he has made the sun go forth from the windows of the east," etc., 83:11). This certainly reminds one of Essenism showing its influence on the mind of the writer. The 108th chapter is more plainly Essenic. The pious, whom God rewards with blessings, are described as having lived a life of purity, self-denial, and asceticism like to that of the Essenes. Yet Dillmann appears disinclined to find any reflection of Essenism in 83:11, or elsewhere *(Das Buch Henoch, Allgemeine Einleitung,* page 53). We admit that the other parts of the bookare free from it. It is obvious that the writer did not belong to the school of the Pharisees. He was tolerably free from the sects of his people; rising above the narrow confines of their distinctive peculiarities, which were not then fully developed.

VIII. *Style*. — It is obvious that the author was a poet of no mean order. His inspiration was high, his ideas elevated and pure. He had a creative

fancy which could body forth new forms and shapes. Speaking out of the midst of his own time, he could throw himself back into the past, and mould it suitably to his purpose. His language, too, has the living freshaess of a master. He was well acquainted with the book of Daniel, as is obvious from the spirit of his production. Not that he was an imitator of that bookfar from it; his mind was too powerful and independent. It is characteristic of him that he calls Jehovah *Lord of Spirits,* that he specifies as the seven spiritual beings that stand before God the four highest angels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, Phanuel; and the three highest hosts, the Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim; that he speaks of *the Elect* by way of eminence, the *Son of Man,* i.e., the Messiah. The charm of the writer's descriptions is irresistible, transporting the reader into the highest regions of the spiritual world. With a genuine glow of feeling, and the elevation of purest hope, he carries us away, till we are lost in wonder at the poetic inspiration of one living at a period comparatively so late. His work must have crested a new branch of writing at the time, leading to numerous imitations.

IX. *Authorship.* — The general unity which the book possesses in its present form marks it, in the main, as the work of one man. The several parts, while they are complete in themselves, are still connected by the development of a common purpose. But internal coincidence shows with equal clearness that different fragments were incorporated by the author into his work, and some additions have been probably made afterwards. Different "books" are mentioned in early times, and variations in style and language are discernible in the present book. To distinguish the original elements and later interpolations is the great problem which still remains to be solved, for the different theories which have been proposed are barely plausible. In each case the critic seems to start with preconceived notions as to what was to be expected at a particular time, and forms his conclusions to suit his prejudices. Hoffmann and Weisse place the composition of the whole work after the Christian aera, because the one thinks that Jude could not have quoted an apocryphal book (Hoffmann, *Schriftbeweis,* 1:420 sq.), and the other seeks to detach Christianity altogether from a Jewish foundation (Weisse, *Evangelienfrage,* page 214 sq.). Stuart *(Am. Bibl. Repos.* 1840) so far anticipated the argument of Weisse as to regard the Christology of the book as a clear sign of its post-Christian origin. Ewald, according to his usual custom, picks out the different elements with a daring confidence, and leaves a result so

complicated that no one can accept it in its details, while it is characterized in its great features by masterly judgment and sagacity. He places the composition of the groundwork of the book at various intervals between B.C. 144 and B.C. cir. 120, and supposes that the whole assumed its present form in the first half of the century before Christ. Licke (2d ed.) distinguishes two great parts, an older part including chapteres 1-36, and 72-105, which he dates from the beginning of the Maccabaean struggle, and a later, chapters 37-71, which he assigns to the period of the rise of Herod the Great (B.C. 141, etc.). He supposes, however, that later interpolations were made without attempting to ascertain their date. Dillmann at first *(ut sup.)* upheld more decidedly the unity of the book, and assigned the chief part of it to an Aramean writer of the time of John Hyrcanus (B.C. cir. 110). To this, according to him, "historical" and "Noachian additions" were made, probably in the Greek translation *(Einl.* 52). Latterly, however (in Herzog's *Encyklop.* 12:309), he has greatly modified this opinion. Kostlin (in Zeller's *Jahrb.* 1856, page 240 sq., 370 sq.) assigns chapters 1-16, 21-36, 72-05 to about B.C. 110; chapters 37-71 to B.C. cir. 100-64; and the "Noachian additions" and chapter 108 to the time of Herod the Great. Hilgenfeld himself places the original book (chapters 1-16, 20-36, 72-90, 91:1-19; 93:105) about the beginning of the first century before Christ *(vt sup.* page 145 n.). This book he supposes to have passed through the hands of a Christian writer who lived between the times "of Saturninus and Marcion" (page 181), who added the chief remaining portions, including the great Messianic section, chapters 37, 71. In the face of these conflicting theories it is evidently impossible to dogmatize, and the evidence is insufficient for conclusive reasoning. The interpretation of the Apocalyptic histories (chapters 76, 77, 85-90), on which the chief stress is laid for fixing the date of the book, involves necessarily minute criticism of details, which belongs rather to a commentary than to a general Introduction; but, notwithstanding the arguments of Hilgenfeld and Jost *(Gesch. Jud.* 2:218 n.), the whole book appears to be distinctly of Jewish origin. Some inconsiderable interpolations may have been made in successive translations, and large fragments of a much earlier date were undoubtedly incorporated into the work, but, as a whole, it may be regarded as describing an important phase of Jewish opinion shortly before the coming of Christ. That the entire production appeared before the Christian aera is clearly deducible from the fact that the Roman empire never appears as a power dangerous to Israel. Volkmar, however,-contends (in the *Zeitschr. der morg. Gesellsch.* 1860,

page 87 sq.) that it was written by a disciple of Akiba to encourage the Jewish revolt under Bar-Cocheba; a view which is ably controverted by Hilgenfeld *(Ib.* page 111 sq.).

Stuart has laid considerable stress on the Christology of the book as indicative of an acquaintance on the authors' part with the N.T., especially the Apocalypse. But the Christological portions do not possess sufficient distinctness to imply a knowledge of the N.T. The name JESUS never occurs. Neither are the appellations *Lord, Lord Jesus, Jesus Christ,* or even *Christ* employed. The *words faith, lelievers, God and his anointed, deny,* etc., can hardly be claimed as Christian terms, because they occur in the Ethiopic O.T. as the representatives of Hebrew-Greek ones. All that can be truly deduced from the Christology is that it is highly developed, and very elevated in tone, yet fairly derivable from the O.T. in all its essential and individual features. Nor is there anything in the eschatology or angelology to necessitate a Christian origin. We allow that the Messiah is spoken of in very exalted terms. His dignity, character, and acts surpass the descriptions presented in other Jewish books. But they are alike in the main, colored by the highly poetical imagination of the writers, in conformity with the sublimity and animation of their creations. We must therefore reject Stuart's opinion of a JewishChristian origin. All the arguments adduced on its behalf are easily dissipated, since Dillman's edition and Ewald's criticisms have led to a better acquaintance with the text of the work itself. Nor is Hilgenfeld's attempt to show that the so-called first Enoch book (37-71) proceeded from Christian Gnostics more successful, as Dillmann has remarked *(Pseudepigraphen des A.T.* in Herzog's *EEncyklopaidie,* 12:309, 310). Equally futile is Hoffmann's endeavor to show that the work did not appear till after the destruction of Jerusalem in the first century, when both Jude's epistle and the Apocalypse had been written *(Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellschaft,* 6:87 sq.). Not very dissimilar is Bdttcher's view, that the book, like the Sybilline oracles, was made up in the first and second centuries after Christ of pieces belonging to different times *(De Inferis,* 1, § 505). Nothing is more certain than that the work belongs to an ante-Christian world; and therefore the only problem is how to distribute the different books incorporated, and when to date them separately and collectively. After Laurence, Hoffmann and Gfrorer had erred in placing the whole under Herod the Great; Krieger and Lucke assigned different portions to different times, putting chaps. ixxxvi and lxxii-cviii to the early years of the Maccabaean struggle, and xxxvii-lxxi to

B.C. 38-34. How far this apportionment is correct will be seen from the preceding statements (see Krieger's *Beitrage z. Kritik und Exegese,* 1845, and Licke's *Versuch einer vollstandigen Einleitung in die Ojfenbarung des Johannes, §* 11).

X. *The Place where it was written.* — The place where the author lived and wrote is Palestine. This alone seems to suit the circumstances implied in the work, which is largely pervaded by the spirit of persons whose power, religion, and independence had been overborne by foreign interference. Laurence, however, endeavors to show from the 72d chapter (71st Laurence), where the length of the days at various periods of the year is given, that the locality must have been between the 45th and 49th degrees of north latitude, in the northern districts of the Caspian and Euxine seas. Hence he conjectures that the writer was one of the Jews who had been carried away by Shalmaneser and did not return. Krieger supposes *(Beitrage,* page 53) that Enoch, the imaginary writer, drew from the astronomical traditions or writings of northern Asia, regardless of the difference of Palestine's geographical position. Murray has shown (page 63 sq.) that one passage favors the idea that the author lived in Abyssinia; whence he infers that the production proceeded from various persons belonging to countries removed from one another. But De Sacy has remarked that as the authors' astronomical system is partly imaginary, their geography may also be visionary. Neither Egypt, nor Chaldaea, nor Palestine, suits the astronomy of the book. The scientific knowledge of the Israelites was imperfect. It is therefore idle to look for accuracy in geography or astronomy. The writer or writers systematized such knowledge as they had of natural phenomena after their own fashion, as appears from the fact that to every third month thirty-one days are assigned. The allusions to the Oriental theosophy and the opinions of Zoroaster do not necessarily commend a Chaldaean origin, at least of the astronomical part, since the images of fire, radiance, light, and other Oriental symbols may be satisfactorily accounted for by the Jews' intercourse with other nations, and their residence there for a time. The Oriental philosophy of Middle Asia was evidently not unknown to the authors. Zoroastrian doctrines are embodied in the work because Persian influences had been felt by the Israelites since the Babylonian captivity.

XI. *Did Jude really quote the Book of Enoch?* — A simple comparison of the language of the apostle and that found in the corresponding passage of

the extant book seems to settle this question conclusively in the affirmative, especially as the Scripture citation is prefaced with the direct acknowledgment of quotation: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying," etc. The following are the words respectively:

EPISTLE OF JUDE, verses <650114>Jude 1:14, 15; *Authorized Version.*

> "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."

BOOK OF ENOCH, chapter 2;

Laurence's Version.

> "Behold, he comes with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon them, and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal for everything which the sinful and ungodly have done, and committed against him."

Some, however, are most unwilling to believe that an inspired writer could cite an apocryphal production. Such an opinion destroys, in their view, the character of his writing, and reduces it to the level of an ordinary composition. But this is preposterous. The apostle Paul quotes several of the heathen poets, yet who ever supposed that by such references he sanctions the productions from which his citations are made, or renders them of greater value? All that can be reasonably inferred from such a fact is, that if the inspired writer cites a particular sentiment with approbation, it must be»regarded as just and right, irrespective of the remainder of the book in which it is found. The apostle's sanction extends no farther than the passage to which he alludes. Other portions of the original document may exhibit the most absurd and superstitious notions. It has always been the current opinion that Jude quoted the book of Enoch, and there is nothing to disprove it. It is true that there is some variation between the quotation and its original, but this is usual even with the N.T. writers in citing the Old.

Others, as Cave, Simon, Witsius, etc., suppose that Jude quoted a *traditional* prophecy or saying of Enoch, and we see no improbability in the assumption. Others, again, believe that the words apparently cited by

Jude were suggested to him by the Holy Spirit. But surely this hypothesis is unnecessary. Until it can be shown that the book of Enoch did not exist in the time of Jude, or that his quoting it is unworthy of him, or that such knowledge was not handed down traditionally so as to be within his reach, we abide by the opinion that Jude really quoted the book. While there are probable grounds for believing that he might have become acquainted with the circumstance independently of inspiration, we ought not to have recourse to the hypothesis of *immediate suggestion.* On the whole, it is most likely that the book of Enoch existed before the time of Jude, and that the latter really quoted it in accordance with the current tradition. Whether the prophecy ascribed to Enoch was *truly* ascribed to him is a question of no importance in this connection. *SEE JUDE.*

XII. *Literature.* — Bange, *De libro Henochi* (in his *Caelum Orientis,* Hafn. 1657, 4to, pages 16-19; and *Exercitationes,* Cracow, 1691, 4to); Bruce, *Travels,* 2, 8vo; Butt, *Genuineness of Enoch* (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Dillmann, *Liber Henoch AEthiopiae* (Lpz. 1851, 8vo); Id., *Das Buch Henoch ubersetzt und erklart* (Leipz. 1853, 8vo); Id., *Pseudepigraphen des A.T.* (in Herzog's *Encyklopadie,* 12:308 sq.); Dorsche, *De prophetia Henochi* (in his *Auctarium Pentadecadis,* diss. 1, page 555 sq.); Drusius, *De propheta Henoch* (Franec. 1615, 4to; also in the *Critici Sacri,* 1:373); Ewald, *Abh. uib. d. Ethiopishen Buches Henoch* (Gotting. 1854, 4to); Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigraphus V.T.* 1:160-224; Firnhabir, *De Henocho quaestiones* (Wittemberg, 1716, 4to); Gfrorer, in the *Tuib. Zeitschr. f. Theologie,* 1837, 4:120 sq.; Id. *Das Jahrhundert des Heils,* 1:93 sq.; Hilgenfeld, *Die Jiidische Apokalyptik* (Jen. 1857, 8vo); Hoffmann, *Das Buch Henoch* (Jen. 1833, 1838, 8vo); Hottinger, *De prophetia Henochi* (in his *Ennead. Diss.* Heidelb. 16..., 4to); Kostlin, in Baur and Zeller's *Jahrbuch,* 1856, 2, 3; Laurence, *The Book of Enoch* (3d edit. Oxford, 1838, 8vo); Lucke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis* (Bonn, 1848, 8vo, § 11, 2d ed.); Von Meyer, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, 3:63 sq.; Murray, *Enoch Restitutus* (London, 1836, 8vo); Pfeiffer, *De Henocho* (Wittemb. 1670, 8vo; also in his *Opera Philol.* Tr. ad Rh. 1704, 8vo, page 519); De Sacy, in the *Magasin Encyclopedique* (VI, 1:382; transl. into Germ. by Rink, Konigsb. 1801, 8vo); and in the *Journal des Savans,* October 1822; Stuart, in the *Am. Bibl. Repository,* January and July 1840; Volkmar, in *Zeitschr. d. deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft,* 1860, 1; and in the *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theologie,* 1862, 2; Wieseler, *Apokalypt. Litteratur des A. u. N.T.* 1:162 sq.; Id., *Die* 70 *Wochen des Daniel* (Gott.

1839); Philippi, *D.B. Henoch, sein Zeitalter u. Verhaltnisse zum Judasbriefe* (Stuttg. 1868).

Enoch, City Of

SEE ENOCH, 1.

Enon

SEE AENON.

E'nos

(Hebrews *Enosh',* vwnE, poet. a *man;* Sept. and N.T. Ἐνώς ; Josephus Ἔνωσος, *Ant.* 1:3, 2), the son of Seth, and grandson of Adam (<01506>Genesis 5:6-11; <42338>Luke 3:38). He lived 905 years (B.C. 3937-3032), and is remarkable on account of a singular expression used respecting him in <01026>Genesis 4:26, "Then began men to call on the name of the Lord." This isnot to be taken absolutely, as it would be absurd to suppose that none called on the name of the Lord before that time, and accordingly there are two interpretations given of the passage: one is the marginal reading of the A.V., "Then began men to call themselves *by the name* of the Lord," in order, it would seem, to distinguish themselves from those who were already idolators, and were termed children of men; the other, "Then men *profanely* called on the name of the Lord," intimating that at that period idolatry began to be practiced among men. The latter is the interpretation adopted by the Jewish expositors generally, but the former has more currency among Christian commentators. It may be observed that they both unite in the common idea of the widening difference between the pious and the wicked. In either case the passage may be regarded as implying that divine worship, which till that time had been confined to private families, now became public — that is, religious services were held on fixed days and in public assemblies. In <130101>1 Chronicles 1:1, the name is Anglicized ENOSH.

E'nosh

a more correct mode of Anglicizing (<130101>1 Chronicles 1:1) the name ENOS *SEE ENOS* (q.v.).

En-rim'mon

(Hebrews *Eyn Rimmon'*, ˆ/Mæræê y[,e *fountain of Rimmon;* Sept. ἐν ῾Ρεμμώ ν v. r. ἐν ῾Ρεμαώ ν, Vat. MS. omits, Vulg. *et in Remmon)*, a place occupied by the descendants of Judah after the exile (<161129>Nehemiah 11:29). It appears from the associated places to be the same with the *"Ain and Rimmon"* of <061532>Joshua 15:32 (comp. <061907>Joshua 19:7; <130432>1 Chronicles 4:32), where perhaps, in like manner, but one place is referred to, a *spring* adjoining the town of *Rimmon*. *SEE AIN*. Yet the enumeration ("five cities") of <130432>1 Chronicles 4:32 ("Ain, Rimmon") requires them to be taken as distinct. In fact, there appears to have been a Levitical city en-Rimmon near to, but originally distinct from the nonLevitical Rimmon, and indicated by a remarkable reservoir still extant in the vicinity. *SEE RIMMON.*

En-ro'gel

(Hebrews *Eyn Rcgel'*, lgeró y[,e *fount of* the *treader,* q.v. *foot-fountain;* construed by Furst, after the Targums, with the Arabic and Syriac versions, *"Fullers' Spring,"* because fullers trode the clothes in the water; but Gesenius renders *"fountain of* the *spy;"* Sept. πηγὴ ῾Ρωγή λ, Vulg. *fons Rogel)*, a spring which formed one of the landmarks on the boundary-line between Judah (<061507>Joshua 15:7) and Benjamin (18:16). It was the point next to Jerusalem, and at a lower level, as is evident from the use of the words " ascended" and "descended" in these two passages. Here, apparently concealed from the view of the city, Jonathan and Ahimaaz remained, after the flight of David, awaiting intelligence from within the walls (<101717>2 Samuel 17:17), and here, "by the stone Zoheleth, which is 'close to' (lx,ae) En-rogel," Adonijah held the feast, which was the first and last act of his attempt on the crown (<110109>1 Kings 1:9). By Josephus, on the last incident *(Ant.* 7:14, 4), its situation is given as "without the city, in the royal garden," and it is without doubt referred to by him in the same connection, in his description of the earthquake which accompanied the sacrilege of Uzziah *(Ant.* 9:10, 4), and which, "at the place called Erove" (Ἐρωγῆ v.r. Ἐῤῥωγῆ), shook down a part of the Eastern hill, "so as to obstruct the roads, and the royal gardens." In more modern times, a tradition, apparently first recorded by Quaresmius, would make En-rogel identical with what is now called by the Franks the *well of Nehemiah*, and by the natives that of *Job (Bir-Eyub).* Robinson describes it as "a deep well situated just below the junction of the valley of Hinnom with that of

Jehoshaphat. The small oblong plain there formed is covered with an olive-grove, and with the traces of former gardens extending down the valley from the present gardens of Siloam. Indeed, this whole spot is the prettiest and most fertile around Jerusalem. The vell is very deep, of an irregular quadrilateral form, walled up with large squared stones, terminating above in an arch on one side, and apparently of great antiquity. There is a small rude building over it, furnished with one or two large troughs or reservoirs of stone, which are kept partially filled for the convenience of the people. The well measures 125 feet in depth, 50 feet of which was now full of water. The water is sweet, but not very cold, and is at the present day drawn up by the hand. In the rainy season the well becomes quite full, and sometimes overflows at the mouth. Usually, however, the water runs ,off under the surface of thie ground, and finds an outlet some forty yards below the well, whence it is said to flow for sixty or seventy days in winter, and the stream is sometimes large" *(Researches,* 1:490). In favor of this identification is the fact that in the Arabic version of (0657)Joshua 15:7 the name of Ain-Eyub, or "spring of Job," is given for En-rogel, and also that in an early Jewish Itinerary (Uri of Biel, in Hottinger's *Cippi Hebraici,* page 48) the name is given as "well of *Joab,"* as if retaining the memory of Joab's connection with Adonijah — a name which it still retains in the traditions of the Greek Christians (Williams, *Holy City,* 2:490). Against this general belief the following strong but not conclusive arguments are urged by Bonar in favor of identifying En-rogel with the present "Fountain of the Virgin," *'Ain Ummed-Daraj* — “spring of the mother of steps"-the perennial source from which the Pool of Siloam is supplied *(Land of Promise,* App. 5):

1. The *Bir Eyub* is a wel and not a spring (En), while, on the other hand, the "Fountain of the Virgin" is the only real spring close to Jerusalem. This objection, however, as the above description shows, but partially applies.

2. The situation of the Fountain of the Virgin agrees somewhat better with the course of the boundary of Benjamii than that of the *Bir Eyub,* which is rather too far south. This objection, however, does not apply to the *original* boundary of Benjamin, which necessarily followed the valley of Siloam. *SEE TRIBE*.

3. *Bir Eyub* does not altogether suit the requirements of (1017)2 Samuel 17:17. It is too far off both from the city, and from the direct road over Olivet to the Jordan, and is in full view of the city (Van de Velde, 1:475),

which the other spot is not. But we may readily suppose that a more retired route and a secluded spot would have been chosen for concealment.

4. The martyrdom of St. James (q.v.) was effected by casting him down from the temple wall into the valley of Kedron, where he was finally killed by a fuller with his washing-stick (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 2:23). The natural inference is that the martyred apostle fell near where the fullers were at work. Now *Bir Eyub* is too far off from the site of the temple to allow of this, but it might very well have happened at the Fountain of the Virgin. (See Stanley's *Sermons on the Apost. Age,* page 333-4). But this is too remote and indirect an agreement, and one based upon a vague tradition.

5. *Daraj* and *Rogel* are both from the same root, and therefore the modern name may be derived from the ancient one, even though at present it is taken to allude to the "steps" by which the reservoir of the fountain is reached.

6. The Fountain of the Virgin is still the great resort of the women of Jerusalem for washing and treading their clothes.

7. The level of the king's gardens must 'have been above the *Bir Eyub,* even when the water "is at the mouth of the well, and it is generally seventy or eighty feet below; while they must have been lower than the Fountain of the Virgin, which thus might be used without difficulty to irrigate them. The last considerations, however, have little weight (see Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:528). *SEE JERUSALEM.*

Enrolment

or ἀπογραφή (Luke 2:1, "taxing"). *SEE CENSUS.*

Ens

is "either *ens reale* or *ens rationis. Ens rationis* is that which has no existence but in the idea which the mind forms of it, as a golden mountain. *Ens reale,* in philosophical language, is taken *late et stricte,* and is distinguished as *ens potentiale,* or that which may exist, and *ens actuale,* or that which does exist. It is sometimes taken as the concrete of *essentia,* and signifies what has essence and may exist as a rose in winter; sometimes as the participle of *esse,* and it then signifies what actually exists. *Ens* without intellect is *res a* thing." — Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy,* s.v.

Ensample

SEE EXAMPLE.

En-she'mesh

(Hebrews *Eyn-She'mesh* (vm;v'Aˆy[e*fountain of* the *sun;* Sept. ἡ πηγὴ ἡλίου and πηγὴ Σάμες; Vulgate, *Ensemes, id est, Fons Solis),* a spring which formed one of the landmarks on the north boundary of Judah (<06517>Joshua 15:7) and the south boundiry of Benjamin (<06817>Joshua 18:17). From these notices it appears to have been between the "ascent of Adummim" the road leading up from the Jordan valley south of the wady Kelt and the spring of En-rogel, in the valley of Kedron. It was therefore east of Jerusalem and of the Mount of Olives. The only spring at present answering to this position is the *Ain-Haud* or *Ain-Chot* — the "Well of the Apostles" — about a mile below Bethany, the traveler's first halting-place on the road to Jericho (Tobler, *Topog. von Jerus.* 2:400). The aspect of this spring is such that the rays of the sun are on it the whole day. This is not inappropriate in a cfountain dedicated to that luminary. Dr. Robinson thinks that En-shemesh must have been either this spring or the fountain near St. Saba *(Researches,* 1:493).

Ensign

Picture for Ensign

is the renderinn in the Auth. Vers. for two Hebrew words: t/a, *oth* (the flag of a single tribe, <04012>Numbers 2:2), a *sign* or *token,* as elsewhere rendered; sn,e*nes* (a lofty *signal,* e.g. a "pole," <04208>Numbers 21:8, 9), a ship's *standard or flag* ("sail," <23323>Isaiah 33:23; <26707>Ezekiel 27:7), a *beacon* or *signal* on a hill, chiefly on the irruption of an enemy, in order to point out to the people a place of rendezvous. There is a third and more emphatic word relating to the subject, namely, lgD, *de'gel* (from lgD; to *cover),* which, however, is in. variably rendered "standard" (except Cant. 2, "banner"). The distinction between these three Hebrew terms is sufficiently marked by their respective uses: NES is a *signal;* DEGEL, a military *standard* for a *large* division of an army; and OTH, the same for a *small* one. Neither of them, however, expresses the idea which "standard" conveys to our minds, viz. a *flag;* the standards in use among the Hebrews

probably resembled those of the Egyptians and Assyrians — a figure or device of some kind elevated on a pole. *SEE BANNER.*

1. The notices of the *nes* or "ensign" are most frequent; it consisted of some well-understood signal which was exhibited on the top of a pole from a bare mountain top (<23302>Isaiah 13:2; 18:3) — the very emblem of conspicuous isolation (<23017>Isaiah 30:17). Around it the inhabitants mustered, whether for the purpose of meeting an enemy (<23526>Isaiah 5:26; 18:3; 31:9), which was sometimes notified by the blast of a trumpet (<24021>Jeremiah 4:21; 51:27); or as a token of rescue (<19604>Psalm 60:4; <23110>Isaiah 11:10; <24006>Jeremiah 4:6); or for a public proclamation (Jeremiah 1, 2); or simply as a gathering point (<23922>Isaiah 49:22; 62:10). What the nature of the signal was we have no means of stating; it has been inferred from <23323>Isaiah 33:23, and <26707>Ezekiel 27:7, that it was a flag: we do not observe a flag depicted either in Egyptian or Assyrian representations of vessels (Wilkinson, 3:211; Bonomi, pages 166,167); but, in lieu of a flag, certain devices, such as the phoenix, flowers, etc., were embroidered on the sail, whence it appears that the device itself, and perhaps also the sail bearing the device, was the *nes* or "ensign." It may have sometimes been the name of a leader, as implied in the title which Moses gave to his altar, "Jehovahnissi" (<021715>Exodus 17:15). It may also have been, as Michaelis *(Suppl.* page 1648) suggests, a blazing torch. The important point, however, to be observed is, that the *nes* was an occasional signal, and not a military standard, and that *elevation* and *conspicuity* are implied in the use of the term: hence it is appropriately applied to the "pole" on which the brazen serpent hung (<042108>Numbers 21:8), which was indeed an "ensign" of deliverance to the pious Israelite: and again to the censers of Korah and his company, which became a "sign" or beacon of warning to Israel (<041638>Numbers 16:38). *SEE SIGNAL*.

2. The term *degel* is used to describe the standards which were given to each of the four divisions of the Israelitish army at the time of the Exodus (<040152>Numbers 1:52; 2:2 sq.; 10:14 sq.). Some doubt indeed exists as to its meaning in these passages, the Sept. and Vulgate regarding it not as the standard itself, but as a certain military division annexed to a standard, just as a *vexilumi* is sometimes used for a body of soldiers (Tacitus, *Hist.* 1:70; Livy, 8:8). The sense of *compact and martial array* does certainly seem to lurk in the word; for in <220604>Song of Solomon 6:4,10, the brilliant glances of the bride's eyes are compared to the destructive advance of a well. arrayed host, and a similar comparison is employed in reference to the bridegroom

(<22510>Song of Solomon 5:10); but, on the other hand, in <22204>Song of Solomon 2:4, no other sense than that of a "banner" will suit, and we therefore think the rendering in the A.V. correct. No reliance can be placed on the term in <19005>Psalm 20:5, as both the sense and the text are matters of doubt (see Olshausen and Hengstenberg, in loc.). A standard implies, of course, a standard-bearer; but the supposed notice to that officer in <23018>Isaiah 10:18, is incorrect, the words meaning rather "as a sick man pineth away;" in a somewhat parallel passage (<23919>Isaiah 59:19) the marginal version is to be followed rather than the text. The character of the Hebrew military standards is quite a matter of conjecture; they probably resembled the Egyptian, which consisted of a sacred emblem, such as an animal, a boat, or the king's name (Wilkinson, 1:294). Rabbinical writers state the devices to have been as follows: for the tribe of Judah, a lion; for Reuben, a man; for Ephraim, an ox; and for Dan, an eagle (Carpzov, *Crit. Ap.* page 667); but no reliance can be placed on this. As each of the four divisions, consisting of three tribes, had its standard, so had each tribe its " sign" *(oth)* or "ensign," probably in imitation of the Egyptians, among whom not only each battalion, but even each company, had its particular ensign (Wilkinson, 1.c.). We know nothing of its nature. The word occurs figuratively in <19704>Psalm 74:4, apparently in reference to the images of idol gods. *SEE STANDARD*.

Entablature

(Lat. *In, tabula)*, "the superstructure which lies horizontally upon the columns in classic architecture: it is divided into *architrave*, the *part* immediately above the column; *frieze*, the central sp,; and *cornice*, the upper projecting mouldings. Each of the orders has its appropriate entablature, of which, both the general height and the subdivisions are regulated by a scale of proportions derived from the diameter of the column."

En-Tannim

(Hebrews *Eyn hat-tannim',* µyNæhi ˆy2ê[, *fountain of the dragons* or *jackals;* Sept. πηγὴ τῶν συκῶν), a reservoir on the west side of Jerusalem (<16213>Nehemiah 2:13). probably the present upper pool of Gihon; Anglicized DRAGON-WELL *SEE DRAGON-WELL* (q.v.).

En-tap'puah

(Hebrews *Eyn Tappu'ach,* jWPTiˆy[e; *fountain of Tappuah;* Sept. ἡ πηγὴ Θαπφουέ v.r. Θαφθώθ), a spring near the city Tappuah (q.v.), put for that place in 1607Joshua 17:7 (comp. verse 8).

Entelechy

(ἐντελέχεια, from ἐντελές, *perfect;* and ἔχειν, to *have;* in Latin *perfectihabia).* "In one of the books of the Pythagoreans, viz. *Ocellus Lucanus,* Περὶ τοῦ πάντος, the word συντέλεια is used in the same sense. Hence it has been thought that this was borrowed from the Pythagoreans" (Monboddo, *Ancient Metaphysics,* book 1, chapter 3, page 16, note). Cicero *(Tuscul. Qucest.* lib. 1, quaest. 1) interprets it to mean *quandam quasi continuatam motionem et perennem.* Melancthon *(Opera,* 13:12-14, ed. 1846) gives two interpretations of *endelechy,* as he writes it. He says that ἐνδελεχές signifies *continuus,* and ἐνδελέχεια *continuitas.* According to him, Aristotle used it as synonymous with ἐνέργεια. Hence Cicero translated it by continuous movement or agitation. Argyropolus blames Cicero for this, and explains it as meaning "interior perfection," as if it were τὸ ἐντὸς τελειοῦν. But Melancthon thinks Cicero's explanation in accordance with the philosophy of Aristotle. According to others, ἐνδελέχεια means *continuance,* and is a totally different word from ἐντελέχεια, which means *actuality* (Arist. *Metaphys.* Bohn's Libr. page 68, 301; Donaldson, *New Cratylus,* pages 339-344). According to Leibnitz, *"entelecheia* is derived apparently from the Greek word which signifies *perfect,* and therefore the celebrated Hermolaus Barbarus expressed it in Latin, word for word, *by perfecti habia,* for act is the accomplishment of power; and he needed not to have consulted the devil, as he did, they say, to tell him this much (Leibnitz, *Theodicae,* part 1, § 87). You may give the name of *entelechies* to all simple substances or created monads, for they have in them a certain perfection (ἔχουσι τὸ ἐντελές), they have a sufficiency (αὐτάρχεια) which makes them the source of their internal actions, and, so to say, incorporeal automatons" *(Monadologie, §* 18).. He calls a nomad an autarchic automaton, or first *entelechie,* having life and force in itself. *"Entelechy is* the opposite to *potentiality,* yet would be ill translated by that which we often oppose to potentiality, *actuality.* Εἶδος expresses the substance of each thing viewed in repose — its form or constitution; ἐνέργεια its substance; considered as active and generative; ἐντελέχεια seems to be the synthesis or harmony of

these two ideas. The *effectio* of Cicero, therefore, represents the most important side of it, but not the whole" (Maurice, *Mor. and Metaphys. Philosophy*, page 191, note). Ἐντελέχεια ce qui a en soi sa fin, qui par consequent. ne releve que de soi-m-'m, et constitue une units indivisible (Cousin, *note to his transl.* of Aristotle, in *taph.* book 12, page 212). " *L'Entelechie* est opposee a la simple puissance, comme la forme a la matiere, l'etre au possible. C'est elle qui, par la vertu de la fin, constitue l'essence meme des choses, et imprime le mouvement a la matiere aveugle; et c'est en ce sens qu' Aristote, a pu donner de l'ame cette celebre definition, qu'elle est l'entelechie ou forme premiere de tout corps naturel qui possede la vie en puissance" *(Diet. des Sciences Philosophiques).* Aristotle defines the soul of man to be an *entelechy*, a definition of which Dr. Reid said he could make no sense. — Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s.v.

Entertainment

(hTæv]mæa *"feast,"* comp. ξενιζω, to "entertain" a stranger, <580132>Hebrews 13:2). This took place among the Hebrews sometimes in connection with a public festival (Deuteronomy 16; Tob. 2:1) and accompanied by offerings, *SEE SACRIFICIAL FESTIVAL*, (<090913>1 Samuel 9:13; 16:3; <110109>1 Kings 1:9; 3:15; in token of alliance, <012630>Genesis 26:30; 31:54); sometimes with a domestic or social occurrence, and, so faras the latter reference is concerned, they were chiefly held at the weaning of children (<012108>Genesis 21:8; comp. Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 6:243 sq.), at weddings (<012922>Genesis 29:22; <071410>Judges 14:10; <430201>John 2:1 sq.), on birthdays (<180104>Job 1:4), particularly in royal courts (<014020>Genesis 40:20 [?<280705>Hosea 7:5]; <401906>Matthew 19:6; comp. Herod. 1:133; 9:109; Lucian, *Gall.* 9; Athen. 4:143; see Dougtaei, *Analect.* 1:44; 2:33; Laurent, *De notalit. convitiisque quae in iisdem agitabantur*, in Gronovii *Thesaur.* 8), on the reception and departure of dear friends or else respected personages (<011903>Genesis 19:3; <100320>2 Samuel 3:20; 20:4; <120623>2 Kings 6:23; Tobit 7:9; 8:20 sq.; 1 Macc. 16:15; 2 Macc. 2:28; <420529>Luke 5:29; 15:23 sq.; <431202>John 12:2), at sheepshearing (<100823>2 Samuel 13:23; <092512>1 Samuel 25:2, 36), and vintage (<070927>Judges 9:27), also at funerals (<100335>2 Samuel 3:35; <241607>Jeremiah 16:7; Tob. 4:18 [the µynæa µj,l,of <280904>Hosea 9:4]; comp. Josephus, *War*, 2:1, 1; Homer, *II.* 23:29; 24:802; see Harmer, 3:203), and mostly occurred in the evening (Josephus, *War*, 1:17, 4). The guests were invited by servants (<200903>Proverbs 9:3; <402203>Matthew 22:3 sq.), in more, honorable instances a

second time (Matthew 22:4; comp. Luke 14:7; comp. Eskuche, *Erlduter.* 2:410 sq.), and these summoners (like the Roman *vocatores* or *invitatores)* seem to have had the business of assigning the guests their relative position (Walch, *Observ. in Matthew ex inscript.* page 62). On their arrival the guests were kissed (Tob. 9:8; Luke 7:45), their feet were washed (Luke 7:44; comp. Homer, *II.* 10:576 sq.; *Odyss.* 3:476; 8:454; Petron. *Sat.* 31; see Dougtaei *Anal.* 1:52); the hair of their head and beard, even their clothes, oftentimes their feet (Luke 7:38; John 12:3; comp. Athen. 12:553), anointed with costly oil (Psalm 23:5; Amos 6:6; comp. Homer, *II.* 10:577; Plutarch, *Sympos.* 3:6, page 654; Petron. *Sat.* 65; Lucret. 4:1125; see Walch, *De unctionibus vet. Ebrceor. convivialibus,* Jen. 1751), and their persons decked with garlands, with which their head was especially adorned (Isaiah 28:1; Wisd. 2:7 sq.; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 19:9, 1; Athen. 15:685; Plutarch, *Sympos.* 3:1 page 645; 3:6, page 654; Philostr. *Apoll.* 2:27; Aristoph. *Av.* 460; Horace, *Od.* 2:7, 23; *Sat.* 2:3, 256; Plautus, *Mencechm.* 3:1, 16; Lucretius, 4:1125; Juvenal, 5:36; Petron. 65; Ovid, *Fast.* 5:337); and then, with consideration to the rank (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:2, 4); comp. Becker, *Charicles,* 1:427), they were assigned their respective places (1 Samuel 9:22; Luke 14:8; Mark 12:39; Philo, 2:78; comp. Buckingham, *Mesopot.* 1:279). All received, as a rule, like portions sent by the master of the house (1 Samuel 1:4; 2 Samuel 6:19; 1 Chronicles 16:3; comp. Homer, *Odyss. 20:*280 sq.; *II.* 24:626; Plutarch, *Sympos.* 2:10, pages 642, 644), which, however, when special honor was intended, was doubled, or even increased fivefold (Genesis 43:34; comp. Herod. 6:57), or a tidbit sent in place of it (1 Samuel 9:24; compare Homer, *II.* 7:321; see Koster, *Erlauter.* page 197 sq.). The management of the entertainment was in the hands of the *architriclinus* (q.v.) (John 2:8), generally a friend of the family (comp. Sir. 32:1, 23; see Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 5:223). The pride of the entertainer exhibited itself partly in the number of the guests (Genesis 29:22; 1 Samuel 9:22; 1 Kings 1:9, 25; Luke 5:29; 14:16), partly in expense of the eating and drinking vessels (Esth. 1:6 sq.; compare Curtius, 8:12, 16; see Kype, *De apparatu conviv. regis Persar.* Regiom. 1755), partly and especially in the variety and excellence of the viands (Genesis 27:9; Isaiah 25:6; Amos 6:4; Job 8:21; comp. Psalm 23:5; Job 28:16; Niebuhr, *Trav.* 3:385), as well as their richness (Genesis 18:6; 1 Samuel 9:24; Judges 6:19). Such banquets also lasted longer than with Occidentals (3 Macc. 6:28; comp. Esth. 1:3 sq.; Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 3:294), and in Persia weighty state

interests were discussed and determinations reached at the royal table (Esth. 1:15; 7:1 sq.; Herod. 1:113; Plutarch, *Sympos.* 7:9; Ammian. Marc. 18:5, page 169, Bip. ed.; Athen. 4:144; comp. Tacit. *Germ.* 22). The amusement consisted in part of music eand song (<2162>Isaiah 5:12; <3065>Amos 6:5; <1913>Psalm 69:13; Sir. 32:7; comp. Homer, *Odyss.* 17:358; Rosenmiller, *Morgenl.* 5:200), also the dance (<4146>Matthew 14:6), in part of jests and riddles (<7142>Judges 14:12 sq.; compare Athen. 10:452, 457). At their departure the guests "were again perfumed, especially on the beard (Maundrell, page 400 sq.). The women feasted on such occasions probably not with the men (Buckingham, 2:404), but in a separate apartment (Esth. 1:9; see Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 3:296; Bachelor, *Chron.* page 98; comp. the later meretricious custom, <2762>Daniel 5:2; Judith 12:11 sq.; Herod. 5:18); but in plebeian homes the sexes were intermingled (<4208>John 12:8). The Israelites were forbidden heathenish sacrificial entertainments (<2345>Exodus 34:15; yet see <4251>Numbers 25:1 sq.), partly because these were in honor of false worship, and partly because they would thus be liable to partake of unclean flesh (<4608>1 Corinthians 10:28). See Buxtorf, *De conviv. Ebr.* in Ugolini *Thesaurus* 30; Geier, *De Vet. Ebr. ratione ccenandi,* in the *Biblioth. Lubec.* vi, sq.; Stuck, *Antiquit. conviv.* (Tigur. 1597); Mercurial. *De arte gymnast.* page 75 sq. ed. Amst. *SEE MEAL-TIME.*

An especial sort of entertainment were the κῶμοι, or *comissationes* (“revellings"), which played so conspicuous a part in the sensual times during which the apostles labored (<4513>Romans 13:13; <4052>Galatians 5:21; <6043>1 Peter 4:3). Young men assembled to banquetings on festival occasions, or in the crowd of public associations, became excited with song or music, and traversed the streets inspired with wine, jubilating, and committing many extravagances (comp. Wetstein, 2:85 sq.; Bos, *Observ. in N.T.* page 117 sq.; Schwarz, *De comessatione vet.* Altdorf, 1744; Ilgen, *De poesi scol.* p. 197 sq.; Apulej. ed. Oudenorp. 1:133 sq.). On the luxury and wantonness of entertainments generally in the Roman period, see Philo, 2:477 sq. The rich Jews followed the example of their pagan masters. *SEE FEAST.*

Enthusiasm

(ἐνθουσιασμός from ἔνθεος, *inspired; God-possessed; rapt)* is used both in a good and a bad sense.

1. In the first, which springs from its derivation, it signifies divine inspiration in general; or, secondarily, any extraordinary mental or moral exaltation. "The raptures of the poet, the deep meditations of the philosopher, the heroism of the warrior, the devotedness of the martyr, and the ardor of the patriot, are so many different phases of *enthusiasm.*" In this sense it "is almost a synonyme of genius; the moral life in the intellectual light, the will in the reason; and without it, says Seneca, nothing truly great was ever achieved" (Coleridge). "There is a temper of mind called enthusiasm, which, though rejecting the authority neither of reason nor of virtue, triumphs over all the vulgar infirmities of men, contemns their ordinary pursuits, braves danger, and despises obloquy, which is the parent of heroic acts and devoted sacrifices, and which devotes ease, pleasure, interest, ambition, and life to the service of one's fellow-men" (Mackintosh, *Miscellaneous Works,* London 1851, page 731).

2. The bad sense of the word was formerly in much more common use than now. According to it, an enthusiast is one who substitutes his own fancies for reason and truth, especially in matters of religion. "Every enthusiast is properly a madman; yet his is not an ordinary, but a religious madness. The enthusiast is generally talking of religion, of God, or of the things of God, but talking in such a manner that any reasonable Christian may discern the disorder of his mind. Such enthusiasm may be described, in general, as a religious madness arising from some falsely imagined influence or inspiration of God; at least, from imputing something to God which ought not to be imputed to him, or expecting something from God which ought not to be expected from him" (Wesley, *Sermon on Enthusiasm, Works,* 2:331 sq.). Warburton similarly defines enthusiasm as "that temper of mind in which the imagination has got the better of the judgment" *(Div. Leg.* book 5, Appendix). James Blair *(Sermons,* 1740, 4:274) makes religious enthusiasm to consist especially in "setting up the private spirit to assert anything contrary to Scripture." So Waterland *(Works,* Oxford, 1843, 4:422) says that “enthusiasm, in the bad sense, is a subtle device of Satan upon ill-meaning or unmeaning instruments, making use of their ambition, self-admiration, or other weakness, to draw them by some plausible suggestions into a vain conceit that they have something within them either of equal authority with Scripture, or superior to it." On the stupid misapplication of the term enthusiasm by worldly men to designate true Christian life, see Wesley's sermon above, and also Taylor, *Natural Hist. of Enthusiasm* (N.Y. 1834, 4th ed. 12mo).

Entity

(entitas), "in the scholastic philosophy, was synonymous with essence or form. To all individuals of a species there is something in conmmon — a nature which transiently invests all, but belongs exclusively to none. This essence, taken by itself and viewed apart from any individual, was what the scholastics called an *entity*. It denoted the common nature of the individuals of a species or genus. It was the idea or model according to which we conceived of them. The question whether there was a reality corresponding to this idea divided philosophers into *Nominalists* and *Realists* (q.v.). *Entity* is also used to denote anything that exists, as an object of sense or of thought. *SEE ENS*." — Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy,* page 162.

Entrance into the Church

Certain ceremonies early grew into use as signs of reverence on the part of Christians on entering the church building. They washed their hands and faces in the fountains or cisterns which were generally found in the *atrium* or court before the church; probably referring to the Psalmist's expression, "I will wash my hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar." Many took off their shoes or sandals, especially when they went to receive the Eucharist; interpreting as applicable to themselves the command to Moses, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." In some instances bowing towards the altar was practiced; and when emperors or kings went into the house of God, they not only left their arms and guard, but also their crowns, behind them. It was also not uncommon for men to kiss the doors, threshold, or pillars in token of their love. The germ of many of the absurd practices and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church may be found in these customs. — Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Diet.* s.v.; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 8, chapter 10, § 12.

Entwisle, Joseph

a Wesleyan Methodist minister, was born in Manchester, England, April 15, 1767. At sixteen he began to preach, and in 1787 Mr. Wesley called him into the itinerant ministry. He devoted himself to his work, studying theology, under many difficulties, and also the ancient languages. He filled acceptably a number of the most important appointments, and in 1812 was chosen president of the Conference. In 1834 he was made governor of the

Wesleyan Theological Institution, in which office he remained until 1838, when his infirm health compelled him to retire. He died at Tadcaster in 1841. See *Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Entwisle,* by his Son (Lond. 1850, 12mo); *Methodist Quarterly Review,* April 1851, page 305.

Enzinas

(or Encinas), Francisco de, a Spanish Protestant, was born at Burgos about 1520. He is commonly named Dryander, and also used the names Duchesne, Van Eyck, Eichman, all of the same meaning *(oak-man)* as the Spanish name Enzinas. After completing his academical studies in Italy, he went to Louvain, and studied there, and also spent some time with Melancthon at Wittemberg. Having wealthy relatives in the Netherlands, he fixed his abode there, and openly embraced the Reformed cause. He published a Spanish version of the N.T., dedicated to Charles V (1543). He was arrested December 13, 1543, and imprisoned at Brussels. He escaped in February 1545, to Antwerp, thence to Germany and England (1548). He carried letters of commendation from Melancthon to Edward VI and to Cranmer, who received him warmly, and gave him a post at Oxford. After somer time he returned to the Continent, and continued his literary labors at Strasburg, Basle, and Geneva. He died about 1570. — McCrie, *Reformation in Spain,* chapter 5; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 15:122.

Enzinas Jayme de

a Spanish Protestant, brother of the preceding (known, like his brother, bythe name Dryander), studied at Louvain and Paris, and embraced Reformed principles. At the request of his father he returned to Italy, and remained there in great uneasiness for some years. He was preparing to rejoin his brother in Germany when he was denounced before the Inquisition as a heretic. He was tried, condemned, and burnt alive in 1546. — McCrie,, *Reformation in Spain,* chapter 5.

Eon or Eudo de Stella

a fanatic nobleman who lived in the middle of the 12th century. He was a native of the Bretagne, and a man without education. In the form used in exorcising evil spirits he heard these words, *"per Eum, qui venturus es tjudicare vivos et mortuos,*" and concluded, from the resemblance between the word *Eum* and his own name, that he was the person who should judge the quick and the dead. His views seem to be connected with those of the

Cathari. He is said to have taught that baptism was of value only for believers; that the only true baptism was that of the Spirit by the imposition of hands; that the hierarchy had not been instituted by God; that the Church of Rome was not the true Church, because her priests did not lead a holy life. He denied the resurrection of the body, and rejected marriage as a sacrament. He went about preaching these doctrines, found many adherents, and was reported to possess thepower of working miracles. In 1145 the cardinal-legate Albericus came from Ostia to the Bretagne, and preached against Eon and his adherents at Nanteso. He also induced archbishop Hugo, of Rouen, to write a work against him, which is, however, rather a diffuse explanation of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, than a refutation of Eon *(Dogmatum Christianae idei contra haereticos sui temporis libri tres; Bibl. Patru. Max.* tom. 22). At the same time troops were sent out against the new heretics, and in the diocese of Alet many were burned. Eon withdrew into the province of Guienne; in 1148 he repaired to Champagne, where his band was scattered, and he, together with some of his prominent adherents, was captured. He was taken before the council at Rheims, and asked, who he was. He replied, *Is qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.* The synod declared him to be insane, and charged the archbishop of Rheims to take care of him. Many of his followers were sentenced to be burned. After Eon's death the sect soon died out. — Schmidt, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 4:212; Wetzeru. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:602; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* book 3, cent. 12 part 3, chapter 5, § 16; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3, div. 3, chapter 7, § 84. (A.J.S.)

Eon

SEE GNOSTICISM.

Eonian

SEE EON.

Eoquinians

a sect of the 16th century; socalled from one Eoquinus, who taught that Christ did not die for the wicked, but for the faithful only.

Epact

"in chronology, is the excess of the solar month above the lunar synodical month; or of the solar year above the lunar year of twelve synodical

months; or of several solar months above as many synodical months; or of several solar years above as many periods, each consisting of 12 synodical months. The menstrual epact is the excess of the civil calendarmonth above the lunar month. For a month of 31 days, this epact is 1 day 11 hours 15 minutes 57 seconds, if we suppose new moon to occur on the first day of the month. The annual epact is the excess of the solar year above the lunar. As the Julian solar year is (nearly) 365 days, and the Julian lunar year is (nearly) 354 days, the annual epact is nearly 11 days. The epact for two Julian years is, therefore, nearly 22 days; for three years, 33 days; and so on. When, however, the epact passes 30 days, 30 falls to be deducted from it, as making an intercalary month. For three years, then, the epact is properly 3; and for 4 years, adding 11 days, it is 14 days; and so on. Following the cycle, starting from a new moon on the 1st of January, we find that the epact becomes 30 or 0 in the 19th year. The epact for the 20th year is again 11; and so on. The years in the cycle are marked by Roman numerals I, II, III, etc., called the Golden Numbers; and a table of the Julian epacts exhibits each year in the cycle with its golden number and epact. As the Gregorian year, *SEE CALENDAR*, differs from and is in advance of the Julian by 11 days (the number lost on the Julian account before the Gregorian computation of time was introduced in England), and as 11 days is the difference between the solar and lunar years, it follows that the Gregorian epact for any year is the same with the Julian epact for the year preceding 1."

Epeen'etus

(Ἐπαίνετος, *commendable),* a Christian resident at Rome when Paul wrote his epistle to the Church in that city, and one of the persons to whom he sent special salutations (Romans 16:5). A.D. 55. In the received text he is spoken of as being *"the first-fruits ofAchaia"* (ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας); but "the first-fruits of Asia" (τῆς Ἀσίας) is the reading of the best MSS. (a A B C D E F G 67), of the Coptic, Armenian, AEthiopic, Vulgate, the Latin fathers, and Origen *(In Ep. ad Romans Comment.* lib. 10, *Opera,* 7, page 431; *In Numer. Hom.* 11, *Opera,* 10, page 109). This reading is preferred by Grotius, Mill, Bengel,Whitby, Koppe, Rosenmuller, Ruckert, Olshausen, and Tholuck; and admitted into the text by Griesbach, Knapp, Tittmann, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorff; also by Bruder, in his edition of Schmidt's Concordance, Lips. 1842. Dr. Bloomfield, who also adopts it in his Greek Testaments (2d ed. 1836), remarks that "the

very nature of the term ἀπαρχή suggests the idea of *one person* only (see 461520 1 Corinthians 15:20), and, as in 461615 1 Corinthians 16:15, *Stephanas* is called the ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας, Epaenetus could have no claim to the name." With respect to the former part of this statement, the learned writer has strangely overlooked such passages as 590118 James 1:18, " that *we* should be a kind of first-fruits" (ἀπαρχήν τινα), and 661404 Revelation 14:4, "These were redeemed from among men, being the first-fruits" (ἀπαρχή): and as to the latter part, not Stephanas alone, but his *house,* is said to be the first-fruits, and to have addicted *themselves* (ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς) to the ministry of the saints.' Macknight's remark in favor of the received reading, that if Epsenetus was one of that house, he was a part of the first-fruits of Achaia, seems somewhat forced. The synopsis of the pseudo-Dorotheus makes him first bishop of Carthage, but Justinian remarks that the African churches do not recognize him.

Epaon

Synod of, *Concilium Epaonense or Epaunense,* a general synod of the Catholic bishops of Burgundy, held in 517. A great change in the relation of the Catholic Church of Burgundy to the state government took place in 516, when the new king Sigmond, son of the Arian king Gundobald, joined it. The Catholic Church thus became the State Church, though it does not appear that Sigmond, like so many kings of his times, aspired to exercise a controlling influence upon Church affairs. The Council of Epaon, which was to establish Church discipline in the .new Catholic kingdom upon a permanent basis, was not called by the king, but by Avitus, bishop of Vienne, and Viventiolus, metropolitan of Lyons. The letters of both bishops are still extant. That of Viventiolus is addressed to all bishops, clergymen, lords, and notables of the land, complains of want of discipline among the clergy, and invites every one who has to bring charges against the moral conduct of any clergyman to appear before the council. The clergymen are commanded to be present, and the laymen are permitted to attend in order that the people may receive information of what the bishops will decree. The letter of Avitus complains that the Church law ordering the holding of two synods every year had entirely fallen into disuse, and states that he had been censured by the Pope on this account, and had been commanded to assemble a synod, to renew and enforce the old Church laws, as far as they were still applicable, and to add, if necessary, new ones. As no such censure can be found in a letter of the Pope to Avitus, written in February 517, nor in any other papal letter extant, it has been inferred

(Vogel, in Herzog's *Real-Enycklop.* s.v.) that Avitus, in order to secure the meeting of the council, used the papal authority to a greater extent than he was authorized to do. In compliance with the letters of invitation, 24 bishops appeared personally at Epaon, and one sent representatives. Their deliberations were of but short duration, and on September 14, 517, the bishops signed the acts upon which, "under divine inspiration," they had agreed. The acts consist of a brief preface and 40 canons which concern the conduct of bishops, clergymen, monks, secular authorities, and laymen, the intercourse with the Arian heretics, the property and discipline of the Church. . The provisions concerning the heretics are of special importance. Catholic clergymen, under severe penalties, are forbidden to sit at table with heretics. With a Jew no layman shall dine, under penalty of being never admitted to a clergyman's table. Heretics who wish to join the Church must apply to the bishops personally; only when they are on the death-bed they may be received by a priest. The church edifices of the heretics are declared to be objects worthy of special horror, and their purification is declared impossible. The 30th canon forbids marriages with near relatives, in particular with the sister of a deceased wife. This canon directly concerned a prominent officer at the royal court, Stephanus, who was married to his sister-in-law Palladia. The bishops seem to have anticipated trouble from the opposition of Stephanus, for, after the dissolution of the Council of Epaon, eleven bishops, among whom was Apollinaris, bishop of Valence and brother of Avitus, went to Lyons, where, under the presidency of Viventiolus, they agreed upon a line of conduct for the enforcement of the canon, providing even for the case that the king should leave the Church, and appoint Arian bishops for some of the episcopal sees.

A part of the canons of Epaon remained in force in Southern France, as canons of the Council of Agde *("Agathenses").* This council had been held in 504, and established 47 canons, to which subsequently, for the purpose of obtaining a complete code of discipline, 24 canons of other councils were added; of these 24, 13 were taken from the Council of Epaon.

The site of Epaon cannot be established with certainty. According to some, it is the little town of Yenne, in Savoy, on the left bank of the Rhone; according to others, a little village, Ponas, about half way between Lyons and Vienne. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:75; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:603; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* 2:660; Landon, *Manual of*

Councils, page 224; Mansi, *Coll. Concil.* 8:310; Labbe, *Dissertatio de Concil. Epaunensi.* (A.J.S.)

Ep'aphras

(Ἐπαφρᾶς, usually considered a contraction of *Epaphroditus*, but the last syllable in that case is hardly regular), an eminent teacher in the Church at Colossae, denominated by Paul "his dear fellow-servant," and "a faithful minister (διάκονος) of Christ" (<51107>Colossians 1:7; 4:12). A.D. 57. It has been inferred from <51107>Colossians 1:7 that he was the founder of the Colossian Church; and Dr. Neander supposes that the apostle terms him ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος Χριστοῦ *(a servant of Christ in our stead)* because he committed to him the office of proclaiming the Gospel in the three Phrygian cities Colossae, Hierapolis, and Laodicea, which he could not visit himself *(Hist. of Planting*, 1:200, 373). This language, however, is by no means decisive; yet most probably Epaphras was one of the earliest and most zealous instructors of the Colossian Church (see Alford's prolegomena to that epistle, *Gr. Test.* 3:35 sq.). Lardner thinks that the expression respecting Epaphras in Coloss. 4:12, ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν, is quite inconsistent with the supposition of his being the founder of the Church, since the same phrase is applied to Onesimus, a recent convert *(Hist. of the Apostles and Evangelists*, c. 14; *Works*, 6:153). But in both cases the words in question seem intended simply to identify these individuals as the fellow-townsmen of the Colossians, and to distinguish them from others of the same name in Rome (see Macknight on <51107>Colossians 4:2). He was at that time with Paul at Rome (<51107>Colossians 4:12), and seems by the expression there used to have been at least a Colossian by birth. We find him again mentioned in the epistle to Philemon (verse 23), which was sent at the same time as that to the Colossians. Paul there calls him ὁ συναιχμαλωτός μου, *my fellow-prisoner;* but some regard the word there as only a tender and delicate expression of Epaphras's attention to the apostle in his imprisonment (comp. <51107>Romans 16:13). The martyrologies make Epaphras to have been first bishop of Colossee, and to have suffered martyrdom there. *SEE EPAPHRODITUS.*

Epaphrodi'tus

(Ἐπαφρόδιτος, belonging *to Aphrodite*, or Venus), a messenger (ἀπόστολος) of the Church at Philippi to the apostle Paul during his imprisonment at Rome, who was intrusted with their contributions for his

support (Philippians 2:25; 4:18). A.D. 57. Paul's high estimate of his character (see Evans, *Script. Biog.* 2:300) is shown by an accumulation of honorable epithets (τὸν ἀδελφόν, καὶ συνεργόν, καὶ συστρατιώτην μου), and by fervent expressions of gratitude for his recovery from a dangerous illness brought on in part by a generous disregard of his per. sonal welfare in ministering to the apostle (Philippians 2:30). Epaphroditus, on his return to Philippi, was the bearer of the epistle which forms part of the canon. Grotius and some other critics conjecture that Epaphroditus was the same as the *Epaphras* mentioned in the epistle to the Colossians (see Sirk. *De Epaphrodito Philippensiumn apostolo,* Lips. 1741; Strohbach, *De Epaphra Colossensi,* Lips. 1710). But, though the latter name may be a contraction of the former, the fact that Epaphras was most probably in prison at the time, sufficiently marks the distinction of the persons. The name Epaphroditus was by no means uncommon (see Tacit. *Ann.* 15:55; Sueton. *Domit.* 14; Joseph. *Life,* 76), as Wetstein has shown *(Nov. Test. Gr.* 2:273).

Eparch

(ἔπαρχος, *ruler over* a district), a commander (e.g. of vessels, AEschylus, *Ag.* 1227), hence *praefect* of a province (comp. ἐπαρχία, Acts 23:24; 25:1); applied as a title to Sisinnes (q.v.), the Persian satrap of Syria (1 Esdr. 7:1, "governor"). *SEE TOPARCHY*, etc.

Eparchy

(ἐπαρχία) was the official term of a province in the administration of the Roman empire. It consisted of a number of communities, and was a subdivision of a diocese (διοίκησις). In the organization of the Church, the ecclesiastical heads of communities were called bishops, those of the capitals of eparchies, metropolitans; those of the dioceses, patriarchs. The term eparchy is thus used in can. 4 of the Council of Nice, and by Macarius of Ancyra (Suicer, *Thesaur. Ecces.* s.v.). The meaning of the term was subsequently changed in the Greek Church, so as to denote, in general, the diocese of any bishop, archbishop, or metropolitan). In Russia the eparchies are divided into three classes, the first of which comprised in 1866 the four metropolitan sees of Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and Novgorod; the second twenty sees, the incumbents of which, with the exception of one, had the title archbishop; the third twenty-nine sees, six of which had the title archbishop, while the others were merely bishops.

Eparchies can be transferred at the pleasure of the czar from one class to the other. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:80; Wetzeru. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:604; *Churchman's Calendar for* 1868. *SEE GREEK CHURCH AND RUSSIA. (A.J.S.)*

Epee Charles Michel De L',

born in Versailles November 25, 1712, was distinguished for his labors in behalf of the deaf and dumb. He entered into orders as a Roman Catholic priest, but, having been interdicted from the exercise of his functions, he devoted himself to the care of deaf mutes. Two young girls, mutes, had been under the care of father Vanin, at whose death L'Epee took charge of them. From this time his talents, time, and property were all consecrated to this cause. He framed a series of signs (the basis of the system now in use), and his success induced the due de Penthievre and others to aid him. He organized an asylum, which, after his death, was taken under the patronage of the French government, and placed under Sicard (q.v.), the worthy successor of L'Epee. He died at Paris December 23, 1789. ' His writings give full accounts of his method; among them are *Institution des Sourds et des Muets,* 1774, 12mo; enlarged edition, 1776, 12mo; and again improved, 1784, 12mo. See especially his *Art d'enseigner a parler aux Sourds Muets,* with notes by Sicard, and the *eloge* of L'Epee by M. Bebian (Paris, 1820, 8vo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Ggner.* 30:829.

Epefanoftschins

a Russian sect, followers of a monk of Kiev who was ordained bishop through forged letters of recommendation. He died in prison, but is esteemed a martyr by his followers. Their sentiments are nearly the same as the *Starobredsi,* or Old Ceremonialists. Pinkerton's *Greek Church,* page 304. *SEE RUSSIA*; *SEE RUSSIAN SECTS*.

Epen'etus

SEE EPAENETUS.

E'phah

(Hebrews *Eyphah',* hpy[e *gloom),* the name of a tribe (including that of the founder), also of a woman and of a man.

1. (Sept. Γεφάρ v.r. in Chron. Γαιφάρ, Isaiah Γαιφά.) The first in order of the five sons of Midian (<012504>Genesis 25:4; <130133>1 Chronicles 1:33), B.C. cir. 1988; afterwards mentioned by Isaiah in the following words: "The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; all they from Sheba shall come: they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify tlhe house of my glory" (<236006>Isaiah 60:6, 7). This passage clearly connects the descendants of Ephah with the Midianites, the Keturahite Sheba, and the Ishmaelites, both in the position of their settlements and in their wandering habits, and shows that, as usual, they formed a tribe bearing his name. But no satisfactory identification of this tribe has been discovered. The Arabic word *Gheyfeh*, which has been supposed to be the same as Ephah, is the name of a town, or village, near Pelusium, or Bulbeys (the modern Bilbeys), a place in Egypt, in the province of Sharklyeh, not fai from Cairo; but the tradition that Ephah settled in Africa does not rest on sufficient authority. *SEE MIDIAN*.

2. (Sept. Γαιφά.) A concubine of Caleb, of the tribe of Judah, by whom she had several sons (<130246>1 Chronicles 2:46). B.C. post 1856.

3. (Sept. Γαιφά.) A son of Jahdai, who was apparently the grandson of the oldest of the foregoing sons (<130247>1 Chronicles 2:47). B.C. long post 1856.

Ephah

(הפיע, *eyphah'*, rarely הפע, *ephah'*), a measure of grain, containing "*three seahs* or *ten omers*," and equivalent in capacity to the *bath* for liquids (<021636>Exodus 16:36; <091717>1 Samuel 17:17; <380506>Zechariah 5:6; <070619>Judges 6:19; <080217>Ruth 2:17; the "double ephah," <202010>Proverbs 20:10; <052514>Deuteronomy 25:14; <300805>Amos 8:5, means two ephahs, the one just, the other false). According to Josephus (*Ant.* 8:2, 9), the ephah contained 72 sextarii, equal to the Attic (liquid) metretes, or 1933.95 Paris cubic inches, about 1 and one-twelfth bushels English (see Bockh, *Metrolog. Untersuch.* pages 259, 278). This is also confirmed by other testimony; so that there is doubtless an error in another passage of Josephus (*Ant.* 15:9, 2), where the ephah seems to be equal to 96 sextarii, or the Attic medimnus. The origin of this word is to be sought in the Egyptian language, where it signifies a *measure*, especially of corn, from which comes the Sept. rendering οἰφί

(see Rediger, in *Allg. Encyklop.* s.v.; Gesenius, *Thes. Ling. Hebrews* in Append.). *SEE MEASURES.*

E'phai

(Hebrews *Ephay'* ypy[e text ypiwø[efor ypi/ [, *Ophay'], languid,* hence *gloomy;* Sept. Ἰωφέ v.r. Ωφέ, Ωφή, and Ωφέτ, *Vulg. Ophi),* a Netophathite, whose sons were among the "captains (µyr æ) of the forces" left in Judah after the deportation to Babylon, and who warned the Babylonian governor of the plots against him (<244008>Jeremiah 40:8). B.C. 588. They submitted themselves to Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor, and were apparently massacred with him by Ishmael (41:3; comp. 40:13).

Epheh

SEE VIPER.

E'pher

(Hebrews *id.* rp,[ethe *gopher,* so called from its gray or ashy color), the name of a tribe (including that of its founder) and of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἀφείρ v.r. Ὀφείρ, in Chron. Ὀφέρ, Vulg. *Opher* and *Epher.)* The second in order of the sons of Midian (<012504>Genesis 25:4; <130133>1 Chronicles 1:33), Abraham's son by Keturah. B.C. post 1988. According to Gesenius, the name is equivalent to the Arabic *Ghifr,* signifying "a calf," and "a certain little animal, or insect, or animalcule." Two tribes bear a similar appellation, *Ghifar;* but one was a branch of the first Amalek, the other of the Ishmaelite Kinaneh (comp. Caussin, *Essai sur l'Hist. des Arabes,* 1:20, 297, 298; and Abulfeda, *Hist. Anteislamica,* edit. Fleischer, page 196): neither is ascribed to Midian. The first settled about Yethrib (El-Medineh); the second in the neighborhood of Mekkeh. *SEE MIDIAN*.

2. (Sept. Ἀφέρ v.r. Γαφέρ, *Vulg. Epher.)* The third son of Ezra, a descendant of the tribe of Judah, and apparently of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (<130417>1 Chronicles 4:17). B.C. cir. 1618.

3. (Sept. Ὀφέρ, Vulg. *Epher.)* The head of one of the families of Manasseh cast, who were carried away by Tiglath-Pileser (<130524>1 Chronicles 5:24). B.C. ante 740. The name may be compared with that of Ophrah (q.v.), the native place of Gideon, in Manasseh, on the west of Jordan.

E'phes-dam'mim

(Heb. *E'phes Dammim'*, spa,µyMid; appar. *boundary of blood;* Sept. Ἀφεσδομίν or Ἀφεσδομμείν v.r. Ἐφερμόν, *Vulg. fines Dommin), a* place in the tribe of Judah between Shochoh and Azekah, where the Philistines were encamped when David fought with Goliath (<091701>1 Samuel 17:1). The similar, but not parallel passage (<131113>1 Chronicles 11:13), has the shorter form *Pas-Dammim.* The name was probably derived from its being the scene of frequent sanguinary encounters between Israel and the Philistines. On his way from Beit-Jibrin to Jerusalem, Van de Velde came past a ruined site on the high northward-looking brow of wady Musur, about one hour E. by S. of Beit-Netif, called *Khirbet Damun*, which he has no doubt represents the ancient Ephes-Dammim, and "which fixes the place of the camp of Goliath just at its foot, where the valley contracts, and may, indeed, be called the pass [or extremity] of Dammim" *(Memoir*, page 290). In that case the narrative of 1 Samuel 17, becomes plain: "the gorge" (ayGih) between the battle-lines of the two armies (verse 3), and along which the first rout and pursuit occurred (verse 52), was no other than the wady Musur itself, which is so narrow immediately at this spot. *SEE ELAH (VALLEY OF).*

Ephe'sian

(Ἐφέσιος), a native or resident of the city of Ephesus (q.v.), in Asia Minor (<441928>Acts 19:28, 34, 35; 21:29). The similar adj. *Ephesine* (Ἐφεσῖνος, "of Ephesus") also occurs (<660201>Revelation 2:1).

EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO

or Paul's letter addressed to the Christian Church at the ancient and famous city of Ephesus (see below), that church which the apostle had himself founded (<441901>Acts 19:1 sq.; comp. 18:19), with which he abode so long (τριετίαν, <442031>Acts 20:31), and from the elders of which he parted with such a warm-hearted and affecting farewell (<442018>Acts 20:18-35). *SEE PAUL.*

I. *Authenticity*. — This epistle expressly claims to be the production of the apostle Paul (1:1; 3:1); and this claim the writer, in the latter of these passages, follows up by speaking of himself in language such as that apostle is accustomed to use in describing his own position as an

ambassador of Christ (3:1, 3, 8, 9). The justice of this claim seems to have been universally admitted by the early Christians, and it is expressly sanctioned by several of the fathers of the second and third centuries (Irensus, *adv. Haer.* 5:2, 3; 5:14, 3; Clemens Alexandr. *Paedagog.* 1:108; *Protrept.* 9:69, ed. Potter; *Strom.* 4:8, page 592; Origen, *cont. Cels.* 3:20; 4:211, ed. Spencer; Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 5:11, 17; *De Prescr. Her.* chapter 36; Cyprian, *Testim.* 3:7, etc.); and after them the constant and persistent tradition of the ancient Church. Even Marcion did not deny that the epistle was written by Paul, nor did heretics refuse occasionally to cite it as confessedly due to him as its author lrcnaeus, *Hesr.* 1:8, 5; see Hug, *Introd.* Fosdick's transl. page 551; Hippolytus, *Philosophumena,* 6:34). In recent times, however, its genuineness has been somewhat vehemently called in question. The epistle is also cited as part of sacred Scripture by Polycarp *(Ep. ed Philipp.* c. 1; c. 12); and it is probably to it that Ignatius refers in writing to the Ephesians (c. 12; compare Cotelerii *Annot.* in loc.; Pearson, *Vind. Ignatian.* part 2, page 119; Lardner's *Works,* 2:70, 8vo). De Wette has attempted, from internal evidence, to set aside this external proof of the Pauline origin of this epistle; but his cavils have been so fully and satisfactorily answered by Schott *(Isag. in N.T.* page 260), Guerike *(Beitrage zur hist. krit. Einleitung ins N.T.* page 106), Hemsen *(Der Ap. Paulus,* page 130), Rickert *(Der Br. Pauli an die Epheser,* page 289), and others, that later De Wette himself, both in the introductory pages of his *Commentary* on this epistle (ed. 2, 1847), and in his *Introduction to the N.T. (ed.* 5, 1848), only labors to prove that it is a mere spiritless expansion of the epistle to the Colossians, though compiled in the apostolic age. Schwegler *(Naehapost. Zeitalt.* 2:330 sq.), Baur *(Paulus,* page 418 sq.), and others advance a step farther, and reject both epistles as of no higher antiquity than the age of Montanism and early Gnosticism. The objections adduced are chiefly the following:

1. The absence of any friendly greetings in this epistle, coupled with what are alleged to be indications of want of previous acquaintance on the part of the writer with the Ephesians, facts which, it is asserted, are incompatible with the supposition that it was written by Paul, whose relations with the Ephesian Church were so intimate.

2. The occurrence of words, and phrases, and sentiments, which indicate acquaintance with those Gnostic ideas which were familiar only at a period much later than that of the apostle.

3. The close resemblance of this epistle to the epistle to the Colossians, suggesting that the former is only an enlargement of the latter. The first of these objections may be passed by here, as the allegations on which it rests will be particularly considered when we come to the question of the destination of the epistle; at present it may suffice to cite the remark of Reuss in reference to the *unreasonablenzess* of such objections: "If Paul writes simple letters of friendship, they are pronounced insignificant, and so spurious, because there is a want of the didactic character in them; and, on the other hand, if this prevails, there is proof of the spuriousness of the writing in the absence of the other. What! must both elements always be united according to some definite rule? is it so with us? or are any two of Paul's epistles alike in this respect?" *(Die Geschichte d. H. Schr. Neuen Test.* page 104, 3d ed.) The second of the above objections has reference to such passages as 1:21; 2:7; 3:21, where it is alleged the Gnostic doctrine of Sons is recognised; and to the expression πλήρωμα, 1:23, as conveying a purely Gnostic idea; and to such words as μυστήριον, σοφία, γνῶσις, φῶς, σκοτία, etc. On this it seems sufficient to observe, without denying the existence of Gnostic allusions in this epistle, that, on the one hand, the objection assumes that, because Gnostic *schools* and *systems* did not make their appearance till after the age of the apostles, the *ideas* and *words* in favor with the Gnostics were unknown at an earlier period, a position which cannot be maintained, *SEE GNOSTICS*; and, on the other, that, because the apostle uses phraseology which was employed also by the Gnostics, he uses it in the *same sense* as they did, which is purely gratuitous and indeed untrue, for to confound the αἰῶνες and πλήρωμα of the apostle with the αἰῶνες and πλήρωμα of the Gnostics, as Baur does, only proves, as Lange has remarked, that "a man may write whole books on Gnostics and Gnosticism without detecting the characteristic difference between the Christian principle and Gnosticism" *(Apostol. Zeitalt.* 1:124). With regard to the resemblance between this epistle and that to the Colossians, it can surprise no one that, written at the same time, they should in many respects resemble each other (see Klopper, *De origine Epp. ad Ephesians et Colossians* Gryph. 1853); but it does not require much penetration to discover the many points of difference between them, especially in the point of view from which the writer contemplates his main subject, the Lord Jesus Christ, in each; in the one as the prehistoric, pre-existent, supreme source of all things; in the other as the incarnate, historical, exalted, glorified head of the Church, to whom all things are subjected (comp. <40120>Ephesians 1:20-23, with <51015>Colossians 1:15-20; and

Lange, *Ap. Zeit.* 1:118). As for the alleged "copious expansion," that may be left to the judgment of the reader, as well as the counter notion of Schneckenburger, that the epistle to the Colossians is an epitome of that to the Ephesians made by Paul himself. On such objections in general, we may say with Reuss that "rash hypotheses, whatever acceptance they may have received, tell by their deficiency or strangeness, not against the epistle, but against themselves; and, in opposition to all cavils, the many traits which disprove the presence in the thoughts of a deceptive imitation by a foreign hand stand as valid arguments in its defense" *(Gesch.* page 104). For a detailed reply to the arguments of De Wette and Baur, the student may be referred to Meyer, *Einleit. z. Ephesians* page 19 sq., ed. 2; Davidson, *Introd. to N.T.* 2:352 sq., and Alford, *Prolegomena,* page 8.

II. *The Readers for whom this Epistle was designed.* — In the opening words, "'Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, to the saints that are in Ephesus and faithful in Christ Jesus," the words *in Ephesus,* ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, are omitted by the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., the cursive numbered 67, by Basil (expressly), probably by Origen, and possibly by Tertullian. This. combined with the somewhat noticeable omission of all greetings to the members of a church with which the apostle stood in such affectionate relation, and some other internal objections, have suggested a doubt whether these words really formed a part of the original text. On the subject of the persons addressed, therefore, two hypotheses have been principally entertained, besides the common opinion which, following the (disputed) reading in 1:1, regards the party to whom it was sent as the Church at Ephesus. (See the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1866, page 129 sq., 742 sq.)

1. Grotius, reviving the opinion of the ancient heretic Marcion, maintains that the party addressed in this epistle was the Church at Laodicea, and that we have in this the epistle to that Church which is commonly supposed to have been lost. The view of Grotius, which has been followed by some scholars of eminent name, among whom are found Hammond, Mill, Venema, Wetstein, and Paley, rests chiefly on two grounds, viz. the testimony of Marcion, and the close resemblance between this epistle and that to the Colossians, taken in connection with Colossians 4:16. With respect to the former of these grounds, it is alleged that, as Marcion was under no temptation to utter a wilful falsehood in regard to the destination of this epistle, he probably had the authority of the Church at Laodicea, and, it may be, the tradition of the churches generally of Asia Minor, for

the opinion which he expresses (Grotius, *Proleg. ad Ephes.;* Mill, *Proleg. ad N. Test.* page 9, Oxon. 1707). But, without charging Marcion with *designedly* uttering what was false, we may suppose that, like some critics of recent times, this view was suggested to him by the apostle's allusion, in <51046>Colossians 4:16, to an epistle addressed by him to the Laodiceans. Nor is there the least ground for supposing that Marcion spoke in this instance on the authority of the Asiatic churches; on the contrary, there is every reason to believe the opposite; for not only do Origen and Clement of Alexandria, who were fully acquainted with the views of the Eastern churches on such matters, give.no hint of any such tradition being entertained by them, but Tertullian, to whom we are indebted for our information respecting the opinion of Marcio, expressly says that in that opinion he opposed the tradition of the orthodox churches, and imposed upon the epistle a false title, through conceit of his own superior diligence in exploring such matters *(adv. Marc.* 5:17). With regard to the other argument by which this view is advocated, admitting the fact of a close resemblance between the epistle to the Colossians and that before us, and the fact that Paul had, some time before sending the former epistle, written one to the Church at Laodicea, which he advises the Colossians to send for and read, how does it follow from all this that the epistle to the Laodiceans and that now under notice were one and the same? It appears more probable that, seeing the two extant epistles bear so close a resemblance to each other, had the one now bearing the inscription "to the Ephesians" been really the one addressed to the Laodiceans, the apostle would not have deemed it of so much importance that the churches of Colossee and Laodicea should interchange epistles. Such being the chief arguments in favor of this hypothesis (for those which, in addition, Wetstein alleges from a comparison of this epistle with that to the Church at Laodicea, in the Apocalypse, are not deserving of notice; see Michaelis, *Introd.* 4:137), we may venture to set it aside as without any adequate support. It may be observed, also, that it seems incompatible with what the apostle says, <51045>Colossians 4:15, where he enjoins the Church at Colossie to send his greetings to the brethren at Laodicea, etc. No one sends greetings by *another* except when it is impossible to express them one's self. But if Paul wrote to Laodicea at the same time as to Colossee, and sent both letters by the same bearer, Tychicus, there was manifestly no occasion whatever for hit sending his salutations to the latter of these churches through the medium of the former; it was obviously as easy, and much more natural, to send his salutations to the Church at Laodicea in the epistle addressed to

themselves. This seems to prove that the epis'tle to the Laodiceans had been written some consider.able time before that to the Colossians, and therefore could not have been the same with that now under Mnotice. *SEE LAODICEANS (EPISTLE TO).*

2. The opinion that this epistle was not specially adAlressed to any one church, but was intended as a sort ῥof circular letter for the use of several churches, was first broached by archbishop Usher *(Annal. Vet. et Nov. Test.* page 680, Bremae, 1686). To this opinion the great majority of critics have given their suffrage; indeed, it may be regarded as the received opinion of Biblical scholars in the present day. This may make it ap.parently presumptuous in us to call it in question, and yet it seems to us so ill supported by positive evidence, and exposed to so many objections, that we cannot yield assent to it.

(1.) In *thefirst* place, it is to be observed that this is a hypothesis entirely *of modern* invention. No hint is furnished of any such notion having been entertained concerning the destination of this epistle by the early Church. With the solitary exception of Marcion, so far as we know, all parties were unanimous in assigning Ephesus as the place to which this epistle was sent, and Marcion's view is as much opposed to the supposition of its being a circular letter as the other. As respects the external evidence, therefore, this hypothesis is purely destitute of support

(2.) It is a hypothesis suggested for the purpose oaf accounting for certain alleged facts, some of which are, to say the least, doubtful, and others of which may be explained as well without it as with it. These facts are, a. The alleged omission of the name of any place at the commencement of the epistle; *b.* Marcion's assertion that this epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans, which, it is said, probably arose out of his having seen that copy of this circular epistle which (had been sent to Laodicea; *c.* The want of any precise allusions to personal relations subsisting between the apostle and those to whom this epistle was addressed; and *d.* The expressions of unacquaintedness with those 'to whom he wrote, which occur in this epistle, e.g. 3:1-4. How these facts may be reconciled with the supiposition that this epistle was addressed to the Ephesians will be considered afterwards; at present the question is, How do they favor the hypothesis that this was a circular letter? Now, supposing them to be unquestionable, and admitting that they are not irreconcilable with this hypothesis, it must yet appear to all that they go very little way towards affording *primary*

evidence in its support. It is not one which grows naturally out of these facts, or is suggested *by* them; it is plainly of foreign birth, and suggested for them. But when it is remembered that the *first* of these alleged facts is (to say the least) very doubtful; that the *second* is made to serve this hypothesis only by means of another as doubtful as itself, and that, were its services admitted, it would prove too much, for it would go to show that, to the Laodiceans, the apostle not only sent a peculiar epistle, mentioned <51046>Colossians 4:16, but gave them a share also in this circular epistle written some time after their own; and that ;the *third and fourth* are both either partially or wholly questionable, it must be admitted that this hypothesis stands upon a basis which is little better than none.

(3.) Had the epistle been addressed to a particular circle of churches, some designation of these churches would have been given, by which it might have been known what churches they were to which this letter belonged. When it is argued that this must be a circular letter, because there is no church specified to which it is addressed, it seems to be forgotten that the designation of a particular set of churches is as necessary for a circular epistle as the designation of one church is for an epistle specially addressed to it. If we muff leave out the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in <49101>Ephesians 1:1, what are we to put in their place? for if we take the passage as it stands without them, it will follow that the epistle was addressed to *all* Christians everywhere, which is more than the advocates of the hypothesis now under notice contend for. The supposition that the title was left blank is equally gratuitous, unreasonable, and unnecessary.

(4.) In <49621>Ephesians 6:21,22, Paul mentions that he had sent to those for whom this epistle was destined Tychicus, who should make known to them all things, that they might know his affairs, and that he might comfort their hearts. From this it appears that Tychicus was not only the bearer of this letter, but that he was personally to visit, converse with, and comfort those to whom it was addressed. On the supposition that this was a circular letter, this could hardly have been practicable.

3. We return, then, to the question of the genuineness of the suspected words "at Ephesus," ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.. At first sight the doubts against them seem plausible; but when we oppose to these

(a) the preponderating weight of diplomatic evidence for the insertion of the words,

(b) the testimony of all the versions,

(c) the universal designation of this epistle by the ancient Church (Marcion standing alone in his assertion that it was written to the Laodiceans) as an epistle *to the Ephesians*,

(d) the extreme difficulty in giving any satisfactory meaning to the isolated participle (τοῖς ο υσι, *to those that are),* and the absence of any parallel usage in the apostle's writings, we can scarcely feel any doubt as to the propriety of removing the brackets in which these words are enclosed in the 2d and later editions of Tischendorf, and of considering them an integral part of the original text.

If called upon to supply an answer to, or an explanation of the internal objections, we must record the opinion that none on the whole seems so free from objection as that which regards the epistle as *also* designed for the benefit of churches either conterminous to, or, dependent on that of Ephesus. The counter-arguments of Meyer, though ably urged, are not convincing. Nor can an appeal to the silence of writers of the ancient Church on this further destination be conceived to be of much weight, as their references are to the usual and *titular* designation of the epistle, but do not and are not intended to affect the question of its wider or narrower destination. It is not unnatural to suppose that the special greetings here omitted might have been separately intrusted to the bearer Tychicus, possibly himself an Ephesian, and certainly commissioned by the apostle (⁴⁰⁶²Ephesians 6:22) to inform the Ephesians of his state and circumstances.

III. *Occasion of writing this Epistle*. — It does not seem to have been called out by any special circumstances, nor even to have involved any distinctly precautionary teaching (compare Schneckenburger, *Beitrage,* page 135 sq.), whether against Oriental or Judaistic theosophy, but to have been suggested by the deep love which the apostle felt for his converts at Ephesus, and which the mission of Tychicus, with an epistle to the Church of Colossae, afforded him a convenient opportunity of evincing in written teaching and exhortation. The epistle thus contains many thoughts that had pervaded the nearly contemporaneous epistle to the Colossians, reiterates many of the same practical warnings and exhortations, bears even the tinge of the same diction, but at the same time enlarges upon such profound mysteries of the divine counsels, displays so fully *the origin and*

developments of the Church in Christ, its union, communion, and aggregation in him, that this majestic epistle can never be rightly deemed otherwise than one of the most sublime and consolatory outpourings of the Spirit of God to the children of men. To the Christians at Ephesus dwelling under the shadow of the great temple of Diana, daily seeing its outward grandeur, and almost daily hearing of its pompous ritualism, the allusions in this epistle to that mystic building of which Christ was the corner-stone, the apostles the foundations, and himself and his fellow-Christians portions of the august superstructure (<4920>Ephesians 2:19-22), must have spoken with a force, an appropriateness, and a reassuring depth of teaching that cannot be overestimated.

IV. *Contents.* — These easily admit of being divided into two portions, the first mainly *doctrinal* (1-3), the second *honorary and practical.*

1. The doctrinal portion opens with a brief address to the saints in Ephesus, and rapidly passes into a sublime ascription of praise to God the Father, who has predestinated us to the adoption of sons, blessed and redeemed us *in Christ,* and made known to us his eternal purpose of uniting all in him (<4901>Ephesians 1:3-14). This not unnaturally evokes a prayer from the apostle that his converts may be enlightened to know the hope of God's calling, the riches of his grace, and the magnitude of that power which was displayed in the resurrection and transcendent exaltation of Christ-the head of his body, the Church (<4901>Ephesians 1:15-23). Then, with a more immediate address to his converts, the apostle reminds them how, dead as they had been in sin, God had quickened them, raised them, and even enthroned them with Christ; and how all was by grace, not by works (<4902>Ephesians 2:1-10). They were to remember, too, how they had once been alienated and yet were now brought nigh in the blood of Christ; how he was their Peace, how by him both they and the Jews had access to the Father, and how on him as the corner-stone they had been built into a spiritual temple to God (<4902>Ephesians 2:11-22). On this account, having heard, as they must have done, how to the apostle was revealed the profound mystery of this call of the Gentile world, they were not to faint at his troubles (<4903>Ephesians 3:1-13): nay, he prayed to the great Father of all to give them inward strength, to teach them the love of Christ, and fill them with the fullness of God (<4903>Ephesians 3:13-19). The prayer is concluded by a sublime doxology (<4903>Ephesians 3:20, 21), which serves to usher in the more directly *practical portion.*

2. This the apostle commences by entreating them to walk worthy of this calling, and to keep the unity of the Spirit: there was but one body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one God (<4401>Ephesians 4:1-6). Each, too, had his portion of grace from God (<4407>Ephesians 4:7-10), who had appointed ministering orders in the Church, until all come to the unity of the faith, and grow up and become united with the living Head, even Christ (<4411>Ephesians 4:11-16). Surely, then, they were to walk no more as darkened, feelingless heathen; they were to put off the old man, and put on the new (<4417>Ephesians 4:17-24). This, too, was to be practically evinced in their outward actions; they were to be truthful, honest, pure, and forgiving; they were to walk in love (<4425>Ephesians 4:25-5:2). Fornication, covetousness, and impurity were not even to be named; they were once in heathen darkness, now they are light, and must reprove the deeds of the past (<4503>Ephesians 5:3-14). Thus were they to walk exactly, to be filled with joy, to sing, and to give thanks (<4515>Ephesians 5:15-21). Wives were to be subject to their husbands, husbands to love and cleave to their wives (<4523>Ephesians 5:23-33); children were to honor their parents, parents to bring up holily their children (<4601>Ephesians 6:1-4); servants and masters were to perform to each other their reciprocal duties (<4605>Ephesians 6:5-9). With a noble and vivid exhortation to arm themselves against their spiritual foes with the armor of God (<4610>Ephesians 6:10-20), a brief notice of the coming of Tychicus (<4621>Ephesians 6:21, 22), and a twofold doxology (<4623>Ephesians 6:23, 24), this sublime epistle comes to its close.

V. *Date.* — This epistle was written during the latter part of the apostle's first imprisonment at Rome, at about the same time with that to the Colossians, A.D. 57. This appears from the following circumstances: Timothy was not yet with Paul (<4001>Ephesians 1:1); Paul was then a prisoner (<4001>Ephesians 3:1; 4:1), but had been allowed to preach (<4620>Ephesians 6:20; comp. <4430>Acts 28:30, 31); Tychicus (on his first journey) carried this epistle (<4621>Ephesians 6:21; comp. <5407>Colossians 4:7, 8). The question of order in time between this epistle and that to the Colossians is very difficult to adjust. On the whole, both inter. nal and external considerations seem somewhat in favor of the priority of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Comp. Neander, *Planting*, 1:329 (Bohn), Schleiermacher, *Stud. und Krit.* for 1832, page 500, and Wieseler, *Chronol.* page 450 sq. *SEE COLOSSIANS (EPISTLE TO).*

VI. *Commentaries, etc.* — The following is a full list of separate exegetical helps on this epistle, the more important having an asterisk (*) prefixed: Victorinus, *In ep. ad Ephes.* (in Mai's *Script. Vet.* III, 1:87); Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 7:537; also in *Opp. Suppos.* 11:995); Chrysostom, *Homilice* (in *Opp.* 11:1; *Bibl. Patr.* 9); Claudius Taurinensis, *Expositio* (in Mabillon, *Vet. Anal.* 91); *Calvin, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.;* also tr. into English, Lond. 1854, 8vo) ; also *Sermons* (tr. by Golding, Lond. 1577, 4to); Ridley, *Commentary* (in Richmond's *Fathers,* 2:14); Megander, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1534, 8vo); Sarcer, *Adnotationes* (Frckf. 1541, 8vo); Major, *Enarratio* (Wittemb. 1552, 8vo); Nailant, *Enarrationes* (Ven. 1554; Lond. 1570, 8vo); Weller, *Commentaries* (Norimb. 1559, 8vo); Vellerus, *Enarrationes* (Nuremb. 1559, 8vo); Bucer, *Praelectiones* (Basil. 1562, fol.); Musculus, *Commentariis* (Basil. 1569, fol.); Heminge, *Commentary* (Lond. 1581,. 4to); Binemann, *Expositio* (Lond. 1581, 4to); Anon., *Exposition* (Lond. 1581, 4to); Stewart, *Commentarius,* (Ingolst. 1593, 4to); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Edinb. 1590, 4to; Genesis 1593, 8vo); Zanchius, *Commentaria:* (Newstad. 1594, fol.); Weinrich, *Explicatio* (Lips. 1613, 4to); Battus, *Commentarii* (Rost. 1620, 4to); De Quiros, *Commentarius* (Hisp. 1622, fol.; Lugd. 1623, 4to); Meeleuhrer, *Commentarius* (Norimb. 1628, 4to); Hanneken, *Explicatio* (4to, Marp. 1631; Lips., 1718; Jen. 1731); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1636, 4to); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 5); Althofer, *Animadversiones* (Alt. 1641, 4to); Crocius, *Commentarius* (Cassel, 1642, 8vo); Bayne, *Commentary* (Lond. 1643, fol.); Wandalin, *ParapIrasis* (Slesw. 1650, 8vo), Boyd, *Praelectiones* (fol., London, 1652; Genesis 1660); Anon., *Annotationes* (8vo, Cambr. 1653; Amst. 1703; also in tihe *Critici Sacri);* Ferguson, *Exposition* (Edir b. 1659, 8vo); Crell, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 1:4); Lagus, *Commentatio* (Gryph. 1664, 4to); Schmidt, *Paraphrasis* (Arg. 1684, 1699, 4to); Du Bosc, *Sermons* (Fr., Rotterd. 1699, 3 volumes, 8vo); Goodwin, *Exposition* (Strasb. 1699, 4to); Spener, *Erklar.* (Hal. 1706, 1730, 4to); Gerbaden, *Geopent Door* (Tr. ad Rh. 1707, 4to); Pfeffinger, *Dissertationes* (Arg. 1711, 8vo); also, *De visitatione Pauli ap. Ephesios* (Arg. 1721, 4to); Roll, *Commentarius* (Tr. ad Rh. 1715, 1731, 2 volumes, 4to); Hazevoet, *Verklaar.* (L.B. 1718, 4to); *Dinant, *Commentalrii* (Rotterd. 1721, 4to; also in Low Dutch, ib., 1711, 1722, 2 volumes, 4to); Van Til, *Commentarius* (Amsterd. 1726, 4to); Fend, *Erlaut.* (s. 1. 1727, 4to); Ziegler, *Einleit.* (in Henke's *Magaz.* 4:225); Crusius, *De statu Ephesinorum* (Hafn. 1733, 4to); Gude, *Erleut.* (Laub. 1735, 8vo); also, *De eccl. Ephesians statu* (Lips. 1732, 8vo); Royaards, *Verklaar.* (Amst. 1735,

3 volumes, 4to); Van Alphen, *Specimen* (Tr. ad Rh. 1742, 4to); Huth, *Ep. ex Laod. in encycl. ad Ephesians* (Erlang. 1751, 4to); Justi; *Br. a. Laod. d. Br. an d. Ephesians* (in his *Verm. Abhandl.* page 81); Pezold, *De sublimitate in ep. ad Ephesians* (Lips. 1771, 4to); Moldenhauer, *Uebers.* (Hamb. 1773, 8vo); Chandler, *Paraphrase* (London, 1777, 4to); Schitze,. *Commentarii* (8vo, Lips. 1778, 1785); Cramer, *Ausleg.* (Hamb. 1782, 4to); Esmarch, *Uebers.* (Alton. 1785, 8vo); Krause, *Anmerk.* (Frkf. 1789, 8vo) ; Brinkman, *Uebers.* (Hamb. 1793, 8vo); Muller, *Erklar.* (Hdlb. 1793, 4to); Morus, *Acroases* (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Hanlein, *De lectorib. ep. ad Ep.* (Erl. 1797, 4to); Popp, *Erklar.* (Rost. 1799, 4to); Van Bemmlen, *Epp. ad Ephesians et Colossians collatce* (L.B. 1803, 8vo); Schneckenburger, *Aphorismen d. Br. a. d. Ephesians* (in his *Einl. ins N.T.* No. 13); Von Flatt *Vorles.* (Tub. 1828, 8vo); Holzhausen, *Erklar.* (Hanov. 1833, 8vo); Simcoe, *Illustration* (Lond. 1833, 4to); *Meier, *Commentar* (Berl. 1834, 8vo); *Harless, *Commentar* (8vo, Erl. 1834; Stuttg. 1858); *Ruckert, *Erklar.* (Lpz. 1834, 8vo); Matthies, *Berucks.* (Griefsw. 1834, 8vo); Lohlein, *Syrus interpres* (Erl. 1835, 8vo); Passavant, *Ausleg.* (Basel, 1836, 8vo); Lunemann, *De ep. ad Ephesians authentia* (Gott. 1842, 8vo); *De Wette, *Handb.* (Lpz. 1843, 8vo, volume 2); *Stier, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1848-9, 2 volumes, in 3 parts, 8vo; abridged, 1859, 8vo); Perceval, *Lectures* (Lond. 1846, 12mo); M'Ghie, *Lectures* (Dublin, 1846, 2 volumes, 8vo); *Baumgarten-Crusius, *Commentar* (Jena, 1847, 8vo); *Meyer, *Commentar* (Gott. 1853, part 2); *Eadie, *Commentary* (Glasg. 1854, 8vo); Bisping, *Erkldr.* (Munst. 1855, 8vo); Kahler, *Predigten* (Kiel, 1855, 8vo); Hodge, *Commentary* (N.Y. 1856, 8vo); *Turner, *Commentary* (N.Y. 1856, 8vo); *Ellicott, *Commentary* (8vo, Lond. 1855, 1859, 1864; Andov. 1860); Neuland, *New Catena* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Clergymen (4), *Revision* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Pridhamr, *Notes* (Lond. 1862, 12mo); Lathrop, *Discourses* (Phila. 1864, 8vo); Bleek, *Vorlesungen* (Berl. 1865, 8vo). *SEE EPISTLES.*

Eph'esus

Picture for Eph’esus

(Ἔφεσος, according to one legend from ἔφεσις, the *permission* given by Hercules to the Amazons to settle here), an illustrious city (Athen. 8:361) in the district of Ionia (πόλις Ἰωνίας ἐπιφανεστάτη, Steph. Byz. s.v.), on the western coast of the peninsula commonly called Asia Minor — not that this geographical term was known in the first century. The ASIA of the N.T. was simply the Roman province which embraced the western part

of the peninsula. Of this province Ephesus was the capital. *SEE ASIA MINOR.*

1. *History.* — It was one of the twelve Ionian cities in Asia Minor in the mythic times (Herod. 1:142), and said to have been founded by the Amazons, but in later times inhabited by the Carians and Leleges (Strabo, 14:640), and taken possession of by the Ionians under Androclus, the son of Codrus (Cramer, *Asia Miswr*, 1:363). Besides the name by which it is best known, it bore successively those of *Samorna, Trachea, Ortygia,* and *Ptelea.* Being founded by Androclus, the legitimate son of Codrus, it enjoyed a pre-eminence over the other members of the Ionian confederacy, and was denominated the royal city of Ionia. The climate and country which the colonists from Attica had selected as their future abode surpassed, according to Herodotus (1:142), all others in beauty and fertility; and, had the martial spirit of the Ionians corresponded to their natural advantages, they might have grown into a powerful independent nation. The softness, however; of the climate, and the ease with which the necessaries of life could be procured, transformed the hardy inhabitants of the rugged Attica into an indolent and voluptuous race: hence they fell successively under the power of the Lydians (B.C. 560) and the Persians (B.C. 557); and, though the revolt of Histioeus and Aristagoras against the Persian power was for a time successful, the contest at length terminated in favor of the latter (Herod. 6:7-22). The defeat of the Persians by the Greeks gave a temporary liberty to the Ionian cities; but the battle of Mycale transferred the virtual dominion of the country to Athens. During the Peloponnesian war they paid tribute indifferently to either party, and the treaty of Antalcidas (B.C. 387) once more restored them to their old masters the Persians. They beheld with indifference the exploits of Alexander and the disputes of his captains, and resigned themselves without a struggle to successive conquerors. Ephesus was included in the dominions of Lysimachus; but, after the defeat of Antiochus (B.C. 190), it was given by the Romans to the kings of Pergamum. In the year B.C. 129 the Romans formed their province of Asia. The fickle Ephesians took part with Mithridates against the Romans, and massacred the garrison: they had reason to be grateful for the unusual clemency of L. Cornelius Sulla, who merely inflicted heavy fines upon the inhabitants. Thenceforward the city formed part of the Roman empire. While, about the epoch of the introduction of Christianity, the other cities of Asia Minor declined, Ephesus rose more and more. It owed its prosperity in part to the favor of

its governors, for Lysimachus named the city Arsinoe in honor of his second wife, and Attalus Philadelphus furnished it with splendid wharves and docks; in part to the favorable position of the place, which naturally made it the emporium of Asia on this side the Taurus (Strabo, 14:641, 663). Under the Romans, Ephesus was the capital not only of Ionia, but of the entire province of Asia, and bore the honorable title *of the first and greatest metropolis of Asia* (Bockh, *Coap. Inscript. Graec.* 2968-2992). The bishop of Ephesus in later times was the president of the Asiatic dioceses, with the rights and privileges of a patriarch (Evagr. *Hist. Eccles.* 3:6). Towards the end of the 11th century Ephesus experienced the same fate as Smyrna; and, after a brief occupation by the Greeks, it surrendered in 1308 to sultan Saysan, who, to prevent future insurrections, removed most of the inhabitants to Tyriaeum, where they were massacred

2. *Biblical Notices.* — That Jews were established there in considerable numbers is known from Josephus *(Ant.* 14:10, 11), and might be inferred from its mercantile eminence; but it is also evident from (44209)Acts 2:9; 6:9. In harmony with the character of Ephesus as a place of concourse and commerce, it is here, and here only, that we find disciples of John the Baptist explicitly mentioned after the ascension of Christ ((44825)Acts 18:25; 19:3). The case of Apollos ((44824)Acts 18:24) is an exemplification further of the intercourse between, this place and Alexandria. The first seeds of Christian truth were possibly sown at Ephesus immediately after the great Pentecost (Acts 2). Whatever previous plans Paul may have entertained ((44166)Acts 16:6), his first visit was on his return from the second missionary circuit ((44839)Acts 18:19-21), and his stay on that occasion was very short; nor is there any proof that he found any Christians at Ephesus, but he left there Aquila and Priscilla (verse 19), who both then and at a later period ((55019)2 Timothy 4:19) were of signal service. In Paul's own stay of more than two years ((44908)Acts 19:8, 10; 20:31), which formed the most important passage of his third circuit, and during which he labored, first in the synagogue ((44908)Acts 19:8), and then in the school of Tyrannus (verse 9), and also in private houses ((44920)Acts 20:20), and during which he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, we have the period of the chief evangelization of this shore of the AEgean. The direct narrative in Acts 19 receives but little elucidation from the Epistle to the Ephesians, which was written after several years from Rome; but it is supplemented in some important particulars (especially as regards the apostle's personal habits of

self-denial, (Acts 20:34) by the address at Miletus. This address shows that the Church at Ephesus was thoroughly organized under its presbyters. On leaving the city, the apostle left Timothy in charge of the Church there (1 Timothy 1:3), a position which he seems to have retained for a considerable period, as we learn from the second epistle addressed to him. *SEE TIMOTHY*. Among Paul's. other companions, two, Trophimus and Tychicus, were natives of Asia (Acts 20:4), and the latter probably (2 Timothy 4:12), the former certainly (Acts 21:29), natives of Ephesus. In the same connection we ought to mention Onesiphorus (2 Timothy 1:16-18) and his household (4:19). On the other hand must be noticed certain specified Ephesian antagonists of the apostle, the sons of Sceva and his party (Acts 19:14), Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Timothy 1:20; 2 Timothy 4:14), and Phygellus and Hermogenes (2 Timothy 1:15). *SEE PAUL*. Ephesus is also closely connected with the apostle John, not only as being the scene (Revelation 1:11; 2:1) of the most prominent of the churches of the Apocalypse, but also in the story of his later life as given by Eusebius *(Hist. Eccl.* 3:23, etc.). According to a tradition which prevailed extensively in ancient times, John spent many years in Ephesus, where he employed himself most diligently for the spread of the Gospel, and where he died at a very old age, and was buried. *SEE JOHN (THE APOSTLE*). Possibly 'his Gospels and Epistles were written here. There is a tradition that the mother of our Lord was likewise buried at Ephesus, as also Timothy. Some make John bishop of the Ephesian communities, while others ascribe that honor to Timothy. In the book of Revelation (Revelation 2:1) a favorable testimony is borne to the Christian churches at Ephesus. Ignatius addressed one of his epistles to the Church of this place (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀξιομακαρίστῳ, τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας, Hefele, *Pat. Apostol.* page 154), which held a conspicuous position during the early ages of Christianity, and was in fact, the metropolis of the churches of this part of Asia.

Picture for Eph’esus 2

3. *Location.* — Ephesus lay on the Egoean coast, nearly opposite the island of Samos, 320 stadia from Smyrna (Strabo, 14:632). The ancient town seems to have been confined to the northern slope of Coressus (Herod. 1:26), but in the lapse of time the inhabitants advanced farther into the plain, and thus a new town sprang up around the temple (Strabo, 14:640). All the cities of Ionia were remarkably well situated for the growth of commercial prosperity (Herod. 1:142), and none more so than

Ephesus. With a fertile neighborhood (Strabo, 14:637) and an excellent climate, it was also most conveniently placed for traffic with all the neighboring parts of the Levant. In the time of Augustus it was the great emporium of all the regions of Asia within the Taurus (Strabo, 14:950); its harbor (named Panormus), at the mouth of the Cayster, was elaborately constructed, though alluvial matter caused serious hinderances both in the time of Attalus and in Paul's own time (Tacitus, *Ann.* 16:23). The apostle's life alone furnishes illustrations of its mercantile relations with Achaia on the W., Macedonia on the N., and Syria on the E. At the close of his second missionary circuit, he sailed across from Corinth to Ephesus (<44819>Acts 18:19), when on his way to Syria (<44821>Acts 18:21, 22): some think that he once made the same short voyage over the AEgaean, in the opposite direction, at a later period. *SEE CORINTHIANS, FIRST EP. TO.* On the third missionary circuit, besides the notice of the journey from Ephesus to Macedonia (<44921>Acts 19:21; 20:1), we have the coast voyage on the return to Syria given in detail (20, 21), and the geographical relations of this city with the islands and neighboring parts of the coast minutely indicated (<44015>Acts 20:15-17). To these passages we must add <540103>1 Timothy 1:3; <550412>2 Timothy 4:12, 20; though it is difficult to say confidently whether the journeys implied there were by land or by water. See likewise <44927>Acts 19:27; 20:1.

As to the relations of Ephesus to the inland regions of the continent, these also are prominently brought before us in the apostle's travels. The "upper coasts" (τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη, <44901>Acts 19:1), through which he passed when about to take up his residence in the city, were the Phrygian table-lands of the interior; and it was probably in the same district that on a previous occasion (<44606>Acts 16:6) he formed the unsuccessful project of preaching the Gospel in the district of Asia. Two great roads at least, in the Roman times, led eastward from Ephesus; one through the passes of Tmolus to Sardis (<660301>Revelation 3:1), and thence to Galatia and the N.E., the other round the extremity of Pactyas to Magnesia, and so up the valley of the Mieander to Iconium, whence the communication was direct to the Euphrates and to the Syrian Antioch. There seem to have been Sardian and Magnesian gates on the E. side of Ephesus corresponding to these roads respectively. There were also coast-roads leading northwards to Smyrna, and southwards to Miletus. By the latter of these it is probable that the Ephesian elders traveled when summoned to meet Paul at the latter city (<44017>Acts 20:17, 18). Part of the pavement of the Sardian road has been

noticed by travelers under the cliffs of Gallesus. *SEE LEAKE'S ASIA MINOR, AND MAP.*

Among the more marked physical features of the peninsula are the two large rivers, Hermus and Mseander, which flow from a remote part of the interior westward to the Archipelago, Smyrna (Revelation 2:8) being near the mouth of one, and Miletus (Acts 20:17) of the other. Between the valleys drained by these two rivers is the shorter stream and smaller basin of the Cayster, called by the Turks Kutschuk-Mendere, or the Little Maeander. Its upper level (often called the Caystrian meadows) was closed to the westward by the gorge between Gallesus and Pactyas, the latter of these mountains being a prolongation of the range of Messogis, which bounds the valley of the Maeander on the north, the former more remotely connected with the range of Tmolus, which bounds the valley of the Hermus on the south. Beyond the gorge and towards. the sea the valley opens out again into an alluvial flat (Herod. 2:10), with hills rising abruptly from it. The plain is now about 5 miles in breadth, but formerly it must have been smaller, and some of the hills were once probably islands. Here Ephesus stood, partly on the level ground and partly on the hills.

Of the hills, on which a large portion of the city was built, the two most important were Prion and Coressus, the latter on the S. of the plain, and being, in fact, almost a continuation of Pactyas, the former being in front of Coressus and near it, though separated by a deep and definite valley. Further to the N.E. is another conspicuous eminence. It seems to be the hill mentioned by Procopius *(De AEdif.* 5:1) as one on which a church dedicated to the apostle John was built; and its present name *Ayasaluk* is absurdly thought to have reference to him, and to be a corruption of his traditionary title ὁ ἅγιος θεόλογος. (See generally Cellarii *Notit.* 2:80.)

4. *Government.* — It is well known that Asia was a proconsular province; and in harmony with this fact we find proconsuls (ἀνθύπατοι, A.V. "deputies") specially mentioned (Acts 19:38). Nor is it necessary to inquire here whether the plural in this passage is generic, or whether the governors of other provinces were present in Ephesus at the time. Again, we learn from Pliny (5:31) that Ephesus was an assize-town *(Jorum* or *conventus);* and in the N.T. narrative (Acts 19:38) we find the court-days alluded to as actually being held (ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται , A.V. " the law is open") during the uproar; though perhaps it is not absolutely necessary to give the expression this exact reference as to time (see Wordsworth in

loc.). Ephesus itself was a "free city," and had its own assemblies and its own magistrates. The senate (γερουσία, or βουλή) is mentioned not only by Strabo, but by Josephus *(Ant.* 14:10, 25; 16:6, 4 and 7); and Luke, in the narrative before us, speaks of the δῆμος (verses 30, 33, A.V. "the people") and of its customary assemblies (ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, verse 39, A.V. "a lawful assembly"). That the tumultuary meeting which was gathered on the occasion in question should take place in the theater (verses 29, 31) was nothing extraordinary. It was at a meeting in the theater at Caesarea that Agrippa I received his death-stroke (<44123>Acts 12:23), and in Greek cities this was often the place for large assemblies (Tacitus, *Hist.* 2:80; Val. Max. 2:2). We even find conspicuous mention made of one of the most important municipal officers of Ephesus, the "town-clerk" (q.v.) (γραμματεύς), or keeper of the records, whom we know from other sources to have been a person of great influence and responsibility. It is remarkable how all these political and religious characteristics of Ephesus, which appear in the sacred narrative, are illustrated by inscriptions and coins. An ἀρχεῖον, or state-paper office, is mentioned on an inscription in Chishull. The γραμματεύς frequently appears; so also the Ἀσιάρχαι and ἀνθύπατοι. Sometimes these words are combined in the same inscription; see, for instance, Bockh, *Corp. Inscr.* 2999, 2994, 2996. The later coins of Ephesus are full of allusions to the worship of Diana in various aspects. The word νεωκόρος (warden, A.V. "worshipper") is of frequent occurrence. That which is given last below has also the word ἀνθύπατος (proconsul, A.V. "deputy"); it exhibits an image of the temple, and, bearing as it does the name and head of Nero, it must have been struck about the time of Paul's stay in Ephesus. The one immediately preceding it bears the name (Cusinius) of the acting γραμματεύς ("town-clerk") at the time.

Picture for Eph'esus 3

5. *The Asiarchs.* — Public games were connected with the worship of Diana at Ephesus. The month of May was sacred to her. The uproar mentioned in the Acts very probably took place at this season. Paul was certainly at Ephesus about that time of the year (<461608>1 Corinthians 16:8), and Demetrius might well be peculiarly sensitive if he found his trade failing at the time of greatest concourse. However this may be, the Asiarchs (Ἀσιάρχαι, A.V. "chiefs of Asia") were present (<441931>Acts 19:31). These were officers appointed, after the manner of the aediles at Rome, to

preside over the games which were held in different parts of the province of Asia, just as other provinces had their *Galatarchs, Lyciarchs,* etc. Various cities would require the presence of these officers in turn. In the account of Polycarp's martyrdom at Smyrna (Hefele, *Pat. Apost.* page 286) an important part is played by the Asiarch Philip. It is a remarkable proof of the influence which Paul had gained at Ephesus that the asiarchs took his side in the disturbance. See Dr.Wordsworth's note on Acts 19:31. *SEE ASIARCH*.

Picture for Eph’esus 4

Picture for Eph’esus 5

6. *Religion.* — Conspicuous at the head of the harbor of Ephesus was the great temple of Diana or Artemis, the tutelary divinity of the city. She was worshipped under the name of *Artemis.* There was more than one divinity which went by the name of Artemis, as the Arcadian Artemis, the Taurian Artemis, as well as the Ephesian Artemis. (See Dougtsei *Analect.* 2:91; Miinter, *Relig. d. Karthag.* page 53.) Her worship in this instance was said to have originated in an image that fell from heaven (διοπετές, Acts 19:35; comp. Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* page 14; Wetstein in loc.), and believed to have been an object of reverence from the earliest times (Pliny, 16:79). The material of which it was composed is disputed, whether ebony, cedar, or otherwise (see Spanheim, *ad Callim. Dian.* verse 239). She was represented as many-breasted (πολύμαστος, *multimamia,* see Gronovii *Thesaur.* 7; Zorn, *Biblioth. Antiq.* 1:439 sq.; Creuzer, *Symbol.* 2:176 sq.), although different explanations are given of her figure in this respect. The following is the description given by Mr. Falkener *(Ephesus,* pages 290, 291) of an antique statue of the Ephesian Diana now in the Naples Museum: "The circle round her head denotes the nimbus of her glory; the griffins inside of which express its brilliancy. In her breast are the twelve signs of the zodiac, of which those seen in front are the ram, bull, twins, crab, and lion; they are divided by the hours. Her necklace is composed of acorns, the primeval food of man. Lions are on her arms to denote her power, and her hands are stretched out to show that she is ready to receive all who come to her. Her body is covered with various beasts and monsters, as sirens, sphinxes, and griffins, to show she is the source of nature, the mother of all things. Her head, hands, and feet are of bronze, while the rest of the statue is of alabaster, to denote the ever-varying light and shade of the moon's figure... . Like Rhea, she was crowned with

turrets, to denote her dominion over terrestrial objects." It will be seen, from the figure given, that this last differed materially from the Diana, sister of Apollo, whose attributes are the bow, the quiver, the girt-up robe, and the hound; whose person is a model of feminine strength, ease, and grace, and whose delights were in the pursuits of the chase. *SEE DIANA.*

Around the image of the goddess was erected, according to Callimachus *(Hymn. in Dian.* 248), her large and splendid temple. This building was raised (about B.C. 500) on immense substructions, in consequence of the swampy nature of the ground. The earlier temple, which had been begun before the Persian war, was burnt down in the night when Alexander the: Great was born (B.C. 355), by an obscure person of the name of Eratostratus, who thus sought to transmit. his name to posterity (Strabo, 14:640; Plutarch, *Alex.* 3; Solin, 43; Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* 2:27); and, as it seemed somewhat unaccountable that the goddess should permit a place which redounded so much to her honor to be thus recklessly destroyed, it was given out that Diana was so engaged with Olympias in aiding to bring Alexander into the world that she had no time nor thought for any other concern. At a subsequent period Alexander made an offer to rebuild the temple, provided he were allowed to inscribe his name on the front, which the Ephesians refused. Aided, however, by the whole of Asia Minor, they succeeded in erecting a still more magnificent temple, which the ancients have lavishly praised and placed among the' seven wonders of the world. It took two hundred and twenty years to complete. Pliny *(Hist. Nat.* 36:21), who has given a description of it, says it was 425 feet in length, 220 broad, and supported by 127 columns, each of which had been contributed by some prince, and were 60 feet high; 36 of them were richly carved. Chersiphron, the architect, presided over the undertaking, and, being ready to lay violent hands on himself in consequence of his difficulties, was restrained; by the command of the goddess, who appeared to hint during the night, assuring him that she herself had accomplished that which had brought him to despair. The altar was the work of Praxiteles. The famous sculptor Scopas is said by Pliny to have chiselled one of the columns. Apelles, a native of the city, contribated a splendid picture of Alexander the Great. The rights of sanctuary, to the extent of a stadium in all directions round the temple, were also conceded, which, in consequence of abuse, the emperor Tiberius abolished. The temple was built of cedar, cypress, white marble, and even gold, with which it glittered (Spanh. *Observat. in Hymn. in Dian.* 353). Costly and magnificent offerings of various kinds were

made to the .goddess and treasured in the temple, such as paintings, statues, etc., the value of which almost exceeded computation. The fame of the temple, of the goddess, and of the city itself, was spread not only through Asia, but the world, a celebrity which was enhanced and diffused the more readily because sacred games were practiced there, which called competitors and spectators from every country. In style, too, this famous structure constituted an epoch in Greek art (Vitruv. 4:1), since it was here first that the graceful Ionic order was perfected. The magnificence of this sanctuary was a proverb throughout the civilized world (Philo Byz. *Spect. Mund.* 7). All these circumstances give increased force to the architectural allegory in the great epistle which Paul wrote in this place (<460309>1 Corinthians 3:9-17), to the passages where imagery of this kind is used in the epistles addressed to Ephesus (<490219>Ephesians 2:19-22; <540315>1 Timothy 3:15; 6:19; <550219>2 Timothy 2:19, 20), and to the words spoken to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (<442032>Acts 20:32). The temple was frequently used for the safe custody of treasure. Of more questionable character was the privilege which, in common with some other Greek temples, it enjoyed of an asylum, within the limits of which criminals were safe .from arrest (Strabo, 14:641; Plutarch, *De cere al.* c. 3; Apollon. *Ephesians epist.* 65). By Alexander this asylum was extended to a stadium, and by Mithridates somewhat further; fmark Antony nearly doubled the distance; but the abuses hence arising became so mischievous, that Augustus was compelled to abolish the privilege, or at least restrict it to its ancient boundary. Among his other enormities, Nero is said to have despoiled the temple of Diana of much of its treasure. It continued to conciliate no small portion of respect till it was finally burnt by the Goths in the reign of Gallienus. (See Hirt, *Der Tempel der Diana zu Ephesus*, Berlin, 1809.)

The chief points connected with the uproar at Ephesus in the case of Paul (<442023>Acts 19:23-41) are mentioned in the articles DIANA *SEE DIANA* and PAUL *SEE PAUL* ; but the following details must be added. In consequence of this devotion, the city of Ephesus was called νεωκόρος (verse 35) or " warden" of Diana (see Van Dale, *Dissert.* page 309; Wolf and Kuinol, in loc.). This was a recognized title applied in such cases, not only to individuals, but So communities. In the instance of Ephesus, the term is abundantly found both on coins and on inscriptions. Its *neocorate* was, in fact, as the "town-clerk" said, proverbial. Another consequence of the celebrity of Diana's worshi$_p$ at Ephesus was that a large manufactory grew up there of portable shrines (ναοί, verse 24, the ἀφιδρύματα of

Dionys. Halicarn, 2:2, and other writers), which strangers purchased. and devotees carried with them on journeys or set up in their louses. Of the manufacturers engaged in this business, perhaps Alexander the "coppersmith" (ὁ χαλκεύς, 2 Timothy 4:14) was one. The case of Demetrius the "silversmith" (ἀργυροποῖος in the Acts) is explicit. He was alarmed for his trade when he saw the Gospel, under the preaching of Paul, gaining ground upon idolatry and superstition, and he spread a panic among the craftsmen of various grades, the τεχνίται (verse 24) or designers, and the ἐργάται (verse 25) or common workmen, if this is the distinction between them. (See Schmid, *Templa Denmetrii argentei*, Jena, 1695; Wilisch, Ναΐδια *vett.* Lips. 1716.) *SEE DEMETRIUS.*

6. *Magical Arts.* — Among the distinguished natives of Ephesus in the ancient world may be mentioned Apelles and Parrhasius, rivals in the art of painting, Heraclitus, the man-hating philosopher, Hipponax, a satirical poet, Artemidorus, who wrote a history and description of the earth. The claims of Ephesus, however, to the praise of originality in the prosecution of the liberal arts are but inconsiderable, and it must be content with the dubious reputation of having excelled in the refinements of a voluptuous and artificial civilization. With culture of this kind, a practical belief in and a constant use of those arts which pretend to lay open the secrets of nature, and arm the hand of man with supernatural powers, have generally been found conjoined. Accordingly, the Ephesian multitude were addicted to sorcery; indeed, in the age of Jesus and his apostles, adepts in the occult sciences were numerous: they traveled from country to country, and were found in great numbers in Asia, deceiving the credulous multitude and profiting by their expectations. They were sometimes Jews, who referred their skill and even their forms of proceeding to Solomon, who is still regarded in the East as head or prince of magicians (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:2,5; Acts 8:9; 13:6, 8). In Asia Minor Ephesus had a high reputation for magical arts (Ortlob, *De Ephes. Libris combustis*, Lips. 1708). This also comes conspicuously into view in Luke's narrative (Acts 19:11-20). The peculiar character of Paul's miracles (δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχούσας, ver. 11) would seem to have been intended as antagonistic to the prevalent superstition. The books mentioned as being burned by their possessors in consequence of his teaching were doubtless books of magic. How extensively they were in use may be learned from the fact that "the price of them" was "fifty thousand pieces of silver" (more than $30,000). Very celebrated were the Ephesian letters (Ἐφέσια γράμματα), which appear

to have been a sort of magical formulae written on paper or parchment, designed to be fixed as amulets on different parts of the body. such as the hands and the head (Plut. *Sym.* 7; Lakemacher, *Obs. Philol.* 2:126; Deyling, *Observ.* 3:355). Erasmus *(Adag. Cent.* 2:578) says that they were certain signs or marks which rendered their possessor victorious in every thing. Eustathius *(ad Hom. Odys.* 10:694) states an opinion that Croesus, when on his funeral pile, was very much benefited by the use of them; and that when a Milesian and an Ephesian were wrestling in the Olympic games, the former could gain no advantage, as the latter had Ephesian letters bound round his heel; but, these being discovered and removed, he lost his superiority, and was thrown thirty times. The faith in these mystic syllables continued, more or less, till the sixth century (see the Life of Alexander of Tralles, in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.). We should enter on doubtful ground if we were to speculate on the Gnostic and other errors which grew up at Ephesus in the later apostolic age, and which are foretold in the address at Miletus, and indicated in the epistle to the Ephesians, and more distinctly in the epistles to Timothy. *SEE CURIOUS ARTS.*

7. *Modern Remains.* — The ruins of Ephesus lie two short days' journey from Smyrna, in proceeding from which towards the south-east the traveler passes the pretty village of Sedekuy; and two hours and a half onwards he comes to the ruined village of Danizzi, on a wide, solitary, uncultivated plain, beyond which several burial-grounds may be observed; near one of these, on an eminence, are the supposed ruins of Ephesus, consisting of shattered walls, in which some pillars, architraves, and fragments of marble have been built. The soil of the plain appears rich. It is covered with a rank, burnt-up vegetation, and is everywhere deserted and solitary, though bordered by picturesque mountains. A few corn-fields are scattered along the site of the ancient city, which is marked by some large masses of shapeless ruins and stone walls. Towards the sea extends the ancient port, a pestilential marsh. Along the slope of the mountain and over the plain are scattered fragments of masonry and detached ruins, but nothing can now be fixed upon as the great temple of Diana. There are some broken columns and capitals of the Corinthian order of white marble: there are also ruins of a theater, consisting of some circular seats and numerous arches, supposed to be the one in which Paul was preaching when interrupted by shouts of "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." The ruins of this theater present a wreck of immense grandeur, and the original must have been of the largest and most imposing dimensions. Its form alone can now be

spoken of, for every seat is removed, and the proscenium is a hill of ruins. A splendid circus (Fellows's *Reports*, page 275) or stadium remains tolerably entire, and there are numerous piles of buildings, seen alike at Pergamus and Troy as well as here, by some called gymnasia, by others temples; by others again, with more propriety, palaces. They all came with the Roman conquest. No one but a Roman emperor could have conceived such structures. In Italy they have parallels in Adrian's villa near Tivoli, and perhaps in the pile upon the Palatine. Many other walls remain to show the extent of the buildings of the city, but no inscription or ornament is to be found, cities having been built out of this quarry of worked marble. The ruins of the adjoining town, which arose about four hundred years ago, are entirely composed of materials from Ephesus. There are a few huts within these ruins (about a mile and a half from Ephesus), which still retain the name of the parent city, *Asaluk* — a Turkish word, which is associated with the same idea as Ephesus, meaning the City of the Moon (Fellows). A church dedicated to St. John is thought to have stood near, if not on the site of the present mosque. Arundell *(Discoveries,* 2:253) conjectures that the gate, called the Gate of Persecution, and large masses of brick wall which lie beyond it, are parts of this celebrated church, which was fortified during the great Council of Ephesus. The tomb of St. John was in or under his church, and the Greeks have a tradition of a sacred dust arising every year, on his festival, from the tomb, possessed of miraculous virtues: this dust they term manna. Not far from the tomb of St. John was that of Timothy. The tomb of Mary and the seven παιδία *(boys,* as the *Synaxaria* calls the Seven Sleepers) are found in an adjoining hill. At the back of the mosque, on the hill, is the sunk ground-plan of a small church, still much venerated by the Greeks. The sites of two others are shown at Asaluk. There is also a building, called the Prison of St. Paul, constructed of large stones without cement. The situation of the temple is doubtful, but it probably stood where certain large masses remain on the low ground, full in view of the theater. The disappearance of the temple may easily be accounted for, partly by the rising of the soil, and partly by the incessant use of its materials for medieval buildings. Some of its columns are said to be in St. Sophia at Constantinople, and even in the cathedrals of Italy.

Though Ephesus presents few traces of human life, and little but scattered and mutilated remains of its ancient grandeur, yet the environs, diversified as they are with hill and dale, and not scantily supplied with wood and water, present many features of great beauty. Arundell (2:244) enumerates

a great variety of trees, which he saw in the neighborhood, among which may be specified groves of myrtle near Ephesus. He also found heath in abundance, of two varieties, and saw there the common fern, which he met with in no other part of Asia Minor. Dr. Chandler (page 150, 4to) gives a striking description of Ephesus, as he found it on his visit in 1764: "Its population consisted of a few Greek peasants, living in extreme wretchedness, dependence, and insensibility, the representatives of an illustrious people, and inhabiting the wreck of their greatness — some the substructure of the glorious edifices which they raised, some beneath the vaults of the stadium, once the crowded scene of their diversions; and some in the abrupt precipice, in the sepulchers which received their ashes. Such are the present citizens of Ephesus, and such is the condition to which that renowned city has been reduced. It was a ruinous place when the emperor Justinian filled Constantinople with its statues, and raised the church of St. Sophia on its columns. Its streets are obscured and overgrown. A herd of goats was driven to it for shelter from the sun at noon, and a noisy flight of crows from the quarries seemed to insult its silence. We heard the partridge call in the area of the theater and of the stadium. The pomp of its heathen worship is no longer remembered; and Christianity, which was then nursed by apostles, and fostered by general councils, barely lingers on, in an existence hardly visible." However much the Church at Ephesus may (Revelation 2:2), in its earliest days, have merited praise for its "works, labor, and patience," yet it appears soon to have "left its first love," and to have received in vain the admonition — "Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove: thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." If any repentance was produced by this solemn warning, its effects were not durable, and the place has long since offered an evidence of the truth of prophecy, and the certainty of the divine threatenings, as well as a melancholy subject for thought to the contemplative Christian. Its fate is that of the once flourishing seven churches of Asia: its fate is that of the entire country — a garden has become a desert. Busy centers of civilization, spots where the refinements and delights of the age were collected, are now a prey to silence, destruction, and death. Consecrated first of all to the purposes of idolatry, Ephesus next had Christian temples almost rivaling the pagan in splendor, wherein the image of the great Diana lay prostrate before the cross; and, after the lapse of some centuries, Jesus gave place to Mohammed, and the crescent glittered on the dome of the recently

Christian church. A few more scores of years, and Ephesus had neither temple, cross, crescent, nor city, but was 6a desolation, a dry land, and a wilderness." Even the sea has retired from the scene of devastation, and a pestilential morass, covered with mud and rushes, has succeeded to the waters which brought up ships laden with merchandise from every part of the known world. (See Herod. 1:26; 2:148; Livy, 1:45; Pausanias, 7:2. 4; Philo Byz. *de* 7 *Orb. Mirac.;* Creuzer, *Symbol.* 2:13; Hassel, *Erdbeschr.* 2:182.)

7. *Literature.* — The site of ancient Ephesus has been visited and examined by many travelers during the last 200 years, and descriptions, more or less copious, have been given by Pococke, Tournefort, Spon and Wheler, Chandler, Poujoulat, Prokesch, Beaujour, Schubert, Arundell *(Seven Churches,* Lond. 1828, page 26), Fellows *(Asia Minor,* Lond. 1839, page 274), and Hamilton. The fullest accounts are, among the older travellers, in Chandler *(Travels,* Oxford, 1775, page 131), and, among the more recent, in Hamilton *(Researches,* Lond. 1842, 2:22). Some views are given in the second volume of the *Ionian Antiquities,* published by the Dilettanti Society. Leake, in his *Asia Minor* (Lond. 1824, pages 258, 346), has a discussion on the dimensions and style of the temple. In Kiepert's *Hellas* is a map, more or less conjectural, the substance of which will be found in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v. Ephesus. The latest and most complete work is Falkener's *Ephesus and the Temple of Diana* (London, 1862, 8vo). A railway now renders Ephesus accessible from Smyrna (Pressense, *Land of Gospel*, page 215). To the works above referred to must be added Perry, *De rebus Ephesiorum* (Gott. 1837), a slight sketch; Guhl, *Ephesiaca* (Berl. 1843), a very elaborate work, although his plans are mostly from Kiepert; Hemsen's *Paulus* (Gott. 1830), which contains a good chapter on Ephesus; Biscoe, *On the Acts* (Oxf. 1829), pages 274-285; Mr. Akerman's paper on the Coins of Ephesus in the *Trans. of the Numismatic Soc.* 1841; Gronovius, *Antiq. Graec.* 7:387-401; and an article by Ampere in the *Rev. des Deux Mondes* for January 1842. Other monographs are Anon. *Acta Pauli cum Ephesiis* (Helmst. 1768); Epinus, *De duplici bapt. discip. Ephesinor.* (Altorf, 1719); Benner, *De bapt. Ephesiorum in nonzen Christi* (Giess. 1733); Bircherode, *De cultu Diance Ephes.* (Hafn. 1723); Conrad, *Acta Pauli Ephes.* (Jena, 1710); Deyling, *De tumultu a Demetrio* (in his *Obss. sacr.* in, 362 sq.); Lederlin, *De templis Diance Ephesiorum* (Argent. 1714); Schurzfleish, *De literis Ephesior.* (Viteb. 1698); Siber, *De* περιεργίᾳ *Ephesiorum* (Viteb. 1685); Wallen,

Acta Pauli Ephes. (Grybh. 1783); Stickel, *De Ephesiis literis linguae Semiticae vindicandis* (Jeh. 1860). *SEE EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO.*

Ephesus, General Council Of.

The third oecumenical council, convoked by the emperor Theodosius II, was held at Ephesus in 431, upon the controversy raised by Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, who objected to the application of the title of Θεοτόκος to the Virgin Mary. For the circumstances which led to the convocation of this council, see the articles NESTORIUS *SEE NESTORIUS* , NESTORIANS *SEE NESTORIANS* , PELAGIUS *SEE PELAGIUS* . Celestine, the pope, not seeing fit to attend in person, sent three legates, Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philip, a priest. Among the first who arrived at the council was Nestorius, with a numerous body of followers, and accompanied by Ireneus, a nobleman, his friend and protector. Cyril of Alexandria also, and Juvenal of Jerusalem came, accompanied by about fifty of the Egyptian bishops; Memnon of Ephesus had brought together about forty of the bishops within his jurisdiction; and altogether more than two hundred bishops were present. Candidianus, the commander of the forces in Ephesus, attended, by order of the emperor, to keep peace and order; but by his conduct he greatly favored the party of Nestorius. The day appointed for the opening of the council was June 7th; but John of Antioch, and the other bishops from Syria and the East not having arrived, it was delayed till the 22d of the same month. At the first session of the council (June 22), before the Greek and Syrian bishops had arrived, Cyril and the bishops present condemned the doctrines of Nestorius, and deposed and excommunicated him. This sentence was signed by one hundred and ninety-eight bishops, according to Tillemont, and by more than two hundred according to Fleury; it was immediately made known to Nestorius, and published in the public places. At the same time, notice of it was sent to the clergy and people of Constantinople, with a recommendation to them to secure the property of the Church for the successor of the deprived Nestorius. As soon, however, as Nestorius had received notice of this sentence, he protested against it, and all that had passed at the council, and forwarded to the emperor an account of what had been done, setting forth that Cyril and Memnon, refusing to wait for John and the other bishops, had hurried matters on in a tumultuous and irregular way. On the 27th of June twenty-seven Syrian bishops arrived, chose John of Antioch for their president, and deposed Cyril in their turn. In August, count John, who had been sent by Theodosius, arrived at

Ephesus, and directed the bishops of both synods to meet him on the following day. Accordingly, John of Antioch and Nestorius attended with their party, and Cyril with the orthodox; but immediately a dispute arose between them the latter contending that Nestorius should not be present, while the former wished to exclude Cyril. Upon this, the count, to quiet the dispute, gave both Cyril and Nestorius into custody, and then endeavored, but in vain, to reconcile the two parties. And thus matters seemed as far from a settlement as ever. The emperor at last permitted the fathers of the council to send to him eight deputies, while the Orientals or Syrians, on their part, sent as many. The place of meeting was Chalcedon, whither the emperor proceeded, and spent five days in listening to the arguments on. both sides; and here the Council of Ephesus may, in. fact, be said to have terminated. Nothing is known of what passed at Chalcedon, but the event shows that Theodosius sided with the Catholics, since upon his return to Constantinople he ordered, by a letter, the Catholic deputies to come there, and to proceed to consecrate a bishop in the place of Nestorius, whom he had already ordered to leave Ephesus, and to confine himself to his monastery near Antioch. Afterwards he directed that all the bishops at the council, including Cyril and Memnon, should return to their respective dioceses. The judgment of this council was at once approved by the whole Western Church, and by far the greater part of the East, and was subsequently confirmed by the (Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, consisting of six hundred and thirty bishops. Even, John of Antioch and the Eastern bishops very soon acknowledged it. But Nestorius protested to the last that he did not hold the heretical opinions anathematized by the council. *SEE NESTORIUS*.

Of the other councils of Ephesus, the following are all that need be mentioned: 1, in 245 (?), against the Patropassian Noetus; 2, in 400, under Chrysostom, where Heraclidus was consecrated bishop of Ephesus, and six simoniacal bishops deposed; and the ROBBER COUNCIL (see next article). — Landon, *Manual of Councils,* page 235; Mansi, *Conc.* 4:1212, 1320, et al.; Gieseler, *Ch. History, §* 88; Neander, *Church Hist.* 2:468 sq.; Murd. Mosheim, *Church Hist.* 1:358; Palmer, *On the Church,* 1:385 sq.; Cunningham, *Historical Theology,* 1:328 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* 2:161 sq. ; Smith, *Tables of Church History; Christian Examiner,* 54:49.

Ephesus, Robber Council Of

(σύνοδος λῃστρική, *latrocinium Ephesinum)*, the so-called second general council at Ephesus, A.D. 449. Eutyches (q.v.), whom Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, had in the, preceding year deposed on account of heretical opinions, appealed to a general council, at which the patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and other heads of the Church should be present, and prevailed upon the emperor to convoke the council immediately. Theodosius wrote to Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, desiring him to attend at Ephesus on the1st of August, with ten metropolitan and as many Egyptian bishops, and no more, in order to inquire into a question of faith in dispute between Flavianus and Eutyches, and to remove from the Church the favorers of Nestorius. In the same manner he wrote to other bishops, always fixing the same number of metropolitans and bishops, and especially forbidding: Theodoret to leave his diocese. He sent his own officers, Elpidus and Eulogius, with authority to provide such troops as they might deem necessary, in order to carry into effect what might be required. The bishops who had sat in judgment upon Eutyches at the council held by Flavianus at Constantinople in 448 were present at the council, but were allowed to take no part in the debates, and Dioscorus was allowed to take the lead in everything relating to the council. The council met August 8, and about 130 bishops attended. Dioscorus and his party ruled throughout; Eutyches was declared orthodox, and re-established in his priesthood and office of abbot; and sentence of deposition was pronounced upon Flavianus. Flavianus appealed from this decision to the bishop of Rome, whose legate, Hilary, boldly opposed the sentence; at; the same time many of the bishops on their knees implored Dioscorus to reconsider the matter, but he, determined to carry it through, cried out for the imperial officers, upon which the proconsul Proclus entered, followed by a band of soldiers, armed with swords and sticks, and carrying chains, who by threats and blows compelled the bishops to sign the sentence of deposition. This, at last, ninety-six of them did, many, however, being first severely wounded; Flavianus himself was treated with such excessive violence that he died of the injuries he had received within three days; it is said that Dioscorus jumped upon him as he lay upon the ground, and that Barsumas and the monks kicked him with the utmost brutality. To the condemnation of Flavianus that of Eusebius of Dorylaeum was added, which ended the first session; after which the legate Hilary, dreading fresh scenes of violence, fled secretly to Rome. In the

following sessions Theodoret of Tyre was deposed, also Domnus of Antioch .and Ibas of Edessa; after which Dioscorus departed, and the bishops withdrew from Ephesus. Thus ended the σύνοδος ληστρική, as the Greeks justly named this disgraceful assembly, in which violence and injustice were carried on to the utmost excess. — Landon, *Manual of Councils,* page 236; Mansi, *Concil* 6:588 et al.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:509 sq.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist. §* 89; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* 2:350 sq.; Schaff, *Church Hist.* 2:348; 3:738; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 1:278; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 4:81; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:610; Lewald, *Die sogenannte Raubersynode,* in Illgen's *Zeitschriftfiir d. histor. Theol.* 1838, page 39. *SEE DIOSCORUS.*

Eph'lal

(Hebrews *Ephlal',* לַפְלַל, *judicator;* Sept. Ὀφλάδ v.r. Ἀφαμήλ, Vulg. *Ophlal),* son of Zabad and father of Obed, of the lineage of Sheshan, of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:37). B.C. post 1618.

E'phod

(Hebrews *Ephod',* אֵפוֹד, an *ephod* [q.v.]; Sept. Οὐφίδ v.r. Σουφί, Vulg. *Ephod),* the father of Hanniel, which latter, as head of the tribe of Manasseh, was one of the men appointed to assist Joshua and Eleazar in the apportionment of the land of Canaan (Numbers 34:23). B.C. ante 1618.

Ephod

Picture for Ephod 1

(אֵפוֹד [rarely אֵפֹד], *ephod',* twice [Exodus 28:8; 39:5] in the fem. אֲפֻדָּה, *aphuddah',* something *girt;* ἐπωμίς, Ecclus. 45:8), a sacred vestmerit originally appropriate to the high-priest (Exodus 28:4), but afterwards worn by ordinary priests (1 Samuel 22:18), and deemed characteristic of the office (1 Samuel 2:28; 14:3; Hosea 3:4). A kind of ephod was worn by Samuel (1 Samuel 2:18), and by David when he brought the ark to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 6:14; 1 Chronicles 15:27); it differed from the priestly ephod in material, being made of ordinary linen (בַּד), whereas the other was of fine linen (שֵׁשׁ); it is noticeable that the Sept. does not give ἐπωμίς or Ἐφούς in the passages last quoted, but

terms of more general import, στολὴ ἔξαλλος, στολὴ βυσσίνη. Attached to the ephod of the high-priest was the breast-plate with the Urim and Thummim; this was *the* ephod by eminence, which Abiathar carried off (1 Samuel 23:6) from the tabernacle at Nob (1 Samuel 21:9), and which David consulted (1 Samuel 23:9; 30:7). The importance of the ephod as the receptacle of the breast-plate led to its adoption in the idolatrous forms of worship instituted in the time of the judges (Judges 8:27; 17:5; 18:14 sq.). The amount of gold used by Gideon in making his ephod (Judges 8:26) has led Gesenius *(Thesaur.* page 135), after Vatke *(Bibl. Theol.* 1:267), following the Peshito version, to give the word the meaning of an idol-image, as though that, and not the priest, was clothed with the ephod: but there is no evidence that the idol was so invested, nor does such an idea harmonize with the general use of the ephod. Idols of wood were often thus overlaid with plates of gold or silver, and are probably alluded to in Judges 17:5; 18:17-20; Hosea 3:4; Isaiah 30:22. The ephod itself, however, would require a considerable amount of gold (Exodus 28:6 sq.; 39:2 sq.), but certainly not so large a sum as is stated to have been used by Gideon; may we not therefore assume that to *make an ephod* implied the introduction of a new system of worship with its various accessories, such as the graven image, which seems, from the prominence assigned to it in Judges 18:31, to represent the Urim and Thummim, the molten image, and the Teraphim (17:4, 5), and would require a large consumption of metal? The ephod was worn over the tunic and outer garment or pallium (Exodus 28:31; 29:5), without sleeves, and divided below the armpits into two parts or halves, of which one was in front, covering the breast and belly, and the other behind, covering the back. These were joined above on the shoulders by clasps or buckles of gold and precious stones, and reached down to the middle of the thighs; they were also made fast by a belt around the body (Exodus 18:6-12). The ancient Egyptian priests appear to have been arrayed in white garments of the same materials. The *hierogramnat,* or sacred scribe, especially wore, over the kelt or apron (corresponding to the Jewish sacerdotal "6 breeches" or drawers) which constituted the universal nether undergarment, a loose upper robe with full sleeves, which in all cases was of the finest linen, and was secured by a girdle round the loins. Sometimes a priest who offered incense was clad in like manner. At other times the priests wore, in addition to the apron, a shirt with short tight sleeves, over which was thrown a loose robe, leaving the right arm exposed (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egypt.* 1:334). *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*

Picture for Ephod 2

Eph'phatha

(ἐφφαθά, a Graecized form of the Syro-Chaldee imperative j tPḥa or j tPḥa, strictly j tP;t ḥa, meaning *be opened*, as it is immediately interpreted), an exclamation uttered by Christ in curing the deaf-mute (<410734>Mark 7:34).

Ephraem Manuscript

Picture for Ephraem Manuscript

(CODEX EPHRAEMI, usually designated as C. of the New Test.), a very important uncial palimpsest, which derives its
name from having been (about the 12th century), rewritten over with a portion of the Greek works of Ephraem the Syrian (q.v.). It seems to have been brought from the East by Andrew John Lascar, at whose death; (A.D. 1535) it passed into the hands of cardinal Nicolas Ridolfi, and thence, through Pietro Strozzi, into the possession of Catharine de Medici, who deposited it in the Royal Library at Paris, where it still remains (numbered MS. 9). The old Greek writing, which is barely legible (having been partly effaced to, make room for the later matter) contains portions of the Sept. version of the O.T. on 64 leaves, and fragments(enumerated in Scrivener's. *Introd.* page 94 note) of every part of the N.T. on 145 leaves. It is elegantly written, very much resembling in form and arrangement of the books and general appearance the Codex Alexandrinus, and has but one column on a page, consisting of 40 to 46 lines. The characters vary in size, are somewhat elaborate, and have the characteristics of the Alexandrian recension, and of the 5th century. The Ammonian sections stand in the margin, but not the Eusebiancanons; the latter, perhaps, having been washed out, as they were usually in red ink. There are no chapter divisions, and but few punctuation marks. Traces of at least three later correctors may be discovered; the first, perhaps of the 6th century, inserted many accents, and the *rough* breathing; by him or the third hand (whose changes are but few), small crosses were interpolated as; stops; the second reviser, not earlier than the 9th century, appears to have clumsily added the ecclesiastical notes in the margin. A chemical preparation, applied to the MS. at the instance of Fleck in 1834, though it revived much that was before illegible, has defaced the vellum with stains of various color. The

older writing was first, noticed by Peter Allix nearly two centuries ago; various readings extracted from it were communicated by Boivin to Kuster, who published them in his edition of Mill's N.T., 1711. A complete collation of the N.T. portion was first made by Wetstein in 1716, for Bentley's projected edition, and used by Wetstein in his own Greek Test. of 1751-2. In 1843 Tischendorf published the N.T. part fully, and the O.T. in 1845, in a splendid and accurate form, page for page and line for line, in capital but not fac-simile letters, with valuable prolegomena, etc. — Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* 4:166 sq.; *Christian Remembrancer,* October 1862; Tischendorf, *Nov. Test. Gr.* 7th edit. page 149 sq. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.*

E'phraim

Picture for E’phraim

(Hebrews *Ephra'yim,* µyaæ¥p]a, a dual form; Gesenius suggests=twin-land; Fürst derives from a sing. yrip]a=yrP], *fruitful; Sept.* Ἐφραΐμ), the name of a man (including the tribe and tract named from him, with other kindred objects), and of one or two other places of doubtful authenticity and certainly of much less note.

1. (Josephus Graecizes Ἐφραΐμης, *Ant.* 2:7, 4.) The second son of Joseph by Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah (<014620>Genesis 46:20), born during the seven years of plenteousness (B.C. cir. 1878), and an allusion to this is possibly latent in the name, though it may also allude to Joseph's increasing family: "The name of the second he called Ephraim (i.e., double fruitfulness), for God hath caused me to be fruitful (ynaæ¥p]h,æ *hiphrani)* in the land of my affliction" (<014152>Genesis 41:52). Josephus *(Ant.* 2:6, 1) gives the derivation of the name somewhat differently —"Restorer, because he was restored to the freedom of his forefathers" (ἀποδιδούς ... διὰ τὸ ἀποδοθῆναι). The first incident in his history, as well as that of his elder brother Manasseh, is the blessing of the grandchildren by Jacob, "Genesis 48 — a passage on the age and genuineness of which the severest criticism has cast no doubt (Tuch, *Genesis,* page 548; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 1:534, note). Like his own father, on an occasion not dissimilar, Jacob's eyes were dim so that he could not see (48:10; comp. 27:1). The intention of Joseph was evidently that the right hand of Jacob should convey its ampler blessing to the head of Manasseh, his first-born, and he had so arranged the young men. But the result was otherwise ordained. Jacob had been himself

a younger brother, and his words show plainly that he had not forgotten this, and that his sympathies were still with the younger of his two grand-children. He recalls the time when he was flying with the birthright from the vengeance of Esau; the day when, still a wanderer, God Almighty had appeared to him at "Luz in the land of Canaan," and blessed him in words which foreshadowed the name of Ephraim ("I will make thee fruitful," Úrþ]mi, *maphreka,* <014804>Genesis 48:4; "Be thou fruitful," hrep], *pereh,* 35:11; both from the same root as the name *Ephraim);* the still later day when the name of Ephrath (comp. Ewald, *Gesch.* 1:493, n.) became bound up with the sorest trial of his life (48:7; 35:16). *SEE EPHRAIMITE*. Thus, notwithstanding the prearrangement and the remonstrance of Joseph, for the second time in that family, the younger brother was made greater than the elder — Ephraim was set before Manasseh (48:19, 20). Ephraim would appear at that time to have been about twenty-one years old (comp. <014728>Genesis 47:28). Before Joseph's death Ephraim's family had reached the third generation (<010123>Genesis 1:23), and it may have been about this time that the affray mentioned in <130721>1 Chronicles 7:21, occurred, when some of the sons were killed on a plundering expedition along the sea-coast to rob the cattle of the men of Gath, and when Ephraim named a son Beriah, to perpetuate the memory of the disaster which had fallen on his house. *SEE BERIAH*. Obscure as is the interpretation of this fragment, it enables us to catch our last glimpse of the patriarch, mourning inconsolable in the midst of the circle of his brethren, and at last commemorating his loss in the name of the new child, who, unknown to him, was to be the progenitor of the most illustrious of all his descendants — Jehoshua, or Joshua, the son of Nun (<130727>1 Chronicles 7:27: see Ewald, 1:491). To this early period, too, has been referred the circumstance alluded to in <197809>Psalm 78:9, when the "'children of Ephraim, *armed bowmen* (yqev]n tvq,9ymer, A. V. "being armed [and] carrying bows," which Gesenius and others support, from the Sept. and Vulg.; although Ewald strikingly renders ‘carrying *slack* bows’), turned back in the day of battle." Others, however, assign this defection to the failure of the tribe (in common with the rest of the Israelites) to expel the Canaanites (<070129>Judges 1:29).

1. TRIBE OF EPHRAIM. This tribe, although, in accordance with the ancient laws of primogeniture, inferior, as being the junior, yet received precedence over that descended from the elder Manasseh by virtue of the blessing of Jacob (<014152>Genesis 41:52; 48:1). That blessing was an adoptive act, whereby Ephraim and his brother Manasseh were counted as sons of

Jacob, in the place of their father; the object being to give to Joseph, through his sons, a double portion in the brilliant prospects of his house. Thus the descendants of Joseph formed *two* of the tribes of Israel, whereas every other of Jacob's sons counted but as one. There were thus, in fact, thirteen tribes of Israel; but the number twelve is usually preserved, either by excluding that of Levi (which had no territory) when Ephraim and Manasseh are separately named, or by counting these two together as the tribe of Joseph when Levi is included in the account. The intentions of Jacob were fulfilled, and Ephraim and Manasseh were counted as tribes of Israel at the departure from Egypt, and, as such, shared in the territorial distribution of the Promised Land (<04013>Numbers 1:33; <06714>Joshua 17:14; <13720>1 Chronicles 7:20). The precise position of the immediate descendants of Joseph in Egypt might form an interesting subject for speculation. Being the sons of one in eminent place, and through their mother connected with high families in Egypt, their condition could not at once have been identified with that of the sojourners in Goshen; and perhaps they were not fully amalgamated with the rest of their countrymen until that king arose who knew not Joseph.

The numbers of the tribe did not at all times correspond with the promise of the blessing of Jacob. At the census in the wilderness of Sinai (<04012>Numbers 1:32, 33; 2:19) its numbers were 40,500, placing it at the head of the children of Rachel — Manasseh's number being 32,200, and Benjamin's 35,400. But forty years later, on the eve of the conquest (<04637>Numbers 26:37), without any apparent cause, while Manasseh had advanced to 52,700, and Benjamin to 45,600, Ephraim had decreased to 32,500, the only smaller number being that of Simeon, 22,200. At this period the families of both the brother tribes are enumerated, and Manasseh has precedence over Ephraim in order of mention. It is very possible that these great fluctuations in number may, in part at least, have been owing to the various standards under which the "mixed multitude" (b r ,[ ), i.e., mongrel population of semi-Hebrew Egyptians that followed the emigrating host (<02138>Exodus 12:38), ranged itself in its fickleness at different times *(Meth. Quart. Rev.* April 1863, page 305 sq.). During the march through the wilderness the position of the sons of Joseph and Benjamin was on the west side of the tabernacle (<04028>Numbers 2:18-24), and the prince of Ephraim was Elishama, the son of Ammihud (<04010>Numbers 1:10).

It is at the time of the sending of the spies that we are first introduced to the great hero to whom the tribe owed much of its subsequent greatness. The representative of Ephraim on this occasion was "Oshea, the son of Nun," whose name was at the termination of the affair changed by Moses to the more distinguished form in which it is familiar to us. As among the founders of the nation Abram had acquired the name of Abraham, and Jacob of Israel, so Oshea, "help," became Jehoshua or Joshua, "the help of Jehovah" (Ewald, 2:306).

According to the arrangement of the records of the book of Joshua-the " Domesday book of Palestine" — the two great tribes of Judah and Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh) first took their inheritance; and after them the seven other tribes entered on theirs (Joshua 15, 16, 17, 18:5). The boundaries of the portion of Ephraim are given in 16:1-10, and a part of it apparently in duplicate in verses 5, 7. The south boundary was coincident for part of its length with the north boundary of Benjamin (q.v.), which latter, however, is somewhat more exactly stated in <061812>Joshua 18:12 sq. *SEE TRIBE*. Commencing at the Jordan, at the reach opposite Jericho (strictly *Jordan of Jericho,* /jyræ]ˆDery, an expression that would lead as to locate the boundary at the point nearest that city, did not the necessity of including within Benjamin certain other pretty well identified places compel us to carry it somewhat farther up the river), it ran to the "water of Jericho," probably the vicinity of the Ras el-Ain; thence by one of the ravines, perhaps the wady Samieh, it ascended through the wilderness *Xidbar,* the uncultivated waste hills-to Mount Bethel and Luz; and thence by Ataroth, "the Japhietite," Bethhoron the lower, and Gezer-places two of which are known-along the northern boundary of Dan (q.v.) to the Mediterranean, probably about Joppa. This agrees with the enumeration in 1 Chronicles 7, in which Bethel is given as the eastern, and Gezer-somewhere east of the present Ramleh-as the western limit. In <061606>Joshua 16:6, 8, we apparently have fragments of the northern boundary (compare 17:10), and as at least three of the points along that line (Asher, Tappuah, and Janohah) are pretty well identified (see each name), we are tolerably safe in fixing the eastern extremity on the Jordan at about the mouth of wady Fasail, and the western, or the torrent Kanah, at the modern Nahr Falaik, north of Apollonia. But it is possible that there never was a very definite subdivision of the territory assigned to the two brother tribes. Such an inference, at least, may be drawn from <061714>Joshua 17:14-18, in which the two are represented as complaining that only one 'portion had been allotted

to them. Among the towns named as Manasseh's were Bethshean in the Jordan valley, Endor on the slopes of the "Little Hermon," Taanach on the north side of Carmel, and Dor on the sea-coast south of the same mountain. Ephraim thus occupied the very center of Palestine, embracing an area about 40 miles in length from E. to W., and from 6 to 25 in breadth from N. to S. It extended from the Mediterranean on the W. to the Jordan on the E. on the N. it had the half-tribe of Manasseh, and on the S. Benjamin and Dan (Joshua 16:5 sq.; 17:7 sq.). This fine country included most of what was afterwards called Samaria, as distinguished from Judaea on the one hand, and from Galilee on the other. *SEE SAMARIA*.

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities within this tribe, with the probable modern sites; those not identified by any modern traveler are enclosed in brackets:

Antipatris.	Town.	*Kefr-Saba.*
Archi.	do.	*[Kefr-Musr]?*
Arumah.	do.	*El-Ormah.*
Ataroth (-addar).	do.	*Atara.*
Baal-hamon.	Vineyard.	[S.E. of Jenin]?
Baal-shalisha.	Town.	*SEE SHALISHA*.
Beth-horon.	do.	*Beit-Ur.*
Bochim.	Altar Stone.	*[Khurbet-Jeradeh]*?
Ebal.	Mount.	*[Jebel Sitti-Salamiyeh]*
Gaash.	do.	[Sepulchral Hill S. of Tibneh]?
Gazer.	Town.	*SEE GEZER*.
Gerizim.	Mount.	*Jebel et-Tur.*
Gezer.	Town.	*Abu Shusheh.*
Gibeah.	do.	*Khurbet-Jibia?*
Gilgal (2 Kings 2:2).	do.	*Jiljilia.*

Gilgal ([<061223>]Joshua 12:23).	do.	*Jiljuliyeh.*
Gob	do.	*SEE GEZER.*
Jacob's Well.	Well.	*Bir-Yakub.*
Janohah.	Town.	*Yanun.*
Japhleti.	Village.	*[Beit Unia]?*
Jeshanah.	Town.	*[Ain-Sinia]?*
Kanah.	Brook.	*Nahr Fulaik?*
Lasharon.	Plain.	*SEE SHARON.*
Lebonah.	Town.	*Lubbban.*
Luz.	do.	[N. of Beitin]?
Michmethah.	do.	[On Wady Bidan]?
Moreh.	Hill.	[S. spur of Jebel Duhy]?
Pirathon.	Town.	*Ferata.*
Salim.	do.	*Sheikh Salim.*
Samaria.	do.	*Sebustiyeh.*
Saron.	Region.	*SEE SHARON.*
Shalem.	Town.	*Salim.*
Shalisha.	Region.	*[Khurbet Hatta].*
Sharon.	do.	N. part maritime plain.
Shechem.	Town.	*Nablus.*
Shiloh.	do.	*Seilun.*
Sychem or Sychar.	do.	*SEE SHECHEM.*
Tappuah.	do.	*‘Atuf?*
Thebez.	do.	*Tubas.*
Timnath (-heres or}	do.	*Tibneh.*

-serah.)

Tiphsah.	do.	*[Asira]?*
Tirzah.	do.	*Talusa.*
Uzzen-sherah.	do.	*[Suffa]?*
Zalmon.	Mount.	*[Jebel Sleiman].*

Central Palestine consists of an elevated district which rises from the flat ranges of the wilderness on the south of Judah, and terminates on the north with the slopes which descend into the great plain of Esdraelon. On the west a flat strip separates it from the sea, and on the east another flat strip forms the valley of the Jordan. Of this district the northern half was occupied by the great tribe we are now considering. This was the *Haar-Ephraim*, or "Mount Ephraim," a district which seems to extend as far south as Ramah and Bethel (<09001>1 Samuel 1:1; 7:17; <14134>2 Chronicles 13:4, 19, compared with 15:8), places but a few miles north of Jerusalem, and within the limits of Benjamin. (See below.) In structure it is limestone — rounded hills separated by valleys of denudation, but much less regular and monotonous than the part more to the south, about and below Jerusalem; with "wide plains in the heart of the mountains, streams of running water, and continuous tracts of vegetation" (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 225). All travelers bear testimony to the "general growing richness" and beauty of the country in going northwards from Jerusalem, the "innumerable fountains" and streamlets, the villages more thickly scattered than anywhere in the south, the continuous corn-fields and orchards, the moist, vapory atmosphere (Martineau, pages 516, 521; Van de Velde, 1:386-8). These are the "precious things of the earth, and the fullness thereof," which are invoked on the "ten' thousands of Ephraim" and the "thousands of Manasseh" in the blessing of Moses. These it is which, while Dan, Judah, and Benjamin are personified as lions and wolves, making their lair and tearing their prey among the barren rocks of the south, suggested to the lawgiver, as they had done to the patriarch before him, the patient "bullock" and the "bough by the spring, whose branches ran over the wall" as fitter images for Ephraim (<01422>Genesis 49:22; <05317>Deuteronomy 33:17). And centuries after, when its great disaster had fallen on the kingdom of Israel, the same images recur to the prophets. The "flowers" are still there in the "olive valleys," "faded" though they be (<23301>Isaiah 28:1). The vine is an empty, unprofitable vine, whose very abundance is evil (<28001>Hosea 10:1); Ephraim is still the

"bullock," now "unaccustomed to the yoke," but waiting a restoration to the "pleasant places" of his former "pasture" (<24818>Jeremiah 31:18; <28913>Hosea 9:13; 4:16) — "the heifer that is taught and loveth to tread out the corn," the heifer with the "beautiful neck" (<28101>Hosea 10:11), or the "kine of Bashan on the mountain of Samaria" (<30401>Amos 4:1).

The wealth of their possession had not the same immediately enervating effect on this tribe that it had on some of its northern brethren, e.g., Asher (q.v.). Various causes may have helped to avert this evil.

1. The central situation of Ephraim in the highway of all communications from one part of the country to another. From north to south, from Jordan to the Sea — from Galilee, or still more distant Damascus, to Philistia and Egypt — these roads all lay more or less through Ephraim, and the constant traffic along them must have always tended to keep the district from sinking into stagnation.

2. The position of Shechem, the original settlement of Jacob, with his well and his "parcel of ground," with the two sacred mountains of Ebal and Gerizim, the scene of the impressive and significant ceremonial of blessing and cursing; and the tomb and patrimony of Joshua, the great hero not only of Ephraim, but of the nation — the fact that all these localities were deep in the heart of the tribe, must have made it always the resort of large numbers from all parts of the country — of larger numbers than any other place, until the establishment of Jerusalem by David. Moreover, the tabernacle and the ark were deposited within its limits, at Shiloh; and the possession of the sacerdotal establishment, which was a central object of attraction to all the other tribes, must, in no small degree, have enhanced its importance, and increased its wealth and population. It is, perhaps, to this fact that David alludes in <19206>Psalm 132:6, if by *"Ephratah"* this tribe is there meant. 3. But there was a spirit about the tribe itself which may have been both a cause and a consequence of these advantages of position. That spirit, early domineering and haughty (<06714>Joshua 17:14), though sometimes taking the form of noble remonstrance and reparation (<14809>2 Chronicles 28:9-15), usually manifested itself in jealous complaint at some enterprise undertaken or advantage gained in which they had not a chief share. To Gideon (<07801>Judges 8:1), to Jephthah (<07201>Judges 12:1), and to David (<10941>2 Samuel 19:41-43), the cry is still the same in effect — almost the same in words — "Why did ye despise us that our advice should not have been first had?" "Why hast thou served us thus that thou calledst us

not?" The unsettled state of the country in general, and of the interior of Ephraim in particular (Judges 9), and the continual incursions of foreigners, prevented the power of the tribe from manifesting itself in a more formidable manner than by these murmurs during the time of the Judges and the first stage of the monarchy. Samuel, though a Levite, was a native of Ramah in Mount Ephraim, and Saul belonged to a tribe closely allied to the family of Joseph, so that during the priesthood of the former and the reign of the latter the supremacy of Ephraim may be said to have been practically maintained. Certainly in neither case had any advantage been gained by their great rival in the south. But when the great tribe of Judah produced a king in the person of David, the pride and jealousy of Ephraim were thoroughly awakened, and it was doubtless chiefly through their means that Abner was enabled for a time to uphold the house of Saul; for there are manifest indications that by, this time Ephraim influenced the views and feelings of all the other tribes. They were at length driven by the force of circumstances to acknowledge David upon conditions; and were probably not without hope that, as the king of the nation at large, he would establish his capital in their central portion of the land. Again, the brilliant successes of David, and his wide influence and religious zeal, kept matters smooth for another period, even in the face of the blow given to both Shechem and Shiloh by the concentration of the civil and ecclesiastical capitals at Jerusalem. Twenty thousand and eight hundred of the choice warriors of the tribe, "men of name throughout the house of their father," went as far as Hebron to make David king over Israel (<13120>1 Chronicles 12:30). Among the officers of his court we find more than one Ephraimite (<13270>1 Chronicles 27:10, 14), and the attachment of the tribe to his person seems to have been great (<10941>2 Samuel 19:41-43). But as he not only established his court at Jerusalem, but proceeded to remove the ark thither, making his native Judah the seat both of the theocratic and civil government, the Ephraimites, as a tribe, became thoroughly alienated, and longed to establish their own ascendency. The building of the temple at Jerusalem, and other measures of Solomon, strengthened this desire; and although the minute organization and vigor of his government prevented any overt acts of rebellion, yet the train was then laid, and the reign of Solomon, splendid in appearance but oppressive to the people, developed both the circumstances of revolt and the leader who was to turn them to account. Solomon saw through the crisis, and if he could have succeeded in killing Jeroboam, as he tried to do (<11140>1 Kings 11:40), the disruption might have been postponed for another century. As it was, the outbreak

was deferred for a time, but the irritation was not allayed, and the insane folly of his son brought the mischief to a head. Rehoboam probably selected Shechem — the old capital of the country — for his coronation, in the hope that his presence and the ceremonial might make a favorable impression, but in this he failed utterly, and the tumult which followed shows how complete was the breach — "To your tents, O Israel! now see to thine own house, David!" Rehoboam was certainly not the last king of Judah whose chariot went as far north as Shechem, but he was the last who visited it as a part of his own dominion, and he was the last who, having come so far, returned unmolested to his own capital. Jehoshaphat escaped, in a manner little short of miraculous, from the risks of the battle of Ramoth-Gilead, and it was the fate of two of his successors, Ahaziah and Josiah — differing in everything else, and agreeing only in this — that they were both carried dead in their chariots from the plain of Esdraelon to Jerusalem.

Thenceforth the rivalry of Ephraim and Judah was merged in that between the two kingdoms; although still the predominance of Ephraim in the kingdom of Israel was so conspicuous as to occasion the whole realm to be called by its name, especially when that rivalry is mentioned. This title is particularly employed in the prophetical books (<2908>Isaiah 9:8; 17:3; 28:3; <2807>Hosea 4:17; 5:3; 9:3). When the land of Ephraim is meant, the word is fem. in the original (<2809>Hosea 5:9); when the people, masc. (<2708>Isaiah 7:8). Thus in two senses the history of Ephraim is the history of the kingdom of Israel, since not only did the tribe become a kingdom, but the kingdom embraced little besides the tribe. This is not surprising, and quite susceptible of explanation. North of Ephraim the country appears never to have been really taken possession of by the Israelites. Whether from want of energy on their part, or great stubbornness of resistance on that of the Canaanites, certain it is that of the list of towns from which the original inhabitants were not expelled, the great majority belong to the northern tribes, Manasseh, Asher, Issachar, and Naphtali. In addition to this original defect there is much in the physical formation and circumstances of the upper portion of Palestine to explain why those tribes never took any active part in the kingdom. They were exposed to the inroads and seductions of their surrounding heathen neighbors — on one side the luxurious Phoenicians, on the other the plundering Bedouins of Midian; they were open to the attacks of Syria and Assyria from the north, and Egypt from the south; the great plain of Esdraelon, which communicated

more or less with all the northern tribes, was the natural outlet of the no less natural high roads of the maritime plain from Egypt, and the Jordan valley for the tribes of the East, and formed an admirable base of operations for an invading army. But, on the other hand, the position of Ephraim was altogether different. It was one at once of great richness and security. Her fertile plains and well-watered valleys could only be reached by a laborious ascent through steep and narrow ravines, all but impassable for an army. There is no record of any attack on the central kingdom, either from the Jordan valley or the maritime plain. On the north side, from the plain of Esdraelon, it was more accessible, and it was from this side that the final invasion appears to have been made. But even on that side the entrance was so difficult and so easily defensible — as we learn from the description in the book of Judith (4:6, 7) — that, had the kingdom of Samaria been less weakened by internal dissensions, the attacks even of the great Shalmaneser might have been resisted, as at a later date were those of Holofernes. There are few things more mournful in the sacred story than the descent of this haughty and jealous tribe, from the culminating point at which it stood when it entered on the fairest portion of the Land of Promise the chief sanctuary and the chief settlement of the nation within its limits, its leader the leader of the whole people — through the distrust which marked its intercourse with its fellows, while it was a member of the confederacy, and the tumult, dissension, and ungodliness which characterized its independent existence, down to the sudden captivity and total oblivion which closed its career. Judah had her times of revival and of recurring prosperity, but here the course is uniformly downward — a sad picture of opportunities wasted and personal gifts abused. 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt... . I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms, but they knew not that I healed them. I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love ... but the Assyrian shall be their king, because they refused to return... . How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim?" (<28101>Hosea 11:1-8). *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.*

2. MOUNT EPHRAIM, a mountain or group of mountains in Central Palestine, in the tribe of the same name, on or towards the borders of Benjamin (<06175>Joshua 17:15; 19:50; 20:7; <07024>Judges 7:24; 17:1; <09904>1 Samuel 9:4; <11048>1 Kings 4:8). From a comparison of these passages it may be collected that the name of "Mount Ephraim" was applied to the whole

of the ranges and groups of hills which occupy the central part of the southernmost border of this tribe, and which are prolonged southward into the tribe of Benjamin. (See above.) In the time of Joshua these hills were densely covered with trees (<06718>Joshua 17:18), which is by no means the case at present. In <24019>Jeremiah 1:19, Mount Ephraim is mentioned in apposition with Bashan, on the other side of the Jordan, as a region of rich pastures, suggesting that the valleys among these mountains were well watered and covered with rich herbage, which is true at the present day. Joshua was buried in the border of his own inheritance in Timnath-heres, "in the mount of Ephraim, on the north side of the hill Gaash" (<07009>Judges 2:9).

EPHRAIM, GATE OF

(µyæPÞa, r [iv; Sept. πύλη Ἐφραΐμ), one of the gates of the city of Jerusalem (<12413>2 Kings 14:13; <14523>2 Chronicles 25:23; <16806>Nehemiah 8:16; 13:39), doubtless, according to the Oriental practice, on the side looking towards the locality from which it derived its name, and therefore on the north, probably at or near the position of the present "Damascus gate." *SEE JERUSALEM.*

EPHRAIM, WOOD OF

(µyæpÞa, r [iy; Sept. δρυμὰς Ἐφραΐμ), a forest (the word *yaar* imploring dense growth), in which the fatal battle was fought between the armies of David and of Absalom (<10806>2 Samuel 18:6), and the entanglement in which added greatly to the slaughter of the latter (verse 8). It would be very tempting to believe that the forest derived its name from the place near which Absalom's sheep-farm was situated (<10123>2 Samuel 13:23), and which would have been a natural spot for his headquarters before the battle, especially associated as it was with the murder of Amnon. Moreover, there appears to have been another *woodland of Ephraim* in the mountains belonging to that tribe in this neighborhood (<06715>Joshua 17:15-18).

But the statements of <06702>Joshua 17:24, 26, and also the expression of 18:3, "That thou succor us out of the city," i.e., Mahanaim, allow no escape from the conclusion that the locality was on the east side of Jordan, though it is impossible to account satisfactorily for the presence of the name of Ephraim on that side of the river. The suggestion is due to Grotius that the name was derived from the slaughter of Ephraim at the fords of Jordan by

the Gileadites under Jephthah (<07120>Judges 12:1, 4, 5); but that occurrence took place at the very brink of the river itself, while the city of Mahanaim and the wooded country must have lain several miles away from the stream, and on the higher ground above the Jordan valley. Is it not at least equally probable that the forest derived its name from this very battle? The great tribe of Ephraim, though not specially mentioned in the transactions of Absalom's revolt, cannot fail to have taken the most conspicuous part in the affair, and the reverse was a more serious one than had overtaken the tribe for a very long time, and possibly combined with other circumstances to retard materially their rising into an independent kingdom. But others suppose that it was because the Ephraimites were in the habit of bringing their flocks into this quarter for pasture; for the Jews allege that the Ephraimites received from Joshua, who was of their tribe, permission to feed their flocks in the woodlands within the territories of any of the tribes of Israel; and that, as this forest lay near their territories on the other side the Jordan, they were wont to drive their flocks over to feed there (see Jarchi, Kimchi, Abarbanel, etc., on <10806>2 Samuel 18:6). It is probably referred to under the name EPHRATAH *SEE EPHRATAH* (q.v.) in <19206>Psalm 132:6, where the other member of the verse has "fields of the wood." Others, however, not unreasonably suppose this to be a different locality. *SEE FOREST*.

2. In "Baal-hazor, which is 'by' Ephraim," was Absalom's sheep-farm, at which took place the murder of Amnon, one of the earliest precursors of the great revolt (<10823>2 Samuel 13:23). The Hebrew particle μ2P[, rendered above "by" (A.V. "beside"), always seems to imply actual proximity, and therefore we should conclude that Ephraim was not the tribe of that name, but a town. The cities of Dan and Asher are other instances of localities beyond the tribes, yet bearing their names; and the former suggests that the appellation may in all these cases have arisen by colonization. Ewald conjectures that the place here in question is identical with EPHRAIN, EPHRO, and OPHRAH of the O.T., and also with the EPHRAIM which was for a time the residence of our Lord *(Gesch.* 3:219, note). But with regard to the first three names there is the difficulty that they are spelt with the guttural letter *ayin,* and this is very rarely exchanged for the *aleph,* which commences the name before us. The Sept. makes the following addition to verse 34: "And the watchman went and told the king, and said, I have seen men on the road of the Oronen (τῆς ὡρωνῆν, Alex. τῶν ὀρεωνῆν) by the side of the mountain." Ewald considers this to be a

genuine addition, and to refer to Beth-horon, N.W. of Jerusalem, off the Nablus road, but the indication is surely too slight for such an inference. Any force it may have is against the identity of this Ephraim with that in <43154>John 11:54, which was probably in the direction N.E. of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, the best solution of the question appears to be to identify this place with the one following. *SEE BAAL-HAZOR*.

3. A city (Ἐφραΐμ λεγομένην πόλιν) "in the district near the wilderness," to which our Lord retired with his disciples when threatened with violence by the priests in consequence of having raised Lazarus from the dead (<43154>John 11:54). By the "wilderness" (ἔρημος) is probably meant the wild uncultivated hill-country N.E. of Jerusalem, lying between the central towns and the Jordan valley (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebrews* pages 97, 953). In this case the conjecture of Dr. Robinson is very admissible, that OPHRAH *SEE OPHRAH* (q.v.) of Benjamin (<061823>Joshua 18:23) and Ephraim are identical, and that their modern representation is *et-Taiyibeh,* a village on a conspicuous conical hill, commanding a view "over the whole eastern slope, the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea" *(Researches,* 2:121). It is placed by Eusebius *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἐφρών) eight Roman miles north of Jerusalem, while Jerome, with more probability, makes the distance 20 Roman miles. This indication would seem to make it the same with the EPHRAIN or EPHRON which is mentioned in <141319>2 Chronicles 13:19, along with Bethel and Jeshanah, as towns taken from Jeroboam by Abijah. This, again, is doubtless the same which Josephus also names (Ἐφραΐμ) along with Bethel as "two small cities" (πολίχνια), which were taken and garrisoned by Vespasian while reducing the country around Jerusalem *(War,* 4:9, 9). It is likewise probably identical with the EPHRAIM (see above) near Baal-Hazor (<101323>2 Samuel 13:23). *SEE APHAEREMA*.

E'phraimite

as a designation of a descendant of the patriarch Ephraim, is properly denoted in the Hebrews by the patronymic µyaæpÞAˆB, *son of Ephraim* (<042202>Numbers 10:22, plur. A.V. "children of Ephraim"), or simply *Ephraim* (often rendered " Ephraimites" in the A.V.);. but in <071205>Judges 12:5 it appears as a rendering of ytæpÞe,an *Ephrathite* (q.v.), meaning thereby, however, an Ephraimite, which is apparently likewise the meaning of the same Hebrews word in <090101>1 Samuel 1:1; <111126>1 Kings 11:26, in both which passages, however, the A.V. regularly Anglicizes "Ephrathite." The

narrative in Judges raises the inquiry whether the Ephraimites had not a peculiar accent *orpatois,* similar to that which in later times caused "the speech" of the Galilaeans to "betray" them to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (<402673>Matthew 26:73).

E'phraïn

(Hebrews in the margin *Ephra'yin,* ˆyæip]['], but in the text *Ephron',* ˆ/æip]['], 2Pe. ˆ/rp][, which latter appears to be the genuine reading, *SEE EPHRON*; Sept. Ἐφρών, Vulg. *Ephron),* a city of Israel, which, with its dependent hamlets (t/nB;= “daughters," A.V. "towns"), Abijah and the army of Judah captured from Jeroboam with Bethel and Jeshanah (<141319>2 Chronicles 13:19). It appears to be mentioned in the Talmud *(Menach. 9:*1) as *Ephraim* (µyæip][). It has been conjectured that this Ephrain or Ephron is identical with the EPH-RAIM by which Absalom's sheep-farm of Baalhazor was situated (<101323>2 Samuel 13:23); also with the city called EPHRAIM, near the wilderness in which our Lord lived for some time (<431154>John 11:54); and with OPHRAH (hrp][), a city of Benjamin, apparently not far from Bethel (<061823>Joshua 18:23; comp. Josephus, *War,* 4:9, 9), and which has been located by Dr. Robinson *(Researches,* new ed. 1:447), with much probability, at the modern village of *et-Taiyibeh.* (See Ewald, *Geschichte,* 3:219, 466; 5:365; Stanley, *Palestine,* page 210.) *SEE EPHRAIM* 3.

Eph'ratah

[some *Ephra'tah]* (Hebrews *Ephra'thah,* hT;r;p]a,, <013516>Genesis 35:16, 19; 48:7 twice; <19D206>Psalm 132:6; <330501>Micah 5:1; <130250>1 Chronicles 2:50; 4:4; Sept. Ἐφραθά or Ἐφραθᾶ,*Vulg. Ephrata,* A.V. "Ephratah" in all but Genesis and the last-named passage of Chron., where it gives " Ephrath"), a prolonged [or sometimes "directive"] form of Eph'rath (Hebrew *Ephrath',* trp]a,, *probably fruitful,* <130219>1 Chronicles 2:19; Sept. Φράθ, Vulg. *Ephrata),* the name of a woman and of one or two places.

1. The second wife of Caleb, the son of Hezron, mother of Hur, and grandmother of Caleb the spy, according to <130219>1 Chronicles 2:19, 50, and probably 24 *SEE CALEB-EPHRATAH*, and 4:4, in which last passage Hur is apparently called "the father (i.e., founder) of Bethlehem" (see below). B.C. post 1856.

2. The ancient name of Bethlehem in Judah, as is manifest from <01516>Genesis 35:16, 10; 48:7, both which passages distinctly prove that it was called Ephrath or Ephratah in Jacob's time, and use the regular formula for adding the modern name, µj,l,Atybiayhaw, *which is Bethlehem* (comp. e.g. <01212>Genesis 23:2; 35:27; <06510>Joshua 15:10). It cannot, therefore, have derived its name from Ephratah, the mother of Hur, as the author of *Quaest. Hebr. in Paraleip.* says, and as one might otherwise have supposed from the connection of her descendants, Salma and Hur, with Bethlehem, which is somewhat obscurely intimated in <13250>1 Chronicles 2:50, 51; 4:4. It seems obvious, therefore, to infer that, on the contrary, Ephratah, the mother of Hur, was so called from the town of her birth, and that she probably was the owner of the town and district; in fact, that her name was really gentilitious. But if this be so, it would indicate more communication between the Israelites in Egypt and the Canaanites than is commonly supposed. When, however, we recollect that the land of Goshen was the border country on the Palestine side; that the Israelites in Goshen were a tribe of sheep and cattle drovers (<01703>Genesis 47:3); that there was an easy communication between Palestine and Egypt from the earliest times (<01210>Genesis 12:10; 16:1; 21:21, etc.); that there are indications of communications between the Israelites in Egypt and the Canaanites, caused by their trade as keepers of cattle (<13021>1 Chronicles 7:21); and that, in the nature of things, the owners or keepers of large herds and flocks in Goshen would have dealings with the nomad tribes in Palestine, it will perhaps seem not impossible that a son of Hezron may have married a woman having property in Ephratah. Another way of accounting for the connection between Ephratah's descendants and Bethlehem, is to suppose that the elder Caleb was not really the son of Hezron, but merely reckoned so as the head of a Hezronite house. He may in this case have been one of an Edomitish or Horite tribe an idea which is favored by the name of his son Hur, *SEE CALEB*, and have married an Ephrathite. Caleb the spy may have been their grandson. It is singular that "Salma, the father of Bethlehem," should have married a Canaanitish woman. Could she have been of the kindred of Caleb in any way? If she were, and if Salma obtained Bethlehem, a portion of Hur's inheritance, in consequence, this would account for both Hur and Salma being called "father of Bethlehem." Another possible explanation is, that *Ephratah* may have been the name given to some daughter of Benjamin to commemorate the circumstance of Rachel his mother having died close to Ephrath. This would receive some support from the son of Rachel's other son Joseph being called *Ephraim*, a

word of identical etymology, as appears from the fact that ytæpæ]a, means indifferently an Ephrathite, i.e., *Bethlehemite* (<080101>Ruth 1:1, 2), or an *Ephraimite* (<090101>1 Samuel 1:1). But it would not account for Ephratah's descendants being settled at Bethlehem. From <080102>Ruth 1:2, where the sons of Naomi are called" Ephrathites of Bethlehem [of] Judah," it would seem that Ephrath was the name of a district of which Bethlehem was the chief town; and the designation of <330402>Micah 4:2 as "Bethlehem [of] Ephratah," is rendered in <400206>Matthew 2:6, "Bethlehem [in the] land (γῆ) of Judah," as if to distinguish it by adding the name of a district, although a larger one (Lange, *Comment. on Matthew* in loc.). At all events we should note that in Genesis, and perhaps in Chronicles, it is called *Ephrath* or *Ephratah;* in Ruth, *Bethlehem-Judah,* but the inhabitants *Ephrathites;* in Micah, *Bethlehem-Ephratah;* in Matthew *Bethlehem in the land of Juda.* The Sept. supplies [Ἐφραθά (αὕτη ἐστὶ Βηθλέεμ)] its omission among the cities of Judah in <061560>Joshua 15:60 (see Reineccius, *Progr.* on this point, Weissenfels, 1723). Jerome, and after him Kalisch, observe that *Ephratah,.fruitful,* has the same meaning as Bethlehem, *house of bread,* a view which is favored by the neighboring cornfields. Ver Poortenn has written monographs entitled *Tabernacula Dei in Ephrata* [Psalm 133 (Coburg, 1739); *Initia Bethlehemi* (ib. 1728); also two: entitled *Fata Bethlehemi* (both ib. eod.). *SEE BETHLEHEM*.

3. Gesenius and others think that in <191326>Psalm 132:6, *"Ephratah"* means EPHRAIM *SEE EPHRAIM* (q.v.). The meaning of that passage, however, is greatly disputed. The. most obvious reference is to *Bethlehem,* which is elsewhere known by that name (see above), and may herebe spoken of as the residence of David at the time when as a youth he first heard of the sacred ark (so Hengstenberg, in loc.). Others consider the name asequivalent to the *tribe Ephraim* (comp. Ephrathite for Ephraimite, <071205>Judges 12:5), which contained Shiloh, the depository of Jehovah's early favor (so Good, in loc., as most interpreters; Delitzsch, *Commentar. itber d. Psalter,* 2:265, argues at length in favor of this view). Perhaps the best explanation is that which refers the word to *Matthew* Ephraim (as a special designation of that part of the tribe which contained Shiloh), in parallelism with the other part of the verse alluding to the *forest.* Hupfeld (in loc.), however, considers it as; merely a poetical term for fruitful *field,* e.g. Beth-shemesh, the latter part of the verse alluding to Kirjathjearim as the " wood" (r [y'; *yaar).*

Eph'rathite

(Hebrews *Ephrathi'*, ytæpÞa), the designation of the inhabitants of two widely different localities.

1. Properly BETHLEHEMITE, or citizen of Ephrathl (q.v.) or Bethlehem (Ruth 1:2; 1 Samuel 17:12; Sept, Ἐφραθαῖος, *Vulg. Ephrateus).*

2. By some confusion or analogy, an EPHRAIMITE, or inhabitant of the tribe of Ephraim (q.v.) (Judges 12:5, with the art. ytæpÞah; Sept. ἐκ τοῦ Ἐφραίμ v.r. Ἐφραθίτης, *Vulg. Ephratheus,* A.V. "an Ephraimite" [the last clause; in the two previous occurrences of the verse, as well as in the context, the original is *Ephraim];* 1 Samuel 1:1, Ἐφραίμ, *Ephrathceus,* "an Ephrathite;" Kings 40:26, ὁ Ἐφραθί, *Ephratceus,* "an Ephrathite").

Ephrem or Ephraem Syrus, an eminent Churchfather, and the greatest light of the Syrian Church, was born at Nisibis (Sozom. *H. E.* 3:16), Syria, or at Edessa, and flourished A.D. 370. The accounts of his early life are variant and unreliable. His parents were heathen, according to one account, and drove him from home for becoming a Christian; but, according to other accounts, he was bred a Christian by his Christian parents. Jacob of Nisibis took care of his education, and took him to the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325. In 363 Nisibis was ceded .by the emperor Jovinian to the Persians, and Ephrem went to Edessa, whither the most distinguished Syrians came to receive his instruction. Here he lived as a hermit, only coming from his seclusion to teach and preach. His repute for piety and learning became so great that he was elected bishop; but when he heard of it he rushed forth into the market-place, and acted in such a manner that the people thought he was out of his senses. "He then absconded until another had been appointed; to the office of bishop in his place. He now went to Caesarea in Cappadocia to see Basilius the Great, who formed the highest opinion of his learning and piety. Ephrem spent the greater part of his life in writing and preaching on devotional and moral subjects, and, especially against the Arian heresy; but he was equally energetic whenever there was any occasion to show by his acts that he really was the benevolent man that he appeared to be. This was especially manifest at the time when Edessa was suffering from famine: he, gave his assistance everywhere; he called upon the rich to help the poor, and he himself undertook the care of seeing that the poor received what was intended for them. He was looked up to with

admiration and reverence by his contemporaries, who distinguished him by the honorable designation of 'the prophet of the Syrians.' He died about 378, having ordered in his will that no one should praise him, according to the common practice, in a funeral oration, that his body should not be wrapped up in costly robes, and that no monument should be erected on his tomb" *(English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). This "will" of Ephrem is, however, generally held to be spurious.

All accounts unite in testifying to the virtues of Ephrem. Sozomen *(Hist.* [2016]*Ecclesiastes* 3:16) tells the fol'lowing story to illustrate his command of a naturally irascible temper. After a fast, his servant, presenting some food to him, let fall the dish on which it was placed. Ephrem, seeing him overwhelmed with shame and terror, said to him, "Take courage; as the food has not come to us, we will go to it." Whereupon Ephrem sat down on the floor, and ate the fragments left in the broken dish.

He was a voluminous author, writing commentaries, practical religious works, sermons, and numerous poems. The commentaries and hymns are in Syriac; the other writings exist only in Greek and other versions. It is doubtful whether he understood Greek; Sozomen (i.c.) expressly says that he knew only Syriac, but that his writings "were translated into Greek during his life, and preserve much of their original force and power, so that they are not less admired in Greek than in Syriac." One of the legends tells that in his visit to Basil both were miraculously enabled to speak the other's language — Basil the Syriac, and Ephrem the Greek. "His commentaries extended over the whole Bible, 'from the book of creation to the last book of grace,' as Gregory of Nyssa says. We have his commentaries on the historical and phrophetical books of the Old Testament and the book of Job in Syriac, and his commentaries on the epistles of Paul in an Armenian translation. They have been but little used thus far by commentators. He does not interpret the text from the original Hebrew, but from the old Syriac translation, the Peshito, though he refers occasionally to the original. His sermons and homilies, of which, according to Photius, he composed more than a thousand, are partly expository, partly polemical, against Jews, heathen, and heretics. They evince a considerable degree of popular eloquence; they are full of pathos, exclamations, apostrophes, antitheses, illustrations, severe rebuke, and sweet comfort, according to the subject; but also full of exaggerations, bombast, prolixity, and the superstitions of his age, such as the over-estimate of ascetic virtue, and excessive veneration of the Virgin Mary, the saints, and relics. Some of his

sermons were publicly read after the Bible lesson in many Oriental, and even Occidental churches. His hymns were intended to counteract the influence of the heretical views of Bardesanes and his son Harmonius, which spread widely by means of popular Syrian songs. 'When Ephrem perceived,' says Sozomen, 'that the Syrians were charmed with the elegant diction and melodious versification of Harmonius, he became apprehensive lest they should imbibe the same opinions; and therefore, although he was ignorant of Greek learning, he applied himself to the study of the metres of Harmonius, and composed similar poems in accordance with the doctrines of the Church, and sacred hymns in praise of holy men. From that period the Syrians sang the odes of Ephrem, according to the method indicated by Harmonius.' Theodoret gives a similar account, and Jays that the hymns of Ephrem combined harmony and melody with piety, and subserved all the purposes of valuable and efficacious medicine against the heretical hymns of Harmonius. It is reported that he wrote no less than three hundred thousand verses. But, with the exception of his commentaries, all his Syriac works are written in verse, i.e., in lines of an equal number of syllables, and with occasional rhyme and cassonance, though without regular metre (Schaff. *History of the Christian Church*, 3:952 sq.)."

The best edition of his collected works is *Ephraemi Syri Opera omnia*, Gr., Syr., et Lat., *edita cum praefationibus, notis, var. lectionibus*, studio J.S. Assemanni et P. Benedetti (Romae, 1732-46, 6 volumes, fol). Before this edition, many of his writings had been collected and translated from Greek into Latin by Gerard Voss, who published them (1) at Rome, A.D. 1589-93-97; (2) at Cologne in 1603 and 1616; and (3) at Antwerp in 1619 (3 volumes, in one). "The first volume consists of various treatises, partly on subjects solely theological, as the priesthood, prayer, fasting, etc., with others partly theological and partly moral, as truth, anger, obedience, envy. The second volume contains many epistles and addresses to monks, and a collection of apophthegms. Vol. in consists of several treatises or homilies on parts of Scripture, and characters in the Old Testament, as Elijah, Daniel, the three children, Joseph, Noah. Photius gives a list of 49 homilies of Ephrem (Cod. 196), but which of these are included in Voss's edition it is impossible to ascertain, though it is certain that many are not" (Smith, *Dictionary of Biography*, s.v.).

Of separate works there are numerous editions, of which lists may be found in Hoffmann, *Bibliographisches Lexikon*, 2:3 sq., and in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, ed. Harles, 8:217 sq. An edition containing only the

Greek writings of Ephrem was published by Thwaites (Oxford, 1709), edited from 28 MSS. in the Bodleian Library. An English translation from the Syrian by J.B. Morris (Oxf. 1847) contains 13 pieces of verse on the Nativity, 1 against the Jews, and 90 on the faith. The Reverend H. Burgess has published *Select metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus,* translated from the original Syriac, with an Introduction, and historical and philological notes (Lond. 1853). In his introduction Mr. Burgess mentions, as extant in Syriac verse, "eleven exegetical discourses, more than a hundred controversial sermons, and nearly as many practical hortatory homilies, *all in poetry;* four pieces on the *freedom of the will,* not only in meter, but the strophes arranged in alphabetic order, like the verses of the 119th Psalm; and he assures us that all these compositions show a high degree of poetic talent, and are distinguished for their 'sonorousness and grace,' and have 'a charm which no translation can express.' Indeed, almost all the three folios of St. Ephraem's printed works in Syriac are poetical. In this volume the author gives us translations of 35 of Ephraem's Syriac hymns, and 9 of his metrical homilies or sermons. They are illustrated by a learned introduction and very instructive notes. More than half the hymns relate to death and eternity, and the others are on various topics pertaining to the Christian life. The subjects of the poetical sermons are the following:

(1) Paradise,
(2) Satan,
(3) to the clergy,
(4) the Trinity,
(5) matter not eternal,
(6) error counterfeits truth,
(7) the Trinity,
(8) two natures of Christ,
(9) man ignorant of himself" *(Biblioth. Sacra,* October 1853, page 835).

M. Caillau published a Latin version of Ephrem in 8 volumes, 8vo (Paris, 1832-35, forming volumes 34-41 of the *Patres Selecti),* in which the following order is used:

1. Commentaries;
2. Exegetical homilies;
3. Sermons;

4. Epistles;
5. Prayers.

The writings of Ephrem in Armenian were published at Venice, 4 volumes, 8vo, 1836. Hahn und Sieffert's *Chrestomathia Syriaca* (Leipsic, 1825, 8vo) contains 19 select hymns of Ephrem; see also Hahn, *Bardesanes Gnosticus* (Leips. 1819). A German version of many of his poems is given by Zingerle, *Ausg. Schriften des hell. Ephraem* (Innspr. 1830-37, 6 volumes). His funeral sermons are translated into Italian *(Innifunebri di S. Efrem Siro, tradotti par* Angelo Paggi e Fausto Lasinio, Firenze, 1851). In 1853 J. Alsleben announced a complete edition of the Syriac works of Ephrem, in a pamplilet (Berl. 8vo) containing a sketch of Ephrem's life, and some literary remarks of value. Many writings of Ephrem remain in MS., of which there is a valuable collection in the British Museum; among them a *Chronicle,* from Creation to the time of Christ, is ascribed to him.

See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), 1:149 sq.; Oudin, *De Script. Ecclesiastes* 1:493 sq.; Dupin, *Auteurs Eccls.* (Paris, 1593), 2:145 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Par. 1860), volume 6, chapter 1; Lardner, *Works,* 4:304 sq.; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature,* 1:403; Von Lengerke, *Comm. de Ephraemo Syr. interprete* (Halle, 1828); the same, *De Ephesians Syr.* art. *hermeneutica* (Kinigsb. 1831); Villemain, *Tableau de l'Iloquence Chret. au 4me Siecle* (Paris, 1849, 12mo), page 242; Neve, *De la Renaissance des etudes Syriaques* (Annales de Philosophie, 1854); *North British Review,* August 1853, page 247; *Jour. of Sacred Literature* July 18553, page 389; Rödiger, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:85 sq.

E'phron

(Hebrews *Ephron',* ˆ/ r p][, signif. doubtful; Sept. Ἐφρών, Vulg. *Ephron),* the name of a man and also of two or three places.

1. The son of Zohar, a Hittite; the owner of a field which lay facing Mamre or Hebron, and of the cave contained therein, which Abraham bought from him for 400 shekels of silver (Genesis 23:8-17; 25:9; 49:29, 30; 1, 13). B.C. 2027. By Josephus *(Ant.* 1:14) the name is given as *Ephraim* (Ἐφράιμος, and the purchase-money 40 shekels. *SEE ABRAHAM.*

2. The textual reading (but with initial a) in the Masoretic Bible, and the marginal in the A.V. for EPHRAIM *SEE EPHRAIM* (q.v.), a city within the borders of the kingdom of Israel (2 Chronicles 13:19).

3. A mountain, the "cities" of which formed one of the landmarks on the northern boundary of the tribe of Judah (Joshua 15:9), between the "water of Nephtoah" and Kirjath-jearim. As these latter are with great probability identified with Ain Yalo and Kuriet el-enab, Mount Ephron is probably the elevated region on the south side of wady Beit-Hanina (traditional valley of the Terebinth), near its junction with wady Ain-Haniyeh or wady el-Werd. This seems to be the "high plain" indicated by Schwarz *(Palest.* page 96) as appropriately called Mount Ephron, in comparison with the deep valleys adjoining. The "cities of Mount Ephron" may then be denoted by such ruined sites as el-Sus and Mar-Zakaria in this vicinity.

4. A very strong city (πόλις μεγάλη ὀχυρά σφόδρα) on the east of Jordan, between Carnaim (AshterothKarnaim) and Bethshean, attacked and demolished by Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 5:46-52; 2 Macc. 12:27, 28; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:8, 5). From the description in these two passages it appears to have been situated in a defile or valley, and to have completely occupied 'the pass. It was possibly near the outlet of the Jabbok into the Jordan. Kildens conjectures *(Landes, kunde von Palistina,* Berl. 1817, page 75) that it was the present *Kulat er-Rubud,* a strong Saracenic castle on the top of a hill up the wady Rajib, and the residence of the chief of Jebel Ajlun (Burckhardt, *Syria,* page 266 sq.; Robinson, *Researches, 2:*121; 3:166).

Epicrates

(Ἐπικράτης, *controller,* a common Gr. name), one of the generals left by Antiochus Grypus, in connection with Callimander, in charge of the Syrian forces besieging Hyrcanus in Samaria, but whose cupidity led him to betray Scythopolis into the hands of the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:10, 2, 3).

Epicurean Philosophy — Epicurus

The Epicurean philosophy received its name and its complete development from its founder Epicurus. Little was added to the system by its disciples. It was a reaction against the Socratic School, and constituted one of the most marked forms of speculation during the period of Greek decline. It exercised considerable influence over the Latin world in the decay of the Roman republic, and during the first two centuries of the empire. With important changes of form, but with little modifications of spirit, it survived the overthrow of ancient civilization, perpetuated itself through,

out the Middle Ages, reappeared with the revival of philosophy, and may still be recognized in many recent theories.

The Epicurean philosophy, which has survived so many successions of empire, and so vast mutations of thought, is intimately connected with the earlier speculations of the Greeks. Its ethical views are directly deducible from the Cyrenaic School; but its dependence on the Eleatics is unmistakable. *SEE ELEATIC SCHOOL*. In physics it displayed an inclination to return to the Ionic method. It is, however, in immediate affiliation with the doctrines of Democritus and Leucippus. From them it derived its atoms, and the casual formation of the universe.

Notwithstanding its connections with previous modes of thought, the Epicurean philosophy is so definite in principle and form that it may be more readily treated without regard to its descent than almost any other type of speculation, ancient or modern.

The Epicurean philosophy was fully developed by its founder, and was long contained almost entirely in his numerous productions. These perished early. Fragments only have been preserved in the philosophical treatises of Cicero, the moral lectures of Seneca, and the late compilation of Diogenes Laertius. Epicurus's physical theory of the universe, which formed the basis of his theological and ethical conclusions, is transmitted to us in its integrity in the abstruse but brilliant poem of Lucretius. In consequence of the reverence of the disciples for the instructions of the master, and their abstinence from development of his teachings, Epicurus occupies a more prominent position in the exposition of his doctrine than any other Greek philosopher except Pythagoras. It is, accordingly, expedient to consider the circumstances of his life and the peculiarities of his character before entering upon the details of his system.

Life of Epicurus. — Epicurus was of pure Athenian descent; of a good family, though reduced to poverty; and settled in Samos, where his father Neocles was a *cleruchus*, and eked out a scanty support by the occupation of a school-master. His mother, Charestrata, added to the resources of a poor household by practicing enchantments and by other superstitious pretenses, in which she was aided by her son, who may thus have acquired an early contempt for the current theology and superstition. Epicurus was born at Samos, A.C. 342-1, seven years after the death of Plato, and within a year of Aristotle's acceptance of the office of tutor to Alexander the Great. About the time of Alexander's death, Epicurus came to Athens, at

the age of 18, where he is supposed to have attended the instructions of Xenocrates in the academy. Aristotle was still teaching in the lyceum. Epicurus made no long stay at this time in the metropolis, but removed to Colophon and opened a school. He adopted the atomistic doctrine of Democritus, and during five years undertook to teach philosophy at Mitylene and Lampsacus. At the age of 35 he returned to Athens, taught philosophy there for a period of 36 years till his death, and became the founder of a sect, having at first been content with declaring himself a follower of Democritus. The groves of the academy were frequented by the Platonists under Xenocrates; "the shady spaces" around the lyceum were occupied by the Peripatetics under Theophrastus, who possessed a house and garden of his own within the precincts, which were bequeathed to his successors. Epicurus imitated the Peripatetic example, and purchased a garden in the heart of the city for 80 minae (about $1400 in gold). This abode, the celebrated *horti Epicuri,* became the place of instruction and of convivial assemblage, and gave name to the school, "the philosophy of the Garden." The life of Epicurus was "simple, temperate, and cheerful;" he was "a kind-hearted friend, and even a patriotic citizen." He kept aloof from the political distractions of the time, and took no part in public affairs. His maxim was λάθε βιώσας — avoid notice in life. The political and social disorders of the time, amid the wars of the *Diadochi* and the factious contentions of a city where liberty was supplanted by tyranny or anarchy, might suggest the philosophy which is supposed to have regulated his conduct, viz. that the mind alone is free; all without is at the mercy of capricious violence or incalculable contingencies. In the progress of civil discords and convulsions the only hope of tranquillity must be sought in absolute seclusion and disregard of public transactions.

In his quiet and graceful retreat, surrounded by affectionate pupils and admiring friends, enlivened by the frequent presence of brilliant *hetaerae,* one half of the long life of Epicurus was passed. His intercourse was characterized by genial good-humor, and his establishment was conducted with frugal elegance. His temperament and his doctrine, his habits and his precepts, were in entire unison. He sought and obtained for himself the gentle pleasure, the unruffled serenity which he preached to his hearers. He was laborious in the dissemination of his opinions. He is designated as πολυγραφώτατος by Diogenes, and is said to have written three hundred volumes, filled, of course, with repetitions. This copious authentic promulgation of his philosophy dispensed with any necessity for expansion

or commentary. The theory was, indeed, so simple and perspicuous that nothing remained to be stated after the first exposition.

Before the death of Epicurus in A.C. 270, a rival school had arisen in Athens under the colonnades of the Painted Porch, and nearly every one of his tenets was directly opposed by Zeno of Citium and the Stoic philosophy, The reaction excited by the extreme materialism and fortuitism of Epicurus occasioned an equal extravagance on the other side. With Epicurus the universe was an aggregate of blind atoms compacted and diversified by an equally blind chance; with Zeno it was a divine organism, vital in all its parts, and governed by the immutable decrees of fate. With Epicurus the deities were incognizant or regardless of temporal affairs; with Zeno everything was controlled by a superintending Providence, whose will was an unalterable necessity, and manifested by the heavenly orbs *(sidera conscia fati).*

The Philosophy of Epicurus divides itself naturally into three parts, Theology, Ethics, and Physics. The last alone received any thoroughly systematic development. It was devised as a scientific basis for the two former, which were rather foregone conclusions, in which "the wish was father to the thought," than strictly logical deductions from established principles. The philosophy of Epicurus was designed for his own immediate satisfaction, and for the practical uses of life. The logomachies of Eleatics and Sceptics, Sophists and Socratics, had produced no settled convictions, and had arrested neither public calamities nor private wretchedness; a doctrine was desired which might bring peace to the individual, and restore happiness or enjoyment to life. The canonization of pleasure, the regulation and sanctification of natural passions, seemed to afford the solution required, and Epicurus was to his time what Fourier was to the last generation. In order to sanction pleasure as the guide of existence, it was necessary to get rid of the menaces of conscience and the terrors of heaven. Hence Epicurus practically denied the gods by relegating them to the eternal isolation of unconcerned indolence and reverie. This was regarded by his votaries as the most essential service of his career (Lucret. 1:63-80). But to exorcise the divinities and to abrogate religion, it was necessary to explain the marvelous order, economy, and variety of the creation, without recourse to a creator; to furnish, like La Place, a system of the world which should exclude the notion of a divine architect. This task Epicurus undertook, with such materials as were at hand. The Eleatic School had asserted an absolute severance of the divine and the transitory,

and had devoted their regards to the former. Epicurus repudiated the former, and confined his attention to the material and sensible, disproving all creative or divine agency by his physical doctrine, and maintaining the: authority of carnal impulses and earthly pleasures by the repudiation of the gods and of their worship.

Theology of Epicurus. — Epicurus acquiesced in the existence of the gods, but denied them any participation in the process of the universe. He ascribed to them immortality and human form, and assigned to them attenuated and spectral bodies, as Milton also, appears to have done *("negat esse corpus deorum, sed tamquam corpus, nec sanguinem, sed tamquam sanguinem,"* Cic. *De. Nat. Deor.* 1:25). He accords to them indestructibility, immutability, and the serene happiness of eternal repose. Their tranquillity would have been disturbed by any care; accordingly, they are entirely unconcerned with everything that falls under human apprehension. This mode of recognizing and at the same time cashiering divinity has been recently imitated by Herbert Spencer. So far as human actions or thoughts are concerned, the gods are practically non-existent, and religion is nothing better than a vague and irrational superstition, founded upon dreams, and cherished by ignorant fear.

Ethics of Epicurus. — Without divine sanction, without responsibility or existence hereafter, with either reward nor penalty in a future life for "deeds done in the body," no real system of ethics is conceivable. There is no constraint, no obligation to rectitude; there is no moral compulsion; there is no domain for conscience; there can only be a more or less judicious and provident adaptation of actions to the judgments or dispositions of men, and to the supposed satisfaction of the individual. Morality without religion is a pretense and a delusion. A tranquil and pleasurable existence becomes the *summum bonum* of the sage; the gratification of every passion as it arises the sole duty of an eager and undisciplined nature. Every restraint is removed except such as may be voluntarily imposed; and though cool, impassive, and indolent dispositions may maintain an external propriety of demeanor when exposed to no temptation, there can be no guarantee for rectitude of conduct, and the license of all passions will be gratified by the unclean beasts who wallow in the Epicurean style. The insufficiency of the doctrine as a rule of conduct was exhibited from the very first. Epicurus placed the highest pleasure in undisturbed repose, but he considered every pleasure to be good *in:* itself; and his favorite disciple, Metrodorus, asserts that the dictates of natural

reason would limit all care to the satisfaction of the belly, thus taking as the cornerstone of the system the declaration of Ecclesiastes, "All a man's labor is for his mouth." The stories which circulated in regard to the connection of Epicurus and his companions with Leontium, Marmarium, and other notorious ladies of the like persuasion, show that the tendencies of the doctrine were at once recognized, even if they were not illustrated in practice.

As all the religious foundations of virtue were removed, no logical foundation remained. The *canonic* of Epicurus, which was at once his logic and his metaphysics, amounted to the negation of any absolute or immutable truth. The sensible impression was the sole criterion of truth. Every sensation, as every general conception, was necessarily true; and we are here reminded, though in different modes and degrees, of the positions assumed by Des Cartes and by Hume. No guidance is accorded for the conduct of the understanding more assured than the immediate impression or the unregulated fancy, and the passions are thus left without any valid control by the reason. A life according to natural impulses becomes therefore the aim and the duty of a philosopher.

The Physics of Epicurus were devised as a means of escape from all divine authority and superintendence. They constitute the most elaborate, coherent, and original portion of the Epicurean system. Even here there was little real originality. Epicurus was a man of little learning, of little logical perspicacity; but he was actuated by a distinct purpose, and possessed of a clear rather than a penetrating mind. He diligently availed himself of everything subservient to his aims in previous systems, and worked out whatever accorded with his plans into a plausible and superficial scheme, in which consistency was little regarded, and acceptability assured by addressing the natural inclinations of men. The Physical Theory of Epicurus acquired more reputation in antiquity from its connection with theology and ethics, and from its exposition of Lucretius, than from any estimation in which it was held by the real students of science. The object of Epicurus was to explain, like Des Cartes, how the universe might have been formed and perpetuated without any foreign agency, though he went further than Des Cartes in rejecting even a divine agency for its first creation.

The leading lines of his physical doctrine are that matter is uncreated and indestructible. Its primitive elements are indivisible particles — atoms —

which are eternal and imperishable, passing through various combinations, and assuming new properties and forms according to these mutable compositions. These atoms are infinite in number, and solid, though so small as to be imperceptible by the senses. They possess gravity, and move downwards in an infinite vacuum. Their descent, however, is not in a uniform line; they are deflected by a spontaneous impulse, due to mere contingency, and come into collision, conjunction, composition with each other. Thus worlds, infinite in number, and infinitely varied in their phenomena, are formed. These atoms are in a continual state of vibration or oscillation, and from their concretions and dissolutions, their coherences and dissidencies, all the multitudinous changes of inorganic and organic nature are derived. All, however, are governed by chance alone; there is no compulsion, no necessity, no external law, no decree of fate. The cause of being is not extrinsic, but is involved in the process and act of being. No room is allowed for the operation of any conscious and ordaining intelligence; the world is nothing more than the curious result of uncomprehending, undesigning accidents. It will be observed that this theory of Epicurus differs from the vortices of Des Cartes in little more than in ascribing a straight, downward, but variable motion to the atoms in a vacuum, while Cartesianism assigns to them a gyratory movement and denies a vacuum. The difference is more obvious between this system and the recent doctrine of evolution, but the logical principle is the same — the construction and continuation of the universe by simple elements and simple forces generated within its own sphere, and independent of foreign determination. It is consequently not surprising that an attempt has been very recently made to bring the Epicurean Physics into harmony with modern science, whose present tendencies are in the direction of similar irrational self-sufficiency. A like attempt was made by Gassendi more legitimately, but without any permanent acceptance, in the 17th century; and it may be confidently asserted that, in an age of infidel appetencies, there will always be a revival of the Epicurean philosophy and Epicurean proclivities.

Authorities. — The historians of ancient philosophy: Bayle, tit. *"Leucippi Lucrece;"* Gassendi, *De Vita et Moribus Epicuri* (Hag. Comit. 1656, 4to); *Syntagma philosophiae Epicuri* (1659); Bremer, *Versuch einer Apologie des Epicur* (Berlin, 1776, 8vo); Rondel, *La Vie d'Epicure* (Par. 1679); Warnekros, *Apologie und Leben Epicurs* (Greifswald, 1795, 8vo); Munro, *Lucretius, with a Translation and Notes* (Cambridge and London, 1864, 2

volumes, 8vo); Lange, *Gesch. des Materialismus* (Iserlohn, 1866); *North Brit. Rev.* March, 1868. (G.F.H.)

Epicure'ans

(Ἐπικουρεῖοι, Acts 17:18), followers of Epicurus or adherents of the Epicurean philosophy (q.v.).

Epimenides

a Greek poet, born in Crete, and highly revered as a prophet and natural sage at Athens, where he came by invitation B.C. cir. 596, and spent a long life. Our chief account of him is given by Diogenes Laeitius (1:10). He is said to have written prose works on sacrifices and the political constitution of Crete, together with two letters to Solon, which have all perished, as the extant copies of the last are spurious. Diogenes also attributes to him poetical works entitled the "Genesis and Theogony" of the Curetes and Corybantes (in 5000 verses), an epic on Jason and the Argonauts (in 6500 verses), and an epic on Minos and Rhadamanthys (in 4000 verses); but it is doubtful whether he ever wrote them. He may have been the author of poems called "Useful" and "Pure" (Χρησιμοί and Καθαρμοί), which are ascribed to him by other ancient authorities (Suidas, s.v. Ἐπιμενίδης ; Strabo, 10, page 479; Pausan. 1:14, 4). But all these have equally perished. He is probably referred to by the apostle Paul in the words (Titus 1:12; see Alford, *Gr. Test.* in loc.), "One of themselves [the Cretans], even a prophet of their own, said, 'The Cretans are always liars,'" etc., apparently quoting from certain old-fashioned poems written upon skins, and popularly attributed to Epimenides. — Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biogr.* s.v.; Heinrich, *Epimenides aus Creta* (Lpz. 1801); also the monographs *De Epimenide* of Gottschalck (Altorf, 1714), and Schuremann (Hafn. 1733).

Epiph'anes

(Ἐπιφανής, *manifest*, hence *famous)*, an epithet given to the gods when appearing to men, The Syrian king Antiochus, brother of Seleucus, coming fortunately into Syria a little after the death of his brother, was regarded as some propitious deity, and was hence called Epiphanes — the *splendid* (1 Macc. 1:10; 10:1; 2 Macc. 4:17; 10:9). *SEE ANTIOCHUS* 3.

Epiphanes, or Epiphanius

son of Carpocrates, heretic and gnostic, like his father. He supposed an infinite eternal principle, and united with this fundamental principle the system of Valentinus. According to him, as according to some modern reformers, it is ignorance and passion which, in disturbing the equality and the community of goods, have introduced evil into the world; and the idea of property forms no part of the divine plan, but is of human invention. He concluded, therefore, that all laws should be suppressed, and equality re-established. He concluded, also, that the community of wives, as well as of the fruits of the earth, is necessary to the re-establishment of order. He died at the early age of seventeen years. A temple was consecrated to him in Cephalonia. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:449; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* book 1, chapter 2, part 2, chapter 5, § 14, n. 17; Hoefer, *Nozuv. Biog. Gener.* 16:159.

Epiphania

SEE HAMATH.

Epiphanius

(Επιφάνιος), bishop of Constantia, one of the Church fathers, was born in Palestine, near Eleutheropolis, in the early part of the 4th century (between 310 and 320). His parents are said to have been Jews, but in his sixteenth year he embraced Christianity; the only case of the kind among the fathers, for the rest of them were either converts from heathenism, or born of Christian parents. He went to Egypt, and there gave himself to ascetic life among the monks; one record also says that he imbibed Gnostic errors, from which he was reclaimed by the monkish discipline. He became an earnest patron and friend of monasticism, and founded a monastery near his native village, of which he became abbot. In 367 he was elected bishop of Constantia (Salamis), the metropolis of Cyprus. Here he remained thirty-six years, busy with the duties of his episcopate, and especially busy with his pen. He devoted himself to the vindication of orthodoxy with unquestioned learning, but with intemperate zeal and violence. He cherished a special hatred for Origen and his doctrines, and wrote, preached, and traveled in order to destroy their influence in the Church. This hatred led him into a quarrel with John, bishop of Jerusalem. "A report that Origen's opinions were spreading in Palestine, and sanctioned even by John, bishop of Jerusalem, excited Epiphanius to such a pitch that he left Cyprus (A.D. 394) to investigate the matter on the spot. At

Jerusalem he preached so violent a sermon against any abettors of Origen's errors, and made such evident allusions to the bishop, that John sent his archdeacon to beg him to stop. Afterwards, when John preached against anthropomorphism (of a tendency to which Epiphanius had been suspected), he was followed up to the pulpit by his undaunted antagonist, who announced that he agreed in John's censure of anthropomorphites, but that it was equally necessary to condemn Origenists. Having excited sufficient commotion at Jerusalem, Epiphanius repaired to Bethlehem, where he was all-powerful with the monks; and there he was so successful in his denunciation of heresy, that he persuaded some to renounce their connection with the bishop of Jerusalem" (Smith, *Dict. of Biog.* s.v.). He also interfered with the diocesan jurisdiction of John, by ordaining one Paulinianius in Palestine. The quarrel became very bitter, and was for many years a source of great trouble and injury to the Church. Epiphanius formed an alliance with the violent and unscrupulous Theophilus of Alexandria (q.v.), who had been an Origenist, but, for his own purposes, changed his professed opinions on the subject, and ordered the Nitrian monks to give up all Origen's writings. They refused, and he called a council at Alexandria, A.D. 399, which condemned Origen, his writings, and his followers. Soldiers were sent to drive the monks from Nitria. Some of them went to Constantinople, where Chrysostom (q.v.) gave them his protection. Theophilus persuaded Epiphanius (now over 80 years old) to call a council of Cyprian bishops (A.D. 401). Here Origen was again condemned. Epiphanius wrote to Chrysostom to join in this condemnation. As Chrysostom did not reply, Epiphanius took it for granted that he favored Origenism, and determined to go in person to Constantinople to "crush Amalek," to use his own words (in a letter to Jerome). Sozomen *(Eccl. Hist.* 8:14) gives a pretty full account of this visit, saying that, on the arrival of Epiphanius, Chrysostom went out with all his clergy to meet the visitor and do him honor; "but Epiphanius declared that he would neither reside with John, nor pray with him, unless he would denounce the works of Origen, and expel Dioscorus and his companions from the city. Not considering it just to act in the manner proposed until judgment had been passed on the case, John tried to postpone the adoption of further measures to some future time. In the mean time his enemies met together, and arranged that on the day when the people would be assembled in the Church of the Apostles, Epiphanius should publicly pronounce condemnation on the works of Origen, and on Dioscorus and his companions as the partisans of this writer; and also denounce the bishop of

the city as the abettor of Dioscorus. By this means it was hoped that the affections of the people would be alienated from their bishop. The following day, when Epiphanius was about entering the Church, in order to carry his design into execution, he was stopped by Serapion, at the command of John, who had received intimation of the plot. Serapion proved to Epiphanius that while the project he had devised was unjust in itself, it could be of no personal advantage to him, for that, if it should excite a popular insurrection, he would be regarded as responsible for the outrages that might follow. By these arguments Epiphanius was induced to relinquish his designs." About this time the empress Eudoxia sent for Epiphanius to pray for her son Theodosius, who was ill; Epiphanius replied that her son would recover provided she would not patronize the defenders of Origen. To this message the empress answered that Epiphanius had failed to save that of his own archdeacon, who had recently died. Finally, some of the Origenists had a conversation with Epiphanius, in which they seem to have convinced him that he had acted rashly. Soon after (Sozomen, *1*.c.), he embarked for Cyprus, either because he recognised the futility of his journey to Constantinople, or because, as there is reason to believe, God had revealed to him his approaching death, for he died while on his voyage back to Cyprus. It is reported that he said to the bishops who had accompanied him to the place of embarkation, "I leave you the city, the palace, and the stage, for I shall shortly depart." He died at sea, on his return to Cyprus, A.D. 403. He is commemorated as a saint in the Church of Rome on May 12.

Epiphanius was "a man of earnest monastic piety, and of sincere but illiberal zeal for orthodoxy. His good nature. allowed him to be easily used as an instrument for the passions of others, and his zeal was not according to knowledge. He is the patriarch of heresy-hunters. He identified Christianity with monastic piety and ecclesiastical orthodoxy, and considered it the great mission of his life to pursue the hydra of heresy into all its hiding-places. His learning was extensive, but ill digested. He understood five languages — Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and a little Latin. Jerome, who knew but three languages, though he knew these far better than Epiphanius, calls him πεντάγλωσσος, the five-tongued; and Rufinus reproach. fully says of him that he considered it his sacred duty to slander the great Origen in all languages and nations. He was lacking in knowledge of the world and of men, in sound judgment, and in critical discernment. He was possessed of a boundless credulity, now almost

proverbial, causing innumerable errors and contradictions in his writings. His style is entirely destitute of beauty or elegance; still, his works are of considerable value as a storehouse of the history of ancient heresies and of patristic polemics" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* 3, § 169). Scaliger calls Epiphanius an ignorant man, who committed the greatest blunders, told the greatest falsehoods, and knew next to nothing about either Hebrew or Greek.

Hook *(Ecclesiastes Biography,* 4:583) cites Epiphanius as one of the writers to whom we can refer for proof of the errors of modern Romanism, and for justification of the Reformation. For example, against invocation of saints, "Neither Elias (he says), nor John, nor Thecla, nor any of the saints is to be worshipped. For that ancient error shall not prevail with us, that we should forsake the living God and worship the things that are made by him. For they worshipped and served the creature above the Creator, and became fools. For if he will not permit angels to be worshipped, how much more would he not have her who was born of Anna? Let Mary, therefore, be had in honor, but let the Lord be worshipped." Again he observes "that the creature cannot be worshipped without injuring the true faith, and falling back to the errors of the ancient pagans, who forsook the worship of the true God to adore the creature; or without incurring the malediction spoken of by St. Paul — they worshipped, and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever; therefore God gave them up to vile affections." "Sed neque Helias, neque Joannes-neque quisquam sanctorm adoratur," etc. *(Haer.* 79 and 62). As decisive is his testimony against the doctrine of a purgatorial state. " In the age to come (he says) there is no advantage of fasting, no call to repentance, no display of charity; none are admitted after their departure hence, nor can we then correct what was before amiss. There Lazarus goeth not to Dives, nor Dives to Lazarus; the garners are sealed, the combat finished, the crowns distributed. Those who have not yet encountered have no more opportunity, and those who have conquered are not cast out. All is finished after we have departed hence" *(Hoer.* 59).

The extant writings of Epiphanius are the following, in the order in which they are given in the edition of his works by Petavius (Paris, 1622; Leipzig, 1682; and in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca,* volumes 41, 42, 43):

1. Παναριον, Panarium *(medicine-chest),* a treatise against heresies. It was written at the request of two monks, named Paul and Acacius,

belonging to a monastery near Berea, in Lower Syria. Prefixed to the work is a letter to these monks, which serves as a preface. The whole work is divided into three books, which are subdivided into seven tomes or sections. The first book contains three of these subdivisions, and each of the others two. The whole includes an account of eighty heresies, twenty of which were before Christ:

1, the Barbarians, from Adam to Noah;

2, the Scythians, from Nimrod to Terah;

3, the Hellenists, including all who paid divine honors to the creature, including idolatry proper, and also the philosophical arts of Stoics, Platonists, Pythagoreans, Epicureans;

4, the Samaritanism, arising from a mixture of Hellenism and Judaism, and including four sects;

5, the Judaeans (Judaism), including the seven sects of Sadducees, Scribes, Pharisees, Hemerobaptists, Nazarenes, Essenes, and Herodians. Of Christian heresies he names the Simonians (followers of Simon Magus), the Basilidians, and other Gnostic sects. With the sixty-fourth heresy he begins his account of the heresies of his own age, Origenism, Arianism. A critical work of great ability on the information given by Epiphanius has been published by Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius.* It limits itself to heresies 13 to 57, which are mostly Gnostic systems. Lipsius shows that Epiphanius, Philaster, and Pseudo-Tertullian made use of the same source, and that this source was the work of Hippolytus against 52 heresies called συνταγμα, which was still known to Photius.

2. Ἀγκυρωτός, Ancoratus *(anchored)*, i.e., *anchor* or defense of the faith, especially of the doctrine of the Trinity; so called "because," says Epiphanius, "I have collected, according to my slender abilities, all those passages of Scripture which are calculated to *establish* our faith; that this book may, like the *anchor of a ship*, establish believers in the orthodox faith, in the midst of the agitations and tempests of heresy."

3. *Anacephalaeosis* (Migne, 42:833), which is a summary or abridgment of the Panarium, the order of topics being somewhat varied.

4. Περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν, De Mensuris et Ponderibus *(of measures and weights),* in which he gives an account of the weights and measures used in Scripture, a book still useful for Biblical archaeology.

5. Περὶ τῶν δώδεκα λίθων, de xii gemmis quse erant in veste Aaronis *(on the* 12 *gems which were in Aaron's breast-plate).*

A Commentary on the Song of Songs, under the name of Epiphanius, was published by Foggini, in a Latin version (Rome, 1750, 4to; and the same was published [in Greek and Latin], Rome, 1772, 4to), by Giacomellus, who attributes it to Philo Carpasius. *SEE PHILO*.

The complete editions of Epiphanius (by Petavius and Migne) have been named above. There is a new edition by Dindorf (Leips. 5 volumes, 8vo, 1859-1863). The *Panarion* is given in volumes 2, 3, of Oehler, *Corpus Haeresiologicum* (Berlin, 1859-1862, 5 volumes, 8vo). There is a German translation of portions of Epiphanius, with notes, by Rosler (1778, 8vo). His account of the Arian and Meletian heresies was translated into English by Whiston, in his *Collection of Ancient Monuments on the Trinity* (Lond. 1713, 8vo). A separate life of Epiphanius was published by Gervaise (Paris, 1738, 4to).

See Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 6:32; 8:15; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 6:10, 12, 14; Dupin, *Ecclesiastes Writers,* 2:234; the account of the Bollandists, in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* 41; Oudin, *De Script.* <210105>*Ecclesiastes* 1:527; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Paris, 1860), volume 6, chapter 15; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* (Genev. 1720), 1:147; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Grceca,* ed. Harles, 8:255 sq.; Lardner, *Works,* 4:185 sq.; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature,* 1:324; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's), 2:680, 697; Schaff, *Ch. History,* volume 3, § 169; Hoffmann, *Bibliog. Lexikon,* 2:25 sq.

Epiphanius, St

bishop of Pavia, was born in that city, of a noble family, in 439 (according to others 438). He received an education for the priesthood under the special superintendence of St. Crispin, bishop of Pavia. He was consecrated subdeacon in 456, deacon in 458, and on the death of Crispin in 466, he was unanimously chosen bishop by the clergy and people. He had long been noted for his rigid asceticism, and after his election his rigor greatly increased. He took only one meal a day, abstained altogether from wine and meat, never used a bath, and was present at divine service with

feet locked together. At that time the West Roman empire was falling to pieces, and a prey to the incursions of northern tribes. During these disturbances, bishop Epiphanius seems to have gained to a high degree the esteem and the confidence of all the rulers. He mediated a peace between emperor Anthemus and his son-in-law Ricimer. In 474 he was sent by the emperor Nepos as envoy to Enrich, king of the Visigoths. In 476 king Odoacer conquered Pavia, and gave the city up to plundering, on which occasion the cathedral was destroyed. Epiphanius rebuilt the cathedral, and prevailed upon the king to exempt the city for five years from all taxes. During the war between Odoacer and Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, he gained the confidence of both parties. Theodoric, who in 493 became the master of Italy, granted, upon the intercession of Epiphanius, an amnesty to all who had borne arms against him. Theodoric then (494) sent Epiphanius on a mission to Gundobald, king of the Burgundians, to treat with him for the release of the Ligurian prisoners, who were to repeople the desolated districts of Italy. The mission was successful, and Theodoric subsequently remitted to the Ligurians two thirds of the taxes. Epiphanius died in Pavia, January 21, 497. In 962 the emperor Otho had his relics transported to Hildesheim, in Germany. The Church of Rome commemorates him as a saint on January 21. — Butler, *Lives of Saints*, 1:191; *Acta Sanctorum*, January 21 (biography by his successor Ennodius); Neander, *Light in Dark Places* (New York, 1853), page 97; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 16:161; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:100. (A.J.S.)

Epiphanius, Scholasticus

an ecclesiastical writer of the Latin Church, lived at the beginning of the 6th century, and is supposed to have been an Italian by birth. At the request of his friend Cassiodorus (q.v.) he translated from Greek into Latin the works of the Church historians Socrates, Sozonmen, and Theodoret. Cassiodorus revised the translation, and made out of the three works one, which, under the name of *Historia Tripartita*, remained throughout the Middle Ages one of the standard historical works. Likewise, at the request of Cassiodorus, Epiphanius translated several other works, as the *Codex Encyclicus* (a collection of synodal epistles to the emperor Leo I in defense of the Council of Chalcedon); a Commentary of bishop Epiphanius of Cyprus on the Song of Songs; a Commentary of Didymus on the Proverbs and the catholic epistles. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), 1:320; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 16:162; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:100.

Epiphany

(ἐπιφάνεια, τὰ ἐπιφάνια, the "manifestation" of Christ), one of the oldest festivals of the Christian Church, and mentioned as such by Clement of Alexandria *(Stromat.* 1:1). Until the time of Chrysostom, it opened in the Eastern Church the cycle of festivals. It denoted at first the baptism of Christ, which, as Chrysostom himself remarks, was, in a higher sense than his birth, his real manifestation to men. A special festival of the birth of Christ arose later than the festival of Epiphany, and up to that time the commemoration of the birth of Christ was included in that of Epiphany. According to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, it was at first celebrated at Alexandria by the Basilidians, but soon it was introduced into the orthodox Church also. Neander thinks that it did not originate with the Basilidians, but that they derived it from Jewish Christians in Syria and Palestine. The first trace of the festival in the Latin Church is found in 360, when, as Ammianus Marcellinus (21:2) mentions, the emperor Julian took part in a celebration of the festival at Vienne. In the Western Church it came early to denote the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, with especial reference to his appearance to the wise men of the East, who came to adore him and bring him presents (⁴⁰02Matthew 2:1-12). Gradually the commemoration of other events in the life of Christ was connected with the celebration of Epiphany, as the working of the first miracle at the wedding at Cana (hence it was called "bethphania," manifestation in a house), and the feeding of five thousand persons (hence the name "phagiphania"). Prominent,.however, in the Latin Church remained the celebration of Epiphany as the manifestation of Christ to the wise men. The tradition of the Church venerated the wise men as the "Three Holy Kings," and the festival itself was commonly called in the Church the festival of the Three Kings *(festum trium regum, festum Magorum, festum stellae).* Like other high festivals, Epiphany was celebrated by a vigil, by the preaching of homilies, by the reception of the Lord's Supper, and by granting liberty to slaves. During the Middle Ages a dramatic representation of the oblation of the wise men was incorporated into divine worship, and in some countries these performances have maintained themselves until the present century. Peculiar popular amusements also connected themselves with the celebration of the day in Roman Catholic countries, and partly exist even at the present day. In the city of Rome there is on the festival of Epiphany a great exhibition in the College of the Propaganda, young men from all countries making addresses in their native languages, in order thus to

represent the appearance of Christ to all nations. In some Western churches, especially in Africa, Epiphany was used as a day of baptism *(dies luminum);* but Pope Leo I was a decided opponent of this custom, calling it *irrationabilem novitatem* (an unreasonable novelty). Among the Franks the custom was also known, and Charlemagne mentions it in an epistle to the bishop Garibald, but without approving it. Previously Gregory II, in 726, had forbidden to baptize except on Easter and Pentecost. In the Greek Church it was customary to consecrate the water on this day, and the custom still prevails in Russia. Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 20, chapter 4; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 4:94; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:283; Augusti, *Handbuch d. christl. Arch.ologie,* 1:528; 2:476; Binterim, *Denkwiurdigkeiten der christl.-kath. K.* volume 5. *SEE THEOPHANY.* (A.J.S.)

Epiphi

(Ἐπιφί, 3 Macc. 6:38), the name of the eleventh month of the Egyptian Vague year, and the Alexandrian or Egyptian Julian year: Copt. *epep;* Arab. *apib.* Its beginning corresponds with the 25th of June in the Julian calendar (Ideler, *Handb. d. Chronol.* 1:98, 144). In ancient Egyptian it is called "the third month [of] the season of the waters." *SEE EGYPT.* The name Epiphi is derived from that of the goddess of the month, *Apap-t* (Lepsius, *Chron. d. Eg.* 1:141). The supposed derivation of the Hebrew month-name *Abib* from Epiphi is discussed in other articles. *SEE MONTH.*

Episcopacy

(ἐπίσκοπος, *bishop;* ἐπισκοπεῖν, *to superintend),* the government of bishops in the Church, whether as an order superior to presbyters or not. For the classes, duties, insignia, elections, and jurisdiction of bishops, *SEE BISHOP.* For the controversy as to the exclusive validity of Episcopal orders, *SEE SUCCESSION, APOSTOLICAL.* We give, in this article, a brief statement of the origin of Episcopacy, and of the theories of Episcopacy maintained in the prominent Episcopal churches of Christendom.

I. *Origin of Episcopacy.* — The high Episcopal writers, both of the Church of Rome and the Church of England, maintain that the order of bishops takes the place of the apostles in the Christian Church by direct divine appointment. Their view has been stated as follows: "While our Lord remained upon earth he acted as the immediate governor of his

Church. Having himself called the apostles, he kept them constantly about his person, except at one time, when he sent them forth upon a short progress through the cities of Judea, and gave them particular directions how they should conduct themselves. The seventy disciples whom he sent forth at another time are never mentioned again in the New Testament. But the apostles received from him many intimations that their office was to continue after his departure; and as one great object of his ministry was to qualify them for the execution of this office, so, in the interval between his resurrection and his ascension, he explained to them the duties of it, and he invested them with the authority which the discharge of those duties implied (<4028>Matthew 28:19, 20; <4320>John 20:21, 22). Soon after the ascension of Jesus, his apostles received those extraordinary gifts of which his promise had given them assurance, and immediately they began to execute their commission as the rulers of that society which was gathered by their preaching. In Acts vi we find the apostles ordering the Christians at Jerusalem to 'look out seven men of honest report,' who might take charge of the daily ministrations to the poor, and to bring the men so chosen to them, that 'we,' said the apostles, ' may appoint them over this business.' The men accordingly were 'set before the apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them.' Here are the apostles ordaining deacons. Afterward we find St. Paul, in his progress through Asia Minor, ordaining in every church elders, πρεσβυτέρους (<4423>Acts 14:23). The men thus ordained by St. Paul appear, from the Acts and the Epistles, to have been teachers, pastors, overseers, of the flock of Christ; and to Timothy, who was a minister of the Word, the apostle speaks of 'the gift which is in thee by the putting on of my hands' (<5506>2 Timothy 1:6). Over the persons to whom he thus conveyed the office of teaching he exercised jurisdiction, for he sent to Ephesus to the elders of the church to meet him at Miletus; and there, in a long discourse, gave them a solemn charge (<4417>Acts 20:17-35), and to Timothy and Titus he writes epistles in the style of a superior. He not only directs Timothy, whom he had besought to abide at Ephesus, how to behave himself in the house of God as a minister, but he sets him over other ministers. He empowers him to ordain men to the work of the ministry (<5502>2 Timothy 2:2). He gives him directions about the ordination of bishops and deacons; he places both these kinds of office-bearers in Ephesus under his inspection, instructing him in what manner to receive an accusation against an elder who labored in word and doctrine; and he commands him to charge some that they teach no other doctrine but the form of sound words. In like manner he

describes to Titus the qualifications of a bishop or elder, making him the judge how far any person in Crete was possessed of these qualifications; he gives him authority over all orders of Christians there; and he empowers him to reject heretics. Here, then, is that apostle with whose actions we are best acquainted seemingly aware that there would be continual occasion in the Christian Church for the exercise of that authority over pastors and teachers which the apostles had derived from the Lord Jesus; and by these two examples of a delegation, given during his lifetime, preparing the world for beholding that authority exercised by the successors of the apostles in all ages. Accordingly, the earliest Christian writers tell us that the apostles, to prevent contention, appointed bishops and deacons; giving orders, too, that upon their death other approved men should succeed in their ministry. We are told that the other apostles constituted their first-fruits, that is, their first disciples, after they had proved them by the Spirit, bishops and deacons of those who were to believe; and that the apostle John, who survived the rest, after returning from Patmos, the place of his banishment, went about the neighboring nations, ordaining bishops, establishing whole churches, and setting apart particular persons for the ministry, as they were pointed out to him by the Spirit" (Watson, s.v.). In substance, the high Episcopalians claim that "after the ascension of our Lord, and before the death of the inspired apostles, there were in the Church three orders in the ministry — apostles, presbyters, and deacons; sand these three orders have continued ever since. The name apostle, out of respect to the memory of the *inspired* apostles, was changed to bishop, while the *office* remained the same."

The view above given, however satisfactory it may be to high Episcopalians, is not adopted by the more moderate writers on that side, nor by other denominations of Christians. The following brief account, from Neander's Introduction to Coleman's *Apostolical and Primitive Church,* is both lucid and impartial. "The earliest constitution of the Church was modeled, for the most part, after that religious community with which it stood in closest connection, and to which it was most assimilated the Jewish synagogue. This, however, was so modified as to conform to the nature of the Christian community, and to the new and peculiar spirit with which it was animated. Like the synagogue, the Church was governed by an associated body of men appointed for this purpose. The name *of presbyters,* which was appropriated to this body, was derived from the Jewish synagogue. But in the Gentile churches formed by the

apostle Paul they took the name of ἐπίσκοποι, *bishops,* a term more significant of their office in the language generally spoken by the members of these churches. The name *presbyter* denoted the dignity of their office, while *bishop,* on the other hand, was expressive rather of the nature of their office, ἐπισκοπεῖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *to take the oversight of the Church.* Most certainly no other distinction originally existed between them. But, in process of time, some one, in the ordinary course of events, would gradually obtain the pre-eminence over his colleagues, and, by reason of that peculiar oversight which he exercised over the whole community, might come to be designated by the name ἐπίσκοπος, *bishop,* which was originally applied to them all indiscriminately. The constant tumults, from within and from without, which agitated the Church in the time of the apostles, may have given to such a one opportunity to exercise his influence the more efficiently; so that, at such a time, the controlling influence of one in this capacity may have been very salutary to the Church. This change in the relation of the presbyters to each other was not the same in all the churches, but varied according to their different circumstances. It may have been as early as the latter part of the life of John, when he was sole survivor of the other apostles, that one, as president of this body of presbyters, was distinguished by the name of ἐπίσκοπος, *bishop.* There is, however, no evidence that the apostle himself introduced this change, much less that he authorized it as a perpetual ordinance for the future. Such an ordinance is in direct opposition to the spirit of that apostle. This change in the mode of administering the government of the Church, resulting from peculiar circumstances, may have been introduced as a salutary expedient, without implying any departure from the purity of the Christian spirit. When, however, the doctrine is, as it gradually gained currency in the third century — that the bishops are by divine right the head of the Church, and invested with the government of the same; that they are the successors of the apostles, and by this succession inherit apostolical authority; that they are the medium through which, in consequence of that ordination which they have received merely in an outward manner, the Holy Ghost, in all time to come, must be transmitted to the Church when this becomes the doctrine of the Church, we certainly must perceive in these assumptions a great corruption of the Christian system. It is a carnal perversion of the true idea of the Christian Church. It is a falling back into the spirit of the Jewish religion. Instead of the Christian idea of a church, based on inward principles of communion, and extending itself by means of these, it presents us with the image of one like

that under the Old Testament, resting in outward ordinances, and seeking to promote the propagation of the kingdom of God by external rites. This entire perversion of the original view of the Christian Church was itself the origin of the whole system of the Roman Catholic religion, the germ from which sprung the popery of the Dark Ages. We hold, indeed, no controversy with that class of Episcopalians who adhere to the Episcopal system as well adapted, in their opinion, to the exigencies of their Church. But the doctrine of the absolute necessity of the Episcopal as the only valid form of government, and of the Episcopal succession of bishops above mentioned in order to a participation in the gifts of the Spirit, we must regard as something foreign to the true idea of the Christian Church. It is in direct conflict with the spirit of Protestantism, and is the origin, not of the true catholicism of the apostle, but of that of the Romish Church. When, therefore, Episcopalians disown, as essentially deficient in their ecclesiastical organization, other Protestant churches which evidently have the spirit of Christ, it only remains for us to protest, in the strongest terms, against their setting up such a standard for the Christian Church. Far be it from us, who began with Luther in the Spirit, that we should now desire to be made perfect by the flesh (Galatians 3:3)."

Bunsen gives the following view of the original character of the Episcopacy: "The episcopate was originally the independent position of a city clergyman, presiding over the congregation, with the neighboring villages, having a body of elders attached to him. Where such a council can be formed there is a complete Church — a bishopric. The elders are teachers and administrators. If an individual happen to be engaged in either of these offices mose exclusively than the other, it makes no real alteration in his position, for the presbyters of the ancient Church filled both situations. Their office was literally an Office, not a rank. The country clergymen were most probably members of the ecclesiastical council of the city church, as the bishops of the country towns certainly were members of the metropolitan presbytery" *(Hippolytus and his Age,* 3:246).

Professor R.D. Hitchcock *(American Presbyterian Review,* January 1867) gives a luminous sketch of the origin and growth of Episcopacy. Admitting that the Episcopal system was in full force in the Church before the end of the third century, he shows clearly, nevertheless, that it was not of apostolical origin, but a later growth of ecclesiastical development, as follows: (1.) The best Episcopal writers now admit that the Episcopal system is not to be found in the N.T. (2.) The earliest witness, outside of

the N.T., is Clement of Rome (about A.D. 100), in whose *Epistle to the Corinthians* the words bishop and presbyter are used interchangeably. Dr. Hitchcock analyzes the letters of Ignatius (t 115?) both in the Syriac version of his Epistles and in the shorter Greek version, giving every passage in which Episcopacy occurs. His conclusions are that, (1.) Admitting the substantial integrity of the texts, the strong infusion of Episcopacy in them "is best explained by supposing it to be a new thing, which Ignatius was doing, always and everywhere, his utmost to recommend. As special pleading for a novelty, the Episcopal tone of the Ignatian epistles is easily understood. (2.) The Ignatian Episcopacy is not diocesan, but Congregational. *Each* of the churches addressed had its own bishop, presbyters, and deacons. (3.) The apostolic succession (in Ignatius) is not Episcopal, but Presbyterian. The bishop is the representative of Christ, as Christ is of the Father; the presbyters are representatives of the apostles, and the deacons of the precept or commandment of Christ. In short, the Ignatian Episcopacy, instead of having the appearance of a settled polity, handed down from the apostles, has the appearance of being a new and growing institution, unlike what went before as well as what was coming after" *(Amer. Presb. Review,* January1867, page 145). — The next witness is Irenaeus (t 202), who, according to Dr. Hitchcock, commonly uses the words "bishop," "episcopal," "episcopate" in the Ignatian Congregational sense; while in certain cited passages he uses "bishop" and " presbyter" interchangeably, as Clement does. This "wavering terminology is indicative, not of apostolic tradition, but of later genesis and growth, and that growth not yet completed." — Tertullian (t 240?) draws the line distinctly between clergy and laity, and discriminates clearly between bishops, priests, and deacons. In Cyprian (248-258), as has been remarked above, Episcopacy is fully matured. (*SEE CHURCH*, 2:328.)

II. *Episcopacy of the Roman Catholic Church.* —

(1.) 'The theory of the Episcopacy according to Roman writers springs from the Romish doctrine of a visible Church. "An invisible Church" (Mohler, *Symbolism,* § 43) "needs only an inward, purely spiritual sacrifice, and a general priesthood;" but the visible Church, in its very idea, according to the Romish view, requires an external sacrifice, and the consecration of especial *priests* to perform it. The priest is supposed to receive the internal consecration from God through the external consecration of the Church — that is to say, he receives the Holy Ghost

through the imposition of hands of the *bishops.* The stability of the visible Church is supposed to require, therefore, an ecclesiastical ordination, originating with Christ, and perpetuated in uninterrupted succession; so that, as the apostles were sent forth by Christ, they, in their turn, instituted bishops, and these have appointed their successors down to our days. But, if these bishops are to form a perpetual corporation, they need a center and head connecting them firmly together, and exercising jurisdiction over them, and this head is found in the pope. The Episcopacy, *with the pope at its head,* is revered in the Church of Rome as a divine institution.

(2.) We say "with the pope at its head,"' for this point is essential to the Romish idea of an Episcopacy *jure divino.* The Roman Church has been divided on this question for ages. It formed one of the chief controversies in the Council of Trent, where many of the bishops earnestly endeavored to have their office pronounced to be of divine right apart from the pope, while the papal legates strenuously, but adroitly, resisted this claim, and managed to prevent its authorization by the council. The declarations of Trent on the subject are as follows (sess. 23, *De Reformatione;* chapter 4): "The sacred and holy synod declares that, besides the other ecclesiastical degrees, bishops, who have succeeded unto the place of the apostles, principally belong to the *(this)* hierarchical order; that they are placed, as the apostle says, by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God (Acts 20:28); that they are superior to priests; confer the sacrament of ordination; ordain the ministers of the Church, etc." Further (same session, Can. 6): "If any one shall say that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy instituted by divine ordination, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers, let him be anathema." And also (Can. 7), "If any one shall say that bishops are not superior to priests, or that they have not the power of confirming and ordaining, etc., let him be anathema." Nothing is said here of the *divine right* of the Episcopal order. But, in fact, it is not even called an order at all. In chapter 2 of the same: session *(Touching the seven orders)* we have priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, but not a word about bishops; So far as *order* is concerned, the bishops are simply priests. *The Catechism of the Council of Trent* declares that the order of priesthood, though essentially one, has different degrees of dignity and power — 1, simple priests; 2, bishops; 3, archbishops; 4, patriarchs; and, 5, superior to all, the sovereign pontiff. The history of the stormy 22d session of the council throws great light upon these decrees. A canon was proposed concerning "the institution of

bishops," and the Spanish prelates demanded an addition to it, declaring the Episcopate to be of divine right. This question arose, in fact, in 1546, and was before the council, in some shape or other, until 1562 (sess. 22), when it took the precise form, "Are bishops superior to priests by divine right, or only by ecclesiastical and papal right?" The pope knew that if it should be decided that the bishops held their power directly from God, there was no ground for the doctrine that they existed only through the pope, and feared that they would ultimately assert their entire independence. The dispute ended in dropping altogether the canon on the "institution of bishops," and substituting the vague decree and canon above cited.

(3.) Two theories, then, of the Episcopate exist in the Roman Church:

1, the so-called *Papal system,* according to which the pope is the sole bishop by divine right, and all other bishops exist only through him, and derive their superiority to presbyters solely from him;

2, the *Episcopal system,* which asserts an independent divine right on the part of each bishop. The former is the ultramontane view, and it is now prevalent throughout almost all the Roman world. The latter is the moderate or Gallic view. It holds that the bishops are the rightful governors of the Church, superior to presbyters by the direct appointment of God; and maintains that the pope is, with regard to other bishops, *primus inter pares,* appointed for the sake of keeping up the unity of the Church as a corporate body. The question, in fact, turns upon that of the primacy of the see of Rome. *SEE PRIMACY*. The *Episcopal* theory was adopted by the Gallican clergy *SEE GALLICANISM*, by the Jansenists (q.v.), and by Hontheim (q.v.). The present tendency of the entire Romish Church, however, is to the ultramontane theory.

The Romish Episcopacy, as a whole, is *diocesan. SEE DIOCESE*. The clergy of the diocese are subject to the bishop, but his authority does not extend beyond the diocese. There are, besides the diocesan bishops, bishops *vacantes,* bishops *in partibus,* bishops *suffragan,* etc., for which distinctions, *SEE BISHOPS*. "The division of the Church into dioceses may be viewed as a natural consequence of the institution of the office of bishops. The authority to exercise jurisdiction, whein committed to several hands, requires that some boundaries be defined within which each party may employ his powers, otherwise disorder and confusion would ensue, and the Church, instead of being benefited by the appointment of

governors, might be exposed to the double calamity of an overplus of them in one district, .and a total deficiency of them in another. Hence we find, so early as the New-Testament history, some plain indications of the rise of the diocesan system in the cases respectively of James, bishop of Jerusalem; Timothy, bishop of Ephesus; Titus, of Crete, to whom may be added the angels or bishops of the seven churches in Asia. These were placed in cities, and had jurisdiction over the churches and inferior clergy in those cities, and probably in the country adjacent. The first dioceses were formed by planting a bishop in a city or considerable village, where he officiated statedly, and took the spiritual charge, not only of the city itself, but the suburbs, or region lying round about it, within the verge of its [civil] jurisdiction, which seems to be the plain reason of that great and visible difference which we find in the extent of dioceses, some being very large, others very small, according as the civil government of each city happened to have a larger or lesser jurisdiction" *(Hook).* See Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. ix, ch. 2. The bishops are named from the principal city of the diocese, as Rome, Lyons, etc. There were bishops, *not* diocesan, in Ireland, until the 12th century (see *Christian Remembrancer,* January 1855, page 215). While the Romish bishops are independent of each other, they are all subordinate to the pope, and must make regular returns to him of the state of their dioceses. *SEE BISHOPS*.

III. (1.) *The Church of England* and the *Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* hold that there are three *orders* of ministers in the Church, bishops, priests, and deacons, and that bishops are the successors of the apostles, and superior to priests and deacons. The High-Church theory maintains the *divine right* of Episcopacy, and its absolute necessity to the existence of the Church; the Low-Church party deny that there is any positive command upon the subject in Scripture, or that there is anything in the standards of the Church of England which makes episcopacy to be of the essence of a church. The High-Churchmen maintain, and the Low-Churchmen reject the theory of the "exclusive validity of episcopal orders." *SEE SUCCESSION*. In the preface to the ordinal of the Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, it is declared as "evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." The doctrine of those churches in general is, "That there is in the Church a superior order of office-bearers, the successors of

the apostles, who possess in their own persons the right of ordination and jurisdiction, and who are called ἐπίσκοποι, as being the overseers not only of the people, but also of the clergy; and an inferior order of ministers, called presbyters, the literal translation of the word πρεσβύτεροι, which is rendered in our English Bibles *elders*, persons who receive from the ordination of the bishop power to preach and to administer the sacraments, who are set over the people, but are themselves under the government of the bishop, and have no right to convey to others the sacred office which he gives them authority to exercise under him." According to a phrase used by Charles I, who was by no means an unlearned defender of that form of government to which he was a martyr, the presbyters are *episcopigregis* [bishops of the flock], but the bishops are *episcopi gregis et pastorum* [bishops of the flock and of the pastors.] "The liberal writers, however, in the Church of England do not contend that this form of government is made so binding in the Church as not to be departed from and varied according to circumstances. It cannot be proved, says Dr. Paley, that any form of church government was laid down in the Christian as it had been in the Jewish Scriptures, with a view of fixing a constitution for succeeding ages. The truth seems to have been, that such offices were at first erected in the Christian Church as the good order, the instruction, and the exigencies of the society at that time required, without any intention, at least without any declared design of regulating the appointment, authority, or the distinction of Christian ministers under future circumstances." To the same effect, also, Bishop Tomline says, "It is not contended that the bishops, priests, and deacons of England are at present precisely the same that bishops, presbyters, and deacons were in Asia Minor seventeen hundred years ago. We only maintain that there have always been bishops, priests, and deacons in the Christian Church since the days of the apostles, with different powers and functions, it is allowed, in different countries and at different periods; but the general principles and duties which have respectively characterized these clerical orders have been essentially the same at all times and in all places, and the variations which they have undergone have only been such as have ever belonged to all persons in public situations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and which are, indeed, indispensable from every thing in which mankind are concerned in this transitory and fleeting world. I have thought it right to take this general view of the ministerial office, and to make these observations upon the clerical orders subsisting in this kingdom, for the purpose of pointing out the foundation and principles of Church authority, and of showing that our

ecclesiastical establishment is as nearly conformable as change of circumstances will permit to the practice of the primitive Church. But, though I flatter myself that I have proved episcopacy to be an apostolical institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops. No church can exist without some government; but, though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the offices of public worship, though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers, and though a subordination among them is expedient in the highest degree, yet it does not follow that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country; they may vary with the other varying circumstances of human society, with the extent of a country, the manners of its inhabitants, the nature of its civil government, and many other peculiarities which might be specified. As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. But he has, in the most explicit terms, enjoined obedience to all governors, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and whatever may be their denomination, as essential to the character of a true Christian. Thus the Gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents." Bishop Tomline, however, and the High-Episcopalians of the Church of England, contend for an original distinction in the office and order of bishops and presbyters; which notion is contradicted by the founder of the Church of England, Archbishop Cranmer, who says, "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things;' but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion" *(Watson).* On the inconsistency of the position of that portion of the so-called evangelical Episcopalians which holds that bishops are really successors of the apostles, see an admirable article in the *Princeton Review,* January 1856 (art. 1).

(2.) The episcopacy of the Church of England is *diocesan,* like that of the Church of Rome, and the bishops are named from the chief city of the diocese (London, York, etc.). In the Protestant Episcopal churches the dioceses are generally coterminous with the States of the Union, and the bishops are named accordingly (Delaware, Connecticut, etc.). The larger states are in some instances subdivided. "In the American Church the bishops are all of equal authority each ruling his own diocese independently

of the control of an ecclesiastical superior. No bishop is amenable to any central authority." There are no archbishops; but *assistant* and *missionary* bishops are authorized. *SEE BISHOPS, AND PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.*

IV. *Methodist Episcopal Church.* —

(1.) The episcopacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church is believed to be nearer to the apostolic model than that of the churches which maintain the apostolical succession. Its simple idea, is, that certain elders are chosen from the body of the presbyters to superintend the Church, and are called *bishops* or *superintendents,* both terms being used in the Methodist ritual. The bishops, in virtue of their functions, naturally stand above their brethren. With regard to the ordinary functions of the ministry, they do not differ from other ministers; but extraordinary functions, such as ordaining, presiding in assemblies, and the like, are devolved upon them by their brethren, and exercised by them exclusively and of right — right not divine, but ecclesiastical and human, founded upon the will of the body of pastors. The primitive principle that bishops and presbyters are of equal rank in the N.T. is fully recognized; nor are bishops regarded as the successors of the apostles. "As soon as a church has more than one pastor, it is natural and necessary that one should preside over the rest," and that "certain functions should be reserved to him" (Buigener, *Council of Trent,* book 5, chapter 2). It is not contrary to the essence of the ministry, but rather in harmony with its missionary and pastoral aims, that the presidency thus arising should last for life, and that he who exercises it should govern the body of pastors according to laws adopted and approved by them, should appoint the ministers to their work, and should exercise all the functions necessary to an effective and vigorous superintendency; and if the superintendent or bishop is appointed for life, it is quite in accordance with scriptural usage that he should be set apart for his work by "the laying on of hands." Accordingly, the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church are elected by the General Conference (q.v.) for life, and are ordained according to a special form, modified from the ordinal of the Church of England (Discipline, pt. ii, chap. in). The limits of their authority are clearly set forth in the Book of Discipline (part 1, chapter 4). A bishop is amenable, *not* to the bench of bishops, but to the General Conference, which may even " expel him for improper conduct if they deem it necessary" (Discipline, part 1, chapter 9). "In the American branch of the Methodist Church, episcopacy exists not only in the form in which it does in every English

circuit — which is the old parochial episcopacy — but by formally committing general oversight into the hands of bishops, who have no other charge. These claim no superiority in order over their brethren, but exercise well-defined powers, simply as an arrangement of the Church for its own welfare — an arrangement which has worked admirably; and it may be questioned whether any form of church government in the world has more of the elements of power and permanence than this, which expresses Wesley's own idea of a fully organized church" *(Lond. Quarterly Review,* July 1856, page 530).

It has been objected to the Methodist episcopacy that, while the theory of the Church admits but two *orders* in the ministry, the separate ordination of bishops really implies three. But the objection is groundless. (See above, II, 2.) In fact, the number of "orders" has always been an open question, even in the Roman Church; the Council of Trent did not settle it (compare *Canons of Trent,* sess. 13, can. 2). The "balance of authority, even from the earliest ages, certainly inclines to consider the episcopate, as an order, to be identical with the priesthood, not the completion of it" (Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia,* 3:81. So also Palmer: "If we understand the word *order in,* the sense of *degree,* we may say that there are three orders of the Christian ministry; but if we distribute it according to its *nature,* there are hut two, viz. bishops (or presbyters) and deacons" *(On the Church,* part 6, § 1).

Some Methodist writers have maintained that three orders, bishops, priests, and deacons, belong to the constitution of the Church as laid down in Scripture, and therefore that the episcopal office is not simply an ecclesiastical one. See especially Grayson, *The Church and the Ministry* (Louisville, 1853, 8vo).

(2.) The Methodist episcopacy is not *diocesan,* like that of the churches of Rome and England, but *general* and *itinerant.* Instead of being confined to a city or district, the bishop is, required to "travel at large;" and if "he cease from traveling without the consent of the General Conference, he cannot thereafter exercise the episcopal office." *SEE CONFERENCES, AND METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH*. While, under the Methodist system, the bishops do not claim to be "successors of the apostles," or to be endowed, either as individuals or collectively, with superior authority to teach or to govern, apart from power given them by the body of presbyters as represented in the General Conference, it yet appears to be clear that, as

to their functions and jurisdiction, they approach nearer to the apostolical idea than bishops under the diocesan system. Dollinger (perhaps the ablest of living Romanist writers), in maintaining that "bishops are the successors of the apostles, and have received their authority," is yet forced to admit that, under the Roman episcopal system, the authority of bishops is strictly limited to a particular diocese, while the jurisdiction of the apostles " extended to every part of the earth, wheresoever their universal vocation to convert the nations and to found churches conducted them" *(Church History*, 1:226, Lond. 1840). Under the Methodist system, a bishop may preside in a Conference and ordain presbyters in March in New York, in May in Illinois, in July in California, in October in China, and in December in Germany.

(3.) The Methodist episcopacy was instituted by Wesley. During the Revolutionary War in America, most of the clergy of the Church of England left the country. Before the war, the American preachers, like those in England, had been forbidden to administer the sacraments: the people were sent to the clergy of the Church of England for baptism and the Lord's Supper. After the war the societies were without the ordinances, and were likely to be disbanded in consequence. After duly considering the exigency, Mr. Wesley (who had previously in vain urged the bishop of London to ordain preachers for America) determined to organize the American Methodists into an independent Episcopal Church, and ordained the Reverend Thomas Coke, LL.D., as superintendent, and Richard, Whatcoat and Thomas Vasev as elders. In 1784 the Rev. Francis Asbury was ordained by Dr. Coke, and. the Methodist Episcopal Church was duly organized the first American Episcopal Church. *SEE METHODISM*. Mr. Wesley did not pretend to ordain bishops in any other sense than according to his view of primitive episcopacy, in which, as he maintained, bishops and presbyters are the same order. The grounds of his procedure in the case are stated in his “Letter to Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury," prefixed to "Sunday Service of the Methodists" (1784); given also in Watson's *Life of Wesley* (page 244). An excellent sketch of the rise of the Methodist episcopacy is given by Stevens, *History of Methodism,* volume 2.

V. The Moravian Church *(Unitas Fratrum)* holds to episcopacy. Their bishops, however, are not diocesan. The history of the preservation of the episcopate is given in De Schweinitz, *The Moravian Episcopate:* (Bethlehem 1865). *SEE MORAVIANS.*

See Canones et Decreta Concil. Trident., sess. xxiii; Catechism of the Council of Trent, part 2, *Sacrament of Orders;* Bungener, *History of the Council of Trent,* book 5, chapter 2; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism,* book 2, chapter 15; Mohler, *Symbolism, §* 43; Rothe, *Anfänge d. christlichen Kirche,* vol. i; Baur, *Ursprung des Episcopats* (Tabingen, 1838, 8vo); *Neander, Church History,* 1:190; Mosheim, *Ch. History,* volume 1; Killen, *Ancient Church,* section 3, chapters 6, 7; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* chapter 8; Coleman, *Apostolical and Primitive Church,* chapter 6; Lord King, *Primitive Church* (12mo); Bangs, *Original Church of Christ* (N.Y. 12mo); Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* volume 1, § 107, 108; Emory, *On Episcopacy;* Emory, *Defence of our Fathers* (N.York, 8vo); Wesley, *Works,* 7:312; Stillingfleet, *Irenicum,* 8vo; Stevens, *History of Methodism,* volume 2, chapters 6, 7; Watson, *Life of Wesley,* chapter 13; Burnet, *History of English Reformation,* 1:400, 586; 4:176; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism; Princeton Review,* January 1856; Lightfoot, *On Philippians* (1868), Appendix; *The Rise of the Episcopate (New Englander,* July, 1867); Palmer, *On the Church* (High-Church view), 2:349 sq.; Hinds, *Rise and Early Progress of Christianity (Encyclop. Metropol.* London, 1850, 12mo); and the article SUCCESSION *SEE SUCCESSION* . The High-Episcopal view is well stated for modern readers in *Vox Ecclesiae* (Philadelphia, 1866, 12mo); the moderate, in.Litton, *The Church of Christ* (Lond. 1851, 8vo; Phila. 1853, 8vo).

Episcopalians

members of those churches which adopt the Episcopal form of Church government. *SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH; SEE MORAVIANS; SEE LUTHERAN CHURCH; SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.*

Episcopius, Simon

(Dutch, *Bisschop),* an eminent and learned Arminian theologian, was born in January 1583, at Amsterdam, where he received his school education. In 1600 he went to the University of Leyden, where he took his degree of M.A. in 1606. He thenceforward devoted himself to the study of theology. "Earnestly," says Curcellaeus (in his eulogy on Episcopius), "did he listen to the lectures of those very learned professors, Francis Gomarus, Luke Trelcatius, and James Arminius; and in the exercises of debates and

harangues, which they commonly called *theses*, he left many of his equals far in the distance, and was highly esteemed as one worthy of being called to the ministry of the divine word. But when, especially after the death of Trelcatius, that terrible discussion on predestination, which afterwards agitated all Holland, finally arose, and was not only secretly carried on between the two professors, but also broke forth into open violence, our Episcopius became favorably inclined towards the Arminian doctrines. For this reason he received little favor from the pastors on the opposite side of the controversy, so that when the very illustrious councils of the state of Amsterdam, to whom the singular learning and piety of Episcopius had become known, would have invited him to become their preacher, these pastors, by causing delays, entirely frustrated the plans of the councils. Episcopius, disheartened at this affair, determined to leave the academy at Leyden, and in the year 1609 (in 'which' year Arminius died) he betook himself to the Franeker Academy, belonging to the Frisii, incited especially by the fame of that most illustrious man and learned professor of the sacred language, John Drusius. But there he displayed, as youths of a bold mind are wont, such a zeal in the theological discussions, that he gave not a little offense to Sibrandus Lubbertus, a professor of that academy. Accordingly, a few months after, he departed and came into France, where in a brief space of time he obtained so fair a mastery of the French language that he not only understood it, but could speak it with considerable ease and purity. Finally, in the year 1610, he returned to his native land, only to receive the same tokens of ill will." In that year he was ordained pastor of Bleyswick, a village near Rotterdam. In 1611 a colloquy was held at the Hague, by order of the States General, with a view to ending the agitating controversy between the Gomarists and Arminians, between six Remonstrant pastors and six Contra-Remonstrants. Episcopius, as one of the six Remonstrants, displayed so much learning and skill that his fame spread through all the country. In 1612 he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Leyden, as successor of Gomarus. Here his pre-eminent talents had full scope, and his reputation grew rapidly. The Gomarist controversy, however, waxed hotter and hotter; the orthodoxy of Episcopius was called in question by his theological opponents; and the rage of the Calvinistic party among the populace even went so far as to threaten violence. In 1614 he went to Amsterdam to attend a baptism, and the minister, Heyden, having stigmatized him as a heretic, he was saved from stoning only by the zeal of his friends. A blacksmith once ran after him with a hot iron with the cry, "Stop the Arminian disturber of the

Church," and would probably have murdered him but for the interference of bystanders.

The Synod of Dort was held in 1618. *SEE DORT*. Episcopius was the chief spokesman of the Arminians. At the 23d session he delivered a discourse of great power, which is to be found in his *Works,* in Limborch's *Vita Episcopii,* and in Calder's *Life of Episcopius* (N.Y. 1837, chapter 10). The synod condemned the Arminians, and by the aid of the civil, government banished the Remonstrant ministers. Episcopius retired first to Antwerp, where he wrote his *Responsio ad duas Petri Waddingii Jesuitae Epistolas* (1621, on the Rule of Faith and on the Worship of Images); his celebrated *Confessio Fidei Remonstrantium* (Remonstrants' Confession of Faith, 1622; *Opera,* volume 3); *Antidotum, sive genu. ina Declaratio sent. Synodi Dordracence (Opera,* volume 2, Lond. 1678). When the war between Spain and the Netherlands was renewed, Episcopius took refuge in France, residing chiefly in Paris (1621-1626). Here he published *Paraphrasis* in cap. 8-11 *Epist. ad Romanos* (Paraphrase on Romans 8-11, *Opera,* volume 1); *Bodecherus Ineptiens* (Bodecherus the Simple; a defense of the Remonstrants against the charge of Socinianism; *Examen thesium J. Capelli* (on the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy in Belgium); *Tractatus de Libero Arbitrio (Opera,* volume 1); Correspondence with Job. Cameron on Grace and Free Will *(Opera,* volume 1). On the death of Prince Maurice (1625) the persecution of the Remonstrants slackened, and it became safe for Episcopius to return to his country in 1626, when he became minister to the Remonstrants of Rotterdam. Here he published *Apologiapro Confessione,* etc. (Apology for the Confession of the Remonstrants), and other controversial tracts *(Opera,* volume 3). In 1634 he *was* made rector of the newly-established college of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, where the rest of his life was spent in diligent and successful teaching, and in constant literary and pastoral activity. The fruits of his lectures appear in permanent form in his *Institutiones Theologicae,* lib. 4, which, however, was left unfinished, and published posthumously *(Opera,* volume 1); and also in *Responsio ad Quaestiones Theologicas 54* (Answers to 64 questions in theology proposed by stu: dents). He died April 4, 1643.

Episcopius was acknowledged, even by his enemies, to be a man of very rare abilities, as well as of great learning. Heidanus (one of his opponents) says he was endowed with "great learning, penetration, eloquence, and skill." His friend Uitenbogaert declared that he had never met a theologian

"to be compared with Episcopius for his knowledge of the Scriptures and of divine subjects." Mabillon recommends his *Institutes* as of great value to students of divinity, except the parts in which he speaks against Romanist doctrines. Bull (in his *Judgment of the Catholic Church)* speaks of him as the "very learned Episcopius." His talent for controversy was of a very high order; but his *Institutes* shows that he also possessed the power of clear and luminous statement to a rare degree. The theology of Episcopius is, in substance, that of Arminius. He has been charged with Socinianism, but his writings, controversial and other, sufficiently refute that charge as brought not only against him, but against the early Remonstrants in general. The charge was in part due to the fact that he held the ethical side of Christianity to be the test of communion rather than the doctrinal; holding that Christianity is not so much a doctrine as a life, and that it has its doctrines only with a view to its life. The two great champions of the doctrine of the Trinity in England, Waterland and Bull, both wrote against Episcopius. Waterland *(Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, Works,* Oxford, 1853, 3:440 sq.) states that Episcopius holds "the doctrine of the Trinity, as to the main substance of it, to be certain and clear, but yet not necessary to be believed in order to salvation," and adds that the doctrine is "taught in full and strong terms in the 'Confession of the Remonstrants,' and in other places in the works of Episcopius." He then goes on, and successfully, to show the error and danger of the unguarded statement of Episcopius as to its importance. Bull's *Judgment of the Catholic Church on the necessity of believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is very God (Works on the Trinity,* Oxford, 1854, volume 3), was written expressly to refute the statement of Episcopius *(Institutes,* book 4, chapter 34, § 2), that "in the primitive churches, during at least three centuries, the belief and profession of the special divine sonship of Christ was not judged necessary to salvation." It is hardly necessary to say that Bull makes out his case. He does not, however, charge Episcopius with doctrinal error, but with too great and even dangerous liberality. He states also that, "although Episcopius was a man of unquestionably great ability, and in many respects possessed learning of no ordinary kind, yet he but little consulted or regarded, nay, he actually despised the writings of the ancient fathers and doctors." But on this see Limborch (cited by Calder, *Life of Episcopius,* N.Y. ed. page 433). After the death of Episcopius, Jurieu charged him with Socinianism, which gave rise to a sharp letter from Clericus (Le Clerc) refuting the charge (see Bayle, s.v. Episcopius).

The writings of Episcopius were collected by Curcellaeus, who published volume 1, Amst. 1650, with a sketch of the author's life; volume 2, edited by Poelenburg, appeared in 1665. A second edition was published under the title *S. Episcopii opera omnia theologica, cum autographo collata, et a mendis aliquot gravioribus repurgata* (Lond. 1678, 2 volumes, fol.). His life was also written by Philip Limborch, first in Dutch, and afterwards enlarged in Latin *(Hist. Vitc S. Episcopii,* etc., Amst. 1701). There is an English version of his *Labyrinthus Pontificius* under the title *Popish Labyrinth,* or *a Treatise on Infallibility* (Lond. 1763). See also Calder, *Memoirs of Simon Episcopius* (New York, 1837, 12mo); Heppe, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:100; a translation of Curcellseus's sketch, in the *Methodist Quarterly Review,* October 1863, page 612; Nichols, *Calvinism and A rminianism compared* (Lond. 1824. 2 volumes, 8vo); Morison, *On the ninth of Romans,* page 40 (Kilmarnock, 1849, 8vo); Schrdckh, *Kirchengeschichte seit d. Reformation,* 5:239-296; and the articles *SEE ARMINIANISM*; *SEE DORT*; *SEE REMONSTRANTS*.

Episcopus Episcoporum

bishop of bishops, a title assumed by the popes.

Episcopus in Partibus

bishop *in partibus infidelium, SEE BISHOP*, volume 1, page 821, col. 2.

Episcopus Oecumenicus

Ecumenical bishop, a title of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Epistle

(ἐπιστολή, something *sent,* as a "letter"). The use of written letters implies, of course, considerable progress in the development of civilized life. There must be a recognised system of notation, phonetic or symbolic; men must be taught to write, and have writing materials at hand. In the early nomadic stages of society accordingly, like those which mark the period of the patriarchs of the O.T., we find no traces of any but oral communications. In the Homeric poems, though messages are usual, yet a sort of hieroglyphical letters is not unknown *(Il.* 6:168). Messengers were sent instructed what to say from Jacob to Esau (0130Genesis 32:3), from Balak to Balaam (0415Numbers 22:5, 7, 16), bringing back in like manner a verbal, not a written answer (0412Numbers 24:12). *SEE MESSENGER*. The

negotiations between Jephthah and the king of the Ammonites (<07112>Judges 11:12, 13) were conducted in the same way. It was still the received practice in the time of Saul (<09107>1 Samuel 11:7, 9). The reign of David, bringing the Israelites, as it did, into contact with the higher civilization of the Phoenicians, witnessed a change in this respect also. *SEE AMBASSADOR*. The first recorded letter (ר ס פ = "book;" comp. use of βιβλίον, Herod. 1:123) in the history of the O.T. was that which "David wrote to Joab, and sent by the hand of Uriah" (<10114>2 Samuel 11:14), and this must obviously, like the letters that came into another history of crime (in this case also in traceable connection with Phoenician influence, <11208>1 Kings 21:8, 9), have been "sealed with the king's seal," as at once the guarantee of their authority, and a safeguard against their being read by any but the persons to whom they were addressed. The material used for the impression of the seal was probably the "clay" of <183814>Job 38:14. The act of sending such a letter is, however, pre-eminently, if not exclusively, a kingly act, where authority and secrecy were necessary. Hence they contained simply royal commands, and nothing is said of salutation or even address in connection with them. Joab, on the other hand, answers the letter which David had sent him after the old plan, and receives a verbal message in return. The demand of Benhadad and Ahab's answer to it are conveyed in the same way (<112002>1 Kings 20:2, 5). Jehu wrote letters, and sent them to Samaria to authorities, respecting Ahab's children, the form of which, or of the one transcribed, is the first instance in the Bible of anything like a formula. It begins, "Now as soon as this letter cometh to you," but ends without any like phrase. It was apparently replied to by a message, and Jehu wrote another letter, which, as given, has not the same peculiarity as the first. That Jehu, who, though perhaps well born, was a rough soldier, should have written and there is no ground for supposing that he used a scribe, but, from the extremely characteristic style, rather evidence against such an idea indicates that letter-writing was then common (<120010>2 Kings 10:1-7). In this case secrecy may have been thought desirable, but the importance of the matter would have been a sufficient reason for writing. Written communications, however, become more frequent in the later history. The letter which the king of Syria, Benhadad, sent by Naaman to Jehoram, king of Israel, though to a sovereign with whom the writer was at peace, is in the same peremptory style, with no salutation (<120505>2 Kings 5:5, 6), from which we may conjecture that only the principal contents are given in this and like instances. The "'writing" (bT;k]m) to Jehoram, king of Judah, from Elijah (q.v.) must have been a written prophecy rather than a

letter (<14212>2 Chronicles 21:12-15); though it must be observed that such prophecies when addressed to persons are of an epistolary character. Hezekiah, when he summoned the whole nation to keep the Passover, sent letters *"from* the king and his princes," as had been determined at a council held at Jerusalem by the king, the princes, and all the congregation. The contents of these letters are given, or the substance. The form is that of an exhortation, without, however, address. The character is that of a religious proclamation (<14301>2 Chronicles 30:1-9). Hezekiah, in fact, introduced a system of couriers like that afterwards so fully organized under the Persian kings (comp. Herod. 8:98, and <17810>Esther 8:10, 14). The letter or letters of Sennacherib to Hezekiah seem to have been written instructions to his messengers, which were given to Hezekiah to show him that they had their master's authority. It is to be observed that the messengers were commanded, "Thus shall ye speak to Hezekiah," and that Hezekiah "received the letter" from them. What he received was probably a roll of papyrus, as that which Jehoiakim burnt seems to have been (<24623>Jeremiah 36:23), for when he took it to the Temple he "spread it before the Lord" (<12909>2 Kings 19:9-14; <23709>Isaiah 37:9-14; comp. <14217>2 Chronicles 32:17). It does not appear to have been usual for the prophets to write letters. Generally they seem, when they did not go themselves to those whom they would address, either to have sent a messenger, or to have publicly proclaimed what they were commissioned to say, knowing that the report of it would be carried to those whom it specially concerned. When Nebuchadnezzar had carried captive some of the people of Judah, we read how Jeremiah addressed them by a letter, which is a written exhortation and prophecy (29:1-23). It can scarcely be said that here we perceive a positive distinction between the later prophets and the earlier, for Elijah sent a letter or "writing" to Jehoram, king of Judah, as already noticed. The distance of Babylon from Jerusalem, and of Jerusalem from the kingdom which was the scene of Elijah's ministry, seems to afford the true explanation. That letters were not uncommon between the captives at Babylon and those who remained at Jerusalem before it was destroyed, appears probable from the mention of letters to Zephaniah the priest, and to others from a false prophet Shemaiah, at Babylon, in contradiction of Jeremiah's letter (24-29). Jeremiah was commanded to send to the captives a condemnation of this man (30-32), and it is therefore probable that at least three letters passed on this occasion. Though with the little evidence we have we cannot speak positively, it seems as if the custom of letter-writing had become more common by degrees, although there is no ground

for inferring any change in its character. Still we find nothing of an address or signature. The letter seems to be always a document, generally a message written for greater security or to have full authority, and was probably rolled, tied up, and sealed with the writer's seal. *SEE LETTER*.

Although no Hebrew letters are preserved of the time before David, it might be supposed that the form might have been derived from Egypt. We have papyri containing copies by Egyptian scribes of the kings of the Rameses family about the 13th century B.C., of letters of their own correspondence. These show a regular epistolary style, the conventionalism of which at once removes us from all ideas of Shemitic literature. There is an air of the monuments about it that strikes us in the descriptive character of certain of the formulas. Some letters, from a superior to an inferior, commence in the manner shown in the following example: "The chief librarian Amen-em-an, of the royal white house, says to the scribe Penta-ur, Whereas, this letter is brought to you, saying communication." A usual ending of such letters is, "Do thou consider this." Some begin with the word "Communication." The fuller form also seems to be an abbreviation. An inferior scribe, addressing his superior, thus begins: "The scribe Penta-ur salutes his lord, the chief librarian, Amen-em-an, of the royal white house. This comes to inform my lord. Again I salute my lord. Whereas I have executed all the commissions imposed upon me by my lord, well and truly, completely and thoroughly [?] I have done no wrong. Again I salute my lord." He ends, "Behold, this message is to inform my lord." A more easy style is seen in a letter of a son to his father, which begins, The scribe Amen-mesu salutes [his] father, captain of bowmen, Bek-en-ptah," and ends "Farewell." A military of, ficer writing to another, and a scribe writing to a military officer, appear to begin with a prayer for the king before the formula "Communication." A royal or government letter is a mere written decree, without any formal introduction, and ending with an injunction to obey it. The contents of these letters are ale ways addresses to the persons written to, the writer using the first person singular. The subject-matter is various, and perhaps gives us a better idea of the literary ability of the Egyptians, and their lively national character, than any other of their compositions (see Goodwin on the *"Horatic Papyri,"* in the *Cambridge Essays*, 1855, page 226 sq.). Indeed in Egypt everything of importance was committed to writing (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 2:176, abridgm.), and the monuments constantly depict scribes taking an inventory or check of all sorts of operations. *SEE EGYPT*.

Picture for Epistle,

In the books of Scripture written after the return from Babylon, mention is made of letters of the enemies of the Jews to the kings of Persia, and of the kings to these persons, the Jews, or their officers, some of which are given. These are in an official style, with a greeting, and sometimes an address. The letter to Artaxerxes contains the form, "Be it known unto the king," "Be it known now unto the king" (<15041>Ezra 4:11-16); and his answer thus begins, "Peace [or "welfare"], and so forth" (17-22), the expression "and so forth" occurring elsewhere in such a manner that it seems to be used by the transcriber for brevity's sake (10, 11; 7:12). It must, therefore, not be compared to the common modern Arabic formula of commencement, "After the [usual] salutations." The letter of the opponents of the' Jews to Darius (Hystaspis) thus begins: "Unto-Darius the king, all peace. Be it known unto the king (<15106>Ezra 5:6-17)." The letter of Artaxerxes (Longimanus) to Ezra is a written decree, and not an ordinary letter, save in form (<15711>Ezra 7:11, 26). Nehemiah asked for, and was granted, letters from the same king to the governors and the keeper of the king's forest (<16207>Nehemiah 2:7, 9). When he was rebuilding Jerusalem, Sanballat sent him "an open letter" by his servant, repeating an invented rumor of the Jews' intention to rebel (6:5, 7): no doubt it was left not sealed purposely, either in order that the rumor should be so spread as if by accident, or to show disrespect. At this time many letters passed between the nobles of Judah and Tobiah, and letter-writing seems to have been common (17; see also 19). In Esther we read of exactly the same custom as that spoken of in the case of Jezebel's letter, the authority of writings with the king's name and seal, even if not written by him. It is related that Ahasuerus "took his signet from his hand and gave it unto Haman," who caused letters to be written containing a mandate: "In the name of king Ahasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king's signet" (<17810>Esther 3:10, 12, 13). In like manner; the same authority was given to Esther and Mordecai, and it is remarked, "For the writing which is written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's signet, may not be reversed" (8:7, 8). The influence of Persian, and yet more, perhaps, that of Greek civilization, led to the more frequent use of letters as a means of intercourse. Whatever doubts may be entertained as to the genuineness of the epistles themselves, their occurrence in 1 Macc. 11:30; 12:6, 20; 15:1, 16; 2 Macc. 11:16, 34, indicates that they were recognized as having altogether superseded the older plan of messages orally delivered. *SEE LETTER.*

The two stages of the history of the N.T. present in this respect a very striking contrast. The list of the canonical books shows how largely epistles were used in the expansion and organization of the Church. Those which have survived may be regarded as the representatives of many others that are lost. We are perhaps too much in the habit of forgetting that the absence of all mention of written letters from the Gospel history is just as noticeable. With the exception of the spurious letter to Abgarus (q.v.) of Edessa (Euseb. *H.E.* 1:13) there are no epistles of Jesus. The explanation of this is to be found partly in the circumstance of one who, known as the "carpenter's son," was training as his disciples those who, like himself, belonged to the class of laborers and peasants, partly in the fact that it was by personal rather than by written teaching that the work of the prophetic office, which he reproduced and perfected, had to be accomplished. *SEE JESUS CHRIST.* In the Acts of the Apostles we have the short epistle addressed by the apostolic council held at Jerusalem to the Gentile converts in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia (<44152>Acts 15:23-24). There is also a letter from Claudius Lysias to Felix, which may be supposed to preserve the official style of the provinces. Both these use the common Greek formulas, beginning, after the names of the writer and the person written to, with the salutation, and ending with the adieu. The epistles of the N.T. in their outward form are such as might be expected from men who were brought into contact with Greek and Roman customs, themselves belonging to a different race, and so reproducing the imported style with only partial accuracy. They begin (the Epistle to the Hebrews and 1 John excepted) with the names of the writer, and those to whom the epistle is addressed. Then follows the formula of salutation (analogous to the ε υ πράττειν of Greek, the *S.*, S.*D.*, or *S.D.M.*, *salutem, salutem dicit, salutem dicit multam,* of Latin correspondence) — generally in Paul's Epistles in some combination of the words "grace, mercy, and peace" (χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη); in others, as in <44152>Acts 15:23; <59001>James 1:1, with the closer equivalent of χαίρειν, "greeting," which last is never used by Paul. Then the letter itself commences in the first person, the singular and plural being used, as in the letters of Cicero, indiscriminately (comp. 1 Corinthians 2; <47108>2 Corinthians 1:8, 15; <52301>1 Thessalonians 3:1, 2; and passim). When the substance of the letter has been completed, questions answered, truths enforced, there come the individual messages, characteristic, in Paul's Epistles especially, of one who never allowed his personal affections to be swallowed up in the greatness of his work. The conclusion in this case was probably modified by the fact that the letters

were dictated to an amanuensis. When he had done his work, the apostle took up the pen o - reed, and added, in his own large characters (<480611>Galatians 6:11), the authenticating autograph, sometimes with special stress on the fact that this was his writing (<461621>1 Corinthians 16:21; <480611>Galatians 6:11; <510418>Colossians 4:18; <530217>2 Thessalonians 3:17), always with one of the closing formula of salutation, "Grace be with thee" — "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit." In one instance, <451622>Romans 16:22, the amanuensis in his own name adds his salutation. In the "farewell" (ἔῤῥωσο of <442330>Acts 23:30, ἔῤῥωσθε of <441529>Acts 15:29) we have the equivalents to the *vale, valete,* which formed the custonary conclusion of Roman letters. It need hardly be said that the fact that Paul's Epistles were dictated in this way accounts for many of their most striking peculiarities, the frequent digressions, the long parentheses, the vehemence and energy as of a man who is speaking strongly as his feelings prompt him rather than writing calmly. An allusion in <470301>2 Corinthians 3:1 brings before us another class of letters which must have been in frequent use in the early ages of the Christian Church, the ἐπιστολαί συστατικαί, or *letters of recommendation,* by which travelers or teachers were commended by one church to the good offices of others. Other persons (there *may be* a reference to Apollos, <441827>Acts 18:27) had come to the Church of Corinth relying on these. Paul appeals to his converts as Christ's epistle (ἐπιστολή Χριστοῦ, <470303>2 Corinthians 3:3), written, "not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God." For other particulars as to the material and implements used for epistles, *SEE WRITING*.

Epistles, Apostolical

All the revelations of God to mankind rest upon history. Therefore in the Old, as well as in the New Testament, the history of the deeds of God stands first, as being the basis of holy writ; thereupon follow the books which exhibit the doctrines and internal life of the men of God — in the Old Testament the Psalms, the writings of Solomon, etc., and in the New Testament the epistles of the apostles; finally, there follow in the Old Testament the writings of the prophets, whose vision extends into the times of the New Testament; and at the conclusion of the New Testament stands its only prophetic book, the Revelation of John.

1. The PAULINE epistles are thirteen in number, or fourteen, if we add to them the epistle to the Hebrews. Three of these are distinctively styled the *Pastoral Epistles,* namely, those to Timothy and Titus, as being chiefly on

the duties of the pastorate. Up to our days the genuineness of the first thirteen epistles of Paul has almost unanimously been recognized in Germany, with the exception only of the pastoral epistles, and more especially the first letter to Timothy. Eichhorn and Bauer have attacked the genuineness of all the three pastoral epistles, and Schleiermacher that of the first epistle to Timothy. Indeed, the very peculiar character of the Pauline epistles is so striking to any one who is not ignorant of the want of ease and originality conspicuous in the counterfeit writings of early times, as to leave not the least doubt of their genuineness. Depth of thought, fire of speech, firmness of character — these manly features, joined withal to the indulgence of feelings of the most devoted love and affection, characterize these epistles. The amiable personal character of the apostle may be most beautifully traced in his epistle to the Philippians and in that to Philemon. (On many peculiarities of the Pauline epistles, see Laurent, *Neutestam. Studien,* Gotha, 1866.) *SEE PAUL.*

All Paul's epistles, except the one to the Romans were called forth by circumstances and particular occasions in the affairs of the communities to which they were addressed. It is believed that all the apostolical epistles of Paul have been preserved; for the inference from 1 Corinthians 5:9, that a letter to the Corinthians has been lost, is not warranted by the language and circumstances. *SEE CORINTHIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO*. From Colossians 4:16, it has also been concluded — though probably erroneously, since there perhaps the letter to the Ephesians is referred to — that another letter to the community of Laodicea has likewise been lost. *SEE LAODICEANS, EPISTLES TO AND FROM*. Press of business usually compelled Paulas was, besides, not uncommon in those times — to use his companions as amanuenses. He mentions (Galatians 6:11), as something peculiar, that he had written this letter with his own hand. This circumstance may greatly have favored the temptation to forge letters in his name, because, since the period of Alexandrine literature, it was not unusual to indite spurious books, as is evident from Eusebius *(Hist. Ecclesiastes* page 23); and even Christian bishops made complaints about the falsification of their letters. Paul alludes to this (2 Thessalonians 2:2), and therefore writes the greeting (2 Thessalonians 3:17) with his own hand. Paul himself exhorted the communities mutually to impart to each other his letters to them, and read them aloud in their assemblies (Colossians 4:16). It is therefore probable that copies of these letters had been early made by the several communities, and deposited in the form

of collections. So long, therefore, as the various communities transmitted the manuscripts to each other, no other letters, it is obvious, could come into the collections than those to whose genuineness the communities to whom they were originally addressed bore witness. Even Peter (2 Peter 3:16) seems to have had before him a number of Paul's letters, as, about forty years later, a number of letters of Ignatius were transmitted by Polycarp to Smyrna, while the church of Philippi forwarded to him those directed to them *(Ep. Polic.* sub. fin.; Euseb. *Hist.* *Ecclesiastes* 3:36). The Pauline collection, in contradistinction to the Gospels, passed by the name of ὁ ἀπόστολος, or "The Apostle."

The letters of Paul may be chronologically arranged as those written before his first Roman imprisonment, those written during it, and those written after it: thus,

(a), beginning with his first letter to the Thessalonians, and concluding with that to the Romans, embracing an interval of about six years (A.D. 49-55);

(b), from the letter to the Ephesians to that to the Hebrews, about two years (A.D. 57-8); and

(c), his letter to Titus and his second to Timothy, about two years (A.D. 63-4). *SEE ACTS (OF THE APOSTLES*).

In our Bibles, however, the letters are arranged according to the pre-eminent parts and stations of the communities to whom they were addressed, and conclude with the epistles to the two bishops and a private letter to Philemon. (See each in its proper place.)

That these epistles offered great difficulties was already felt in the earliest times (2 Peter 3:16). In the Roman Church their true understanding was more particularly lost by the circumstance that it understood by THE LAW only the *opus operatumn* of the ceremonial law; consequently the Roman Church could not comprehend justification by faith, and taught instead justification by works. As soon, therefore, as the true understanding of the Pauline epistles dawned upon Luther, his breach with the Roman Church was decided. *SEE JUSTIFICATION.*

2. The CATHOLIC epistles. There is, in the first instance, a diversity of opinion respecting their name: some refer it to their *writers* (letters from all the other apostles who had entered the stage of authorship along with

Paul); some, again, to their *contents* (letters of no special, but general Christian tenor); others, again, to the *recipients* (letters addressed to no community in particular). None of these views, however, is free from difficulties. The first and the second views — and more especially the first — cannot be brought to harmonize with the idiomatic expressions in the extant pages of the ancient writers; the second is, besides, contradicted by the fact that the letter of James is of a special tenor, while, on the contrary, that to the Romans is of such a general character as to deserve the name "Catholic" (q.v.) in that sense. The third opinion is most decidedly justified by passages from the ancient writers (Euseb. *Hist.* <210518>*Ecclesiastes* 5:18; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 4:15, ed. Potter, p. 606; Orig. *c. Cels.* 1:63). The Pauline epistles all had their particular directions, while the letters of Peter, James, 1 John, and Jude were circular epistles. The epistles 2 and 3 John were subsequently added, and included on account of their shortness, and to this collection was given the name *Catholic Letters,* in contradistinction to the *Pauline,* which were addressed to particular churches or individuals. The dates of nearly all of them are later than those of Paul, but their precise time is uncertain. See each in its order; also under *SEE ACTS (OF THE APOSTLES)*.

3. *Literature.* — Besides the general Introductions (q.v.) to the N.T., or parts of it, and the Prolegomena in most modern commentaries on each epistle, there is a wide range of general discussion relating to them which cannot here be profitably reviewed: special treatises only can be enumerated, and even these not exhaustively. On the *autograph* letters there are monographs in Latin by Rathlef (Hannov. 1752) and Stosch (Guelf. 1751); on *ecclesiastical letters* in general, and their various *descriptions,* by Berg (Jen. 1666), Bencini (Taurin. 1730), Brondley (Hafn. 1711-1712), Friderici (Gotha, 1754), Kiessling (Lips. 1744), Miller (Stad.. 1682), Pezold (Lips. 1698), Schmid (Helmst. 1713), Spies (Altorf. 1745); also Dodwell *(Dissert. Cyprian.* Oxon. 1684, page 17 sq.), Cassabritius *(Notit. Concil.* Lugd. 1670, page 275 sq.); *introductory* in general, by Braun *(Selecta Sancta,* pages 1-162), Kleuker (German, Hamb. 1799), Kohler (Germ. Lpz. 1830); and of the catholic epistles specially, by Storr (Tub. 1789), Tiegler (Rost. 1807), Staudler (Gott. 1790).

Special COMMENTARIES on *all* the epistles of the N.T. are the following, of which the most important are denoted by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Cassiodorus, *Complexiones* (ed. Chandler, Lond. 1722, 12mo); Card. Cajetan, *Enarratio* (Ven. 1531, Par. 1532, 1537, 1546, Antw. 1611,

fol.; Paris, 1540, Lugd. 1556, 1558, Paris, Par. 1571, 8vo; also in *Opp.* 5); Titelmann, *Elucidatio* (Antw. 1532, 1543, 8vo; Par. 1553, Ant. 1540, Ven. 1547, Lugd. 1553, 12mo); Bullinger, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1537, 1549, 1558, 1582, 1588, 1603, fol.); Pellican, *Commentarii* (Tigurini. 1539, fol.); Gagneus, *Scholia* (Par. 1543, 1547, 1550, 1563, 1629, 1633, 8vo); Politus (or Catharinus), *Commentarius* (Romans 1546,Ven. 1551, Par. 1566, fol.); *Calvin, *Commentarii* (Geneva, 1551, fol.); Buonricci, *Parafrsasi* (Ven. 1565, 4to); Beza, *Explicatio* (Genev. 1565, 1570, 8vo); Hemming, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1572, Vitemb. 1576, Frcft. 1579, Argent. 1589, fol.); Arias Montanus, *Elucidationes* (Antw. 1588, 8vo); Gualther, *Homiliae* (Tigurini. 1599, fol.); Erythrophilus, *Auslegung* (Gosl. 1605, sq., 4 volumes, 4to); *Lubin, *Exercitationes* [on nearly all the epistles] (Rost. 1610, 4to); *Este, *Commentarius* (Duoci. 16146, Colon. 1631, Paris, 1633,1640, 1653, 1659, 1666, 1679, fol.); Vorstius, *Commentary* [on most of the epistles] (Amst. and Herder. 1631, 4to); Fabricius, *Analysis* (in *Catena,* Lips. 1634, 1639, fol.); Gomarus, *Explicatio* (in *Opp.* 1644, fol.); *Dickson, *Commentarius (Glasg.* 1645, 4to; in English, Lond. 1659, fol.); Trapp, *Commentary* (Lond. 1647, 4to); Godeau, *Paraphrases* (Par. 1651, *6* volumes, Rouen, 1657, Lyons, 1685, 3 volumes, 12mo); Fromond, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1653, Paris, 1674, fol.); Anon. *Verklaring* (Amst. 1679, 4to); *Whitby, *Commentary* (London, 1700, fol., and since with others); Hunn, *Commentarii* (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Noel Alexander, *Commentarius* (Rothm. 1710, 2 vols. fol.); Pyle, *Paraphrase* (London, 1725, 8vo); *Lang, *Erklarung* (Halle, 1729, fol.); Locke, Pierce, and Benson, *Paraphrase* (published separately, London, 1733-52, 3 volumes, 4to; upon the same plan, and together forming a commentary on all the epistles); Dale, *Analysis* (London, 1737, 2 volumes, 8vo); Weitenauer, *Explicatio,* etc. (Aug. Vind. 1769, 8vo); Hess, *Schr. der Apostel* (Ziir. 1775, 1820 sq., 3 volumes, 8vo); Leutwein, *Erkldrung* (Leipzig, 1782-9, 3 volumes, 8vo); Nisbit, *Illustration* (Lond. 1787, 1789; in Germ., Nurnb. 1790, 8vo); Bahrdt, *Erklaruag* (Berlin, 1787-9, 3 volumes, 8vo); Przipcovius, *Cogitationes* (in *Opp.* Amst. 1792, fol., 36); Jaspis, *Annotationes* (Lips. 1793-7, enlarged, 1821, 2 volumes, 8vo); Kuster, *Anmerkungen* (Chemn. 1794, Berl. 1803, 8vo); *Macknight, *Commentary* (London, 1795, 4 volumes, 4to; 1806, 1816, 8 volumes, 8vo; without the Greek text, 1795, 3 volumes, 4to; 1809, 1816, 4 volumes, 8vo; 1832, 1 volume, 8vo); Roberts, *Harmony* (Cambr. 1800, 4to); Shuttleworth, *Paraphrase* (Oxf. 1829, 8vo); Slade, *Annotations* (4th ed. London, 1836, 8vo); Schotl and Winzer, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1834 sq., 2 volumes, 8vo);

Barlee, *Version* (London, 1837, 8vo); Peile, *Annotations* (Lond. 1848-52, 4 volumes, 8vo); *Prichard, *Commentary* (Lond. 1864 sq., 3 volumes, 8vo have appeared). *SEE NEW TESTAMENT*.

On the whole of the *Pauline* epistles alone, the following: Origen, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* 4:690); Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 2:15); Chrysostom, *Homiliae* (in *Opp.);* Pelagius, *Commentarii* [on the first 13 epistles] (in Augustini *Opp.* Append.); Theodoret, *Commentarius* (London, 1636, fol.; also in *Opp.* III, 1; and *Bibl. Patr.* [Oxf. 8vo] 8); Avitus, *Fragmenta* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 9, etc.); Primasius, *Commentaria (ib.* 10:142); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 6:31); St. John Damascenus, *Excerpta* [from Chrysostom] (in *Opp.* 2:1); Claudius Taurinensis, *Prologus* (in Mlai, *Script. et.* VII, 1:274); Sedulius, *In epp. P.* (Basil, 1528; also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 6:458); (Ecumenius, *In epp. P.* (Gr. and Lat. Ver. 1532, Paris, 1631, 2 volumes, fol.; also in *Opp.);* Lanfranc, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.;* also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 18:621); Raban Maurus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.);* Remigius Autiss. [Haimo] *Explanationes* (Colossians 1618, fol.; also in *Bibl. Max. Patr. 8:*883); Theophylact, *Commentarius* (Gr. and Latin, Lond. 1636, fol.; also in *Opp.* 2); Anselm, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* ed. 1612); Hugo A St. Victor, *Quc*estiones (in *Opp.* 1:266); Aquinas, *Expositio* (Basil, 1475; Lugd. 1689, fol.; also in *Opp.* 6, 7); Bruno, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1509, fol.); Dionysius Carthus., *Commentaria* (Paris, 1531, 8vo); Peter the Lombard, *Collectanea* [from the fathers] (Paris, 1535, fol.; 1537, 1541, 1543, 1555, 8vo); Salmeron, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 13-15); Contarini, *Scholia* (Par. 1571; Ven. 1589, fol.; also in *Opp.);* Faber, *Commentarius* (Par. 1512, 1515, 1531, Basil. 1527, fol.; Colossians 1531, 4to; Antw. 1540, 8vo); Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* [on most of these epistles] (Argent. 1524, Basil. 1525, 1527, 8vo); *Calvin, *Commentaria* (Argent. 1539, Genev. 1548, 4to; Genev. 1551, 1556, 1600, 1617, fol.; also since, and in French and English); Guilliaud, *Collationes* (Lugd. 1542, 1543, 4to; Par. 1550, 8vo); Arboreus, *Commentarius* (Par. 1553, fol.); *Musculus, *Commentarii* [on nearly all of these epistles] (in parts, Basil. 1555 sq., 4 volumes, fol.); Sasbout, *Commentarius* [on most of these epistles] (Antw. 1561, 8vo); Major, *Enarrationes* (in *Opp.* Vitemb. 1569, fol., 1); Hyperius, *Commentarii* (Tigurini. 1583, fol.); *Selnecker, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1595, fol.); Hespus, *Commentarius* (Muhlh. 1604, Lips. 1605, fol.); Weinrich, *Commentarii* [on most of these epistles] (in separate volumes, Lips. 1608-18, together — 1620, 1670, 4to); *Baldwin, *Commentarius* (in separate volumes, Vitemb. 1608-18;

together, Freft. 1644, 1664, 1680, 4to; 1691, 1700, 1710, Vitemb. 1655, fol.); Justinianus, *Explanationes* (Lugd. 1612, 1613, 2 vols. fol.); a Lapide, *Commentaria* (Antwerp, 1614, 1617, 1622, 1627, 1633, 1656, 1665, 1679; Paris, 1621, 1625, 1631, 1638; Lugd. 1644, 1683, fol.); Gorcom, *Epitome* [from Este and others] (Antw. 1619, Par. 1623, 8vo); Quistorp, *Commentarius* (partly in separate vols. Rost. 1636 sq.; complete, 1652, 4to); Laurence, *Explicatio* (Amst. 1642, 4to); Scultetus, *Annotata* [on Tim., Titus, and Philem.] (in the *Critici Sacri*, 7); Crell, *Commentaria* [on many passages of these epistles] (in *Opp.* 3:167); De Launay, *Paraphrase* (Car. 1650, 4to); Ambianas, *Commentaria* (Par. 1659-64, 3 vols. fol.); Crocius, *Commentarius* [on the smaller of these epistles] (Marp. 1663. Cas. 1670, 2 vols. fol.); Calixtus, *Expositiones* [on most of these epistles] (in parts, Helmst. 1664-6, 4to); Woodhead, Allestry, and Walker Eed. Fell], *Paraphrase* (Oxon. 1674,1702; Lond. 1707, 8vo); Schomer, *Exegesis* (voti, Rost. 1699, 1705; 2:1700, 1706, 4to); Heidegger, *Exegetica* (Tigur. 1700, 4to); A Picon, *Expositio* (Par. 1703, fol.); Schmid, *Commentarii* [on most of these epistles] (at first in separate parts; together, Hamb. 1704, 4to); Locke, *Paraphrase* [on several of these epistles] (in parts, London, 1705 sq.; together, 1709, 1733, 4to); Wells, *Help* [on many of these epistles] (Lond. 1715, 8vo); Lang, *Commentatio* (Hal. 1718, 4to); Van Til, *Commentarius* [on four of these epistles] (Amsterd. 1726, 4to); Pierce, *Notes* [on the smaller of these epistles] (in parts, London, 1729 sq.; together, 1733, 4to); G. Benson, *Paraphrase* (London, 1734 sq.; in several volumes separately, and together, 1752-6, 2 vols.; in Germ., Lips. 1761, 4 volumes, 4to); Remy, *Commentarius* (Aug.Vind. 1739, 4to); Van Alphen, *Specimena* [on five of these epistles] (Tr. ad Rh. 1742, 4to); *Michaelis, *Anmerkungen* [on most of these epistles] (Gott. 1750, 1791, 4to); Baumgarten, *Auslegung* [on the smaller of these epistles] (Hal. 1767, 4to); Zacharia, *Erkladrung* [on the smaller of these epistles] (Gotting. 1771,. 1787, 8vo); Addington, *Remarks* (in his *Life of Paul,;* London, 1784, 8vo); Krause, *Anmerk.* [on Philemon and 1 Thessalonians] (Frkft. 1790, 8vo); Anonymous, *Uebers.*, etc. (Hirsch. 1791, 8vo); Struve, *Uebers.*, etc. (Alton. 1792, 8vo, part 1); Morus, *Acroases* [on Galatians and Ephes.] (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Rullmann, *Observationes* [on the Koemerian MS.] (Rint. 1795, 4to); Bp. Burgess, *Introductio* [excerpts from old writers on many of these epistles) (Lond. 1804, 12mo); Bevan, *Notes* (in his *Life of Paul*, London, 1807, 8vo); Weingert, *Commentarius* [on the smaller epistles, chiefly compiled] (Goth. 1816, 8vo) Belsham, *Exposition* (Lond. 1823, 4 volumes, 8vo); *Flatt,

Commentar (Tibing. 1826-32, 5 volumes, 8vo); Stenerson, *Commentarius* (Christ. 1829-30, 2 volumes, 8vo); Hemcen, *Schriften*, etc. (in his *Leben Paulus*, Gott. 1830, 8vo), Schrader, *Paulus* (Leipzig, 1830-3, 5 volumes, 8vo); Paulus *Erlaut.* [on Romans and Gal.] (Heidelberg, 1831, 8vo); Eyre, *Illustration* (London, 1832, 2 volumes, 8vo); Steiger, *Bearleitung* [on the smaller of these epistles] (Erlang. 1835, 8vo); Latham, *Atrangement* (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Morehead, *Explanation* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Whately, *Essays* (London, 1845, 6th ed. 1849, 8vo); Sumner, *Exposition* (London, 1845 sq., 3 volumes, 8vo); Lewin, *Life and Epist. of Paul* (Lond. 1851, 2 volumes, 8vo); *Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Ep. of Paul* (Lond. 1852, 2 volumes, 4to; 1856, 1858, N.Y. 1855, 2 volumes, 8vo); Jowett, *Notes* [on Romans, Galatians, and Thessalonians] (Lond. 1855, 2 volumes, 8vo); *Ewald, *Erklarung* (Gott. 1857, 8vo); Linton, *Notes* (Lond. 1858, 12mo); *Ellicott, *Commentary* [on several of these epistles] (in separate vols. Lond. 1859 sq.; Andover, 1865, 8vo); Newland, *Catena* [on Ephesians and Philippians] (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Macevilly, *Exposition* (2d ed. Lond. 1860, 2 volumes, 8vo); Bisping, *Bandb.* (Miinst. 1864 sq. 8vo). *SEE COMMENTARY.*

On the three *pastoral* epistles alone (1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus), the following: Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp. Suppos.* 11); Chrysostom, *Homilice* (tr. in *Lib. of Fathers*, Oxf. 1843, 8vo, 12); Calvin, *Sermons* (Genev. 1563, fol.; tr. Lond. 1579, 4to; different from his *Commentary* on these epistles, Edinb. 1856, 8vo, tr. from his *Commentarii*, in *Opp.);* Daille, *Sermons* (Geneva,: 1555-61, 5 volumes, 8vo); Magalianus, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1609, 4to); Soto, *Commentarius* (Par. 1610, fol.); Scultetus, *Observationes* (Francf. 1624, Vitemb. 1630, 4to; also in the *Crit. Sacri*, 7); Habertus, *Expositio* (Par. 1656, 8vo); Heydenreich, *Erlauter.* (Hadamar. 1826-8, 2 volumes, 8vo); *Flatt, *Anmerk.* (Tubing. 1831, 8vo); Anon. Μεταφρασιᾷ (Par. 1831, 8vo); Mack, *Commentar* (Tubing. 1831, 1841, 8vo); Malthies, *Erklar.* (Greifsw. 1840, 8vo); Moller, *Commentar* (Kopenh. 1842, 8vo); Paterson, *Commentary* (London, 1848, 8vo); *Ellicott, *Commentary* (London, 1856, Andover, 1864, 8vo). *SEE TIMOTHY; SEE TITUS (EPISTLES TO).*

On all the *Catholic* epistles alone (James, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2, and 3 John, and Jude), the following: Theophylact, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 3); also *Enarrationes* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gall. 6:286); OEcumenius, *Expositio* (Frcft. 1610, 4to; also in *Opp.* 2); Bede, *Expositio (in Opp.* 5:673; *Works*, 12:157; comp. *Works*, 1:215); Cramer, *Commentarii* [from the fathers] (in his

Catena, 8); Aquinas, *Expositio* (Paris, 1543, 1563; Lugdun. 1556, Antwerp, 1592, 8vo; etc.); Hus, *Commentarii* (in *Monumenta,* 2:105); Faber, *Commentarius* (Basil, 1527, fol.; Antw. 1540, 8vo); Imler, *Commentarius* (Freft. 1542, 2 volumes, 8vo); Horne, *Expositio* (Brunswick, 1554, 4to); Hemming, *Commentarius* (in separate volumes, Havn. 1563, and Vitemb. 1569, 8vo; together, in English, Lond. 1577, 4to); Ferus, *Exegesis* (Complut. 1570, fol.); Aretius, *Commentarius* (Morg. 1589, Berne, 1608, 8vo); Grynaeus, *Explicatio* (Basil, 1593, 8vo); Salmeron, *Disputationes* (in *Opp.* 16); Crell, *Commentarius* [on many passages of these epistles] (in *Opp.* 3:318); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* 6); Various, *Annotations* (in the *Critici Sacri,* 8); Serarius, *Commentarius* (Moguntiac. 1612, fol.); Lorinus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1619, 2 volumes fol.); Justinianus, *Explanationes* (Lugd. 1621, fol.); Turnemann, *Meditationes* (Frcft. 1625, 4to); Alsted, *Notationes* (Herb. 1631,1640, 8vo); Lenseus, *Commentarii* (Holm. 1645, 4to); Benson, *Paraphrase* (London, 1706, 4to); Grarmlich, *Anmerkungen* (Stuttg. 1721, 8vo); Riclot, *Paraphrase* (Metz, 1727, 12mo); Collet, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1734, 8vo); Boysen, *Erklar.* [on Peter and Jude] (Halle, 1775, 8vo); Zacharia, *Erk/dr.* (Gott. 1776, 8vo); Schirmer, *Erklar.* [on Peter, James, and Jude] (Breslau, 1778, 8vo); Schroder, *Erklar.* [on Peter and Jude] (Schwabach, 1781, 8vo); Schlengel, *Anmerk.* (Halle, 1783, 8vo); Seemiller, *Annotationes* [on James and Jude] (Norimburg, 1783, 8vo); Semler, *Paraphrasis* [on Peter and Jude] (Halle, 1784, 8vo); Pott, *Annotationes* (in parts, Gott. 1786-90, 8vo; also in the *N.T. Koppian.* 9); E. Bengel, *Erkldrung* (Tib. 1788, 8vo); Carpzov, *Scholia* (Hal. 1790, 8vo); Gopfert, *Anmerk.* (Zwickau and Lpz. 1791, 8vo); Morus, *Prcelectiones* (on Peter and James] (Lips. 1794, 8vo); Roos, *Auslegung* [on Pet. and Jude] (Tub. 1798, 8vo); Augusti, *Erklar.* (Lemgo, 1801-8, 3 volumes, 8vo); Hottinger, *Commentarius* [on 1 Peter and James] (Lips. 1815, 8vo); Grashof, *Erkldr.* (Essen. 1830, 8vo); Sumner, *Exposition* (Lond. 1840, 8vo); Diedrich, *Erklar.* (Lpz. 1861, 8vo). See each epistle in its place.

Epistles Of Barnabas

SEE BARNABAS.

Epistles Of Clement

SEE CLEMENT.

Epistles Of The Apostolical Fathers

SEE BARNABAS; SEE CLEMENT OF ROME; SEE IGNATIUS; SEE POLYCARP.

Epistles, Spurious

Of these many are lost; but there are several extant, of which the following are the principal (see Jones, *A new Method of settling the Canon,* volume 2). *SEE CANON.*

1. *The Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans.* — There was an "Epistle to the Laodiceans" extant in the beginning of the second century, which was received by Marcion, but whether this is the same with the one now extant in the Latin language is more than doubtful. "There are some," says Jerome, "who read the Epistle to the Laodiceans, but it is universally rejected." The original epistle was most probably a forgery founded on ⁵¹⁰⁴⁶Colossians 4:16. "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that *ye likewise read the Epistlefrom Laodicea."* The apparent ambiguity of these last words has induced some to understand Paul as speaking of an epistle written by him to the Laodiceans, which he advises the Colossians to procure from Laodicea and read to their Church. "Some," says Theodoret, "imagine Paul to have written an epistle to the Laodiceans, and accordingly produce a certain forged epistle; but the apostle does not say the epistle *to,* but the *epistle from* the Laodiceans." Bellarmine among the Roman Catholics, and among the Protestants Le Clerc and others, suppose that the passage in Colossians refers to an epistle of Paul, now lost, and the Vulgate translation — *eam quae Laodicensium est* — seems to favor this view. Grotius, however, conceives that the Epistle to the Ephesians is here meant, and he is followed by Hammond, Whitby, and Mill, and also by archbishop Wake *(Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers).* Theophylact, who is followed by Dr. Lightfoot, conceives that the epistle alluded to is 1 Timothy. Others hold it to be 1 John, Philemon, etc. Mr. Jones conjectures that the epistle now passing as that to the Laodiceans (which seems entirely compiled out of the Epistle to the Philippians) was the composition of some idle monk not long before the Reformation; but this opinion is scarcely compatible with the fact mentioned by Mr. Jones himself, that when Sixtus of Sienna published his *Bibliotheca Sancta* (A.D. 1560), there was a *very old* manuscript of this epistle in the library of the Sorbonne.

This epistle was first published by James le Fevre, of Estaples, in 1517. It may be found in Gr. and Lat. in Fabricius, *Codex Apocr.* 2:871; and translated in Hone's *Apocryphal N.T.* page 94. *SEE LAODICEANS (EPISTLE TO).*

2. *The Third Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.* — It was the opinion of Calvin, Louis Capell, and many others, that the apostle Paul wrote several epistles besides those now extant. One of the chief grounds of this opinion is the passage 1 Corinthians 5:9. There is still extant, in the Armenian language, an epistle from the Corinthians to St. Paul, together with the apostle's reply. This is considered by Mr. La Croze to be a forgery of the tenth or eleventh century, and he asserts that it was never cited by any one of the early Christian writers. In this, however, he is mistaken, for this epistle is expressly quoted as Paul's by St. Gregory the Illuminator in the third century, Theodore Chrethenor in the seventh, and St. Nierses in the twelfth. Neither of them, however, is quoted by any ancient Greek or Latin writer (Henderson, *On Inspiration,* page 497. The passages are cited at length in father Paschal Aucher's *Armenian and English Grammar, Venice,* 1819. Lord Byron's translation of them is given by Stanley in his *Commentary on Corinthians,* 2:303). *SEE CORINTHIANS (FIRST EPISTLE TO).*

3. *The Epistle of Peter to James* is a very ancient forgery. It was first published by Cotelerius, and is supposed to have been a preface to the *Preaching of Peter,* which was in great esteem among some of the early Christian writers, and is several times cited as a genuine work by Clement of Alexandria, Theodotus of Byzantium, and others. It was also made use of by the heretic Heracleon, in the second century. Origen observes of it that it is not to be reckoned among the ecclesiastical books, and that it is neither the writing of Peter nor of any other inspired person. Mr. Jones conceives it to be a forgery of some of the Ebionites in the beginning of the second century. It is given in Gr. and Latin by Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* 2:907. *SEE PETER.*

4. *The Epistles of Paul and Seneca* consist of eight extended Latin letters from the philosopher Seneca to the apostle Paul, and six from the latter to Seneca. (See Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* 2:872; and the translation in Hone's *Apocryphal N.T.* page 95 sq.) Their antiquity is undoubted. St. Jerome had such an idea of the value of these letters that he was induced to say, "I should not have ranked Seneca in my catalogue of saints, but that I

was determined to it by those epistles of Paul to Seneca and Seneca to Paul, which are read by many... . He was slain by Nero two years before Peter and Paul were honored with martyrdom." St. Augustine also observes *(Epistle to Macedonius)* that "Seneca wrote certain epistles to St. Paul which are now read." The epistles are also referred to in the spurious "Acts" of Linus, the first bishop of Rome after the apostles. But these *Acts* are a manifest forgery, and were first alluded to by a monk of the eleventh century. The letters do not appear to have been mentioned by any other ancient writer; but it seems certain that those now extant are the same which were known to Jerome and Augustine. The genuineness of these letters has been maintained by some learned men, but by far the greater number reject them as spurious. Mr. Jones conceives them to be a forgery of the fourth century, founded on Phillipians 4:22. Indeed, there are few persons mentioned in the New Testament as companions of the apostle who have not had some spurious piece or other fathered on them. *SEE SENECA.*

5. Among the apocryphal letters now universally rejected are the well-known *Epistle of Lentulus* to the Roman senate, giving a description of the person of Christ *(Orthodoxographia,* page 2, Basil. 1555; Fabricii *Cod. Epig.* 1719), and some pretended epistles of the Virgin Mary. One of these is said to be written in Hebrew, and addressed to the Christians of Messina in Sicily, of which a Latin translation has been published, and its genuineness gravely vindicated *(Veritas Vindicata,* 1692, fol.). It is dated from Jerusalem, in the 42d year "of our Son." nones of July, *Luna* 17, *Feria quinta.* The metropolitan church of our Lady of the Letter, at Messina, takes its name from the possession of this celebrated epistle, of which some have pretended that even the autograph still exists. An epistle of the Virgin to the Florentines has been also celebrated, and there is extant a pretended letter from the same to St. Ignatius, together with his reply. (For three of these spurious letters, see Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* 2:842.) *SEE JESUS CHRIST*.

For other spurious epistles, *SEE APOCRYPHA*.

Epistolae

When the ancient Christians were about to travel into a foreign country, they took with them letters of credence from their own bishop, in order that they might communicate with another church. These letters were of three kinds: *epistole commendatoriae,* given to persons of quality, or

persons whose reputation had been called in question, or to the clergy who had occasion to travel into foreign countries; *epistola communicatoriae,* given to such as were in peace and communion with the Church; *epistolae dimissoriae,* such as were given by the bishops to the clergy when removing from one diocese to another. All these were called *epistolae formatae,* because they were written in a *peculiar form,* with certain marks, which served to distinguish them from counterfeits. Farrar, *Ecclesiastes ,Dictionary,* s.v.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 2, chapter 4.

Epistolae Obscunorum Virorum

(Epistles of obscure Men), a celebrated collection of letters by anonymous authors, in which the opponents of Humanism, and the Church of Rome in general, were castigated with pungent satire. The special occasion for the publication of these epistles was a bitter controversy between the learned Reuchlin (q.v.) on the one hand, and a converted Jew named Pfefferkorn, and the Dominicans of Cologne (headed by Hochstraten [q.v.], the inquisitor, and by Prior Ortuinus Gratius) on the other. The latter advocated the expulsion of all Jews from Germany, the burning of their books, and the forcible education of their children in the Christian religion. Reeuchlin, being asked for his opinion, advised that only the writings of the Jews against Christianity should be burned. The bishop of Spires declared in favor of Reuchlin. Pope Leo X, who personally cared more about the friendship of the Humanists than about the Church, but who, as pope, dared not to offend the monks, delayed his decision. The Humanists now organized themselves everywhere into a league, and flooded Germany with books against the fanatical monks. Among these books, the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* are the most celebrated. They successfully imitate the barbaric Latin of the monks. The types, which were of very poor quality, and abounding in abbreviations, were a studious imitation of those used by Quentil of Cologne, the publisher of Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans. The name of Aldus Manutius was used as publisher, and Venice as the place of printing, and a pretended papal privilege guaranteed it for ten years against counterfeited editions. They were addressed to Ortuinus Gratius, a leading man among the band of literary fanatics at Cologne, who was regarded as the real author of the writings of Pfefferkorn against Reuchlin. They give a vivid picture of the opinions, the talk, and the writings of the monks and their friends, and expose their ignorance, hypocrisy, arrogance, and licentiousness. The satire was so skillful, and the imitation of the monkish language and spirit so successful,

that, according to the testimony of Erasmus, the Franciscans and Dominicans of England at first received the epistles with great applause, and a Dominican prior circulated a number of copies among members of his order, believing them to be written in its honor. When the real character was discovered, the rage of the monks was great, and the pope was prevailed upon to issue against the epistles a brief of condemnation. Pfefferkorn wrote a book against the epistles in 1516 *(Defensio Joa. Pepericorni contra famosas et criminales obscurorum virorum epistolas),* and the monks, in 1518, published against it a work called *Lamentationes obscurorum virorum;* but all these books were so poor and insipid that they increased rather than weakened the effect of the epistles. The *Lamentationes* in particular, as a defense of the monks, are so ineffective that some Roman Catholic writers, though without good reason, ascribe the authorship to the Humanists themselves. The epistles consist of three parts. The first was printed in 1515 at Hagenau by the learned printer Wolfgang Angst, a friend of Reuchlin, under the title *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum ad venerabilem virum Mag. Ortuinum Gratium, Daventriensem* ("a native of Deventer") *Coloniae Agrippinae bonas litteras docentem, variis et locis et temporibus missae ac demum in volumen coactae.* The second part was printed at Basel in 1517 by Froben; the third, which is much inferior to the two former, appeared much later. Sir William Hamilton *(Edinburgh Review,* 53:193) remarks that "the *Epistolae* are at once the most cruel and the most natural of satires, and, as such, they were the most effective. They converted the tragedy of Reuchlin's persecution into a farce; annihilated, in public consideration, the enemies of intellectual improvement; and even the friends of Luther, in Luther's lifetime, acknowledged that no other writing had contributed so powerfully to the downfall of the papal domination."

As to the authorship of the *Epistolae,* there has been much dispute. It appears certain that neither Erasmus nor Reuchlin had any part in the compilation. The recent German critics generally incline to think that the first part was chiefly compiled by Wolfgang Angst and Crotus Rubianus, and the second by Crotus Rubianus, Hutten, and Pirkheimer; but Hamilton, in the article above cited, shows almost decisively that Hutten, Crotus, and Buschius were the joint authors. A late writer, Chauffour-Kestner *(Ulrich von Hutten,* translated by A. Young), attributes the work exclusively to Hutten (see *British and For. Evang. Review,* October 1867, page 775). The *Epistolae* have frequently been printed; among the earlier editions,

those of Frankfort (1643), London (1710), and another London edition (without date), with nine pictures, are the best. There are modern editions by Dr. Munch (Lpz. 1827), by Rotermund (Hanov. 1827), and by Boecking (Lpz. 1858). The London edition of 1710 is the most elegant in form. It was edited by the learned Maittaire, who really believed it to be the genuine work of the monks, as did Steele, to whom Mattaire's edition was dedicated, and who noticed it, as if genuine, in *The Tatler*. This edition was reproduced by Clements, London, 1742. The literary history of the *Epistolae* is very fully given in Sir W. Hamilton's article above referred to, which criticizes Munch's edition with some severity. Very full information on the *Epistolk* is given in the three last-named editions. See, besides the authors already cited, Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:111; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:633.

Epistolae Praestantium Virorum

a valuable collection of letters illustrating the history of the Arminians and Remonstrants. Its full title is *Praestantium ac Eruditorum irorum Epistolae Ecclesiasticae et Theologiae varii argumenti, inter quas eminent ece, quae a* Jac. Arminio, Conr. Vorstio, Sim. Episcopio, Hug, Grotio, Casp. Barlaeo, *conscripts sunt.* (Amst. 1660, 8vo; 2d ed. Amst. 1684, fol.).

Epistolare

(plur. *-aria),* a term used in Biblical criticism (q.v.) to distinguish those MS. Lectionaries (q.v.) or selections from the Greek Test. anciently employed in Church service that contained selections from the *epistles* only. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE*.

Epistolarium

The office of the Holy Communion was in the early ages of the Church contained in four volumes, viz. the Antiphoner, the Lectionary, the Books of the Gospels, and the Sacramentary. The second of these, the *Lectionary,* was the book of the epistles read at mass (Du Cange, *Glossarium,* s.v. Lectionarius), generally called the *Epistolarium,* also *Comes* and *Apostolus.* — Procter, *On the Book of Common Prayer,* page 9.

Epitaphia

(ἐπιτάφια), funeral orations. It was usual in the early Church to make funeral orations (λόγοι ἐπικήδειοι) in praise of those who had been

distinguished during life by their virtues and merits. Several of these are extant, as that of Eusebius at the funeral of Constantine; those of Ambrose on the deaths of Theodosius and Valentinian, and of his own brother Satyrus; those of Gregory of Nazianzus upon his father, his brother Csesarius, and his sister Gorgonia; and that of Gregory of Nyssa upon the death of Melitus, bishop of Antioch. — Riddle, *Christ. Antiq.* book 7, chapter 3.

Epoch

1. The point of time, usually marked by some important event, from which a series of year's, termed an *era,* is computed or dated; although "epoch" and "aera" are often used synonymously for either a chronological period or date in general (see *Penny Cyclopedia,* s.v. AEra). An aera properly so called the ancient Hebrews did not possess. Signal events seem to have been made use of as points from which to date. Moses, like Herodotus, reckoned by generations. The Exodus, as may be seen in <02901>Exodus 19:1, and <04338>Numbers 33:38, probably, also, the building of the first Temple (<11010>1 Kings 9:10; <14302>2 Chronicles 3:2), were employed as starting-points to aid in assigning events their position in historical succession. Also the destruction of the first Temple, or the beginning of the Babylonish captivity (in the summer of the year B.C. 586), and the liberation of the Jews from the Syrian yoke by the valor of the Maccabees (in the autumn of the year B.C. 143), were used as epochs from which time was reckoned. After the manner of other nations, the Hebrews computed time by the succession of their princes, as may be seen throughout the books of Kings and Chronicles. At a later period, and in the first book of the Maccabees, what is termed the Greek sera, or that of the Seleucidae, began to be employed. This aera, which is also called the aera of the Syro-Macedonians, commences from the year of Rome 442, twelve years after the death of Alexander, and 311 years and four months before the birth of our Savior, the epoch of the first conquest of Seleucus Nicator in that part of the West which afterwards composed the immense empire of Syria (see Noris, *Annus et epocha Syro-Macedonum,* Lips. 1696). The Julian year, formed of the Roman months, to which Syrian names were given, was used. The aera prevailed not only in the dominions of Seleucus, but among almost all the people of the Levant, where it still exists. The Jews did not abandon the use of this sera until within the last 400 years. At present they date from the Creation, which they hold to have taken place 3760 years and three months before the commencement of the Christian aera. In order to fix

their new moons and years; as well as their feasts and festivals, they were obliged to make use of astronomical calculations and cycles. The first cycle they used for this purpose was one of 84 years, but this being discovered to be faulty, they had recourse to: the Metonic cycle of 19 years, which was established by the authority of rabbi Hillel, prince of the Sanhedrim, about the year 360 of the Christian aera. This they still use, and say it is to be observed till the coming of the Messiah. Indeed, some contend that their present practice of dating from the Creation of the world is of great antiquity. Their year is luni-solar, consisting either of 12 or 13 months each, and each month of 29 or 30 days; for in the compass of the Metonic cycle there are 12 common years, consisting of 12 months, and seven intercalary years, consisting of 13 months, which are the third, sixth, eighth, eleventh, fourteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth of the cycle. *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

The birth of the Savior of the world probably took place somewhat earlier than the date which is usually assigned to it. Usage, however, has long fixed the aera to which it gave rise, namely, *the Christian aera,* or the sera of the Incarnation, to begin on the 10th day of January, in the middle of the fourth year of the 194th Olympiad, the 753d year of the building of Rome, and in the 4714th of the Julian period. The use of the Christian aera was introduced in the sixth century; in France it was first employed in the seventh. About the eighth it was generally adopted; but considerable difference has existed not only in various countries, but even in the same place in the same country and at the same period, respecting the commencement of the year. Nor did the use of the sera become universal in Christendom till the fifteenth century. The Christian year consists of 365 days for three successive years, and of 366 in the fourth, which is termed leap-year. This computation subsisted for 1000 years without alteration, and is still used by the Greek Church. The simplicity of this form has brought it into very general use, and it is customary for astronomers and chronologists, in treating of ancient times, to date back in the same order from its commencement. There is, unfortunately, a little ambiguity on this head, some persons reckoning the year immediately before the birth of Christ as 1 B.C., and others noting it with 0, and the second year before Christ with 1, thus producing one year less than those who use the former notation. The first, however, is the usual mode. The Christian year, arranged as has been shown, was 11' 11" too long, an error which amounted to a day in nearly 129 years. Towards the end of the sixteenth

century the time of celebrating the Church festivals had advanced ten days beyond the periods fixed by the Council of Nice in 325. It was, in consequence, ordered by a bull of Gregory XIII that the year 1582 should consist of only 355 days, which was brought about by omitting ten days in the month of October, namely, from the 5th to the 14th. And to prevent the recurrence of a like irregularity, it was also ordered that in three centuries out of four the last year should be a common instead of a leap-year, as it would have been by the Julian Calendar. The year 1600 remained a leap-year, but 1700, 1800, and 1900 were to be common years. This amended mode of computing was called "The New Style." It was immediately adopted in all Catholic countries, but Protestants came to use it only gradually. In England the reformed calendar was adopted in the year 1752 by omitting eleven days, to which the difference between the styles then amounted. The alteration was effected in the month of September, the day which would have been the third being called the fourteenth. *SEE VULGAR AERA.*

The following summary shows the correspondence of the principal epochs, aeras, and periods with that of the birth of Christ, or Christian aera. (A valuable treatise on *AEras of ancient and modern Times* may be found in the *Companion to the Almanac,* 1830.) *SEE AERA*.

Picture for Epoch

2. The term epoch is used by modern writers to denote "critical junctures in the development of history, the signals of a new creation; hence termed ἐποχαί, pauses or resting-places for contemplation. What exists at the epoch in the germ is developed to a more advanced stage, and thus afterwards becomes the *Period.* The former denotes the fountain-head, the latter the stream; their limits are where a new form of culture again appears in an epoch. The epochs are either critical and destructive, or creative and organizing." — Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas,* 1:20.

Equitius

a lay abbot of many monasteries, both male and female, in the province of Valeria, who liv.ed in the 6th century. The year both of his birth and death are unknown. He had not taken orders, but was nevertheless very active in preaching. He was therefore denounced at Rome, and the pope summoned him before his tribunal, but the great and general reputation of Equitius induced the pope to dismiss the case. Equitius led a very ascetic life, and is

said to have always, during his many travels, carried the Bible with him. According to Baronius, pope Gregory I was a monk according to the rule of St. Equitius, but this is denied by other writers. — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 4:113; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 3:638. (A.J.S.)

Equity

"is that exact rule of righteousness or justice which is to be observed between man and man. Our Lord beautifully and comprehensively expresses it in these words: 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets' (<4007>Matthew 7:12). This golden rule, says Dr. Watts, has many excellent properties in it.

1. It is a rule that is easy to be understood, and easy to be applied by the meanest and weakest understanding (<2308>Isaiah 35:8).

2. It is a very short rule, and easy to be remembered: the weakest memory can retain it; and the meanest of mankind may carry this about with them, and have it ready upon all occasions.

3. This excellent precept carries greater evidence to the conscience, and a stronger degree of conviction in it, than any other rule of moral virtue.

4. It is particularly fitted for practice, because it includes in it a powerful motive to stir us up to do what it enjoins.

5. It is such a rule as, if well applied, will almost always secure our neighbor from injury, and secure us from guilt if we should chance to hurt him.

6. It is a rule as much fitted to awaken us to sincere repentance upon the transgression of it as it is to direct us to our present duty.

7. It is a most extensive rule, with regard to all the stations, ranks, and characters of mankind, for it is perfectly suited to them all.

8. It is a most comprehensive rule with regard to all the actions and duties that concern our neighbors. It teaches us to regulate our temper and behavior, and promote tenderness, benevolence, gentleness, etc.

9. It is also a rule of the highest prudence with regard to ourselves, and promotes our own interest in the best manner.

10. This rule is fitted to make the whole world as happy as the present state of things will admit. See Watts, *Sermons,* serm. 33, volume 1; Evans, *Sermons,* serm. 28. *SEE ETHICS.*

Equivocation

"(aquae, voco, to use one word in different senses). 'How absolute the knave is! We must speak by the card, or *equivocation* will undo us' *(Humlet,* act 5, scene 1). In morals, to *equivocate* is to offend against the truth by using language of double meaning, in one sense, with the intention of its being understood in another or in either sense according to circumstances. The ancient oracles gave responses of ambiguous meaning. *Aio, te, AEacide, Romanos vincere posse* may mean either, 'I say that thou, O descendant of Jacus, canst conquer the Romans,' or 'I say that the Romans can conquer thee, O descendant of AEacus.' *Latronem Petrum occidisse* may mean 'a robber slew Peter,' or 'Peter slew a robber.' *Edwardum occidere nolite timere borum est.* The message penned by Adam Orleton, bishop of Hereford, and sent by queen Isabella to the jailers of her husband, Edward II. Being written without punctuation, the words might be written two ways: with a comma after *timere,* they would mean, 'Edward, to kill fear not, the deed is good;' but with it after *nolite,* the meaning would be, 'Edward kill not, to fear the deed is good.' Henry Garnet, who was tried for his participation in the Gunpowder Plot, thus expressed himself in a paper dated March 20, 1605-6, 'Concerning *equivocation,* this is my opinion: in moral affairs, and in the common intercourse of life, when the truth is asked among friends, it is not lawful to use *equivocation,* for that would cause great mischief in society wherefore, in such cases, there is no place for *equivocation.* But in cases where it becomes necessary to an individual for his defense, or for avoiding any injustice or loss, for obtaining any important advantage, without danger or mischief to any other person then equivocation is lawful' (Jardine, *Gunpowder Plot,* page 233). Dr. Johnson would not allow his servant to say he was not at home when he really was. 'A servant's strict regard for truth,' said he, 'must be weakened by such a practice. A philosopher may know that it is merely a form of denial, but few servants are such nice distinguishers. If I accustom a servant to tell a lie for *me,* have I not reason to apprehend that he will tell many lies for *himself?'* (Boswell, *Letters,* page 32.) There may be *equivocation* in sound as well as in sense. It is told that the queen of George III asked one of the dignitaries of the Church if ladies might *knot* on Sunday. His reply was, Ladies may *not;* which, in so

far as sound goes, is *equivocal." — Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy,* s.v.

Er

(Hebrews *id.* r [,ê*watchful;* Sept. and N.T. "Hp, Vulg. *Her.),* the name of three men. *SEE ERI*.

1. The oldest son of the patriarch Judah by BathShuah (daughter of Shuah), a Canaanitess. His wife was Tamar, but he had no issue, and his widow eventually became the mother of Pharez and Zarah by Judah. Er "was wicked [[r , a paronomasia of r [ ] in the sight of the Lord; and the Lord slew him" (<0138>Genesis 38:3-7; <0469>Numbers 26:19). B.C. cir. 1896. It does not appear what the nature of his sin was; but, from his Canaanitish birth on the mother's side, it was probably connected with the abominable idolatries of Canaan.

2. A "son" of Shelah (Judah's son), and "father" of Lecah (<1401>1 Chronicles 4:21). B.C. prob. ante 1618.

3. Son of Jose and father of Elmodan, in Christ's genealogy, of David's private line prior to Salathiel (<4228>Luke 3:28). B.C. cir. 725.

Era

SEE AERA.

Erakim

SEE TALMUD.

E'ran

(Hebrews *Eran',* ˆ r ;[ê*watchful;* Sept. Ἐδέν, appar. reading ˆ d [, with the Samar. and Syr.; Vulg. *Heran),* son of Shuthelah (eldest son of Ephraim), and progenitor of the family of the Eranites (<0426>Numbers 26:36). B.C. post 1856. The name does not occur in the genealogies of Ephraim in <1720>1 Chronicles 7:20-29, though a name, ELADAH (verse 20) or ELEAD (verse 21), is found which may be a corruption of it.

E'ranite

(Hebrews with the art. *ha-Erani'*, ynæ[ie; Sept. οἘδενί [like the Samar. and Syr. reading d for r], Vulg. *Heranitz,* A.V. "the Eranites"), a patronymic designation of the descendants of the Ephraimite ERAN (<042636>Numbers 26:36).

Erasmus, Desiderius

Picture for Erasmus, Desiderius

was born at Rotterdam, October 28, 1467 (1465). His father's name was Gerhard, his mother's Margaretha; they were never married. The boy was called Gerhardus Gerhardi, which he changed into the name Desiderius Erasmus (properly Erasmius), having the same meaning in Latin and Greek *(amiable).* The father went to Rome. Being informed there that Margaretha was dead, he entered into orders; but, finding her alive on his return, he and she devoted themselves to the training of their son. At six he was a chorister in the cathedral at Utrecht. At nine he was sent to school at Deventer, where he had for school-fellow a youth who afterwards became pope Adrian VI. He displayed so great talent at Deventer that it was even then predicted that he would one day be the most learned man in Germany. After the death of his parents, when he was under fourteen, his guardians determined to make a monk of him, in order, it is said, that they might secure his patrimony for themselves. He refused to enter the monastic life; but his guardians placed him in the seminary at Herzogenbusch, where, as he says, he spent three useless and unhappy years. He was then put at the monastic house of Zion, near Delft, and finally he entered the Augustinian monastery of Emaius, or Stein, near Gouda. Here, after sturdy resistance, he entered on his novitiate in 1486. His life at Stein was unhappy, except so far as it was relieved by study, to which he devoted all the time possible. His hatred of monkery increased with each year of his stay in the monastery. In 1491, the bishop of Cambray, desiring a capable Latinist as his secretary for a projected journey to Rome, obtained permission for Erasmus to leave the convent. The journey did not come off, and Erasamus (who was ordained priest in 1492) remained some years under the bishop of Cambray, who authorized him to proceed to Paris to continue his studies, instead of returning to the monastic life. At Paris, Eras**Error! Not a valid filename.**mus barely supported himself, by taking pupils, and he suffered greatly from sickness and poverty. He afterwards

attributed his weakness of constitution to his wretched food and unwholesome lodgings in Paris. After a short visit to Cambray and to Holland for his health, he returned to Paris, where his pension from the bishop failed, and he taught for his bread. Among his pupils was lord William Mountjoy, who ever after remained his friend and patron. For him he wrote the treatise *De Ratione conscribendi epistolas.* Mountjoy offered him a pension to accompany him to England. Erasmus passed a year there (1498-9), chiefly at London, Oxford, and Cambridge, and became acquainted with many Englishmen distinguished for piety and learning. At Oxford he studied in St. Mary's College, and formed many connections which were afterwards of use to him. Among his special friends were Colet, Grocyn, Latimer, and the celebrated chancellor Thomas More. From England Erasmus returned to Paris, where he again supported himself by pupils. In 1499 he returned to the Continent, and spent his time chiefly in studying Greek, and in translating Greek authors into Latin. He had no fixed abode; now he was in Paris, and again in the provinces of France or in Holland. The *Adagia* and the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* were published between 1500 and 1504. He began his Biblical studies also about this time, publishing in 1505 a new edition of the *Remarks of Laurentius Valla on the N.T.* In 1505 he spent a short time in England, where he made the acquaintance of archbishop Warham, to whom he dedicated his translation of the Hecuba. In 1506 he accomplished his long-cherished desire of visiting Italy, where he succeeded in obtaining from pope Julius II a dispensation from his monastic vows. At Turin he was made D.D. (1506), and his time was divided between Bologna, Rome, Florence, and Padua, where he improved his knowledge of Greek under the instruction of the best Greek and Italian scholars. In 1507 he superintended, at Venice, a new edition of his *Adagia,* printed by the celebrated Aldus Manutius. "At Rome he met with a flattering reception, and promises of high advancement; but, having engaged to return to England, he did so in 1510, in the expectation that the recent accession of Henry VIII, with whom he had for some time maintained a correspondence, would insure to him an honorable provision." On the journey he wrote the work which gave him his greatest celebrity for the time, the *Encomium Moriae* (Panegyric on Folly), which he dedicated to Thomas More. He lived "for some time at Cambridge, where he was appointed Lady Margaret professor (in divinity), and also lectured on Greek. His lodging was in Queen's College, in the grounds of which Erasmus's Walk is still shown. In 1509, at the request of Colet, he published *Copia Verborum ac rerum,* long in use as a school-

book. He accepted an invitation from the archduke, afterwards Charles V, and went to Brabant in 1514, with the office of councillor, and a salary of 200 florins. After this we find him resident sometimes in the Netherlands, sometimes at Basel, where the great work in which he had been many years engaged, the first edition of the New Testament in Greek, was published in 1516, accompanied by a new Latin translation. Some amusing specimens of the objections made to this undertaking by the ignorant clergy will be found in his 'Letters' (6:2)" *(Engl. Cyclop.).* It was dedicated to pope Leo X. His fame had by this time spread all over Europe; he and Reuchlin were called *the Eyes of Germany.* From this period onward he resided chiefly at Basel, though his wandering habits were never entirely shaken off. The second edition of his N.T. appeared in 1519, and prefixed to it was his *Ratio sen Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram Theologiam* (also published separately, 1522). In 1521 he published his *Colloquia,* "composed ostensibly to supply young persons with an easy school-book in the Latin language, and at the same time to teach them religion and morals. For the purpose of teaching the Latin language this little book seems peculiarly well adapted: it was long used for this purpose in England. In these 'Colloquies,' which are generally very amusing, Erasmus has made some of his smartest attacks on various superstitions of the Roman Catholic Church. On this account the book was prohibited" *(Eng. Cyclop.).* His *Annotations in N.T.* appeared at Basel (1516-22, many editions), and his *Paraphrases in N.T.* (1524, fol.; Berlin, 1777-80, 3 volumes, fol.) The *Paraphrases* were so much esteemed in England that it was made the duty of every parish church, by an order in council (1547), to possess a copy of the English translation (Lond. 1548, 2 vols. fol., by Udall, Coverdale, and others; 2d edit. 1551).

As Erasmus had decided to remain in the Church of Rome, his residence at Basel became an uneasy one when the Reformation got possession of that city. In 1529 he removed to Freiburg, in Breisgau, where he built a house with a view to permanent residence, but never liked it. His later years were embittered by literary and religious quarrels. His pecuniary affairs, however, which had always been embarrassed in his early years, were now easy. In 1535 he returned to Basel, intending, however, only a short stay before returning to his native land to die. He was soon taken ill, but recovered sufficiently to continue his literary labors, especially on his edition of Origen. He suffered from gravel; an attack of dysentery

supervened, and carried him off on the night of July 11-12 (O.S.), 1536. He left his property to the poor.

The literary industry of Erasmus during his whole life was prodigious. He early imbibed a love for the ancient classics, and contributed largely to increase the taste for ancient culture by his writings in praise of them, by his editions of classic authors, and by his attacks on the scholastic theology and on the ignorance of the monks. "He worked incessantly in various branches, and completed his works with great rapidity; he had not the patience to revise and polish them, and accordingly most of them were printed exactly as he threw them out; but this very circumstance rendered them universally acceptable; their great charm was that they communicated the trains of thought which passed through a rich, acute, witty, intrepid, and cultivated mind, just as they arose, and without any reservations. Who remarked the many errors which escaped him? His manner of narrating, which still rivets the attention, then carried every one away" (Ranke, *Reformation,* by Austin, book 2, chapter 1). His *Ciceronianus* is "an elegant and stinging satire on the folly of those pedants who, with a blind devotion, refused to use in their compositions any words or phrases not to be found in Cicero. Erasmus's own Latin style is clear and elegant; not always strictly classical, but like that of one who spoke and wrote Latin as readily as his mother tongue. His 'Letters,' comprising those of many learned men to himself, form a most valuable and amusing collection to those who are interested in the manners and literary histories of the age in which they were written; and several of them in particular are highly valuable to Englishmen as containing a picture of the manners of the English of that day" *(Eng. Cyclop.).* But, of all his writings, the only ones that are likely to retain a lasting place in literature are the *Colloquies,* and the *Panegyric on Folly* — writings of his comparative youth, and regarded by him rather as pastime. "For neither as a wit nor as a theologian, nor perhaps even as a critic, does Erasmus rank among master intellects; and in the other departments of literature no one has ventured to claim for him a very elevated station. His real glory is to have opened at once new channels of popular and of abstruse knowledge — to have guided the few, while he instructed the many — to have lived and written for noble ends — to have been surpassed by none in the compass of his learning, or the collective value of his works — and to have prepared the way for a mighty revolution, which it required moral qualities far loftier than his to accomplish. For the soul of this great man did not partake of the energy of

his intellectual faculties. He repeatedly confesses that he had none of the spirit of a martyr, and the acknowledgment is made in the tone of sarcasm rather than in that of regret. He belonged to that class of actors on the scene of life who have always appeared as the harbingers of great social changes — men gifted with the power to discern and the hardihood to proclaim truths of which they want the courage to encounter the infallible results; who outrun their generation in thought, but lag behind it in action; players at the sport of reform so long as reform itself appears at an indefinite distance; more ostentatious of their mental superiority than anxious for the well-being of mankind; dreaming that the dark page of history may hereafter become a fairy tale, in which enchantment will bring to pass a glorious catastrophe, unbought by intervening strife, and agony, and suffering; and therefore overwhelmed with alarm when the edifice begins to totter, of which their own hands have sapped the foundation. He was a reformer until the Reformation became a fearful reality; a jester at the bulwarks of the papacy until they began to give way; a propagator of the Scriptures until men betook themselves to the study and the application of them; depreciating the mere outward forms of religion until they had come to be estimated at their real value; in short, a learned, ingenious, benevolent, amiable, timid, irresolute man, who bearing the responsibility, resigned to others the glory, of rescuing the human mind from the bondage of a thousand years. The distance between his career and that of Luther was therefore continually enlarging, until they at length moved in opposite directions, and met each other with mutual animosity" *(Edinburgh Review*, 68:302).

The relations of Erasmus to the Reformation have been summarily stated in the paragraph just cited. He was the literary precursor of the Reformation. His exegetical writings prepared the way for later expositors, opened a new era in Biblical criticism, and also aided in giving the Bible its Protestant position as the rule of faith. His satires upon the monks, upon the scholastic theology, and upon Church abuses generally, contributed largely to prepare the minds of literarymen throughout Europe for a rupture with Rome. He taught, in anticipation of Protestantism, that Christian knowledge should be drawn from the original sources, viz. the Scriptures, which he said should be translated into all tongues. In his *Encomium Morice,* Folly is introduced as an interlocutor who "turns into ridicule the labyrinth of dialectic in which theologians have lost themselves, the syllogisms with which they labor to sustain the Church as Atlas does the

heavens, the intolerant zeal with which they persecute every difference of opinion. She then comes to the ignorance, the dirt, the strange and ludicrous pursuits of the monks, their barbarous and objurgatory style of preaching; she attacks the bishops, who are more solicitous for gold than for the safety of souls; who think they do enough if they dress themselves in theatrical costume, and under the name of the most reverend, most holy, and most blessed fathers in God, pronounce a blessing or a curse; and, lastly, she boldly assails the court of Rome and the pope himself, who, she says, takes only the pleasures of his station, and leaves its duties to St. Peter and St. Paul. Among the curious wood-cuts, after the marginal drawings of Hans Holbein, with which the book was adorned, the pope appears with his triple crown. It produced an indescribable effect: twenty-seven editions appeared even during the lifetime of Erasmus; it was translated into all languages, and greatly contributed to confirm the age in its anticlerical dispositions" (Ranke, *1.c.).* But the personal character of Erasmus was not fitted for such storms as those of the Reformation. Intellectually, he was too many-sided and too undecided; morally, he was of too flaccid a fibre, too timid, and too fond of ease, to devote himself to a certain strife with very uncertain issues. Moreover, he never had profound religious convictions or experience. The monks, nevertheless, were right to a certain extent in their saying that "Erasmus laid the egg; Luther hatched it." At first Erasmus regarded Luther with favor as a coadjutor in his attacks upon the ignorance of the monks, and in his plans for the reformation of literature. But Luther saw the weakness and spiritual poverty of Erasmus, and expressed his fears in letters to Spalatin and Lange as early as 1517; while Erasmus, in letters to Zwingle, deprecated the haste and vehemence of Luther. In 1519 (March 28) Luther wrote a friendly letter to Erasmus, who says in reply (April 30): "I hold myself aloof from the controversies of the times to devote my whole strength to literature. After all, more is to be gained by moderation than by passion; so Christ conquered the world. It is better to write against those who have abused the authority of the papacy than against individual popes." In 1520, Frederick, elector of Saxony, meeting Erasmus at Cologne, asked his opinion of Luther; his reply was, *Lutherus peccavit in ducous, nempe quod tetigit coronam pontificis et ventres monachorum:* "Luther has committed two blunders; he has ventured to touch the crown of the pope and the bellies of the monks ... but his language is too violent," etc. He expressed similar cautions in a letter to Justus Jonas at the time of the Diet of Worms (1521). The earnest Ulrich von Hutten sought to draw Erasmus openly to

the Protestant side, but in vain. In 1522 Hutten published an *Expostulatio cum Erasmo,* abounding in bitter invective, to which Erasmus replied in *Spongia adversus Hutteni aspergines* (Basel, 1523) (see Gieseler, *Church History,* ed. by Smith, 4, § 3). Luther is said to have condemned both these pamphlets as disgraceful. Luther wrote (1524) to Erasmus an earnest letter, urging him, if he would not join the Reformers, at least to refrain from open opposition. "You might, indeed, have aided us much by your wit and your eloquence; but, since you have not the disposition and the courage for this, we would have you serve God in your own way. Only we feared, lest our adversaries should entice you to write against us, and that necessity should compel us to oppose you to your face. If you cannot, dear Erasmus, assert our opinions, be persuaded to let them alone, and treat of subjects more suited to your taste" *(Biblioth. Sacra,* 1862, page 129). "From this time Erasmus complains incessantly of the hostility of the Evangelicals. The haughty style in which Luther offered him peace (in the letter above cited) could only have the effect upon that ambitious man of giving additional weight to the request which reached him at the same time from England, that he would take revenge upon Luther for his attack upon the royal author (Henry VIII). And so, to assail the formidable Luther in the weakest part of his theological system, Erasmus wrote his treatise *De Libero Arbitrio* (Sept. 1524). 'Luther replied with his usual bitterness in his *De Servo Arbitrio* (December 1525). Erasmus replied. in like coin in his *Hyperaspistes* (1526). Thus the renowned Erasmus now passed over into the ranks of the enemies of the Reformation, though he did not cease to recommend conciliatory measures towards it'" (Gieseler, *1.c.).*

The writings of Erasmus were collected and published in 1540-41 (9, volumes, fol.), and also by Clericus (Leclerc), under the title *Des. Erasmi Opera Omlia, emendatoria et auctiora,* etc. (L. Bat. 1703-6, 10 volumes in 11, fol). He edited many of the fathers, viz. Origen, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom, Lactalitius, and translations of selections from them are given in his *Opera.* The separate editions of his more popular works (the *Encomium, Adagia, Colloquia,* etc.) are very numerous. There are English versions of the following: *Panegyric upon Folly* (two translations: one by Chaloner, the other by Kennet; often printed); *Colloquies* (1671, and often, especially in selections); *Enchiridion Militis,* by W. de Worde (1533, 16mo, and often); *Christian's Manual* (from the *Enchiridion Militis,* London, 1816, 8vo); *Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher* (chiefly from Erasmus, London, 1797, small 8vo); *De Contemptu Mundi*

(Lond. 1533, 16mo); *De Immensa Dei Misericordia* (1533, and often). Many of Erasmus's smaller tracts were also translated. There are several biographies of Erasmus (none very good), viz. Beatus Rhenanus, in Erasmi *Opera*, tom. i (1540); Leclerc's, in volume 1 of Erasmi *Opera* (1703); Merula, *Vita Erasmi* (Leyden, 1607, 4to); Knight, *Life of Erasmus* (London, 1726, 12mo); Burigny, *Vie d'Erasme* (Par. 1757, 2 volumes, 12mo); Jortin, *Life of Erasmus* (Lond. 1758, best ed. 1808, 3 volumes, 8vo; abridged by Laycey, London, 1805, 8vo); Hess, *Leben des Erasmus* (Zurich, 1790); Butler, *Life of Erasmus* (London, 1825, 8vo); Nisard, in *Etudes sur la Renaissance* (Par. 1855); Miiller, *Leben des Erasmus* (Hamb. 1828, 8vo; reviewed by Ulllnmnn, *Studien u. Krit.* 1829, page 1); Glasius, *On Erasnmus as Church Reformer* (a crowned prize-essay in the Dutch. language, The Hague, 1850). See also Bayle, *Dictionary* (s.v. Erasnuis); Dupin, *Auteurs Ecclesiastes* tom. 13; Waddington, *History of the Reformation* (London, 1841), chapter 23; Merle d'Aubigne, *History of the Reformation*, volume 1; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 16:207; Hallam, *History of Literature* (Harper's ed.), 1:134 sq.; Mackintosh, *Miscellaneous Works* (London, 1851), 1:190 sq.; *Christ. Examiner*, 49:80; *Christian. Review*, April, 1858; *Quart. Review*, 1859, art. 1; *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1859, page 533; *Bibliotheca Sacra*. 19:106; *Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, July, 1867, page 517; H. Rogers, in *Good Words*, February 1868.

Erastianism

the title generally given to "that system ‘which would rest the government of the Church spiritual as well as civil altogether in the Christian magistrate.' This, however, 'was far from being an invention of Erastus, since in every kingdom of Europe the Roman claims had been resisted on thee like principles for centuries before he was born; the peculiarity of Erastus's teaching lay rather in his refusing the right of *excommunication* to the Christian Church' (see Oxf. Hooker, Ed. Pref. page 58)" (Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s.v.). Hardwick propeses; "Byzantinism" as the proper title for the theory named instead of "Erastianism" *(History of the Reformation*, chapter 8, page 356). See also Nichols, *Anecdotes of Bowyer* (London, 1782, 4to), page 71; Pretyman, *The Church of England and Erastianisna* (Lond. 1854);: Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines* (Smith's ed.), 2:299; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, 2:569; Orme, *Life and Times of Baxter*, 1:71; *Christian Review*, 8:579; and the articles *SEE*

CHURCH; *SEE DISCIPLINE*; *SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY*; *SEE ERASTUS, THOMAS*.

Eras'tus

(Ἔραστος, *beloved,* an old Grecian name, Diog. Laert. 3:31), a Corinthian, and one of Pull's disciples, whose salutations he sends from Corinth to the Church at Rome as those of "the *chamberlain* (q.v.) of the city" of Corinth (<451623>Romans 16:23). The word so rendered (οἰκονόμος, Vulg. *arcarius)* denotes the *city treasurer* or steward (Suicer, *Thesaur.* 2:464; see Flessa, *De arcariis,* Baruth. 1725-6, 2, § 11; also Elszner, *Obs.* 2:68), an officer of great dignity in ancient times (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 7:8, 2); so that the conversion of such a man to the faith of the Gospel was a proof of the wonderful success of the apostle's labors in that city. We find Erastus with Paul at Ephesus as one of his attendants or deacons (οἱ διακονοῦντες αὐτῷ), whence he was sent, along with Timothy, into Macedonia, while the apostle himself remained in Asia (<441922>Acts 19:22), A.D. 51. They were both with the apostle at Corinth when he wrote, as above,-from that city to the Romans, A.D. 55; and at a subsequent period (A.D. 64) Erastus was still at Corinth (<550420>2 Timothy 4:20), which would seem to have been the usual place of his abode (ἔμεινε). According to the traditions of the Greek Church *(Menol. Graecum,* 1:179), he was first *aeconomus* to the Church at Jerusalem, and afterwards bishop of Paneas, and died a natural death. Many critrics, however (Grotius, Kype, Kuinol, De Wette, Winer, etc.), regard the Corinthian Erastus as a different person from Paul's companion, on the ground that the official duties of the former would not allow such an absence from the city (Neander, *Planting and Training,* 1:392, note), or that, if he was with Paul at Ephesus, we should be compelled to assume that he is mentioned in the epistle to the Romans by the title of an office which he had once held and afterwards resigned (Meyer, *Kommentar.* in loc.).

Erastus, Thomas

(properly LIEBER or LIEBLER, which he put into the Greek form, *Erastus),* was born at Baden, in Switzerland (according to another account, at Auggen, in Baden-Durlach), September 7, 1524. He studied divinity and philosophy at Basel, and afterward at Pavia and Bologna, where he graduated M.D. In 1558 he became physician to the prince of Henneberg. The elector palatine, Frederick III, also appointed him first

physician and professor of medicine in the University of Heidelberg. In 1560 and 1564 he attended the conferences of Lutheran and Reformed divines at Heidelberg and Maulbronn on the Lord's Supper, and vigorously maintained the Zuinglian view. He maintained the same doctrine in a treatise .*De Caena Domini* (1565; transl. by Shute, Lend. 1578, 16mo). He was charged with Socinianism, but without just ground. But his name is chiefly preserved for his views on Church authority and excommunication. "A sort of fanaticism in favor of the use of ecclesiastical censures and punishments had been introduced by Olevianus, a refugee from Treves, and by several fugitives from the cruelties of the duke of Alva in the Low Countries, and had spread among the Protestants of the Palatinate. Erastus termed it 'febris excommunicatoria,' and thought it an unwise policy for the Protestants, surrounded by their enemies, to be zealous in cutting off members from their own communion. He examined the principles and Biblical authority of ecclesiastical censures, and carried on a controversy in which he was violently opposed by Dathenus, and more mildly by his friend Beza. This controversy would have probably died as a local dispute had it not been revived by Castelvetro, who had married the widow of Erastus, publishing from his papers the theses called *Explicatio Quaestionis gravissimnce de Excommunicatione,* which bears to have been written in 1568, and was first published in 1589. The general principle adopted by Erastus is, that ecclesiastical censures and other inflictions are not the proper method of punishing crimes, but that the administration of the penal law, and of the law for compelling performances of civil obligations, should rest with the temporal magistrate. He held that the proper ground on which a person could be prohibited from receiving the ordinances of a church — such as the sacrament or communion of the Lord's Supper was not vice or immorality, but a difference in theological opinion with the church from which he sought the privilege. The church was to decide who were its members, and thereby entitled to partake in its privileges, but was not entitled to take upon itself the punishment of offenses by withholding these privileges, or by inflicting any other punishments on the ground of moral misconduct. Few authors so often referred to have been so little read as Erastus. The original theses are very rare. An English translation was published in 1669, and was re-edited by the Reverend Robert Lee in 1845. By some inscrutable exaggeration, it had become the popular view of the doctrines of Erastus that his leading principle was to maintain the authority of the civil magistrate over the conscience, and to subject all ecclesiastical bodies to his direction and control, both in their doctrine and their

discipline. In the discussions in the Church of Scotland, of which the result was the secession of a large body of the clergy and people because it was found that the Church could not make a law to 'nullify the operation of lay patronage, those who maintained within the Church the principle that it had no such power were called Erastians as a term of reproach. As in all cases where such words as Socinian, Arian, Antinomian, etc., are used in polemical debates, the party rejected with disdain the name thus applied to it. But it is singular that in the course of this dispute no one seems to have thought of explaining that the controversy in which Erastus was engaged was about a totally different matter, and that only a few general and very vague remarks in his writings have given occasion for the supposition that he must have held the principle that all ecclesiastical authorities are subordinate to the civil. Erastus died at Basel on the 31st December-January 1, 1583." — *English Cyclopaedia;* Wordsworth, *Ecclesiastes Biography;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 31:174; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:121.

Erdt, Paulinus

a German Franciscan monk, professor of theology at the University of Freiburg, was born at Vertoch in 1737. He displayed much zeal in opposing infidelity, both by his translations from English and French as well as his own works. The most important of his works is *Historiae litterariae theologiae rudimenta octodecim libris conprehensa, seu via ad historiam litterariums theologiae revelatae, adnotationibus litterariis instructa* (Augsburg, 1785, 4 volumes, 8vo). Erdt died Dec. 16,1800.

Erebinthi,Village Of

(Ἐρεβίνθων οἶκος, *house of chick-peas),* a place on the line of Titus's wall of circumvallation around Jerusalem during the final siege (Josephus, *War,* 5:12, 2); apparently on the brow of the hill opposite Mount Zion, on the west. *SEE JERUSALEM*. Eusebius speaks of a village *Erezmintha* (Ἐρεμίνθα, *Onomast.* s.v.), situated, however, in the south of Judaea, which Reland thinks *(Palest.* page 766) is the same as the *Betherebin* (Βιθθέρεβιν) mentioned by Sozomen *(Hist. Eccl.* 9:27).

E'rech

(Hebrews *E'reok,* Ërą, *length;* Sept. Ὀρέχ,Vulg. *Arach),* one of the cities which formed the beginning of Nimrod's kingdom in the plain of Shinar

(<01010>Genesis 10:10). It is not said that he built these cities, but that he established his power over them; from which we may conclude that they previously existed. It was probably also the city of the ARCHEVITES, who were among those who were transplanted to Samaria by Asnapper (<15409>Ezra 4:9). Until recently, the received opinion, following the authority of St. Ephrem, Jerome, and the Targumists, identified Erech with Edessa or Callirhoe (now Urfah), a town in the northwest of Mesopotamia. This opinion is supported by Von Bohlen *(Introd. to Genesis* page 233), who connects the name Callirhoe with the Biblical Erech through the Syrian form *Eurhok*, suggesting the Greek word ἐ υῤῥοος. This identification is, however, untenable: Edessa was probably built by Seleucus, and could not, therefore, have been in existence in Ezra's time (<15409>Ezra 4:9), and the extent thus given to the land of Shinar presents a great objection. Erech must be sought in the neighborhood of Babylon. Gesenius *(Thesaur.* page 151), following Bochart *(Phaleg*, 4:16), rather seeks the name in *the* ῎Αρακκα or *Aracha* of the old geographers, which was on the Tigris, upon the borders of Babylonia and Susiana (Ptolemy, 6:3; Ammian. Marcell. 33:6, 26). This was probably the same city which Herodotus (1:185; 6:119) calls *Ardericca* (῎Αρδέρικκα), i.e. Great Erech. Rosenmüller happily conjectures *(Alterth.* 1, 2:25) that Erech probably lay nearer to Babylon than Aracca; and this has lately been confirmed by Colossians Taylor, the British resident at Bagdad, who is disposed to find the site of the ancient Erech in the great mounds of primitive ruins, indifferently called *Irak, Irka, Werka*, and *Senkerah*, by the nomade Arabs and sometimes *El-Asayiah*, "the place of pebbles" (Bonomi, *Nineveh*, page 40). These mounds, which are now surrounded by the almost perpetual marshes and inundations of the lower Euphrates, lie some miles east of that stream, about midway between the site of Babylon and its junction with the Tigris. This is doubtless the same as *Orchoa* (Ὀρχόη) 82 miles south, and 42 east of Babylon (Ptolemy, 6:20, 7), the modern designations of the site bearing a considerable affinity to both the original names. It is likewise probable that the *Orcheni* (Ὀρχηνοί) described by Strabo as an astronomical sect of the Chaldaeans dwelling near Babylon (21, page 739); in Ptolemy as a people of Arabia living near the Persian Gulf (5:19, 2); and in Pliny as an agricultural population, who banked up the waters of the Euphrates, and compelled them to flow into the Tigris (6:27, 31), were really inhabitants of Orchoe and of the district surrounding it. This place appears to have been the necropolis of the Assyrian kings, the whole neighborhood being covered with mounds, and strewed with the remains of

bricks and coffins. Some of the bricks bear a monogram of "the moon," and Colossians Rawlinson surmises that the name Erech may be nothing more than a form of jir[illegible]; the Hebrews name for that luminary *(Athenceum,* 1854, No. 1377); but the orthography does not sustain this conjecture. Some have thought that the name of Erech may be preserved in that of Irak (Irak-Arabi), which is given to the region enclosed by the two rivers in the lower part of their course. (See Chesney, *Euphrates Expedition,* 1:116, 117; Ainsworth, *Researches,* page 178; Loftus, *Chaldcea,* page 160 sq., where a full description is given.) For another Erech, probably in Palestine, *SEE ARCHI.*

Eremite

(ἔρημος, *desert),* one who lives in a *wilderness,* or other solitude, for purposes of religious contemplation. The name was given in the ancient Church to those Christians who fled from the persecutors of Christianity into the wilderness, and there, isolated from all other men, gave themselves up to a life of rigid asceticism. Paul of Thebes is called the first eremite, and he soon found numerous followers. From the association of eremites the coenobites arose, who, in turn, form the transition to the monastic orders, which became in the Church of Rome and in the Eastern Church the most common form of organized asceticism. The name eremite remained, however, in use both for those who, in opposition to monastic association, preferred the eremitic life, and for a number of orders or branches of orders (orders of eremites), which either retained some customs in the life of the original eremites, or which made special provisions that their members could live in entire isolation from each other meeting only for the celebration of divine service. Thus the proper name of the Augustinians (q.v.) was the Eremites of St. Augustine, although they became, in fact, a regular order. There were also eremites belonging to the orders of Franciscans (q.v.), Camaldulenses (q.v.), Coelestines (q.v.), Hieronymites (q.v.), and Servites (q.v.). Among the other orders of the eremites were the Eremites of St. John the Baptist, *SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST, EREMITES OF,* and the Eremitesof St. Paul. — Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:501. *SEE PAUL, ST., EREMITES OF.*

Erez

SEE CEDAR.

Erfurt

a city in the Prussian province of Saxony, with, in 1885, 58,386 inhabitants. In 741, Erfurt became the seat of a bishop, but St. Adalar was the last as well as the first bishop, the see being united with that of Mentz. In 1378 the city received permission from the pope residing at Avignon (Clement VII) to establish a university, and the permission was in 1389 confirmed by the Roman pope Urban VI. In 1392 the university was opened, being the fifth university of Germany. At the beginning of the 16th. century, Luther was for some time one of its professors. Subsequently its reputation dwindled down, and; it was abolished in 1816. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 3:661.

Erhard, Bishop

SEE HILDULF.

E'ri

(Hebrews *Eri'*, yrae[e, *watchful)*, the fifth son of the patriarch Gad ([<01466>]Genesis 46:16; Sept. Ἀηδείς, Vulg. *Haeri)*, and progenitor ([<04266>]Numbers 26:16; Sept. Ἀδδί, Vulg. *Her)* of the ERITES *SEE ERITES* (q.v.). B.C. 1856.

Eric IX

(according to some historians VIII), surnamed the Saint, a king of Sweden. He was the son of Jedward, a "good and rich yeoman," as he is called in an old Swedish chronicle, and of Cecilia, the sister of king Eric Arsal. Having become king of Sweden, his chief endeavor was the Christianization of Sweden. He conquered southern Finland, and compelled the inhabitants to adopt the Christian religion. He also united Norway with Sweden. In the war against the Danish prince Magnus, he fell in a battle near the town of Upsala, May 18, 1160. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 16:243.

Erigena

SEE SCOTUS ERIGENA.

E'rite

(Hebrews collect. with the art. *ha-Eri'*, yræ[eh; Sept. [appar. everywhere in this name reading d for r] oÅδδί, Vulg. *Heritae*, A.V. "the Erites"), a patronymic designation (<042616>Numbers 26:16) of the descendants of the Gadite ERI *SEE ERI* (q.v.).

Erizatsy

(SARGIS or SERGIUS), a learned Armenian bishop, born towards the middle of the 13th century, at Eriza or Arzendjan, a city of Armenia. In, 1286, James I, patriarch of Sis, called him to his court, and made him his secretary. In 1291 he was consecrated bishop of Arzendjan, and, a short time after, the king of the Armenians of Cilicia (Hayton or Hathoum II) made him almoner of his palace. In 1306 he was present at the national council which was held at Sis, capital of Cilicia, and died a short time after. He wrote a treatise on *The Hierarchy*, and several other Works, which remain in MS. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 16:258.

Erlangen

a city in Bavaria, with a population of 15,828 inhabitants, mostly Protestant. It is the seat of one of three universities of Bavaria, with a Lutheran theological faculty. The University was, founded: in 1742 by the margrave Friedrich of Brandenburg. Baireuth for his residence, but in 1743 transferred to Erlangen. The University has in modern times been a chief seat of the Confessional party in the Lutheran Church. (A.J.S.)

Ernesti, Johann August

an eminent critic and scholar, was born August 4, 1707, at Tennstadt, in Thuringia. He completed his academical studies at Wittenberg and Leipsic. In 1712 he became professor of ancient literature at Leipsic, and in 1758 doctor and professor of theology there. He held the two last-named professorships together till 1770, when he gave up the former to his nephew, August Wilhelm. He died September 11, 1781. He distinguished himself greatly by his philological and classical publications, and also by the new light which his theory of interpretation threw upon the sacred Scriptures. He adopted from Wetstein the *grammatico-historical* method of interpretation, and gave it general currency. Among the most important of his critical and philological writings are *Opuscula philologico-critica*

(Amster. 1762, 8vo): *Opuscula oratoria, oratioes, prolusiones et elogia* (Leyd. 1762 and 1767, *8vo): — Archaeologia litteraria* (Leips. 1768 and 1790; *8vo): — Initia doctrine solidioris* (Leips. 1736, 7th ed. 1783, 8vo). The style of this work gave to Ernesti the name of the Cicero of Germany. His most important work in the field of theology is his *Institutio interpretis Novi Testamenti* (Leips. 1761, 8vo; 5th ed. 1809). This work first clearly set forth what is called the *grammatico-historical* method of interpretation. It was translated by lerrot, and published in the *Biblical Cabinet* (Edinb. 1843, 2 volumes, 16mo); there is also an edition, with notes and appendix, by Moses Stuart (Andover, 1827, 12mo). Some valuable essays may be found in his *Opuscula theologica* (1792, 8vo). He rendered great service to theological literature by the publication of the *Neue theologische Bibliothek* (17601779, 14 volumes). His *Lectiones Academicae in Epistolam ad Hebraeos* was published by G.J. Dindorf in 1815 (Lips. 8vo). Ernesti's reputation as a classical scholar rests chiefly upon his excellent editions of Homer (Leips. 1759, 8vo), of Callimachus (Leyd. 1761, 2 volumes, 8vo), of Polybius (Leips. 1763-64, 3 vols. 8vo), of Xen-ophon, Aristotlej and of Cicero *(ib.* 1776, 3d ed. 7 volumes), of Tacitus *(ib.* 1772, 2 volumes, 8vo); also of Suetonius, Aristophanes, etc. His *Eulogy,* by Augustus William Ernesti, was published at Leipsic (1781, 8vo). See Hagenbach, *German Rationalism,* transl. by Gage, page 76; Teller, Ernesti's *Verdienste um Theologie und Religion* (Leips. 1783); Van Voorst, *Oratio de J.A. Ermnestio* (Leyd. 1804); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale,* 16:296; Kahnis, *German Protestantism,* page 119.

Eroge

(Ἐρωγή), a place "before the city" (πρὸ τῆς πόλεως) Jerusalem, according to Josephus *(Ant.* 9:10, 4), where the mountain (Matthew of Olives) split asunder for a space of half a mile, filling the king's gardens with the detritus of the avalanche: an account which is evidently an embellishment of the prophetical commentary (<38145>Zechariah 14:5) upon the earthquake (<30101>Amos 1:1) on the occasion of Uzziah's usurpation of the sacerdotal functions (<14616>2 Chronicles 26:16-21). Schwarz ingeniously explains *(Palest.* page 263 note) the name *Eroge* as a Graecized transposition for Zechariah's expression *gorge of my mountains* (yrhAayGe *gey-haray',* Sept. φάραγξ ὀρέων, Vulg. *vallis mnontium eorum,* A.V. "valley of the mountain"). For another identification, *SEE EN-ROGEL.*

Erpen, Thomas Van

(Latin form ERPENIUS), a celebrated Orientalist, was born at Gorkum, Holland, September 7, 1584. He studied theology at Leyden, where, under the guidance of J.J. Scaliger, he also devoted himself particularly to the study of Oriental languages. He traveled in England, France, Italy, and Germany, everywhere enlarging his knowledge of Oriental literature; and in 1613 became professor of Oriental languages at Leyden. A second Hebrew chair in the university was founded expressly for him in 1619. "Soon after this he was appointed Oriental interpreter to the government, in which capacity he read and wrote replies to all official documents coming from the East. Such was the elegance and purity of his Arabic, as written at this time, that it is said to have excited the admiration of the emperor of Morocco. 'Towards the close of his life tempting offers of honors and distinction came pouring in upon him from all parts of Europe; but he was never prevailed upon to leave his native country, where, in the midst of an eminent career, he died November 13,1624. Although the present standard of Oriental knowledge in Europe is much in advance of that of Erpen's day, there is no doubt that it was through him principally that Eastern, especially Arabic, studies have become what they are. With hardly any better material than a few awkwardly printed Arabic alphabets, he contrived to write his famous grammar *(Grammatica Arabica, quinque libris methodiae explicata,* Leyden, 1613; recent edition by Michaelis, Gött. 1771), which for 200 years, till the time of Silvestre de Sacy, enjoyed, an undisputed supremacy; and there are many who think his *Rudimenta* unsurpassed, even at the present day, as a work for beginners. Among his other important works the best known is his *Proverbiorum Arabicorum Centurice Duce* (Leyden, 1614)" (Chambers, s.v.); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale.* 16:308; Herzog. *Real-Encyklop.* 19:487.

Error

"Knowledge being to be had only of visible certain truth, error is not a fault of our knowledge, but a mistake of our judgment, giving assent to that which is true (Locke, *Essay on Human Underst.* book 4, chapter 20). 'The true,' said Bossuet, after Augustine, 'is that which is, the false is that which is not.' To err is to fail of attaining to the true, which we do when we think that to be which is not, or think that not to be which is. Error is not in things themselves, but in the mind of him who errs, or judges not according to the truth. Our faculties, when employed within their proper sphere, are

fitted to give us the knowledge of truth. We err by a wrong use of them. The causes of error are partly in objects of knowledge and partly in ourselves. As it is only the true and real which exists, it is only the true and real which can reveal itself. But it may not reveal itself fully, and man, mistaking a part for the whole, or partial evidence for complete evidence, falls into error. Hence it is that in all error there is some truth. To discover the relation which this partial truth bears on the whole truth is to discover the origin of the error. The causes in ourselves which lead to error arise from wrong views of our faculties and of the conditions under which they operate. Indolence, precipitation, passion, custom, authority, and education may also contribute to lead us into error (Bacon, *Noevum Organum,* lib. 1; Malebranche, *Recherche de la Verite;* Descartes, *On Method;* Locke, *On Human Understand.* book 6, c. 20)." — Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy,* pages 166-167.

Erskine, Ebenezer

an eminent and pious Scotch divine, founder of the "Secession Church." He was born in the prison of the Bass Rock, June 22, 1680, and educated at the University of Edinburgh. He acted for some time as tutor and chaplain in the family of the earl of Rothes, and became a licentiate in divinity in 1702. In 1703 he was chosen minister of Portmoak, in the shire of Kinross, and became a very popular preacher. He accepted a charge in Stirling in 1731. "Mr. Erskine's first difference with his colleagues of the Church of Scotland was in his support of the principles of 'the Marrow of Modern Divinity,' a subject of great contention during the early part of the 18th century. He was one of several clergymen who, in connection with this subject, were 'rebuked and admonished' by the General Assembly. The 'secession of the body, headed by Mr. Erskine, was occasioned by the operation of the act of queen Anne's reign restoring lay patronage in the Church of Scotland, and, though not in all respects technically the same, it was virtually on the same ground as the late secession of 'The Free Church.' The presbytery of Kinross, led by Erskine's brother Ralph, had refused to induct a presentee forced on an objecting congregation by the law of patronage. In 1732, the General Assembly enjoined the presbytery to receive the presentee. At the same time they passed an act of Assembly regulating inductions, which, as it tended to enforce the law of patronage, was offensive to Mr. Erskine, and he preached against it. After some discussion, the General Assembly decided that he should be 'rebuked and admonished,' confirming a decision of the inferior ecclesiastical courts.

Against this decision Mr. Erskine entered a 'protest,' in which he was joined by several of his brethren. He was afterwards suspended from his functions. The Assembly subsequently endeavored to smooth the way for his restoration, but he declined to take advantage of it, and he and his friends, including his brother Ralph, formally seceded in 1736. When the Secession was divided into the two sects of Burghers and anti-Burghers, Mr. Erskine and his brother were of the Burgher party. He died on the 2d of June, 1756. The Secession Church, reunited by the junction of the Burghers and antiBurghers in 1820, remained a distinct body till 1847, when a union being effected with the Relief Synod (a body which arose from Mr. Gillespie's secession from the Established Church of Scotland in 1752), the aggregate body assumed the name of the United Presbyterian Church" *(English Cyclopedia).* Erskine bore a very high reputation as a scholar. His writings are collected in *The whole Works of Ebenezer Erskine,* consisting of sermons and discourses on the most important and interesting subjects (Lond. 1799, 3 volumes, 8vo). See Hetherington, *Church of Scotland,* 2:297 sq. *SEE SECEDERS; SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF*; *SEE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.*

Erskine, John, D.D

an eminent Scotch divine, was born in Edinburgh, June 2, 1721, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. His father (author of the *Institutes of the Laws of Scotland)* wished him to devote himself to law, but finally yielded to his son's desire that he should study theology. At twenty he published an essay on *The Law of Nature sufficiently propagated to the Heathen World,* aiming to show that the ignorance and unbelief of the heathen is not due to want of evidence (Romans 1:29). In 1743 he was licensed to preach by the presbytery of Dunblane, and in 1744 he became minister of Kirkintillock. In 1748, Mr. Erskine, and other evangelical clergymen of the Established Church, invited Whitefield into their pulpits. An animated discussion took place, in which Mr. Erskine triumphantly defended himself. Such a course required courage at a time when the character and doctrines of Whitefield, as well as his open-air preaching, were looked upon by many with suspicion or dislike. In the following year Mr. Erskine published *An Essay intended to promote the more frequent dispensation of the Lord's Supper.* In 1753 he was translated to Culross, and in 1758 to New Greyfriars' church, Edinburgh. Here he prepared his *Theological Dissertations* (Lond. 1765, 12mo), including the two essays above mentioned: one on the *Covenant of Sinai,* one on *Saving Faith,* and

one on the *Apostolic Churches.* He also edited a new edition of Hervey's *Theron and Aspasio,* with a preface against John Wesley, written with some bitterness, which gave rise to some letters between Erskine and Wesley, in which the latter appears to decided advantage (Wesley, *Works, N.* York ed. 6:125 sq., 744). In 1769 he published anonymously a pamphlet under the title *"Shall I go to war with my American brethren?"* to expose the impolicy of such a contest. On the outbreak of hostilities he republished it with his name, following it up with another, entitled *Reflections .on the Rise, Progress, and probable Consequences of the present Contentions with the Colonies,* in which he urged the duty of the mother country resorting to conciliatory measures. In 1776 he issued a third pamphlet, under the title *The Equity and Wisdom of the Government in the Measures that have occasioned the American Revolt tried by the sacred Oracles.* On this subject Erskine was one of the few clear-sighted men of the time in Great Britain. When nearly sixty he studied Dutch and German in order to read the Continental divines; the fruit of these studies appeared in *Sketches and Hints of Church History and theological Controcersy, translated or abridged from foreign Writers* (Edinburgh; 1790-97, 2 volumes, 12mo). He died January 19, 1803. After his death appeared his *Discourses* (Edinburgh, 1818, 2 vols. 12mo). — Jamieson, *Religious Biography,* page 139; Jones, *Christian Biography,* page 191; Wellwood, *Life of Erskine.*

Erskine, Ralph

brother of Ebenezer, was born at Monilaws, Northumberland. March 18, 1685, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1711 he became minister at Dunfermline. In 1734 he joined his brother and others in their secession from the Church. *SEE SECEDERS*. He died November 6, 1752. He was a preacher of great popular abilities, devotional and zealous. His writings are collected under the title *Sermons and other practical Works,* consisting of above 150 sermons, besides his poetical pieces, to which is prefixed an account of the author's life and writings (Falkirk, 10 volumes, 8vo, 1794-96). — Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica,* 1:1063.

Erubim

SEE TALMUD.

Erythrian Sibyl

SEE SIBYL.

Esa'ias

(Rec. Text Ἠσαΐας, Lachm. with Codex B Ἠσαΐας; Vulg. *Isaias,* Cod. Amiat. *Esaias),* the Graecized form, constantly used in the N.T. (<400303>Matthew 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:14; 15:7; <410706>Mark 7:6; <420304>Luke 3:4; 4:17; <430123>John 1:23; 12:38, 39, 41; <440828>Acts 8:28, 30; 28:25; <450927>Romans 9:27, 29; 10:16, 20; 15:12) for ISAIAH *SEE ISAIAH* (q.v.). *SEE ESAY*.

E'sar-had'don

(Hebrews *Esar'-Haddon',* ˆDhæAr sæe, perhaps akin with Pers. *Athrodana, gift of fire;* Sept. Ἀσορδάν [in Ezra Ἀσαραδδών] v.r. Ἀσαραδάν, in Tob. 1:21, Σαρχηδονός; Josephus, *Ant.* 10:1, 5, Ἀσσαραχόδδας), the son and successor of Sennacherib (<121937>2 Kings 19:37; <233738>Isaiah 37:38). The date apparently assigned by these passages is B.C. 712, but, as he seems to be the *Asaradinus* (Ἀσαρίδανος) of Ptolemy's *Canon,* whose reign bears date from B. C. 680, we may either suppose that the death of Sennacherib occurred some years after his defeat before Jerusalem, or that an interregnum occurred before the accession of Eskrhaddon. It has generally been thought that he was Sennacherib's eldest son, and this seems to have been the view of Polyhistor, who made Sennacherib place a son, *Asordanes,* on the throne of Babylon during his own lifetime (ap. Euseb. *Chron. Can.* 1:5). The contrary, however, appears by the inscriptions, which show the Babylonian viceroy-called *Asordanes* by Polyhistor, but *Aparanadius* (Assaranadius?) by Ptolemy to have been a distinct person from Esar-haddon, who is called in cuneiform (q.v.) *Asshur-akh-iddina* (Rawlinson, *Herodotus,* 1:386 sq.). Thus nothing is really known of Esar-haddon until his succession (B.C. cir. 680; see Colossians Rawlinson in the *Lond. Athenceum,* August 22, 1865), which seems to have followed quietly and without difficulty on the murder of his father and the flight of his guilty brothers (<121937>2 Kings 19:37; <233738>Isaiah 37:38). It may, perhaps, be concluded from this that he was *at the death of his father* the eldest son, Assaranadius, the Babylonian viceroy, having died previously. It is impossible to fix the length of Esarhaddon's reign, or the order of the events which occurred in it. Little is known to us of his history but from his own records, and they haye not come down to us in the shape of annals, but only in the form of a general summary (see them translated by H.F. Talbot, in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* April 1859, pages 68-79). That he reigned thirteen years at Babylon is certain from the Canon of Ptolemy, and he

cannot have reigned a shorter time in Assyria. He *may*, however, have reigned longer, for it is not improbable that after a while he felt sufficiently secure of the affections of the Babylonians to re-establish the old system of viceregal government in their country. Saosduchinus may have been set up as ruler of Babylon by his authority in B.C. 667, and he may have withdrawn to Nineveh, and continued to reign there for some time longer. His many expeditions and his great works seem to indicate, if not even to require, a reign of some considerable duration. It has been conjectured that he died about B.C. 660, after occupying the throne for twenty years. He appears to have been succeeded by his son Asshur-bani-pal, or Sardanapalus II, the prince for whom he had built a palace in his own lifetime. No farther mention is made of this monarch in Scripture but that he settled certain colonists in Samaria (Ezra 4:2). *SEE ASNAPPER*.

Esar-haddon appears by his monuments to have been one of the most powerful, if not *the* most powerful of all the Assyrian monarchs. He carried his arms over all Asia between the Persian Gulf, the Armenian mountains, and the Mediterranean. Towards the east he engaged in wars with Median tribes "of which his fathers had never heard the name;" towards the west he extended his influence over Cilicia and Cyprus; towards the south he claimed authority over Egypt and Ethiopia. In consequence of the disaffection of Babylon, and its frequent revolts from former Assyrian kings, Esar-haddon, having subdued the sons of Merodach-Baladan who headed the national party, introduced the new policy of substituting for the former government by viceroys a direct dependence upon the Assyrian crown. He did not reduce Babylonia to a province, or attempt its actual absorption into the empire, but united it to his kingdom in the way that Hungary was, until 1848, united to Austria, by holding both crowns himself, and residing now at one and now at the other capital. He is the only Assyrian monarch whom we find to have actually reigned at Babylon, where he built himself a palace, bricks from which have been recently recovered bearing his name. His Babylonian reign lasted thirteen years, from B.C. 680 to B.C. 667, and it was undoubtedly within this space of time that Manasseh, king of Judah, having been seized by his captains at Jerusalem on a charge of rebellion, was brought before the Assyrian monarch *at Babylon* (2 Chronicles 33:11), and detained for a time as prisoner there. This must therefore have been Esar-haddon, who, persuaded of his innocence, or excusing his guilt, eventually restored him to his throne (comp. verse 13), thus giving a proof of clemency not very

usual in an Oriental monarch. It seems to have been in a similar spirit that Esar-haddon, according to the inscriptions, gave a territory upon the Persian Gulf to a son of Merodach-Baladan, who submitted to his authority and became a refugee at his court. As a builder of great works Esar-haddon is particularly distinguished. Besides his palace at Babylon, which has already been mentioned, he built at least three others in different parts of his dominions, either for himself or his son, while in a single inscription he mentions the erection by his hands of no fewer than *thirty* temples in Assyria and Mesopotamia. His works appear to have possessed a peculiar magnificence. He describes his temples as "shining with silver and gold," and boasts of his Nineveh palace that it was "a building such as the kings his fathers who went before him had never made." The south-west palace at Nimrud is the best preserved of his constructions. This building, which was excavated by Mr. Layard, is remarkable for the peculiarity of its plan as well as for the scale on which it is constructed. It corresponds in its general design almost exactly with the palace of Solomon (1 Kings 7:1-12), but is of larger dimensions, the great hall being 220 feet long by 100 broad (Layard's *Nin. and Bab.* page 558, Harpers' edit.), and the porch or antechamber 160 feet by 60. It had the usual adornment of winged bulls, colossal sphinxes, and sculptured slabs, but has furnished less to our collections than many inferior buildings, from the circumstance that it had originally been destroyed by fire, by which the stones and alabaster were split and calcined. This is the more to be regretted as there is reason to believe that Phoenician and Greek artists took part in the ornamentation. See Bridge, *Hist. of Esarhaddon* (Lond. 1881). *SEE ASSYRIA*.

E'sau

(Hebrews *Esav'*, wc;[*hairy* [see Genesis 25:25; his surname EDOM was given him from the *red* pottage, Genesis 25:30]; Sept. and N.T. Ησαῦ), the eldest son of "Isaac, Abraham's son" (Genesis 25:19) by Rebekah, "the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, of Padanaram, the sister to Laban the Syrian." The marriage remaining for some time (about 19 years; comp. Genesis 25:20, 26) unproductive, Isaac entreated Jehovah, and Rebekah became pregnant. Led by peculiar feelings "to inquire of Jehovah," she was informed that she should give birth to twins, whose fate would be as diverse as their character, and, what in those days was stranger still, that the elder should serve the younger. On occasion of her delivery, the child that was born first was "red, all over like a hairy

garment; and they called his name Esau." Immediately afterwards Jacob was born. B.C. 2004. This was not the only remarkable circumstance connected with the birth of the infant. Even in the womb the twin brothers struggled together (Genesis 25:22). Esau was the firstborn; but, as he was issuing into life, Jacob's hand grasped his heel. The bitter enmity of two brothers, and the increasing strife of two great nations, were thus foreshadowed (Genesis 25:23, 26). From the special attention drawn to his hairy appearance, one would suppose that the name Esau (wci[e, or Esav, was intended to give expression to that quality. So have many learned men in recent as well as former times held, though they are obliged to resort to the Arabic for the etymological explanation; a word very similar in Arabic, signifying *hairy.* The older Hebrew commentators, however, derived it from the verb jc;[; *asuh',* to *make,* and explained the word as signifying "made," "complete," "full-grown" — viewing the hair as an indication of premature manly vigor. But the Jews of the present day seem more disposed to fall in with the other derivation (for example, Raphall in loco). The unusual covering of hair, which not only distinguished Esau as a child, but kept pace with his growth, and in mature life gave his skin a kind of goat-like appearance (Genesis 27:16), was undoubtedly meant to be indicative of the man; it was a natural sign, coeval with his very birth, by which his parents might descry the future man-as one in whom the animal should greatly preponderate over the moral and spiritual qualities of nature-a character of rough, self-willed, and untamed energy. From the word designating his hairy aspect, *sear* (r[ice, it is not improbable that the mountain-range which became the possession of his descendants was called Mount *Seir,* though it is also possible that the rough, wooded appearance of the mountain itself may have been the occasion of the name. *SEE SEIR.*

In process of time the different natural endowments of the two boys began to display their effects in dissimilar aptitudes and pursuits. While Jacob was led by his less robust make and quiet disposition to fulfill the duties of a shepherd's life, and pass his days in and around his tent, Esau was impelled, by the ardor and lofty spirit which agitated his bosom, to seek in the toils, adventures, and perils of the chase his occupation and sustenance; and, as is generally the case in natures like his, he gained high repute by his skill and daring, which allied him to the martial exercises of the Canaanites (Genesis 25:27). He was, in fact, a thorough *Bedawy,* a "son of the desert" (so we may translate hdc;vyaa, *man of the field),* who delighted to

roam free as the wind of heaven, and who was impatient of the restraints of civilized or settled life. His old father, by a caprice of affection not uncommon, loved his willful, vagrant boy; and his keen relish for savory food being gratified by Esau's venison, he liked him all the better for his skill in hunting (<01258>Genesis 25:28). A hunter's life is of necessity one of uncertainty as well as hardship; days pass in which the greatest vigilance and the most strenuous exertions may fail even to find, much less capture game (see Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:399). The hunting tribes of North America often find themselves, after severe and long-continued labor and watching, unprovided with food, and necessitated to a length of abstinence which would be fatal to persons bred in towns or living by the ordinary pursuits of the field. Esau had on one occasion experienced such a disappointment, and, wearied with his unproductive efforts, exhausted for want of sustenance, and despairing of capturing any prey, he was fain to turn his steps to his father's house for succor in his extremity. On reaching home he found his brother enjoying a darefully prepared dish of pottage: attracted by the odor of which, he besought Jacob to allow him to share in the meal. His brother saw the exigency in which Esau was, and determined not to let it pass unimproved. Accordingly, he put a price on the required food. Esau was the elder, and had, in consequence, immunities and privileges which were of high value. The surrender of these to himself Jacob made the condition of his complying with Esau's petition. Urged by the cravings of hunger, alarmed even by the fear of starvation, Esau sold his birthright to his younger bother, confirming the contract by the sanction of an oath. Jacob, having thus got his price, supplied the famishing Esau with needful refreshments. Jacob took advantage of his brother's distress to rob him of that which was dear as life itself to an Eastern patriarch. The birthright not only gave him the headship of the tribe, both spiritual and temporal, and the possession of the great bulk of the family property, but it carried with it the *covenant blessing* (<01728>Genesis 27:28, 29, 36; <58216>Hebrews 12:16, 17). Yet, though Esau, under the pressure of temporary suffering, despised his birthright by selling it for a mess of pottage (<01534>Genesis 25:34), he afterwards attempted to secure that which he had deliberately sold (<01704>Genesis 27:4, 34, 38; <58217>Hebrews 12:17). It is evident the whole transaction was public, for it resulted in a new name being given to Esau. He said to Jacob, "Feed me with that same *red* (µraâh); therefore was his name called *Edom"* (µ/dE; <01530>Genesis 25:30). It is worthy of note, however, that this name is seldom applied to Esau himself, though almost universally given to the country he settled in, and to

his posterity. *SEE EDOM*. The name "Children of Esau" is in a few cases applied to the Edomites (<050204>Deuteronomy 2:4; <244908>Jeremiah 49:8; Obad. 18), but it is rather a poetical expression.

Arrived now at forty years of age, Esau married two wives in close succession. B.C. cir. 1963. Some unhappy feelings appear to have previously existed in the family; for while Esau was a favorite with his father, in consequence, it appears, of the presents of venison which the youth gave him, Jacob was regarded with special affection by the mother. These partialities, and their natural consequences in unamiaible feelings, were increased and exaggerated by Esau's marriage. His wives were both Canaanites, and, on .account of their origin, were unacceptable to Isaac and Rebekah. The latter was especially grieved. "I am weary," she said (<012746>Genesis 27:46), "of my life, because of the daughters of Heth." Esau thus became alienated from the parental home. Even his father's preference for him may have been injuriously affected. The way was in some measure smoothed for the transference of the coveted birthright to the younger son.

There is much apparent confusion in the accounts of Esau's wives and their relatives and posterity, as given in <012634>Genesis 26:34; 28:9; 36:2-5, 1030, 40-43; <130135>1 Chronicles 1:35-42, 51-54, which may be adjusted by the following combination:

(1.) His first wife was Adah, the daughter of Elon the Hittite (<013602>Genesis 36:2), or an aboriginal Canaanite. *SEE HITTITE*. In <012634>Genesis 26:34, she is incorrectly called Bashemath, apparently by confusion with the name of his third wife, although her parentage is correctly given. Her only child was Eliphaz, who was therefore Esau's first-born (<013610>Genesis 36:10, 15; <130135>1 Chronicles 1:35).

(2.) Esau's second wife was Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, as all the accounts agree except that in <012634>Genesis 26:34, where, by some error or variation of names, she is called Judith, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite. This Anah, in <013602>Genesis 36:2, 14, is called the daughter of Zibeol, but from verses 20, 24, 25, and <130138>1 Chronicles 1:38, it is evident that he was the son of Zibeon, his brother being Ajah, and his only children a son Dishon and this daughter Aholibamah. We may also remark that this Anah and this Dishon had each an uncle of the same name respectively (<013620>Genesis 36:20, 21), and the name Aholibamah belonged subsequently to a chieftain of an Edomitish-tribe (verse 41). Zibeon was a son of Seir, the original settler of the mountain which went by his name. His

descendants were properly called Horites (<0136D>Genesis 36:20, 29), but in verse 20 he is called a Hivite, a term frequently interchangeable for heathenish tribes, as Hittite, in <01234>Genesis 26:34, is twice used for the same purpose. This connection of Esau with the original inhabitants of Idumaea will explain his subsequent removal to that region, and the eventual supremacy of his descendants there. His children by Aholibamah were Jeush, Jaalam, and Korah.

(3.) Esau's third wife, taken, not like the former, from foreign families, but from kindred stock, was Bashemath (otherwise called Mahalath), sister of Nebajoth and daughter of Ishmael, who bore him Reuel (<01360>Genesis 36:3, 4; 28:9). This elucidation substantially agrees with that proposed by Prof. Turner *(Companion to Genesis,* page 323), after Hengstenberg. These sons of Esau rose to the importance of sheiks ("dukes") in their respective families (those by Ahoe libamah being especially so styled, <01368>Genesis 36:18) and this was naturally more emphatically the case with his grandsons (<01365>Genesis 36:15, 16, where the name Korah is an interpolation, and Amalek is reckoned along with the legitimate children of Eliphaz; comp. the parallel account in <13036>1 Chronicles 1:36, where the name Timna is in like manner interpolated), who were probably cotemporaneous with the native sheiks mentioned in verses 29, 30, or but little later-the gradual superiority of the Esauites over the Horites appearing from the fact that the heirs of the latter (verses 22-28) are not named with this distinction (comp. verses 20, 21). This double line of chieftains of the respective tribes appears to have continued for a long time; for in the subsequent list of native kings (verses 31-39) and heads of the Edomitish part of the inhabitants (verses 40, 43), coming down in parallel lines to about the time of the Exode (but from what point dated is uncertain), each appears to have regularly succeeded his predecessor, not by hereditary right indeed, but by that species of common consent, founded upon acknowledged pre-eminence, which is to this day recognized in the election of Arab emirs. *SEE EDOMITE*.

The time for the fulfillment of the compact between the brothers has at length arrived. Isaac is "sick unto death." His appetite, as well as his health, having failed, is only to be gratified by provocatives. He desires some savory venison, and gives the requisite instructions to Esau, who accordingly proceeds in quest of it. On this Rebekah begins to feel that the critical time has come. If the hated Hittites are not to enter with her less favored son into possession of the family property, the sale of the birthright

(the original idea of which she may have suggested to the "plain man," her son Jacob) must now in some way be confirmed and consummated. One essential particular remained — the father's blessing. If this should be given to Esau, all hope was gone; for this, like our modern wills, would hand the inheritance and the accompanying headship of the tribe to Esau and his wives. Isaac, however, had lost his sight — indeed, all his senses were, dull and feeble. It was therefore not very difficult to pass off Jacob upon him as Esau. Rebekah takes her measures, and, notwithstanding Jacob's fears, succeeds. Isaac, indeed, is not without suspicion, but a falsehood comes to aid Jacob in his otherwise discreditable personation of Esau. The blessing is pronounced, and thus the coveted property and ascendency are secured. The affectionate endearments which pass between the deceiver and the abused old blind father stand in painful contrast with the base trickery by which the mother and the son accomplished their end. This episode in the history of Esau and Jacob is still more painful than the former, as it fully brings out those bitter family rivalries and divisions which were all but universal in ancient times, and which are still a disgrace to Eastern society. Esau, however, returns from the field, approaches his decrepid and sightless father, declaring who he is. "And Isaac trembled very exceedingly, and said, Who? where is he that hath taken venison and brought it me, and I have eaten of all before thou camest, and have blessed him? yea, and he shall be blessed." On this Esau becomes agitated, and entreats a blessing for himself — "Bless me, even me also, O my father." Urging this entreaty again and again, even with tears, Isaac at length said to him, "Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; and 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" (Genesis 27). Thus, deprived forever of his birthright, in virtue of the irrevocable blessing, Esau but too naturally conceived and entertained a hatred of Jacob, and he vowed vengeance. But, fearing his aged father's patriarchal authority, he secretly congratulated himself: "The days of mourning for my father are at hand, then will I slay my brother Jacob" (Genesis 27). Thus he imagined that by one bloody deed he would regain all that had been taken from him by artifice. But he knew not a mother's watchful care. Not a sinister glance of his eyes, not a hasty expression of his tongue, escaped Rebekah. Words to the above effect which Esau let drop were repeated to his mother, who thereupon felt that the life of her darling son, whose gentle nature and domestic habits had won her heart's affections. was now in imminent peril;

and she prevailed on her younger son to flee to his uncle Laban, who lived in Haran, there to remain until time, with its usual effect, should have mitigated Esau's wrath. B.C. 1927. The sins of both mother and child were visited upon them by a long and painful separation, and all the attendant anxieties and dangers. By a characteristic piece of domestic policy, Rebekah succeeded both in exciting Isaac's anger against Esau, and obtaining his consent to Jacob's departure — "And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth; if Jacob take a wife such as these, what good shall my life do me?" Her object was attained at once. The blessing was renewed to Jacob, and he received his father's commands to go to Padan-aram (<01Ge 27:46>Genesis 27:46; 28:1-5.)

When Esau heard that his father had commanded Jacob to take a wife of the daughters of his kinsman Laban, he also resolved to try whether by a new alliance he could propitiate his parents. He accordingly married his cousin Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael (<01Ge 28:8>Genesis 28:8, 9). This marriage appears to have brought him into connection with the Ishmaelitish tribes beyond the valley of Arabah. He soon afterwards established himself in Mount Seir; still retaining, however, some interest in his father's property in Southern Palestine. It is probable that his own habits, and the idolatrous practices of his wives and rising family, continued to excite and even increase the anger of his parents; and that he, consequently, considered it more prudent to remove his household to a distance. He was residing in Mount Seir when Jacob returned from Padan-aram, and had then become so rich and powerful that the impressions of his brother's early offences seem to have been almost completely effaced. Jacob, however, feared lest his elder brother might intercept him on his way, to take revenge for former injuries. He accordingly sent messengers to Esau, in order, if possible, to disarm his wrath. Esau appears to have announced in reply that he would proceed to meet his returning brother. When, therefore, Jacob was informed that Esau was on his way for this purpose with a band of four hundred men, he was greatly distressed, in fear of that hostility which his conscience told him he had done something to deserve. What, then, must have been his surprise when he saw Esau running with extended arms to greet and embrace him? and Esau "fell on his neck, and kissed him, and they wept." Jacob had prepared a present for Esau, hoping thus to conciliate his favor; but, with the generous ardor which characterizes, and somewhat of the disinterestedness which adorns, natures like his, Esau at first courteously refused the gift: "I have enough, my

brother; keep that thou hast unto thyself" (Genesis 33). But doubts and fears still lurked in the mind of Jacob, and betrayed him into something of his old duplicity; for, while he promises to go to Seir, he carefully declines his brother's escort, and immediately after his departure turns westward across the Jordan (<01307>Genesis 32:7, 8, 11; 33:4, 12, 17). B.C, 1907. The whole of this rencounter serves to show that, if Jacob had acquired riches, Esau had gained power and influence as well as property; and the homage which is paid to him indirectly and by implication on the part of Jacob, and directly, and in the most marked and respectful manner, by the females and children of Jacob's family, leads to the supposition that he had made himself supreme in the surrounding country of Idumaea. *SEE EDOM*.

It does not appear that the brothers again met until the death of their father, about twenty years afterwards. Mutual interests and mutual fear seem to have constrained them to act honestly, and even generously towards each other at this solemn interview. They united in laying Isaac's body in the cave of Machpelah. B.C. 1883. (See Rost, *Pietas Esavi inparentes*, Bautzen, 1788.) Then "Esau took all his cattle, and all his substance, which he had got in the land of Canaan" — such, doubtless, as his father, with Jacob's consent, had assigned to him — "and went into the country from the face of his brother Jacob" (<01529>Genesis 35:29; 36:6). He now saw clearly that the covenant blessing was Jacob's, that God had inalienably allotted the land of Canaan to Jacob's posterity, and that it would be folly to strive against the divine will: He knew also that as Canaan was given to Jacob; Mount Seir was given to himself (comp. <01739>Genesis 27:39; 32:3; and <05205>Deuteronomy 2:5), and he was therefore desirous, with his increased wealth and power, to enter into full possession of his country, and drive out its old inhabitants (<05212>Deuteronomy 2:12). Another circumstance may have influenced him in leaving Canaan. He "lived by his sword" (<01740>Genesis 27:40), and he felt that the rocky fastnesses of Edom would be a safer and more suitable abode for such as by their habits provoked the hostilities of neighboring tribes than the open plains of Southern Palestine. Esau is once more presented to us (Genesis 36) in a genealogical table, in which a long line of illustrious descendants is referred to "Esau, the father of the Edomites" (<01643>Genesis 36:43). The country to which Esau, with his immense family and flocks, retired, was the tract of Mount Seir, from which they gradually dispossessed the thinly scattered population that preceded them in its occupancy, and which they continued to hold for many generations. It was a region entirely suited to

the nomadic and roving character of the race. But in regard to the relationship between them and the seed of Israel, the remote descendants of Esau proved less pliant or generous than their progenitor; for from the time that Israel left the land of Egypt, when the two families again came into contact, the posterity of Esau seemed to remember only the old quarrel between the respective heads of the races, and to forget the brotherly reconciliation. A spirit of keenest rivalry and spite characterized their procedure towards Israel; through many a bloody conflict they strove to regain the ascendency which the decree of heaven had destined in the other direction; and in the times of Israel's backsliding and weakness they showed themselves ever ready, according to the prophetic word of Isaac, "to break his yoke from off their neck," and to drive the evil to the uttermost. But it was a fruitless struggle; the purpose of Heaven stood fast; the dominion remained with the house of Jacob; and in the course of the Maccabbean wars the children of Esau finally lost their independent existence, and became substantially merged in the house of Israel. The decree of Heaven, as we have said, had so fixed it; but that decree did not realize itself arbitrarily; the preference for Israel and his seed was no senseless favoritism; from the first the qualities were there which inevitably carried along with them the superiority in might and blessing; while, on the other hand, in Esau's carnalism, sensuality, godlessness, the destiny of his race was already indicated. *SEE IDUMAEA.*

If the historical outline now given is supported by the scriptural narrative, the character of Esau has not ordinarily received justice at the hands of theologians. The injurious impression against him may be traced back to a very ancient period. The Targum of Jonathan (at Genesis 25:34) sanctioned and spread, if it did not originate, the misjudgment by unwarrantable additions to the account given in Genesis. The reason, it states, why Esau did not at once slay his brother was lest, as happened in the case of Cain and Abel, another man-child might be born, and thus he should still be deprived of his inheritance; he therefore resolved to wait till the death of Isaac, when the murder of Jacob would leave him in safe and undisputed possession. Representations made in the Talmud are of a similar tendency (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* Page 207; Wetstein, *N.T.* 2:437; comp. Philo, *Opp.* 1:551; 2:441, 675). The Arabians likewise commemorate him (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* page 53 sq.). Cedrenius gives *(Hist. Eccl.* page 34) the story of his having been killed by an arrow discharged byJacob. The fathers of the Church, particularly Augustine, regard Esau as the

representative of the damned, while they admire Jacob as that of the elect (see Stempel, *De salute Esavi*, Jena, 1678), basing these views upon an erroneous interpretation of such passages as Romans 12:16; 9:13. (Shuckford's *Connections*, 2:174; Clarke's *Comment.* on Genesis 27, 35; Kitto's *Daily Illustr.* in loc.; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 2:153 sq.; Baumgarten, *Allg. Welthist.* 2:50 sq.; Bauer, *Hebr. Gesch.* 1:147; Hochheimer, *Im Orient.* 1841, No. 35; Sherlock, *Works*, 5; Dupin, *Nouv. Bibl.* 4; Evans, *Script. Biog.* 1; Roberts, *Sermons*, page 134; Puckle, *Sermons*, 1:96; Simeon, *Works*, 1:211; Alcock, *Apology for Esau*, Plymouth, 1791; Townsend, *Sermons* [1849], page 253; Goodwin, *Parish Sermons*, 2:1.) *SEE JACOB.*

E'sau

(Ἠσαύ, Vulg. *Sel)*, given (1 Esd. 5:29) as the name of the head of one of the families of "Temple servants" or Nethinim that returned from the captivity; in place of the ZIHA *SEE ZIHA* (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra 2:43).