THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Esay - Eusebians

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

E'say

(Ἡσαΐας, Vulg. *Is'aia, Isaias)*, the form in which the name of the prophet ISAIAH *SEE ISAIAH* (q.v.) constantly appears in the A.V. of the Apocrypha (Ecclus. 48:20, 22; 2 Esd. 2:18). *SEE ESAIAS.*

Eschatology

(a discussion of the *last things*, ἔσχατα), a branch of theology which treats of the doctrines concerning death, the condition of man after death, the end of this world period, resurrection, final judgment, and the final destiny of the good and the wicked. We treat it here,

I. In its *Biblical aspects*, especially as to the doctrine of the Bible concerning the end of the world, denoted by the use of the phrase "last days," which is applied in the O.T. to the consummation of the Jewish economy by the introduction of the Messianic (Isaiah 2:2; Micah 4:1; comp. Acts 3:1; Hebrews 1:2), and in the N.T. is extended to the still expected developments of the divine purposes respecting the Church (2 Timothy 3:1; 2 Peter 3:3). *SEE LAST DAY.*

1. *The Maccabcean Age.* — In the O.T. prophets the return from Babylon is often made a type of the incoming of the more glorious dispensation of the Gospel. This is the first, more obvious, and most literal eschatological symbol, and much of the language (especially of Isaiah) bearing upon it has therefore a double sense (q.v.) or twofold application. *SEE RESTORATION (OF THE JEWS).*

2. *The Chiliastic Period.* — This is the Christian, as the preceding was the Jewish view of the consummation of the existing divine economy, *so far as relates to the administration of this world.* It will be treated under MILLENNIUM *SEE MILLENNIUM* .

3. *The final Denouement of all terrestrial Affairs.* This whole branch of the subject is particularly exhibited in our Lord's discourse to his disciples upon the Mount of Olives (Matthew 24, 25), in which the two scenes of the retribution impending over Jerusalem, and the final judgment, are intimately associated together, in accordance with that almost constant practice in the Hebrew prophets by which one event is made the type and illustration of another much farther in the future. *SEE HYPONOIA.* This is emphatically exemplified in the vaticinations of ISAIAH *SEE ISAIAH*

(q.v.), who perpetually refers to the coming glory of Christ under the figure of the nearer deliverance from Babylon, both these *denouements* being projected upon the same plane of prophecy, without any note of the interval of time between; likewise in the visions of John in the Revelation (q.v.), where the *dramatis personae* are generic representations of certain principles constantly reappearing in the history of the Church rather than confined to particular characters at one time only. Such often repeated developments of divine providence are the "coming of the Son of Man" and its attendant phenomena, in the sketches or rather glimpses afforded us by the Scriptures into the future. *SEE SIGN (OF THE SON OF MAN).*

As to the passage in Matthew, which forms the leading proof-text of eschatological treatises, the following expository hints will serve to clear up much of the obscurity and ambiguity which has been thrown around the text by the confused manner in which many interpreters have treated its predictions (see Strong's *Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels,:§*123; Stier, *Words of Jesus,* in loc.; Whedon, *Commentary,* in loc.; Nast, *Commentary,* in loc.).

(1.) The question of the apostles (Matthew 24:3) relates to two distinct subjects, namely, the "coming of the 'Son of man' to do these things," and the "end, of the world;" these two topics; therefore, are discussed by Christ in his reply. (More strictly, there are two questions concerning the *first* event, namely, "when," and "the sign." Mark and Luke evidently mean to confine their reports of this discourse to this former catastrophe, and therefore they do not mention the second inquiry as to the "end of the world" at all.) Yet, as the questioners apparently supposed that these two events would be simultaneous, or at least intimately connected (as the constant tenor of all former prophecies had naturally made them think), the answer also uses very similar language in treating them both, a style which their analogous nature peculiarly required. Still, the Great Teacher could not fail to give them true criteria by which to separate these two catastrophes, and for these we are to look in his language. That all the events predicted in Matthew's account as far as 24:34 are connected with the former of these themes, namely, the demolition of Jerusalem and abolition of the Jewish polity, is certain from the declaration at that verse, that they should ALL occur within the then living generation; and the following verses are so intimately connected with these, both by continuity of idea and notes of simultaneousness, that a disruption anywhere before chapter 25:31 would be very harsh and arbitrary. At this point, however,

we discover clear intimations of a transition *(easy* indeed, as the typical correspondence of the two catastrophes would lead us to expect, yet a real and marked one) to the second subject, the general judgment. The change is introduced by the notes of time, "But unwarrantably omitted in our translation] *when .... then,"* and by the loftier tone of the style, besides the distinctive mention of " *all* nations" as the subjects of that adjudication (verse 32). In the latter portion of Christ's discourse alone is employed the briefer and more general mode of prediction usual with the prophets in prefiguring far-distant events, and here only is the language all *exclusively* applicable to the final judgment. The expressions deemed by some to point out such a transition at other points than those assumed above (24:35, and especially 25:31) will be noticed presently; — it is sufficient here to say in general that, as the passages embraced within the medial portion (24:27, 25:30) are designed to be a link of connection between two judicial events so correlative in character, they naturally assume a style that might be applied to either, borrowing some expressions in describing the former which otherwise would belong exclusively to the latter. See a similarly blended style in describing the former of these two events in <530107>2 Thessalonians 1:7-9; comp. with 2:2; and comp. <401627>Matthew 16:27, 28.

Many place at the end of <402428>Matthew 24:28 the transition to the final judgment; but it is difficult to extend 'the intimations of consecutiveness that follow ("[But] immediately after," "But in those days") over such a chasm. It is true, the description ensuing in verses 29-31 is unusually allegorical for a prose discourse, but this is explained by the fact that it is evidently borrowed almost wholly from familiar poetic predictions of similar events. Many of these particulars, moreover, may refer, partially at least, in a literal sense, to the concurrent natural phenomena intimated in <422111>Luke 21:11; and in their utmost stretch of meaning they also *hint* at the collapse of nature in the general judgment. The objection of anachronism in this application of the "tribulation" of verse 29 as a *subsequent* event, is obviated by considering that this term here 'refers to the incipient stages of the "tribulation" of verse 21, where the previous context shows that the distress of *the first* siege and preliminary campaign are "specially intended; Luke (verse 24) there gives the *personal* incidents of the catastrophe itself as succeeding, with an allusion to the long desolation of the land that should follow; so that Christ here resumes the thread of prophetic history (which had been somewhat interrupted by the caution against the impostors who were so rife in the brief interim of the suspension of actual

hostilities) by returning to the *national* consequences of the second and decisive onset of the Romans. The assignment of these events contained in the ensuing verses, as to take place *"after* the tribulation" (presumed to be that of the acme of the Jewish struggle), is the strongest argument of those who apply this whole following passage to the final judgment. But they overlook the equally explicit limit "*immediately* after," and, moreover, fail to discriminate the precise date indicated by "that tribulation." This latter is made (in verse 21 of Matthew) simultaneous with the flight of the Christians, which could not have been practicable in the extremity of the siege, but is directed (in verse 15) to be made on the approach of the besiegers. The consummation intimated here, therefore, refers to the *close* of the siege (i.e., the *sack* itself), and the preceding rigors are those *of its progress.* It ought, moreover, to be considered that the fall of the capital was but the precursor of the extinction of the Jewish nationality (here typified by celestial prodigies); the utter subjugation of the country at large of course following that event. Another interpretation is, that the following passage refers to a second overthrow (the final extermination of the Jewish metropolis under the emperor Adrian in a subsequent war), as distinguished from the first under Titus; this is ingenious, but would hardly justify the strong language here employed, and would, moreover, require the limit "immediately" to be extended half a century farther, when the living "generation" must have entirely passed away. Nor at this later event could the "redemption" of the Christians properly be said to "draw nigh" (verse 28 of Luke), the Jews having then long ceased to have any considerable power to persecute; compare the deliverance prophetically celebrated in Revelation 11, especially verses 8, 13.

(2.) In the highly-wrought description of Matthew 24:29; Luke 21:25, 26 (which constitutes the transition point or intermediate part of our Savior's discourse), the political convulsions during the acme of the Jewish struggle with the Romans are compared with a contest among the elements, in which the sun, moon, stars, earth, and waves join in one horrible war to aggravate human misery and desperation (comp. Judges 5:20); the individual terms are therefore to be understood as merely heightening the general idea. To those who suppose the final judgment referred to in the expressions of this and the following verses, it may here be remarked that these symbolical phenomena of nature are all said to take place "immediately after [Mark, 'in'] ... those days," while the subsequent "coming" is made simultaneous by the word "then" used by all the

evangelists; and all these events are specially noted as signals of a "deliverance" (Luke, verse 28), evidently the same with that of the Christians from Jerusalem's ruin and power to oppress be. fore alluded to; the whole being limited by all the evangelists in distinct terms to the present generation. In order to understand many of the phrases of this representation (as especially those of verses 30, 31), the *induction* (so to speak) of a style of language usually appropriated to the second catastrophe (as intimated at the close of paragraph 1 above), must be borne in mind.

The first element of this "tribulation" (that affecting the celestial luminaries, a statement common to all the evangelists here) is cited from <232310>Isaiah 13:10, a passage spoken with reference to the fall of Babylon; comp. <290315>Joel 3:15, and many similar passages, in which the prophets represent great national disasters by celestial phenomena of an astounding character. All the following quotations, as they appear in the evangelists, are cited by our Savior with considerable latitude and irregularity of order, as his object was merely to afford' brief specimens of this style; but the general resemblance to the original pictures is too strong to be mistaken. See <233404>Isaiah 34:4; 13:13; <263207>Ezekiel 32:7, and especially <290230>Joel 2:30, a prediction expressly quoted by the apostle Peter (<440219>Acts 2:19) as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem.

In illustration of the *angels* spoken of in connection with these incidents (<402431>Matthew 24:31; <411327>Mark 13:27), it should be borne in mind that the Jew naturally associated a retinue of angelic servants with the advent of the Messiah in his triumphant career, and this idea Christ here accommodates, in order to assimilate this first with his final judicial appearance, and thus impress it more deeply upon his volatile disciples' mind (comp. <270710>Daniel 7:10). The "angels" in this case are the providential means (including particularly the Roman invaders), by which the Christians' rescue from siege, sack, and especially persecution, was effected; and the "trumpet sound" refers to the warning intimations which the belligerent preparations afforded them, thus giving them at once an assurance and a signal of deliverance. In the similar language of <401341>Matthew 13:41, 49, the primary reference is to the general judgment. But in the passage before us it is to be specially noted that the "trumpet" is to "gather together his *elect"* only, in distinction from the "all nations" of <402532>Matthew 25:32.

At <40244>Matthew 24:44 (comp. <42124>Luke 12:41), the discourse, which previously had been slightly tinged with allusions to the second judicial coming of Christ (verses 29-31), now begins to verge more distinctly to that final stage, as the reply to Peter that follows indicates. Still, there is no *mark* that the transition to the last judgment is effected till <40253>Matthew 25:31.

In the conclusion of the first topic of Christ's discourse (<40251>Matthew 25:1-13; comp. <42125>Luke 12:35-38: the parable in <40514>Matthew 25:14-30 is parallel with an earlier one of our Lord, <42911>Luke 19:11 sq.), the near anticipation of the second topic produces almost a *double* sense in this (and to a degree, in the preceding) parable, which is not so much the effect of direct design as the natural moulding of the 'language while on a kindred subject, by the vivid presence to the mind of a sublime one which is soon to be introduced; and, indeed, scarcely any phraseology (especially in the far-reaching style of allegory) could have been' consistently adopted which would not have been almost equally applicable to both events ... Still, a comparison of verse 13 with chapter 24:36, 42 shows that the same occurrences (Jerusalem's siege and fall) are here *chiefly* referred to.

(3.) The imaginative style of the representation of the judgment day (<40253>Matthew 25:31-36), which is especially betrayed in the comparison with the shepherd, shows that many of its descriptive particulars are designed only for poetic *"drapery,"* needed to portray the actualness of that scene of the invisible world; the *body* of reality couched under it consists in the fact of a universal discrimination of mankind at a future set timely Christ in the capacity of judge, according to their religious character, followed by the assignment of a corresponding destiny of happiness or misery Comp. <45140>Romans 14:10, 12; <47510>2 Corinthians 5:10; <52416>1 Thessalonians 4:16.

See Cremer, *Eschatologische Rede Christi* (Stuttg. 1860); Dorner, *De oratione Chisti eschatologica* (Stuttg. 1844); Lippold, *De Christo venturo oracula* (Dresd. 1776); also the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, 2:269; 1846, 4:965; 1861-3; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* January 1857; Stowe, in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 7:452. There are special exegetical treatises on Matthew 24 and 25, in Latin, by Jachmann (Lips. 1749), Brandes (Abose, 1792), Rintsch (Neost. ad Oril. 1827), Kenon (Abo, 1798), Schmid (Jen. 1777), Masch *(Nov. Bibl. Lubec.* 2:69), Anon. (Lips. 1809); in German, by Crome *(Brem. u. Verd. Bibl.* 2:349), Ammon *(N. theol. Journ.* 1:365), Jahn (in Bengel's *Archiv.*

2:79), Anon. (in Eichhorn's *Biblioth.* 3:669; *Beitriage z. Beford.* 11:118; Tollner's *Kurze verm. Aufsitze,* II, 1:221-50): on Christ's coming *(rapovaia, SEE ADVENT*), in Latin, by Tychsen (Gott. 1785), Schott (Jen. 1819); in German, by Baumeister (in Klaiber's *Stud.* I, 2:219-41; 3:1-59; II, 1:1-104; 2:3-48), Schulthess *(Neueste theol. Nachtr.* 1829, p. 1848): on the phrase ουδε ο υιος, in Latin, by Osiander (Tub. 1754): on the parallel passage of Luke, in German, by Goze *(Sendschr.* Hamb. 1783, 1784), Moldenhauer *(ib.* 1784, bis). See Kahle, *Biblische Eschatologie* (Gotha, 1870).

II. *Theological Eschatology* is a subdivision of systematic, and more particularly of dogmatic theology. It generally constitutes the concluding part of dogmatic theology, as it treats of what constitutes both for the individual Christian and for the Christian Church, as a whole, the completion of their destiny. As eschatology presupposes a belief in the immortality of the soul, some writers on dogmatic theology (as Hase) treat of it in connection with the doctrine of man, and before they treat of the Church. Others connect the doctrine of death with the doctrine of sin. On some points of eschatology, different views were held at an early period of the Church. Origen understood a passage in the Epistle to the Romans on the Apocatastasis (q.v.) as meaning a final reconciliation and salvation of the wicked, and this view has found some adherents at all times. *SEE RESTORATIONISTS*. In modern times, some go so far as to deny all punishment after the present life, and asserting the immediate salvation of all men, *SEE UNIVERSALISTS*; while others teach that immortality will be the lot of only the good, and that the wicked, after their death, will be annihilated. *SEE ANNIHILATIONISTS*. See also the articles *SEE DEATH*, *SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE*, *SEE JUDGMENT*, *SEE HEAVEN*, *SEE HELL*, *SEE RESURRECTION*, *SEE IMMORTALITY*. The Church of Rome developed the theory of a future state, different from heaven and hell, for which see the article PURGATORY *SEE PURGATORY* . No point connected with eschatology has from the earliest period of the Church been more productive of excited controversy than the doctrine of the second advent of Christ and of the Millennium. For the history of this doctrine; see the article MILLENNIUM *SEE MILLENNIUM* . In German there are separate treatises on eschatology, e.g. Richter, *die Lehre von den letzten Dinzgen* (Bresl. 1833, 8vo); Lau, *Paulus Lehre v. d. letzt. Dingen* (Brandenbl. 1837, 8vo); Valenti, *Eschatologie* (Basel, 1840, 8vo); Karsten, *Lehre von d. letzten Dingen* (Rostock, 3d ed. 1861); Schultz,

Voraussetzungen der christl. Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit (Gettingen, 1861); Wilmarshof, *Das Jenseits* (Leipz. 3 parts, 1863-1866); Noldechen, *Grade der Seligkeit* (Berlin, 1863); Splittgerber, *Tod, Fortleben u. Aferstehung* (Halle, 1863); Rink, *Vom Zustande nach dem Tode* (Ludwigsburg, 2d ed. 1865); Oswald, *Eschatologie* (Paderborn, 1868). — Hagenbach, *Encycl. §* 89; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 4:155.

Escobar y, Mendoza Antonio,

a Spanish Jesuit and noted casuist, was born at Valladolid in 1589, and took the vows of the order of Jesuits in 1604. He became very eminent as a preacher, and is said to have preached daily (sometimes twice a day) for fifty years. He was also a prolific writer, leaving more than forty folio volumes of ascetic divinity, sermons, casuistry, etc. His *Liber Theologiae Moralis* (Lyon, 1646, 7 volumes, 8vo) passed through many (39 in Spain) editions, and was long the favorite text-book of the Jesuits. He also wrote *Universae Theologiae Moralis problemata* (Lyon, 1652, 2 volumes, *fol.)*: — *Universae Theol. Moral. receptiores sententiae*, etc. (Lyon, 7 volumes, fol.). Escobar became the butt of Pascal's wit in the *Provincial Letters*, a fact which will carry his name to the latest posterity. His "liberality" in morals was so excessive that even Rome was compelled to disavow some of his doctrines. His complete works fill 42 volumes. He died July 4, 1669. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 16:375; Alegambe, *Biblioth. Scriptorum Soc. Jesu* (Louvain, 1854).

Escurial, or Escorial

a city of Spain, twenty-four miles N.W. of Madrid, containing a celebrated convent palace generally called *Escurial.* The convent, built for 160 monks of the order of Jerome, was erected 1653-84, by Philip II, in fulfillment of a vow made at the battle of St. Quentin, fought on the anniversary of St. Lawrence. It is built in the form of a gridiron, in commemoration of the martyrdom of the saint, and the king's palace forms the handle. The buildings are 740 feet long, inclosing 20 courts, in which are 63 fountains; there are 17 cross paths, 890 doors, 1000 columns, 5000 windows, 9 towers surmounted by cupolas, a magnificent church with 48 altars in side chapels. The main altar is adorned by a statue of St. Lawrence in solid silver, weighing 450 pounds. Underneath is the costly burying vault of the king, of marble and jasper, The library of the convent contains some 4600 MSS., 1905 Arabic, and is the principal collection of Oriental history and

literature. Many of the MS. and other treasures were lost when the place was sacked by the French in 1808. Besides these, there are some 32,143 vols. of ancient authors, principally on history. The picture-gallery contains some 465 original paintings. A park surrounds the king's palace, or Casa del *Principe. — Penny Cyclopedia;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:157.

Esdraela

SEE JEZREEL.

Esdrae'lom

SEE ESDRAELON.

Esdrae'lon

[from v.r. Ἐσδραηλών*]* (or rather *Esdrelon,* Ἐσδρηλών, Judith, 3:9; 4:6; but *"Esdreloam,"* Ἐσδρηλών, Judith 1:8; "Esdraelom," 7:3, where it is called "the great plain," as simply in Josephus everywhere, τὸ πεδίον μέγα), the name of a valley or large bottom, a Graecized form derived from the old royal city of *Jezreel,* which occupied a commanding site, near the eastern extremity of the plateau, on a spur of Mount Gilboa. "The great plain of Esdraelon" extends across central Palestine from the Mediterranean to the Jordan, separating the mountain ranges of Carmel and Samaria from those of Galilee. The western section of it is properly the plain of Accho or Acre ('Akka). The main body of the plain is a triangle. Its base on the east extends from Jenin (the ancient Engannim) to the foot of the hills below Nazareth, and is about 15 miles long; the north side, formed by the hills of Galilee, is about 12 miles long; and the south side, formed by the Samaria range, is about 18 miles. The apex on the west is a narrow pass opening into the plain of 'Akka. This vast expanse has a gently undulating surface — in spring all green with corn where cultivated, and rank weeds and grass where neglected — dotted with several low gray tells, and near the sides with a few olive groves. This is that *valley of Megiddo* (/Dgæm] t [iqBæ, so called from the city of Megiddo [q.v.], which stood on its southern border), where Barak triumphed, and where king Josiah was defeated and received his death-wound (Judges 5; 2 Chronicles 25). Probably, too, it was before the mind of the apostle John when he figuratively described the final conflict between the hosts of good and evil who were gathered to a place called *Ar-mageddon* (Ἀρμαγεδδών, from the Hebrews /Dgæm] r [; that is, *the city ofMegiddo;* Rev. 16:16). The river

Kishon — "that ancient river" so fatal to the army of Sisera (Judges 5:21) — drains the plain, and flows off through the pass westward to the Mediterranean.

From the base of this triangular plain three branch plains stretch out eastward, like fingers from a hand, divided by two bleak gray ridges — one bearing the familiar name of Mount Gilboa; the other called by Franks Little Hermon, but by natives Jebel ed-Duhy. The *northern* branch has Tabor on the one side, and Little Hermon on the other; into it the troops of Barak defiled from the heights of Tabor (Judges 4:6); and on its opposite side are the sites of Nain and Endor. The *southern* branch lies between Jenin and Gilboa, terminating in a point among the hills to the eastward; it was across it that Ahaziah fled from Jehu (2 Kings 9:27). The *central* branch is the richest as well as the most celebrated; it descends in green, fertile slopes to the banks of the Jordan, having Jezreel and Shunem on opposite sides at the western end, and Bethshean in its midst towards the east. This is the " valley of Jezreel" proper — the battle-field on which Gideon triumphed; and Saul and Jonathan were overthrown (Judges 7:1 sq.; 1 Samuel 29 and 31). Indeed, a large part of the most sanguinary battles fought in Palestine in every age have been waged upon this eventful plain.

Two things are worthy of special notice in the plain of Esdraelon: 1. *Its wonderful richness.* — Its unbroken expanse of verdure contrasts strangely with the gray, bleak crowns of Gilboa, and the rugged ranges on the north and south. The gigantic thistles, the luxuriant grass, and the exuberance of the crops on the few cultivated spots, show the fertility of the soil. It was the frontier of Zebulon — "Rejoice, Zebulon, in thy *going out"* (Deuteronomy 33:18). But it was the special portion of Issachar — "And he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute" (Genesis 49:15). 2. *Its desolation.* — If we except the eastern branches, there is not a single inhabited village on its whole surface, and not more than one sixth of its soil is cultivated. It is the home of the wild, wandering Bedouin, who scour its smooth turf on their fleet horses in search of plunder; and when hard pressed can speedily remove their tents and flocks beyond the Jordan, and beyond the reach of a weak government. It has always been insecure since history began. The old Canaanitish tribes drove victoriously through it in their iron chariots (Judges 4:3, 7); the nomad Midianites and Amalekites —those "children of the East," who were "as

grasshoppers for multitude," Whose "camels were without number" — devoured its rich pastures (Judges 6:1-6; 7:1); the Philistines long held it, establishing a stronghold at Bethshean (1 Samuel 29:1; 31:10); and the Syrians frequently swept over it with their armies (1 Kings 20:26; 2 Kings 13:17). In its condition, thus exposed to every hasty incursion and to every shock of war, we read the fortunes of that tribe which for the sake of its richness consented to sink into a half-nomadic state — "Rejoice, O Issachar, in thy *tents*... . Issachar is a strong ass, crouching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant, and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute" (Genesis 49:14,15; Deuteronomy 33:18). Once only did this tribe shake off the yoke-when under the heavy pressure of Sisera, "the chiefs of Issachar were with Deborah" (Judges 5:15). Their exposed position and valuable possessions in this open plain made them anxious for the succession of David to the throne, as one under whose powerful protection they would enjoy that peace and rest which they loved; and they joined with their neighbors of Zebulun and Naphtali in sending to David presents of the richest productions of their rich country (1 Chronicles 12:32, 40). *SEE ISSACHAR*.

The whole borders of the plain of Esdraelon are dotted with places of high historic and sacred interest. Here we group them together, while referring the reader for details to the separate articles. On the east we have Endor, Nain, and Shunem, ranged round the base of the "hill of Moreh;" then Bethshean in the center of the plain where the "valley of Jezreel" opens towards ,the Jordan; then Gilboa, with the "well of Harod," and the ruins of Jezreel at its western base. On the south are Engannim, Taanach, and Megiddo. At the western apex, on the overhanging brow of Carmel, is the scene of Elijah's sacrifice; and close by the foot of the mountain below runs the Kishon, on whose banks the false prophets of Baal were slain. On the north, among places of less note, are Nazareth and Tabor. The modern Syrians have forgotten the ancient name as they have forgotten the ancient history of Esdraelon, and it is now known among them only as *Merj ibn-'Amer*, "the Plain of the Son of Amer." A graphic sketch of Esdraelon is given in Stanley's *Syr. and Pales.* page 327 sq.; see also Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, p. 851 sq.; Jowett, *Christian Researches,* page 146, 222; Robinson, *Researches*, new edition, 2:315-30, 366; 3:113 sq.; Thomson; *L(rd and Book.* 2:216 sq.; Walther, *De* Μεγαλωπεδιῳ *Paulestinca* (Lips. 1792). *SEE JEZREEL*.

Es'dras

(Εσδρας; Vulg. *Esdras),* the Graecized form, used throughout the Apocrypha (1 Esd. 8:1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 19, 23, 25, 91, 92, 96; 9:1, 7, 16, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 49; 2 Esd. 1:1; 2:10, 33, 42; 6:10; 7:2, 25; 8:2, 19; 14:1, 38), of the name of the scribe EZRA *SEE EZRA* (q.v.). In several manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, as well as in all the printed editions anterior to the decree of the Council of Trent, and in many since that period, there will be found four books following each other, entitled the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th books of Ezra. The first two are the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the 3d and 4th form the subject of the articles below. They are the same which are called 1st and 2d Esdras in the English Authorized Version. For their use and relation to the canonical books see Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, 1710), page 47 sq.; Trendelenburg, in Eichhorn's *Biblioth.* 1:180 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einleit. in d. Apocr.* page 335 sq.; Herzfeld, *Gesct. d. Israel,* page 320 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* 4:131 sq.; Keil, *Einleit. in d. A. T.* (ed. 1859), page 677 sq.; Davidson, *Text of O.T.* page 937 sq. *SEE APOCRYPHA.*

Esdras, First Book Of

This is the first of the apocryphal books in the English translations of the Bible (viz., Coverdale, Matthews, Taverner, the Geneva Bible, Cranmer's Bible, the Bishops' Bible, the A.V.), which follow Luther and the translators of the Zurich version, who were the first that separated the apocryphal from the canonical books. It must, however, be observed that Luther himself never translated the apocryphal portions of Ezra, because he regarded them as unworthy of a place among the apocrypha (see below, sec. 5).

I. *Title and Position.* — This book has different titles.. In some editions of the Sept. it is called ὁ ῾ Ιερεύς, *the Priest* (Cod. Alex.), which is equivalent to Ezra, who, by way of eminence, was styled "the priest" or "the scribe," in others it is designated ῞Εσδρας, *Ezra,* while in the Vatican and many modern editions of the Sept., as well as in the *old Latin* and the Syriac, it is called *"the first* book of Ezra," and accordingly is placed before the canonical Ezra, which is called *"the second* book of Ezra," because the history it gives is in part anterior to that given in the canonical Ezra. In the Vulg., again, where Ezra and Nehemiah are respectively styled *the first* and *second* book of Ezra, this apocryphal book, which comes immediately after

them, is called "*the third* book of Ezra." Others, again, call it *"the second* book of Ezra" (Isidore, *Origg.* 6:2), because Ezra and Nehemiah, which it follows, were together styled *"the first* book of Ezra,"' according to a very ancient practice among the Jews, who, by putting the two canonical books together, obtained the same number of books in the Scriptures as the letters in the Hebrew alphabet; and others call it *Pseudo-Ezra,* in contradistinction to the canonical Ezra. The name *first* Esdras given to it in the A.V. is taken from the Geneva Bible; the older English translations (viz. Coverdale's Bible, Matthew's Bible, the Bishops' Bible), as well as the sixth article of the Church of England (1571), following Luther and the Zurich Bible, call it *the third* Esdra, according to the Vulg. Since the Council of Trent (1546), this book has been removed from its old position to the end of the volume in the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Vulg. In the list of revisers or translators of the *Bishops'* Bible, sent by Archbishop Parker to Sir William Cecil, with the portion revised by each, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the apocryphal books of Esdras seem to to all comprised under the one title of ESDRAS. Barlow, bishop of Chichester, was the translator, as also of the books of Judith, Tobias, and Sapientia *(Corresp. of Archbp. Parker,* Park. Soc. page 335).

II. *Design and Contents.* — The object of this book, as far as its original portion is concerned (3:50-5:6), is to excite the heathen rulers of Judaea to liberality and kindness towards the Jews, by depicting the good example of Darius, from whom Zerubbabel obtained permission, by the aid of wisdom, to return with his brethren to Palestine, and to rebuild the city and the Temple. This design is worked out in the following attractive story. Darius, having given a sumptuous feast to all his subjects in the second year of his reign, retired to rest (3:1-3); when asleep, his three bodyguards, Zerubbabel being one of them, proposed each to write a maxim stating what he thought was the most powerful thing, in the hope that the king would reward the wisest writer (verses 4-9). Accordingly, they all wrote: one said "Wine is the most powerful;" the other, "A king is the most powerful;" while Zerubbabel wrote, "Women are very powerful, but truth conquers all." The slips containing these maxims were put under the king's pillow, and were given to him when he awoke (verses 10-12). When he had read them he immediately sent for all his magnates, and, having read these maxims before them (verses 13-15), called upon the three youths to explain their sayings (ver. 16, 17). The first spoke elaborately about the great power which wine manifests in different ways (ver. 18-24); the second

descanted upon the unlimited power of royalty, illustrating it by various examples (4:1-12); while Zerubbabel discoursed upon the mighty influence of women, frequently contravening the power of wine and monarchs, and then burst forth in praise of truth so eloquently, that all present exclaimed, "Great is truth, and mightiest above all things" (verses 13-41). Darius then offered to Zerubbabel anything he should ask (verse 42), whereupon he reminded the king of his vow to rebuild Jerusalem and return the sacred vessels when he ascended the throne (verses 43-47). The king stood up, kissed Zerubbabel, wrote to all officials to convey him and all his brethren to Palestine, and to supply all the necessary materials for the rebuilding of the Temple (verses 48-63).

This is preceded and followed by descriptions of events which present the whole as one continuous narrative, relating in historical order the restoration of the Temple-service first under Josiah, then under Zerubbabel, and finally under Ezra, and which are compiled from the records contained in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and 'Nehemiah', as follows:

1. Chapter 1 corresponds to 2 Chronicles 35 and 36, giving an account of Josiah's magnificent celebration of the. Passover-feast is the eighteenth month of his reign, and continuing the history till the Babylonien captivity.

2. Chapter 2:1-15, corresponds to 15001Ezra 1:1-11, recording the return of the Jews from Babylon under the guidance of Sana bassarin the reign of Cyrus.

3. Chapter 2:16-30, corresponds to 15047Ezra 4:7-24. giving an account of Artaxerxes' prohibition to build the Temple till the second year of Darius.

4. Chapter 3:50-5:6, contains the original piece.

5. Chapter 5:7-73, corresponds to 15001Ezra 2:1-4:5, giving a list of the persons who returned with Zerubbabel, describing the commencement of the building of the Temple and the obstacles whereby it was interrupted "for the space of two years" until the reign of Darius.

6. Chapter 6:50-7:15, corresponds to 15065Ezra 5:50-6:22, giving an account of the building of the Temple by Zerubbabel under Darius, of its. completion in the sixth year of this monarch's reign, and of the commencement of the Temple service.

7. Chapter 8:1-9:36, corresponds to <15701>Ezra 7:1-10:44, describing the return of Ezra with his colony, and the putting away of the strange wives. Chapter 9:37-55 corresponds to <16723>Nehemiah 7:23-8:12, giving an account of Ezra's public reading of the law. The original piece around which all this clusters has evidently been the cause of this transposition and remodeling of the narrative contained in the canonical books. Having assumed that Zerubbabel returned to Jerusalem with a portion of his brethren in *the second* year of Darius, the compiler naturally placed <15201>Ezra 2:1-4:5, which gives the list of those that returned, *after* the original piece, for it belongs to Zerubbabel's time, according to 2:2, and the original piece he placed after <15407>Ezra 4:7-24, because Ezra (<15424>Ezra 4:24) led him to suppose that Artaxerxes reigned before Darius. Hence a twofold design in the compiler is discernible. One was to introduce and give scriptural sanction to the legend about Zerubbabel, which may or may not have a historical base, and may have existed as a separate work; the other was to explain the great obscurities of the book of Ezra, and to present the narrative, as the author understood it, in historical order, in which. however, he has signally failed. For, not to advert t innamerable other contradictions, the introducing of the opposition of the heathen, as offered to Zerubbabel *after* he had been sent to Jerusalem in such triumph by Darius, and the describing of that opposition as lasting "until the reign of Darius" (5:73), and as put down by an appeal to the decree of Cyrus, is such a palpable inconsistency as is alone sufficient quite to discredit the authority of the book. It even induces the suspicion that it is a farrago made up of scraps by several different hands. At all events, attempts to reconcile the different portions with each other, or with Scripture, is lost labor.

III. *Unity and Original Language.* — The above analysis of its contents shows that the book gives us a consecutive history *de templi restitutione,* as the *old Latin* tersely expresses it. It is, however, not complete in its present state, as is evident from the abrupt manner in which it concludes with <16812>Nehemiah 8:12. We may therefore legitimately presume that the compiler intended to add <16813>Nehemiah 8:13-18, and perhaps also chapter 9. Josephus, who follows the history given in this book, continues to speak of the death of Ezra *(Ant.* 11:5, 5), from which it may be concluded that it originally formed part of this narrative. More venturous are the opinions of Zunz, that Nehemiah 1-7 originally belonged to this book *(Die*

Gottesdienstl. Vortriige, page 29), and of Eichhorn, that 2 Chronicles 34 followed the abrupt breaking off *(Einleitung in d. Apokr*. page 345 sq.).

As to its original language, this compilation is undoubtedly made directly from the Hebrew, and not from other parts of the present Sept. This is evident from the rendering of µ[ħ;yfte]l ae by ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ λαοῦ, reading yfpe]l ae (compare 1:11 with <143412>2 Chronicles 34:12), and of hy*Dm;ij }miyl K] l kw by καὶ συνετέλεσαν πάντα τὰ ἔνδοξα αὐτῆς, reading l kW l kw] (comp. 1:53 with <143619>2 Chronicles 36:19; see also 2:7-9 with <150104>Ezra 1:4, 6; 2:17 with <150409>Ezra 4:9; 2:16 with <150407>Ezra 4:7; 2:24 with <150416>Ezra 4:16; 9:10 with <151004>Ezra 10:4), since these can only be accounted for on the supposition that the book was compiled and translated from the Hebrew. The translator, however, did not aim so much to be literal as to produce a version compatible with the Greek idiom. Hence he sometimes abbreviated the Hebrew (comp. 1:10 with <143510>2 Chronicles 35:10-12; 2:15, 16 with <150407>Ezra 4:7-11; 5:7 with <150506>Ezra 5:6, 7; 6:4 with <150503>Ezra 5:3, 4; 8:6 with <150706>Ezra 7:6; 8:14 with <150717>Ezra 7:17; 8:20 with <150722>Ezra 7:22), and sometimes tried to make it more intelligible by adding some words (comp. 1:56 with <142620>2 Chronicles 26:20; 2:5 with <150103>Ezra 1:3; 2:9 with <150104>Ezra 1:4; 2:16 with <150406>Ezra 4:6; 2:18 with <150412>Ezra 4:12; 5:40 with <150263>Ezra 2:63; 5:47 with <150301>Ezra 3:1; 5:52 with <150305>Ezra 3:5; 5:66 with <150401>Ezra 4:1; 6:41 with <150264>Ezra 2:64; 6:8 with <150414>Ezra 4:14; 6:9 with <150508>Ezra 5:8; 7:9 with <150618>Ezra 6:18). The original portion, too, is a Palestinian production, embellished to suit the Alexandrian taste. The Hebrew forms of it may be seen in Josephus *(Ant.* 11:3, 1) and Josippon ben-Gorion (1, c. 6, page 47 sq., ed. Breithaupt).

IV. *Author and Date.* — As regards the time and place when the compilation was made, the *original* portion is that which alone affords much clew. This seems to indicate that the writer was thoroughly conversant with Hebrew, even if he did not write the book in that language. He was well acquainted, too, with the books of Esther and Daniel (1 Esdr. 3:1, 2 sq.), and other books of Scripture (ib. 20, 21, 39, 41, etc., and 45 compared with <19D707>Psalm 137:7). But that he did not live under the Persian kings, and was not contemporary with the events narrated, appears from the undiscriminating way in which he uses promiscuously the phrase *Medes and Persians*, or *Persians and Medes*, according as he happened to be imitating the language of Daniel or of the book of Esther. The allusion in 4:23 to "sailing upon the sea and upon the rivers," for the

purpose of "robbing and stealing," seems to indicate a residence in Egypt, and an acquaintance with the lawlessness of Greek pirates there acquired. The phraseology of 5:73 savors also strongly of Greek rather than Hebrew. If, however, as seems very probable, the legend of Zerubbabel appeared first as a separate piece, and was afterwards incorporated into the narrative made up from the book of Ezra, this Greek sentence from ch. v would not prove anything as to the language in which the original legend was written. The expressions in 4:40, "She is the strength, kingdom, power, and majesty of all ages," is very like the doxology found in some copies of the Lord's Prayer, and retained by us, "Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory forever." But Lightfoot says that the Jews in the Temple service, instead of saying Amen, used this antiphon, Blessed be the Name of the Glory of His Kingdom forever and ever *(Works,* 6:427). Thus the resemblance may be accounted for by their being both taken from a common source.

Whoever the author was, he seems to have lived in Palestine (comp. 5:47), and certainly was a master of Greek, as is evident from his superior style; which resembles that of Symmachus, and from his successfully turning the Hebraisms into good Greek (comp. 8:5 with <15807>Ezra 8:17; 9:13 with <15104>Ezra 10:14). The compiler must have lived at least a century before Christ, since Josephus follows his narrative of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah *(Ant.* 11:5; 11:45). The book must therefore have existed for some time, and have acquired great reputation and authority, to make the Jewish historian prefer its description of those days to that of the canonical books.

V. *Canonicity and Importance.* — This book was never included in the Hebrew canon, nor is it to be found in the catalogues of the Hebrew Scriptures given by the early fathers, e.g. Melito, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, the Council of Laodicea, and many others; and St. Jerome emphatically warns us "not to take pleasure in the dreams of the 3d and 4th apocryphal books of Ezra" *(Pref. in Esdr. et Nechum.).* The councils of Florence (1438) and Trent (1546) decided against its canonicity. The reason of this last exclusion seems to be that the Tridentine fathers were not aware that it existed in Greek; for it is not in the Complutensian edition (1515), nor in the Biblia Regia. Vatablus (1540) had never seen a Greek copy, and, in the preface to the apocryphal books, speaks of it as only existing in some MSS. and printed *Latin* Bibles. Baduel also, a French Protestant divine

(Bibl. Crit.) (about 1550), says that he knew of no one who had ever seen a Greek copy. For this reason it seems it was excluded from the Canon, though it has certainly quite as good a title to be admitted as Tobit, Judith, etc. It has indeed been stated (Bp. Marsh, *Compar. View.* ap. Soames, *Hist. of Ref.* 2:608) that the Council of Trent, in, excluding the two books of Esdras, followed Augustine's Canon; but this is not so. Augustine *(de Doctr. Christ.* lib. 2:13) distinctly mentions among the libri canonici *Esdrce duo;* and that one of these was our 1st Esdras is manifest from the quotation from it given in his *De Civit. Del.* Hence it isalso sure that it was included among those pronounced as canonical by the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397 or 419, where the same title is given, *Esdrce lib i duo:* here it is to be noticed by the way that Augustine and the Council of Carthage use the term canonical in a much broader sense than we do; and that the manifest ground of considering them canonical in any sense is their being found in the Greek copies of the Sept. in use at that time. Luther would not even translate it, "because there is nothing in it which is not better said by Esop in his Fables, or even in much more trivial books" *(Vorrede auf den Baruch);* the version given in the later editions of Luther's Bible is the work of Daniel Cramer, and the Protestant Church generally has treated it with great contempt, because it contradicts the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah. On the other hand, Josephus, as we have seen, regards it as a great authority, and it was treated with great reverence by the Greek and Latin fathers. St. Augustine mentions it among the canonical books *(De Doctr. Christ.* lib. 2:13), and quotes the famous passage, "Truth is the strongest" (chapter 3:12), as Ezra's prophecy respecting Christ *(De Civitat. Dei,* 18:16); the same sentence is quoted as Scripture by Cyprian *(Epist.* 74; comp. also Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* 1; Athanasius, *Orat.* 3, *cont. Arianos;* Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.).* Modern criticism has justly taken the middle course between treating it with contempt and regarding it as canonical, and has recognized in it an important auxiliary to the settling of the text, and to the adjusting of the facts recorded in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, since this book has evidently been made from a different recension of the Hebrew, and has some readings and divisions preferable to those contained in the canonical books (comp. 5:9 with <15212>Ezra 2:12; 9:12 with <15106>Ezra 10:6; 9:16 with <15106>Ezra 10:16). Both Bertheau in his commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah *(Exeget. Handb.* part 18), and Fritzsche in his commentary on the apocryphal Ezra *(Exeget. Handb. z. d. Apoir.* part 1), have shown the

important services which the canonical and uncanonical records may render to each other.

VI. There are no separate *commentaries* on the first book of Esdras, and the literature pertaining to it is given under foregoing heads.

Esdras, Second Book Of,

i.e., the second in the order of the apocryphal books as given in the English translations of the Bible, which follow the Zurich Bible.

I. *Title and Position.* — The original designation of this book, by which it is appropriately called in the Greek Church, is Ἀποκάλυψις Ἔσδρᾶ or προφητεία Ἔσδρᾶ, *the Revelation* or *prophecy of Ezra* (comp. Nicephorus, apud Fabric. *Cod. Pseud. V.T.* 2:176; *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* 1:951 sq.; Montfaucon, *Biblioth. Coislin.* page 194). The designation "1 Ezra," which it has in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, arises from the fact that it was placed before the canonical Ezra because it begins a little earlier (i.e., B.C. 558) than the Hebrew Ezra. It is called "2 Ezra" in the Latin version because it follows the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah, which were together styled *the first* Ezra, and it is still more generally denominated "4 Ezra," a name given to it by St. Jerome (comp. *Praef. in Esdr. et Nechen.),* because it is in most of the Latin MSS. the fourth of the books which go by the name of Ezra, and which are placed in the following order: 1 Ezra, i.e. the canonical Ezra; 2 Ezra, i.e., Nehemiah; 3 Ezra, i.e., 1 apocryphal Ezra; and 4 Ezra, i.e., this book. The name "4 Ezra" is retained by Luther, the Zurich Bible, Coverdale, Matthew's Bible, Cranmer's Bible, the Bishops' Bible, and in the 6th article of the Church of England (1571). The name "2 Esdras," given to it in the A.V., is taken from the Geneva Bible, and is the title given to it by the author himself (2 Esdr. 1:1). This book, like the former one, is placed at the end of the Vulgate in the Sixtine and Clementine editions, because it has been excluded from the Canon by the Council of Trent.

II. *Design and Plan.* — The object of this book was to comfort the chosen people of God who were suffering under the grinding oppression of the heathen, by assuring them that the Lord has appointed a time of deliverance when the oppressors shall be judged, and the ten tribes of Israel, in union with their brethren, shall return to the Holy Land to enjoy a glorious kingdom which shall be established in the days of the Messiah.

This is gradually developed in *an introduction,* and *Seven angelic revelations,* or *visions,* in which Ezra is instructed in the mysteries of the moral world, as follows:

1. *Introduction* (3:1-36, A.V.; or 1:1-36, Ethiopic Vers.). — When on his couch in Babylon, in the 30th year after the destruction of Jerusalem (B.C. 558), mourning over the deplorable fate of his brethren (verses 1-3), and recounting the dealings of God with mankind generally (verses 4-12), and with his chosen people in particular, in consequence of their sinful nature inherited from Adam (verses 13-22), for which the Temple was destroyed and the city delivered into the hands of Gentiles (verses 23-27), Ezra asked God why the heathen sinners of Babylon are spared, whilst the people of his covenant are so unsparingly punished (verses 28-36)?

2. *First Revelation* (4:50-5:15, A.V.; 2:1-3:23, Eth.). — In answer to this, the angel Uriel is sent, who, after censuring the presumptuousness of a short-sighted man in trying to fathom the unsearchable dealings of the Most High, when he cannot understand the things below (verses 1-21), and after Ezra's earnest reiteration of the question (verses 22-25), says that sin has not yet reached its climax (verses 26-31), enumerates the signs whereby the fullness of that time will be distinguished, and promises to reveal to him still greater things if he will continue to pray and fast seven days (verses 32-5:15).

3. *Second Revelation* (5:16-6:34, A.V.; 3:24-4:37, Eth.). — Having fasted seven days according to the command of the angel, and against the advice of the prince of the Jews (verses 16-21), Ezra again appeals to God, asking why he does not punish his sinful people himself rather than give them over to the heathen (verses 22-30)? Uriel, who appears a second time, after referring again to the inscrutable judgments of God (verses 31-56), reveals to Ezra, according to promise, more distinctly what shall be the signs of the latter days, saying that with Esau [the Idumaeans] the present world will terminate, and the world to come will begin with Jacob (6:1-10), whereupon the day of judgment will follow, and be announced by the blast of a trumpet (verses 11-25); Enoch and Elias, the forerunners of the Messiah, shall appear (verse 26), and sin and corruption will be destroyed (verses 27, 28); tells him to be comforted, patient, and resigned, and that he shall hear something more if he will fast again seven days (verses 29-34).

4. *Third Revelation* (6:35-9:25, A.V.; 4:38-9:27, Eth.). — The fasting being over, Ezra again appeals to God, to know how it is that his chosen people for whom this wonderful world was created, are deprived of their inheritance (verses 35-59)? Whereupon Uriel appears a third time, tells him that it is because of their sin (7:1-25), describes the death of the Messiah, the resurrection, the judgment, and the things which will-come to pass, concluding with an admonition to Ezra to fast and pray again (verses 26-9:25).

5. *First Vision* (9:26-10:59, A.V.; 9:28-10:74, Eth.). — After appealing again to God in behalf of his brethren (verses 26-37), Ezra suddenly saw a woman in the deepest mourning for her only son, who had been born to her after being married thirty years, and who died on the day of his nuptials (verses 38-10:l), and she would not be comforted (verses 2-4). He rebuked her for being so disconsolate about the loss of one son, when Sion was bereaved of all her children (verses 2-14), and recommended her to submit to the dealings of God (verses 15-24); her face speedily shone very brightly, and she disappeared (verses 25-27); whereupon Uriel appeared to Ezra, and told him that the woman is Sion, the thirty years of her barrenness are "the thirty years wherein no sacrifice was offered in her," her first-born is the Temple built by Solomon, his death on the day of his marriage is the destruction of Jerusalem, and the extraordinary brightness of the mother's face is the future glory of Sion (verses 28-59).

6. *Second Vision* (11:50-12:51, A.V.; 11:50-12:58, Eth.). — Ezra in a dream had a revelation of the latter days under the figure of an eagle coming up from the sea with three heads and twelve wings, which afterwards produced eight smaller wings spread over all things, and reigning over all the world (verses 1-7). These wings, beginning from the right side, according to a voice which proceeded from the body of the eagle, reigned successively over all the earth, and perished, so that there remained six small wings (verses 8-23), which, however, in attempting to rule, also perished, and the three heads only were left on the eagle's body (verses 24-31). These now reigned, one after the other, and perished, so that a single head remained (verses 32-35). A lion (the Messiah) declared to the eagle that all his wings and heads were destroyed because he ruled the earth wickedly (verses 36-46); then the body and whatever was left of the eagle were bumnt in fire (12:1, 2). Ezra awoke, and having prayed for the interpretation of this vision (verses 3-9), was told by the angel that the

eagle was the fourth monarchy which Daniel saw, and was admonished again to fast and pray (verses 10-51).

7. *Third Vision* (13:1-58, A.V.; 13:1-64, Eth.). — Ezra then had another dream, in which he saw a mighty spirit (πνεῦμα) arise from the sea resembling a man, who destroyed all his enemies with the blast of his mouth, and gathered around him large multitudes (verses 1-13). On awaking, Ezra was told by the angel that it was the Messiah, who shall gather together the ten tribes, lead them to their holy land, and give them Sion "prepared and builded for them" (verses 14-58).

8. *Conclusion* (14:1-48, A.V.; 14:1-52, Eth.).Three days later, the voice which spoke to Moses in the bush tells Ezra that the latter days are at hand (verses 1-12), bids him set his house in order, reprove those that are living (verses 13-18), and write down, for the benefit of those who are not yet born, ninety-four books, i.e., the twenty-four inspired books of the O.T. which have been burnt, and seventy books of divine mysteries, which he duly did with the help of scribes (verses 19-44), the recovered Scriptures to be communicated to all, and the Cabbalistic books only to the sages (verses 45 -48).

The chief characteristics of the "three-headed eagle," which refer apparently to historic details, are 'twelve feathered wings" (duodecim aloe pennarum), "eight counter-feathers"(contrarie pennae),and "three heads;" but, though the writer expressly interprets these of kings (12:14, 20) and "kingdoms" (12:23), he is, perhaps intentionally, so obscure in his allusions that the interpretation only increases the difficulties of the vision itself. One point only may be considered certain — the eagle can typify no other empire than Rome. Notwithstanding the identification of the eagle with the fourth empire of Daniel (comp. Barnabas, *Epist.* page 4), it is impossible to suppose that it represents the Greek kingdom (Hilgenfeld; compare Volkmar, *Dias vierte Buch Esra*, page 36 sq.). The power of the Ptolemies could scarcely have been described in language which may be rightly applied to Rome (11:2, 6, 40); and the succession of kings quoted by Hilgenfeld to represent "the twelve wings," preserves only a faint resemblance to the imagery of the vision. But when it is established that the interpretation of the vision is to be sought in the history of Rome, the chief difficulties of the problem begin. The second wing (i.e., king) rules twice as long as the other (11:17). This fact seems to point to Octavianus and the line of the Caesars; but thus the line of " twelve" leads to no plausible

conclusion. If it is supposed to close with Trajan (Licke, 1st ed.), the "three heads" receive no satisfactory explanation. If, again, the "three heads" represent the three Flavii, then "the twelve" must be composed of the nine Caesars (Jul. Caesar-Vitellius) and the three pretenders, Piso, Vindex, and Nymphidius (Gfrorer), who could scarcely have been brought within the range of a Jewish Apocalypse. Volkmar proposes a new interpretation, by which two wings are to represent *one* king, and argues that this symbol was chosen in order to conceal better from strange eyes the revelation of the seer. The twelve wings thus represent the six Caesars (Caesar — Nero); the eight "counter-feathers," the usurping emperors Galba, Otho,Vitellus, and Nerva; and the three heads the three Flavii. This hypothesis offers many striking coincidences with the text, but at the same time it is directly opposed to the form of interpretation given by Ezra (12:14, regnabunt ... *duodecim* reges; 5:18, *octo* reges), and Volkmar's hypothesis that the *twelve* and *eight* were marked in the original MS. in some way so as to suggest the notion of division, is extremely improbable. Van der Vlis and Liicke, in his later edition, regard the twelve kings as only generally symbolic of the Roman power; and while they identify the three heads! with the triumvirs, they seek no explanation of the other details. All is evidently as yet vague and uncertain, and will probably remain so till some clearer light can be thrown upon Jewish thought and history during the critical period B.C. 100-A.D. 100.

In tone and character, the Apocalypse of Ezra offers a striking contrast to that of Enoch (q.v.). Triumphant anticipations are overshadowed by gloomy forebodings of the destiny of the world. 'The idea of victory is lost in that of revenge. Future blessedness is reserved only for "a very few" (7:70; 8:1, 3, 5255; 7:1-13). The great question is, "not how the ungodly shall be punished, but how the righteous shall be saved, for whom the world is created" (9:13). The "woes of Messiah" are described with a terrible minuteness which approaches the despairing traditions of the Talmud (5; 14:10 sq.; 9:3 sq.); and after a reign of 400 years (7:28-35; the clause is wanting in Eth., 5:29), "Christ," it is said, "my Son, shall die (Arab. omits), and all men that have breath; and the world shall be turned into the old silence seven days, like as in the first beginning, and no man shall remain" (7:29). Then shall follow the resurrection and the judgment, "the end of this time and the beginning of immortality" (7:43). In other points the doctrine of the book offers curious approximations to that of Paul, as the imagery does to that of the Apocalypse (e.g. 2 Esdr. 13:43 sq.;

5:4). The relation of "the first Adam" to his sinful posterity, and the operation of the law (3:20 sq.; 7:48; 9:36); the transitoriness of the world (4:26); the eternal counsels of God (vi, sq.); his providence (7:11) and longsuffering (7:64); his sanctification of his people "from the beginning" (9:8), and their peculiar and lasting privileges (6:59), are plainly stated; and, on the other hand, the efficacy of good works (8:33), in conjunction with faith (9:7), is no less clearly affirmed.

III. *Unity and Original Language.* — For along time this book of Ezra was known only by an old Latin version, which is preserved in some MSS. of the Vulgate. This version was used by Ambrose, and, like the other parts of the *Vetus Latina*, is probably older than the time of Tertullian. It is published in Walton's *Polyglot*, volume 4. An Arabic text was discovered by Mr. Gregory, about the middle of the 17th century, in two Bodleian MSS., and an English version made from this by Simon Ockley was inserted by Whiston in the last volume of his *Primitive Christianity* (London, 1711). Fabricius added the various readings of the Arabic text to his edition of the Latin in 1723 *(Cod. Pseudep. V.T.* 2:174 sq.). An Ethiopic text was published by [archbishop] Laurence, with English and Latin translations *(Primi Esrae libri, versio Ethiopica ... Latine Angliceque reddita*, Oxon. 1820); likewise from a Bodleian MS. which had remained wholly disregarded, though quoted by Ludolf in his dictionary. The Latin translation has been reprinted by Gfrörer, with the various readings of the Latin and Arabic *(Pref. Pseudep.* Stuttg. 1840, page 66 sq.); but the original Arabic text has not yet been published.

The three versions were all made directly from a Greek text. This is evidently the case with regard to the Latin (Lücke, *Versuch einer vollst. Einitung*, 1:149) and the Ethiopic (Van der Vlis, *Disputatio; critica de Ezrae lib. apocr.* page 75 sq.), and apparently so with regard to the Arabic. A clear trace of a Greek text occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas (c. 12 =2 Ezra 5:5), but the other supposed references in the apostolic fathers are very uncertain (e.g. Clem. 1:20; Herm. *Past.* 1:1, 3, etc.). The next witness to the Greek text is Clement of Alexandria, who expressly quotes the book as the work of "the prophet Ezra" *(Strom.* 3, 16, § 100). A question, however, has been raised whether the Greek text was not itself a translation from the Hebrew (Bretschneider, in Henke's *Mus.* 3:478 sq., ap. Lucke *1.*c.); but the arguments from language, by which the hypothesis of a Hebrew (Aramaic) original is supported, are wholly unsatisfactory; and, in default of direct evidence to the contrary, it must be supposed that the

book was composed in Greek. This conclusion is farther strengthened by its internal character, which points to Egypt as the place of its composition. The idea of a Hebrew original has now been pretty generally given up by scholars, despite the positive assertion of Galatinus *(De Arcanis Catholice Veritatis)* that a copy of it was reported to exist among the Jews at Constantinople in his day, and it is commonly believed that it was written in Greek. Although the Greek is lost, yet there can be no doubt that the *Old Latin* version, through which alone this book has been known to us till lately, was a translation from that language. This is evident from the fact that it imitates the Greek idiom in making the adjective in the comparative degree govern *a genitive case,* and not, as in Latin, *an ablative,* and introduces other Gracisms, which are barbarous, in the version (comp. 2:24; 5:13, 26, 39; 6:25, 31, 46, 57; 7:5; 8:7, 8, 38, 44; 9:14; 11:42). This is, moreover, corroborated by the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, as well as the quotation from this book in the fathers (see below, sect. 5), which prove the very early existence of it in Greek. It is, however, equally certain that many of the things contained in this book are of Palestinian origin, and are still to be found in Hebrew or Aramaic dispersed through the Talmud and Midrashim.

The common Latin text, which is followed in the English version, contains two important interpolations (chapter 1, 2; 15, 16) which are not found in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, and are separated from the genuine Apocalypse in the best Latin MSS. Both of these passages are evidently of Christian origin: they contain traces of the use of the Christian Scriptures (e.g. 1:30, 33, 37; 2:13, 26, 45 sq.; 15:8, 35; 16:54), and: still more they are pervaded by an anti-Jewish spirit. Thus, in the opening chapter, Ezra is commanded to reprove the people of Israel for their continual rebellions (1:1-23), in consequence of which God threatens to cast them off (1:24-32), and to "give their houses to a people that shall come." But, in spite of their desertion, God offers once more to receive them (2:1-32). The offer is rejected (2:33), and the heathen are called. Then Ezra sees "the Son of God" standing in the midst of a great multitude "wearing crowns and bearing palms in their hands" in token of their victorious confession of the truth. The last two chapters (15, 16) are different in character. They contain a stern prophecy of the woes which shall come upon Egypt, Babylon, Aria, and Syria, and upon the whole earth, with an exhortation to the chosen to guard their faith in the midst of all the trials with which they shall be visited (? the Decian persecution; comp. Lucke, page 186 sq.).

Another smaller interpolation occurs in the Latin version in 7:28, where *filius meus Jesus* answers to *"My Messiah"* in the Ethiopic, and to "*My Son Messiah"* in the Arabic (comp. Lucke, page 170, n., sq.). On the other hand, a long passage occurs in the Ethiopic and Arabic versions after 7:35 which is not found in the Latin (Ethiop. c. 6), though it bears all the marks of genuineness, and was known to Ambrose *(De bono mort.* 10, 11). In this case the omission was probably due to dogmatic causes. The chapter contains a strange description of the intermediate state of souls, and ends with a peremptory denial of the efficacy of human intercession after death. Vigilantius appealed to the passage in support of his views, and called down upon himself by this the severe reproof of Jerome *(Lib. c. Vigil.* c. 7). This circumstance, combined with the Jewish complexion of the narrative, may have led to its rejection in later times (comp. Lücke, page 155 sq.).

Despite the arbitrary division into chapters in our English version which sometimes interrupts a vision in the middle of a sentence, few readers will fail to see the intimate connection and the beautiful adjustment of these angelic revelations, and how every one of them forms an essential part in leading us farther and farther till we reach the climax of the apocalypse. It is owing to this remarkable unity which the whole work displays that the numerous interpolations made for dogmatic purposes have so easily been detected.

IV. *Author and Date*. — The greatest divergency of opinion prevails on this subject. The author has successively been described as a true prophet who lived B.C. 336; an impostor who flourished A.D. 160; a Jew, a Christian, a converted Jew, and as a Montanist. The whole complexion of the book, however, incontestably shows that the author of it was a Jew. His personating Ezra, the contempt and vengeance which he breathes against the Gentiles (6:50, 57), the intense love he manifests for the Jews, who alone know the Lord and keep his precepts (3:30-36), declaring that for them alone was this world created (4:63, 66; 6:55, 59; 7:10, 11), and reserving all the blessings of salvation for them (7:1-13); his view of righteousness, which consists in doing the works of the law, and that the righteous are justified and rewarded for their good works (8:33, 36); the purport of his questions, referring exclusively to the interests of this people (4:35; 6:59); the Hagadic legends about the Behemoth and Leviathan which are reserved for the great Messianic feast (6:49-52); the ten tribes (13:39-47); the restoration of the Scriptures and the writing of cabbalistic

books for the sages or rabbins of Israel (14:20-22, 31-47) — all this proves beyond doubt that the writer was a thorough Hebrew. Chapters 1, 2, 15, and 16, which contain allusions to the N.T. (compare 1:30 with Matthew 33:37-39; 2:11 with <2169>Luke 16:9; 2:12 with <6212>Revelation 22:2; 15:8 with <6660>Revelation 6:10; 16:29 with Matthew 34:10; 16:4244 with <4079>1 Corinthians 7:29), and especially the anti-Jewish spirit by which they are pervaded, as well as the name of *Jesus* in chapter 8:28, which have been the cause why some have maintained that this book is the production of a Christian, are now generally acknowledged to be later interpolations made by some Christian. (See above, sect. 3.)

As to *the date* of the book, the limits within which opinions vary are, narrower than in the case of the book of Enoch. Licke *(Versuch einervollst. Einl.* etc., ed. 2, 1:209) places it in the time of Caesar; Van der Vlis *(Disput. crit.* 1..) shortly after the death of Caesar. Laurence *(1*.c.) brings it down somewhat lower, to B.C. 28-25, and Hilgenfeld *(Jud. Apokr.* page 221) agrees with this conclusion, though he arrives at it by very different reasoning. On the other hand, Gfrorer *(Jahrh. d. Heils,* 1:69 sq.) assigns the book to the time of Domitian, and in this he is followed by Wieseler and by Bauer (Lucke, page 189 sq.), while Lücke, in his first edition, had regarded it as the work of a Hellenist of the time of Trajan. The interpretation of the details of the vision of the eagle, which furnishes the chief data for determining the time of its composition, is extremely uncertain, from the difficulty of regarding the history of the period from the point of view of the author; and this difficulty is increased by the allusion to the desolation of Jerusalem, which may be merely suggested by the circumstances of Ezra, the imaginary author; or, on the contrary, the last destruction of Jerusalem may have suggested Ezra as the medium of the new revelation. (Comp. Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep.* 2, page 189 sq., and Lucke, page 187, n., sq., for a summary of the earlier opinions on the composition of the book.) But no two expositors agree in their explanation of the vision in chapter 11 and 12, and every one finds in the "three heads," the "twelve feathered wings," and the "eight counter-feathers" such emperors, kings, and demagogues as will square with his preconceived notions as to what they shall describe. So, for instance, the learned Whiston makes the three heads to mean the kingdom of France since Francis the Great, A.D. 1515; of Spain since Ferdinand, the author of the Inquisition, A.D. 1468; and the house of Austria since the emperor Albert, A.D. 1438 — all of whom persecuted the Protestants *(Authen. Records,*

1:81). The safest and most satisfactory data for determining its age are — 1. The quotations from it in the epistle of St. Barnabas (chapter 12 with 2 Ezra 5:3) and in Clemens Alexandrinus *(Strom.* 3:16), showing beyond doubt that the book was well known at the commencement of the Christian sera, and must therefore have been written some time before to have obtained such general currency and acceptance; and, 2. The minute description which the writer gives of the pre-existence and death of the Messiah (7:29; 14:7), such as no Jew would have given at the very outset of Christianity, to which we have traced the book, when these very points were the stumbling-block to the ancient people, and formed the points of contest between Judaism and Christianity, thus showing that it must have been written before Christ. We may therefore safely assign it to about B.C. 50.

But, while the date of the book must be left undetermined, there can be no doubt that it is a genuine product of Jewish thought. Weisse *(Evangelienfrage,* page 222) alone dissents on this point from the unanimous judgment of recent scholars (Hilgenfeld, page 190 sq.); and the contrast between the tone and style of the Christian interpolations and the remainder of the book is in itself sufficient to prove the fact. The Apocalypse was probably written in Egypt; the opening and closing chapters certainly were.

V. *Canonicity and Importance.* — By many of the fathers this book was undoubtedly regarded as canonical. The quotation from it in the epistle of Barnabas is described as the saying of *a prophet* (chapter 12); the quotation by Clemens Alexandrinus is introduced in the same manner (Ἔσδρας ὁ προφήτης λέγει, *Strom.* 3:16); and Ambrose speaks of it as containing *divine revelations (De Bono Mortis,* 10, 11). The famous story about Ezra being inspired to write again the law, which was burned (14:20-48), has been quoted by Irenaeus *(adv. Haer.* 3:21, 2); Tertullian *(De Cult. afem.* 1:3); Clemens Alexandrinus *(Stromat.* 1:22); Chrysostom *(Homil.* 8 *in Heb.),* and many others. The Ethiopian Church regards it as canonical, which may be seen from the manner in which it is alluded to in the Book of Devotions called "The Organon of the blessed Virgin Mary" (written in A.D. 1240), "Open my mouth to praise the virginity of the mother of God, *as thou didst. open the mouth of Ezra?* who rested not for forty days until he had finished writing the words of the law and the prophets, which Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, had burnt" *(Prayer for Monday;* see also *Prayer for Tuesday).* St. Jerome was the first who denounced it. In

reply to Vigilantius, who, regarding this book as inspired, appealed to 12:36-45, to prove that "none would venture to intercede for others in the day of judgment," this father, playing upon the name Vigilantius, remarked, "Tu vigilans dormis, et dormiens scribis, et propinas mihi libruim *apocryphum,* qui *sub nomine Esdrae a te et similibus tui legitir,* ubi scriptum est, quod post mortem nullus pro aliis gaudeat deprecari, quem ego librum *nunquan legi,* quid enim necesse est in manus sumere, quod *Ecclesia non recepit.* Nisi forte Balsamum et Barbelum, et thesaurum Manichaei, et ridiculum nomen Leusiborae proferas; et quia radices Pyrenaei habitus, vicinusque es Hiberiae, Basilidis, antiquissimi haeretici, et imperitae scientiae incredibilia portenta prosequeris, et proponis, *quoad totius orbis auctoritate damnatur" (Ep.* 53 *ad Vigilant.).* This is a most important passage, inasmuch as it shows that those of the primitive Church who, from their knowledge of Hebrew, had the best means of ascertaining what were the canonical Scriptures of the ancient synagogue, repudiated this book as uncanonical. In the Council of Trent, the second Ezra, like the first, was excluded from the canon, and Luther denounced it as worse than AEsop's Fables. *SEE ESDRAS, FIRST BOOK OF*. But this is going too far. Historico-critical expositors of the Bible, and those who are engaged in Christological works, while regarding 2 Esdras as not belonging to the Canon, yet see in it a most important record of Jewish opinion on some vital points. It shows that the Jews, before the rise of Christianity, most distinctly believed in the immortality of the soul, that the Messiah was denominated *the Son of God,* that he *existed in heaven previous to his appearance upon earth* (14:7), and that he was to die (7:29).

One tradition which the book contains obtained a wide reception in early times, and served as a pendant to the legend of the origin of the Septuagint. Ezra, it is said, in answer to his prayer that he might be inspired to write again all the law which was burnt, received a command to take with him tablets and five men, and retire for forty days. In this retirement a cup was given him to drink, and forthwith his understanding was quickened and his memory strengthened; and for forty days and forty nights he dictated to his scribes, who wrote ninety-four books *(Latin,* 204), of which twenty-four were delivered to the people in place of the books which were lost (14:20-48). This strange story was repeated in various forms by Irenaeus *(adv. Haer.* 3:21, 2), Tertullian *(De cult. fam.* 1:3, "Omne instrumentum Judaicae literaturae per Esdram constat restauratum"), Clement of Alexandria *(Strom.* 1:22, page 410, P.; compare page 392),

Jerome *(adv. Helv.* 7; comp. Pseudo-Augustine, *De Mirab. S. Scr.* 2:32), and many others; and probably owed its origin to the tradition which regarded Ezra as the representative of the men of "the Great Synagogue" (q.v.), to whom the final revision of the canonical books was universally assigned in early times. *SEE CANON*.

Although Esdras is included in the 6th article of the Church of England, among the other books read for edification, etc. *SEE DEUTERO-CANONICAL*, it will be observed that no lessons are taken from it in the offices of the Church of England. References are, however, made from it in the Authorized Version to parallel passages in the Old and New Testament. Grabe and others have conceived that this was the book cited as the " *Wisdom of God"* (Luke 11:9; comp. with 4 Esdras 1:32).

VI. *Literature.* — Lee, *Dissertation upon the second Book of Esdras* (Lond. 1722); Whiston, *Authentic Records* (Lond. 1727), 1:44 sq.; Van der Vlis, *Disputatio Critica de Ezrae Libro Apocrypho* (Amst. 1839); Gfrorer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (Stuttgart, 1838), 1:69 sq., and *Prophets veteres Pseudepigraphi* (Stuttgart, 1840), page 66 sq.; Lucke, *Einleitung in d. Offenbarung Johannis*, 2d ed., page 138 sq.; Davidson, *The Old Testament Text Considered* (Lond. 1856), page 990 sq.; Hilgenfeld, *Die judische Apokalyptik* (Jena, 1857), page 187 sq.; Volkmar, *Das vierte Buch Ezra* (Zurich, 1858); Keil, *Einleitung in d. Alte Testament* (1859,1863), page 734 sq.; Tresenreuter, *De libro quarto Esdrae* (Cobl. 1742); Vogel, *De quarto libro Esdrae* (in his *Progr. de Conjecturae usu em crisi N.T.* page 48 sq.); Ewald, *Das vierte Ezrabuch* (Gott. 1864); Calinet, *Sur le quatrieme livre d'Esdras* (in his *Commentaire*, 3:253 sq.); Greswell, *Second Book of Esdras* in his *Parables*, V, 2:280 sq.). See especially Hilgenfeld in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1858-67; Benslev, *The Missing Fragments qfthe Fourth Book of Ezra* (Lond. 1878, 4to).

Es'ebon, They Of

(οιἘσεβωνίται v. r. οἱ Ἐσεβών, Vulg. *Hesebon),* a Graecized form of the name of certain Canaanites beyond Jordan referred to in the Apocrypha (Jude 5:15) as having been destroyed by the Israelites; evidently the inhabitants of HESHBON *SEE HESHBON* (q.v.) of the O.T. (Numbers 21:26).

Ese'brias

(Ἐσερεβίας, Vulg. *Sedebias),* the first named of the ten priests separated with ten others by Ezra to transport the silver and gold from Babylon to Jerusalem (1 Esd. 8:54); evidently the SHEREBIAH *SEE SHEREBIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<150824>Ezra 8:24).

E'sek

(Hebrew *id.* qc,[e, *quarrel;* Sept. and Vulg. translate Ἀδικία, *calumnia,* as if reading qv,[ ), a well (raeB]) containing a spring of water, which the herdsmen of Isaac dug in the valley of Gerar, and which received its name because the herdmen of Gerar quarreled Wqv][it]hi, *wrangled,* Sept. ἠδίκησαν, Vulg. evasively, A.V. "strove;" but different from the Wbyr]Y;wi of the preceding clause, ἐμαχήσαντο, *jurgiun fuit,* "strove") with him for the possession of it (<012620>Genesis 26:20). Isaac seems to have therefore relinquished it. It appears not to have been one of those which Abraham had previously dug (verse 18; the contest there was a question of *title,* here of *possession).* There are still several wells in this vicinity. *SEE GERAR.*

Esh'baal

[some *Esh-ba'al]* (Hebrew *Esba'al,* l [Biv]a, in pause l [B;v]a, *man of Baal;* Sept. Ἀσαβάλ v.r. Ἰεβάλ and Βαάλ, Vulg. *Esbaal),* the appropriate name of the fourth son of king Saul, according to the genealogy of <130833>1 Chronicles 8:33 and 9:39. He is doubtless the same person (see <093102>1 Samuel 31:2, compared with <100208>2 Samuel 2:8) as ISH-BOSHETH *SEE ISH-BOSHETH* (q..v.), since it was the practice to change the obnoxious name of *Baal* into *Bosheth* or *Besheth,* as in the case of Jerub-besheth for Jerub-baal, and (in this very genealogy) of Merib-baal for Mephi-bosheth: compare also <280910>Hosea 9:10, where Bosheth (A.V. "shame") appears to be used as a synonym for Baal. *SEE BAAL.*

Esh'ban

(Hebrew *Eshban',* ˆB;v]a, *man of considera*tion; Sept. Ἀσεβάν and Ἐσεβάν v. r. Ἀσεβών, Vulg. *Eseban),* the second named of the four sons of Dishan (<013626>Genesis 36:26, A.V. "Dishon") or Dishon (<130141>1 Chronicles 1:41), the son of Seir the Horite. B.C. post 1963.

Esh'col

(Hebrew *Eshkol',* lKoʲa,[twice plenu l/Kvʲa, <041324>Numbers 13:24; 33:9], a *bunch* of grapes), the name of a man and also of a place.

1. (Sept. Ἐσχώλ, Josephus Ἐσχώλης, Vulg. *Eschol.)* A young Amoritish chieftain, who, with his brothers Mamre and Aner, being in alliance with Abraham, when the latter resided near Hebron, joined him in the recovery of Lot from the hands of Chedorlaomer and his confederates (<011413>Genesis 14:13, 24; comp. 13:18). B.C. cir. 2085. According to Josephus *(Ant.* 1:10, 2) he was the foremost of the three brothers, but the Bible narrative leaves this quite uncertain (comp. verse 13 with 24). Some have thought that the name of Eshcol remained attached to one of the fruitful valleys in that district till the arrival of the Israelites (<041324>Numbers 13:24), who then interpreted the appellation as significant of the gigantic "cluster" (in Hebr. *eshcol)* which they obtained there; but this does not accord with the independent origin of the latter name as assigned in the narrative (see below).

2. A *wady* (l jṅ; winter-torrent; Sept. and Vulg. [translating likewise the name itself] φάραξ βότρυος, *vallis botri,* or [<041324>Numbers 13:24] *Nehelescol;* A.V. "brook" and "valley") in which the Hebrew spies obtained the fine cluster of grapes which they took back with them, borne " on a staff between two," as a specimen of the fruits of the Promised Land (<041324>Numbers 13:24). The cluster was doubtless large; but the fact that it was carried in this manner does not, as usually understood, imply that the bunch was as much as two men could carry, seeing that it was probably so carried to prevent its being bruised in the journey. *SEE GRAPE*. From the fact that the name had existed in this neighborhood centuries before, when Abraham lived there with the chiefs Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, not Hebrews, but Amorites (see <011413>Genesis 14:13), many have supposed that the appellation in this instance ("because of the cluster, l/Kvʲah; Sept. βότρυς, Vulg. *torrens botri)* was merely the Hebrew way of appropriating the ancient name derived from that hero into the language of the conquerors, consistently with the paronomastic turns so much in favor at that time, and with a practice traces of which are deemed to appear elsewhere; but it is more probable that the same reason which led the Israelites to apply to the valley such a designation, had operated also among the original possessors of the soil. In that case the Amoritish

chieftain may have been so called (that dialect being doubtless akin to the Heb.) from his fertile region. From the terms of two of the notices of this transaction (Numbers 32:9; Deuteronomy 1:24), it might be inferred that Eshcol was the farthest point to which the spies penetrated; but this would contradict the express statement of Numbers 13:21, that they went as far northward, as Rehob. They must, therefore, either have carried the bunch of grapes this whole distance and back, or, as is more likely, they cut it on their return. From the context (Numbers 13:22), the valley in question seems to have been in the vicinity of Hebron. Accordingly, the valley through which lies the commencement of the road from Hebron to Jerusalem is traditionally indicated as that of Eshcol. This valley is now full of vine. yards and olive-yards, the former chiefly in the valley itself, the latter.up the sides of the inclosing hills. "These vineyards are still very fine, and produce the finest and largest grapes in all the country" (Robinson, *Researches,* 1:317). Eusebius, however *(Onomast.* s.v. φάραγξ βότρυος), places it, with some hesitation, at Gophna, 15 miles north of Jerusalem, on the Neapolis road. By Jerome it is given as north of Hebron, on the road to Bethsur *(Epitaph. Paulae).* The Jewish traveler Ha-Parchi speaks of it as north of the mountain on which the (ancient) city of Hebron stood (Benjamin of Tudela, ed. Asher, 2:437); and here the name has apparently been observed still attached to a spring of remarkably fine water called *'Ain-Eskali,* in a valley which crosses the vale of Hebron north-east and southwest, and about two miles north of the town (Van de Velde, *Narrative,* 2:64). Dr. Rosen, however, still more recently, writes the name as *Ain el-Rashkala (Zeitschr. d. morpenl. Gesellsch.* 1858, page 481).

Esh'eän

[some *E'sheän]* (Hebrews *Eshan',* ˆ2P[va, a *prop;* Sept. Ἐσάν v.r. Σομά, Vulg. *Esaan),* a city in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Dumah and Janum (Joshua 15:52), situated in the group west by south of Hebron (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.). Vai de Velde thinks *(Memoir,* pages 310, 311) the place may be the same as Ashan (q.v.); but this is inadmissible, partly because of the difference in the name (ˆvae), and partly because the only Ashan mentioned in Scripture lay in the low country (Joshua 15:42; comp. verse 33), while Eshean is expressly placed in the hill country of Judah (verses 48, 52). To escape this last and fatal objection, Van de Velde follows Von Raumer *(Palist.* page 173) in supposing two Ashans, one in the mountains of Judah, and the other in the

southern plain of Palestine, belonging to Simeon; but that the Ashen of Judah and that of Simeon were one and the same, is evident from comparing <061542>Joshua 15:42 and 19:9, where Ether appears as in the vicinity of both, and <061907>Joshua 19:7 with <130432>1 Chronicles 4:32, where the same is the case with Ain-Rimilon. Still, although Eshean cannot thus be identified with the Chor-ashan of <093030>1 Samuel 30:30, we may perhaps adopt Van de Velde's location of the former at the ruins of *Khursa* (Robinson's *Researches,* in, Append. page 116), not far south-west of Hebron (Stewart, *Tent,* page 224).

E'shek

(Hebrews *id.* qv,[e, *oppression;* Sept. Ἐσελέκ *v.* r. Ἀσήλ, Vulg. *Esec):* brother of Azel (q.v.), a Benjamite, one of the late descendants of king Saul; he was the father of several sons, among them Ulam, the founder of a large and noted family of archers, lit. "treaders of the bow" (<130839>1 Chronicles 8:39). B.C. ante 588. They are omitted in the parallel list of <130935>1 Chronicles 9:35-44.

Eshel

SEE TAMARISK.

Esh'kalonite

(Hebrews collect. with the art. *ha-Eshkeloni',* ynæl qv]a,h; Sept. οἈσκαλωνίτης, Vulg. *Ascalonite,* A.V. "the Eshkalonites"), the patrial designation (<061303>Joshua 13:3) of the inhabitants of ASHKELON *SEE ASHKELON* (q.v.).

Esh'taol

(Hebrews *Eshtaol',* l/aT;v]a [but defectively laT;v]a, in <071325>Judges 13:25; 18:2, 8, 11], according to Fürst, narrow *pass,* but Gesenius suggests *perhaps petition;* Sept. Ἀσθαώλ v.r. [in <071305>Judges 13:5] Ἐσδαόλ, *Vulg. Esthaol* or [in <061533>Joshua 15:33] *Estaob),* a town in the low country of Judah, the Shephelah or plain of Philistia. It is the first of the first group of cities in that district (<061533>Joshua 15:33) enumerated with Zoreah (Hebrews *Zareah),* or Zorah, in company with which it is commonly mentioned. Zorah and Eshtaol were two of the towns allotted to the tribe of Dan out of Judah (<061941>Joshua 19:41). Between them, and behind Kirjath-jearim, was

situated Mahaneh-Dan, the camp or stronghold which formed the head-quarters of that little community during their constant encounters with the Philistines. Eshtaol was one of the great strongholds of the Danites, and its inhabitants, with these of Zorah, were noted for their daring. *SEE DAN*. The 600 men who captured and colonized Laish were natives of these two towns (Judges 18). Here, among the old warriors of the tribe, Samson spent his boyhood, and experienced the first impulses of the Spirit of Jehovah; and hither, after his last exploit, his mangled body was brought, up the long slopes of the western hills to its last rest in the burying-place of Manoah his father (07035Judges 13:25; 16:31; 18:2, 8, 11, 12). In the genealogical records of 1 Chronicles the relationship between Eshtaol, Zareah, and Kirjathjearim is still maintained (1005 1 Chronicles 2:53). In the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome (s.v. Ἀσθαώλ and Ἐσθαώλ), Eshtaol is twice mentioned —

(1) as *Astaol* of Judah, described as then existing between Azotus and Ascalon under the name of *Astho* (Ἀσθώ);

(2) as *Esthaul* of Dan, ten miles north of Eleutheropolis. The latter position is quite in accordance with the indications of the Bible. It is connected with Zorah, Zanoah, and Bethshemesh (0653Joshua 15:33; 19:41); and as these three places have been identified, we may conclude that Eshtaol was situated close to the foot of the mountains of Judah, and in or near wady Surar. Schwarz *(Palest.* page 102) mentions a village named *Stual,* west of Zorah, but, apart from the fact that this is corroborated by no other traveler and by no map, the situation is too far west to be "behind Kirjath-jearim" if the latter be Kuryet el-Enab. The village marked on the maps of Robinson and Van de Velde, as *Yeshua,* and alluded to by the former *(Researches,* new ed., 3:154, who states that the name is pronounced *Eshwa),* is nearer the requisite position. Yeshua lies at the eastern extremity of the broad valley which runs up among the hills between Zorah and Bethshemesh. The mountains rise steep and rugged immediately behind it, but the village is encompassed by fruitful fields and orchards. Zorah occupies the top of a conical hill scarcely two niles westward, and a lower ridge connects the hill with the mountains at Yeshua. Upon that ridge the permanent camp, or gathering-place of Dan (07035Judges 13:25) was probably fixed (Robinson, *Later Res.* page 153 sq.). *SEE MAHANEH-DAN*.

Esh'taulite

[many *Esh'taulite]* (Hebrews collect. with the art. *ha-Eshtaili'*, y l æaT,v]a,h; Sept. οιἘαθαωλαῖοι v.r. ὑἱοὶ Ἐσθαάμ,Vulg. *Esthaolitae,* A.V. "the Eshtaulites"), the designation of the inhabitants of ESHTAOL *SEE ESHTAOL* (q.v.), who, with the Zareathites, were at a later period among the families of Kirjath-jearim (<130253>1 Chronicles 2:53).

Eshtemno'a

[many *Eshtem'oa]* (Hebrews *Eshtemo'd,* [/mT]v]a,[but defectively [moT]v]a,in 1 Chronicles], *obedience* Sept. in <062114>Joshua 21:14 Ἐσθεμώ, in 1 Samuel Εσθιέ, in <130417>1 Chronicles 4:17, 19 Ἐσθαιμών v.r. Ἐσθεμών *and* Ἐσθημωνή, in <130657>1 Chronicles 6:57 [42] Ἐσθαμώ v.r. Ἐσταμώ; *Vulg 'Esthamo,* but *Estemo* in Josh., and *Esthemo* in 1 Chronicles vi) or Esh'temoh (Hebrews *Eshtemoh',* hmoT]v]a, by an interchange of final gutturals, <061550>Joshua 15:50; Sept. Ἐσθεμώ, Vulg. *Istemo),* a town of Judah, in the mountains; mentioned between Jattir and Holon (<062114>Joshua 21:14; <130657>1 Chronicles 6:57), and Letween Anab and Anim (<061550>Joshua 15:50). With its "suburbs" Eshtemoa was allotted to the priests (<062114>Joshua 21:14; <130657>1 Chronicles 6:57). It was one of the places frequented by David and his followers during the long period of their wanderings; and to his friends there he sent presents of the spoil of the Amalekites (<093028>1 Samuel 30:28; comp. verse 31). In the lists — half genealogical, half topographical — of the descendants of Judah, Eshtemoa occurs as having been founded or rebuilt by an Ezrahite called Ishbah (<130417>1 Chronicles 4:17) (q.v.), perhaps the same with Naham of verse 19 *SEE MERED*, where the place has the dubious epithet of "Maachathite" (q.v.). Others, however, regard the Eshtemoa there named as a *person* from Maachah Eusebius and Jerome simply mention the place as "a very large village" in the Daroma, in the province of Eleutheropolis *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἐσθεμά, Esthemo). There is little doubt that it has been discovered thy Dr. Robinson at *Semu'a,* a village seven or eight miles south of Hebron, on the great road from el-Milh, containing considerable ancient remains, and in the neighborhood of other villages still bearing the names of its companions in the list of Joshua 15: Debir, Socoh, Jattir, etc., and itself the last inhabited place toward the desert *(Researches,* 2:194; comp. Schwarz, *Palest.* page 105). It is a considerable village, situated on a low hill, with broad valleys round about; not susceptible of much tillage, but full of flocks and herds all in fine order.

In several places there are remains of walls built of very large stones, bevelled, but left rough in the middle, several of them more than ten feet in length. There are the ruins of a castle at this place, with one tower tolerably perfect, but it is probably of Saracenic origin (Robinson, *Researches,* 2:627; Wilson, *Lands of Bible,* 1:355). A city Shema is also mentioned in the south of Judah (<06556>Joshua 15:26); too far south, however, to correspond to Semua.

Es'hton

(Heb., Eshton', ˆ/Tvb, according to Gesenius *uxorious,* according to Furst *careless;* Sept. Ἀσσαθών, Vulg. *Esthon),* a son of Mehir, and grandson of Chelub, of the tribe of Judah (<13011>1 Chronicles 4:11). B.C. ante 1618. Among his four sons and one grandson enumerated (verse 12) as "the men of Recah," two (Beth-rapha and Ir-nahash) seem, however, to be rather names of places.

Eskridge, Vernon

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church (South), was born in Westmoreland County, Virginia, October 26, 1803. His early education was neglected, and on this account he hesitated to enter the ministry, to which he felt strong leanings; but on the death of his young wife and child he hesitated no longer, and in 1827 he began to preach as an itinerant minister. In this service he labored faithfully until 1837, when ill health compelled him to retire from the itineracy, though he still preached diligently as his health would allow. In 1851 he was appointed chaplain in the U.S. Navy, and during his service in the Cumberland in 1852 some twenty were converted, including captain Upshur. On his return to Portsmouth, Va., the yellow fever was raging there. He devoted himself night and day to the service of the sick, and on Sept. 4,1855, he was taken with the disease, and died September 11. — Sprague, *Annals,* 7:735.

Es'li

(Ἐσλί v.r. Ἐσλεί), son of Naggai and father of Naum, of the maternal ancestors of Christ after the exile (<42325>Luke 3:25); apparently identical with ELIOENAI, the son of Meariah and father of Johanan (<13023>1 Chronicles 3:23, 24). *SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).*

Esne, Esna, or Esneh

"the hieroglyphic *Sen,* and the Greek *Latopolis* or *Lattpolis* — the city of the latus fish or *Latus nobilis,* from the fish there worshipped — is a small and badly-built town of Upper Egypt, and is situated on the left bank of the Nile, in lat. 250 15' N. The central portion of Esne has edifices of colored brick. It contains about 4000 inhabitants, of whom 1500 are Copts, and has some manufactories of blue cotton and pottery. There are famous ruins at Esne, which consist of a sandstone temple, with a portico of four rows of six columns, which appears to have been founded by Thothmes III, whose name is seen on the jambs of a door. The temple, however, seems to have been restored or principally constructed by Ptolemy Euergetes (B.C. 246-222), and the pronaos was erected in the reign of the emperor Claudius (A.D. 41-54), and completed in that of Vespasian. The interior is of the date of Trajan, the Antonines, and Geta, whose name, erased or replaced by that of Caracalla, is there found. The great temple was dedicated to Chnumis, Satis and Har-Hek. It has a zodiac like that of Denderah. formerly thought to be of the most remote antiquity, but now known to be no older than the Romans. A smaller temple with a zodiac, erected in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes, formerly stood at E'Deyr, 21 miles north of Esne, but it has been destroyed. At Esne is also a stone quay, bearing the names of M. Aurelius. This city was the capital of a nome, and the coins struck in it in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 127-128) represent the fish latus. See Champollion, *Not. Descrip.* p. 283; Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt.* 2:268; Tochon d'Annecy, *Midailles."*

Esnig

(or ESNAG, EZNIG, EZNAG), one of the most prominent men of the Armenian Church. He was born in 397, at Gochp or Golp, a place near Mount Ararat, and was one of the pupils of the patriarch Isaak and of Saint Mesrop. As he was acquainted with the Syrian language, he was sent in 425, together with Joseph of Palin, to Edessa, in order to translate the writings of the Syrian Church fathers into Armenian. After finishing this work they went to Constantinople, learned the Greek language, and began the translation of Greek works. On returning home in 431 they took with them many writings of Greek fathers, the acts of the synods of Nice and Ephesus, and a correct copy of the Alexandrine version. From the latter the Armenian version of the Bible, in which Esnig cooperated, was made. Many other theological works were translated by him, and he is one of the

six learned Armenians to whom the honorary title "Targmanitschk" (translators) was given. In 449 Esnig was present at the national synod of Artachad, which replied to the Persian king's demand upon the Armenians to embrace the doctrine of Zoroaster. He died about 478, as bishop of Bagrewand. Besides the numerous translations of foreign works, Esnig wrote an original work against heresies. It is divided into four books, of which the first is directed against the pagans, the second against the Parsees, the third against the Greek philosophers, and the fourth against the Marcionites and Manichaeans. This work contains some valuable information on the Parsees and on. the system of Marcion which is not known, from any other source. It has been published at Smyrna (1762): and at Venice (1826), and a French translation has appeared by Le Vaillant de Florival *(Refutation des different Sectes des paiens*, Paris, 1853. Parts of it have been translated into German by Neumann (in Hermes, volume 33, and in *Zeitschriftfar histor. Theolog.* 1834) and by Dr. Windischmann *(Bayrische Annalen*, 1834), and into Latin by Dr. Petermann (in his *grammat. ling. Armen.* pages 44-48). A Latin translation of the whole work was promised by the distinguished Orientalist, Dr. Windischmann, but it has never appeared. An appendix to the Venice edition contains a "collection of sentences drawn from the Greek fathers, and in particular from St. Nilus." In point of style, Esnig is counted among the classics of Armenian literature.Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:163; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* <011608>*Genesis* 16:886; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:711; Neumann, *Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Lit.* (Tub. 1841). (A.J.S.)

Eso'ra

(properly LESSRA, Αἰσωρά, Vulg. omits), a place fortified by the Jews on the approach of the Assyrian army under Holofernes (Judith 4:4). The name may be the representative of the Hebrew word HAZOR or ZORAH (Simonis, *Onom. N.T.* page 19). The Syriac reading *(Bethchorn)* suggests BETHI-HORON, which is not impossible.

Esoteric

(Greek ἐσωτερικός), scientific as opposed to popular; applied, especially with regard to the ancient mysteries, to doctrines taught only to the initiated, as distinguished from *exoteric*. (ἔξω, *without)* doctrines, which could be taught to the vulgar and uninitiated. "The philosophy of the Pythagoreans, like that of the other sects, was divided into the *cxoteric* and

the *esoteric;* the open, taught to all; and the secret, taught to a select number" (Warburton, *Div. Leg.* book 2, note B B). "According to Origen, Aulus Gellius, Porphyry, and Jamblichus, the distinction of eso*teric* and *exoteric* among the Pythagoreans was applied to the disciples, according to the de.ree of initiation to which they had attained, being fully admitted into the society, or being merely postulants (Ritter, *Hist. Plilos.*, French transl., 1:248). Plato is said to have had doctrines which he taught publicly to all, and other doctrines which he taught only to a few, in secret. There is no allusion to such a distinction of doctrines in the writings of Plato. Aristotle *(Physica,* 4:2) speaks of opinions of Plato which were not written. But it does not follow that these were secret. Aristotle himself frequently speaks of some of his writings as *exoteric,* and others as acroamatic or *esoteric.* The former treat of the same subjects as the latter, but in a popular and elementary way, while the *esoteric* are more scientific in their form and matter (Ravaisson, *Essai sur la Metaph. d'Aristote,* t. 1, c. 1; Tucker, *Light of Nature,* volume 2, chapter 2)." — Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy,* s.v.

Espen Zeger Bernhard Van,

one of the most celebrated writers on the ecclesiastical law in the 18th century, was born at Louvain July 9,1646. He studied theology and philosophy at the university of his native city, and after having been ordained priest in 1673, lie was two years later made *Doctor Juris* (doctor of law), and appointed professor of canonical law at the *Collegium Adrianum* at the University. He lived very retired, devoting his whole time to study, but such became soon his reputation that he was consulted by a number of princes, bishops, tribunals and learned corporations. Many of his opinions, however, particularly on the Congregation of the Index. on dispensations, immunities, exemptions, the royal placet; and the appeal from the ecclesiastical to civil power, were note favorable to the pretensions of the popes, and in 1704 and 1734 all his works were put on the Index. His defense of the consecration of a Jansenist archbishop at Utrecht caused in 1728 his suspension from all priestly functions, as well as from his chair at the University. All demands made upon him by the archbishop of Malines to revoke his opinions he firmly refused. He fled to Amersfort, a common refuge of Jansenist exiles, where he died October 2, 1728, at the advanced age of 82 years. Van Espen is universally classed among the ablest writers on ecclesiastical law, and even pope Benedict did not withhold a recognition of his ability. The best edition of his works is

the one published by Baren *(Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum,* 5 volumes, Louvain, 1753-65; also Cologne, 1777, 5 volumes; Mentz, 1791, 3 volumes). An abstract of this work was published by Oberhauser (Augsburg, 1782; Cilli. 1791). — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 3:711; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 16:410; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 4:164; G. du Pac de Bellegarde, *Vie de Van Espen* (Louvain, 1767). (A.J.S.)

Espousals

1. Among the Jews this was the ceremony of betrothing, or coming under obligation for the purpose of marriage, and was a mutual agreement between the parties which usually preceded the marriage some time. The espousals frequently took place years before the parties were married. *SEE BETROTHAL; SEE MARRIAGE.*

2. In the early Christian Church espousals differed from marriage. The two terms are in early writers *sponsalia* and *ntuptiae.* Certain preliminaries were necessary before persons could complete a marriage: they consisted in a mutual contract or agreement between the parties concerning their marriage to be performed within a certain limited time, which contract was confirmed by certain gifts or donations, called *arrhae* or *arrhabones,* the earnest of marriage; as also by a ring, a kiss, a dowry, a writing or instrument of dowry, with a sufficient number of witnesses to attest it. The free consent of parties contracting marriage was declared necessary by the old Roman law, which was confirmed by Diocletian, and inserted by Justinian in his code. When the contract was made, it was usual for the man to bestow presents on the woman: these were sometimes called *sponsalia,* espousals, and sometimes *sponsalitiae donationes,* espousal-gifts, or *arrhae* and *pignora,* pledges of future marriage, because the giving and receiving them was a confirmation of the contract. These donations were publicly recorded. The ring was then presented to the woman as a further confirmation of the contract, and does not appear to have been given in the actual solemnization of marriage. Bingham, in proof of this, quotes the words of pope Nicholas I, and also refers to Ambrose and Tertullian. The origin of the marriage-ring has been traced to the tenth century, and is supposed to have been introduced in imitation of the ring worn by bishops. Isidorus Hispalensis refers to the marriage-ring in this language: *Quod autem in nuptiis annulus a sponso sponsae datur, id fit vel propter mutuae dilectionis signum, vel propter id magis, ut hoc pignore corda eorum jungantur; unde et quarto digito annulus inseritur, ideo*

quod vena quaedam (ut fertur) sanguinis ad cor usque perveniat: "The reason why a ring is given by the bridegroom to the bride is either as a mark of mutual love, or rather a pledge of the union of their hearts; mnd the reason for its being placed on the fourth finger is because a certain vein (as it is said) reaches thence to the heart." The kiss was solemnly given, with the joining together of the hands of the betrothed. The dowry settled upon the woman was by a stipulation made in writing, or by public instruments under hand and seal. Chosen witnesses were present, the friends of each party, and their number was generally ten. Occasionally a ministerial benediction was used in espousals as well as in marriage. *SEE MARRIAGE*. — Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* s.v.; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 22, chapter 3; Procter, *On Common Prayer,* page 401.

Espouse

(properly (c ria; *aras',* <100314>2 Samuel 3:14, to *betroth*, as elsewhere rendered; μνηστεύομαι, <400118>Matthew 1:18; <420127>Luke 1:27; 2:5; less correctly for hN;t uji} *chat thunnah',* Cant. 3:11, *nuptials;* t/lWlB] *keluloth',* <240202>Jeremiah 2:2, the *bridal state,* i.e., condition of a bride before marriage; ἁρμόζομαι. <471102>2 Corinthians 11:2, to *cause to be married,* i.e., negotiate the match). Espousal was a ceremolny of betrothing, or coming under obligation for the purpose of marriage, and was a mutual agreement between the two parties which usually preceded the marriage some considerable time. *SEE MARRIAGE*. The reader will do well carefully to attend to the distinction between espousals and marriage, as espousals in the East are frequently contracted years before the parties are married, and sometimes in very early youth. This custom is alluded to figuratively, as between God and his people (<240202>Jeremiah 2:2), to whom he was a husband (21:32), and the apostle says he acted as a kind of assistant *(pronuba)* on such an occasion: "I have espoused you to Christ" (<471102>2 Corinthians 11:2); have drawn up the writings, settled the agreements, given pledges, etc., of your union (compare <235405>Isaiah 54:5; <402506>Matthew 25:6; Revelation 19). *SEE BETROTH.*

Es'ril

(Ἐσρίλ v.r. Ἐζρίλ, Vulg. omits), one of the Israelites, "sons of Ozora," who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (1 Esd. 9:34); corresponding in position with the SHARAI *SEE SHARAI* (q.v.) of the Hebrew text

(<15040>Ezra 10:40), although the form is confused with that of Azaelus =Azareel following it.

Es'rom

(Ἐσρώμ v.r. Ἐσρών), a Graecized form (<40103>Matthew 1:3; <42035>Luke 3:35) of the name of HEznoc (q.v.), the grandson of Judah (<13025>1 Chronicles 2:5).

Ess, Karl van

a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Warburg, in Westphalia, September 25, 1770. He entered the Benedictine order in 1788, and in 1801 became prior of the Abbey of Huysburg, near Halberstadt. Together with his cousin, Leander van Ess (q.v.), he published a German translation of the Bible (Brunswick, 1807, and a great many editions since), which had an immense circulation until it was forbidden by the pope. Being appointed in 1811, by the bishop of Paderborn, episcopal commissary, he abandoned his liberal views. He wrote a brief history of religion *(Entweurf einer kurzen Geschichte der Religion*, Halberstadt, 1817), which called forth several replies. He died October 22, 1824. — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 19:488.

Ess, Leander van

a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, and cousin of the preceding one, was born a Warburg, in Westphalia, February 15, 1772. At an early age he entered the Benedictine abbey of Marienmünster, in the diocese of Paderborn. In 1813 he was appointed pastor at Marburg, and extraordinary professor at the university of that city; and later he also became assistant director of the normal school. No priest in the Roman Catholic Church of the 19th century showed so, great a zeal for the circulation of the Bible as Leander van Ess. Aided byhis cousin Karl (q.v.), he prepared a German translation of tihe New Testament, and enlisted the British and Foreign Bible Societe in its circulation. A translation of the Old Testament he published in 1819 (Nuremberg). He also published an edition of the Vulgate (1822), and an edition of the Greek New Testament cut from the Vatican manuscript (1824). The pope was highly indignant at his undertaking, and on this occasion issued one of the notorious papal bulls against Bible societies. Karl van Ess timidly receded from his liberal position, but Leander bravely maintained it. He resigned his offices at

Marburg, and devoted his time chiefly to a literary defense of his efforts in circulating the Bible. He compiled, to encourage Roman Catholic readers of the Bible, "a selection from the works of Church fathers and other great Catholic writers concerning the necessary and useful reading of the Bible" *(Auszuge aus den heil. Vateri,* etc., Leips. 1808); a Latin treatise on the authority of the original text of the Bible as compared with the Vulgate *(Pragmatica doctorum Catholicorum Tridentini circa Vulgatum decreti sensum testantium historia,* Salzburg, 1816; in German, Tub. 1824); and several other works, urging a frequent reading of the Bible by the people *(Was war die Bible der ersten Christen?* 1816; *Gedanken uber Bibel u. Bibellesen,* 1816; *Die Bible nicht ein Buch war für Priester,* 1818). He also wrote a book in defense of marriages between Protestants and Roman Catholics *(Rechtfertigung der gemischt. Ehen,* 1821). He died October 13, 1847. His very valuable library, rich in manuscripts and incunables, was purchased by the Union Theological Seminary in New York. — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 19:489.

Essence

(essentia, from *essens,* the old participle of *esse,* to be), a term in philosophy corresponding to οὐσία in Greek, and sometimes to *nature,* sometimes to *being* or *substance* in English. Augustine *(De Civ. Dei,* 12:11) derives it as follows: "*Sicut ab eo quod est sopere, vocatur sapientia; sic ab eo quod est esse, vocatur essentia."* Chauvin *(Lex. Phil.)* gives the definition, "*Totum illudper quod res est, et est id quod est."* Locke *(Essay,* book 3, chapter 3, § 15) says: *"Essence* may be taken for the very being of anything, whereby it is what it is." Locke distinguishes the *real* and the *nominal essence.* "The nominal essence depends upon the real essence; thus the *nomiinal* essence of gold is that complex idea which the word 'gold' represents, viz. 'a body yellow, heavy, malleable, fusible, and fixed;' but its real essence is the constitution of its insensible parts, on which these qualities and all its other properties depend, which is wholly unknown to us. The essence of things is made up of that common nature wherein it is founded, and of that distinctive nature by which it is formed. This latter is commonly understood when we speak of the formality, or *formalis ratio* (the formal consideration) of things; and it is looked upon as being more peculiarly the essence of things, though it is certain that a triangle is as truly made up in part of figure, its common nature, as of the three lines and angles which are distinctive and peculiar to it" (Fleming, *Vocab. of Philosophy,* s.v.).

With regard to the Trinity, the Greek writers (Athanasius and others) distinguish οὐσία (*essentia, substantia),* which denotes what is common to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, from ὑπόστασις *(persona),* which denotes what is individual, distinctive, and peculiar to the three in one. Shedd *(History of Doctrine,* 2:363) distinguishes the various scholastic terms carefully, and says of *ocaia,* or *essence,* that it "denotes that which is common to Father, Son, and Spirit. It denominates the substance, or constitutional being of the Deity, which is possessed alike and equally by each of the personal distinctions. The essence is in its own nature one and indivisible, and hence the statement in the creed respecting it affirms simple unity, and warns against separation and division. The terms 'generation' and 'procession' do not apply to it." McCosh discusses the term and its uses in his *Intuitions of the Mind* (1866, 8vo, page 152).

Essenes (Ἐσσηνοί, Josephus generally; *Esseni,* Pliny) or ESSÆANS (Ἐσσαῖοι, Josephus, *War,* 1:3, 5, etc.; Philo), a Jewish sect of mystico-ascetics, which combined foreign elements, especially Oriental and Greek, with Jewish doctrines, and with certain peculiar views and practices of their own. They rejected most of the Jewish sacrifices, and made their fellowship an exclusive one.

I. *Signification of the Name.* — This has been very variously explained, as follows:

1. Philo *(Quod omnis prob. lib. §* 12) derives it from the Greek ὅσιος, *holy.*

2. Josephus, according to Jost *(Geschichte d. Judenthums, 1:*207), seems either to derive it from the Chaldee avj; *to be quiet, to be mysterious,* because he renders ˆv,j, *the high-priest's breastplate,* for which the Sept. has λογεῖον, by ἐσσῆν, or directly from ˆv,j, in the sense of λογεῖον or λόγιον, *endowed with the gift of prophecy.*

3. Epiphanius *(Hær.* xix) takes it to be the Hebrew ˆysajæ=στιβαρὸν γένος, *the stout race.*

4. Suidas (s.v.) and Hilgenfeld *(Die jud. Apokal.* page 278) make it out to be the Aramaic form ˆyzajæ=θεωρητικοί, *seers,* and the latter maintains that this name was give en to the sect because they pretended to see visions and to prophesy.

5. Josippon ben-Gorion (lib. 4, § 6, 7, page 274 and 278, ed. Breithaupt) takes it for the Hebrews dysæj; *the pious, the puritans.*

6. De Rossi *(Meor Exaim,* c. 3), Gfrorer *(Philo,* 2:341), Dahne (Ersch und Gruber's *Encyklop.* s.v.), Nork *(Real-Worterbuch,* s.v.), Herzfeld *(Gesch'chte de V. Israel,* 2:395), and others, insist that it is the Aramaic ayS;a;= θεραπευτής, *physician,* and that this name was given to them because of the spiritual or physical cures they performed.

7. Aboth R. Nathan (c. 36), and a writer in Jost's *Annalen* (1:145), derive it from hc;[;; *to do, to perform;* the latter says that it is the Aramaic from anyce[e; and that they were so called because of their endeavors to perform the law.

8. Rappaport *(Erech Millin,* page 41) says that it is the Greek ισος, *an associate, a fellow of the fraternity.*

9. Frankel *(Zeitschrift,* 1846, page 449 sq.) and others think that it is the Hebrew expression µy[æWnx], *the retired.*

10. Ewald *(Geschichte d. V. Israel,* 4:420) is sure that it is the Rabbinic ˆz;j;, *servant (of God),* and that the name was given to them because it was their only desire to be θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ.

11. Gratz *(Geschichte d. Juden.* in, 525) will have it that it is from the Aramaic aj;S], *to bathe,* with Aleph prosthetic, and that it is the shorter form for yjeS;arp]x= tyrij}viylbeT] f, ἡμεροβαπτισταί, *hemerobaptists,* a name given to this sect because they baptized themselves early in the morning.

12. Dr. Low *(Ben Chaanaja,* 1:352) never doubts but that they were called *Essenes* after their founder, whose name he tells us was yviyæ, or *Jesse,* the disciple of Joshua b. Perachja.

13. Others, again, say that it alludes to Jesse, the father of David.

14. Others, again, submit that it is derived from the town Essa, or the place *Vadi Ossis* (compare Ewald, *Geschichte d.* V. I. 4:420).

15. Dr. Adler *(Volkslehrer,* 6:50), again, derives it from the Hebrew rsa; *to bind together, to associate,* and says that they were called µyrsa} because they united together to keep the law.

16. Dr. Cohn suggests the Chaldee root ˆvi[} *to be strong,* and that they were called y2ayVæ} because of their strengtl of mind to endure sufferings and to subdue their passions (Frankel's *Monatsch.* 7:272).

17. Oppenheim thinks that it may be the form ˆycæ{, and stands for vdQhi trh]f;ˆycæ{ or trh]f;ˆycæ{ tadij} *observers of the laws of purify and holiness (ib.).*

18. Jeilinek *(Ben Chananja,* 4:374), again, derives it from the Hebrew ˆxjo *sinus,* περίζωμα, alluding to the µypæK mentioned in the Talmud *(Bechoroth,* 30, a), i.e. *the apron* which *the Essenes* wore.

19. Others, again, derive it from a supposed form ayso} in the sense of *pious,* because it connects the Essenes with the *Chasidin,* from which they are thought to have originated. *SEE ASSIDAEANS.*

II. *Tenets and Practices.* — The cardinal doctrine of this sect was the sacredness of the inspired law of God. To this they adhered with such tenacity that they were led thereby to pay the greatest homage to Moses the lawgiver, and to consider blasphemy of his name a capital offense. They believed that to obey diligently the commandments of the Lord, to lead a pure and holy life, to mortify the flesh and the lusts thereof, and to be meek and lowly in spirit, would bring them in closer communion with their Creator, and make them the temples of the Holy Ghost, when they would be able to prophesy and perform miracles, and, like Elias, be ultimately the forerunners of the Messiah. This last stage of perfection, however, could only be attained by gradual growth in holiness, and by advancement from one degree to another. Thus, when one was admitted a member of this order, and had obtained the zyrzæ = περίζωμα, *apron,* which, from its being used to dry one's self with after the baptisms, was the symbol of purity, he attained,

1. To the state of *outward or bodily* purity by baptisms (haybm twzyrz twyqn ydyl). From bodily purity he progressed to that stage which

imposed abstinence from concubial intercourse (twçyrp ydyl haybm twyqn).

3. From this stage, again, he attained to that of *inward or spiritual* purity (hrjf ydyl haybm twçyrp).

4. From this stage, again, he advanced to that which required the banishinr of all anger and malice, and the cultivation of a meek and lowly spirit (ydyl haybm hrhf hwn[).

5. Thence he advanced to the stage of holiness (twrysj ydyl haybm hwn[).

6. Thence, again, he advanced to that wherein he was fit to be the temple of the Holy Spirit, and to prophesy (twdysj q8hr ydyl haybm).

7. Thence, again, he advanced to that state when he could perform miraculous cures and raise the dead (m8hjt ydyl vdqh twr); and,

8. Attained finally to the position of Elias, the forerunner of the Messiah (whyla ydyl m8jjt). Comp. Jerusalem Talmud, *Sabbath,* c. 1; *Shekalim,* c. 3; Bably, *Aboda Zara,* 20:6; Midrash Rabba, *Shir Hashirins init.;* and *Ben Chenanja,* 4:374.

As contact with any one who did not practice their self-imposed Levitical laws of purity, or with anything belonging to such a one, rendered them impure, the Essenes were, in the course of time, obliged to withdraw altogether from general society, to form a separate community, and live apart from the world. Their manner of life and practices were most simple and self-denying. They chiefly occupied themselves with tilling the ground, tending flocks, rearing bees, and making the articles of fool and dress required by the community (as it was contrary to their laws of Levitical purity to get anything from one who did not belong to the society), as well as with healing the sick, and studying the mysteries of nature and revelation. Whatever they possessed was deposited in the general treasury, of which there were appointed by the whole fraternity several managers, who supplied therefrom the wants of every one, so that they had all things in common; hence there were no distinctions amongst them of rich and poor, or of masters and servants. They reprobated slavery and war, and would not even manufacture martial instruments. They rose before the sun,

and did not talk about any worldly matters till they had all assembled together and offered up their national prayer for the renewal of the light of the day (/ral ryamh), whereupon they dispersed to their respective engagements, according to the directions of the overseers, till the fifth hour, or eleven o'clock when the labor of the forenoon terminated, and all reassembled, had a baptism in cold water, after which they put on their white garments, entered their refectory with as much religious solemnity as if it were the holy Temple, sat down together in mysterious silence to a common meal, which had the character of a sacrament — and may be the reason why they did not offer sacrifices in the Temple — the baker placed before each one a little loaf of bread, and the cook a dish of the most simple food, the priest invoked God's blessing upon the repast, and concluded with thanks to the Bountiful Supplier of all our wants. This was the signal of their dismissal when all withdrew, put off their sacred garments; and resumed their several employments till the evening, when they again partook of a common meal. Such was their manner of life during the week. On the Sabbath, which they observed with the utmost rigor, and on which they were more especially instructed in their distinctive ordinances, Philo tells us, "They frequent the sacred places which are called synagogues, and there they sit, according to their age, in classes, the younger sitting below the elder in becoming attire, and listening with eager attention. Then one takes up the holy volume and reads it, whilst another of the most experienced ones expounds, omitting that which is not generally known; for they philosophize on most things in symbols, according to the ancient zeal" (Quod *oensis prob. lib.* sec. 12). The study of logic and metaphysics they regarded as injurious to a devotional life. They were governed by a president, who was chosen by the whole body, and who also acted as judge. In cases of trial, however, the majority of the community, or at least a hundred members of it, were required to constitute the tribunal, and the brother who walked disorderly was excommunicated, yet he was not regarded as an enemy, but was admonished as a brother, and received back after due repentance.

As has already been remarked, the Essenes generally were celibates; their ranks had therefore to be recruited from the children of the Jewish community at large, whom they carefully trained for this holy and ascetic order. Previous to his final admission, the candidate for the order had to pass through a novitiate of two stages. Upon entering the first stage, which lasted twelve months, the novice (νεοσύστατος) *had* to cast in all his

possessions into the common treasury, and received a *spade* (σκαλίς, ἀξινάριον=dtpy) to bury the excrement (compare Deuteronomy 23:12-15*), an aproa* (περίζωμα=zyrz), used at the baptisms, and a *white robe* to put on at meals, which were the symbols of purity, and, though still an outsider, he had to observe some of the ascetic rules of the society. If, at the close of this stage, the community found that he had properly acquitted himself during the probationary year, the novice was then admitted into the second stage, which lasted two years. During this period he was admitted to a closer fellowship with the brotherhood, and shared in their lustral rites, but was still excluded from the common meals. Having passed satisfactorily through the second stage of probation, the novice was then fully received into the community (εἰς τὸν ὅμιλον), when he bound himself by awful oaths (the only occasion on which they allowed swearing) "that, in the first place, he will exercise piety towards God; and then that he will observe justice towards all men; and that he will do no harm to any one, either of his own accord or by the command of others; that he will always hate the wicked, and help the righteous; that he will ever be faithful to all men, especially his rulers, for without God no one comes to be ruler, and that if he should be ruler himself he will never be overbearing, nor endeavor to outshine those he rules either in his garments or in finery; that he will always love truth, and convince and reprove those that lie; that he will keep his hand from stealing, and his soul clear from any unjust gain; that he will not conceal anything from the members of his society, nor communicate to any one their mysteries, not even if he should be forced to it at the hazard of his life; and, finally, that he will never deliver the doctrines of the Essenes to any one in any other manner than he received them himself; that he will abstain from all species of robbery, and carefully preserve the books belonging to their sect and the names of the angels" *(War,* 2:8, 7). This last expression refers to the secrets connected with the *Tetragranmaton* (µç çrwpmh), and the other names of God and the angels comprised in the theosophy (hbkrm hç[m), and to the mysteries connected with the cosmogony (hç[m tyçarb) which played so important a part both among the Essenes and the Cabbalists.

III. *Origin and Relationship to Judaism and Christianity.* — The origin of this sect has been greatly mystified by Philo and Josephus, who, being anxious to represent their co-religionists to cultivated Greeks in a Hellenistic garb, made the Essenes resemble as much as possible the

Ascetic, Pythagorean, Platonic, and other philosophers. It has been still more mystified by the account of Pliny, who tells us that this community has prolonged its existence for thousands of Ages ("per seculorum millia — incredibile dictu — gens sterna est in qua nemo nascitur," *Hist. Nat.* 5:15). Most modern writers have shaped their description of this community according to these accounts, supposing that the Essenes are neither mentioned in the N.T. nor in the ancient Jewish writings, and hence concluding that the sect originated in Egypt or Greece, or in the philosophic systems of both countries. Hilgenfeld *(Zeits. fur wiss. Theol.,* 1867, 1, art. 6) undertakes to show the historical connection of Essenism with Parsism and Buddhism. Frankel seeks, from a number of passages in the Talmud and Midrashim, to show that Essenism is simply an order of Pharisaism, that both are sections of the Chasidim or Assidseans *SEE CHASIDIM*, and that all these three orders are frequently spoken of under the same name. That the Essenes are an order of Pharisees is distinctly stated in *Aboth R. Nathan,* c. 37, where. we are told that there are eight distinctions or orders among the Pharisees, and that *those Pharisees who live in celibacy are the Essenes* (ynaç[wtpwjm çwrp—µh µyçwrp 8j). This will, moreover, be seen from a comparison of the following practices, which Josephus describes as peculiar characteristics of *the Essenes,* with the practices of the Pharisees, as given in the Talmud and Midrashim:

1. The Essenes had four classes of Levitical purity, which were so marked that a member of the upper class had to bathe himself when he touched anything belonging to the lower class, or when he came in contact with a stranger; so also the Pharisees (comp. Josephus, *War,* 2:8, 10, with *Chagiga,* 2:7).

2. The Essenes regarded ten persons as constituting a complete number for divine worship, and held the assembly of such n, number as sacred; so the Pharisees (comp. *War,* 2, 8, 9, with *Aboth,* 3:6; *Berachoth,* 54, a).

3. The Essenes would not spit out in the presence of an assembly, or to the right hand; so the Pharisees (comp. *War,* 2:8, 9, with Jerusalem, *Berachoth,* 3:5).

4. The Essenes regarded their social meal as a sacrament; so the Pharisees (compare *War,* 2:8, 5, with *Berachoth,* 55, a).

5. The Essenes bathed before meals; so the Pharisees (comp. *War,* 2:8, 5, with *Chagiga,* 18, b).

6. The Essenes put on an apron on the lower part of the body when bathing; the Pharisees covered themselves with the *talith* (comp. *War,* 2:8, 5, with *Berachoth,* 24, b).

7. The Essenes bathed after performing the duties of nature; so the priests (comp. *War,* 2:8, 9, with *Yoma,* 28, a).

8. The Essenes abstained from taking oaths; so the Pharisees (compare *War,* 2:8, 6, with *Shebuoth,* 39, b; *Gittin,* 35, a; *Bemidbar Rabba,* 22).

9. The Essenes would not even remove a vessel on the Sabbath; so the Pharisees (compare *War,* 2:8, 9, with *Tosiphta Succa,* 3).

10. The Essenes had a steward in every place where they resided to supply the needy strangers of this order with articles of clothing and food; so the Pharisees (comp. *War,* 2:8, 4, with *Peah,* 8:7; *Baba Bathra,* 8, a; *Sabbath,* 118).

11. The Essenes believed that all authority comes from God; so the Pharisees (comp. *War,* 2:8, 7, with *Berachoth,* 58, a).

12. An applicant for admission to the order of the Essenes had to pass through a novitiate of twelve months; so the rbj among the Pharisees (compare *War,* 2:8, 7, with *Bechoroth,* 30, b).

13. The novice among the Essenes received *an apron* (περίζωμα) the first year of his probation; so the Chaber among the Pharisees (compare *War,* 2:8, 7, with *Tosiphta Demay,* c. 2; Jerusalem, *Demay,* 2:3, b; *Bechoroth,* 30, b).

14. The Essenes delivered the theosophical books, and the sacred names, to the members of their society; similarly the Pharisees (comp. *War,* 2:8, 7, with *Chagiga,* 2:1; *Kiddushim,* 1, a).

The real differences between the Essenes and the Pharisees developed themselves in the course of time, when *the extreme* rigor with wich the former sought to perform the laws of Levitical purity made them withdraw from intercourse with their fellow-men, and led them,

1. To form an isolated order;

2. To keep from marriage, because of the perpetual pollutions to which women are subject in menstruation and childbirth, and because of its being a hindrance to a purely devotional state of mind;

3. To abstain from frequenting the Temple and offering sacrifices (compare Josephus *Ant.* 18:1, 5); and,

4. Though they firmly believed in the immortality of the soul, yet they did not believe in the resurrection of the body *(War*, 2:8, 11).

To the Pharisees they stood nearly in the same relation as that in which the Pharisees themselves stood with regard to the mass of the people. The difference lay mainly in rigor of practice, and not in articles of belief. *SEE PHARISEE*.

But the best among the Jews felt the peril of Essenism as a system, and combined to discourage it. They shrank with an instinctive dread from the danger of connecting asceticism with spiritual power, and cherished the great truth which lay in the saying, "Doctrine is not in heaven." The miraculous energy which was attributed to mystics was regarded by them rather as a source of suspicion than of respect, and theosophic speculations were condemned with emphatic distinctness (Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 1853, page 62 sq., 68, 71).

As to their *connection with Christianity*, there can be no difficulty in admitting that Christ and the apostles recognised those principles and practices of the Essenes which were true and useful. Though our Savior does not mention them by the name *Essenes, which* Philo and Josephus coined for the benefit of the Greeks, yet there can be no doubt he refers to them in <40192>Matthew 19:12, when he speaks of those "who abstain from marriage for the kingdom of heaven's sake," since they were the only section of Jews who voluntarily imposed upon themselves a state of celibacy in order that they might devote themselves more closely to the service of God. Also 1 Corinthians vii can hardly be understood without bearing in mind the notions about marriage entertained by this God-fearing and self-denying order. As to other coincidences, <40534>Matthew 5:34, etc., ed <59512>James 5:12, urge the abstinence from using oaths which was especially taught by the Essenes. The manner in which Christ commanded his disciples to depart on their journey (<40608>Mark 6:8-10), is the same which these pious men adopted when they started on a mission of mercy. The primitive Christians, like the Essenes, sold their land and houses, and

brought the prices of the things to the apostles, and they had all things in common (<40402>Acts 4:32-34). John the Baptist was a parallel to this holy order, as is evident from his ascetic life (<42122>Luke 11:22); and when Christ pronounced him *to be Elias* (<40114>Matthew 11:14), he may almost be said to have declared that the Baptist had really attained to that spirit and power which the Essenes strove to obtain in their highest stage of purity. From the nature of the case, however, Essenism, in its extreme form, could exercise very little direct influence on Christianity. In all its practical bearings it was diametrically opposed to the apostolic teaching. The dangers which it involved were far more clear to the eye of the Christian than they were to the Jewish doctors. The only real similarity between Essenism and Christianity lay in the common element of true Judaism; and there is little excuse for modern writers who follow the error of Eusebius, and confound the society of the Therapeutne with Christian brotherhoods. Nationally, however, the Essenes occupy the same position as that to which John the Baptist was personally called. They mark the close of the old, the longing for the new, but without political aspirations. In place of the message of the coming "kingdom" they could proclaim only individual purity and isolation. At a later time traces of Essenism appear in the Clementines, and the strange account which Epiphanius gives of the *Osseni* (Ὀσσενοί) appears to point to some combination of Essene and pseudo-Christian doctrines *(Her.* 19). After the Jewish war the Essenes disappear from history. The character of Judaism was changed, and ascetic Pharisaism became almost impossible.

IV. *Date, Settlements, and Number of this Order.* — The fact that the Essenes developed themselves gradually, and at first imperceptibly, through intensifying the prevalent religious notions, renders it impossible to say with exactness at what degree of intensity they are to be considered as detached from the general body. The Savior and the ancient Jewish writers do not speak of them as a separate body. Josephus, however, speaks of them as existing in the days of Jonathan the Maccaboean, B.C. 143 (Ant. 13:5, 9); he then mentions Judas, an Essene, who delivered a prophecy in the reign of Aristobulus I, B.C. 106 *(War,* 1:3, 5; *Ant.* 13:11, 2). The third mention of their existence occurs in connection with Herod *(Ant.* 15:10, 5). These accounts distinctly show that the Essenes at first lived among the people, and did not refrain from frequenting the court, as Menachem the Essene was a friend of Herod, who was kindly disposed towards this order (ib.). This is, moreover, evident from the fact that there was a gate at

Jerusalem which was named after them (Ἐσσηνῶν πύλη, *War*, 5:4, 2). When they ultimately withdrew themselves from the rest of the Jewish nation, the majority of them settled on the north-west shore of the Dead Sea (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 5:17; Eusebius, *Hist.* <21017>*Ecclesiastes* 2:17), and the rest lived in scattered communities throughout Palestine and other places. Their number is estimated both by Philo and Josephus at 40930.

The obscurity of the Essenes as a distinct body arises from the fact that they represented originally a tendency rather than an organization. The communities which were formed out of them were a result of their practice, and not a necessary part of it. As a sect they were distinguished by an aspiration after ideal purity rather than by any special code of doctrines; and, like the Chasidimi of earlier times, they were confounded in the popular estimation with the great body of the zealous observers of the law (Pharisees). The growth of Essenism was a natural result of the religious feeling which was called out by the circumstances of the Greek dominion, and it is easy to trace the process by which it was matured. From the Maccaboaan age there was a continuous effort among the stricter Jews to attain an absolute standard of holiness. Each class of devotees was looked upon as practically impure by their successors, who carried the laws of purity still further; and the Essenes stand at the extreme limit of the mystic asceticism which was thus gradually reduced to shape. The associations of the "Scribes and Pharisees" (µyrbj *"the companions, the wise")* gave place to others bound by a more rigid rule; and the rule of the Essenes was made gradually stricter. Those whom Josephus speaks of as allowing marriage may be supposed to have belonged to such bodies as had not yet withdrawn from intercourse with their fellow-men. But the practice of the extreme section was afterwards regarded as characteristic of the whole class, and the isolated communities of Essenes furnished the type which is preserved in the popular descriptions.

The character of Essenism limited its spread. Out of Palestine, Levitical purity was impossible, for the very land was impure; and thus there is no trace of the sect in Babylonia. The case was different in Egypt, where Judaism assumed a new shape from its intimate connection with Greece. Here the original form in which it was molded was represented, not by direct copies, but by analogous forms, and the tendency which gave birth to the Essenes found a fresh development in the pure speculation of the Therapeuta (q.v.). These Alexandrine mystics abjured the practical labors which rightly belonged to the Essenes, and gave themselves up to the study

of the inner meaning of the Scriptures. The impossibility of fulfilling the law naturally led them to substitute a spiritual for a literal interpretation; and it was their object to ascertain its meaning by intense labor, and then to satisfy its requirements by absolute devotion. The "whole day, from sunrise to sunset, was spent in mental discipline." Bodily wants were often forgotten in the absorbing pursuit of wisdom, and "meat and drink" were at all times held to be unworthy of the light (Philo, *De vit. contempl.* § 4).

According to Credner, *Ueber Essener und Ebioniten* (in Winer's *Zeitschr. I,* 2-3, 217 sq.), the Ebionites descended from the Essenes. Grisse says (ib. page 653) that the Therapeutae, who lived in Egypt (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr. 2:*138 sq., 725), were a class of the Essenes (see Bald, *Diss. Essmos Pgythagorissantes delineatura,* Upsal. 1746); and he presumes that they existed as early as the time of Alexander the Great, and, spreading from Egypt to Palestine, there became acquainted with the Pythagorean or Oriental philosophy (comp. Josephus, Ant. 15:13). Dr. Wise thinks that the founder of the Essenes must have been an Egyptian Jew who was acquainted with the Pythagorean order, and came to Palestine about B.C. 200; and says farther that the Therapeuts (founded about B.C. 170) of Egypt and elsewhere were in name and essence an imitation of the Essenes. He asserts also that no positive traces of their messianic views are left either by Josephus or Philo, or even by the Talmud, but that, in consideration of their numerous similarities to the Egyptian Jews, they may be supposed to have entertained messianic hopes similar to the Egyptians *(The Israelite,* November 1, 1867).

V. *Literature.* — The oldest accounts we have of the Essenes are those given by Josephus, *War,* 2:8, 2-15; Ant. 12:5, 9; 15:10, 4 sq.; 18:1, 2 sq.; Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber,* § 12 sq.; Pliny, *Hist. Nater.* 5, c. 16, 17; Solinus, *Polyhist. c.* 35; Porphyry, *De Abstinentia,* page 381; Epiphanius, *ad. firer.* lib. 1; Eusebius, *Histor. Ecclesiastes* 2, c. 17. Of modern productions we have Bellermann, *Geschichtliche Nachrichten cus dem Alterthume fiber Essier und Therapeuten* (Berlin, 1821), who has studiously collected all the descriptions of this order; Gfrörer, *Philo und die judischh alexandrinische Theosophe* (Stuttgart, 1835), page 299 sq. Prideaux, *Connection of the O. and N.T.,* part 2, book 5:5; Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch alexandrinischen Religions Philosophie,* 1:467 sq.; and by the same author, the article *Essier,* in Ersch und Gruber's *Encyklopädie;* Neander, *History of the Church,* ed. Bohn, volume 1. The Essays of Frankel, in his *Zeitschrift fer die religiosen*

Interessen d. Judenthmums (Lpz. 1848), page 441 sq.; and *Monatsschrift fcir Geschichte u. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums,* 2:30 sq., 61 sq., are most important, and may be considered as having created a new epoch in the treatment of the history of this order, Adopting the results of Frankel, and pursuing the same course still further, Gratz has given a masterly treatise upon the Essenes in his *Geschichte der Juden* (Leipzig , 1856), 3:96 sq., 518 sq.; treatises of great value ale also given by Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner-Secten* (Leipzig, 1857), page 207 sq.; and Herzfeld, *Geschichte, d. V. Israel* (Nordhausen, 1857), 2:368, 388 sq. The accounts given by Ewald, *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel* (Gdttingen, 1852), 4:420 sq., and Hilgenfeld, *Die jddische Apokalyptik* (Jena, 1857), page 245 sq., though based upon Philo and Josephus, are important contributions to the literature of the Essenes; that of the latter is interesting and ingenious, but essentially onesided and subservient to the writer's theory (compare Volkmar, *Das vierte B. Fzra,* page 60). To these must be added the very interesting and important relics of the Essenes, published by Jellinek, with instructive notices by the learned editor, in *Beth la Midrash,* volume 2 (Leipzig, 1853), page 18 sq.; volume 3 (Leipzig, 1855), page 20 sq.

See also Ginsburg, *History and Doctrines of the Essenes* (Lond. 1864); Hermes, *De Essais* (Hal. 1720); Lund, *De Pimar. Sadd. et Ess is* (Abose, 1689); Sauer, *De Essenis et Therapeutis* (Vratisl. 1829); Willemer, *De 1Essenis* (Viteb. 1680); Zeller, *Ueb. d. Zusammenh. d. Essaismus mit Griechenthum* (in the *Tub. theol. Jahrb.* 1856, pages 401-433); Roth, *De Essenis (Jen.* 1669); Willemer, *id.* (Viteb. 1680); Lange, *id.* (Hal. 1721); Tresenreuter, *De Essceorum nomine* (Alt. 1743); Van der Hude, *Num discipli Joh. Bapt. fuerunt. Esscei* (Helmst. 1754); Carpzov, *Dank-cpfer an Gott.* page 282 sq.; Ernesti, *Ueb. "Porphyrius de Abstinentia"* (in his *Theol. Jibl.* 9:63 sq.); Grave, *De Pythagor. et Fssenor. discipline* (Gott. 1808); Bielcke, *De Essusis et Therapeutis* (Starg. 1755); Bittner, *De Essmis* (Jen. 1670); Credner, *Ueb. Essder and Ebioniten* (in Winer's *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* 2:211-264); Grossmann, *De ascetis Judceorumn* (Altenb. 1833); Zinck, *De, Therapeutis* (Lips. 1724). On the supposed relations of Essenism to Christianity, there are special treatises in Latin by Zorn, (in his *Opusc. Sacr.* 2:62 sq.), Kaiser (in his *Quaestion. Synodal.* [Curise, 1801], page 25 sq.), Dorfmiiller (Wunsiedel, 1803), Tinga (Groning. 1805); in German by Litderwald (in Henke's *Magaz;* 4:371 sq.), Bengel (in Flatt's *Magaez.* 7:126 sq.). See likewise the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, 3:549; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* October 1852, pages 176-186.; April,

1853, page 170 sq.; *Blackwood's Magazine,* 1840, pages 105, 463, 639; *Amer. Bibl: Repos.* January 1849, page 162 sq.; Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.fuzr wissensch. Theologie,* 1867, 1, art. 6; Illgen's *Zeitschr. fur hist. Theol. 1841,* 2:3 sq.; the Strasb. *Revue de theol.* 1867, page 221 sq.; Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.* 1855, page 315 sq.; 1850, page 401 sq.; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* July, 1867, page 450; *North British Rev.* December 1867, page 151; Pressense, *Religions before Christ,* pages 231-234; Schaff, *Apostolic Church,* pages 175, 657 sq.; Holzmann, *Gesch. d. Vodes Israel,* 1:206 sq.; Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (Strasb. 1881). *SEE SECTS, JEWISH*.

Essenius, Andrew

a Dutch theologian, was born at Bommel in February, 1618, and was educated at Utrecht, where he became pastor in 1651. In 1653 he was made professor of theology in the University of Utrecht. He died May 18, 1677. Among his writings are *Triumphus Crucis* (Amst. 1649): — *De Moralitate (Sabbati 1658): — Systema Theologicumn (1659): — Compendium Theol. Dogmas.* (1669). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 16:441.

Essentia

SEE ESSENCE.

Establishment

This term is applied to the position of that religious denomination in any country which solely or peculiarly enjoys the patronage of the state, and the clergy of which have, in consequence, their several endowments and incomes especially settled and maintained by the Legislature or government. The general tendency of opinion in all countries is now against established churches, and in favor of the voluntary principle for the support of churches. The subject is discussed at length, historically and otherwise, in the article *SEE CHURCH AND STATE* (2:329). We present here a summary of the arguments on both sides.

I. The partisans for religious establishments observe

1. that they have prevailed universally in every age and nation. The office of prophet, priest and king were united in the same patriarch (<01819>Genesis 18:19; 17 and 21; 14:18). The Jews enjoyed a religious establishment dictated and ordained by God. In turning our attention to the heathen

nations, we shall find the same incorporation of religious with civil government. (<014722>Genesis 47:22; <121727>2 Kings 17:27, 29). Every one who is at all acquainted with the history of Greece and Rome knows that religion was altogether blended with the policy of the state. The Koran may be considered as the religious creed and civil code of all the Mohammedan tribes. Among the Celts, or the original inhabitants of Europe, the Druids were both their priests and their judges, and their judgment was final. Among the Hindoos the priests and sovereigns are of different tribes or castes, but the priests are superior in rank; and in China the emperor is sovereign pontiff, and presides in all public acts of religion.

2. Again: it is said that. although there is no form of Church government absolutely prescribed in the New Testament, yet from the associating law, on which the Gospel lays so much stress, by the respect for civil government it so earnestly enjoins, and by the practice which followed and finally prevailed, Christians cannot be said to disapprove, but to favor religious establishments.

3. Religious establishments also, it is observed, are founded on the nature of man, and interwoven with all the constituent principles of human society: the knowledge and profession of Christianity cannot be upheld without a clergy; a clergy cannot be supported without a legal provision; and a legal provision for the clergy cannot be constituted without the preference of one sect of Christians to the rest. An established church is most likely to maintain clerical respectability and usefulness by holding out a suitable encouragement to young men to devote themselves early to the service of the Church, and likewise enables them to obtain such knowledge as shall quilify them for the important work.

II. They who reason on the contrary side observe

1. that the patriarchs sustaining civil as well as religious offices is no proof at all that religion was incorporated with the civil government in the sense above referred to, nor is there the least hint of it in the sacred Scriptures. That the case of the Jews can never be considered in point, as they were under a theocracy and a ceremonial dispensation that was to pass away, and consequently not designed to be a model for Christian nations. That, whatever was the practice of heathens in this respect, this forms no argument in favor of that system which is the very opposite to paganism.

2. The Church of Christ is of a spiritual nature, and ought not, yea, cannot in fact be incorporated with the state without sustaining material injury. In the three first and purest ages of Christianity the Church was a stranger to any alliance with temporal powers; and, so far from needing their aid, religion never flourished so much as while they were combined to suppress it.

3. As to the support which Christianity, when united to civil government, yields to the peace and good order of society, it is observed that this benefit will he derived from it in at least as great a degree without an establishment as with it. Religion, if it have any power, operates on the *conscience* of men; and, resting solely on the belief of invisible realities, it can derive no weight or solemnity from human sanctions. Human establishments, it is said, have been, and are, productive of the greatest evils, for in this case it is requisite to give the preference to some particular system; and as the magistrate is no better judge of religion than others, the chances are as great of his lending his sanction to the false as the true. The thousands that have been persecuted and suffered in consequence of establishments will always form an argument against them. Under establishments also, it is said, corruption cannot be avoided. Emolument must be attached to the national church, which may be a strong inducement to its ministers to defend it, be it ever so remote from the truth. Thus, also, error becomes permanent; and that set of opinions which happens to prevail when the establishment is formed, continues, in spite of superior light and improvement, to be handed down, without alteration, from age to age. Hence the disagreement between the public creed of the Church and the private sentiments of its ministers.

4. Finally, though all Christians should pay respect to civil magistrates as such, and all magistrates ought to encourage the Church, yet no civil magistrates have any power to establish any particular form of religion binding upon the consciences of the subject; nor are magistrates ever represented in Scripture as officers or rulers of the Church. As Mr. Coleridge observes, the Christian Church is not a kingdom, realm, or state of the world, nor is it an estate of any such kingdom, realm, or state; but it is the appointed opposite to them all collectively — the sustaining, correcting, befriending opposite of the world — the compensating counterforce to the inherent and inevitable evils and defects of the state as a state, and without reference to its better or worse construction as a particular state; while, whatever is beneficent and humanizing in the aims,

tendencies, and proper objects of the state, it collects in itself as in a focus, to radiate them back in a higher quality; or, to change the metaphor, it completes and strengthens the edifice of the state, without interference or commixture, in the mere act of laying and securing its own foundations. And for these services the Church of Christ asks of the state neither wages nor dignities; she asks only protection, and to be let alone. These, indeed, she demands; but even these only on the ground that there is nothing in her constitution nor in her discipline inconsistent with the interests of the state; nothing resistant or impedimental to the state in the exercise of its rightful powers, in the fulfillment of its appropriate duties, or in the effectuation of its legitimate objects.

5. As to the provision made for the clergy, this may be done without an establishment, as matter of fact shows in hundreds of instances in the Dissenting and Methodist churches in England, and universally by all churches in America. Indeed, the question of the value of the voluntary principle may be considered as finally settled by the experience :of the English and American churches. In England, in 1855, the Established Church had church accommodation for 5,300,000, and all other denominations could seat 4,900,000, making in all church-room for 10,200,000 of the population. in the United States there were church accommodation in 1850 for 14,00,00000, and it is computed by Dr. Baird *(Religion in America)* that there must be altogether far more than one minister for each 900 inhabitants. In England they have an establishment of untold wealth. For centuries they have been accumulating edifices for worship the most costly and durable that the world knows, and yet the United States, without any aid from the government, seats a larger proportion of the inhabitants in houses of worship, and raises $25,000,000 annually for religious benevolence. That which has been the cause of this superior success in America is the more perfect action of the voluntary principle. Even in England this principle has worked in the same manner. Fifty years ago the population of that country was less than half what it now is. Then the Church of England could seat 4,000,000, now 5,300,000. But at that time the Dissenters could seat only *one fifth* of the numbers they can at present. In America the population has doubled itself five or six times since the Revolution, and yet *then* there was but about one minister to every 2000 inhabitants, *now* there is one to every 1000. See Warburton, *Alliance between Church and State;* Christie, *Essay on Establishments;* Paley, *Mor. Philippians* 5:2, c. 10; Bp. Law, *Theory of Religion;* Watts,

Civil Power in Things Sacred, third volume of his *Works;* Hall, *Liberty of the Press,* section 5:; Conder, *Protestant Nonconformity;* Baird, *Religion in America* (N.Y. 1856, 8vo); and art. *SEE CHURCH AND STATE*.

Es'ther

Picture for Es’ther

[vulgarly pronounced *Es'ter],* a beautiful Jewish maiden, the heroine of the Biblical book that bears her name.

1. *Name.* — Her proper Hebrew name was *Eadassah* (q.v.), but on her introduction into the royal harem she received, in accordance with Oriental usage (comp. <270107>Daniel 1:7), the new and probably Persian name of *Esther* (rTeb, *Ester';* Sept. Ἐσθήρ, and so Josephus [Genesis ἦρος, *Ant.* 11:6, 2, etc.; Vulg. *Esther),* which thenceforth became her usual and better-known designation, as appears from the formula rTeb,ayhæ "that is, Esther" (<170207>Esther 2:7), exactly analogous to the usual addition of the modern names of towns to explain the use of the old obsolete ones (<013519>Genesis 35:19, 27; <061510>Joshua 15:10, etc.). As to its signification, Gesenius *(Thes. Hebrews* page 134, a) cites from that diffuse Targum on this book, which is known as the second Targum on Esther, the following words: "She was called Esther from the name of the star Venus, which in Greek is *Aster"* (i.e., ἀστήρ, Lat. *aster,* Engl. *star;* see Lassen, *Ind. Biblioth.* 3:8, 18). Gesenius then points to the Persian word *satarah,* star, as that of which Esther is the Syro-Arabian modification; and brings it, as to signification, into connection with the planet *Venus,* as a star of good fortune, and with the name of the Syrian goddess *Ashtreth* (q.v.). In this etymology Fürst acquiesces *(Hebrews Handwb.* s.v.).

2. *History.* — She was the daughter of Abihail (who was probably the son of Shimei), a Benjamite, and uncle of Mordecai (q.v.). Her ancestor Kish had been among the captives led away from Jerusalem (part of which was in the tribe of Benjamin) by Nebuchadnezzar when Jehoiachin was taken captive. The family did not avail itself of the permission to return to Palestine under the edict of Cyrus. Her parents being dead, Esther was brought up as a daughter by her cousin Mordecai, who had an office in the court or household of the Persian monarch "at Shushan, in the palace." The reigning king of Persia, Ahasuerus, having divorced his queen, Vashti, on account of the becoming spirit with which she refused to submit to the

indignity which a compliance with his drunken commands involved, search was made throughout the empire for the most beautiful maiden to be her successor. Those whom the officers of the harem deemed the most beautiful were removed thither, the eventual choice among them remaining with the king himself. That choice fell on Esther, who found favor in the eyes of Ahasuerus, and was advanced to a station enviaile only by comparison with that of the less favored inmates of the royal harem. B.C. 479. The king was not aware, however, of her race and parentage; and so, with the careless profusion of a sensual despot, on the representation of Haman the Agagite, his prime minister, that the Jews scattered through his empire were a pernicious race, he gave him full power and authority to kill them all, young and old, women and children, and take possession of all their property. The circumstance that Esther herself, though queen, seemed to be included in this doom of extirpation, enabled her to turn the royal indignation upon Haman, whose resentment against Mordecai had led him to obtain from the king this monstrous edict. The laws of the empire would not allow the king to recall a decree once uttered; but the Jews were authorized to stand on their defense; and this, with the known change in the intentions of the court, averted the worst consequences of the decree. The Jews established a yearly feast in memory of this deliverance, which is observed among them to this day. See PURIM. Such is the substance of the history of Esther, as related in the book which bears her name. (See below.) The details, as given in that book, afford a most curious picture of the usages of the ancient Persian court, the accuracy of which is vouched for not only by the historical authority of the book itself, but by its agreement with the intimations afforded by the ancient writers, as well as by the fact that the same usages are in substance preserved in the Persian court at the present day. *SEE HAREM.*

Sir John Malcolm tells us that the sepulcher of Esther and Mordecai stands near the center of the city of Hamadan. It is a square building, terminated by a dome, with an inscription in Hebrew upon it, translated and sent to him by Sir Gore Ouseley, ambassador to the court of Persia, as follows: "Thursday, fifteenth of the month Adar, in the year 4474 from the creation of the world, was finished the building of this temple over the graves of Esther and Mordecai, by the hands of the good-hearted brothers Elias and Samuel, the sons of the deceased Ishmael of Kashan." According to the vulgar Jewish sera, this would have been not more than eleven centuries ago; but' the date may be after the computation of the Eastern Jews, which

would make it about A.D. 250. Local tradition says that it was thoroughly repaired about 175 years since by a Jewish rabbi named Ismael (Kitto, *Pict. Bible,* at Esth. 10:1). *SEE ACHMETHA.*

3. *Proposed Identifications with Personages in Profane History.* — The question as to the identity of the Persian king referred to in connection with Esther is discussed under AHASUERUS *SEE AHASUERUS* , and the reasons there given lead to the conclusion that he was Xerxes, the son of Darins Hystaspis. (See, however, a contrary view in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1860, page 406 sq.)

A second inquiry remains, Who, then, was Esther? *Artissona, Atossa,* and others are indeed excluded by the above decision; but are we to conclude, with Scalirer, that because Ahasuerus is Xerxes, therefore Esther is *Amestris?* Surely not. None of the historical particulars related by Herodotus concerning Amestris (Herod 9:108; comp. Ctesias, ap. Photius, *Cod.* 72, page 57) make it possible to identify her with Esther. Amestris was the daughter of Otanes (Onophas in Ctesias), one of Xerxes's generals, and brother to his father Darius (Herod. 7:61, 82). Esther's father and mother had been Jews. Amestris was wife to Xerxes before the Greek expedition (Herod. 7:61), and her sons accompanied Xerxes to Greece (Herod. 7:39), and had all three come to man's estate at the death of Xerxes in the 20th year of his reign. Darius, the eldest, had married immediately after the return from Greece. Esther did not enter the king's palace till his 7th year, just the time of Darius's marriage. These objections are conclusive, without adding the difference of character of the two queens. The truth is that history is wholly silent both about Vashti and Esther. Herodotus only happens to mention one of Xerxes's wives; Scripture only mentions two, if indeed either of them were wives at all. But since we know that it was the custom of the Persian kings before Xerxes to have several wives, besides their concubines; that Cyrus had several (Herod. 3:3); that Cambyses had four whose names are mentioned, and others besides (3:31, 32, 68); that Smerdis had several (ib. 68, 69); and that Darius had six wives, whose names are mentioned *(ib. passim),* it is most improbable that Xerxes should have been content with one wife. Another strong objection to the idea of Esther being his one legitimate wife, and perhaps to her being strictly his wife at all, is that the Persian kings selected their *wives* not from the harem, but, if not foreign princesses, from the noblest Persian families, either their own nearest relatives, or from one of the seven great Persian houses. It seems therefore

natural to conclude that Esther, a captive, and one of the harem, was not of the highest rank of wives, but that a special honor, with the name of queen, may have been given to her, as to Vashti before her, as the favorite concubine or inferior wife, whose offspring, however, if she had any, would not have succeeded to the Persian throne. This view, which seems to be strictly in accordance with what we know of the manners of the Persian court, removes all difficulty in reconciling the history of Esther with the scanty accounts left us by profane authors of the reign of Xerxes.

It may be convenient to add that the Od year of Xerxes, in which the banquet that was the occasion of Vashti's divorce was held, was B.C. 488, his 7th, B.C. 479, and his 12th, B.C. 474 (Clinton, *F.B.),* and that the simultaneous battles of Plataea and Mycale, which frightened Xerxes from Sardis (Diod. Sic. 11:36) to Susa, happened, according to Prideaux anl Clinton, in September of his 7th year. For a fuller discussion of the identity of Esther, and different views of the subject, see Prideaux's *Connexion,* 1:236, 243, 297 sq., and Petav. *De doctr. temp.* 12:27, 28, who make Esther wife of Artaxerxes Longim., following Joseph. *Ant.* 11:6, as he followed the Sept. and the apocryphal Esther; J. Scalig. (*De emend. temp.* 6:591; *Animadv. Euseb.* page 100) making Ahasuerus, Xerxes; Usher *(Annal. Vet. Test.)* making him Darius Hystaspis; Loftus, *Chaldaea,* etc. Eusebius *(Cenon. Chron.* £38, ed. Mediol.) rejects the hypothesis of Artaxerxes Longim. en the score of the silence of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and adopts that of Artaxerxes Mnemon, following the Jews, who make Darius Codcmannus to beathe same as Darius Hystaspis, and the son of Artaxerxes by Esther! It is most observable that *all* Petavius's and Prideaux's arguments against Scaliger's view apply solely to the statement that Esther is Amestris. *SEE XERXES.*

4. The *character* of Esther, as she appears in the Bible, is that of a woman of deep piety, faith, courage, patriotism, and caution, combined with resolution; a dutiful daughter to her adoptive father, docile and obedient to his counsels, and anxious to share the king's favor with him for the good of the Jewish people. That she was a virtuous woman, and, as far as her situation made it possible, a good wife to the king, her continued influence over him for so long a time warrants us to infer. There must have been a singular grace and charm in her aspect and manners, since she "obtained favor in the sight of all that looked upon her" (Esther 2:15). That she was raised up as an instrument in the hands of God to avert the destruction of the Jewish people, and to afford them protection, and forward their

wealth and peace in their captivity, is also manifest from the Scripture account. But to impute to her the sentiments put in her mouth by the apocryphal author of chapter 14, or to accuse her of cruelty because of the death of Haman and his sons, and the second day's slaughter of the Jews' enemies at Shushan, is utterly to ignore the manners and feelings of her age and nation, and to judge her by the standard of Christian morality in our own age and country instead. In fact, the simplicity and truth to nature of the scriptural narrative afford a striking contrast both with the forced and florid amplifications of the apocryphal additions, and with the sentiments of some later commentators. See Debaeza, *Historia Esther* (in his Com*ment. Ahegor.* vi); Anon. *De Assuero* (in the *Crit. Sac. Thes. Nov.* 1:761); Robinson, *Script. Char.* 2; Hughes, *Esther and her People* (London, 1846); Justi, *Ueb. d. Ahasuerus in Esther* (in Eichhorn's *Repertor.* 15:1 sq.); Tyrwhitt, *Esther and Ahasuerus* (London, 1868, 2 volumes, 8vo).

Esther, Book Of

the last of the historical books of the O.T., according to the arrangement in the Auth. Engl. Version. (See Davidson, in Horne's *Introd.*, new ed., 2:697 sq.)

I. *Contents, Name, and Place in the Canon.* — In this book we have an account of certain events in the history of the Jews under the rule of the Persian king Ahasuerus (Achashverosh), doubtless the Xerxes of the Greek historians. *SEE AHASUERUS* 3. The writer informs us of a severe persecution with which they were threatened at the instigation of Haman, a favorite of the king, that sought in this way to gratify his jealousy and hatred of a Jew, Mordecai, who, though in the service of the king, refused to render to Haman the homage which the king had enjoined, and which his other servants rendered; he describes in detail the means by which this was averted through the influence of a Jewish maiden called "Hadassab, that is, Esther," the cousin of Mordecai, who had been raised to be the wife of the king, along with the destruction of Haman and the advancement of Mordecai; he tells us how the Jews, under the sanction of the king, and with the aid of his officers, rose up against their enemies, and slew them to the number of 75,000; and he concludes by informing us that the festival of Purirn was instituted among the Jews in commemoration of this remarkable passage in their history. From the important part played by Esther in this history, the book bears her name. It is placed among the hagiographa (q.v.) or *Kethubiln'* (μybtK) by the Jews, and in that first portion of them

which they call the five *Megilloth* (tl/Lgam, *rolls),* or books read in the synagogue on special festivals; the season appropriate to it being the feast of Purim, held on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar, of the origin of which it contains the account. Hence it stands in the Hebrew Canon after Koheleth or Ecclesiastes, according to the order of time in which the Megilloth are read. By the Jews it is called *the* Megillab, by way of eminence, either from the importance they attach to its contents, or from the circumstance that from a very early period it came to be written on a special roll (hLgam) for use in the synagogue (Hottinger, *Thes. Philippians* page 494). In the Sept. it appears with numerous additions, prefixed, interspersed, and appended; many of which betray a later origin, but which are so inwrought with the original story as to make with it a continuous and, on the whole, harmonious narrative. By the Christians it has been variously placed; the Vulgate places it between Tobit and Judith, and appends to it the apocryphal additions [see next article]; the Protestant versions commonly follow Luther in placing it at the end of the historical books.

II. *Canonicist.* — Among the Jews this book has always been held in the highest esteem. There is some ground for believing that the feast of Purim was by some of the more ancient Jews opposed as an unlicensed novelty (Talm. Hieros. *Megilloth, fol.* 70; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebrews* ad Job. 10:22); but there is no trace of any doubt being thrown by them on the canonicity of the book. By the more modern Jews it has been elevated to a place beside the law, and above the other hagiographa, and even the prophets (Pfeiffer, *Thes. Hermen.* page 597 sq.; Carpzov, *Introd.* page 366 sq.). Indeed, it is a saying of Maimonides that in the days of the Messiah the prophetic and hagiographical books will pass away, except the book of Esther, which will remain with the Pentateuch. This book is read through by the Jews in their synagogues at the feast of Purim, when it was, and is still in some synagogues, the custom at the mention of Haman's name to hiss, and stamp, and clench the fist, and cry, Let his name be blotted out; may the name of the wicked rot. It is said, also, that the names of Haman's ten sons are read in one breath, to signify that they all expired at the same instant of time. Even in writing the names of Haman's sons in the 7th, 8th, and 9th verses of Esther 9, the Jewish scribes have contrived to express their abhorrence of the race of Haman; for these ten names are written in three perpendicular columns of 3, 3, 4, as if they were hanging upon three parallel cords, three upon each cord, one above another, to represent the

hanging of Raman's sons (Stehelin's *Rabbinical Literature,* 2:349). The Targum of Esther 9, in Walton's Polyglot, inserts a very minute account of the exact position occupied by Haman and his sons on the gallows, the height from the ground, and the interval between each; according to which they all hung in one line, Haman at the top, and his ten sons at intervals of half a cubit under him. It is added that Zeresh and Haman's seventy surviving sons fled, and begged their bread from door to door, in evident allusion to <19>Psalm 109:9, 10. Some of the ancient Jewish teachers were, somewhat staggered at the peculiarity of this book, that the name of God does not once occur in it; but others accounted for it by saying that it was a transcript, under divine inspiration, from the Chronicles of the Medes and Persians, and that, being meant to be read by heathen, the sacred name was wisely omitted. Baxter *(Saint's Rest,* part 4, chapter 3) speaks of the Jews using to cast to the ground the book of Esther because the name of God was not in it. (See Pareau's *Principles of Interpretation,* and Hottinver's *Thes. Philippians* page 488.) But Wolf *(Bibl. Hebr.* Part 2, page 90) denies this, and says that if any such custom prevailed among the Oriental Jews, to whom it is ascribed by Sandys, it must have been rather to express their hatred of Haman. Certain it is that this book was always reckoned in the Jewish canon, and is named or implied in almost every enumeration of the books composing it, from Josephus downwards.

It has been questioned whether Josephus considered the book of Esther as written before or after the close of the canon. Du Pin maintains that, as Josephus asserts *SEE DEUTERO-CANONICAL* that the sacred books were all written between the time of Moses and the reign (ἀρχή) of Artaxerxes, and *(Ant.* 11) places the history of Esther in that reign, he consequently includes it among those books which he says were of inferior authority, as written under and since the reign of that prince *(Complete Hist. of the Canon,* page 6). Eichhorn, on the other hand, favors the opinion that Josephus meant to include the reign of that prince within the prophetical period, and concludes that this historian considered the book of Esther as the latest of the canonical writings.

In the Christian Church the book of Esther has not been so generally received. Jerome mentions it by name in the *Prolog. Gal.*, in his Epistle to Paulinus, and in the preface to Esther; as does Augustine, *De Civit. Dei,* and *De Doctr. Christ.*, and Origen, as cited by Eusebius *(Hist.* <21>*Ecclesiastes* 6:25), and many others. Whilst apparently accepted without question by the churches of the West in the early centuries, the

testimony of the Eastern Church concerning it is more fluctuating. It is omitted in the catalogue of Melito, an omission which is shared with Nehemiab, and which some would account of, by supposing that both these books were included by him under Ezra, a supposition that may be admitted in reference to Nehemiah, but is less probable in reference to Esther. Origen inserts it, though not among the historical books, but after Job, which is supposed to indicate some doubt regarding it on his part. In the catalogues of the Council of Laodicea, of the apostolical canons, of Cyrill of Jerusalem, and of Epiphanius, it stands among the canonical books; by Gregory of Nazianzus it is omitted; in the *Synopsis Scrip. Sac.* it is mentioned as said by some of the ancients to be accepted by the Hebrews as canonical; and by Athanasius it is ranked among the ἀναγινωσκόμενα, not among the canonical books. These differences undoubtedly indicate that this book did not occupy the same unquestioned place in general confidence as the other canonical books of the O.T.; but the force of this, as evidence, is greatly weakened by the fact that it was not on historical or critical grounds, but rather on grounds of a dogmatical nature, and of subjective feeling, that it was thus treated. On the same grounds, at a later period, it was subjected to doubt, even in the Latin Church (Junilius, *De partibus Leg. Div. c.* 3). At the time of the ReformationI, Luther, on the same grounds, pronounced the book more worthy to be placed "extra canonem" than "in canone" *(De servo arbitrio;* comp. his *Tischreden,* 4:403, Berlin ed. 1848), but in this he stood alone in the Protestant churches of his day; nor was it till a comparatively recent period that his opinion found any advocates. The first who set himself systematically to impugn the claims of the book was Semler, and him Oeder, Corrodi, Augusti, Bertholdt, De Wette, and Bleek have followed. Eichhorn with some qualifications, Jahn and Havernick unreservedly, have defended its claims.

The objections urged against the canonicity of the book resolve themselves principally into these three —

1. That it breathes a spirit of narrow, selfish, national pride and vindictiveness, very much akin to that displayed by the later Jews, but wholly alien from the spirit which pervades the acknowledged books of the O.T.;

2. That its untheocratic character is manifested in the total omission in it of the name of God, and of any reference to the divine providence and care of Israel; and,

3. That many parts of it are so incredible as to give it the appearance rather of a fiction or romance than the character of a true history (Bertholdt, De Wette, etc.). In regard to the first of these; whilst it must be admitted that the spirit and conduct of the Jews, of whom the author of this book writes, are not those which the religion of the O.T. sanctions, it remains to be asked whether, in what he narrates of them, he has not simply followed the requirements of historical fidelity; and it remains to be proved that he has in any way indicated that his own sympathies and convictions went along with theirs. There can be little doubt that among the Jews of whom he writes a very different state of religious and moral feeling prevailed from what belonged to their nation in the better days of the theocracy. The mere fact that they preferred remaining in the land of the heathen to going up with their brethren who availed themselves of the permission of Cyrus to return to Judaea, shows how little of the true spirit of their nation remained with them. This being the case, the historian could do nothing else than place before us such a picture as that which this book presents; had he done otherwise he would not have narrated the truth. It does not follow from this, however, that he himself sympathized with those of whom he wrote, in their motives, feelings, and conduct, or that the spirit dominant in them is the spirit of his writing. It is true, occasions may frequently present themselves in the course of his narrative when he might have indulged in reflections of an ethical or didactic character on what he has narrated, but to do this may not have been in the plan and conception of his work, and he may therefore have intentionally avoided it.

Observations to the same effect may be made on the second objection. If the purpose of the author was to relate faithfully and without comment the actions and words of persons who were living without any vital recognition of God, the omission of all reference to God in the narrative will be sufficiently accounted for by this circumstance. If it be said, But a pious mat would have spontaneously introduced some such reference, even though those of whom he wrote gave him no occasion to do so by their own modes of speech or acting, it may suffice to reply that, as we are ignorant of the reasons which moved the author to abstain from all remarks of his own on what he narrates, it is not competent for us to conclude from the omission in question that he was not himself a pious man. If again it be

said, How can a book which simply narrates the conduct of Jews who had to a great extent forgotten, if they had not renounced the worship of Jehovah, without teaching any moral lessons in connection with this, be supposed to have proceeded from a man under God's direction in what he wrote, it may be replied that a book may have a most excellent moral tendency, and be full of important moral lessons, even though these are not formally announced in it. That it is so with the book of Esther may be seen from such a work as M'Crie's *Lectures* on this book, where the great lessons of the book are expounded with the skill of one whose mind had been long and deeply versed in historical research. As the third objection above noticed rests on the alleged unhistorical character of the book, its force will be best estimated after we have considered the next head.

III. *Credibility.* — In relation to this point three opinions have been advanced:

1. That the book is wholly unhistorical, a mere legend or romance;

2. That it has a historical basis, and contains some true statements, but that with these much of a fabulous kind is intermixed;

3. That the narrative is throughout true history. Of these opinions the first has not found many supporters: it is obviously incompatible with the reception of the book into the Jewish canon; for, however late be the date assigned to the closing of the canon, it is incredible that what must have been known to be a mere fable, if it is one, could have found a place there; it is incompatible with the early observance by the Jews of the feast of Purim, instituted to commemorate the events recorded here (comp. 2 Macc. 15:36); and it is rendered improbable by the minuteness of some of the details, such as the names of the seven eunuchs (Esther 1:10), the seven officers of the king (Esther 1:14), the ten sons of Haman (Esther 9:7-10), and the general accurate acquaintance with the manners, habits, and contemporary history of the Persian court which to author exhibits. (See the ample details on this head collected by Eichhorn and Havernick, *Einleit.* II, 1:338-357). The reception of the book into the canan. places a serious difficulty in the way of the second opinion; for if those who determined this would not have inserted a book wholly fabulous, they would as little have inserted one in which fable and truth were indiscriminately mixed. It may be proper, however to notice the parts which are alleged to be fabulous, for only thus can the objection be

satisfactorily refuted. First, then, it is asked, How can it be believed that if the king had issued a decree that all the Jews should be put to death, he would have published this twelve months before it was to take effect (Esther 3:12, 13)? But, if this seem incredible to us, it must, if untrue, have appeared no less incredible to those for whom the book was written; and nothing can be more improbable than that a writer of any intelligence should by *mistake* have made a statement of this kind; indeed, a fiction of this sort is exactly what a fabulist would have been most certain to have avoided; for, knowing it not to be in accordance with fact and usage, he must have been sure that its falsehood would be at once detected. Secondly, It is said to be incredible that the king, when he repented of having issued such an edict, should, as it could not be recalled, have granted permission to the Jews to defend themselves by the slaughter of their enemies, and that they should have been permitted to do this to such an extent as to destroy 75,000 of his own subjects. To our habits of thinking this certainly appears strange; but we must not measure the conduct of a monarch like Xerxes by such a standard: the caprices of Oriental despots are proverbially startling, their indifference to human life appalling; and Xerxes, as we know from other sources, was apt even to exceed the limits of ordinary Oriental despotism in these respects (comp. Herod. 1:183; 7:35, 39, 238; 9:108-113; Justin, 2:10, 11). Now if it be true, as Diodorus Siculus relates, that Xerxes put the Medians foremost at Thermopylse on purpose that they might all be killed, because he thought they were not thoroughly reconciled to the loss of their national supremacy, it is surely not incredible that he should have given permission to Haman to destroy a few thousand strange people like the Jews, who were represented to be injurious to his empire, and disobedient to his laws. Nor, again, when we remember what Herodotus relates of Xerxes in respect to promises made at banquets, can we deem it incredible that he should perform his promise to Esther to reverse the decree in the only way that seemed practicable. It is likely, too, that the secret friends and adherents of Haman would be the persons to attack the Jews, which would be a reason why Ahasuerus would rather rejoice at their destruction. Thirdly, it is asked how can we believe that the king would issue an edict to all his subjects that every man should bear rule in his own house (1:22)? We reply that, as the edicts of Oriental despots are not all models of wisdom and dignity, here seems to us nothing improbable in the statement that such an edict was, under the circumstances, issued by Ahasuerus. Fourthly, Is it credible, it is asked, that Esther should have been so long a

time in the palace of the king without her descent being known to the king or to Haman, as appears to have been the case? We reply that it does not appear certain that her Jewish descent was unknown; and, if it were, we are too little acquainted with the usages of the Persian royal harem to be able to judge whether this was an unlikely thing to occur or not: we may suggest, however, that the writer of the history was somewhat more likely to know the truth on such points than German professors in the 19th century.

The casual way in which the author of 2 Macc. 15:36 alludes to the feast of Purim, under the name of "Mardochaeus's day," as kept by the Jews in the time of Nicanor, is another strong testimony in its favor, and tends to justify the strong expression of Dr. Lee (quoted in Whiston's Josephus, xi, chapter 6), that "the truth of this history is demonstrated by the feast of Purim, kept up from that time to this very day."

The style of writing is remarkably chaste and simple, and the narrative of the struggle in Esther's mind between fear and the desire to save her people, and of the final resolve made in the strength of that help which was to be sought in prayer and fasting, is very touching and beautiful, and without any exaggeration. Even De Wette observes that the book is simple in its style, free from declamation, and thus advantageously distinguished from the similar stories in the Apocrypha *(Introduction,* Parker's translation, Boston, 1843).

IV. *Authorship and Date.* — Augustine *(De Civitate Dei)* ascribes the book to Ezra. Eusebius *(Chronic.* 47, d. 4), who observes that the facts of the history are posterior to the time of Ezra, ascribes it to some later but unknown author. Clemens Alexandrinus *(Stromata,* lib. 1, page 329) assigns it and the book of Maccabees to Mordecai. The pseudo-Philo *(Chronographia)* and Rabbi Azarias maintain that it was written at the desire of Mordecai by Jehoiakim, son of Joshua; who was high-priest in the 12th year of the reign of Artaxerxes. The subscription to the Alexandrian version states that the epistle regarding the feast of Purim was brought by Dositheus into Egypt, under Ptolemy and Cleopatra (B.C. cir. 160); but it is well known that these subscriptions are of little authority. The authors of the Talmud say that it was written by the members of the Great Synagogue (q.v.), who also wrote Ezekiel and the twelve Prophets. But the whole account of the Great Synagogue, said to have been instituted by Ezra, and concluded by Simon the Just, who is said to have closed the canon, and

whose death took place B.C. 292, is by some looked upon as a rabbinical romance. Of all these suppositions, the ascription to Mordecai seems the most probable. The minute details given of the great banquet, of the names of the chamberlains and eunuchs, and Haman's wife and sons, and of the customs and regulations of the palace, betoken that the author lived at Shushan, and probably at court, while his no less intimate acquaintance with the private affairs both of Esther and Mordecai well suits the hypothesis of the latter being himself the writer. It is also in itself probable that as Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who held high offices under the Persian kings, wrote an account of the affairs of the nation, in which they took a leading part, so Mordecai should have recorded the transactions of the book of Esther likewise. The termination of the book with the mention of Mordecai's elevation and government agrees also with this view, which has the further sanction of many great names, as Aben Ezra, and most of the Jews, Vatablus, Carpzov, and many others. Those who ascribe it to Ezra, or the men of the Great Synagogue, may have merely meant that Ezra edited and added it to the canon of Scripture, which lee prob. ably did, bringing it, and perhaps the book of Daniel, with him from Babylon to Jerusalem. *SEE MORDECAI*.

That the book was written after the downfall of the Persian monarchy in the time of the Maccabees is the conclusion of Bertholdt, De Wette, and Bleek. The reasons, however, which they assign for this are very feeble, and have been thoroughly nullified by Havernick. The latter supposes it to have been written at a much earlier date, and the reasons he urges for this are —

1. The statement in <170932>Esther 9:32, compared with <170902>Esther 10:2, where the author places what he himself has written on a par in point of authenticity with what is recorded in the Persian annals, as if contemporary productions;

2. The vividness, accuracy, and minuteness of his details respecting the Persian court;

3. The language of the book, as presenting, with some Persianisms, and some words of Chaldaic affinity, which do not occur in older Hebrew (such as rmia}mi, ^/yZmi, ^gv,tPi, fyBr]vi), those idioms which characterize the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles; and,

4. The fact that the closing of the canon cannot be placed later than the reign of Artaxerxes, so that an earlier date must be assigned to this book, which is included in it. *SEE EZRA*. Whether the book was written in Palestine or in Persia is uncertain, but probability inclines to the latter supposition.

VI. *Commentaries*. — The following are separate exegetical works on the canonical potion of the book of Esther, in addition to the formal *Introductions* to that portion of Scripture, and exclusive of the purely rabbinical treatises on the Jewish usages referred to in the book; the most important have an asterisk (*) prefixed: Raban Maurus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.);* Arama, vWrPe (Constantinople, 1518, 4to); Bafiolas, vWrPe (Riva di Trento, 1560, 4to); Strigel, *Scholia (Lips.* 1571, 1572, 8vo); Brentius, C(ommentarii (Tubing. 1575, 4to; in Engl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1584, 8vo); Askenz, jqil ,ãsæy (Cremona, 1576, 4to, etc.); Feuardent, *Commentaria* (Par. 1585, 8vo, etc.); Melammed, ykD]r]n; rmaiami (Constantpl. 1585, 4to); *Drusius, *Annotationes* (Leyd. 1586, 8vo); *Senarius, *Commentarii* (Mogunt.1590, fol., etc.); Zahalon, µyhaEl Ëvye (Ven. 1594, 4to); Alsheich, hv,m taic]mi (Ven. 1601, 4to); Cooper, *Notes* (London, 1609, 4to); D'Aquine, *Raschii Scholia* (Par. 1622, 4to); Wolder, *Dispositiones* (Dantz. 1625, 4to); *Sanctius, *Commentarii* (Leyd. 1628, fol.); Conzio, *Commento* (Chieri. 1628, 4to); Duran, tLgæm] rp,se (Ven. 1632, 4to); Crommius, *Theses* (Lovan. 1632, 4to); Merkel, ayk;D]; arymæ (Lublin, 1637, 4to); *Bonart, *Commentarius* (Colossians Agr. 1647, fol.); Montanus, *Commentarius* (Madr. 1648,. fol.); Trapp, *Commentary* (London, 1656, fol.); De Celada, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1658, fol.); Jackson, *Explanation* (London, 1658, 4to); Barnes, *Paraphrasis poetica* (Lond. 1679, 8vo); Adam, *Observationes* (Groningen, 1710, 4to); Rambach, *Notce* (in his *Adnot. V.T.* 2:1043); Heumann, *Estherae auctoritas* (Gotting. 1736, 4to); Meir, ˆ2æyyi hTev]mi (Fürth, 1737, 8vo); Nestorides, *Annotazioni* (Ven. 1746, 4to); Aucher. *De auctoritate Estherae* (Havn. 1772, 4to); Cru*sins, Nktzl. Gebrauch der B. Esther* (from the Latin, Lpz. 1773, 4to); *Vos, *Oratio* (Ultr. 1775, 4to); Zinck, *Commentarius* (Augsb. 1780, 4to); De Rossi, *Var. Lect.* (Rome, 1782, 8vo); Pereles, tr,t,Kohi tLGu (Prague, 1784, 4to); Tolfssohn, rTes]a, (Benl. 1788, 87vo); Lamson, *Discourses* (Edinb. 1804, 12mo); Lowe, vr,h; r/a (Nouydwor, 1804, 4to); *Schirmer, *Observationes* (Vratislav. 1820, 8vo); *Kele, *Vindiciae*

(Freib. 1820, 4to); *Calmberg, *Commentarius* (Hamb. 1837, 4to) *M'Crie *Lectures (Works*, 1838, 8vo); *Baumgarten, *De fide Esthere* (Hal. 1839, 8vo); Morgan, *Esther typical* (London, 1855, 8vo); Crosthwaite, *Lectures* (London, 1858, 12mo); Davidson, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1859, 8vo); *Bertheau (in the *Kurzgef. exeg. fandb.* Lpz. 1862, 8vo); Oppert, *Commentaire d'apris les inscriptions Perses* (Par. 1864, 8vo). *SEE OLD TESTAMENT*.

Esther, Apocryphal Additions To The Book Of. —

Besides the many minor deviations from the Hebrew, there are six important additions in the Septuagint and the other ancient versions of the book of Esther.

I. *Title and Position.* — In the Sept. and *the Old Latin* these additions are dispersed through the canonical book, forming therewith a well-adjusted whole, and have therefore no separate title. St. Jerome, however, separated them in his translation, and removed them to the end of the book, because they are not found in the Hebrew. They are, therefore, in this position in the MSS. and the printed editions of the Vulgate, and form, according to cardinal Hugo's division, the last seven chapters of the canonical Esther. Luther, who was the first that separated the apocryphal from the canonical books, entirely detached these additions, and placed them among the Apocrypha under the title *"Stucke in Esther."* In the Zurich Bible, where the apocryphal and canonical books are also separated, the canonical volume is called 1 *Esther*, and these additions are denominated 2 *Esther*. Our English versions, though following Luther's arrangements, are not uniform in their designation of these additions. Thus Coverdale calls them *"The chapters of the book of Hester, which are not found in the text of the Hebrew, but in the Greek and Latin."* In Matthews and the Bishops' Bible, which are followed by the A.V., they are entitled, *"The rest of the chapters of the book of Esther, which are found neither in the Hebrew nor in the Chaldee,"* whilst the Geneva version adopts Luther's title.

The reason of their present confused arrangement seems to be this: When Jerome translated the book of Esther, he first gave the version of the Hebrew only as being alone authentic. He then added at the end a version in Latin of those several passages which he found in the Sept., and which were not in the Hebrew, stating where each passage came in, and marking them all with an obelus. The first passage so given is that which forms the continuation of chapter 10 (which of course immediately precedes it),

ending with the entry about Dositheus. Having annexed this conclusion, he then gives the *Prooemium*, which he says forms the beginning of the Greek Vulgate, beginning with what is now verse 2 of chapter 11; and so proceeds with the other passages. But in subsequent editions all Jerome's explanatory matter has been swept away, and the disjointed portions have been printed as chapter 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, as if they formed a narrative in continuance of the canonical book. The extreme absurdity of this arrangement is nowhere more apparent than in chapter 11, where the verse (1) which closes the whole book in the Greek copies, and in St. Jerome's Latin translation, is actually made immediately to precede that (verse 2) which is the very first verse of the Prooemium. As regards the place assigned to Esther in the printed Sept., in the Vatican *edition* (not MS.), and most others, it comes between Judith and Job. Its place before Job is a remnant of the Hebrew order, Esther there closing the historical, and Job beginning the metrical *Megilloth.* Tobit and Judith have been placed between it and Nehemiah, doubtless for chronological reasons. But in the ancient MSS. the position is different. *SEE BIBLE*.

II. *Design and* Contents. — The object of these additions is to give a more decidedly religious tone to the record contained in the book of Esther, and to show more plainly how wonderfully the God of Israel interposed to save his people and confound their enemies. This the writer has effected by elaborating upon the events narrated in the canonical volume as follows:

1. Esther 1:1 of the canonical volume is preceded in the Sept. by a piece which tells us that Mordecai, who was in the service of Artaxerxes, dreamt of the dangers which threatened his people, and of their deliverance (verses 1-12). He afterwards discovered a conspiracy against the king, which he discloses to him, and is greatly rewarded for it (verses 13-18). This is, in the Vulgate and Eng. version, chapter 11:2-12:6.

2. Between verse 13 and 14 of chapter 3 in the canonical book, the Septuagint gives a copy of the king's edict addressed to all the satraps, to destroy without compassion that foreign and rebellious people, the Jews, for the good of the Persian nation, in the fourteenth day of the twelfth month of the coming year. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, chapter 13:1-7.

3. At the end of <17017>Esther 4:17 of the canonical book, the Sept. has two prayers of Mordecai and Esther, that God may avert the impending destruction of his people. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, chapter 13:8-14:19.

4. Between verse 1 and 2 of chapter 5 in the canonical book, the Sept. inserts a detailed account of Esther's visit to the king. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, chapter 15:1-16.

5. Between verse 13 and 14 of chapter 8 in the canonical hooks, the Sept. gives a copy of the edict, which the king sent to all his satraps, in accordance with the request of Mordecai and Esther, to abolish his former decree against the Jews. This is, in the Vulg. and Eng. version, chapter 16:1-24.

6. At the close of the canonical book, chapter 10:3, the Sept. has a piece in which we are told that Mordecai had now recalled to his mind his extraordinary dream, and seen how literally it had been fulfilled in all its particulars. It also gives us an account of the proclamation of the Purim festival in Egypt.

The whole book is closed with the following entry: "In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemaeus and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said lie was a priest and Levite, and Ptolemy his son, brought this epistle of Phurim, which they said was the same, and that Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy, that was in Jerusalem, had interpreted it." This entry was apparently intended to give authority to this Greek version of ESTHER by pretending that it was a certified translation from the Hebrew original. Ptolemy Philometor, who is here meant, began to reign B.C. 181. He is the same as is frequently mentioned in 1 Mace. *(e.g.* 10:57; 11:12; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 13:4, 1 and 5, and Clinton, *F.H.* 3:393). Dositheus seems to be a Greek version of Mattithiah; Ptolemy was also a common name for Jews at that time.

III. *Origin, historical Character, and Unity.* — The patriotic spirit with which the Jewish nation so fondly expatiated upon the remarkable events and characters of by-gone days, and which gave rise to those beautiful legends preserved in their copious literature, scarcely ever had a better opportunity afforded to it for employing its richly inventive powers to magnify the great Jehovah, embalm the memory of the heroes, and brand the names of the enemies of Israel, than in the canonical book of Esther. Nothing could be more natural for a nation who "have a zeal of God" than

to supply the name of God, and *to point out more distinctly* his interposition in their behalf in an inspired book, which, though recording their marvelous escape from destruction, had for some reasons omitted avowedly to acknowledge the Lord of Israel. Besides, the book implies and suggests far more than it records, and it cannot be doubted that there are many other things connected with the history it contains which were well known at the time, and were transmitted to the nation. This is evident from the fact that Josephus *(Ant.* 11:6, 6 sq.) gives the edict for the destruction of the Jews in the Persian empire, the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, and the second edict authorizing the Jews to destroy their enemies, also mentioning the name of the eunuch's servant, a Jew, who betrayed the conspiracy to Mordecai, and citing other passages from the Persian chronicles read to Ahasuerus, besides that relating to Mordecai, and amplifications of the king's speech to Haman, etc.; and that the second Targum, the Chaldee, published by De Rossi, and Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, page 74 sq.), give the dream of Mordecai, as well as his prayer and that of Esther.

The first addition which heads the canonical book, and in which Mordecai *foresees* in a dream both the dangers and the salvation of his people, is in accordance with the desire to give the whole a more religious tone. The second addition originated from the fact that Esther 3:13 of the canonical book speaks of the royal edict, hence this piece pretends to give a copy of the said document; the same is the case with the third addition, which follows Esther 4:17, and gives the prayers of Mordecai and Esther, for the said passage in the canonical volume relates that Esther ordered prayers to be offered. The fourth addition after Esther 5:1, giving a detailed account of Esther's interview with the king, originated from a desire to give more information upon the fact, which is simply alluded to in the canonical passage. The fifth addition, after Esther 8:13, originated in the same manner as the second, viz. in a desire to supply a copy of the royal edict, while the sixth addition, after Esther 10:3, beautifully concludes with an interpretation of the dream with which the first addition commences the canonical volume. From this analysis it will be seen that these supplementary and embellishing additions are systematically dispersed through the book, and form a well-adjusted and continuous history. In the Vulgate, however, which is followed by the versions of the Reformers on the Continent and our English translations, where these

additions are torn out of the proper connection and removed to a separate place, they are most incomprehensible.

IV. *Author, Date, and original Language*. — From what has been remarked in the foregoing section, it will at once be apparent that these apocryphal additions were neither manufactured by the translator of the canonical Esther into Greek, nor are they the production of the Alexandrian nor of any other school or individual, but embody some of the numerous national stories connected with this marvelous deliverance of God's ancient people, the authorship of which is lost in the nation. Many of them date as far back as the nucleus of the event itself, around which they cluster, and all of them grew up at first in the vernacular language of the people (i.e., in Hebrew or Aramaic), but afterwards assumed the complexion and language of the countries in which the Jews happened to settle down. Besides the references given in the preceding section which lead us to these conclusions, we also refer to the two Midrashim published by Jellinek in his *Beth Ha-Midrash,* (Lpz. 1853), 1 sq. In chapter 3 the pretended copy of Artaxerxes's decree for the destruction of the Jews is written in thorough Greek style; the prayer of Esther excuses her for being wife to the uncircumcised king, and denies her having eaten anything or drunk wine at the table of Haman; the pretended copy of Artaxerxes's letter for reversing the previous decree is also of manifestly Greek origin in chapter 8, in which Haman is called a Macedonian, and is accused of having plotted to transfer the empire from the Persians to the Macedonians, a palpable proof of this portion having been composed after the overthrow of the Persian empire by the Greeks.

V. *Canonicity of these Additions.* — It is of this Sept. version that Athanasius *(Hist. Epist.* page 39, Oxf. translation) spoke when he ascribed the book of Esther to the non-canonical books; and this, also, is perhaps the reason why, in some of the lists of the canonical books, Esther is not named, as, e.g. in those of Melito of Sardis and Gregory Nazianzen (see Whitaker, *Disput. on H. Scr.* Park. Soc. pages 57, 58; Cosin on the *Canon of Scr.* pages 49, 50), unless in these it is included under some other book, as Ruth or Esdras ("this book of Esther, or sixth of Esdras, as it is placed in some of the most ancient copies of the Vulgate," Lee's *Dissert. on 2d Esdas,* page 25). The fathers, who regarded the Septuagint as containing the sacred scriptures of the O.T., believed in the canonicity of these additions. Even Origen, though admitting that they are not in the Hebrew,

defended their canonicity *(Ep. ad African.* ed. West, page 225), and the Council of Trent pronounced the whole book of Esther, with all its parts, to be canonical. These additions, however, were never included in the Hebrew canon, and the fact that Josephus quotes them only shows that he believed them to be historically true, but not inspired. St. Jerome, who knew better than any other father what the ancient Jews included in their canon, most emphatically declares them to be spurious ("Librum Esther variis translatoribus constat esse vitiatum; quem ego de archivis Hebraeorum relevans, verbum e verbo expressius transtuli. Quem librum editio vulgata laciniosis hinc inde verborum sinibus [al. funibus] trahit, addens ea quae ex tempore dici poterant et audiri; sicut solitum est scholaribus disciplinis sumto themate excogitare, quibus verbis uti potuit, qui injuriam passus est, vel qui injuriam fecit," *Praef. in* 1 *Esth.).* Sixtus Senensis, in spite of the decision of the council, speaks of these additions after the example of Jerome (as "la cinias hinc inde quorumdam scriptorum temeritate insertas"), and thinks that they are chiefly derived from Josephus; but this last opinion is without probability. The manner and the order in which Josephus cites them *(Ant.* 11, 6) show that they had already, in his days, obtained currency among the Hellenistic Jews as portions of the book of Esther, as we know from the way in which he cites 6ther apocryphal books that they were current likewise, with others which are now lost; for it was probably from such that Josephus derived his stories about Moses, about Sanballat, and the temple on Mount Gerizim, and the meeting of the high-priest and Alexander the Great.

VI. *Literature.* — Josephus, *Ant.* 11:6,6 sq.; the *Midrash Esther;* Targum *Sheni* on Esther, in Walton's *Polyglot,* volume 4; Josippon ben-Gorion (ed. Breithaupt, 1710), page 72 sq.; Whitaker, *Disputation on Scripture* (Park. Soc., ed. 1849), page 71, etc.; Usher, *Syntagma de Graeca LXX interpretum vessione* (London, 1655); De *Rossi, Specimen Variarum Lectionum sacsri Textus et Chaldaica Estheris Additanmenta* (Romns, 1782); Eichhorn, *Einleitung in d. Apokr. Schriften d. A.T.* (Leip. 1795),). 483 sq.; Fritzsche, Ἐσθήρ, *Duplicem libritextum ad optinsos cdd. emend. et cum selecta lectionis varietate* (ed. Torici. 1848); and by the same author, *Exegetisches Handbuch z. d. Apokr. d. A.T.* 1:69 sq.; Davidson, *The Text of the O.T. Considered* (London, 1856), page 1010 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes. Israel,* vol. (Nordhausen, 1857), page 365 sq.; Keil, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleituqng,* etc. (ed. 1859), page 705 sq.; Wolf's *Bibl. febr.* pages 11, 88 sq.; Hotting. *'Thesaur.* page 494;

Walton, *Proleg.* 9, § 13; Nickes, De *Estherae libro* (Romans 1857, 1858); Baumgarten, De *Fide Lib. Esther* (Hal. 1839); Schnurrer (ed.), *Var. Lect. Estheris* (2d ed. Tubing. 1783). *SEE APOCRYPHA.*

Esther, Fast Of

(rTsa, tynaTi) so called from the fact that it was ordered by Esther to avert the impending destruction which at that time threatened the whole Jewish population of the Persian dominions (comp. <17046>Esther 4:16, 17). The Jews to this day keep this fast on the 13th of Adar, the day which was appointed for their extirpation, and which precedes *the feast of Purim*, because it was ordained both by Esther and Mordecai, that it should continue a national fast, to be observed annually in commemoration of that eventful day (comp. <17091>Esther 9:31). During the Maccabaean period, and for some time afterwards, this fast was temporarily superseded by a festival which was instituted to celebrate the anniversary of the victory obtained by Judas Maccabaeus over Nicanor *on the 13th of Adar* (comp. 1 Macc. 7:49; Josephus, Ant. 12:10, 5; *Megillath Taranith*, *c.* 12; Josippon ben-Gorion, 3:22, page 244, ed. Breithaupt). But this festival has long since ceased to be celebrated, and as early as the ninth century of the Christian aera we find that *the fast of Esther* was again duly observed (comp. *Sheelthoth* of R. Achai, Purim 4), and it has continued ever since to be one of the fasts in the Jewish calendar. The Jews entirely abstain from eating and drinking on this day, and introduce into the daily service penitential psalms, and offer prayers which have been composed especially for this occasion. If the 13th of Adar happens to be on a Sabbath, this fast is kept on the Friday, because fasting is not allowed on the Sabbath day. Some Jews go so far as to fast *three days*, according to the example of Esther (<17046>Esther 4:6). *SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.*

Estienne

SEE STEPHENS.

Estius, Gulielmus

(*William Hessels van Est),* an eminent Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Gorcum, Holland, 1542, and studied at Utrecht and Louvain. He was for ten years professor at Louvain; in 1580 he became professor of divinity at Douai, and in 1603 chancellor of the University. Estius obtained great repute for learning and piety. Benedict XIV named him *doctor*

fundatissimus. He died at Douai September 20, 1613. His principal writings are *Commentarii in Epistolas Aposfolicas* (Douai. 1614-16; Colossians 1631, 3 volumes, fol. 3:1; Paris, 1679, fol.; Rouen, 1709, 2 volumes, fol.): — *In quat. libros sententiarnsm commentarii* (Par. 1638, fol.; Naples, *1720): — Annot. In preacipua difficiliora S.S.* (Antw. 1621, fol.). His Commentary on the Epistles is extolled alike by Romanists and Protestants. There is a new edition, edited by Sausen (Ma ence, 1841, 8vo). — Horne, *Introd. Bib. Appendix,* page 134; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Ginerale,* 24:588.

Estrangelo

SEE SYRIAC LANGUAGE.

E'tam

(Hebrew *Eytam',* µfy[e, *eyrie, i.e.,* place of ravenous birds; Sept. Ητάμ in Judges, Αἰτάμ in 1Ch 4:3 1 Chronicles 4:3, elsewhere Αἰτάν; Josephus Αἰτάν in Ant. 5:8, 8; Ηταμέ in Ant. 8:10, 1, Ἤθαμ in Ant. 8:7 7, 3; Vulg. Etam), the name apparently of two places in Palestine.

1. A village (rx;h;) of the tribe of Simeon, specified only in the list in 1Ch 4:32 1 Chronicles 4:32 (comp. Jos 19:7 Joshua 19:7); but that it is intentionally introduced appears from the fact that the number of places is summed as five, though in the parallel list as four. Near this place (hence its name, q.d. eagle's nest) was probably situated a "rock" ([l;s, πέτρα, *silex)* or clif, into a cleft or chasm (ãy[æ; A.V. "top") of which Samson retired after his slaughter of the Philistines, in revenge for their burning the Timnite woman who was to have been his wife (Jg 15:8 Judges 15:8, 11). This natural stronghold (πέτρα δ ἐστὶν ὀχυρά, Josephus, Ant. 5:8, 8) was in the territory usually assigned to the tribe of Judab yet not far from the Philistine border; and near it, probably at its foot, was Lehi or Ramath-lehi, and Enhak-kore (15:9, 14, 17, 19). As Van de Velde has, with great probability, identified Lehi with Lekiyeh, on the edge of the Philistine plain S.E. of Gaza *(Narrative,* 2:141), he is probably also right in locating this Etam at *tell Khewefeh,* a little north of it (*Memoir,* page 311), in the immediate vicinity of tell Hua or En-hakkore (q.v.). Schwarz's location of Etam at *Khudna* (he says Gutna, i.e., Utma, Palest. page 124) is without support.

2. A city in the tribe of Judah, fortified and garrisoned by Rehoboam (<14106>2 Chronicles 11:6). From its position in this list we may conclude that it was near Bethlehem and Tekoah; and in accordance with this is the mention of the name among the ten cities which the Sept. insert in the text of <06560>Joshua 15:60, "Thecoe and Ephratha, which is Bethleem, Phagor and Etan (Αἰτάν)," etc. Here, according to the statements of the Talmudists, were the sources of the water from in which Solomon's gardens and pleasure-grounds were fed, and Bethlehem and the Temple supplied. (See Lightfoot, on *John* 5) Hence we may perhaps infer that the site was identical with that of Solomon's Pools at *El-Buruk*, near Bethlehem (see Schwarz, *Palaest.* page 268). *SEE JERUSALEM; SEE WATER*. Josephus *(Ant.* 8:7, 3) places it at fifty stadia (in some copies sixty) from Jerusalem (southward), and alleges that Solomon was in the habit of taking a morning drive to this favored spot in his chariot. It is thus probable that this weas the site of one of Solomon's houses of pleasure, where he made him gardens and orchards, and pools of water (<21005>Ecclesiastes 2:5, 6). The same name occurs in the lists of Judah's descendants (<13403>1 Chronicles 4:3), but probably referring to the same place, Bethlehem being mentioned in the following verse. *SEE JEZREEL* 3. Dr. Robinson *(Researches,* 1:515; 2:168) inclines to find Etam at a place about a mile and a half south of Bethlehem, where there is a ruined village called *Urtas,* at the bottom of a pleasant valley of the same name. Here there are traces of ancient ruins, and also a fountain, sending forth a copious supply of fine water, which forms a beautiful purling rill along the bottom of the valley. This location is in accordance with all the foregoing notices, and is adjacent to Solomon's Pools (Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:431). Williams *(Holy City,* 2:500) fully accredits the above Rabbinical account, and also states that the old name is perpetuated in a *wady Etam,* which is on the way to Hebron from Jerusalem, and that there are still connected with it the largest and most luxuriant gardens to be met with in the hilly region of Judaea.

Eternal is in general the rendering in the A.V. of the Hebrews μ l ʕ [olam', and the Greek αἰών or αἰώνιος (both frequently "everlasting," "ever," etc.), besides occasionally of μ d ק, *ke'demn* (strictly *early, of yore,* referring to the past, <05327>Deuteronomy 33:27, elsewhere "ancient," "of old," etc.), and ἀΐδιος (<45120>Romans 1:20; "everlasting," Jude 6), which is kindred in etymology and import with αἰώνιος. Both μ l ʕ [and αἰών are properly represented by "eternal," inasmuch as they usually refer to indefinite time *past* as well *as fetusre.* The former is from the root μ l i [; *to*

hide, and thus strictly designates the occult time of the past, q.d. "time out of mind," or time immemorial (<19912>Psalm 129:24; <24616>Jeremiah 6:16; 18:15; <18215>Job 22:15; <33911>Amos 9:11; <05207>Deuteronomy 32:7; <20228>Proverbs 22:28; <19247>Psalm 24:7; 143:3; <26620>Ezekiel 26:20), but not necessarily remote antiquity (<19924>Psalm 139:24; <18215>Job 22:15; <24616>Jeremiah 6:16; 18:15; <27924>Daniel 9:24; and especially. <23858>Isaiah 58:12; 61:4). Prospsetively it denotes an indefinite time to come, *forever, i.e.,* relatively, e.g. to an individual life (<05557>Deuteronomy 15:17, <02106>Exodus 21:6; <09272>1 Samuel 27:12, etc.), that of a race (<09220>1 Samuel 2:20; 13:12; <10716>2 Samuel 7:16; <13772>1 Chronicles 17:12, etc.), or of the present constitution of the universe (<21004>Ecclesiastes 1:4; <19405>Psalm 104:5; 78:69, etc.); or absolutely (<01707>Genesis 17:7; 17:8; <02124>Exodus 12:14; <24539>Jeremiah 51:39; <21205>Ecclesiastes 12:5, etc.). Yet that the nature of the subject is to apply the only limitation is shown by the fact that while the term is used of God in the widest sense, both of the past and future (<01233>Genesis 21:33; <23928>Isaiah 40:28; <27707>Daniel 12:7), it is also employed hyperbolically or poetically of a "good long period" (<23014>Isaiah 30:14, 15), especially in salutations and invocations (<11031>1 Kings 1:31; <16203>Nehemiah 2:3). In all these significations and applications it is often used in the plural (µymlo[), whether past (<23509>Isaiah 51:9; <27924>Daniel 9:24; <21010>Ecclesiastes 1:10) or future (<19605>Psalm 61:5; 77:6, etc.), and this sometimes in a reduplicated form, like "ages of ages" (αἰῶνες). Peculiar is the Rabbinical usage (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1620) for the *world* (so Greek αἰών), but only in <21811>Ecclesiastes 3:11. — Gesenius's and Fürst's *Hebrews Lex.* s.v.; Hommel, *De vi vocis* µlo[(Wittemb. 1795).

The Greek term αἰών remarkably corresponds to the Hebrew µlo[in nearly all these senses, and is its usual rendering in the Sept. It is derived from ἄω, ἀΐω, *to breathe,* or directly from the adverb αέί (originally αἰεί), *always* (itself an old dative from an obsolete noun αί῎ός or αἷον =Lat. *aevum,* probably derived from ἄω, and the same in root with the English *ever,* and also, perhaps, *aye),* with the *locative* termination ών appended to the root. The adjective αἰώνιος, with which we are here more directly concerned, follows most of the shades of meaning and appropriations of the primitive. Its general import is *enduring, perpetual.* In the N.T. it is spoken of the past in a restricted manner, in the sense of ancient or primeval (<45625>Romans 16:25; <55109>2 Timothy 1:9; <56102>Titus 1:2); or of the past and future absolutely (<45626>Romans 16:26; <58914>Hebrews 9:14); elsewhere of the future, in an unlimited sense, *endless* (<47418>2 Corinthians

4:18; 5:1; <421609>Luke 16:9; <581320>Hebrews 13:20; 9:12; <661406>Revelation 14:6; <540616>1 Timothy 6:16; <570115>Philemon 1:15), as of the prospect of Christ's kingdom (<610111>2 Peter 1:11), but especially of the happy future of the saints in heaven (particularly in the phrase "life everlasting," <401916>Matthew 19:16, 29; 25:46, and often), or the miserable fate of the wicked in hell (e.g. as punishment, <402546>Matthew 25:46; condemnation, <410329>Mark 3:29; judgment, <580602>Hebrews 6:2; destruction, <530109>2 Thessalonians 1:9, or fire, <401808>Matthew 18:8; 25:41; Jude 7). — Robinson, *Lex. of the N.T.* s.v.; Leavitt, in the *Christian Month. Spect.* 9:617; Goodwin, in the *Chris. Examiner*, 9:20; 10:34, 166; 12:97, 169; Stuart, in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, 2:405; Cremer, *Worterbuch d. N.T. Gracitat*, page 46.

Eternal Life

(ζωὴ αἰώνιος).

I. *Biblical Usage of the Terms.* —

1. In the O.T. we find this expression occurring only in <271202>Daniel 12:2: *Some shall awaken* wYjil]µl/[Sept. εἰς ζωὴν αἰὼνιον, the others µl/[ˆ/ar]dle]. For the first indication on this point, <031805>Leviticus 18:5 <262011>Ezekiel 20:11; 18:21; Habakuk 2:4 (comp. <480311>Galatians 3:11, 12); <193413>Psalm 34:13 (comp. <600310>1 Peter 3:10) are to be referred to.

2. In the N.T. it is of frequent occurrence. In the first three evangelists, we find ζωὴ αἰώνιος (eternal life), or sometimes only ζωή (life), represented as the object and destiny of man, e.g. <400714>Matthew 7:14; 18:8, 9; <421028>Luke 10:28; comp. verse 25, and 18:18. The resurrection of the dead precedes it (<421414>Luke 14:14). It therefore comprises the whole future of the disciple of Christ, his full reward; and the idea is thus connected with that of felicity (μισθὸς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, *reward in heaven*, <400512>Matthew 5:12; reception into the αἰώνιαι σχηναί, *everlasting habitations*, <421609>Luke 16:9). In <401929>Matthew 19:29; 25:46, we find it opposed to κόλασις αἰώνιος *(eternal punishment)*. Paul considers the ζωὴ αἰώνιος as the supreme reward of well-doing (<450207>Romans 2:7; <540612>1 Timothy 6:12, 19), the result of continually walking in the holiness secured to us by Christ; the τέλος (<450622>Romans 6:22), the reward (<480608>Galatians 6:8), as also the object of our faith (<540116>1 Timothy 1:16), and of saving grace (<450521>Romans 5:21), and consequently also the object of our hopes (<560102>Titus 1:2; 3:7; comp. <650121>Jude 1:21). It appears synonymous with the ἐπαγγελία ζωῆς τῆς

μελλούσης (promise of the life to come) (1 Timothy 4:8), the receiving of the incorruptible crown of righteousness (1 Corinthians 9:25; 2 Timothy 4:8), the preservation unto the heavenly kingdom (2 Timothy 4:18). By Peter it is described as the κληρονομία which consists in the σωτηρία ψυχῆς, revealed as δόξα, and retained in heaven (1 Peter 1:4, 9; 5:1, 10). James considers it as the promised crown of life and inheritance of the kingdom (James 1:12; 2:5). In the epistle to the Hebrews it is described as the Sabbath of the people of God (4:9; compare 12:22 sq., etc.). While, however, life everlasting thus belongs to the future, we must not forget that, according to Paul's exposition, it appears in its essence indissolubly connected with our present life. As our relation to God, as altered by sin, can but lead to death, so in the restoration of the original relation there must necessarily, and, indeed, as an ethical religious principle, be ζωή (life) presented in the δικαιοσύνη, *righteousness* (Romans 5:21; 8:10; Galatians 3:21); so that δικαιοσύνη in its connection with ζωη (Romans 5:18, δικαίωσις ζωῆς, *justification of life),* constitutes the very essence of the σωτηρία *(salvation)* imputed to the subject, even though in the Judaic epistles of the apostle the ζωή itself is dwelt upon more than the fundamental idea of the δικαιοσύνη. Christ is ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν *(our life);* though yet concealed (Colossians 3:3, 4; Philippians 1:21; Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 3:17; 1 Corinthians 15:45), he is found in us (Galatians 4:19); we have put him on, and become parts of his body (Ephesians 5:30; Galatians 3:27; Colossians 1:18, etc.). From this it results that his life of glory must also become ours, which idea is presented to us in various ways (Romans 6:8; 2 Timothy 2:11, 12; Romans 5:17, 21; 8:30; Ephesians 2:5, 6). The Spirit gives also the πνεῦμα ζωῆς *(Spirit of life),* as the element of new life (Romans 8:2; comp. 2 Corinthians 3:17), the foundation of that life which overcomes that which is mortal (2 Corinthians 5:4, 5; Ephesians 1:14); our mortal body is by it made alive (Romans 8:11); its results arepeace and life (Romans 8:6, 10, 13). In this respect eternal life is the "gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord" (Romans 6:23). As λόγος ζωῆς (the word of life) (Philippians 2:16), Christ has destroyed death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel (2 Timothy 1:10).

Aside from this evident connection between eternal life and the newness of life of the Christ was derived from Christ (Romans 6:4), the ζωὴ αἰώνιος (eternal life) is still always considered in Paul's writings as

posterior to the casting off if the mortal body, and the exchange of the corruptible for the incorruptible. The consequences of these premises in their full development are first presented to us, however, in the epistles of John. Here we find' the most important principle for the subjective aspect .of Christianity: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον (he that believeth on the Son hath eternal life) (<430336>John 3:36; 3:15,16; 5:24; 6:47, 53-58; 10:28; 17:2, 3; 20:31; <620512>1 John 5:12, 13). Having passed from death unto life, death has no longer dominion over him (<430524>John 5:24), and he is free from the law and from the anger of God; he becomes partaker of the fullness of salvation. On the contrary, those who do not hearken to the Son have not life, neither shall they see it, but the anger of God abides with them. Thus, while Paul distinguishes between the actual state of grace, with its accompanying hope on the one hand, and the future attainment of the object of our hope, John unites these in his conception of eternal life, and thus uses the expressions ζωὴ αἰώνοις (eternal life) and ζωή (life), which stand in the relation of form and contents, indifferently with or without the article (John in, 36; v. 24; <620314>1 John 3:14, 15; 5:11, 12, 13, etc.). The life of the faithful on this earth is inseparably connected with their eternal life, from the fact of their absolute deliverance fromn the sentence of death resulting from a state of estrangement from God (<430653>John 6:53). It is a result of the birth of the Spirit (John 3; comp. 5:21; <620105>1 John 1:5; <430336>John 3:36). See also <430414>John 4:14; 5:28; 6:40; 17:24; <620302>1 John 3:2.

This eternal life, with its divine course and its victorious power, finds its ground in the communion of life with Christ which is the result of faith. For while God as the absolute being is He whose life is "of himself" (<430657>John 6:57), and is Himself "eternal life" (<620520>1 John 5:20), the source of all life, yet the communication of life to the world, i.e., to mankind, has from the beginning, even before time began, (<430856>John 8:56), been irrevocably vested in the Son. He is the λόγος (word) as well in his relation to God as in his relation to the world. He has received the fullness of divine life from the Father in such a manner that it belongs to him as thoroughly his (<430526>John 5:26; <620511>1 John 5:11). Now, inasmuch as the Logos became flesh, the eternal life, which was of God, became manifested in him. It is, in the next place, the revealed light of life. Christ, in his relation to the world, is therefore as well ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς as ἡ ζωή (<620101>1 John 1:1, 2; <430103>John 1:3, 4; 6:53 sq.; 14:6); in one word, the really sole source of life, the universal priiciple of life in the world, both spiritual and material (<430521>John

5:21-29; 10:9, 28; 11:25; 14:19; 6:27, 35, 39, 63; 7:38, 39). From this it is easilyseen how eternal life is designated in the N.T. as the command of the Father, the knowledge of God and of Christ, or also as the commandment of Christ (<431250>John 12:50; comp. 8:51; 17:3; <620225>1 John 2:25; 3:14, 15; comp. <431225>John 12:25).

Confirmations of this view, by which the ζωή comes to occupy the first place in the plan of salvation in Christ, are to be found in numerous passages of the N.T. Christ is represented as the ever-living (<660118>Revelation 1:18), the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς (<440315>Acts 3:15), the λίθος ζῶν, by virtue of whom those who follow him become λίθοι ζῶντες, living stones (<600204>1 Peter 2:4, 5). In <600307>1 Peter 3:7 (comp. 4:6) we read of a κληρονομία χάριτος ζωῆς, and in the apocalyptic description of the heavenly Jerusalem we still read of a ποταμὸς ὕδατος ζωῆς (river of the water of life) which flows from the throne of God and of the Lamb, as also of a ξύλον ζωῆς (tree of life) by the shores of the stream (<662201>Revelation 22:1, 2, 14, 19; 2:7). See the different interpretations given to John's ζωὴ αἰώνιος in Kaeuffer, *De bibl.* ζ. ἀ. notione, page 22.

II. *History of the Doctrine.* —

1. The Talmudists speak only of the aBḝhiµ l'[, in which all Israelites have part, but nowhere of an eternal life; while the Targumists make use of the expression, for instance, in <031805>Leviticus 18:5.

2. It was long before even the Christian Church, was able to understand the full scope of the idea. In early times the ζωὴ αἰώνιος (eternal life) was represented only as future happiness, to be fully accomplished only after the resurrection and the judgment of the world. Irenaeus *(adv. Haer.* 1, c. 10) states what the per universum orbem usque ad fines terree seminata ecclesia (the Church dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth) believes on this point, the rediturum — ut justis et sanctis — incorruptibilem statum largiatur et vitam seternam tribuat (coming of Christ to confer eternal life upon the righteous and holy). So also Tertullian *(De prcescr. Hceret.* C. 13). Augustine *(De Sp. et Lit.* c. 24): "Cum venerit, quod perfectum est, tune erit vita seterna; it is totum prsemiumn, cujus promissione gaudemus" (that is, the complete reward, in the promise of which we joy) (Pe *snorib. eccl. oath.* page 25; *De Trin.* 1:13; *Enchir.* § 29, etc. Basil (Essarr. *Psalm 45)* connects it with the eternal membership of heaven. The Apostles' Creed and the Athanasian

Creed end the enumeration of their articles of faith with the dogma concerning eternal life as emanating from God, the absolute cause, and represent it as the final object of all ordained development *(Const. Apost. 7:*41). John of Damascus, at the end of his *Orthod. fid.*, where he treats of the resurrection, says expressly, αἰώνιος ζωὴ τὸ ἀτελεύτατον τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος δηλοῖ: οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἡμέραις καί νυξὶν ὁ χρόνος ἀριθμηθήσεται: ἔστι δὲ μᾶλλον μία ἡμέρα ἀνέσπερος, τοῦ ἡλίον τῆς δικαιοσύνης τοῖς δικαίοις φαιδρῶς ἐπιλάμποντος. Even when the fathers speak of Christ as the ζωή they refer almost exclusively to the imparting of future blessedness: Cyril of Alexandria and Anamonius (Catena *on* <4146>*John 14:*6), Gregory Nazianzenus *(Orat.* 10, *c. Eunom.).* At all events, they call the assurance of life resting on communion with Christ merely ζωή, ἡ κυρίου ζωή, but not ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Yet occasionally they touch upon nearly all the questions connected with that point, without, however, arriving at any definite system of doctrine. In their description of the state of the blessed they mention as the most important points its endless duration, freedom from evil, and absolute satisfaction. The latter was sometimes defined as complete knowiedge, perfect moral liberty inner and outer peace, or immediate intercourse with God and the saints, together with personal reunion with those who have preceded us; or, again, as the contemplation of God, as the fulfillment of all human desire, or as several of these different points together. The *finis desidesiorumn nostrorum* is God himself, *qui sinefine videbitur, sinefostidio anabiter, sirvefatigatione laudabitur* (Justin, *Apol.* 1:8; Origen, Deprinc. 3:318, 321; Cyprian, De mortal. [1726], page 166; Greg. Naz. Osat. 16:9; 8:23; Greg. Nyss. *Orat. fun. de Placilla et Orat. de Mortuis;* Basil, Hom. 6 in *Hexaom. et Hom.* in Psalm 114; August. *De civ. Dei,* 22:29, 30; Chrysost. Hose. 14 in *Ep. ad Rona;* Ambros. *in Galatians* 6; Cassiodor. *De anima,* c. 12). The idea of different degrees of felicity in future life, as differences of reward, was widely prevalent, without however, making it lose its character as *gratia pro* gratia (grace for grace) (August. Tract. 13 in John; Theodoret on <4162>*Romans* 6:23, and in *Canticum* 1). According to the ἀξία (desert) of every one, there are πολλαὶ ἀξιωμάτων διαφοραί, βαθμοὶ πολλοί and μέτρα (Orig. 1:1, 2, 11; Greg. Naz. Orat. 27:8; 14:5; 19:7; 32:33; Basil in *Eunom.* 1:3; August. *De Carv. Dei,* 22:30, 2; Hieron. *ad. Jov.* 2). The fathers say also very positively that the joys of heaven cannot be described in words, and human imagination can only form an approximative idea of them. So Greg. *Nyss. (Orat. Catecls.* c. 40). "Bona

vitae aeternae tam multa sunt ut numerum, tam magna ut mnensuram, tam pretiosa ut aestimationem omnem excedant" (August. *De triapl. habit.* c. 1, *Conf. Orth.).*

3. The divines of the Middle Ages brought to light no new truths on this point, but assembled those already recognized into a system. They also established a doctrinal distinction between *vita aeterna* (eternal life) and *beatitudo* (happiness), defining them both. Anselm *(De simil.* c. 47) counts fourteen *partes beatitudinis,* seven of which relate to the glorifying of the body, and seven to the soul. The occupations of the saints are generally connected also with the number seven. Yet it was more customary to divide the different aspects of that state-of course subject to all kinds of occasional modifications into twelve parts (Bonaventura, *Dieta salut.* 10, c. 4; Peter d'Ailly, *Spec. consid.* 3, c. 11; Johan. de Turre crem. *Tract.* 36 *in reg.):* "Duodecim considerationes vitae asternae:

1. Illa sola est vita vera;
2. Possidetur sanitas sine quacunque infirmitate, molestia aut passione;
3. Pulchritudo sine quacunque deformitate;
4. Copia omnium bonorum;
5. Satietas et adimpletio omnium desideriorum sine quocunque defectu;
6. Securitas et pacis tranquillitas sine timore quocunque;
7. Visio beata clarissima et jucundissima divinitatis;
8. Delectatio summa;
9. Sapientia et plenissima cognitio absque ignorantia (an especially gratifying prospect for the scholastics; so that, for instance, Duns Scotus wonders whether the saints knew the real essence of things);
10. In illa viventes sumnmo ibi honore et gloria sublimantur;
11. Est in ea jucunditas ineffabilis;
12. Laus interminabilis."

(The twelve points are:

1. Eternal life is the only true life;
2. It has health without infirmity or passion;
3. Beauty without disfigurement;
4. All blessings in abundance;
5. Satisfaction of all desires;
6. Peace and tranquillity without fears;
7. Beatific vision of the Divinity;

8. Supreme delight;
9. Wisdom and perception without ignorance;
10. The highest honor and glory;
11. Ineffable sweetness;
12. Endless praise.)

Thomas Aquinas recognized, besides, the general and common *beatitud*, especial *dotes*, gifts. Thus, aside from the *corona aurea*, he reserves a special *aureola* to the martyrs and saints, and also to monks and nuns, as a sort of superadded reward. According to him, the organ of transmission of the blessings of future life is knowledge ; according to Scotus, the will. After the times of Anselm, and among the scholastics and mystics, we find very attractive descriptions of the blessed state, full of elevated ideas. "Praemium est," says Bernard *(De meditat.* c. 4), "videre Deum, vivere cum Deo, esse cum Deo, esse in Deo, qui erit omnia in omnibus; habere Deum, qui est summum bonum; et ubi est summum bonum, ibi summa felicitas." (The reward is, to see God, to dwell with God, to exist with God and in God, who shall be All in All; to possess God, who is the highest Good; and where the highest Good is, there is perfect bliss.)

4. The Roman Catholic Church has simply gathered the teachings of the scholastics into a whole on this point, and has established them in a more fixed and dogmatic manner, as is shown in the exposition given in the Roman Catechism. According to it, the *vita aeterna* (eternal life), by which believers are, after their resurrection, to attain the perfection after which they aim, is *non magis perpetuitas vitae, quam in perpetuitate beatitudo, quae beatorunm desiderium expleat* (not only perpetuity of life, but also bliss in that perpetuity, satisfying all the desires of the blessed). It is evident, moreover, that the nature of the blessedness of the saints cannot be appreciated by our minds in any but an empirical, not an absolute manner. According to the scholastics, the eternal blessings can be divided into,

1. Essential; the contemplation of God in his nature and substance, and the consequent participation in his essence, which is identical with his possession.

2. Accessory; glory, honor, perfect peace, etc. They are expressly represented as incentives to lead a virtuous life. On their connection with good works in the Romanist system, see Council of Trent *(Sess.* 6, c. 26).

5. With the exception of the part relating to purgatory, the doctrine of the elder Protestantism on this subject does not essentially differ from that of the Romish Church. The symbolical books of the evangelical Church afford us but little information on this point. In general, the *vita aeterna* continued to be considered as *salutis nostrce complementum, spei meta, finis fidei* (the goal of hope, the end of faith). By it was understood the position of the just, partly after this life in general, and partly after the resurrection. (Comp. *Augsburg Conf:* art. 17; *Apol.* 4:212; *Cat. Min.* 2:3; *Formula Concordiae,* 633, 723; *Coif. Belg.* art. 67; Luther, *Works,* 1:360, 887, 997; 11:1487; Melancthon, *loci.* 1553, 75; Calvin, *Institutes,* 3:9, 1.) Still the effects of a deeper study of Scripture (a result of the Reformation) became manifest in various ways, and especially in the idea of a beginning of eternal life in the heart of the believer, which was recognised as connected with regeneration *(Apol. Confessionis,* 4:140, 148, 99, 187, 209, 210, 285, mostly in the German text; Buddeus, 445, 503; Zwingli, *Exp. cld.* 12; P. Martyr, *Loci.* 442; Cat. Pal. 58; Alting, *Expl. Catech.* 280; Alsted, 759; Perkins, *Cat.* 778; Confessio Bohem. *Niem.* 846). Compare also Jansenius, *Comm. Cone. Ev.* c. 136, 976. Yet this truly evangelical view was not steadily persisted in, but, on the contrary, it was soon asserted again that the expression "eternal life" occurred only in Scripture to designate the reward of Christian fidelity. Nevertheless, the fundamental points of the idea of eternal life remained in the doctrine of a mystical union with Christ, and in the doctrine concerning the Eucharist. Many draw a distinction between the *vita spiritualis* (spiritual life), of which Christ is the *alimentum* (food), and the *vita aeterna* (eternal life). The former was also designated as *vita gratie* (the life of grace), and the latter as *vita glorie* (the life of glory). There were three degrees of eternal life recognized: 1. initialis, in this world; 2. partialis, after the death of the individual; 3. perfectionalis, after the last judgment. (So Pearson, *On the Creed,* Oxford, 1820, 1:598.) Gerhard's definition *(Cotta,* 20, 533) is an excellent exposition of the Protestant scholastic views on this subject: "Vita aeterna est felicissimus ac beatissimus ille siatus, quo Deus ex immensa misericordia (causa efficiens principalis) propter Christum mediatorem (causa efficiens meritoria) perseverante fide (causa instrumentalis) adprehensum pios post hanc vitam beabit, ut primum quidem animae eorum a corporibus separatse, postmodum vero eaedem in die resurrectionis glorificatis corporibus reunita, ab omnibus miseriis, doloribus et malls liberatae, cum Christo, angelis sanctis et omnibus electis in sempiterna lmetitia, gloria et felicitate vivant, perfecta Dei cognitione,

perfecta sanctitate et justitia ornatae Deum a facie ad faciem sine fine videant, sine fastidio ament ac sine defatigatione glorificent." The early Protestant theologians speak of the felicity of the future life as incomprehensible and ineffable *(Conf. Belg.* 37; *Bohem.* in Niem. 846; Calvin, 3, 15, 10; Gerhard, 20, 340). Its blessings are partly privative, partly positive: the meeting again and recognition of Christians was considered one of them (Zwingli *In exp. fid.* 12); this is called a positive blessing. That individual blessedness will not be disturbed by the, knowledge of the damnation of others is called a privative blessing. In opposition to Rome, the influence of personal merit on the future state was denied by these theologians; but some of them, while admitting that blessedness is essentially the same for all, hold to several *degrees* of blessedness. A number of other questions as to the language of the blessed, the manner of the contemplation of God, if he shall be praised in word, etc., are generally treated by the ancient theologians after the example of Calvin, *Inst.* 3, 25, 6, as irrelevant, and of no religious importance. In later times they have been discussed anew.

VII. *Later Views.* — The evangelical Protestant churches probably would all agree that eternal life commences in Christian experience in this world. So Wesley *(Sermons,* 2:181): "This is the testimony, that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life [the eternal life here spoken of]; and he that hath not the Son hath not life." As if he had said, This is the sum of the testimony which God hath testified of his Son, that God hath given us not, only a title to, but the real beginning of eternal life; and this life is purchased by, and treasured up in his Son, who has all the springs and the fullness of it in himself, to communicate to his body, the Church. This eternal life, then, commences when it pleases the Father to reveal his Son in our hearts; when we first know Christ, being enabled to "call him Lord by the Holy Ghost;" when we can testify, our conscience bearing us witness in the Holy Ghost, "The life which I now live I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." And then it is that happiness begins — happiness real, solid, substantial. Then it is that heaven is opened in the soul, that the proper heavenly state commences, while the love of God, as loving us, is shed abroad in the heart, instantly producing love to all mankind; general pure benevolence, together with its genuine fruits, lowliness, meekness, patience, contentedness in every state; an entire, clear, full acquiescence in the whole

will of God, enabling us to "rejoice evermore, and in everything to give thanks."

As to the nature of the blessedness of the future life, "the sum of what we are taught by reason and Scripture on this point may be comprehended under the three following particulars:

(a) We shall hereafter be entirely freed from the sufferings of this life;
(b) Our future blessedness will be a continuation of the happiness of this life;
(c) But it will also be increased by the addition of many new joys, which stand in no natural or necessary connection with our preceding condition in this life.

But, for want of accurate knowledge of the state of things in the future world, we can say nothing definite and certain as to the nature of these positive rewards. In the doctrine of the New Testament, however, positive rewards are considered most obviously as belonging to our future felicity, and as constituting a principal part of it. For it always represents the joys heaven as resulting strictly from the favor *of God,* and as being *undeserved* by those to whom they are given. Hence there must be something more added to the natural good consequences of our actions, something which cannot be considered as the necessary and natural consequences of the good actions we may have before performed. Some theologians have supposed that the saints in heaven may be taught by *immediate divine revelations (lumen glories);* especially those who may enter the abodes of the blessed without knowledge, or with only a small measure of it; e.g. children, and others who have died in ignorance for which they themselves were not to blame. On this subject nothing is definitely taught in the Scriptures; but both Scripture and reason warrant us in believing that provision will be made, for all such persons in the future world. A principal part of our future happiness will consist, according to the Christian doctrine, in the enlargement and correcting of our knowledge respecting God, his nature, attributes, and works, and in the salutary application of this knowledge to our own moral benefit, to the increase of our faith, love, and obedience. There has been some controversy among theologians with regard to the vision *of God (visio Dei intuitiva,* or *sensitiva,* or *beatifica, or comprehensiva);* but Christ is always represented as one who will be *personally visible* by us, and whose personal, familiar intercourse and guidance we shall enjoy. And herein Christ himself places a chief part of

the joy of the saints (John 14, 17, etc.). And so the apostles often describe the blessedness of the pious by the phrase *being with Christ.* To his guidance has God entrusted the human race in heaven and on earth. And Paul says (<4006>2 Corinthians 4:6) we see ‘the brightness of the divine glory in the face of Christ;' he is 'the visible representative of the invisible God' (<5015>Colossians 1:15). Paul says expressly (<5047>1 Thessalonians 4:17) that we shall be with Christ, in company *with our friends who died before us* (ἁμα σὺν αὐτοῖς); and this presupposes that we shall recognize them, and have intercourse with them, as with Christ himself. Paul advises that Christians should comfort themselves under the loss of their friends by considering that they are at home with the Loa d, and that they shall be again united together" (Knap *Christ. Theology,* sec. 140, pages 490-494). See also Cotta, *fist. Dorm. de Vita aeterna; Cotta, Theses Theol. de Vita caterna* (Tttbing. 1758); Storr, *Opuscula Academica,* 2:75; Wesley, *Sermons,* 2:180 sq.; Baxter, *Saints' Rest;* Isaac Taylor, *Physical Theory of another Life;* Naville *Vie Eternelle* (1865); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:254 (from which this article is in part a translation); Maartensen, *Christian Dogmnatics,* § 283-290. *SEE IMMORTALITY; SEE RESURRECTION; SEE HEAVEN.*

Eternity of God

SEE GOD.

E'tham

(Hebrews Etham', μ t aę supposed by Jablonsky [Opusc. ed. to Water. 2:157] to be i.q., Coptic *atiom,* i.e., "boundary of the sea;" Sept. Ὀθώμ, but omits in <0433>Numbers 33:8; Vulg. *Etham),* the third station of the Israelites when they left Egypt; a place described as lying "in the edge of the wilderness," where they encamped after the journey from Succoth (<0213>Exodus 13:20; <0433>Numbers 33:6). This description, and the route pursued by them, seem to fix upon some spot on the east of Egypt, north of the Red Sea, near the desert tract stretching thence along the whole eastern shore as far as Marah, to which the same name, "desert of Etham," is therefore naturally applied in the text (<0433>Numbers 33:8). The precise locality of Etham has been a matter of dispute, according to the various theories of the passage across the sea. *No* spot more likely has been indicated than a point in the valley of the bitter lakes opposite the foot of wady AbuZeid, in the direct route around the point of the sea, but from

which there is a passage sharply deflecting, up wady Ena-shesh, around Jebel Attaha, which the Israelites were at this point commanded to take. *SEE EXODE; SEE DESERT.* The sense of the passage (Numbers 33:6-8, is evidently this: At the end of the second day they had already arrived at the bolders of the Arabian desert, at Etham, from which the tract of country lying next to Egypt receives the name, desert of Etham; but, instead of advancing directly into the desert, they turned down again farther into Egypt, to the Arabian Gulf. Afterwards, instead of going round the sea, they proceeded through it into the desert of Etham. *SEE SHUR*. Schwarz says *(Palaest.* page 211) that the part of the desert north of the Red Sea, near Suez, is still called Ethia, but this lacks confirmation.

E'than

(Hebrews *Eythan'*, ˆtyae, *perpetuity*, as often), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Αἰθάν, v.r. Γαιθάν and Αἰθαιμ.) One of four persons ("Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mabol") who were so renowned for their sagacity that it is mentioned to the honor of Solomon that his wisdom excelled theirs (1 Kings 4:31 [Hebrews 5:11]), Ethan being distinguished as "the Ezrahite" from the others, who are called "sons of Mahol;" unless, indeed, this word *Alahol* (q.v.) be taken, not as a proper name, but appellatively for "sons of music, dancing," etc., in which case it would apply to Ethan as well as to the others. This interpretation is strengthened by our finding the other names associated with that of Ethan in 1 Chronicles 2:6, as "sons of Zerab," i.e., of Ezra, the same as Ezrahites, or descendants of the son of Judah. *SEE EZRAHITTE*. With this agrees the Jewish chronology, which counts them as prophets during the sojourn in Egypt *(Seder Olam Rabba,* page 52), although the Jews have also a tradition confounding Ethan with Abraham, Heman with Moses, and Chalcol with Joseph (Jerome, *Comment. on Kings,* in loc.). In 1 Chronicles 2:8, Ethan's "sons" are mentioned, but only one name is given, that of Azariah. B.C. post 1856. In the title to the 89th Psalm an "Ethan the Ezrahite" is named as the author; but there seems to be some confusion here in the latter epithet. See No. 3 below.

2. (Sept. Αἰθάμ v.r. Οὐρί.) Son of Zimmah and father of Adaiah, in the ancestry of the Levite Asaph (1 Chronicles 6:42 [27]). B.C. cir. 1585. In verse 21 he seems to be called JOAH, the father of Iddo.

3. (Sept. Αἰθάν v.r. Αἰθάμ.) A Levite, son of Kushi or Kushaiah, of the family of Merari; appointed one of the leaders of the Temple music by David (as singer, 1 Chronicles 6:44 [29], or player on cymbals, 15:17, 19). B.C. 1014. In the latter passages he is associated with Heman and Asaph, the heads of two other families of Levites; and inasmuch as in other passages of these books (1 Chronicles 25:1, 6) the names are given as Asaph, Heman, and JEDUTHUN, it has been conjectured that this last 'and Ethan were identical. There is at least great probability that Ethan the singer was the same person as Ethan the Ezrathite (comp. No. 1 above), whose name stands at the head of Psalm 89, for it is a very unlikely coincidence that there should be two persons named Heman and Ethan so closely connected in two different tribes and walks of life. The difficulty is even greater in the case of Heman (q.v.), who, in the title to Psalm 88, is likewise expressly called an Ezrahite, and yet identified in its authorship with the sons of Korah. Hengstenberg supposes *(Comment. on Psalms,* Clark's ed. 3:89) that both Heman and Ethan, although descendants of Judah, were *adopted* into the ranks of the Levites; but this will not meet the above genealogy of this Ethan, who is moreover classed with the Merarites, and not with the Korahites. *SEE HEMAN*, and *SEE EZRAHITE.*

Eth'anim

(Hebrews *Eythanim',* µynaeyae, *perennial* streams; Sept. Ἀθανίν), another name for the month TISRI *SEE TISRI* (q.v.); so called from the fullness of the *brooks* at that time of the year, being swelled with the autumnal rains (1 Kings 8:2). *SEE CALENDAR*.

Eth'baal

(Hebrews *Ethba'al,* l[Bit]a, *with Baal, i.e.,* enjoying his favor and help; Sept. Ἐθβάαλ), a king of Sidon, father of the infamous Jezebel, the wife of Ahab (1 Kings 16:31). According to Josephus *(Ant.* 8:13, 1 and 2; *Apion,* 1:18), Ethbaal is called *Ithobalus* (Ἰθόβαλος or Εἰθώβαλος, *i.e.,* l[bi/Taa *Baal with him)* by Menander, who also says that he was a priest of Astarte, and, having put the king Pheles to death, assumed the scepter of Tyre and Sidon, lived sixty-eight years, and reigned thirty-two (comp. Theophil. *Autol.* 3, page 132). As fifty years elapsed between the deaths of Hiram and Pheles, the date of Ethbaal's reign may be given as about B.C. 940-908. The worship of Baal was no doubt closely allied to that of

Astarte, and it is even possible that a priest of Astarte might have been dedicated also to the service of Baal, and borne his name. We here see the reason why Jezebel, the daughter of a priest of Astarte, was so zealous a promoter of idolatry, the taint of which, with its attendant tyranny, eventually extended to the throne of Judah in the person of Athaliah; and as, twenty-one years after the death of Ethbaal, his granddaughter Dido built Carthage, and founded that celebrated commonwealth (Josephus, as above), we may judge what sort of a spirit animated the females of this royal family. *SEE AHAB*. Another Phoenician king of the same name (Ἰθόβαλος or Εἰθώβαλος) appears as a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar (Josephus, *Ant.* 10:11, 1; *Apion,* 1:21; Eusebius, *Chron. Armen.* 1:74). *SEE PHOENICIA.*

Ethelbert

king of Kent, was born A.D. 546 or 552, and succeeded to the throne about A.D. 560 (?). About A.D. 590 he was acknowledged as Braetwalda (president of the Heptarchy). In 570 he married Bertha, a Christian, and daughter of Charibert, a Frankish king. It had been agreed before her marriage that she should be allowed to enjoy her own religion. The most important event of his reign was the introduction of Christianity into his kingdom by Augustine, who landed in Kent in 596. *SEE AUGUSTINE* (volume 1, page 544). In 597 the king himself was baptized. He founded the bishopric of Rochester, and, with his nephew Sebert, king of Essex, erected the church of St. Paul's in London. Ethelbert died in 616. — Maclear, *Christian Missions during the Middle Ages* (1863), chapter 5; Collier, *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain,* 1:156 sq.

Ethelwold

the principal reformer of monastic orders in England, was born in Winchester about 925. From early youth he distinguished himself by his learning, and obtained the favor of king Athelstah. He was ordained priest simultaneously with Dunstan, and when the latter became abbot of Glastonbury, about 947, Ethelwold, entered his monastery and became a companion of his studies. He distinguished himself as a poet, grammarian, and theologian. He is also reported to have been familiar with the mechanical arts, and to have constructed two bells. When he declared his intention to go to France, in order to perfect himself in his studies, king Edred, who wished to retain him in England, refused to him permission to

travel, and appointed him abbot of Abingdon. This monastery was then in ruins, and was rebuilt by Ethelwold. In 963 king Edgar appointed him bishop of Winchester, The great task of his life henceforth was the reorganization of the Anglo-Saxon monasteries, which were at that time administered by secular priests *(clerici, canonic, presbyteri).* The discipline in the monastery was anything but severe, and many of the priests were married. Ethelwold substituted for the secular priests regular monks, and displayed great activity in rebuilding the monasteries that had been destroyed by the Danes, and in repeopling those that had been abandoned. The monastery of Winchester, under his direction, became a celebrated school, from which proceeded several distinguished abbots and bishops. He died August 1, 984, at Winchester. The chief work of Ethelwold is an Anglo-Saxon translation of the Latin rule of St. Benedict. It has never been printed. He also wrote a mathematical treatise, still extant in manuscript. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale,* 16:598; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 435 sq. (A.J.S.)

E'ther

(Hebrews *id.* r t,[*abundance),* one of the cities in the plain (Shephelah) of Judah (mentioned between Libnah and Ashan, <0654>Joshua 15:42, Sept. Ἄθερ v.r. Ἰθάκ), eventually assigned to Simeon (mentioned between Remmon and Ashan, <0697>Joshua 19:7, Sept. Ἄθερ v.r. Ἰεθέρ). In the parallel list of the towns of Simeon in <1042>1 Chronicles 4:32, TOCHEN is substituted for Ether. In the *Onomasticon* Eusebius and Jerome mention it twice (s.v. Ἔθέρ, Ether; Ἰεθέρ, Jether — in the latter case confounding it with JATTIR, a city of priests, which contained friends of David during his troubles under Saul), and state that it was then a considerable place (κώμη μεγίστη), retaining the name of *Jethira* (Ἰεθειρά, Ἰεθαρά), very near Malatha, in the interior of the district of Daroma, that is, in the desert country below Hebron and to the east of Beersheba. At Beit-Jibrin Van de Velde heard of a *tell Athar* in this neighborhood, but could not learn its distance or direction *(Memoir,* page 311). For the present, we may conjecturally place it at *Beit-Auwa,* in the vicinity of the associated localities, S. of Beit-Jibrin and W. of Hebron; a ruined village, covering low hills on both sides of the path, and exhibiting foundations of hewn stones, leading to the inference that it was once an extensive town (Robinson, *Researches,* 3:10).

Etheridge, John Wesley

Ph.D., a Methodist minister and eminent scholar, was born at Grangewoods, Isle of Wight, February 24, 1804, and died at Camborne May 24,1866. His parents were Methodists, and he was brought up with religious care. In 1827 he entered the ministry of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and was appointed to the Hull Circuit. In 1838 his health failed, and he became "supernumerary." In 1846 he was able to return to the itinerant ministry, in which service he remained until his death. "He was an eminently holy man. Whether in the pulpit or in the social circle, he appeared clothed with humility, and radiant with Christian benevolence; Constrained by the love of Christ, he lived only to promote the interests of the Church. He was 'a burning and shining light,' and consumed himself in the service of his Lord and Savior" *(Minutes,* 1867).

Dr. Etheridge's devotion to letters, amid the engrossing labors of the Methodist ministry, was very remarkable. Early in life he showed extraordinary aptitude for languages, and by continued study he learned to read and write Hebrew and Syriac with facility. In the literature of these two languages he became pre-eminent before his death. His published writings include *The Syrian Churches, their early History, Liturgies, and Literature* (London, 1846, 12mo: this work contains a translation, also, of the four Gospels from the Peschito)*: — The Apostolical Acts and Epistles from the Peschito, with the remaining Epistles and the Revelation, after a later Syrian Text* (London, 1849, 12mo) *for a Aramaicae* (London, 1843, 12mo: a useful series of Essays on the. Shemitic, Aramaic, and Syriac languages and literature)*: — Jerusalem and Tiberias, a Survey of the religious and scholastic Learning of the Jews, designed as an Introduction to Hebrew Literature* (London, 1856, 12mo): — *The Targums of Onkelos and* Jonathan ben-Uzziel, etc. (London, 1862, 12mo). Besides these he published *Misericordia,* or *Contemplations on the Mercy of God* (Lond. 1842): — *The Life of Dr. Adam Clarke* (London, 1858; N.Y. 1860): — *The Life of Dr. Thomas Coke* (Lond. 1860): — *The Life of the Reverend John Fletcher. — Minutes of Conferences* (English) for 1867; *Christian Examiner,* 64:346.

Ethics

from ηθος, originally the Ionic form of ἔθος, in Germ. *Sittenlehre,* in English *moral philosophy,* though this last phrase sometimes covers the

whole science of mind. Ethics are related to law and duty, and to virtue and vice. "Aristotle says that ηθος, which signifies moral virtue, is derived from ἔθος, custom, since it is by repeated acts that virtue, which is a moral habit, is formed" (see Fleming's *Vocab. Philippians* page 171). "Ethics, taken in its widest sense, as including the moral sciences or natural jurisprudence, may be divided into,

1. Moral philosophy, or the science of the relations, rights, and duties by which men are under obligations towards God, themselves, and their fellow-creatures.

2. The law of nations, or the science of those laws by which all nations, as constituting the society of the human race, are bound in their mutual relations to one another.

3. Public or political law, or the science of the relations between the different ranks in society.

4. Civil law, or the science of those laws, rights, and duties by which individuals in civil society are bound — as commercial, criminal, judicial, Roman, or modern.

5. History, profane, civil, and political" (Peemans, *Introd. ad Philosoph.* page 96). Ethics, then, covers the science of all that is moral, whether it relates to law or action, to God or the creature, to the individual or the state. It goes wherever the ideas of right and wrong can enter.

I. Ethical science may be divided into philosophical ethics, theological ethics, and Christian ethics.

(a.) *Philosophical Ethics.* — The science, in this aspect, must find its root and its life, its forms and its authority, in the depths of the human constitution This leads necessarily to the idea of God. We do not affirm that ethics cannot be discussed at all without bringing in the notion of a supreme being. On the contrary, it is undeniable that we find in man a moral nature; whatever may be the character of his morality, the very doubts about that imply the fact of morality. He manifestly has relations to virtue and vice, to right and wrong, to blame and praise, to guilt and innocence. True, if he does not accept the idea of God, morals seem to lose their foundation. Why should a man obey the dictates of his nature, even when obedience seems to be right and useful, unless his nature is a product

of wisdom, and reveals the law and the nature of an infinite intelligence? But truth is stubborn, and even a fragment of it, swinging in the air without a foundation, will live. Pulled up out of the soil of the doctrine of God, the moral ideas, however shorn of their strength and withered, still assert their authority and insist on obedience, from motives of utility, or fitness, or happiness. A genuine philosophical ethics, however, will find a Creator from the study of the creature, and will raise from the nature of man a law which will ground itself in the idea of God.

(b.) *Theological Ethics.* — This is grounded upon acme religion or theology. But in this aspect the science is broad enough to cover every religion. The ethics might be theological, and at the same time Buddhistic, or Mohammedan, or Brahminical. Theological ethics, therefore, might be a system on which the fundamental principle of morals had been perverted by the admixture of cruel and impure superstitions, just as a so-called philosophical ethics might be atheistic or pantheistic.

(c.) *Christian Ethics.* — Christian ethics is theological ethics limited by Christianity. As thus stated, it might appear to be narrower than either philosophical or theological ethics, but in reality it is far otherwise. Philosophical ethics is Christian so far as it is true and just, and, from the very nature of Christianity, as containing a complete account of human duty, it must even be broader and deeper than all human philosophies which relate to it. As to the relation of Christian ethics to any other supposed theological ethics, or to all other theologies in their moral aspects taken together, its position must be that of judge among them all; it must measure them all, eliminating whatever is false, restoring what is lacking, or rather supplanting them one and all as the only standard of moral truth and duty.

Besides, Christian ethics, considered as a science, and hence as a field for speculation, covers the whole ground. Philosophy and theology, in their ethical relations, are entirely within its scope. It must judge them both wherever it touches them. It has made ethics, and indeed all speculation, a different thing from what it was before it entered into human thought, and it aims to master all human thinking within its sphere. It is, to be sure, amenable to philosophical thought, and cannot repel the tests of right reason; it readily enters into the struggle with every adverse intellectual tendency, carrying with it a divine confidence that alone contains the infallible and indestructible norm of humanity regarded as moral.

Christian ethics, indeed, considered as speculative, is not infallible. God has given the ethical norm, but man is obliged to speculate for himself Evidently the complete form of Christian ethics, considered as philosophical, has not yet been reached. Its condition is yet militant, both in relation to false systems and to its own development. The genuine Christian ethics, in the scientific sense, lies scattered in various human treatises, in part is yet to be born, and remains to be evolved in the coming ages, and to be wrought into a system of beneficence and beauty which shall settle down on the whole human race, at once an atmosphere)f divine and filial love, and an antidote to discord, injustice, and all impurity.

"As between theological and philosophical speculation, so between theological and philosophical ethics, in so far as they are speculative, we must make a strong distinction. The latter pair differ precisely as the former do. But, much as philosophical and theological ethics differ, they are not opposites. Within the Christian world, Christian ethics, like philosophy in general, must always be' essentially Christian. It has always been so, as the result of an inviolable historical necessity, but in different degrees at different periods of time, and in the several stages of its progress. There may, indeed, arise a relative hostility between philosophical ethics and the contemporaneous Christian teaching, or even a hostility between ethical writers and Christianity in general; or, rather, such a hostility is unavoidable precisely in the degree in which humanity fails to be penetrated by Christianity. But, so long as this continues to be the case, it must be a proof of imperfection, not in philosophy only, but also in Christian piety. For even if Christian piety, looking at the doctrine in itself, should be convinced that it possessed the true results, yet she possesses her treasure without the scientific ability to understand it, or; to vindicate it to the understanding of others. It is, therefore, as science, still imperfect. A result of this will be that theological ethics will share in the imperfection. So long as the moral consciousness of the Christian, which is specifically determined by the church of which he is a member, does not clearly recognize itself in the forms of morality prevailing in his circle, a Christian ethical philosophy must remain a want — a desideratum. This, however, is only to say that this want will last while the general moral sentiment and that of the Church remain apart. The more nearly each approaches perfection in its own sphere, the nearer they come to being one. If we conceive of each as perfect, they remain two only in form, i.e., not different

in their method, but only in the order according to which, under the same method, they scientifically arrange themselves.

"What has now been said of the relation between philosophical and theological ethics, holds of the latter only so far as it is conceived of as speculative. In other modes of treating theological ethics, especially in the traditional, it is easy to conceive that the relation would be different... . It must be distinctly affirmed that a Christian character belongs to philosophical ethics throughout the Christian world. We do not mean that it *ought* to be so, but that it really *is* so; not, indeed, always in the highest and fullest sense, and as it ought to be, but still, in such a sense, whatever men may be conscious of, that without Christianity it never could have been what it is. In the Christian world there is no element of the moral or intellectual life which is not associated with some result of Christianity, itself undeniably the ground-principle of the historical development of our whole, Christian times. It can never be sufficiently remembered, especially in our own times, that what is actually Christian, and, indeed, what is essentially and specifically Christian, reaches, in all the relations of life, far beyond the sphere to which usage gives the name of *Christian,* or of which the present generation is at all conscious as Christian. The Christian element inheres in the very blood of that portion of humanity which passes under the name of Christendom. This is not the less true because certain individuals belonging to the Christian community may not feel its regenerating power. Besides, that would be a poor ethical system, considered as philosophy, which should ignore the great facts through which morality becomes Christian, and which should refuse to those facts the controlling position which actually belongs to them in making the moral world what. in point of science, it has become. These great facts, let men close their eyes as they will, are the breaking out of sin and the development of its destructive power in the world on the one hand, and the entrance of Jesus, the God-man, and the historical redeeming power proceeding from him on the other. Even philosophical morality, if it would not degenerate into mere unphilosophical abstractions, must make the moral life, considered as historical and concrete, scientifically comprehensible; the concrete historical form of the moral world, however, is, for us at least, before everything else, Christian, just as general history since the time of Christ is itself Christian.

"But, so long as we follow Schleiermacher, and, in explaining the relation between philosophical and theological ethics, make the religious

consciousness the opposite of speculation, we shall never escape confusion. The religious consciousness finds its antithesis not in speculation, but in the *not religious*, and speculation finds its opposite not in piety, but in empirical reflection: empirical reflection and speculation stand in very similar relations to piety. The larger number of theological writers are still of the opinion that the distinction between philosophical and theological ethics lies in the former being the universal, the abstract, the ethics of humanity, and the latter the concrete and specifically Christian, because it rests on history. Thus Schmid and Wuttke. These writers hold that the great facts which form the angles of the Christian theory of the world, namely, sin and redemption by Christ, are, according to their nature, inadequate as the basis of any purely *a priori* or speculative theory. They lay great stress on this. But why reason thus? At bottom, because they start with the presupposition that there is no other necessity but the necessity of *nature*. But, in spite of all the confident assertions of the contrary, we cannot doubt that from the specifically Christian consciousness of God, which is the subject treated here, sin and redemption should be deduced as a logical necessity" (Rothe, *Theologische Ethik*, 1:57).

II. *Position of Ethics in Theology.* — "Ethics is a part of systematic theology, which also includes dogmatics. As systematic science, it is to be distinguished from *exegetical* and *historical* theology. Its office is not merely to show what is the original, and thus normative Christian ethics, nor what has been accepted as such, but rather to teach that Christian ethics is the genuine ethical truth." ... . "On the other hand, ethics must be separated from the various branches of practical theology among which it has often been placed. The two sciences are different both in scope and aim. Ethics embraces the whole Christian idea of *good*, and not merely the Church, in which it finds only its culmination, and points away from itself to practical theology, the aim of which is, of course, practical" (Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* art. Ethik).

Place in Systematic Theology. — "In ancient times, and down to the Reformation, it was not independent, but held a subordinate place in the science of dogmatics. From the 17th century the two have been separated, and, following P. Ramus, most writers have distinguished between them as between theory and practice. In point of fact, dogmatics has practical importance, and ethics, as the science of the *good*, has a theory" (Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* art. Ethik). "Dogmatics and ethics are as certainly

independent *disciplinae* as God and man are separate beings. Only a point of view like that of Spinoza, in his *Ethics,* which denies the existence of a real creation and a moral world separate from God, can controvert the independent position of ethics by the side of dogmatics" *(idem).*

These views are substantially correct. "Christian ethics has a right to an independent position in the sphere of systematic theology, and it and dogmatics are as certainly distinct as are God and man." Still it is none the less true that, God and man conceived to be such as they are, ethics cannot be practically separated from religion. Ethics finds its highest sanctions in religion, as religion must consist largely in prescribing ethics. God and man being presented to the mind, ethics must cover the character of each, and also the relation between them.

III. *The Ethical* Faculty — Conscience. — There has been a great waste of controversy on the question whether or not conscience is a distinct and separate faculty of the soul, or only an application of the reason or judgment to moral subjects. The truth is that, the mind being a unit, all its faculties are only so many powers of applying itself differently according to demand. A faculty is a power of doing or acting, and a separate faculty is the power of acting in a particular, direction, as distinguished from other directions. The mind is as certainly and distinctly moral as it is intellectual, on imaginative, or volitional. Each of these expresses a distinct power of the one mind.

This faculty of forming moral judgments we call conscience and, if the views now expressed be correct, there is little propriety in discussions respecting the origin of conscience. It has no origin but that of its possessor; it is born with him, though from its nature it is only developed farther on in life, just as reason and imagination are. It has been asked, in reply to this view, whether conscience is not made what it is in any given case by the circumstances about it — In teaching, by the man's own acts — in short, by all the influences brought to bear upon him. We answer it is as to its form but there was first conscience, a moral faculty in the man to be shaped. We concede that neither moral ideas nor ideas of any sort, are innate; lent the capacity, nay, the constitutional necessity for moral ideas is innate.

IV. *The Ethical Standard* is, of course, according to Christianity, to be found in the Scriptures, but there is still in the sphere of science a wide

diversity as to their meaning. But when the standard is supposed to be understood on a given question, and the conscience submits to it, there must follow a perfect self-abnegation; degradation miust result fronc disolbedience. In the case of a conflict between the conscience and the law of the state, for example, in which case the conscience of the lawgiving majority collides with the individual conscience, who shall yield? The answer, from the very nature of the case, is neither. They must fight it out. The state, from its nature, is supreme, and cannot yield; but for *the* man the conscience is also supreme. The man can only die, or make some other atonement, and thus maintain allegiance to the highest tribunal.

V. *History of Ethics.* —

(a.) The sources of knowledge here are Christ, his person and teaching; also the writings of flee apostles, as shown in the New Testament. In the Old Testament the whole contents are authoritative, except as modified or repealed by the New Testament. By the side of these objective sources we have a subjective source in the New Covenant; it is the influence of the Holy Spirit in the faithful. To this Barnabas, Justin, and Clement of Alexandria bear witness. This life of the Spirit in the Church was by-and-by supplanted by the supposed efficacy of ordination, by which the Spirit was bound to the priesthood exclusively. There came now an outward law of the Church to modify the New Testament, and it controlled the ethical consciousness of Christendom until the Reformation.

(b.) Abundance of ethical material is found in the apostolical fathers, who base ethics on individual personality, on marriage, the family, etc. The most effective of the earlier writers was Tertullian (220). His ethical writings were very numerous, such as *concerning spectacles, concerning the veiling of virgins, monogamy, penitence, patience,* etc. His idea of Christianity was that it was a vast and defiant war power, separated from all the heathen customs of the Old World, and resolved to bring upon that world the judgment of Heaven. Cyprian, with his high claims for the episcopate, exercised great influence on the ethical sphere of the Church. He concentrated the truth of the Church in the episcopacy, in which he saw the vehicle of the Holy Ghost, and the instrument by which unity and the Holy Spirit should be assured to the Church forever. He, carried this idea of the dignity of the episcopate, and the sanctity and sanctifying power of orders, to a ridiculous extent. His doctrine of the efficacy of orders and the dignity of bishops was set over against certain sects — Novatians,

Montanists, Donatists — who held that the holiness and unity of the Church demanded that none but holy persons should be members. Augustine fell heir to this controversy. As the Church grew into an earthly kingdom, her ethics took more and more the direction of a so-called higher virtue, whose chief forms were celibacy, poverty, conventual life, and self-imposed torture.

Asceticism not only formed a part of the Church life, it became also the center from which the Christian life was forced to receive rule and law. It determined what was sin, and what was right and good: it dictated to councils; and, getting control of the state, it dispensed at will its spiritual and temporal awards; penitential books in great numbers were compiled, and, bad as the system was, in itself, it became a powerful instrument in bringing to order the various heathen peoples. For the books and writers on these subjects, see Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* 4:194, where the relation of asceticism to mysticism is well presented, and it is shown that all these terrible struggles had their root in the consciousness of the infinite demerit of sin, and found their happy solution in Luther's doctrine of faith.

The Reformation not only conquered the prevailing errors b) leading men back to the holy Scriptures, but it established positively the real principle of Christian ethics. It did this through justifying faith which, working by love, creates the possibility of Christian ethics. Love, springing from faith, is the fulfilling of the law. It is ethics in the soul, ready to take shape in noble action. This, working in time community inwardly, proceeds to mold all relations, private and public-marriage, family, church, state, science, art, and culture. The great reformers did not write complete ethical treatises, though they discussed many ethical subjects, such as prayer, oaths, marriage, etc.; but they especially discussed ethics in their explanations of the Decalogue in the Catechism. Indeed, the original form of Christian ethics is the Catechism. See Paul of Eitzen, *Ethicae doctrinae, lib.* 4 (1751), with later additions; also David Chytrdus, 1600, *Virtutum descriptiones in praepta Decalogi distributae* (1555); Lambert Daneau (t 1596), *Ethices Christianae,* lib. 3 (Geneva, 1577); Thomas Venatorius, *De Virtuto Christiana,* lib. 3; comp. Schwarz, *Thomas Venatorius, and the beginnings of Protestant ethics, in connection with the doctrine of justification, Stud. u. Krit.* (1850), heft. 1. See also Melancthon, in his *Philosophia Moralis* (1539), his *Enarratio aliquot librorum Aristotelis* (1545), and his *Phiysica.* Add to these Keckerncaun, *Systema ethicae tribus liris adornatum* (Geneva, 1614); Weigel, Johann Arndt, Valentin

Andrea, Spener, Nitzsch, Henry Muller, Scriver, and others, all mystics. The Reformed have also done something in this line, especially G. Voetius, C. Vitringa, H. Witsius, Amesius, Amyraldus *(Morale Chretienne,* 6 volumes, 1652-1660).

Three men, according to J.A. Dorner (in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 4:199), form the transition stage to the emancipation of philosophy — Hugo Grotius (*De jure pacis et belli),* Puffendorf; with his school, and Christian Thomasius. Then come Wolf, Mosheim (in his *Moral,* 9 volumes), Steinhart, Bahrdt, Buddeus, Chr. Aug. Crusius and J.F. Reuss *(Elementa theolegia Moralis,* 1767). Even the Roman Catholic Church of the last two centuries has felt the influemlce of the modern philosophy; the following Romanist writers are Wolfians: Luby, Schwarzhuber, Schanza, and Stadler; and the following are Kantians: Wanker, Mutschelle, Hermes, with his disciples Braun, Elvenica, and Vogelsang. Weiller is a Schellingian; independent. and, at the same time, mild and evangelical, pious and rich in thought, are Michael Sailer and Hirscher. Geishuttner is a Fichtian.

Kant's "practical reason," the metaphysics of ethics, occupies in the philosophy of morals a most important place, and, notwithstanding certain defects, it has the immortal honor to have discovered that the most certain of all things is the conscience in its relation to the practical reason, and to have made an end of the eudaemonism of ethics by means of the majesty of the moral law, which he compares with the glory of the starry heavens. To his "categorical imperative" certain rationalistic Kantians adhere; for example, J.W. Schmid, Karl Christian Schmid, and Krug. Some of the supernaturalists,: as Staudlin and Tieftrunk, Ammon and Vogel, incline to Jacobi's philosophy, See also Fichet, *System of Ethics* (1797). To the Jacobi-Friesian school belong De Wette *(Christliche Sittenlehre,* 4 bde. 1819-23), Kahler, and Baumgarten-Crusius. To the school of Hegel belong Michelet *(System der Philosoph. Moral,* Berlin, 1828), L.V. Henning *(Princip. der Ethik in historischer Entwicklung,* 1824), Vatke, *Von der menschl. Freiheit im Verhaltniss zu Suinde und Gnade,* 1843); Marheineke *(Christliche Moral,* 1847), Daub *(Christliche Moral,* 1840). Of this school, yet more under the influence of Schleiermacher, are Martensen *(Syst. Moral Philos.* 1841), Wirth *(Sys. specul. Ethik,* 1841), H. Merz *(Syst. Christl. Sittenlehre, nach den Grundsatzen des Protestantismus,* etc., 1841).

The activity of Schleiermacher in Christian ethics, as in other departments of theology, was immense. From 1819 he published his treatises on "the idea of virtue," "the idea of duty," and on "the relation between the moral law and the law of nature;" also on the idea of what may be "allowed" and the "chief good." His system was not further published by himself, but after his death A. Schweizer edited his *Philos. Ethik* in 1835, and Jonas his *Christl. Sitte* in 1843. See also Sartorius, *Heil. Liebe;* Harless, *Christliche Ethik;* and especially Rothe, *Theolog. Ethik* (2d edit. 1867). Rothe (translated by Morrison, Clark's Library, Edinlurgh, 1888, 8vo) seeks to combine Hegel's standpoint of objective knowledge with Schleiermacher's fine moral tact and organizing power, and to excel them both in his highly original method. See also Ritenick's *Christl. Stenlehrle* (1845); Gelzer, *De Religion im Leben,* etc. (1854); Schwarz, *Evan. Chr. Ethik* (1836, 3d ed.); Wendt, *Kirchliche Ethik v. Standpunkte d. christl. Fr iheit* (2 volumes, 8vo, Leipz. 1864-65); Culman, *D. christliche Ethik* (Stuttgardt, 1864-66, 2 volumes, 8vo). This sketch of the history of ethics is chiefly condensed from Dorner's article *(Ethik)* in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:165 sq. (B.H.N.)

Appendix. — It is proper to add to the above a brief account of the history of ethics, or moral philosophy, in England. A survey of this field will be found in Mackintosh, *General View of the Progress of Ethical Philosophy (Encyc. Britannica,* Prelim. Diss.), separately printed in his *Miscellaneous Works* (Lond. 1851, 12mo), and in a separate volume (Phila. 1832, 8vo); also in Whewell, *Lectures on the Hist. of Moral Philosophy in England* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); there is also a summary sketch of the history in Brando, *Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art,* 1:821 sq. (Lond. 1865, 3 volumes, 8vo). From these, and other sources we condense the following sketch:

The modern English theories may be classed as selfish or disinterested, according as they found virtue on a selfish or a benevolent principle. The Selfish theory is advocated by Hobbes (1679), who makes self-love the exclusive passion, and considers pleasure the only motive to action (see his *Human Nature,* his *Leviathan,* and our article *SEE HOBBES*). The same theory is adopted in substance by Jeremy Bentham (t 1832), who assumes Hobbes's principle as self-evident, that every object is indifferent, except for its fitness to produce pleasure or pain, which he declares are the sole motives to action. "Bentham is the most distinguished propounder of the principle of utility as the basis of morals, a principle explained by him as in contrast, first, to asceticism, and next to 'sympathy and antipathy,' by which

he meant to describe all those systems, such as the moral-sense theory, that are grounded in internal feeling, instead of a regard to outward consequences. In opposing utility to asceticism, he intended to imply that there was no merit attaching to self-denial as such, and that the infliction of pain or the surrender of pleasure could only be justified by being the means of procuring a greater amount of happiness than was lost" (Chambers, s.v.). See Bentham, *Treatise on Morals and Legislation;* and our article *SEE BENTHAM, JEREMY*. Locke (t 1704) denied the existence of a separate faculty for perceiving moral distinctions. In his *Essay on the Human Understanding* (book 1, chapter 3), he maintains that virtue is approved of, not because it is innate, but because it is profitable. Paley (t 1805) also rejected the doctrine of a moral sense, and held, in substance, the utilitarian theory, maintaining that "virtue is the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness" *(Moral and Political Philosophy).* The utilitarian theory is taught by all the recent English writers of the materialistic school: see James Mill, *Analysis of the Human Mind* (Lond. 1829; *SEE MILL, JAMES*) ; Austin, *Province of Jurisprudence determined* (2d ed. London, 1861); John Stuart Mill, *Dissertations and Discussions* (1859); and his *Utilitarianism*, reprinted from Fraser's *Magazine* (1862; 2d ed. 1864); Bain, *The Emotions and the Will* (Lond. 1859); *The Senses and the Intelect* (Lond. 1855); also his *Mental and Moral Science* (Lond. 1868, 8vo), where he teaches that conscience is solely the product of education. See also in reply to these writers, *The North British Review*, September, 1867, art. 1; *The British Quarterly* January, 1868, art. 6.

Opposed to the utilitarian theory there are two theories, which may be called the *instinctive* and the *rational*. The former refers the moral principle to the sensitive or emotive part of man's nature; the latter, to the perception of moral good and evil by the intellect. To the first class belongs Adam Smith (t 1790), whose *Theory of the Moral Sentiments* (Glasgow, 1759; London, 1790, and often) refers the moral sense to *sympathy*. His view is thus stated by Mackintosh *(Ethical Philosophy*, Philadelphia, 1832, page 149): "That mankind are so constituted as to sympathize with each other's feelings, and to feel pleasure in the accordance of these feelings, are the only facts required by Dr. Smith, and they certainly must be granted to him. To adopt the feelings of another is to *approve* them. When the sentiments of another are such as would be excited in us by the same objects, we approve them as *morally prosper*. To obtain this accord, it

becomes necessary for him who enjoys or suffers to lower his expression of feeling to the point to which the bystander can raise his fellow-feelings, on which are founded all the high virtues of self-denial and self-command; and it is equally necessary for the bystander to raise his sympathy as near as he can to the level of the original feeling. In all unsocial passions, such as anger, we have a *divided sympathy* between him who feels them and those who are the objects of them. Hence the propriety of extremely moderating them. Pure malice is always to be concealed or disguised, because all *sympathy* is arrayed against it. In the private passions, where there is only a *simple sympathy* — that with the original passion — the expression has more liberty. The benevolent affections, where there is a *double sympathy* — *with* those who feel them and those who are their objects — are the most agreeable, and may be indulged with the least apprehension of finding no echo in other breasts. Sympathy with the gratitude of those who are benefited by good actions prompts us to consider them as deserving of reward, and forms the *sense of merit;* as fellow-feeling with the resentment of those who are injured, by crimes leads us to look on them as worthy of punishment, and constitutes the *sense of demerit.* These sentiments require not only beneficial actions, but benevolent motives for them; being compounded, in the case of merit, of a direct sympathy with the good disposition of the benefactor, and an indirect sympathy with the person benefited; in the opposite case with the precisely opposite sympathies. He who does an act of wrong to another to gratify his own passions must not expect that the spectators, who have none of his undue partiality to his own interest, will enter into his feelings. In such a case he knows that they will pity the person wronged, and be full of indignation against him. When, he is cooled, he adopts the sentiments of others on his own crime, feels *shame* at the *impropriety* of his former passion, pity for those who have suffered by him, and a dread of punishment from general and just resentmment. Such are the constituent parts of remorse. Our moral sentiments respecting *ourselves* arise from those which others feel concerning us. We feel a self-approbation whenever we believe that the general feeling of mankind coincides with that state of mind in which we ourselves were at a given time.

'We suppose ourselves the spectators of our own behavior, and endeavor to imagine what effect it would in this light produce in us.' We must view our own conduct with the eyes of others before we can judge it. The sense of duty arises from putting ourselves in the place of others, and adopting

their sentiments respecting our own conduct. In utter solitude there could have been no self-approbation. The *rules* of morality are a summary of those sentiments, and often beneficially stand in their stead when the self delusion of passion would otherwise hide from us the nonconformity of our state of mind with that which, in the circumstances, can be entered into and approved by impartial bystanders. It is hence that we learn to raise our mind above local or temporary clamor, and to fix our eyes on the surest indications of the general and lasting sentiments of human nature. 'When we approve of any character or action, our sentiments are derived from four sources: first, we sympathize with the motives of the agent; secondly, we enter into the gratitude of those who have been benefited by his actions; thirdly, we observe that his conduct has been agreeable to the general rules by which these two sympathies generally act; and, last of all, when we consider such actions as forming part of a system of behavior which tends to promote the happiness either of the individual or of society, they appear to derive a beauty from this utility not unlike that which we ascribe to any well-contrived machine'" *(Theory,* 2:304, Edinb. 1801).

Lord Shaftesbury (t 1713) published in 1699 his *Inquiry concerning Virtue* (also London, 1709, and in his *Characteristics),* which, according to Mackintosh, "is unquestionably entitled to a place in the first rank of English tracts on moral philosophy, and contains more intimations of an original and important nature on the theory of Ethics than perhaps any preceding work of modern times." This praise rests on the fact that Shaftesbury developed the doctrine of a moral *sense.* The "most original, as well as important of his suggestions is, that there are certain affections of the mind which, being contemplated by the mind itself through what lie calls a *reflex sense,* become the objects of love, or the contrary, according to their nature. So approved and loved, they constitute virtue or *merit* as distinguished from mere *goodness,* of which there are traces in animals who do not appear to *reflect* on the state of their own minds, and who seem, therefore, destitute of what he elsewhere calls a *moral sense.* These statements are, it is true, far too short and vague. He nowhere inquires into the origin of the reflex sense. What is a much more material defect, he makes no attempt to ascertain in what state of mind it consists. We discover only by implication, and by the use of the term *sense,* that he searches for the fountain of moral sentiments, not in mere reason, where Cudworth and Clarke had vainly sought for it, but in the heart, whence the main branch of them assuredly flows. It should never be forgotten that we

owe to these hints the reception into ethical theory of a moral sense, which, whatever may be thought of its origin, or in whatever words it may be described, must always retain its place in such theory as a main principle of our moral nature. His demonstration of the utility of virtue to the individual far surpasses all attempts of the same nature, being founded, not on a calculation of outward advantages or inconveniences, alike uncertain, precarious, and degrading, but on the unshaken foundation of the delight, which is of the very essence of social affection and virtuous sentiment; on the dreadful agony inflicted by all malevolent passions upon every soul that harbors the hellish inmates; on the all-important truth that to love is to be happy, and to hate is to be miserable; that affection is its own reward, and ill-will its own punishment; or, as it has been more simply and more affectingly, as well as with more sacred authority, taught, that to give is more blessed than to receive, and that to love one another is the sum of all human virtue" (Mackintosh, *History of Ethical Philosophy,* page 95).

Bishop Butler (t 1752) sets forth his moral doctrine in his *Sermons* (often reprinted), which have been recently published as a text-book by the Reverend J.C. Passmore, under the title *Bishop Butler's Ethical Discourses* (Philadelphia, 1855, 12mo). He is undoubtedly the greatest of modern English writers on the true nature of ethics. "Mankind," he says, "have various principles of action, some leading directly to the private good, some immediately to the good of the community But the private desires are not self-love, or any form of it; for self-love is the desire of a man's own happiness, whereas the object of an appetite or passion is some outward thing. Self-love seeks things as means of happiness; the private appetites seek things, not as means, but as ends. A man eats from hunger, and drinks from thirst; and though he knows that these acts are necessary to life, that knowledge is not the motive of his conduct. No gratification can imideed lie imagined without a previous desire. If all the particular desires did not exist independently, self-love would have no object to employ itself about, for there would be no happiness, which, by the very supposition of the opponents, is made up of the gratification of various desires. No pursuit could be selfish or interested if there were not satisfactions first gained by appetites which seek their own outward objects without regard to self, which satisfactions compose them mass which is called a man's interest. In contending, therefore, that the benevolent affections are disinterested, no more is claimed for them than must be granted to mere animal appetites and to malevolent passions. Each of these principles alike seeks its own

object for the sake simply of obtaining it. Pleasure is the result of the attainment, but no separate part of the aim of the agent. The desire that another person may be gratified seeks that outward object alone, according to the general course of human desire. Resentment is as disinterested as gratitude or pity, but not more so. Hunger or thirst may lee, as much as the purest benevolence, at variance with self-love. A regard to our own general happiness is not a vice, but in itself an excellent quality. It were well if it prevailed more generally over craying and short-sighted appetites. The weakness of the social affections and the strength of the private desires properly constitute selfishness, a vice utterly at variance with the happiness of him who harbors it, and, as such, condemned by self-love. There are as few who attain the greatest satisfaction to themselves as who do the greatest good to others. It is absurd to say with some that the pleasure of benevolence is selfish because it is felt by self. Understanding and reasoning are acts of self, for no man can think by proxy; but no one ever called them *selfish.* Why? Evidently because they do not *regard* self. Precisely the same rule applies to benevolence. Such an argument is a gross confusion of self, as it is a *subject* of feeling or thought, with self considered as the *object* of either. It is no more just to refer the private appetites to self-love because they commonly promote happiness, than it would be to refer them to self-hatred in those frequent cases where their gratification obstructs it. But, besides the private or public desires, and besides the calm regard to our own general welfare, there is a principle in man, in its nature supreme over all others. This natural supremacy belongs to the faculty which surveys, approves, or disapproves the several affections of our minds and actions of our lives. As self-love is superior to the private passions, so conscience is superior to the whole of man. Passion implies nothing but an inclination to follow it, and in that respect passion differs only in force. But no notion can be formed of the principle of reflection or conscience which does not comprehend judgment, direction, superintendency. Authority over all other principles of action is a constituent part of the idea of conscience, and cannot be separated from it. Had it strength as it has right, it would govern the world. The passions would have their power but according to their nature, which is to be subject to conscience. Hence we may understand the purpose at which the ancients, perhaps confusedly, aimed when they laid it down that virtue consisted in following nature. It is neither easy, nor, for the main object of the moralist, important to render the doctrines of the ancients of modern language. If Butler returns to this phrase too often, it was rather from the

remains of undistinguishing reverence for antiquity than because he could deem its employment important to his own opinions. The tie which holds together religion and morality is, in the system of Butler, somewhat different from the common representations, but not less close. Conscience, or the faculty of approving or disapproving, necessarily constitutes the bond of union. Setting out from the belief of theism, and combining it, as he had entitled himself to do, with the reality of conscience, he could not avoid discovering that the being who possessed the highest moral qualities is the object of the highest moral affections. He contemplates the Deity through the moral nature of man. In the case of a being who is to be perfectly loved, 'goodness must be the simple actuating principle within him, this being the moral quality which is the immediate object of love.' 'The highest, the adequate object of this affection, is perfect goodness, which, therefore, we are to love with all our heart with all our soul, and with all our strength.' 'We should refer ourselves implicitly to him, and cast ourselves entirely upon him. The whole attention of life should be to obey his commands' (Sermon 13, *On the Love of God).* Moral distinctions are thus presupposed before a step can be made towards religion: virtue leads to piety; God is to be loved, because goodness is the object of love; and it is only after the mind rises through human morality to divine perfection that all the virtues and duties are seen to hang from the throne of God" (Mackintosh, *History of Ethical Philosophy,* 116 sq.).

To the same school belong Hutcheson (t 1747), who taught that moral good is simply what the word itself expresses, which is not explicable by any other phrase. From this he argues that moral good must be perceived by a sense, because the senses alone are percipient of simple qualities (see his *Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue,* Glasgow, 1725, and often). Hume *(Inquiry concerning the Principles of Moral,)* asserts, indeed, that general utility constitutes a uniform ground of moral distinctions, and that reason judges of the utility of actions. But he asserts also that we *approve* of good and *disapprove* of evil in virtue of a primary sentiment of our nature (distinct from self-love), which he calls benevolence or humanity, but which is identical with conscience, or the moral sense. As to the idea of moral obligation, he makes it simply a judgment of the understanding that happiness flows from obedience to the moral faculty rather than from obedience to self-love. For the doctrines of Mackintosh, we must refer our readers to his admirable sketch (so often cited in this article) of the *History of Ethical Philosophy.*

Of the so-called *Rational* school, the distinctive characteristic is "that it considers the idea of good to be an a *priori* conception of reason, in which the idea of obligation is necessarily and essentially implied. As to the nature of the idea itself, two opinions have been held, viz. 1, that it is simple and immediate; 2, that it derives its explanation and authority from some higher notion of the intellect. The most distinguished representatives of the latter opinion are Clarke and Wollaston, while the former has found able advocates in Cudworth, Price, and Stewart" (Brande, 1.c.).

Dr. M'Cosh *(American Presbyt. Review*, January 1868, art. 1) classes the modern views on ethics in Great Britain into the two schools of Sensational and Rational (or *priori),* "corresponding to the two schools of philosophy which have divided Europe since Descartes and Locke." Under the latter he classes Cudcworth, Clarke, Coleridge, Reid, Stewart, and Sir W. Hamilton; "none of them, however, except Coleridge, taking up so high *a priori* grounds as Descartes and Cousin in 'France, or Kant and Hegel in Germany." The Protestants of England, in the main, at this time, according to the same writer, do not agree with those Roman Catholic writers who deny an independent morality apart from the authority of the Church; while, on the other hand, they do not agree with the philosophers who assert not only the independence, but the *sufficiency* of ethnic or natural morality. (See the article cited for a view of the relations Of the modern sensational doctrine to theology and religion.)

Among American writers, Jonathan Edwards (t 1758) is first to be named in this field. In his *Dissertation concerning the End of true Virtue,* and that *On the End for which. God created the World* (both contained in his *Works,* N.Y. ed. volume 2), he sets forth an ethical theory marked by the subtlety and originality which characterize all his speculations. Mackintosh sums it up as follows: "True virtue, according to him, consists in benevolence, or love to being 'in general,' which he afterwards limits to ‘intelligent being,' though *sentient* would have involved a more reasonable limitation. This good will is felt towards a particular being, first, *in proportion to his degree of existence* (for, says he 'that which is great has more existence, and is farther from nothing, than that which is little'); and, secondly, *in proportion to the degree in which that particular being feels benevolence to others.* Thus God, having infinitely more existence and benevolence than man, ought to be infinitely more loved; and for the same reason, God must love himself infinitely more than he does all other beings. He can act only from regard to himself, and his end in creation can only be

to manifest his whole nature, which is called acting for his own glory." See also, on his ethical theory, the article *SEE EDWARDS* in Appleton's *Cyclopedia,* 7:18; and the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* April 1853, page 402 sq. There are many excellent manuals, prepared for text-books, by American writers, such as those of Adams, Wayland, Alexander, Haven, Alden, Hopkins, etc., for farther mention of which we have not space. Hickok *(System of Moral Science,* 1853, 8vo) treats the subject froan the a priori point of view, and also in its relations to Christian theology, in a very masterly manner. He makes duty an end in and of itself. The voice of conscience is imperative. "There is an awful sanctuary in every immortal spirit, and man needs nothing more than to exclude all else, and stand alone before himself, to be made conscious of an authority he can neither dethrone nor delude. From its approbation comes self-respect; from its disapprobation comes self-contempt. A stern behest is ever upon him that he do nothing to degrade the real dignity of his spiritual being. He is a law to himself, and has both the judge and executioner within himself, and inseparable from him." "We may call this the imperative of the reason, the constraint of conscience, or the voice of God within him; but, by whatever terms expressed, the real meaning will be that every man has consciously the bond upon him to do that, and that only, which is due to his spiritual excellency." "To be thus worthy of spiritual approbation is the end of all ends; and as worthy of happiness, this many now righteously be given and righteously taken, but not righteously paid as price or claimed as wages. The good is to be worthy, not that he is to get something for it. The highest good — the summum bonum — is worthiness of spiritual approbation" *(Moral Science* pages 45-49).

Christian ethics, as distinguished from moral philosophby in general, has not received the same attention from English and American writers as from German. The earlier Looks on Casuistry (q.v.) and Cases of Conscience, however, belong under this head. Most of the standard English and American writers commingle philosophical morals with Christian ethics. Butler brings out with clearness the relations of ethics to the Christian religion. Wardlaw's *Christian Ethics* (Od ed. Lond. 1837, Boston; 5th ed. Lond. 1852) asserts that "the science of morals has no province at all independently of theology, and that it cannot be philosophically discussed except upon theological principles (Boston ed. page 367, note). Watson *(Theolog. Instzt.* part. 3) treats of Christian ethics under the title "The Morals of Christianity," and denies the is priori method (see Cocker, in

Meth. Quart. January 1864). Spalding *(Philippians of Christian Morals,* Lond. 1843, 8vo) has "recourse both to science as derived from an examination of mcan's moral nature, and to revelation as derived from an examination of the Scriptures."

In France, the orthodox Romaim Catholic writers have generally confirmed themselves to the so-called Moral Theology (q.v.). The Cartesian school *SEE DES CARTES*, cultivated Ethics in the new philosophical spirit; its best representative is Malebranchme. Virtue he defines to be the love of universal order, as it eternally existed in the divine reason, where every created reason contemplates it. Particular duties are but the applications of this love. He abandoned the ancient classification of four cardinal virtues, and for it substituted the modern distinction of duties toward God, men, and ourselves. The French school of Sensualismi, of which Condillac was the head *SEE CONDILLAC*, regarded all intellectual operations, even judgment and volition, as transformed sensations; and Helvetius, applying the theory to morals, held that self-love or interest is the exclusive motor of man, denied disinterested motives, made pleasure the only good, and referred to legislative rewards and punishments as illustrating the whole system of individual action. La Mettrie maintained an atheistic Epicunanism, and Condorcet wished to substitute an empirical education for the ideas and sanctions of religion and morality. The most complete and logical elaboration of the materialism, atheism, and fatalism of the period, which had pleasure for its single aim and law, was given in D'Holbach's *Systeme de la nature*. Of the later French writers, Jouffroy is perhaps the most important. He gave a peculiar explanation of good and evil. Every thing is good in proportion as it aids in the fulfillment of our destiny. The problem of human destiny, therefore, lies at the foundation of morality. There can be no a prior judgment as to the moral quality of actions, since that is relative to the agent, depending on the influence they may have on the destiny for which he was created. Good, in the case of any particular being, is the fulfillment of its own specific destiny; good, in itself, is the fulfillment of the destiny of all beings; and an interruption in the accomplishment of destiny constitutes evil. His system of Ethics is chiefly laid down in his *Cours* dam *Droit* naturel (2 volumes, Par. 1835; a third volume was edited after his death by Damriron, 1842), his most eloquent work, which, besides ethics, treats of psychology and theodicy. Some points are more fully developed in a series of *essays*, which first appeared

in periodicals, and of which subsequently two collections *(Melanges philosophiques* and *Nouveaux melanges philosophiques)* were published.

See, besides the authors named in the course of this article, *A Sketch of the History of Moral Philosophy,* in the introduction to St. Hilaire's translation of Aristotle's Politics *(Politique d'Aristote,* Paris); Meiners, *Allgem. Krit. Geschichte d. alteren u. neueren Ethik* (Gottingen, 1801, 2 volumes); Hagrenbach, *Encyclop. u. Methodologie,* § 92; Cousin, *OEuvr. Philosophiques* (Paris, 1846-52); Bautain, Morale (Paris, 1842, 2 volumes); Damiron, *Cours de Philosophie,* volumes 3 and 4 (Paris, 1842); Jouffroy, *Introd. to Ethics,* transl. by Channing (Boston, 1840, 2 volumes, 8vo); Janet, *Hist. des ides morales et politiques* (Paris, 1856); Neander, *Vorlesungen ui. d. Geschichte d. christl. Ethik* (Berl. 1865, 8vo); Neander, *Relations of Grecian to Christian Ethics; Christ. Exam.* 29:153; 30:145; *Bibl. Sac.* 1853, 476 sq.; article *Ethics* in Chambers' *Encyclopcedia,* and in the Penney *Cyclopaedia,* both in the interest of the sensational philosophy; *North British Review,* December 1867, arts. 4; Wuttke, *Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre* (2 volumes, 8vo, 1861-62; 2d edit. 1866); Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy;* Maurice, *The Conscience: Lectures on Casuistry* (London, 1868). On the nature of evil, *SEE EVIL; SEE SIN.* On liberty and necessity, *SEE WILL*. For the Roman Catholic way of treating ethics, *SEE MORAL THEOLOGY*.

Ethio'pia

Picture for Ethio’pia

(1 Esdr. 3:2; Est. 13:1; 16:1; Judith 1:10; <44827>Acts 8:27; the Hebrew vWK, *Kush, i.e.,* CUSH, as it is generally rendered, <01013>Genesis 2:13; <12919>2 Kings 19:9; <17101>Esther 1:1; <18819>Job 28:19; <19683>Psalm 68:31; 87:4; <23101>Isaiah 18:1; 20:3, 5; 27:9; 45:14; <26304>Ezekiel 30:4, 5; 38:5; <34839>Nahum 3:9), a country which, as thus designated by the ancients, lay to the south of Egypt, and embraced, in its most extended sense, the modern *Nubia, Sennaar, Kordofan,* and northern *Abyssinia,* and in its more definite sense the kingdom of Meroe, from the junction of the Blue and White branches of the Nile to the border of Egypt. In one passage in the description of the garden of Eden, an Asiatic Cush or Ethiopia must be intended (<01013>Genesis 2:13), and the distribution of the descendants of Cush, with later Biblical historical indications, should be compared with the classical mentions of eastern and western Ethiopians, and other indications of profane history. In

all other passages, the words Ethiopia and the Ethiopians, with one possible exception, "the Arabians, that [were] near the Ethiopians" (<14216>2 Chronicles 21:16), which may refer to Arabians opposite to Ethiopia, may be safely considered to mean an African country and people or peoples. In the Bible, as in classical geography, but one limit of Ethiopia is laid down, its northern frontier, just beyond Syene, the most southern town of Egypt. Egypt is spoken of as to be desolate "from Midol to Syene, even unto the border of Ethiopia" (<26910>Ezekiel 29:10), or "from Midol to Syene" (30:6), showing that then, as now, the southern boundary of Egypt was at the First Cataract. In other directions the boundaries can only be generally described as the Red Sea on the E., the Libyan desert on the W., and the Abyssinian highlands on the S. The extent assigned to Ethiopia in ancient times may have been very great, as it was the land of the negroes, and therefore represented all that was known of inner Africa, besides that part of the continent south is of Egypt which is washed by the Red Sea. The references in the Bible are, however, generally, if not always, to the territory which was at times under Egyptian rule, a tract watered by the Upper Nile, and extending from Egypt probably as far as a little above the confluence of the White and Blue Rivers.

The Hebrews do not appear to have had much practical acquaintance with' Ethiopia itself, though the Ethiopians were well known to them through their intercourse with Egypt. They were, however, perfectly aware of its position (<26910>Ezekiel 29:10), and they describe it as a well-watered country lying "from the side of" (A.V. "beyond") the waters of Cush (<23801>Isaiah 18:1; <36310>Zephaniah 3:10), being traversed by the two branches of the Nile, and by the Astaboras or Tacazze. 'The Nile descends with a rapid stream in this part of its course, forming a series of cataracts: its violence seen is to be referred to in the words of <23802>Isaiah 18:2, "whose land the rivers have spoiled." The Hebrews seem also to have been aware of its tropical characteristics, the words translated in the A.V. "the land shadowing with wings" (<23801>Isaiah 18:1), admitting the sense of "the land of the shadow of both sides," the shadows falling towards the north and south at different periods of the year, a feature which is noticed by many early writers (compare the expression in Strabo, 2, page 133, αμφισκιοι; Virgil, Ecl. 10:68; Pliny, 2:75). The papyrus boats ("vessels of bulrushes," <23802>Isaiah 18:2), which were peculiarly adapted to the navigation of the Upper Nile, admitting of being carried on men's backs when necessary, were regarded as a characteristic feature of the country. The Hebrews carried on

commercial intercourse with Ethiopia, its "merchandise" (Isaiah 45:14) consisting of ebony, ivory, frankincense, and gold (Herod. 3:97, 114), and precious stones (Job 28:19; Josephus, Ant. 8:6, 5).

The following close translation of Isaiah's splendid summons (chapter 18) to the Ethiopians, as auxiliaries to the Egyptians in the struggle against Sennacherib, is inserted here as graphic of many salient features of that warlike state:

Ho! land of whirring wings,
That art across the rivers of Cushi;
That sendest on the sea ambassadors,
Even in vessels of papyrus upon the face of the waters.

Go ye light messengers,
To a nation drafted and drilled,
To a people fearful henceforth and onward,
A nation most valiant and dominant,
Whose land rivers have split:
All ye inhabitants of the world,
And dwellers of the land,
At the lifting of the standard of the mountains you shall see,
And at the clanging of the trumpet you shall hear.

For thus has Jehovah said to me:I will calmly look in my place —
Like serene heat above sunlight,
Like the cloud of dew in the heat of harvest;
Yet before the harvest, when the blossom has grown perfect,

Or a plump green grape can the flower become,
Then has one cut the shoots with the pruning-knives,
And the twigs has he removed, lopped.
And they shall be left together for the buzzard of the mountains,
And for the beast of the earth;
And upon him shall the buzzard summer,

And every beast of the earth shall winter upon him.
In that time shall a present be led to Jehovah of armies,
Of a people drafted and drilled,
Even from a people fearful henceforth and onward,
A nation most valiant and dominant,
Whose land rivers have split,
To the place of the name of Jehovah of armies, Mount Zion.

The inhabitants of Ethiopia were a Hamitic race (<01006>Genesis 10:6), and are described in the Bible as a dark-complexioned (<24123>Jeremiah 13:23) and stalwart race (<23514>Isaiah 45:14, "men of stature;" 18:2, for "scattered," some substitute "tall"). Their stature is noticed by Herodotus (3:20, 114) as well as their handsomeness. Not improbably the latter quality is intended by the term in <23802>Isaiah 18:2, which in the A.V. is rendered "peeled," but which may mean "fine-looking." Their appearance led to their being selected as attendants in royal households (<24807>Jeremiah 38:7). The Ethiopians are on one occasion coupled with the Arabians, as occupying the opposite shores of the Red Sea (<142116>2 Chronicles 21:16); but elsewhere they are connected with African nations, particularly Egypt (<19687>Psalm 68:31; <23203>Isaiah 20:3, 4; 43:3; 45:14), Phut (<24609>Jeremiah 46:9), Lub and Lud (<26005>Ezekiel 30:5), and the Sukkiim (<141203>2 Chronicles 12:3). They were divided into various tribes, of which the Sabaeans were the most powerful. *SEE SEBA; SEE SUKKIIM*.

The name Cush is found in the Egyptian KISH, which is evidently applied to the same territory, though we have the same difficulty in determining its limits, save on the north. The classical *Ethiopia* (Αἰθιοπια) may have the same origin, through the Coptic *ethos,* of which, unless it be derived from *thos,* "a boundary," the Sahidic form *esos* may be the purest, and connect the classical with the ancient Egyptian name. The Greeks themselves regarded it as expressive of a dark complexion (from αἴθω, "to burn," and ὤψ, "a countenance"). In the Bible there is no certain notice of any Ethiopian race but Cushites.

According to Dr. Brugsch, the first country above Egypt was TA-MERU-PET, or TA-HENS, corresponding to Nubia, and extending, under the Pharaohs, at least as far south as Napata. Dr. Brugsch supposes that TA-HENS was, in the earlier times, the whole tract south of Syene under Egyptian rule [therefore governed by the prince of KISH, and corresponding to or included in that country], and, in the later times, little more than the Dodecasotcenus of the Ptolemies and Romans, the remains of the older territory (*Geographische Inschriften,* 1:100). As a nome, Nubia, before the formation of the Ombite Nome, included Ombos, Silsilis being probably the first city of the Egyptian Apollinopolite Nome. Although it is not impossible that at Silsilis was anciently the great natural barrier of Egypt on the south, we think that this extension of Nubia was simply for purposes of government, as Dr. Brugsch seems to admit *(Geogr. Inschr.* 1:100). South of the Nubia of the Pharaohs he places a region of

which the name perhaps reads PENT-HEN-NUFRE, which, however, was probably a district of the former country. Still further, and near Merob, he puts the land of KISH, and in and, about Meroe the land of the NEHSI or negroes. Others, however, think that KISH commenced immediately above Egypt, lerobably always at the First Cataract, and included all the known country south of Egypt, TA-MERU-PET or TAKENS, save as a nome, being a part of it, the modern Nubia. Names of conquered negro nations, tribes, or countries occur on the monuments of the empire: of these, the most suggestive are the BARBARTA and TAKRERR (see Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr*. 1:100 -107, 150164; 2:4-13, 20; 3:3, 4, and indices s.v. Athiopien, Kes, etc.).

Ethiopia comprises two very different tracts. North of the region of tropical rains, it is generally an extremely narrow strip of cultivated land, sometimes but a few Cards wide, on both sides, or occasionally on one side only, of the Nile. Anciently the watered tract was much broader, but the giving way of a barrier at Silsilis (Jebel es-Silsileh) or Syene (Aswatn) has lowered the level of the river for some distance above the First Cataract; exactly how far cannot be accurately determined, but certainly for the whole space below the Third Cataract. The cultivable soil which was anciently productive is now far above the highest level of the stream. The valley is, however, never broad, the mountains seldom leaving a space of more than a mile within the greater part of the region north of the limit of tropical rains. The aspect of the country is little varied. On either side of the river, here narrower than in its undivided course in Upper Egypt, rise sterile sandstone and limestone mountains, the former sometimes covered by yellow sand-drifts. At the First Cataract, at Kalab'sheh, and at the Second Cataract, the river is obstructed, though at the second place not enough to form a rapid, by red granite and other primary rocks. The groves of date-palms, here especially fine, are the most beautiful objects in the scene, but its general want of variety is often relieved by the splendid remains of Egyptian and Ethiopian civilization, and the clearness of the air throws a peculiar beauty over everything that the traveler beholds. As he ascends the river, the scenery, after a time, becomes more varied, until on the east he reaches the Abyssinian highlands, on the west the long meadows, the pasture-lands of herds of elephants, through which flows the broad and sluggish White Nile. In this upper region the climate is far less healthy than below, save in Abyssinia, which, from its height, is drained, and enjoys an air which is rare and free from exhalations. The country is

thus for the most part mountainous, the ranges gradually increasing in altitude towards the S., until they attain an elevation of about 8000 feet in Abyssinia.

The Nile is the great fertilizer of the northern regions of Ethiopia, which depend wholly upon its yearly inundation. It is only towards the junction of the two great streams that the rains take an increasingly important share in the watering of the cultivable land. In about N. lat. 170 40', the great river receives its first tributary, the Astabloras, now called the Atbarah. In about N. lat. 150 40' is the confluence of the Blue and White Niles. The Blue Nile, which has its source in Abyssinia, is a narrow, rapid stream, with high, steep mild-banks, like the Nile in Egypt; it is strongly charged with alluvial soil, to which it owes the dark color which has given it its distinctive name. From this stream the country below derives the annual alluvial deposits. The White Nile is a colorless river, very broad and shallow, creeping slowly through meadows and wide in marsh-lands. Of the cultivation and natural products of Ethiopia little need be said, as they do not illustrate the few notices of it in Scripture. It has always been, excepting the northern part, productive, and rich in animal life. Its wild animals have gradually been reduced, yet still the hippopotamus, the crocodile, and the ostrich abound, though the second alone is found throughout its extent. The elephant and lion are only known in its southernmost part.

In the Bible a Cushite appears undoubtedly to be equivalent to a negro, from this passage, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his stripes?" (Jeremiah 13:23); and it is to be observed, that whenever the race of KISH is represented on the Egyptian monuments by a single individual, the type is that of the true negro (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 1:404, abridgm.), It is therefore probable that the negro race anciently extended further to the north than at present, the whole country watered by the Nile, as far as it is known, being now peopled by a race intermediate between the negro race and the Caucasian. There is no certain mention in the Bible of this intermediate race in Ethiopia, but the Egyptian and Ethiopian monuments afford us indications of its ancient existence in its modern territory, though probably it did not then extend as far south as now. At the present day, Ethiopia is inhabited by a great variety of tribes of this race: the Kunuz, said to be of Arab origin, nearest to Egypt, are very dark; the Nubeh, the next nation, much lighter; beyond them are some fair Arabs, the Caucasian Abyssinians, with scarcely any trace of negro influence save in

their dark color, and tribes as black as the true negro, or nearly so, though not of the pure negro type. The languages of Ethiopia are as various as the tribes, and appear to hold the same intermediate place between the Shemitic group and the Nigritian, if we except the Ethiopic, which belongs to the former family. *SEE ETHIOPIC LANGUAGE*.

In all that relates to the civilization of ancient Ethiopia we see the same connection with Egypt that is constantly indicated in the Bible. So far as the Egyptian sway extended, which was probably, under the empire, as far as somewhat above the junction of the two Niles the religion of Egypt was probably practiced. While the tract was under Egyptian rule this was certainly the case, as the remains of the temples sufficiently show. We find it as the religion of Tirhakah in his Ethiopian as well as his Egyptian sculptures, and this is also the case with the later kings of Ethiopia who held no sway in Egypt. There were evidently local differences, but apparently nothing more. Respecting the laws and forms of government the same may be supposed. We have very little evidence as to the military matters of the Ethiopians, yet, from their importance to Egypt, there can be little doubt that they were skillful soldiers. Their armies were probably drawn from the Ethiopian or intermediate race, not from the negro. Of the domestic life of this people we have but slight hints. Probably they were more civilized than are their modern successors. Their art, as seen in the sculptures of their kings in Ethiopian temples from Tirhakah downwards, is merely a copy of that of Egypt, showing, after the first, an inferiority in style to the contemporary works of the original art. Their character can scarcely be determined from scanty statements, applying, it may be, to extremely different tribes. In one particular all accounts agree: they were warlike, as, for instance, we equally see in the defiance the Ethiopian king sent to Cambyses (Herod. 3:21), and in the characteristic inscription at Kalab'sheh of Silco, "king (βασιλίσκος) of the Nubadse and all the Ethiopians" *(Modern Egypt and Thebes,* 2:81, 312), who is to be regarded as a very late Ethiopian king or chief in the time of the Roman empire. The ancients, from Homer downwards, describe them as a happy and pious race. In the Bible they are spoken of as "secure" or "carelessly (Ezekiel 30:9), but this may merely refer to their state when danger was impending. Probably the modern inhabitants of Ethiopia

give us a far better picture of their predecessors than we can gather from the few notices to which we have alluded. If we compare the Nubians with the representations of the ancient Egyptians on the monuments, we are

struck by a similarity of type, the same manner of wearing the hair, and a like scantiness of clothing. There can be no question that the Nubians are mainly descended from an Egyptianized Ethiopian people of two thousand years ago, who were very nearly related to the Egyptians. The same may be said of many tribes further to the south, although sometimes we find the Arab type and Arab manners and dress. The Ethiopian monuments show us a people like the ancient Egyptians and the modern Nubians. The northern Nubians are a simple people, with some of the vices, but most of the virtues of savages. The chastity of their women is celebrated, and they are noted for their fidelity as servants. But they are inhospitable and cruel, and lack the generous qualities of the Arabs. Further south manners are corrupt, and the national character is that of Egypt without its humanity, and untouched by any but the rudest civilization.

In speaking of the history of the country, we may include what is known of its chronology, since this is no more than the order in which kings reigned. Until the time of the 12th dynasty of Egypt we have neither chronology nor history of Ethiopia. We can only speculate upon the earlier conditions of the country with the aid of some indications in the Bible. The first spread of the descendants of Cush seems to be indicated by the order in which the Cushite tribes, families, or heads are enumerated in Genesis 10. All the names, excepting Nimrod, might be thought to indicate a colonization of Southern and Eastern Arabia, were there not good reason to suppose that Seba, though elsewhere mentioned with Sheba (<19720>Psalm 72:10), is connected with Ethiopia, and is probably the Hebrew name of the chief Ethiopian kingdom from the time of Solomon downwards. (Josephus calls Meroh Saba, Ant. 2:10, 2, and Seba of Cush he calls Sabas, *ib.* 1:6, 2.) If this be the case, it would be remarkable that Nimrod is mentioned at the end of the list and Seba at the beginning, while the intervening names, mostly if not all, are Arabian. This distribution may account for the strongly-Caucasian type of the Abyssinians, and the greater indication of Nigritian influence in all the other Ethiopian races; for a curve drawn from Nimrod's first kingdom there can, we think, be little doubt that the meaning in Genesis is, that he went northward and founded Nineveh — and extending along the South Arabian — coast, if carried into Africa, would first touch Abyssinia. The connection of Southern Arabia and Abyssinia has been so strong for about two thousand years that we must admit the reasonableness of this theory of their ancient colonization by kindred tribes. The curious question of the direction from which Egyptian civilization

came cannot here be discussed. It is possible that it may have descended the Nile, as was, until lately, supposed by many critics, in accordance with statements of the Greek writers. The idea or tradition of which these writers probably build may be due to the Nigritian origin of the low nature-worship of the old Egyptian religion, and perhaps, as far as it is picture-writing, of the hieroglyphic system, of which the characters are sometimes called Ethiopic letters by ancient writers.

The history of Ethiopia is closely interwoven with that of Egypt. The two countries were not unfrequently united under the rule of the same sovereign. The first Egyptian king who governed Ethiopia was one of the 12th dynasty, named Osirtasen I, the Sesostris of Herod. 2:110. During the occupation of Egypt by the Hyksos, the 13th dynasty retired to the Ethiopian capital, Napata; and again we find the kings of the 18th and 19th dynasties exercising a supremacy over Ethiopia, and erecting numerous temples, the ruins of which still exist at Semneh, Amada, Soleb, Abusimbel, and Jebel Berkel. The tradition of the successful expedition of Moses against the Ethiopians, recorded by Josephus (*Ant.* 2:10), was doubtless founded on the general superiority of the Egyptians at that period of their history.

Under the 12th dynasty we find the first materials for a history of Ethiopia. In these days Nubia seems to have been thoroughly Egyptianized as far as beyond the Second Cataract, but we have no indication of the existence at that time in Ethiopia of any race but the Egyptian. We find an allusion to the negroes in the time between the 12th dynasty and the 18th, in the name of a king of that period, which reads RA?-NEHSI, or "the Sun? of the Negroes," rather than "the Negro Sun?" *(Turin Papyrus of Kings,* ap. Lepsius *Konigsbuch,* pl. 18:197; 19:278). The word NEESI is the constant designation of the negro race in hieroglyphics.

Before passing to the beginning of the 18th dynasty, when the Egyptian empire definitely commenced, *SEE EGYPT*, we may notice two possible references to the Ethiopians in connection with the Exodus, an event which probably occurred at an early period of that empire. In Isaiah 43, which though relating to the future, also speaks of the past, and especially mentions or alludes to the passage of the Red Sea (see particularly verse 16, 17), Ethiopia is thus apparently Connected with the Exodus: "I gave Egypt [for] thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee" (verse 3). It can scarcely be supposed that this is an emphatic relation of future events, and

it is difficult to connect it with any other known past event, as the conquest of Egypt by Sennacherib, which may have already occurred. If this passage refer to the Exodus, it would seem to favor the idea that the Israelites went out during the empire, for then Ethiopia was ruled by Egypt, and would have been injured by the calamities that befell that country. In Amos there is a passage that may possibly connect the Ethiopians with the Exodus: "[Are] ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the LORD. Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" (9:7). But the meaning may be that the Israelites were no better than the idolatrous people of Cush.

At the beginning of the 18th dynasty we find the Egyptians making expeditions into Ethiopia, no doubt into its farther regions, and bringing back slaves. At this time the Egyptians seem to have intermarried with people of Ethiopia, probably of the intermediate race, darker than the Egyptians, but not of the negro race. One of the wives of Adhhmes, or Amosis, the first king of the. 18th dynasty, is represented as black, though not with negro features. A later sovereign of the same dynasty, Amenoph III, is seen by his statues to have been partly Ethiopian, and this may have been one cause of his identification by the Greeks with Memnon. Daring this and the dynasty which succeeded it, the 19th, we have no proof that the regularly-governed Egyptian dominions extended beyond Napata, but it is probable that they reached a little beyond the junction of the White and Blue Niles. There can be no doubt that Ethiopia remained subject to Egypt as late as the reign of Rameses VI, soon after whom the proper Egyptian empire may be said to have closed, having lasted three centuries from the beginning of the 18th dynasty. Under that empire, Ethiopia, or at least the civilized portion, was ruled by a governor, who bore the title SUTEN-SA-EN-KISH, "Prince," literally "Royal son," "of Cush," etc. The office does not seem to have been hereditary at any time, nor is it known to have been held by a son of the reigning king, or any member of the royal family.

After the reign of Rameses VI, the feebleness of the later Theban kings may have led to the loss of Ethiopia, and we know that in Solomon's time there was a kingdom of Sehna. Shishak, the first king of the 22d dynasty, probably made Ethiopia tributary. When this king, the Sheeshonk I of the monuments, invaded the kingdom of Judah, he had in his army "the Lubim, the Sukkiim, and the Cushiim" (<14I2I3>2 Chronicles 12:13). The Lubinm are a people of Northern Africa, near Egypt and the Sukkiimi are of doubtful

place. The indications are of an extensive dominion in Africa; for, though the Lubim and Sukkiim may have been mercenaries, it is unlikely that the Cushim were also. There can be no doubt that Shishak was a powerful king, especially as he was strong enough to invade Judah, and it is therefore probable that he restored the influence of the Egyptians in Ethiopia. *SEE SHISHAK*. Zerah the Ethiopian, on account of his army being of Cushim and Lubim, and thus, as well as in consisting of chariots, horsemen, and foot, of like composition with that of Shishak (2 Chronicles 16:8; 14:9, 12, 13; 12:2, 3), seems certainly to have been either a king of this dynasty, or else a general of such a king. In the former case he would probably correspond to Osorkon II. The names Osorkon and Zerah seem very remote, but it must be remembered that Egyptian words transcribed in Hebrew are often much changed, and that in this case it is probable that both Egyptian and Hebrew forms, if they be two orthographical representations of one word, come from a third source. The style "Zerah the Cushite" is unlike that applied to kings of Egypt who were foreigners, or of foreign extraction, as in the cases of "So, king of Egypt," and "Shishak, king of Egypt." On this account, and especially from the omission of the word king, or any royal appellation, though we cannot infer positively from the few instances in Scripture, Zerah may be rather supposed to have been a general, but the army that he commanded must, from the resemblance of its composition to that of Shishak's, have been that of a king of the same line. Mr. Kenrick rather too hastily remarks as to the term Cushite, that "no king of the Bubastite [22d] dynasty could have been so designated," and is at some pains to explain what he considers to be a mistake *(Ancient Egypt,* 2:297 sq.). It is recorded that Asa had an army of 580,000, and that Zerah the Ethiopian came against him with 1,000,000, and 300 chariots. These high numbers have been objected to; but the history of our times shows that war upon this large scale is not alone possible to great kingdoms, but also to states of no very large population which put forth their whole strength. It is to be noticed that Asa was evidently struck by the greatness of the hostile army, to which the prophet Hanani alludes, reproving him at a later time (2 Chronicles 16:8). *SEE NUMBER*. Asa encountered Zerah "in the valley of Zephathah at Mareshah, and, praying for God's aid against this huge army, it was put to the rout, and he pursued it to Gerar, and smote all the cities round Gerar, which seem to have been in alliance with the invaders, and took much spoil from the cities, and also smote the tents of cattle, from which he took many sheep and camels (14:8-15). This great overthrow may have

been a main cause of the decline of the power of the 22d dynasty, which probably owed its importance to the successes of Shishak. *SEE ZERAH.*

During the later period of this dynasty, it is probable that Ethiopia became wholly independent. The 23d dynasty appears to have been an Egyptian line of little power. The 24th, according to Manetho, of but one king, Bocchoris the Saite, was probably contemporary with it. In the time of Bocchoris, Egypt was conquered by Sabaco the Ethiopian, who founded the 25th dynasty of Ethiopian kings. The chronology and history of this line is obscure. We take Manetho's list for the chronology, with a few necessary corrections in the length of the reigns, in the following table *SEE EGYPT*:

The duration here given to the first and second reigns can only be considered to be conjectural. Herodotus assigns 50 years as the duration of the Ethiopian dominion in Egypt (2:137, 139), and as he lived at no great distance from the time, and is to be depended upon for the chronology of the next dynasty, we should lay some stress upon his evidence did he not speak of but one Ethiopian king, Sabacos. Perhaps he includes in this single reign that of Tirhakah, and omits that of the first Sabacos. There are two Hebrew synchronisms and one Egyptian point of evidence which aid us in endeavoring to fix the chronology of this dynasty. Either the first or second king of the dynasty is supposed to be the So of the Bible, with whom Hoshea, who began to reign B.C. 729-8, made a treaty at least three years before the taking of Samaria: the latter eyent is fixed at B.C. 720; therefore one of these two Ethiopians was probably reigning in B.C. 723, or somewhat, perhaps seven. years, earlier. See So. Nor is it supposable that the treaty may have been made before the conquest of Egypt; for So is expressly called "king of Egypt" (<2 Kings 17:4), whereas Zerah and Tirhakah are distinctively styled Cushites (<2 Chronicles 14:9; <2 Kings 19:9). Tirhakah was contemporary with Hezekiah and Sennacherib at the time of the destruction of the Assyrian army. The chronology of Hezekiah's reign is, with respect to these synchronisms, difficult; but we are disposed to think that the common reckoning, varying not more than three years, is correct, and that the preferable date of the accession of Hezekiah is B.C. 726. Some chronologers follow Dr. Oppert in supposing that the date of Sennacherib's invasion should be Hezekiah's 24th year instead of the 14th year *(Chronologie des Assyriens et des Babyloniens,* pages 14, 15), but we rather infer a long interval between two wars. *SEE HEZEKIAH*. The last year of Hezekiah is thus B.C. 697, unless we

suppose that his reign was longer than is stated in the Masoretic text, and that it was for the latter part contemporary with Manasseh's. Tirhakah's reign is nearly determined by the record in a tablet of the tombs of the Butls Apis, that one of them was born in his twenty-sixth year, and died at the end of the 20th of Psammetichus I. The length of its life is unfortunately not stated, but it exceeded twenty years, and the longest age recorded is twenty-six. Supposing it to have lived twenty-one years, the first year of Tirhakah's reign would fall in B.C. 690 (see Rawlinson's *Herod. 2:*319, where the successor of Psammetichus is proved to date from B.C. 664), which would correspond to the 8th year of Manasseh. The contemporaneousness of Tirhakah and Hezekiah can be explained by one of two suppositions, either that Hezekiah's reign exceeded twenty-nine years, or that Tirhakah ruled in Ethiopia before coming to the throne of Egypt. It must be remembered that it cannot be proved that the reigns of Manetho's 25th dynasty form a series without any break, and also that the date of the taking of Samaria is considered fixed by the Assyrian scholars. At present, therefore, we cannot venture on any changes. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*;

We do not know the cause of the rise of the 25th dynasty. Probably the first king already had an Ethiopian sovereignty when he invaded Egypt. That he and his successors were natives of Ethiopia is probable from their being kings of Ethiopia and having non-Egyptian names. Though Sabaco conquered Bocchoris and put him to death, he does not seem to have overthrown his line or the 23d dynasty: both probably continued in a tributary or titular position, as the Sethos of Herodotus, an Egyptian king of the time of Tirhakab, appears to be the same as Zet, who, in the version of Manetho by Africanus, is the last king of the 23d dynasty, and as kings connected with Psammetichus I of the Salte 26th dynasty are shown by the monuments to have preceded him in the time of the Ethiopians, and probably to have continued the line of the Salte Bacehoris. We think it probable that Sabaco is the "So, king of Egypt," who was the cause of the downfall of Hoshea, the last king of Israel. The Hebrew name aws, if we omit the Masoretic points, is not very remote from the Egyptian SHEBEK. It was at this time that Egypt began strongly to influence the politics of the Hebrew kingdoms, and the prophecies of Hosea, denouncing an Egyptian alliance, probably refer to the reign of So or his successor; those of Isaiah, of similar purport, if his book be in chronological order, relate to the reign of Tirhakah. Tirhakah is far more fully commemorated by monuments than

his predecessors. At Thebes he has left sculptures, and at Jebel-Berkel, Napata, one temple and part of another. There seems to be no doubt that Sethos (Zet?) was at least titular king of part of Egypt, or the whole country, under Tirhakah, on the following evidence: In the Bible; Tirhakab, when mentioned by name, is called "king of Cush (Ethiopia)," and a Pharaoh is spoken of at the same period (<2302>Isaiah 30:2, 3; 36:6; <1282>2 Kings 18:21); in the Assyrian inscriptions a Pharaoh is mentioned as contemporary with Sennacherib; and the Egyptian monuments indicate that two or three royal lines centered in that of the 26th dynasty. The only event of Tirhakah's reign certainly known to us is his advance against Sennacherib, apparently in fulfillment of a treaty made by Hezekiah with the Pharaoh whom we suppose to be Sethos. This expedition was rendered needless by the miraculous destruction of the Assyrian army, but it is probable that Tirhakah seized the occasion to recover some of the cities of Palestine which had before belonged to Egypt. Herodotus gives a traditional account of Sennacherib's overthrow, relating that when Egypt was ruled by Sethos, a priest-king, the country was invaded by Sennacherib, against whom Sethos, who had offended the military class, marched with an army of artificers and the like, and encamped near Pelusium, where in the night a multitude of field-mice gnawed the bow-strings and shield-straps of the Assyrians, who, being thus unable to defend themselves, took to flight (2:141). It has been well observed that it is said by Horapollo that a mouse denoted "disappearance" in hieroglyphics (Herog. 1:50). Here we have evidently a confused tradition of the great overthrow of the Assyrians. Strabo, on the authority of Megasthenes, tells us that Tirhakab, in his extensive expeditions, rivaled Sesostris, and went as far as the Pillars of Hercules (15:686).

The beginning of the 26th dynasty was a time of disaster to Egypt. Tirhakah was either dead or had retired to Ethiopia, and Egypt fell into the hands of several petty princes, probably the dodecarchs of Herodotus, whose rule precedes, and perhaps overlaps, that of Psammetichus I, who is said to have been at first a dodecarch. In this time Esarhaddon twice invaded and conquered the country; but, after his second invasion, Psammetichus seems to have entirely thrown off the Assyrian yoke, and restored Egypt to somewhat of its ancient power. There are several passages in Scripture which probably refer to these invasions, and certainly show the relation of Ethiopia to Egypt at this time. The prophet Nahum, warning Nineveh, describes the fall of Thebes, "Art thou better than No

Amon, that was situate among the rivers, [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea, [and] her wall from the sea? Cush and Mizraim [were her] strength, and [it was] infinite; Put and Lubim were in thy help" (3008Nahum 3:8, 9). The sack and captivity of the city are then related. The exact period of Nahum is not known, but there is much probability that he lived about the time of the invasion of Judaea by Sennacherib (3011Nahum 1:11, 12). *SEE NAHUM*. He therefore appears, to refer to one of the conquests of Egypt by Sennacherib, Sargon, or Shalmaneser. See No. The close alliance of Cush and Mizraim seen as to point to the period of the Ethiopian rule, when the states would have united against a common enemy. Three chapters of Isaiah relate to the future of Ethiopia and Egypt, and it is probably that they contain what is virtually one connected subject, although divided into a prophecy against Ethiopia, the burden of Egypt, and the record of an event shown to prefigure the fall of both countries, these divisions having been followed by those who separated the hook into chapters. The prophecy against Ethiopia is extremely obscure. (See the version above.) It appears to foretell the calamity of Ethiopia to its farthest people, to whom messengers should be sent in vessels of papyrus, by the sea, here the Nile, as in the description of Thebes by the prophet Nahum *(1.*c.), bearing, probably, that news which is related in the next chapter. In the end the Ethiopians would send a present to the Lord at Zion (chap. xviii). Then follows " the burden of Egypt," apparently foretelling the discord and strife of the dodecarchy, the delivering of the people into the hand of a cruel lord, probably the Assyrian conqueror, the failure of the waters of Egypt and of its chief sources of revenue, and the partial conversion of the Egyptians, and, as it seems, their ultimate admission to the Church (chapter 19). We then read how a Tartan, or general; of Sargon, the king of Assyria, took Ashdod, no doubt with a garrison from the Egyptian army. At this time Isaiah was commanded to walk "naked and barefoot," probably without an outer garment, three years, as a sign to show how the Egyptians and Ethiopians, as no doubt had been the case with the garrison of Aehdod, probably of both nations, should be led captive by the king of Assyria. This captivity was to be' witnessed by the Jews who trusted in Ethiopia and Egypt to be delivered from the king of Assyria, and the invasions of Egypt by Esarhaddon are therefore probably foretold (chapter 20). In the books of later prophets Ethiopia does not take this prominent place: no longer a great power, it only appears as furnishing part of the Egyptian forces or sharing the calamities of Egypt, as in the history of Egypt we find Ethiopia occupying

a position of little or no political importance, the successors of Tirhakah in that country being perhaps tributaries of the kings of the 26th dynasty. In the description by Jeremiah of Phaiaob-Necho's army, the Ethiopians (Cush) are first spoken of among the foreign warriors mentioned as serving in it (<2469>Ezekiel 46:9). Ezekiel prophecies the fear of Ethiopia at the overthrow of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar (<2630>Ezekiel 30:4-9), and though the helpers of Egypt were to fall, it does not seem that the invasion of their lands is necessarily to be understood. One passage illustrates the difficult 18th chapter of Isaiah: "In that day shall messengers go forth from me in ships to make ["secure" or] careless Ethiopia afraid, and. great pain shall come upon them as in the day of Egypt" (<2630>Ezekiel 30:9). Zephaniah, somewhat earlier, mentions the Ethiopians alone, predicting their overthrow (<3612>Zephaniah 2:12). It is probable that the defeat of the Egyptian army at Carchemish by Nebuchadnezzar is referred to, or else the same king's invasion of Egypt.

The kings of Egypt do not appear to have regained the absolute rule of Ethiopia, or to have displaced the native kings, though it is probable that they made them tributary. Under Psammetichus, a revolt occurred in the Egyptian army, and a large body of rebels fled to Ethiopia, and there established themselves. A Greek inscription on one of the colossi of the great temple of Abu-Simbil, not far; below the Second Cataract, records the passage of Greek mercenaries on their return from an expedition up the river, "king Psamatichus" having, as it seems, not gone beyond Elephantine. This expedition was probably that which Herodotus mentions Psammetichus as having made in order to bring back the rebels (2:30), and, in any case, the inscription is valuable as the only record of the 26th dynasty which has been found above the First Cataract. It does not prove, more especially as the king remained at Elephantine, that he governed any part of Ehiopia. The next event of Ethiopian history is the disastrous expedition of Cambyses, defeated by the desert-march, and not by any valor of the invaded nation. From this time the country seems to have enjoyed tranquillity, until the earlier Ptolemies acquired part of Lower Nubia that was again lost to them in the decline of their dynasty. When Egypt became a Roman province, Syene was its frontier town to the south; but when, under Augustus, the garrison of that town had been overwhelmed by the Ethiopians, the prefect Petronius invaded Ethiopia, and took Napata, said to have been the capital of queen Candace. The extensive territory subdued was not held, and though the names of some of

the Caesars are found in the temples of Lower Nubia, in Strabo's time Syene marked the frontier. This part of Ethiopia must have been so unproductive, even before the falling of the level of the Nile, which Sir Gardner Wilkinson supposes to have happened between the early part of the 13th dynasty and the beginning of the 18th, that it may well have been regarded as a kind of neutral ground.

The chronology of the kings of Ethiopia after Tirhakah cannot yet be attempted. Professor Lepsius arranges all the Ethiopians under four periods: 1st. The 25th dynasty, first and second kings, 2d. Kings of Napata, beginning with Tirhakah, who, in his opinion, retired from Egypt, and made this his capital: of these kings, one, named NASTES-SES, or NASTES-NEN, has left a tablet at Dongolah, recording the taking in his wars of enormous booty in cattle and gold (Lepsius, *Denkminler,* 5:16; *Brugsch, Geogr. Istschr.* 1:163, 164). 3d. Older kings of Meroe, among whom is a queen KENTAHI, in whom a Candace is immediately recognized, and also MI-AMEN ASRU and ARKAMEN, the latter Ergamenes, the contemporary of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who had, according to Diodorus Siculus, received a Greek training, and changed the customs of Ethiopia (3:6). Some of these princes had an extensive dominion. The name of Ergamenes is found from Lower Nubia to Meroe. 4th. Later kings of Meroe, some, at least, of whom ruled both Meroe and Napata, though the former seems to have been the favorite capital in the later period *(Konigsbuch,* pl. 71, 72, 73). The importance of queens is remarkably characteristic of an African people. *SEE MEROE*.

The spread of Christianity in Ethiopia is a remarkable event in the history of the country, and one in which the truth of "the sure word of prophecy" has been especially evident. In this case, as in others, the Law may have been the predecessor of the Gospel. The pious eunuch, "Ebed-melech the Ethiopian," who befriended Jeremiah (2407Jeremiah 38:7-13; 39:15-18), may have been one of many converts from paganism, but it is scarcely likely that any of these returned to their native land. The Abyssinian Jews, being probably a colony of those of Arabia, were perhaps of later origin than the time of the introduction of Christianity. But in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, who had charge of all the treasure of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, and who, on his return from worshipping at Jerusalem, was baptized by Philip the deacon, we see evidence of the spread of the old dispensation in Ethiopia, and of the reception there of the new (4027Acts 8:27-39). In Psalm 68 (31), in Isaiah (2514Isaiah 45:14), and probably in

Zephaniah (Zephaniah 3:10), the calling of Ethiopia to God's service is foretold. Whether conversion to the Law or to Christianity, or indeed to both, is in. tended, it is remarkable that, though-long deprived of its actual geographical contact with the Coptic Church. of which it is a branch, by the falling away of Nubia, the Abyssinian Church yet remains, and the empire and the kingdom of Shoa are the only Christian sovereignties in the whole of Africa. *SEE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH*.

The ancient monuments of Ethiopia may be separated into two great classes, the Egyptian and the Egypto-Ethiopian. In Lower Nubia the Egyptian are almost universal; at Napata we find Egypto-Ethiopian, as well as higher up in the island of Meroe. In the monuments north of Napata, of which the chief lie between the first and second cataracts, we perceive no difference from those of Egypt save in the occurrence of the names of two Ethiopian kings-ARKAMEN, or Ergamenes, and ATSHERAMEN. The remains attest the wealth of the kings of Egypt rather than that of the country in which they are found; their abundance is partly owing to the scanty modern population's not having required the ancient masonry for building materials. The nearness of the mountains on either side to the river, and the value of the little tracts of alluvial soil, have rendered wholly or partly rock-hewn temples numerous here. Tombs are few and unimportant. Above the second cataract there are some similar remains, until the traveler reaches Jebel Berkel, the sacred mountain beneath which stood Napata, where, besides the remains of temples, he is struck with the sight of many pyramids. Other pyramids are seen in the neighborhood. They are peculiar in construction, the proportion of the height to the base being much greater than in the pyramids of Egypt. The temples are of Egyptian character, and one of them is wholly, and another partly, of the reign of Tirhakah. The pyramids are later, and are thoroughly Ethiopian. Yet higher up the river are the monuments of Meroe and neighboring places. They are pyramids, like those of Napata, and temples, with other buildings, of a more Ethiopian style than the temples of the other capital. The size and importance of these monuments prove that the sovereigns who ruled at Meroe must have been very rich, if not warlike. The farthest vestiges of ancient civilization that have been found are remains of an Egyptian character at Sobah, on the Blue Nile, not far south of the junction of the two rivers. The name suggests the Biblical Seba, which, as a kingdom, may correspond to that of Meroe; but such resemblances are dangerous. The tendency of Ethiopian art was to imitate the earliest

Egyptian forms of building, and even subjects of sculpture. This is plain in the adoption of pyramids. The same feeling is strongly evident in Egypt under the 26th dynasty, when there was a renaissance of the style of the pyramid period, though no pyramids seem to have been built. This renaissance appears to have begun under, or immediately after, the later part of the 25th dynasty, and is seen in the subjects of sculpture and the use of titles. The monuments of Ethiopian princes, at first as good as those of Egypt at the same time, become rapidly inferior, and at last are extremely barbarous, more so than any of Egypt. The use of hieroglyphics continues to the last for royal names, but the language seems, after the earlier period, to have been little understood. An Ethiopian demotic character has been found of the per iod, which succeeded the hieroglyphic for common use, and even for some inscriptions. We do not offer any opinion on the language of this character. The subject requires full investigation. The early Abyssinian remains, as the obelisk at Axum, do not seem to have any connection with those of more northern Ethiopia: they are of later times, and probably are of Arab oririn. Throughout Ethiopia we find no traces of an original art or civilization, all the ancient monuments save those of Abyssinia, which can scarcely be called ancient, showing that the country was thoroughly Egyptianized. Lepsius has published the Ethiopian monuments in his Denkmdler (part 5; pl. 1-75), as well as the inscriptions in Ethiopian demotic (part 6; pl. 1-11; see also 12, 13).

For the Christian history and relations of Ethiopia, see Titelmann, *De fide, religione et moribus AEthiopum* (Antwerp, 15034); De Goes, id. (Par. 1541, and since); Dresser, *De statu eccles. Ethiopicae* (Lips. 1584); De Vereta, *Historia de Etiopia* (Valentia, 1590); *Predicadores en la Etopia* (ib. 1611); Godiger, *De rebus Abassinorum* (Lugd. 1615); Machalt, *De rebus in AEthiopia* (Paris, 1624-6) ; Da Viega, *Christ. religio in Ethiopia* (Laus. 1628); Dannhauer, *Ecclesia Ethiopica* (Argent. 1664); Ludolf, *Historia Ethiopica* (Fr. ad M. 1681; with the supplemental Specimen, Ib. 1687; *Commentarius,* ib. 1691; and Adpendix, ib. 1693; the original work in English, Lond. 1684; abridged in French, Par. 1684); Cavatus, *Descriptio Congo, Matambe et Angola* (Bonn, 1687); Geddes, *Hist. of Ethiopia* (Lond. 1696); Windham, *Einleitung in d. ithiop. Theologie* (Helmst. 1719); Lobo, *Iter hist. in Abyssiniam* (publ. only in a transl. *Relation historique d'Abyssinie,* Par. 1727, Amst. 1728) La Croze, *Christianisme dEthiopie* (Hague, 1739, in Germ. 1740); Oertel, *Theologia*

AEthiopum (Wittemb. 1746); Kocker, *Fasti Habissinorumn* (Berne, 1760); Bruce, *Travels in Abyssinia* (Edinb. 1790). *SEE ABYSSINIA*.

Ethio'pian

(Αἰθίοψ, <44827>Acts 8:27; yvWK, *Kushi'*, <04201>Numbers 12:1; <14213>2 Chronicles 12:3; 14:9, 12, 13; 16:8; 21:16; <24123>Jeremiah 13:23; 38:7, 10, 12; 39:16; <27143>Daniel 11:43; <33907>Amos 9:7; <36222>Zephaniah 2:12; i.e., *Cushite;* elsewhere as a rendering of the simple vWK, *Kush),* an inhabitant of the land of ETHIOPIA *SEE ETHIOPIA* (q.v.) or CUSH *SEE CUSH* properly "Cushite" (<24123>Jeremiah 13:23); used of Zerah (<14409>2 Chronicles 14:9 [8]) and Ebedmelech (<24807>Jeremiah 38:7, 10, 12; 39:16). *SEE CUSHI*.

Ethiopian Eunuch

(ἀνὴρ Αἰθίοψ, εὐνοῦχος), a person described (<44827>Acts 8:27) as a chief officer (vizier) of the Ethiopian queen Candacs (δυνάστης Κανδάκης τῆς βασιλίσσης Αἰθιόπων), who was converted to Christianity through the instrumentality of the evangelist Philip (q.v.). Ethiopic tradition calls him *Indich* (see Bzovii Annal. ad 1524, page 542; but comp. Ludolf, *Hist. AEth.* 3:2), and Irenaseus (3:12) and Eusebius (Hist. *Eccl.* 2:1) make him thie founder of Christianity in Arabia Felix and Ethiopia, but according to Sophronius he preached in the island of Ceylon, and suffered martyrdom there. His official title does not necessarily indicate an emasculated person *SEE EUNUCH*, but probably here denotes a prime minister of state rather than a simple *cubicularius* or chamberlain (q.v.). Kuindl (ad loc.) thinks he was a Jew of the *Diaspora;* and certainly he was at least a proselyte (q.v.). As to the place of his power, it is not quite certain that the passage in Pliny *(Hist. Nat.* 6:5) refers to Meroa as the seat of government of the female sovereigns (comp. βασιλέας, Strabo, 17:2, 3); but possibly rather to Napata (Τανάπη, Dion Cass. 54:5), the capital of a different part of Ethiopia (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 2:35), or perhaps an uncertain locality (Ritter, *Erdk.* 1:592). On the historical elements of the question, see Laurent, *Neutestamen. Studien* (Gotha, 1866), page 140 sq.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1866, page 515; on the religious teachings of the narrative, *SEE SAM*. Smith, Sermon *on the Eth. Eunuch's Con*version (Lond. 1632). *SEE CANDACE*.

Ethiopian Woman

(Hebrews *Kshith',* tyvKu fem. of *Cushite;* Sept. Αἰθιοπίσσα, Vulg. AEthiopissa). Zipporah, the wife of Moses, is so described in <04120>Numbers 12:1. She is elsewhere said to have been the daughter of a Midianite (<02121>Exodus 2:21, compared with 16), and, in consequence of this, Ewald and others have suppiosed that the allusion is to another wife whom Moses married after the death of Zipporah; but the Arabian Ethiopia is probably referred to in this case. *SEE ZIPPORAH*.

ETHIO'PIANS

(vWK, <23204>Isaiah 20:4; <24609>Jeremiah 46:9, yvWK; Sept. Αἰθίοπες, Vulg. *Ethiopia, Ethiopes),* properly "Cush" or "Ethiopia" in two passages (<23204>Isaiah 20:4; <24609>Jeremiah 46:9); elsewhere "Cushites," or inhabitants of Ethiopia (<14212>2 Chronicles 12:3; 14:12 [11], 13 [12]; 16:8; 21:16; <27143>Daniel 11:43; <30907>Amos 9:7; <36212>Zephaniah 2:12). *SEE CUSHITE*.

Ethiopic Language

As it is maintained by competent judges that the Amharic and the Tigre are really dialects of the ancient Ethiopic or Geez (which is doubted by Adelung and Vater in the *Mithridates),* it may be expected, from the recent progress of comparative grammar, that future scholars will apply them to elucidate the structure of the other Syro-Arabian languages. At present, however, as even the Amharic is not yet able to boast of adequate and accessible means for its study, and as neither possesses any ancient version of any part of the Bible, the Geez is the only one which claims a particular notice here. *SEE AMHARIC LANGUAGE*.

The ancient Ethiopic or Geez, which is the only one of the three dialects that either has been or is now generally used in written documents of a sacred or civil kind, is to be classed as an ancient branch of the Arabic. This affinity is evident from the entire grammatical structure of the language; it is confirmed by the relation of its written character to that of the Himyarite alphabet; and either supports, or is supported by, the assumption that Habesh or Abyssinia was actually peopled by a colony from Southern Arabia. The grammatical structure of the Geez shows a largely predominant identity with that of Arabic; but it also possesses some traits which are in closer accordance with the other Syro-Arabian idioms, and some which are peculiar to itself alone. The main features of its

structure are as follows: The verb possesses the first ten conjugations of the Arabic verb, with the exception of the eighth and ninth; besides these it has two other conjugations which are unknown to the Arabic. There is a special conjunctive mood; the double infinitive is often used as a noun, irrespective of the absolute or construct form; the participle is wanting. The formation of nouns' resembles most that of Hebrew; but nouns often have superfluous end-vowels, which are modified in particular cases, and are analogous to the Arabic nunnation. As for the flexion of nouns, the masculine and feminine plurals are either formed by affixed syllables (*an*, *at*) on the principle common to the whole Syro-Arabian family, or by changes within the compass of the radical letters, after the manner of the so-called *broken* plurals of the Arabic grammar. The "construct state," and that relation of the noun which is equivalent to our objective case, are denoted by changes in the final vowels, or by employing the relative pronoun; the dative is indicated by prepositions. The comparative and superlative are expressed by means of particles. There is no form for the dual number either in the verb or the noun. With regard to the vocabulary of the language, one third of the roots are to be found in the same state in Arabic. By making allowance for commutations and transpositions, many other roots may be identified with their Arabic correspondents: some of its roots, however, do not exist in our present Arabic, but are to be found in Aramaic and Hebrew. Besides this, it has native roots peculiar to itself; it has adopted several Greek words, but shows no traces of the influence of Coptic.

The alphabet possesses twenty-six consonants, arranged in a peculiar order, twenty-four of which may, however, be regarded as essentially equivalent (although with different sounds in many instances) to the letters in the Arabic alphabet. The remaining two are letters adopted to express the Greek Φ and Ψ.

The vowel-sounds, which are seven, are not expressed by separable signs, as in the Hebrew and Arabic punctuation, but are denoted by modifications in the original form of the consonants, after the manner of the Devanagari alphabet. The mode of writing is from left to right. The position of the accent depends upon many complicated rules. As for the written characters, Gesenius has traced the relation between some of them and their equivalents in the Phoenician alphabet. There is, however, the most striking resemblance between the Geez letters generally and those in the Himyarite inscriptions, a circumstance which accords well with the

supposed connection of Southern Arabia and Habesh. Moreover, Lepsius, in an interesting essay, *Ueber die Anordnung und Verwandschaft des Semitischen, Indischen, AEthiopischen, etc. Alphabets* (in his *Zwei sprachvergleichende Abhandlungen,* Berlin, 1836, 8vo, pages 74-80), has adduced some striking arguments to prove that the Devanagari alphabet must have had some influence on the development of the Geez.

The literature of the Geez language is very scanty indeed, and that little is almost exclusively of a Biblical or ecclesiastical character. Dr. Laurence has lately added considerably to this by the publication of the Book of Enoch (q.v.), the Ascension of Isaiah (q.v.), and the first Book of Esdras (q.v.), in the Ethiopic version. There also exist in Ethiopic the Christian *Book of Adam* (in Germ. by Dillmann, Gott. 1853), and several other apocryphal works relating the miracles of Christ, Mary, etc. It possesses nothing, not even an imitation of the national poetry, nor of the lexicographical and grammatical works of the Arabs. Some few historical works in the shape of chronicles, and a few medical treatises, constitute the main body of their profane literature. The Geez has ceased, ever since the beginning of the 14th century, to be the vernacular language of; any part of the country, having been supplanted at the court of the sovereign by the Amharic. It still continues, however. to, be the language used in religious rites, in domestic affairs of state, and in private, correspondence. See Ludolf, *Grammatica AEthiopica* (2d edit. Freft. 1702, fol.), and his *Lexicon AEthiopico-Latinum* (2d edit. ib. 1699, fol., originally Lond. 1661, 4to); Hasse, *Prakt. Hdb. d. arab. u. athiop. Sprache* (Jen. 1793, 8vo); Hupfeld, *Exercitt. AEthiopiae* (Lips. 1826, 4to); Gesenius, in Ersch und Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyclopadie,* s.v. Aethiopische Sprache; Dillmann, *Lexicon Ling. AEthiopicae* (Lpz. 1862 sq., 4to); *Chrestomathia Ethiopica* (Lpz. 1865, 8vo); Castell, *Lexicon Heptaglottum* (Lond. 1669, fol.); Schrader, *De Linguae AEthiop. indole* (Vien. 1860 sq., 4to). *SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.*

Ethiopic Version

Picture for Ethiopic Version

The libraries of Europe contain some, although very rarely complete, manuscript copies of a translation of the Bible into the Geez dialect (see Ludolf, *Historia AEthiopica,* Lond. 1684; also Platt's *Catalogue of AEth. MSS.,* London, 1823). This version of the Old Testament was made from

the Greek of the Septuagint, according to the Alexandrian recension, as is evinced, among other things, by the arrangement of the Biblical books, and by the admission of the Apocrypha without distinction. Tradition assigns it to Frumentius as the author, but it probably proceeded from various Christian hands. Dorn supposes *(De Psalterio AEthiopico,* Lips. 1825) that the translator consulted the Hebrews original, but this is disputed by Gesenius and Rodiger *(Aligem. Litt. Zeit.* 1832). It is divided into four parts: *The Law,* or the Octateuch, containing the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth; *The Kings,* in thirteen books, consisting of two books of Samuel, two of Kings, two of Chronicles, two of Ezra (Ezra and Nehemiah), Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, the Psalms; *Solomon,* in five books, consisting of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, and Sirach; *Prophets,* in eighteen books, consisting of Isaiah, Jeremiah's prophecy and Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve minor prophets; lastly, they have also two books of the Maccabees. Besides this, they possess an apocryphal book of Enoch, which they place next to that of Job. The critical uses of this version are almost exclusively confined to the evidence it gives as to the text of the Septuagint. The version of the New Testament was made directly from the Greek original (see Bode, *N.T. AEth. cum Graeco collatum,* Brunswick, 1753). It follows the verbal arrangement of the Greek very closely, and has mistakes that are only to be explained by the confusion of words which resemble each other in that language. It is difficult to determine what recension it follows, but it frequently agrees with the Peshito and the Itala. It is impossible to ascertain the date of the execution of either of these translations, but they may both be ascribed with much probability to the beginning of the fourth century. — Kitto, s.v. Although there are several MSS. in Europe containing the Ethiopic version entire, only parts have yet been printed: the Psalter, first by Potken, along with Canticles (Romans 1513, 4to); also by the Bible Soc. (Lond. 1815), with notes by Ludolf (Frcft. 1701, 4to); the Canticles alone. by Nissel (Lugd. 1660, 4to); Jonah, in Lat. by Petraeus (ib. eod. 4to); Ruth, by Nissel (ib. eod. 4to); Malachi, in Lat. by Petraeus (ib. 1661, 4to); Joel, by the same (lb. eod. 4to); first 4 chapters of Genesis, by Biircklin (Freft. 1696, 4to); Jonah, with a glossary, etc., by Staudacher (ib. 1706, 8vo); various fragments, by Bode (Helmst. 1755, 4to). Dillmann is publishing for the first time the O.T. entire *(Biblia V.T. AEth.,* Lips. 1860 sq., 4to). The whole New Testament has, however, appeared. It was first published by three Abyssinians (Rome, 1548-9, 3 vols. 4to), reprinted in Walton's *Polyglot* (London, 1857, fol.; volume 5, with a Latin version, also

1698). Platt has edited the entire O.T. in Amharic (Lond. 1840, 4to). The Gospels were edited anew from MSS. by Platt (Lond. 1826, 4to), and the whole N.T. by the same in 1830. Bode published translations and critical editions of several portions: Ep. to Hebrews (Rome, 1548, 4to), Matthew's Gaosp. (Hal. 1749, 4to). See Rosenmuller, *Handb.f. d. Lit. d. bibl. Krit.* 3:65 sq.; Davidson, *Biblical Criticism,* 2:202 sq.; Dillmann, in Herzog's *Encyklopadie,* s.v. *SEE VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE*.

Eth'ma

(Ἐθμά v.r. Νοομά,Vulg. *Nobei),* given (1 Esd. 9:35) as the name of the head of one of the families of Israelites, several of whose "sons" divorced their Gentile wives after the exile; apparently a corruption of NEBO *SEE NEBO* (q.v.) in the Hebrews list (<151043>Ezra 10:43).

Eth'nan

(Hebrews *Ethnan',* ˆn;t]a, a *gift;* Sept. Ἐσθανάμ v. r. Ἐνθαδί Vulg. Ethnan), a descendant of Judah; one of the sons of Helah, the wife of Ashur, "the father of Tekoa" (<130407>1 Chronicles 4:7). B.C. post 1618.

Ethnarch

(ἐθνάρχης), properly *ruler of a nation;* hence generally a praefect of a district or city (Lucian, *Macrob.* 17), e.g. Simon Maccabaeus, as head of the Jewish crommonwealth (1 Macc. 14:47, "governor;" 15:1, 2, "prince ;" Josephus, Ant. 13:6, 6); Archelaus, appointed lay his father's will and the emperor's ratification, his viceroy in Judaea (Josephus, War, 2:6, 3), of the national head (modern *"patriach")* of time Jews in Egypt (Josephus, Ant. 14:7, 2; conp. Strabo, 16:798). Spoken of the "governor" or mayor of the city of Damascus (2 Corinthians 11:02), under the Arabian king Aretas (q.v.). (See Walch, *Disert. in Acta Aposit.* 2:85.)

Eti'ni

(Hebrews *Ethni'* ynæt]a, munificent, Sept. Ἀθανί v.r. Ἀθανεί), son of Zerah and father of Adaiab, of the Levitical family of Gershom (<130641>1 Chronicles 6:41 [26]). B.C. cir. 1420. In ver. 21, the same person appears to be designated hsy the name of JEATARAI. *SEE ASAPH.*

Ethnology

Picture for Ethnology 1

may be defined as that branch of modern science which treats of the various nations of the earth with respect to their *races, i.e.*, their relative origin, and their linguistic and social affinities; and it is thus distinguished from political geography, which discusses their association under their several civil governments. In the Bible, this subject, like all other scientific questions, is rather touched upon incidentally as connected with the history of mankind than in any formal and exact manner; yet the information thus afforded is of inestimable value, being, in fact, the only trustworthy clew to guide the investigator through the labyrinth in which later complications, and especially recent speculations, have involved the whole matter. Infidelity has striven hard to impugn the statements of Scripture on this ground especially; and it is therefore satisfactory to know that the most candid and general researches strongly tend to corroborate the positions of Holy Writ relative to all the main points involved in the discussion. These, so far as the Bible is directly concerned, all center in one cardinal topic, the unity of the human race; and they bear upon this chiefly in two lines of argument, namely, 1st, the analogous and common elements of various languages, showing an origin from one source; and, 2dly, the manner in which men are distributed, or, rather, grouped, over the surface of the earth, as illustrating the ethnological chart laid down in the tenth chapter of Genesis, This last only, or *"the Dispersion of Nations,"* we propose to discuss in the present article, referring the other two to the article *SEE ADAM*, and, especially, the article *SEE MAN*, and articles there referred to; *SEE TONGUES (CONFUSION OF)*, and other articles there referred to. For the physiological part of the argument we refer to the researches of Blumenbach, Dr. Prichard in his elaborate volumes on this subject, the notes in J. Pye Smith's *Scripture and Geology*, and a dissertation by Samuel Forrey, M.D., entitled *The Mosaic Account of the Unity of the Human Race confirmed by the Natural History of the American Aborigines*, in the American Biblical Repository, July, 1843. For a complete synoptical view of the present races of men, see Prichard's *Ethnological Maps* (Londoma, 1843, fol.). The following account embraces the principal points.

I. *Fact of an early Dissemination of the Race.* Many obvious reasons incline us to suppose that the small number of mankind which divine mercy

spared from the extirpation of the Deluge, eight persons, forming at the utmost five families, would continue to dwell near each other as long as the utmost stretch of convenience would permit them. The undutiful conduct of Ham and his fourth son cannot well be assigned to a point of time earlier than twenty or thirty years after the Flood. So long, at least, family affection and mutual interests would urge the children of Noah not to break up their society. The dread of dangers, known and unknown, and every day's experience of the benefit derived from mutual aid, would strengthen other motives. It is evident from <01110>Genesis 11:10-16, that about 100 years, according to the Hebrew text, were spent in this state of family propinquity, yet with a considerable degree of proximate diffusion, which necessity would urge; but the dates of the Septuagint, without including the generation of the post-diluvian Caanan (q.v.), give 400. The Hebrew period, much more the others, will afford a sufficient time for such an increase of mankind as would render an extensive outspread highly expedient. A crowded population would be likely to furnish means and incentives to turbulence on the one hand, and to some form of tyranny on the other. Many of the unoccupied districts would become dangerously unwholesome by stagnating waters and the accumulation of vegetable and animal putrescence. The products of cultivation and of other arts would have been acquired so slowly as to have retarded human improvement and comfort. Tardy expansion would have failed to reach distant regions till many hundreds or thousands of years had run out. The noxious animals would have multiplied immoderately. The religious obedience associated, by the divine command, with the possession and use of the earth, would have been checked and perverted to a greater degree than the world's bitter experience proves that it actually has been. Thus it may appear with pretty strong evidence that a dispersion of mankind was highly desirable to be in a more prompt and active style than would have been effected by the impulses of mere convenience and vague inclination. *SEE GEOGRAPHY.*

That this dictate of reasonable conjecture was realized in fact, is determined by the Mosaic writings. Of the elder son of Eber, the narrative says his "name was Peleg (גֶּלֶפ, *division),* because in his days the earth was divided" (<01025>Genesis 10:25); and this is repeated, evidently as a literal transcript, in <13019>1 Chronicles 1:19. If we might coin a word to imitate the Hebrew, we might show the paronomasia by saying "the earth was *pelegged"* (הגּלפה). Some are of opinion that the event took place about the time of his birth, and that his birth-name was given to him as a

memorial of the transaction. But it was the practice of probably all nations in the early times that persons assumed to themselves, or imposed upon their children and other connections, new names at different epochs of their lives, derived from coincident events in all the variety of associated ideas. Of that practice many 'examples occur in the Scriptures. The conjecture is more prob. able that, in this instance, the name was applied in the individual's maturer age, and on *account of* some personal concern which he had in the commencement or progress of the separation. But the signification usually given is by no means a matter of indubitable certainty. The verb occurs only in the two passages mentioned (strictly but one), and in Psalm 55:9, "divide their tongues," and Job 38:25, "who bath divided a channel for the torrent" (produced by a heavy thunder-shower)? Respectable philologists have disputed whether it refers at all to a separation of mankind, and think that the event which singularly marked Peleg's life was an occurrence in physical geography, an earthquake which produced a vast chasm, separating two considerable parts of the earth in or near the district inhabited by men. That earthquakes and dislocations of land have taken place in and around that region at various times before the historical period, the present very different levels, and other results of volcanic agency, afford ample proofs. The *possibility*, therefore, of some geological convulsion cannot be denied; or that it might have been upon a t great scale, and followed by imperfect effects upon the condition of mankind. The transpiration of some comparatively local interest, however, would seem a more appropriate occasion for the name of an individual than so world-wide an occurrence as the general distribution of mankind. But if the race was as yet confined to a narrow circle and a single community, the breaking up of that society would be a very signal event to celebrate in his name. *SEE PELEG.*

But neither the affirming nor the rejecting of this interpretation of "the earth's being divided" can affect the question upon the primeval separation and migratory distributions of men. The reasons which we have mentioned render it certain that some such event, and successive events, have taken place; and, without urging the passage of disputed interpretation, it is evident that Genesis 10 and 11 assume the fact, and may be considered as rather a summary recognition of it than as a detailed account. Thus (9:19), "These are the three sons of Noah, and from these all the earth was *scattered over"* (h [p]* n). Again (10:32), "These are the families of the sons of Noah, [according] to their generations, in their nations; and from

these the nations were *dispersed* (Wrrpnæ) in the earth after the Flood." Here another verb is used, often occurring in the Old Testament, and the meaning of which admits of no doubt. We find it also at verse 5, "From these the isles of the nations were *dispersed* (Wdrpnæ) in their lands, each [according] to its language, [according] to their families in their nations." The Biblical date thus assigned to the dispersion is not inconsistent with the most careful estimate of the antiquity of nations, such as Egypt and Assyria. *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

In the latest composition of Moses is another passage, which, in this inquiry, must not be neglected (<053208>Deuteronomy 32:8, 9): "In the Most High's assigning abodes to the nations, in his dispersing the sons of Adam, he fixed boundaries to the peoples according to the number (rPsimæ *numeration)* of the sons of Israel: for the assigned portion of Jehovah is his people; Jacob, the lot of his inheritance." Of this 8th verse the Septuagint translation is remarkable, and it thus became the source of extraordinary interpretations: "When the Most High apportioned nations, when he scattered abroad the, sons of Adam he fixed boundaries of nations according to the number of the *angels of God."* There might be a reading *(El* or *Elohim* instead of *Israel)* which would yield that meaning from comparison with <180106>Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7. Also the Alexandrine translators might welcone a colorable reasoning for the rendering, that it might haply serve as a protection from the danger of the Macedonico-Egyptian government, taking up the idea that the Jews claimed a divine right of supremacy over all other nations. This reading, however, save occasion to the Greek fathers (Justin Martyr, Origen, Eusebius, etc.) to maintain the doctrine of a later Jewish origin, that the grandsons of Noah being seventy, each was the ancestor of a nation, each nation having its own language derived from the confusion of Babel, and each also its guardian angel set over it by the Creator, excepting the nation of Israel, of which Jehovah himself was the tutelary deity. The only real difficulty of this passage lies in its seeming to assert that the nascent population was distributed into groups with the express design of effecting a *numerical* correspondence with the Israelitish family eight hundred years after. The names assigned to the third degree, that is, the sons (rather tribes or nations) of Noah's three sons, are, Japhet fourteen, Ham thirty-one, Shenm twenty-five, making *seventy;* and the whole family of Jacob, when it came to be domiciliated in Egypt, was *seventy* (<014656>Genesis 46:26; <020105>Exodus 1:5; <051022>Deuteronomy 10:22). Some have also fancied a parallel in the seventy elders (<022401>Exodus

24:1, 9; <04116>Numbers 11:16, 24, 25; see also Kitto, *Pictorial Palestine,* Civil History, Index, "Elders"). These puerilities might have been prevented had men considered that rPs]m does not signify merely an arithmetical amount, but is used to denote an *exact narration* (<070715>Judges 7:15). The passage is in the highly poetical style of the magnificent ode in which it occurs, and, reduced to plain terms, simply declares that the Almighty Sovereign, in whose hands of necessity lies the disposal of human birth-places, had so arranged these, in mapping out the world, as best to subserve the future occupancy of Canaan by his chosen people.

But the main passage of Scripture usually relied upon to prove the fact of a sudden and violent disruption of primeval society into the germs of the early nations, as well as to explain its circumstances and cause, is the account of the building of the tower of Babel (<011101>Genesis 11:1-9), in which the dispersion of those engaged in that enterprise has been regarded as a part of the disseverance commemorated in the name of Peleg. There are, however, some objections to this view of the narrative. In the first place, these two events are not thus connected in the account itself. The sporadic varieties of language, which is the grand distinction between the different tribes that have founded the ancient monarchies and cities, had not yet appeared; nor could they be accounted for in this manner if the original community had already begun to separate into the more modern states. The only supposition that would make the two occurrences compatible, if connected, is that the whole body of the Noachites, while in process of migration westward (µdQ,mæ[s]h}B), with a view to settling in different localities, were arrested by the inviting character of the plain of Shinar, until their purpose of diffusion (/WP, the same word in verses 4 and 8) was renewed by the divine interference. In the second place, it is not certain that either of the incidents thus associated is of so cosmopolitan a character as this theory assumes. By simply rendering /r,a, *land* or region, instead of "earth," the whole affair is reduced to a petty dispute or misunderstanding among the workmen engaged upon a public edifice, and a consequent dissolution of that particular cluster of inhabitants. Certain it is that all the dialects of this polyglot globe cannot be referred to a single incident or occasion like this. Such, at least, are in substance the arguments that have been offered against interpreting the sacred narrative here as having a general application to the whole race, nor can it be denied that they possess a certain degree of plausibility (see Bryant, *Ancient Mythology,* 3d ed. 4:23-44, 92 pq.). On the other hand, if, as everything in the context seems

to require, we conceive the descendants of Noah to have been at this time (say about the birth of Peleg, i.e., one hundred years after the Flood) quite limited in numbers and extent (as the longevity of the patriarchs and their pastoral habits both indicate), we shall find no particular difficulty in taking the entire statement in its broadest and most literal sense, as the opening wedge of that universal split, which has since widened more and more, in language and abode, among the sons of men. This narrative, then, of the Dispersion begins with the remarkable statement: "Now the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from [or "in"] the East, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there" (Genesis 11:1:2). The expressions " language" (lip) and "speech" (words) are too precise to be understood (as Vitringa, *Obs. Sacrae,* chapter 9, page 109) as indicating merely an agreement in purpose. The journeying together shows that the time spoken of was before the Noachians had ceased to be a single nation, and perhaps when they formed but a great tribe, and were journeying ([sn; to pull up stakes, as a tent or encampment) after the manner of time Arabs across the plains watered by the Tigris and Euphrates. It cannot be doubted that Shinar was Babylonia. The name, indeed, is perhaps traceable in Mesopotamia in the modern Sinjhi, and it is noticeable that the ancient Egyptian transcription of Shinar (r [n] v) is SANSART (this *k* corresponding to the Hebrew g, as though the ` had been pronounced like the Arabic Gain). But there is no evidence that the Hebrews called any country except Babylonia "the land of Shinar." The direction of the journey, if it be indicated as "from the East," probably would only mark the previous halting-place of the Noachians, not the place at which they first began to repeople the earth. The narrative then relates the attempt to build a city and a tower in order to prevent the scattering of mankind, and the punishment of the builders by the confusion (if their language and their being scattered abroad from the unfinished city Babel, or Confusion. Leaving the subject of the Confusion of Tongues for later discussion, we must observe the general agreement of profane historians as to the antiquity of Babylon, and the reminiscence of the Tower in the towers of the Babylonian temples. The Pyramids of Egypt and those of Mexico should be compared with these towers; and, in the case of the former, on account of their extreme antiquity, the comparison is very impertant. The exact character of the scattering is difficult to infer. The cause, according to the ordinary explanation of the narrative, was the Confusion of Tongues,

but some have supposed the latter to have been the consequence of the Dispersion. From verse 4 compared with verse 9, it would appear to have been but a resumption of the original plan of immigration, now that their holding together had become impossible, for the want of a common medium of vocal communication. Whatever difficulties we may discover in this and the preceding chapter of Genesis, "it is no longer probable only, but it is absolutely certain, that the whole race of man proceeded from Irann [the proper and native name of Persia and some connected regions] as from a center, whence they migrated first in *three great colonies;* and that those three branches grew from a common stock, which bad been miraculously preserved in a general convulsion and inundation of this globe" (Sir William Jones, On *the Origin and Families of Nations,* Works, ed. by Lord Teignmouth, 8vo, 3:196). There is, perhaps, no distinct reference to the building of the Tower and the Dispersion in the traditions of any heathen nation. The Greek story of the giants who piled mountains one upon another to reach Olympus is perhaps the most probable trace. Unlike the case of the Flood, there is no clear evidence that the Dispersion made a strong impression upon the minds of those who witnessed and shared in it. This would indicate that it was unaccompanied by any great outward manifestation of God's anger, and was the immediate consequence of such difficulties as would arise from the sudden division of mankind into tribes speaking different languages or dialects. *SEE BABEL (TOWER OF).*

II. *Preliminary Considerations in examining the List of Genesis 50–70.* The enumeration comprises only nations existing in the age of Moses, and probably of them only the most conspicuous, as more or less connected with the history of the Israelites. Many nations have been formed in subsequent times, and, indeed, are still forming, by separation and by combination; these can be considered only as included on the ground of long subsequent derivation. Such are the populations of Eastern Asia, Medial and South Africa, America, and Australasia.

2. It cannot be affirmed with certainty that we are here presented with a complete *Table of Nations,* even as existing in the time of Moses. Of each of the sons of Noah it gives the sons; but of their sons (Noah's great-grandsons) it is manifest that all are not mentioned, and we have no possible means of ascertaining how many are omitted. Thus, of the sons of Japheth, the line is pursued only of Gomer and Javan; Magog, Madai, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras are dropped without any mention of their issue; yet we have evidence that nations of great importance in the history of

mankind have descended from them. Ham had four sons: of three of them the sons, or rather clannish or national descendants, are specified; but to Phut, the fourth, no posterity is assigned. Shem had five sons, but the descendants of only two of them are recorded. It cannot be supposed that those whose sequence is thus cut off died without children; for as we shall presently see, nations of great historical interest may be traced up to them.

3. Mere similarity, or even identity of name, is not a sure guide. So remarkable a name as Hazarmaveth can scarcely be mistaken when we find it in Hadramaut. Such a name would not be repeated, and the Hadramaut which we discover in Arabia cannot be doubted to indicate the settlement of Joktan's son Hazarmaveth; but this is an exceptional case. When the similarity of Dodanim to Dodona is considered to be a sufficient proof of identity, all criticism is set at defiance. For the investigation before us we have an aid, invaluable both for its ample comprehension and its divine authority, in the account of the traffic of Tyre (Ezekiel 27).

4. The list is, in one aspect, a kind of geographical table: many names in its descents are found in later places of Scripture as geographical terms designating nations, or at least important tribes. Therefore

> **(1.)** We must not look for a name in that of a town. There is an exceptions probably not the only one, in the case of Sidon, the city of the Sidonians, who were doubtless a Canaanitish tribe, but to trace names in general in those of towns is very hazardous.
>
> **(2.)** The tracing of a nation or tribe to a name in the list is of little value, unless neighboring or kindred nations, or nations otherwise markedly connected with it, can also be traced to the same part of the list.

5. Preference must always be given to the oldest documents in seeking for identifications. Next to the O.T., the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian monuments must be cited. In each set of documents, the notices nearest in point of time are always likely to be the best commentators; for it must be remembered that migrations and deportations are less likely to affect evidence the earlier it is.

6. Although the list is geographical, its form is genealogical; and it does sometimes, and may frequently, state or convey the name of the founder of

a nation or tribe-thus, all those terminating in the plural *ins,* and those specified by the Gentilitian adjective, the Jebusite, the Hivite, etc. Yet

(1.) We must not attempt to identify a founder's name in the traditions of nations, except when it is distinctly mentioned there as such.

(2.) As before, we must not be satisfied unless the identification is' supported by the geographical position of the founder's nation, or its ethnological character, or else by some marked characteristics connecting it: with other names identified in the same part of the list.

III. *The Immediate Sons of* Noah. — Shem is always mentioned first of the three sons of Noah when their names occur together, the order being Shem, Ham, and Japheth. In <01021>Genesis 10:21 he is called "the elder brother of Japheth," which the A.V. incorrectly translates "the brother of Japheth the elder," where a comma after "Japheth" gives the correct sense. In the list of that chapter, notwithstanding the occurrence of the usual order in verse 1, the sons of Japheth are first mentioned, then those of Ham, and lastly those of Shem, the order being inverted. It has been supposed that Shem was put at the close of the list in order that the insertion of the other descendants of Noah might not form a digression in the history of the Shemites and their Hebrew branch. The Japhethites may have been put at the head of the list as the most widely spread, and so the most distant; and, for a like reason, the Hamites may have preceded the Shemites, the order being that of the extent of colonization. Or, again, the order may be geographical, from west to east, in accordance with the western, central, and eastern positions of the three great stocks. We shall see that the details favor the last view.

Shem (µv)e signifies "name, good name, fame;" Ham (µj;), "hot, warm;" Japheth (tpy), "spread," from htP; The names are probably prophetical of the future renown of the Shemites, of the hot land of the Hamites, and the spread of the Japhethites. The prophecy of Noah (<01025>Genesis 9:25, 26, 27) indicates the appropriateness of Japheth's name to his future; and a prophetical sense of the names of his brethren may therefore be conjectured. But there is no distinct allusion to any such sense in their cases. It might be thought that the appropriateness of Shem's name as illustrious could be traced in the prediction that his should be the believing stock, but there is no indication whatever of any moral significance in the name of Ham.

1. Shem. — There is no trace of any single nation or country named after Shem, probably because the Shemites, by an instinct afterwards remarkable in their descendants, early separated into distinct tribes, though not migrating very far. This was the case with the Israelites; and with the Arabs the same process is still in constant operation. *SEE SHEM*.

2. Ham. — The name of Ham has been connected with an appellation of Egypt in Hebrew, only occurring in three. passages in the poetical books- "the land of Ham" (Psalm 78:51; 105:23; 106:22), and with the most usual Egyptian name of the country, KEM, the black (land)." The former term we cannot doubt contained the patriarch's name. Is the latter identical with it? The significations of Ham and KEM are sufficiently near. Ham may reasonably be derived from µmij; "he or it was warm," and compared with µWj, "he or it was black," and the Arabic *cham*, of the same signification as the last, and chama, "black fetid mud" *(Kdmsues)*, or "black mud" *(Sihah* MS.). KEli cannot be taken for an Egyptian transcription of Ham, but it may be a word of cognate origin (comp. KAR, "a circle," lWh, lyjæ "he or it turned, turned round;" KARR, "a furnace," hr;j; "it burned;" ENA, "to bend," hn;j; "he or it bowed down, inclined"). There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that the Egyptian name of the country is identical with the Hebrew name of the patriarch. Are they of separate origin? We must either suppose this, or that "the land of Ham" became changed to "Ham-land," or "black land." The genius of the Egyptian language would account for such a change, which seems not improbable. That Ham should have given his name to a country might be accounted for by the supposition that, except the Canaanites, the Hamites penetrated into Africa, and at first established themselves in Egypt. *SEE HAM.*

3. *Japheth*. — It is impossible not to see the name of Japheth in the Greek Japetus the Titan, son of Uranus and Ge, and the supposed ancestor of the human race; for, as we shall see, the Greeks, or at least those of the Hellenic stock, are classed among the Japhethites in the list of Genesis. *SEE JAPHETH.*

IV. *The Descendants* of Japheth.— The following is the table of the Japhethites:

Japheth.	1. Gomer.	a. Ashikenaz.
		b. Riphath.
		c. Togarmah.

2. Magog.
3. Madai.
4. Javan.
- a. Elishah.
- b. Tarshish.
- c. Kittim.
- d. Dodanim.

5. Tubal.
6. Meshech.
7. Tiras.

1. Gomer. — This name occurs in but one later place in connection with geography, as that of a nation of tribe allied with Magog, and it is there mentioned immediately before Togarmah, distinguished as northern (<26806>Ezekiel 38:6). It has therefore been supposed to point to a remote northern nation, Scythic, or perhaps European. Two great gentile names have been compared, the Cimmerians of the Tauric Chersonese, who invaded the west of Asia Minor early in the 7th century B.C., and the Cimbri and Cymry, whose ethnic and nominal identity cannot be doubted. Considering the migratory character of the Cimmerians and Cimbri, it is reasonable to suppose that they had the same origin. In the cuneiform inscriptions of Darius Bystaspes, Gimiri occurs as the Shemitic equivalent of the Arian name *Saka (Sakai).* (Sir H. Rawlinson, in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 3:150, note 1.) *SEE GOMER*.

a. Ashkenaz. — In a single later mention Ashkeumaz occurs, in a confederacy against Babylon, with Ararat, Minni, and Middai (<245127>Jeremiah 51:27, 28). It was therefore a nation in the direction of Armenia.

b. Riphath, written in <130106>1 Chronicles 1:6, Diphath, does not occur elsewhere in Scripture. It has been compared with the Riphasan Mountains of Greek geography; but the statement of Josephus, commenting on this list, that the Paphlagonians were anciently called Riphathmeams, is worthy of notice (Ant. 1:6, 1).

c. Togarmah is mentioned in Ezekiel among the traders with Tyre, after Tarshish, Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, all Japhethites, and before Dedan, here probably the country of which the inhabitants, called Dodanina, are classed among the sons of the Japhethite Javan (<262712>Ezekiel 27:12-15); and, in a later place, "the house of Togarmah, of the north quarters," follows Gomer in the list of the army of Gog,

prince of Magog (<2638>Ezekiel 38:6). These particulars point to a northern people not remote from Greece. Togarmah traded with Tyre "with horses and horsemen, and mules" (<2714>Ezekiel 27:14), whence we may suppose these traffickers came by land. All the indications agree very well with the opinion that Togarmah may be connected with the Armenians.

2. *Magog* is elsewhere mentioned by Ezekiel only, first among the countries ruled by Gog, and especially associated with Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal (<2602>Ezekiel 38:2, 3), and apparently spoken of as dwelling "in the isles" (<2916>Ezekiel 39:6). The term "isles" certainly must not be taken necessarily to indicate islands, but it is apparently limited to maritime, transmarinei, and very remote regions. It has generally been held that Magog, used for a nation, is applied to the Scythians of the Greeks, though perhaps in a restricted sense. Certainly, in the time of Ezekiel, the Scythians who invaded Western Asia were the most powerful nation of the country to which the confederacy mentioned by the prophet may reasonably be assigned; and the agreement of Josephus *(Ant.* 1:6, 1) and Jerome *(Quaest. in <0102>Genesis 10:2*) in the identification is not to be overlooked. *SEE MAGOG*.

3. *Madai,* always later applied to the country Media, very appropriately follows Magog, if the latter, when used geographically, indicates the Scythiian neighbors of the Medes. Madai, like other names afterwards employed for a country rather than a people, may originally have been a man's name (comp. *Mizraim,* infra). *SEE MADAI*.

4. *Javan.* — Except where applied to an Arabian place or tribe (<2719>Ezekiel 27:19; and perhaps <2906>Joel 3:6), this is, in all later places, the name of the Greeks, or at least of the Hellenic Greeks. The Persians, like the Hebrews, called all the Greeks Ionians. *SEE JAVAN*.

a. Elishahi at the head of the descendants of Javan, is to be looked for in Hellenic geography. It is mentioned in Ezekiel as trading with Tyre, "Blue and purple, from the isles of Elishah, was that which covered thee" (<2707>Ezekiel 27:7). The name has been compared with Elis, Hellas, and the AEolians. Etymologically the first and third are equally probable, but other circumstances seem almost decisive in favor of the latter. The coast of the AEolian settlements in Asia Minor produced purple, and the name of so important a division of the Hellenic nation

would suit better than that of a city which never was rich and powerful enough to be classed with Sidon, Tyre, or Carthage.

b. Tarshish is in later Biblical history the name of a great mart, or, as some hold, of two. The famous Tarshish, supposing there were two, was one of the most important commercial cities of the period of the kings; second only, if second, to Tyre. It was accessible from the coast of Palestine, but its trade was carried on in large ships, "ships of Tarshish," which implies a distant voyage from Palestine. It brought to Tyre "silver, iron, tin, and lead" (<26>Ezekiel 27:12). These products, seem to point incontestably to a Spanish emporium, and the majority of modern commentators agree in fixing on the celebrated Tartessus, said to have been founded by the Phoenicians, and with which the Phoenicians traded. In some places Tarshish seems to be evidently a country.

c. Kittim.— This Gentile noun, usually written Chittim in the A.V., is generally connected with Citium of Cyprus. Other indications of Scripture seem not unfavorable to this identification, which would make the Kittim or Chittim a seafaring population of Cyprus.

d. Dodanim, closely connected in the table by construction as well as in form with Kittim — "Elishah and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim" (<01>Genesis 10:4) — was a maritime or insular people. Ezekiel says of Tyre, "The men of Dedan [were] thy merchants; many isles [were] the merchandise of thine hand': they brought thee [for] a present horns of ivory and ebony" (<01>Genesis 27:15). The reading in the list as given in <13>1 Chronicles 1:7 is Rodanim, a form which is probably the true one, as supported by the Sept. and Saniaritan versions. The Sept. identifies this people with the Rhodians in all instances, including that in Ezekiel. In the prophet's time Rhodes was a great seat of Phoenician commerce, and at the site of Camirus, one of its three important cities before the city Rhodes was founded, many objects of Phoenician style have been discovered. It may be added that ivory is one of the materials of its antiquities. The identification, considering the probable place of the Kittim, is very likely.

5. *Tubal, and,*

6. *Meshech,* are in later places mentioned together (<26>Ezekiel 27:13; 38:2, 3; 39:1), and were evidently northern nations (<26>Ezekiel 39:2). They have

been traced in the Moschi and Tibareni mentioned together by Herodotus (3:94; 7:78), and as Muskai and Tuplai, in the Assyrian inscriptions (Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 1:530), which inhabited the northern coast of Asia Minor towards the Caucasus.

7. *Tiras,* last in the list of the sons of Japheth, has not been satisfactorily identified. The best comparison is perhaps with the Tyrrhenians or Tyrsenians, as then all the chief territories of Japhethite civilization would seem to have been indicated — Armenia, Asia Minor, Thrace, the Asiatic Islands, European Greece, Italy, and Spain.

V. *Descendants of Ham,* or Hamites:

Ham.	1. Cash.	a. Seba.	
		b. Havilah.	
		c. Seabtah.	
		d. Raamah.	
			a. Sheba.
			b. Dedan.
		e. Sabtechah.	
		f. Nimrod.	
	2. Mizraim.	a. Ludim.	
		b. Anamim.	
		c. Lehabim.	
		d. Naphtuhim.	
		e. Pathrusim.	
		f. Casluhim.	a. Philistim.
		g. Caphtorim.	
	3. Phut.		
	4. Canaan.	a. Sidon.	
		b. Heth.	
		c. Jebusite.	
		d. Amorite.	
		e. Girgasite.	
		f. Hivite.	
		g. Arkite.	
		h. Sinite.	
		i. Arvadite.	
		j. Zemarite.	
		k. Hamathite.	

1. *Cush* is immediately recognised in KISH, the ancient Egyptian name of Ethiopia above Egypt, With this identification all geographical mentions in Scripture, except that in the account of Paradise (Genesis 2:13), agree. The latter may refer to a primaeval Cush, but an Asiatic settlement is positively indicated in the history of Nimrod, and we shall see that the settlements of the Cushites extended from African Ethiopia to Babylon, through Arabia. *SEE CUSH*.

a. Seba is connected by Isaiah with Egypt and Cush (43:3; 45:14), and the statement of Josephus that the island and city of Meroe bore this name is therefore to be noticed. In the ancient Egyptian geographical lists, SAHABA and SABARA occur among names of tribes or places belonging to Ethiopia (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* 2, page 9, pl. 12, k. 1.).

b. Havilah. — The identification of Havilah is difficult, as the name recurs in the list of the sons of Joktan; and in Biblical geography, except only in the description of Edent it is found in Arabia alone. If the two stocks intermixed, and thus bore a common name, a single localization would be sufficient.

c. Sabtah can only be doubtfully traced in Arabian geography.

d. Raamah, in the Sept. Ῥεγμά, is well traced in the Ῥέγμα of Ptol. (6:7), and Ῥῆγμα of Steph. Byz. (s.v.), a city of Arabia on the Persian Gulf.

a. Sheba, and, b. Dedan, bear the same names as two descendants of Keturah (Genesis 25:3), from which it has reasonably been supposed that we have here an indication of a mixture of Cushite and Abrahamite Arabs, like that of Cushite and Joktanite Arals inferred in the case of the two Havilahs. It is to be remarked that the name of Dedan has been conjecturally traced in the modern name of the island of Dadan, on the east coast of Arabia, and that of Sheba in, the ruins of an ancient, city called Seba, in the neighboring island of Awal.

e. Sabtechah is not identified.

f. Nimrod is generally thought to have been a remoter descendant of Cush than son, and this the usage of Hebrew genealogies may be held to sanction. He is the first and only known instance in the list of the leader of a dynasty rather than the parent of a nation or tribe. His name is followed by a parenthetical passage relating to his power and the

establishment and extension of his kingdom. It is probable that this narrative is introduced to mark the commencement of the first Noachian monarchy. It may be compared with the notices of inventions in the account of Cain's descendants (<01040>Genesis 4:20-22). The name of Nimrod is probably Shemitic, from r r m; " he was rebellious." It occurs in ancient Egyptian, in the form NAMURET, in the family of the 22d dynasty, which was certainly, at least in part, of foreign origin, The like names SHESHENK, USARKEN, TEKERUT, appear to be Shemitic.

2. *Mizraim*, literally "the two Mazors," is the common name of Egypt in the Bible; the singular, Mazor, being rarely used. It has been thought to be a purely geographical name, from its having a dual form, but it has been discovered in ancient Egyptian as the name of a Hittite or kindred chief, B.C. cir. 1300, contemporary with Rameses II, written in hieroglyphics MATRIMA, where the MA is known to express the Hebrew dual, as in MAHANMA for Mahanaim. That it should be used at so early a time as a proper name of a man suggests that the fact that Egypt was so called may be due to a Noachian's name having had a dual form, not to the division of the country into two regions. If, however, we suppose that in Genesis 10 Mizraim indicates the country, then we might infer that Ham's son was probably called Mazor. It is remarkable that Mazor appears to be equivalent to Ham: as we have seen, the meaning of the latter is evidently "hot" or "black," perhaps both, and a cognate word is used in Arabic for "black mud;" among the meanings of *misr*, the Arabic equivalent of Mazor, the *Kaaitls* gives "red earth or mud." Thus Ham and Mazor or Mizraim would especially apply to darkness of skin or earth; and, since both were used geographically to designate the "black land," as cultivated Egypt always was from the blackness of its alluvial soil, it is not surprising that the idea of earth came to be included in one of the significations of each. If Mizraim were purely geographical in the list, then we might perhaps suppose that it was derived from Mazor as a Shemitic equivalent of Ham. It is certainly remarkable that all the descendants of Mizraim are mentioned as tribes in the plurals of gentile nouns. *SEE MIZRAIM.*

a. Ludim, perhaps mentioned in passages of the prophets as Lud or Ludim (<23619>Isaiah 66:19; <24609>Jeremiah 46:9; <26710>Ezekiel 27:10; 38:5; 30:4, 5), where, however, the Shemitic Lud may be intended. There would be no doubt that in at least one of these passages (<26304>Ezekiel 30:4,5), where Egypt, and, as far as they are identified, African nations

or countries are spoken of, the Ludim are those of the Mizraite stock, were it not possible that under the term Ludim or Lydian the Ionian and Carian mercenaries of the Pharaohs may be indicated.

b. Anamim, a nation as yet not identified. c. Lehabim, no doubt the same as the Lubim or Libyans mentioned in later places of Scripture as allies or mercenaries contributing to the armies of the Pharaohs, and supporting or dependent on Egypt as a race in very close relations. They correspond to the REBU or LEBU of the Egyptian inscriptions, western neighbors of Egypt, conquered by the kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties.

d. Naphtuhim strikingly resembles the Coptic name of the westernmost part of Lower Egypt, the territory of the city Marea, probably the older Mareotic nome *Niphaiat* or *Niphaiad,* a plural form commencing with the definite article *ni.*

e. Pathrusim, a tribe of which the territory, "the country of Pathros," is mentioned in later places. The latter has been compared with the Egyptian Pathyrite or Phaturite Nome; in Coptic *papitoures, papithoures;* in ancient Egyptian PA-HAT-HER; the chief objection to which identification is, that the geographical importance of the name seems scarcely sufficient.

f. Casluhim, not as yet identified.

g. Caphtorim, and the land of Caphtor, have given rise to much discussion. Poole has proposed as the equivalent of Caphtor the ancient Egyptian name of Coptos, KEBTU, KEBTA, KEBHER, probably pronounced Kuht, Kabt, Kebthor, the Coptic *Keft, Kepto, Kepto, Kebto,* Gr. Κόπτος, Arab. *Kuft,* and ventured to compare Αἴγυπτος with r/Tpæiyaa*SEE CAPHTOR.* It must be rememtered that the city Coptos, or its nome, has given its name to the whole nation of Egyptians, who were known as Copts by the Arabs at the time of the conquest. But good reasons have been urged in favor of Cyprus, especially the circumstance of the Philistine migration.

h. Philistim. — The Philistines are here said to have come forth from the Casluhim; elsewhere they are called Caphtorim, and said to have come out of Caphtor. It is not allowable to read that the Philistim and Caphtorim came from the Casluhitn. Perhaps there is a transposition in

the text. The origin of the Philistines from a Mizraite stock is a very important fact for the explanation of the list.

3. *Phut*. — In later places, Put or Phut occurs as the name of an African country or nation, closely connected with Egypt, like the Lubim. It may be compared with those geographical names in the ancient Egyptian inscriptions in which the element PET, "the bow," occurs. Nubia was called the "bow-land," TU-PET, where it is usual to read TU-KENS, but the bow has not the sound KENS elsewhere; and it is probable that a part of Nubia was called Kens, and that the bow was written as a determinative symbol to show that Kens was included in "the bow-land;" but the question is full of difficulties. *SEE PHUT*.

4. *Canaan*, in Genesis 9 (18, 22, 25, 26, 27), is distinctly mentioned as the son of Ham. It has been thought that his name means the "degraded," "the subdued" man, "the lowlander," for both senses are possible. *SEE CANAAN.*

a. Sidon, "the first-born" of Canaan, like Heth, immediately following, is a proper name, whereas all the remaining names are gentile nouns in the singular. Sidon is thought to signify "the fishing-place," so that the name of the place would seem here to be put for that of the founder, "the fisherman," Αλιεύς of Sanchoniathon or Philo of Byblus. But it must be noticed that the next name, Heth, is treated in later places as that of a man. The position of the Sidonians, like that of most of the Canaanitish tribes, need not here be described.

b. Heth, ancestor of the "Children of Heth," or Hittites, a very important nation of Palestine and Syria. 'There are indications in Scripture of Hittites out of Palestine, and the ancient Egyptians warred with the KHETA in the valley of the Orontes, whose names show that they spoke a Shemitic language. The Egyptian monumental representations show that their armies were composed of men of two races, the one apparently Shemite in type, the other beardless, and resembling the Tatar type. *SEE HITTITE*.

c. The Jebusite,

d. Amorite,

e. Girgasite (properly Girgashite),

f. Hivite, all inhabitants of Palestine; but the Amorite, like the Hittite nation, seems to have had a wider extension, for the territory in which stood KETESH, the great stronghold of the KHETA on the Orontes, is called in Egyptian "the land of AMAR" (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* 2, page 21, 22, pl. 18:44, 47).

g. The Arkite, compared with the Phoenician town of Area.

h. The Sinite, not satisfactorily identified. Perhaps one of their settlements may be traced in Sin or Pelu-slum.

i. The Arvadite, no doubt the people of Aradus. The derivation from dWr, with the sense " wandering," "place of fugitives," is in accordance with the tradition referred to by Strabo, who says that Aradus was built by Sidonian fugitives (16:2, 13, 14). Aradus was a Phoenician city.

j. The Zemarite, conjecturally traced in the town Simyra, which has nothing to recommend it but its neighborhood to Arka and Aradus.

k. The Hamathite, well known to have been seated in Upper Syria, where Hamath, on the Orontes, was long a capital of an important kingdom.

VI. *Descendants of Shem,* or Shemites:

Shem.

I. Elam.
II. Asshur.
III. Arphaxad.
a. Salah. a. Eber. *(a.)* Peleg.
(b.) Joktan.
(a.) Almodad.
(b.) Sheleph.
(c.) Hazarmaveth.
(d.) Jerah.
(e.) Hadoram.
(f.) Uzal.
(g.) Diklah.
(h.) Obal.
(i.) Abimael.

(j.) Sheba.
(k.) Ophir.
(l.) Havilah.
(m.) Jobab.

IV. Lud.

5. Arian.

a. Uz.
b. Hul.
c. Gether.
d. Mash.

1. *Elam,* when used geographically, held to correspond to Susiana, not to Persia Proper.

2. *Asshur,* afterwards the Assyrian nation. In the cuneiform inscriptions Asshur is the chief object of worship of the kings. *SEE ASSHUR*.

3. *Arphaxad,* probably well traced, in the province Arrapachitis.

a. Salah seems to be only a genealogical link. In the Shemitic family the list is clearly something more than ethnological and geo graphical; it is of the nature of a pedigree, at least as far as it deals with the ancestry of Abraham.

b. Eber. — It is impossible here to discuss the difficult question whether to this patriarch the name of the Hebrews owed its origin. The argument based on the mention in this list that Shem was " the father of all the children of Eber" (<581021>Hebrews 10:21) seems to us almost unanswerable on the affirmative side. *SEE EBER.*

(a.) Peleg seems, like Salah, to be but a genealogical link.

(b.) Joktan is perhaps only a similar link: his descendants form an important series.

(a.) Almodad, supposed to b e traceable in Arabian names.

(b.) Sheleph, traced in El-Yemen.

(c.) Hazarmaveth, identical in name with the great region of Hadramaut, in Southern Arabia.

(d.) Jerah, not certainly identified, and **(e.)** Hadoram, not traced.

(f.) Uzal, the same name as Awzal, the ancient name of San'a, capital of El-Yemen.

(g.) Diklah,

(h.) Obal,

(i.) Abimael, not traced.

(j.) Sheba is the same name as the Arabic Sebh, the old kingdomn of El-Yemen. The mentions in the Bible of the kingdom of Sheba point towards Arabia, amid the Arabic indication thus fixes the position of Joktanite Sheba in the south.

(k.) Ophir, perhaps traced in Southern Arabia.

(l.) Havilab, as already remarked under the head of the Cushite Havilab, may indicate a mixture of Cushite and Joktanite settlers in Arabia.

(m.) Jobab, not certainly identified.

4. *Lud* has been compared to Lydus, the traditional ancestor of the Lydians. The Shemitic character of the Lydian civilization is confirmatory of this view. The Egyptian monuments of the empire mention a powerful Asiatic people of Shemitic type, apparently living not far from Mesopotamia, called RUTEN or LUDEN. It is possible that the Lydians may have migrated into Asia Minor after the time of the Egyptian empire, or that there may have been two Lydian settlements. It is not clear whether the Lud or Ludini of later places of Scripture were of this stock, or the same as the Alizraite Ludim, as already remarked.

5. Aram is, in later places, the geographical designation of Syria, though the term is not of the same extent as our Syria. We read of Aram-namharaimm, "Aram of the two rivers," either Mesopotamacia, according to the general opinion, or the country of the Orontes and Leontes, of Padan-Aram, perhaps a part of the same tract, or another name for it; and also of Arama-Zobah, Aram-Bath-rehob, Aram-Maachah, and Aram-Dammesek, or Syria of Damascus, all kingdoms in the country Aram (q.v.).

a. *Uz*. Mention is made of "the land of Uz"-in the book of Job, where other indications seem to point to the north of Arabia.

b. Hul, and,

c. Gether, are not identified;

d. Mash is but conjecturally traced in Mesene, in Lower Babylonia, or Mons Masius, at the north of Mesopotauinia.

VII. Results. — These are twofold:

RACES.	LANGUAGES.
I. Caucasian.	I. Shemitic (as Hebrew).
1. White (as Greek).	II. Iranian (Greek).
2. Tawny (Arab).	III. Barbaric.
3. Brown (Abyssinian).	1. Egyptian.
II. Lower Nilotic (Egyptian).	2. Nigritian.
III. Nigritian (Negro).	3. Tatar.
IV. Tatar (Chinese).	

In the table which follows, the first column gives those names from Genesis 10 for which there are highly probable geographical identifications; the second column states these identifications; the third contains ethnological evidence from Egyptian (Eg.), Assyrian (As.), or other. sources; the fourth exhibits the like philological evidence.

Picture for Ethnology 2

From this evidence we may draw the followimeg inferences on several important points:

1. *Order of Names.* — The Japhethites seem to be placed first, as the most distant nations. In the list of the Hamites, the southern, and, therefore, most distamnt Cushites, are arranged from west to east, Seba (Meroe) being followed by Raamah (in Arabia), and the series closing with Nimrod, who ruled in Babylonia and Assyria. North of Cush is Mizrain, in the enumeration of whose tribes the western Lehabinin (Libyans) are followed after an interval by the easternmost Philistim, apparently the only Mizraites of Palestine. The list of the Canaanites begins with Sidon, the Phoenicians of the sea-coast north of the Philistines; then mentions under Heth the Hittites, perhaps on account of their southern settlement, and, going northwards, enumerates tribes near Lebanon, closing with the Syrian Hamathites. The Shemitic tribes begin in the east, extending regularly from

Susiana to Arabia, and then ascending to Syria. Lud may be an exception, but, as we have seen, the Lydians may primeavally have been settled near Syria, otherwise Lud may be mentioned between the Arabs and Aram as, an outlying Shenaitic tribe, to be spoken of before the enumeration of those nearest Palestine.

2. Race. — All the names identified with a high degree of probability are, with six exceptions, of Caucasian nations. The exceptions are: three certainly of the Lower Nilotic race, which is intermediate between the Caucasian and Nigritian races, showing strong traits of both, a fourth probably of the same race, and two others which require more particular investigation. Cush, in ancient Egyptian, applies to Nigritians, for the race of KISH is represented on the Egyptian monuments as of the most marked Nigritian type: the kings and other royal personages of Merohi, and the Ethiopians of rank under them, are, however, represented on their monuments as similar to the Lower Nilotic race. This suggests that Cush may indicate a country mainly peopled by Nigritians, yet with a governing mixed race. The remaining exception is the case of the Hittites, who are represented on the Egyptian monuments as of two types — the one Caucasian. the other apparently Tatar. This may show that two different races were ruled by those Hittite kings with whom the Pharaohs warred, as Og, the king of Bashan, was a Rephaite, not an Amorite.

3. Language. — The languages are all Iranian or Shemitic, with three exceptions. Egyptian, occurring twice in our table, has a monosyllabic barbaric vocabulary, with an amalgamate Shemitic grammar. Here, therefore, as in race, there is a departure from the unmixed type. To Cush we have conjecturally assigned a barbaric Niriitian language, because the names of Ethiopian tribes conquered by the Egyptians, and of Ethiopian sovereigns of later times, are not readily traceable to either an Egyptian or a Shemitic source; but we cannot say certainly that a Shemitic element is wholly wanting in the languages to which these words belong.

The order indicates that the intention of the list is partly geographical. In the detail of each division the settlements of races are probably indicated rather in the order of position than of ancestral relationship;, though the principle of relationship is never departed from, as far as we can see.

4. Date. — The list of Genesis 10 contains certain statements which may now be examined, in order to infer the date to which the document refers. It is said, "Afterward were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad"

(Genesis 10:18); which may indicate the formation of the great Hittite settlement in the valley of the Orontes, or other like extensions. In any case it points to an event, or series of events almost certainly prior to the establishment of the Israelites in Palestine. So, too, the definition of the otherwise unknown Resen, as "the great city" (Genesis 10:12), indicates a period anterior to that of the kings who ruled at Asshur (Kal'ah Sherghat) and Calah (Nimrud), the earliest of whom is placed about B.C. 1270. At the time of the Egyptian empire the capital appears to have been Nineveh, "and the date of the list would therefore be anterior to that time, or at least to the reign of Thothmes III, to whom it was tributary about 1450 B.C. It would appear, therefore, that the list was either written or put into its present form not long after, or at the time of Moses if not earlier, and that it refers to a yet earlier period — that of the first spread of the Noachians.

VIII. Omissions. — The nations omitted in the list must now be noticed, as far as they seem to be of a like hi oh antiquity. In Deuteronomy 2 there is mention of several tribes or nations which had been destroyed by other tribes or nations who reached Palestine or its neighborhood before the Israelitish occupation. Certain of these are called Rephaim, others not. The particulars are as follows, as far as they relate to our present subject:

1. *Emim Rephaim,* succeeded by Moabites (Deuteronomy 2:9-11).

2. *Horim,* succeeded by Edomites (verses 12, 22).

3. *Zamzummim,* elsewhere called Zuzi in (Genesis 14:5), Rephaim, succeeded byAmmonites (Deuteronomy 2:19-21).

4. Avim, succeeded by Caphtorim, that is, Philistines (verse 23).

5. Anakim, here mentioned as Rephaim (verses 10, 21) still occupying the south of Palestine at the time when the Israelites entered it.

The Avim were probably also a Rephaite nation, for as late as David's time giants were found among the Philistines. Elsewhere in Palestine the Israelites seem to have found, besides "the three sons of Anak," or the Anaekim of Hebron, Og, the king of Bashan, who "remained of the remnant of Rephaim" (2:11), a man of gigantic stature. The position of these Rephaim is that of a few powerful chiefs among the Canaanites and Philistines, representing tribes destroyed by Hebrews, the only exceptional case being that of the Philistines, if, as we suppose, the Avim were Rephaim, for in that case the former must have first attacked , but

ultimately changing their policy, abstained from annihilating the older population.

At an earlier time we find a very different condition of the country. The powerful confederacy of which (Chedorlaomaer as chief, attacked and conquered, besides the kings of the cities of the plain, the Rephaim, Zuzim, Emim, Horim, Amalekites, and Amorites. Here the Canaanites occupy a very inferior position in the south and east of Palestine, but one Canaanitish nation being mentioned, and besides undoubted Rephaites, the Horim probably of the same stock, and the ancient and pedigreeless nation of Amalek.

We thus find an indication of an old population of Palestine distinct from both Canaanites and Hebrews, and especially remarkable for their great height. That they were in race still more remote from their successors than has usually been held, has been argued from the Anakim's being spoken of as "of the Nephilim" (Numbers 14:33), the term applied to the giants before the Flood, where it is said "the Nephilim were in the earth in those days" (Genesis 6:4). On this subject, compare Poole, *The Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, 2d ed. pages 80-82, 284, 285, where it is maintained that the Nephilim were a pre-Adamite race.

IX. Literature. — Bochart, *Phaleg et Canaan, sive Geographia Sacra* (Cadomi. 1646); Michaelis, *Spicilegiuna Geographiae exterae Hebrmorena* (Gotting. 1769, 1780); Forster, *Epistolae ad J.D. Michaelem* (Gotting. 1772); Volney, *Recherches nouvelles* (Paris, 1814), chapter 18; Feldhoff, *Volkestafel der Genesis* (Elberf. 1837); Hohlenberg, *Comnaent. de cap.* 10 *Geneseos* (Hafn. 1828); Eichhorn, *De Cuscheis verisinailia* (Amst. 1774); Krebs, *De divisione Phalegria* (Lips. 1750); Nagel, *Commentatio exeget.* in Act. 17:26 (Altd. 1740); Zacharih, *Dissent. philol.* in loc. und. (Hal. 1754); Schulthess, *Das Paradies* (Zier. 1816); Krucke, *Erklar. d. Volkestatfeln in erst B. Moses* (Bonn, 1837); Rosenmuller, *Bibl. Alterthumsk.* 1, 1:221 sq.; Knobel, *Die Volkestafel der Genesis* (Giess. 1850); Milhenhoff, in the *Gotting. Anzeigen*, 1851, page 17 sq.; Joseph 5: Gorres, *Die Japhidem und ihr Auszug aus Armenien* (Regensb. 1845); Beke, *Origines Biblicae* (Lond. 1884); Forster, *Hist. Geography of Arabia* (Lond. 1844); Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses* (in Clarke's Library); Brace, *Races of the Old World* (N.Y. 1863). *SEE DISPERSION OF MANKIND*; *SEE DIVISION OF THE EARTH*; *SEE MAN*.

Ets-Aboth

SEE THICK-TREE.

Ets-Gopher

SEE GOPHER-WOOD.

Ets-Hadar

SEE GOODLY-TREE.

Etshmiadzin

a remarkable Armenian convent in Erivan, a Transcaucasian province of Russia, and about 16 miles west of the town of Erivan. "It is of great extent, is surrounded by a wall 30 feet in height, and 1I miles in circuit. This wall encloses several distinct churches, each of which is presided over by a bishop; is cruciform in shape, and is surmounted by a kind of cupola crowned by a low spire. For many centuries this has been the seat of the Catholics (the head or patriarch of the Armenian Church). This patriarch presides at the synodical meetings, but cannot pass a decree without its having the approval of the. moderator, an official appointed by the Russian emperor, in whose hands the control of the convent virtually rests. In the convent library there are 635 manuscripts 462 of which are in the Armenian language."

Ets-Shemen

SEE OIL-TREE.

Ettwein, John

a distinguished divine of the Moravian Church, was born June 29, 1721, at Freudenstadt, Wurtemberg. In 1754 he came to America, where for nearly half a century he labored as an evangelist, as a member of the executive board, and finally as a bishop, to which latter office he was appointed in 1784. He traveled thousands of miles, often afoot, and preached the Gospel in eleven of the original thirteen colonies, as also in what is now the State of Ohio, to white people, negroes, and Indians. In 1772 he was the leader of the Christian Indians on their exodus from the Susquehanna country in Pennsylvania to the Tuscarawas in Ohio, exposing himself to great hardships and dangers. During the Revolutionary War he was in

frequent intercourse and correspondence with Washington and several members of Congress; and when the general hospital of the American army was transferred to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, he devoted himself with singular disinterestedness to the spiritual wants of the sick, in spite of his many other duties. To him, too, must be ascribed the honor of originating, in 1787, "the Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen," which still exists, and now has a large funded capital, and to which Congress made a grant of several townships on the Tuscarawas, in trust for the Christian Indians. He died January 2, 1802. (E. de S.)

Etun

SEE LINEN.

Eubu'lus

(Εὔβουλος, *good in counsel),* a Christian at Rome whose greeting Paul sent to Timothy during his last imprisonment (<550421>2 Timothy 4:21), A.D. 64.

Eucharist

one of the names of the Lord's Supper, from εὐχαριστία, *giving of thanks. SEE LORD'S SUPPER.*

Euchel Isaac Ben Abraham,

a Jewish scholar, born in 1756, was a distinguished member of the Society for the Promotion of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, which was formed in the days of Mendelssohn (q.v.). He is the author of a very learned treatise on the ancient mode of burial among the Jews, *Ist nach judischen Gesetzen das Uebernachten der Todten wirklich verboten?* (Breslau, 1797.) He published also a translation of the Jewish Prayers, μ`μyk/bn/h r/m μyvWrP, or *Mose Maimuni's Mose Nebuchim,* with the Commentary of Mose Narboni, called yn/B r]h;, and others (Sulzbach, 1828, 3 volumes, 4to); a history of the life of Moses Mendelssohn (Berlin, 1798, 8vo; Vienna, 1812); eand as a part of the great Bible work started by Mendelssohn, *Die Spruche Salomo's im Original ins Deutsche ubersetzt und hebraiisch commentirt* (8vo, Berlin, 1789, 1790, and often). — Furst,

Bibliotheca Judaica, pages 259, 260; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Biblical Literature,* s.v.

Euchelaion

the oil of prayer, a ceremony in the Greek Church answering to *extreme unction* in the Latin. To such penitents as are conscious of the guilt of any "mortal sin," as adultery, fornication, or pride, this sacrament is administered by the bishop or archbishop, assisted by seven priests, who commences with this prayer: "Lord, who with the oil of thy mercies hast healed the wounds of our souls, do thou sanctify this oil, that they who are anointed therewith may be freed from their infirmities, and from all corporeal and spiritual evils." The *oil of prayer* is pure and unmixed, having in it no other ingredient. A quantity sufficient to serve for the whole year is consecrated on Wednesday in the Holy Week by the archbishop or bishop. In the administration, the priest dips some cotton at the end of a stick, and thereby anoints the penitent in the form of a cross on the forehead, on the chin, on each cheek, and on the backs and palms of the hands; after which he repeats this prayer: "Holy Father, physician of souls and bodies, who hast sent thine only Son Jesus Christ, healing infirmities and sins, to free us from death, heal this thy servant of corporeal and spiritual infirmities, and give him salvation and the grace of thy Christ, through the prayers of our more than holy lady, the mother of God, the eternal virgin, through the assistance of the glorious, celestial, and incorporeal persons, through the virtue of thy life-giving and holy cross, of the holy and glorious prophet, the forerunner, John the Baptist, and the holy and glorious apostles." — Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Dictionary,* s.v.; Pinkerton, *Present State of the Greek Church,* 193.

Eucherius

bishop of Lyons in the 5th century, was born of a noble family at Lyons. He was a senator, happily married, and the father of two sons, Veranius and Salonius, who at an early age were sent to the monastery of Lerins (now St. Honorat) for education. In 422 Eucherius entered the same convent as a monk, having obtained the consent of his wife Galla, who likewise devoted herself to monastic life. Soon after, Eucherius retired into solitude on the island of Lero (St. Marguerite). In 434 he was, in consequenca of the reputation of his great piety, elected bishop of Lyons, and, as such, was present at the two synods of Orange (441 and 442). He

died in 454 (according to others, in 450 or 449). He is commemorated as a saint on the 16th of November. He was followed on the see of Lyons by his son Veranius, while the second, Salonius, became bishop of Geneva. Eucherius wrote, about the year 427, *Epistola paraenetica de contemtu mundi et secularis philosophie* (edit. by Rosweid, Antwerp, 1621); in 428, *Epistola de laude eremi seu vita solitaria* (edit. by Rhenanus, Basel, 1516, and by Erasmus, Basel, 1520): — *Liber formularum spiritalis intelligentice*: — *Institutionum libri II*: — *Exhortatio ad Monachos;* and several homilies. Several other works are wrongly attributed to him. It seems that he sympathized with the Semiiarians. A collection of all his works was published by Brassicanus (Basel, 1531), in the *Biblioth. Patr. Max. Lugd.* tom. 6 and 27; and in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. 1. *SEE HERZOG, Real-Encyklop.* 19:490.

Euchites

SEE MESSALIANS.

Euchologion

(εὐχή λόγος), the common name of the liturgical books of the Greek Church, containing the services for the sacraments, conferring of orders, and other religious offices. There is an edition by Goar, entitled *Euchologion, sive Rituale Graecormm, complectens ritus et ordines divince Liturgice, officiorum, sacramertorum, etc., juxta usum Orientalis ecclesiae* (Par. 1647). See Covel, *Some Account of the Greek Church* (Lond. 1722, fol.), chapters 2, 3; Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church,* part 1 (Lond. 1850), 1:317.

Eudaemon John Andrew,

a Greek Jesuit, was born at Canea, in Candia, about 1560. He derived his descent from the imperial family of the Paleologi; went to Italy when very young, and in 1581 entered the Society of Jesus. After having taught philosophy at Rome and theology at Padua, he was appointed rector of the Greek College, which pope Urban VIII had just established at Rome. He accompanied, as theologian, the papal legate, cardinal Barberini, to France, and died at Rome in 1625. He wrote a large number of controversial works against Casaubon, Brightman, John Barclay, Robert Abbot, and many others. Pamphlets against Henry IV and Louis XIII were also ascribed to him. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gener.* 16:663.

Eudaemonism

(Gr. εὐδαιμονία, happiness), a principle in philosophical ethics according to which the attainment of happiness is represented as the true aim of life. Those who hold this view are called EUDEMONISTS. Opposed to eudsemonism are all those systems of ethics which regard not the pleasure of the individual, but the recognition of some universal law as the higher principle. Eudeemonism lay at the basis of the Cyrenaic school founded by Aristippus, and of the Epicurean philosophy (q.v.). It was developed to its utmost consequences by Hegesias, who taught that if no enjoyments are to be expected by men, death is preferable to life. Essentially different from this class of Eudaemonists is the system of Aristotle, who regarded virtue as a spiritual enjoyment, and in this sense represented ethics as the doctrine of seeking and finding a happy life. This view has found adherents among Christian writers on ethics, who define and treat ethics as the doctrine of a happy life. Others have combined with eudaemonism common usefulness, moral sentiment, and perfection, and thus have purified and ennobled it. Belonging properly to the schools of Aristippus and Epicurus are in modern times the different systems of sensualism (q.v.) and materialism (q.v.). In an ennobled form, Eudsemonism reappears in some representatives of the Scotch school, who, in opposition to the self-love of Hobbes, develop the longing for universal happiness as the supreme ethical principle. In direct and keen opposition to every form of eudaemonism, Kant established the principle of the categorical superlative, according to which the good must be done for its own sake, and the moral law, with the duties emanating from it, can alone be made the central principle of ethics. *SEE KANT*. Schleiermacher assigned to the idea of the highest good the highest position in ethics, and likewise rejected Eudaemonism as a principle. This is now, in general, the attitude of writers on Christian ethics; the thirst of man for happiness is not absolutely rejected, but it is found unsuited for a fundamental principle, which must be sought in a universaldivine law, not in the natural longings of the individual. *SEE ETHICS*. Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:207.

Eudes, Jean

founder of the congregation called the Eudists, was born at Rye, Normandy, November 14, 1601, and died at Caen, August 19, 1680. At 14

he commenced his studies under the Jesuits at Caen, entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1623, and was ordained priest in 1625. From 1627 to 1632 he was engaged in missionary labors among the plague-stricken people of Normandy, and in 1642 he became superior of the Congregation of the Oratory at Caen. Much of his time was spent in missions throughout France to reform the clergy. In 1643 he organized a new society, which took the name "Eudists," or the "Congregation of Jesus and Mary," and soon had numerous branches in France. Its members were devoted to the education of young candidates for the priesthood, and to "missions" (in the Roman Catholic sense) among the clergy. Eudes wrote a number of books of devotion. The Eudists were scattered at the Revolution, but were revived by the abbe Blanchard in 1826. They have a college, called St. Gabriel's, in the State of Indiana.

Eudists

SEE EUDES.

Eudo de Stella

SEE EON DE STELLA.

Eudocia

wife of the emperor Theodosius II, was the daughter of Leontius, an Athenian sophist. She was called Athenais, and was carefully instructed by her father in Greek letters. She was also noted for personal beauty. On the death of her father, the jealousy and avarice of her brothers compelled her to go to Constantinople, where she appealed to Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II, who was so fascinated by her beauty and talent that she induced Theodosius to marry her, A.D. 421. She was baptized under the name of Eudocia, and long retained great influence with the emperor. In A.D. 438 she made a splendid pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Soon after she was charged with aspiring to the government of the Eastern empire; and later, with an intrigue with one Paulinus, a courtier. About A.D. 449, "the emperor, through jealousy, dismissed all her court, and had her exiled to Palestine, where she continued to reside after his death. She there embraced the opinions of Eutyches, and supported by her liberality and influence the monk Theodosius, who forced himself into the see of Jerusalem, after driving away Juvenal, the orthodox bishop, and kept it until he was himself driven away by order of the emperor Marcianus.

Euthlymius, called the Saint, by his reasonings brought back Eudocia to the orthodox faith, after which she spent the remainder of her days at Jerusalem, where she died in 460, protesting her innocence of the crime with which her husband had charged her." Eudocia wrote several works: (1) Photius quotes a translation in verse of the first eight books of the Old Testament. (2) There is also attributed to her a *Life of Christ,* composed of lines taken from Homer, translated into Latin by Eachard, and published under the title of *Homerocentra,* or *Homerici Centones* (Gr. and Lat. Frlncof. 1541,1554; Par. 1578, 12mo; Lips. 1793, 8vo); an account of the martyrdom of St. Cyprian, Greek and Latin, ed. by Bandini, in his *Graecae Ecclesiastes vet. Monumenta,* 1:130-189. — Hoffmann, *Bibliogr. Lex.* 2:63; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall,* chapter 32.

Eudoxia

wife of the emperor Arcadius, was born in the year 375, and was married to Arcadius in 395. She was the mother of Theodosius II, or the younger. Her name is mentioned here on account of her difficulties with Chrysostom. She used her influence for the banishment of Clilysostom, against whom her hatred was incited by the unsparing attacks which he made against all evil-doers, and especially, it is said, by his declaration that she was “a new Herodias thirsting after the blood of John." She died in 404. — Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 3:736: Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biog. Generale,* 13:687; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Harper's ed.), 3:343 et sq.

Eudoxians

SEE EUDOXIUS.

Eudoxius

an Arian, and bishop of Constantinople, was born at Arabissus, in Armenia, first mentioned as bishop of Germanicia (near Mount Taurus). About 356 he obtained by artifice the patriarchate of Antioch, where he soon came forward as a patron of the Aetians (Theodoret, *H.E.* book 2, chapters 25, 26). Sozomen says that "when Eudoxius found himself in possession of the Church of Antioch he ventured to uphold the Aetian heresy openly. He assembled in Antioch all those who held the same opinions as himself, among whom were Acacius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, and Uranius, bishop of Tyre, and rejected the terms of 'like substance' and 'con-

substantial,' under the pretext that they had been denounced by the Western bishops" *(H.E.* book 2, chapter 12). Although he was deposed at the synod of Seleucia, yet he does not appear to have ever vacated his see; and on Macedonius being ejected from the see of Constantinople, says Socrates, Eudoxius, who now despised that of Antioch, was promoted to the vacant bishopric *(H.E.* book 2, c. 43). He obtained the see of Constantinople in 359, and retained it until his death in 370. Some fragments remain of a treatise of his *De Incarnatione Dei Verbi*. — Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* 5:7; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:403-11; Cave, *Hist.Lit.* (Geneva, 1720), 1:138.

Euer'getes

(Εὐεργέτης, *a benefactor;* see Josephus, *War,* 3:9, 8; Diod. Sic. 11:26; Xenoph. *Anab.* 7:6, 38; sometimes Anglicized EVERGETES), a common surname and title of honor (comp. Plato, *Gorg.* page 506 C, and Stallb. ad loc.) in Greek states, conferred at Athens by a public vote (Demosth. Page 475), and so notorious as to pass into a proverb (Luke 22:25). It was bestowed by states upon those who had conferred benefits upon them, and was taken by several kings. *SEE PTOLEMY; SEE ANTIOCHUS*.

A king is mentioned by this title in the 2d prologue to Ecclesiasticus, wherein the translator states that, having gone into Egypt in the 38th year of king Euergetes, and been there some time, he found this book by his grandfather, (Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως παραγενηθεὶς εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ συγχρονίσας, ε υρον οὐ μικρᾶς παιδείας ἀφόμοιον). There can be no question that a king of Egypt is here meant; for, though a king of Syria could be intended by this title, Alexander I, Antiochus VII, and Demetrius III being shown by their coins tohave been styled Euergetes, no one of them reigned more than a few years. It is more probable, on *prima facie* grounds, that an Egyptian Euergetes is here spoken of, if the same discrepancy should not be found. Two of the Ptolemies bore this title: Ptolemy III, always known as Euerzetes, who reigned twenty-five years, B.C. 247-222, and Ptolemy VII (or IX), Euergetes II, more commonly called Physcon, who began to reign jointly with his brother Ptolemy VI (or VI I), Philometor, B.C. 170, and became sole king in B.C. 146, dying in his fifty-fourth year, reckoned from the former date, and the twenty-ninth year of his sole reign, B.C. 117 (Fynes Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici,* 3:382, 383, 386, 399; Lepsius, *Konigsbuch,* Synoptische Tafeln, page 9). A great

difficulty has arisen in the attempt to decide which of these kings is intended. Everything hinges upon the manner in which the reigns were reckoned. There is no satisfactory evidence for supposing that Euergetes I counted his regnal years from a time before his accession; the evidence of the inscription at Adule, that Fynes Clinton adduces in favor of as high a date as the 27th year, is wholly inconclusive (pages 382, 386); besides, the 27th year is far short of the 38th. To ascertain the official reckoning of the years of Euergetes II, during the latter part of his rule, and thus to determine from what date he then counted his regnal years, we have only to examine the demotic papyai of his reign. From these Dr. Young collected a list of dates which appeared thirty years ago in his posthumous *Rudiments of an Egyptian Dictionary.* These dates are year 29, 84, 45,46,47 or 43, 52, 53 (pages 27-31). It. is thus proved incontestably that Physcon counted his years from the commencement of his joint reign with Philometor, without any separate reckoning from his accession as sole king of Egypt. The hieroglyphic inscriptions, as we would expect, follow the same reckoning. Thus one of the Apis tablets gives the dates of the 28th, 31st, 51st, and 52d years of this king (Lepsius, The 22d *Egyptian Royal Dynasty,* transl. by Dr. Bell, page 41). We must not pass by the idea of Jahn *(Einleiteng,* 2:930 sq.), that the 38th year refers to the translator's age instead of a king's reign. It would be better to suppose an asra. Three seem possible, the man of the Seleucidae, that of Simon the Maccabee, used in Palestine, and the aera of Dionysius used in Egypt. The aera of the Seleucidas began B.C. 312, and its 38th year is therefore too early for the reign of Euergetes I; the aera of Simon the Maccabee began B.C. 143, or a little later, and its 38th year is too late for, the reign of Euergetes II. The aera of Dionysitus commenced B.C. 285 (Lepsius, *Kanigsbuch, 1.*c.), and its 38th year was therefore the last of Ptolemy II, Euergetes I coming to the throne in the next year. The construction that does not allow the year of the reign of Euergetes to be intejaded, and thus necessitates some such explanation, is certainly the more correct; but as Dr. Davidson, who has laboriously collected upon this question much criticism which We have shown to be needless, observes, we need not here look for correct grammar *(Horne's Introd.* 1856, 2:1026-1028). With this admission the usual reading cannot be doubted, and the date mentioned would be B.C. 133. Other evidence for the time of the composition of Ecelesiasticus, which, of course, can be approximately inferred from that of the translation, is rather in favor of the second than the first Euergetes. — *SEE ECCLESIASTICUS; SEE JESUS, SON OF SIRACH.*

Eugenicus

a Greek theologian, lived in the first half of the 15th century. He began public life as an instructor in rhetoric, but his learning and eloquence soon procured him the first positions in the Church, and towards 1436 he was made archbishop of Ephesus. Two years later he accompanied the emperor (John Palaeologus) to the Council of Florence. Here he not only represented his own diocese, but acted also for the patriarchs of Antioch and of Jerusalem. A zealous defender of the Greek Church and adversary of the Roman, Eugenicus was the only one who, at the close of the council, refused to recognize the pretensions of the pope and to sign the acts of the council. On his return to Constantinople the people received him with great enthusiasm. Even upon his death-bed in 1447, he solemnly adjured George the Scholastic to continue the strife against the Latins. The numerous writings of Eugenicus are of a polemical nature, directed against the Latin Church and those prelates of the Greek Church who were favorable to the former. Many have never been published; but they are recorded by Fabricius. We make mention here only of his printed works: *Letter to the Emperor Palaeologus,* in which he advises the Greeks against the Council of Florence, and exposes the intrigues of the Latinists. This letter has been translated into Latin, with a reply by Joseph of *Methone,* in Labbe, Concilia, 13:677. An encyclical letter upon the same subject in Labbe, Concilia, 13:714; *A Treatise on Liturgicaul Topics; A Profession of Faith,* a fragment of which is given by Allatius, *De Consensu,* 3:3. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* 01107*Genesis* 16:706; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca,* 11:670; Oudin, *Script.* 21032*Ecclesiastes* 3:2343.

Eugenios Bulgaris

SEE BULGARIS.

Eugenius I, Pope

a son of the Roman Rufinianus, was elected by the Romans September 8, 654, as successor to Martin I, who had been sent into banishment to the Thracian Chersonesus by order of the emperor Constans II, who favored the schism of the Monothelites. Martin dying in the following year, Eugenius continued in dispute with the court of Constantinople till he died, June 1, 657, and was succeeded by Vitalianus. In order to reestablish peace with the Greeks, his legates made an arrangement with Peter, the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, that instead of one or two wills in

Christ three should be assumed — one substantial, the two others natural. — Bower, *History of the Popes*, 3:70.

II. Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded Paschal I February 14, 824, in the midst of great disorder, which occurred at Rome, owing to the corrupt state of society and mal-administration of that city. To reform these, the emperor Louis the Good sent his son Lotharius to Rome, who corrected many abuses, which, by the account of Eginhardt and other chroniclers, had grown to an enormous extent. He confirmed the right of electing the pope to the clergy and people of Rome; and the Council, of Rome, which he convoked on November 1, 826, issued many beneficent decrees for the restoration of Church discipline, for the establishment of schools, and against the worldly occupations of clergymen. He died August 827. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 4:214; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 4:205.

III. Pope. He was a monk of Citeaux, disciple and friend of St. Bernard, and afterwards abbot of St. Anastasius. He was elected to the pontifical chair of Rome February 27, 1145. He appears to have been a year sincere disciple of Bernard, and anxious, like him, to reform the manners of the clergy and consolidate the papal power. Through the greater part of his pontificate, owing to the turbulence of the Roman people *SEE ARNOLD OF BRESCIA*, he was unable to reside in the city. This circumstance, however, did not hinder his being acknowledged as pope, or his exercising the functions of his office. During his reign the second crusade, under the preaching of St. Bernard, was undertaken. *SEE CRUSADERS*. Shortly after its mortifying failure the pontiff died at Tivoli, July 8, 1153. See Neander, *Bernard und s. Zeit.* 190-296; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:214.

IV, Pope, Gabriele Condolmiere, a native of Venice, succeeded Martin V as pope March 3, 1431. At the early age of twenty-four he was made by pope Gregory XII, with whom he was related, bishop of Siena, and soon after (1408) cardinal. "His was a most stormy pontificate. He drove away the powerful family of Colonna, including the nephews of the late pope, from Rome, charging them with having enriched themselves at the expense of the papal treasury. He afterwards made war against the various lords of Romagna, who were supported by the Visconti of Milan. But the greatest annoyance to Eugenius proceeded from in the Council of Basle, which had been convoked by his predecessor, and which protracted its sittings year after year, broaching doctrines very unfavorable to the papal supremacy. *SEE BASLE, COUNCIL OF* Eugenius, who had been obliged to escape

from Rome in disguise on account of a popular revolt, and had taken up his residence at Bologna in 1437, issued a bull dissolving the council, recalling his nuncio who presided at it, and convoking another council at Ferrara. *SEE FERRARA*. Most of the fathers assembled at Basle refused to submit, and summoned the pope himself to appear before them, to answer the charge of simony schism, and others, and after a time proceeded against him as contumacious, and deposed him. Eugenius meanwhile had opened in person his new council at Ferrara in February, 1438, in which, after annulling all the obnoxious decrees of the Council of Basle, he launched a bull of excommunication against the bishops who remained in that assembly, which he characterized as a 'satanic conclave, which was spreading the abomination of desolation into the bosom of the Church.' The Catholic world was divided between the two councils; that of Basle proceeded to elect a new pope in the person of Amadeus VIII of Savoy, who assumed the name of Felix V, and was solemnly crowned at Basle. Eugenius encouraged the Hungarians and Poles to break the peace they had solemnly sworn with the Turks, under pretense that their oaths were not valid without the sanction of the pope; he even sent cardinal Julian as his nuncio to attend the Christian army. The result was the battle of Varna, 1444, in which the Christians were completely defeated, and king Ladislaus of Poland and cardinal Julian lost their lives. Eugenius died at Rome Feb. 23, 1447. He left the Church in a state of schism between him and his competitor Felix, his own states a prey to war, and all Christendom alarmed at the progress of the Turkish arms" *(English Cyclopaedia)*. *SEE BOWER, History of the Popes*, 7:238.

Eugippius, or Eugyppius

a learned monk, who lived at the close of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century. He seems to have been the descendant of an Italian family, and was at first monk in the monastery of St. Severin (q.v.) at Fariana, in Noricum (near the present Pchlarn, in Austria), subsequently in the monastery of Castrum Lucullanum (now Castello del Novo, belonging to the city of Naples). He is sometimaes called "abbot," but it is doubtful whether he was, in the later years of his life, abbot of Lucullanum, or whether the name was only given him as an honorary title. He is the author of a life of his teacher, St: Severinus *(Vita St.* Severini, publ. by Canisius, *Antiq. Lect.* t. 6, in *Acta Sanctorun*, January 8; and by Welser, Augsb. 1594), which is a very important contribution to the Church history of Germany. He also compiled a collection of Thoughts and Sentences from

the works of St. Augustine *(Thesaurus Augustinianeus* (Basle, 1542; Venice, 1513), which was dedicated to the Roman virgin Proba. The author of the second work was formerly believed by some writers to be a different person from the author of the life of St. Severin, but this opinion has now been generally abandoned. Among the letters of Fulgentius (q.v.) of Ruspe, there is one addressed to Eugippius; a letter of Eugippius to Fulgentius is lost. Edgippius was also in literary connection with Dionysius Exiguus. There is a monastic rule which is ascribed to Eugippius, but it was early superseded by that of St. Benedict. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:217.

Euhemerus

a Greek historian, philosopher, and traveler, lived about the year B.C. 300. It is not exactly known whether he was born at Messina (in Sicily), at Tegea (in the Peloponnesus), on the isle of Cos, or at Agarigentum. He belonged to the Cyrenaic school, well known for its skepticism in religious matters. As bold as the other philosophers of this school, and more systematic, Euhemerus proposed a general interpretation of the myths, which has been justly compared with modern German Rationalism. An exposition of his doctrine is given by Diodorus Siculus. "Euhemaerus," he says, "friend of Cassander (king of Macedonia B.C. 320-296), was entrusted by this prince with certain missions to some of the Southern countries. On his way he passed in the Indian Ocean a group of isles, of which the largest was called Panchaia. "The Panchaeans were distinguished for their piety, and honored the gods by sacrifice and offerings of gold and silver." They worshipped Jupiter, and such other gods as we meet with in Grecian mythology; but all these gods were really men distinguished for great actions, and deified on account of them. On his return from the voyage Euhemerus wrote a *Sacred History* (῾Ιερὰ ἀναγραφή), in about nine books,in which he showed, according to Lactantius and Arnohbius, that these gods were but men (Lactantius, *De Falsa Religione,* 1:11). A Latin translation was made by the poet Ennius. Of this translation only ninety-five lines now remain (Amsterdam, 1707). This work contains the history of the gods of the Panchasans, of the people and their manners, Euhemerus himself leaning in fact to the doctrines of the Panchasans. The form in which he presented his system was not entirely new, for Plato had adopted a similar course in his *Republic;* the germ of the system itself is to be found in some passages of Herodotus and Thucydides. The originality of Euhemerus consists in exaggerating, and in carrying out even to

absurdity, the idea that Mythology contains certain historical elements. In effect, he resolved all mythology into history, maintaining that the gods "were originally illustrious kings, deified after death either by the spontaneous reverence of the people or by the cunning of the rulers." But mythology contains, aside from this, so much that bears on astronomy, the physical sciences, metaphysics, and, most of all, so much of fiction, that it is next to impossible to determine what in this confusion is truly historical. Some historians, like Diodorus Siculus, who have attempted to interpret mythology after the plan of Euhemerus, have succeeded only in substituting prosaic fiction for the imaginative popular legends. The pagame writers generally treat Euhemerus with severity. After the origin of Christianity, the views of Euhemerus, as containing the satires of a pagan on pagan religions, were made great use of in argument by the Church fathers against paganism, with some exaggerations, perhaps, of the doctrines of Euhemerums. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Lactantius, Chrysostom, in arguing against paganism, adopt the view of Euhbenerus, that the worship of great men was the original source of all idolatry, and gave birth to all the pagan divinities. In 1641, Vossius, following an idea of Tertullian, sought to show that the gods of paganism were the patriarchs of the O.T. Serapis was Joseph; Janus, Noah; Minerva, Naomi, etc. Huet, bishop of Avranches, discovered Moses in Osiris and Bacchus, as well as in manyotheu pagan divinities. Euhemereism, as a method of interpreting the ancient mythology, was supplanted by the symbolisma of Kreuzer, a system infinitely superior to the other two above mentioned, but still containing much that is illusory and erroneous. A Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale,* 16:828; Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature and Doctrine* (see Index); Gerlach, *Historische* Studien (Hamb.1841, 8vo); Lecky, *History of Rationalism,* 1:327; Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philosophiae,* 1:604 sq.; Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici* (Oxon. 1830), 2:481; Meiners, *Hist. Doct. apud Graecos,* 2:664 sq.; Fabricinis, *Bibliotheca Graeca,* in, 616; Hoffman, *Bibliographisches Lexicon,* 1:65; Milman, *History of Christianity* (New York, 1866), 1:49, note. *SEE MYTHOLOGY.*

Eulalia

a saint of the Church of Rome, was born at Merida, Spain, in 290. She was the descendant of a noble Christian family. When the general persecution of Christians began under Maximian, Eulalia, contrary to the directions given by the Church, voluntarily sought martyrdom by presenting herself to

the prefect of Lusitania, remonstrating with him against idolatry and the persecution of Christianity, and by personally insulting him (spitting in his face, etc.).

She was consequently burned alive December 10 (or 12), 303 (or 304). Her relics were preserved at Merida, and many miracles were ascribed to them at the time of the invasion of the Goths and Vandals. Barcelona also claims the possession of the relics of St. Eulalia, and the legend of this saint is so much like that of Eulalia of Merida that it is generally believed that the two are only one person, and that, as is common in the Church of Rome, the same relics are. claimed by two cities. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 16:708.

Eulalius

anti-Pope, lived in the first part of the fifth century. Created arch-cardinal by Innocent I, he was, after the death of pope Zosimus, near the close of the year 418, through the influence of Symmachts, elected pope in opposition to Boniface I, who had been elected by a legal majority. For several months he contended against Boniface, but finally the emperor Honorius decided in favor of Boniface, being persuaded that Eulalius had been illegally elected, and gave orders to Symmachus, the governor of the city of Rome, to drive Eulalius from the city, and to put Boniface in possession of the see. Eulalius thereupon left Rome, and became bishop of Nepi. After the death of Boniface, at the election of Celestine I, the friends of Eulalius offered, to contend again in his favor, but he promptly declined the papal dignity. — Bower, *History of the Popes,* 1:358 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* ◁0167▷*Genesis* 16:709; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:750; Jaffe, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum.* (J.H.W.)

Eulogia

(εὐλογία).

(1.) A term used in reference to the consecrated bread of the Eucharist. In the early Church, at the end of mass, the loaves offered by the faithful (not consecrated) were blessed by the celebrant, and distributed as a sign of communion, as they now are in the Greek Church, to those who had not communed, and formerly to catechumens who were not admissible. They were called eulogies or *antidora,* compensations, by the Council of Antioch in 341.

(2.) Εὐλογία was one of the early titles of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and appears to have been taken from the language of Paul when he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless" — τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας. Down to the time of Cyril and Chrysostom, εὐλογία is used synonymously with εὐχαριστία, but after the fifth century the term was appropriated to the bread set apart from the oblations for the poor and the clergy. To this custom we may refer the origin of private masses, and of communion in one kind.

(3.) The practice of giving the *eulogia* also tends to explain the custom of non-communication which sprang up in the Church about the same time. The faithful who did not communicate retired from the assembly before the celebration of the Lord's Supper began, but not without receiving the benediction of the minister. The *fideles* were soon divided into two *classes* — *communicantes* and *non-communicantes* — *of* which the Church knew nothing in earlier ages. The Council of Nantes, about A.D. 890, ordered the presbyters to keep some portions of the oblations in a proper vessel, so that those persons who were not prepared to communicate might, on every festival and Lord's day, receive some of the *euloqia,* previously blessed with a proper benediction. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 10, chapter 2, § 16; book 15, chapter 4, § 3; Riddle, *Christ. Antiquities,* pages 545, 578.

Eulogius

patriarch of Alexandria from 581 to 608. Pope Gregory I makes particular mention of him as a successful polemic against the Nestorians, Severians, Theodosians, Cainites, Acephalians, and Agnoetae. Photius preserves numerous fragments of his writings. He died in 608. — Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Ler.* 3:753, 754; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca,* (ed. Harles), 10:753.

Eulogius Of Cordova

was in 859 elected archbishop of Toledo, but, by the opposition of the Moors, he, was not permitted to enter upon the duties of his office. He was a learned and brave defender of Christianity against Mohammedanism, and sealed his love for the cause by his own blood, being beheaded by the Moors, March 11, 859, for the assistance which he had rendered a young girl who had been converted and by him baptized in the Christian faith. His writings are: *Memoriale Sanctorum sive libri in de Martyribus Cordubensibus,* a work in which the glory of the Spanish martyrs of his times is recorded: — *Exhortatio ad martyrium sire docunentum martyriale*

ad Floras et Miariam virgines confessores: —Apologeticus pro martyribus adversus calumniatores, in which he denies the assertion that the Christians desired martyrdom. He also wrote letters to the bishop Wilifindus of Pampeluna, his friend Alvarus, and others. His remains are to be found in Schott, *Hispania Illustrata,* volume 4; in the *Bibliotheca Patrum,* 15:242; also in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* tom. 115. A biography of Eulogius, written by his friend Alvarus, is also in Migne, t. 115. — Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Sac. et Eccl.* 19:64; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:754, 755; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* <011607>*Genesis* 16:719; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:220; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca,* 4:257; Clarke, *Sacred Literature,* volume 2.

Eulogy

SEE FUNERAL.

Eu'natan

(Ἐννατάν v.r. Ἐλναθάν, Vulg. *Ennagam),* given (1 Esd. 8:44, where it is perhaps but an original misprint for *Ennatan)* as the name of one of the principal men directed by Ezra to procure priests for the returning party of exiles; apparently a corruption for the second ELNATHAN *SEE ELNATHAN* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<150816>Ezra 8:16).

Euni'ce

(Εὐνίκη, *good victory,* originally the name of one of the Nereids), the mother of Timothy, and the wife of a Greek; spoken of (<550105>2 Timothy 1:5) as possessing unfeigned faith, and described in <441601>Acts 16:1 as a believing Jewess (γυνὴ Ἰουδαία πιστή). A.D. ante 47. *SEE TIMOTHY*.

Eu'menes

(Εὐμένης, well-disposed) II, king of Pergamus, and son of Attalus I. His accession to the throne is fixed by the death of his predecessor to B.C. 197 (Clinton, *F.H.* 3:408). He inherited from his father the friendship and alliance of the Romans, and when peace was made in B.C. 196 with Philip V, king of Macedonia, he was presented with the towns of Oreus and Eretria in Eubcea (Livy, 33:34). In B.C. 191 Eumenes and the Romans engaged the fleet of Antiochus (Livy, 36:43-45), and, seeing more than ever the policy of adhering to the Romans, he, in the following year, rendered them valuable assistance at the battle of Magnesia, commanding

his own troops person (Livy, 37:39-44; Justin, 31:8; Appian, *Syr.* 34). As soon as peace was concluded, B.C. 188, Eumenes set out for Rome to ask some rewards for his services. The senate were pleased with the modesty of his behavior, and conferred upon him the Thracian Chersonese, Lysimachia, both Phrygias, Mysia, Lycaonia, Lydia, and Ionia, with some exceptions. One province only would have much enlarged his dominions, but by this large addition to his territory he found himself one of the most powerful of monarchs (Livy, 37:56; 38:39; Polyb. 22:27; Appian, *Syr.* 44). About the same time he married the daughter of Ariarathes IV, king of Cappadocia (Livy, 38:39). Eumenes continued in good favor with the Romans for several years, and repeatedly sent embassies to them. In B.C. 172 he again visited Rome, and in returning nearly lost his life through the treachery of Perseus, king of Macedonia (Livy, 42:1-16). In B.C. 169 Eumenes is said to have had secret correspondence with Perseus, by which act he lost the favor of the Romans (Polyb. *Frag. Vat.* 29, Didot ed. pages 39, 40), and two years after he was forbidden to enter Rome (Livy, *Epit.* 46). The latter part of his reign was disturbed by frequent wars with Prusias, king of Bithynia. The Romans favorably received his brother Attalus, apparently for the purpose of exciting him gaiinst Eumenes, who had sent him to Rome. Attains, however, was induced, through the entreaties of a physician named Stratius, to abandon any such ideas. Eumenes thus managed to keep on friendly terms with his brother and the Romans till his death (Livy, 45:19, 20; Polyb. 30:1-3; 31:9; 32:5). The exact date of his death is not mentioned by any writer, but it must have taken place in B.C. 159 (Clinton, *F.H.* 3:406). Eumenes II much improved the city of Perganeus by erecting magnificent temples and other public buildings. His greatest act was the foundation of a splendid library, which rose to be a rival in extent and value even to that of Alexandria (Strabo, 13:4, Diddt ed. page 533; Pliny, 22:11 (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.). *SEE PERGAMUS*.

The large accession of territory which was granted to Eumenes from the former dominions of Antiochus is mentioned 1 Macc. 8:8, but the present reading of the Greek and Latin texts offers insuperable difficulties. "The Romans gave him," it is said, "the *country of* India and Media, and Lydia, and parts of his (Antiochus's) fairest countries (ἀπὸ τῶν καλλ. χωρῶν αύ τ οῦ)." This is particularly out of the question, for neither India nor Media ever belonged to Antiochus or the Romans. Various conjectures have been proposed to remove these obvious errors; but, though it may

reasonably be allowed that *Mysia* may have stood originally for Media (ysm for ydm, Michaelis), it is not equally easy to explain the origin of χώραν τὴν Ἰνδικήν. Grotius, without any MS. authority, conjectured *Ionia* to be meant, which agrees with the account of Livy (37:55). It is possible that Ἰνδικήν may have been substituted for Ἰωνικήν after Μηδίαν was already established in the text. Other explanations are given by Grimm, *Exeg. Handb.* ad loc.; Wernsdorf, *Defide Libr. Macc.* page 50 sq., but they have less plausibility. Josephus states the matter but summarily (Ant. 11:10, 6).

Eunomians

a sect of Arians, so called after their founder, EUNOMIUS. *SEE EUNOMIUS.*

Eunomius

a bishop and founder of a sect of Arians. He was born in the village of Dacora, in Cappadocia, and is described by his admirer, Philostorgius, as ugly in appearance, and somewhat stammering. He was educated by his father until, under the advice of the Arian bishop Secundus, of Antioch, he went to Alexandria, where he became the disciple, associate, and notary of Aitius (q.v.), the head of the Anomacmans. On a journey which he undertook to visit the emperor, he was seized by the Semiarians and sent to Phrygia; but in 360, his friend Eudoxius, formerly bishop of Antioch, but who had recently been called to Constantinople, procured for him the see of Cyzicum. There he proclaimed his views, first cautiously and moderately, but soon openly and unreservedly. The people of Cyzicum loudly complained of him, and, though he defended himself at Constantinople with great eloquence, he was abandoned by Eudoxius, who prevailed upon him to resign, since he was unwilling to subscribe the formula of Ariminum, or approve the deposition of Aftius. After this time Eunomius acted as the acknowledged head of the party. Under Julian, who recalled all the exiled bishop's, Eunomius was with Aritius in Constantinople, disseminating their views, collecting adherents, and consecrating bishops, who settled in many regions of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. Being suspected of intimate relations with Procopius, a rebel against the authority of emperor Valens, he was twice exiled, but each time soon recalled. In 383 the emperor Theodosius demanded from all the prominent men of the several religious parties an explanation of their

theological views, rejected the profession of faith made by Ennomius, had him arrested at Chalcedon and exiled to Halmnyris, in Mcesia, and from there to Caesarea, in Cappadocia. From there, when his longer stay was not tolerated, he returned to his native place, where he died about 396.

Eunomius wrote a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, and a number of letters, which were known to Photius. Both the commentary and the letters are lost. His first defense (ἀπολογητικός), which was written either in 360 or (according to Rettberg) in 365, called forth a long reply from Basil. From several manuscripts of the latter, the text of this work of Eunomius has been restored. It is partly given by Cave *(Hist. Liter.* Genev. 1720, 1:139), and completely by Fabricius *(Biblith. Graeca,* 8), Canisius *(Lect. Antiq.* 1), and Thilo *(Biblioth. dogmat.* 2). A second defense (ὑπὲρ ἀπολογίας ἀπολογία, as Gregory calls it) elicited in reply the twelve orations of Gregory of Nyssa. The fragments of Eunomius contained in the work of Gregory have been collected by Rettberg (Marcelliana, page 125). His profession of faith (ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως), which Eunomrius in 383 presented to the emperor Theodosius, has been published by Valesius (notes to Socrates, 5:10), Fabricius *(1.c.),* Cave *(1.*c.), and Rettberg (Marcelliana, page 149).

Eunomius was one of the prominent leaders of the Arians. He was capable, keen, undaunted, and full of contempt for his opponents. He had a keener dialectic faculty than Arius, and anticipated Des Cartes in making clearness the test of truth. "An opponent of whatever was inconceivable and transcendental, he pursued knowledge in a one-sided direction, not deeply speculative, but proceeding from an empirical understanding to make everything clear, which was his principal aim. In short, he advocated an intelligent supranaturalism, in which a rationalistic tendency was concealed, similar to what we find in Socinus" (Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas,* ed. Ryland, 1:264). The following account of the confession of faith of the Eunomians is given biny Cave (volume 1, page 140), from a manuscript in archbishop Tennison's library: "There is one God, uncreated and without beginning, who has nothing existing before him, for nothing can exist before what is uncreate; nor with him, for what is uncreate must be one; nor in him, for God is a simple and uncompounded Being. This one simple and eternal Being is God, the Creator and Ordainer of all things. For God created, begot, and made the Son only, by his direct operation and power, before all things, and every other creature; not producing, however, any being like himself, or imparting any of his own proper substance to his Son; for God

is immortal, uniform, and indivisible, and therefore cannot communicate any part of his own proper substance to another. He alone is unbegotten, and it is impossible that any other being should be formed of an unbegotten substance. He did not use his own substance in begetting his Son, but his will only; nor did he beget him in the likeness of his substance, but according to his own good pleasure. He then created the Holy Spirit, the first and greatest of all spirits, by his own power and operation mediately, yet by the immediate power and operation of the Son. After the Holy Spirit, he created all other things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, corporeal and incorporeal, mediately by himself, by the power and operation of his Son." The adherents of Eunomnius, who were very numerous, were, together with those of Ahtius, condemned as heretics by the second (Ecumenical Council. After the death of Eunomius, the Eunomians fully separated from the communion of the predominant Church. Some factions called themselves after prominent teachers, as Eutychius, Theophronius. The Church gave them a number of nicknames, as ὀνοβόσται, *spadones.* They baptized, not upon the Trinity, but upon the death of Christ. They did not exist long as a sect, but soon died out, in consequence of internal dissensions and numerous secessions to the dominant Church. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:220; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 1:248, 301, Tillemont; Dorner, *Lehre Christi,* 1:819 (Edinb. transl., div. 1, volume 2, page 243); Neander, *Church Hist.* 2:319-425; Clarke, *Sacred Liter.* 1:318; Schaff, *Church History,* 3, § 121. (A.J.S.)

Eunuch

(εὐνοῦχος) has, in its literal (Greek) sense, the harmless meaning of "bed-keeper," i.e., one who has the charge of beds and bed-chambers; but as only persons deprived of their virility have, from the most ancient times, been employed in Oriental harems, and as such persons are employed almost exclusively in this kind of service, the word "bed-keeper" became synonymous with "castratus." Castration, according to Josephus *(Ant.* 4:8, 40), was not practiced by the Jews upon either men or animals, *SEE BEAST*; yet the custom is frequently referred to in the Bible by the Hebrew term סריס *(saris',* Sept. εὐνοῦχος; Vulg. *spado;* A.V. "eunuch," "officer," and "chamberlain," apparently as though the word intended a class of attendants who were not always mutilated), which (from the Arabic root *saras, to be impotent* ad Venerem) clearly implies the incapacity which mutilation involves (Isaiah 56:3; Sirach 20:20 [21]),

and perhaps includes all the classes mentioned in Matthew 19:12, not signifying, as the Greek εὐνοῦχος, an office merely. The law, Deuteronomy 23:1 (comp. Leviticus 22:24), is repugnant to thus treating any Israelite; and Samuel, when describing the arbitrary power of the future king (1 Samuel 8:15, marg.), mentions "his eunuchs," but does not say that he would make "their sons" such. This, if we compare 2 Kings 20:18; Isaiah 39:7, possibly implies that these persons would be foreigners. It was a barbarous custom of the East thus to treat captives (Herod. 3:49; 6:32), not only of tender age (when a non-development of beard, and feminine mold of limbs and modulation of voice ensues), but, it would seem, when past puberty, which there occurs at an early age. Physiological considerations lead to the supposition that in the latter case a remnant of animal feeling is left, which may explain Ecclus. 20:4; 25:20 (comp. Juv. 6:366, and Mart. 6:67; Philostr. Apoll. Tyan. 1:37; Ter. *Eun.* 4:3, 24), where a sexual function, though fruitless, is implied. Busbecq *(Ep.* 3:122, Oxf. 1660) seems to ascribe the absence or presence of this to the total or partial character of the mutilation; but modern surgery would rather assign the earlier or later period of the operation as the real explanation. (Comp. Juv. 12:35; Philo, *Opp.* 2:264; Mishna, *Yebaimh*, 8:2; Deuteronomy 23:2; see Gesenius, *Thes.* page 338; Paul. A*Egin.* 6:68; Fischer, *Proluss.* page 497; Pierer, *Medic. Realw.* I, 2:63.) It is total among modern Turks (Tournefort, 2:8, 9, 10, ed. Par. 1717, *taille fleur de ventre);* a precaution arising from mixed ignorance and jealousy. The "officer" Potiphar (Genesis 37:36; 39:1, marg. "eunuch") was an Egyptian, was married, and was the "captain of the guard." The Jewish tradition is that Joseph was made a eunuch on his first introduction to Egypt; and yet the accusation of Potiphar's wife, his marriage and the birth of his children, are related subsequently without any explanation. (See *Targum* Pseudojon. on Genesis 39:1, 41:50; and the details given at 39:13.) On the Assyrian monuments a eunuch often appears, sometimes armed and in a warlike capacity, or as a scribe, noting the number of heads and amount of spoil, as receiving the prisoners, and even as officiating in religious ceremonies (Layard, *Nineveh, 2:*324-6, 334.) A bloated beardless face and double chin is there their conventional type. *SEE ATTIRE*. Chardin *(Voyages en Perse,* 2:283, ed. Amst. 1711) speaks of eunuchs having a harem of their own. If Potiphar had become such by operation for disease, by accident, or even by malice, such a marriage seems, therefore, according to. Eastern notions, supposable. (See Grotius on Deuteronomy 23:1; comp. Burckhardt, *Tramv. in Arab.* 1:290.) Nor is

it wholly repugnant to that barbarous social standard to think that the prospect of rank, honor, and royal confidence might even induce parents to thus treat their children at a later age, if they showed an aptness for such preferment. The characteristics as regards beard, voice, etc., might then perhaps be modified, or might gradually follow. The Potipherah of <01450>Genesis 41:50, whose daughter Joseph married, was "'priest of On," and no doubt a different person. (See Delphini, *Eunuchi conjugium*, Hal. 1680.)

The origination of the practice is ascribed to Semiramis (Amm. Marcell. 14:6), and is no doubt as early, or nearly so, as Eastern despotism itself. Their incapacity, as in the case of mutes, is the ground of reliance upon them (Clarke's *Travels*, part 2, § 1, 13; Busbecq, Ep. 1:33). By reason of the mysterious distance at which the sovereign sought to keep his subjects (Herod. 1:99; comp. <17041>Esther 4:11), and of the malignant jealousy fostered by the debased relation of the sexes, such wretches, detached from social interests and hopes of issue (especially when, as commonly, and as amongst the Jews, foreigners), the natural slaves of either sex (<17045>Esther 4:5), and having no prospect in rebellion save the change of masters, were the fittest props of a government resting on a servile relation, the most complete organs of its despotism or its lust, the surest (but see <17021>Esther 2:21) guardians (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 7:5, § 15; Herod. 8:105) of the monarch's person, and the sole confidential witnesses of his unguarded or undignified moments. Hence they have in all ages frequently risen to high offices of trust. Thus the "chief" of the cup-bearers (q.v.) and of the cooks of Pharach were eunuchs, as being near his person, though their inferior agents need not have been so (<01401>Genesis 40:1). (Wilkinson *[Anc. Egypt*, 2:61] denies the use of eunuchs in Egypt. Herodotus, indeed [2:92], confirms his statement as regards Egyptian monogamy; but if this as a rule applied to the kings, they seemed, at any rate, to have allowed themselves concubines [page 181]. From the general beardless character of Egyptian heads, it is not easy to pronounce whether any eunuchs appear in the sculptures or not.) The complete assimilation of the kingdom of Israel, and latterly of Judah, to the neighboring models of despotism, is traceable in the rank and prominence of eunuchs (<12816>2 Kings 8:6; 9:82; 23:11; 25:19; <23603>Isaiah 56:3, 4; <24202>Jeremiah 29:2; 34:19; 38:7; 41:16; 52:25). — They mostly appear in one of two relations — either military, as "set over the men of war," greater trustworthiness possibly counterbalancing inferior courage and military vigor, or associated, as we mostly recognize them,

with women and children. (<14B01>2 Chronicles 28:1 is remarkable as ascribing eunuchs to the period of David, nor can it be doubted that Solomon's polygamy made them a necessary consequence; but in the state they do not seem to have played an important part at this period.) We find the Assyrian Rab-Saris, or chief eunuch (<12B17>2 Kings 18:17), employed, together with other high officials, as ambassador. Similarly, in the details of the travels of an embassy sent by the duke of Holstein (page 136), we find a eunuch mentioned as sent on occasion of a state-marriage to negotiate, and of another (page 273) who was the *Meheter,* or chamberlain of Shah Abbas, who was always near his person, and had his ear (comp. Chardin, 3:37), and of another, originally a Georgian prisoner, who officiated as supreme judge. Fryer *(Travels in India and Persia,* page 1698) and Chardin (2:283) describe them as being the base and ready tools of licentiousness, as tyrannical in humor, and pertinacious in the authority which they exercise; Clarke *(Travels in Europe,* etc., part 2, § 1, page 22), as eluded and ridiculed by those whom it is their office to guard. A great number of them accompany the shall and his ladies when hunting, and no one is allowed, on pain of death, to come within two leagues of the field, unless the king sends a eunuch for him. So eunuchs run before the closed arabahs of the sultanas when abroad, crying out to all to keep at a distance. This illustrates <17010>Esther 1:10, 12, 15, 16; 2:3, 8, 14. The moral tendency of this sad condition is well known to be the repression of courage, gentleness, shame, and remorse, the development of malice, and often of melancholy, and a disposition to suicide. The favorable description of them in Xenophon (*1.c.)* is overcharged, or, at least, is not confirmed by modern observation. They are not more liable to disease than others. unless of such as often follows the foul vices of which they are the tools. The operation itself, especially in infancy, is not more dangerous than an ordinary amputation. Chardin (2:285) says that only one in four survives; and Clot Bey, chief physician of the pasha, states that two thirds die. Burckhardt, therefore *(fub.* page 329), is mistaken when he says that the operation is only fatal in about two out of a hundred cases. *SEE HAREM*.

It is probable that Daniel and his companions were thus treated, in fulfillment of <12017>2 Kings 20:17, 18; <23907>Isaiah 39:7; comp. <27003>Daniel 1:3, 7. The courf of Herod of course had its eunuchs (Josephus, Ant. 16:8, 1; 15:7, 4), as had also that of queen Candace (<44027>Acts 8:27). Michaelis (2:180) regards them as the proper consequence of the gross polygamy of the East, although his further remark that they tend to balance the sexual

disparity which such monopoly of woman causes is is less just, since the countries despoiled of their women fur the one purpose are not commonly those which furnish male children for the other.

In the three classes mentioned in <401912>Matthew 19:12, the first is to be ranked with other examples of defective organization; the last, if taken literally, as it is said to have been personally exemplified in Origen (Euseh. *Eccl. Hist.* 6:8; see Zorn, *De eunachisomo Origenis,* Giess. 1708), is an instance of human ways and means of ascetic devotion being valued by the Jews above revealed precept (see Schdttgen, *Hor.* <580101>*Hebrews* 1:159). Our Savior in that passage doubtless refers to the voluntary and ascetic celibacy of the Essenes (q.v.). But a figurative sense of εὐνοῦχος (comp. <460732>1 Corinthians 7:32, 34) is also possible. *SEE CELIBACY*.

In the A.V. of Esther the word "chamberlain" (marg,. "eunuch") is the constant rendering of syræ; *saris,* and as the word also occurs in <441220>Acts 12:20, and <451623>Romans 16:23, where the original expressions are very different, some caution is required. In <441220>Acts 12:20, τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος τοῦ βασιλέως may mean a "chamberlain" merely. Such were persons of public influence, as we learn from a Greek inscription preserved in Walpole's Turkey (2:559), in honor of P. Aelius Alcibiades, "chamberlain of the emperor" (ἐπὶ κοιτῶνος Σεβ.), the epithets in which exactly suggest the kind of patronage expressed. In <451623>Romans 16:23, the word ἐπίτροπος is the one commonly rendered " steward" (e.g. <402008>Matthew 20:8; <420803>Luke 8:3), and means the one to whom the care of the city was committed. See generally Salden, Otia *Theol. de* Eunuchis, page 494 sq. *SEE CHAMBERLAIN*.

In <052301>Deuteronomy 23:1 (hKÞA[WxP], one *mutilated by crushing, i.e.,* the testicles, Sept. technically θλαδίας), and also probably in <032120>Leviticus 21:20 (Ëv,a; jiyrm], one *crush*ed as to his *testicles,* Sept. partially μονόρχις), the allusion is to a peculiar kind of emasculation still practiced in the East, according to the Greek physicians (Paulus AEgineta, book 6), which consists in softening the testicles of very young boys in warm water, and then rubbing and pressing them till they disappear. As the heathen priests were often thus qualified for office, persons so mutilated were excluded from the Jewish Church. *SEE ASHTORETH*.

Eunuchs

a sect of heretics in the third century, who were said to be mad enough to emasculate themselves under the assumption that they should thus eradicate their evil propensities, and qualify themselves for performing, into a more holy and acceptable manner, the duties of religion. Origen was the subject of this miserable delusion. The practice is prevalent at this day in Russia, among the sect of the Skoptzi (q.v.). In the Council of Nicaea persons of this class were condemned, and excluded from holy orders. *SEE CELIBACY AND VALESIANS.*

Euo'dias

or, rather, EUODIA (Εὐοδία, *a good* journey; for, as found in Philippians 9:2, Εὐοδίαν is fem., since the following verse refers to that and the associated name by αὐταῖς and αἵτινες), a female member of the Church at Philippi, who seems to have been at variance with another female member named Syntyche. A.D. 57. Paul describes them as women who had "labored much with him in the Gospel," and implores their. to be of one mind (³⁰⁴²Philippians 4:2, 3).

Euodius

SEE EVODIUS.

Euphemites

SEE MESSALIANS.

Euphra'tes

is the Greek form (Εὐφράτης) of the river designated in Hebrews by the name PHRATH or *Perath'* (t r P] which Gesenius regards as i.q. "sweet water," referring to the present Arabic name *Frah* as having that signify; but Furst refers to an obsolete root indicating the impetuous character of the stream), and is probably a word of Arian origin, the initial element being *'u,* which is in Sanscrit *su,* in Zend *ha,* and in Greek ε υ; and the second element being *fra,* the particle of abundance. The Euphrates is thus "the good and abounding river." It is not improbable that in common parlance the name was soon shortened to its modern form of Frat, which is almost exactly what the Hebrew Uiteration expresses. But it is most frequently denoted in the Bible by the tearn r h N h i han-nahar', i.e., "the

river," the river of Asia, in grand contrast with the shortlived torrents of Palestine, being by far the most considerable stream in that part of the continent. Thus, in <02303>Exodus 23:3, we read, "from the desert unto the river" (comp. <23807>Isaiah 8:7). In like manner, it is termed in <05017>Deuteronomy 1:7 "the great river." The Euphrates is named in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.).

1. It is first mentioned in <01014>Genesis 2:14, where the Euphrates is stated to be the fourth of the riflers which flowed from a common stream in the garden of Eden. Its celebrity is there sufficiently indicated by the absence of any explanatory phrase, such as accompanies the names of the other streams. *SEE EDEN*. We next hear of it in the covenant made with Abraham (<01518>Genesis 15:18), where the whole country from "the great river, the river Euphrates," to the river of Egypt is promised to the chosen race. In Deuteronomy and Joshua we find that this promise was borne in mind at the time of the settlement in Canaan (<05017>Deuteronomy 1:7; 11:24; <06104>Joshua 1:4); and from an important passage in the first book of Chronicles it appears that the tribe of Reuben did actually extend itself to the Euphrates in the times anterior to Saul (<13509>1 Chronicles 5:9). Here they came in contact with the Hagarites, who appear upon the Middle Euphrates in the Assyrian inscriptions of the later empire. It is David, however, who seems for the first time to have entered on the full enjoyment of the promise by the victories which he gained over Headadezer, king of Zobab, and his allies, the Syrians of Damascus (<10803>2 Samuel 8:3-8; <13803>1 Chronicles 18:3). The object of his expedition was "to recover his border," and "to stablish his dominion by the river Euphrateas;" and in this object he appears to have been altogether successful, in so much that Solomon, his son, who was not a man of war, but only inherited his father's dominions, is said to have "reigned over all kingdoms from the river (i.e., the Euphrates) unto the land of the Philistines and unto the border of Egypt" (<11421>1 Kings 4:21; comp. <14926>2 Chronicles 9:26). Thus, during the reigns of David and Solomon, the dominion of Israel actually attained to the full extent both ways of the original promise, the Euphrates forming the boundary of their empire to the northeast, and the river of Egypt to the south-west. This wide-spread dominion was lost, upon the disruption of the empire under Rehoboam; and no more is heard in Scripture of the Euphrates until the expedition of Necho against the Babylonians in the reign of Josiah. The "Great River" had meanwhile served for some time as a boundary between Assyria and the country of the

Hittites, *SEE ASSYRIA*, but had repeatedly been crossed by the armies of the Ninevite kings, who gradually established their sway over the countries upon its right bank. The crossing of the river, was always difficult, and at the point where certain natural facilities fixed the ordinary passage the strong fort of Carchemish had been built, probably in very early times, to command the position. *SEE CARCHEMISH*. Hence, when Necho determined to attempt the permanent conquest of Syria, his march was directed upon "Carchencish by Euphrates" (<145220>2 Chronicles 35:20), which he captured and held, thus extending the dominion of Egypt to the Euphrates, and renewing the old glories of the Ramesside kings. His triumph, however, was short-lived. Three years afterwards the Babylonians — who had inherited the Assyrian dominion in these parts — made an expedition under Nebuchadnezzar against Necho, defeated his army, "which was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish" (<244602>Jeremiah 46:2), and recovered all Syria and Palestine. Then "the king of Egypt came no mire out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt" (<122407>2 Kings 24:7).

These are the chief events which Scripture distinctly connects with the "Great River." The prophets made use of the Euphrates as a figurative description of the Assyrian power, as the Nile with them represented the power of Egypt; thus, in <230807>Isaiah 8:7, "The Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria" (<240218>Jeremiah 2:18; comp. <661614>Revelation 9:14; 16:12). It is probably included among the "rivers of Babylon," by the side of which the Jewish captives "remembered Zion" and "wept" (<19701>Psalm 137:1); and no doubt is glanced at in the threats of Jeremiah against the Chaldaean "waters" and "springs," upon which there was to be a "drought" that should "dry them up" (<240103>Jeremiah 1:38; 513:26). The fulfillment of these prophecies has been noticed under the head of CHALDAEA. The river still brings down as much water as of old, but the precious element is wasted by the neglect of man; the various water-courses along which it was in former times conveyed are dry, the main channel has shrunk, and the Water stagnates in unwholesome marshes.

It is remarkable that Scripture contains no clear and distinct reference to that striking occasion when, according to profane historians (Herod. 1:191; Xenoph. *Caqrop.* 7:5), the Euphrates was turned against its mistress, and used to effect the ruin of Babylon. The brevity of Daniel (5:30, 31) is

perhaps sufficient to account for his silence on the point; but it might have been expected from the fullness of Jeremiah (chapter 1 and 51) that so remarkable a feature of the siege would not have escaped mention. We must, however, remember, in the first place, that a clear prophecy may have been purposely withheld, in order that the Babylonians might not be put upon their guard. And, secondly, we may notice that there does seem to be at least one reference to the circumstance, though it is covert, as it was necessary that it should be. In immediate conjunction with the passage which most clearly declares the taking of the city by a surprise is found an expression which reads very obscurely in our version — "the passages are stopped" (<245132>Jeremiah 51:32). Here the Hebrew term used (t/rB;[}mi) applies most properly to "fords or ferries over rivers" (comp. <070328>Judges 3:28); and the whole passage may best be translated, "the ferries are seized" or "occupied;" which agrees very well with the entrance of the Persians by the rivers and with the ordinary mode of transit in the place, where there was but one bridge (Herod. 1:186). The fords were at Thapsacus (Xenoph. *Asab.* 1:4, 11).

2. The Euphrates is the largest, the longest, and by far the most important of the rivers of Western Asia. It rises from two chief sources in the Armenian mountains, one of them at Domli. 25 miles N.E. of Erzeroum, and little more than a degree from the Black Sea; the other on the northern slope of the mountain range called Ala-Tagh, near the village of Diyadin, and not far from Mount Ararat. The former, or Northern Euphrates, has the name Frat from the first, but is known also as the *Kara-Su* (Black River); the latter, or Southern Euphrates, is not called the *Frat*, but the *Murad Chai*, yet it is in reality the main river. Both branches flow at the first towards the west or south-west, passing through the wildest mountain districts of Armenia; they meet at Kebban-Maden, nearly in long. 390 E. from Greenwich, having run respectively 400 and 270 miles. Here the stream formed by their combined waters is 120 yards wide, rapid, and very deep; it now flows nearly southward, but in a tortuous course, forcing a way through the ranges of Taurus and and-Taurus, and still seeming as if it would empty itself in the Mediterranean, but prevented from so doing by the longitudinal ranges of Amanus and Lebanon, which here run parallel to the Syrian coast, and at no great distance from it; the river at last desists from its endeavor, and in about lat. 360 turns towards the south-east, and proceeds in this direction for above 1000 miles to its embouchure in the Persian Gulf (Herod. 1:180; Strabo, 2:521; Ptolem. 5:13; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*

5:20; Q. Curt. 1:13; *Orbis Terrarum,* C.. Kaercher Auct.). In conjunction with the Tigris, it forms the rich alluvial lands of Mesopotamia (q.v.), over which it flows or is carried by canals, and thus diffuses abroad fertility and beauty. At Bagdad and Hillah (Babylon), the Euphrates and Tigris approach comparatively near to each other, but separate again, forming a kind of ample basin, till they finally become one at Koorma. Under the Caesars the Euphrates was the eastern boundary of the Roman empire, as under David it was the natural limit of the Hebrew monarchy. *SEE TIGRIS*.

The last part of its course, from Hit downwards, is through a low, flat, and alluvial plain, over which it has a tendency to spread and stagnate; above Hit, and from thence to Sumeisat (Samosata), the country along its banks is for the most part open, but hilly; north of Sumeisat the stream runs in a narrow valley among high mountains, and is interrupted by numerous rapids. The entire course is calculated at 1780 miles, nearly 650 more than that of the Tigris, and only 200 short of that of the Indus; and of this distance more than two thirds (1200 miles) is navigable for boats, and even, as the expedition of colonel Chesney proved for small steamers. The width of the river is greatest at the distance of 700 or 800 miles from its mouth — that is to say, from its junction with the Khabour to the village of Werai. It there averages 400 yards, awhile lower down, from Werai to Lamlun, it continually decreases, until at the last-named place its width is not more than 120 yards, its depth having at the same time diminished from an average of 18 to one of 12 feet. The causes of this singular phenomenon are the entire lack of tributaries below the Khabour, and the employment of the water in irrigation. The river has also in this part of its course the tendency already noted, to run off and waste itself in vast marshes, which every year more and more cover the alluvial tract west and south of the stream. From this cause its lower course is continually varying, and it is doubted whether at present, except in the season of the inundation, any portion of the Euphrates water is poured into the *Shat-el-Arab.*

In point of current it is for the most part a sluggish stream; for, except in the height of the flooded season, when it approaches 5 miles an hour, it varies from 24 to 3½, with a much larger portion of its course ,under 3 than above. Its general description for some distance below Erzingan is that of a river of the first order, struggling through high hills, or rather low mountains, making an exceedingly tortuous course as it forces its way over a pebbly or rocky bed from one natural barrier to another. As it winds

round its numerous barriers, it carries occasionally towards each of the cardinal points a considerable body of water, and is shallow enough in some places for loaded camels to pass in autumn, the water rising to their bellies, or about 4½ feet. The upper portion of the river is enclosed between two parallel ranges of hills, covered for the most part with high brushwood and timber of moderate size, having a succession of long, narrow islands, on several of which are moderate-sized towns; the borders of this ancient stream being still well inhabited, not only by Bedouins, but by permanent residents. The following towns may be named: Sumeisat, Haorum, Romkala, Bir, Giaber, Deir, Rava, Anna, Hadisa, El-Us, Jibba, Hit, Hillah, Lemlun, Korna, and Bussora. The scenery above Hit, in itself very picturesque, is greatly heightened by the frequent re-currence of ancient irrigating aqueducts, beautiful specimens of art, which are attributed by the Arabs to the Persians when fire-worshippers: they literally cover both banks, and prove that the borders of the Euphrates were once thickly inhabited by a highly-civilized people. They are of stone. Ten miles below Hit is. the last of these. The country now becomes flatter, with few hills; the river winds less; and the banks are covered with Arab villages of mats or tents, with beautiful mares, cattle, and numerous flocks of goats and sheep. From Hit to Babylon the black tent of the Bedouin is almost the only kind of habitation to be seen. This distance is cultivated only in part; the rest is desert, with the date-tree showing in occasional clusters. In descending, the irrigating cuts and canals become more frequent. Babylon is encircled by two streams, one above, the other below the principal ruin, beyond which they unite and produce abundance. For about thirty miles below Hillah both banks, have numerous mud villages, imbedded in date-trees: to these succeed huts formed of bundles of reeds. The country lower down towards Lemlun is level, and little elevated above the river; irrigation is therefore easy: in consequence, both banks are covered with productive cultivation, and fringed with a double and nearly continuous belt of luxuriant date-trees, extending down to the Persian Gulf. At one mile and a half above the town of Dewania is the first considerable deviation from this hitherto majestic river; another takes place 22 miles lower; and nine miles farther — at Lemlun — it again separates into two branches, forming a delta not unlike that of Damietta, and, when the river is swollen, inundating the country for a space of about 60 miles in width with a shallow sheet of water, forming the Lemlun marshes, nearly the whole of which is covered with rice and other grain the moment the river recedes (in June). Here mud villages are swept away by the water every year. Below Lemlun the Tigris

sends a branch to the Euphrates, which is thus increased in its volume, and, turning to the east, receives the chief branch of the Tigris, thence running in one united stream, under the name of the *Shat-el-Arab*, as far as the sea (the Persian Gulf). In this last reach the river has a depth of from 3 to 5 fathoms, varies in breadth from 500 to 900 yards, and presents banks covered with villages and cultivation, having an appearance at once imposing and majestic. The length of that part of the river, reckoning from Bir to Bussora, navigable for large vessels at all times of the year, is 143 miles. It is very abundant in fish. The water is somewhat turbid, but, -when purified, is pleasant and salubrious. The Arabians set a high value on it, and name it *Morad-Su* that is, Water of desire, or longing.

The annual inundation of the Euphrates occurs in the month of May. The river begins to rise in March, and continues rising till the latter end of May. The consequent increase of its volume and rapidity is attributable to the early rains, which, falling in the Armenian mountains, swell its mountain tributaries; and also, in the main, to the melting of the winter snows in these lofty regions. About the middle of November the Euphrates has reached its lowest ebb, and, ceasing to decrease, becomes tranquil and sluggish. The greatest rise of the Tigris is earlier, since it drains the *southern* flank of the great Armenian chain. The Tigris scarcely ever overflows, *SEE HIDDEKEL*, but the Euphrates inundates large tracts on both sides of its course from Hit downwards. The great hydraulic works ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar (Abyden. Fr. 8) had for their great object to control the inundation by turning the waters through sluices into canals prepared for them, and distributing them in channels over a wide extent of country. "When the Euphrates," says Rich, "reaches its greatest elevation, it overflows the surrounding country, fills up, without the necessity of any human labor, the canals which are dug for the reception of its waters, and thus amazingly facilitates the operations of husbandry. The ruins of Babylon are then inundated, so as to render many parts inaccessible, the intermediate hollows being converted into marshes" *(Babylon and Persepolis*, page 54). Rauwolf observes, "The water of the Euphrates, being always troubled, and consequently unfit for drinking, is placed in earthen jars or pitchers for an hour or two, until the sand and other impurities sink to the bottom, where they are soon found lying to the thickness of a man's finger" (comp. 2402018Jeremiah 2:18; 13:4-7). Mr. Ainsworth says, "The period at which the waters of the Euphrates are most loaded with mud, are in the first floods of January; the gradual melting of

the snows in early summer, which preserves the high level of the waters, does not at the same time contribute much sedimentary matter. From numerous experiments made at Bir in December and January, 1836, I found the maximum of sediment mechanically suspended in the waters to be equal to one eightieth part of the bulk of fluid, or every cubic inch of water contained one eightieth part of its bulk of suspended matters; and from similar experiments, instituted in the month of October of the same year, at the issue of the waters from the Lemlum marshes, I only obtained a maximum of one two hundredth part of a cubic inch of water (mean temp. 740). The sediments of the river Euphrates, which are not deposited in the upper part of the river's course, are finally deposited in the Lemlum marshes. In navigating the river in May, 1836, the water flowing into the marshes was colored deeply by mud, but left the marshes in a state of comparative purity" *(Researches,* pages 110, 111).

The Euphrates has at all times been of some importance as furnishing a line of traffic between the East and the West. Herodotus speaks of persons, probably merchants, using it regularly on their passage from the Mediterranean to Babylon (Her. 1:185). He also describes the boats which were in use upon the stream (1:194), and mentions that their principal freight was wine, which he seems to have thought was furnished by Armenia. It was, however, more probably Syrian, as Armenia is too cold for the vine. Boats such as he describes, of wicker-work, and coated with bitumen, or sometimes covered with skins, still abound on the river (Chesney, *Euphrates,* 2:639-651). Men wishing to swim across or along the stream simply throw themselves upon an inflated skin and thus float, precisely in the manner described by ancient writers, and depicted of the Assyrian sculptures (Botta, *Nineveh,* page 238 sq.). Alexander appears to have brought to Babylon by the Euphrates route vessels of some considerable size, which he had had made in Cyprus and Phoenicia. They were so constructed that they could be taken to pieces, and were thus carried piecemeal to Thapsacus, where they were put together and launched (Aristobul. ap. Strab. 16:1, 11). The disadvantage of the route was the difficulty of conveying return cargoes against the current. According to Herodotus, the boats which descended the river were broken to pieces and sold at Babylon, and the owners returned on foot to Armenia, taking with them only the skins (1:194). Aristobulus, however, related (ap. Strab. 16:3, 3) that the Gerrhaeans ascended the river in their rafts not only to Babylon, but to Thapsacus, whence they carried their wares on foot in

all directions. The spices and other products of Arabia formed their principal merchandise. On the whole, there are sufficient grounds for believing that throughout the Babylonian and Persian periods this route was made use of by the merchants of various nations, and that by it the east and west continually interchanged their most important products (see Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon,* pages 456, 457). Caravans were employed above Thapsacus (Haeren, *Asiatic Nations,* 1:429, 430). The emperor Trajan constructed a fleet in the mountains of Nisibis, and floated it down the Euphrates. The emperor Julian also came down the river from the same mountains with a fleet of not fewer than 1100 vessels. A great deal of navigation is still carried on from Bagdad to Hillah, the ancient Babylon, but the disturbed state of the country prevents any above the latter place. In the time of queen Elizabeth merchants from England went by this river; which was then the high road to India. There were anciently many canals which connected the Tigris with the Euphrates; many of them are still in being. The Euphrates steamer passed from the Euphrates to the Tigris by the Iva canal, which leaves the former a few miles above Felugo, and enters the latter a short way below Bagdad. The steam navigation of the Euphrates must be a question of considerable importance, and colonel Chesney has proved that it may be navigated as high as Bir by steamers drawing four feet of water; yet it can hardly be expected that it can ever be made available as an ordinary channel between Europe and India. Its navigation would undoubtedly confer the greatest advantages on the inhabitants of the vast and fertile countries through which it flows, should they once more be emancipated from the barbarism under which they have so long been oppressed.

3. See, for a general account of the Euphrates, colonel Chesney's *Euphrates Expedition,* volume 1; and, for the lower course of the stream, compare Loftus's *Chaldma and Susiana.* See also Rawlinson's *Herodofus,* volume 1, Essay 9; and Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon,* chapters 21 and 22; Wahl's *Asien,* page 700; Ritter's *Erdk.* 2:120; *Traite Element. G ographique* (Bruxelles, 1832), volume 2; Mannert's *Geogr.* 2:142; Reichard's *Kl. Geogr. Schrif.* page 210; Parliam. *Rep. of Steans Navigation to India* (1834); M'Culloch's *Geograph. Dict.* s.v.; Ainsworth's *Travels in Asia Minor,* etc. (1842); Ker Porter, *Travels,* 2:403; Forbiger, *Alte Geographie,* 2:69 sq.; Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* 1, 1:188 sq. *SEE BABYLON.*

Euphrates

bishop of Cologne, was the successor of bishop Maternus. He was present at the Synod of Sardica in 347, and was sent by the bishops of that synod with recommendatory letters from the emperor Constance to the emperor Constantius to obtain the recall of the exiled catholic bishops. The report that a synod held at Cologne in 346 deposed Euphrates for not believing in the divinity of Christ is now generally regarded as spurious. The acts of this pretended synod were probably compiled in the eighth century, and are from beginning to end a forgery. — Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexik.* 12:241; Rettberg, *Kirchen-Geschichte Deutschlands,* volume 1. (A.J.S.)

Eupol'emus

(Εὐπόλεμος, *good* us *war,* a frequent Greek name), the "son of John, the son of Accos (q.v.), one of the envoys sent to Rome by Judas Maccabaeus, B.C. cir. 161, to negotiate an alliance with then Romans (1 Macc. 8:17; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:10, 6). He has been identified (Euseb. Praep. *Eu.* 9:17 sq.) with the historian of the same name (Josephus, *Apion,* 1:23), who wrote several works on the affairs of the Jews (Kuhlusey, *Eupolemi fragmenta,* Berlin, 1840, 8vo); but it is by no means clear that the historian was of Jewish descent (yet comp. Jerome, *de Vir. Illustr.* 38). His father, John (q.v.), is spoken of as having procured special privileges for the Jews from the Syrian kings (2 Macc. 4:11).

Euroc'lydon

(Εὐροκλύδων, q.d. *south-east billow),* the name given (Acts 27:14) to the gale of wind in, the Adriatic Gulf, which off the south coast of Crete seized the ship in which Paul was ultimately wrecked on the coast of Malta. *SEE SHIPWRECK OF PAUL*. The circumstances of this gale are described with much particularity, and they admit abundant illustration from the experience of modern seamen in the Levant. In the first place it came down from the island (κατ᾽ αὐτῆς), and therefore must have blown more or less from the northward, since the ship was sailing along the south coast, not far from Mount Ida, and on the wary from Fair-Havens towards Phoenice. So Captain Spratt, after leaving Fair-Havens with a light southerly wind, fell in with "a strong northerly breeze blowing direct from Mount Ida" (Smith, Voyage *and Shipwreck of St. Paul,* 1856, pages 97, 245). Next, the wind is described as being like a *typhoon* (mod. tuffone, i.e., "striker") or whirlwind (τυφωνικός, A.V. "tempestuous;" comp.

τυφών, Aristot. Meteor. 1; *De Mundo*, 4:18); and the same authority speaks of such gales in the Levant as being generally "accompanied by terrific gusts and squalls from those high mountains" (Conybeare, Life *and Epistles of St. Paul*, 1856, 2:401). It is also observable that the change of wind in the voyage before us (27:13, 14) is exactly what' might have been expected; for Captain J. Stewart observes, in his remarks on the Archipelago, that "it is always safe to anchor under the lee of an island with a northerly wind, as it dies away gradually, but it would be extremely dangerous with southerly winds, as they almost invariably shift to a violent northerly wind" (Purdy's *Sailing Directory*, part 2, page 61). The long duratian of the gale ("the fourteenth night," verse 27), the overclouded state of the sky ("neither sun nor stars appearing," verse 20), and even the heavy rain which concluded the storm (τὸν ὑετόν, 28:2), could easily be matched with parallel instances in modern times (see Smith. *Voyage and Shipwreck*, page 144; Conybeare, Life *and Epp.* 2:412). We have seen that the wind has more or less northerly. The context gives us full materials for determining its direction with great exactitude. The vessel was driven from the coast of Crete to Clauda (27:16), and apprehension was felt that she would be driven into the African Syrtis (verse 17). Combining these two circumstances with the fact that she was less than half way from Fair-Havens to Phoenice when the storm began (verse 14), we come to the conclusion that it came from the N.E. or E.N.E., and hence might fitly be termred a *north-easter.* This is quite in harmony with the natural sense of Εὐρακύλων (Vulg. *Euro-aquilo, i.e.* north-east wind, the modern *Gregalia* of those seas), which is regarded as the true reading by Bentley, and is found in some of the best MSS.; but we are disposed to adhere to the received text, more especially as it is the more difficult reading, and the phrase used by Luke (ὁ καλούμενος Εὐροκλύδων) seems to point to some peculiar word in use among the sailors. Alford thinks that the true name of the wind was εὐρακύλων, but that the Greek sailors, not understanding the Latin termination, corrupted the word into εὐροκλύδων, aid that so Luke wrote it (Comment. in loc.). Such winds are known to modern mariners in the Mediterranean bythe name of *Levanters.* They are not confined to any single point, but blow in all directions from the northeast round by the north to the south-east. The "great wind" or mighty tempest experienced by the prophet Jonah on his way from Joppa to Tarshish (1, 4; comp. the destructive "east wind" of ¹⁹⁸⁷Psalm 48:7) appears to have been one of these gales (comp. Josephus,

War, 3:8, 3, who calls it the "black north wind," μελαμβόρειον). *SEE WIND.*

Europe

the smallest, but also the most highly civilized and most populous of the three great divisions of the old continent.

I. It is separated from America on the west and north-west by the Atlantic; from Africa on the south by the Mediterranean; and from Asia by the Archipelago, Sea of Marmora, Black Sea, Caucasian ridge, Caspian Sea, Ural River and Mountains, and the Kara River. It is in the form of a huge peninsula, projecting from the north-west of Asia. Its extent from Cape St. Vincent on the south-west to the mouth of the Kara River on the north-east is 3400 miles; and from Cape Nordkun, the most northerly point of the Scandinavian main land, to Cape Matapan, the southmost point of Greece, 2400 miles. The continent of Europe, irrespective of islands, lies within lat. 360 1'-71° 6' N., and long. 9° 30' W. — 68° 30' E. Its area is estimated at nearly 3,800,000 square miles; and its coastline, more extensive in proportion to its size than that of any other great natural division of the globe, is estimated at 19,500 miles, giving a proportion of 1 linear mile of coast for every 190 square miles of surface. It had in 1888 a population of 330,000,000, which 'gives an average of about 87 for every square mile.

II. *Church History*. — Europe early received the seed of Christianity from the apostles themselves. The territory embraced in what is now Turkey, Greece, and Italy was for many years the scene of the apostolic labors of Paul, who founded a number of churches, and wrote epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Thessalonians. Whether he visited Spain, England, and other countries of Europe, as has been asserted by some writers, is doubtful. Peter is claimed by the Roman Catholic Church to have been for twenty-five years bishop of Rome. The fact of his having been in Rome, and having presided for several years over the Church there, is generally recognized by most of the historians. The share of the other apostles in the Christianization of Europe is doubtful, and the accounts of their missionary labors rest more on legends than historic documents (see the articles on each of the apostles, and each of the European countries); but it is a well-established fact that, even before the close of the first century, numerous churches were established in Turkey, Greece, Malta, Italy, France, Spain, and Southern and Western Germany. The growing

authority of the bishops of Rome, *SEE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH* soon made Europe the center of the Christian world. When Constantine became a Christian, the Christianization of all that portion of Europe which belonged to the Roman empire made rapid progress, and was soon completed. In the fifth and sixth centuries, Spain, France, Scotland, England, and several German tribes became Christian. Christianity steadily advanced in all directions, but it was not until the sixteenth century that every pagan people of Europe had adopted the Christian doctrine. In the mean while, however, part of the Christian territory in Southern Europe had been conquered by the Mohammedans, who at one time even hoped for the conquest of all Europe. They lost, however, in the course of the following centuries, most of their conquests, retaining only the control of one empire in Eastern Europe. Thus Europe has been for many centuries a predominantly Christian division of the world, while of both Asia and Africa only small sections became Christian. The schism between the Greek and the Latin churches became complete in the ninth century, and the ecclesiastical connection between Eastern and Western Europe has been interrupted ever since. Still greater became the alienation between the countries which adhered to the Reformation of the sixteenth century and those over which the Church of Rome retained, control, and more than one destructive war grew out of this division. *SEE REFORMATION*; *SEE PROTESTANTISM.*

III. *Ecclesiastical Statistics*. — The following tabular statement of the statistics of the Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Eastern churches, prepared by Prof. A.J. Schem, is taken from the *American Year-book* for 1869.

It will be seen from the above table that the Eastern churches (or, more particularly, the Greek Church) prevail in Russia, Turkey, and Greece. In Turkey the government is Mohammedan, but the majority of the population belong to the Greek Church. The Roman Catholic Church prevails in Portugal, Spain, France, the South German States, Austria, Italy (inclusive of the Papal States, San Marino and Monaco), and Belgium, while Protestantism is the prevailing religion in the North German Confederation, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. (A.J.S.)

Eusebians

a name given to the Arians from Eusebius of Nicomedia. *SEE EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA.*