THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Eusebius- Ezri

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

Eusebius

the only pope of this name, and, according to a tradition, the son of a physician, became bishop of Rome in 310, after the death of Marcellus. The time of his pontificate is variously stated at from four months to six years. No events of importance are recorded of his pontificate. According to an epitaph published by Baronius (but which Baronius himself refers, not to the pope, but to some priest of the same name), the *lapsi* (q.v.) in Rome demanded immediate absolution, which Eusebius refused. Tumult arose, in consequence of which Eusebius was exiled by the usurper Maxentius to Sicily. He is commemorated as a saint on the 26th of September. Several decrees circulating under his name, as well as three letters to the bishops of Gaul, to the Egyptians, and to the bishops of Tuscia and Campania, are spurious. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 4:246; *Acta Sanct. ad* 26 *Septbr.;* Pagi, *Breviarum pontific. Roman.* (1, page 65); Bower, *Hist. of the Popes;* Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgem. Encyklop.* (section 1, volume 40, page 445).

Eusebius Of Alexandria.

I. In the Eastern churches, a number of homilies, ascribed to one Eusebius of Alexandria, enjoyed a great reputation, especially during the 6th and 7th centuries. They are either dramatic representations of the chief events in the life of Christ, or discussions of moral and practical questions. Their author is variously designated as monk, bishop, archbishop, or papa; most frequently bishop or archbishop of Alexandria. An ancient biography, published by cardinal Mai *(Spicileg.* Romans 9, page 103), represents him as a sainted monk living near Alexandria, and endowed with the faculty of working ciracles, who became successor of Cyril in the see of Alexandria, transferred his episcopal functions, after seven years (another reading says twenty years), to a noble Alexandrine named Alexander, and died in the retirement of a monastery. That this account is false we know from the list of bishops of Alexandria, which nowhere leaves room for a bishop Eusabius. According to Thilo *(Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandrien und des Eusebius von Emesa,* Halle, 1832), the author was either one of the four monks known in the Origenistic controversies under the name of the four "tall brothers," and distinguished among the monks of the Nitrian desert for piety and theological learning, or a presbyter at the court of Justinian I, who, honored with the title Papa, took an active part in the dogmatic controversies of the 6th century. Semisch (in Herzog's *Real-*

Encyklop. s.v.) thinks that neither of these two men has all the qualifications which one would expect from the author of the Homilies. The only thing certain, in his opinion, is that the homilies were compiled in the 5th or 6th century. The number of homilies that are at present known is twenty-one. Some of them were published at Paris, 1575, and Antwerp, 1602. Augusti *(Euseb. Emes qua supersunt opuscula*, Elberfeld, 1829) wrongly attributed three of the homilies (of the dramatic class) to Eusebius of Emesa. Thilo, in the work already mentioned, combated the views of Augusti, and in an appendix published a revised text of four of the homilies, to which, in 1834, he added an edition of a new homily on astrology. His views were confirmed by cardinal Mai *(Spicil.* Roman. 9), who, from a Vatican manuscript, published a number of homilies for the first time. A homily on alms, which has never been printed is to be found in the Vienna Imperial Library. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:226; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* (ed. Harles), 7:409. (A.J.S.)

II. Eusebius, bishop of Laodicea, being a native of Alexandria, is sometimes called Eusebius of Alexandria.

Eusebius

with the surname BRUNO, after 1047 bishop of Angers. Little is known of his early life. Soon after becoming bishop he was suspended with a number of other bishops, being suspected, it is thought, of simony. But he seems to have fully justified himself, for in 1049 he was present at the reformatory council of Rheims, and was chosen a member of the committee to welcome pope Leo IX in the name of the council. In a letter written from Rome (1049), he complained of the measures taken by the pope against Berengar, who, in his opinion, was free from any heresy. Berengar himself counted Eusebius among his patrons, and it was the advice of Eusebius which induced him to take, at the Synod of Tours in 1054, the oath which the synod demanded from him. One of the foremost opponents of Berengar, bishop Theotwin of Liege, calls Eusebius one of the chief renewers of the heresy which finds in the Lord's Supper nothing but a shadow and an image of the body of Christ. But when count Geoffroi of Anjou, the powerful protector of the French heretics, died (1060), the courage of Eusebius was at an end. At the Episcopal Convention of Angers in 1062 he showed an inclination to accept the doctrine of the Church, though he still made a profession of personal friendship for Berengar. The same indecision shows itself in the celebrated letter, written between 1063 and 1066, in which

Eusebius de. chines to act as arbiter at a theological disputation which Berengar desired to told with the priest Gaufrid Martini, and defines his dogmatical position. The letter (which is regarded by Lessing as the ablest theological essay of the 11th century) deprecates new dogmatic explanations concerning the Eucharist, and declares that we ought not to appeal to the fathers, but to adhere to Scripture, and abide by the simple words that the bread and wine are the true body and blood of Christ as a duty of pious faith. The letter may be found in Menardus *(Augustini c. Juliani operis imperfecti 1.*2 *priores),* with arbitrary alterations in De Roye *(Vita, haeres. et poenit. Berengar.),* and Boulay *(Hist. Univers. Paris).* Two other letters of Eusebius are given by Sudendorf (Bereng. Turon.,185,0). Eusebius died at Angers Aug. 27, 1081. — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 4:228; Lessing, Werke (edit. Lachmann), volume 8; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 16:778; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey), 3:576; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas* (Ryland), 2:462. (A.J.S.)

Eusebius Of Caesarea,

the "father of Church history," was born about 270. The place of his birth is not certainly known, but it is supposed to have been Caesarea in Palestine. Coming to Antioch towards the end of the 3d century, he there studied the Scriptures under Dorotheus (Eusebius, *H.E.* 7:32). On his return to Caesarea he was ordained by Agapius then bishop of that place. Here he became intimate with Pamphilus, a learned presbyter, who was head of a divinity school at Caesarea and who had gathered many books illustrative of Scripture and theology, especially the writings of Origen. This friendship was lifelong, and from it Eusebius took the name Εὐσέβιος (ὁ ἵλος) τοῦ Παμφίλου, Eusebius Pamphili. It was probably under Pamphilus that Eusebius imbibed his fondness for the writings of Origen. During the persecution by Dioclesian, Pamphilus was imprisoned, and finally died a martyr (A.D. 309). Eusebius taught in the school of Pamphilus for years, but during the persecution he went to Tyre and to Egypt, where he himself was imprisoned as a confessor, and where he witnessed the sufferings of the faithful described in his *Church History* (book 8, c. 7, 9). Epiphanius *(Her.* 58:7) tells. us that Eusebius was charged at the Synod of Tyre (A.D. 335, where he sided against Athanasius), by Potamon, bishop of Heraclea, with having shown cowardice during the persecution in Egypt, and even with having offered incense to idols. But the charge doubtless arose from party feeling, as it is not likely that he could, with such a character, have been made bishop in

that age. In 313 or 315 he was chosen bishop of Caesarea, which see he administered with eminent success for twenty-five years.

The part taken by Eusebius in the Arian controversy has been the subject of much dispute. When Arius was deposed by Alexander, he enlisted numerous bishops in his behalf, especially Eusebius of Nicomedia, namesake and friend of Eusebius of Caesarea; and the latter wrote to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (two letters, of which fragments are extant), aiming, not to settle the doctrinal dispute, but rather to show that the views of Arius were misrepresented. He sought to reconcile the contending parties, and this conciliatory, if not compromising temper, characterized Eusebius through life. *SEE ARIUS; SEE ATHANASIUS*. The part taken by Eusebius in the Council of Niceas (Nice, A.D. 325) is described by Valesius (Introd. to his edit. of Eusebius) as follows: "In this greatest and most celebrated council, Eusebius was far from an unimportant person; for he both had the first seat on the right hand, and in the name of the *whole* synod addressed the emperor Constantine, who sat on a golden chair, between the two rows of the opposite parties. This is affirmed by Eusebius himself *(Life of* Constantine), and by Sozomen *(Ecclesiastes Hist.).* Afterwards, when there was a considerable contest amongst the bishops relative to a creed or form of faith, Eusebius proposed a formula at once simple and orthodox, which received the general commendation both of the bishops and of the emperor himself. Something, notwithstanding, seeming to be wanting in the creed, to confute the impiety of the new opinion, the fathers of the Nicene Council determined that these words, 'VERY GOD OF VERY GOD; BEGOTTEN, NOT MADE; 'BEING OF ONE SUBSTANCE WITH THE FATHER,' should be added. They also annexed anathemas against those who should assert that the Son of God was made of things not existing, and that there was a time when he was not. At first, indeed, Eusebius refused to admit the term ὁμοούσιος, but when the import of that word was explained to him by the other bishops he consented, and, as he himself relates in his letter to his diocese at Caesarea, subscribed to the creed (Socrates, *H.E. i.* 8). Some affirm that it was the necessity of circumstances, or the fear of the emperor, and not the conviction of his own mind, that induced Eusebius to subscribe to the Nicene Council. Of some present at the synod this might be believed, but we cannot think it of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea. After the Nicene Council, too, Eusebius always condemned those who asserted that the Son of God was made of things not existing. Athanasins likewise affirms the

same concerning him, and, though he frequently mentions that Eusebius subscribed to the Nicene Council, nowhere intimates that he did it insincerely. Had Eusebius subscribed to that council, not according to his own mind, but fraudulently and in pretense, why did he afterwards send the letter we have mentioned to his diocese at Caesarea, and therein ingenuously profess that he had embraced the faith which had been published in the Nicene Council?" (For details, see Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1:8, 9.)

After the deposition of Eustathius (q.v.), A.D. 351, the see of Antioch was offered to Eusebius, but he declined the honor, probably in fear of tumult, and even bloodshed, from the excited state of the popular mind in Antioch. The conduct of Eusebius in this case greatly gratified the emperor Constantine, who wrote him a letter praising his prudence, and saying that he was worthy of being bishop, "not of the city merely, but of almost the whole world" (Socrates, *H.E,* 1:24). In the later course of the Arian dispute, Eusebius, though theoretically orthodox, substantially acted with the Arians to a great extent. Even in his *Church History* he avoids even mentioning the controversy, ending his book with A.D. 324. He presided at the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335 (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 58:7), summoned for the trial of Athanasius, and joined in the condemnation of that great man (see art. ATHANASIUS, volume 1, page 505). The prelates assembled at Jerusalem, and deputed Eusebius to the emperor Constantine, to obtain his approval of their decision, and he seems to have used his influence with the emperor to secure both the recall of Arius and the exile of Athanasius.

In his last years Eusebius lived in close intimacy with the emperor Constantine, who cherished the warmest esteem and affection for him. In A.D. 336 Eusebius wrote his *Panegyric on Constantine.* The emperor had assigned him the task of superintending the transcription of fifty copies of the Scriptures on parchment, for the use of the churches of Constantinople. This was the last literary labor in which be was engaged *(Vita Constant.* 4:35) before his death, which took place A.D. 340.

From the general tenor of his life as sketched above, it is not to be wondered that Eusebius has been charged with a leaning towards Arianism. "So thought, among the ancients, Hilary, Jerome (who otherwise speaks favorably of Eusebius), Theodoret, and the second Council of Nicaea (A.D. 787), which unjustly condemned him, even expressly, as an Arian heretic; and so have thought, among moderns, Baronius, Petavius,

Clericus, Tillemont, Gieseler; while the Church historian Socrates, the Roman bishops Gelasius and Pelagius II, Valesius, G. Bull, Cave (who enters into a full vindication, volume 1, page 111), and Samuel Lee (and most Anglicans), have defended the orthodoxy of Eusebius, or at least mention him with very high respect. The Gallican Church has even placed him in the catalogue of saints. Athanasius never expressly charges him with apostasy from the Nicene faith to Arianism, or to semi-Arianism, but frequently says that before 325 he held with Arius, and changed his opinion at Nicaea. This is the view of Mohler also *(Athanasius d. Grosse,* page 333 sq.), whom Dorner *(Christology,* 1:792) inaccurately reckons among the opponents of the orthodoxy of Eusebius. The testimonies of the ancients for and against Eusebius are collected in Migne's edition of his works, tom. 1, pages 68-98. Among recent writers, Dr. Samuel Lee has most fully investigated the orthodoxy of Eusebius in the preliminary dissertation to his translation of the Theophania from the Syriac, pages 24-49. He arrives at the conclusion (page 48) that Eusebius was no Arian, and that the same reasoning must prove that he was no semi-Arian; that he did in no degree partake of the error of Origen, ascribed to him so positively and so groundlessly by Photius. But this is merely a negative result." — Schaff *Hist. of the Christian Church,* 2:874. Compare also Dupin, *Ast. Eccl.* (Paris, 1683), 2:1-15.

It is in the field of Church-history that the merits and services of Eusebius stand pre-eminent among early writers. He had large acquaintance with both Christian and pagan learning, and used it, if not with critical or philosophical skill, yet with patient industry and with literary integrity. He was the first to collect the scattered annals of the first three centuries of the Church in his *Ecclesiastical History,* the most important of all his writings, which traces the history of Christianity from the advent of the Messiah to the defeat of Licinius, A.D. 324. In this work he rejects, with greater care than is usually attributed to him, the doubtful facts and the fabulous narratives. And this is not his only merit. A living sympathy with the fortunes of Christianity, and earnest admiration for the heroism of its martyrs and confessors, inspires him throughout. "Others," he says in the beginning of the fifth book, "that compose historical narratives, would record nothing but victories in battle, the trophies of enemies, the warlike achievements of generals, the bravery of soldiers, sullied with blood and innumerable murders, for the sake of children, and country, and property. But our narrative embraces that conversation and conduct which is

acceptable to God the wars and conflicts of a most pacific character, whose ultimate tendency is to establish the peace of the soul." In Dr. Schaff's opinion *(Ch. Hist.* 3:877), the *Church History* of Eusebius "gives a colorless, defective, incoherent, fragmentary, yet interesting picture of the heroic youth of the Church, and ewes its incalculable value not to the historic art of the authors but almost entirely to his copious and mostly literal extracts from foreign, and, in some cases, now extinct sources."

In the 8th book of the *Ecclesiastical History* (c. 2) Eusebius states that it is no part of his plan to relate all the wickedness and dissensions of the Christians before the persecution, or to name those who were untrue to the faith; adding, "we shall only, upon the whole, introduce those events into our history that may be profitable first to us of the present day, and hereafter to posterity." In the *Martyr. Palestin.* (chapter 12) he states as a historical principle that the "events most suitable to be recorded in a history of the martyrs are those which redound to their honor." Gibbon *(Decline and Fall,* chapter 16) remarks that "such an acknowledgment will naturally excite a suspicion that a writer who has so openly violated one of the fundamental laws of history has not paid a very strict regard to the observance of the other." Certainly it was an error of judgment in Eusebius to hold back anything in his accounts. The Scripture might have taught him better; it does not omit the faults of patriarchs or saints. If nothing, moreover, is to be told of martyrs but "what redounds to their honor," one's admiration of these honorable facts must be lessened by the fear that what is kept back might counterbalance what is told. The *principle* of Eusebius is here historically bad. But Gibbon attacks Eusebius still more strongly in his *Vindication of Chapters* 15 and 16 of his history. Eusebius gives as the title of chapter 31, book 12, of the *Praeparat. Evang.,* the question "How far it may be lawful to use falsehood as a medicine for the benefit of those who need such a procedure?" He begins the chapter with a citation from Plato *(De Legibus,* 2), as follows: "A legislator of any value, even if the fact were not such as our discourse has just established it, if in any case he might make bold to deceive young persons for their advantage; could he possibly inculcate any falsehood more profitable than this, or more potent to lead all without force or compulsion to the practice of all justice? 'Truth, my friend, is honorable and permanent; but not, it would seem, very easy of persuasion.' To this passage of Plato, Eusebius adds: "You may find a thousand such instances in the Scriptures, where God is described as jealous, or sleeping, or angry, or liable to other human

affections, so expressed for *the advantage of those who require such a method* (ἐπ ὠφελείᾳ τῶν δεομένων τοῦ τοιούτου τρόπου)." This is all that is said on the subject, and it may be interpreted to mean nothing more than that one's statements must be adapted to the understanding of his hearers or readers. But the use of the word "falsehood" in the heading of the chapter shows that, in the mind of Eusebius, either there was no just appreciation of the difference between "falsehood" and "accommodation," or else that his moral sense as to veracity had been vitiated by the ecclesiastical casuistry which even in his time had begun to show itself. It is easily to be seen, however, that Gibbon really misleads his readers by his statement of the case: "In this chapter," says he, "Eusebius alleges a passage of Plato which approves the occasional practice of pious and salutary frauds; nor is he ashamed to justify the sentiments of the Athenian philosopher by the example of the sacred writers of the Old Testament." This is not warranted by the passage, which is fully cited above. We adopt, nevertheless, the remark of Waddington *(History of the Church,* chapter 6, ad fin.): "It was disgraceful to the less enlightened fathers of the second and third centuries that, even in the midst of trial and tribulation, they borrowed a momentary succor from the profession of falsehood; but the same expedient was still more shameful to Eusebius, who flourished during the prosperity of the Church, whose age and more extensive learning left him no excuse in ignorance or inexperience, and whose great name and unquestionable piety gave sanction and authority to all his opinions. There can be no doubt, then, that the publication of that detestable principle in any one of his writings, however modified and limited by his explanation, must to a certain extent disturb our confidence in the rest; the mind which does not profess to be constantly guided by truth possesses no claim to our implicit submission. Nevertheless, the works of Eusebius must at last be judged by the character which severally pervades them, not by any single principle which the author has once only laid down, to which he has not intended (as it would seem) to give general application, and which he has manifestly proposed rather as a philosophical speculation than as a rule for his own composition. At least we feel convinced that whoever shall calmly peruse his *Ecclesiastical History* will not discover in it, any deliberate intention to deceive; in the relation of miraculous stories he is more sparing than most of the Church historians who succeeded him, and seemingly even than those whom he has copied; and, upon the whole, we shall not do him more than justice if we consider him as an avowed but honest *advocate*,

many of whose statements must be examined with suspicion, while the greater part bear direct and incontestable marks of truth."

Of his *Chronicon* it has also been justly asserted, "'that for centuries it was the source of all synchronistical knowledge of history in the Greek, Latin, Oriental, and Christian world, everywhere translated, continued, excerpted, and made the basis of the different works on this subject." His panegyrical writings on Constantine, however, afford, with much that is commendable and historically useful, abundant proofs of the weakness of his moral fibre, and of his sycophancy in dealing with the emperor. But it is to his credit that he never used his influence at court for merely personal ends. When Constantine on one occasion at Caesarea asked Eusebius to demand a favor for his Church, he declared "his Church was not in need of any favors. The only boon he asked was permission to use the public archives to enable him to write a history of the martyrs; which favor was readily granted him" (Jerome, *Ep. ad Chromatium et Heliodorum;* comp. Hefele in the *Freib. Kirchen-Lex.* 6:135 et sq.). Less important than the historical works of Eusebius, but nevertheless very meritorious, are his *Apologetical* writings, the most extensive in ancient apologetics. His notices of the oldest mythologies in the *Praeparatio Evangelica* are a valuable storehouse for theologians and philologists. In the field of *doctrinal* theology *(contra Marcellum)* the writings of Eusebius appear to less advantage than in any other. They touch upon the great question of his time, the Person of Christ. In these writings, as in his practical life, he appears to waver between orthodoxy and subordinationism.

The writings of Eusebius are here classified as A. Historical; B. Apologetic; C. Dogmatic; D. Exegetical.

A. *Historical.* —

1. The ἱστορία ἐκκλησιαστική, *Ecclesiastical History,* in ten books, beginning with the incarnation of Christ, relates the history of the Church, including accounts of writers, martyrs, persecutions, etc., up to A.C. 324. It was probably composed before the Nicene Council (325), as, near its close, Crispus, the eldest son of Constantine, is very favorably mentioned, which could hardly have happened after the execution of Crispus (325). The best editions of the *History,* with the Greek text, are Valesius, with life of Eusebius prefixed (Par. 1659-1673, 3 volumes, fol., often reprinted); Reading's edition of Valesius's Eusebius (Gr. and Lat.), with the fragments of Theodoret, Evagrius, and Philostorgius (Camb. 1720 and 1746, 3

volumes, fol.); Zimmermann, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* (Francfort, 1822, Gr. and Lat., 2 volumes, 8vo); Heinichen, *Hist. Eccles.*, Reading's edition of Valesius, with Stroth's notes, and additional notes and indices by the editor (Leips. 1827-8, 3 volumes, 8vo; also see below); Burton, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* (Gr.) (Oxon, 1838, 1845, 1856, 8vo), also *Annotationes Variorum*, 2 volumes, 8vo (Oxon, 1842, 2 vols& 8vo); cheap edition by Schwegler (Tibing. 1852, 8vo) Laemmer, *Hist. Eccles.*, cum tabulis specimina cod. vii cont. (Schaffhausen, 1862, large 8vo, page 836, with tables in fol.).

English Translations. — Hanmer, *Ch. History of Eusebins, Socrates, and Evagrius, with the Life and Panegyric of Constantine* (Cambridge, 1577, and often, fol.); the same, with Saltonstall's translation of *The Life of Constantine* (1650, fol.; 1663, fol.); Wells (based on the preceding, 1709, fol.); Parker's abridred (Lond. 1729, 4to); best translation, Cruse's (with Bovle's *Council of Nice*, Philadelphia, 1846; 10th ed. N.Y. 1856, 8vo; also in Bohn's *Ecclesiastical Library*, Lond, 12mo; and in Bagster's *Greek Eccl. Historians*, Lond. 1843. 8vo).

German Trasnslations. — Hedion (Strasb. 154, fol.); Stroth (Quedlinburg, 1777, 3 volumes, 8vo); Closs (in two editions, one for Romanists, the other for Protestants, Stuttgart, 1839, 8vo). *French translation* by Cousin (Paris, 1675, and often). On the Moscow MS. of the *Eccl. Hist.*, see *Zeits. Hist. Theol.* 1861, page 311, and *Theolog. Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, heft 3.

2. The χρονικῶν κανόνων παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία, generally callel *Chronicon*, hibb. 2, is an abridgment of the history of the world from its creation up to A.D. 325, with chronological tables, in which the chronography of Julius Africanus is largely made use of. For the arbitrary changes made by Busebius in the text of Africanus, see Brunet de Presle, *Dynasties Egyptiennes* (Paris, 1850, 8vo). Of this chronicle there remain fragments in Greek and two translations: one in Latin by Jerome, and one in Armenian. The latter was first edited by Zohraab (Milan, 1818), Latin, by A. Mai; better ed. by Aucher (Lat. version from the Arrmenian, with the Greek fragments, Venet. 1818, 4to; reprinted in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* tom. 19); new edithon by Schone (the Armenian translated by Peter.mann and Rodiger, Berlin, 1866).

3. *The Life of Constantine*, εἰς τὸν βίον Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως λόγοι 4; *de vita Constantini*, lib. 4; generally printed with the *Ecclesiastical Hist.* (see above); also separately, ed. by Heinichen, with

Reading's and Stroth's notes, etc. (Leipsic, 1829, 8vo); English translation in Bohn's *Ecclesiastes Library* (London, 12mo).

4. *Panegyric on Constantine,* εἰς Κωνσταντῖνον τριακόντα ετηρικός, an oration in praise of Constantine on .the thirtieth anniversary of his accession; generally printed with the *Church History;* also in Heinichen's *Life of Constantine* (see above, 3).

5. Σύγγραμμα περὶ τῶν καὶ αὐτὸν μαρτυρισάντων, *de martyribus Palestinw;* really, *de martyribus suis tcmparis;* containing reports of numerous martyrs of the Diocletian persecution (A.D. 303-310), printed as an appendix to the eighth books of the *Ecclesiastes History;* specially interesting is Cureton's *History of the Martyrs of Palestine, by Eusebius,—discovered in a very ancient Syrian MS., and transl. into English* (Lond. 1860, 8vo); given also in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* tom. 20.

6. The *Acta St. Pamphili et sociorum* (on the Martyrdom of his teacher Pamphilus) is only a fragment of a work on the life of Pamphilus, in three books which seems to have been lost.

B. *Apologetic.* —

1. The *Preparation of the Gospel History,* προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελική, *praparatia evangelica,* in fifteen books. In the first six books Eusebius vindicates Christianity by extracts from Grecian and Roman writers, and by criticisms on them and on the Phoenician and Egyptian mythologies and worship. In books 7-15 he treats of Judaism, its religion, history and institutions, showing its superiority to heathenism. The work pictures the condition of the world previous to the advent of Christ. Ed. by Rob. Stephens (Gr. 1544), and with Latin version by Viger (Paris, 1628, Cologne, 1688); ed. by Heinichen (Lips. 1842-3, 2 volumes, 8vo); ad. by Gaisford (Oxf. 1843, 4 volumes, 8vo); also in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* t. 21. Cumberland translated Sanchoniathon's *Phoenician History* from book 1 of the *Praep. Evang.* (Lond. 1720, 8vo).

2. The *Evangelical Demonstration,* ἀπόδειξις εὐαγγελική, *demonstratio evangelica,* in twenty books, of which only ten remain. Eusebius wrote in order to prove that the Christian religion is *demonstrably* true fronc its internal character, and from the fulfillment of the Jewish prophecies. He points out the true relations between Judaism and Christianity, and the provisional character of the latter; and in books 3-

10 he comments on the Messianic prophecies. This work is intended to be the complement of the *Praepar. Evang.* (see above). Translated into Latin by Donatus of Verona, and published either at Rome or Venice in 1498; and at Cologne in 1542. The Greek text appeared, with that of the *Praeparatio,* at Paris in the editions both of Robt. Stephens and Viger (see above, 1); also separately by Stephens (Paris, 1545, fol.), edited by Gaisford (Gr. and Latin, Oxford, 1852, 2 volumes, 8vo); abridged German version in Rdssler, *Bibl. der Kirchemviter* (1778, 8vo), 5:203 sq.

3. Of a similar character are

(a) the ἐκλογαὶ προφητικαί, *Ecloga Propheticae,* of which four books only are preserved. They give mostly allegorical interpretations of Old-Test. Messianic passages (edited by Gaisford, Oxon. 1842, 8vo; also in Migne, *Patrologisa Grac.).*

(b) The five books of The *Theophany,* θεοφανεία, preserved in a Syriac translation, long lost, but discovered by Tattam. in 1839 in a Nitrian monastery, and published under the title *Eusebius on the Theophania. or divine Manifestation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, translated from an ancient Syriac Version of the Greek Original now lost, with Notes,* and a *Vindication of the Orthodoxy and prophetical Views of the Au*thor, by Prof. S. Lee (Camb. 1843, 8vo). Dr. Lee assigns the MSS. (now in the British Museum) to the year A.D. 411. The Greek fragments, with Lat. version, compared also with Lee's edition, are given in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* 24:607 sq. See a full treatment of this subject in Ceillier, *Ant. Sacr.* (Par. 1865, 8va), page 258 sq.

4. The small work, *Against Hierocles,* πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Φιλοστράτου εἰς Απολλώνιον τὸν Τυανέα διὰ τὴν ῾Ιεροκλεῖ παραληφθεῖσαν αὐτοῦ το καὶ Χριστοῦ σύγκρισιν, generally cited *Adversus Hieroclem,* shows very ably that the magician amid philosopher Apollonius of Tyana cannot bear comparison with Christ. It is to be found in Morell's *Philostratus;* (Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1608); edited, with new transl. and notes, by Olearius (Leips. 1709); eand, with the *libri contra Marcellum,* ead. by Gaisford (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); also in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* 22:795 sq.

C. *Dogmatical and Polemical.* —

1. Two books, κατὰ Μαρκέλλου, *contra Marcellum,* written by desire of the Council of Constantinople (held A.D. 336) to vindicate the

condemnation of Marcellus for Sabellianism by that council (see Hefelea *Conciliengeschichte,* volume 1, § 51). It is given in Viger's ed. of the *Praep. Evang.* (1628 and 1688); also in Gaisford's edition of the Liber *cont.* Hieroclem, (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); and in Migne, *Patrol. Gicec.* 24:707.

2. The three books, *Of the Ecclesiastical Theology,* περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς θεολογίας, *De ecclesiastica theologia,* are likewise intended against Marcellus, as θεολογία here means *sermo de Filio Dei ejusque* natura *divina,* with a biblico-dogmatical proof of the hypostatical existence of the Son. It is given (Greek and Latin) by Rettberg (Gottingen, 1794); in *Covst. Hiero*clem, ed. by Gaisford (Oxon, 1852, 8vo); and in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* 24, 826 sq.

3. The short treatise, περὶ τῆς τοὺ πάσχα ἑορτῆς, *De solemnitate paschali,* treats of the typical character of the Jewish Passover, and of its consummation in the new covenant. It is in Migne, *Patrologia Graec.* 24:694 sq.

4. Fourteen smaller treatises. among which the most important are, *Dejide adv. Sabelliums, De resurrectione, De incorporali* animna; *quod Deus Pater incorporalis* sit, which remain only in Latin, and are all contained in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca,* tom. 24.

D. Exegetical. — These are partly introductory; partly commentaries, written upon the allegorical method of Origen, and without any knowledge of Hebrew.

1 The Onomasticon, or περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ, *De locis Hebraicis,* a topographical and alphabetical index of the names of places occurring in the Bible. It was translated into Latin by Jearome, and edited in Greek by Bonfrerius (Paris, 1631, and 1659, fol.); Gr. and Lat. in Hieron. Opera, t. 2 (Paris, 1699); by (Clericus (Amst. 1707, fol.); by Lard sow and Parthey (Berlin, 1862, 8vo).

2. *Evangelici canones,* a kind of Gospel-harmony, to be found in the editions of the N.T. by Erasmus, Stephens, and Mill; also in Migne, *Patrolog. Graec.* 22:1273 sq.

3. Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις, *Quaestiones evangelicae,* in three books, containing solutions of seeming contradictions of the evangelists; edited by Mai in his *Coll. Script. Vet.* (1825, 4to), 1:101 sq.

4. *Commentaries on the Psalms* and *On Isaiah,* which are preserved to a great extent, and given in Migne, *Patrol. Graeca,* tom. 24 and 25. Of his commentary on *Solomon's Song, Proverbs, Daniel,* and *Luke,* only fragments are left us, which are given in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* tom. 24, who prints also Mai's newly-discovered fragments from his *Nov. Patr. Bibliotheca,* volume 4.

There is no absolutely complete edition of the works of Eusebius. The. nearest to such are Eusebii Pamphili *Opera Omnia,* Lat. (Basil. 1542, 4 volumes, fol.; 1559, 2 volumes, fol.; Paris, 1581, fol.); most complete of all (following Valesius, Montfaucon, Mai, and Gaisford), Migne, *Patrol. Grcec.* volumes 19-24. A new edition of the *Scripta Historica,* by Heinichen, was begun in 1867 (volume 1, 8vo, the *Hist. Eccles.);* and of the *Opera Omnia* by Dindorf (Leipsic, 1865-67, volumes 1-3, 8vo).

See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1:111; Dupin, *Auteurs Eccl.* 2:1-15; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca,* ed. Harles, 7:335 sq.; Oudin, *Script.* [2003]*Ecclesiastes* 1:312 sq.; Lardner, *Works,* 4:69 sq.; Hoffmann, *Bibliog. Lexikon,* 1:98 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Paris, 1865), 3:168 sq.; Neander, *Ch. History,* Torrey's transl., 2:367, 383; Jortin, *Remarks on Ecclesiastes Hist.* (London, 1767), 2:252; Waddington, *Church History* (in 1 volume), chapter 6; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* volume 3, § 161; Alzog, *Patrologie,* § 44; Lardner, *Works,* 4:69; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 1:233 et al.; Dowling, *On the Study of Ecclesiastes Hist.* page 13 sq.; Kestner, *De Fide Eusebii* (Gottingen, 1817); Baur, *Comp. Euseb. cum Herodoto* (Tubing. 1834,12mo); Hilnnell, *De Eusebio Relig. Christ. Defensore* (Getting. 1843); Lamson, *Church of the First Three Centuries,* 233 sq.; Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Edinb. transl.), div. 1, volume 2:218 sq.; Waterland, *Works,* 2:475 sq.

Eusebius Of Dorylaeum,

born at the end of the fifth century, began his public life as a lawyer, and obtained the place of imperial commissioner *(agens in rebus).* Evagrius *(Hist.* [2009]*Ecclesiastes* 1:9) says of him that, "while still practising as a rhetorician, he was the first to expose the blasphemy of Nestorius." It seems to have been he who interrupted Nestorius in a sermon about A. D. 430 (when he denied to Mary the title θεοτόκος), by crying aloud, "No, the eternal Logos himself subjected himself to a second birth." This, at least, is the conclusion of Neander *(Church History,* Torrey's transl.,

2:504). He also thinks it probable that Eusebius was the author of the formal complaint publicly posted against Nestorius in the church of Constantinople, comparing him to Paul of Samosata (Neander, *1.c.*). It is possible that it was as a reward for this zeal that he was made bishop.

At all events, he entered into orders, and became bishop of Dorylaeum, in Phrygia. In the year 448, at the *Home Council* (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα), held at Constantinople, he entered complaint against Eutyches (whom he had previously warned privately), as holding false and blasphemous doctrines, contrary to the fathers, as to the person of Christ (Mansi, *Concil.* 6:495, 650). *SEE EUTYCHES*. At this synod Eutyches was condemned, but in the next year, at the Robber-Council, *SEE EPHESUS, ROBBER-COUNCIL OF*, Eutyches was restored, and Eusebius condemned and deprived of his see. When he attempted at this council to explain the doctrine of two natures in Christ, voices exclaimed, "Burn Eusebius! As he has cut Christ asunder, so let him be cut asunder." He fled to Rome. The tide was turned by the death of Theodosius, A.D. 450. Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, prevailed upon Marcian, the successor of Theodosius, to convene another general council, which met at Chalcedon A.D. 451, and Eusebius was restored to his see. A few polemical writings of Eusebius are still extant, as Con*sertatio adversus Nestorium* (in the works of Marius Mercator, 2, page 18): — *Libellus adversus Eutycheten* (in; Labbe, volume 4, page 151): — *Libellus adversus Dioscurum* (ib. volume 4, page 380): — *Epistola ad Marcianum imperatorem* (ib. page 95). — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:505-513; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 16:777.

Eusebius

bishop of Emesa, fourth century. Socrates *(Hist.* ◁2009▷*Ecclesiastes* 2:9) gives the following account of him: "Who this person was, George, bishop of Laodicea, who was present on this occasion, informs us; for he says, in the book which he has composed on his life, that he was descended from a noble family of Edessa, in Mesopotamia, and that from a child he had studied the Holy Scriptures; that he was afterwards instructed in Greek literature by a master resident at Edessa; and finally, that the sacred books were ex pounded to him by Patrophilus and Eusebius, the latter of whom presided over the church at Caesarea, and the former over that at Scythopolis. Having afterwards gone to Antioch, about the time that Eustathius was deposed on the accusation of Cyrus of Bercea for holding the tenets of Sabellius, he lived on terms of familiar intercourse with

Euphronius, that prelate's successor. When, however, a bishopric was offered him, he retired to Alexandria to avoid the intended honor, and there devoted himself to the study of philosophy. On his return to Antioch he formed an intimate acquaintance with Placitus or Flaccillus, the successor of Euphronius. At length he was ordained bishop of Alexandria by Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, but did not go thither in consequence of the attachment of the people of that city to Athanasius. He was therefore sent to Emesa, where the inhabitants excited a sedition on account of his appointment, for they reproached him with the study and practice of judicial astrology; whereupon he fled to Laodicea and abode with George, who has given so many historical details of him. George, having taken him to Antioch, procured his being again brought back to Emesa by Flacciillus and Narcissus; but he was afterwards charged with holding the Sabellian heresy. His ordination is elaborately described by the same writer, who adds at the close that the emperor (Constantius) took him with him in his expedition against the barbarians, and that miracles were wrought by his hand" (see also Sozomen, *Hist. Ecclesiast.* 3:6). During the latter years of his life he lived at Antioch, devoted to study. He died at Antioch about A.D. 360. Among the numerous works of Eusebius, Jerome mentions treatises against the Jews, the Pagans, and Novatians; a Commentary, in 10 books, to the Epistle to the Galatians, and Homilies on the Gospels. Theodoret mentions works of Eusebius against the Marcionites and Manichaeans; Ebedjesu. Questions on the Old Testament; and Xenajas (Asseman. *Bibl.* 2, page 28) a work on faith, and other addresses. Of all these works only fragments are extant. Two homilies (against Marcellus) undoubtedly belonging to him were falsely ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea. Some homilies are of a more recent date. *SEE EUSEBIUS OF ALEXANDRIA.* A biography of Eusebius, by bishop George, of Laodicea, is lost. A work on Eusebius and his writings has been written by Augusti *(Euseb. Emes. opuscula quae supersunt graeca*, Elberfeld, 1829); and some of the statements in this work have been refuted by Thilo *(Ueber d. Schriften des Euseb. v. Alex. u. des Euseb. von Emisa* (Halle, 1832). Some of the homilies ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea are attributed to Eusebius of Emesa.

Eusebius

a Nitrian monk (beginning of 5th century), one of the "four tall brothers" condemned by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, for defending the opinions of Origen. The three others were Dioscurus, Ammonius, and

Euthymius. They retired first to Jerusalem and Scythopolis, and then to Constantinople, where Chrysostom received them kindly, but did not admit them to communion. They were "pious men, though not wholly exempt from a certain fanatical ascetic tendency." — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:691; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 8:12, 13; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 6:7.

Eusebius Of Laodicea,

a native of Alexandria, and therefore sometimes called Eusebius of Alexandria. As deacon in Alexandria, he accompanied his bishop, Dionysius, in the Valerian persecution of Christians before the proconsul AEmilianus (257), and by nursing the imprisoned Christians and burying the martyrs gave a shining testimony of his undaunted faith. When (from 260 to 263) a terrible epidemic and civil war devastated Alexandria, Eusebius again distinguished himself by his zeal in nursing the sick, ‘both pagan and Christian, and, in union with his friend Anatolius, procured relief to thousands of inhabitants who were threatened with starvation.' In 264 he attended, as the representative of bishop Dionysius, whom old age and sickness retained in Alexandria, the Synod of Antioch, which was to take action on the heresy of Paul of Samosata. Subsequently he became bishop of Laodicea in Syria, where he died in 270. He was succeeded by his friend Anatolius. Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:240; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 7:32. (A.J.S.)

Eusebius Of Nicomedia,

who may be called the leader, if not the organizer, of the Arian party in the fourth century, was a distant relative of the emperor Julian, and was born about A.D. 324 (Ammianus Marcellinus, *Hist.* 12:9). He was first bishop of Berytus, in Phoenicia, but got himself translated to Nicomedia — Theodoret says (1:19) in violation of the canones — by the influence of Constantia, sister of the emperor Constantine, whose confidence he had completely won. After the excommunication of Arius by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 321), Eusebius took Arius (who had written him a letter asking his aid) under his protection, offered him an asylum in his own house, and wrote urgently, though at the present time respectfully, in his favor, to Alexander, the patriarch of Alexandria (for details, *SEE ARIANISM*, volume 1, page 389). As Eusebius had been a disciple of Lucian, he probably held the opinions of Arius at the time. Socrates says that "Eusebius of Nicomedia and his partisans, with such as embraced the

sentiments of Arius, demanded by letter that the sentence of excommunication which had been pronounced against him should be rescinded, and that those who had been excluded should be readmitted into the Church, as they held no unsound doctrine" *(Hist. Eccl.* 1:6; see also Sozoman.

At the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), Eusebius and his friends used all possible efforts first to carry their own opinions through, and then to hinder a definitive sentence. Their opposition was finally concentrated against the application of the term ὁμοούσιος *(consubstantial)* to the Son. All opposition failed, and the orthodox doctrine was established by the council. *SEE ARIANISM*, *SEE NICAEA, COUNCIL OF*. Eusebius, finding himself standing nearly alone, affixed his signature at last Philostorgius (1:9) asserts that instead of the term ὁμοούσιος (of the same essence), Eusebius and his friends secretly introduced the semi-Arian term ὁμοιούσιος (of like essence); but the statements of Philostorgius are not to be implicitly believed. The decree of the council contained not only time Nicene Creed, but also an anathema of certain propositions of Arius. This last Eusebius refused to sign, declaring to the council that he "submitted to their determinations concerning the faith, and consented to subscribe to it, even admitting the word *consubstantial*, according to the genuine signification of it, and consequently that he held no erroneous opinion; but that as for the condemnation of Arius, he could not subscribe to it; not that he had a mind to reject the points of faith which they had decided, but because he did not think that he, whom they accused, was in the error that they laid to his charge: that, on the contrary, he was entirely persuaded, by the letters which he received from him, and by the conferences which he had had with him, that he was a man whose sentiments were entirely different from those for which he was condemned." Theognis of Nice, Theonas of Marmorica, and Secundus of Ptolemais, agreed with him in this. The council condemned them as heretics, and Constantine condemned them to banishment. But Arius, Theonas, and Secundus having submitted, Eusebius and Theognis finally signed, and were forgiven by the emperor.

Soon after the close of the council "Eusebius showed a desire to revive the controversy, for which he was deprived of his see and banished into Gaul. On this occasion Constantine addressed a letter to the people of Nicomedia, censuring their exiled bishop in the strongest manner as disaffected to his government, as the principal supporter of heresy, and a man wholly regardless of truth (Theodoret, *Bed. Hist.* 1:20). But he did

not long remain under the imperial displeasure; indeed, he subsequently so completely regained Constantine's favor as to be selected to baptize him, not long before his death (A.D. 337). His Arian feelings, however, broke out again. He procured the deprivation of Eustathius (q.v.), bishop of Antioch, and, if we may believe Theodoret (1:21), by suborning a woman to bring against him a false accusation of the most infamous kind. He was, perhaps, the most bitter opponent of Athanasius *SEE ATHANASIUS*, and exerted himself to procure the restoration of Arius to the full privileges of churchmanship, menacing Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, with deposition unless he at once admitted him to the holy communion, in which he would have succeeded but for the sudden death of Arius. In 339 Eusebius managed to procure his election. to the see of Constantinople, in defiance of a canon against translations agreed to at Nicae. He died about A.D. 342. Though Eusebius lies under the disadvantage of having his character handed down to posterity almost entirely by the description of theological enemies, yet it is difficult to imagine that he was in any way deserving of esteem. His signature to the Nicene Creed was a gross evasion; nor can he be considered to have signed it merely as an article of peace, since he was ever afterwards a zealous opponent of its principles. It can scarcely be doubted that he was worldly and ambitious. Athanasius considers him as the teacher rather than the disciple of Arius; and afterwards, when the Arians were divided among themselves into parties, those who maintained the perfect likeness which the substance of the Son bore to that of the father *(Homoiousians)* against the Consubstantialists on the one hand, and the pure Arians or *Anomoians* on the other, pleaded the authority of this Eusebius. The tenets of this party were sanctioned by the Council of Seleucia, A.D. 359" (Smith, *Dict. of Biography*, s.v.). See, besides the works already cited, Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev.) 1, 118; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:367 sq.; Newman, *History of the* Arians; Lardner, *Works*, 3:594; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:242; Waterland, *Works* (Oxf. 1843), 2:369 sq.

Eusebius Of Vercelli,

was born in Sardinia;, was baptized in Rome by pope Eusebius; and became *lector,* or ecclesiastical reader at Rome. He was ordained bishop of Vercelli, in Piedmont, A.D. 340, with the unanimous consent of clergy and people. He was the first in the West who united the monastic life with the clerical (Ambrose, cited by Ceillier, 5:500). Pope Liberius requested him to go with Lucifer of Cagliari, and other legate's,: on an embassy to

Constantius, by whom the persecution of Athanasius had been sanctioned. They visited the emperor (at Arles or Valende), and prevailed on him to summon the Council De Milan, which met A.D. 355. The Eusebians (Arians) at this council urged the condemnation of Athanasius, and the emperor sided with them. Eusebius of Vercelli having received the emperor's order to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, refused, but expressed his willingness to subscribe the Nicene Creed. Lucifer of Cagliari and Dionysius of Milan refused also. The third session was held in the palace, the Arian party fearing the violence of the people. The emperor himself then sent for the three above-mentioned bishops, and commanded them either to sign the document or to prepare for banishment; they, on their part, earnestly entreated him to remember the account he would be called upon to give in the day of judgment, and besought him not to introduce the heresy of Arius into the Church; but all was of no avail, and Eusebius, Dionysius, and Lucifer were sentenced to banishment. At Scythopolis, in Palestine, his place of exile, he was warmly welcomed, and also encouraged by an embassy from his people at Vercelli. But at last he was brutally outraged, dragged naked through the streets, and imprisoned in a dungeon. He was then transferred to Cappadocia, and thence to the Thebald (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 3:4; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 5:12). After the death of Constantius, his successor, Julian, issued an edict recalling the exiled bishops. Eusebius went first to Alexandria, where he stood by Athanasius in the council of A.D. 362 in taking measures to heal the Antiochian schism. *SEE EUSTATHIANS*. The council sent him to Antioch to end the strife there, but the ordination of Paulinus (q.v.) by Lucifer of Cagliari had made matters worse than ever. After travelling through the East he returned to Italy, where he was welcomed with enthusiasm, particularly in his own diocese. He showed himself, in the latter years of his life, a great admirer of monasticism, and introduced among the clergy of his diocese the common life. Having learned that the bishop Auxentius, of Milan, with the support of the emperor Valentinian, was very actively laboring for the triumph of Arianism, Eusebius, in 364, suddenly appeared in Milan to attack Arianism in its stronghold, but the emperor soon ordered him back to his diocese. He died in 371. An inscription on his tomb calls him a martyr, and, according to a later legend, he was killed by the Arians; but the writers that are best informed about him (Ambrose, Gregory of Tours, etc.) know nothing of his martyrdom. The Church of Rome formerly commemorated him as a martyr on the 1st of August, and now on the 16th of December. We possess three *Epistolae* of Eusebius:

1. *Ad Constantium Augustum: —*

2. *Ad presbyteros et plebes Italiae,* written on the occasion of his banishment, to which is attached *Libellus facti,* a sort of protest against the violent conduct of the Arian bishop Patrophilus, who was in some sort his jailor during his residence at Scythopolis: —

3. *Ad Gregorium Episc. Hisp.,* found among the fragments of Hilary (11, § 5). He executed, also, a translation of the Commentary of his namesake, Eusebius of Caesarea, on the Psalms; and an edition of the Evangelists, from a copy said to be transcribed by his own hand, preserved at Vercelli, was published at Milan (1748, 4to) by J.A. Irico; and again by Blanchini, at Rome, 1748. This edition is given also in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* volume 12. The *Epistole* will be found in *Bibl. Patr. Galland.* volume 5; part of them in *Bib. Max. Pair.* volume 5; and all in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* volume 12. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 4:245 Mohler, *Athanasius der Grosse;* Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Paris, 1865), 4:271 sq.

Eusebius St., Of Samosata,

one of the pillars of the orthodox Church of the fourth century in its conflicts with Arianism. Nothing is known of his early life. He was appointed bishop of Samosata in 361, and in the same year was present at the Synod of Antioch, at which both Arians and Catholics elected Meletius patriarch of Antioch. The document of election, signed by both parties, was deposited with Eusebius. When Meletius, in his very first sermon, declared himself strongly in favor of the doctrine of theCouncil of Nice, the Arians induced the emperor to demand from Eusebius the surrender of the certificate of election. On his refusal he was threatened with, having his right hand cut off; but he resolutely held out both hands, declaring his readiness to lose both his hands rather than "resign a document containing so manifest a demonstration of the impiety of the Arians" (Theodoret, *Hist.* [2022]*Ecclesiastes* 2:32). During: the persecution of the orthodox by Valens, he traveled, disguised as a soldier, through Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, everywhere consecrating orthodox. priests, and confirming the people in the Nicene faith. At the disputed election of a bishop for Caesarea, in Cappadocia (370), he aided in securing the success of the orthodox Basil (q.v.). He ever after remained an intimate friend of Basil, and with him, in 372 and 373, took a leading part in the effort to secure, with, the support of the Western churches, the success of the Nicene party also in the East.

He was, therefore, a special object of hatred to the Arians, whom 373 prevailed upon the emperor to exile him to Thracia. After the death of Valens (378) Eusebius was allowed to return to his diocese. He at once began to display an extraordinary activity in appointing Nicene in the place of Arian bishops. While entering the town of Dolica for this purpose in 379 (or 380), he was killed by a stone thrown by the hand of some Arian woman (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 5:4). The Church of Rome venerates him as a saint on July 21, and the Greek Church on July 22.-Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:499; Ceiliier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Paris, 1865), 5:1 sq. (A.J.S.)

Eusebius

bishop of Thessalonica, A.D. 601, wrote against the *Aphthartodocetae*, especially in reply to a, monk Andreas, "who taught that Christ's body became incorruptible when joined to his divinity; that Adam's body was not created liable to corruption; and that the world, in its original form, was incorruptiblealso." These and other errors Eusebius wished him to retract; but, instead of prevailing, Andreas attempted to fortify his posts by farther defenses, which induced Eusebius to write ten books against the positions he had before attacked, showing that Andreas had misunderstood Scripture and willfully misquoted the fathers. Of these works there are no remains except what are preserved by Photius in his *Biblioth Cod.* 162. — Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), 1:373; Clarke, *Succ. Sac. Lit.* 2:376.

Eustathians

1. Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, was deposed at the Arian Council of A.D. 331. *SEE EUSTATHIUS*. The orthodox people of Antioch refused to receive an Arian bishop as his successor, and. kept aloof, thereby gaining the name "Eustathians.” In A.D. 360, Meletius (q.v.) was transferred by the Arians from the see of Sebaste to Antioch; but, though he adhered to the Nicene Creed, the "Eustathians" would not recognize him, as they refused to regard an Arian ordination. A moderate party, however, of the orthodox in Antioch did recognize him, and so arose. the opposition of the "Meletians" to the "Eustathians." The schism was made worse by the appointment of Paulinus (A.D. 362) as bishop of the Eustathians. The Western churches, with the Egyptian, recognized Paulinus, while the Orientals recognised Meletius. — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* Torrey's transl. 2:411; Guericke. *Ch. Hist.* Shedd's transl. § 85. *SEE MELETIUS*.

2. A sect in the fourth century, which taught that married people were excluded from salvation, prohibited their followers from praying in their houses, and' obliged them to quit all their possessions as incompatible with the hope of salvation. They wore a particular habit; appointed Sunday as a fast, and taught that the ordinary fasts of the Church are needless after people have attained to a certain degree of purity. The sect probably derived its name from Eustathius semi-Arian bishop of Sebaste (t 380), who was condemned in the Council of Gangra, in Paphlagonia, held between the years 326 and 341. But it has been strongly argued on the other hand that the Eustathius who founded the sect was a different person, an Armenian monk. Walch ([Hist. *d. Ketzereien,* in, 536) has treated the subject at large. — Murd. Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* book 2, c. 4, part 2, chapter 3, § 19, n. 39; Socrates, *H.E.* 2:43; Sozomen, *H.E.* 3:14; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:419; Dupin, *Hist. Eccl.* cent. 4; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 22, Ch. 1, § 8. *SEE EUSTATHIUS OF SEBASTE.*

Eustathius Of Antioch

was born at Sida, in Pamphylia (Hieron. Catal. 85). He was for some time bishop of Berea, from whence he was translated to the see of Antioch in 325 by the unanimous suffrage of clergy and people (Theodoret, *H.E.* 1:7). At the Council of Nice, in 325, he earnestly opposed the Arians, who, at the (Arian) Synod of Antioch, A.D. 331, took their revenge upon him. Eusebius of Nicomedia (or Cyrus of Berea) charged him with Sabellianism (Socrates, *H.E.* 1:24); but, according to Sozomen *(H.E.* 2:19), the pretext resorted to for his deposition was that he "had defiled the priesthood byunholydeeds." The synod deposed him, and the people of Antioch was stirred by the act almost to the point of sedition. This angered Constantine, who, moreover, was now, under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia, favorable to the Arians. Eustathius had also incurred the ill will of Eusebius of Caesarea, whom he charged with unfaithfulness to the Nicene Cread. He was banished to Thrace, where he died before A.D. 337 (Socrates, 1:24, 25; Sozomen, 1. c.). His innocence as to the charge of immorality was fully shown by the confession of the woman who had sworn against him. The orthodox people of Antioch refused to acknowledge any other bishop, and, so long as they remained in this separate condition (until the fifth century), they were called Eustathians (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* Torrey's, 2:411). Eustathius was a thorough opponent of the school of Origen, and this constituted one of the points of antagonism between him and Eusebius of Caesarea. He was a copious writer, but only one work of his known to be

genuine is now extant, viz. Κατὰ Ωριγένους διαγνωστικὸς εἰς τὸ τῆς ἐγγαστρομύθου θεώρημα, against Origen, on the subject of the Pythoness consulted by Saul. Origen had asserted that the witch of Endor had really brought up the spirit of Samuel; Eustathius refutes him with great acuteness, but also not without an unworthy disdain in replying to so great a man. This treatise is to be found at the end of Leo Allatius's edition of the *Hep*tcemeron (1629, 4to, improperly ascribed to Eustathius). It is also given in the *Critica Sacra,* 8:331 sq., and in *Bibl. Max. Patr.,* 17. There are fragments of a treatise of his on *The Soul,* and of his *Homilies;* all of which, withethe treatise against Origeme above named, are given in Migne, *Patrol. Grac.* 18:614 sq. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* aed. Harles, 9:131 sq.; Oudin, *Script. Eccl.*1:317 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacre's,* Paris, 1865, 3:168 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* Genev. 1720, 1:119; Lardner, Works, 4:149; Dorner, *Person of Christ,* Edinburgh transl., div. 1, volume 2, page 518 sq.

Eustathius Of Thessalonica,

one of the most learned bishops of the Greek Church in the Middle Ages, was a native of Constantinople. He was at first a monk, subsequently a deacon of the church of St. Sophia, and a teacher of eloquence. He also held a position at the court, having charge of all petitions, and in this capacity presented to the emperor a petition of the city of Constantinople on the occasion of a great scarcity of water. In this period of his life Eustathius compiled his celebrated commentaries on Greek classics, which give proof of an immense amount of reading, and are the more valuable as they contain many extracts from works which are now lost. It is especially the commentary on Homer (Rome, 1542-50, 4 volumes; Basel, 1559-60, 3 volumes; with register by Devarius, edited by Stallbaum, Leips. 1825-30, 6 volumes), which is a storehouse of learning. Of his commentary an Pindar, only the proaemium is now extant (published by Schneidewin, Gotting. 1837). In 1174 (or 1175) he was elected bishop of Myra, in Lycia, but before he had assumed the administration of this diocese the emperor appointed him metropolitan of Thessalonica. In 1180 when the emperor Manuel desired a mitigation of the formula of abjuration which the converts from Mohammedanism had to pronounce, Eustathius, at the synod, firmly opposed the emperor, who was greatly displeased with this opposition, but nevertheless remained a patron of Eustathius. When, in 1185, Thessalonica was conquered and plundered by the Normans under William II of Sicily, Eustathius was indefatigable in his efforts in behalf of

the city. His theological writings were for the first time published by Dr. Tafel *(Opusculae codd. Basil. Paris. Veneto, nune primum edidit* Th. L.F. Tafel, Francof. 1832; and with an Appendix, in Tafel *De Thessalonica,* Berlin, 1839). They are noted for outspoken evangelical sentiments. Of special importance in this respect is the work *Meditations on the Monastic State* (ἐπίσκεψις βίου μοναχικοῦ; transl. into German *Betrachtungen uber d. Monchsstand]* by G.L.F. Tafel, Berlin, 1847). Saune of his works, e.g. a commentary on John of Damascus, are still extant in MS. Eustathius died in Tlcessalonica about 1194. — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 4:247; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 3:771; Neander, *Karakteristik des Bustathius in seiner reformator. Richtung,* in Neander, *Tissenschaftliche Abhandl.* (Berlin, 1851). (A.J.S.)

Eustathius

semi-Arian bishop of Sebaste, in Armenia, in the fourth century, was a great advocate of monasticism, which he introduced into Armenia. The ascetic fanatics called Eustathians are supposed to have taken their name and their practices from him (but *SEE EUSTATHIANS*, 2). He also founded in Sebaste a hospital for the poor, over which he placed Aarius, then his devoted friend. But later Aarius charged him with avarice, and they quarreled. *SEE LERIANS.* Eustathius died about A.D. 380. — Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 2:43; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 3:14; Neander, *Church Hist.* Torrey's transl. 2:342; Hefele, *Concliengaeschichtea* 1:652 sq.

Eustochium Julia,

was born at Rome about A.D. 365. A daughter of Paula (q.v.), she imitated the ascetic piety of her mother. In 382 she took the vow of virginity, and put herself under the direction of Jerome, who gave her instructions relative to the life she had chosen. It was for her that he wrote (383) his treatise on *Virginity.* On his departure from Rome, Paula and Eustochium accompanied him, and settled near him in a monastery, near Bethlehem. After the death of Paula (404), Eustochium succeeded her as superior of the monastery. So greatly was she profited by Jerome's instructions that she gained a knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages. To her Jerome dedicated his Commentaries on Ezekiel and Isaiah. He translated also the rules of Pachomius into Latin for the use of the members of the monastery at Bethlehem. In 416 the Pelagians burned this monastery and outraged the inmates. She is celebrated as a saint in the Roman Church on

the 28th of September. — Hoefer, Nouv. *Biog. Genirale,* 16:792; Butler, *Lives of the Saints,* 9:775; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity* (N.Y. 1866), 3:234.

Euthalius

bishop of Sulce, 5th century, is supposed to have been the first to divide the N.T. into verses. Some of the poetical parts of the O.T. had been arranged. in lines (στίχοι), and Euthalius (A.D. 438) divided Paul's epistles into verses. Afterwards he so arranged Acts and the Catholic Epistles. The division into chapters had been made by a previous writer (A.D. 396), and Euthalius adopted it. Erasmus, In his N.T., inserts the Arguments of Euthalius to the Acts and to Paul's epistles. *His Prologue to St. Paul's Epistles,* including a sketch of Paul's life, was published by J.H. Bocclerus at the end of his N.T. (Argentor. 1645, 1660). All the remains of Euthalius are given by Zaccagni, *Call. Mton. Vat. Ecclesiastes Grac.* (Rome, 1698, 4to). — Horne, Introduction, part 1, chapter 2, § 3; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), 1.

Euthymius Zigabeinus

(or ZIGADENUS), a Greek monk and theologian of the 12th century. He lived in the time of the emperor Alexius Comnenus (about A.D. 1120), and was his intimate friend. Of his life little is known, except from the *Alexias* of Anna Comnena (lib. 15), who praises his talent and scholarship. The following writings of his have been pubished:,

1. Πανοπλία δογματική, *Panoplia Dossatica,* against all heresies, written by the order of Alexius Camnenus, and divided into two parts and 24 sections each treating of a heresy. It consists chiefly of digested extracts from preceding writers. A Latin translation of it was published by Zinus (Venice, 1555, fol.; reprinted at Lyons, 1556 and 1580, 8vo); also in *Bibl.* Patrum (Lyons), 19:This translation omits the 12th and 13th titles "against the Pope and the Italians." The Greek original was published at Tergovist, in Wallachia (1710, fol.), and is very rare. It omits the *last* title, which is contained in Sylburg's *Saracenica,* pages 1-54.

2. *Victoria et triumphus de sepia Massalianorum secta,* etc. (Victory and Triumph over the impious, manifold, and execrable sect of the Messalians, etc.), together with fourteen anathemas against them; edited, Gr., with

Latin version and notes, by Tollius, in his *Insignia Itineris Italici* (Traject. ad Rhen. 1696, 4to); also in Gahlandii *Bibl. Patr.* 14:293.

3. *Commentarius in Psalmos (Commentary* on *all the Psalms of David);* Latin version by Saulus (Verona, 1530, fol.; often reprinted); also (Gr. and Lat.) in *Theophylacti Opera Omnia,* volume 4 (Venet. 1763, fol.).

4. A *Commentary on the four Gospels,* his most important work compiled from St. Chrysostom and other fathers; Latin version by J. Hentenius (Louvain, 1544, fol.; Paris, 1547, 1560, and 1602, 8vo); best edit. by C.F. Mattheei, Gr. and Lat. (Lips. 1792, 4 volumes). The work is still considered one of great value. See Matthasei's preface for full notices of Euthymius, and for the judgments of the learned concerning his writings. Many of his writings yet remain in MS. All his published works are given in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca,* volumes 128-131, Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, ed. Harles, 8:328 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720), 1:567; Oudin, *Script. Eccl.* 2:979; Lardner, Works, v. 164; Ullmann, in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, page 647 sq.

Eutyches

the so-called founder of Eutychianism, though the opinions advocated by him existed before (see Selig, *De Eutychianismo ante Eutychen).* His name Eutychas means *"the Fortunate,* but his opponents said he should rather have been named *Atyches, the Unfortunate.* He must not be confounded with the deacon Eutyches, who attended Cyril to the Council of Ephesus. Leo the Great, in his renowned letter to Flavian, calls him very ignorant and unskilled, Multum imprudens et nimis imperitus, and justly attributes his error rather to imperitia than to versutia. So also Petavius and Hefele (2:300). His relation to the Alexandrian Christology is like that of Nestorius to the Ametiochian; that is, he drew it to a head, brought it to popular expression, and adhered obstinately to it; but he is considerably inferior to Nestorius in talent and learning. His connection with this controversy is in a great measure accidental" (Schaff, *Hist. of Christ. Church,* 3:736). He led, from his early age, an ascetic life; was for thirty years archimacandrite of a monastery near Constantinople, and had reached his 70th year without being known for anything except his illiterate fanaticism his intimate relations with the all powerful Chrysaphius, minister of Theodosius, and his influence with the monastic party which blindly followed the lead of Cyril of Alexandria. He used his influence in favor of

Cyril at the OEcumenical Council of Ephesus, a copy of the minutes of which was sent to him by Cyril. After the death of Cyril he was on intimate terms with Cyril's successor, Dioscurus (q.v.). In 448 Eutyches wrote a letter to the Roman bishop Leo to prejudice him against the school of Antioch (q.v.), which, he insinuated, was bent on reviving Nestorianism. To counteract his operations, patriarch Domnus, of Antioch, in 448 charged Eutkyches with renewing the heresy of Apollinaris. No notice seems to have been taken at the imperial court of this charge; but the charges brought against him before the Synod of Constantinople (448) by his former friend Eusebius, bishop of Dorylasum (q.v.), had more effect. Patriarch Flavian, of Constantinople (q.v.) wished to avoid taking any decisive action, but Eusebius prevailed upon the synod to summon Eutyches. The latter, after making several excuses, obeyed the third summons, and presented himself before the synod, attended by a large number of monks and imperial officers. He defended his views in a long speech, but the synod, largely consisting of adherents of the Antioch school, found him guilty of heresy, and, in spite of all the secular pressure brought to bear upon them in favor of Eutyches, deprived him of his position of archimandrite, and excommunicated him. Eutyches, with the aid of his friend Chrysaphius, obtained from the emperor a revision of the trial by a new general council to be convoked at Ephesus. Flavian and Leo of Rome strenuously opposed the holding of the council. Leo, who had been written to by both parties, was encouraged by this circumstance to claim a right to decide the controversy, and for this purpose wrote the celebrated epistle to Flavian (Mansi, 5:1366 sq.) See the article *SEE CHALCEDON*; and *SEE LEO*. But, owing to the influence of Eutyches and Dioscurus of Alexandria, the council was held, under the presidency of Dioscurus, and, amidst scenes of unheard of violence, which have given to the council the name of the Robber Council, the bishops were compelled to restore Eutyches to the Church and his former position, and to condemn the prominent men of the Antioch school. *SEE EPHESUS, ROBBER-COUNCIL OF*. The emperor promptly sanctioned this decision, and thus Eutychianism was on the point of becoming the predominant doctrine of the Eastern Church, when the death of Theodosius (450) gave a new turn to the controversy. The empress Puleheria and her husband Marcian sympathized with the opponents of Eutyches, recalled the exiled bishops. and convened the OEcumenical Council of Chaleed (which condemned the views held by Eutyches, and declared that "in Christ two distinct natures are united in one person, and that without any change, mixture, or

confusion." *SEE CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF*. Even before the meeting of the council Eutyches had again been excommunicated by patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, and expelled from his monastery by Marcian. The council did not again condemn him by, name. Of the last years of Eutyches we only know that he died in exile. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:251; Baur, Lehre *voss d. Dreieinagkeit,* 1:800; Neander, Church *History* (Torrey's), 3:501-505; Dorner, *Person of Christ,* div. 2, volume 1 and 2; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford), 3:411, 481, (A.J.S.)

Eutychianism

the name of a doctrinal system called after Eutyches, according to which there was in Christ only one nature, that of the incarnate Word, his human nature having been absorbed in a manner by his divine nature. Eutyches, like Cyril, laid chief stress on the divine in Christ, and denied that two natures could be spoken of after the incarnation. In our Lord, after his birth, he worshipped only one nature, the nature of God become flesh and man: μίαν φύσιν προσκυνεῖν, καὶ ταύτην Θεοῦ σαρκωθέντος καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος, or, as he declared before the synod at Constantinople, Ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐνήσεως: μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ (Mansi, 6:744). In behalf of his view he appealed to the Scriptures, to Athanasius and Cyril, and to the Council of Ephesus in 431. The impersonal human nature is assimilated, and, as it were, deified by the personal Logos, so that his body is by no means of the same substance (ὁμοούσιον) with ours, but a divine body. All human attributes are transferred to the one subject, the humanized Logos. Hence it may and must be said, God is born, God suffered, God was crucified and died. He asserted, therefore, on the one hand, the capability of suffering and death in the Logos-personality, and, on the other hand, the deification of the human in Christ. The other side imputed to Eutychianism the doctrine of a heavenly body, or of an apparent body, or of the transformation of the Logos into flesh. So Theodoret *(Fab. haer.* 4:13). Eutyches said Christ had a σῶμα ἀνθρώπου, but not a σῶμα ἀνθρώπινον and he denied the consubstantiality of his *acrop* with ours. Yet he expressly guarded himself against Docetism, and against all speculation: Φυσιολογεῖν ἐμαυτῷ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω. He was really neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but only insisted on some theological opinions and points of doctrine with great tenacity and obstinacy" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* 3:737 sq.).

Bishop Forbes cites Photius and Johannes Damascenus aptly on Eutychianism as follows, viz.: "If there be one nature in Christ, it is either the divine or the human nature; if it be only the divine nature, where is the human? and if there be only the human, you cannot escape from denying the divine. But if it be something different from these (for this is the only other alternative they have, and they seem to lean that way), how shall not in that case Christ be of a different nature, both from his Father and from us? Can anything be more impious or absurd to say that the Word of God, who is God, became man, to the corruption of his own deity, and to the annihilation of the humanity he assumed? For this absolutely follows with those who have dared to speak of Christ as of neither nature, but of one besides these" (Photius, *Epist.* 1, *cont. Eutych. cit. Suicer).* "The two natures were without conversion or alteration joined together, and the divine nature did not depart from its own simplicity, nor did the nature of man turn into the nature of God, nor was it deprived of existence, nor was one composite nature made out of two; for a composite nature cannot be consubstantial with either of those natures from whence it is compounded. If, therefore, according to the heretics, Christ exist in one compounded nature after the union, he is changed from a simple into a compounded nature, and is not consubstantial with his Father, who is of a simple nature, nor with his mother, for she is not made up of the Godhead and manhood. And he will be neither in the Godhead nor in the manhood, nor will he be called God or man, but Christ only; and Christ will be the name not of his person, but of his own nature, as they deem. But we do not hold Christ to be of a composite nature, as the body and soul make the man, but we believe and confess that he is of the Godhead and manhood; perfect God and perfect man from and in two natures. Were he of one nature, the same nature would be at once created and increate, simple and composite, mortal and immortal. And the union of two natures in Jesus Christ has taken place neither by disorder (φυομός) nor by mixture (syncrasis or anacrasis), as Eutyches, Dioscorus (of Alexandria), and Severus say; neither is it personal (προσωπικόν) nor relative, nor κατ' ἀξίαν, nor from identity of will, nor from equality of honor, nor from the same name, as Nestorius, Diodorus (of Tarsus), and Theodorus (of Mopsuestia) said; but by synthesis; or personally (καθ ὑπόστασιν), immutably, inconfusedly, unalterably, inherently, inseparably, in two perfect natures in one person. And we term this union essential (ούσιώδη), that is, true and not fantastic; essential, not in that one nature is made of the two, but that they are mutually united in truth into one composite person of the Son of

God. And their substantial differences are preserved, for that which is created remains created, and that which is increate remains increate; the mortal remains mortal, the immortal abides immortal. The one shines forth in miracles, the other submits to injuries; and the Word appropriates to itself that which is of man, For its are the things that pertain to the Sacred Flesh, and it gives its own properties to the flesh, .according to the law of the communication of properties and the unity of person, for he is the same who performs both the God-like and the manlike actions in either form with the communion of the other. Wherefore the Lord of glory is said to be crucified, although the divine nature did not suffer, and the Son of man, even before his passion, is confessed to be in heaven, as the Lord himself said (John 3). For there is one and the same Lord of glory, who is naturally and in truth the Son of man, that is, made man. We acknowledge both his miracles and his sufferings, though the first were performed according to one nature, the latter endured according to the other. Thus we know that his one person and his two natures are preserved. By the difference of the natures he is, on the one hand, one with the Father and the Holy Ghost; on the other hand, he is one with his mother and with us. And these two natures are joined in one composite person, in which he differs as from the Father and the Holy Ghost, so from his mother and us also" (Joh. Damascenus, *Fid. Orth.* 3:3, abr.). Bishop Forbes adds: “Now we have all a great tendency to Eutychianism. It gets over a great difficulty in the reception of truth to believe the humanity of our Lord destroyed. For faith now requires of us to believe that the human body of Jesus Christ still is, and that to it the Word is hypostatically joined, and that beyond the spheres and systems of which we are cognizant, it, partaking of our nature, is at the right hand of God" *(On the Nicene Creed,* Oxford, 1852, page 201 sq.).

The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) adopted the doctrine stated by pope Leo in his letter to Flavianus, *SEE LEO*, viz. in substance, "that in Christ two distinct natures were united in one person, without any change, mixture, or confusion." The Creed of Chalcedon states that "the one Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with us according to the manhood — like to us in all things except sin; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, in two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without division, without separation — the difference of the natures not being taken away by reason of the unity, but the propriety of each being preserved and joined together to form one person." The creed of the

council was not by any means universally received in the East. But the name Eutychianism gave way to that of Monophysitism. The ecclesiastical organizations adhering to the heresy are commonly known by the names of Jacobites, Armenian Church, Copts, and Abyssinian Church (see the special articles on these churches). For a sketch of the fortunes of the theory known as Eutychianism, *SEE MONOPHYSITES*. *SEE CHALCEDON*; *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*; *SEE EUTTYCHES*; *SEE DIOSCUROS*; and consult Pearson, On *the Creed* (Oxford, 1820), 2:179 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. History,* 1.c.; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford), 3:115, 411; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* 2:249 et al.; Baur, *Dogmengeschichte,* 1:2, 256 sq.; Cunningham, *Historical Theology,* chapter 10, § 1.

Eutychianus

pope and martyr, succeeded Felix I, bishop of Rome, January 275; died as martyr or confessor December 8, 283. Some decretals are ascribed to him, which may be found in Migne's ed. of the remains of *Sixti Pap,:* et al. *(Patrol. Latina,* volume 5).

Eutychius Of Constantinople

"was originally a monk of the town of Amaseia, whence he was sent by his fellow-citizens to Constantinople as proxy for their bishop. The great talent he displayed in some theological controversy gained him general admiration, and the emperor, in A.D. 553, raised him to the highest dignity in the Church at Constantinople. In the same year he accordingly presided at an oecumenical synod which was held in that city. In A.D. 564 he incurred the anger of the emperor Justinian by refusing to give his assent to a decree respecting the incorruptibility of the body of Christ previous to his resurrection, and was expelled from his see in consequence. He was at first confined in a monastery, then transported to an island, Princepo, and at last to his original convent, Amaseia. In 578 the emperor Tiberius restored him to his see, which he henceforth retained until his death in 585, at the age of 73. There is extant by him a letter addressed to pope Vigilius on the occasion of his elevation in A.D. 553. It is printed in Greek and Latin among the *Acta Synodi quintce Concil.* v. 425, etc. He also wrote some other treatises, which, however, are lost" (Smith, *Dict. of Biography,* s.v.). — Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:38; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* (Genev. 1720) 1:341.

Eutychius

patriarch of Alexandria, was born at Fostat (ancient Cairo) in 876. His Arabic name was *Said-ibn-Batrik.* He was originally a physician, applied himself to the study of theology towards the close of his life, and was elected Melchite (or orthodox) patriarch of Alexandria in 933, and died about A.D. 946. He wrote, in Arabic, a *Chronicle* or *Annals* from the creation of the world to A.D. 937, under the Arabic title *Nathm-el-Gauhar, String of Pearls;* translated and edited by E. Pococke under the title *Contextio Gemmarum, sive Annales,* Arab. et Lat. (Oxonii. 1658-59, some copies 1656-64, 2 volumes, 4to): — *Fragmenta duo de Paschate, et de SS. Eucharistice institutione* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* 9:623). Selden published an extract under the title *Ecclesie sure origines, ex Arabico cum vers. Lat.* (Lond. 1642, 4to), to which Abraham Ecchelensis replied in *Eutychius Vindicatus, sive Responsio ad J. Seldeni Origines* (Romans 1661, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 16:810; Graesse, *Tresor de Livres Rares,* 1:530.

Eu'tychus

(Εὔτυχος, *of good fortune,* a frequent name; see Josephus, Ant. 18:6, 5; 19:4, 4), a young man of Troas, who sat in the open window of the third floor while Paul was preaching late in the night, and who, being overcome by sleep, fell out into the court below, May, A.D. 55. He was "taken up dead" (ἦρθη νεκρός); but the apostle, going down, extended himself upon the body and embraced it, like the prophets of old (1 Kings 17:21; 2 Kings 4:34); and when he felt the signs of returning life, restored him to his friends, with the assurance that "his life was in him." Before Paul departed in the morning the youth was brought to him alive and well (Acts 20:5-12). All the intimations of the narrative forbid. us for a moment to entertain the view of those critics who suppose that animation was merely suspended (Bloomfield, Hackett, in loc.). *SEE PAUL.*

Mr. Jowett states that, during his residence at Haivali in May, 1818, the house in which he abode gave him a correct idea of the falling of Eutychus from the upper loft while Paul was preaching at Troas. "According to our idea of houses," he remarks, "the scene of Eutychus's falling from the upper loft is very far from intelligible; and besides this, the circumstance of preaching generally leaves on the mind of cursory readers the notion of a church. To describe this house, which is not many miles distant from the

Troad, and perhaps, from the unchanging character of Oriental customs, nearly resembles the houses then built, will fully illustrate the narrative. On entering my host's door, we find the ground floor entirely used as a store; it is filled with large barrels of oil, the produce of the rich country for many miles round; this space, so far from being habitable, is sometimes so dirty with the dripping of the oil that it is difficult to pick out a clean footing from the door to the first step of the staircase. On ascending, we find the first floor, consisting of a humble suite of rooms, not very high; these are occupied by the family for their daily use. It is on the next story that all their expense is lavished; here my courteous host has appointed my lodging; beautiful curtains, and mats, and cushions to the divan, display the respect with which they mean to receive their guest; here, likewise, their splendor, being at the top of the house, is enjoyed by the poor Greeks with more retirement and less chance of molestation from the intrusion of the Turks; here, when the professors of the college waited upon me to pay their respects, they were received in ceremony and sat at the window. The room is both higher and also larger than those below; it has two projecting windows; and the whole floor is so much extended in front beyond the lower part of the building, that the projecting windows considerably overhang the street. In such an upper room — secluded, spacious, commodious — Paul was invited to preach his parting discourse. The divan; or raised seat, with mats or cushions, encircles the interior of each projecting window; and I have remarked, that when the company is numerous, they sometimes place large cushions behind the company seated on the divan, so that a second tier of company, with their feet upon the seat of the divan, are sitting behind, higher than the front row. Eutychus, thus sitting, would be on a level with the open window, and, being overcome with sleep, he would easily fall out from the third loft of the house into the street, and be almost certain, from such a height, to lose his life. Thither Paul went down, and comforted the alarmed company by bringing up Eutychus alive. It is noted that there were many lights in the upper chamber. The very great plenty of oil in this neighborhood would enable them to afford many lamps; the heat of these and so much company would cause the drowsiness of Eutychus at that late hour, and be the occasion likewise of the windows being open." *SEE HOUSE*.

Evagrius Ponticus

(Εὐάγριος), monk and ascetic writer, was born at Iberis, on the Black Sea, about A.D. 345. He was made deacon by Gregory of Nyssa or

Gregory of Nazianzum, and received his theological culture to some extent under the latter, who took him to Constantinople in 379 or 380, and made him archdeacon. In the Origenistic controversies he took the side of Origen. After some experience of the dangers of personal beauty and vanity, he renounced the world, assumed the monastic garb, and departed for Egypt in 383 or 384, where he lived as an ascetic up to the day of his death in (probably) 399. Socrates speaks very highly (*H.E.* 4:23) of his character and writings, of which there remain, 1. Μοναχός (in Cotelerius, *Mon. Groc.* 3:68): — 2. Ἀντιῤῥητικός (in Pallad. *Vita Chrysost.* page 349): — 3. *Rerum Monachalium rationes;* and a few other tracts, collected in Galland. *Bibl. Patrol.* 7:553; also in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* 40:1219 sq. See Tillemont, *Memoires,* 10:368; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 3:7; 4:23; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 6:30; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* Anno 380.

Evagrius Scholasticus

the Church historian, was probably born at Epiphaneia, on the Orontes, in or about A.D. 536, and had a good education. He lived in Antioch, where he was a lawyer *(scholasticus),* whence his surname. He rendered essential service to the patriarch Gregory, whom he defended (against charges of adultery and incest) at a synod in Constantinople, A.D. 589. He was made *quaestorian,* as a reward for his professional skill, by the emperor Tiberius. Evagrius wrote *An Ecclesiastical History,* in continuation, of Eusebius and Theodoret, which extends from the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, to the twelfth year of the reign of the emperor Maurice, A.D. 5934. He is credulous and superstitious, but orthodox. The best edition, Gr. and Lat., is that of Valesius (Henri de Valois), which includes Eusebius and the other early Greek ecclesiastical historians (Par. 1659-73, fol.; reprinted, with some additional "variorum" notes, under the title *Eccl. Scriptores cun not/s Valesi et Reading,* Cantab. 1720, 3 volumes); also in Migne, *Patrol. Graca,* volume 79; translated into English, *A History of the Church, with an account of the Author and his Writings,* trans. by Meredith Hanmer, in Bagster's *Eccl. Histori*ans (Lond. 6 volumes, 8vo); and in Bohn's *Ecclesiastes Library* (Lond. 1851, 12mo); into German by REssler, in his *Bibl. d. K/rcheavdter,* volume 7 (1775, 8vo). — Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Grceca,* ed. Harles, 9:284 sq.; Hoffmann, *Bibliog. Lexikon,* 2:37; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* 3:882.

Evangeliarium

SEE EVANGELISTARY.

Evangelical

appertaining to, or *characteristic of, the Gospel.*

(1.) The term "has been applied to a portion of the English Church who either profess, or are supposed to know and inculcate the *Gospel* in an especial manner, and to give peculiar prominence to the doctrine of salvation by faith in the atonement. It is probably true that among this portion of the Church of England many, but not all maintain the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism; and there may have been a time when (in the opinion of some) lower views of the sacraments and of Church authority prevailed among them than what are generally received among other members of that Church. Very many persons lament the use of this term, and consider that, like all party appellations, it tends to perpetuate division in the Church; accordingly, they desire that it should be disused as a party term, and carefully confined to its original meaning" (Eden).

(2.) In Prussia, the United Established Church (since 1817) has been called the "Evangelical Church." *SEE PRUSSIA AND UNITED EVANGELICAL CHURCH.*

(3.) In England and America the term "evangelical" is frequently used to distinguish those churches which believe in the divinity of Christ and the atonement from those that do not.

Evangelical Alliance

is the name of an association of Christians belonging to the denominations collectively called Evangelical, and having for its object to represent the unity of these churches in all the more important articles of faith, notwithstanding their separation by external organization. The Alliance originated in Great Britain, and the rupture in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland seems to have greatly contributed to its establishment. On August 5, 1845, a number of persons belonging to different denominations drew up a, proposal of closer union. The advantages promised by such a movement were at once appreciated in England, and an assembly was convoked at Liverpool October 1, 1845, which was in session three days, and at which were present 216 persons, representing 20 different religious

societies. The first General Assembly of the Evangelical Alliance was held in Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen Street, London, and lasted from August 19 to September 2, 1846; 921 Christians from all parts of the world took part in its 26 sessions; among them were 47 from the European continent, and 87 from America and other parts. Among them we find the names of Dr. Barth, of Calvin. Wiirtemberg Dr. Baird, of New York; Reverend Dr. Bonnet, of Frankfort on the Maine (editor of the letters of Calvin); Dr. Buchanan, of Glasgow; Dr. Cunningham, of Edinburgh; William Jones, president of the Tract Society; Dr. Marriott, of Basel; the missionary Mogling, of Mangalur; the missionary inspector (subsequently superintendent general), Dr. Hoffmann; Reverend Adolphe Tonod (then in Montauban); Reverend Dr. Oneken, of Hamburg; Reverend Dr. Panchaud of Brussels; Reverend Baptist Noel, of London; and Dr. Tholuck, of Halle. Some fifty different denominations were represented, some of which, however as the reformed churches of France and Geneva, and the Lutheran churches of North America and Witrtemberg, differed only on local points. Some colored preachers also took part in the proceedings. Sir Culling Eardley (q.v.) was chosen as chairman, and remained the head of the Alliance until his death. The platform was clearly and unanimously defined: the Evangelical Alliance is not to be a union of the different denominations, neither is it its aim to bring about such as its result; its object is only to promote Christian feelings, loving, friendly intercourse between the different denominations, and an effective cooperation in the efforts to repulse the common enemies and dangers. As the means of effecting this purpose, it advocates, not a sort of official or semi-official representative assembly of the different denominations, but rather the union of individuals. It is to be a Christian union, not a Church union; one in which a number of earnest, faithful Christians of the different denominations may join. Being a union of Christians, not of churches, the doors of the Evangelical Alliance are open to all who admit the fundamental principles of Christianity, without inquiring into the minutiae of their particular confessions. It only asks its members to accept (whether because or in spite of their particular confession does not matter) the fundamental principles and doctrines of the Gospel. This naturally led to a definition of these fundamental principles, the admission of which should be considered the basis of the Alliance. On the motion being made by Dr. Edward Bickersteth, the following nine articles' were, after mature deliberation, received as the fundamental principles of the Evangelical Alliance:

"The parties composing the Alliance shall be such parties only as hold and maintain what are usually understood to be evangelical views in regard to the matter of doctrines understated, namely:

1. The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures.

2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

3. The unity of the Godhead, and the trinity of persons therein.

4. The utter depravity of human. nature in consequence of the Fall.

5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners and mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign.

6. The justification of the sinners by faith alone.

7. The work of the Holy Spirit. in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

These principles were embodied in a document entitled *Societatis Evangelicae constitutionis et statutorum expositio brevis.* The members bind themselves to pray zealously for the Holy Spirit to descend upon all believers, and to employ jointly the morning of the first weekday as a season of prayer, as also the first week of each year; as also to use Christian circumspection in their speech and writings when touching, on points of difference. The Alliance was organized on the 2d of September. They organized a series of seven branch associations: 1. Great Britain and Ireland; 2. United States of North America; 3. France, Belgium, and the French portion of Switzerland; 4. Northern Germany; 5. South Germany, and the German portion of Switzerland; 6. British North America; 7.West Indies. These branch associations Went into actual operation afterwards. The Alliance spread in France, Switzerland, and Belgium, without agreement with its definition of the evangelical treed being insisted on. It

met with much opposition in Germany from the Lutherans, who did not find the creed sufficiently explicit on certain points, and from the disciples of Scbleiermacher, who disapproved of some of the articles. A *second assembly* was held in Paris in 1855 on the occasion of the World's Exhibition. The *third meeting* was held in Berlin in 1857. The ("Confessional") Lutherans became more determined in their opposition, while the evangelical party of Germany, though approving of the general scope of the Alliance, deemed it inexpedient to insist on the acceptance of the nine principles as a condition of membership. This meeting was largely attended, delegates from Macao, Africa, and Australia being present, and brought the Alliance more prominently before the churches of Continental Europe. *The fourth meeting* was held at Geneva in 1860. It was successful, notwithstanding the declension of the Genevan National Church to sympathize with its objects. Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland; Dr. Baird, of the United States; Monod, Pressense, and Gasparin, of France; Krummacher and Dorner, of Germany; Groen van Prinsterer, of Holland; and Merle d'Aubigne, of Switzerland, were among the most prominent and active members. The fifth meeting was to have been held at Amsterdam in 1866, but was postponed on account of the prevalence of the cholera at, the appointed time till 1867. The fifth *General Conference* actually took place at Amsterdam on August 18, 1867, and was largely attended. There were delegates from France, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, the United States, the British American provinces, Italy, Spain, Sweden, and Eastern countries. Baron Van Wassenaar Catwijk presided. Among the more prominent delegates were Dr. Krummacher, Prof. Herzog, Dr. Tholuck, and Prof. Lange, of Germany; Pasteur Bersiea, Dr. de Pressense, and Prof. St. Hilaire, of France; Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland; John Pye Smith, archdeacon Philpot, and S. Gurney, M.P., of England; Merle d'Aubigne, of Switzerland; the Reverend Dr. Prime, of the United States, and many others. The opening sermon was preached by Prof. Van Oosterzee. Among the subjects discussed were the religious condition of the Church of England, the Scottish churches, the connection of missions with civilization, Christianity, and literature; and art and science; the methods of operating missions; the religious condition of Germany, France, Holland, Belgiuma, and Italy; evangelical nonconformity; Christianity and the nationalities; and various subjects of theology and philosophy. Interesting reports were received of the progress of religious liberty in Turkey, and of the thraldorn of opinion in Spain. The observance of the Sabbath received especial consideration, resulting in the adoption of a resolution calling

upon the members of the Alliance to use in their several places of abode and spheres of influence earnest endeavors to secure from states, municipalities, and masters of establishments, from every one, the weekly day of rest from labor, "in order that all may freely and fully participate in the temporal And spiritual benefits of the Lord's day." A letter of affection and sympathy was adopted to Christians scattered abroad, particularly to those who are laboring against the hostile influences of heathenism or of superstition, and whose rights. of public worship are restrained or abridged. A protest against war was adopted. Special meetings were held on Sunday-schools And systematic benevolence. A series of meetings for the poor were held in one of the mission-rooms of the city with wholesome effect, and two temperance meetings. The. assembly adjourned on Tuesday, August 27.

The Evangelical Alliance of the United States was organized in New York city on January 30, 1867. Eminent divines and laymen of the Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, German Reformed Reformed, and Baptist churches, and from various parts of the country, signified their approval of the movement either by attendance in person or by letter. A letter of cooperation was read from the secretary of the British branch of the Alliance. The Hon. William E Dodge was elected president of the American branch. At a meeting held in New York November 12,1868, it was resolved to convene a new General Conference of the. Evangelical Alliance in the city of New York in the autumn of 1869. The British branch only of the national branches has been in the practice of holding annual meetings.

"Among the results already attained by the Alliance as incidental and secondary to its great object may be mentioned, The supply of an obvious want, namely, the existence of an organized body with and. by whom correspondence and cooperation may be easily and effectually carried on between Christians in different parts of the world, and which may greatly aid in uniting Christians in this country separated by ecclesiastical differences and other causes; the holding of conferences of Christians from all parts of the world, for devotion and mutual consultation, in London, Paris, Berlin, and other cities; aiding in the revival of religion both at home and abroad; the convening of very many meetings for united prayer forthe outpouring of the Spirit, and in reference to passing events of importance; the communication of much information as to the religious condition of Christendom; the encouragement of Christians exposed to trials and

difficulties by the expression of sympathy, and in several instances by eliciting pecuniary aid; sucessful interference on behalf of Christians and others when persecuted in Roman Catholic and Mohammedan countries; the mitigation or removal of the persecution of Protestants by their fellow-Protestants in Germany and elsewhere; the presentation of memorials to the sovereigns of Europe, including the sultan himself; on behalf of liberty of conscience for Mussulmen;the encouragement and assistance of the friends of pure evangelical doctrine in all Protestant countries in their struggle with Rationalism or infidelity; the uniting of evangelical Christians in different countries for fraternal intercourse and for mutual protection; opposition, in common with other bodies, to the progress of popery; the resistance of projects which would: tend to the desecration of the Lord's-day; the origination and extensive circulation of prize essays on the Sabbath, and on Popery and infidelity; and the origination of societies established on the principle of united action among evangelical Christians, such as, the Turkish Missions Aid Society, the Continental Committee for Religious Liberty, Christian Vernacular Education Society for India, and German Aid Society. Although these practical results are thus referred to, yet it is to be understood that, even if no. such secondary objects had been accomplished or attempted, the great value of the Alliance would still! remain in its adaptation to promote and manifest union! among Christians. The preceding is from an authoritative statement made by the Alliance" (Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia,* s.v.). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* page 270; Schem, *American Ecclesiastical Almanac for* 1868; the full reports of the General Assemblies of the Alliance; Dr. Massie, *The Evangelical AIliance, its* Origin and *Development* (Lond. John Snow 1847); L. Bonnet, *L'unite de l'esprit par le lieu de la paix; Lettres sur l'alliance evangelique* (Paris, Delay, 1847); *Ans. and For. Ch.* Union, September 1856, page 269; December 1856, page 367; *Princeton Rev.* October 1846. (A.J.S.)

Evangelical Association

an ecclesiastical body which took its rise in the year 1800, in the eastern part of Pennsylvania, and resulted from an organization into classes and congregations of the disciples of Reverend Jacob Albright, a native of Eastern Pennsylvania, who, being impressed by the general decline of religious life, and the corruption of doctrines and morals that prevailed in the German churches in that portion of country, undertook, about 1790, to work a reform among them. The effect of his first labors encouraged him

to travel through a great part of the country at his own expense, preaching the Gospel as he had opportunity in churches, schools, private houses, on public roads, etc. Although he commenced his labors without any ulterior design of forming a distinct ecclesiastical organization, yet he son found it necessary to unite his converts, scattered over several counties, into small societies for mutual support and sympathy. At a meeting called for the purpose of consulting upon the best measures to be adopted for the furtherance of a cause in which they all felt a deep interest, the assembly, without regard to the teachings of High-Churchism respecting a valid ministry, unanimously elected and ordained Mr. Albright as their pastor or bishop, authorizing him to exercise all the functions of the ministerial office over them, and declared the Bible to be their rule of faith and practice. This organization, incomplete at first, was soon after considerably improved by the adoption of a creed and rules for Church government. In course of time, as laborers increased and the society spread, annual conferences were held; and in 1816, sixteen years after the first organization of the Church, a general conference was held, for the first time, in Union County, Pennsylvania, which consisted of all the elders in the ministry. Since 1843 a general conference, composed of delegates elected by the annual conferences from among their elders, has held quadrennial sessions. For the first thirty years of its existence the society struggled against violent opposition; but during its later years it has made rapid progress, so that it now (1888) comprises 14 annual conferences, and 1123 itinerant and 634 local preachers, whose field of labor extends over the Northern, Western, and Pacific states, and into Canada and Europe.. The membership approximates 139,000, all adults; the number of churches is 1836 and parsonages 2572, valued together at $4,872,500; Sunday-schools 2348, and scholars 162,837; catechetical classes, exclusive of those connected with Sunday-schools, 341, with 3559 catechumefins. In the year 1838 a missionary society was formed, which has up to this time supported about 600 home missions, most of which are now self-supporting stations, circuits, or even conferences. At present this society supports 542 missions in America and Europe. For a number of years it has been gathering funds for heathen missions,, and has entered Japan with success. There is also a Sunday-school and tract society in operation, publishing Sunday-school books and religious tracts. A charitable society was founded in the year 1835, which has received funds amounting to a considerable sum, by bequests, the interest of which is annually applied to the support of the widows and orphans of poor itinerant preachers. There are also church-

building societies established in several conferences. The Northwestern College, a flourishing institution of learning located at Naperville, Illinois, has been founded, and is supported by the Western conferences of the Church, and an endowment is being collected which now amounts to $100,000. Several seminaries are also patronized by the Church. An orphan institution, favorably located at Flat Rock, Ohio, has been founded within a few years, and is in successful operation. A prosperous publishing-house at Cleveland, Ohio, issues four periodicals: one, its German organ, *Der Christliche Botschafter,* a large weekly, and the oldest German religious paper published in America; another, its English organ, *The Evagelical Messenger,* also a weekly; and the third and fourth, *Der Christicche Kinderfreund,* and the *Sunday-school Messenger,* are monthly juvenile papers, intended chiefly for Sunday-schools. The weekly papers have together a circulation of 25,000, and the juveniles 30,000. Perhaps no other religious denomination in America is better organized and disciplined for work than the Evangelical Association. In doctrine and theology this Church is Arminian; with regard to sanctification, Wesleyan; but generally holds the essential doctrines of the Gospel as they are held in common by the evangelical churches of the land, with all of whom it aims to cultivate a fraternal spirits The ministry is divided into two orders, deacons and elders; and, faithful to the principles and examples of their founder, they practice itinerancy. The highest permanent order is the eldership; for, although the society has its bishops (elected by General Conference) and presiding elders (elected by the individual conferences), yet these, to be continued, must be reelected every four years; and if not re-elected they hold no higher rank or privilege than an elder. The General Conference meets every four years, and constitutes the highest legislative and judicial authority recognized in the Church; then come the annual and quarterly conferences, whose transactions are mostly of an executive and practical nature for the promotion of the work. In its mode of worship and usages the Evangelical Association is Methodistic; and preaching, originally in German, is now largely in English (R.Y.)

The denomination is at present greatly divided. In October 1891, two rival general conferences were held, one in Indianapolis, the other in Philadelphia, each of which elected different bishops and other officers. This led to protracted litigation, which has not yet been fully settled.

The following statistics are gathered from the United States census of 1890, but do not include the conferences in Canada, Germany, Switzerland, and Japan.

Evangelical Church Conference

the name of periodical meetings of delegates of the Protestant state churches of Germany. The object of these meetings is, to have a free exchange of opinion on important questions of ecclesiastical life, to furnish a bond of union for the several Protestant state churches of Germany, and: to advance their harmonious development. The impulse to meetings of this kind proceeded, in 1815, from king Wilhelm of Wirtemberg. Invitations to a conference were issued conjointly by Prussia and Wurtemberg to the governments of South Germany, and by Prussia. and Hanover to the governments of Northern Germany. At the first conference, which met at Berlin in 1846, the Church boards of all the German states except Austria, Bavaria, Oldenburg, and the FreeCities were represented. This meeting was secret, and the proceedings have never been officially published. It is known, however, that they concerned the periodical holding of conferences of this kind, confessions, liturgy, and Church constitution. The second meeting was to have been held at Stuttgardt in 1848, but did not take place, in consequence of the disturbances caused by the revolution. At the Church diets (q.v.) of Stuttgardt (1850) and Elberfeld (1851), ecclesiastical officers of several countries deliberated on the resumption of the official Church conferences, and suggested the establishment of a central organ, which was to contain the decrees of all the supreme Church boards of the German States. Accordingly, the conference met ,again at Eisenach in June 1852, and in the same year an official central organ of the German Church governments was established at Stuttgardt *(Allgem. Kirchenblatt fur das evangel. Deutschland).* Since then the conference has met always at Eisenach, in 1855, 1857, 1859, 1861, 1863, 1865, and 1868. One of the first results of the conferences was a compilation of 150 of the best German Protestant hymns *(Kernlieder),* which was recommended to the several states as a proper basis of, or appendix to, the hymn-books of the several churches. In 1855 some resolutions concerning the treatment of sects by the state churches were unanimously adopted. These resolutions declared against the principle of full religious liberty, but recommended that the members 'of sects be allowed to contract valid civil marriages. The same conference adopted resolutions in behalf of a better observance of Sunday; of giving to congregations the right of cooperation *(votum*

negativum) in the appointment of ecclesiastical officers, and of introducing special liturgical devotions during the week of Passion. The conference of 1857 held important discussions on the revival of Church discipline, on reforms in the legislation concerning divorces, and on Christian burial. Among the results of the later meetings of the conference were the following: The introduction of a prayer for the German fatherland, to be used every Sunday in every Protestant church; resolutions on Church patronage, on liturgical, matters, on the examinations of theological students, on catechization, on the revision of the Lutheran Bible, on the best' way of collecting the statistics of the German Lutheran Church, on the construction of evangelical churches, on the State-Church system, etc. An account of each meeting of the conference since 1855 is given in Matthes, *Allgem. Kirchliche Chronik;* see also Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 4:273.

Evangelical Counsels

SEE CONSILIA EVANGELICA.

Evangelical Union

"the name assumed by a religious body constituted in Scotland in 1843 by the Reverend James Morison, of Kilmarnock, and other ministers, whose doctrinal views had been condemned in the United Secession Church, to which they previously belonged, and the congregations adhering to them. They were soon afterwards joined by a number of ministers and congregations of similar views previously connected with the Congregational Union or Independents of Scotland, and have, since extended themselves considerably in Scotland and the north of England. Their doctrinal views are those which, from the name of Mr. Morison, have now become known in Scotland as *Morisonian. SEE MORISONIANISM*. Their church government is Independent, but in some of the congregations originally Presbyterian the office of the eldership is retained. A notable practice of this denomination is the very frequent advertising of sermons and their subjects." In 1851 the Union had in Scotland 28 places of worship, with 10,319 sittings.

Evangelist

(εὐαγγελιστής), the name of an order or body of men included in the constitution of the Apostolical Church (q.v.). The term is applied in the New Testament to a certain class of Christian teachers who were not fixed

to any particular spot, but traveled either independently, or under the direction of one or other of the apostles, for the purpose of propagating the Gospel. The absence of any detailed account of the organization and practical working of the Church of the first century leaves us in some uncertainty as to their functions and position. The meaning of the name, "The publishers of glad tidings," seems common to the work of the Christian ministry generally, yet in <49411>Ephesians 4:11 the "evangelists" appear, on the one hand, after the "apostles" and "prophets;" on the other, before the "pastors" and "teachers" (thus: αὐτὸς ἔδωκε τοὺς μὲν αποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους). Assuming that the apostles here, whether limited to the twelve or not, are those who were looked upon as the special delegates and representatives of Christ, and therefore higher than all others in their authority, and that the prophets were men speaking under the immediate impulse of the Spirit words that were mighty in their effects on men's hearts and consciences, it would follow that the evangelists had a function subordinate to theirs, yet more conspicuous; and so far higher than that, of the pastors who watched over a church that had been founded, and of the teachers who carried on the work of systematic instruction. This passage, accordingly, would lead us to think of them as standing between the two other groups sent forth as missionary preachers of the Gospel by the first, and as such preparing the way for the labors of the second. The same inference would seem to follow the occurrence of the word as applied to Philip in <42118>Acts 21:18. He had been one of those who had gone everywhere "preaching" (εὐαγγελιζόμενοι) the word (<44804>Acts 8:4), now in one city, now in another (<44840>Acts 8:40); but he has not the power or authority of an apostle, does not speak as a prophet himself, though the gift of prophecy belongs to his four daughters (<42109>Acts 21:9), and he exercises apparently no pastoral superintendence over any portion of the flock. The omission of evangelists in the list of 1 Corinthians 12 may be explained on the hypothesis that the nature of Paul's argument led him there to speak of the settled organization of a given local Church, which of course presupposed the work of the missionary preacher as already accomplished, while the train of thought in <49411>Ephesians 4:11 brought before his mind all who were in any way instrumental in building up the Church universal. It follows, from what has been said, that the calling of the evangelist is expressed by the word κηρύσσειν, "preach," rather than διδάσκειν, "teach," or παρακαλεῖν, "exhort;" it is the proclamation of the glad tidings to those who have not known them, rather

than the instruction and pastoral care of those who have believed and been baptized. This is also what we gather from <550402>2 Timothy 4:2, 5. Timotheus is "to preach the word;" in doing this he is to fulfill " the work of an evangelist." It follows, also, that the name denotes a work rather than an *order.* The evangelist might or might not be a bishop-elder or a deacon. The apostles, so far as they evangelized (<440825>Acts 8:25; 14:7; <461017>1 Corinthians 1:17), might claim the title, though there were many evangelists who were not apostles. The brother "whose praise was in the Gospel", (<470818>2 Corinthians 8:18) may be looked upon as one of Paul's companions in this work, and probably known by the same name, in short, the itinerant and temporary character of their calling chiefly serves to distinguish them from the other classes of Christian laborers. In this, as in other points connected with the organization of the. Church in the apostolic age, but little information is to be gained from later writers. The name was no longer explained by the presence of those to whom it had been specially applied, and it came to be variously interpreted. Theodoret (on <490411>Ephesians 4:11) describes the evangelists (as they have been described above) as traveling missionaries. Chrysostom, as men who preached the Gospel; but without going everywhere (μὴ περιΐοντες πανταχοῦ); by which he probably denotes a restricted sphere to their labors, in contrast with the world-wide commission of the apostles. The account given by Eusebius *(Hist.* <210303>*Ecclesiastes* 3:37), though somewhat rhetorical and vague, gives prominence to the idea of itinerant missionary preaching. Referring to the state of the Church in the time of Trajan, he says, "Many of the disciples of that time, whose souls the divine word had inspired with an ardent love of philosophy, first fulfilled our Savior's precept by distributing their substance among the poor. Then traveling abroad, they performed the work of evangelists (ἔργον ἐπετέλουν Εὐαγγελιστῶν), being ambitious to preach Christ, and deliver the Scripture of the divine Gospels. Having laid the foundations of the faith in foreign nations, they appointed other pastors (ποιμένας το καθιστάντες ἑτέρους), to whom they entrusted the cultivation of the parts they had recently occupied, while they proceeded to other countries and nations." One clause of this description indicates a change in the work, which before long affected the meaning of the name. If the Gospel was a written book, and the office of the evangelists was to read .or distribute it, then the writers of such books were κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν The evangelists. It is thus, accordingly, that Eusebius *(Hist.* <210303>*Ecclesiastes* 3:39) speaks of them, though the old meaning of the word (as in *Hist. Eccl.* 5:10, where he

applies it to Pantaenus) is not forgotten by him. Soon this meaning so overshadowed the old that OEcumenius (Estius on <40411>Ephesians 4:11) has no other notion of the evangelists than as those who have written a Gospel (compare Harless on <40411>Ephesians 4:11). Augustine, though commonly using the word in this sense, at times remembers its earlier signification *(Sermoni* 99 and 246). Ambrosianus (Estius, *1.c.)* identifies them with deacons. In later liturgical language the work was applied to the reader of the Gospel for the day (comp. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity,* book 78:7, 9). In modern phraseology the term is almost exclusively applied to the writers of the canonical Gospels (q.v.). *See Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History,* 1:148150; Neander's *History of the Planting of the Christian Church,* 1:173; Middelboc, *De evangelistis ecclesice apostolica* (Hafn. 1779); Schaff, *Apostolical Church, §* 131.

Evangelistarium

(Book of the Gospels), the name given in the earlier ages to a volume containing the portions appointed to be read from the Gospels. If the four Gospels complete were contained in the book, it was called *Evangelistarium Plenarium. — Proc*ter, *Common Prayer,* page 9; Siegel, *Alterthumer,* 3:249. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE*.

Evangelium AEternum

(Everlasting Gospel), the name given to a book published in the 13th century (A.D. 1254), which was properly entitled *Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum,* probably written by the Franciscan Gerhardus. The idea of a new "everlasting Gospel" was one of the peculiar notions of Joachim of Floris (t 1202), who attacked the corruptions of the Church, and predicted an approaching renovation. *SEE JOACHIM OF FLORIS*. These predictions were appropriated by the Franciscans as really referring to the rise and character of their order, which was founded by Francis of Assisi six years after Joachim's death. An apocalyptic party arose among the Franciscans, which seems to have been led by Gerhardus, and by Johannes of Parma (q.v.). The *Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum* seems to have been chiefly made up from three of the writings of Joachim, viz. *Concordia Veter, et Nov. Test.; Psalt. decem Chordareum;* and *Apocalypsis nova.* It set forth Joachim's doctrine of the "dispensations" *(status)* of the Church, the last of which, the dispensation of the Spirit, was to be opened about A.D. 1200. The movement was a new form of

Montanism. "Many vague notions were entertained about the Eternal Gospel of the Franciscans, arising from superficial views, or a superficial understanding of Joachim's writings, and the offspring of mere rumor of the heresy-hunting spirit. Men spoke of the Eternal Gospel as of a book composed under this title, and circulated among the Franciscans. Occasionally, also, this Eternal Gospel was confounded perhaps with the above-mentioned *Introductorius.* In reality, there was no book existing under this title of the Eternal Gospel, but all that is said about it relates simply to the writings of Joachim. The opponents of the Franciscan order objected to the preachers of the Eternal Gospel, that, according to their teaching, Christianity was but a transient thing, and a new, more perfect religion, the absolute form, destined to endure forever, was to succeed it. William of St. Amour *(De periculis novissimorum temporum*, page 38) says: 'For the past fifty-five years some have been striving to substitute in place of the Gospel of Christ another gospel, which is said to be a more perfect one, which they call the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, or the Everlasting Gospel;' whence it is manifest that the anti-Christian doctrine would even now be preached from the pulpits if there were not still something that *withholdeth* (<530206>2 Thessalonians 2:6), namely, the power of the pope and the bishops. It is said in that accursed book, which they called the Everlasting Gospel, which had already been made known in the Church, that the Everlasting Gospel is as much superior to the Gospel of Christ as the sun is to the moon in brightness, the kernel to the shell in value. The kingdom of the Church, or the Gospel of Christ, was to last only till the year '1260.' In a sermon, St. Amour points out the following as doctrines of the Everlasting Gospel: that the sacrament of the Church is nothing; that a new law of life was to be given, and a new constitution of the Church introduced; and he labors to show that, on the contrary, the form of the hierarchy under which the Church then subsisted was one resting on the divine order, and altogether necessary and immutable" (Neander, *Church Hist.* 4:619). The *Introductorius* has not come down to us, but its contents are partly known from a writing of Hugo of Caro, preserved in Quetif and Echard, *Script. Ord. Prcedic.* 1:202 sq., and partly from extracts given by the inquisitor Nicolas Eymeric, in his *Directorium Inquisitoriunm,* part 2, qu. 9, No. 4. The theologians of Paris attacked the book upon its first appearance, and it was formally condemned by Alexander IV, A.D. 1255. — Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's transl.), 4:618; Engelhardt *Kircheng. Abhandlungen* (Erlangen, 1832); Engelhardt in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:275; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* per. 3, § 70.

Evans, Caleb

D.D., son of the Reverend Hugh Evans, was born at Bristol about the year 1737, and was educated at the Homerton Academy. In 1767 he became colleague to his father as pastor of the church, and tutor in the academy at Broadmead. In 1770 he originated "The Bristol Education Society," to supply the dissenting congregations, and especially the Baptist, with able and evangelical ministers, as well as missionaries for propagating the Gospel in the world. From this time to the period of his death, August 9, 1791, Dr. Evans continued to discharge the duties of president of the society. He published an *Answer to Dr. Priestley's Appeal, and* a small volume entitled *Christ Crucified,* or the *Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement* (Bristol, 1789, sm. 8vo), besides occasional sermons. On the breaking out of the American War he advocated the freedom of the colonies, and wrote *A Letter to John Wesley, in reply to his Calm Address to the American Colonies* (London, 1775, 12mo); also a *Reply to Fletcher's Vindication of Wesley's Address* (Bristol, 1776, 12mo). — Jones, *Christian Biography*, page 144; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* s.v.

Evans, Christmas

an eloquent Welsh preacher, was born December 25, 1766, at Llandyssul, Cardiganshire. His father was poor, and he had no school education. At seventeen he was converted, and joined the Baptist Church. He then first learned to read the Welsh, Bible, and soon after began to exhort. His first settlement as a preacher was at Lleyn; two years after he went to Anglesea to labor as an evangelist at ten preaching places, on a salary at first of £17 a year. He died at Swansea, July 20, 1838. He early showed oratorical powers, but in Anglesea he began to be a wonder. For a series of years he made preaching tours through. South Wales, and the memory of his sermons remains to this day. The following sketch of one of these sermons is given by his biographer, the Reverend D. M. Evans: "In the midst of a general hum and restlessness the preacher had read for his text, 'And you that were some time alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblamable, and unreproachable in his sight.' His first movements were stiff, awkward, and wrestling, while his observations were perhaps crude and commonplace rather than striking or novel; but he had not proceeded far before, having thus prepared himself, he took one of his wildest flights, bursting forth at the same time into those unmelodious

but all-piercing shrieks under which his hearers often confessed his resistless power. Closer and closer draw in the scattered groups, the weary loungers, and the hitherto listless among the motley multitude. The crowd becomes dense with eager listeners as they press on insensibly towards the preacher. He gradually gets into the thickening plot of his homely but dramatic representation, while, all forgetful of the spot on which they stood old men and women, accustomed to prosy thoughts and ways, look up with open mouth through smiles and tears. Big burly country folk, in whom it might have been thought that the faculty of imagination had long since, been extinguished became: engrossed with ideal scenes. Men ‘whose talk is of bullocks' are allured into converse with the most spiritual realities. The preachers present become dazzled with the brilliance of this new star on the horizon; they start on their feet round the strange young man, look hard at him in perfect amazement; loud and rapturous confirmations break forth from their lips: 'Amen,' 'Ben digedig,' 'Diolch byth,' fall tumultuously on the ear; the charm swells onwards from the platform to the extreme margin of the wondering crowd, and to the occasional loud laugh there has now succeeded the baptism of tears. The excitement is at its highest; the preacher concludes, but the weeping and rejoicing continue till worn out nature brings the scene to an end." His chief qualities as a preacher "include passion, or ardent excited feeling, a dramatic imagination, and grotesque humor. The published scraps of sermons which remain, and have been translated into English, illustrate these qualities, and almost only *these." — (Christian Spectator* (Lond.) September 1863, reprinted in *The Theolog. Eclectic,* 1:147; Evans *Memoir of Christmas Evians* (1862); Stephen, *Life of Christians Evans* (London, 1847); *Sermons of C. Evans with Memoir by Jas. Cross* (Phila. 1854, 8vo).

Evans, John

D.D., an eminent Nonconformist divine, was born in 1680, at Wrexham, in Denbighshire. His father was minister of Wrexham. The son was first placed under the care of Mr. Thomas Rowe, near London, and studied afterwards at the seminary of Mr. Timothy Joule. He was ordained and settled at Wrexham, August 18, 1702. "Dr. Daniel Williams, of London, hearing that Mr. Evans was invited to Dublin, to prevent his leaving England sent for him to the metropolis, where he first assisted the doctor, afterwards became co-pastor, and at length succeeded him at his death. In the Arian controversy he refused to subscribe to any articles, but maintained the orthodox sentiments.” In the public services of the

dissenters he was often called to preside, and was appointed to assist in completing Matthew Henry's Commentary, of which he supplied the notes on the Epistles to the Romans so well, that Dr. Doddridgea says, 'The exposition of the Romans, begun by Henry, and finished by Dr. Evans, is the best I ever saw.' He was for some years preparing to write a history of nonconformity from the Reformation to the civil wars, but, by his death, the work devolved on Mr. Neal. He died May 16, 1730." Besides a number of separate sermons, he published *Discourses concerning the Christian* Temper, 38 *Sermons* (4th ed. London, 1737, 2 volumes, 8vo), *with Life by John Erskine* (1825, 8vo), which are called by Dr. Watts "the most complete summary of those duties which make up the Christian life," and by Doddridge "the best practical pieces in our language." See Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters,* 2:364; Jones, *Christian Biography,* page 143; Skeats, *Free Churches of England* (London, 1868, 8vo), page 249.

Evanison, Edward

a minister of the Church of England, was born at Warrington, Lancashire, in 1731, and was educated at Emanuel College, Cainbridge, where he passed M.A. in 1753. In 1768 he became, vicar of South Mimms; in 1770, rector of Tewkesbury. He soon began to manifest doubts about the Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. For a sermon preached in 1771 he was prosecuted. In 1778 he resigned his preferments in the Church, and retired to Mitcham, where he kept a school. He died September 25, 1805. Among his writings are, On *the Observance of Sunday* (Spawich, 1792)

The Dissonance of the four Evangelists, and their Authority (Gloucester, 1805, 8vo). In this work Evanson rejects all the Gospels but Mark, and also, Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, James, Peter, John, and Jude. It was refuted by Falconer, *Bamptone Lectures,* 1810.

Evaristus

bishop of Rome, is said to have been born at Bethlehem, and to have succeeded Clement as bishop of Rome about A.D. 100. He is said to have first organized Rome into parishes, and to have fallen a martyr A.D. 109.

Evarts Jeremiah,

secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, was born in Sunderland, Vermont, February 3, 1781, and graduated at

Yale College in 1802. He studied law, and practiced it at New Haven up to 1810, when he removed to Charlestown in order to edit *The Panoplist*, which he continued up to 1820. In 1811 he entered the service of the American Board as treasurer. He continued in that work, first as treasurer, then as secretary (in 1821), during the rest of his life. In 1820 *The Panoplist* was discontinued, and the publication of *The Missionary Herald* was begun by the American Board, with Mr. Evearts as its editor. He died in Charleston, South Carolina (whither he, had gone for the benefit of his health), May 10, 1831. The Reports of the Board during his connection with it were generally from his pen, and that of 1830, the last which he wrote, is a document of great power. His essays, under the signature of William Penn, on the rights and claims of the Indians, were published in 1829. See Tracy, Memoirs *of Jeremiah Evarts* (Boston, 1845); *Christian Review,* 11:20; *Spirit of Pilgrims,* 4:599.

Eve

(Hebrews *Chavvah',* hW;j ¡ life or *living,* so called as the progenitor of all the human family; Sept. accordingly translates Ζωή in Genesis 3:20, elsewhere Εὔα, N. Test. Ε υα, Josephus Εὐέα, Ant. 1:1, 2, 4), the name given by Adam to the first woman, his wife (Genesis 3:20; 4:1). B.C. 4172. The account of her creation is found at Genesis 2:21, 22. It is supposed that she was created on the sixth day, after Adam had' reviewed the animals. Upon the failure of a companion suitable for Adam among the creatures which were brought to him to be named, the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon him, and took one of his ribs (according to the Targum of Jonathan, the thirteenth from the right side!), which he fashioned into a woman, and brought her to the man (comp. Plato, *Sympos.* pages 189, 191). The Almighty, by declaring that "it was not good for man to be alone," and by providing for him a suitable companion, gave the divine sanction to marriage and to *monogamy*. "This companion was taken from his side," remarks an old commentator, " to signify that he was to be dear unto him as his own flesh. Not from his head, lest she should rule over him; nor from his feet, lest he should tyrannize over her; but from his side, to denote that species of equality which is to subsist in the marriage state" (Matthew Henry, *Comment.* in loc.). Perhaps that which is chiefly adumbrated by it is the foundation upon which the union between man and wife is built, viz. identity of nature and oneness of origin. Through the subtlety of the serpent (q.v.), Eve was beguiled into a violation of the

one commandment which had been imposed upon her and Adam. She took of the fruit of the forbidden tree and gave it her husband (comp. <47 11 03>2 Corinthians 11:3; <54 02 13>1 Timothy 2:13). *SEE ADAM*. The apostle seems to intimate (<54 02 14>1 Timothy 2:14, 15) that she was less aware than her husband of the character of her sin; and that the pangs of maternity were to be in some sort an expiation of her offense. The different aspects under which Eve regarded her mission as a mother are seen in the names of her sons. At the birth of the first she said "I have gotten a man from the Lord," or, as some have rashly rendered it, “I have gotten a man; *even* the Lord," mistaking him for the Redeemer. When the second was born, finding her hopes frustrated, she named him Abel, or *vanity*. When his brother had slain him, and she again bare a son, she called his name Seth, and the joy of a mother seemed to outweigh the sense of the vanity of life: "For God," said she, "hath appointed ME another seed instead of Abel, for Cain slew him." *SEE ABEL*.

The Eastern people have paid honors to Adam and Eve as to saints, and have some curious traditions concerning them (see D'Herbelot, *Bibliothieque Orientale,* s.v. Havah; Fabricius, *Pseudepigr. V. Test.* 1:103 sq.). There is a remarkable tradition preserved among the Rabbis that Eve was not the first wife of Adam, but that previous to her creation one had been created in the same way, which, they sagaciously observe, accounts for the number of a man's ribs being equal on each side. *Lilith,* or *Lilis,* for this was the name of Adam's first consort, fell from her state of innocence without tempting, or, at all events, without successfully tempting her husband. She was immediately ranked among the fallen angels, and has ever since, according to the same tradition, exercised an inveterate hatred against all women and children. Up to a very late period she was held in great dread lest she should destroy male children previous to circumcision, after which her power over them ceased. When that rite was solemnized, those who were present were in the habit of pronouncing, with a loud voice, the names of Adam and Eve, and a command to Lilith to depart (see Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum,* 2:421). She has been compared with the *Pandora* of classic fable (Bauer, *Mythol.* 1:96 sq.; Buttmann, *Mythologus,* 1:48 sq.; Hasse, *Entdeckung.* 1:232).

See Olnmsted, *Our First Mother* (N.Y. 1852); Reineccius, *De Adamo androgyno* (Weissenf. 1725); Thilo, *Filius matris viventium in virum Jehovam* (Erlangen, 1748); Kocher, *Comment. philol. ad* <01 02 18>*Genesis* 2:18-

20 (Jen. 1779); Schulthess, *Exeget. theolog. Forschungen,* 1:421 sq.; Bastard, *Doctrine of Geneva,* 2:61; Hughes, *Female Characters,* page 1.

Evelyn John,

was born October 31, 1620, at his father's seat of Wotton, in Surrey. He was educated at Baliol College, Oxford, served a short time as a volunteer in the Low Countries, and returned at the breaking out of the Civil War to rejoin the king's forces; but, on the king's defeat at Gloucester, he left England, and during the rest of the troubles he traveled in France and Italy. In 1652 he returned to England, and on the restoration he took an honorable part in public business. He died February 27, 1706. He was one of the original members of the Royal Society, and a frequent contributor to its transactions. His most valuable work was *Sylva, or a Discourse on Forest Trees.* His *Diary* (not published till 1818) is exceedingly useful for the knowledge it conveys of the times in which Evelyn lived. The *Diary and Correspondence* has lately been re-edited, with much new matter (Lond. 1850-52, 4 volumes, 8vo). His *History of Religion, a rational. Account of the true Religion,* was also first published from the MS. in 1850 by the Rev. N. M. Evanson (London, 2 volumes, 8vo); and in 1848 his *Life of Mrs. Godolphin* (from MSS.) was published by bishop Wilberforce. — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* s.v.

Evening

(b r ,[, *e'reb, e dusk;* ἑσπέρα, ὀψία), the period following sunset, with which the Jewish day (νυχθήμερον) began (<01005>Genesis 1:5; <41335>Mark 13:35). *SEE DAY*. Some writers have argued that the first creative day (<01005>Genesis 1:5) is reckoned from the *morning,* when light first appeared (verse 3), as if "evening" then designated not a *portion* of time, but a *termination* of the first creative period or age; but this does violence to the whole order of the narrative, in which a period of night invariably precedes one of daylight, precisely in accordance with the conventional Hebrew usage of a νυχθήμερον or "evening-and-morning," and as the terms are expressly defined in the former clause of verse 5. If "evening" in the phrase in question be distinguishable from the "night" as a terminus, it is certainly a *terminus a quo,* as dating the latter from the aboriginal "darkness," verse 2, and not a *terminus ad quem* of the ensuing day. *SEE NIGHT.*

The Hebrews appear to have reckoned *two* evenings in each day; as in the phrase µyBir][iˆyBe, *between* the *two evenings* (Exodus 16:12; 30:8), by which they designated that part of the day in which the paschal lamb was to be killed (Exodus 12:6; Leviticus 23:5; Numbers 9:3, 5; in the Hebrews and margin); and, at the same time, the evening sacrifice was offered, the lamps lighted, and the incense burned (Exodus 29:39, 41; Numbers 28:4). But the ancients themselves disagreed concerning this usage; for the Samaritans and Caraites (comp. Reland, *De Samarit.* § 22, in his *Diss. Miscell* volume 2; Trigland, *De Karaeis,* chap. iv) understood the time to be that between sunset and twilight, and so Aben Esra at Exodus 12:6, who writes that it was about the third hour (9 o'clock P.M.); the Pharisees, on the other hand, as early as the time of Josephus *(War,* 6:9, 3), and the Rabbins *(Pesach,* 5:3), thought that "the *first* evening" was that period of the afternoon when the sun is verging towards setting (Gr. δείλη πρωΐα), "the *second* evening" the precise moment of sunset itself (δείλη ὀψία), according to which opinion the paschal lamb would bed slaughtered from the ninth to the eleventh hour (3 to 5 o'clock P.M.). The former of these opinions seems preferable on account of the expression in Deuteronomy 16:6, "when the sun goeth down," vm,Vˆhi a/boB; and also on account of the similar phraseology among the Arabs (Borhaneddin, *Enchiridion Studiosi, 8:*36, ed. Caspin, Lips. 1838; *Kamus,* page 1917; on the contrary, see Pococke, *Ad Carmen Tograi,* page 71; Talmud Hieros. *Berach.* chapter 1; Babyl. *Sabb.* 2:346, fol.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:634, Lips.). *SEE PASSOVER.*

Evening Sacrifice

SEE DAILY OFFERING.

Even-Song

the form of divine service appointed to be "said or sung" in the evening of each day in the Church of England, the expression "sung" meaning not an intonation of the voice, where the service is otherwise professedly read, but the chanting of the service, as in cathedrals. — Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary,* s.v.

Everett Joseph,

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Queen Anne's Co., Maryland, June 17, 1732; was converted in the time of Whitefield, under the preaching of the Presbyterians (then called "New Lights"), in June, 1763, but soon lost his religion, and remained in sin until in 1778 or 1779 he was reclaimed through Asbury's preaching. In 1780 he entered the itinerant ministry, and labored as pastor and presiding elder with great unction and success until 1804, when he became superannuated, and died in Dorchester, Maryland, October 16, 1809, having preached Christ earnestly for thirty years, and been instrumental in the salvation of many souls. He was a preacher "mighty through God," and died in great triumph. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1:179; also Autobiographical Sketch in the Arminian *Magazine*, volume 2; Sprague, Annals, 7:71; Stevens, *Hist. M.E. Church.* (G.L.T.)

Everlasting

SEE ETERNAL.

Everlasting Gospel

SEE EVANGELIUM AETERNUM.

Eves, or Vigils

the nights or evenings before certain holy days of the Church. In the primitive times, it was the custom for Christians to pass great part of the nights that preceded certain holydays in religious exercises; these, from their being performed in the night-time, were called vigils or watchings. One of the most remarkable in the early Church was the Easter vigil. According to the testimony of Lactantius and Jerome, the early Christians expected the second coming of Christ on this night, and prepared themselves, by fasting, prayer, and other spiritual exercises, for that great event. The illuminations on these vigils were often splendid. The night-watchings, in all probability, owed their origin to the necessity under which the primitive Christians lay of meeeting by night when the occasion ceased, the custom still continued. These night-meetings came to be much abused. Vigilantius, in the 4th century, strongly inveighed against them on the ground of their being injurious to the morals of young persons. He was opposed in this view by Jerome. Complaints, however, continued to

increase, till at length the custom was abolished. The fasts, however, were retained, keeping the former name of vigils. The Church of England has assigned vigils to several of her festivals, but has prescribed no other observance of them than the reading. of the collect peculiar to the festival. The holydays which have vigils may be seen in the English Prayer-book, in the table of the vigils, fasts, and days of abstinence to be observed in the year. There are no vigils recognized in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the table of vigils being left out by the revisers. TheMethodist Episcopal Church observes one vigil in the year, the Watch-night, December 31, in which service is kept up until midnight. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 8, chapter 10, § 1; 13:111, 4; Eden, *Churchman's Dict.* s.v.

E'vi

(Hebrews *Evi'*, יְוִי, *desire* or *dwelling;* Sept. Εὐεί, Εὐίν), one of the five kings ("dukes") of the Midianites (near Sihon) slain by the Israelites in the war arising out of the idolatry of Baal-peor, induced by the suggestion of Balaam (Numbers 31:8), and whose lands were afterwards allotted to Reuben (Joshua 13:21). *SEE MIDIAN.*

Evidence

I. Evidence is the rendering in the A.V. of רְפֵסֶ, *seapher,* a *book* (as usually rendered), or writing (q.v.) generally, hence a document of title, i.e., *deed* or *bill of sale* (Jeremiah 32:10, 117 14, 44); ἔλεγχος, *proof* (Hebrews 11:1; "reproof," 2 Timothy 3:16, i.e., conviction).

II. Evidence is defined by Blackstone "to signify that which demonstrates, makes clear, or ascertains the truth of the very fact or point in issue, either on the one side or the other" *(Comm.* 3:23). "*Intuitive evidence* comprehends all first truths, or principles of common sense, as 'every change implies the operation of a cause;' axioms in science, as 'things equal to the same thing are equal to one another;' and the evidence of consciousness, whether by sense, or memory, or thought, as when we touch, or remember, or know, or feel anything. Evidence of this kind arises directly from the presence or contemplation of the object, and gives knowledge without any effort upon our parts. *Deductive evidence* is distinguished as demonstrative and probable. *Demonstrative evidence* rests upon axioms, or first truths, from which, by ratiocination, we attain to other truths. It is scientific, and leads to certainty. It admits not of degrees;

and it is impossible to conceive the contrary of the truth which it establishes. *Probable evidence* has reference, not to necessary, but contingent truth. It admits of degrees, and is derived from various sources; e.g., experience, analogy, and testimony" (Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy,* s.v.).

The Scotch school of metaphysics presents the doctrine of evidence as follows: "The theory of evidence was not unknown to Aristotle and the ancient writers, but it is chiefly to the researches of modern logicians, from Bacon downwards, that we are indebted for a complete exposition of it. The grounds on which we believe a statement to be either true or false are termed the evidence. These grounds, it is obvious, may vary in kind as well as in degree. Some truths are capable of being established with undoubted certainty; others, again, admit of a proof more or less strong. It is of great importance, therefore, to know by what kind of evidence any fact or statement can be supported, and thus we may readily ascertain to what extent our belief in it may be carried. The two great classes into which all kinds of evidence are usually reduced are. intuitive and *deductive,* the former calling for immediate and irresistible belief, independently of any process of argumentation whatever; the latter requiring for its proof various consecutive steps of reasoning. Some writers are in the habit of dividing evidence into three classes: intuitive — deductive, and. demonstrative, and the evidence of testimony. Under intuitive evidence, which commands instant and irresistible belief, are generally included, besides those *priori* truths which are necessarily involved in an act of consciousness, the evidence of sense, of memory, and of axioms or general principles. 'It is well, however, to bear in mind that consciousness and intuitive evidence are convertible terms, and that is in no sense entitled to be considered as resting on intuitive evidence which is not involved in an act of consciousness. This view of the subject no doubt limits the number of intuitive, and therefore dogmatically certain truths; sufficient, however, remains to establish a sure foundation for all future reasonings of every kind. And this is all that ought to be desired. Those truths only are entitled tom be ranked as intuitions which we cannot deny without involving ourselves in an obvious contradiction. What is essentially necessary to the operation of our intellectual and moral nature is intuitive. We cannot think, for example, without being subjected to the influence of the evidence of consciousness. To these, then, in so far as man is concerned, dogmatical certainty belongs. He cannot doubt their truth without disclaiming the

nature with which he has been endowed. The evidence of intuition, or consciousness, is certain in itself, but from its truths no other truths can be deduced. Hence the distinction drawn between this and all the other species of evidence, which are classed under one head, termed deductive. Deductive evidence, or that which is chiefly available in the evolution of unknown from known truths, is usually distinguished into two kinds, demonstrative and moral, or probable evidence, giving rise to a corresponding distinction in modes of reasoning. It is of great importance that the difference between demonstrative and probable evidence be kept constantly in view, that we may be prevented from confounding two species of truth so completely distinct from one another. The evidence of demonstration applies to necessary, moral or probable evidence to contingent truth. The great mass of objects upon which our judgment and reasonings are exercised rests upon probable evidence. Demonstrative evidence is very limited in the range of its application, extending no farther than to the relations of number and quantity, which are capable of being expressed in language so strictly definite as to admit of no misunderstanding or mistake. On the strict definition of terms rests the whole certainty of mathematical truth, which is not an absolute, therefore, but a hypothetical certainty; and to the great mass of phenomena, and events with which we are familiarly, conversant, such a mode of reasoning would be altogether inapplicable. The language employed is too vague and ambiguous to admit of strict definition; and such is the imperfection of language that, however desirable it might be to have words used in, a fixed meaning, it is impracticable. The idea has, no doubt, been entertained of reducing words, expressive of our views on general subjects, to a fixed and certain signification; and even the illustrious names of Leibnitz and Locke are found in connection with such a plan, and yet we fear the experience of all past ages must pronounce it utopian. However advantageous, indeed, such a plan in some respects might be, it is very doubtful whether it might not so fetter and constrain the mind that no scope would be given for the exercise of those powers which the labor required in procuring probable evidence summons into action his very injurious to the mind to entertain too strong a partiality for one species of evidence rather than another. We thereby lose sight of the important fact that the same kind of evidence is not equally applicable in all cases, and that therefore we ought only to require such evidences as the particular circumstances of the case admit. Instead, therefore, of being dissatisfied with the kind of evidence adduced, it ought to be' our chief inquiry whether, in any given case, we have

obtained the strongest evidence of that kind which is applicable." On the distinction between probable and demonstrative evidence, see Butler, *Analogy of Religion* (Introduction). See also Gardner, *Christian (Encyklopaedia* page 352; Bergier, *Dict. de Theologei,* 2:534; Brown, On *Cause and Effect,* notes E, F; Abercrombie, *On Intellectual Powers,* part 2; Starkie, On *Evidence,* 1:471; Gambier, On *Moral, Evidence* (London, 1824, 8vo).; Locke, *Essay,* book 4, chapter 15. Evidences of Christianity, the title generally given by English writers to the proofs of the divine origin of the Christian revelation. This branch of theology does not include demonstrations of the being of God against the atheists, but is directed against all who deny the divine authority of Christianity and of the Scriptures on which it rests. The term *Apologetics* has been adopted in Germanv for the name of this science, and under that title and that of *Apology* we have given an account of the forms which the proofs and defences of Christianity have assumed in the various periods of Church history. In this article we give (I.) a summary of the evidences as they are commonly stated by English writers; (II.) a summary of the views held by different writers as to the relative value of the several branches of evidence.

I. *Summary of Christian* Evidences. — The evidences of Christianity are usually classed by English writers under three heads — External, Internal, and Collateral. The External evidences are those which demonstrate the authenticity, credibility and divine authority of the Scriptures, including the arguments from miracles and prophecy. The Internal evidence is drawn from the excellence and beneficial tendency of the doctrines and morals of Scripture, from the character of Christ, and froan the marks of integrity, consistency, and inspiration which are inherent in the record. The Collateral evidence is drawm from the history of Christianity itself, from its marvellous diffusion, its effects upon human nature, upon the progress of society, and upon what is generally called civilization. One of the best sketches of the evidences, according to: this classification of them, is that given by Watson (Institutes, volume 1). Preliminary to a consideration of these direct evidences, he gives an excellent sketch of the *presumptive* evidence, of which the following is a brief outline. Man is universally admitted, by all who admit the being of God, to be a moral and, responsible agent, under the dominion of the law of God. But deists assert that this law is given in nature sufficiently, and that. revelation is unnecessary. It can be shown, on the other hand, that human reason, unaided, has never afforded to man any clear standard of moral quality for actions, and that, even if it

could do so, its decisionslack authority to control the will; they are, at best, but *opinions,* which may be received or not, at pleasure. History shows that sober views of religion have been found nowhere since the times of the patriarchs, except in the writings of the O. and N.T., and in writings drawn from: them; and that whatever truth; has been found in the religious systems of the heathen can be traced to revelation. Their notions as to the very rudimentary doctrines of religion e.g. God, providence, immortality, etc., clearly show the necessity of revelation. Admitting, then, the presumption that a revelation should be given in some way, we, may show, a *priori,* that it must

(1) contain information on the subjects most important to man;

(2) that it must accord with the principles of former revelations;

(3) that it must have an external authentication; and

(4) that it must contain provisions for its own effectual promulgation. All these conditions are fulfilled by the revelation given in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and nowhere else.

1. The external evidences include miracles and prophecy. "We need not inquire whether external evidence of a revelation is in all cases requisite to him n who immediately and at first receives it; for the question is not, whether private revelations have ever been made by God to individuals, and what evidence is required to authenticate them, but what is the kind of evidence which we ought to require of one who professes to have received a revelation of the will of God with a command to communicate it to us, and to enjoins it upon our acceptance and submission as the rule of our opinions and manners. He may believe that a divine communication has been made to himself, but *his* belief has no authority to command ours. He may have actually received it, but we have not the means of knowing it without proof. That proof is not the high and excellent nature of the truths he teaches in other words, that which is called the internal *evidence* cannot be that proof. For we cannot tell whether the doctrines he teaches, though they should be capable of a higher degree of rational demonstration than any delivered to the world before, may not be the fruits of his own mental labor. He may be conscious that they are not, but we have no means of knowing that of which he is conscious except by his own testimony. To us, therefore, they would have no authority but as the opinions of a man whose intellectual attainments we might admire, but to wham we could not

submit as to an infallible guide, and the less so it any part of the doctrine taught by him were either mysterious or above our reason, or contrary to our interests, prejudices, and passions. If, therefore, any person should profess to have received a revelation of truth from God to teach to mankind, and that he was directed to command their obedience to it an pain of the divine displeasure, he would be asked for some external authentication of his mission; nor would the reasonableness and excellence of his doctrines be accepted in place of this. The latter might entitle him to attention, but nothing short of the former would be thought a ground sufficiently strong for yielding to him an absolute obedience. Without it he might reason and be heard with respect, but he could not command. On this very reasonable ground the Jews on the occasion asked our Lord, *"By what* authority *doest thou these things?"* and on another, "*What* sign *showest thou unto us*?" Agreeably to this, the authors both of 'the Jewish, and the Christian revelations profess to have authenticated their mission by the two great external proofs, MIRACLES and PROPHECY, and it remains to be considered whether this kind of authentication be reasonably sufficient to command our faith and obedience.

The question is not whether we may not conceive of external proofs of the mission of Moses, and of Christ and his apostles, differing from those which are assumed to have been given, and more convincing. In whatever way the authentication had been made, we might have conceived of modes of proof differing in kind, or more ample in circumstance; so that to ground an objection upon the absence of a particular Mind of proof, for which we have a preference, would "be trifling. But this is the question: Is a mission to teach the will of God to man, under his immediate authority, sufficiently authenticated when miracles are really performed, and *prophecies* actually and unequivocally accomplished? We have, then, first to show that miracles and prophecies are possible, that their credibility can be established by human testimony, and that, when thus authenticated, they afford the necessary evidence of revelation. These topics will be treated under the heads of MIRACLES and PROPHECY (q.v.). The records of both miracles and prophecy are found in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The antiquity of these writings is demonstrated by the very fact of the existence, on the one hand of the Jewish 'polity,' and, on the other, of the Christian religion, as well as by the concurrent testimony ,of ancient profane authors. These books can be shown, by testimony more accurate and minute than exists with regard to any other ancient records, to

be substantially the same now as when originally written, nay, that they have come down to our times without any material alteration whatsoever. The credibility of the testimony of the sacred writers themselves is fairly proved by the character of the men, by the circumstances under which they wrote, and by the entire absence of motive for falsification. Allowing, then, the New Testament to be genuine, it follows,

"**1.** That the writers knew whether the facts they state were true or false (<430108>John 1:3; 19:27, 35; <442707>Acts 27:7, 9).

2. That the character of these writers, so far as we can judge by their works, seems to render them worthy of regard, and leaves no room to imagine they intended to deceive us. The manner in which they tell their story is most happily adapted to gain our belief. There is no air of declamation and harangue; nothing that looks like artifice and design: no apologies, no encomiums, no characters, no reflections, no digressions; but the facts are recounted with great simplicity, just as they seem to have happened, and those facts are left to speak for themselves. Their integrity, likewise, evidently appears in the freedom with which they. mention those circumstances which might have exposed their Master and themselves to the greatest contempt amongst prejudiced and inconsiderate men, such as they knew they must generally expect to meet with (<430145>John 1:45, 46; 7:52; <420204>Luke 2:4, 7; <411603>Mark 6:3; <402020>Matthew 8:20; <430748>John 7:48). It is certain that there are in their writings the most genuine traces not only of a plain and honest, but a most pious and devout, a most benevolent and generous disposition, as everyone must acknowledge who reads their writings.

3. The apostles were under no temptation to forge a story of this kind, or to publish it to the world knowing it to be false.

4. Had they done so, humanly speaking, they must quickly have perished in it and their foolish cause must have died with them, without ever gaining any credit in the world. Reflect more particularly on the nature of those grand facts, the death, resurrection and exaltation of Christ, which formed the great foundation of the Christian scheme, as first exhibited to the apostles. The resurrection of a dead man, and his ascension into an abode in the upper world, were such strange things that a thousand objections would immediately have been raised against them, and some extraordinary proof would have been justly required as a balance to them. Consider the manner in which the apostles

undertook to prove the truth of their testimony to these facts, and it will- evidently appear that, instead of confirming their scheme, it must have been sufficient utterly to have overthrown it, had it been itself the most probable. imposture that the wit of man could ever have contrived. See Acts 3, 9, 14, 19, etc. They did not merely assert that they had seen miracles wrought by Jesus, but that he had endowed them with a variety of miraculous powers; and these they undertook to display, not; in such idle and useless tricks as sleight of hand might perform, but in such solid and important works as appeared worthy of divine interposition, and entirely superior to human power. Nor were these: things undertaken in a corner, in a circle of friends or dependents; nor were they said to be wrought, as might be suspected, by any confederates in the fraud; but they were done often in the most public manner. Would impostors have made such pretensions as these? or, if they had, must they not immediately have been, exposed and ruined? Now, if the New Testament be genuine, then it is certain that the apostles pretend to have wrought miracles in the very presence of those to whom their writings were addressed; nay, more, they profess likewise to have conferred those miraculous gifts in some considerable degrees on, others, even on the very persons to whom they write, and they appeal to their consciences as to the truth of it. And could there possibly be room for delusion here?

5. It is likewise certain that the apostles did gain early credit, and succeeded in a most wonderful manner. This is abundantly proved by the vast, number of churches established in early ages at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Colosse, etc.

6. That, admitting the facts which they testified concerning Christ to be true, then it was reasonable for their contemporaries, and is reasonable for us, to receive the Gospel which they have transmitted to us as a divine revelation. The great thing they asserted was, that Jesus was the Christ, and that he was proved to be so by prophecies accomplished in him, and by miracles wrought by him, and by others in his name. If we attend to these we shall find them to be no contemptible arguments, but must be forced to acknowledge that the premises being established, the conclusion most easily and necessarily follows; and this conclusion, that Jesus is the Christ, taken in all its extent, is an abstract of the Gospel revelation, and therefore is sometimes put for the whole of it (4087Acts 8:37; 1218)."

2. The Internal evidence of Christianity is drawn from a consideration of the doctrines of Scripture, of their consistency with the character of God, and their tendency to promote the virtue and happiness of men. It takes note also of the morals of Christianity, and of their superiority to all other systems of ethics; and especially of the character of Christ, as a real life far transcending even the highest imaginations of merely human moralists. "Of its just and sublime conceptions and exhibitions of the divine character; of the truth of that view of the moral state of man upon which its disciplinary treatment is founded; of the correspondence that there is between its views of man a mixed relation to God as a sinful creature, and yet pitied and cared for, and that actual mixture of good and evil, penalty and forbearance, which the condition of the world presents; of the connection of its doctrine of atonement with hope; of the adaptation of its doctrine of divine influence to the moral condition of mankind when rightly understood, and the affecting benevolence and condescension which it implies; and of its noble and sanctifying revelations of the blessedness of a future life, much might be said — they are subjects, indeed, on which volumes have been written, and they can never be exhausted. Nowhere except in the Scriptures have we a perfect system of morals; and the deficiencies of pagan morality only exalt the purity, the comprehensiveness, the practicability of ours. The character of the Being acknowledged as supreme must always impress itself upon moral feeling and practice, the obligation of which rests upon his will. The God of the Bible is 'holy,' without spot; 'just,' without partiality; 'good,' boundlessly benevolent and beneficent; and his law is the image of himself, 'holy, just, and good.' These great moral qualities are not made known to us merely in the abstract, so as to be comparatively feeble in their influence, but in the person of Christ, our God incarnate, they are seen exemplified in action, displaying themselves amidst human relations, and the actual circumstances of human life. With pagans the authority of moral rules was either the opinion of the wise, or the tradition of the ancient, confirmed, it is true, in some degree, by observation and experience; but to us they are given as commands immediately issuing from the supreme Governor, and ratified as his by the most solemn and explicit attestations. With them many great moral principles, being indistinctly apprehended, were matters of doubt and debate; to us, the explicit manner in which they are given excludes both: for it cannot be questioned whether we are commanded to love your neighbor as ourselves; to do to others as we would that they should do to us, a precept which comprehends almost all relative morality in one plain

principle; to forgive our enemies; to love all: mankind; to live righteously and soberly, as well as godly; that magistrates must be a terror only to evil-doers, and a praise to them that do well; that subjects are to render honor to whom honor, and tribute to whom tribute, is due; that masters are to be just and merciful, and servants faithful and obedient. These, and many other familiar precepts, are too explicit to be mistaken, and too authoritative to be disputed; two of the most powerful means of rendering law effectual. Those who never enjoyed the benefit of revelation, never conceived justly and comprehensively of that moral state of the heart from which right and beneficent conduct alone can flow; and, therefore, when they speak of the same virtues as those enjoined by Christianity, they are to be understood as attaching to them a lower idea. In this the infinite superiority of Christianity displays itself. The principle of obedience is not only a sense of duty to God and the fear of his displeasure, but a tender love, excited by his infinite compassions to us in the gift of his Son, which shrinks from offending. To this influential motive as a *reason* of obedience is added another, drawn from its *end:* one not less influential, but which heathen moralists never knew the testimony that we please God, manifested in the acceptance of our prayers, and in spiritual and felicitous communion with him. By Christianity, impurity of thought and desire is restrained in an equal degree as are their overt acts in the lips and conduct. Humanity, meekness, gentleness, placability, disinterestedness, and charity are all as clearly and solemnly enjoined as the grosser vices are prohibited; and on the unruly tongue itself is impressed 'the law of kindness.' Nor are the injunctions feeble; they are strictly LAW, and not mere advice and recommendations: 'Without holiness no man shall see the Lord' and thus our entrance into heaven, and our escape from perdition, are made to depend upon this preparation of mind. To all this is added possibility, nay, certainty of attainment, if we use the appointed means. A pagan could draw, though not with lines so perfect, *a beau ideal* of virtue which. he never thought attainable; but the 'full assurance of hope' is given by the religion of Christ to all who are seeking the moral renovation of their nature, because 'it is God that worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure.' When such is the moral nature of Christianity, how obvious is it that its tendency, both as to individuals and to society, must be in the highest sense beneficial! From every passion which wastes, and burns, and frets, and enfeebles the spirit, the individual is set free, and his inward peace renders his obedience cheerful and voluntary; and we might appeal to infidels themselves whether, if the moral principles of the Gospel were

wrought into the hearts and embodied in the conduct of all men, the world. would not be happy; whether if governments ruled, and subjects obeyed, by the laws of Christ; whether if the rules of strict justice which are enjoined upon us regulated all the transactions of men, and all that mercy to the distressed which we are taught to feel. and to practice came into operation; and whether, if the precepts which delineate and enforce the duties of husbands, wives, masters, servants, parents, children, did, in fact, fully and generally govern all these relations — whether a better age than that called *golden* by the poets would not then be realized, and Virgil's

Jams redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,
[Now Astraea returns, and tihe Saturnian reign,]

be far too weak to express the mighty change? [It was in the reign of Saturn that the heathen poets fixed the Golden Age. At that period, according to them, Astraea (the goddess of justice), and many other deities, lived on earth, but, being offended with the wickedness of men, they successively fled to heaven. Astraea staid longest, but at last retired to her natives seat, and was translated into the sign Virgo; next to Libra, who holds her balance.] Such is the tendency of Christianity. On immense numbers of individuals it has superinduced these moral changes; all nations where it has been fully and faithfully exhibited, bear, amidst their remaining vices, the impress of its hallowing and benevolent influence: it is now in active exertion in many of the darkest and worst parts of the earth, to convey the same blessings; and he who would arrest its progress, were he able, would quench the only hope which remains to our world, and prove himself an enemy not only to himself, but to all mankind. What, then, we ask, does all this prove, but that theScriptures are worthy of God, and propose the veryends which rendered a revelation necessary? Of the whole system of practical religion which it contains we may say, as of that which is embodied in our Lord's sermon on the mount, in the words of one who, in a. course of sermons on that divine composition, has entered most deeply into its spirit, and presented a most. instructive delineation of the character which it was intended to form, Behold Christianity in its native form, as delivered by its great author. See a picture of God, as far as he is imitable by man, drawn by God's own hand. What beauty appears in the whole! How just a symmetry! What exact proportion *in* every part! How desirable is the happiness here described! How venerable, how lovely is the holiness!' 'If,' says Jeremy Taylor, 'wisdom, and mercy, and justice, and simplicity, and holiness, and purity, and meekness, and contentedness, and

charity be images of God and rays of divinity, then that doctrine, in which all these shine so gloriously, and in which nothing else is ingredient, must needs be from God. If the holy Jesus had come into the world with less splendor of power and mighty demonstrations, yet the excellency of what he taught makes him alone fit to bet he master of the world;' and agreeable to all this has been its actual influence upon mankind. Although, says Bishop Perteus, Christianity has not always been so well understood or so honestly practiced as it ought to have been; although its spirit has been often mistaken and its precepts misapplied, yet under all these disadvantages it has gradually produced a visible change in those points which most materially concern the peace and quiet of the world. Its beneficent spirit has spread itself through all the different relations and modifications of life, and communicated its kindly influence to almost every public and private concern of mankind. It has insensibly worked itself into the inmost frame and constitution of civil states. It has given a tinge to the complexion of their governments, to the temper and administration of their laws. It has restrained the spirit of the prince and the madness of the people. It has softened the rigors of despotism and tamed the insolence of conquest. It has, in some degree, taken away the edge of the sword, and thrown even over the horrors of war a veil of mercy. It has descended into families; has diminished the pressure of private tyranny; improved every domestic endearment; given tenderness to the parent, humanity to the master, respect to superiors, to inferiors ease; so that mankind are, upon the whole, even in a temporal view, under infinite obligations to the mild and pacific temper of the Gospel, and have reaped from it more substantial worldly benefits than from any other institution upon earth. As one proof of this among many others, consider only the shocking carnage made in the human species by the exposure of infants, the gladiatorial shows, which sometimes cost Rome twenty or thirty lives in a month; and the exceedingly cruel usage of slaves allowed and practiced by the ancient pagans. These were not the accidental and temporary excesses of a sudden fury, but were legal, and established, and constant methods of murdering and tormenting mankind. Had Christianity done nothing more than brought into disuse, as it confessedly has done, the two former of these inhuman customs entirely, and the latter to a very great degree, it has justly merited the title of the benevolent religion. But this is far from being all. Throughout the more enlightened parts of Christendom there prevails a gentleness of manners widely different from the ferocity of the most civilized nations of antiquity; and that liberality with which every species of

distress is relieved is a virtue peculiar to the Christian name. But we may ask farther, What success has it had on the mind of man as it respects his eternal welfare? How many thousands have felt its power, rejoiced in its benign influence, and under its dictates been constrained to devote themselves to the glory and praise of God! Burdened with guilt, incapable of finding relief from hunman resources, the mind has here found peace unspeakable in beholding that sacrifice which alone could atone for transgression. Here the hard and impenitent heart has been softened, the impetuous passions restrained, the ferocious temper subdued, powerful prejudices conquered, ignorance dispelled, and the obstacles to real happiness removed. Here the Christian, looking round on the glories and blandishments of this world, has been enabled, with a noble contempt, to, despise all. Here death itself, the king of terrors, has lost all his sting; and the soul, with a holy magnanimity, has borne up in the agonies of a dying hour, and sweetly sung itself away. to everlasting bliss. In respect to its future spread, we have reason to believe that all nations shall feel its happy effects. The prophecies are pregnant with matter as to this belief. It seems that not only a nation or a country, but the whole habitable globe, shall become the kingdom of our God and of his Christ" (Watson, *Dictionary,* s.v. Christianity).

3. The *Collateral* evidence treats of the marvelous diffusion of the Gospel, and of its actual effects upon mankind and upon the history of civilization, as proofs of its divine origin. "Of its early triumphs, the history of the Acts of the Apostles is a splendid record; and in process of time it made a wonderful progress through Europe, Asia, and Africa. In the third century there were Christians in the camp, in the senate, and in the palace; in short, everywhere, as we are informed, except in the temples and the theaters: they filled the towns, the country, and the islands. Men and women of all ages and ranks, and even those of the first dignity, embraced the Christian faith, insomuch that the pagans complained that the revenues of their temples were ruined. They were in such great numbers in the empire, that, as Tertullian expresses it, if they had retired into another country, they would have left the Roman territory only a frightful solitude. For the illustration of this argument, we may observe that the Christian religion was introduced everywhere in opposition to the sword of the magistrate, the craft and interest of the priests, the pride of the philosophers, the passions and prejudices of the people, all closely combined in support of the national worship, and to crush the Christian faith, which aimed at the

subversion of heathenism and idolatry. Moreover, this religion was not propagated in the dark by persons who tacitly endeavored to deceive the credulous, nor delivered out by little and little, so that one doctrine might prepare the way for the reception of another; but it was fully and without disguise laid before men all at once, that they might judge of the whole under one view. Consequently mankind were not deluded into the belief of it, but received it upon proper examination and conviction. Besides, the Gospel was first preached and first believed by multitudes in Judaea, where Jesus exercised his ministry, and where every individual had the means of knowing whether the things that were told him were matters of fact; and in this country, the scene of the principal transactions on which its credibility depended, the history of Christ could never have been received unless it had been true, and known to all as truth. Again: the doctrine and history of Jesus were preached and believed in the most noted countries and cities of the world, in the very age when he is said to have lived. On the fiftieth day after our Lord's crucifixion, three thousand persons were converted in Jerusalem by a single sermon of the apostles; and a few weeks after this, five thousand who believed were present at another sermon preached also in Jerusalem (<4024>Acts 2:41; 4:4; 6:7; 8:1; 9:1, 20). About eight or ten years after our Lord's death, the disciples were become so numerous at Jerusalem and in the adjacent country that they were objects of jealousy and alarm to Herod himself (<4012>Acts 12:1). In the twenty-second year after the crucifixion, the disciples in Judaea are said to have been many myriads (<4021>Acts 21:20). The age in which Christianity was introduced and received was famous for men whose faculties were improved by the most perfect state of social life, but who were good judges of the evidence offered in support of the facts recorded in the Gospel history; for it should be recollected that the success of the Gospel was not restricted to Judaea, but it was preached in all the different provinces of the Roman empire. The first triumphs of Christianity were in the heart of Greece itself, the nursery of learning and the polite arts, for churches were planted at a very early period at Corinth, Ephesus, Beroea, Thessalonica, and Philippi. Even Rome herself, the seat of wealth and empire, was not able to resist the force of truth at a time when the facts related were recent, and when they might, if they had been false, have easily been disproved. From Greece and Rome, at a period of cultivation and refinement, of general peace and extensive intercourse, when one great empire united different nations and distant people, the confutation of these facts would very soon have passed from one country to another, to the utter confusion of the persons who

endeavored to propagate the belief of them. Nor ought it to be forgotten that the religion to which such numbers were proselyted was an exclusive one. It denied, without reserve, the truth of every article of heathen mythology, and the existences of every object of their worship. It accepted no compromise; it admitted of no comprehension. If it prevailed at all, it must prevail by the overthrow of every statue, altar, and temple in the world. It pronounced all other gods to be false, and all other worship vain. These are considerations which must have strengthened the opposition to it, augmented the hostility which it must encounter, and enhanced the difficulty of gaining proselytes; and more. especially when we recollect that, among the converts to Christianity in the earliest age, a number of persons remarkable for their station, office, genius, education, and fortune,, and who were personally interested by their emoluments and honors in either Judaism or heathenism, appeared among the Christian proselytes. Its evidences approved themselves not only to the multitude, but to men of the most refined sense and most distinguished abilities, and it dissolved the attachments which all powerful interest and authority created and upheld" (Watson, *1.c.).*

Paleay's *View of the Evidences of Christianity* for a long time held the first place as a textbook on evidences in England. Paley even goes so far as to say we can conceive of no way in which a revelation could be made except by miracles. "In whatever degree it is probable, or not very improbable, that a revelation should be communicated to mankind at all, in the same degree it is probable, — or not very improbable, that miracles should be wrought. Therefore, when miracles are related to have been wrought in the promulgation of a revelation manifestly wanted, and, if true, of inestimable value, the improbability which arises from the miraculous nature of the things related is not greater than the original improbability that such a revelation should be imparted by God." The book is divided into two parts: I. The direct historical evidence of Christianity, and wherein it is distinguished from the evidence alleged for other miracles; II. The 'auxiliary evidences of Christianity'. The first part is then divided into two propositions:

> **(I.)** "That there is satisfactory evidence that many, professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles, passed their lives in labors, dangers, and sufferings, voluntarily undergone in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of: their

belief in those accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motives, to new rules of conduct."

(II.) "That there is not satisfactory evidence that persons pretending to be original witnesses of any other similar miracles have acted in the same manner in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief in the truth of those accounts." The argument rests on the credibility of testimony, and aims to show that the testimony in this case is indubitable. The second part treats briefly the argument from prophecy, from the morality of the Gospel, and the internal evidences afforded both by the sacred writings, and by the doctrines and histories which they contain.

Coleridge, who disparaged the comparative value of evidence from miracles and prophecy, dictated to a friend the following scheme of evidences:

"**I.** Miracles, as precluding the contrary evidence of no miracles.

II. The material of Christianity, its existence and history.

III. The doctrines of Christianity, and the correspondence of human nature to these doctrines, illustrated,

1st, historically, as the actual production ,of the new world, and the dependence of the fate of the planet upon it;

2d, individually, from its appeal for its truth to an asserted fact, which, whether it be real or not, every man possessing reason has an equal power of ascertaining within himself, namely, a will which has more or less lost its freedom, though mot the consciousness that it ought to be and may become free; the conviction that this cannot be achieved without the operation of a principle connatural with itself; the evident rationality of an entire confidence in that principle, being the condition end means of its operation; the experience in his own nature *of* the truth of the process described by Scripture as far as he can place himself within the process, aided by the confident assurances of others as to the effects experienced by them, and which he is striving to arrive at.

All these form a practical Christian. Add, however, a gradual opening out of the intellect to more and more clear perceptions of the strict coincidence

of the doctrines of Christianity, with the truths evolved by the mind from inflexions on its own nature. To such a man one main test of the objectivity, the entity, the objective truth of his faith, is its accompaniment by an increase of insight into the moral beauty and necessity of the process which it comprises, and the dependence of that proof on the causes asserted. Believe, and, if thy belief be right, that insight which gradually transmutes faith into knowledge will be the reward of that belief. The Christian, to whom, after a long profession of Christianity, the mysteries remain as much mysteries as before, is in the same state as a school-boy with regard to his arithmetic, to whom the facit at the end of the examples in his ciphering-book is the whole ground for his assuming that such and such figures amount to so and so. 3d. In the above I include the increasing discoveries in the correspondence of the history, the doctrines, and the promises of Christianity with the past, present, and probable future of human nature; and in this state a fair comparison of the religion as a divine philosophy with all other religions which have pretended to revelations and all other systems of philosophy, both with regard to the totality of its truth and its identification with the manifest march of affairs. I should conclude that, if we suppose a man to have convinced himself that not only the doctrines of Christianity, which may be conceived independently of history or time, as the Trinity, spiritual influences, etc., are coincident with the truths which his reason, thus strengthened, has evolved from its own sources, but that the historical dogmas, namely, of the incarnation of the creative Logos, and his becoming a personal agent, are themselves founded in philosophical necessity then it seems irrational that such a man should reject the belief of the actual appearance of a religion strictly correspondent therewith, at a given time recorded, even as much as that he should reject Caesar's account of his wars in Gaul, after he had convinced himself *a priori* of their possibility. As the result of these convictions, he will not scruple to receive the particular miracles recorded,. inasmuch as it would be miraculous that an incarnate God should not work what must to mere man appear as miracles, inasmuch as it is strictly accordant with the ends and benevolent nature of such a being to commence the elevation of man above his mere senses by attracting and enforcing attention, first, through an appeal to those senses. But with equal reason will he expect that no other or greater force should be laid on those miracles as such; that they should not be spoken of as good in themselves much less as the adequate and ultimate proof of that religion; and, likewise, he will receive additional satisfaction should he find these miracles so wrought, and on such

occasions, as to give them a personal value as symbols of important truths when their miraculousness was no longer needful or efficacious" (Coleridge, *Works,* N.Y., 5:555).

On the argument of Butler's *Analogy, SEE BUTLER.*

II. As to the *comparative value* of the different classes of the Christian evidences there has been much dispute. Coleridge admitted the value of the testimony from miracles for the Jews at the beginning of Christianity, but considered that argument as much less valuable *now* than the internal evidence. "It was only to overthrow the usurpation exercised in and through the senses that the senses were miraculously appealed to. *Reason and religion are their* own *evidence.* The natural sun is in this respect a symbol of the spiritual. Ere he is fully risen, and while his glories are still under veil, he calls up the breeze to chase away the usurping vapors of the night season, and thus converts the air itself into the minister of its own purification: not surely a proof or elucidation of the light from heaven, but to prevent its interception. Wherever, therefore, similar circumstances coexist with the same moral causes, the principles revealed and the examples recorded in the inspired writings render miracles superfluous; and if we neglect to apply truths in expectation of wonders, or under pretext of the cessation of the latter, we tempt God, and merit the same reply which our Lord gave to the Pharisees on a like occasion. I shall merely state here what my belief is concerning the true evidences of Christianity.

1. Its consistency with right reason I consider as the outer court of the temple, the common area within which it stands.

2. The miracles, with and through, which the religion was first revealed and attested, I regard as the steps, the vestibule, and the portal of the temple.

3. The sense, the inward feeling in the soul of each believer of its exceeding *desirableness,* the, experience that he needs something, joined with the strong foretokening that the redemption and the graces propounded to us in Christ are *what* he needs — this I hold to be the *true foundation* of the spiritual edifice. With the strong *a priori* probability that flows in from 1 and 3 on the correspondent historical evidence of 2, no man can refuse or neglect to make the experiment without guilt. But,

4, it is the experience derived from a practical conformity to the conditions of the Gospel; it is the opening eye, the dawning light, the terrors and the

promises of spiritual growth, the blessedness of loving God as God, the nascent sense of sin hated as sin, and of the incapability of attaining to either without Christ; it is the sorrow that still rises up from beneath, and the consolation that meets it from above; the bosom treacheries of the principal in the warfare, and the exceeding faithfulness and long-suffering of the uninterested ally; in a word, it is the actual trial of the faith in Christ, with. its accompaniments and results that must form the arched roof, and faith itself is the completing KEY-STONE. In order to an efficient belief in Christianity a man must have been a Christian, and this is the seeming argumentumn *in circulo* incident to all spiritual truths, to every subject not presentable under the forms of time and space, as long as we attempt to master by the reflex acts of the understanding what we can only *know* by the act of *becoming.* 'Do, the will of my father, and ye shall know whether I am of God.' These four evidences I believe to have been, and still to be, for the world, for the whole Church, all necessary, all equally necessary; but that at present, and for the majority of Christians born in Christian countries, I believe the third and the fourth evidence to be the most operative; not as superseding, but as involving a glad, undoubting faith in the two former" (Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria,* chapter 24).

Ullmann *(Sinlessness of Jesus,* § 1) remarks "that the nature of the case, and the necessities of their contemporaries, justified the apostles in proving the divine mission of Christ by the argument from miracles and prophecy. But the necessity of the times and of individuals may in this respect vary; and although the Gospel in its *essence* remains the same, and contains eternal, unchangeable truth, yet in a different age a different method of proof may lead more immediately to the acknowledgment of this truth. In our own time it seems proper to fix our eyes especially upon the spiritual character of Jesus in order to obtain satisfactory proof of the divinity of his mission and instructions, not because the apostolical mode of proof has become untenable, but because the other mode has a more vital efficacy on account of the style of education prevalent at the present day. We do not finf ourselves in immediate, conscious connection with the spirit and prophecies of the Old Testament, as thee Jews were in the time of the apostles; we live among contemporaries to whom miracles are more a ground of doubt than of faith; we should not forget that the, proof from miracles exerts its full power, properly speaking, on none but the eye-witnesses of them and, conducts us to the desired conclusion only by a circuitous path. On the other hand, a vivid apprehension of the inward

character of Jesus brings us nearest to the operative center of Christianity, and at the; same time makes us feel the influence of the moral power which goes forth from that center. Here faith in Jesus rests immediately on himself; it is free, spiritual confidence in his person. As with his contemporaries everything depended on the yielding confidence with which they received the favors which he brought them, so likewise with us this confidence may be the element of a full belief in Christianity, and is, at all: events, a condition of receiving benefit from our Redeemer."

The tendency of German theology has gone against the external: evidences of Christianity, but this very tendency opened the door to rationalism and infidelity, above which German orthodoxy has only recently begun to emerge. On this point, see the *Nasa* York *Review,* 2:141 sq. See also bishop Butler's admirable discussion of the "particular" evidence for Christianity in his *Analogy of Religion,* part 2, chapter 7. See also Mansell, in *Aids to Faith,* Essay 1 (London, 1861, 8vo). The tendency of the best modern apologists is not to thrust the argument from miracles. into the background, but to vindicate it afresh. So Auberlen, *Gottliche Offenbarung* (1864); Mozley, *On Miracles;* Fisher, *Essays on the* supernatural *Origins of Christianity,* page 12 sq., 503 sq. The rejection of miracles generally leads to a rejection of the doctrine of the personality of God. See, for a fuller treatment of this branch of the subject, the article MIRACLES *SEE MIRACLES* . The chief task of the apologist for Christianity in the present age (apart from the metaphysical conflict with Pantheism and Positivism, for which see articles, under those heads) is to vindicate the authenticity and the early date of the books of the N.T. against the assaults not merely of avowed skeptics, but also of theologians within the Christian Church, such as those of the: Tubingen school (q.v.). This task resolves itself, again, into that of vindicating the historical reality of the scriptural miracles. "The recent criticism of the N.T. canon, embracing the attempt to impeach the genuineness of various books, is only a part of the great, discussion of the historical truth of the N.T.; for it is difficult to attack the credibility of the Gospel historians without first disproving their genuineness." (Fisher, *Essays,* page 14). In the noted *Essays and Reviews* (Boston ad. 1865, 12mo), Prof. Baden Powell has an article on "The Study of the Evidences of Christianity," in which he undertakes to state the present condition of the discussion, and to indicate the true line: of Christian evidences. He disparages the "professed advocates of an external revelation and historical evidence" by innuendo as

well as by direct attack, and *assumes* the inconceivability and impossibility of miracles. See Goodwin's article in the *American Theological Review,* July 1861, which closes as follows: "It is one thing to urge other evidences of Christianity as stronger and more satisfactory than that from miracles; it is another thing to reject all miracles as incredible and absurd. He who takes the former course may show an eminently Christian spirit, and for ourselves we cordially sympathize with his position; but he who takes the latter course, if not an infidel himself; is certainly playing into the hands of infidels and atheists."

One of the chief forms taken by recent Christian apologetics is the argument drawn from the actual phenomena of Christianity, the *existing facts* which nobody can deny. The first of these is the *character of Christ,* which has been so described by rationalistic and infidel writers (e.g. Strauss, Renan, Schenkel) as to bring the argument down almost, if not quite, to the point whether Jesus were an impostor or no. The replies to these attacks within the last twenty years have brought with greater force than ever the eternal light of evidence which the person and life of the Redeemer contain in favor of the whole system of Christianity. See the works on this subject of Neander, Lange, Schaff, Pressense, Ellicott, Young, Plumptre, and others. Dr. Schaff sums up the result of a study of Christ in one strong passage: "Jesus of Nazareth is the one absolute and unaccountable exception to the universal experience of mankind. He is the great central miracle of the whole Gospel history; and all his miracles are but the natural and necessary manifestations of his miraculous person, performed with the same ease with which we perform our ordinary daily works." The second of these phenomena is found in the *books of the New Testament* themselves, as affording abundant internal evidence of reality and truthfulness. The third is the specific Christian *doctrine,* which can be traced up (through the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians, the genuineness and early date of which are admitted even by the Tubingen school) to within thirty years after the death of Christ. (See an excellent article on the *Unexhausted Resources of Christian Evidence,* by Prof. Lorimer, in *B. and F. Ev. Review,* January 1865, reprinted in *The Theolog. Eclectic,* New Haven, in, 30 ;sq.) Dr. H. Schmidt, of Meiningen, taking the Tubingen critics at their word, undertakes to find in the four unquestioned epistles (Galatians, 1st and 2d Corinthians, and Romans) a full vindication of the truth and divine origin of Christianity. See his *Der Paulinische Christus* (Weimar, 1867, 8vo).

The *comparison of Christianity with heathen religions* 'is opening a new and rich mine of Christian evidences. The science of "Comparative Religion," so called, is yet in its infancy, but all contributions to it only tend to bring out the argument for the divine origin of Christianity into clearer relief. See Maurice, *Religions of the World* (1846, 12mo); Pressense, *Religions before Christ* (1866, 8vo); Muller, *Chips from a German Workshop* (1867, 2 volumes, 12o); Hardwick, *Christ and ether Masters* (Lond. 2d ed., 1863, 2 volumes, 12mo); and an article by Caldwell, *Bapt. Quart. Rev.* October 1868.

The question of the origin and dates of the several gospels is treated under the separate articles Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The Tubingen school, and the modern critics who follow them, put the dates forward into the second century. *SEE TUBINGEN SCHOOL*. On the questions involved, see Fisher, *Essays,* already cited; Westcott, *On the Canon of the N.T.* (Cambridge, 1855); Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst* (Leipsig, 1865; transl. by W.L. Gage, under the title *Origin of the four Gospels,* Lond. 1868; Amer. Tract Society, 1868).

Literature. — For a pretty copious account of the literature of the subject, *SEE APOLOGETICS; SEE APOLOGY*. We add here the following: Translation of Luthardt's *Apol. Vortrage* (noticed in volume 1, page 305), entitled *Apologetic Lectures on the fundamental Truths of Christianity* (1867, crown 8vo); and Auberlen's *Offenbarung* (see our volume 1, page 301), entitled *The Divine Revelation* (Edinburgh, 1867); Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels,* abridged edit. (Boston, 167, 12mo); Barneo, *Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1868, 12mo); M'Cosh, *The Supernatural in its Relations to the Natural;* Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (Boston, 1867), chapter 3; Schaff, *Person of Christ* (Am. Tract Society); Plumptre, *Christ and Chris.tesnom* (Lond. 1867, 8vo); Gratry. *Les Sophistes et la Critique* (Paris, 1864, 8vo); *Princeton Review,* April, 1852, art. 6; Bartlett on “Christianity and prominent Forms of Assault," in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* January, 1868; *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*. July 1868, art. 6. *SEE APOLOGETICS; SEE APOLOGY, INSPIRATION; SEE JESUS;SEE MIRACLES.*

Evil

is discord or disturbance in the order of the universe. Leibnitz divides it into metaphysical evil, i.e., imperfection; physical evil, i.e., suffering; moral

evil, i.e., sin. Origen defined evil to be the negation of good; and in this he has been followed by many Christian thinkers. The distinction into natural and moral evil is the only one now generally recognized.

1. "Natural evil is whatever destroys or any way disturbs the perfection of natural beings, such as blindness, diseases, death, etc. But as *all* that we call natural evil is not the penalty of sin, nor, as some have supposed, *only the* penalty of it, such disturbance is not necessarily an evil, inasmuch as it may be counterpoised, in the whole, with an equal if rot greater good, as in the afflictions and sufferings of good men. When such disturbance occurs as the penalty of transgression, it is the necessary consequence of moral evil." The tendency of modern thought is towards the doctrine that the (apparent) disturbances of the physical world are likely to be reconciled with universal law as science advances.

2. "Moral evil is the disagreement between the actions of a moral agent and the rule of those actions, whatever it be. Applied to choice, or acting contrary to the revealed law of God, it is termed *wickedness* or *sin.* Applied to an act contrary to a mere rule of fitness, it is called a *fault"* (Bucky s.v.). On the origin of evil, and its relations to the government of God, *SEE SIN; SEE THEODICY*.

E'vil-mer'odach

(Hebrews *Evil' Merodak',* lywræ Ëdirom]; Sept. Εὐιαλμαρωδέκ, Οὐλαιμαδάχαρ), son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who, on his accession to the throne (B.C. 561), released the captive king of Judah, Jehoiachin, from prison, after 37 years of incarceration, treated him with kindness and distinction, and set his throne above the other conquered kings who were detained at Babylon (<121257>2 Kings 25:27; <244631>Jeremiah 52:31-34). *SEE CHALDAEAN*. A Jewish tradition (noticed by Jerome on <231429>Isaiah 14:29) ascribes this kindness to a personal friendship which Evil-merodach had contracted with the Jewish king when he was himself consigned to prison by Nebuchadnezzar, who, on recovering from his seven years' monomania, took offense at some part of the conduct of his son, by whom the government had in the mean time been administered. This story was probably invented to account for the fact. His name is variously written by other ancient authors (Εὐειλμαράδουκος by Berosus, in Josephus, *Apion* 1:20; Εὐιλμαλουροῦχος by Megasthenes and Abydenus, in Euseb. *Chron. Armen.* page 128; Ἀβιλμαρώδαχος by

Josephus, *Ant.* 10:11, 2). Hales identifies him with the king of Babylon who formed a powerful confederacy against the Medes, which was broken up, and the king slain by Cyrus, then acting for his uncle Cyaxares. But this rests on the authority of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia,* the historical value of which he estimates far too highly. *SEE CYRUS*. He is doubtless the same as the *Ilvoradam* of Ptolemy's "Canon," who reigned but a short time, having ascended the throne on the death of Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 561, and being himself succeeded by Neriglissar in B.C. 559. *SEE BABYLON*. He thus appears to have reigned but two years, which is the time assigns ed to him by Abydenus *(Fr.* 9) and Berosus *(Fr.* 14). At the end of this brief space Evil-merodach was murdered by Neriglissar *SEE NERGAL-SHAREZER*, a Babylonian noble married to his sister, who then seized the crown. The other ancient authorities assign him different lengths of reign. According to Berosus, Evil-merodach provoked his fate by lawless government and intemperance. Perhaps the departure from the policy of his father, and the substitution of mild for severe measures, may have been viewed in this light.

The latter half of the name Evil-merodach is that of a Babylonian god MERODACH *SEE MERODACH* (q.v.). Two modes of explaining the former part of it have been attempted. Since ev*il,* as a Hebrew word, means "foolish," Sinconis proposes to consider it the derivative of lwa, in the Arabic signification of "to be first," affording the sense of "prince of Merodach." This rests on the assumption that the Babylonian language was of Syro-Arabian origin. Gesemmius, on the other hand, who does not admit that origin, believes that some Indo-Germanic word, of similar sound, but reputable sense, is concealed under evil, and that the Hebrews made some slight perversion in its form to produce a word of contemptuous signification in Hebrew, just as is assumed in the case of Beelzebul.

Evil-speaking

"the using language either reproachful or untrue respecting others, and thereby injuring them. It is an express command of Scripture to speak evil of no man (⁵⁶⁰⁰²Titus 3:2; ⁵⁹⁰⁴¹James 4:11); by which, however, we are not to understand that there are no occasions on which we are at liberty to speak of others that which may be considered as evil.

1. Persons in the administration of justice may speak words which in private intercourse would be reproachful.

2. God's ministers may inveigh against vice with sharpness and severity, both privately and publicly (<235801>Isaiah 58:1; <560113>Titus 1:13).

3. Private persons may reprove others when they commit sin (<031917>Leviticus 19:17).

4. Some vehemence of speech may be used in defense of truth and impugning errors of bad consequence (<650103>Jude 1:3).

5. It may be necessary, upon some important occasions, with some heat of language, to express disapprobation of notorious wickedness (<440823>Acts 8:23). Yet in all these the greatest equity, moderation, and candor should be used; and we should take care,

1. Never to speak in severe terms without reasonable warrant or apparent just cause.

2. Nor beyond measure.

3. Nor out of bad principles or wrong ends; from ill will, contempt, revenge, envy, to compass our own ends; from wantonness or negligence, but from pure charity for the good of those to whom or of whom we speak.

This is an evil,however, which greatly abounds, and which is not sufficiently watched against; for it is not when we openly speak evil of others only that we are guilty, but even in speaking what is true we are in danger of speaking evil of others. There is sometimes a malignant pleasure manifested; a studious recollection of everything that can be brought forward; a delight in hearing anything spoken against others; a secret rejoicing in knowing that another's fall will be an occasion of our rise. All this is base to an extreme. The impropriety and sinfulness of evil-speaking will appear if we consider,

1. That it is entirely opposite to the whole tenor of the Christian religion.

2. Expressly condemned and prohibited as evil (<196403>Psalm 64:3; <590411>James 4:11).

3. No practice hath more severe punishments denounced against it (<461511>1 Corinthians 5:11-6:10).

4. It is an evidence of a weak and distempered mind.

5. It is even indicative of ill breeding and bad manners.

6. It is the abhorrence of all wise and good men (<19503>Psalm 15:3).

7. It is exceedingly injurious to society, and inconsistent with the relation we bear to each other as Christians (<59306>James 3:6).

8. It is branded with the epithet of folly (<20606>Proverbs 18:6, 7).

9. It is perverting the design of speech. 10. It is opposite to the example of Christ, whom we profess to follow. *SEE SLANDER*." (Barrow, *Works,* volume 1, serm. 16; Tillotson, *Sermons* serm. 42; Jack, *Sermons on Evil Speaking;* Seed, *Sermons,* 1:339; Campbell, *Dissertations,* diss. 3, § 22.)

Evodius

a Latin theologian, was born about the middle of the fourth century, at Tagaste, in Africa. He was a countryman of St. Augustine, and was united with him in an intimate and lifelong friendship. After following in his youth a secular profession, he became, in 396 or 397 bishop of Uzalis. Augustine asserts that while there he performed several miracles by means of the relics of St. Stephen, which Orosius in 416, had brought from Palestine. Evodius took an active part in the controversy against the Donatists and Pelagians, and in 427 wrote on this subject a letter to the monks of Adrumetum. He died about 430. We have from him four letters to St. Augustine (160, 161, 163, and 177 in the edition of the Benedictines); a letter addressed by him, conjointly with four other bishops, to bishop Innocent I, of Rome (published in volume 6 of the Benedictine edit. of the' works of Augustine); fragments of a letter to the monks of Adrumetum (joined to the letter 216 of St. Augustine). His treatise on the miracles performed by the relics of St. Stephen is lost; for the *Libri duo de Miraculis S. Ste*phani, appended to Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* (in volume 7 of his works), cannot be attributed to him. A treatise *De Fide,* or *De Unitate Trinitatis contra Manichceos,* is by some likewise ascribed to Evodius. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 16:842.

Ewald Johann Ludwig,

theologian, was born at Dreieichenhain, Hesse, September 16, 1747. He studied at the University of Marburg. After serving two years as tutor to

the children of the prince of Hesse-Philippsthal, he became pastor at Offenbach, 1768. He began preaching as a Rationalist, but in a few years he found reason alone inadequate for his personal guidance and for his public teaching. In 1778 he announced publicly this change of conviction. In 1781. he became general superintendent and court preacher at Detmold; but his pungent preaching soon got him into trouble. He founded at Detmold a seminary for teachers. In 1796 he accepted a pastoral charge at Bremen; and here, also, he greatly promoted the. schools, visiting the establishments of Pestalozzi and Fellenberg, in Switzerland, to inform himself on their systems. In 1805 he was called to Heidelberg as professor of ethics, and in 1807 became church councillor at Carlsruhe, where he died, March 19, 1822. He was a voluminous author. Doering gives a list of eighty-nine different publications of his. The chief are, *Predigerbeschaftigung* (Lemgo, 1783-94, 9 parts): — *Christenthum und Kosmopolitismus* (Lemgo, 1788-89, 2 volumes, 8vo): — *Salomo; Versuch einer psychologisch-biographischeen Darstellung* (Gera, 1800, 8vo): — *Die Gottlichkeit d. Christenthums* (Brem. 1800, 8vo): — *Briefe fiber die alte Mystik u. d. neuen Mysticismus* (Leipsig, 1822, 8vo); besides numerous sermons and books on practical religion and education. — Doering, *Die deutschen Kanzel-Redner*, 1:46.

Ewe

stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative of the following Hebrews words: l j æ; *(rachel', fem.)*, a "ewe" (<013138>Genesis 31:38; 32:14) or *"sheep"* generally (<220606>Song of Solomon 6:6; <235307>Isaiah 53:7); hc, *(sek*, masc. <021205>Exodus 12:5; fem. Jeremiah 1, 17; <263420>Ezekiel 34:20), a sheep or goat from a flock generally, variously rendered ("cattle," "sheep," "goat," "ewe"); hcþKi *(kibsah')* or hcþKi *(kabsah'*, fem., so called from being fit for coupling*)*, a "ewe-lamb," i.e., from one to three years old (<012128>Genesis 21:28, 29, 30; <031410>Leviticus 14:10; <040614>Numbers 6:14; <101203>2 Samuel 12:3, 4,6); t / l [;(aloth', *milk-giving* fem. plur.), milch ("[ewes] with young," <197871>Psalm 78:71; <234011>Isaiah 40:11). *SEE SHEEP*, etc.

Ewer

Picture for Ewer

or pitcher (q.v.) accompanying a wash-hand basin (q.v.). It is stated as a description of Elisha (<120301>2 Kings 3:11) that he *"poured water on the hands*

of Elijah." This was the act of an attendant or disciple; and it was so much his established duty, that the mere mention of it sufficed to indicate the relation in which Elisha had stood to Elijah. It is also an indication that the Hebrews were accustomed to wash their hands in the manner which is now universal in the East, and which, whatever may be thought of its convenience, is unquestionably more refreshing and cleanly than washing in the water as it stands in a basin, which is a process regarded by the Orientals with great dislike. The hands are Therefore held over a basin, the use of which is only to receive the water which has been poured upon the hands, sometimes of several persons successively, from the jug or ewer held above them (Lane, *Modern Egyptians,* 1:212). A servant or some other person approaches with the ewer in his right hand and the basin in his left; and when the hands have been placed in proper position over the basin, which he continues to hold, lets fall a stream of water upon them from the ewer, suspending it occasionally to allow the hands to be soaped or rubbed together. No towel is offered, as every one dries his hands in his handkerchief, or however else he pleases. The water is usually tepid, and always so after a meal, in order to clear the grease contracted by eating with the hands. In the East, the basin, which, as well as the ewer, is usually of tinned copper, has commonly a sort of cover, rising in the middle and sunk into the basin at the margin, which, being pierced with holes, allows the water to pass through, thus concealing it after it has been defiled by use. The ewer has a long spout, and a long, narrow neck, with a cover, and is altogether not unlike our coffee-pots in general appearance: it is the same which the Orientals use in all their ablutions. It is evident that a person cannot conveniently thus wash his own hands without assistance. If he does, he is obliged to fix the basin, and to take up and lay down the ewer several times, changing it from one hand to the other. Therefore a person never does so except when alone. If he has no servant, he asks some bystander to pour the water upon his hands, and offers a return of the obligation, if it seems to be required (Kitto, *Pict. Bible,* note ad loc.). *SEE WASHING OF HANDS.*

Ewing, Finis

one of the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, was born July 10, 1773, in Bedford County, Virginia. His father was of ScotchIrish descent, and both his parents were eminent for their piety, the father for many years being an elder in the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Ewing had but little early education. He spent some time in college, but where is not

known. His biographer says, "Like Franklin, he seems very early to have acquired a fondness for books. His varied and extensive reading made him emphatically a learned man, though not systematically educated, and the brilliancy of his success as a minister of the Gospel evinced intellectual endowments of a high order." His parents having died in Virginia, the surviving family moved to what was called the "Cumberland Country," and settled in Davidson County, Tennessee, near Nashville. On January 15, 1793, he married the daughter of general William Davidson, of North Carolina. The county was named from him (Davidson), in honor of his many valuable services during the war of the Revolution. Here Mr. Ewing and his wife united with Reverend Dr. Craighead's church, and lived in its communion some years before either of them knew anything about experimental religion. After the birth of their first child (but at what time is not known) Mr. Ewing removed to Kentucky, and settled in what was afterwards Logan County, near Red River Church, of which Reverend James M'Gready was pastor. In the great revival of 1800, which swept over all the Western States, and out of which originated the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Mr. Ewing heard for the first time in his life the doctrines of regeneration and *personal* holiness insisted upon from the pulpit. He became satisfied that he had not a saving knowledge of the truth, and communicated his feelings to his wife, whom he found in a similar state of mind. After many prayers and tears, while engaged in family worship, he "became filled with joy and peace in believing." Some time after this (the precise period is not known)' he told his impressions to preach the Gospel to Transylvania Presbytery, which body, at the advice of Reverend David Rice, D.D., one of the oldest ministers: in the presbytery, licensed Mr. Ewing and three others to exhort. His success was wonderful; scores of sinners were converted wherever he went. His talents, piety, commanding language, and zeal carried. everything before them. He was soon licensed to preach as a probationer, but the prevailing party in the presbytery opposed his licensure. He went on preaching very successfully, however, revival attending his labors wherever he traveled. His labor was so much called for, and so marked with success, that at the urgent call of several congregations he was ordained, in November 1803, to the work of the ministry. The revival went on with unabated power for several years; in the mean time Kentucky Synod had pretended to dissolve Cumberland Presbytery, which had ordained him, because of alleged irregularities. The presbytery remained for four years not attempting to exercise its functions as a presbytery; after which, failing to secure a redress of their grievances

from the General Assembly, they determined to organize again, even contrary to the wishes of a majority of Kentucky Synod. On February 4, 1810, Mr. Ewing and two other ordained ministers united and formed the first presbytery of the new Cumberland Presbyterian Church, giving it the name of the presbytery Kentucky Synod had dissolved, viz. *Cumberland Presbytery;* hence the name "Cumberland Presbyterians." Mr. Ewing removed after some years to Todd County, Kentucky, and became pastor of Lebanon congregation, near Ewingsville. Here under his eye was sustained for many years a flourishing classical seminary of learning. In 1820, at the urgent call of many. friends and brethren, he removed to the State of Missouri, and settled in what is now Cooper County. It was not long until he built up a large congregation at New Lebanon, which still flourishes. Here he prepared and published his *Lectures on Divinity*, which have been extensively circulated and read, and which contain the germ of the peculiarities of Cumberland Presbyterians. He labored here with great acceptance and success until 1836, when he removed to the town of Lexington, Lafayette County, Mo. Here he soon gathered a congregation, built a church, and, with others, was the means of extending the work of grace all over the vast incoming territories of the West. Mr. Ewing died here July 4, 1841, in his 68th year. He was tall, portly in appearance, had a keen, penetrating eye, always bore a dignified look, was a man of extraordinary pulpit talents, and of great success among all classes in winning souls to the Redeemer. In our troubles with Great Britain in 1812 he did not hesitate to give all the weight of his great influence in favor of his country. He was no politician, yet at one time, being an intimate friend and acquaintance of general Jackson, he was by him appointed register of the land office at Lexington, Mo. He died lamented by a large and growing denomination, and by many others, as a great and good man. His remains rest in the cemetery at Lexington, Moa (J.B.L.)

Ewing, John

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, and provost of the University of Pennsylvania, was born in Nottingham, Cecil County, Maryland, June 22, 1732, and graduated in 1754 in New Jersey College, of which he remained tutor for two years. Having completed his theological course, he was ordained, became instructor; in the College of Philadelphia, and was installed pastor of the first Presbyterian church, Philadelphia, in 1759. He visited England and Scotland in 1773 in behalf of the academy in Newark, Del., and returned in 1775 to the duties of his ministry. In 1779 he was

appointed provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and professor of natural philosophy, in which science he delivered annually a course of learned lectures. In this station united with that of pastor, he continued to the end of life. He was also one of the vice-presidents of the American Philosophical Society. He died September 8, 1802. He published Lectures on Natural *Philosophy* (2 volumes, 8vo), and *Sermons* (8vo) — Sprague, *Annals,* 3:216.

Exactions

(Let. *exactiones, taliae),* the name given in ecclasiastical law to taxes of an extraordinary kind, which either were not in use before, or the rate of, which hash been increased. As a general rule, taxes of this kind are forbidden. Thus the third Council of Toledo prohibited the bishops from "imposing exactions upon the diocese," and Leo IV designates as unlawful exactions any "gifts beyond the statutes of the fathers" that bishops may impose upon clergymen or laymen. The prohibition was renewed at the Council of Lateran in 1179 by Alexander III, who "prohibited bishops or abbots, or any other prelates, from imposing new takes upon the churches, or from increasing the old ones, or from appropriating for their private uses any portion of the revenue." 'The imposition of exactions requires a reasonable cause, and limitation to what is necessary. State churches cannot impose an exaction without previously obtaining the permission ofthe state government. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:280.

Exactor

the rendering (Isaiah 60:17) of *nogesh',* driver (task-master, Exodus 3:7; Job 3:18; Isaiah 9:3; or simply driver of animals, Job 39:7); hence *exactor* of a debt (or tribute, Daniel 11:20; Zechariah 9:8); hence (in accordance with Oriental ideas and customs) a *ruler*, king, tyrant (Isaiah 3:12; 94:2; Zechariah 10:4): as the parallel term "prince" in the above passage of Isaiah shows to be, there the meaning.

Exaltation of Christ

(status exaltationas), a theological phrase, including in its scope the resurrection of Christ, his ascension into heaven, his sitting at the right hand of God the Father, and his coming to judge the world at the last day.

See articles on these heads; also CHRISTOLOGY *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*; and Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, Smith's ed., 2:352.

Exaltation of the Cross

SEE CROSS, EXALTATION OF THE,

Example

(δεῖγμα, <60107>Jude 1:7), especially CHRIST'S (ὑπόγραμμα, <60221>1 Peter 2:21) for the imitation of his followers (ὑπόδειγμα, <43135>John 13:15; elsewhere in other relations, <59041>Hebrews 4:11; 8:5; 9:23; <59510>James 5:10; <60206>2 Peter 2:6), and subordinately pastors for their flack (τὐπος, <50317>Philippians 3:17; <53609>2 Thessalonians 3:9; <54412>1 Timothy 4:12; <60503>1 Peter 5:3, etc.). See Flatt, Das *Beispiel Jesu* (in the *Magaz. fur chr. Doymat.* 1:179 sq.); Keil, *De Exemplo Christi* (Lips. 1792; *Opusc.* 1:100-135); Oeder, *De Christi* imitatione (in his *Obss. sacr.* 1:33-56); Schmid, *De perverso Christi* imitatione (Lips. 1710);, Stober, De *exemplorum* imitatione (Argent. 1771-6); Wolf, *De exemplis caute adhibendis* (Lips. 1785-6); Kempis, *Imitaio of Christ* (often published).

Example

"a copy or pattern, in a moral sense, is either taken for a type, instance, or precedent for our admonition, that we may be cautioned against the faults or crimes which others have committed, by the bad consequences which have ensued from them; or example is taken for a pattern for our imitation, or a nmodel for us to copy after. That *good examples* have a peculiar power above naked precepts to dispose us to the practice of virtue and holiness may appear by considering, 1. That they most clearly express to us the nature of our duties in their subjects and sensible effects. General precepts form abstract ideas of virtue, but in examples, virtues are most visible in all their circumstances. 2. Precepts instruct us in what things are our duty, but examples assure us that they are possible. 3. Examples, by secret and lively incentive, urge us to imitation. We are touched in another manner by the visible practice of good men, which reproaches our defects, and obliges us to the same zeal which laws, though wise and good, will not effect. The life of Jesus Christ forms the most beautiful example the Christian can imitate. Unlike all others, it was absolutely perfect asmd uniform, and every way accommodated to our present state. In him we “behold all light without a shade," all beauty without a spot, all the purity

of the law and the excellency of the Gospel. Here we see piety without superstition, and moraliter without ostentation; hunaility without mean and fortitude without temerity; patience without apathy, and compassion without weakness; zeal without rashness, and beneficence without prodigality. The obligation we are under to imitate this example arises from ditty, relationship, engagement, interest, and gratitude. *SEE JESUS CHRIST*. Those who set *bad examples* should consider,

1. That they are the ministers of the devil's designs to destroy souls.

2. That they are acting in direct opposition to Christ, he who came to save and not to destroy.

3. That they are adding to the misery and calamities which are already in the world.

4. That the effects of their example may be incalculable on society to the end of time, and perhaps in eternity; for who can tell what may be the consequence of one sin on a family, a nation, or posterity?

5. They are acting contrary to the divine command, and thus exposing themselves to final ruin" (Tillotson, Sermons, ser. 189, 190; Barrow, *Works*, volume 3, ser. 2 and 3; Flavel, *Works*, 1:29, 30; Dwight, *Theology*, ser. 54; *Christ our Example*, by Caroline Fry).

Exarch

(ἔξαρχος),

(1.) the title given, under the Byzantine emperors, to their viceroys in Italy and Africa, after Justinian's reconquest of those provinces.

(2.) The title was adopted in the early Church for the highest orders of the hierarchy. Primates or metropolitamas were styled ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας, and the patriarchs were called ἔξαρχοι τῆς διοικήσεως. In the 6th canonm of Sardiea (A.D. 344) the former title (exarch of the eparchy) is given to primates; the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, forbade its use (Riddle, *Antiquities*, book 3, chapter 3). The exarch, as primate, was "inferior to the patriarch, and superior to the metropolitan. In the third century there were three exarchs, viz. Ephesus, with the diocese of Asia, 12 provinces and 300 sees; Heraclea, with the diocese of Thrace, and, 6 provinces, Caesarea, 13 provinces and 104 sees. The privileges of

these exarchates were transferred by the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) to the patriarch of Constantinople."

(3.) The *exarch* in the Greek Church at the present day is the patriarch's deputy, whose duty it is to visit the provinces under, his inspection, to inform himself as to the lives and morals of the clergy; to take cognizance of eclesiastical causes — the manner of celebrating divine ordinances, the sacraments, particularly confession, the observance of the canons, monastic discipline, affairs of marriages, divorces, etc.; but, above all, to take account of the revenues which the patriarch receives from the several churches. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles*. Bohn's ed. 1:61, 67.

Exchanger

(τραπεζίτης, so called from the *table* used for holding; the coin *SEE CHANGER OF MONEY*), a broker or banker (i.e., bench-man) *SEE BANK*, one who exchanged money, and also received money on deposit at interest, in order to loan it out to others at a higher rate (<40 25 27>Matthew 25:27). (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. Mensarii.) *SEE MONEY-CHANGER; SEE LOAN.*

Excommunication

the judicial exclusion of offenders from the religious rites and privileges of the particular comemunlity to which they belong. It is a power founded upon a right inherent in all, religious societies, and is analogous to the powers of capital punishment, banishment, and exclusion from membership which are exercised by political and municipal bodies. If Christianity is merely a philosophical idea thrown into the world to do battle with other theories, and to be valued according as it maintains its ground or not in the conflict of opinions, excommunication, and ecclesiastical punishments and discipline are unreasonable. If a society has been instituted for maintaining any body of doctrine and any code of morals, they are necessary to the existence of that society. That the Christian Church is an organized polity, a spiritual "kingdom of God" on earth, is the declaration of the Bible; and that the Jewish Church was at once a spiritual and a temporal organization is clear. Among the Jews, however, excommunication was not only an ecclesiastical, but also a civil punishment, because in their theocracy there was no distinction between the divine and the statutory right (<02 31 14>Exodus 31:14; <15 10 08>Ezra 10:3, 11; <16 13 28>Nehemiah 13:28). But among Christians excommunication was strictly confined to ecclesiastical relations, as the

situation and constitution of the Church during the first three centuries admitted of no intermingling or confounding of civil and religious privileges or penalties. Excommunication, in the Christian Church, consisted at first simply in exclusion from the communion of the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts: "with such a one, no, not to eat" (<461511>1 Corinthians 5:11). It might also include a total separation from the body of the faithful; and such a. person was, with regard to the Church, "as a heathen man and a publican." But this excision did not exempt him from my duties to which he was liable in civil life, neither did it withhold from him any natural obligations, such as are founded on nature, humanity, and the law of nations (<401817>Matthew 18:17; <461605>1 Corinthians 5:5, 11; 10:16-18; <530306>2 Thessalonians 3:6, 14; 2 John 10, 11). *SEE CHURCH*.

I. *Jewish.* — The Jewish system of excommunication was threefold. For a first offense a delinquent was subjected to the penalty of yWDni(niddui). Rambaam (quoted by Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae,* on <461605>1 Corinthians 5:5), Moriunus *(De Panitentia,* 4:27), and Buxtorf (Lexicon *Tahn.* col. page 303 sq.) enumerate the twenty-four offenses for which it was inflicted. They are various, and range in heinousness from the offense of keeping a fierce dog to that of taking God's name in vain. Elsewhere (Talm. Bab. Moed *Katon,* fol. 16, 1) the causes of its infliction are reduced to two, termed money and epicurism, by which is meant debt and wanton insolence. The offender was first cited to appear in court, and if he refused to appearer to make amends, his sentence was pronounced "Let NI. or N. be under excommunication." The excommunicated person was prohibited the use of the bath, or of the razor, or of the convivial table; and all who had to do with him were commanded to keep him at four cubits' distance. He was allowed to go to the Temple, but not to make the circuit in the ordinary manner. The term of this punishment was thirty days, and it was extended to a second and to a third thirty days when necessary. If at the end of that time the offender was still contumacious, he was subjected to the second excommunication termed µrḥ,(cherem), a word meaning something devoted to God (<032721>Leviticus 27:21, 28; <022220>Exodus 22:20 [19]; <041814>Numbers 18:14). Severer penalties were now attached. The offender was not allowed to teach or to be taught in company with others, to hire or to be hired, nor to perform any commercial transactions beyoand purchasing the necessaries of life. The sentence was delivered by a court of ten, and was accompanied by a solemn malediction, for which authority was supposed to be found in the "Curse ye Meroz" of <070523>Judges 5:23.

Lastly followed תַּחֲמִי *(shamma-tha),* which was an entire cutting off from the congregation. It has been supposed by some that these two latter forms of excoanmunication were undistinguishable from each other. See BAN.

The punishment of excommunication is not appointed by the law of Moses. It is founded on the natural right of self-protection which all societies enjoy. The case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. (Numbers 16), the curse denounced on Meroz (<07053>Judges 5:23), the commission and proclamation of Ezra (7:26; 10:8), and the reformation of Nehemiah (13:25), are appealed to by the Talmudists as precedents by which their proceedings are regulated. In respect to the principle involved, the "cutting off from the people" commanded for certain sins (<02033>Exodus 30:33, 38; 31:14; <03704>Leviticus 17:4), and the exclusion from the camp denounced on the leprous (Leveticus 13:46; <04124>Numbers 12:14), are more apposite.

In the New Testament, Jewish excommunication is brought prominently before us in the case of the man that was born blind and restored to sight (John 9). "The Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. Therefore said his parents, He is of age, ask him" (verses 22, 23). "And they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out" (verses 34, 35). The expressions here used, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται—ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω, refer, no doubt, to the first form of excommunication, or niddui. Our Lord warns his disciples that they will have to suffer excommunication at the hands of their countrymen (<43602>John 16:2), and the fear of it is described as sufficienmt to prevent persons in a respectable position from acknowledging their belief in Christ (<43242>John 12:42). In <42622>Luke 6:22, it has been thought that our Lord referred specifically to the three forms of Jewish excommunication, "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company [ἀφορίσωσιν], and shall reproach you [ὀνειδίσωσιν], and cast out your name as evil [ἐκβάλωσιν], for the Son of man's sake." The three words very accurately express the simple separation, the additional malediction, and the final exclusion of *niddui,* cherem, and *shammathal.* This verse makes it probable that the three stages were already formally distinguished from each other, though, no doubt, the words appropriate to each are occasionally used inaccurately. See the monographs in Latin on Jewish excommunication by Musculus (Lips. 1703), Opitz (Kilon. 1680).

II. *In the New* Testament. — Excommunication in the New Testament is not merely founded on the natural right possessed by all societies, nor merely on the example of the Jewish Church and nation. It was instituted by our Lord (<40185>Matthew 18:15, 18), and it was practiced by and commanded by Paul (<540120>1 Timothy 1:20; <460511>1 Corinthians 5:11; <560310>Titus 3:10).

1. Its Institution. — The passage in Matthew has led to much controversy, into which we do not enter. It runs as follows: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained the brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear themn, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be. bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Our Lord here recognizes and appoints a way in which a member of his Church is to become to his brethren as a heathen man and a publican, i.e., be reduced to a state analogous to that of the Jew suffering the penalty of the third form of excommunication. It is to follow on his contempt of the censure of the Church passed on him for a trespass which he has committed. The final excision is to be preceded, as in the case of the Jew, by two warnings.

2. *Apostolic Example*. — In the Epistles we find Paul frequently claiming the right to exercise discipline over his converts (comp. <470123>2 Corinthians 1:23; 13:10). In two cases we find him exercising this authority to the extent of cutting off offenders from the Church. One of these is the case of the incestuous Corinthian "Ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (<460502>1 Corinthians 5:2-5). The other case is that of Hymenmeus and Alexander: "Holding faith and a good conscience, which some, having put away concerning faith, have made shipwreck; of whom is Hymeneeus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (<540119>1 Timothy 1:19, 20). It seems certain that

these persons were excommunicated, the first for immorality, the others for heresy. What is the full meaning of the expression "deliver unto Satan" is doubtful. All agree that excommunication is contained in it, but whether it implies any further punishment, inflicted by the extraordinary powers committed specially to the apostles, has been questioned. The strongest argument for the phrase meaning no more than excommunication may be drawn from a comparison of <51013>Colossians 1:13. Addressing himself to the "saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse," Paul exhorts them to "give thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." The conception of the apostle here is of men lying in the realm of darkness, and transported from thence into the kingdom of the Son of God, which is the inheritance of the saints in light, by admission into the Church. What he means by the power of darkness is abundantly clear from many other passages in his writings, of which it will be sufficient to quote <49612>Ephesians 6:12: "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil; for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Introduction into the Church is therefore, in Paul's mind, a translation from the kingdom and power of Satan to the kingdom and government of Christ. This being so, he could hardly more naturally describe the effect of excluding a man from the Church than by the words "deliver him unto Satan," the idea being that the man ceasing to be a subject of Christ's kingdom of light, was at once transported back to the kingdom of darkness, and delivered therefore into the power of its ruler, Satan. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the terms in which Paul describes the commission which he received from the Lord Jesus Christ when he was sent to the Gentiles: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (<44618>Acts 26:18). Here again the act of being placed in Christ's kingdom, the Church, is pronounced to be a translation from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God. Conversely, to be cast out of the Church would be to be removed from light to darkness, to be withdrawn from God's government, and delivered into the power of Satan (so Balsamon and Zonaras, *in Basil. Can.* 7; Estius, in 1 Corinthians

5; Beveridge, *in Can. Apost.* 10). If, however, the expression means more than excommunication, it would imply the additional exercise of a special apostolical power, similar to that exerted on Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1), Simon Magus (8:20), and Elymas (13:10). (So Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Hammond, Grotius, Lightfoot.)

3. *Apostolic Precept.* — In addition to the claim to exercise discipline, and its actual exercise in the form of excommunication by the apostles, we find apostolic precepts directing that discipline should be exercised by the rulers of the Church, and that in some cases excommunication should be resorted to: "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," writes Paul to the Thessalonians (2 Thessalonians 3:14). To the Romans: "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have heard, and avoid them" (Romans 16:17). To the Galatians: "I would they were even cut off that. trouble you" (Galatians 5:12). To Timothy: "If any man teach otherwise, ... from such withdraw thyself" (1 Timothy 6:3). To Titus he uses a still stronger expression: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject" (Titus 3:10). John instructs the lady to whom he addresses his second epistle not to receive into her house, nor bid God speed to any who did not believe in Christ (2 John 10); and we read that in the case of Cerinthus he acted himself on the precept that he had given (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3:28). In his third epistle he describes Diotrephes, apparently a Judaizing presbyter, "who loved to have the pre-eminence," as "casting out of the Church," i.e., refusing Church communion to the stranger brethren who were traveling about preaching to the Gentiles (3 John 10). In the addresses to the Seven Churches the, angels or rulers of the church of Pergamos and of Thyatira are rebuked for "suffering" the Nicolaitans and Balaamites "to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things, sacrificed unto idols" (Revelation 2:20). There are two passages still more important to our subject. In the epistle to the Galatians, Paul denounces, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed [ἀνάθεμα ἔστω]. As I said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, Galatians 1:8, 9). And in the second epistle to the Corinthians: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha" (1

Corinthians 16:22). It has been supposed that these two expressions, "let him be Anathema," "let him be Anathema Maranatha," refer respectively to the two later stages of Jewish excommunication — the *cherem* and the *shammahi.* This requires consideration.

The words ἀνάθεμα and ἀνάθημα have evidently the same derivation, and originally they bore the same meaning. They express a person or thing set apart, laid up, or devoted. But whereas a thing may be set apart by way of honor or for destruction, the words, like the Latin "sacer" and the English "devoted," came to have opposite senses—τὸ ἀπηλλοτριωμένον Θεοῦ, and τὸ ἀφωρισμένον Θεῷ. The Sept. and several ecclesiastical writers use the two words almost indiscriminately, but in general the form ἀνάθημα is applied to the votive offering (see 2 Macc. 9:16; <422105>Luke 21:5; and Chrysost. *Hom.* 16 *in Ep. cad Rom.),* and the form ἀνάθεμα to that which is devoted to evil (see <050726>Deuteronomy 7:26; <060617>Joshua 6:17; 7:13). Thus Paul declares that he could wish himself an ἀνάθεμα from Christ if he could thereby save the Jews (<450903>Romans 9:3). His meaning is that he would be willing to be set apart as a vile thing, to be cast aside and destroyed, if only it could bring about the salvation of his brethren. Hence we see the force of ἀνάθεμα ἔστω in <480108>Galatians 1:8. "Have nothing to do with him," would be the apostle's injunction, "but let him be set apart as an evil thing, for God to deal with him as he thinks fit." Hammond (in loc.) paraphrases it as follows: "You are to disclaim and renounce all communion with him, to look on him as on an excommunicated person, under the second degree of excommunication, that none is to have any commerce with in sacred things." Hence it is that ἀνάθεμα ἔστω came to be the common expression employed by councils at the termination of each canon which they enacted, meaning that whoever was disobedient to the canon was to be separated from the communion of the Church and its privileges, and from the favor of God, until he repented (see Bingham, *Ant.* 16:2,16). *SEE ANATHEMA.*

The expression Ἀνάθεμα μαρανάθά as it stands by itself without explanation in <461622>1 Corinthians 16:22, is so peculiar, that it has tempted a number of ingenious expositions. Parkhurst hesitatingly derives it from µr;j}m; hTaj, "Cursed be thou." But this derivation is not tenable. Buxtorf, Morinus, Hammond, Bingham, and others identify, it with the Jewish *shammatha.* They do so by translating *shammatha,* "The Lord comes." But *shammatha* cannot be made to mean "The Lord comes" (see Lightfoot, in

loc.). Several fanciful derivations are given by rabbinical writers, as " There is death," "There is desolation;" but there is no mention by them of such a signification as "The Lord comes." Lightfoot derives it from tMe, and it probably means a thing excluded or shut out. Maranatha, however peculiar its use in the text may seem to us, is a Syro-Chaldaic expression, signifying "The Lord is come" (Chrysostom, Jerome, Estius, Lightfoot), or "The Lord cometh." If we take the former meaning, we may regard it as giving the reason why the offender was to be anathematized; if the latter, it would either imply that the separation was to be in perpetuity, "donee Dominus redeat" (Augustine), or, more properly, it would be a form of solemn appeal to the day on which the judgment should be ratified by the Lord (comp. Jude 14). In any case it is a strengthened form of the simple ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. And thus it may be regarded as holding towards it a similar relation to that which existed between the *shanmaftha* and the *cherem*, but not on any supposed ground of etymological identity between the two words *shammatha* and *maranatha*. Perhaps we ought to interpunctuate more strongly between ἀνάθεμα, and μαραναθά and read ἤτω ἀνάθεμα: μαραναθά, i.e., "Let him be anathema. The Lord will come." The *anathema* and the *cherem* answer very exactly to each other (see Leviticus 27:28; Numbers 21:3; Isaiah 43:28). *SEE MARANATHA*.

4. *Restoration to Communion.* — Two cases of excommunication are related in Holy Scripture, and in one of them the restitution of the offender is specially recounted. The incestuous Corinthian had been excommunicated by the authority of Paul, who had issued his sentence from a distance without any consultation with the Corinthians. He had required them publicly to promulgate it and act upon it. They had done so. The offender had been brought to repentance, and was overwhelmed with grief. Hereupon Paul, still absent as before, forbids the further infliction of the punishment, pronounces the forgiveness of the penitent, and exhorts the Corinthians to receive him back to communion, and to confirm their love towards him.

5. *The Nature of Excommunication* is made more evident by these acts of Paul than by any investigation of Jewish practice or of the etymology of words. We thus find

(1) that it is a spiritual penalty, involving no temporal punishment except accidentally;

(2) that it consists in separation from the communion of the Church;

(3) that its object is the good of the sufferer (1 Corinthians 5:5), and the protection of the sound members of the Church (2 Timothy 3:17);

(4) that its subjects are those who are guilty of heresy (1 Timothy 1:20) or gross immorality (1 Corinthians 5:1);

(5) that it is inflicted by the authority of the Church at large (Matthew 18:18) wielded by the highest ecclesiastical officer (1 Corinthians 5:3; Titus 3:10);

(6) that this officer's sentence is promulgated by the congregation to which the offender belongs (1 Corinthians 5:4), in deference to his superior judgment and command (2 Corinthians 2:9), and in spite of any opposition on the part of a minority (*ib.* 6);

(7) that the exclusion may be of indefinite duration or for a period;

(8) that its duration may be abridged at the discretion and by the indulgence of the person who has imposed the penalty *(ib.* 8);

(9) that penitence is the condition on which restoration to communion is granted *(ib.* 7);

(10) that the sentence is to be publicly reversed as it was publicly promulgated *(ib.* 10).

III. *In the Post-Apostolic Christian Church.—*

(I.) *In general.* — Such a power is necessarily inherent in *every* community; and although "the only sense in which the apostles, or, of course, any of their successors in the Christian ministry, can be empowered to 'forgive sins' *as against God* is by pronouncing and proclaiming *his* forgiveness of all those who, coming to him through Christ, repent and forsake their sins," yet since offenses *as against a community* may "be visited with penalties by the regular appointed officers of that community, they may enforce or remit such penalties. On these principles is founded the right which the Church claims both to punish ecclesiastical offenses, and to pronounce an absolute and complete pardon of a particular offender on his making the requisite submission and reparation."

(II.) *In the early Christian Church.* —

1. In the discipline of the primitive Church, according to the apostolic injunction, recourse was not had to excommunication until "after the first and second admonition" (προθέσμια). If the offender proved refractory after the time granted for repentance (Siegel, *Alterthumer*, 2:131), he was liable to excommunication, which at first consisted simply in the removal of the offender from the Lord's Supper and the love-feasts: hence the word *excommunication*, separation from *communion.* The practice was founded on the words ,f the apostle (1 Corinthians 5:11), "with such an one, no, not to eat;" which do not refer to ordinary meals and the common intercourse of life, but to the *agapae* and other solemnities. The chief difference between Jewish and Christian excommunication consisted in this: the former extended in its consequences to the affairs of civil life, whereas the latter was strictly confined to ecclesiastical relations. It was impossible, in the constitution and situation of the Church during the three first centuries, that there should have been any confounding or intermingling of civil and religious privileges or penalties. But, though instituted at first for the purpose of preserving the purity of the Church, excommunication was afterwards by degrees converted by ambitious ecclesiastics into an engine for promoting their own power, and was often inflicted on the most frivolous occasions (Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 15, chapter 2). The primitive Church was very cautious in exercising its power of excommunication. No man could be condemned to it in his absence, or without being allowed liberty to answer for himself. Legal conviction was always required, i.e., by his own confession, by credible evidence, or by open notoriety. Minors were subjected to corporal discipline rather than to this censure (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 16, chapter 2; Cave, *Prim. Christianity*, 3:5).

2. There were two excommunications, the greater (major) and lesser (minor). The *excommunicatio minor* (ἀφορισμός) excluded from participation in the Eucharist and prayers of the faithful, but did not expel from the Church; for the person under its sentence might stay to hear the psalmody, reading of the Scripture, sermons and prayers of the catechumens and penitents, and then depart as soon as the first service, called the *service of catechumens,* was ended (Theod. *Ep.* 77; *ad Eelul.* 3:797). This punishment was commonly inflicted upon lesser crimes, or if upon greater, upon such sinners only as showed a willingness to repent-upon those who had lapsed rather through infirmity than maliciousness.

The *excommunicatio* major, greater excommunication (παντελὴς ἀφορισμός), was a total expulsion from the Church, and separation from communion in all holy offices with it *(Encyclop.* Metropolitana). When attended with execratioans, excommunication was called anathema (see article, volume 1, page 219). The several churches mutually informed each other of their own separate excommunications in order that a person excommunicated by one church might be held so by all; and any church which received him was held deserving of similar punishment. He who was guilty of any intercourse with an excommunicated person, himself incurred a like sentence, which deprived him of Christian burial and insertion in the diptychs or catalogues of the faithful. No gifts or oblations were received from the excommunicated. No intermarriages might take place with them. Their books might not be read, but were to be burned (Bingham, *Oruq. Eccl.* book 15). For the restoration of excommunicated persons, penances (q.v.) and public professions of repentance were required; and in Africa and Spain the absolution of *lapsed* persons (i.e., those who, in time of persecution, had yielded to the force of temptation, and fallen away from their Christian profession by the crime of actual sacrifice to idols) was forbidden, except at the hour of death, or in cases where martyrs interceded for them. *SEE LAPSI.*

(III.) *The Roman Church.* — As the pretensions of the hierarchy increased, excommunication became more and more an instrument of ecclesiastical power, as well as a means of enlarging it. When the Church had full control of the state, its sentences were attended with the gravest civil as well as ecclesiastical consequences. There are three degrees of excommunication, the minor, the *major,* and the anathema.

1. The minor is incurred by holding communion with an excommunicated person: oratione, *locutione, bibendo,* comedendo — praying, speaking, drinking, eating; and absolution may be given by any priest on confession. Priests who have incurred the minor ban may administer the Eucharist, but cannot partake of it.

2. The major excommussicatio falls upon those who disobey the commands of the pope, or who, having been found guilty of any offense, civil or criminal, refuse to submit to certain points of discipline; in consequence of which they are excommunicated from the Church triumphant, and delivered over to the devil and his angels. It requires a written sentence from a bishop after three admonitions. It deprives the condemned person of all the

blessings of the Church in any shape, except that he is not debarred from hearing the Word. So long as the State obeyed the Church, civil disabilities followed the sentence of excommunication; no obedience was due to the excommunicated; the laws could give them no redress for injuries; and none could hold intercourse with them under penalty of excommunication. On this last point, however, a distinction has been made since the 15th century between those who are called tolerati (tolerated) and those who are designated as *vitandi* (persons to be shunned). Only in the case of the latter (a case extremely rare, and confined to heresiarchs, and other signal offenders against the faith or public order of the Church) are the ancient rules for prohibition of intercourse enforced. With the 'tolerated,' since the celebrated decree of Pope Martin V in the Council of Constance, the faithful are permitted to maintain the ordinary intercourse. By the 12th century the word ban (*bannus, bannum*), which in ancient jurisprudence denoted a declaration of outlawry, had come into ecclesiastical use to denote the official act of excommunication. *SEE BAN.*

The professed aim of excommunication was the reform of the offender as well as the purification of the Church. Absolution can be granted, in case of the major ban, only by the authority which laid the bans or its successor. Before absolution the authorities must be satisfied of penitence. The "penitent must first swear to obey the commands of the Church, and to make all necessary atonement for his special offense; he must then be *reconciled* by kneeling, bareheaded and stripped to his shirt, before the bishop sitting at the church gates. Here he again repeats his oath, and the bishop, reciting the psalm *Deus misere*atar, strikes him with a rod during each verse. Then, after certain prayers, he absolves him and leads him into the church."

3. The anathema is attended with special ceremonies. "The bishop must be attended by twelve priests, each of whom, as well as himself, bears a lighted candle. He then sits before the high altar, or any other public place which he prefers, and delivers his sentence, which adjudges the offender to be anathemizatsum et damnatum *cum diabolo et angelis ejus et* omnibus *reprobis in wternum igem* — cursed and damned with the devil and his angels and all the reprobate to eternal fire. The candles are then dashed down. The ceremonials of absolution from this sentence are not very different from the last, although the form of prayer is varied" *(Encyclop. Metrop.* s.v.). The effects of the anathema were summed up in the monkish lines

Si pro delicto anathema quis efficiatur,
Os, orare, vale, comnamunio, mensa negatur.

SEE ANATHEMA; SEE BELL, BOOK, AND CANDLE.

"In the Roman Catholic Church the power or excommunicating is held t6 reside, not in the congregation, but in the bishop; and this is believed to be in exact accordance with the remarkable proceeding commemorated in the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 5:3, 5), and with all the earliest recorded examples of its exercise. Like all the powers of the episcopate, it is held to belong, in an especial and eminent degree, to the Roman bishop, as primate of the Church; but it is by no means believed to be. long to him exclusively, nor has such exclusive right ever been claimed by the bishops of Rome. On the contrary, bishops within their sees, archbishops while exercising visitatorial jurisdiction, heads of religious orders within their own communities, all possess the power to issue excommunication, not only by the ancient law of the Church, but also by the most modern discipline" (Chambers, s.v.). But Aquinas held that excommunication, as not belonging to the keys of *or*der, not to those of *jurisdiction,* and as not referring to grace directly, but only accidentally, might be exercised by persons not in holy orders, but yet having jurisdiction in ecclesiastical courts (Summa, *Suppl.* 3, qu. 22). See Marshall, *Penitential Discipline*, Oxf. 1844, page 139. The Council of Trent declares (sess. 25, chapter 3, *de Reform.)* that, "Although the sword of excommunication is the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline, and very salutary for keeping the people in their duty, yet it is to be used with sobriety and great circumspection; seeing that experience teaches that if it be rashly or for slight causes wielded, it is more despised than feared, and produces destruction rather than safety. It shall be a crime for any secular magistrate to prohibit an ecclesiastical judge from excommunicating any one, or to command that he revoke an excommunication issued, under pretext that the things contained in the present decree have not been observed; whereas the cognizance hereof does not pertain to seculars but to ecelesiastics. And every excommunicated person soever who, after the lawful monitions, does not change his mind, shall not only not be received to the sacraments and to communion and intercourse with the faithful, but if, being bound with censures, he shall, with obdurate heart, remain for a year in the defilement thereof, he may even be proceeded against as suspected of heresy." The popes have exercised the power of excommunication against entire communities at once. The *Capitularies* of

Pepin the Less, in the 8th century, ordained that the greater excommunication should be followed by banishment from the countmy. On the claim of the popes to excommunicate and depose monarchs, and to free subjects from their allegiance, see M'Clintock, *Temporal Power of the Pope* (N.Y. 1855, 12mo). "The latest examples of papal excommunication of monarchs were Napoleon I in 1809, and Victor Emmanuel, king of Italy, in 1860; neither of whom, however, was excommunicated by name, the pope having confined himself to a solemn and reiterated publication of the penalties decreed by his predecessors against those who unjustly invaded the territories of the Holy See, usurped or violated its rights, or violently impeded their free exercise. The excommunication of a sovereign was regarded as freeing subjects from their allegiance; and, in the year 1102, this sentence was pronounced against the emperor Henry IV, an example which subsequent popes likewise ventured to follow. But the fearful weapons with which the popes armed themselves in this power of excommunication were rendered much less effective through their incautious employment, the evident worldly motives by which it was sometimes governed and the excommunications which rival popes hurled against each other during the time of the great papal schism" (Chambers, s.v.).

(IV.) *The Greek Church.* — In the Greek Church excommunication cuts off the offender from all communion with the 318 fathers of the first Council of Nicena, consigns him to the devil and his angels, and condemns his body to remain after death as hard as a piece of flint, unless lie humbles himself and makes atonement for his sins by a sincere repentance. "The form abounds with dreadful imprecations; and the Greeks assert that, if a person dies excommunicated, the devil enters into the lifeless corpse; and, therefore, in order to prevent it, the relations of the deceased cut his body in pieces and boil them in wine. Every year, and a fixed Sunday, the ‘greater ban' is pronounced against the pope and the Church of Rome, on which occasion, together with a great deal of idle ceremony, he drives a nail into the ground with a hammer as a mark of malediction" (Buck, s.v.). Sir Paul Rycaut *(Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches,* Lond. 1679, 8vo), who wrote his observations on the state of that communion in 1678, has gives? in the original Greek, the form of an excommunication issued against an unknown thief whom the authorities were seeking to discover. It runs as follows: "If they restore not to him that which is his own, and possess him peaceably of it, but suffer him to remain

injured and damnifyed, let him be separated from the Lord God Creator, and be accursed, and unpardoned, and undissolvable after death in this world, and in the other which is to come. Let wood, stones, and iron be dissolved, but not they: may they inherit the leprosy of *Gehazi* and the confusion of *Judas* may the earth be divided, and devour them like Dathn and Abiram; may they sigh and tremble an earth like Cain, and the wrath of God be upon their heads and countenances; may they see nothing of that for which they labor, and beg their bread all the days of their lives; may their works, possessions, labors, and services be accursed; always without effect or success, and blown away like dust; may they have the curses of the holy and righteous patriarchs *Abram, Isaac,* and *Jacob;* of the 318 saints who were the divine fathers of the Synod of *Nice,* and of all other holy synods; and being without the Church of Christ, let no human administer unto them the things of the Church, or bless them, or offer sacrifice for them or give them the ἀντίδωρον, or the blessed bread, or eat, or drink, or work with them, or converse with them; and after death let no man bury them, in penalty of being under the same state of excommunication; for so let them remain until they have performed what is here written."

(V.) *In Protestant Churches.* — New relations between Church and State followed hard upon the Reformation, and new limits were soon assigned to the exercise of discipline. According to the view of the Wittemberg reformers, the ban could have no civil effect unless ratified by the State. The necessity of the power of excommunication in the Church was asserted by all the Reformers. They maintained that excommunication is the affair of the whole Church, clergy and laity (Calvin, *Institut.* volume 4, chapter 11; Melancthon, *Corpus Ref. ed. Bretschneider,* 3:965). *SEE ERASTIANISM.* They disclaimed the right of using the *excommunicatio major.* In general, the "Reformers retained only that power of excommunication which appeared to them to be inherent in the constitution of the Christian society, and to be sanctioned by the Word of God; nor have any civil consequences been generally connected with it in Protestant countries. To connect such consequences with excommcunication in any measure whatever is certainly inconsistent with the principles of the Reformation" (Chambers, s.v.).

The causes of excommunication in the established *Church of England* are, contempt of the bishops' court, heresy, neglect of public worship and the sacraments, incontinency, adultery, sinony, etc. If the judge of any spiritual court excommunicates a man for a cause of which he has not the legal

cognizance, the party may have an action against him at common law, and he is also liable to be indicted at the suit of the king (Can. 65, 68; see also the Homily *On the Right Uses of the Church).* The 33d Article of Religion is as follows: "That person which, by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and publican until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto." "By old English law an excommunicated person was disabled from doing any act required to be done by one that is *probes et legalis honzo.* He could not serve on juries, nor be witness in any court, nor bring an action real or personal to recover lands or money due to him. By stat. 5 and 6 Edward VI, cap. 4, striking, or drawing a weapon to strike, in a church or churchyard, incurred *ipso facto* excommunication; *ipso facto* excommunication, or *latae sententivs,* meaning some act so clear or manifest that no sentence is requisite, in contradistinction from *sententiae ferendae, i.e.,* when sentence must be passed before the offender be considered excoamumunicated. The offenses which, in the reign of Edward III, 1373, were punished by *ipsofacto* excommunication, are enumerated in some *articai* issued when Wittlesey was archbishop of Canterbury; most of them are such as might be injurious to the persons or properties of the clergyi The document may be found in *Conc. Magn. Britt.* 3:95. By 3 James I, cap. 5, every popish recusant convict stands to all intents and purposes disabled, as a person lawfully excommunicated. The ecclesiastical law denies Christian burial to those excommunicated *majori excommunicatione,* and an injunction to the ministers to that effect will be found in the sixty-eighth canon, and in the rubric of the burial service. The law acknowledged two excommunications: the *lesser* excluded the offender from the communion of the Church only; the *greater* from that communion, and also from the company of the faithful, etc. The sixty fifth canon enjoins ministers solemnly to denounce those who stand lawfully excommunicated every six months, as well in the parish church as in the cathedral church of the diocese in which they remain, 'openly in time of divine service, upon some Sunday,' 'that others may be thereby both admonished to refrain their company and society, and excited the rather to procure out a writ *de exconmunicato copiendo,* thereby to bring and reduce them into due order and obedience.' By statute 52 George III, cap. 127, excommunications, and the proceedings following thereupon, are discontinued, except in certain cases specified in the act; which may receive definitive sentences as spiritual censures for offenses of

ecclesiastical cognizance; and instead of sentence of excommunication, which used to be pronounced by the ecclesiastical courts in cases of contumacy, the offenders are to be declared contumacious, and to be referred to the court of chancery, by which a writ *de contumae capiendo* is issued instead of the old writ *de excommunicato capiendo.* Formerly this writ *de excommunicato capiendo* was issued by the court of chancery upon it being signified by the bishop's certificate that forty days have elapsed since sentence of excommunication has been published in the church without submission of the offender. The sheriff then received the writ, called also a *significavit,* and lodged the culprit in the county jail till the bishop certified his reconciliation. A similar method of proceeding to that now adopted was recommended by a report of a committee of both houses of Parliament as far back as March 7, 1710, and again on April 30, 1714. No person excommunicated for such offenses as are still liable to the punishment can now be imprisoned for a longer term than six months (Burns, *Eccl. Law,* by Tyrwhit, *adv.).* In Scotland, when the lesser excommunication, or exclusion from the sacraments has failed, the minister pronounces a form by which the impenitent offender is declared 'excommunicated, shut out from the communion of the faithful, debarred from their privileges, and delivered unto Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' The people are then warned to avoid all unnecessary intercourse with him. Anciently, in Scotland, an excommunicated person was incapable of holding feudal rights, but at present the sentence is unaccompanied by any civil penalty or disqualification" *(Encyclopaedia Metropolitana,* s.v.).

The law of the *Protestant Episcopal Church* in America, as expressed by the 42d canon of 1832, is as follows: Sec. 1. If any persons within this Church offend their brethren by any wickedness of life, such persons shall be repelled from the holy communion, agreeably to the rubric. Sec. 2. On information being laid before the bishop that any one has been repelled from communion, it shall not be his duty to institute an inquiry unless there be a complaint made to him in writing by the repelled party. But on receiving complaint, it shall be the duty of the bishop, unless he think fit to restore him from the insufficiency of the cause assigned by the minister, to institute an inquiry, as may be directed by the canons of the diocese in which the event has taken place. Sec. 3. In the case of a great heinousness of offense on the part of members of this Church, they may be proceeded against to the depriving them of all privileges of church membership,

according to such rules or process as may be provided by the General Convention, and, until such rules and process shall be provided, by such as may be provided by the different State Conventions. See also the 33d *Article of Religion.*

In the *Methodist Episcopal Church* the power of excommunication lies with the minister after trial before a jury of the peers of the accused party. The grounds and forms of trial are given in the *Discipline,* part in, chap. i It is provided in the Constitution that no law shall ever be made doing away the privilege of accused ministers or members to have trial and right of appeal *(Discipline,* part 2, chapter 1, § 1).

"Among the *Independents, Congregationalists,* and *Baptists,* the persons who are or should be excommunicated are such as are quarrelsome and litigious (<4852>Galatians 5:12); such as desert their privileges, withdraw themselves from the ordinances of God, and forsake his people (Jude 19); such as are irregular and immoral in their lives, railers, drunkards, extortioners, fornicators, and covetous (<4905>Ephesians 5:5; <4651>1 Corinthians 5:11). In the United States these simple principles of Church discipline are very generally followed by all evangelical denominations" (Buck, s.v.). See particularly the *Form, of Government of the Presbyterian Church,* book 2 of Discipline; Dexter, *On Congregationalism* (Boston, 1865), pages 191-2; Ripley, *On Church Polity* (Bost. 1867), page 81 sq.; Edwards, *Nature and Use of Excommunication (Works,* N.Y. 1848), 4:6:8.

Literature. — See, besides the works already cited, Ferraris, *Promta Bibliotheca,* ed. Migne, 3:846 sq.; Siegel, *Christl.-kirchl. Alterthumer, 2:*131 sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 16, chapter 2, 3; Van Espen, *De Censuris Ecclesiasticis (Opera,* Paris, 1753, 4 volumes); Scheele, *Die Kirchenzucht* (Halle, 1852, 8vo); Hooker, *Eccl. Polity,* 8:1, 6; Calvin, *Institutes,* book 4, chapter 12; Thorndike, *Works* (Oxford, 1856), 6:21; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford, 1853), 3:456; Winer, *Comp. Darstellung,* § 20; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* ed. Smith, § 255; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopaldie,* s.v. Bann; Palmer, *On the Church,* 1:96; 2:277, 304; Watson, *Theological Institutes,* 2:574; Burnet, *On the Articles,* Browne, *On the Articles,* Forbes, *On the Articles* (each on Article XXXIII); Wheatly, *On Common Prayer,* Bohn's ed., page 442 sq.; Scott, *Synod of Dort* (Philadelphia Presb. Board), page 249; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall,* chapter 15, part 5. *SEE ANATHEMA;SEE BAN; SEE DISCIPLINE*.

Exeat

a Latin term, signifying either the permission given by a bishop to a clergyman of his diocese that *he may* for a time *go out* of his diocese, or the same permission given by an abbot to one of the "religious" of his monastery, or by the authorities of a college (in England) to a student.

Execration

(hl'a; *alah',* 24218Jeremiah 42:18; 44:12; a "*curse"* or "oath," abstractly, as elsewhere) is properly the representative of the Greek word κατάρα, which occurs (in the verb καταράομαι) in the Sept. at 04238Numbers 23:8; 24:9; 06026Joshua 6:26; 09043 1 Samuel 17:43, etc., as a rendering of various Hebrews terms (rr'a; µ[;; lLeq; etc.), and also in the N.T. ("curse," 40544Matthew 5:44; 41022Mark 2:21, etc.). It is used also in profane authors to denote the imprecations which it was customary among ancient nations to pronounce upon their enemies for the purpose of calling down the divine wrath, branding them with infamy, and exciting against them the passions of the multitude. By this means they also devoted their enemies to the ruin they considered them to deserve. These imprecations were chiefly pronounced by priests, enchanters, or prophets. *SEE BALAAM*. The Athenians made use of them against Philip of Macedon. They convened an assembly, in which it was decreed that all statues, inscriptions, or festivals among them, in any way relating to him or his ancestors, should be destroyed, and every other possible reminiscence of him profaned; and that the priests, as often as they prayed for the success of the Athenian affairs, should pray for the ruin of Philip. It was also customary, both among the Greeks and Romans, after having destroyed cities in war, the revival of whose strength they dreaded, to pronounce execrations upon those who should rebuild them. Strabo observes that Agamemnon pronounced execrations on those who should rebuild *Troy*, as Croesus did against those who should rebuild *Sidena;* and this mode of execrating cities Strabo calls an ancient custom (κατὰ παλαιὸν ἔθος, 13, page 898, edit. 1707). The Romans published a decree full of execrations against those who should rebuild Carthage (Zonaras, *Annal.).* An incident somewhat analogous is related (06026Joshua 6:26) after the taking of Jericho. From the words “and Joshua adjured them at that time," it is likely that he acted under a divine intimation that Jericho should continue in ruins, as a monument of the divine displeasure and a warning to posterity. The words "cursed *be* the

man (the *individual)* before the Lord that riseth up and buildeth this city Jericho," although transformed into an execration by the word *supplied* by the translators, amount to no more than a *prediction* that "he shall lay the foundation thereof in his first-born, and in his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it," that is, he shall meet with so many impediments to his undertaking that he shall *outlive* all his children, *dying in the course of nature* before he shall complete it. *SEE JERICHO*. Execrations were also pronounced upon cities and their inhabitants before undertaking a' siege (Macrobius has preserved two of the ancient forms used in reference to the destruction of Carthage, *Saturnal.* 3:9), and before engaging with enemies in war. Tacitus relates that the priestesses of ancient Britain devoted their Roman invaders to destruction with imprecations, ceremonies, and attitudes, which for a time overwhelmed the soldiers with terror *(Anal.* 14:29). The execrations in the 83d Psalm, probably written on the occasion of the confederacy against Jehoshaphat, and other instances of a like nature, partake of the execrations of the heathen in nothing but form, being the inspired predictions or denunciations of divine vengeance against the avowed enemies of the God of Israel, notwithstanding the proofs they had witnessed of his supremacy; and the object of these imprecations, as in many other instances, is charitable, namely, their conversion to the true religion (verse 18; see also <195912>Psalm 59:12). *SEE ANATHEMA; SEE IMPRECATION.*

Execution

or capital punishment, among the Jews, when lawful and regular, was of one of the following kinds.

1. *Death by the sword* (b r ,j ,ypil], or b r]j ,b] hKḥi, also sinply hKḥi; <100115>2 Samuel 1:15; <121025>2 Kings 10:25; <242623>Jeremiah 26:23), by which, however, we are not to understand beheading (in <121007>2 Kings 10:7, the bodies were probably decapitated after death), as the Rabbins will have it (Mishna, *Sanhedr.* 7:3), a penalty that early occurs in Egypt (<014001>Genesis 40:1)), and later in the Roman period among the Jews, as the introduction of foreign princes (<401410>Matthew 14:10 sq.), and as is probably meant in <441202>Acts 12:2 (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 15:1, 2); but the offender was stabbed or cut to death, as the case might be.

2. *Stoning* (q.v.); since the *shooting* with a dart, mentioned in <021913>Exodus 19:13, was only selected in place of this when an individual was to be put

to death at a distance. These punishments were intensified by indignities to the corpse; namely,

(a.) Burning (v aB; ã r C; Levo 20:14; 21:9; compare <060715>Joshua 7:15, 25; <013824>Genesis 38:24; 1 Macc. 3:5; [see Michaelis in loc.]). That we are here not to think of a burning alive, we may gather from <060725>Joshua 7:25; and it is the more probable from the procedure detailed in the Mishna *(Sanhedr.* 7:2), which directs that the delinquent's mouth should be forced open by a cloth drawn around the neck, and melted lead then be poured in!

(b.) Hanging (h l ;T) on a tree or post (<052122>Deuteronomy 21:22; <042504>Numbers 25:4; comp. <061026>Joshua 10:26; <100412>2 Samuel 4:12; <093108>1 Samuel 31:8, 10), with which mutilation of the dead body was often connected (<100412>2 Samuel 4:12). The person hung was regarded as execrated (<052123>Deuteronomy 21:23; comp. <480313>Galatians 3:13), and was not allowed to remain suspended over night (<052123>Deuteronomy 21:23; comp. <060829>Joshua 8:29; 10:26 sq.), through fear of tainting the atmosphere, since putrescence soon began. The opposite treatment was deemed an extraordinary severity (<102106>2 Samuel 21:6, 9 sq.). The hanging of a living person (<150611>Ezra 6:11) is a Persian punishment. Under the Herods this custom was likewise introduced among the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* 16:11, 6), as in the Roman period in Egypt (Philo, 2:529).

(c.) Finally, a heap of stones (l wdG; µyn ba} l G) was thrown over the body, i.e., the grave (<060725>Joshua 7:25 sq.; 8:29; <101817>2 Samuel 18:17), This dishonor is still common in the East (Panlus, *Neu. Repert. 2:*53; Jahn, *Archaol* II, 2:353). One of these kinds of punishment is constantly referred to by the legislative precept, "That soul shall be cut off from the people" (wM [i bE Qm i ayh h i v p N h i h t ;r k]n]i, or hy M, [m e); as especially appears from <023114>Exodus 31:14; <031704>Leviticus 17:4; 20:17 (see Michaelis, *Mos. Rech'*, 5:37 sq.; the cases are specified in the Mishna, *Cherithuth,* 1:1); but the Rabbins are not altogether agreed; comp. Abarbanel on <041530>Numbers 15:30; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 30); not, as most will have it, a mere interdict from political or religious privileges. *SEE EXCOMMUNICATION*. All penal inflictions were usually speedy (<060724>Joshua 7:24 sq.; <092216>1 Samuel 22:16), and originally inflicted directly by the populace, but under the kings by their body-guard, or one of their attendants. *SEE CHERETHITE*.

Foreign punishments, unknown to the Jewish law, were the following:

1. *Sawing* in pieces (<10123>2 Samuel 12:31). *SEE SAW.*

2. *Dichotomy, i.e.,* cutting asunder (διχοτομεῖν or μελίζειν=" quartering") or dismemberment (ãSvj <09153>1 Samuel 15:33; μελιστὶ διαιρεῖν, Josephus, *Ant. 15:*8, 4; a barbarous instance is given in Josephus, *Ant.* 13:12, 6; and an inhuman murder in <07929>Judges 19:29; but <11035>1 Kings 3:25, does not belong here) of the living being (see Krumbholz, *Depznaper* τὸ διχοτομεῖν *signeiicata,* in the *Bibl. Brem. 7:*234 sq.), which was universal among the Babylonians (<27005>Daniel 2:5; 3:29: in <10042>2 Samuel 4:12; 2 Macc. 1:16, mangling after death is indicated by way of infamy; compare Livy, 8:28; in <26160>Ezekiel 16:40; 20:47, dichotomy is not to be understood), as well as Egyptians (Herod. 2:139; 3:13) and Persians (Herod. 7:39; Died. Sic. 17:83; comp. Horace, *Sat.* 1:1, 99 sq.; 2 Macc. 7:8; <40251>Matthew 24:51; <42246>Luke 12:46; Koran, 20:74; 26:49; Assemani, *Martyrol. Or.* 1:241 sq.). 3. *Precipitation* (h fymv] <14512>2 Chronicles 25:12; comp. Psalm cxli. 6 κατακρημνισμός, <42029>Luke 4:29; comp. 2 Macc. 6:10) from a rock ("dejicere de saxo Tarpeio" or "ex aggere," Suetonius, *Calig.* 27) is well known as a Roman mode of execution (for the Athenians, see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth.* 2:20). 4. *Tympanisn* (τυμπανισμός), or beating to death (<58135>Hebrews 11:35; A.V. "torture;" comp. Aristot. *Rhet.* 2:5; Lucian, *Jup. Trag.* 19, etc.), of which the instrument was a cudgel (τύμπανον, 2 Macc. 6:19, 28, A.V. "torment;" Aristophanes, *Plut.* 476); but it is uncertain whether we are thereby to understand simply a club with which the unfortunates were dispatched, or a wooden hoop upon which they were stretched in the manner of a rack (comp. Joseph us, *De Maccab.* 8:5 and 9). *SEE TYMPANUM.*

Besides the above, the following methods of execution are. named in the Bible as practiced by nations in the neighborhood of Palestine: 1. *Burning alive* in a furnace (<27006>Daniel 3:6, 11, 15, 19 sq.), which occurs in modern Persia (Chardin, *Voyage,* 6:218), is of very early date (if we may trust the traditions concerning Abraham [q.v.], Targ. on <14803>2 Chronicles 28:3); likewise roasting or boiling convicts over a slow fire. (<24922>Jeremiah 29:22 [see Hebenstreit, *De Achali et Zelekie cupplicio,* Lips. 1736]; 2 Macc. 6:5). *SEE JOHN (THE APOSTLE).* An example of burning alive does not occur (<10210>2 Samuel 21:31, marg. ^b l m; see Thenius. in loc.) until the time of Herod (Josephus, *War,* 1:33, 4); but in Egypt the vindictive Roman magistrates took pleasure in burning Jews (Philo, 2:542, 527). No instances of burying alive (Ctesias, *Pers.* 41:53; Livy, 8:15, etc.) are found

in the Scriptures (<04160>Numbers 16:30 sq., is not in point). 2. *Casting into the lions' den* (Daniel 6). *SEE LION*; DEN.

3. *Sufocation* in hot ashes (2 Macc. 13:5 sq.; comp. Valer. Max. 9:2, 6, "He filled with ashes a place inclosed by high evalls, with a beam projecting within, upon which he placed the doomed, so that, when overcome with drowsiness, they fell into the insidious ash-heap below;" see Ctesias, *Pers.* 47 and 52). *SEE ASHES*.

4. Dashing in pieces children (sucklings) an the corneas of walls, which occurred on the sack of cities (<23316>Isaiah 13:16, 18; <28140>Hosea 14:1; <34310>Nahum 3:10; comp. <19709>Psalm 137:9), like the ripping open of pregnant women (<12812>2 Kings 8:12; 15:16; <28140>Hosea 14:1; <30101>Amos 1:13), is, with the exception of <12416>2 Kings 14:16, only a heathenish barbarity. On crucifixion, *SEE CRUCIFY*.

5. Finally, drowning (καταποντισμός, <40606>Matthew 18:6), and fighting with wild beasts (θηριομαχία, <46532>1 Corinthians 15:32), are but casually alluded to in the N.T. Drowning, as a mode of inflicting death, is old (comp. <02122>Exodus 1:22). Among the Romans, those guilty of parricide were sewed in sacks (culei) and then drowned (Cicero, *Rose. Am. 25; ad* Herean. 1, 13; Seneca, Clem. 1:15; Juvenal, 8:214); but this in the time of the emperors came to be deemed an inhuman mode of execution (comp. Josephus, *A at. 14:*15, 10; *War,* 1:22, 2; Lactantius, *Mort. persec*. 15:3); and thus remaining under the water (<24506>Jeremiah 51:63) was thought a peculiarly severe fate (Josephus, Apiosm, 1:04; comp. <40606>Matthew 18:6; see Gitz, *De pistrinis vett.* page 131 sq.; Grdfe, De καταποντισμῷ, *num fuerit supplic. Judaeorums,* Lips. 1662.; Welleius, *De supplicio submers.* Havn. 1701; Scherer, *De* καταποντ *ap*. antiq. Argent. 17:4). Such cruel punishments sometimes followved the mutilations of martyrdom (2 Macc. 7:4, 7, 10). On *tlmairomachy, SEE GAMES*; and on the passage 3 Macc. 5, comp. Porphyry, *Abstin.* 2:57. See generally Carpzov, Appar. page 581 sq.; Alichaelis, *De judiciis poenisque capitatibus in S.S.* (Hal. 1749; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 26, and Pott's *Sylloge,* 4:177 sq.); Jahn, *Archdol.* II, 2:347 sq.; Alichaelis, *Mosaisches Racht,* 5:11 sq. *SEE PUNISHMENT*.

Executioner

(σπεκουλάτωρ, for Lat. *speculator*, originally a *scouet,* afterwards a *life-guardsman* under the emperor), a member of the royal bodyguard adopted by Herod in imitation of the Romans (see Tacitus, *Hist.* 2:11; Suetonius,

Claud. 35), and in accordance with Oriental despotisni, and enplooyed to execute his sanguinary orders (<41627>Mark 6:27). (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antia.* s.v. Spaculatores; Schwarz, *De Speculatoribus vett.* Romanorum, Altd. 1726.) *SEE CHERETRITE*.

In ancient times persons of the highest rank and station were employed to execute the sentence of the law. The office of Potiphar, in the Egyptian court, mentioned in <01736>Genesis 37:36, is thought to have been “chief of the executioners," as in the margiuc of our version. *SEE GUARD*. This is still a high office in the East as a *court* office. Such executioners have nothing to do with carrying into effect the awards of the law in its ordinary course, but only with those of the king. It is there an office of great responsibility; and to insure its due and strict fulfillment, it is entrusted to an officer of the court, who has necessarily under his command a body of men whose duty it is to preserve the order and peace of the palace and its precincts, and to attend and guard the royal person on public occasions; and, under the direction of their chief, to inflict such punishment as the king awards upon those who incur his displeasure. Potiphar, therefore, in this sense might be called captain of the guard. He had his official residence at the public jail (<01403>Genesis 40:3). Nebuzaradan (<12508>2 Kings 25:8; <24039>Jeremiah 39:9) and Arioch (<27214>Daniel 2:14) held the same office. That the "captain of the guard" himself occasionally performed the duty of an executioner appears from <11025>1 Kings 2:25, 34. Nevertheless the post was one of high dignity, and something beyond the present position of the *zabit* of modern Egypt (comp. Lane, 1:163), with which Wilkinson (2:45) compares it. It is stillnot unusual for officers of high rank to inflict corporal punishment with their own hands (Wilkinson, 2:43). It does not appear that the Jews had public executioners, but the prince or general laid his commands on any of his attendants. Gideon commanded Jether, his eldest son, to execute his sentence on the kings of Midian; Saul ordered the footmen who stood around him, and were probably a chosen body of soldiers for the defense of his person, to put to death the priests of the Lord, and when they refused, Doeg, an Edomite, one of his principal officers executed, the command (<09218>1 Samuel 22:18). Long after the days of Saul, the reigning monarch commanded Benaiah, the chief captain of his armies, to perform the duty of putting Joab to death. Sometimes the chief magistrate executed the sentence of the law with his own hands; for when Jether shrank from the duty which his father required, Gideon, at that time the supreme magistrate in Israel, did not hesitate to do it himself. Thus also in Homer *(Odyss.* 21,

fin.; 22, imit.) we read that the exasperated Ulysses commanded his son Telarnsachus to put to death the suitors of Penelope, which was immediately done. In condemnations under the Mosaic law, the congregation or assembly of people executed the criminal, but the witnesses commenced the work of death (<03246>Leviticus 24:16; <05707>Deuteronomy 17:7; <40807>John 8:7; <44075>Acts 7:57-60). Executions in the East are often very prompt and arbitrary. In many cases, among the Turks and Persians, the suspicion is no sooner entertained, or the cause of offense given, than the fatal order is issued, the messenger of death hurries to the unsuspecting victim, shows his warrant, and executes his order that instant in silence and solitude (<12632>2 Kings 6:32; <20614>Proverbs 16:14; <41027>Mark 6:27). *SEE PUNISHMENT*.

Exedrae

buildings contiguous to the church. *SEE CHURCH EDIFICES*.

Exegesis

SEE EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

Exegetical Collections

SEE CATENA; SEE COMMENTARIES.

Exegetical Theology

that branch of theology which treats of the exposition and interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. *SEE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THSEOLOGY*. Exegesis (ἐξήγησις) is *statement, explanatioa,* from ἐξηγέομαι, *I lead, describe, explain;* and froan this, an *exegete*, ἐξηγητής, *guide, interpreter.* The word exegetical, then, includes all that belongs to *explassat/on,* and Exegetical Theology includes all that belongs to the explanation and interpretation of the holy Scriptures.

I. *Matter of Exegetical Theology*. — The Bible, including both the O. and N.T., is the material on which the science of exegetical theology is employed. Some writers therefore designate it as Biblical theology; but the real work of exegesis is to gather from the word the material of Biblical theology, leaving the arrangement and coordination of this material to fall into a separate branch of the science. *SEE BIBICAL THEOLOGY; SEE THEOLOGY*. In fact, the results of exegetical study may fall, according to

their nature, into historical, doctrinal, or practical theology. *SEE BIBLE*. As the Bible comes to us as the record of a revelation from God, its claims in this respect form the subject of a separate branch, entitled INSPIRATION *SEE INSPIRATION* (q.v.). The study of inspiration leads to the general question of the possibility and nature of REVELATION *SEE REVELATION* (q.v).

II. *Method of Exegetical Theology*. —

1. *Philology.* As the Bible comes to us in ancient languages (Hebrew, Chaldee, Hellenistic Greek), the first requisite of exegesis is the knowledge of these languages, both as to their grammatical structure and their vocabulary. This branch is called *Sacred Linguistics*, or *Sacred Philology.* The knowledge of classical Greek is of course presupposed, while Syriac, Samaritan, and Arabic are cognate and auxiliary. For details, see the separate articles in this work on the various topics named.

2. *Archceology*. — Not only does the Bible come to us in ancient languages, but it was also written at various times, in various countries, and under various conditions of life (social, political, religious, etc.). Thus arise the various branches of Bible history (belonging partly to exegetical and partly to historical theology), Biblical geography, chronology, ethnography, natural history of the Bible, laws, usages, domestic economy, agriculture, sacred rites, and worship. All these branches are summed up under the general title Antiquities, or Archaoeoloy. See both these heads in this Cyclopaedia, and also the other topics named, for the details and the literature.

3. Canon. — As these books come to us claiming to be authoritative, we must be able to answer the question, What books belong to the Bible as a sacred book? The answer to this question gives rise to that branch called the science of the Canon of Scripture. It is divided into canon of the O.T. and canon of the N.T. *SEE CANON OF SCRIPTURE*.

4. Criticism. — Granting that we have certain books admitted to be canonical, the farther question arises, Have we these writings in their original and correct forms? The answer to this question gives rise to *Criticism*, which is divided into the lower or text-criticism, which seeks to ascertain the true and original reading of the text as accurately as possible, and the higher criticism, which examines into the integrity, genuineness, and authenticity of the books. The higher criticism seeks to distinguish the

true from the false, and forms, to a certain degree, the basis of Apologetics (q.v.); the text-criticism distinguishes the original from the altered or corrupted. *SEE CRITICISM*.

5. Interpretation. — All the studies heretofore named are preparatory to the work of getting at the meaning of the sacred Scriptures, which is the function of *Interpretation,* or *Hermeneutics* (ἑρμηνεύω). The *general* principles on which any other writings would be interpreted are of course applicable here (General Hermeneutics); but the special character of these writings as sacred gives rise to an enlargement of those general principles of interpretation (Sacred Hermeneautics). When the sense of Scripture is sought simply by the use of linguistics or criticism, the interpretation is called Grammatical. When not only linguistics and criticism, but also all the knowledges embraced above under archaeology are employed, the interpretation is called *Grammatico-Historical.* When, in addition, the traditional sense of the Church as to the substantial facts and doctrines of revelation is brought to bear upon the Word, the interpretation is called *Doctrissal,* or *Dogmatical.* Finally, when a farther sense than that conveyed in the words of the writer is sought, the interpretation is called *Allegorical.* For the nature, history and value of these, *SEE HERMENEUTICS*; *SEE INTERPRETATION.*

III. *Results or Products of Exegetical Theology.* — The application of the laws of hermeneutics, and of the preparatory or propaeudeutic sciences mentioned above, in practical work, is *Exegesis.* The fruit of this labor may appear, within the sphere of exegetical theology itself, in translations of the Bible, or of any of its parts *SEE VERSIONS*; or in commentaries on the Bible, or on separate books of the Bible, or on separate passages in any of the books. *SEE COMMENTARIES*. The principles and rules of exegesis are also to be used by the preacher in the preparation of his discourses for the congregation. *SEE HOMILETICS*; *SEE SERMON*.

Most of the topics of exegetical theology are embraced in what is called *Introduction to the Scriptures,* a vague title, formerly much in use, but now giving way to more scientific and distinctive terms, such as *Literary History of the Bible,* for a general name, and the several titles mentioned above for special branches. The books on Introduction, are often rather useful collections of propaedeutic knowledge than scientific treatises. *SEE INTRODUCTION*. There are no books in English treating exegetical theology as a separate branch in scientific form; but English literature

abounds in excellent works on the several branches, which will be found indicated under the several titles in this Cyclopedia. The most. important general works are the so-called books of "Introduction," such as Horne, Introduction (new ed., London, 1860, 4 volumes, 8vo); Davidson, *Introduction to N.T.* (Lond. 1848-51 [Dr. Davidson's later writings are not so trustworthy as his earlier]); Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (reprinted, Bost. 1867, 12mo). On the literature, see farther under the head INTRODUCTION. On the scope of exegetical theology, and its relations to the other branches of the science, see Hagenbach, *Encyklopadie and Methodologie* (Leipsig, 1864, 7th edit, § 34-56); Marsh, *Lectures on the Arrangement of the several Branches of Divinity* (Cambridge, 1809, 8vo); Pelt, *Theologische Encyklopadie als System* (Hamburg, 1843, 8vo), § 10-28; Clarisse, *Encyklopaedite Theologicae Epitome* (Lugd. Bat. 1835, 8vo), sect. 1, 2, and our articles *SEE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THEOLOGY*; *SEE THEOLOGY*.

Exemption designates, in ecclesiastical law, the release of persons or institutions from the jurisdiction of the regular superior, and their subordination to a higher or special superior.

1. *Roman Catholic Church*. — The first example of formal exemption is the release of monasteries from the episcopal jurisdiction. Many wealthy convents induced the popes, emperors, and kings to allow them a free election of their superiors, and a free administration of their property. Subsequently many of the monastic orders were altogether exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, the members being subordinate only to their monastic superiors and the pope. The bishops incessantly labored for a restoration of their full jurisdiction, and the Council of Constance favored them, but most of the popes sided with the monks rather than with the bishops. The Council of Trent granted most of the demands of the bishops, but the difficulties between bishops and monastic orders have never wholly ceased. Bishops sometimes are exempt from the usual subordination to an archbishop, being subordinate directly to the pope. Sometimes (as in Austria) the army was exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and placed under the jurisdiction of a special army-bishop.

2. *Protestant Churches*. — The Protestant state churches retained, with other parts of the ecclesiastical law, the idea of exemption. The princes claimed for themselves exemption from the usual ecclesiastical jurisdiction; later, the same exemption was claimed for civil and military officers. In

some countries the nobility also were exempt. In Prussia, a circular of the government in 1817 abolished all exemptions, but it was not executed. Churches which are based on the voluntary principle know of no exemption, because they compel none of their members to belong to any particular congregation.

In many districts in Germany, Roman-Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed pastors had jurisdiction even over members of the two other churches; and the exemption of Protestants from Roman Catholic jurisdiction, and vice versa, is not yet fully carried through. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:286; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:841. (A.J.S.)

Exercise, Bodily

(σωματικὴ γυμνασία, *i.e., physical training,* i.q., *gymnastics,* 1 Timothy 4:8). What the apostle seems to disparage under this term is not the athletic discipline which it classically imports (Arrian, *Epict.* 1:27, 6; Polyb. 4:7, 6), and which his frequent allusions to the Grecian games (q.v.) might imply, but rather that ascetic mortification of the fleshly appetites, and even innocent affections (comp. verse 3; Colossians 2:23), which characterized some of the Jewish fanatics (verse 7), especially the Essenes (q.v.). — Fleischmann, *Interpretatio,* in loc.; Seelen, *De Gymnasiis ad quae Peulus* (in hoc loc.) *alludit* (Lubec, 1758). *SEE TIMOTHY.*

Exercises, Spiritual

(exercitia spiritualia), a title given by Romanists to certain exercises held under the leadership generally of a confessor *(magister exercitiorum),* for spiritual edification. They consist, generally, in alternate meditations and prayers at regularly appointed hours, with seclusion, mortification, etc. These exercises are practiced both by clergy and laity, especially before communion, and as preparatory to the great Church festivals. Especially before ordination to the priesthood, such exercises are not only commended, but required of candidates. The most elaborate form of the exercises is that of Ignatius Loyola. His method received the approbation of the pope, and Alexander VII granted, in a brief dated October 12, 1657, full absolution to all, whether priests or laymen, who should submit to them for eight days in the houses of the Company of Jesus. These exercises consist in alternate meditations, readings, oral prayers, and self-scrutiny, as special preparation for the reception of the sacraments of penitence and communion. In case of there being several persons exercising together,

silence is recommended as a duty. The new missions established by the Jesuits and Redemptorists make use of these exercises, transforming the work of sanctification into a dead mechanical action. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:289; Aschbach, *Allg. Kirchen-Lex.* 2:707; Ferraris, *Promta Bibliotheca,* 3:916 sq. See Bellecius, *Medulla asaeseos seu exercitia Sancti Patris Ignatii* (new ed. by Westhoff); and the articles *SEE JESUITS*, and *SEE LOYOLA*.

Exhortation

(παράκλησις, strictly a *calling near,* invitation, and so "*entreaty,*" 2 Corinthians 8:4; hence *admonition,* special hortatory instruction in public, Luke in, 18; Acts 13:15; 1 Timothy 4:13; also *"consolation"* or comfort, Romans 15:4, etc.) seems to have been recognized in the Apostolic Church as a distinct supernatural or prophetic office or function (χάρισμα, "gift") bestowed by the Holy Spirit (Romans 12:8). As such, it was doubtless a subordinate exercise of the general faculty of teaching (1 Corinthians 14:31). Olshausen *(Conmment.* in loc.) thinks that Paul does not distinguish it as a special *charism,* but rather regards it as coordinate with eldership. *SEE GIFT (SPIRITUAL*).

2. It is defined as "the act of laying such motives before a person as may excite him to the performance of any duty. It differs only from *suasion* in that the latter principally endeavors to convince the understanding, and the former to work on the affections. It is considered as a great branch of preaching, though not confined to that, as a man may exhort, though he do not preach; though a man can hardly be said to preach if lie do not exhort. *SEE EXHORTERS*. The Scriptures enjoin ministers to exhort men, that is, to rouse them to duty by proposing suitable motives (Isaiah 58:1; 1 Timothy 6:2; Hebrews 3:13; Romans 12:8); it was likewise the constant practice of prophets, apostles, and Christ himself (Isaiah 1:17; Jeremiah 4:14; Ezekiel 37; Luke 3:18; 12:3; Acts 11:23)" (Buck, *Theological Dictionary,* s.v.). "The above, and numerous other passages of Scripture, indicate several important particulars: 1. That it was not beneath the dignity, or foreign to the office of the inspired apostles, frequently to *exhort.* 2. That they enjoined a similar practice and the duty of exhortation upon young ministers of their day. 3. That exhortation, as separate from preaching, was the special office of a certain class of religious teachers in the New-Testament Church. 4. That mutual exhortation for their own

profit and edification was enjoined by the apostles upon Christians generally" (Kidder, *Homiletics*, page 105). *SEE EXHORTERS*.

3. In the book of Common Prayer, the short addresses of the minister to the people in the daily service, in the communion office, and in the office for the visitation of the sick, are called *Exhortations.* The first of these, beginning "Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us," etc., was introduced into the English formulary at the Reformation. Palmer *(Orig. Liturg.* 1:211) compares it to a passage in a sermon of Avitus of Vienne, fifth century. Procter *(Common Prayer*, page 206) remarks that "it was constructed partly from the preceding sentences, and partly by adaptations from previously existing forms." But, in fact, this exhortation, with the other opening portions of morning prayer, is chiefly due to a ritual drawn up by Calvin, for the church at Strasburg, entitled *La Forme des Prieres et Chantes ecclesiasiques* (Strasburg, 1545). See Baird, *Eutaxia* (N. York, 1855, page 191). The exhortations to the communion were also introduced at the Reformation. "The ancient Church, indeed, had no such exhortations, for their daily, or at least weekly communions made it known that there was then no solemn assembly of Christians without it, and every one (not under censure) was expected to communicate. But now, when the time is somewhat uncertain, and our long omissions have made some of us ignorant, and others forgetful of this duty; most of us unwilling, and all of us more or less indisposed for it, it was thought both prudent and necessary to provide these exhortations, to be read *when the minister gives warning of the communion, which he is always to do upon the Sunday or some holy day immediately preceding"* (Wheatly, *On Common Prayer*, page 284). The second exhortation was compiled apparently by Peter Martyr at the instance of Bucer (Procter, *On Common Prayer*, page 344).

Exhorters, a class of lay persons licensed in the Methodist Episcopal Church to *exhort*, not to preach. The leaders meeting (q.v.), or class (q.v.), recommend such persons, and the preacher issues the license. The duties of an exhorter are "to hold meetings for prayer and exhortation wherever opportunity is afforded, subject to the direction of the preacher in charge; to attend all the sessions of the Quarterly Conference; be subject to an annual examination of character in the Quarterly Conference, and renewal of license annually by the presiding elder, or preacher having the charge, if approved by the Quarterly Conference." This office has been found very useful, both in the edification of the Church, and in developing the talent of

persons likely to be called to the ministry. *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 1868, pages 113, 114.

Exile

(only occurs of an expatriated person, חצ, *tsoeh'*, *bent*, "captive exile," Isaiah 51:14; הלגלה, *goleh'*, *a transported* captive, as elsewhere often *SEE BANISH), ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN*, of the Israelitish nation (comp. Cellarii *Dissertatt.* page 178 sq.). *SEE CAPTIVITY*.

1. Of the kingdom of *Israel*, as early as the time of Pekah (q.v.), B.C. cir. 741. Tiglath Pileser (q.v.), in accordance with a cardinal maxim of Oriental despots (compare Haeren, *Ideen*, I, 1:405 sq.; Gesenius, *Jesa.* 1:949), transported to Assyria (2 Kings 15:29; comp. Isaiah 8:23) a part of the inhabitants of Galilee and the trans-Jordanic provinces (Gilead). A still earlier deportation (1 Chronicles 5:26) seems to have been made by Pul (q.v.). After the destruction of Samaria (q.v.) and the entire northern state (B.C. 720) by Shalmaneser (q.v.), the same fate overtook all the distinguished and serviceable Israelites (2 Kings 17:6; 18:9 sq.; 1 Chronicles 5:26). They were assigned a residence on the Chaboras, in Mesopotamia *SEE HABOR*, and in Media (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 9:14, 1), and there established the worship of Jehovah after their corrupt fashion (2 Kings 17:27 sq.). See Witsius, Δεκάφυλον, *site de decem tribubus Isr.* (in his *,Egyptiaca,* page 318 sq.), Michaelis, *De exilio decem tribuum* (in his *Comment. Soc. Gott.* Brem. 1774, page 31 sq.). *SEE ISRAEL (KINGDOM OF)*.

2. Respecting the carrying away of the *Jews* in several colonies, there are various accounts in the Hebrew historical books, which modern writers have not carefully distinguished (see Bauer, *Hebrews Gesch.* 2:370 sq.; Jahn, *Archdol.* 11, 1:190 sq.; Bertholdt, *Zeittafel zum* Daniel, page 503 sq.).

(a.) The books of Kings mention only two deportations: *the first* occurred after the surrender of Jerusalem to Nebuchadnezzar, in the time of Jehoiachin (2 Kings 24:14 sq.; comp. Jeremiah 27:20 sq.; in this way involved Mordecai (Esther 2:6), and it befell (besides the king himself) the affluent and useful citizens, 10,000 and upwards in number (Josephus says 10,832, Ant. 10:7, 1); the second was the result of a formal capture of Jerusalem by assault of the Chaldaeans in the time of Zedekisah, and was effected by Nebuchadnezzar's general (in that prince's 19th year)

Nebuzaradan (<12511>2 Kings 25:11). Only the common people, devoted to agriculture, remained (<12512>2 Kings 25:12, 22).

(b.) The books of Chronicles expressly record only the carrying away under Zedekiah (<14610>2 Chronicles 26:20), while (verse 10), in mentioning the transportation of king Jehoiachin, they say nothing of a deportation of the people at that time.

(c.) <24528>Jeremiah 52:28 sq., specifies three distinct carryings away, and assigns to each not only the number of those deported, but also a date namely, the first deportation in the 7th year (of Nebuchadnezzar, comp. verses 29, 30), which consisted of 3023 Jews; the second in the 18th of Nebuch., of 832 chiefs of Jerusalem; then third in the 23d of Neb., of 745 individuals. Finally

(d.), according to <27101>Daniel 1:1, 3 sq., as early as the 3d yeas of Jehoiakim's reign, some Jewish youths of noble families among them Daniel himself) must have been carried to Babylon. These difficulties (see Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of Daniel* [Clarke's ed.], page 43 sq., against De Wette, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* 23:7 sq.; Lengerke, *Daniel*, page 13 sq.) are readily adjusted by observing, 1st, that the years of Nebuchadnezzar in this passage of Jeremiah bear date from his full accession to the throne of Babylon (the beginning of B.C. 604), while those in Kings are reckoned from the epoch of his viceroyship, a little over one year earlier *SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR*; and, 2dly, that the apparent discrepancy in the number of citizens transported naturally arises from the different manner in which they are enumerated and classified in the several narratives. Thus viewed, the transactions will appear concisely as follows:

1. (Early in B.C. 6516.) Nebuuchadnezzar's invasion, in the 3d year of Jehoiakimn (<27101>Daniel 1:1).

2. (Sumumer of B.C. 606.) Subjugation by Nebuchadnezzar in his first associate year, and the 4th of Jehoiakiam (<24501>Jeremiah 25:1); when, besides some of the sacred vessels (<14607>2 Chronicles 36:7), a few royal youths were taken away as hostages, including Daniel and his companions (<27102>Daniel 1:2 sq.).

3. (Spring of B.C. 598) First general deportation, in the 7th year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (<24528>Jeremiah 52:28), or the 8th of his viceroyship (<12412>2 Kings 24:12), and the beginning of Jehoiachin's reign (2 Kings xxiv,

8), when 3028 eminent Jews (<24528>Jeremiah 52:28), including the king (<14660>2 Chronicles 36:10), his family, and officers (<12412>2 Kings 24:12), with such men as Mordecai (<17206>Esther 2:6), also some 7000 warriors (<12216>2 Kings 21:16), were carried away, making about 10,000 individuals of note (<12414>2 Kings 24:14), besides about 1000 artisans (<12416>2 Kings 24:16, and leaving only the poorer classes of the city and its neighborhood (<12414>2 Kings 14:14).

4. (Late in B. C. 588.) Second general deportation, in Nebuchadnezzar's 18th year of reign (<24529>Jeremiah 52:29), or the 19th of his viceroyship (<12518>2 Kings 25:8), when, besides the rest of the sacred vessels (<14668>2 Chronicles 36:18), 832 more of the principal men who had by that time rallied to Jerusalem were taken away (<24529>Jeremiah 52:29), iucluding especially the refugees (<12501>2 Kings 25:1), and leaving but the commonest agricultural laborers (<12514>2 Kings 25:14).

5. (Early in BS.C. 582.) Final deportation, in Nebuchadnezzer's 28d year (<24520>Jeremiah 52:30), when the last 745 private persons (<24520>Jeremiah 52:30) who had not fled to Egypt (<24405>Jeremiah 43:5-7), nor been destroyed in the pa vioum massacres (<14660>2 Chronicles 36:20), ware taken away making 4600 definitely enumerated (<24520>Jeremiah 52:10), but in all somue 12,600 male heads of families, with their wives, children, and dependents, from Jerusalem and its vicinity alone, and a proportionate number from the residue of the country of Judaea.

The Babylonian exile thus began with the Jews partially in B.C. 598, but generally in B.C. 588. It ended in the first year of the reign of Cyrus (over Babylon), i.e., B.C. 536, and therefore lasted strictly 51-52 years. The reckoning of Jeremiah, however (<24511>Jeremiah 25:11 sq.; 29:10; compare <14621>2 Chronicles 36:21; <38112>Zechariah 1:12; 7:5; Josephus, War, 5:9, 4), which assigns it a length of 70 years, is to be understood as computed from Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Western Asia in B.C. 606, when, as appears from <27001>Daniel 1:1 sq. 1 some of the members of the royal family of Judah were carried into captivity, in fulfillment of <23906>Isaiah 39:6, 7. (See Offerhaus, *Spicilegium*, page 181 sq.; Schroder, *Rege.* Babyl. page 286 sq.). This was the more natural epoch to the Jews, inasmuch as from that time Nebuchadnezzar became to all intents and purposes the liege lord of the Jewish kings, and in the above table we see the years of his reign are dated accordingly. It is a remarkable coincidence that from thee date of the destruction of the Temple, B.C. 588 (<12518>2 Kings 25:8), to the time of its

complete restoration, B.C. 517 (<15165>Ezra 6:15), is precisely the commensurate (and sacred) term of 70 years; and this period is sometimes employed as an aera by the sacred writers (<26401>Ezekiel 40:1). Other very strained conjectures as to this time are those of Behin (in Iken and Hase's *Thesaur. theol. philol.* 1:954 sq.), Bengel *(Ordo temporum,* page 196 sq.), etc. Ideler deems the desolation of the Temple to be exclusively referred to *(Flandbuch d. Chronol.* 1:530). Gramberg *(Religionsid.* 2:388 sq.) and Hitzig *(Jerem.* page 230) think the 70 years merely a round number. *SEE SEVENTY YEARS' CAPTIVITY.*

The condition of the Hebrews in the exile was certainly, as a general thing, not so severe (Jahn, *Archaologie,* II, 1:209; comp. Leydecker, *De var. reip. Hebr. statu,* page 299 sq., especially page 310 sq.; Verbrugge, De *statu ad condit. Judaeurum teampore exil. Babyl.,* in his work De *nomin. Hebr. plur.* num. [Groning. 1730], page 71 sq.) as is usually held. Most of them became settled (<24915>Jeremiah 29:5 sq.), and acquired property, even to affluence (Tob. 1:22, 25; 2:1; 6:13; 8:21; 9:3: 10:11; 14:15, etc.), and the possession of slaves (Tob, 8:14 sq.; 11:10). Several were taken to court (<27003>Daniel 1:3 sq., 19), and even promoted to high station (<27048>Daniel 2:48 sq.; 6:2; compare <17003>Esther 10:3), or were honored with important trusts (Tob. 1:16); indeed, in one instance a Jewess actually reached queenly dignities (<17017>Esther 2:17). They also appear to have kept up in some sort their national constitution (<26401>Ezekiel 14:1; 20:1; Susan. 5:28), and to have maintained among themselves an observance of the Mosaic law (Tob. 7:14; Susan. 5:62). According to the Talmud (R. Gedaliah in *Shalshel. Flakkab.* folio 13; Gemara, *Makkoth,* 1:1; *Sanhedr.* 1:12 and 21), they were under the general direction of an *aichmalotarch* (q.v.), or "chief of the exiles" (tWlGhivaw), one of their own nation (Buddaei *Hist. Vet. T.* 2:863). Religious discipline was exercised among them; but, as they could not lawfully offer sacrifice outside Jerusalem, their worship necessarily consisted of prayer (and public reading, out of which naturally grew expounding) in stated assemblies (comp. Psalm 137). *SEE SYNAGOGUE.* They did not lack strong comfort and exhortation: Ezekiel (q.v.) lifted in their midst his prophetic voice, and Jeremiah (q.v.) sent them from afar a monitory epistle (chapter 29). Probably many surrendered themselves to levity and vice (<26331>Ezekiel 33:31), and yielded an ear to false prophets (<24921>Jeremiah 29:21; but comp, Tob. 2:14 sq., 22).

Of the permission to return to Palestine, which Cyrus granted to the entire people (<15105>Ezra 1:5; 7:13), Jews alone, in the first instance at least, availed

themselves (Ezra 2; Nehemiah 7; comp. Josephus, Ant. 11:5, 2: "But the whole people of the Israelites remained in the mine country ... The ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates to this day, unknown and innumerable myriads"); for the return mentioned in <151201>Ezra 2:1, is only of such exiles as had been carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, and in the list there following there are (besides priests and Levites) only recited Judahites and Benjamites; nor can "Israel" (verse 59; compare <160761>Nehemiah 7:61) be there referred to the former kingdom so called. The indications of <240104>Jeremiah 1:4 sq., 17, 19; <263711>Ezekiel 37:11 sq., had, moreover, not at that time been fulfilled (the date in <130526>1 Chronicles 5:26 is uncertain; Keil, *On Kings*, page 497, n.). (See Witsius, Δεκάφυλον, page 344 sq.; Ritter, *Erdk.* 10:250.) Yet it cannot well be doubted that many of the exiles from the northern kingdom, who were likewise embraced in the decree of Cyrus, and at the time included in his dominions, did eventually join their Jewish brethren, if not in some of the homeward expeditions named in Scripture as having taken place under Ezra, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, yet in some smaller, later, or less distinguished companies. This supposition is not only justified by the, nature of the case, but fortified by the numerous intimations in the prophets (e.g. <240104>Jeremiah 1:4, 5, 17-20, 33-35) coupling the return of both the kingdoms (see *Meth. Quart. Review*, July, 1855, page 419 sq.), and is well-nigh established by the Palestinian occurrence in a late age of individuals from the northern tribes (e.g. <420236>Luke 2:36; comp. <442607>Acts 26:7). What proportion thus returned we have no means of determining; it was doubtless small, as was indeed that of the exiles from the southern tribes compared with the great mass who still remained in the land of their captivity, now become their home. Community of lot must have drawn both branches of the common stock of Israel nearer together during the captivity under the same heathen government, and it is altogether likely that in a few centuries those who permanently remained lost all trace of the sectarian distinction that had once estranged "Judah and Ephraim." *SEE RESTORATION (OF THE JEWS).*

The descendants of those who did not return either centred at certain points, especially Babylon (q.v.), where they afterwards became celebrated for their Jewish schools of Rabbinical literature; or, as was chiefly the case, it may be presumed, with the more distant and earlier removed ten tribes, wandered still farther in numerous Jewish colonies into the Medo-Babylonian provinces (Lightfoot, Append. to *Hor. Hebr.* in Acts, page 264

sq.), remnants of which have survived to a late day (Benj. of Tudela, quoted in Ritter, *Erdk.* 10:241 sq.). It is possible even that the *Samaritans* may have owed their mongrel origin to some such source (Gesenius, *De Pentat. Samar.* page 4), as they were transplanted to Palestine before the deportation of the Jews, and yet sufficiently late to have allowed a partial amalgamation with the heathen whence they came to have taken place, and especially as they had only the Pentateuch (Paulus, in Eichhorn's *Biblioth.* 1:931). From the provinces of the Persian empire the Jewish colonists may readily have spread into Arabia, India, and even China. Wild attempts at their discovery have been abundantly made, such as those of Adair *(tlistory of the American Indians*, Lond. 1775), Noah *(The Amer. Indians the Descendants of the ten Lost Tribes of Israel,* N.Y, 1835), and Grant *(Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes,* N.Y. 1841). *SEE DISPERSED JEWS*.

Exinanition

SEE CHRISTOLOGY.

Existence of God

SEE GOD.

Exocontians

(or EXOUCONTIANS, Ἐξουκόντιοι), a name given to the strict Arians, because they maintained that Christ was created ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, before the beginning of things. They were also called Anomoeans, Altians. See these titles, and also *SEE ARIANS*.

Exode

Picture for Exode

OF THE ISRAELITES FROM EGYPT TO CANAAN (usually referred to in Hebrews by the phrase µyirxmi /ya,mel aer;cyiynEB]Ata, h/hy]ayxi/h, “The Lord did bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt," <021251>Exodus 12:51; to which is often emphatically added, hy;Wfn] [irzþbW hqz;j }ryB], "with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm," <052608>Deuteronomy 26:8, to express the miraculous interventions of Providence in the series of events), the great national epoch of the Hebrew people, in fact their "independence day," and as such constantly referred to

in all their subsequent history and vaticinations. Several of the Psalms are but a poetical rehearsal of its scenes (e.g. Psalm 114, 136); it is the burden of Habakkuk's lofty ode (Habakkuk 3); and besides the recapitulation of many of its incidents by Moses in Deuteronomy, it constitutes the main topic of one of the books of Scripture. The following account, including especially the date of the event, and the identifications of the place of crossing the Red Sea and of the stations in the desert, is a resume of nearly all the important matters not treated by us under other heads. *SEE EXODUS*.

I. *Date*. — The particular Egyptian monarch under whom this great event, the first definite link of the Hebrew with other ancient history, occurred, is so differently identified with those of early profane chronicles, and of the monuments by various Egyptologers, that but little reliance, unfortunately, can be placed upon any of them, based as they almost entirely are upon conjectural adaptations or arbitrary premises. The only one of these hypotheses that seems to afford any independent evidence of agreement is that lately propounded by Osburn (in the *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* for July, 1860), who conceives that the Egyptian king in question was Sethos II, the grandson of the great Sesostris, but of so odious a character and so inglorious a reign that his sarcophagus was demolished and his cartouche effaced by the early Egyptians themselves. *SEE PHARAOH*. This king, however, began to reign about B.C. 1240, a date entirely too late for the event under consideration. The historical questions connected with this point are noticed under EGYPT *SEE EGYPT* . Hales places the Exode in B.C. 1648, Usher in B.C. 1491, Bunsen in B.C. 1320, and Poole in B.C. 1652. A careful collation of the Biblical elements of the calculation, the only definite and trustworthy data, point to the spring of B.C. 1658 as the most probable date of the beginning of the series of exodic transactions. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. As to the account of the Exode given by Manetho, it was confessedly a mere popular story, for he admitted it was not a part of the Egyptian records, but a tale of uncertain authorship (Josephus, *c. Apion.* 1:16). A critical examination shows that it cannot claim to be a veritable tradition of the Exode: it is, indeed, if based on any such tradition, so distorted that it is impossible to be sure that it relates to the king to whose reign it is assigned. Yet, upon the supposition that the king is really Menptah, son of Rameses II, the advocates of the Rabbinical date entirely base their adjustment of Hebrew with Egyptian history at this period. *SEE MANETHIO.*

II. *The Outset.* — The Exode is a great turningpoint in Biblical history. With it the patriarchal dispensation ends and the law begins, and with it the Israelites cease to be a family and become a nation. It is therefore important to observe how the previous history led to this event. The advancement of Joseph, and the placing of his kinsmen in what was, to a pastoral people at least, "the best of the land," yet, as far as possible, apart from Egyptian influence, favored the multiplying of the Israelites and the preservation of their nationality. The subsequent persecution bound them more firmly together, and at the same time loosened the hold that Egypt had gained upon them. It was thus that the Israelites were ready, when Moses declared his mission, to go forth as one man from the land of their bondage. *SEE JOSEPH*.

The intention of Jehovah to deliver the Israelites from Egyptian bondage was made known to Moses from the burning bush at Mount Horeb, while he kept the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law. Under the divine direction, Moses, in conjunction with Aaron, assembled the elders of the nation, and acquainted them with the gracious design of Heaven. After this they had an interview with Pharaoh, and requested permission for the people to go, in order to hold a feast unto God in the wilderness. The result was not only refusal, but the doubling of all the burdens which the Israelites had previously had to bear. Moses hereupon, suffering reproach from his people, consults Jehovah, who assures him that he would compel Pharaoh "to drive them out of his land." "I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm and with great judgments" (Exodus 3-6:6). Then ensue a series of miracles (Exodus 6-12), commonly called the PLAGUES OF EGYPT *SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT* (q.v.). At last, overcome by the calamities sent upon him, Pharaoh yielded all that was demanded, saying, "Rise up, and get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel; and go serve the Lord as ye have said; also take your flocks and your herds, and be gone." Thus driven out, the Israelites, to the number of about 600,000 adults, besides children, left the land, attended by a mixed multitude, with their flocks and herds, even very much cattle (Exodus 12:31 sq.). Being "thrust out" of the country, they had not time to prepare for themselves suitable provisions, and therefore they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt. *SEE MOSES.*

On the night of the self-same day that terminated a period of 430 years, during which they had been in Egypt, were they led forth from Rameses or

Goshen. They are not said to have crossed the River Nile, whence we may infer that Goshen lay on the eastern side of the river. Their first station was at Succoth (Exodus 12:37). *SEE SUCCOTH*. The nearest way into the Land of Promise was through the land of the Philistines. This route would have required them to keep on in a north-east direction. It pleased their divine conductor, however, not to take this path, lest, being opposed by the Philistines, the Israelites should turn back at the sight of war into Egypt. If; then, Philistia was to be avoided, the course would lie nearly direct east, or south-east. Pursuing this route, "the armies" come to Etham, their next station, "in the edge of the wilderness" (Exodus 13:17 sq.). Here they encamped. Dispatch, however, was desirable. They journey day and night, not without divine guidance, for "the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and night." This special guidance could not well have been meant merely to show the way through the desert, for it can hardly be supposed that in so great a multitude no persons knew the road over a country lying near to that in which they and their ancestors had dwelt, and which did not exceed more than some forty miles across. The divine guides were doubtless intended to conduct the Israelites in that way and to that spot where the hand of God would be most signally displayed in their rescue and in the destruction of Pharaoh. *SEE PILLAR*.

The Land of Goshen may be concluded, from the Biblical narrative, to have been part of Egypt, but not of what was then held to be Egypt proper. It must therefore have been an outer eastern province of Lower Egypt. It is enough here to say that it was on the eastern side of the Nile, probably in the province of Esh-Shurkiyeh. Rasmeses was the place of rendezvous. But it is evident, from the frequent communications of Moses with the Egyptian court on the one hand, and with the Israelites on the other, that the latter must have been, at the time of starting, congregated at a point not far from the capital. They could only, therefore, have gone by the valley now called the wady et-Tumeylht, for every other cultivated or cultivable tract is too far from the Red Sea. In the Roman time, the route to Gaza from Memphis and Heliopolis passed the western end of the wady et-Tumeylat, as may be seen by the Itinerary of Antoninus (Parthey, *Zur Erdk. d. Alt. AEgyptens*, map 6), and the chief modern route from Cairo to Syria passes along the wady et-Tumeylut and leads to Gaza (Wilkinson, *Handbook*, new ed. page 209). Rameses, as we shall see, must have lain in this valley, which thus corresponded in part at least to Goshen. That it

wholly corresponded to that region is evident from its being markedly a single valley, and from the insufficiency of any smaller territory to support the Israelites. *SEE GOSHEN*. It is not difficult to fix very nearly the length of each day's march of the Israelites. As they had with them women, children, and cattle, it cannot be supposed that they averaged more than fifteen miles daily; at the same time, it is unlikely that they fell far short of this. The three journeys would therefore give a distance of about forty-five miles. There seems, however, as we shall see, to have been a deflexion froum a direct course, so that we cannot consider the whole distance from the starting-point, Rameses, to the shore of the Red Sea, as much more than about forty miles in a direct line. Measuring from the western shore (of the Arabian Gulf south-east of the wady et-Tumeylat, a distance of forty miles in a direct line places the site of Rameses near the ruins called in the present day Abu Kesheib, not far from the middle of the valley. This is in accordance with the location of Robinson and Lepsius. That the Israelites started from a place in this position is farther evident from the account of the two routes that lay before them: "And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not [by] the way of the land of the Philistines, although that [was] near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt, but God let the people turn to the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Exodus 13:17, 18). The expression used, bSWi, does not necessarily imply a change in the direction of the journey, but may mean that God did not lead the Israelites into Palestine by the nearest route, but took them about by the way of the wilderness. Were the meaning that the people turned, we should have to suppose. Ranceses to have been beyond the valley to the west, and this would probably make the distance to the Red Sea too great for the time occupied in traversing it, besides overthrowing the reasonable identification of the land of Goshen. Rameses is evidently the Rameses of Exodus 1:11. It seems to have been the chief town of the land of Goshen, for that region, or possibly a part of it, is called the land of Rameses in Genesis 47:11; comp. 4, 6. *SEE RAMESES*.

1. The direct route thence to the Red Sea was along the valley of the ancient canal. If, however, they rendezvoused near the metropolis, their route would be different. From the vicinity of Cairo there runs a range of hills eastward to the Red Sea, the western extremity of which, not far from Cairo, is named Jebel-Mokattem; the eastern extremity is termed Jebel-

Ataka, which, with its promontory Ras Ataka, runs into the Red Sea. Between the two extremes, some. where about the middle of the range, is an opening which affords a road for caravans. Two routes offered themselves here. Supposing that the actual starting-point lay nearer Cairo, the Israelites might strike in from the north of the range of hills at the opening just mentioned, and pursue the ordinary caravan road which leads from Cairo to Suez; or they might go southward from Mokattem, through the wady et-Tih, that is, the Valley of Wandering, through which also a road, though less used, runs to Suez. According to Niebuhr, they took the first; according to ancient tradition, Father Sicard *(Ueber der Weg der Israel/ten),* Paulus *(Samml.* 5:211 sq.), and others, they took the iast. Sicard found traces of the Israelites in the valley. He held Rameses to be the starting-point, and Rameses he placed about six miles from ancient Cairo, where Bezatin is now found. Here is a capacious sandy plain, on which Sicard thinks the Israelites assembled on the morning when they began their journey. In this vicinity a plain is still found, which the Arabs call the Jews' Cemetery, and where, from an indefinite period, the Jews have buried their dead. In the Mokattem chain is a hill, a part of which is called Mejanat Musa, "Moses's Station." On another hill in the vicinity ruins are found, which the Arabs name Meravad Musa, "Moses's Delight." Thus several things seem to carry the mind back to the time of the Hebrew legislator. Through the valley which leads from Bezatin (the Valley of Wandering) to the Red Sea, Sicard traveled in three days. He reckons the length to be twenty-six hours, which if we give two miles to each hour (Robinson), would make the distance fifty-two miles. This length is also assigned by Girard *(Descrip. Topograp. de la Valise de 1'Egarement).* The valley, running pretty much in a plain surface, would afford a convenient passage to the mixed bands of Israelites. About eighteen miles from Bezatin you meet with Gendelhy, a plain with a fountain. The name signifies a military station, and in this Sicard finds the Succoth (tents) of Exodus, the first station of Moses. The haste with which they left (were driven out) would enable them to reach this place at nightfall of their first day's march. Sicard places their second station, Etham, in the plain Ranaliyeh, eighteen miles from Gendelhy, and sixteen from the sea. From this plain is a pass four miles in length, so narrow that not more than twenty men can go abreast. To avoid this, which would have caused dangerous delay, the order was given them to turn (Exodus 14:2). Etham is said (Exodus 13:20) to be on the edge of the wilderness. Jablonski says the word means "terminus maris," the termination or

boundary of the sea. Now, in the plain where Sicard fixes Etham (not to be confounded with the Eastern Etham, through which afterwards the Israelites traveled three days, (Numbers 33:8), is the spot where the waters divide which run to the Nile and to the Gulf of Suez, and Etham is therefore truly *terminus maris.*

On the other hand, if, as the position of Rameses, and the nature of the ground between that point and the head of the gulf seems to indicate, they pursued the direct route thence down the valley of the bitter lakes, we may locate Succoth not far from the ruins of Serapeum, and Etham at a point about half way between. that spot and the head of the gulf; for we may suppose that the encumbered multitude made but little progress the first day, whereas on the third their march may have been quickened by apprehensions of the approaching Egyptians in pursuit. *SEE ETHAM*.

2. At the end of the second day's march, for each camping-place seems to mark the close of a day's journey, the route appears to have been altered from the natural thoroughfare around the head of the gulf. The first passage relating to the journey, after the mention of the encamping at Etham, is this, stating a command given to Moses: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they turn [or 'return'] and encamp [or 'that they encamp again,' Ynhyw]Wbvyw] before Pihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon" (Exodus 14:2). This explanation is added: "And Pharaoh will say of the children of Israel, They [are] entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in" (verse 3). The rendering of the A.V., "That they turn and encamp," seems to us the most probable of those we have given: "return" is the closer translation, but appears to be difficult to reconcile with the narrative of the route; for the more likely inference is that the direction was changed, not that the people returned: the third rendering does not appear probable, as it does not explain the entanglement. It is most likely that they at once turned, although they may have done so later in the march. The direction cannot be doubted, for thee would have been entangled (verse 5) only by turning southward. not northward. They encamped for the night by the sea, probably after a full day's journey. Pi-hahiroth (the mouth of the hiding-places) Sicard identifies with Tuarek (small caves), which is the name still given to three or four salt springs of the plain Baideah, on the south side of Mount Attaka, which last Sicard identifies with Baal-zephon, and which is the northern boundary of the plain Baideah, while Kulalah (Migdol) is its southern limit. But we would prefer to transpose these names, assigning

Migdol to Jebel Attaka, and Baal-zephoen to Jebel Deraj or Klulaih, while Wady Tuwarik will remain for Pi-hahiroth. (See each in its order.) The pass which leads to Suez, between Attaka and the sea, is very narrow, and could easily be stopped by the Egyptians. In this plain of Baideah Pharaoh had the Israelites hemmed in on all sides. This, then, according to all appearance, is the spot where the passage through the sea was effected. Such is the judgment of Sicard and of Raumer *(Dea Zug der Israeliten,* Leipzig, 1837; for a description of the Valley of Wandering, see also Ritter, *Erdkunde,* 1:858). It cannot be denied that this route satisfies all the conditions of the case. Equally does the spot correspond with the miraculous narrative furnished by holy writ. A different route is laid down by Niebuhr (Arab. page 407). Other writers, who, like him, endeavor to explain the facts without the aid of miracle, imitate his example. (See below.)

It is no small corroboration of the view now given from Sicard and Ranmer that in substance it has the support of Josephus, of whose account we shall, from its importance, give an abridgment. The Hebrews, he says, took their journey by Latopolis where Babylon was built afterwards when Cambyses Lid Egypt waste. As they went in haste, on the third day they came to a place called Baal-zephon, on the Red Sea. Moses led them this way in order that the Egyptians might be punished should they venture in pursuit, and also because the Hebrews had a quarrel with the Philistines. When the Egyptians had overtaken the Hebrews they prepared to fight them, and by their multitude drove them into a narrow place; for the number that went in pursuit was 600 chariots, 50,000 horsemen, and 200,000 infantry, all armed. They also seized the passages, shutting the Hebrews up between inaccessible precipices and the sea; for there was on each side a ridge of mountains that terminated at the sea, which were impassable, and obstructed their flight. Moses, however, prayed to God, and smote the sea with his rod, when the waters parted, and gave the Israelites free passage. The Egyptians at first supposed them distracted; but when they saw the Israelites proceed in safety, they followed. As soon as the entire Egyptian army was in the channel, the sea closed, and the pursuers perished amid torrents of rain and the most terrific thunder and lightning (Ant. 2:15).

III. *Passage of the Red* Sea. — This was the crisis of the Exode. It was the miracle by which the Israelites left Egypt and were delivered from the oppressor, All the particulars relating to this event, and especially those which show its miraculous character, require careful examination.

1. It is usual to suppose that the most northern place at which the Red Sea could have been crossed is the present head of the Gulf of Suez. This supposition depends upon the idea that in the time of Moses the gulf did not extend farther to the northward than at present. An examination of the country north of Suez has convinced some geographers, however, that the sea has receded many miles, and that this change has taken place within the historical period, possibly in fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah (<23 11 15>Isaiah 11:15; 19:5; comp, <38 10 11>Zechariah 10:11). The old bed is thought by them to be indicated by the Birket et-Timsah, or "Lake of the Crocodile," and the more southern bitter lakes, the northernmost part of the former corresponding to the ancient head of the gulf. In previous centuries it is not supposed that the gulf extended farther north, but that it was deeper in its northernmost part. We are inclined to believe, however, that such a change, if it ever took place, cannot materially affect the question of the place of the Israelites' passage.

From Pi-hahiroth the Israelites crossed the sea. The only points bearing on geography in the account of this event are that the sea was divided by an east wind, whence we may reasonably infer that it was crossed from west to east, and that the whole Egyptian army perished, which shows that it must have been some miles broad. Pharaoh took at least six hundred chariots, which, three abreast, would have occupied about half a mile, and the rest of the army cannot be supposed to have taken up less than several times that space. Even if in a broad formation some miles would have been required. It is more difficult to calculate the space taken up by the Israelitish multitude, but probably it was even greater. On the whole, we may reasonsably suppose about twelve miles as the smallest breadth of the sea.

2. A careful examination of the narrative of the passage of the Red Sea is necessary to a right understanding of the event. When the Israelites had departed, Pharaoh repented that he had let them go. News is carried to the monarch which leads him to see that the reason assigned (namely, a sacrifice in the wilderness) is but a pretext; that the Israelites had really fled from his yoke; and also that, through some (to him) unaccountable error, they had gone towards the south-east, had reached the sea, and were hemmed in on all sides. He summons his troops and sets out in pursuit — "all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, and his horsemen and his army;" and he overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, before Baal-zephon" (<02 14 09>Exodus 14:9). It might be conjectured, from one part of

the narrative (verses 1-4), that he determined to pursue them when he knew that they had encamped before Pi-hahiroth, did not what follows this imply that he set out soon after they had gone, and also indicate that the place in question refers to the pursuit through the sea, not to that from the city whence he started (verses 5-10). This city was most probably Zoan, and could scarcely have been much nearer to Pi-hahiroth, and the distance is therefore too great to have been twice traversed, first by those who told Pharaoh, then by Pharaoh's army, within a few hours. The strength of Pharaoh's army is not farther specified than by the statement that "he took six hundred chosen chariots, and [or 'even'] all the chariots of Egypt, and captains over every one of them" (verse 7). The war-chariots of the Egyptians held each but two men, an archer and a charioteer. The former must be intended by the word µvilèv; rendered in the A.V. "captains." Throughout the narrative the chariots and horsemen of Pharaoh are mentioned, and "the horse and his rider" (Exodus 15:21) are spoken of in Miriam's song, but we can scarcely infer hence that there was in Pharaoh's army a body of horsemen as well as of men in chariots, as in ancient Egyptian the chariot-force is always called HTAR or HETRA, "the horse," and these expressions may therefore be respectively pleonastic and poetical. There is no evidence in the records of the ancient Egyptians that they used cavalry, and, therefore, had the Biblical narrative expressly mentioned a force of this kind, it might have been thought conclusive of the theory that the Pharaoh of the Exode was a shepherd-king. With this army, which, even if a small one, was mighty in comparison with the Israelitish multitude, encumbered with women, children, and cattle, Pharaoh overtook the people " encamping by the sea" (verse 9). When the Israelites saw the oppressor's army they were terrified, and murmured against Moses. "Because [there were] no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?" (verse 11.) Along the bare mountains that skirt the valley of Upper Egypt are abundant sepulchral grottoes, of which the entrances are conspicuously seen from the river and the fields it waters: in the sandy slopes at the foot of the mountains are pits without number and many built tombs, all of ancient times, No doubt the plain of Lower Egypt, to which Memphis, with part of its far-extending necropolis, belonged politically, though not geographically, was throughout as well provided with places of sepulture. The Israelites recalled these cities of the dead, and looked with Egyptian horror at the prospect that their carcasses should be left on the face of the wilderness. Better, they said, to have continued to serve the Egyptians than thus to perish (verse 12). Then

Moses encouraged them, bidding them see how God would save them, and telling them that they should behold their enemies no more. There are few cases in the Bible in which those for whom a miracle is wrought are commanded merely to stand by and see it. Generally the divine support is promised to those who use their utmost exertions. It seems from the narrative that Moses did not know at this time how the people would be saved, and spoke only from a heart full of faith, for we read, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward; but lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it; and the children of Israel shall go on dry [ground] through the midst of the sea" (verses 15, 16). That night the two armies, the fugitives and the pursuers, were encamped near together. Here a very extraordinary event takes place: "The angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face and stood behind them; and it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these; so that the one came not near the other all the night" (verses 19, 20). The monuments of Egypt portray an encampment of an army of Rameses II during a campaign in Syria; it is well-planned and carefully guarded: the rude modern Arab encampments bring before us that of Israel on this memorable night. Perhaps in the camp of Israel the sounds of the hostile camp might be heard on the one hand, and on the other the roaring of the sea. But the pillar was a barrier and a sign of deliverance. The time had now come for the great decisive miracle of the Exode. "And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea: and the Lord caused the sea to go [back] by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry [land], and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went through the midst of the sea upon the dry [ground]; and the waters [were] a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left" (verses 21, 22; comp. 29). The narrative distinctly states that a path was made through the sea, and that the waters were a wall on either hand. The term "wall" does not appear to oblige us to suppose, as many have done, that the sea stood up like a cliff on either side, but should rather be considered to mean a barrier; as the former idea implies a seemingly needless addition to the miracle, while the latter seems to be not discordant with the language of the narrative. It was during the night that the Israelites crossed, and the Egyptians followed. In the morning watch, the last third or fourth of the night, or the period before sunrise, Pharaoh's army was in full pursuit in the divided sea (verses

23-25). Delays are now occasioned to the Egyptians; their chariot-wheels are supernaturally taken off, so that "in the morning-watch they drave them heavily." The Egyptians are troubled, they urge each other to fly from the face of Israel. Then was Moses commanded again to stretch out his hand, and the sea returned to its strength and overwhelmed the Egyptians, of whom not one remained alive (verses 26-28). The statement is so explicit that there could be no reasonable doubt that Pharaoh himself, the great offender, was at last made an example, and perished with his army, did it not seem to be distinctly stated in Psalm 36 that he was included in the same destruction (verse 15). The sea cast up the dead Egyptians, whose bodies the Israelites saw upon the shore. From the song of triumph which Moses sang upon this occasion we learn some other particulars, as that *"the depths* covered Pharaoh's host, *they sank to the bottom* as a stone;" language which, whatever deduction may be made for its poetic character, implies that the miracle took place in deep water (Exodus 15; comp. <19A609>Psalm 106:9 sq.). In a later passage some particulars are mentioned which are not distinctly stated in the narrative in Exodus. The place is indeed a poetical one, but its meaning is clear, and we learn from it that at the time of the passage of the sea there was a storm of rain, with thunder and lightning, perhaps accompanied by an earthquake (<19775>Psalm 77:15-20). To this Paul may allude where he says that the fathers "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (<4602>1 Corinthians 10:2); for the idea of baptism seems to involve either immersion or sprinkling, and the latter could have here occurred: the reference is evidently to the pillar of the cloud: it would, however, be impious to attempt an explanation of what is manifestly miraculous. These additional particulars may illustrate the troubling of the Egyptians, for their chariots may have been thus overthrown.

Here, at the end of their long oppression, delivered finally from the Egyptians, the Israelites glorified God. In what words they sang his praise we know from the Song of Moses, which, in its vigorous brevity, represents the events of that memorable night, scarcely of less moment than the night of the Passover (<02501>Exodus 15:1-18; verse 19 is probably a kind of comment, not part of the song). Moses seems to have sung this song with the men, Miriam with the women also singing and dancing, or perhaps there were two choruses (verses 20, 21). Such a picture does not recur in the history of the nation. Neither the triumphal song of Deborah, nor the rejoicing when the Temple was recovered from the Syrians,

celebrated so great a deliverance, or was joined in by the whole people. In leaving Goshen, Israel became a nation; after crossing the sea, it was free. There is evidently great significance, as we have suggested, in Paul's use of this miracle as a type of baptism; for, to make the analogy complete, it must have been the beginning of a new period of the life of the Israelites.

3. The importance of this event in Biblical history is shown by the manner in which it is spoken of in the books of the O.T. written in later times. In them it is the chief fact of Jewish history. Not the call of Abraham, not the rule of Joseph, not the first Passover, not the conquest of Canaan, are referred to in such a manner as this great deliverance. In the Psalms it is related as foremost among the deeds that God had wrought for his people. The prophet Isaiah recalls it as the great manifestation of God's interference for Israel, and an encouragement for the descendants of those who witnessed that great sight. There are events so striking that they are remembered in the life of a nation, and that, like great heights, increasing distance only gives them more majesty. So no doubt was this remembered long after those were dead who saw the sea return to its strength and the warriors of Pharaoh dead upon the shore.

It may be inquired how it is that there seems to have been no record or tradition of this miracle among the Egyptians. This question involves that of the time in Egyptian history to which this event should be assigned. The date of the Exode, according to different chronologers, varies more than three hundred years; the dates of the Egyptian dynasties ruling during this period of three hundred years vary fully one hundred. The period to which the Exode may be assigned therefore virtually corresponds to four hundred years of Egyptian history. If the lowest date of the beginning of the 18th dynasty be taken, and the highest date of the Exode, both which we consider the most probable of those that have been conjectured in the two cases, the Israelites must have left Egypt in a period of which monuments or other records are almost wholly wanting. Of the 18th and subsequent dynasties we have as yet no continuous history, and rarely records of events which occurred in a succession of years. We know much of many reigns, and of some we can be almost sure that they could not correspond to that of the Pharaoh of the Exode. We can in no case expect a distinct Egyptian monumental record of so great a calamity, for the monuments only record success; but it might be related in a papyrus. There would doubtless have long remained a popular tradition of the Exode; but if the king who perished was one of the shepherd strangers, this tradition would

probably have been local, and perhaps indistinct. Josephus, indeed, gives us some extracts from the last work of Manetho, who appears, if we may trust the criticisms of the Jewish historian *(contra Apionem, §* 14, 26), to have greatly garbled the account in favor of the Egyptians. *SEE HYKSOS*.

Endeavors have been made to explain away the miraculous character of the passage of the Red Sea. It has been argued that Moses might have carried the Israelites over by a ford, and that an unusual tide might have overwhelmed the Egyptians. But no real diminution of the wonder is thus effected. How was it that the sea admitted the passing of the Israelites, and drowned Pharaoh and his army? How was it that it was shallow at the right time, and deep at the right time? Some writers *(Wolfenb. Fragm.* page 64 sq.) have at once declared the whole fabulous, a course which appears to have been taken as early as the time of Josephus *(Ant.* 2:16, 5). Others, who do not deny miracles as such, yet with no small inconsistency seek to reduce this particular miracle to the smallest dimensions. Writers who see in the deliverance of the Hebrews the hand of God and the fulfillment of the divine purposes, follow the account in Scripture implicitly, placing the passage at Ras Attaka, at the termination of the Valley of Wandering; others, who go on rationalistic principles, find the sea here too wide and deep for their purpose, and endeavor to fix the passage a little to the south or the north of Suez. The most recent advocate of the passage at or near Suez is the learned Dr. Robinson *(Biblical Researches in Palestine).* The *route* taken by Moses was, according to Robinson, from Rameses to the head of the Arabian Gulf, through Succoth to Etham. The last place he fixes on the edge of the desert, on the eastern side of the line of the gulf. Instead of passing down the eastern side, at the top of which they were, the Israelites thence marched down the western side of the arm of the gulf, stopping in the vicinity of Suez, where the passage was effected. This view of the miracle, however, entirely fails to satisfy the Scripture account, and has been amply refuted by Dr. Olin *(Travels in the East,* N.Y. 1843) and others. (See the account of Mr. Blumhardt's visit, October 1836, in the *Church Missionary Record,* January 1836; Kitto's *Scripture Lands,* page 58; *Daily Bible Illustrat.* 2:95.) Some have supposed the Red Sea anciently extended farther north, and have sought to identify the localities of the passage on that theory (see Sharpe in Bartlett's *Forty Days in the Desert,* page 23 sq.); but this is quite improbable and without evidence. Another explanation (Dr. Durbin, *Observations in the Fast,* 1:254) makes the Israelites to have turned from the vicinity of the bitter lakes to the western

side of the head of Suez, and so to have followed the shore to the plain of Baideah let the mouth of wady Tuwarik, and there crossed; but if (as some travelers affirm) there is room for such a passage along the shore by Ras Attaka, the Israelites inight have escaped by the same route by simply retreating, or, if that had been prevented by the Egyptians following along the same path behind them, they uuuight still have fled up the wady Tih, and thence around Jebel Attaka and the head of the sea. A still later view (Captain Moresby, in Aiton's *Lands of the Messiah,* page 107) places the scene of the passage still farther south, at the mouth of the next valley opening on the Red Sea near Ras Abu Deraj; but it would be difficult to show how the Israelites could have reached this spot from their former position in the edge of the wilderness, and it would also bring them out too far south on the other side of the Red Sea. Indeed, the mountains approach so steeply the shore all along at these points, that they could only have arrived at the valley or plain of Baideash, where we have supposed the passage to have been made, by turning sharply at Ethamm around the western base of Mount Attaka, and so partly back into the wady et-Tih, through which they were immediately pursued by the Egyptiames. The latter thus hemmed them in completely, and drove them forward to the extreme edge of the shore projecting in front of Mount Attaka, around which they were unable to escape. Here it was that Providence opened to them a miraculous path through the deep waters to the opposite point (at the mouth of wady Beyanah), near which are situated the wells of Moses, which doubtless derived their name from the first encampment of the Hebrews after their rescue. *SEE RED SEA.*

IV. *The Route from the Red Sea to* Sinai. — When safe on the eastern shore, the Israelites, had they taken the shortest route into Palestine, would have struck at once across the desert in a south-easterly direction to el-Arish or Gaza. But this route would have brought them into direct collision with the Philistines, with whom they were as yet quite unable to cope. Oar they might have traversed the desert of Paran, following the pilgrim road of the present day to Elath, and, turning to the north, have made for Palestine. In order to accomplish this, however, hostile hordes and nations would have to be encountered, whose superior skill and experience in war might have proved fatal to the newly-liberated tribes of Israel. Wisely, therefore, did their leader take a course which necessitated the lapse of time, and gave promise of affording intellectual and moral discipline of the highest value. He resolved to lead his flock to Sinai, in order that they might see

the wonders there to be exhibited, and hear the lessons there to be given. At Sinai, and on the journey thither, might the great leader hope that the moral brand which slavery had imprinted on his people would be effaced, and that they would acquire that self-respect, that regard to God's will, that capacity of self-guidance which alone could make liberty a blessing to the nation, and enable Moses to realize on their behalf the great and benign intentions which Godhadled him to form. There were, however, two ways by which he might reach Sinai. By following a south-easterly direction, and proceeding across the desert et-Tih, he would have reached at once the heart of the Sinaitic, region. This was the shorter and the more expeditious road. The other route lay along the shore of the Red Sea, which must be pursued till an opening gave thee means of turning suddenly to the east, and ascending at once into the lofty district. The latter was preferable for the reason before assigned, namely, the additional opportunities which it offered for the education of the undisciplined tribes of recently emancipated slaves.

Moses did not begin his arduous journey till, with a piety and a warmth of gratitude which well befitted the signal deliverance that his people had just been favored with, he celebrated the power, majesty, and goodness of God in a triumphal ode, full of the most appropriate, striking, and splendid images; in which commemorative festivity he was assisted by "Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron," and her associated female band, with poetry music, and dancing. The nature of these festivities gives us full reason to conclude that, if the people at large were still slaves in intellect and morals, there were not wanting individuals in the camp who were eminently skilled in the best refinements of the age. The spot where these rejoicings were held could not have been far from that which still bears the nanme of *Ayuen Meisa*, "the fountains of Moses," the situation of which is even now marked bv a few palm-trees. This was a suitable place for the encampment, because well supplied with water. Here Robinson counted seven fountains, near which he saw a patch of barley and a few cabbage-plants.

1. In tracing the track pursued by the host, we should bear in mind the limitation that a variety of converging or parallel routes naust often have been required to allow of the passage of so great a number (Robinson, *Researches*, 1:106). Assuming the passage of the Red Sea to have been effected at the spot indicated above, they eould march froma their point of landing, a little to the E. of S. Here they were in the wilderness of Shur,

and in it "they went three days and found no water." The Israelites seem to have proceeded along the coast, probably following the route usually pursued by modern travelers, being at a short distance from the shore and parallel with it. The district is hilly and sandy, with a few water-courses running into the Red Sea, which, failing rain, are dry. "These wadys," says Robinson, "are mere depressions in the desert, weith only a few scattered herbs and shruebs, now withered and parched with drought." *SEE SHUR*.

At the end of three days the Israelites reached the fountain Marah, but the waters were bitter, and could not be drunk. The stock which they had brought with them being now exhausted, they began to utter murmurings on finding themselves disappointed at Marah. Moses appealed to God, who directed him to a tree, which, being thrown into the waters, sweetens ed them. The people were satisfied and admonished. The present *'Ain el-Hawara* has been thought icy most travelers since Burckhardt's time to be Marah. The basin is six or eight feet in diameter, and the water Robinson found about two feet deep. Its taste is unpleasant, saltish, and somewhat bitter. The Arabs pronounce it bitter, and consider it as the worst water in all these regions. Near the spring are numerous bushes of the shrub *ghurkud* — a low, bushy, thorny shrub, producing a small fruit, which ripens in June, not unlike the blackberry, very juicy, and slightly acidulous. It delights in a saline soil, and is found growing near the brackish fountains in and around Palestine, affording a grateful refreshment to travelers. By means of the berries, or, if they were met ripe, the leaves of this plant, the bitterness may have been removed from the waters of Marah. Not improbably the miracle in the case lae in this, that Jehoasah directed Moses to use the tree (bush) itself, instead of what was usual, the berries, as from the time of year, shortly after Easter, they could hardly have been ripe. Between Ain Howarah and Ayuin Musa the plain is alternately — gravelly, stony, and sandy, while under the range of Jebel Wardan (a branch of et-Tih) chalk and flints are found. There is no water on the direct line of route (Robinson, 1:127-144). Hawara stands in the lime and gypsum region which lines the eastern shore of the Gulf of Suez at its northern extremity. Seetzen (Reisen, 3:117) describes the water as salt, with purgative qualities; but adds that his Bedouins and their camels drank of it. He argues, from its inconsiderable size, that it could not be the Marah of Moses. This, however, seems an inconclusive reason. It would not be too near the point of landing assumed, as above, as Dr. Stewart argues (page 55), when we consider the encumbrances which would delay the host, and,

especially while they were new to the desert, prevent rapid marches. But the whole region appears to abound in brackish or bitter springs (Seetzen, *ib.* 3:117, etc.; *Anmerk.* page 430). For instance, about one and three-fourths hours nearer Suez than the wady Ghurundel (which Lepsius took for Marah, but which Niebuhr and Robinson regard as more probably Elim), Seetzen *(ib.* 3:113, 114) found a wady Tal, with a salt spring and a salt crust on the surface of its bed, the same, he thinks, as the spot where Niebuhr speaks of finding rock-salt. This corresponds in general proximity with Marah. The neighboring region is described as a low plain girt with limestone hills, or more rarely chalk. On this first section of their desert march, Dr. Stanley *(Sinai and Palst.* page 37) remarks, "There can be no dispute as to the general track of the Israelites after the passage (of the Red Sea). If they were to enter the mountains at all, they must continue in the route of all travelers, between the sea and the table-land of the Tih, till they entered the low hills of Ghurufndel." He adds in a note, "Dr. Graul, however, was told ... of a spring near Tih el-Amara, right (i.e., south) of Hawara, so bitter that neither men nor camels could drink of it. From hence the road goes straight to wady Ghurundel." Seetzen also inclines to view favorably the identification of el Amara with Marah. He gives it the title of a "wady," and precisely on this ground rejects the pretensions of ei-Hawara as being no "wady," but only a brook; whereas, from the statement "they encamped" at Marah, Marah must, he argues, have been a wady. *SEE MARAH.*

2. The next station mentioned in Scripture is Elim, where were twelve wells of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees. As is customary with travelers in these regions, "they encamped there by the waters" (Exodus 16:1). The indications given in the Bible are not numerous nor very distinct. Neither time nor distance is accurately laid down. Hence we can expect only general accuracy in our maps, and but partial success in fixing localities. Elim, however, is generally admitted to be *wady Ghurundel,* lying about half a day's journey south-east from Marah. The way from Egypt to Sinai lies through this valley, and, on account of its water and verdure, it is a chief caravan station at the present day. It seems certain, at all events, that wady Ghuirundel — whether it be Marah, as Lepsius and (although doubtfully) Seetzen thought, or Elim, as Niebuhr, Robinson, and Kruse — must have been on the line of march, and almost equally certain that it furnished a camping station. In this wady Seetzen found more trees, shrubs, and bushes than he anywhere else saw in his journey from Sinai to

Suez. He particularizes several date-palms and many tamarisks, and notes that the largest quantity of the vegetable manna, now to be found anywhere in the Peninsula, is gathered here (3:116) from the leaves of the last-named tree, which here grows "with gnarled boughs and hoary head; the wild acacia, tangled by its desert growth into a thicket, also shoots out its gray foliage and white blossoms over the desert" (Stanley, *Sinai and Palest.* page 68). The "scenery" in this region becomes "a succession of water-courses" (ib.); and the wady Taiyibeh, connected with Ghurundel by Useit, is so named from the goodly water and vegetation which it contains. These three wadys encompass on three sides the Jebel Hummam; the sea, which it precipitously overhangs, being on the fourth. They are the principal ones of those which the Israelites, going from north-west to south-east along the coast, would come upon in the following order-wady Ghfurundel, wady Useit, wady Thal, and wady Shubeikeh, the last being in its lower part called also wady Taiyibeh, or having a junction with one of that name. Between Useit and Taiyibeh, the coast-range of these hills rises into the Jebel Hummam, "lofty and precip. itous, extending in several peaks along the shore, apparently of chalky limestone, mostly covered with flints . . its precipices ... cut off all passage alongshore from the hot springs (lying a little west of south from the mouth of wady Useit, along the coast) to the mouth of wady Taiyibeh" (Robinson, 1:150; compare Stanley, *Sin. and Palest.* page 35). Hence, between the courses of these wadys the track of the Israelites must have been inland. Stanley says "Elim must be *Ghurindel, Useit*, or *Taiyibeh* (page 37); elsewhere (page 68) that "one of *two* valleys, or perhaps *both*, must be Elim;" these appear from the sequel to be Ghurufndel and Useit, "fringed with trees and shrubs, the first vegetation he had met with in the desert;" among these are "wild palms," not stately trees, but dwarf or savage, "tanmarisks," and the "'wild acacia." To judge from the configuration as given in the maps, there seems to be no reason why all three should not have combined to form Elim. or, at any rate, as Stanley suggests, two of them. Only, from Numbers 33:9, 10, as Elim appears not to have been on the sea, we must suppose that the encampment, if it extended into three wadys, stopped short of their seaward extremities. The Israelitish host would scarcely find in all three more than adequate ground for their encampment. Beyond (i.e., to the south-east of Ghurundel), the ridges and spurs of limestone mountain push down to the sea, across the path along the plain (Robinson, 1:101, and *Map).* This portion of the question may be summed up by presenting, in a

tabular form, the views of some leading travelers or annotators on the site of Elim:

Wady Ghurundel.		*Wady Useit.*	Some warm springs north of Tar, which feed the rich date plantations of the convent there,
Niebuhr, Robinson, Kruse.	One of both, Stanley.	Laborde "possibly." Seetzen.	

[By Lepsius identified with Marah.]

Dr. Kruse *(Anmerk.* page 418) singularly takes the words of (02157)Exodus 15:27, “they encamped there (in Elim) *by the waters,"* as meaning "by the sea;" whereas, from (04309)Numbers 33:9, 10, it appears they did not reach the sea till a stage farther, although their distance from it previously had been but small. *SEE ELIM*.

3. From Elim the Israelites marched, encamping on the shore of the Red Sea, for which purpose they must have kept the high ground for some time, since the precipices of Jebel Hummam — a lofty and precipitous mountain of chalky limestone — run down to the brink of the sea. They therefore went on the land side of this mountain to the head of wady Taiyibeh, which passes down south-west through the mountains to the shore. On the plain of *Ras Zetima,* at the mouth of this valley, was probably (Stanley, page 37) the encampment "by the Red Sea" ((04310)Numbers 33:10).

4. According to (04211)Numbers 32:11, the Israelites removed from the Red Sea, and encamped next in the wilderness of Sin; an appellation no doubt representing some natural feature, and none more probably than the alluvial plain, which, lying at the edge of the sea, about the spot we now regard them as having reached, begins to assume a significant appearance. The modern name for this is *el-Kaa,* identified by Seetzen with this wilderness (3, part 3:412). Stanley calls el-Kaa, at its initial point, "the plain of *Murkhah,"* and thinks it is probably this wilderness (page 37). Robinson likewise identifies it with "the great plain, which, beginning near el-Murkhah, extends with greater or less breadth almost to the extremity of the peninsula. In its broadest part it is called el-Kaa" (1:106). Thus they kept along the shore, and did not yet ascend any of the fruitful valleys which run up towards the center of the district. The account in Exodus 16 knows nothing of the foregoing encampment by the sea, but brings the host at once into "the wilderness of Sin;" but we must bear in mind the general

purpose there of recording not the people's history so much as God's dealings with them, and the former rather as illustrative of the latter, and subordinate to it. The evident design, however, in Numbers 33 belong to place on record their itinerary, this latter is to be esteemed as the *locus classicus* on any topographical questions as compared with others having a less special relation to thettrack. Indeed, we may regard the encampment by the Red Sea as bed essentially in the wilderness of Shur itself. *SEE SIN (DESERT OF).*

The Israelites arrived in the wilderness of Sin on the fifteenth day of the second month after their dep.Arture out of the land of Egypt (<02101>Exodus 21:1), and being now wearied of their journey and tired of their scanty fare, they began again to murmur. Indeed, it is not easy to see how the most ordinary and niggardly food could have been supplied to them, constituting as they did nearly two millions of persons, in such a country as that into which they had come. It is true that some provision might have been made by individuals ere the march from Suez began. It is also probable that the accounts of encampments which we have are to be regarded as chiefly those of Moses and his principal men, with a chosen body of troops, while the multitude were allowed to traverse the open country and forage in the valleys. Still the region was unfavorable for the purpose, and some have hence concluded that here we have one of those numerical difficulties which are not uncommon in the Old Testament Scripture, and which make many suspect some radical error in our conceptions of the Hebrew system of numbers. The contrast between the scanty supply of the desert and the abundance of Egypt furnished the immediate occasion of the outbreak of dissatisfaction. Bread and flesh were the chief demand; bread and flesh were miraculously supplied; the former by manna, the latter by quails (<02163>Exodus 16:13). Manna grows in some of the neighboring valleys; but the Israelites were in the wilderness, so that the supply could not have proceeded from natural resources, even had such existed to a sufficient extent for the purpose. The modern confection sold under that name is the exudation collected from the leaves of the tamarisk-tree (*tamarix Orientales,* Linn.; Arab. *tarfa,* Hebrews lva), only in the Sinaitic valleys, and in no great abundance. If it results from the punctures made in the leaf by an insect (the *coccus manniparus,* Ehrenberg) in the course of June, July, and August, this will not precisely suit the time of the people's entering the region, which was about May. It is said to keep as a hardened sirup for years (Laborde, Comment. *Geogr.* on <02163>Exodus 16:13, 14), and

thus does not answer to the more striking characteristics described in (02164)Exodus 16:14-26. Seetzen thought that the gum Arabic, an exudation of the acacia, was the real manna of the Israelites; i.e., he regards the statement of " bread from heaven" as a fiction *(Reisen,* 3:75-79). A caravan of a thousand persons is said by Hasselquist *(Voyages,* etc., *Materia Medica,* page 298, transl. ed. 1766) to have subsisted solely on this substance for two months. *SEE MANNA*.

5. The next station mentioned in Exodus is Rephidim; but in Numbers Dophkah and Alush are added. The two latter were reached after the people had taken "their Journey out of the wilderness of Sin." Exact precision and minute agreement are not to be expected. The circumstances of the case forbid us to look for them. In a desert, mountainous, and rarely frequented country, the names of places are not lasting. There was the less reason for permanence in the case before us, because the Israelites had not taken the shorter and more frequented road over the mountains to Sinai, but keptsalong the shore of the Red Sea. It still deserves notice, that in (02701)Exodus 17:1 there is something like an intimation given of other stations besides Rephidim ihu the words "after their journeys." Dophlkah is probably to be found near the spot where wady Feiran runs into the Gulf of Suez. *SEE DOPHKAH*. Alush may have lain on the shore near Ras Jehan. *SEE ALUSH*. From this point a range of calcareous rocks, termed Jebal Hemam, stretches along the shore, near the southern end of which the Hebrews took a sudden turn to the northeast, and, going up wady Hibran, reached the central Sinaitic district. On the opposite side, the eastern, the Sinaitic mountains come to a sudden stop, breaking off, and presenting like a wall nearly perpendicular granite cliffs. These cliffs are cut by wady Hibran, and at the point of intersection with the plain which runs between the two ranges probably lay Rephidim. The tabernacle vas not yet set mup, nor the order of march organized, as subsequently (04013)Numbers 10:13, etc.); hence the words "track" or "route," as indicating a line, can only be taken in the most wide and general sense. *SEE REPHIDIM*.

This was the last station before Sinai itself was reached. Naturally enough is it recorded that "there was no water for the people to drink." The road was an and gravelly plain; on either side were barren rocks. A natural supply was impossible. A miracle was wrought, and water was given. The Scripture makes it clear that it was from the Sinaitic group that the water was produced (02706)Exodus 17:6). The plain received two descriptive names: Massah, "Temptation," and Meribah, "Strife." It appears that the

congregation was not allowed to pursue their way to Sinai unmolested. The Arabs thought the Israelites suitable for plunder, and fell upon them. These hordes are termed Amalek. The Amalekites may have been out on a predatory expedition, or they may have followed the Israelites from the north, and only overtaken them at Rephidim; any way, no conclusion can be gathered from this fact as to the ordinary abode of these nomads. It appears, however, that the conflict was a severe and doubtful one, which by some extraordimeary aid ended in favor of the children of Israel. This aggression on the part of Amalek gave occasion to a permanent national hatred, which ended only in the extermination of the tribe (<0424>Numbers 24:20; <0217>Exodus 17:4-16). In commemoration of this victory, Moses was commanded to write an account of it in a book: he also erected there an altar to Jehovah, and called the name of it “Jehovah, my banner." There is no occasion to inquire whether or not there was space for a battle in the spot where Moses was. It was a nomad horde that made the attack and mot a modern army. The fight was not a pitched battle. *SEE AMALEK*.

The word Horeb, applied by Moses to the place whence the water was gained, suggests the idea that Horeb was the general, and Sinai the specific name; Horeb standing for the entire district, and Sinai for one particular mountain. Many passages sanction this distinction; but in the New Testament Sinai only is read, having then apparently become a general name, as it is at the present day (<4730>Acts 7:30-38; <4824>Galatians 4:24). It is a monkish usage which gives the name Sinai to Jebel Musa, and Horeb to the northern part of the same ridge. *SEE HOREB*.

6. The route from Rephidim to Horeb is usually supposed to have been by way of wady Feiran, but we can see no good reason for so circuitous a course, supposing that we have correctly located Rephidim. The Israelites may more probably have ascended wady Hibiahn as far as its junction with wady Bughabigh, and through this first south-easterly, and then north-easterly between Jebel Madsus and Jebel es-Sik; thence, in a northerly direction, along the western base of Jebel Katherin, through wady Um-Kuraf, across wady Tulah. Here they may have followed the path be. tween Jebel Humr and Jebel el-Ghubsheh, which comes out at the modern gardens in the recess of the hills. We thus place them before Mount Horeb, in fite capacious plain Rahah, which, having its widest part in the immediate front of that immense mass of rock, extends as if with two arms, one towards the northwest, the other towards the northeast. The review of the plain by so competent a person as Robinson is of great consequence for

the interests of scientific geography, and the yet more important interests of religious truth; the rather because a belief prevailed, even among the best informed, that there was no spot in the Sinaitic district which answered' to the demands of the scriptural narrative. Even the accurate Winer *(Real-Wort.* in art. "Sinai," not "Horeb," as referred to by Robinson, 1:17; 2:550) says, "Whichever mountain may be considered as the place for the promulgation of the law, the common representation still remains false — that at the foot of the hill there spreads out a great plain, on which the people of Israel might assemble" (comp. Rosenmimiler, Alterth. 3:129). We shall therefore transcribe Robinson's words in extenso: "We came to Sinai with some incredulity, wishing to investigate the point whether there was any probable ground, beyond monkish tradition, for fixing upon the present supposed site. We were led to the conviction that the plain er-Rahah is the probable spot where the congregation of Israel were assembled; and that the mountain impending over it, the present Horeb, was the scene of the awful phenomena in which the law was given. We were surprised as well as gratified to find here, in the inmost recesses of these dark granite cliffs, this fine plain spread out before the mountain, and I know not where I have felt a thrill of stronger emotion than when, in first crossing the plain, the dark precipices of Horeb rising in solemn grandeur before us, we became aware of the entire adaptedness of the scene to the purposes for which it was chosen by the great Hebrew legislator. Moses doubtless, during the forty years in which he kept the flocks of Jethro, had often. wandered over these moanntains, and was well acquainted with their valleys and deep recesses, like the Arabs of the present day. At any rate, he knew and had visited the spot to which he was to conduct his people — this adytum in the midst of the great circular granite region; a secret holy place, shut out from the world amid lone asnd desolate mountains" (1:175 sq.). We subjoin what Robinson reports of the climate: "The weather, during our residence at the convent (of Sinai), as, indeed, during all our journey through the peninsula (March and April), was very fine. At the convent the thermometer ranged only between 470 and 670 F. But the winter nights are said here to be cold; water freezes as late as February, and snow often falls upon the mountains. But the air is exceedingly pure, and the climate healthy, as is testified by the great asge and vigor of many of the monks; and if in general few of the Arabs attain to so great an age, the cause is doubtless to be sought in the scantiness of their fare, and their exposure to privations, and not to any injurious influence of the climate" (page 175). Other travelers, however, have since contended for the plain of

wady es-Sebaiyeh, at the *south-eastern* base of Sinai, as the scene of the giving of the law (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust. 2*:123). This appears a less favorable position for that purpose, but Ait might easily have been reached by the Israelites by keeping along the shore of the Red Sea, and ascending by the next valley opposite Jebel Um-Shaumer. *SEE SINAI*.

V. From *Sinai to Kadesh.* — The sojourn of a year in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai was an eventful one. The statements of the scriptural narrative which relate to the receiving of the two tables, the golden calf; Moses's vision of God, and the visit of Jethro, are too well known to need special mention here; but, besides these, it is certain, from ⁰⁴⁰³Numbers 3:4, that before they quitted the wilderness of Sinai the Israelites were throwemn into mourning bythe untimely death of Aaron's two sons, Nadab and Abihu. This event is probably connected with the setting up of the tabernacle and the enkindling of that holy fire, the sanctity of which their death avenged. That it has a determinate chronological relation with the proanulgations which from time to time were made in that wilderness, is proved by an edict in Leviticus 16, being fixed as subsequent to it (Leviticus 10; comp. 16:1). The only other fact of history contained in Leviticus is the punishment of the son of mixed parentage for blasphemy (⁰³²⁴Leviticus 24:10-14). Of course the consecration of Aaron and his son is mentioned early in the book in connection with the laws relating to their office (⁰³⁰⁹Leviticus 8:9). In the same wilderness region the people were numbered, and the exchange of the Levites against the first-born was effected; these last, since their delivery when God smote those of Egypt, having incurred the obligation of sanctity to him. The offerings of the princes of Israel were here also received. The last incident mentioned before the wilderness of Sinai was quitted for that of Paran is the intended departure of Hobab the Kenite, emhich it seems he abandoned at Moses's urgency. *SEE HOBAB*.

1. After having been thus about a year in the midst of this mountains region, the Israelites broke up their encampment and began their journey in the order of their tribes, Judah leading the way with the ark of the covenant, under the guidance of the directing cloud (⁰⁴⁰⁹Numbers 9:15 sq.; 10:11 sq.). They doubtless proceeded down wady Sheik, having the wilderness of Paran (Debbet er-Ramleh) before them, in a northerly direction; but having come to a gorge in the mountains not far from Sinai, they appear to have struck in a north-easterly direction across some long swells into *wady Sal*, where the subsequent route obliges us to place the

station Taberah. It took the army three days to reach this station. Whatever name the place bore before, it now received that of Taberah (fire), from a superuatural fire with which murmurers, in the extreme parts of the canip, were de, stroyed as a punishment for their guilt. Here, too, the mixed multitude that was among the Israelites not only fell a-lusting themselves, but also excited the Hebrews to remember Egyptian fish and vegetables with strong desire, and to complain of the divinely supplied manna. The discontent was intense and widely spread. Moses became aware of it, and forthwith felt his spirit misgive him. He brings the matter before Jehovah, and receives divine aid by the appointment of seventy elders to assist him in the important and perilous office of governing the gross, sensuous, and self-willed mayriads whom he had to lead to Canaan. Moreover, an abundance of flesh-meat was given in a most profuse supply of quails. It appears that there were now 600,000 footmen in the congregation. *SEE TABERAM.*

2. Thee next station was Kibroth-hattaavah (probably at the intersection of their north-easterly course with *wady Murrah),* near which there are fine springs and excellent pasturage. This spot, the name of which signifies "graves of lust," emas so denominated from a plague inflicted an the people in punishment of their rebellious disposition (Numbers 11:33; 1 Corinthians 10:6). Raumer *(Beitrage z. bib. Geog.* page 6, also *Palast.* 1850, page 442) infers from Deuteronomy 1:3, that Dizahab (now Dahab) lay on the route of the Israelites, and therefore identifies it with Kibroth-hattavah; but this is improbable, and requires a large detour. *SEE KIBROTH-HATTAAVAH.*

3. Thence they journeyed to Hazeroth, which Robinson, after Burckhardt, finds in *el-Hudherah,* where is a fountain, together with palm-trees. "The determination of this point," says Robinson, "is perhaps of more importance in Biblical history than would at first appear; for, if this position be adopted for Hazeroth, it settles at once the question as to the whole route of the Israelites between Sinai and Ksadesh. It shows that they must have followed the route upon which we now were to the sea, and so along the coast to Akabah (at the head of the eastern arm of the Red Sea), and thence, probably, through the great wady el-'Arabah to Kadesh. Indeed, such is the nature of the country, that, having once arrived at this fountain, they could not well have varied their course so as to keep aloof from the sea, and continue along the high plateau of the western desert" (1:223). A glance at Kiepert's, or any map showing the region in detail, will show that

a choice of two main routes exists, in order to cross the intervening space between Sinai and Canaan, which they certainly approached in the first instance on the southern, and not on the eastern side. Here the higher plateau surmounting the Tih region would almost certainly, assuming the main features of the wilderness to have been then as they are now, have compelled them to turn its western side nearly by the route by which Seetzen came in the opposite direction from Hebron to Sinai, or to turn it on the east by going up the 'Arabah, or between the 'Arabah and the higher plateau. Over its southern face there is no pass, and hence the roads from Sinai, and those from Petra towards Gaza and Hebron, all converge into one of two trunk-lines of route (Robinson, 1:147, 151, 2; 2:186). One reason for thinking that they did not strike northwards across the Tih range from Sinai is Moses' question when they murmur, "Shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them, to suffice them?" which is natural enough if they were rapidlynearing the Gulf of 'Akabah, but strange if they were posting towards the inland heart of the desert. Again, the quails are brought by "a wind from the sea" (<04122>Numbers 11:22, 31); and various travelers (Burckhardt, Schubert. Stanley) testify to the occurrence of vast flights of birds in this precise region between Sinai and 'Akabah. Again, Hazeroth, the next station after these, is coupled with Dizahab, which last seems undoubtedly the Dahab on the shore of that gulf (<05001>Deuteronomy 1:1, and Robinson, 2:600, note). This makes a seaward position likely for Hazeroth. Now as Taberah, previously reached, was three days' journey or more from the wilderness of Sinai, they had probably advanced that distance towards the northeast and 'Akabah; and the distance required for this will bring us so near el-Hudherath (the spot which Robinson thought represented Hazeroth in fact, as it seems to do in name), that it may be accepted as a highly probable site. Thus they were now not far from the coast of the Gulf of 'Akabah. A spot which seems almost certain to attract their course was the wady el-'Ain, being *the* water, *the* spring of that region of the desert, which would have drawn around it such "nomadic settlements as are implied in the name of Hazeroth, and such as that of Israel must have been" (Stanley, page 82). Stanley nevertheless thinks this identification of Hazeroth a "faint probability," and the more uncertain as regards identity, "as the name Hazeroth is one of the least likely to be attached to any permanent or natural feature of the desert," meaning "simply the inclosures, such as may still be seen in the Bedouin villages, hardly less transitory than tents" *(Sinai and Palestine,* pages 81, 82). We rely, however, as much on the combination of the various circumstances

mentioned above as on the name. The wady Hfiderah and wady el-'Ain appear to run nearly parallel with each other, from southwest to northeast, nearly from the eastern extremity of the wady es-Sheikh, and their northeast extremity comes nearly to the coast, marking about a midway distance between the Jebel,Musa and 'Akabah. After reaching the sea, however, at Ain el-Waseit, the Israelites may have made a detour by way of wady Wetir nearly to its head, and thence passed through the watercourse running directly northward into the Derb es-Sanna, thence around the northern face of Jebel Herte, down wady Hessi and wady Kureiyeh to the sea again; thus avoiding the narrow shore and the difficult pass across the hill between wady el-Huweimiraty and wady el Huweimirat. (See Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine,* page 84). *SEE HAZEROTH.*

At Hazeroth, where the people seem to have remained a short time, there arose a family dissension to increase the difficulties of Moses. Aaron, apparently led on by his sister Miriam, who may have been actuated by some feminine pique or jealousy, complained of Moses on the ground that he had married a Cushite, that is, an Arab wife, and the malcontents went so far as to set up their own claims to authority as not less valid than those of Moses. An appeal is made to Jehovah, who vindicates Moses, rebukes Aaron, and punishes Miriam (Numbers 12). *SEE MIRIAM*.

The two preceding stations seem from (04101)Numbers 10:1113, 33-36, to have lain in the wilderness of Paran; but possibly the passage in 10:11-13 should come after that of 33-36, and the "three days' journey" of verse 33 lie still in the wilderness of Sinai; and even Taberah and Hazeroth, reached in 11, 12, also there. Thus the Israelites would reach Paran only in 12:16; and 10:12 would be either misplaced, or mentioned by anticipation only. *SEE PARAN (WILDERNESS OF).*

4. The next permanent encampment brought them into the wilderness of Paran, and here the local commentator's greatest difficulty begins. "And afterwards the people removed from Hazeroth, and pitched in the wilderness of Paran," at Kadesh ((04121)Numbers 12:16; 13:26). In (05101)Deuteronomy 1:19-21, we read, "And when we departed from Horeb we went through all that great and terrible wilderness which ye saw by the way of the mountain of the Amorites, as the Lord our God commanded us; and we came to Kadesh-barnea. And I said unto you, Ye are come unto the mountain of the Amorites, which the Lord our God doth give unto us.

Behold, the Lord thy God hath set the land before thee: go up and possess it; fear not, neither be dis. couraged." Accordingly, here it was that twelve men (spies) were sent into Canaan to survey the country, who went up from the wilderness of Zin (Numbers 13:21) to Hebron, and returning after foity days, brought back a very alarming account of what they had seen. Let it, however, be remarked that the Scriptures here supply several local data to this effect: Kadesh- barnea lay not far from Canaan, near the mountain of the Amorites, in the wilderness of Zin, in the wilderness of Paran. It is evident that there is here a great *lacuna,* which some have attempt. ed to fill up by turning the route a little to the west to Rithmah (q.v.), on the borders of Idumaea, and then conducting it with a sudden bend to the west and the south, into what is considered the wilderness of Paran *(Relievo Map of Arabia Petrasa,* published by Dobbs, London). In this view, however, we cannot concur. Both Robinson and Raumer are of a different opinion. At the same time it must be admitted that so great a gap in the itinerary is extraordinary. If, however, we find ourselves in in egard to the journey from Horeb to Kadesh possessed of fewer and less definite materials of information, we have also the satisfaction of feeling that no great scriptural fact or doctrine is concerned. It is certain that the narrative in the early part of Numbers goes at once from Hazeroth to Kadesh; and although the second account (in Numbers 33) supplies other places, these seem to belong properly to a second route and a second visit to Kadesh. The history in the book of Numbers is not, indeed, a consecutive narrative; for after the defeat of the Israelites in their foolish attempt to force a.n entrance into Canaan contrary to the will of God (Numbers 14:45), it breaks suddenly off, and, leaving the journeyings and the doings of the camp, proceeds to recite certain laws. Yet it offers, as we think, a clear intimation of a second visit to the wilderness of Zin and to Kadesh. Without having said a word as to the removal of the Israelites southward, and therefore leaving them in the wilder ness of Zin, at Kadesh; it records in the twentieth chapter (verse 1), "Then *came* the children of Israel, the whole congregation, into the desert of Zin, in the first month, and the people abode in Kadesh." And this view appears confirmed by the fact that the writer immediately proceeds to narrate the passage of the Israelites hence on by Mount Hor southwards to Gilgal and Canaan. Robinson's remarks (2:611) on this point have much force: "I have thus far assumed that the Israelites were twice at Kadesh, and this appears from a comparison of the various accounts. They broke up from Sinai on the the twentieth day of the second month in the second year of their departure out

of Egypt, corresponding to the early part of May; they came into the desert of Paran, whence spies were sent up the mountain into Palestine, 'in the time of the first ripe grapes;' and these returned after forty days to the camp at Kadesh. As grapes begin to ripen on the mountains of Judah in July, the return of the spies is to be placed in Atigust or September. The people now murmured at the report of the spies, and received the sentence from Jehovah that their carcasses should fall in the wilderness, and their children wander in the desert forty years. They were ordered to turn back into the desert 'by the way of the Red Sea,' although it appears that they abode 'many' days in Kadesh. The next notice of the Israelites is, that in the first month they came into the desert of Zin and abode again at Kadesh; here Miriam dies; Moses and Aaron bring water from the rock; a passage is demanded through the land of Edom, and refiused; and they then journeyed from Kadesh to Mount Hor, where Aaron dies in the fortieth year of the-departure from Egypt, in the first day of the fifth month, corresponding to a part of August and September. Here, then, between August of the *second* year and August of *the fortieth* year, we have an interval of thirty-eight years of wandering in the desert. With this coincides another account. From Mount Hor they proceeded to Elath on the Red Sea, and so around the land of Edom *to* the brook Zered, on the border of Moab; and from the time of their departure from Kadesh (meaning, of course, their first departure) until they thus came to the brook Zered, there is said to have been an interval of thirty-eight years."

In this way the scriptural account of the journeyings of the Israelites become perfectly harmonious and intelligible. The eighteen stations mentioned only in the general list in the book of Numbers as preceding the arrival at Kadesh are then apparently to be referred to this eight-and-thirty years of wandering, during which the people atlast approached Eziongeber, and afterwards returned northwards a second time to Kadesh, in the hope of passing directly through the land of Edom. Their wanderings extended, doubtless, over the western desert, although the stations named are probably only those head-quarters where the tabernacle was pitched, and where Moses, and the elders, and priests encamped, while the main body of the people was scattered in various directions.

Where, then, was Kadesh? Clearly on the borders of Palestine. We agree with Robinson and Rauiner in placing it nearly at the top of the wady 'Arabah, where, indeed, it is fixed by Scripture, for in Numbers 12:16 we read, "Kadesh, a city in the uttermost of thy (Edom's) border." The

precise spot it may be difficult to ascertain; but here, in the wilderness of Zin, which lay in the more comprehensive district of Paran, is Kadesh to be placed. Raumer, however, has attempted to fix the locality, and in his views Robinson and Schubert generally concur. Raumer places it south from the Dead Sea, in the low lands between the mountain of the Edomites and that of the Amorites. The country gradually descends from the mountains of Judah southward, and where the descent terminates Raumer sets Kadesh. With this view the words of Moses entirely correspond, when, at Kadesh, he said to the spies, *"Get you up southward* (rather on the south, bgNBi), *and go up* into the mountain" (<04137>Numbers 13:17). The ascent may have been made up the pass es-Sufah; up this the self-willed Hebrews went, and were driven back by the Canaanites as far as to Hormah, then called Zephath (<04120>Numbers 12:17; 14:40-45; <07017>Judges 1:17). The spot where Kadesh lay Robinson finds in the present Ain el-Weibeh. But Raumer prefers a spot to the north of this place — that where the road mounts by wady el-Khurar to the pass Sufah. It ought, he thinks, to be fixed on a spot where the Israelites would be near the pass, and where the pass would lie before their eyes. This is not the case, according to Schubert, at Ain el-Weibeh. Raunier, therefore. inclines to fix on Ain Hasb, which lies near Ain el-Khurar. This is probably Kadesh. The distance from the pass Sufah to Ain Hasb is little more than half the length of that from the same pass to Ain el-Weibeh. According to the Arabs, there is at Ain Hasb a copious fountain of sweet water, surrounded by verdure and traces of ruins, which must be of considerable magnitude, as they were seen by Robinson at a distance of some miles. These may be the ruins of Kadesh; but at Ain el-Weibeh there are no ruins (see Raumer, *Palast.* 1850, page 445). *SEE KADESH*.

By what route, then, did the Israelites come from Hazeroth to Kadesh? We are here supplied with scarcely any information. The entire distance, which is considerable, is passed by the historian in silence. Nothing more remains than the direction of the two places, the general features of the country, and one or two allusions. The option seems to lie between two routes. From Hazeroth, pursuing a direction to the northeast, they would coine upon the seacoast, along which they might go till they c.me to the top of the Bahr Akabah, and thence up wady Arabah to Kadesh, nearly at its extremity. Or they might have taken a northwestern course and crossed the mountain Jebel et-Tih. If so, they must still have avoided the western side of Mount Araif, otherwise they would have been carried to Beer-sheba,

which lay far to the west of Kadesh. Robinson prefers the first route, Raumer the second. "I," says the latter, "am of opinion that Israel went through the desert et-Tih, then down Jebel Araif, but not along wady 'Arabah." This view is thought to be supported by the words found in (5019)Deuteronomy 1:19, "When we departed from Horeb we went *through all that great and terrible wilderness* which ye saw by the way of the mountain of the Amorites [as if Jebel Araif], and we came to Kadesh-barnea." This journey from Horeb to Kadesh-lbarnea took the Hebrews eleven days ((5002)Deuteronomy 1:2). But in this last passage the route is expressly said to be "by the way of *Mouni Seir"* (which must therefore be the "mount of the Amorites" above referred to), and in verse 1 the "wilderness is said to be in the 'Arabah ("plain"), with several places designated as extreme boundary points. *SEE ARABAH*.

VI. *The Wanderings in the Desert.* — At the direct command of Jehovah the Hebrews, left Kadesh, came down to the wady 'Arabah, and entered the wilderness by the way of the Red Sea ((0425)Numbers 14:25). In this wilderness they wandered eight-and-thirty years, but little can be set forth respecting the course of their march. It may in general be observed that their route would not resemble that of a regular modern army. They were a disciplined horde of nomads, and would follow nomadic customs. It is also clear that their stations, as well as their course, would necessarily be determined by the nature of the country, and its natural supplies of the necessaries of life. Hence regularity of movement is not to be expected. A common error is that of supposing that from station to station (in Numbers 33) always represents a day's march merely, whereas it is plain, from a comparison of two passages in Exodus ((0215)Exodus 15:22) and Numbers ((0423)Numbers 10:23), that on two occasions three days formed the period of transition between station and station, and therefore that not day's marches, but intervals of an indefinite number of days between permanent encaneppments are intended by that itinerary; and as it is equally clear from (0922)Numbers 9:22 that the ground mecay have been occupied for "two days, or a month, or a year," we may suppose that the occupations of a longer period only may be marked in the itinerary; and thus the difficulty of apparent chasms in, its enumeration, for instance the greatest, between Ezion-Geber and Kadeash (33:35-37), altogether vanishes. How, except by a constant miracle, two million people were supported for forty years in the peninsula of Sinai, has been thought, under the actual circumstances of the case, to be inexplicable; nor will such scmnty supplies as an occasional well

or a chance oasis do much to relieve the subject. Much of the difficulty experienced by commentators on this head however, arises from a misconception of the nature of the so-called "desert" (RB;r]mæ, which is rather an open uninhabited country thame a desolate wilderness in the strict sense. Indeed, Jotbalh (q.v.), one of the stations named in this part of the route, is explicitly called " a land of rivers of waters" (<051008>Deuteronomy 10:8). Modern travelers through the region in question speak of miany parts of it as well watem-sad, and actually sustaining a numerous nomadic population (coanp. *Math. Quart. Rev.* April, 1863, page 301 sq.). *SEE WILDERNESS*.

1. In the absence of detailed information, any attempt to lay down the path pursued by the Israelites after their emerging from the 'Arabah can be little better than conjectural. Some authorities carry themna quite over to the eastern bank of the Red Sea; but the expression “by the way of the Red Sea" denotes nothing more than the western wilderness, or the wilderness in the direction of the Red Sea. The stations over which the Israelites passed are set down in <043318>Numbers 33:18 sq. (comp. <051006>Deuteronomy 10:6, 7), and little beyond the bare record can be given. Only it seems extraordinary, and is much to be regretted, that for so long a period as eight-and-thirty years our information should be so exceedingly small. Raumer, indeed, makes a feeble effort *(Beitrdge zur biblische Geographie,* Leips. 1843) to fix the direction in which some of the stations'lay to each other, but he locates them all in the valley of the 'Arabah, without being able to identify one of the names with a modern locality (see his *Palestina,* 1850, page 446; also map). Were the interior of the peninsula thoroughly explored, we doubt not many of the ancient names might be found still subsisting which would serve as landmarks to determine the route. As it is, we do not altogether despair of finding some clew to the subject. [See below.] It miIay be of service to subjoin the following table of the places through which the Israelites passed (not all of them exactly *stations)* from the time of their leaving Egypt to their arrival in Canaan, which we take (with some alterations) from Dr. Robinson's paper in the *Biblical Repos.* for 1832, page 794-797.

(1.) FROM EGYPT TO SINAI.

(EXODUS 12-19.)	(NUMBERS 33.)
[1.] From Rameses (12:37).	From Rameses (verse 3).
[2.] Succoth (12:37).	Succoth (verse 5).

[3.] Etham (13:20).	Etham (verse 6).
[4.] Pi-hahirotle (14:2).	Pi-hahiroth (verse 7).
[5.] Passage through the Red Sea (14:22).	Passage through the Red Sea (verse 8).
[6.] Three days' march into the desert of Shur (15:22).	Three days' march in the des desert of Etham (verse 5).
[7.] Marah (15:23).	Marah (verse 8).
[8.] Eline (15:27).	Elim (verse 9).
[9.]	Encampment by the Red Sea (verse 10).
[10.] Desert of Sin (16:1).	Desert of Sin (verse 11).
[11.]	Dophkah (verse 12).
[12.]	Alush (verse 13).
[13] Rephidim (17:1).	Repiuidim (verse 14).
[14.] Desert of Sinai (19:1).	Desert of Sinai (verse 15).

(2.) FROM SINAI TO KADESH THE SECOND TIME.

(NUMBERS 10-20).	(NUMBERS 33).
From the desert of Sinai (10:12).	From the desert of Sinai (verse 16).
[15.] Taberah (11:3; [Deuteronomy 9:2-2].	
[16.] Kibroth-hattaavah 11:34), in the edge of the desert of Paran 10:12).	Kibroth-hattaavah (verse 16).
[17.] Hazeroth (11:35).	Hazeloth (verse 17).
[18.] The desert of 'Arabah, by the way of Mount Seir [Deuteronomy 1:1, 2].	Dreadful desert by the way of mount of the Amorites [Deuteronomy 1:19].
[19.]	Rithmah (verse 18).

[20.] Kadesh, in the desert of Paran (12:16; 13:26); [Deuteronomy 1:2, 19].

[Hence they turn back and wander for 38 years (Numbers 14:25 sq.) through the desert (Deuteronomy 2:1)].

[21.]	Rimmon-parez (verse 19)
[22.]	Libnah (verse 20).
[23.]	Rissah (verse 21) .

[24.]	Kehelathah (verse 22).
[25.]	Mount Shapner (verse 23).
[26.]	Haradah (verse 24).
[27.]	Makheloth (verse 25).
[28.]	Tahath (verse 26).
[29.]	Tarah (verse 27).
[30.]	Mithcah (verse 28)
[31.]	Hashmonah (verse 29).
[32.]	Moseroth (verse 30).
[33.]	Ben-jaakun (verse 31).
[34.]	Hor-hagidgad (verse 32).
[35.]	Jotbathah (verse 33).
[36.]	Ebronah (verse 34).
[37.]	Ezion-geber (verse 35, by the way of the Red Sea [Deuteronomy 2:1].
[38] Return to Kadash, in the desert of Zin (Numbers 20:1), by the way of Matthew Seir (Deuteronomy 2:1).	Kadesh, in the desert of Zin (verse 37).

(3.) FROM KADESH TO THE JORDAN.

(NUMBERS 31; DEUTERONOMY 1, 2, 10).	(NUMBERS 31.)
From Kadesh (Numbers 20, 22).	From Kadeash (verse 37).
[39.] Beeroth Bene-jaakan (Deuteronomy 10:6).	
[40.] Mount Her (Numbers 20, 22), or Moses (Deuteronomy 10:6), where Aaron died.	Mount Hor (verse 38).

[41.] Gudgodah (Deuteronomy 10:7).
[42.] Jotbaith (Deuteronomy 10:7).
[43.] Way of the Red Sea (Numbers 21:4), by Ezion-geber (Deuteronomy 2:5).
[44.] Elath (Deuteronomy 2:8).
[45] Zalmonah (verse 41).
[46.] Punon (verse 42).
[47.] Oboth (Numbers 21:10). Oboth (verse 43).

[48.] Ije-abarim (Numbers 21, 44,45, Ije-abarim, or him (verse 11)
[49.] The brook Zered(<05212>Numbers 21:12; <05213>Deuteronomy 2:13, 14).
[50.] The brook Arnon (<05213>Numbers 21:13; <05224>Deuteronomy 2:24).
[51.] Dibon-gad (verse 45).
[52.] Almon-diblathmaim (v. 46).
[53.] Beer (well), in the desert (<04216>Numbers 21:16,
[54.] Mattanah (21:18).
[55.] Nahaliel (21:19).
[56.] Bamoth (32:19).
[57.] Pisgah, put for the Mountains of Abarim, neat range of Abarim, of Nebo (verse 47).
which Pisgah was part (21:20).
[58.] By the way of Bashan to the plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (<04213>Numbers 21:33; 22:1). Plains of Moab by Jordan, near Jericho (verse 48).

The points indicated in the above route as far as Kadesh have already been identified with considerable precision. It remains to consider how far the residue are capable of identification. For this purpose we have a few coincidences with modern or well-known localities, and several repetitions of the same or similar names, indicating a passage through the same spot from different directions. The rest must be supplied by conjecture, assisted by such suggestions as the nature of the region furnishes. It is a question whether the station Rithmah (<04318>Numbers 33:18) was one reached by the Israelites before or after their first arrival at Kadesh; but as it is mentioned in immediate connection with Hazeroth, we may infer that it was either another name for Ksadesh itself, or a locality so near it as to permit the omission of Kadesh in the summary where it occurs. After their repulse by the Canaanites at the pass called Nukb es-Sufah, the Israelites may be supposed to heave retreated along the westerly shore of the 'Arabah till they reached the wady el-Kafafiyeb, or that of Abu Jeradeh, which would afford them an ascent to the mountainous region occupying the northern interior of the desert, somewhere near the summit of which we may place their next encampment, called Rimmon-parez. Libnah, where they next encamped, may not improbably be the same with Laban, given (<05101>Deuteronomy 1:1) as one of the extreme points of their region of wandering, and may have been situated on the western declivity of the mountains, in thee neighborhood of the wady el-Ain, running down from

'Ain el-Kudeirat. Thence they may have proceeded down wady el-Ain to its junction with the large wady el-Arish, where we may place the next station, Rissah, in the vicinity of el-Kusasby, opposite Jebel el-Helal. Pursuing this last valley southward, they next halted at Kehelathah, perhaps at its junction with eady el-Hasana, opposite Jebel Achmar, and thence eastward up wady el-Mayein, around the northern base of the Arait en-Nakahm, which we may identify with Mount Shapher, to the summit just beyond Ain el-Mamein, where we may locate their next station, Hartidali. Makheloth and Tabath may be located at suitable intervals along the northern base of the ridge el-Mukrah, and Tara at the intersection of the route southeasterly thence with the wady el-Jerafeh, which they would be likely to pursue (stopping at Mitheah on the way) to its intersection with the wady el-Jeib, in the 'Arabah, where we may locate Hashmonah. Thence is an easy stage to the next station, Loseroth, which is doubtless the same with Mosera, afterwards visited (Deuteronomy 10:6), and there identified with the vicinity of Mount Hor, where Aaron died. Here we have a fixed point, whatever may be thought of the preceding conjectural circuit, which doubtless occupied several years. We notice that Schwarz, although unable to fix these stations at this portion of the itinerary of the Israelites, believes that they must have been in this high, rocky plateau, now occupied by the tribe Azazumeh *(Palestine*, page 215).

From Mount Hor the next station indicated is Beneja.akan (q.v.), evidently identical with the wells (Beeroth) of the same name, mentioned subsequently in the reverse order between Kadesh and Mosera (Deuteronomy 10:6), and probably a general term for the well-watered region including the fountains el-Hufeiry, el-Buweirideh, el-Webeh, and el-Ghamr. At this last-named spot; having crossed the 'Arabah in a north-easterly direction, the Israelites may have pursued their route up wady el-Ghamr, avoiding their late track in that vicinity (for the same names do not reappear), and thus by a south-westerly, and then southerly course, have fallen again into wady el-Jerafeh, and followed it up to where it forks into wady el-Ghudhagidh. This last name is probably a relic of that of their next station, Hor-hagidgad, essentially the same with the Gudgodah (q.v.) afterwards visited by them (Deuteronomy 10:7) in retracing their steps through this region; for although the letters of the Arabic and Hebrews names are not identical (as given in Robinson's lists, *Researches,* 3, Appendix. 210, where the orthography was probably taken only by ear), yet they are equivalent in sound, and in both cases contain the same

peculiar reduplication. Thence making a southerly circuit across the heads of several wadys running easterly from the little Jebel et-Tih, their next encampment was Jotbathah, coincident with the Jotbath of <06107>Deuteronomy 10:7, and there described as "a land of rivers and streams," which we may naturally locate at the intersection of the route thus indicated with the upper wady Jerafeh, where is a confluence of several branch wadys. Following up the chief of these, wady Mukutta et-Tawarik, in a south-easterly direction, they would fall in (at the station Ebronah) with the modern Haj route from Cairo, and follow it through the pass of 'Akabah to Eziongeber on the Red Sea. Thence they appear to have taken their first path through the 'Arabah to Kadesh again. The following is a table of a few of the most definite of these results:

NUMBERS 33:30-35.	DEUTERONOMY 10:6, 7.	CONJECTURAL SITE.
(1) Moseroth.	(2.) Mosera.	Ain et-Taiyibeh. near the foot of Mount Hor.
(2.) Bene-jaakan.	(1) Beeroth of the children of Ja akan.	*'Ain el- 'ebeh.*
(3.) Hor-hagidgad.	(3.) Gudgodah.	Wady el-Ghudhagidh.
(4.) Jotbathah.	(4.) Jotbath.	Confluence of *wady el-Aalibeh* with *el — Jerafeh.*

2. The only events recorded during this period (and these are interspersed with sundry promulgations of the ceremonial law), are the execution of the offender who gathered sticks on the Sabbath (<04152>Numbers 15:3236), the rebellion of Korah (chapter 16), and, closely connected with it, the adjudgment of the pre-eminence to Aaron's house with their kindred tribe, solemnly conmirmed by the judicial miracle of the rod that blossomed. This seems to have been followed by a more rigid separation between Levi and the other tribes as regards the approach to the tabernacle than had been practically recognized before (27; 18:22; <04160>Numbers 16:40).

We are not told how the Israelites came into possession of the city Kadesh-Barnea, as seems implied in the narrative of their second arrival there, nor who wvere its previous occupants. The probability is that these last were a remnant of the Horites, who, after their expulsion by Edom from Mount Seir *SEE EDOM*, may have here retained their last hold on the ter itory between Edom and the Canaanitish Amorites of "the south." Probably

Israel took it by force of arms, which may have induced the attack of "Arad the Canaanite," who would then feel his border immediately threatened (<04B340>Numbers 33:40; <042101>Numbers 21:1). This warlike exploit of Israel may perhaps be alluded to in Judges verse 4 as the occasion when Jehovah "went out of Seir" and "marched out of the field of Edom" to give his people victory. The attack of Arad, however, though with some slight success at first, only brought defeat upon himself and destruction upon his cities (21:3). We learn from 33:36 only that Israel marched without permanent halt from Eziongeber upon Kadesh. This sudden activity, after their long period of desultory and purposeless wandering, may have alarmed king Arad. The itinerary takes here another stride from Kadesh to Mount Hor. There their being occupied with the burial of Aaron may have given Arad his fancied opportunity of assaulting the rear of their march, he descending from the north whilst they also were facing southwards. In direct connection with these events we come upon a single passage in Deuteronomyr (10:6, 7), which is a scrap of narrative imbedded in Moses's recital of events at Horeb long previous. This contains a short list of names of localities, on comparing which with the itinerary we get some clew to the line of march from the region Kadesh to Ezion-geber southwards. *SEE KADESH*.

VII. *From Kadesh to Canaan.*

1. This third division of the Israelites' route is more susceptible of identification than either of the others, after having fixed by the foregoing process some important points, and in its latter portion is quite unmistakable. The Israelites evidently retraced their steps down the 'Arabah, perhaps keeping along its western side, at the farthest distance from the borders of Edom, till they arrived once more at the well-watered tract of the descendants of Jaakan, about half way between Kadesh and Mount Hor, or Mosera, to which they next crossed over, and where Aaron died (<050606>Deuteronomy 10:6), From this point, again avoiding the territory of the Edomites, they passed over by a considerable deflection, in a south-westerly direction, through wady el-Jerafeh to wady el-Ghudhagidh (which we have before identified with Gudgodah, or Hor-hagidgad), on their former track, around through Jotbath (<050607>Deuteronomy 10:7), and back again to the Red Sea at Ezion-geber and Elath (<050208>Deuteronomy 2:8, where, however, the two latter names occur in the reverse order). From this last point, having crossed the plain of the 'Arabah, they doubled the southern extremity of Mount Seir, through wady el-Ithm, and pitched at

Zalmonah, probably in the edge of the eastern desert plain, near the junction of wady el-Amran. Pursuing thence their route northeasterly along the present road that skirts the base of Mount Seir, they next arrived at Punon, which we may locate near the intersection of their route with the Haj road from Damascus. Keeping still along the base of the Mount-Seir range, they next halted at Oboth, situated probably in the region of wady el-Ghuweit, where the first stream takes its rise, emptying into the. Dead Sea from the south. Pursuing the same road northwards that travelers at this day take along this route, they doubtless passed near Tufileh (Tophel, one of the points in their wanderings, (BIBLE)Deuteronomy 1:1), and halted at Ije-abarim, probably near the wady el-Ahsy, which runs into wady el-Kurahy, the southern border of Moab. Their next stations are easily identified: the brook Zered can be no other than wady el-Deraah, the two forks of which inclose Kerak; the brook Arnon is conceded to be wady Mojeb; and Dihon-gad is evidently the modern Dhiban. From this last point they appear to have diverged considerably (apparently with a view to meet the hostile Sihon at Jahaz) to the east of the modern road, into the desert, where they passed through several unknown localities (in short stages, while waiting for the return of messengers asking leave of passage), Almon-Diblathaim, Beer, Mattanah, and Nahaliel [see each in its alphabetical place], and then returned by a slight north-westerly circuit to Bamoth (perhaps Jebel-Humeh), apparently some point opposite Pisgah, a peak (specially corresponding probably to Jebel Attarus) of the mountains inclosing the valley of the Jordan on the east. About this time the expedition was sent out against Sihon, Og, and the inhabitants of Bashan; upon the successful return of which they passed northward around the heights of Nebo (probably west of Heshbon), and so across the general range of Abarim by one of the valleys running south-westerly into the Jordan (probably wady Heshban). In this last vicinity they encamped in the plains of Moab, preparatory to crossing the Jordan opposite Jericho. (See each of the stations above-named in its alphabetical place.)

2. When we begin to take up the thread of the story at the second visit to Kadesh, we find that time had, in the interval, been busy at its destructive work, and we thus gain confirmation of the view which has been taken of such second visit. No sooner has the sacred historian told us of the return of the Israelites to Kadesh, than he records the death and burial of Miriam, and has, at no great distance of time, to narrate that of Aaron and Moses. While still at Kadesh a rising against these leaders takes place, on the

alleged ground of a want of water. Water is produced from the rock at a spot called hence Meribah (strife). But Moses and Aaron displeased God in this proceeding, probably because they distrusted God's providence and applied for extraordinary i esources. On account of this displeasure, it was announced to them that they should not enter Canaan. A similar transaction has been already spoken of as taking place in Rephidim (<0270>Exodus 17:1). The same name, Meribah, was occasioned in that as in this matter. Hence it has been thought that we have here two versions of the same story. But there is nothing surprising, under the circumstances, in the outbreak of discontent for want of water, which may well have happened even more than twice. The places are different, very wide apart; the time is different; and there is also the great variation arising out of the conduct and punishment of Moses and Aaron. On the whole, therefore, we judge the two records to speak of different transactions.

Relying on the ties of blood (<0308>Genesis 32:8), Moses sent to ask of the Edomites a passage through their territory into Canaan. The answer was a refusal, accompanied by a display of force. We suggest as an explanation of this unnatural churlishness that perhaps the request chanced to be preferred to the native Horite "king" (probably the very Hadad last mentioned in the list in <0139>Genesis 36:39) rather than to the phylarch of the Esauites contemporary with him (<0136>Genesis 36:43). *SEE ESAU*. The Israelites, therefore, were compelled to turn their face southlward, and, making a turn around the end of the Elanitic gulf, reached Mount Hor, near Petra, on the top of which Aaron died. Finding the country bad for travelling, and their food unpleasant, Israel again broke out into rebellious discontent, and was punished by fiery serpents which bit the people, and many died, when a remedy was provided in a serpent of brass set on the flag-staff (<0421>Numbers 21:4 sq.). There is near Elath a promontory known as the *Ras Um Haye,* "the mother of serpents," which seem to abound in the region adjacent; and, if we may suppose this the scene of that judgment, the event would thus be connected with the line of march, rounding the southern border of Mount Seir, laid down in <0502>Deuteronomy 2:8 as being "through the way of the plain (i.e. the 'Arabah) from Elath and from Ezion-geber," whence "turning northward," having "compassed that mountain (Mount Seir) long enough," they "passed by the way of the wilderness of Moab" (<0503>Deuteronomy 5:3, 8). Still going northward, and probably pursuing the caravan route from Damascus, they at length reached the valley of Zered (the brook), which may be the present wady Kerek, that

runs from the east into the Dead Sea. Hence they "removed and pitched on the other side of Arnon, which is in the border of Moab. between Moab and the Amoritest; (<0213>Numbers 21:13). Beer (the well) was the next station, where, finding a plentiful supply of water, and being rejoiced at the prospect of the speedy termination of their journey, the people indulged in music and song, singing "the song of the well" (<0217>Numbers 21:17, 18). The Amorites being requested, refused to give Israel a passage through their borders, and so the nation was again compelled to proceed still in a northerly course. At length, having beaten the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan, they reached the Jordan, and pitched their tents at a spot which lay opposite Jericho. Here Balak, king of the Moabites, alarmed at their numbers and their successful prowess, invited Balaam to curse Israel, in the hope of being thus aided to overcome them and drive them out. The intended curse proved a blessing in the prophet's mouth. While here the people gave way to the idolatrous practices of the Moabites, when a terrible punishment was inflicted, partly by a plague which took off 24,000, and partly by the avenging sword. Moses, being commanded to take the sum of the children of Israel, from twenty years upwards, found they amounted to 600,730, among whom there was not a man of those whom Moses and Aaron numbered in the wilderness of Sinai (<0264>Numbers 26:47, 64). Moses is now directed to ascend Alarim, to Mount Nebo, in the land of Moab, over against Jericho, in order that he might survey the land which he was not to enter on account of his having rebelled against God's commandment in the desert of Zin (<0272>Numbers 27:12; <5249>Deuteronomy 32:49). Conformably with the divine command, Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountains of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, and there he died, at the age of 120 years: "His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated" (Deuteronomy 34). Under his successor, Joshua, the Hebrews were forthwith led across the Jordan, and established in the Land of Promise.

Thus a journey, which they might have performed in a few months, they spent forty years in accomplishing, bringing on themselves unspeakable toil and trouble, and, in the end, death, as a punishment for their gross and sensual appetites, and their unbending indocility to the divine will (<0142>Numbers 14:23; 26:65). Joshua, however, gained thereby a great advantage, inasmuch as it was with an entirely new generation that he laid the foundations of the civil and religious institutions of the Mosaic polity in

Palestine. This advantage may be assigned as the reason why so long a period of years was spent in the wilderness.

VIII. *Literature.* — Besides the incidental treatment of this subject in general works on sacred geography, the writings of travelers through the region in ques; tion, and comnentaries on the parts of Scripture relating to it, the following special treatises exist: — Laborde, *Commentaire Geographique sur l' Exode et les Nombres* (Paris and Leipz. 1841, fol.); Hase, *Tabula Synoptica statonum Israelitarum,* etc. (Norimb. 1739, fol.); Bertholdt, *De rebus a Mose in AEgypto testis* (Erl. 1795, 8vo); Plitt, *Die* 40 *jahrige Reisen d. Israeliten durch d. Wuste* (Cassel, 1775, 8vo); Calmet, *De tranfretatione Erythkraei* (in volume 1, page 214 sq. of his *Dissertatiors in* V.T., Wirceb. 1789, 8vo); Benzel, *De transitu Israel per Mare Rubrum* (in his *Syntagma Dissertt. 2:*137 sq.); Michaelis (ed.), *Essai sur l'heure du passage des Hebreux de la Mer Rouge* (Gottingen, 1758, 8vo); Zeibich, *Durchgang d. Israeliten,* etc. (in his *Verm. Beitr.* 1:42 sq.); also *De dissidio in enarrando itinere Isr. per Mare* (Viteb. 1752, 4to); Reimarus, *Durchg. d. Israel. durchs rothe Meer* (in Lessing's *Beitrage,* fragm. 3); Richter, *Meer durch welches d. Israel. gegangen.* etc. (Lpz. 1778, 8vo); Kleuker, *Wanderung d. Israel. durchs rothe Meer* (Frankf. 1778, 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Prufung d. dritten Fragments* (Hamb. 1779, 8vo); Luderwald, *Durchg. d. Isr. durchs rothe Meer* (Helmst. 1779, 8vo); Doderlein, *Fragmente u. Antifragmente,* 1:35-112; Ritter, *Ueberg. d. Isr. durch d. roths Meer* (in Henke's *Magaz.* 4:291 sq.); treatises, *De transitu populi Israel.* etc., in the *Critici Sacr, Thes. Nov.* 1:274, 292, 300; Auspitz, rabBit/jWLhi(s. 1. 1818, 8vo); Dietz, *Vestimenta Israel. in* deasrto (Wittenb. 1676, 4to); Dorsh, *De educt. Israel ex AEgypto* (Strasb. 1652, 4to); Holste, *Iter Isr. ex AEg. ad Canaan* (Rost. 1707, 4to); Klein, *Israel's Wanderungen* (Bamberg, 1839, 8vo); Raumer, *Zug der Isr. zus AEgypto nach* Canaan (Leipzig 1837, 8vo); Thierbach, id. (ib. eod. 8vo); also *Durchg. d. Isr. durch einem Theil d s mittell. Meeres* (Erfurt, 1830, 8vo); Unruh, *Zug der Isr. aus AEg. nach Canaan* (Langensl. 1860, 8vo); Zinck, *De transitu Maris Erythraei* (Augsb. 1778, 4to); Banadius, *Itinerarium filiorum Israel* (Antw. 1621, fol.); Lightfoot, *Itinera Israelitarum (Works,* 2:415); Anon. *Journeys of the Children of Israel* (Lond. 1832, 18mo); Seaton; *(Church in the Wilderness* (London, 1821, 2 vols. 12mo); Alexander, *De exitu ex AEgypto (Hist.* 2102*Ecclesiastes* 2:1117); Bp. Lloyd, *Origins of Jewish Church* (in Whiston's *Sacred History,* 1:46); Berton, *L'itineraire des Israelites* (Par. 1860, 4to);

Tischendorf; *De Isr. per Mare Rubrum transita* (Lips. 1847, 8vo); Miss Corbaux, *Exodus Papyri* (London, 1855, 8vo); Krummacher, *Israel's Waunderings in the Wilderness* (London, 1837-8, 2 volumes, 12mo); Bram, *Israel's Wanderung von Gosen bis zum* Sinai (Elbeuf, 1859, 8vo); Forster, *Israel in the Wilderness* (Lond. 1865, 8vo); see the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1839, 2:397 sq.; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* April, 1859; April, 1860. The best *map* of the region where the passage of the Red Sea, was effected is Linant's, in the Atlas of the official surveys for the Suez Canal, entitled "Percement *de l'lsthme de Suez*" (Paris, 1855 sq.). *SEE WILDERNESS*.

Ex'odus

(Gr. Ἔξοδος, an *exit;* in the Hebrew canon t/mv]hLa;w] *ve-l'leh shemoth',* its initial words, or simply t/mv] in the Masora to Genesis 24:8 called ^yqyzn see Buxt. *Lex. Talm.* col. 1325; Vulig. *Exodus),* the second book of the law or Pentateuch, so called from the principal event recorded in it, namely, the *departure* of the Israelites from Egpyt. *SEE EXODE*. With this book begins the proper history of that people, continuing it until their arrival at Sinai, and the erection of the sanctuary there.

I. *Contents.* —

1. *Preparation for the Deliverance of Israel from their Bondage in Eyypt.* — This first section (Exodus 1:50-12:36) contains an account of the following particulars: The great increase of Jacob's posterity in the land of Egypt, and their oppression under a new dynasty which occupied the throne after the death of Joseph (chapter 1); the birth, education, and flight of Moses (chapter 2); his solemn call to be the deliverer of his people (Exodus 3:1-4:17), and his return to Egypt in consequence (Exodus 4:18-31); his first ineffectual attempt to prevail upon Pharaoh, to let the Israelites go, which only resulted in an increase of their burdens (Exodus 5:1-21); a farther preparation of Moses and Aaron for their office, together ewith the account of their genealogies (Exodus 5:22-7:7); the successive signs and wonders, by means of which the deliverance of Israel from the land of hondage is at length accomplished, and the institution of the Passover (Exodus 7:8-12:36).

2. *Narrative of Events from the Departure out of Egypt to the Arrival of the Israelites at Mount Sin*ai.We have in this section

(a.) the departure and (mentioned in connection with it) the injunctions then given respecting the Passover and the sanctification of the first-born (<12123>Exodus 12:37-13:16); the march to the Red Sea, the passage through it, and the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the midst of the sea, together with Moses's song of triumph upon the occasion (<12137>Exodus 13:17-15:21);

(b.) the principal events on the journey from the Red Sea to Sinai, the bitter waters at Marah, the giving of quails and of the manna, the observance of the Sabbath, the miraculous supply of water from the rock at Rephidim, and the battle there with the Amalekites (<12152>Exodus 15:22-17:16); the arrival of Jethro in the Israelitish camp, and his advice as to the civil government of the people (18).

3. *The Solemn Establishment of the Theocracy on* Mount Sinai. — The people are set apart to God as "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (<12196>Exodus 19:6); the ten commandments are given, and the laws which are to regulate the social life of the people are enacted (<12201>Exodus 21:1-23:19); an angel is promised as their guide to the Promised Land, and the covenant between God and Moses, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy elders, as the representatives of the people, is most solemnly ratified (<12320>Exodus 23:20-24:18); instructions are given respecting the tabernacle, the ark, the mercy-seat, the altar of burnt-offering, the separation of Aaron and his sons for the priest's office, the vestments which they are to wear, the ceremonies to be observed at their consecration, the altar of incense, the laver, the holy oil, the selection of Bezaleel and Ahmoliab for the work of the tabernacle, the observance of the Sabbath and the delivery of the two tables of the law into the hands of Moses (<12501>Exodus 25:1-31:18); the sin of the people in the matter of the golden calf, their rejection in consequence, and their restoration to God's favor at the intercession of Moses (<12320>Exodus 32:1-34:35); lastly, the construction of the tabernacle, and all pertaining to its service in accordance with the injunctions previously given (<12501>Exodus 35:1-40:38).

This book, in shout, gives a sketch of the early history of Israel as a nation: and the history has three clearly marked stages. First we see a nation enslaved; next a nation redeemed; lastly a nation set apart, asnd, through the blending of its religious and political life, consecrated to the service of God. The close literarv connection between the books of Genesis and Exodus is clearly marked by the Hebrew conjunctive particle W *(vay)*,

"and," with which the latter begins, and still more by the recapitulation of the name of Jacob's sons who accompanied him to Egypt, abridged from the fuller account in <014608>Genesis 46:8-17. Still the book of Exodus is not a continuation in strict chronological sequence of the preceding history; for a very considerable interval is passed over in silence, saving only the remark, "And the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and eaxed exceedingly mighty; and the land was filled with them" (<020107>Exodus 1:7). The pretermission of all that, concerned Israel during this period and their intercourse with the Egyptians, instead of being an indication, as Rationalists allege, of the fragmentary character of the Pentateuch, only shows the sacred purpose of the history, and that, in the plan of the writer, considerations of a merely political interest were entirely subordinate to the divine intentions already partially unfolded in Genesis, and to be still farther developed in the course of the present narrative regarding the national constitution of the seed of Abraham.

II. Unity. — According to Von Lengerke (*Kenaan*, 88, 90), the following portions of the book belong to the original or Elohistic document: <020101>Exodus 1:1-14; 2:23-25; 6:2-7:7; <021201>Exodus 12:1-28, 37, 38, 40-51 (13:1, 2, perhaps); 16; 19:1; 20; 25-31; 35-40. Stihelin *(Krit. Unterss.)* and De Wette *(Einleitung)* agree in the main with this division. Knobel, the most recent writer on the suhuject, in the introduction to his commentary on Exodus and Leviticus, has sifted these books still muore carefully and with regard to many passages has formed a different judgment. He assigns to the Elohist: <020101>Exodus 1:1-7, 13, 14; <020223>Exodus 2:23-25, front wjnayw, 6:2-7:7; except 6:8; 7:8-13, 19-22; 8:1-3, 11 from alw, and 12-15; <020908>Exodus 9:8-12 and 35; <021109>Exodus 11:9, 10; 12:1-23, 28, 37a, 40-42, 43-51; 13:1, 2, 20; 14:1-4, 8, 9, 15-18 (except yla q[xt hm in verse 15, and ta hfnw ;fm in verse 16), 21-23, and 26-29 (except 27 from bçyw); <021519>Exodus 15:19, 22, 23, 27; 16:l, 2, 9-26, 31-36; <021701>Exodus 17:1; 19:2a; 25-31:1], 12-17 in the main; 35:50-40:38.

A mere comparison of the two lists of passages selected by these different writers as belongiuug to the original document is sufficient to show how very uncertain all such critical processes must be. The first, that of Lengerke, is open to many objections, which have been arged by Havernick (Einleit. *in der Pent.* § 117), Ranke, and others. Thus, for instance, 6:6, which all agree in regarding as Elohistic, speaks of great judgments (µylødG] µyføpv]mi in the plural), wherewith God would redeem Israel, and

yet not a word is said of these in the so-called original document. Again, Exodus 12:12, 23, 27 contains the announcement of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, but the fulfillment of the threat is to be found, according to the critics, only in the later Jehovistic additions. Hupfeld has tried to escape this difficulty by supposing that the original documents did contain an account of the slaying of the first-born, as the institution of the Passover in 12:12, etc., has clearly a reference to it: only he will not allow that the story as it now stands is that account. But even then the difficulty is only partially removed, for thus one judgment only is mentioned, not many (Exodus 6:6). Knobel has done his best to obviate this glaring inconsistency. Feeling no doubt that the ground taken by his predecessors was not tenable, he retains as a part of the originual work much which they had rejected. It is especially worthy of notice that he considers sonue at least of the miraculous portions of the story to belong to the older document, and so accounts for the expression in 6:6. The changing of Aaron's rod into a serpent, of the waters of the Nile into blood, the plague of frogs, of musquitoes (A.V. lice), and of boils, and the destruction of the first-born, are, according to Knobel, Elohistic. He points out what he considers here links of connection, and a regular sequence in the narrative. He bids us observe that Jehovah always addresses Moses, and that Moses directs Aaron howe to act. The miracles, then, are arranged in order of importance: first there is the sign which serves to accredit the mission of Aaron; next follow three plagues, which, however, do not touch men, sand these are sent through the instrumentality of Aaron; the fourth plague is a plague upon man, and here Moses takes the most prominent part; the fifth and last is accomplished by Jehovah himself. Thus the miracles increase in intensity as they go on. The agents likewise rise in dignity. If Aaron with his rod of might begins the work, he gives way afterwards to his greater brother, whilst for the last act of redemption Jehovah employs he human agency, but himself with a mighty hand and outstretched arm effects the deliverance of his people. The passages thus selected have no doubt a sort of connection, but it is in the highest degree arbitrary to conclude that because portions of a work may be omnitted without seriously disturbing the sense, these portions do not belong to the original Work, but must be regarded as subsequent embellishments and additions.

Again, all agree in assigning chapters 3 and 4 to the Jehovist. The call of Moses, as there described, is said to be merely the Jehovistic parallel to Exodus 6:2-7:7. Yet it seems improbable that the Elohist should

introduce Moses with the bare words, "And God spake to Moses" (Exodus 6:2), without a single word as to the previous history of so remarkable a man. So argues Havernick, and, as it appears to us, not without reason. It will be observed that none of these critics attempt to make the divine names a criterion whereby to distinguish the several documents. Thus, in the Jehovistic portion (Exodus 1:15-22), De Wette is obliged to remark, with a sort of uneasy candor, "but verse 17, 20, *Elohim* (?)," and again (Exodus 3:4, 6, 11-15), "here seven times *Elohim."* In other places there is the same difficulty as in Exodus 19:17, 19, which Stahelin, as well as Knobel, gives to the Jehovist. In the passages in chapters 7, 8, 9, which Knobel classes in the earlier record, the name Jehovah occurs throughout. It is obvious, then, that there must be other means of determining the relative antiquity of the different portions of the book, or the attempt to ascertain which are earlier and which are later must entirely fail.

Accordingly, certain peculiarities of style are supposed to be characteristic of the two documents. Thus, for instance, De Wette *(Einl.* § 151, S. 183) appeals to hbrw hrp, Exodus 1:7; hzh 8yh µx[b Exodus 12:17, 41; µysh tyrb, 6:4; the formula rmal hçm la y8 8y rbryw 25:1; 30:11, etc.; twabx, Exodus 6:26; 7:4; 12:17, 41, 51; µybr[h ^yb, Exodus 12:6; 29:41; 30:8, and other expressions, as decisive of the Elohist. Stahelin also proposes on very similar grounds to separate the first fr(om the second legislation. "Wherever," he says, "I find mention of a pillar of fire, or of a cloud (Exodus 33:9, 10), or an 'angel of Jehovah,' as Exodus 23, 24, or the phrase 'flowing with milk and honey,' as Exodus 13:5; 33:3 ... where nmention is made of a coming down of God, as Exodus 19:34:5, or where the Canaanitish nations are numbered, or the tabernacle supposed to be without the camp (Exodus 33:7), I feel tolerably certain that I am reading the words of the author of the second legislation (i.e., the Jehovist)." But these nice critical distinctions are very precarious, especially in a stereoty-ped language like the Hebrew.

Unfortunately, too, dogmatical prepossessions have been allowed some share in the controversy. De Wette and his school chose to set down everything which savored of a miracle as proof of later authorship. The love of the marvelous, which is all they see in the stories of miracles, according to them could not have existed in an earlier and simpler age. But

on their oen hypothesis this is a very extraordinary view; for the earlier traditions of a people are not generally the least wonderful, but the reverse; and one cannot thus acquit the second eriter of a *design* in embellishing his narrative. However, this is not the place to argue with those who deny the possibility of a miracle, or who make the narration of miracles proof sufficient of later authorship. Into this error Knobel, it is true, has not fallen. By admitting some of the plagues into his Elohistic catalogue, he shows that he is at least free from the dogmatic prejudices of critics like De Wette. But his own critical tests are not conclusime. And the way in which he cuts verses to pieces, as in <0811>Exodus 8:11, and <1215>Exodus 13:15, 16, 27, where it suits his purpose, is so completely arbitrary, and results so evidently from the stern constraint of a theory, that his labors in this direction are not more satisfactory than those of his predecessors.

On the whole, there seems mumch reason to doubt whether critical acumen will ever be able plausibly to distinguish between the original and the supplement in the book of Exodus. There is nothing indeed forced or improbable in the supposition either that Moses himself incorporated in his memoil a ancient tradition, whether oral or written, or that a writer later thant Moses made use of materials left by the great legislator in a somewhat fragmentary form. There is an occasional abruptness in the narrative, which suggests that this may possibly have been the case, as in the introduction of the genealogy, <0613>Exodus 6:13-27. The remarke in <1103>Exodus 11:3; 16:35, 36, lead to the same conclusion. The apparent confusion at 11:1-3 may be explained by regarding these verses as parenthetical. Inasmuch, lowever, as there exists no definite proof or knowledge of any later editor, except it he Joshua or Ezra, to whom isolated and unimportant additions may be attributed, we are not warranted in attributing the book to any other author than Moses. *SEE PENTATEUCH*.

III. Credibility. — Almost every historical fact mentioned in Exodus has at some time or other been called in question; but it is certain that all investigation has hitherto only tended to establish the veracity of the narrator. A comparison with other writers and an examination of the monuments confirm, or at least do not contradict, the most material statements of this book. Thus, for instance, Manetho's story of the Hyksos, questionable as much of it is, and differently as it has been interpreted by different writers, points at least to some early connection between the Israelites and the Egyptians, and is corroborative of the fact implied in the

Pentateuch that, at the time of the Israelitish sojourn, Egypt was ruled by a foreign dynasty. *SEE EGYPT.* Manetho speaks, too, of strangers from the East who occupied the eastern part of Lower Egypt; and his account shows that the Israelites had become a numerous and formidable people. According to Exodus 12:37, the number of men, besides women and children, who left Egypt was 600,000. This would give for the whole nation about two millions and a half. There is no doubt some difficulty in accounting for this immense increase, if we suppose (as on many accounts seems probable) that the actual residence of the children of Israel was only 215 years. We must remember, indeed, that the number who went into Egypt with Jacob was considerably more than "threescore and ten souls" *SEE CHRONOLOGY*; we must also take into account the extraordinary fruitfulness of Egypt (concerning which all writers are agreed — Strabo, 15:478; Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* 7:4; Pliny, *H. N.* 7:3; Seneca, *Qu. Nat.* 3:25, quoted by Halvernick), and especially of that part of it in which the Israelites dwelt; and, finally, we must take into the account the "mixed multitude" that accompanied the Israelites (Exodus 12:38).

According to De Wette, the story of Moses's birth is mythical, and arises from an attempt to account etymologically for his name. But the beautiful simplicity of the narrative places it far above the stories of Romulus, Cyrus, and Semiramis, with which it has been compared (Knobel, page 14). As regards the etymology of the name, there can be very little doubt that it is Egyptian (from the Copt. *mo*, "water," and *si*, "to take"), and if so, the author has merely played upon the name. But this does not prove that the whole story is nothing but a myth. Philology as a science is of very modern growth, and the truth of history does not stand or fail with the explanation of etymologies. The same remark applies to De Wette's objection to the etymology in 2:22.

Other objections are of a very arbitrary kind. Thus Knobel thinks the command to destroy the male children (1:15 sq.) extremely improbable, because the object of the king was not to destroy the people, but to make use of them as slaves. To require the midwives to act as the enemies of their own people, and to issue an injunction that every son born of Israelitish parents should be thrown into the Nile, was a piece of downright madness of which he thinks the king would not be guilty. But we do not know that the midwives were Hebrew; they may have been Egyptian; and kings, like other slave-owners, may act contrary to their interest in obedience to their fears or their passions; indeed, Knobel himself compares

the story of king Bocchoris, who commanded all the unclean in his land to be cast into the sea (Lysim. ap. Josephus, c. *Apion.* 1:34), and the destruction of the Spartan helots (Plutarch, *Lycnrg.* 28). He objects further that it is not easy to reconcile such a command with the number of the Israelites at their exode. But we suppose that in very many instances the command of the king would be evaded, and probably it did not long continue in force.

Again, De Wette objects to the call of Moses that he *could not* have thus formed the resolve to become the savior of his people, which, as Havernick justly remarks, is a dogmatical, not a critical decision.

It has been alleged that the place, according to the original narrative, where God first appeared to Mosi was Egypt, God making himself known as Jehovah, that being the first intimation of the name (Exodus 6:2). Another account, it is further alleged, places the scene at Horeb (Exodus 3:2), God appearing as the God of the patriarchs (verse 6), and declaring his name Jehovah (verse 14); while a third makes Midian the scene of the interview (Exodus 4:19). These assumptions require no refutation. It need only be remarked that the name Jehovah in Exodus 6:2 necessarily presupposes the explanation given of it in Exodus 3:14. Further, Moses's abode in Midian, and connection with Jethro, were matters, Knobel affirms, quite unknown to the older writer, while his statement that Moses was eighty years old when he appeared before Pharaoh (Exodus 7:7), is declared irreconcilable with the supplementary narrative which represents him as a young man at the time of his flight from Egypt (Exodus 2:11), and a son by Zipporah, whom he married *probably* on his arrival in Midian, is still young when he returned to Egypt (Exodus 4:20, 25; 18:2). There can be no question that from Moses' leaving Egypt till his return thither a considerable time elapsed. It is stated in Exodus 2:23 as "many days," and by Stephen (Acts 7:30) as forty years. But it is not necessary to suppose that his abode in Midian extended over the whole, of that period. The expression bvyw, "he sat down," or settled (Exodus 2:15), may only point to Midian as the end of his wanderings; or if otherwise, his marriage need not have followed immediately on his arrival, or there may have been a considerable interval between the birth of his two sons. The silence, indeed, of this part of the narrative regarding the birth of the second son may possibly be referrible to this circumstance, more probably indicated, however, by the different feelings of the father as expressed in the names Gershom and Eliezer

(02202Exodus 2:22; 18:4). The order of these names is perplexing to expositors who conceive that the first thoughts of the fugitive would have been thankfulness for his safety, and that only afterwards would spring up the feelings of exile. But if the name Eliezer was bestowed in connection with the preparation to return to Egypt, and particularly with the intimation "all the men are dead which sought thy life" (02409Exodus 4:19), the whole is strikingly consistent. Another instance of the alleged discrepancies is that, according to one account, Moses' reception from his brethren was very discouraging (02609Exodus 6:9), whereas the other narrative describes it as quite the reverse (02431Exodus 4:31). De Wette calls this a striking contradiction, but it is only such when the intermediate section (02509Exodus 5:19-23), which shows the change that in the interval had occurred in the prospects of the Israelites, is violently ejected from the narrative — a process fitted to produce contradictions in any composition. *SEE MOSES*.

The only alleged anachronism of importance in this book is the remark relative to the continuance of the manna (02635Exodus 16:35), which would seem to extend it beyond the time of Moses, particularly when compared with 06511Joshua 5:11, 12, according to which the manna ceased not until after the passage of the Jordan. But, as remarked by Hengstenberg, it is not of the cessation of the manna that the historian here writes, but of its continuance. Besides, "forty years" must be taken as a round number, for the manna, strictly speaking, lasted about one month less (02601Exodus 16:1). *SEE MANNA*.

The ten plagues are physically, many of them, what might be expected in Egypt, although in their intensity and in their rapid succession they are clearly supernatural. Even the order in which they occur is an order in which physical causes are allowed to operate. The corruption of the river is followed by the plague of frogs. From the dead frogs are bred the gnats and flies; from these came the murrain among the cattle land the bolls on men; and so on. Most of the plagues, indeed, though of course in a much less aggravated form, and without such succession, are actually experienced at this day in Egypt. Of the plague of locusts it is expressly remarked that "before them were no such locusts, neither after them shall be such." And all travelers in Egypt have observed swarms of locusts, brought generally by a southwest wind (Denon, however, mentions their coming with an *east* wind), end in the winter or spring of the year. This last fact agrees also with our narrative. Lepsius speaks of being in a "regular snow-drift of *locusts,"* which came from the desert in hundreds of

thousands to the valley. "At the edge of the fruitful plain," he says, "they fell down in showers." This continued for six days, indeed in weaker flights much uonger. He also saw *hail* in Egypt. In January, 1843, he and his party were surprised by a storm. "Suddenly," he writes, "the storm grew to a tremendous hurricane, such as I have never seen in Europe, and hail fell upon us in such masses as almost to turn day into night." He notices, too, an extraordinary cattle murrain "which carried off 40,000 head of cattle" *(Letters from AEgypt,* Eng. transl. pages 49, 27, 14). *SEE PLAGUES (OF EGYPT).*

The institution of the Passover (chapter 12) has been subjected to severe criticism. This has also been called a mythic fiction. The alleged circumstances are not historical, it is said, but arise out of a later attempt to explain the origin of the cememony and to refer it to the time of Moses. The critics rest mainly on the difference between the directions given for the observance of this the first, and those given for subsequent passovers. But there is no reason why, considering the very remarkable circumstances under which it was instituted, the first Passover should not have had its own peculiar solemnities, or why instructions should not then have been given for a somewhat different observance for the future. *SEE PASSOVER.*

In minor details the writer shows a remarkable acquaintance with Egypt. Thus, for instance, Pharaoh's daughter goes to the river to bathe. At the present day, it is true that only women of the lower orders bathe in the river. But Herodotus (2:35) tells us (what we learn also from the monuments) that in ancient Egypt the women were under no restraint, but apparently lived more in public than the men. To this must be added that the Egyptians supposed a sovereign virtue to exist in the Nile waters. The writer spaks of chariots and "chosen chariots" (1214Exodus 14:7) as constituting an important element in the Egyptian army, and of the king as leading in person. The monuments amply confirm this representation. The Pharaohs lead their armies to battle, and the armies consist entirely of infantry and chariots. *SEE CHARIOT.*

As the events of this history are laid in Egypt and Arabia, we have ample opportunity of testing the accuracv of the Mosaical accounts, and surely we find nowhere the least transgression against Egyptian institutions and customs; on the contrary, it is most evident that the author had a thorough knowledge of the Egyptian institutions and of the spirit that pervaded them. Exodus contains a mass of incidents and detailed descriptions which

have gained new force from the modern discoveries and researches in the field of Egyptian antiquities (comp. Hengstenberg, *Die Bucher Mosis und AEgypten*, Berlin, 1841). The description of the passage of the Israelites through the desert also evinces such a thorough familiarity with the localities as to excite the utmost respect of scrupulous and salentific travelers of our own time for the authenticity of the Pentateuch (comp. *ex. gr*. Raumer, *Der Zug der Israeliten aus Egypten nach Canaan*, Leipz. 1837).

The arrangements of the tabernacle, described in the second part of Exodus, likewise throw a favorable light on the historical authenticity of the preceding events; and the least tenable of all the objections against it are, that the architectural arrangements of the tabernacle were too artificial, and the materialas and richness too costly and precious for the condition and position of the Jews at that early period, etc. But the critics seem to have overlooked the fact that the Israelites of that period were a people who had come out from Egypt, a people possessing wealth, Egyptian culture and arts, which we admire even nmow, in the works which have descended to us from ancient Egypt; so that it cannot seem strange to see the Hebrews in possession of the materials or artistic knowledge requisite for the construction of the tabernacle. Moreover, the establishment of a tent as a sanctuary for the Hebrews can only be explained from their abode in the desert, being in perfect unison with their then roving and nomadic life; and it is therefore a decided mistake in those critics who give to the sacred tent a later date than the Mosaical; while other critics (such as De Wette, Von Bohlen, Vatke) proceed much more consistently with their views by considering the narrative of the construction of a sacred tabernacle to be a mere fiction in Exodus, introduced for the purpose of ascribing to the Temple of Solomon a higher antiquity and authority. However, independently of the circumstance that the Temple necessarily presupposes the existence of a far older analogous sanctuary, the whole process of such a forced hypothesis is but calculated to strike out a portion from the Jewish history on purely arbitrary grounds.

The extremely simple and sober style and views throughout the whole narrative afford a sure guarantee for its authenticity and originality. Not a vestige of a poetical hand can b e discovered in Exodus 18; not even the most sceptical critics can deny that we tread here on purely historical ground. The same may fairly be maintained of chapter 20-23. How is it then possible that one and the same book should contain so strange a

mixture of truth and fiction as its opponeemts assert to be found in it? The most striking proofs against such an assumption are, in particular, the accounts, such as in Exodus 32 sq., where the most vehement complaints are made against the Israelites, where the high-priest of the covenant-people participates most shamefully in the idolatry of his people. All these incidents are described in plaen and clear terms, without the least vestige of later embellishmemets and false extolling of former ages. The Pentatemmch, some critics assert, is written for the interest and in favor of the hierarchy ; but can there be more anti-hierarchical details than are founed in that book? The whole representation indicates the strictest impartiality and truth.

IV. The *authorship* and *date* of the book will be discussed under PENTATEUCH.

V. *(Commentaries,* etc. — The following is a list of exegetical helps on the whole book, the most important being designated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Origen, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 2:110); *Selecta (ib.* 2:121); also *Homiliae (ib.* 2:129); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in his Opp. 4:194); Isidore, Commentaria (in his *Opp.);* Theodoret, *Questiones* (in his *Opp.* I, 1); Hugo a St. Victoire, *Adnotationes* (in his *Opp.* 1); Aben-Esra, *Commentar*. (Prague, 1840, 8vo); Bede, *Explanatio* (in his Opp. 4); *Quastiones (ib.* 8); Rupert, In *Exodus* (in his *Opp.* 1:150); Zuingle, *Adnotationes* (Tigurini, 1527); Brent, *Commentatio* (in his *Opp.* 1); Ziegler, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1540, fol.); Phrygio, *Commentarius* (Tub. 1543, 4to); Lippoman, *Catena* (Par. 1550; Leyd. 1657, fol.); Chytraeus, *Enarrationes* (Vitemb. 1556, 1563, 1579, 8vo); Galasius, *Commentarias* (Genev. 1560, fol.); Strigel, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1566, 1572; Brem. 1585, 8vo); Simler, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1584, 1605, fol.); Ystella, *Commentaria* (Romans 1601, fol.); Pererius, *Disputationes* (Ingolst. 1601, 4to); *Mechilthea, *Commentarius* (in Ugolini *Thesaurus,* 14); Willet, *Commentarie* (London, 1608, 1622, 2 vols. fol.); Rung, *Praelectiones* (Vitemb. 1614, 8vgo); Babington, *Notes* (in *Works,* page 165); Reuter, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1616, 4to); *Rivetus, *Commentarii* (L.B. 1634, 4to); Jackson, *Paraphrase* (in *Works,* 9:384); De la Havy, *Commentarii* (Paris 1639, 1641, 2 volumes fol.); Lightfoot, *Gleanings* (Lond. 1643, 4to); Sylvius, *Commentarius* (Duac. 1644, 4to); Cartwright, *Adnotationes* (Lond. 1653, 8vo); Calixtus, *Exposatio* (Helmst. 1641, 1654, 4to); Cocceius, *Observationes* (in his *Opp.* 1:136); Hughes, *Exposition* (Lond.

1672, fol.); *Patrick, *Commentary* (Lond. 1697, 4to); Hagemann, *Betrachtungen* (Brunsw. 1738, 4to); Torellis, *Animadversiones* (Lips. 1746, 4to); Haitsma, *Commentarii* (Franc. 1771, 4to); Hopkins, *Notes* (London, 1784, 4to); *St. Cruce, *Hermentia* (Heidelb. 1787, 4to); *Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bib. Criticism,* 1:47); Cockburn, *Credibility,* etc. (Lond. 1809,8vo); *Rosenmuller, *Scholia* (Lips: 1822, 8vo); Newnham, *Illustrations* (Lond. n. d. 8vo); Vizard, *Commentary* (London, 1838, l2mo); Buddicom, *Exodus* (2d ed. Liverp. 1839, 2 volumes, 12mo); Trower, *Sermone* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Kitto, *Illustration (Daily Bible Illust.* 2); *Bush, *Notes* (N.Y. 1852, 2 volumes, 12mo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); *Kalisch, *Commentary* (London, 1855, 8vo); Osburn, *Israel in Egypt* (London, 1856, 12mo); *Knobel, *Erkurung* (Lpz. 1857, 8vo); Howard, *Notes* (Cambr. 1857, 8vo); *Keil and Delitzsch, *Comment.* (from their *Bibelwerk,* Edinb. 1861, 8vo); *Lanae, *Comment. (in* his *Bibelwerk,* 2, Lpz. 1864, 8vo); *Murphy, *Comment.* (Edinb. 1866, Andov. 1868, 8vo). *SEE OLD TESTAMENT*.

Exomologesis

(ἐξομολόγησις, *confession).* The word was used in the ancient Church to denote not only confession in words, but also the various acts required of penitents to give expression to sorrow for sin, and resolution of amendment.

1. It is common with Romanist writers, when "they meet with the word *exomologesis* in any of the ancient writers, to interpret it as private or auricular confession, such as is now practiced in the communion of that Church, and imposed upon men as absolutely necessary to salvation. But they who, with greater judgment and ingenuity among themselves, have more narrowly considered the matter, make no scruple to confess that the *exomologesis* of the ancients signifies a quite different thing, viz. the whole exercise of public penance, of which public confession was a noted part. The learned Albaspinaeus very strenuously sets himself to refute this error in the writers of his own party. Cardinal Bellarmine, says he *(Observatt.* lib. 2, cap. 26), and Baronius, and Maldonat in his controversies, and Pamelius in his commentaries upon Tertullian and Cyprian, lay it down as a certain truth that the fathers generally take the word *exonologesis* for private and auricular confession; but, having long and accurately considered all the places where it is mentioned, I cannot come in to their opinion. The fathers, adds he, always use this word when they would describe the

external rites of penance, viz. weeping, and mourning, and self-accusation, and other the like things, which penitents usually practiced in the course of public penance" (Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 18, chapter 3).

2. So anxious was the primitive Church to preserve the voluntary character of penance, that it was deemed unlawful to exhort or invite any one to submit to this kind of discipline. It was required that the offenders should seek it as a favor, and should supplicate for admission among the penitents. The following are the duties or burdens imposed upon them. Penitents of the first three classes — the mourners *(flentes),* the hearers *(audientes),* the kneelers or prostrators *(genuflectentes* or *substrati)* — were never allowed to stand during public prayers, but were obliged to kneel. Open and public confession before the whole church was to be made with lamentations, tears, and other expressions of grief, and these were to be often repeated. All ornaments of dress were to be laid aside, and all expressions of joy or pleasure to be abandoned. Male penitents were required to cut their hair and shave their beard in token of sorrow, and females were to appear with their hair dishevelled, and wea. ing a veil. During the whole time of penance the candidates were required to abstain from bathing, feasting, and corporeal pleasures lawful at other times. They were forbidden to Imarry during this period of humiliation. In addition, they were obliged to be present at every religious ceremony, and to perform works of love and charity, particularly almsgiving. They were also expected to perform the office of the *parabolani* in visiting and relieving the sick and burying the dead (Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* book 4, chapter 4).

3. The greater litanies are sometimes termed *exomologeses,* confessions; because fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and confession of sins was usually joined with supplication to avert God's wrath and reconcile him to a sinful people (Bingham, *Orig. Ecclesiastes* book 13, chapter 1, § 11).

Exorcism, Exorcist

(ἐξορκιστής, comp. Acts 19:13).

I. *In General.* — The belief in demoniacal possessions, which may be traced in almost every nation, has always been attended by the professed ability, on the part of some individuals, to release the unhappy victims from their calamity. In Greece, men of no less distinction than both Epicurus (Diog. Laertius, 10:4) and AEschines were sons of women who lived by this art, and both were bitterly reproached, the one by the Stoics, and the

other by his great rival orator Demosthenes *(De Cor.),* for having assisted their parents in these practices. In some instances this power was considered as a divine gift; in others it was thought to be acquired by investigations into the nature of demons and the qualities of natural productions, as herbs, stones, etc., and of drugs compounded of them, by the use of certain forms of adjurations, invocations, ceremonies, and other observances. Indeed, the various forms of exorcism, alluded to in authors of all nations, are innumerable, varying from the bloody human sacrifice down to the fumes of brimstone, etc. *SEE SORCERY.*

II. *In the Old and New Testaments.* — The verb ἐξορκίζω occurs once in the New Testament and once ir. the Sept. version of the Old Testament. In both cases it is used, not in the sense of *exorcise,* but as a synonym of the simple verb ὁρκίζω, *to charge with an oath, to adjure.* Compare <012403>Genesis 24:3 — [yBv]hæ, A.V. "I will make thee swear") with 37, and <402663>Matthew 26:63 with <410507>Mark 5:7; and see <520527>1 Thessalonians 5:27 (ἐνορκίζω, Lachmann, Tischendorf). The cognate noun, however, together with the simple verb, is found once (<441913>Acts 19:13) with reference to the ejection of evil spirits from persons possessed by them (comp. ἐξόρκωσις, ὁρκόω, Josephus, *Ant.* 8:2, 5). The use of the term exorcists in that passage, as the designation of a well-known class of persons to which the individuals mentioned belonged, confirms what we know from other sources as to the common practice of exorcism amongst the Jews (see the Talm. Babyl. *Yoma*, fol. 57:1). That some, at least, of them not only pretended to, but possessed the power of exorcising, appears by our Lord's admission when he asks the Pharisees, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your disciples (υἱοί) cast them out?" (<401227>Matthew 12:27). What means were employed by real exorcists we are not informed. David, by playing skilfully on a harp, procured the temporary departure of the evil spirit which troubled Saul (<091623>1 Samuel 16:23). The power of expelling demons Josephus places among the endowments of Solomon, and relates that he *left behind have* the manner of using exorcisms by which they drive away daemons (for the pretended fragments of these books, see Fabricius, *Cod. Pseud. Vet. Test.* page 1054). He declares that he had seen a man, named Eleazar, releasing people that were demoniacal, in the presence of Vespasian, his sons, captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. He describes the manner of cure thus: "He put a ring that had a *root* of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon to the nostrils of the duemoniac; after which he drew out the

demon through his nostrils, and when the man fell down he adjured him to return no more, making still mention of Solomon and reciting the incantations he composed." He further adds, that even Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a cup or basin full of water a little way off, and commanded the daemon as he went out of the man to overturn it and thereby to let the spectators know he had left the man (Ant. 8:2, 5). He also describes the mode of obtaining the root *baaras*, which, he says, "if it be only brought to sick persons, it quickly drives away the daemons," funder circumstances whih, for their strangeness, may vie with any prescription in the whole science of exorcism *(War,* 7:6, 3). Among all the references to exorcism, as practiced by the Jews, in the New Testament (<40122>Matthew 12:27; <41038>Mark 9:38; <42049>Luke 9:49, 50), we find only one instance which affords any clue to the means employed (<44193>Acts 19:13); from which passage it appears that certain professed exorcists took upon them to call over a demoniac the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.'" Their proceeding seems to have been in conformity with the well-known opinions of the Jews in those days, that miracles might be wrought by invoking the names of the Deity, or angels, or patriarchs, etc., as we learn from Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen, etc., and Lucian *(Frag.* page 141). The epithet applied in the above text to these exorcists (περιερχόμενοι, Vulgate, *circumeuntes Judaei*) indicates that they were traveling mountebanks, who besides skill in medicine, pretended to the knowledge of magic. Justin Martyr has an interesting suggestion as to the possibility of a Jew successfully exorcising a devil, by employing the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Dial. *cum Tryph.* c. 85, page 311, C. See also *Apol.* II, c. 6, page 45, B, where he claims for Christianity Superior but not necessarily exclusive power in this respect. Compare the statements of Irenmus, *adv. Heres.* 2:5, and the authorities quoted by Grotius on <40122>Matthew 12:27). But Justin goes on to say that the Jewish exorcists, as a class, had sunk down to the superstitious rites and usages of the heathen (comp. Pliny, 30:2). *SEE DEMON*.

The power of casting out devils was bestowed by Christ while on eartb upon the apostles (<40108>Matthew 10:8), and the seventy disciples (<42017>Luke 10:17-19), and was, according to his promise (<41617>Mark 16:17), exercised by believers after his ascension (<44618>Acts 16:18); but to the Christian miracle, whether as performed by our Lord himself or by his followers, the N.T. writers never apply the terms "exorcise" or "exorcist." Nor is the

office of the exorcist mentioned by Paul in his enumeration of the miraculous gifts (1 Corinthians 12:9). Mosheim says that the particular order of exorcists did not exist till the close of the third century, and he ascribes its introduction to the prevalent fancies of the Gnostics (cent. 3, 11, c. 4). We notice John's remark upon the *silence* of John himself in his gospel on the subject of possessions, although he introduces the Jews as speaking in the customary way respecting demons and demoniacal possessions, and although he often speaks of the sick who were healed by the Savior; coupled with the fact, that John wrote his gospel in Asia Minor, where *medical science* was very flourishing, and where it was generally known that the diseases attributed to demons were merely materal diseases (Jahn, *Archaol.:* I, 2:232, 477-480; see also Lomeirus, *De Vet. Gent. Lustra.;* Bekker, *Le Alonde Enchante;* Van Dale, *De divinat. idol.* c. 6, page 519 sq.; Amnell, *Diss. aid loc. in Acts,* Upsal. 1758).

III. *In the early Church. —*

1. As Christians were supposed to be in constant conflict with the devil, they used not only prayer, but also *exorcism,* which was held to be a power given to the Church. Thus Tertullian (A.D. 220), speaking of the warfare of the Christian soldier *(De Corona Milit. c.* 11) with demons, says *exorcismis fugavit* (he routs them with exorcisms). So in his *Apologeticus (*c. 23) he says that the "evil spirit will confess himself to be a demon when commanded to speak by any Christian" *(jussus a quolibet Christiano).* So also Origen, *cont. Celsum,* lib. 7, ἰδιῶται τὸ τοιοῦτον πράττουσιν (the common unlettered people do the same). "'Oh, could you but hear,' says Cyprian *(En.* 76), 'and see those demons when they are tortured by us, and afflicted with spiritual chastisement and *ve bat* anguish, and thus ejected from the bodies of the possessed *(obsessorum),* moaning and lamuenting,' with human voice, through the power divine, as they feel the rods and stripes they confess the judgment to come.' The exorcists rule with commanding right over the whole army of the insolent adversary. Oftentimes the devil promises to depart, but departs not; but when we come to baptism, then indeed we ought to be assured and confident, because the demon is then oppressed, and the man is consecrated to God and liberated.' The invocation of Christ, attended by the sign; of the cross, and pronounced by persons formally appointed to the office, was the method by which those stupendous effects were usually produced; and one among the many ears which proceeded from this absurd practice was an opinion, which gained some prevalence among the less enlightened

converts, that the object of Christ's mission was to emancipate mankind from thee yoke of their invisible enemy, and that the promised *redemption* was nothing more than a sensible, liberation from the manifest influence of evil spirits" (Waddington, *Church History*, chapter 13). The *Apostolical Constitutions*, 8:26, says: "An exorcist is not appointed, for the prize pertaineth to voluntary goodness and the grace of God, through Christ, by the influence of the Holy Spirit; for he who hath received the gift of healing is declared by revelation from God, the grace that is in him being manifest unto all. But if there be need of him for a bishop, or preslmyter, or deacon, he is appointed accordingly." Thus it appears

(1) that the power of casting out devils was held to exist in the Church;

(2) that as late as the third century it was not held to belong exclusively to the clergy, but to the whole Church, or at least to some among the laity. The use of exorcism seems to have been at first confined to thee case of persons "possessed with devils," ἐνεργούμενοι, who were given into the care of persons set apart for the purpose (Cyprian, *Epist.* 75, 76). *SEE ENERGUMENS*. But Cyprian also speaks here of baptismal exorcism (see below).

2. Exorcists. — A special *order* of exorcists arose as early as the third century. Before that time, although, as has been seen, the power of exorcising was held to be a spiritual gift common to all classes in the Church, it yet appears to have been chiefly exercised by the clergy. On the date of the rise of the order of exorcists, and of their ordination and office, Bingham *(Onig. Ecclesiastes* book 3, chapter 4) speaks as follows: "'I take Bona's opinion to be the truest, that it came in upon the withdrawing (Rerum *Liturg.* lib. 1, c. 25, note 17) of that extraordinary and miraculous poweer, which probably emas by degrees, and not at the same time in all places. Cornelius (ap. *Euseb.* Lib. 6, c. 43), who lived in the third century, reckons exorcists among the inferior orders of the Church of Rome; yet the author of the Constitutions, who lived after him, says it was no certain order *(Constit. Apost.* lib. 8, c. 26), but God bestowed the gift of exorcising as a free grace upon whom he pleased; and therefore, consonant tc that hypothesis, there is no rule among those Constitutions for giving any ordination to exorcists, as being appointed by God only, and not by the Church. But the credit of the Constitutions is not to be relied upon in this matter; for it is certain by this time exorcists were settled as an order in most parts of the Greek Church, as well as the Latin; which is evident from

th.. Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, in one of whose canons *(Cone. Antioch.* c. 10) leave is given to the *chorepiscopi* to promote subdeacons, readers, and exorcists, which argues that those were then all standing orders of the Church. After this exorcists are frequently mentioned among the inferior orders by the writers of the fourth certury, as in the Council of Laodicea *(Cone. Laodic.* c. 24 and 26), Epiphanius *(Expos. Fid.* note 21), Paulinus *(Natal.* 4, *S. Felicis.),* Sulpicius Severus *(Vit. S. Martin.* c. 5), and the Rescripts of Theodosius *(Cod. Theodos.* lib. 12, tit. 1, *De Decurione Leg.* 121), and Gratian *(id. ib.* lib. 16, tit. 2, *De Episc. Leg.* 24) in the Thaodosian Code, where those emperors grant them the same immunities from civil offices as they do to the other orders of the clergy. Their ordination and office is thus described by the fourth Council of Carthage *(Conc. Carth.* 4, c. 7: Exorcista quum ordinatur, accipiat de manu episcopi libellum, in quo scripti sunt exorcismi, dicente sibi episcopo: Accipe et commenda memoriae, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super energmeumenum, sive baptizatum, sive catechumenumn): "When an exorcist is ordained, he shall receive at the hands of the bishop a book, wherein the forms of exorcising are written, the bishop saying, Receive thou these and commit them to memory, and have thou power to lay hands upon the energumens, whether they be baptized or only catechumens." These forms were certain prayers, together with adjurations in the name of Christ, commanding the unclean spirit to depart out of the possessed person, which may be collected from the words of Paulinus concerning the promotion of St. Felix to this office, where he says *(Natal.* 4, *S. Felcis.:* Primis lector servivit in annis, inde gradum cepit, cui munus voce fideli adjurare malos, et sacris pellere verbis), from a reader he arose to that degree whose office was to adjure evil spirits, and to drive them out by certain holy words. It does not appear that they were ordained to this office by any imposition of hands either in the Greek or Latin Church; but yet no one might pretend to exercise it either publicly or privately, in the church or in any house, without the appointment of the bishop, as the Council of Laodicea directs *(Cone. Laod. c.* 26); or at least the license of a *chorepiscopus,* who in that case was authorized *(Concil. Antiochen.* cap. 10) by the bishop's deputation."

3. *Exorcism in Baptism.* — In the third century (at least after the Council of Carthage, A.D. 256) we find exorcism used in the catechumenate in preparation for baptism, and also as part of the ordinary ceremony of baptism. Riddle *(Christian Antiquities,* book 4, chapter 2) gives the

following view of its origin: "Baptism, as the sacrament of the Holy Ghost, contributes to deliver men from the power of Satan and evil spirits; and hence it appears expedient and right at the reception of that rite to renounce the devil and his works. And when the pumeber of candidates for baptism was multiplied from among the heathen, who are spoken of in Scripture as in a peculiar sense sinners (Galatians 2:15), and who were regarded as being especially under the power of the prince of darkness, it seemed more particularly needful that admission into the Gospel Church — the kingdom of heaven — should be preceded by a formal abjuration of all heathen and superstitious practices or worship; in one word, by a renunciation of Satan. Such appears to be the most natural and simple account of the origin of exorcism at baptism in the Christian Church. Justin Martyr, the first uninspired writer who describes Christian baptism, knew nothing of this practice, although he was not unacquainted with the custom of exorcising evil spirits in the case of persons possessed. Tertullian, however, treats expressly of this matter, and says that the practice of renouncing the devil on occasion of baptism is founded not on Scripture, but on tradition *(De Corona Mil.* c. 3). Cyprian also treats of baptismal exorcism (Ep. 76, *ad* Magy.). At first, indeed, this ceremony was confined to a renunciation of the devil and all his works on the part of the person about to be baptized; and it was not until the fourth century that a form of abjuration *by the officiating minister,* commanding the evil spirit to depart from the new servant of Christ, was brought into use. And hence it is that some writers, making a distinction between the renunciation (ἀποταγή, abrenuntiatio) and exorcism (ἐξορκισμός), contend that the practice of exorcism was altogether unknown until the fourth, or, as others say, the seventh century. The fact, however, appears to be, that these customs are substantially one and the same, differing only in form. And the true state of the case with respect to baptismal exorcism appears to be as follows:

1. In the first century we find no trace of a renunciation of the devil in baptism.

2. In the second and third centuries this practice was in use, as appears from the testimonies of Tertullian and Cyprian, as well as of later writers who appeal to tradition.

3. In the fourth century the fathers speak of exorcism as not being highly expedient, inasmuch as, without it, children would not be free from the influence of evil spirits (Optat. Milev. *De Schism. Donut.* lib. 4, c. 6; Basil.

M. *De Spiritu Sancto,* c. 27; Gregor. Naz. *Orat.* 40). We find mention of baptismal exorcism also in the canons of the Council of Carthage held in the year 256, and those of the first Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. The exorcists, who were concerned at first only with the energumens, or persons possessed, were afterwards called upon to assist at the baptism of all adults; but, as infant baptism gained ground, the duties of this office became superfluous, and they are very rarely mentioned in worls posterior tothe sixth century."

Cyril of Jerusalem (+ 386) gives a somewhat detailed account of the form of exorcism. The ceremonies used were:

1. Preliminary fasting, prayers, and genuflections. These, however, may be regarded as general preliminaries to baptism.

2. Imposition of hands upon the head of the candidate, who stood with his head bowed down in a submissive posture.

3. Putting off the shoes and clothing, with the exception of an under garment.

4. Facing the candidate to the west, which was the symbol of darkness, as the east was of light. In the Eastern Church he was required to thrust out his hand towards the west, as if in the act of pushing away an object in that direction. This was a token of his abhorrence of Satan and his works, and his determination to resist and repel them.

5. A renunciation of Satan and his works thus: 'I renounce Satan and his works, and his pomps and his services, and all things that are his.' This or a similar form was thrice repeated.

6. The exorcist then breathed upon the candidate either once or three times, and adjured the unclean spirit in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to come out of him. This form of adjuration seems not to have been in use until the fourth century; and these several formalities were apparently introduced gradually and at different times. The whole ceremony was at first confined to the reninciation of ‘the devil and his works' on the part of the person about to be baptized (Coleman, *Christian Antziquties,* chapter 14, § 9 ; Riddle, 1. c.).

IV. *Roman Catholic Church.* — In the Roman Catholic Church *exorcists* constitute one of the four minor orders of the clergy-acolytes, exorcists,

readers, porters *(Council of Trent,* session 23, chapter 2, of Orders). When initiating the exorcist the bishop gives him a book containing the exorcisms (or the Missal), and says, *"Accipe et commend e memori, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super energumenum, sive baptizatum sive catechumenum"* (Take this and commit it to memory, and have power to impose hands on persons possessed, be they baptized or catechumens). Every candidate for priests' orders in the Roman Church first receives the four lower orders, including that of exorcist. The process of exorcising water for baptism is given under BAPTISM *SEE BAPTISM* Children are regarded as belonging to the devil until baptized, and the priest or assisting exorcist blows out the evil spirit by the breath (*exsufflation*), and also breathes on the child again *(insufflation),* as a symbol of the gift of the Spirit. So the *Rituale:* "Sacerdos exsufflat ter in faciem catechumeaii, semel dicens: Exi ab eo (ea), spiritus immunde, et da locum Spiritui Sancto Paraclito. Hic in modum crucis halet in faciems ipsius dicat; Accipe Spiritum bon im per istam insufflationem, et Dei benedictionem. +Pax tibi." In cases where the priest is to practice exorcism on a person supposed to be "possessed of the devil," he is to prepare himself specially by prayer, fasting, confession, and mass. The ceremony may be performed in the church, or, if the sufferer be ill, at his house; but there must always be witnesses present. "Here, arrayed in robe, cope, and a blue stole, he first sprinkles the subject with holy water, and, kneeling down, prays the All Saints' litany, the Lord's prayer, and Psalm 53, *Deus in nomine tuo* (in our version Psalm 54); then two prayers in which, making the sign of the cross over the patient, he commands the evil spirit to depart, by the mysteries of the incarnation, the suffering and death, the resurrection and ascension of Christ, the sending of the Spirit, and the coming again to judgment. Thereupon follows the lesson from John 1, In *piancipio erat* Verbum, with <41165>Mark 16:15-18, and <42107>Luke 10:17-19. Then he lays both hands upon the head of the energumen, saying, *'Ecce crucem Domini: Jugite pantes adversae: Vicit leo de triba Juda,'* and the prayer follows, with the proper formula of exorcism *(Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus,* etc.): 'I exorcise thee, unclean spirit, in the name of Jesus Christ; tremble, O Satan! thou enemy of the faith, thou foe of mankind, who hast brought death into the world, who hast deprived men of life, and hast rebelled against justice; thou seducer of mankind, thou root of all evil, thou source of avarice, discord, and envy', the priest meanwhile making three crosses, in the name of the Trinity, on the brow and breast of the possessed person. If the evil spirit does not depart, all these ceremonies must be repeated. In regard to the *exorcism of*

things, the view of St. Paul, that every creature of God, used with thanksgiving, is good, stands true at all times. But in consequence of the curse, which the first sin brought upon all nature, the Church of Rome exorcises beforehand things designed for sacred use, such as the *water* and *salt* required for holy water. Beasts also, horses, fields, and fruits, are so treated, more frequently in the Greek Cheurch than in the Roman" (Herzog, Encyclopadia, Bombuarger's transl., 1:255). When a house is infested with evil spirits the priest is sent for, who, on his arrival, sprinkles the place plentifully with holy water, repeats some prayers, and then pronounces the form of exorcism, whereupon it is supposed, the devils depart. Should they again return the ceremony of exorcism is repeated, and again if necessary until at length the Church proves itself victorious over the powers of hell *(Encycl. Metropolitana;* see also Jeremy Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, § 9, for an account of the forms of exorcism; and the copious collection entitled *Thesaurus exorcismorum atque conjurationem terribilim, potentissimorum, efficacissimorum cum practica, probatissima: quibus spiritus maligni, daemones maleficiage omni, de corporibus humanis obsessis, tanquam flagellis fustibusque fugantur, expellantur, doctrinis refertissimus atque uberrimus*, Colonins, 1628, 8vo).

V. The Greek Church also continues the order of exorcists and the practice of exorcism. The exorcism of catechumens is designated ἀφορκισμός, and it is thrice admiuinistered in making a catechumen (see Euchologion, cap. εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον). Exorcism is also practiced upon the baptism of infants. The priest, having received the child at the church doer, marks him with the sign of the cross on the forehead, then carries him to the font, where, before his immersion, he is exorcised. The ancient forms are preserved with very little change in modern use. Three forms are employed, which may be found in Schmitt, *Morgenland.-griech-russische Kirche* (Mainz, 1826, page 141). In Assemanni, *Codex Litarg.* 2:318 eq., may be found twenty-one forms for exorcising the devil and all evil spirits. In Metrophuanis Critopuli *Confessio* (1661), cap. 7, *de Ecclesia*, is the statement that baptism must be performed with prayers and exorcisms (μετὰ εὐχῶν καὶ ἐξορκισμῶν)*;* also (ἔχομεν δὲ ἐξορκισμοὺς παρὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων πατέρων θαυμασίως συντεθειμένους) "we have forms of exorcism admirably prepared by the ancient fathers;" and in cap. 11, *de Sacerdotio*, he states the duty of the exorcists to be "to exorcise the catechumens and

catechize them" (see Kimmel, Monum. *Fid. Ecclesiastes Orient.* (Jens, 1840, 8eo).

VI. *In Protestant Churches.* — Luther approved of exorcism. In his *Taufbeichlein* he preserved the spirit of the Roman Catholic form of renunciation of the devil. He did not consider it as essential, but as very useful to "remind the people earnestly of the power of sin and the devil." The immediate successors of Luther adopted his views, and they were generally diffused in Saxony, Wutemberg, and the other strongly Lutheran parts' of Germany (Siegel, *Alterthiinzer,* 2:64; Wiedenfeld, *De Exorcismi Origine,* etc., Marburg, 1824). In 1583 Heshusius wrote in favor of abolishing its use. Justus Menius, in a treatise *Voai Exorcismo,* 1590, advocated its retention. Calvin *(Instit.* 4:12, 19), speaking of the "wax taper" and "exorcism" as used by the Romanists in baptism, says, "I am not ignorant of the ancient origin of this adventitious medley, yet it is lawful for me, and for all the faithful, to reject everything that men have presumed to add to the institution of Christ." In the Swedish Church, when the Augsburg Confession was proclaimed anew at the Council of Upsala, 153, exorcism was retained, in its milder expressions, "as a free ceremony, on account of its utility as an admonition to the audience looking on at the baptism" (Ranke, *History of the Papacy,* 1:11, Austin's transl., Edinb. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo). Zuinglius agreed with Calvin in rejecting exorcism and from the beginning the Reformed Chirch was disinclined to it. The question became a sort of test between Lutherans and Calvinists. In the Crypto-Calvinistic struggles the question of exorcism played a part, and one of the accusations against Nicolas Crell (v.r.) was that he “sought to extirpate exorcism from the Church, to its great injury (see Boelemer, *Jis. Eccl. Protest.* 3:843). Among later Lutheran theologians, Gerhardt, Quenstedt, and Hollaz place it among things indifferent; Baur, Baumgarten, and Reinhard urge its abolition. From Reinhard's time it has gradually become obsolete in the Lutheran Church. Since 1822 the "High" Lutherans have attempted to revive its use.

In the Church of England. — In the first liturgy of Edward VI, a form of exorcism at baptism is given. The priest, looking upon the children, was to say, "I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants, whom our Lord Jesus Christ has vouchsafed to call to his holy-baptism, to be made members of his body and of his holy congregation. Therefore, thou accursed spirit, remember thy sentence, remember thy judgment,

remember the day to be at hand wherein thou shalt burn in fire everlasting, prepared for thee and thy angels; and presume not henceforth to exercise any tyranny towards these infants whom Christ hath bought with his precious blood, and by his holy baptism, calleth to be of his flock." *SEE BAPTISM*. Bucer's remonstrance against the indiscriminate use of the form of exorcism, on the ground that it would be uncharitable to suppose that all were demoniacs who came to be baptized, was listened to by the Reformers; for in their revision of the *Prayer-book* in the 5th and 6th of Edward VI, they decided on omitting it altogether. The seventy-second canon of the Church of England forbids any minister attempting to expel a devil or devils, under pain of the imputation of imposture, and cosenage, and deposition from the ministry, except he first obtains the license of the bishop of his diocese, had under his hand and seal (Wheatly, *On Common Prayer*, chapter 7, § 2). In the form of baptism used in the Church of England, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the question is put to the candidate, "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works?" etc. This is a remnant of the old form of renunciation (connected with the exorcism at the baptism of catechumens), but of exorcism itself there is nothing in their formularies.

Literature. — See, besides the works already cited, Suicer, *Thesaurus*, 5. ἀφορκισμός, ἐξορκισμός; Stolle, *De Origine Exorcismi in Baptismo;* Augusti, *Denkwurdigkeiten*, 7:268 sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*, Bohn's ed., 1:435; 2:110 sq.; Augusti, *Christ. Archaeologie*, 2:427 sq.; 3:402; Ferraris, *Promta Bibliotheca*, 3:927 sq.; Kraft, *Ausfuhrl. Hist. von Exorcismo* (Hamburg, 1750, 8vo); Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, book 2, chapter 15; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, page 365.

Exordium

SEE HOMILETICS; SEE SERMON.

Expectancy

(Lat. *expectantia, expectiva, gratia expectiva)*, in canon law, the name of a prospective claim to an ecclesiastical benefice which has not yet become vacant. At first the German emperors granted expectancies for the first place in every chapter that became vacant after their accession to the throne *(jus primae precis).* Afaer the eleventh century the popes granted expectancies at first in the shape of a request, and subsequently in the

shape of an order. The expectancy was either for a definite benefice, or for any benefice of a certain class or chapter. The third Council of Lateran (1179), and later papal rescripts, forbade the expectancies, but the popes themselves continued to grant them. They were again restricted by the Council of Constance, and forbidden by the Council of Basel. The Council of Trent totally abolished them, except in cases of bishops and monastic superiors, to whom, in some specified cases, a coadjutor, with the right of succession, was given. In the Protestant state churches the princes have claimed the right to grant expectancies. — *Allgem. Real-EncykI.* 1:622; Herzog, *Real-Encykll.* 4:292. (A.J.S.)

Expectation Week

the time between Ascension Day and Whitsunday, the period during which the apostles tarried at Jerusalem in expectation of the fulfillment of the Master's promise as to the outpouring of the Comforter. — Procter, *On Common Prayer*, page 289.

Expediency

fitness of means to ends. On expediency as the ground of morals, see Dwight, *Theology*, sermon 99; Robert Hall, *Complete Works*, 1:96; 2:295; *Lit. and Theol. Review*, 4:388; Wayland, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, page 301; and the article ETHICS *SEE ETHICS* .

Experience

(δοκιμή, Romans 5:4, "proof," as elsewhere rendered), *approval* of integrity as the result of trial. " The three stages of ὑπομονή, *endurance*, δοκιμή, *approval*, and ἐλπίς, hope, are considered by the apostle as proceeding from the sufferings; the first denoting the state of moral earnestness implied in patient and faithful endurance, the second that state of approval as genuine which thence results, and bears within it hope as its blossom" (Olshausen, *Comment.* in loc.).

Experience.

I. *In Philosophy.* — "Experience, in its strict sense, applies to what has occurred within a person's own knowledge. *Experience*, in this sense, of course relates to the *past* alone. Thus it is that a man knows by *experience* what sufferings he has undergone in some disease, or what height the tide reached at a certain time and place. More frequently the word is used to

denote that judgment which is derived from *experience in the primary sense,* by reasoning fiom that in combination with other data. Thus a man may assert, on the ground of *experience,* that he was cured of a disorder by such a medicine that that medicine is generally beneficial in that disorder; that the tide may always be expected, under such circum. stances, to rise to such a height. Strictly speaking, none of these can be known *by experience,* but are con. clusionsfrom *experience.* It is in this sense only that *experience* can be applied to *thefuture,* or, which comes to the same thling, to any *general* fact; as, e.g. when it is said that we know *by experience* that water exposed to a certain temperature will freeze" (Whately, *Logic,* app. 1).

Locke *(Essay on Human Understand.* book 2, chapter 1) assigns *experience* as the only and universal source of human knowledge. "Whence hath the mind all the materials of reason and knowledge? To this I answer, in one word, from *experience;* in that all our knowledge is founded, and from that ultimately derives itself. Our observation, employed either about external sensible objects, or about the internal operations of our minds, perceived and reflected on by our. selves, is that which supplies our understanding with all the materials of thinking. These are the fountains of knowledge from whence all the ideas we have, or can naturally have, do spring — that is, sensation and reflection." In opposition to this view, according to which all human knowledge is *a posteriori, or* the result of experience, it is contended that man has knowledge a priori — knowledge which experience neither does nor can give, and knowledge without which there could be no experience, inasmuch as all the generalizations of experience proceed and rest upon it. "No accumulation of experiments whatever can bring a general law home to the mind of man, because, if we rest upon experiments, our conclusion can never logically pass beyond the bounds of our premises; we can never infer more than we have proved; and all the past, which we have not seen, and the future, which we cannot see, is still left open, in which new experiences may arise to overturn the present theory. And yet the child will believe at once upon a single experiment, as having been once burned by fire. Why? Because a hand divine has implanted in him the tendency to generalize thus rapidly. Because he does it by an instinct of which he can give no account, except that he is so formed by his Maker" (Sewell, *Christian Mor.* chapter 24). "We may have seen one circle and investigated its properties, but why,- when our individual experience is so circumscribed, do we assume the

same relations of all? Simply because the understanding has the conviction intuitively that similar objects will have similar properties; it does not acquire this idea by sensation or custom; the mind develops it by its own intrinsic force — it is a law of our faculties, ultimate and universal, from vwhich all reasoning proceeds" (Dr. Mill, *Essays,* page 337). — Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy,* s.v.

II. *In Religion.* —

(1.) Knowledge gained by trial or practice. "A man unacquainted with those spiritual changes in the mind which are mentioned in the Scripture can form no notion of them. He may have some idea of the possibility of the changes called the new birth, sanctification, etc., but he does not understand their nature; they are foolishness to him. Nothing is more common with unregenerate persons than to ridicule as enthusiastic religious experience. But if the constitution of human nature is considered, it will be seen that man has emotions as well as intellect. His passions are original parts of his mental constitution, and must be exercised in religion. They cannot be destroyed. However beautiful religion may be as a theory, its excellency and energy can only be displayed as experienced. Hence the Bible employs the analogous terms *tasting, feeling,* to indicate the internal enjoyment of a Christian. He has peace through believing. He joys in God, through whom he has received the atonement. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart. He is conascious that he is a new creature" (Farrar, *Bibl. Dict.* s.v.). "That our experience is always ablolutely pure in time present state cannot be expected; but if it be genuine, it will not fail, through the exercise of Christian diligence, to become more and more pure. The main point, therefore, is to guard well against mistaking the illusions of the imagination for the operation of divince truth an the conscience and the heart (<520213>1 Thessalonians 2:13). *SEE AFFECTIONS*.

(2.) The most valuable things are most apt to be counterfeited. But Christian experience may be considered as genuine,

> **1.** When it accords with the revelation of God's mind and will, or what he has revealed in his Word. Anything contrary to this, however pleasing, cannot be sound, or produced by divine agency.
>
> **2.** When its tendency is to promote humility in us: that experience by which we learn our own weakness, and to subdue pride, must be good.

3. When it teaches us to bear with others, and to do there good.

4. When it operates so as to excite us to be ardent in our devotion, and sincere in our regard to God. A powerful experience of the divine favor will lead us to acknowledge the same, and to manifest our gratitude both by constant praise and genuine piety.

(3.) Christian experience, however, may be abused. There are some good people who certainly have felt and enjoyed the power of religion, and yet have not always acted with prudence as to their experience.

1. Some boast of their experiences, or talk of them as if they were very extraordinary; whereas, were they acquainted with others, they would find it not so. That a man may make mention of his experience is no way improper, but often useful; but to hear persons always talking of themselves seems to indicate a spirit of pride, and that their experience cannot be very deep.

2. Another abuse of experience is dependence on it. We ought certainly to take encouragement from past circumstances if we can; but if we are so dependent on past experience as to preclude present exertions, or always expect to have exactly the same assistance in every state, trial, or ordinance, we shall be disappointed. God has wisely ordered it that, though he never will leave his people, yet he will suspend or bestow comfort in his own time; for this very reason, that we may rely on him, and not on the circumstance or ordinance.

3. It is an abuse of experience which introduced at improper times and before improper persons. It is true, we ought never to be ashamed of our profesion; but to be always talking to irreligious people respecting experience, which they know nothing of, is as our Savior says, casting pearls before swine." See Buck, *Treatise of Experience; Gurnall, Christian* Armor; Edwards, *On the Affections*; Doddridge, *Rise and Progress;* Wesley, *Sermons.*

Experience

Hume’s argument from. *SEE HUME; SEE MIRACLE*.

Experience Meetings

are assemblies of religious persons, who meet for the purpose of relating their experience to each other." "They are sometimes called covenant and conference meetings, and, in the Methodist Church, *class-meetings (q.v.)*; It has been doubted by some whether these meetings are of any great utility and whether they do not, in some measure, force people to say more than is true, and put up those with pride who are able to communicate their ideas with facility; but to this it has been answered,

1. That the abuse of a thing is no proof of the evil of it.

2. That the most eminent saints of old did not neglect this practice (<19601>Psalm 56:16; <30316>Malachi 3:16).

3. That by a wise and prudent relation of experience the Christian is led to see that others have participated of the same joys and sorrows with himself; he is excited to love and serve God; and animated to perseverance in duty by finding that others, of like passions with himself, are zealous, active, and diligent.

4. That the Scriptures seem to enjoin the frequent intercourse of Christians for the purpose of strengthening each other in religious services (<58104>Hebrews 10:24, 25; <51016>Colossians 3:16; <40820>Matthew 18:20)." *SEE CLASS-MEETINGS*.

Expiation, Jewish Day Of Annual

(<03701>Leviticus 17:1-3a, comp. 23:36, 39; <04907>Numbers 29:7-11), a solemn fast (<44709>Acts 27:9; Philo *Opp*. 2:206, 296, 591; Josephus, Ant. 14:16, 4) and holy-day (ˆ/ t B,vi t B,vi <03624>Leviticus 16:31; 23:32), held from the evening of the 9th till that of the 10th day of the 5th month, Tisri, five days before the feast of Tabernacles. The modern Mohammedan fast called 'Ramadan," held during an entire (lunar) month has sometimes been referred to as having its analogies; likewise the fast of Isis among the ancient Egyptians (Herod. 4:186; comp. 2:40), and the Hindu fast-day "Sandrajonon," etc. *SEE FAST.*

Expiation

"a religious act, by which satisfaction or atonement is made for the commission of some crime, the guilt done away, and the obligation to

punishment cancelled. The chief methods of expiation among the Jews were by sacrifices; and it is important always to recollect that the Levitical sacrifices were of an expiatory character; because as among the Jews sacrifices were unquestionably of divine original, and as the terms taken from them are found applied so frequently to Christ and to his sufferings in the New Testament, they serve to explain that peculiarity under which the apostles regarded the death of Christ, and afford additional proof that it was considered by them, as a sacrifice of expiation, as the grand universal sin-offering for the whole world. For our Lord is announced by John as ‘the Lamb of God;' and that not with reference to meekness or any other moral virtue, but with an accompanying phrase, which would communicate to a Jew the full sacrificial sense of the term employed, 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' He is called 'our Passover, sacrificed for us.' He is said to have given 'himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savor.' As a priest, it was necessary 'he should have somewhat to offer;' and he offered 'himself,' 'his own blood,' to which is ascribed the washing away of sin, and our eternal redemption. He is declared to have put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, to have 'himself purged our sins,' to have 'sanctified the people by his own blood,' to have 'offered to God one sacrifice for sins.' Add to these, and to innumerable other similar expressions and allusions, the argument of the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which, by proving at length that the sacrifice of Christ was superior in efficacy to the sacrifices of the law, he most unequivocally assumes that the death of Christ was a sacrifice and sin-offering; for without that it would no more have been capable of comparison with the sacrifices of the law, than the death of John the Baptist, St. Stephen, or St. James, all martyrs and sufferers for the truth, who had recently sealed their testimony with their blood. This very comparison, we may affirm, is utterly unaccountable and absurd on any hypothesis which denies the sacrifice of Christ; for what relation could his death have to the Levitical immolations and, offerings if it had no sacrificial character? Nothing could, in fact, be more misleading, and even absurd, then to apply those terms which, both among Jewis and Gentiles, were in imse to express the various processes and means of atonement and pecular propitiation, if the apostles and Christ himself did not intend to represent his death strictly as as expiation for sin — misleading, because such would be the natural and necessary inference from the terms themselves which had acquired this as their established meaning; and absurd, because if; as Socinians say they need them metaphorically, there was not even an ideal

resemblance between the figure and that which it was intended to illustrate. So totally irrelevant, indeed, will those terms appear to any notion entertained of the death of Christ which excludes its expiatory character, that to assume that our Lord and his apostles used them as metaphors is profanely to assume themn to be such writers as. would not in any other case be tolerated; writers wholly unacquainted wtih the commonest rules of language, and therefore wholly unfit to be teachers of others, and that not only in religion, but in things of inferior inmportance.

2. "The use of such terms, we have said, would not only be wholly absurd, but criminally misleading to the Gentiles, as well as to the Jews, who were first converted to Christianity. To them the notion of propitiatory offerings, offerings to avert the displeasure of the gods, and which expiated the crimes of offenders, was most familiar, and terms corresponding to it were in constant use. The bold denial of this by Dr. Priestly might well bring upon him the reproof of archbishop Magee, who, after establishing this point from the Greek and Latin writers, observes, 'So clearly does their language announce the notion of a propitiatory atonement, that if we would avoid an imputation on Dr. Priestly's fairness, we are driven, of necessity, to question the extent of his acquaintance with those writers.' The reader may consult the instances given by this writer in No. 5 of his 'Illustrations,' appended to his 'Discourses on the Atonement;' and also the tenth chapter of Grotius's *De Satisfactione,* whose learning has most amply illustrated and firmly settled this view of the heathen sacrifices. The use to be made of this in the argument is, that as the apostles found the very terms they used with reference to the nature and efficacy of the death of Christ fixed in an expiatory signification among the Greeks, they could not, in honesty, use theml ini a distant figurative sense, much less in a contrary one, without giving their readers due notice of their having invested them with a new import. From ἅγος, *a pollution, an impurity,* which was to be expiated by sacrifice, are derived ἁγνίζω and ἁγιάζω, which denote the act of expiation; καθαίρω, too, *to purify, cleanse,* is applied to the effect of expiation; and ἱλάσκομαι denotes the method of propitiating the gods by sacrifice. These, and other words of similar import, are used by the authors of the Septuagint, and by the evangelists and apostles; but they give no premonition of using them in any strange and altered sense; and when they apply them to the death of Christ, they must, therefore, be understood to use them in their received meaning. In like manner the Jews had their expiatory sacrifices, and the terms and phrases used in them are,

in like manner, employed by the apostles to characterize the death of their Lord; and they would have been as guilty of misleading their Jewish as their Gentile readers had they employed them in a new sense, and without warning, which, unquestionably, they never gave.

3. "As to the expiatory nature of the sacrifices of the law, it is not required by the argument to show that *all* the Levitical offerings were of this character. There were also offerings for persons and for things prescribed for purification, which were identical; but even they grew out of the leading notion of expiatory sacrifice, and that legal purification which resulted from the forgiveness of sins. It is enough to prove that the grand and eminent sacrifices of the Jews were strictly expiatory, and that by them the offerers were released from punishment and death, for which ends they were appointed by the lawgiver. When we speak, too, of vicarious sacrifice, we do not mean either, on the one hand, such a substitution as that the victim should bear the same quantum of pain and suffering as the offender limself; or, on the other hand, that it was put in the place of the offender as a mere symbolical act, by which he confessed his desert of punishment; but *substitution made by divine appointment*, by which the. victim was exposed to sufferings and death instead of the offender, in virtue of which the offender himself was released. With this view, one can scarcely conceive why so able a writer as archbishop. Magee should prefer to use the term 'vicarious *import'* rather than the simple and established term 'vicarious,' since the Antinomian notion of substitution may be otherwise sufficiently guarded against, and the phrase 'vicarious *import'* is certainly capable of being resolved into that figurative notion of mere symbolical action, which, however plausible, does in fact deprive the ancient sacrifices of their *typical,* and the oblation of Christ of its *real* efficacy. Vicarious acting is acting for another; vicarious suffering is suffering for another; but the nature and circumstances of that suffering in the case of Christ are to be determined by the doctrine of Scripture at large, and not wholly by the term itself, which is, however, useful for this purpose (and therefore to be preserved), that it indicates the sense in which those who use it understand the declaration of Scripture, 'Christ died for us,' so as that he died not merely for our *benefit,* but *in our stead;* in other words, that, but for his having died, those who believe in him would personally have suffered that death which is the penalty of every violation of the law of God.

4. "That sacrifices under the law were expiatory and vicarious admits of abundant proof. The chief objections made to this doctrine are,

(1.) That under the law, in all capital cases, the offender, upon legal proof or conviction, was doomed to die, and that no sacrifice could exempt him from the penalty.

(2.) That in all lower cases to which the law had not attached capital punishment, but pecuniary mulets, or personal labor or servitude upon their non-payment, this penalty was to be strictly executed, and none could plead any privilege for exemption on account of sacrifice; and that when sacrifices were ordained with a pecuniary mulct, they are to be regarded in the light *of fine,* one part of which was paid to the state, the other to the Church. This was the mode of argument adopted by the author of *The Moral Philosopher,* and noth ng of weight has been added to these objections since his day. Now much of this may be granted without any prejudice to the argument, and, indeed, is no more than the most orthodox writers on this subject have often remarked. The law under which the Jews were placed was at once, as to them, both a moral and a political law; and the lawgiver excepted certain offenses from the benefit of pardon, because that would have been exemption from temporal death, which was the state penalty. He therefore would accept no atonement for such transgressions. Blasphemy, idolatry, murder, and adultery were the 'presumptuous sins' which were thus exempted; and the reason will be seen in the political relation of the people to God; for, in refusing to exempt them from punishment in this world, respect was had to the order and benefit of society. Running parallel, however, with this political application of the law to the Jews as subjects of the theocracy, we see the authority of the moral law kept over them as men and creatures; and if these 'presumptuous sins' of blasphemy and idolatry, of murder and adultery, and a few others, were the only capital crimes considered politically, they were not the. only capital crimes considered morally; that is, there were other crimes which would have subjected the offender to death but for this provision of expiatory oblations. The true question, then, is whether such sacrifices were appointed by God, and accepted instead of the personal punishment or life of the offender, which otherwise would have been forfeited, as in the other cases; and, if so, if the life of animal sacrifices was accepted instead of the life of man, then the notion that 'they were ere mulets and pecuniary penalties' falls to the ground, and the vicarious nature of most of the Levitical oblations is established. That other offenses besides those above

mentioned were capital, that is, exposed the offender to death, is clear from this, that all offenses against the law had this capital character. As death weas the sanction of the commandment given to Adam, so any one who transgressed any part of the law of Moses became guilty of death; every inman was ‘accursed,' that is, devoted to die, who 'continued not in all things written in the book of the law.' 'The man only that doeth these things shall live by them' was the rule; and it was, therefore, to redeem the offenders from this penalty that sacrifices were appointed. So, with reference to the great day of expiation, we read, 'For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be clean from all your sins; and this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year' (<03160>Leviticus 16:30-34).

5. "To prove that this was the intention and effect of the annual sacrifices of the Jews, we need do little more than refer to <03170>Leviticus 17:10, 11: 'I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.' Here the blood which is said to make an atonement for the soul is the blood of the victims; and to make an atonement for the soul is the same as to be a ransom for the soul, as will appear by referring to <02012>Exodus 30:12-16; and to be a ransom for the soul is to avert death. 'They shall give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, that there be no plague among them,' by which their lives might be suddenly taken away. The 'soul' is also here used obviously for the life; the blood, or the life of the victims in all sacrifices, was substituted for the life of man, to preserve him from death, and the victims were therefore vicarious.

6. "The Hebrew word rpk, rendered atonement, signifying primarily *to cover, to overspread,* has been the subject of some evasive criticisms. It comnes, however, in the secondary sense, to signify atonement or propitiation, because the effect of that is to cover, or, in Scripture meaning, to remit offenses. The Septuagint also renders it by ἐξιλάσκομαι, *to appease, to make propitious.* It is used, indeed, where the means of atonement are not of the sacrificial kind; but these instances equally serve to evince the Scripture sense of the term, in cases of transgression, to be that of reconoiling the offended deity by averting his displeasure, so that when the atonetment for sin is said to be made by sacrifice, no doubt can

remain that the sacrifice was strictly a sacrifice of propitiation. Agreeably to this conclusion, we find it expressly declared, in the several cases of pecular oblations for transgression of the divine commands, that the sins for which atonement was made by those oblations should be forgiven.

7. "As the notion that the sacrifices of the law emere not vicarious, but mere mulets and fines, is overturned by the general appointment of the blood to be an atonement for the souls, the forfeited lives, of men, so also is it contradicted by particular instances. Let us refer to <0365>Leviticus 6:15, 16: 'If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance in the holy things of the Lord, he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing, and shall add a fifth part thereto, and shall give it to the priest.' Here, indeed, is the proper fine for the trespass; but it is added, 'He shall bring for his trespass unto the Lord a ram without blemish, and the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering, and it shall be forgiven him.' Thus then, so far from the sacrifice being the fine, the fine is distinguished from it, and with the ram only was the atonement made to the Lord for his trespass. Nor can the ceremonies with which the trespass and sin offerings were accompanied agree with any notion but that of their vicarious character. The worshipper, conscious of his trespass, brought an animal, his own property, to the door of the tabernacle. This was not a eucharistical act; not a memorial of mercies received, but of sins committed. He laid his hands upon the head of the animal, the symbolical act of transferring punishment, then slew it with his own hand, and delivered it to the priest, who burned the fat and part of the animal upon the altar; and, having sprinkled part tof the blood upon the altar, and in some cases upon the offerer himself; poured the rest at the bottom of the maltar. And thus, we are told, 'The priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.' So clearly is it made manifest by these actions, and by the description of their nature and end, that the animal bore the punishment of the offender, and that by this appointment he was reconciled to God, and obtained the forgiveness of his offenses.

8. "An equally strong proof that the life of the animal sacrifice was accepted in the place of the life of man is afforded by the fact that atonement was required by the law to be made, by sin offerings and burnt offerings, for even bodily distempers and disorders. It is not necessary to the argument to explain the distinctions between these various oblations, nor yet to inquire into the reason for requiring propitiation to be made for

corporal infirmities, which in many cases could not be avoided. They were, however, thus connected with sin as the cause of all these disorders; and God, who had placed his residence among the Israelites, insisted upon a perfect ceremonial purity, to impress upon them a sense of his moral purity, and the necessity of purification of mind. Whether these were the reasons, or some others not at all discoverable by us, as such unclean persons were liable to death, and were exempted from it only by animal sacrifices. 'This appears from the conclusion to all the Levitical directions concerning the ceremonial to be observed in all such cases: 'Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness; that they die not in,' or by, 'their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle which is among them' (Leviticus 15:31). So that, by virtue of the sin offerings, the children of Israel were saved from a death which otherwise they would have suffered from their uncleanness, and that by substituting the life of the animal for the life of the offerer. Nor can it be urged that death is in these instances threatened only as the punishment of not observing these laws of purification; for the reason given in the passage just quoted shows that the threatening of death was not hypothetical upon their not bringing the prescribed purification, but is grounded upon the fact of 'defiling the tabernacle of the Lord which was among them,' which is supposed to be done by all uncleanness, as such, in the first instance.

9. "As a further proof of the vicarious character of the principal sacrifices of the Mosaic economy we may instance those statedly offered for the whole congregation. Every day were offered two lambs, one in the morning and the other in the evening, 'for a continual burnt offering.' To these daily victims were to be added weekly two other lambs for the burnt offering of every Sabbath. None of these could be considered in the light of fines for offenses. since they were offered for no particular person, and must be considered therefore, unless resolved into an unmeaning ceremony, pecular and vicarious. To pass over, however, the monthly sacrifices, and those offered at the great feasts, it is sufficient to fix upon those, so often alluded to in the Epistle to the Hebrews, offered on the solemn anniversary of expiation. On that day, to other prescribed sacrifices, were to be added another ram for a burnt offering, and another goat, the most eminent of the sacrifices for a sin offering, whose blood was to be carried by the high-priest into the inner sanctuary, which emas not done by the blood of any other victim, except the bullock, which was offered time same day as a sin offering for the family of Aaron. The circumstances of

this ceremony, whereby atonement was to be made 'for all the sins' of thee whole Jewish people, are so strikingly significant that they deserve a particular detail. On the day appointed for this general expiation the priest is commanded to offer a bullock and a goat as sin offerings, the one for himself and the other for the people; and, having sprinkled the blood of these in due form before the mercy seat, to lead forth a second goat, denominated 'the scapegoat;' and, after laying both his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the people, to put them upon the head of the goats and to send the animal, thus bearing the sins of the people, away into the wilderness; in this manner expressing, by an action which cannot be misunderstood, that the atonement, which, it is affirmed, was to be effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering, consisted in removing from the people their iniquities by this translation of them to the animal. For it is to be remarked that the ceremony of the scape-goat is not a distinct one: it is a continuation of the process, and is evidently the concluding part and symbolical consummation of the sin offering; so that the transfer of the iniquities of the people upon the head of the scapegoat, and the bearing them away into the wilderness, manifestly imply that the atonement effected by the sacrifice of the sin offering consisted in the transfer and consequent removal of those iniquities.

10. "How, then, is this impressive and singular ceremonial to be explained? Shall we resort to the notion of mulcts and fines? If so, then this and other stated sacrifices must be considered in the light of penal enactments. But this cannot aggree with the appointment of such sacrifices annually in succeeding generations: 'This shall be a statute forever unto you.' The law appoints a certain day in the year for expiating the sins both of the high-priest himself and of the whole congregation, and that for all high-priests and all generations of the congregation. Now, could a law be enacted inflicting a certain penalty, at a certain time, upon a whole people, as well as upon their high-priest, thus presuming upon their actual transgression of it? The sacrifice was also for sins in general; and yet the penalty, if it were one, is not greater than individual persons were often obliged to undergo for single trespasses. Nothing, certainly, can be maore absurd than this hypothesis. Shall we account for it by saying that sacrifices were offered for thee benefit of the worshipper, but exclude the notion of expiation? But here we are obliged to confine the benefit to reconciliation and the taking away of sins, and that by the appointed means of the shedding of blood, and the presentation of blood in the holy place, accompanied by the

expressive ceremony of imposition of hands upon the head of the victim; the import of which act is fixed, beyond all controversy, by the priests confessingr over that victim the sins of all the people, and at the same time imprecating upon its head the vengeance due to them (⁰³¹⁶²Leviticus 16:21). Shall we content ourselves with merely saying that this was a symbol? But the question remains, Of what was it the symbol? To determine this, let the several parts of the symbolic action be enumerated. Here is confession of sin; confession before God at the door, of the tabernacle; the substitution of a victim; the figurative transfer of sins to that victim; the shedding of blood, which God appointed to make atonemument for the soul; the carrying the blood into the holiest place, the very permission of which clearly marked the divine acceptance; the bearing away of iniquity; and the actual reconciliation of the people to God. If, then, this is symbolical, it has nothing very correspondent with it; it never had or can have anything correspondent to it but the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, and the communication of the benefits of his passion in the forgiveness of sins to those that believe in him, and ir. their reconciliation emwith God. Shall we, finally, say that those sacrifices had respect, not to God, to obtain pardon by expiation, but to the offerer, teaching him moral lessons, and calling forth moral dispositions? We answer that this hypothesis leaves many of the essential circumstances of the ceremonial wholly unaccounted for. The tabernacle and temple were erected for the residence of God by his own command. There it was his will to be approached, and to these sacred places the victims were required to be brought. Anywhere else they might as well have been offered, if they had had respect only to the offerer; but they were required to be brought to God, to be offered according to a prescribed ritual, and by an order of men appointed for that purpose. Now truly there is no reason why they should be offered in the sanctuary rather than in any other place, except that they were offered to the Inhabitant of the sanctuary; nor could they be offered in his presence without having respect to him. There were some victims whose blood, on the day of atonement, was to be carried into the inner sanctuary; but for what purpose can we suppose the blood to have been carried into the most secret place of the divine residence, except to obtain the favor of him in whose presence it was sprinkled? To this we may add that the reason given for these sacred services is not in any case a mere moral effect to be prcduced upon the minds of the worshippers: they were 'to make atonement,' that is, to avert God's displeasure, that the people might not 'die.'

11. "We may find, also, another more explicit illustration in the sacrifice of the passover. The sacrificial character of this offering is strongly marked; for it was an offering brought to the tabernacle; it was slain in the sanctuary, and the blood was sprinkled upon the altar by the priests. It derives its name from thee passing over and sparing of the houses of the Israelites, on the door-posts of which the blood of the immolated lamb was sprinkled, when the first-born in the houses of the Egyptians were slain; and thus we have another instance of life being spared by time instituted means of animal sacrifice., Nor need we confine ourselves to particular instances. 'Almost all things,' says an apostle, who surely knew his subject, 'are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission.' Thus, by their very law, and by constant usage, were the Jews familiarized to the notion of expiatory sacrifice, as well as by the history contained in their sacred books, especially in Genesis, which speaks of the vicarious sacrifices offered by the patriarchs; and in the book of Job, in which that patriarch is said to have offered sacrifices for the supposed sins of his sons; and where Eliphaz is commanded, by a divine oracle, to offer a burnt-offering for himself and his friends, 'lest God should deal with themafter their folly.'

12. "On the sentiments of the uninspired Jewish writers on this point, the substitution of the life of the animal for that of the offerer, and, consequently, the expiatory nature of their sacrifices, Outram has given many quotations from their writings, which the reader may consult in his work on sacrifices. Two or three only may be adduced by way of specimen. R. Levi ben-Gerson says, 'The imposition of the hands of the offerers was designed to indicate that their sins were removed from themselves and transferred to the animal.' Isaac ben-Arama: 'He transfers his sins from himself, and lays them upon the head of the victim.' R. Moses ben-Nachiacan says, with respect to a sinner offering a victim, 'It was just that his blood should be shed, and that his body should be burned; but the Creator, of his mercy, accepted the victim from him as his substitute and ransom, that the blood of the animal might be shed instead of his blood-that is, that the blood of the animal might be given for his life.'

13. "Full of these ideas of vicarious expiation, then, the apostles wrote and spoke, and the Jews of their time heard and read, the books of the New Testament. The Socinian pretense is, that the inspired penmen used the sacrificial terms which occur in their writings figuratively; but we not only reply, as before, that they could not do this honestly unless they had given

notice of this new application of the established terms of the Jewish theology; but, if this be assumed, it leaves us wholly at a loss to discover what that really was which they intended to teach by these sacrificial terms and allusions. They are themselves utterly silent as to this point; and the varying theories of those who reject the doctrine of atonement, in fact, confess that their writings afford no solution of the difficulty. If, therefore, it is blasphemous to suppose, on the one hand, that inspired men should write on purpose to mislead, so, on the other, it is utterly inconceivable that, had they only been ordinary writers, they should construct a figurative language out of terms which had a definite and established sense, without giving any intimation at all that they employed them otherwise than in their received meaning, or telling us why they adopted them at all, and more especially when they knew that they must be interpreted, both by Jews and Greeks, in a sense which, if the Socinians are right, was in direct opposition to that which they in tended to convey."

Some modern writers deny the expiatory character of the Jewish sacrifices. So Bushnell *(Vicarious Sacrifice,* page 425) asserts that no such thing as expiation is contained or supposed to be wrought out in the Scripture sacrifices. On this see *British Quarterly,* October 1866, reprinted in the *Theol. Eclectic* (New Haven), 4:397; and also an article on the *Expiatory Nature of the Atonenzent (Brit. Quarterly,* October 1867; also in the *Theol. Eclectic,* 5:201 sq.). *SEE ATONEMENT*; *SEE REDEMPTION*; *SEE SACRIFICE*.

Exposition

"the opening up and interpreting larger portions of Scripture in public discourses. In Scotland, where the practice has long obtained, and still extensively prevails, it is called *lecturing.* While the striking and insulated texts of Scripture, which furnish abundant matter for sermons, are calculated, when judiciously treated, to rouse and fix attention; and the discourses founded on them may be more useful to general hearers, especially the careless and unconverted, expository discourses furnish peculiar advantages as it regards the enlargement of the Christian's views of divine truth, and his consequent advancement in the ways of God. By judiciously expounding the Scriptures, a minister may hope to give a clearer exhibition of the great principles of religion in their mutual connections and diversified bearings than could otherwise be done. He will have a better opportunity of unfolding the true meaning of those parts of

the Bible which are difficult of bringing a vast variety of topics before his hearers, which may be of the utmost importance to them, but which he could not so conveniently have treated in preaching from detached texts of exhibiting the doctrines and duties of Christianity in their relative positions of successfully counteracting and arresting the progress of dangerous errors, and of storing the minds of his people with correct and influential views of divine things. (See *Doddridge on Preaching.)* Such a mode of public instruction cannot but prove of great use to a minister's own mind, by rousing his energies, habituating him to close and accurate research, and saving him much of that indecision in the choice of texts which is so much lamented" (Buck, *Theolog. Dictionary*, s.v.). Dr. James W. Alexander was very earnest in advising expository preaching. "It is the most obvious and natural way of conveying to the hearers the import of the sacred volume. It is the very work (to interpret the Scriptures) for which the ministry was instituted." He advises exposition of whole chapters or books in course, pleading for it not only the sanction of ancient usage, but also certain great advantages of the method both to the preacher and his hearers *(Thoughts on Preaching,* N.Y. 1867, 12mo, page 272 sq.). *SEE HOMILETICS*.

Expositions of Scripture

SEE COMMENTARY.

Exsuperius

bishop of Toulouse in the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, celebrated for the exercise of remarkable charity during a great famine. After having given away all his own property, he sold the sacred vessels of gold and silver to help the poor. Jerome compared him to the widow of Sarepta, and dedicated to him his *Commentary on Zechariah.* Pope Innocent addressed a decretal to him. He died about A.D. 417. See *Acta Sanctorum,* Sept. 28; Tillemont, *Memoires,* 10:617, 825; A. Butler, *Lives of Saints*, September 28.

Extempore Preaching

SEE HOMILETICS.

Extravagants

(Extravagantes), a name given to decretal epistles of the popes issued after Gratian's *Decretum,* and not contained in that work (*SEE CANON LAW*,).

They were therefore called *extra decretunm vagantes,* or, briefly, *extravagantes;* and this name was still given to them after their insertion in the body of the canon law. For an account of the different collections *of extravagantes, SEE CANON, LAW.*

Extreme Unction

one of the sacraments (the 5th) of the Roman Church, administered to sick persons *in extremis,* by anointing them with oil when death appears near. It dates from the 11th century, though the Roman Church, of course, seeks to trace it back to the apostolic age.

I. *Origin of the Practice.* — The Church of Rome appeals (see below) to Mark 6:13, and James 5:14-16, as Scripture authority for extreme unction. In Mark we are told that the apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." Clearly there is no trace of the "sacrament" here. The Council of Trent, in Citing this passage, shrewdly says that it is "intimated" only in Mark, because, according to Rome, the apostles were not "priests" until the Last Supper. If, then, the passage in Mark teaches the *institution* of the sacrament, it would follow that others beside priests could administer it. Cardinal Cajetan, as cited by Catharinus, rejects this text as inapplicable to this sacrament; and Suarez (in part 3, disp. 39, § I, n. 5) says that "when the apostles are said to anoint the sick and heal them (Mark 6:13), this was not said in reference to the sacrament of unction, because their cures had not of themselves an immediate respect to the soul." As to the passage in James, it speaks of an anointing for "healing" by all the elders of the Church, who might or might not be laymen; it was "the prayer of faith that was to save the sick" (see, for a thorough discussion of this passage, Elliott, *Delinzeation of Romanism,* book 2, chapter 14).

II. *The Ancient Greek Church.* — The ancient writers of the Greek Church use the passage of James only for exegetical, not for dogmatical purposes. Origen, in the second homily on Leviticus 4, quotes the words of James when he speaks of the different ways which are given to the Christian for the remission of their sins. As the seventh way he mentions severe penance, in which he finds a compliance with the words of James: "If any be sick, let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them lay their hands on him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord," etc. The connection shows that Origen applies the words to mental and physical sickness, and the laying on of hands, which he adds to the apostolic words,

points to a local use of anointment in Alexandria at the reconciliation of the *lapsi.* Chrysostom *(On the Priesthood,* 2:196) quotes the words of James *only* as an argument that the priests have the power of remitting sins. John of Damascus, in speaking of the mysteries of the church, treats only of baptism and the Lord's Supper. The first certain testimony for the use of the anointment of the sick in the Greek Church is given by a Western writer about 798, Theodulf of Orleans.

III. *The Ancient Latin Church.* — In the Western Church, Irenaeus (1, 21, 5) states that the Gnostics, and in particular the Heracleonites, poured upon dying members a mixture of water and oil, amidst an invocation of prayer, in order that their souls might become invisible and inaccessible to the hostile powers of the spiritual world. It is uncritical in the highest degree for Roman Catholic writers to infer from the existence of a Gnostic rite the existence of a similar rite in the orthodox Church. Tertullian and Cyprian, to whom we are indebted for so full information of the ecclesiastical usages of the Western Church, know nothing of extreme unction as a sacrament. This silence can not be explained by a reference to the *disciplina arcani,* as the latter exclusively embraced baptism and the Lord's Supper, and as even these topics, notwithstanding the *disciplina arcani,* are frequently and fully discussed by the ecclesiastical writers. Many of the latter mention the frequent use of oil as a peculiar charisma for miraculous cures. Thus it is related by Tertullian that *the pagan* Severus, father of the emperor Antoninus, was cured by the Christian Proclus by means of anointment. This certainly can have no reference to a sacrament for the use of *Christians.* (Many other examples of this use of oil may be found in Chemnitz, and in Binterim, *Denkwurdigkeiten,* volume 6, part 3, page 289.) Superstition developed this usage; and it occurred, according to the testimony of Chrysostom, that the lamps burning in the churches were plundered for the purpose of using the oil as a preservative against possible, and, as a miraculous remedy, against actual diseases. It is easy to comprehend how this medicinal and miraculous anointment could become the basis and the origin of a sacrament (see on this point Marheineke, *Symbolik,* 1:3, page 258). The transition is visible in an epistle from the Roman bishop Innocent I to bishop Decentius, of Eugubium, written in 416. Innocent calls 'the anointment of the sick a "kind of sacrament" (genus sacramenti); and while he reserves to the bishops the right of preparing the sacred oil, he states that both priests *and laymen* may apply the oil (quod ab episcopo confectum non solum sacerdotibus sed omnibus uti Christianis

licet in sua aut in suorum necessitate unguendum), which is entirely at variance with the present teaching of the Church of Rome, according to which the sacrament can be administered only by priests. From the beginning of the ninth century the anointment of the sick is frequently mentioned in the acts of the Councils. Theodulf of Orleans (798), and the first Council of Mentz (847), place it by the side of penance and the Eucharist, but preceding the two latter. The recovery of the sick is always regarded as the chief object. Its use appears to have been considered necessary only for sinners; for abbot Adelhard, of Corbie, was asked by the monks of the monastery whether he desired to be anointed with the sacred oil, as they were certain that he was free from sins. The conception of the anointment of the sick as an act of penance caused a discussion of the question whether it could be repeated. Ivo of Chartres, and Godfrey, abbot of Vendome (about 2100), denied that the rite could be administered more than once, comparing it with the public penance; and it was a popular belief that a person recovering from sickness after receiving the anointment must not touch the ground with bare feet, and abstain from marital intercourse and the eating of meat. It was in the course of the 12th century that the names *sacramentum exeuntium* and *extrema unctio* came first into use.

IV. *Extreme Unction as a Sacrament in the Church of Rome.* — A full dogmatical treatment of the anointment of the sick, according to the teaching gradually developed in the Church, was first given by Hugo of St. Victor *(De Sacram.fidei lib.* 2, page 15). Peter Lombardus assigned to it, in the series of the seven sacraments which he is the first to mention, the fifth place *(Sentent.* lib. iv, dict. 23). The scholastics, and, in particular, Thomas Aquinas, completed the scientific development of this doctrine, and the shape given to it by Thomas received the sanction of the Councils of Florence and of Trent.

The canons of Trent on this subject are:

"**Canon 1.** If any shall say that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and declared by the blessed apostle James, but only a rite received from the fathers, or a human invention, let him be accursed.

Can. 2. If any shall say that the holy anointing of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor relieve the sick, but that it has ceased, as if it were formerly only the grace of healing, let him be accursed.

Can. 3. If any shall say that the rite and usage of extreme unction, which the holy Roman Church observes, is contrary to the sentence of the blessed apostle James, and therefore should be changed, and may be despised by Christians without sin, let him be accursed.

Can. 4. If any shall say that the presbyters of the Church, whom St. James directs to be called for the anointing of the sick, are not priests ordained by the bishops, but elders in age in any community, and that therefore the priest is not the only proper minister of extreme unction, let him be accursed" *(Concil. Trident. sess.* 14, c. 1 sq.). The authority for this sacrament is stated by the Council (same session, c. 1) as follows: "This sacred unction of the sick was instituted as a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament by Christ Jesus our Lord, being first intimated by Mark (6:13), and afterwards recommended and published to the faithful by James the apostle, brother of our Lord. 'Is any man,' saith he, ‘sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him' (James 5:14, 15). In which words, as the Church has learned by apostolical tradition, handed down from age to age, he teaches the matter, form, proper minister, and effect of this salutary sacrament. For the Church understands the matter of the sacrament to be the oil, blessed by the bishop; the unction most fitly representing the grace of the Holy Spirit, wherewith the soul of the sick man is invisibly anointed. The form is contained in the words of administration."

The ceremony must be performed by a priest. The oil must be olive oil consecrated by a bishop. "No other sort of oil can be the matter of this sacrament; and this its matter is most significant of its efficacy. Oil is very efficacious in soothing bodily pain, and this sacrament soothes and alleviates the pain and anguish of the soul. Oil also contributes to restore health and spirits, serves to give light, and refreshes fatigue; and these effects correspond with and are expressive of those produced, through the divine power, on the sick by the administration of this sacrament" *(Catechism of Trent*, Baltimore, 8vo, page 206). The form of the ceremony is as follows: The priest, having dipped the thumb of his right hand in the holy oil, proceeds to mark the organs of the five senses of the patient with the sign of the cross; and after each, application he wipes the part with a ball of cotton, for which purpose he brings with him seven balls already prepared. The order observed is this: the right eye is first anointed, then the

left eye, the ears, and after them the nostrils (not the tip of the nose) are attended to in the same order, then the lips; after which the palms of the hands and soles of the feet receive the touch of the consecrated unguent. Men are also anointed in the reins, but this is dispensed with in the case of women. At each application the priest says, *"Per hanc sacram unctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam indulgeat tibi Deus quicquid peccasti, per visum,"* or "*auditum*," *"olfactum," "gustum," "et tactum,"* as the case may be "May God, by this holy anointing, and by his most pious mercy, pardon you the sins that you have committed by the eyes," "ears," "nose," "taste," and "touch." "The anointing being ended, the priest rubs those of his fingers which have touched the oil with small pieces of bread, and then washes his hands. The crumbs of bread and the water are next thrown into the fire; and the pieces of cotton employed in the ceremony are carried into thes church and burned, the ashes of which must be thrown into the sacrarium." As to the *parsons* to whom extreme unction is to be administered, the Catechism (1.c.) limits it "to those whose malady is such as to excite apprehensions of approaching dissolution. It is, however, a very grievous sin to defer the holy unction until, all hope of recovery now lost, life begins to ebb, and the sick person is fast verging into insensibility." ... "Extreme unction, then, can be administered only to the sick, and not to persons in health, although engaged in anything however dangerous, such as a perilous voyage, or the fatal dangers of battle. It cannot be administered even to persons condemned to death, and already ordered for execution. Its participation is also denied to insane persons, and to children incapable of committing sin, who, therefore, do not require to be purified from its stains, and also to those who labor under the amful visitation of madness, unless they give indications in their lucid intervals of a disposition to piety, and express a desire to be anointed. To persons insane from their birth this sacrament is not to be administered; but if a sick person, while in the possession of his faculties, expressed a wish to receive extreme unction, and afterwards becomes delirious, he is to be anointed." ... "The pastor will follow the uniform practice of the Catholic Church, and not administer extreme unction until the penitent has confessed and received the Eucharist."

The effect of extrenme unction is stated by the Council of Trent (sess. 14, chapter 2) as follows: "The power and effect of this sacrament are explained in the words and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.

For this power is the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose unction cleanses away sins, if any remain to be expiated, even the last traces of sin and relieves and confirms the soul of the sick man, exciting in him strong confidence of the divine mercy; by which strengthened, he bears far better the inconveniences and pains of his disorder; resists more easily the temptations of the devil, who does, as it were, lie in wait at his heels; and sometimes obtains the restoration of his bodily health, if the same shall further the salvation of his soul."

V. *The Greek Church.* — The Greek Church uses anointing with oil *SEE EUCHELAION* as one of its "mysteries," but does not limit it to cases of supposed mortal illness. She counts it as the seventh of the sacraments, and regards it as instituted by Christ (<41063>Mark 6:13), and introduced into practice by the Church (<591514>James 5:14). The oil may be consecrated by common priests, and is consecrated for every particular case. The anointment is generally performed by seven priests, but it may validly be performed by one. Those who are well enough go to church for the purpose of being anointed, after previously receiving absolution and the Eucharist. On the Thursday of the Passion Week in particular, many sufferers go to church for that purpose. The aim of the rite is to aid the recovery of the sick person, as is seen from the form of prayer used in applying the oil: "O holy Father, the physician of our souls and bodies, who didst send thy only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, to heal all diseases, and to deliver us from death, heal this thy servant M. from the bodily infirmity under which he now labors, and raise him up by the grace of Christ" (Perceval, *Roman Schism;* King, *Greek Church).* In the *Confession* of Metrophanes Critopulos (ed. by Kimmel, Jena, 1850), page 152, it is farther stated that, as many bodily diseases depend on sin, it is proper (δῆλον) that prayer should be offered at the same time for the remission of the sin for which the disease is a penalty. He adds that this *Euchelaion* is not extreme unction (οὐκ ἐσχάτη χρίσις). It canm be administered whenever a person is ill, and hence to the same person many times. For a description of this ceremony as perfoamead in the Greek Church, see Schmidt, *Darstellung dergriechisch-russischen Kirche* (Mentz, 1826, page 220 sq.).

VI. *Extreme Unction and Protestantism.* — As the ancient Waldenses recognized the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, there is no doubt that they also accepted extreme unction. Wycliffe doubted many

points of the doctrine of the Church of Ronme concerning extreme unction, but was willing to regard it as a sacrament for the physical cure of the sick, provided the priests could obtain this effect by their prayer. Luther had no objection to the anointing of the sick if the priests prayed with them and exhorted them, but hue denied the anointment to be a sacrament. Like Luther, all the other Protestant Churches reject extreme unction altogether. The 25th article of the Church of England puts it among the five so-called sacraments of Rome which "are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel." Bishop Forbes (who represents the Romanizing tendency in the Church of England) calls "the unction of the sick the lost pleiad of the Anglican firmament," and recommends its restoration *(On* 39 *Articles,* Art. 25 *ad fin.).* Among the High Church Lutherans there are also some who urge the introduction of the anointing of the sick. On the general subject, see, besides the authors already cited, Siegel, *christl.-kirchl. Alterthumer,* 4:119 sq.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery,* chapter 9; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* book 7, chapter 2; Burnet, On 39 *Articles* (Art. 25); Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* 10:551; and the article *SEE SACRAMENTS*.

Eyck, Hubert Van

SEE PAINTING.

Eye

(ˆyfi a'yin, from the idea of *flowing* [see below]; ὀφθαλμός). In most languages this important organ is used by figurative application, as the symbol of a large number of objects and ideas. In the East such applications of the word "eye" have always been uncommonly numerous, and they were so among the Hebrews. It may be serviceable to distinguish the following uses of the word, few of which are common among us except so far as they have become so through the translation of the Bible. (See Gesenius, *Hebrews* Lex.; Wemyss's *Symbol. Dict.)*

(1.) *A fountain.* This use of the word has already been indicated. *SEE AIN*. It probably originated from the eye being regarded as the fountain of tears.

(2.) *Color,* as in the phrase "and the eye (color) of the manna was as the eve (color) of ladellium" (Numbers 11:7). This originated, pearhaps, in the eye being the part of the body which exhibits different colors in different persons.

(3.) *The surface*, as "the surface (eye) of the land" (<021005>Exodus 10:5, 15; <042205>Numbers 22:5, 11): the last is the passage which affords most sanction to the notion that ˆyI[means in some places "face." This is the sense which our own and other versions give to "eye to eye" (<041414>Numbers 14:14, etc.), translated "face to face." The phrases are indeed equivalent in meaning; but we are not thence to conclude that the Hebrews meant "face" when they said "eye," but that they chose the opposition of the eyes, instead of that of the faces, to express the general meaning. Hence, therefore, we may object to the extension of the signification in such passages as <091612>1 Samuel 16:12, where "beautiful eyes" (hp,y] µyniy[e) is rendered "fair countenance."

(4.) It is also alleged that a between (or about) the eyes means the forehead, in <021309>Exodus 13:9, 16, and the forepart of the head, in <050608>Deuteronomy 6:8; but the passages are sufficiently intelligible if understood to denote what they literally express; and with reference to the last it may be remarked that there is hair about the eves as well as on the head, the removal of which might well be' interdicted as an act of lamentation.

(5.) In <220409>Song of Solomon 4:9 “eye" seems to be used poetically for “look," as is usual in most languages: "thou hast stolen my heart with one of thy looks" (eyes).

(6.) In <202331>Proverbs 23:31, the term "eye" is applied to the beads or bubbles af wine, when poured out, but our version preserves the sense of "color."

(7.) To these some other phrases, requiring notice and explanation, may be added:

"Before the eyes" of any one, meaning in his presence, or, as we should say, "before his face" (<012311>Genesis 23:11, 18; <020430>Exodus 4:30).

"In the eyes" of any one means what appears to be so or so in his individual judgment or opinion, and is equivalent to "seeming" or "appearing" (<011908>Genesis 19:8; 29:20; <091203>1 Samuel 12:3).

"To set the eyes" upon any one is usually to regard him with favor (<014421>Genesis 44:21; <182423>Job 24:23; <243912>Jeremiah 39:12); but it occurs in a bad sense, as of looking with anger, in <300908>Amos 9:8. But angels more usually expressed by the contrary action of turning the eyes away.

As many of the passions, such as envy, pride, pity, desire, are expressed by the eye, so, in the scriptural style, they are often ascribed to that organ. Hence such phrases as "evil eye" (<40:20:15>Matthew 20:15), "bountiful eye" (<20:22:9>Proverbs 22:9), "haughty eyes" (<20:6:17>Proverbs 6:17), "wanton eyes" (<23:3:16>Isaiah 3:16), "eyes full of adultery" (<61:2:14>2 Peter 2:14), "the lust of the eves" (<62:2:16>1 John 2:16). This last phrase is applied by some to lasciviousness, by others to covetousness; but it is best to take the expression in the most extensive sense, as denoting a craving for the gay vanities of this life (comp. <26:24:25>Ezekiel 24:25). In the same chapter of Ezekiel (verse 16), "the desire of they eyes" is put not for the prophet's wife directly, as often understood, but for whatever is one's greatest solace and delight, which in this case was the prophet's wife, but which in another case might have been something else.

Whether the Hebrews attached the same ideas to the expression "evil eye" (<20:23:6>Proverbs 23:6; 28:22) as is done by the Orientals at the present day is not easy to ascertain. It has been obseraed by Mr. Lane, and also by Mrs. Poole, that "nothing distresses an Egyptian parent more than that which in other countries is considered to convey a compliment — admiration of the child. If any one is seen to stare at so as to envy the offspring, the mother hastily snatches it away, to perform some superstitious rite, as a charm against the supposed evil eye." And Mr. Roberts says, among the Hindoos, the *kan-nuru*, "evil eye," of some people is believed to have a most baneful effect upon whatsoever it shall be fixed. Those who are reputed to have such eyes are always avoided, and none but near relations will invite them to a feast.

In <38:04:10>Zechariah 4:10, the angels of the Lord are called "his eyes," as being the executioners of his judgments, and watching and attending for his glory. From some such association of ideas, the favorite ministers of state in the Persian monarchy were called "the king's eyes." So, in <04:10:31>Numbers 10:31, "to be instead of eyes" is equivalent to being a prince, to rule and guide the people. This occurs also in the Greek poets, as in Pindar *(Olymp.* 2:10), where "the eye of Sicilia" is given as a title to one of the chief men in Sicily, showing his power. In like manner, in the same poet, "the eye of the army" stands for a good commander *(Olymp.* 6:16).

To keep anything as the apple or pupil of the eye is to preserve it with particular care (<05:32:10>Deuteronomy 32:10; <38:02:8>Zechariah 2:8).

Eye-service is peculiar to slaves, who are governed by fear only, and is to be carefully guarded against by Christians, who ought to serve from a principle of duty and affection (<4006>Ephesians 6:6; <5022>Colossians 3:22).

The expression in <1912>Psalm 123:2; "As the eyes of servants look unto the hand's of their masters," has suggested a number of curious illustrations from Oriental history and customs, tending to show that masters, especially when in the presence of others, are in the habit of communicating to their servants' orders and intimations by certain motions of their hands, which, although scarcely noticeable by other persons present, are clearly understood and promptly acted upon by the attendants. This custom keeps them with their attention bent upon the hand of their master watching its slightest motions. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustra.* on <2063>Proverbs 6:13.)

The celebrated passage "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's aye, and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye" (<4003>Matthew 7:3), has occasioned much waste of explanation. It seems mecuch better to understand it as a hyperbolical proverbial expression, than to contend that as δοκός cannot literally mean "a beam," it must here signify something else, a disease, a thorn, etc. (see Doddridge and Campbell, in loc.). As a proverbial plurase, parallels have been produced abundantly from the Rabbins, from the fathers, and from the classics. *SEE BLIND*.

Blinding The Eyes

Picture for Blinding the Eyes

as a punishment or political disqualification was a heathen cruelty sometimes referred to in the Scriptures and is found exhibited on the Assyrian monuments. The custom of putting out the eyes of captives especially was very common in the East (<0902>1 Samuel 11:2). Thus Samson was deprived of sight by the Philistines (<0702>Judges 16:21), and Zedekiah by the Chaldees (<1207>2 Kings 25:7). In 1820 Rae Wilson saw a number of individuals at Acre who were disfigured in various ways, by a hand amputated, an eye torn out, or a nose which had been split, or partly or totally cut off. In 1826 two emirs had their eyes *burnt out*, and their tongues in part cut off, by the prince of Mount Lebanon, on account of their having been concerned in some disturbances against his government. In some cases the Orientals deprive the criminal of the light of day by

sealing up his eyes with some kind of adhesive plaster (Isaiah 44:10). *SEE PUNISHMENT.*

"Painting The Eyes,"

Picture for Painting the Eyes 1

or rather the eyelids, is more than once alluded to in Scripture, although this scarcely appears in the Authorized Version, as our translators, unaware of the custone, usually render "eye" by "face," although eye is still preserved in the margin. So Jezebel "painted her eyes," literally "put her eyes in paint," before she showed herself publicly (2 Kings 9:30). This action is forcibly expressed by Jeremiah (Jeremiah 4:30), "Though thou rentest thine eyes with painting." Ezekiel (Ezekiel 23:40) also represents this as a part of high dress: "For whom thou didst wash thyself, *paintedst thy eyes,* and deckedst thyself with ornaments." The custom is also, very possibly, alluded to in Proverbs 6:25: "Lust not after her beauty in thine heart, neither let her take thee *with her eyelids."* It certainly is the impression in Western Asia that this embellishment adds much to the languishing expression and seducement of the eyes, although Europeans find some difficulty in appreciating the beauty which the Orientals find in this adornment. (See Hartmann's *Hebraerim,* 2:149 sq.)

Picture for Painting the Eyes 2

The following description of the process is from Lane's *Modern Egyptians* (1:41-43): "The eyes, with very few exceptions, are black, large, and of a long almond form, with long and beautiful lashes, and an exquisitely soft, bewitching expression: eyes more beautiful can hardly be conceived: their charming effect is much heightened by the concealment of the other features (however pleasing the latter may be), and is rendered still more striking by a practice universal among the females of the higher and middle classes, and very common among those of the lower orders, which is that of blackening the edge of the eyelids, both above and below the eyes, with a black powder called *kohl.* This is a collyrium, commonly composed of the smoke-black which is produced by burning a kind of *libam* — an aromatic resin — a species of frankincense, used, I am told, in preference to the better kind of frankincense, as being cheaper and equally good for the purpose. Kohl is also prepared of the smokeblack produced from burning the shells of almonds. These two kinds, though believed to be beneficial to the eyes, are used merely for ornament; but there are several kinds used for

their real or supposed medical properties, particularly the powder of several kinds of lead ore, to which are often added sarcocolla, long pepper, sugar-candy, fine dust of a Venetian sequin, and sometimes powdered pearls. Antimony, it is said, was formerly used for painting the edges of the eyelids. The kohl is applied with a small probe of wood, ivory, or silver, tapering towards the end, bit blunt: this is moistened, sometimes with rose-water, then dipped in the powder and drawn along the edges of the eyelids: it is called *mirwed;* and the glass vessel in which the kohl is kept, *mulholah.* The custom of thus ornamenting the eyes prevailed among both sexes in Egypt in very ancient times: this is shown by the sculptures and paintings in the temples and tombs of this country; and kohl-vessels, with the probes, and even with the remains of the black powder, have often been found in the ancient tombs. I have two in my possession. But, in many cases, the ancient mode of ornamenting with the kohl was a little different from the modern. I have, however, seen this ancient mode practiced in the present day in the neighborhood of Cairo, though I only remember to have noticed it in two instances. The same custom existed among the Greek ladies, and among the Jewish women in early times."

Sir J.G.Wilkinson alludes to this passage in Mr. Lane's book, and admits that the lengthened form of the ancient Egyptian eye, represented in the paintings, was'probably produced by this means. "Such," he adds, "is the effect described by Juvenal *(Sat.* 2:93), Pliny *(Ep.* 6:2), and other writers who notice the custom among the Romans. At Rome it was considered disgraceful for men to adopt it, as at present in [most parts of] the East, except medicinally; but, if we may judge from the similarity of the eyes of men and women in the paintings at Thebes, it appears to have been used by both sexes among the ancient Egyptians. Many of the kohl-bottles have been found in the tombs, together with the bodkin used for applying the moistened powder. They are of various materials, usually of stone, wood, or pottery; sometimes composed of two, sometimes of three or four separate cells, apparently containing each a mixture, differing slightly in its quality and hue from the other three. Many were simple round tubes, vases, or small boxes; some were ornamented with the figure of an ape or monster, supposed to assist in holding the bottle between his arms, while the lady dipped into it the pin with which she painted her eyes; and others were in imitation of a column made of stone, or rich porcelain of the choicest manufacture" *(Ancient Egyptians,* 3:382). *SEE PAINT.*

Eylert, Ruhlemann Friedrich

was born at Hamm, in Prussian Westphalia, April 5, 1770. He studied theology at Halle, where he imbibed the moderate Rationalism of Niemeyer. In 1794 he became a preacher in his native city, in 1806 court preacher at Potsdam, and after the death of Sack in 1817 he became superintendent, being at the same time appointed minister of public instruction. In his later years his theology assumed a positively orthodox character. He died February 3, 1852. While at court he was the friend and counsellor of king Frederick William III, over whom he exerted a great influence, especially in the matter of the Union and the Liturgy. *SEE PRUSSIA, CHURCH OF*. He was a prolific writer. The most important of his works are, *Betrachtungen u. d. trostvollen Wahrheiten des Christenthums,* etc. (1804; 4th ed. 1834): — *Homiliens u. d. Parabeln Jesu* (1806; 2d ed. 1819): — *Predigten u. Bedurfuisse unsers Herzens* (1803): — *Karakterzuge Friedrich Wilhelm's III* (1846-47). See *Neeuer Nekrolog d. Deutschen* (1852). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:295.

Eymeric, Nicolas

a Spanish inquisitor, was born about 1320 at Gerona. He entered the Dominican order in 1334, and was made inquisitor general of Aragon in 1336. His zeal was too great even for his superiors, and he was removed from his office for a time, but after some years he returned to it. He was umoted especially for his fierce pursuit of the partisans of Raymond Lull (q.v.). His *Directoriun Inquisitorum* has been often reprinted (Rome, 1578, 1589, 1597, fol.; Venice, 1591, 1607). He died January 4, 1399. — Quetif et Echard, *Script. Ord. Praed.* 1:716; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 16:867. *SEE INQUISITION*.

Eyre, John

a minister of the Church of England, was born at Bodmin, Cornwall, January, 1754. He had a good elementary education, and at fifteen was bound apprentice to a clothier. Before the termination of his apprenticeship he embraced a religious life, and on returning to his father's house he commenced holding public religious meetings. His father was offended at this, and drove him from his house. He was soon after admitted into lady Huntingdon's College at Trevecca, and in 1778 he was appointed minister to her chapel at Mulberry Gardens, London. In the same year he entered Emmanuel College, Oxford, and in December, 1779, he was made curate

of Weston. In 1781 he became curate of St. Giles's, Reading, and in 1782 of St. Luke's, Chelsea. In 1785 he became pastor of the Episcopal chapel at Homerton, and opened a school there, which became very successful. He was very popular as a preacher, free from bigotry, and active in all schemes of benevolence. The *Evangelical Magazine* and the *London Missionary* were originated and for a time edited by him. From the profits of the *Evangelical Magazine* between twenty and thirty thousand pounds were paid out for the support of widows of ministers of various denominations. He eas also one of the founders of the *London Missionary Society* (q.v.), of the scheme of "Village Itinerancy," and of the Hackiney Seminary for theological training. After a life of earnest piety and usefulness, he died March 28, 1803. — Morison, *Missionary Fathers,* page 9.

Eyster, Michael

a minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in York County, Pennsylvania, May 16, 1814. He was principally educated at the institutions in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1838. He labored in the ministry successively at Williamsburg, Greencastle, and Greensburg with great acceptance and success. He died August 12, 1853. He, was a man of rare promise, and, although comparatively young, had gained a strong hold upon the affections of the Church. In the pulpit his power over an audience was very great. He usually made a deep and an abiding impression. There was an originality and a freshness in his discourses not always found at the present day. (AM.L.S.)

Ez

SEE GOAT.

E'zar

a less correct mode of Anglicizing (1 Chronicles 1:38) the name EZER (q.v.).

Ez'bai

[many Ez'bai, some *Ezba'i]* (Hebrews *Ezbay'*, יִבְזַי, in pause יִבְזָי, signif. uncertain; Sept. Ἀζβί v. R. Ἀζοβαί, Vulg. *Asbai),* the father of Naarai, which later was one of David's thirty heroes. (1 Chronicles 11:37). B.C. 1046. In the parallel list (2 Samuel 23:30) the names are given

"PAARAI the Arbite," which Kennicott decides to be a corruption of the reading in Chronicles *(Dissertation,* page 209).

Ez'bon

(Hebrews *Etsbon',* ˆBxe, perhaps *working),* the name of two men.

1. (Sept. θασοβάν, Vuig. *Esebon.)* The fourth son of the patriarch Gad (<01646>Genesis 46:16) ; called also (<04616>Numbers 26:16) OZNI *SEE OZNI* (q.v.). B.C. 1856.

2. (ˆwBxe Sept. Ἀσεβών v.r. Εσεβών, Vulg. *Es*bon.) The first-named of the sons (? descendants) of Bela, the son of Benjamin, according to <130707>1 Chronicles 7:7. It is singular, however, that while Ezbon is nowhere else mentioned among the sons of Bela, or Benjamin, he appears here in company with yrIa Iri, which is, nevertheless, not a Benjamite family, according to the other lists, but is found in company with Ezbon among the Gadite families, both in <01646>Genesis 46:16 (Eri, yrIa); and <04616>Numbers 26:16. Were these two Gadite families incorporated into Benjamin after the slaughter mentioned Judges 20? Possibly they were from Jabesh-Gilead (comp. 21:12-14).. *SEE BECHER*. <130702>1 Chronicles 7:2 seems to fix the date of the census as in king David's time. B.C. cir. 1020.

Ezechi'as

(Ἐζεκίας), a mode of Anglicizing, in the Apocrypha, the name of two men.

1. The "son of Theocanus," and one of the two Israelitish leaders prominent in the reform under Ezra (1 Esdr. 9:14); evidently the JAHAZIAH *SEE JAHAZIAH* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (<150105>Ezra 10:15).

2. One who is represented as having prayed for the chosen people in the time of Sennacherib (2 Esdr. 7:40), obviously referring to king HEZEKIAH *SEE HEZEKIAH* (q.v.)

Ezeci'as

(Ἐζεκίας), one of those who supported Ezra on the right while expounding the law (1 Esdr. 9:43), corresponding to the HILKIAH *SEE HILKIAH* (q.v.) of the parallel passage (<160804>Nehemiah 8:4).

Ezeki'as

(Ἐζεκίας), a Grecized form (Ecclus. 48:17, 22; 49:4; 2 Macc. 15:22; <40109>Matthew 1:9, 10) of the namne of king HEZEKIAH *SEE HEZEKIAH* (q.v.).

Eze'kiel

Picture for Eze’kiel

(Heb. *Yechezkel',* לאקזחי, either meaning Whom *God will strengthen* or *God will prevail),* the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἐζεκήλ) The head of the twentieth "course" of priests under David (<131616>1 Chronicles 24:16, where the name is Anglicized JEHEZEKEL *SEE JEHEZEKEL* [q.v.]).

2. (Ἰεζεκιήλ, Josephus Ἰεζεκίηλος, *Ant.* 10:5, 1.) One of the four greater prophets. *SEE PROPHET.*

1. There have been various fancies about his name: according to Abarbanel *(Praef in Ezech.),* it implies "one who narrates the might of God to be displayed in the future," and samne (as Villalpandus, *Praef. in Ezech.* page 10) see a play on the word in the expressions מיקזחי and יקזחי (3:7, 8, 9), whence the groundless conjecture of Sanctius *(Prolegon. in Ezech.* page 2, n. 2) that the name was given him subsequently to the commencement of his career (Carpzov, Introduct. *ad Libr. Bibl. Vet. Testam.* 2, part 3, chapter 5).

2. He was the son of a priest named Buzi (1:3), respecting whom fresh conjectures have been recorded, although nothing is known about him (as archbishop Newcome observes) beyond the fact that he must have given his son a, careful and learned education. The Rabbis had a rule that every prophet in Scripture was also the son of a prophet, and hence (as B. David Kimehi in his Commentary) they absurdly identify Buzi with Jeremiah, who, they say, was so called because he was rejected and despised. Another tradition makes Ezekiel the servant of Jeremiah (Gregory Naz. Or. 47), and Jerome supposes that the prophets being contemporaries during a part of their mission interchanged their prophecies, sending them respectively to Jerusalem and Chaldaea for mutual confirmation and encouragement, that the Jews might hear, as it were, a strophe and

antistrophe of warning and promise; "velut ac si duo cantores alter ad alterius vocem sese componerent" (Calvin, *Comment. ad' Ezech.* 1:2). Although it was only towards the very close of Jeremiah's lengthened office that Ezekiel received his commission, yet these suppositions are easily accounted for by the internal harmony between the two prophets, in proof of which Havernick *(Introduct. to Ezek.)* quotes Ezekiel 13 as compared with <24239>Jeremiah 23:9 sq., and Ezekiel 34 with Jeremiah 33 etc. This inner resemblance is the more striking from the otherwise wide difference of character which separates the two prophets; for the elegiac tenderness of Jeremiah is the reflex of his gentle, calm, and introspective spirit, while Ezekiel, in that age when true prophets were so rare (<26122>Ezekiel 12:21; <25209>Lamentations 2:9), "comes forward with all abruptness and iron consistency. Has he to contend with a people of brazen front and unbending neck? He possesses on his own part an unbending nature, opposing the evil with an unflinching spirit of boldness, with words full of consuming fire" (Havernick, *Introd.*, transl, by Reverend F.W. Gotch in *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* 1:23).

3. Unlike his predecessor in the prophetic office, who gives us the amplest details of his personal history, Ezekiel rarely alludes to the facts of his own life, and we have to complete the imperfect picture by the colors of late and dubious tradition. He was taken captive from a place called Sarera *(*ἐκ γῆς Σαρηρά, Isidor. *De Vit. et Ob. Sanct.* 39; Epiphan. *De Vit. et Mort. Prophet.* 9, ap. Carpzov) in the captivity (or transmigration, as Jerome more accurately prefers to render tWlG; 1:2) of Jehoiachin (not Jehoiakim, as Josephus *[Ant.* 10:6, 3] states, probably by a slip of memory) with other distinguished exiles (<12415>2 Kings 24:15) eleven years before the destruction of Jerusalem. B.C. 598. Josephus (l.c.) says that this removal happened when he was a boy, and although we cannot consider the assertion to be refuted by Havernick's argument from the matured, vigorous, priestly character of his writings, and feel still less inclined to say that he had *"undoubtedly"* exercised for some considerable time the function of a priest, yet the statement is questionable, because it is improbable (as Havernick also points out) that Ezekiel long survived the twenty-seventh year of his exile (39:17), so that, if Josephus be correct, he must have died very young. He was a member of a community of Jewish exiles who settled on the banks of the Chebar, a "river" or stream of Babylonia, which is sometimes taken to be the Khabour, but which the latest investigators suppose to be the Nahr Malcha, or royal canal of Nebuchadnezzar. *SEE*

CHEBAR. The actual name of the spot where he resided was Tel-Abib (bybæ lTe, Vulg. "acervus novarum frugum," Sept. μετέωρος καὶ περιῆλθον (?). *Syr.* "the hill of grief"), a name which Jerome, as usual, allegorizes; it is thought by Michaelis to be the same as Thallaba in D'Anville's map (Rosenmuller, *Bibl. Geog.* 2:188). It was by this river "in the land of the Chaldeans" that God's message first reached him (1:3); the Chaldee version, however, interpolates the words "in the land [of Israel: and again a second time he spake to him in the land] of the Chaldeans," because the Jews had a notion that the Shechinah could not overshadow a prophet out of the Holy Land. Hence R. Jarchi thinks that chapter 17 was Ezekiel's first prophecy, and was uttered before the captivity, a view which he supports by the Hebrew idiom hyhy;hyhw;(A.V. "came expressly") in 1:3. R. Kimchi, hovever, makes an exception to the rule in case the prophecy was inspired in some pure and quiet spot like a river's bank (comp. <19701>Psalm 137:1). His call took place "in the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity," B.C. 594 (1:2), "in the thirtieth year, in the fourth month." The latter expression is very uncertain. Most commentators (see Poll *Synopsis,* in loc.) take it to mean the thirtieth year of his age (so Carpzov, *Appar. Crit.* page 201, and others), the recognized period for assuming full priestly functions (<04023>Numbers 4:23, 30). Origen, following this assumption, makes the prophet a type of Christ, to whom also "the heavens were opened" when he was baptized; in Jordan. But, as Pradlus argues, such. a computation would be unusual, and would not be sufficiently important or well known as a mark of genuineness, and would require some more definite addition. Moreover, the statute referred to required an age of at least thirty full years. The Chaldee paraphrase by Jonah ben-Uzziel has "thirty years after Hilkiah, the high-priest, had found the book of the law in the sanctuary, in the vestibule under the porch, at midnight, after the setting of the moon, in the days of Josiah, etc., in the month Tammuz, in the fifth day of the month" (comp. 2 Kings 22), i.e., the eighteenth of Josiah, or B.C. 623. This view is adopted by Jerome, Usher, Haivernick, etc., and is, on the whole, the most probable, although it has been objected to its adoption that, had this been a recognized area, we should have found traces of it elsewhere, whereas even Ezekiel never refers to it again. But, whatever starting-point we adopt, this will still remain an isolated date in Ezekiel; and the example of Jeremiah, who computes the years of his prophetical ministrations from the reform in the days of Josiah (<24503>Jeremiah 25:3; comp. <14403>2 Chronicles 24:3), warrants the supposition that his contemporary and parallel would note his own call from a similar

religious epoch, the renewal of the passover in the same reign (2Ki 23:23). There are similar and more forcible objections to its being the thirtieth year from the jubilee, as Hitzig supposes, following many of the early commentators. It has been proposed by Scaliger *(De Emendatione Temporuair*, Lugd. Bat. 1598, page 374) that it was the thirtieth year from the new sera of Nabopolassar, father of Nebuchadnezzar, who began to reign B.C. 625, an interpretation adopted by Eichhorn, Pradus, Rosenmiiller, Henderson, etc. The use of this *Chaldee* epoch is the more appropriate as the prophet wrote in Babylonia, and he gives a Jewish chronology in verse 2. Compare the notes of time in Da 2:1; 7:1; Ezr 7:7; Ne 2:1; 5:14. But this would make the date in question B.C. 596 instead of 594. Moreover, as Nabopolassar was long since dead, the reckoning would doubtless have been by the years of the *reigning* monarch, as in the other passages cited. The decision of the question is the less important, because in all other places Ezekiel dates from the year of Jehoiachin's captivity (Eze 29:17; 30:20, et passim). It appears that the call of Ezekiel to the prophetic office was connected with the communication of Jeremiah's predictions to Babylon (Jer 51:59), which took place in the earlier part of the same year (Havernick, page 9). We learn from an incidental allusion (Eze 24:18) — the only reference which he makes to his personal history — that he was married, and had a house (8:1) in his place of exile, and lost his wife by a sudden and unforeseen stroke. He lived in the highest consideration among his companions in exile, and their elders consulted him on all occasions (Eze 8:1; 11:25; Eze 14:1; 20:1, etc.), because in his united office of priest and prophet he was a living witness to "them of the captivity" that God had not abandoned them (comp.Vitringa, *Synag. Vet.* page 332). There seems to be little ground for Theodoret's supposition that he was a Nazarite. The last date he mentions is the twenty-seventh year of the captivity (Eze 29:17), so that his mission extended over twenty-two years, during part of which period Daniel was probably living, and already famous (Eze 14:14; 28:3).

Tradition ascribes various miracles to him, as, for instance, escaping from his enemies by walking dryshod across the Chebar; feeding the famished people with a miraculous draught of fishes, etc. He is said to have been murdered in Babylon by some Jewish prince (?ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λαοῦ, called in the Roman martyrology for 6 Id. Apr. "judex populi," Carpzov. *Introd.* 1.c.), whom he had conyicted of idolatry; and to have been buried

in a double tomb (σπηλαῖον διπλούν*)*, the tomb of Shem and Arphaxad, on the banks of the Euphrates (Epiphan. *De Vit. et Mort. Prophet.).* The tomb, said to have been built by Jehoiachin, was shown a few days' journey from Bagdad (Menasse ben-Israel, *De Resurrec. Mort.* page 23), and was called "the abode of elegance" (habitaculum elegantiae). A lamp was kept there continually burning, and the autograph copy of the prophecies was said to be there preserved. This tomb is mentioned by Pietro de la Valle, and fully described in the Itinerary of R. Benjamin of Ttdela (Hottinger, *Thes. Philippians* II, 1:3; *Cippi Hebraici,* page 82). His tomb is still pointed out in the vicinity of Babylon (Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon,* page 427), at a place called Keffil; and Mr. Loftus is inclined to accept the tradition which assigns this as the resting-place of the prophet's remains *(Chaldaea,* page 35). The spire is the frustum of an elongated cone, tapering to a blunted top by a succession of steps, and peculiarly ornamented *(ib.).* A curious conjecture (discredited by Clemens Alexandrinus [Strom. 1], but considered not impossible by Selden *[Syntagm. de Diis Syr.* 2:120], Meyer, and others) identifies him with "Nazaratus the Assyrian," the teacher of Pythagoras. We need hardly mention the ridiculous suppositions that he is identical with Zoroaster, or with the Ἐζεκίηλος ὁ τῶν Ιουδαϊκῶν τραγωδίων ποιητής (Clem. Alexand. *Strom.* 1; Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 9:28, 29), who wrote a play on the Exodus, called Ἐξαγωγή (Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 2:19). This Ezekiel lived B.C. 40 (Sixt. Sen. *Bibl. Sanct.* 4:235), or later.

4. But, as Havernick remarks, "by the side of the scattered data of his external life, those of his internal life appear so much the richer." We have already noticed his stern and inflexible energy of will and character; and we also observe a devoted adherence to the rites and ceremonies of his national religion. Ezekiel is no cosmopolite, but displays everywhere the peculiar tendencies of a Hebrew educated under Levitical training. The priestly bias is always visible, especially in chapters 8-11, 40-48, and in 4:13 sq.; 20:12 sq.; 22:8, etc. It is strange of De Wette and Gesenius to attribute this to a "contracted spirituality," and of Ewald to see in it "a one-sided conception of antiquity which he obtained merely from books and traditions," and "a depression of spirit (!) enhanced by the long continuance of the banishment and bondage of the people" (Havernick's *Introd.).* It was surely this very intensity of patriotic loyalty to a system whose partial suspension he both predicted and survived, which cheered the exiles with the confidence of his hopes in the future, and tended to preserve their

decaying nationality. Mr. F. Newman is even more contemptuous than the German critics. "The writings of Ezekiel," he says *(Hebr. Monarchy*, page 330, 2d ed.), "painfully show the growth of what is merely visionary, and an increasing value of hard sacerdotalism;" and he speaks of the "heavy materialism" of Ezekiel's Temple, with its priests, sacrifices, etc., as "tedious and unedifying as Leviticus itself." His own remark that Ezekiel's predictions "so kept alive in the minds of the next generation a belief in certain return from captivity, as to have tended exceedingly towards the result," is a sufficient refutation of such criticisms.

We may also note in Ezekiel the absorbing recognition of his high calling which enabled him cheerfully to endure any deprivation or misery (except indeed ceremonial pollution, from which he shrinks with characteristic loathing, 4:14), if thereby he may give any warning or lesson to his people (4; <26245>Ezekiel 24:15, 16, etc.), whom he so ardently loved (<26908>Ezekiel 9:8; 11:13). On one occasion, and on one only, the feelings of the man burst, in one single expression, through the self-devotion of the prophet; and while even then his obedience is unwavering, yet the inexpressible depth of submissive pathos in the brief words which tell how it one day "the desire of his eyes was taken from him" (<26245>Ezekiel 24:15-18), shows what well-springs of the tenderest human emotion were concealed under his uncompromising opposition to every form of sin. See Friderici, *Disputatio de Ezechiele* (Lips; 1719); Verpoorten, *De scriptis Ezechielis* (in his *Dissertt.* page 107); Alexander, *Tist. Ecclesias.* 3:560; Kitto. *Jour. Sac. Lit.* 1*;* Williams, *Characters of O.T.* page 288.

Ezekiel, Book Of

This, both in the Hebrew and Alexandrian canons, is placed next to the writings of Jeremiah.

I. *Order of Contents.* — The central point of Ezekiel's predictions is the destruction of Jerusalem. Previously to this catastrophe his chief object is to call to repentance those who were living in careless security; to warn them against indulging in blind confidence, that by the help of the Egyptians (<26715>Ezekiel 17:15-17; comp. <24307>Jeremiah 37:7) the Babylonian yoke would be shaken off; and to assure them that the destruction of their city and Temple was inevitable and fast approaching. After this event his principal care is to console the captives by promises of future deliverance and return to their own land, and to encourage them by assurances of

future blessings. His predictions against foreign nations stand between these two great divisions, and were for the most part uttered during the interval of suspense between the divine intimation that Nebuchadnezzar was besieging Jerusalem (Ezekiel 24:2) and the arrival of the news that he had taken it (Ezekiel 33:21). The predictions are evidently arranged on a plan corresponding with these the chief subjects of them, and the time of their utterance is so frequently noted that there is little difficulty in ascertaining their chronological order. This order is followed throughout, except in the middle portion relating to foreign nations, where it is in some instances departed from to secure greater unity of subject (e.g. Ezekiel 29:17). The want of exact chronological order in this portion of the book has led to various hypotheses respecting the manner in which the collection of the separate predictions was originally made. Jaha *(Introd.* page 356) supposes that the predictions against foreign nations were placed in their present position by some transcriber in the order in which they happened to come into his hands, and that he through forgetfulness omitted chapters 35, 38, and 39. Eichhorn *(Einleit.* 3:193) thinks it probable that the predictions were written on several greater or smaller rolls, which were put together in their present form without sufficient regard to chronological accuracy. Bertholdt *(Einleit.* 4:1487, quoted by Havernick) supposes that the collector of the whole book found two smaller collections already in existence (chapters 25-32 and Ezekiel 33:21-39), and that he arranged the other predictions chronologically. All such hypotheses belong, as Havernick remarks, to a former age of criticism.

The arranugement, by whomsoever made, is very evidently intentional, and it seems on many accounts most probable that it was made by Ezekiel himself. This is maintained by Hilvernick out the following grounds:

(1.) The arrangement proceeds throughout on a plan corresponding with the subjects of the predictions. In those against foreign nations chronological is united with material order, whilst in those which relate to Ismael the order of time is strictly followed.

(2.) The predictions stand in such connection with each other that every part has reference to what has preceded it.

(3.) Historical notices are occasionally appended to the predictions, which would scarcely be done by a transcriber; e.g. the notice respecting himself in chapters 11, 24, 25, and the close of chapter 19, which Havernick translates “this is a lamentation and was for a

lamentation." The whole book is divided by Havernick into nine sections, as follows:

1. Ezekiel's call to the prophetic office (Ezekiel 2-3:15).

2. The generual carrying out of the comnbmission in a series of symbolical representations and particular predictions foretelling the approaching destruction of Judah and Jerusalem (<26316>Ezekiel 3:16-7).

3. The rejection of the people because of their idolatrous worship; a series of visions presented to the prophet a year and two months later than the former, in which he is shown the Temple polluted by the worship of Adonis, the consequent judgment on thee inhabitants of Jerusalem and on the priests, and closing with promises of happier times and a purer worship (Ezekiel 8-11).

4. The sins of the people rebuked in detail; a series of reproofs and warnings directed especially against the particular errors and prejudices then prevalent amongst his contemporaries (Ezekiel 12-19).

5. The nature of the judgment, and the guilt which caused it; another series of warnings delivered about a year later, announcing the ncoming judgments to be yet nearer (Ezekiel 20-23).

6. The meaning of the now commencing punishment; predictions uttered two years and five months later, when Jerusalem was besieged, announcing to the captives that very day as the commencement of the siege (comp. <122501>2 Kings 25:1), and assuring them of the complete overthrow of the city (chapter 24).

7. God's judgment denounced on seven heathen nations (Ammon, <262501>Ezekiel 25:1-7; Moab, 8-11; Edom, 12-14; the Philistines, Ezekiel 15:17; Tyre, 26-28:19;, Sidon, 20-24; Egypt, 29-32).

8. After the destruction of Jerusalem a prophetic representation of the triumph of Israel and of the kingdom of God on earth (Ezekiel 33-39).

9. The glorious consummation; a symbolic representation of Messianic times, and of the establishnent and prosperity of the kingdom of God (Ezekiel 40-48). See § 3 below.

II. *Genuineness and Completeness.* — According to Jewish tradition, doubts were entertained as to the canonicity of the look on the ground of

its containing some apparent contradictions to the law, as well as because of the obscurity of many of its visions. These, however, were removed, it is said, by Rabbi Hananias, vheo wrote a commentary on the book, in which all these difficulties were satisfactorily solved *(Mischna,* ad. Surenhusius, *Praef. ad Part.* 4; Carpzov, *Introd.* part 3, page 215); but still, on account of their obscurity, the visions at the beginning and close of the book were forbidden to be read by those who were under thirty years of age (Carpzov, page 212). Some Continental critics of the last century have impugned the canonicity of the last nine chapters, and have attributed them to same Samaritan or Hebrew who had returned in later times to the land of Judnea (Oeder, *Freye Untersuchung uber einige Bucher des A.T.,* Hal. Sax. 1771; Vogel, in his remarks on the above; and Corrodi, *Beleuchtunb des Jildisch. und Christl. Bibelkanons,* part 1, page 105, quoted by Rose mcther, Schol. *in Ezech.* ad c. 40). These objections have been fully answered by Eichhorn (*Einleitang*, 3:203), Juahb *(Introd. in Lib. Sac. V.T.* page 356), and others. Jahn has also taken notice of and answered some objections raised by an anonymnous writer in the *Monthly Magazine* (1798), to the canonicity of chapters 25-32, 35, 36, 38, 39. A translation of Jahn's arguments will be found in Horne's Introd. 4:222, old ed. These and similar objections have so little weight or probability that we shall content ourselves with quoting the general remark of Gesenius in reference to the ehoale of Ezekiel's writings: "This book belongs to that not very numerous class, which, from beginning to end, maintains, by means of favorite expressions and peculiar phrases, such a oneness of tone as by that circumstance alone to prevent any suspicion that separate portions of it are not genuine" *(Geschichte der Hebrews Spr.* page 35). The canonicity of the book of Ezekiel in general is satisfactorily established by Jewish and Christian authorities. There is, indeed, no explicit reference to it, or quotation from it, in the New Testament. Eichhorn *(Einleitung*, page 218) mentions the following passages as having apparently a reference to this book: Romans 2:24; comp. Ezekiel 36:21: Roman 10:5; Galatians 3:12; comp. Ezekiel 20:11: 2 Peter 3:4; comp. Ezekiel 12:22; but none of these are quotations. The closing visions of Ezekiel are clearly referred to, though not quoted, in the last chapters of the Apocalypse. The prophet Ezekiel is distinctly referred to by the son of Sirech (Ecclus. 49:8), and by Josephus (Ant. 10:5, 1; 6:3, 7:2, 8:2). The book of Ezekiel is also nentioned as foraming part of the canon in the catalogues of Melito (Eusebius, *Hist.* *Ecclesiastes* 4:26), Origen (apud

Euseb. 1.c. 6:25), Jerome *(Prolegus Caleatus),* and the Talmud (Eichhorn, 3:218; 1:126-137).

One of the passages of Josephus to which we have referred has occasioned much controversy and many conjectures, because he seems to affirne that Ezekiel had written two books of prophecies (Ant. 10:5, 1). According to the ordinary and, indeed, as it would seem, necessary interpretation of this passage, Ezekiel was the *first* who wrote *two books* respecting the Babylonian captivity. The question then arises, Has one of his books been lost, or are the two now joined into one? The former supposition has been maintained by some in order to account for certain professed quotations from the prophet Ezekiel of passages which are not found in his writings at present. Thus Clemens Romanus (1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 8) refers to such a passage, which is given more at length by Clemens Alexand. *(Paedagog.* 1:10). Thus, again, Tertullian *(De carne Christi,* c. 23, page 394, ed. Semlea) says, "Legimus *apud Ezechielem* de vacca illa qune peperit et non peperit." Other instances may be seen in Fabricius *(Codex Pseudapigraphus V.T.,* 2d ed., page 1118), and quoted from hin by Carpzov *(Introd.* part 3, page 208). Both these critics, however, agree that the neost probable explanation of such references is that they were derived fmom Jewish tradition. The latter hypothesis, that our present book was originally two, the second containing the last nine chapters, has received the support of very miany critics (see Le Moyine, *Varnia Sacra,* 2:332; Carpzov, Introd. page 208). This view, however, is not without serious difficulties. There is no evidence that the book, as at present existing, was ever considered two; and the testimony of Josepheus himself, that only twenty-two books were received as sacred *(Contr. Apion.* 1:8), appears quite opposed to such a supposition, since in whatever way the division of the Old Testament into twenty-two books is made there cannot be two out of the number left for Ezekiel. Eichhorn *(Einleitung,* 3:146) maintains that it is Jeremiah of whom Josephus speaks, a position to which we should at once assent if we could with him consider the words ὅς πρῶτος equivalent to ὁ δέ πρῶτος. If this is what Josephus meant, we must suppose some corruption of his text. Becker omits the ὅς.

III. Interpretation. — The latter part of the book has always been regarded as very obscure. It will be seen, by the brief notices of the contents given above, that Havernick considers the whole to relate to Messianic times. The predictions respecting Gog (chapteres 38, 39) have been referred by some to Antiochus Epiphanes; by others to Cambyses, to

the Chaldoeans, the Scythians, the Turks, etc. Mr. Granville Penn has interpreted them of Napoleon and the French (*The Prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gogue,* etc., 1815). *SEE GOG*. The description of the Temple (chapters 40-43) has been thought by many to contain an account of what Solomon's Temple was; by others, of what the second Temple should be. (See Havernick's *Commentar uber Erebhiel*, Erlangen, 1843.) The best interpretation of these predictions is to be found in that of the similar ones of the Apocalypse. *SEE TEMPLE.*

We cannot now enter into the difficulties of these or other chapters (for which we must refer to some of the commentaries mentioned below); but we will enumerate, following Fairbairn, the four main lines of interpretation, viz.,

1. The Historico-literal, adopted by Villalpandus, Grotius, Lowth, etc., who make them a prosaic description intended to preserve the memory of Soiomon's Temple.

2. The Historico-ideal (of Eichhorn, Dathe, etc.), which reduces them "to a sort of vague and well-meaning announcement of future good."

3. The Jewish-carnal (of Lightfoot, Hoffunan, etc.), which maintains that their outline was actually adopted by the exiles.

4. The Christian-spiritual (or Messianic), followed by Luther, Calvin, Cocceius, and most modern commentators, which makes them "a grand complicated symbol of the good God had in reserve for his Church." Rosenmuller, who disapproves alike of the literalism of Grotius, and the arbitrary, ambiguous allegorizing of others, remarks *(Schol.* in 28:26) that it seems a useless task to attempt to refer these prophecies to distinct events, or to refer their poetical descriptions to naked fact. It is most safe to regard them, in accordance with the nature of allegorical representations and visions in general, as having a literal or material basis in the near past or future (i.e., recollections of Solomon's Temple, and provision of hostile powers), which is made the vehicle of a higher and spiritual import setting forth the distant grandeur, glory, and triumph of the kingdom of God. *SEE DOUBLE SENSE (OF PROPHECY).*

IV. *Style.* — The depth of Ezekiel's snatter, and the marvelous nature of his visions, make him occasionally obscure. Hence his prophecy was placed by the Jews among the ˆyzæê] (treasures), those portions of Scripture which

(like the early part of Genesis, and the Canticles) were not allowed to be read till the age of thirty (Jerome, *Ep. ad Eustach.;* Origen, *Proem. hoiuuil.* 4, in *Cantic.;* Hottinger, *Thes. Phil.* 2:1, 3). Hence Jerome compares the "inextricabilis error" of his writings to Virgil's labyrinth ("Oceanus Scripturarum, mysteriorumque Dei labyrinthus"), and also to the Catacombs. The Jews classed him in the very highest rank of prophets. Gregory Naz. (*Or.* 23) bestows the loftiest encomiums upon him. Isidore *(De vit. et ob. Sanct.* 99) makes him a type of Christ from the title "Son of Man," but that is equally applied to Daniel (8:17). Other similar testimonies asre quoted by Carpzov (Instod. 2:193 sq.). The Sanhedrim is said to have hesitated long whether his book should form part of the canon, from the occasional ohescurity, and from the supposed contradiction, of 18:20 to ⁂Exodus 20:5; 34:7; ⁂Jeremiah 32:18. But, in point of fact, these apparent oppositions are the mere expression of truths complementary to each other, as Moses himself might have taught them (⁂Deuteronomy 24:16). Although, generally speaking, comments on this book were forbidden, a certain R. Nananias undertook to reconcile the supposed differences. (Spinoza, *Tract Theol. Polait.* 2:27, partly from these considerations, infers that the present book is made up of mere ἀποσμασμάτια, but his argument from its commencing with a 1, and from the expression in 1:3 above alluded to, hardly needs refutation.)

That Ezekiel was a poet of no mean order is acknowledged by almost all critics (Lowth, *De sacra Poesi Hebraeorum, ed.* J.D. Michaelis, Gottingen, 1770, page 431). Michaelis and Dathe are the only critics of any eminence (as far as we know) who think slightingly of his poetical genius. The question is altogether one of taste, and has, we imagine, been decided by common consent against Michaelis. He remarks more truly that Ezekiel lived at a period when the Hebrew language was declining in purity, when the *silver* age was succeeding to the golden one. It is, indeed, to the matter ratheir than the language of Ezekiel that we are to look for evidence of poetic genius. His style is often sinmply didactic, and he abounds in peculiarities of expression, Aramaisms, and grammatical anomalies which, while they give individuality to his writings, plainly evince the decline of the language in which he wrote. An extended account of such peculiarities is given by Eichhorn *(Einlestuaig in das A.T.* 3:196) and Gesenius *(Geschichte der Heb. Sprache u. Schift,* page 35). Among the most splendid passages are chapter 1 (called by the Rabbis hbKrjm,the prophecy against Tyrus (chapters 26-28), that against Assyria's "the noblest

monument of Eastern history" (chapter 31), and chapter 8, the account of what he saw in the Temple porch,

"When, by the vision led,
His eye surveyed the dark idolatries
Of alienated Judah."
— Milton, Par.* Lost, *1.

V. Commentaries. — The following are special exegetical works on the entire book; the most important have an asterisk (*) prefixed: Origen, *Commentarii*, etc. (in *Opera*, 3:351 sq., 406); Ephraem Syrus, Explanatio (in *Opera*, 5:165); Gregory Nazianzen, *Signaficatio* (in *Opera Spuria*, 1:870); Jerome, *Commentarii*, etc. (in *Opera*, 5); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (in *Opera*, II, 2; also Rome, 1662, fol.); Gregory the Great, *Homiliae* (in Opera, 1:1174); Raban, *Commentarii* (in *Opera*); Rupert, In *Ezech.* (in Opera, page 489); (Ecolampadius, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1534, 4to; 1543, 8vo; Argent. 1634, 4to); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lips. 1539, 1561, 1575, 1579, 8vo); Calvin, *Prelectiones* (Geneva, 1565, 8vo, and since in French, Genev. 1565, fol.; in English, Edinb. 1849-50, 2 volumes, 8vo); Junius, *Comentaria* (Genev. 1609, fol.; 1610, 8vo); Maldonatus, In *Ezech.* (in his *Commentarii*. page 542); Selneeker *Auslegung* (Lips. 1567, 4to); Pinto, Commentarius (Salam. 1568, fol., and later); Lavater, Commentaris (Geneva, 1571, fol.); Serrantus, Counmentarius (Ante. 1572,1607, fol.); Heilbrunner, *Quaestiones* (Laving. 1587, 8vo); Abraham ben-Moses, *Ubersetzung* (Prag. 1602, 4to); *Pradus and Villalpandus, *Explanationes* (Rome, 1605, 3 cols. fo].); Polan, Commentaria (Geneva, 1609, fol, 1610, 8vo); a Lapide, *In Ezech.* (in his Commentaria) Sanctius, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1612, 1619, fol.); Brandmuller, *Commentarius* (Basil, 1621, 4to); *Greenhill, *Exposition* (London, 1645-67, 5 volumes, 4to; also 1827-1863, 8vo; in Dutch, Hague, 17392-6, 4 volumes, 4to); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (Leyd. 1668, 4to; Amst. 1700, fol.); Hennisch *Clavis* (Ratenburg, 1684; Lips. 1697, 4to); Petersen, *Zeugniss* (Freft. 1719, 4to); *Lowth, *Commentary* (London, 1723, 4to); *Starck, *Commentarius* (Freft. ad M. 1731, 4to); Vogel, *Weisagungen* (Hal. 1772, 8vo); Volborth, *Anmerk.* (Gott. 1787, 8vo); Newcome, *Explanation* (Dub. 1788, 8vo, and since); Venema, *Lectionas* (Leov. 1790, 4to); **Horsley*, *Notes* (in *Bib. Crsiticisme*, 2:65); Hanker, *Consideration* (in *Works*, 9:719); *Rosenmuller, Scolia (Lpz. 8vo, 1808-10, 2 volumes; also 1826); Rhesa, *Observationes* (Regiom. 1819, 4to); Stern, laqe[hy] etc. (Vienna, 1842, 8vo); *Havernick, *Commentar* (Erlangen, 1843, 8vo); *Umbreit,

Commentar (Hamb. 1843, 8vo); Macfarlan, *Version* (London, 1845, 8vo); *Hitzig, *Erklarung* (in the *Kurtz. Exeget. Hdb.*, Lpz. 1847, 8vo); *Fairbairn, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1851, 1855, 8vo); *Henderson, *Commentary* (London, 1855, 8vo) Guthrie, *Discourses* (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Shrewsbury, *Notes* (Manch. 1863, 8vo); Kliefoth, *Erklarung* (Rost. 1864-5, 8vo); *Hengstenberg, *Erlauterung* (Brl. 1867 sq., 2 volumes, 8vo; transl. Lond. 1869, 8vo); Cowles, *Notes* (New York, 1867, 12mo). *SEE PROPHETS.*

E'zel

occurs only in the name EBEN-EZEL (Hebrews with the art. repeated, *ha-E'ben ha-E'zel,* lzaָh;ˆbaָ,j ;[in pause lzaָ; *A'zel], the stone of the departure,* perhaps i.e., *mile-stone;* Sept. τὸ ̔Εργὰβ v.r. ἔργον and ὁ λίθος] ἐκεῖνο*;* Vulg. *lapis cui nomen est Ezel;* A.V. "the stone Ezel"), an old testimonial-stone in the neighborhood of Saul's residence, the scene of the parting of David and Jonathan when the former finally fled from the court (<092019>1 Samuel 20:19). It seems to have derived its name from some early circumstance not recorded. At the second mention of the spot (verse 41) the Hebrews text (µgNֶhi lxaָme A.V. "out of a place toward the south," literally "from the slope of the south;" Sept. ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀργάβ,Vulg. *de loco qui vergebat ad austrum)* is, in the opinion of some critics, corrupt, as indicated by the Sept., which in both cases has *Ergab* or *Argab* (i.e. bGorָai, *Argob',* a *heap* of stones) in verse 19 for the Hebrews *Eben,* "stone," and in verse 41 for *han-negeb,* "the south." The sense in verse 41 would then be as follows: "David arose from close to the stone heap" — close to which (the same preposition, lxaֵe; A.V. "by") it had been arranged beforehand that he should remain (verse 19). Other interpreters, however, render simply "on the south side," a signification which sufficiently suits the circumstances. *SEE BETH-EZEL*.

E'zem

(Hebrews *E'tsem,* µxaָ*),* a less incorrect mode (<130429>1 Chronicles 4:29) of Angliciziag the name AZEM *SEE AZEM* (q.v.), as elsewhere (<061903>Joshua 19:3).

Ezen

SEE EZNITE.

E'zer

(Hebrews *E'tser,* rx,ae *treasure;* Sept. Ἀσάρ, Vulg. *Eser*), one of the sons of Seir, and native princes of Mount Hor (<013621>Genesis 36:21, 27, 30; <130142>1 Chronicles 1:42, 38, in which last verse the name is Anglicized "Ezar"). B.C. cir. 1927.

E’zer

(Hebrews *E'zer,* rz,[e rz,[,[in pause, *A'zer,* rz,[ ], *help),* the name of five men. *SEE ROMAMTIEZER*; *SEE EBEN-EZER*.

1. (Sept. Ἐζέρ v.r. Ἀζέρ,Vulg. *Ezer.)* A person named with Elead (q.v.) as a son (or descendant) of Ephraim, who was slain by the aboriginal inhabitants of Gath while engaged in a foray on their cattle (<130721>1 Chronicles 7:21). Ewald *(Gesch. Isr.* 1:490) assigns this occurrence to the pre-Egyptian period. B.C. ante 1658.

2. (Sept. Ἐζέρ v.r. Γαζὴρ,Vulg. *Ezer.)* The father of Hushah, one of the posterity of Hur, of the tribe of Judah (<130404>1 Chronicles 4:4). B.C. cir. 1658. In verse 17 he appears to be called EZRA, but no such son occurs among the list of'those there attributed to him.

3. (Sept. Ἀζέρ v.r. Ἀζά, Vulg. *Ezer.)* The first-named of the Gittite champions who repaired to David at Ziklag (<131209>1 Chronicles 12:9). B.C, 1054.

4. (Sept. Ἀζέρ v.r. Ἀζούρ,Vulg. *Azer.)* Son of Jeshua, and ruler of Mizpah, who repaired part of the city wall near the armory (<160319>Nehemiah 3:19). B.C. 446.

5. (Sept. Ἰεζούρ,Vulg. *Ezer.)* One of the priests who made the circuit of the newly-finished walls of Jerusalem (<161242>Nehemiah 12:42). B.C. 446.

Ezeri'as

(οἘζερίας v.r. Ζεχρίας,Vulg. *Azarias),* the son of Helchiah and father of Saraias, in the ancestry of Esdras (1 Esdr. 8:1); evidently the high priest AZARIAH *SEE AZARIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<150701>Ezra 7:1).

Ezi'as

(οἘζίας v.r. οὈζίας,Vulg. *Azahel),* the son of Meremoth and father of Amarias in the same genealogy (1 Esdr. 8:2); evidently the corresponding AZARIAH *SEE AZARIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (<15703>Ezra 7:3). *SEE AZIEI.*

E'zion-ge'ber

(Hebrews *Etsyon'-Ge'ber,* r bGAˆ/yx][,[in this form only at <11026>1 Kings 9:26; <14087>2 Chronicles 8:17], i.e. *giant's back-bone;* Sept. Γασιὼν [in Deuteronomy Γεσιὼν] Γάβερ [in Chronicles Γαβέρ], but in 1 Kings Ἀσίων Γάβερ ; Vulg. *Asiongaber)* or EZION-GA'BER (being "in pause," Hebrews *Etsyon'-Ga'ber,* r b,*G ˆyxi[,[in <11204>1 Kings 20:49; <14036>2 Chronicles 20:36, fully ˆ/yx][ ], so found also at <04335>Numbers 33:35, 36; <05108>Deuteronomy 2:8; but Angli. cized "Ezion-geber" in <11248>1 Kings 22:48 [49]), a very ancient city near Elath (q.v.), on the eastern arm of the Red Sea. Jonathan's *Targum;* following a false etymology, defines the name as i.e., "castle of the cock" (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 384; Beck, *Chron. Chald. paraphr.* 2:101). It is first mentioned in <04335>Numbers 33:35 as one of the stations where the Hebrews halted in their journeyings through the desert, being the last there named before they came to "the wilderness of Zin, which is Kadesh," and the point where they afterwards turned from the 'Arabah to Elath, towards "the wilderness of Moab" (<05108>Deuteronomy 2:8). *SEE EXODE.* From its harbor it was that Solomon (<11026>1 Kings 9:26) sent the fleet which he had there built to the land of Ophir. *SEE COMMERCE.* Here also Jehoshaphat (<11247>1 Kings 22:47; <14035>2 Chronicles 20:35) built a fleet "to go to Ophir;" but because he had joined himself with Ahaziah, "king of Israel, who did wickedly," "the ships were broken that they were not able to go to Tarshish," being probably destroyed on the rocks which lie in "jagged ranges on each side" (Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine,* page 84). Busching *(Erdbeschr.* V, 1:620) erroneously locates it at *Shurmn,* a port at the southern end of the gulf *(Geogr. Nub.* 3:5). Wellsted *(Travels,* 2:153) would find it in the modern *Dahob,* but this is the ancient Dizahab (q.v.); Laborde *(Commentaire Geogr.* page 124) seeks it in the rocky island *el-Kurdiyah,* which is hardly adequate in extent or position; and Rtippel *(Arab.* page 252) locates it at the mouth of'wadv *Emrag,* i.e., *el-Mlursk,* which is liable to the same objection. Josephus *(Ant.* 8:6, 4) says that Ezion-geber *(*Ἀσσιογγάβαρος) was also called

Berenice, and that it lay not far from JElath. It is probably the same with the once-populous city *'Asyun* (Burckhardt, *Syria,* page 511). Robinson *(Bibliccl Researches,* 1:250) says, "No trace of Ezion-geber seems now to remain, unless it be in the name of a small wady with brackish water, *el-Ghudyan,* opening into el-'Arabah from the western mountain, some distance north of Akabah." It is doubtful, however, whether the sea ever extended so far up the 'Arabah as this. It was probably situated at the point where the Haj route strikes the 'Arabah at the north-west point of the gulf (Robinson, *ib.* 1:239). Yet the town may have given name to this the nearest spring, for *Ghudyan* in Arabic corresponds in all the essential letters to *Ezion* in Heb., which is identical with the later *'A*syun. By comparing <1K 9:26> 1 Kings 9:26, 27, with <2C 8:17> 2 Chronicles 8:17, 18, it is probable that timber was floated from Tyre to the nearest point on the Mediterranean coast, and then conveyed over land to the head of the Gulf of Akabah, where the ships seem to have been built; for there can hardly have been adequate forests in the neighborhood. Dr. Wilson noticed fragments of an old caravan route part way up the hill-side in this vicinity *(Lands of the Bible,* 1:284). *SEE WILDERNESS OF THE WANDERING.*

Ez'nite

(Hebrews in marg. *Etsni',* ynæx][, but in the text /nx][, i.e., *Etsno')* is given in <2S 23:8> 2 Samuel 23:8, in the Auth.Vers., as an epithet of Adino, praefect of David's body-guard; and if considered as a gentile adj., must mean an inhabitant of *Ezen,* a place otherwise unknown. But of the words rendered "Adino the Eznite" *(wnx][h;/nyd[}* Sept. Ἀδινὼν οἈσωναῖος; Vulg. *quasi tenerrimus ligni vermiculus,* as if understanding the latter term to be a form of x[e *wood),* Gesenius *(Hebrews Lex.)* regards the former as a peculiar alliteration for /nD[y] in the sense of "he *brandished,"* from the root ^ydæ[; *to be plant;* and the latter as a rare word, ^x,[e a *spear* (for which sense he finds analogy in the Arabic); and thus the whole phrase will be equivalent to that in the parallel passage (<1C 11:11> 1 Chronicles 11:11), which otherwise we must here interpolate (with our translators) in order to make sense. That these words do not contain the name of a person is clear from the fact that Jashobeam is given in the parallel passage, and is capable of identification *SEE JASHOBEAEL,* and also from the enumeration, in which the two meritorius grades of three each, with the 30 warriors specially enumerated, require just this one special officer to make up the number of 37 specified in the text as peculiarly distinguished. *SEE DAVID.* The

passage in 2 Samuel is conceded to be less trustworthy than that in 1 Chronicles, even by Davidson, who vainly contends *(Sacred Hermeneutics*, page 545) for Adino as a proper name. (See at length in Kennicott, *Dissertation*, 1:71-128; Gesenius, *Thes. Hebrews* page 994-5.) *SEE ADINO*.

Ezob

SEE HYSSOP.

Ez'ra

Picture for Ez’ra

(Hebrews [except in] *Ezra'*, ארזע, *the help,* a Chaldee emphatic for *Ezer),* the name of three or four men.

I. (1Ch 4:17 1 Chronicles 4:17.)

II. (Sept. Ἔζρα v.r. Εσδρας) (Vulgate *Esdras*.) A leading priest among the to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (Nehemiah B.C. 536. His son Meshullam was chief of in the time of the high-priest Joiakim (Ne 12:12 Nehemiah 3:12). In the somewhat parallel list of Ne 10:2 Nehemiah 10:2-8, the name of the same person is written הריזע AZARIAH, as it is probably in Ezr 7:1 Ezra 7:1.

III. (Sept. Ἔσδρας v.r. Ἔζρα, Josephus Ἔσδρας,*Vulg. Esdras.)* The celebrated Jewish scribe (רפוס) and priest (הנהכ), who, in the year B.C. 459, led the second expedition of Jews back from the Babylonian exile into Palestine, and the author of one of the canonical books of Scripture.

1. *Parentage.* — Ezra was a lineal descendant from Phinehas, the son of Aaron (Ezr 7:1 Ezra 7:1-5). He is stated to be the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah; which Seraiah was slain at Riblah by order of Nebuchadnezzar, having been brought thither a captive by Nebuzaradan (2Ki 25:18 2 Kings 25:18-21). *SEE SERAIAH*. But, as 130 years elapsed between the death of Seraiah and the departure of Ezra from Babylon, and we read that a grandson of Seraiah was the high-priest who accompanied Zerubbabel on the first return to Jerusalem, seventy years before Ezra returned thither, we may suppose that by the term *son* here, as in some other places, the relationship of great-grandson, or of a still more remote direct descendant,

is intended. *SEE FATHER*. All that is really known of Ezra is contained in the last four chapters of the book of Ezra, and in Nehemiah 8 and 12:26. In addition to the information there given, that he was a "scribe," a "ready scribe of the law of Moses," "a scribe of the words of the commandments of the Lord and of his statutes to Israel," “a scribe of the law of the God of heaven," and "a priest," we are told by Josephus that he was high-priest of the Jews who were left in Babylon; that he was particularly conversant with the laws of Moses, and was held in universal esteem on account of his righteousness and virtue *(Ant.* 11:5, 1).

2. *Scriptural History*. — The rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem, which had been decreed by Cyrus in the year B.C. 536, was, aftei much powerful and vex" atious opposition, completed in the reign and by the permission of Darius Hystaspis, in the year B.C. 517.

The origin of Ezra's influence with the Persian king Artaxerxes Longimanus does not appear, but in the seventh year of his reign, B.C. 459, in spite of the unfavorable report which had been sent by Rehum and Shimshai, he obtained leave to go to Jerusalem, and to take with him a company of Israelites, together with priests, Levites, singers, porters, and Nethinim. Of these a list, amounting to 1754, is given in Ezra 8; and these, also, doubtless form a part of the full list of the returned captives contained in Nehemiah 7, and in duplicate in Ezra 2. Ezra and his companions were allowed to take with them a large free-will offering of gold and silver, and silver vessels, contributed not only by the Babylonian Jews, but by the king himself and his counselors. These offerings were for the house of God, to beautify it, and for the purchase of bullocks, rams, and the other offerings required for the Templeservice. In addition to this, Ezra was empowered to draw upon the king's treasurers beyond the river for any further supplies he might require; and all priests, Levites, and other ministers of the Temple were exemnpted from taxation. Ezra had also authority given him to appoint magistrates and judges in Judaea, with power of life and death over all offenders. The reason of the interest for the worship of God at this time evinced by Artaxerxes appears to have been a fear of the divine displeasure, for we read in the conclusion of the decree to the treasurers beyond the river, "Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven; *for why should there be wrath against the realm of the king and his sons*?" We are also told (Ezra 7:6) that the king granted Ezra all his request; and Josephus informs us that Ezra, being desirous of going to Jerusalem, requested the

king to grant him recommendatory letters to the governor of Syria *(Ant.* 11:5, 1). We may therefore suppose that the dread which Artaxerxes entertained of the divine judgments was the consequence of the exposition to him by Ezra of the history of the Jewish people. Some writers suppose that this favor shown to the Jews was consequent upon the marriage of Esther with Ahasuerus; but this could not be, even if we should grant, what is unlikely, that the Artaxerxes of the book of Ezra and the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther were the same person, because Ezra set out for Jerusalem in the *first* month in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes, and Esther was not taken into the king's house until the *tenth* month in the seventh year of the reign of Ahasuerus, and did not declare her connection with the Jewish people, and obtain favor for them until after the plot of Haman, in the twelfth year of Ahasuerus. *SEE AHASUIRUS.*

Ezra assembled the Jews who accompanied him on the banks of the river Ahava, where they halted three days in tents. Here Ezra proclaimed a fast, as an act of humiliation before God, and a season of prayer for divine direction and safe conduct; for, on setting out, he "was ashamed to require a band of soldiers and horsemen to help them against the enemy by the way," because he had asserted to the king that the hand of his God is upon all them that seek him for good. Ezra next committed the care of the treasures which he carried with him to twelve of the chief priests, assisted by ten of their brethren, appointing these to take charge of the treasures by the way, and deliver them safely in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem. On the twelfth day from their first setting out Ezra and his companions left the river Ahava, ant arrived safely at Jerusalem in the fifth month, having been delivered from the hand of the enemy and of such as lay in wait by the way. Three days aftel their arrival the treasures were weighed and delivered hiato the custody of some Levites. The returning exiles offered burnt-offerings to the Lord. They delivered also the king's commissions to the viceroys and governors, and gave needful help to the people and the ministers of the Temple.

Ezra's ample commission had been granted him at his own request (verse 6), and it appears that his great design was to effect a religious reformation among the Palestinian Jews, and to bring them back to the obserrance of the law of Moses, from which they had grievously declined. His first care, accordingly, was to enforce a separation from theirwives of all who had iade heathen marriages, in which number were many priests and Levites, as well ass other Israelites. For this an. opportunity soon presented itself.

When he had discharged the various trusts comannitted to him, the parincesa of the Jews came to him and complained that the Jewish people generally who had returned from the captivity, and also the priests and Levites but especially the rulers and princes, had not kept themselves sepapate from the people of the land, but had done according to the abominations of the remhant of the nations whom their forefathers had driven out, and married their daughters and allowed their children to intermarry with them. On this report Ezra evinced his deep affliction, according to the Jewish custom, by rending his mantle and tearing the hair of his head and beard. There gathered round him all those who still feared God, and dreaded his wrath for the transgression of those whom he had brought back from captivity. Having waited till the time of time evening sacrifice, Ezra rose up, and, having again rent his hair and his garments, made public prayer and confession of sin. The assembled people wept bitterly, and Shechaniah, one of the sons of Elam, came forward to propose a general covenant to put away the foreign wives and their children. Ezra then arose and administered an oath to the people that they would do accordingly. Proclamation was also made that all those who had returned from the captivity should within three days gather themselves together to Jerusalem, under pain of excommunication and forfeiture of their goods. The people assembled at the time appointed, trembling on account of their sin and of the heavy rain that fell. Ezra addressed them, declaring to them their sin, and exhorting them to amend their lives by dissolving their illegal connections. The people acknowledged the justice of his rebukes, and promised obedience. They then requested that, as the rain fell heavily, and the number of transgressors was great, he would appoint times at which they might severally come to be examined respecting this matter, accompanied by the judges and elders of every city. A commission emas therefore formed, consisting of Ezra and some others, to investigate the extent of the evil. This investigation occupied three months. Josephus relates the affecting scene which occurred on the reading of the law by Ezra (Ant. 11:5, 5). The account given by Josephus agrees with that of Nehemiah in all leading particulars, except that Josephus places the date and occasion in the reign of Xerxes (Ant. 11:5, 1).

With the detailed account of this important transaction Ezra's autobiography ends abruptly, and we hear nothing more of him till, rhejateen was afterwards, in the twentieth of Artaxerses, we find him again at Jerusalem with Nehemiah the "Tirshatha." B.C. 446. It is generally

assumed that Ezra had continued governor till Nehemiah superseded him; but as Ezra's comemission was only of a temporary nature, "to inquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem" (<15>Ezra 7:14), and to carry thither "the silver; and gold which the king and his counselors had freely offered unto the God of Israel" (verse 15), and as there is no trace whatever of his presence at Jerusalem between the eighth and the twentieth of Artaxerses, it seems probable that after he had effected the above-named reformation, and had appointed competent judges and magistrates, with authority to maintain it, he himself returned to the king of Persia. This is in itself what one would expect, and what is borne out by the parallel case of Nehemiah, and it also accounts for the abrupt termination of Ezra's narrative, and for that relapse of the Jews into their former irregularities which is apparent in the book of Nehemiah. Such a relapse, and such a state of affairs at Jerusalem in general, could scarcely have occurred if Ezra had continued there. Whether he returned to Jerusalem with Nehemiah, or separately, does not appear certainly, but as he is not mentioned in Nehemiah's narrative till after the completion of the wall (<16>Nehemiah 8:1), it is perhaps probable that he followed the latter some months later, having, perhaps, been sent for to aid him in his work. The functions he executed under Nehemiah's government were purely of a priestly and ecclesiastical character, such as reading and interpreting the law of Moses to the people during the eight days of the feast of Tabernacles, praying in the congregation, and assisting at the dedication of the wall, and in promoting the religious reformation so happily effected by the Tirshatha. But in such he filled the first place, being repeatedly coupled with Nehemiah the Tiliathba (8:9; 12:26), while Eliashib the high-priest is not mentioned as taking any part in the reformation at all. In the sealing to the covenant described in Nehemiah 10, Ezra perhaps sealed under the patronymic Seraiah or Azariah (verse 2). In Nehemiah we read that, on the occasion of the celebration of feast of the seventh month, subsequently to Nehemiah's numbering the people, Ezra was requested reading the book of the law of Moses; and that he was herein standing upon a pulpit of wood, which rose him above all the people. As Ezra is not mentioned after Nehemiah's departure for Babylon in the thirty-second, of Artaxerxes, and as everything fell into confusion during Nehemiah's absence (Nehemiah 13), it is not unlikely that Ezra may have again returned to Babylon before that year. *SEE NEHEMIAH.*

3. *Traditionary Acts.* — Josephus, who should be our next best authority after Scripture, evidently knew nothing about the time or the place of his death. He vaguely says, "He died an old man, and, was buried in a magnificent manner at Jerusalem" (Ant. 11:5, 5), and places his death in the high-priesthood of Joacim, and before the government of Nehemiah! According to some Jewish chroniclers, he died in the year in which Alexander came to Jerusalem, on the tenth day of the month Tebeth (that is, the lunation in December), in the same yesear in which took place the death of the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, and in which prophecy became extinct. According to other taditions, Ezra returned to Babylon and died there at the age of 120 years. 'The Talmudic statement is that he died at Zamzumu, a town on the Tigris, while on his road from Jerusalem to Susa, whither he was going to converse with Artaxerxes about the affairs of the Jews. Thus Benjamin of Tudela says of Nehar-Samorah (apparently Zamuza, otherwise'Zamzumu): "The sepulcher of Ezra the priest and scribe is in this place, where he died on his journey fromr Jerusalem to king Artaxerxes" *(Travels,* 1:116). A tomb said to be his is siuomin on the Tigris, near its junction with the Euphrates (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* page 428, note). An interesting description of this tomb is given by Kitto *(Pict. Bible,* note at the end of Ezra).

As regards the traditional history of Ezra, it is extremely difficult to judge what portion of it has any historical foundation. The principal works ascribed to him by the Jews, and, on the strength of their testimony, by Christians also, are the following:

(1.) Some traditions assert that Ezra was, about A.M. 0113, the president of the hlwdgh rsnk, *Synagoga Magna*, and the father of all Mishnic doctors. *SEE SYNAGOGUE, GREAT*. In piety and meekness he was hike Moses' *(Yuchasin,* page 13. See *Zeusach David).* When he went from Babylon to Jerusalem, he took with him all persons whose descent was either illegitiemate or unknown, so that the Jews left in Babylon should be tlwsk yqn *pure like flour (Kiddushin,* c. 4, 1, Gem.). Ezmia is said to have introduced the present square Hebrew character, and, in conjunction emith some other elders, to heave made the Masora (q. .), the punctuation, and accentuation of the whole Bible (Abarbanel, *Praefat. ad Nachalath Aboth* Elias, *Praef. 3 Masor.).* Ezra is also said to have vigorously resisted the sect of the Sadducees, which sprang up in his days; and therefore to have put the words ^m µlw[d[µlw[h *a seculo in seculam,* at the head

of all prayers, as a symbol by which the orthodox could be distinguished (Blb. *Berachoth,* fol. 54). Since the people, during the Babylonian captivity or exile, had become accustomed to the Aramaic languages and scarcely understood Hebrew Ezra established the office of turgomtan, wmgryt *dragoman,* or interpreter, ewho stood near the public reader in the synagogue, and translated every verse after it weas read *(Megillah,* fol. 74). Hence he is usually regarded as the founder of the synagogue worship. *SEE SYNAGOGUE*. Ezra ordained that the year of jubilee should be reckoned from the seventh year after the rebuilding of the Temple (Alimnonides, *Hal. Jobel.* cap. 10).

(2.) Ezra is considered to be the author of the canon, and worthy to have been the lawgiver, if Moses had not preceded him (Bab. *Sanhal. c.* 2, f. 21 comp. the art. *SEE CANON*). He is even said to have rewritten the whole of the Old Testament from memory, the copies of which had perished by neglect. To him is also ascribed the authorship of the hooks of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and, some add, Esther; and, many of the Jews say, also of the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve prophets; to which we may with more probability perhaps add the 119th Psalm. (See each book in its place.) Tischendorf has lately published *(Apocalypses Apocrypha,* Lips. 1861-3) an *editio princeps* of the Greek text of an "Apocalypsis Esdem." *SEE REVELATIONS (SPURIOUS).*

But we must abstain from recounting all the traditional amplifications of the doings of Ezra, since, if sin were to be received, it would be difficult to say what he did not do so strong has been the inclination to connect important facts with his person (comp. 2 Esdr. 14; Irenaeus, *adv. Heares.* 3:25; Clem. Alexandr. Strom. 1, page 142, Augustin. *De Mirabil. Script.* 2:23; Jerome, ad *Halrid.* page 212; Buxtorf *Tiberias,* page 88 sq, Bertholdt, Einleit. 1:69 sq.; De Wvette, Einleit. 17 sq.; Sauer, *Dissert. in canonem Vet. Test.* etc., Altorf; 1792; *Sanhedrin,* fol. 21:1; Rau, *De Synag. Magna,* pages 31, 89; Hartmann, *Verbindung des Altensund Neuen Testamentes,* page 114 sq.). Of most of the above acts of Ezra a full account is given in Prideaux's Connexion, 1:308-348, and 355-376; also in Otho's *Lex. Rabb.* page 208 sq. A compendious account of the arguments by which most of these Jewish statements are proved to be fabulous is given in Stehelin's *Rabbin. Literat.* pages 5-8; of which the chief are drawn from the silence of the sacred writers themselveas, of the apocryphal books and of Josephus and it might be added, of Jerome and from the fact that they may be traced to the author of the chapter in the Mishna called *Pirke*

Aboth. Arabian fables about Ezra are mentioned in Hottinger's *Thes. Philo.* page 113, and in Herbelot, *Bibl. Orientale,* pages 697, etc.

Ezra, Book Of

This is manifestly a continuation of the books of Chronicles, as, indeed, it is called by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, *Sermones dierum Esdrae* (ap. Cosin's Canon *of Script.* page 51), and as was early conceded (Huetius, *Dem. Evaen.* 4:14, page 341). *SEE CHRONICLES (BOOKS OF).*

I. *Contents.* — The book of Ezra contains ἀπομνημονεύματα, *memorabilia,* or records of events occurring about the termination of the Babylonian exile. It contains accounts of the favors bestowed upon the Jewms by the Persian kings; of the rebuilding of the Temple; of the mission of Ezra to Jerusalem, and in regulations and reforms. Such records forming the subject of the book of Ezra, we neust not be surprised that its parts are not so intimately connected with each other as we might have expected if the author had set forth his intention to furnish a complete history of his times (see Pebeble, *Persian Monarchy,* in his *storks,* Lond. 1635, page 345). The events narraated. in thee book of Ezra are spread over the reigns of

	Years.	Months.
Cyrus.....	7	0
Cambyses	7	5
Magums, or Pseudo-Sneerdis	0	17
Darius Hystaspis	36	0
Xerxes	190	5
Artaban.....	0	7
Artaxerxes (in the eighth year of whose) reign the records of Ezra tease).	8	0
Total	79	0

The arrangement of the facts in the book of Ezra is chronological. The book may be divided into twoportions. Thefirst consists of chapters 1-6, and contains the history of the returning exiles and of their rebuilding of the Temple, and comprises the period from the first year of Cyrus, B.C. 536, to the sixth year of Darius Hystaspis, B.C. 515. The *second* portion contains the personal history of the migration of Ezra to Palestine, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. This latter portion, embracing chapters 7-10, is

an autobiography of Ezra during about twelve or thirteen months, in the seventh and eighth years of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimantis.

II. Plan. — The course of events recorded in these ten chapters appears to be as follows: First, the decree of king Cyrus, putting an end to the Babylonish captivity, and instructing the returning Israelites to rea build the Temple and restore the worship of Jehovah (Ezra 1). Second, the consequent proceedings of the people (Ezra 2, 3). Third, the hinderances to which they were exposed by the jealousy of the Persian government, stimulated as this was by the hatred of the neighbors of the Jews, until Darius discovered the original decree of Cyrus, and confirmed and, extended it, so that the Temple was fully rebuilt, and the worship restored according to the law (Ezra 4:l-6). Fourth; the mission of Ezra, who was both a priest and a scribe, and was empowered by king Artaxerxes not only to maintain the prescribed worship; but, greatly more than that, to restore the entire theocratic administration only reserving the temporal supremacy of the Persian monarchy (Ezra 7:7). Lastly, the reconstruction of this theocratic state, which Ezra effected so completely that he carried the people with him in remodelling the family relations by the law against intermarriage with certain races (Ezra 9:10).

III. Utility. — This is a complete narrative in itself; and there is no room for the hypothesis that chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, taken together, form one great historical work. The arguments for this hypothesis are of no weight in themselves for establishing the conclusion; but in so far as they are statement of fact, they are willingly put forward by us as circumstances worthy of consideration in themselves, and apart from the illogical purpose to which they have been applied.

1. The three books have a large number of words and phrases in common, which are parts of Scripture. This agrees well with their composition at a new epoch in the history of the Hebrew nation and its literature, by men who had been brought up together at the same Persian court, Ezra and Nehemiah being also most intimate friends and fellow workers. The opinion is also probable that the chronicles were a compied bu Ezra, as well as the book to which his own name has been given.

2. There is a redilection from genealogical details running through all these books. This seems to have been characteristic of the age; and it was probably necessary, considering the efforts to restore the old arrangements

as to the holding of property, the administration of governing, all of which objects were likely to force genealogical questions upon the notice of men.

3. There is a similar prominence given to details about the priests and Levites. This is unavailable in any treatment of the people of Israel, unless their character as the church of God is to be overlooked. Especially, in whatever proportion must the greater attentuion have been given to its ecclestiastical arrangements.

IV. Authgorship. — A late ingeniuos writer (Reverend and Lord Hervey, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v.) thus pronounces on this question: "Like the two books of Chronicles, it consists of the contemporary historical journals kept from time to time by the prophets, or other authorised persons, who were eye witnesses for the most part of what they record, and whose several narratives were afterward strung together, and either abridged or added to as the case required by a later hand. That later hand, in the book of Ezra, was doubtedly Ezra's as put together by him, yet strictly only the last four chapters are his original work. Nor will it be difficult to point out with tolerable certainty several of the writers of whose writings the first six chapters are composed. Accordingly, that writer, in limitation of any relationship proceeds to dissect the book for this purpose. He regards as a parenthetic addition made in the reign of Artaxerxes Ezra's own production. A still later critic (Dr. Davidson in the new edition of Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Bible Lit s.v.) is even bolder in distributing various portions to "the Chronist" as he designates the unkown interpolater after Ezra.

It is a sufficient refutation of all such attempts to note their extremely subjective character, depending chiefly upon the caprice or conjecture of the critic himself; for the peculiarities cited, when closely examined, are found to be too general and accidental to be relied uponas proofs of authorship, especially in view of the foregoing remarksrespecting the scheme of the book. Moreover, if all admit, Ezra did incorporateolder documents into his history (so even Mosesdoes in the Pentateuch), yet, as he moulded them into a homogenous narrative, this does not mitigate against his claim to be regarded as the proper author, and not simply as the editor of the book ythat bears his name. (See the Einleitungen of Havernick and Keil.)

V. Personality of the Writer. — In the first six chapters the use of the third person predominates in the narrative, except in passages where, by synecdoche, occurs anrma, Hebrews wnrma we said, or where the narrative contains abstracts from documents to which Ezra had access. In these abstracts the Aramiac or Chaldee language of the original documents has been preserved from <151408>Ezra 4:8 to 6:8 and <151712>Ezra 7:12-26. These portions exist in Kennicott's Cod page 240, in a collateral Hebrew translation, reprinted in Knnicott's edition of the Hebrew Bible, and separately in Chaldaicorum Danielis et Eraroe capitum interpretatio Hebraica (Ludovicus Schulze, Halae, 1782, 8vo). An argument has been raised against the opinion that Ezra wasd the author of the whole book that bears his name from the use of the first person pluralin the 4th verse of the 5th chapter, which would seem to imply that the narrative was present on the occasion described; but, setting aside other replies to this argument, it appears that the word we refers to Tatnai and his companions, and not at all to the Jews.Ezra speaks from <151727>Ezra 7:27, to <151915>Ezra 9:15, in the first person. "There is an essential difference between public events which a man recollects, though only as in a dream, to have heard of at the time when they occurred, and those which preceeded his birth. The former we think of with reference to ourselves, the latter are foreign to us. The epoch and duration of the former we measure by our own life; the latter belong to a period for which our imagination has no scale. Life and definiteness are imparted to all that we hear or read with respect to the events of our own life." (Niebuhr, On the distincton between Annals and History). These remarks, which Niebuhr made in reference to Tacitus, are in a great measure applicable also to Ezra. Instances of similar change of person are so frequent in ancient authors that rhewtorians have introduced it among the rhetorical figures under the name of enallages personarum. The prophetical writings of the Old Testament furnish examples of such ἐναλλαγή. For instance, <260101>Ezekiel 1:1-3; <380101>Zechariah 1:1; 6:1; 7:1, 4:8; <240201>Jeremiah 20:1 sq., comp. with 5:7 sq.; 21:1; 28:1-5; 32:1-8; <280102>Hosea 1:2-3; 3:1. So also in Habakkuk, Daniel, etc. The frequency of this ἐναλλαγή especially in the prophetical parts of the Old Testament, arises from either the more objective or more subjective tendency of the style, which of course varies with the contents of the chapter. (See Fromman, Disq. Qua Orientis regibus plurium numero de se loque non inusitatum fuisse, probabiliter ostenditur, Cob. 1762). We express our opinion that even Havernick does not rightly set forth the truth of the matter when, in the Einleitung, he says that this ἐναλλαγή arose from Ezra's imitationof

the prophetic usage, and when he approvingly quotes Schirmer's Observationes exegeticoe et criticoe in librum Esdroem 2:8 (Vratisl. 1830). There was certainly as little imitation of the prophets if we change from the first to the third person in our own communications. Ἐναλλαγή never arises from imitation but only from imitation, but only from the more subjective or more objective turn of our mind, and from that vivacity of style which renders it incumbent upon the reader rather than upon the writer to supply that rm;aOwl, which, as in <320203>Jonah 2:3, forms the transition from the use of the third to the adoption of the first person.

VI. Date. — The reckless assertions of some writers that this composition as a whole must be referred to a period about a century later the Ezra, or more, need not be noticed, because they have not even a pretense of argument in their favor. One writer, Zunz (*Die gottesdienstl. Vortrage der Juden*, 1832), has indeed alleged that there is some exaggeration about the sacred vessels said to have been restored by Cyrus; but his fellow-unbelievers have refused to agree with him, and have defended the historical credibility of the book throughout. Another critic, Bertheau, sees an evidence of the composition of <150622>Ezra 6:22 under the Greek successors of Alexander, because the king of Persia is called the king of Assyria; an argument which might have been left to its own weakness, even though we had been unable to give the parallels <122329>2 Kings 23:29; <250506>Lamentations 5:6, as Keil has done.

On the contrary, critics who rely upon their internal arguments might have seen evidence in favor of its early composition in the fact that its chronology is clear and exact; while the accounts of Jewish affairs under the Persian monarchy, a given by Josephus from apocryphal writers and other sources unknown to us, present extreme confusion and some palpable mistakes. The book begins with the decree to rebuild the Temple, B.C. 536. It narrates the difficulties and hinderances before this was accomplished in the sixth year of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, about B.C. 516. It passes in silence over the rest of his reign, 31 years, and the whole of the reign of Xerxes, 21 years, proceeding directly to the work of Ezra, who received his commission in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C.459. If the whole of the events narrated in the closing chapter took place almost immediately, as is understood, we believe, by all commentators, then the extreme length of time embraced in the narrative is not above 80 years; and the order is strictly chronological, though it is not

continuous, but leaves a blank of almost sixty years. (See Hilgenfeld, *Ezra und Daniel, und ihre neueste Bearbeitungen*, Halle, 1863.)

VII. Language. — The book is written partly in Hebrew and partly in Chaldee. The Chaldee begins at <1948>Ezra 4:8, and continues to the end of <1968>Ezra 6:18. The letter or decree of Artaxerxes, <1972>Ezra 7:12-26, is also given in the original Chaldee.

VIII. Canonicity. — There has never been any doubt about Ezra being canonical, although there is no quotation form it in the New Testament. Augustine styles Ezra "rather a writer of transactions than a prophet" (De Cix. Dei, 18:36).

IX. Apocryphal Additions. — We have spoken thus far of the canonical book of Ezra; there are, however, four books that have received this name, viz, the book noticed above, the only one which was received into the Hebrew canon under that name, the book of Nehemiah, and the two apocryphal books of Esdras, concerning which last *SEE ESDRAS.*

X. Commentaries. — The following are special exegetical works on the entire book, the most important being denoted by an asterisk (*) prefixed: *Aben Ezra, vWrPe(in Buxtorfs Rabbinical Bible, Basle, 1618-19 fol.); Bede, Erposito (in Works, 8:360); *Rashi, vWrPe(Naples, 1487, 4to; Venice, 1517, fol.; in Latin, with other books, Goltha, 1714, 4to); *Kimchi, vWrPe(in Bomberg's *Rabbinical Bible*, Ven. 1549, fol.); Simeon, vYrPe(in the Bible, Venice, 1518, fol.); Jachya, vWrPe(Bologna, 1538, fol.); Jaabez, trwT dsj,(Belvedere, n.d. fol.); Trapp, *Commentary* (London, 1656, fol.); De Oliva, *Commentarii* (Leyden, 1564, 4to; 1679, 2 volumes, fol.); *Strigel, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1570, 1584, fol.); also Scholia (Lips.1571); Wolphius, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1584, fol.); Sanctius, *Commentarii* (Leyd. 1628, fol.); Lombard, *Commentarius* (Par. 1643, fol.); Jackson, *Explanation* (London, 1658, 4to); Lee, *Discourse* (London, 1722, 8vo); *Rambach, *Notae* (in Grotii et Clerici Adnot. in Hagiogri); *Schirmer, *Observationes* (Vratislav. 1817, 8vo; 1820, 450); *Keil, *Apologet*. Vers. etc. (Berl. 1833, 8vo); Kleinert, *Enstehung*, etc. (in the Dorpt. Beitr. 1:1-304; 2:1-232); Jeitteles, arz][, etc. (Vienna, 1835, 8vo); *Bertheau, *Erklar*. (in the Kurzgef. Exeg. Hdb. Lpz. 1862, 8vo).

4. (Sept. Ἔζρα v.r. Ἔσδρας, Vulg. Esdras.) One of the chief Israelites who formed the first division that made the circuit of the walls of Jerusalem when reconstructed (Nehemiah 12:33). B.C. 446.

Ezrach

SEE BAY-TREE.

Ez’rah

(Hebrews Ezrah, חרזע, help, another form of Ezer or Ezra; Sept. Ἐσρί, Vulg. Ezra, A.V. “Ezra”), a descendant of Judah (as if in the line of Caleb), and the father of several sons, although his own parentage is not given (1 Chronicles 4:17), unless he be identical with the Ezer of verse 4, whose son’s name, however, does not correspond. B.C. ante 1618. *SEE MERED.* According to the author of the Quoesliones in Paral. Ezra is the same as Amram, and his sons Jether and Mered are Aaron and Moses; but this is cut of the question. *SEE EZRAHITE*.

Ez’rahite

(Hebrew, with the article ha-Ezrach יחרזה; as if a patronymic from Ezrach; Sept. ὁ Ζαρίτης v.r. οἘζραηλίτης, Vulg. Ezrohita), a title attached to two persons — Ethan (1 Kings 4:31; Psalm 89, title) and Heman (Psalm 88, title). The word is naturally derivable from Ezrah, זרח, or which is almost the same — Zerah, זרי; and accordingly in 1 Chronicles 2:6, Ehan and Heman are both given as sons of Zerah, the son of Judah. Another Ethan and another Heman are named as Levites and musicians in the lists of 1 Chronicles 6 and elsewhere. — Smith, s.v. In the passage first cited, “the Ezrabite,” or, rather, Ezrachite, appears as a designation applied to Ethan, a man famous for his wisdom (1 kings 5:11 [A. V. 4:31]). *SEE ETHAN*. In the inscription of Psalm 89, Ethan the Ezrahite is named as its author; and in the inscription of Isaiah 98 the same is said with respect to it of Heman the Ezrahite. This has led some to identify the Ethan and Heman, who were chief among the singers appointed by David (1 Chronicles 15:19). But we have no reason to believe that, whatever skill these men had in music, they were famed for surpassing wisdom; and the inscription in Psalms is perhaps due to the mistake of some one in whose mind the passage in Kings had got mixed up with 1 Chronicles 2:6, where Ethan and Heman appear among the sons

of Zerah of the tribe of Judah. As yhrza is the same as yhrz with the prosthetic a, it is not improbable that in this last passage it is the Ethan of Kings that is referred to; but we cannot with certainty pronounce this, as there is a want of accordance between the statement of the chronicler and that is Kings respecting the parentage of the other persons mentioned. It is not impossible, however, that the names “Heman, Calcol, and Dara” have been interpolated in the text of Chronicles form the passage in Kings, especially as the writer goes on to state only the descendants of Carmi or Zimri and Ethan (verses 7, 8). In this case Ethan, the son of Zerah, may be Ethan the Ezrahite; but there is no Heman the Ezrahite. — Kitte, S.V. A readier solution of the whole difficulty would be to suppose that "Ezrahite" in the title to Psalm 88 is merely an orthographical variety for IZHARITE (yrhæxiyæ 1362 1 Chronicles 26:23), a Levitical family to which the musical Heman certainly belonged (1013 1 Chronicles 1:33-38); and that the epithet has crept into the title of Psalm 89 by assimilation of the names of Ethan and Heman so frequently associated together (these two Psalms being apparently closely related in authorship, and perhaps originally joined together; set Delitzsch, *Commentar fib. den Psalter*, 1:653 sq.). *SEE ZARHITE*.

Ez'ri

(Hebrews *Ezri'*, yrzi, *helpful;* Sept. Ἐσδρί v.r. Ἐζραΐ, Vulg. *Ezri)*, son of Chelub, superintendent for king David of those “who did the work of the field for tillage of the ground" (1276 1 Chronicles 27:26). B.C. 1014.